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INTRODUCTION

Summary of research findings
This project aimed to identify:
1. the prevalence of technologically-facilitated sexual assault and violence (TFSAV) amongst current SECASA clients and
2. whether this information could be captured in an ongoing fashion.

Method
Counsellor/advocates were asked to complete paper surveys identifying client experiences of technologically-facilitated assault and violence.

Findings
- Almost half of SECASA clients surveyed (45.4%) reported that technology has been used to make them feel unsafe, uneasy or uncomfortable
- Technology is predominantly being used to harass, coerce and control clients
- Mobile phones are the most common device through which SECASA clients are experiencing TFSAV

Recommendations
- Explore options regarding the method in which future data is captured
- Conduct Professional Development for staff on:
  1. Developing awareness of TFSAV
  2. Supporting clients experiencing this form of abuse and/or violence

Applying the data
Data taken from the SECASA database indicates that, in the twelve month period from September 2013 – September 2014, SECASA assisted 3355 clients, an average of 280 clients per month. Taking into account the number of clients whose views were captured in the survey total 163, the assumption can be made that this project gives a reasonable snapshot of client circumstances. If we apply the finding of the survey to the statistics above (45.4% of 3355), as many as 1523 clients may have been victim/survivors of technologically-facilitated sexual assault and violence in the space of a year.
Project background

SECASA has a long history of utilising online technology to promote support and services for victim/survivors and to engage in community awareness around issues such as sexual assault and family violence (CASA Forum 2014, p. 41).

In so far as technology has allowed SECASA to extend support to a broad range of clients, stakeholders and services, technology is also increasingly being used to perpetrate violence. Researchers have long decried the lack of formalised data to capture the extent and prevalence of this issue (Southworth et al. 2005; Woodlock 2013, p.8).

Anecdotally, the number of SECASA clients who have indicated that technology has been used to make them feel unsafe, uneasy or uncomfortable is increasing. Given the subtle and pervasive ways in which technology can be used to exert power and control, and the ever-increasing capacity of technology to do so, the prevalence of such experiences is likely to continue to grow.

It is expected that this trend will continue because:

- Technology is an increasingly prevalent component of our day-to-day lives
- Victims are becoming more aware of this issue itself, and the way in which technology can be used to facilitate sexual assault and violence
- Perpetrators of sexual assault and violence are becoming increasingly technologically-savvy
- The range of technological products, their decreased cost and the increased ease of use make them more readily available.

Prior to the launch of this project, client experiences of TFSAV were not formally documented. The ability to capture these statistics gives SECASA the opportunity to create awareness around this issue and use the information to inform future resource development for staff and support for clients.
Aims
The two questions central to the research project were “To what extent are current SECASA clients experiencing TFSAV?” and “How can we capture this data continuously?”

Method
The main method by which this data was captured was through the use of paper surveys, in addition to liaising with an advisory group and conducting meetings with staff. The timeline of the process was as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>September - October 2014</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• considered topic and research design</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• discussed with key stake holders at area meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• formed survey advisory group to conduct pretesting and pilot testing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• conducted a review of literature around technologically facilitated assault and violence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• considered concepts and variables in survey design</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• developed two separate surveys: one for counsellor/advocates, one for the duty workers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• tested adaptations of the survey across one site and for ‘duty’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• finalised survey design</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>October - November 2014</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• launch the project via email (with supporting documentation and electronic copy of the survey)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• hand out paper surveys</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• formal launch to cross-site colleagues at staff team day</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• liaise with staff on a weekly basis with updates, reminders and FAQs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• collect data from counsellors (both on-site and at intake) over a four-week period – from 27th October – 21st November</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>November - December 2014</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• collate, analyse and evaluate data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• present data and preliminary findings at Management meeting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• write report - documenting findings and recommendations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• present findings</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Given the time constraints and the current organisational climate, it was decided that undertaking research via a paper survey would deliver the most relevant and detailed information in the time available.

The survey was designed to be easy and achievable and allow counsellor/advocates the opportunity to include qualitative information in support of their closed responses if they so desired.
Both variations of the survey – duty and counsellor/advocate - were shaped through consultation and testing of surveys. Consultation was sought regarding the format, structure and language of both surveys.

The decision to conduct the survey on paper, as opposed to using an online survey tool, was made in conjunction with the advisory group of counsellor/advocates who also conducted pre-testing of the surveys. The explanatory fact sheet which accompanied the initial email introducing the survey was also created in consultation with staff.

In response to concerns expressed in the advisory group, counsellor/advocates were given the option to opt-out of asking their client/s to participate if they felt that this would adversely affect the victim/survivor or if it would in some way jeopardise the integrity of the counselling session. The survey design allowed the counsellor/advocates to capture this on their forms so as to protect the integrity of the statistics gathered.

At all stages of the research, client and counsellor details were kept confidential. As some counsellor/advocates chose to complete their survey weekly, while others chose to only complete one survey at the end of the four-week survey period, completed documents were stored securely for the duration of the project and surveys were examined as a whole at the conclusion of that period.
FINDINGS

Summary: on-site counsellor/advocate survey

Counsellor/advocates were given the option to complete the survey on a weekly basis, or to collate their data and present one survey at the end of the data collection period.

Given the higher number of clients to be surveyed by each counsellor over this period, a filter question as part of the semi-structured prompts and an opt-out option were included in this version. The majority of returned forms contained a mixture of clients who declined to participate in the survey, or whom the counsellor decided to not ask, as well as those clients who agreed to participate.

Of the 299 clients seen, 163 responded to the survey questions.

The vast majority of the data collected by on-site counsellors came from the East Bentleigh site. Counsellors from PENSAC at Seaford also made a contribution to the collection of data. The Dandenong site had only the contribution of one counsellor to add to the project. The cohort of clients captured is significant as the Dandenong and Seaford sites have a more culturally and linguistically diverse population, see more survivors of family violence and have a generally younger client group. The majority of clients seen at the East Bentleigh site are survivors of childhood sexual assault and are an older client cohort, who may not have had the exposure to technology to the same extent as clients from the other sites.

The majority of surveys returned to the project team were at the end of the final week, suggesting that counsellor/advocates either kept their own records for the duration of the survey period, or consulted case notes to complete their surveys. Feedback from counsellors suggest that having little time to undertake the survey, in addition to the deadline being quite rigid, impacted upon their ability to contribute to the project data.

Several counsellors identified that they had no need to ask questions of their clients as directed by the survey; some stated they already knew of the role of technology in their client's story, others identified making presumptions based on what they knew of the client and their relationship with technology.

Unique to the counsellor/advocate surveys, some staff used the comments section to provide further qualitative or qualifying information. One counsellor, in addition to completing the survey, created her own table in which she laid out each (de-identified) client's response.

One counsellor went to great lengths to stipulate that while several clients acknowledged the role of technology in previous assaults and experiences of violence, this was separate to the reason that they were attending sessions at SECASA and not sexually motivated in nature.
The deliberately broad scope of the survey also meant that clients had identified such instances as ‘financial scam’ under the section relating to ‘unwanted data’, which was captured and noted by counsellors. There was a deliberate decision made to not define the terms and fields that appeared on the survey itself. By allowing counsellors and clients to be subjective in their interpretations of what constitutes ‘violence’, there was scope for the context of each unique client experience to be captured.

Despite some unexpected anomalies, the large number of client views captured in this host of surveys arguably gives a greater insight into the prevalence of this issue for current SECASA clients.

**The key statistics:**

**45.4% of clients surveyed on-site feel that technology has been used in a way that has made them feel unsafe, uneasy or uncomfortable**

Clients seen: 299
Clients who were not asked, or who declined to participate: 136
Survey pool: 163
Clients reporting technologically-facilitated sexual assault and violence: 74

**Client perceptions of ways in which technology had been used:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Harass</th>
<th>Coerce/control</th>
<th>Restrict</th>
<th>Track</th>
<th>Capture pics</th>
<th>Distribute pics</th>
<th>Receive unwanted/explicit images</th>
<th>Impersonate them</th>
<th>Other (threaten)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>33.7%</td>
<td>25.8%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>7.9%</td>
<td>10.1%</td>
<td>6.7%</td>
<td>4.5%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>2.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Type of technological device used:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mobile</th>
<th>Computer</th>
<th>Camera</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>67.7%</td>
<td>23.1%</td>
<td>9.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Technological platform used:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Social network</th>
<th>Email</th>
<th>Text</th>
<th>Website/app</th>
<th>Phone</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>23.4%</td>
<td>12.5%</td>
<td>42.2%</td>
<td>4.7%</td>
<td>17.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
DISCUSSION

Post-survey feedback and challenges

The organisational climate in which the project was conducted posed a significant challenge to the completion of the project. For some staff, the launch of the project coincided with them being unable to access their emails, preventing them from starting the collection of data alongside colleagues at other sites. Because counsellor/advocates from two of the sites were in the process of moving in the same week as the launch of the project, computers were difficult to access and information regarding the project was difficult to disseminate. Some regular clients were unable to attend appointments because of these changes and, additionally, the emotional stress of moving may have also had an impact upon counsellor/advocate willingness to participate in the project.

Staff perception of the size of their workload may also have impacted upon the ability of some counsellor/advocates to participate in the project. In the early advisory group sessions, staff spoke of their concern regarding the time it would take to log on to a computer to enter the results from each week. They advocated for a paper based survey so as to speed up that process. In that same group, each version of the survey was tested to ensure it was as simple, efficient and purposeful as possible so as to obtain results with as small an intrusion into the workload of counsellor/advocates as possible.

In a further attempt to ensure the survey was as brief and as simple, but effective, as possible, a similar but shorter duty survey was developed as a point of comparison to the counsellor/advocate survey. Given the busy and unpredictable nature of the Crisis Care Unit, also known as duty, it was decided that the survey undertaken in those conditions would be an interesting addition to the study but it would not be compulsory and nor would the counsellors need to double up on that information in both of their surveys. The difficulties of conducting the duty survey lay in the fact that a different counsellor is rostered each day and that the calls received usually involve historical childhood sexual assault or a crisis call, both of which are unlikely to involve TFSAV. The project team hypothesised that the results for the duty survey would be far lower than those found in the general counsellor/advocate survey, and the data supports the anecdotal evidence on which that hypothesis was formed (for duty survey results, see Appendix).

Further to the way in which organisational challenges impacted upon the survey and the project itself, counsellor/advocates and SECASA management were asked to provide feedback regarding the nature of the project and the way in which it was undertaken.

The majority of staff interviewed acknowledged that it was important that this data was captured so that there is an evidence base on which to inform further research and any resulting changes to practice. Staff were not surprised at the percentage of clients who report having experienced technologically-facilitated sexual assault and violence and the anecdotal evidence which formed the basis of this project was similar to the evidence-based results from the project.

The survey advisory group suggested that the results would demonstrate the mobile phones were the means by which much of the TFSAV would take place, and the findings
support that prediction. Staff were also not surprised to learn that clients felt that information communication technologies were being used to harass, control and coerce, facilitated via text messaging and social media more frequently than other platforms.

Staff had varying preferences regarding multiple facets of the project; the way in which the project should be conducted as a whole, details regarding the format and medium by which the survey was presented and concerns over the length of the survey period were discussed at great length in the beginning phases of the project. As far as possible, the project team developed and conducted the survey in line with the suggestions of the majority of the advisory group.

Some staff report feeling challenged by the content of the survey. Some staff have suggested that the strong resistance amongst some counsellors to the survey could perhaps be attributed to a fear of ‘new technology’. This is supported by the comments of a counsellor who stated that they had no issue with the project itself, but felt that by opening up the topic with clients, they would not have the necessary technological knowledge to be able to adequately address the resulting issues. Despite providing counsellor/advocates with an appendix of the most common forms of technologically-facilitated sexual assault and violence prior to the survey period beginning, it is clear that there remains a level of unease amongst counsellors regarding their capacity to explore this area with their clients.

In informal discussions with staff across the sites following the completion of the surveys, several questions were asked of counsellors in order to ascertain feedback about their feelings towards the project as a whole. Staff were asked:
- Did you complete the surveys? Why/why not?
- What changes could be made to the project to make it more relevant?
- Do you have any suggestions about how we collect this data?

Staff responses included:
- Not relevant for my clients
- I did ask but they didn’t experience any so didn’t think that was relevant to include that on the survey form
- I didn’t want to push them, they were in crisis
- I had a lot of new clients and wanted to get to know them before asking about this
- Having to take this to a session when I had my own things that I had planned did not fit well in my sessions
- I did not ask any of my clients. It was not relevant to the cases I had. It is not why they have come to see me
- I didn’t fill it out as I didn’t have any clients at that time

Many of these concerns had been discussed in the initial sessions with the advisory group and it was clear that counsellors were concerned that introducing this material may impact upon the nature of the work within the counselling session. The additional notes provided to counsellors, the frequently asked questions (FAQ) document emailed to all counsellors and the launch of the surveys all contained information supporting the integrity of the counselling process. It was made clear that counsellors were under no
obligation to ask clients to participate in the survey and were discouraged to do so if clients were experiencing a crisis situation.

Though some counsellors declined to ask clients to participate in the survey because they thought that it was not relevant to their clients, there were several who were surprised to learn that some of their clients had been impacted by the use of technology, but had just never thought to ask their client about it.

Some of the positive feedback provided by staff included:

- It was good having them in the counselling rooms as it was a good reminder
- I think it's really important that we capture this information
- I never thought so many of my clients would have encountered this issue

The location of the paper surveys was a much-discussed topic across the SECASA sites. Whereas the counsellors at East Bentleigh chose to keep their surveys with them in their diaries, or at their desks, for them to fill out as they saw fit, the staff at Dandenong and Seaford felt it was more appropriate for the surveys to be located in each counselling room. The poor submission rate from the two larger sites suggests that it was perhaps beneficial for counsellors to complete the survey sheet following a counselling session but many of the staff felt that the data collection method was inflexible and not suitable for all counsellors or circumstances.

Some suggestions about the way in which the data could be captured in an ongoing fashion included:

- Maybe include something on the intake assessment form. It's the place we gather information about the client us the 'first session assessment' form
- Counsellors could fill out a form and then send a referral to the Cyber team for support and/or resources as required
- Put surveys into the waiting rooms and have reception ask clients to fill out while they are waiting
- Clients like to contribute so we should get them do it if they want
- Do an online version. A paper survey was too easy to lose

Discussion regarding the capturing of ongoing statistics relating to TFSAV, informally and at a management meeting, generated several ideas. The majority of staff who were asked support the idea that, in order to continue to gather statistics about this issue, including a section on the intake or assessment forms would be a quick, feasible and non-threatening way to capture these statistics. Material, in the form of posters/fact sheets regarding this issue in counselling rooms and/or reception areas of SECASA will also highlight the importance of the issue to staff and clients alike and help generate discussion. Counsellors have also suggested that clients may be able to take a more active role in the collection of data by being presented with the option of completing a survey (either in the waiting room or in the form of a take-home survey) independent of counsellor questions in a session.

Another suggestion amongst staff was to enlist a group of counsellors to become 'knowledge partners'. These staff would volunteer to be part of a team of counsellors interested in completing the survey on an ongoing basis and be across all sites so as to represent the different client cohorts as previously discussed.
The multifaceted approach to collecting the data in an ongoing fashion is related to the distinct lack of data regarding TFSAV. While the Domestic Violence Resource Centre Victoria (DVRCV) conducted research into the prevalence of technologically-facilitated violence in the context of family violence last year (Woodlock, 2013), the literature review conducted as part of this project could find no other study that examines the prevalence of TFSAV. Academic literature recognises the breadth of the issue, but fails to address the changes amongst relevant organisations needed to address this issue.

SECASA, as a result of the data captured from the survey, now has a greater understanding of the methods and modes of TFSAV affecting their client group. There is a greater recognition amongst staff that information communication technologies are being used in family violence and sexual assault situations. Armed with that knowledge, SECASA is committed to continuing to capture this data and to work with staff to identify ways in which to best support clients experiencing TFSAV. Professional development experiences, opportunities to consult on a needs-based and case-by-case basis with the cyber team and a broader awareness and understanding of TFSAV will expand the resources of SECASA to address this issue.
**Recommendations**

In light of the feedback and challenges noted, and in response to discussions with the cyber outreach team and SECASA management, the following recommendations are made:

1. Further education for counsellor/advocates regarding the types and prevalence of technologically-facilitated sexual assault and violence, including how to raise the subject with, and provide support for, clients.

2. The construction of a team of knowledge partners who are willing to provide qualitative and/or quantitative feedback on a regular basis regarding this issue.

3. That clients are invited to participate directly in the capture of this data by partaking in a written survey developed specifically for survivors of TFSAV.

4. The creation of posters/fact sheets which are SECASA specific and address the use of technology as a way of facilitating violence. These could be placed in counselling or waiting rooms, in addition to a copy being made available via the SECASA website as a way of awareness-raising.

5. The inclusion of a question, specific to TFSAV, on the intake and/or first session assessment forms.
CONCLUSION

The project to determine the extent to which current SECASA clients have experienced technologically-facilitated sexual assault or violence has demonstrated that this issue is as prevalent as the anecdotal evidence suggests.

Almost half (45.4%) of the clients who participated in the paper survey (74 of 163) reported that technology had been used to make them feel unsafe, uneasy or uncomfortable.

A fear of not ‘knowing enough’, in addition to organisational and structural issues beyond the control of the staff, contributed to a smaller sample size than hoped for, but the percentage of clients for whom TFSAV was a concern is significant enough to warrant further exploration of the issue.

One of the key outcomes from the survey was the growing recognition by SECASA staff that this is an important, prevalent issue. Further training and specific professional development opportunities in this area is something the management team feel might be beneficial to staff.

Promotion of the issue via posters or pamphlets, as well as giving clients the opportunity to actively participate in the data collection could also be a way in which this topic could continue to be addressed.

A flexible approach to data collection, via a number of different collection instruments, may encourage counsellor and client participation in the survey.

Providing a field in which to record experiences of TFSAV on the SECASA initial assessment form could afford counsellors a simple and easy way in which to record any such cases, and this information may then be passed to the cyber team for review and support.

Being able to provide an evidence base for the anecdotes about technologically-facilitated sexual assault and violence now allows SECASA to more closely examine the issue with the hope of further educating and supporting both counsellors and clients who are survivors of TFSAV.
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APPENDIX

Counsellor project overview and appendix

Current client experiences of technologically-facilitated sexual assault and violence

SECASA Project Overview

Task:
To capture the extent to which current SECASA clients have experienced technologically-facilitated sexual assault or violence and develop a way in which to continuously capture this data.

Research objectives:
A number of objectives have been established as part of the project and are detailed as follows:
- explore the extent to which current clients are exposed to technology in a way that makes them feel unsafe, uneasy or uncomfortable;
- determine how the technology is being used to facilitate assault and/or violence;
- establish a method whereby this data is continuously captured.

Background to the project:
Anecdotally, the number of SECASA clients who have indicated that technology has been used to make them feel unsafe, uneasy or uncomfortable is increasing. Given the subtle and pervasive ways in which technology can be used to exert power and control, and the ever-increasing capacity of technology to do so, the prevalence of such experiences is likely to continue to grow.

Currently, client experiences of technologically-facilitated sexual assault or violence are not formally documented. The ability to capture these statistics will give SECASA the opportunity to create awareness around this issue and use the information to inform future resource development for staff and clients.

Methodology:
Over the period of four weeks, counsellors will be invited to ask questions of each unique client regarding technologically-facilitated assault and/or violence. At the end of each week over this period, counsellors will be asked to complete a brief survey based on the responses they receive to these questions.

The data will be collated and analysed and the results of the project will be presented in a formal report, to be released in December 2014.

Please note: Counsellors may decline the invitation to pose the research questions to clients, dependent upon the circumstances of the session. Clients may also wish to decline to answer the questions and there will be the opportunity for counsellors to record this in the survey.

Examples of possible questions to elicit information from clients

- Has anybody ever used technology (i.e. phones/internet/email/social media, etc.) to make you feel unsafe, uneasy or uncomfortable?
- How was technology used to make you feel unsafe, uneasy or uncomfortable?

---

1 Please see ‘Appendix A: What is Technologically-Facilitated Sexual Assault and/or Violence?’
Appendix A

‘What is Technologically-facilitated sexual assault and violence?’

The Australian Institute of Family Studies\(^2\) and the Domestic Violence Prevention Centre (Gold Coast)\(^3\) have identified a multitude of ways in which technology can be used to facilitate sexual assault and violence. These include, but are not limited to:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Before</th>
<th>During</th>
<th>After</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Using technology to increase access to others</td>
<td>• Recording of assault for possible future distribution</td>
<td>• Threatening to distribute or upload image or video to threaten or coerce</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Using technology to hasten the trust-building process (online grooming/dating)</td>
<td>• Sending of constant, persistent questions, messages or threats</td>
<td>• Distribution of an image or video with the intent to threaten or coerce</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Sending of unwanted and explicit messages, videos or images</td>
<td>• Using technology to cause emotional harm following a relationship/breakup/encounter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Unwanted monitoring or controlling of a technological device</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Technologically-facilitated sexual assault and violence – Counsellor/Advocate Survey

How many unique clients have you seen during the period of this survey? Start: ___ / ___ / 2014 Finish: ___ / ___ / 2014

How many of those clients indicated that technology had been used to make them feel unsafe, uneasy or uncomfortable?

How many clients did you NOT ask, or whom declined to participate?

Of the clients who participated, how MANY indicated that technology had been used in the following ways? (Please indicate all that apply)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Harass</th>
<th>Control and/or coerce</th>
<th>Restrict</th>
<th>Track</th>
<th>Capture photos of them</th>
<th>Distribute photos of them</th>
<th>Send unwanted or explicit data</th>
<th>Impersonate them</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Other/s (please specify): ____________________________________________________________

Of the clients that participated, how MANY identified that the following devices were used to make them feel this way? (Please indicate all that apply)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mobile phone</th>
<th>Computer</th>
<th>Camera</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Other/s (please specify): ____________________________________________________________

Of the clients that participated, how MANY identified the following platforms as ways in which this was facilitated? (Please indicate all that apply)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Social networking</th>
<th>Email</th>
<th>Text message/SMS</th>
<th>Websites/apps</th>
<th>Phone</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Other (please specify): ___________________________________________________________________

Comments:
Technologically-facilitated sexual assault and violence – Duty Survey

How many callers have you spoken to today?  

How many of the callers indicated that technology had been used to make them feel unsafe, uneasy or uncomfortable?  

Of those, how many indicated that technology had been used in the following ways? (Please indicate all that apply)  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Harass</th>
<th>Control /coerce</th>
<th>Restrict</th>
<th>Track</th>
<th>Capture photos of them</th>
<th>Distribute photos of them</th>
<th>Send unwanted or explicit data</th>
<th>Impersonate them</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Other (please specify):  

How many identified that the following device/s was used to make them feel this way? (Please indicate all that apply)  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mobile phone</th>
<th>Computer</th>
<th>Camera</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Other (please specify):  

How many identified the following platforms as ways in which this was facilitated? (Please indicate all that apply)  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Social networking</th>
<th>Email</th>
<th>Text message/SMS</th>
<th>Websites/apps</th>
<th>Phone</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Other (please specify):  

Comments:
Summary: duty survey

The findings from the data captured on ‘duty’, the intake service for SECASA, were:
1. significantly lower than the overall total;
2. the number of clients who were asked about TFSAV was also lower than anticipated.

Of the 20 duty shifts across the survey period, on only 6 occasions were clients asked to participate in the survey; just over 33% of clients were asked their views.

The key statistics:
9.25% of clients surveyed via duty feel that technology has been used in a way that has made them feel unsafe, uneasy or uncomfortable

Callers surveyed: 54
Callers reporting technologically-facilitated sexual assault or violence: 5

Client perceptions of ways in which technology had been used:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Harass</th>
<th>Coerce/control</th>
<th>Restrict</th>
<th>Track</th>
<th>Capture pics</th>
<th>Distribute pics</th>
<th>Receive unwanted/explicit images</th>
<th>Impersonate them</th>
<th>Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>16.7%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>16.7%</td>
<td>16.7%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Type of technological device used:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mobile</th>
<th>Computer</th>
<th>Camera</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>50%</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
<td>16.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Technological platform used:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Social network</th>
<th>Email</th>
<th>Text</th>
<th>Website/app</th>
<th>Phone</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>28.6%</td>
<td>14.3%</td>
<td>42.9%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>14.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note:
The intake service varies in terms of number of clients seen and spoken to over the course of any day. A higher than average number of calls or crisis presentations on any one shift may have impacted upon a counsellor’s ability to ask the survey questions.