



New Zealand  
Crime and Victims **survey**

**HELP CREATE SAFER COMMUNITIES**

**Survey findings - Cycle 4 report**

**Appendix 1 – Key  
Findings**

June 2022

Results drawn from Cycle 4 (2020/21) of the  
New Zealand Crime and Victims Survey

**ISSN 2744-3981**

### **Disclaimer**

1. While all care and diligence has been taken in processing, analysing, and extracting data and information for this publication, the Ministry of Justice gives no warranty that it is error free and will not be liable for any loss or damage suffered by the use directly, or indirectly, of the information in this publication.
2. Data collection was suspended during COVID-19 Alert Levels 4 and 3 (more detail is provided on page 4 of the full report).
3. This report contains highly aggregated data. No identifiable personal data is included in the report.
4. Count estimates in the text have been rounded to the nearest thousands or hundreds. Percentage and mean estimates have been rounded to the nearest whole number or one decimal place. Graphs and tables provide accuracy to one decimal place. Higher precision may be provided where it is important for the content.
5. Unfortunately, due to an error in data collection, this report does not include over 200 interviews from the Hawke's Bay area. Survey results were revised, amended and re-weighted to maintain accuracy and avoid bias.

Published in June 2022 by the Ministry of Justice

Justice Centre, 19 Aitken Street

DXSX10088, Wellington, New Zealand

ISSN: 2744-3981

### **Suggested citation**

Ministry of Justice. 2022. *New Zealand Crime and Victims Survey. Cycle 4 survey findings. Descriptive statistics. June 2022. Results drawn from Cycle 4 (2020/21) of the New Zealand Crime and Victims Survey.* Wellington: Ministry of Justice.

This document is available at <https://www.justice.govt.nz/justice-sector-policy/research-data/nzcvs/resources-and-results/>



### **Crown copyright © 2022**

This work is licensed under the Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 New Zealand licence. You are free to copy, distribute, and adapt the work, as long as you attribute the work to New Zealand Ministry of Justice and abide by the other licence terms. Please note you may not use any departmental or governmental emblem, logo, or coat of arms in any way that infringes any provision of the Flags, Emblems, and Names Protection Act 1981. Use the wording “New Zealand Ministry of Justice” in your attribution. Do not use the New Zealand Ministry of Justice logo.

If you have any feedback or questions about NZCVS results, please email us on [nzcvs@justice.govt.nz](mailto:nzcvs@justice.govt.nz)

This report contains many graphs and infographics that help to visualise key facts and findings. Only those graphs that support the key findings are included. All observations and graphs in the report are based on the **data tables** that accompany this report, which are available on the [NZCVS resources and results web page](#).

If you are reading the report for the first time, it is recommended that you refer to “Cycle 4 Core report - Section 2 – About this report” to help with understanding and presentation of results.

# Appendix 1: Key findings

Topic	Key findings	More details in
<b>How much crime is there in New Zealand?</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 29% of adults were victimised once or more in the previous 12 months. This level of overall victimisation has remained stable over time (from Cycle 1 to Cycle 4).</li> <li>• The three most common offence types in Cycle 4 were harassment and threatening behaviour; burglary; and fraud and deception. Together, these made up more than half of all offences (51%).</li> <li>• The proportion of households that experienced burglaries fell significantly – from 12.1% in Cycle 1 to 9.3% in Cycle 4. However, the number of burglary incidents increased compared to Cycle 3. This indicates a growing concentration of burglaries. Burglaries are the only offence type with a statistically significant change from Cycle 3.</li> <li>• The above reduction in the prevalence rate of burglaries caused the overall significant reduction in the prevalence rate of household offences – from 20% in Cycle 1 to 18% in Cycle 4.</li> <li>• Apart from burglary, there were no other statistically significant changes in prevalence or incidence rates across individual offence types from Cycle 1 to Cycle 4.</li> <li>• There were no significant changes in prevalence or incidence rates across any broad offence groups from Cycle 1 to Cycle 4 (ie, fraud and cybercrime offences; interpersonal violence offences; theft and damage offences; or vehicle offences).</li> </ul>	Section 3
<b>Who is experiencing crime?</b>	<p><b>Cycle 4 snapshot</b></p> <p>In Cycle 4, key population factors associated with a <b>higher likelihood of victimisation</b> when compared with the New Zealand average included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>personal factors:</b> young adults (aged 15–29); bisexual; Māori; separated</li> <li>• <b>economic and household factors:</b> not employed and not actively seeking work; living in a one-parent-with-child(ren) household or a multi-person household; renting government accommodation; being under high levels of financial pressure</li> <li>• <b>wellbeing factors:</b> having a moderate or high level of psychological distress; having low life satisfaction; having a low feeling of safety.</li> </ul>	Section 4

In Cycle 4, population factors associated with a **lower likelihood of victimisation** when compared with the New Zealand average included:

- **personal factors:** older adults (aged 65+); Asian; widowed
- **economic and household factors:** retired; living alone or in a couple-only household; having a personal or household income of \$20,001–\$30,000; not being under financial pressure
- **geographic factors:** living in the Taranaki region
- **wellbeing factors:** having high life satisfaction; having a high feeling of safety.

### **Changes over time**

Most of the changes in victimisation over time relate to significant reductions in the prevalence rate of household offences and burglaries between the base year (Cycle 1) and the current year (Cycle 4).

- Some of the largest decreases are observed among more vulnerable population groups. The groups included Māori, those living in the more deprived neighbourhoods, those not in a stable relationship, those living alone or in a one-parent-with-child(ren) household, and those with a high level of psychological distress.
- There were no significant regional changes in overall victimisation over time. However, some statistically significant changes did occur between the previous year (Cycle 3) and the current year (Cycle 4) for particular offence types.
- Between the base year and the current year, overall victimisation decreased by almost a third for adults who experience a high level of psychological distress. This reduction is greater for household offences and, in particular, burglaries.
- Adults living in the most deprived neighbourhoods (NZDep2018 quintile 5) saw a significant decrease in the prevalence rate and the incidence rate of burglaries between the base year and the current year.
- However, adults living in quintile 4 neighbourhoods saw a significant increase in the incidence rate of burglaries between the previous year and the current year, where the current year rate appears to have returned to the base year level.

There were also a few statistically significant changes over time found for other offence types.

- Māori saw a significant reduction in the prevalence rate and incidence rate of theft and damage offences between the base year and the current year.
- Those living in a couple-only household saw a significant reduction in overall victimisation between the previous year and the current year.
- Adults living in a household without any children saw a significant reduction between the previous year and the current year in the incidence rate of fraud and cybercrime offences experienced.
- Adults with a household income of \$10,000 or less per annum saw a significant reduction in overall victimisation and personal offences between the base year and the current year.
- Those with a household income of \$20,001–\$30,000 per annum saw a significant decrease in the overall victimisation between the base year and the current year.
- Adults living in the Manawatū-Whanganui region experienced three times as many personal offences per 100 adults in the current year than the previous year. This pattern is even more pronounced in the incidence rate of interpersonal violence offences.
- Adults living in the Otago region saw the prevalence rate of fraud and cybercrime offences double between the base year and the current year.
- Only the major urban areas saw a significant increase in the incidence rate of trespass offences between the base year and the current year.
- Those who were most satisfied with their life (10 out of 10) saw a significant reduction in overall victimisation between the previous year and the current year.

#### **Victimisation by population groups – pooled data**

Compared with the New Zealand average:

#### ***Regional comparison***

- Adults from three regions – Taranaki, West Coast and Southland – were significantly less likely to experience any victimisation.

- Households in the Auckland region were significantly more likely to experience household offences and burglaries, whereas households in the Bay of Plenty, Taranaki, Wellington, Otago, Southland, and Tasman regions were significantly less likely to experience household offences or burglaries.

### ***Age, sex and marital status***

- Females (but not males) aged 40–49 were significantly more likely to experience any type of victimisation. This group was also significantly more likely to experience household offences, personal offences, burglary, interpersonal violence offences and fraud/cybercrime offences.
- Females (but not males) aged 30–39 were significantly more likely to experience household offences. They were also significantly more likely to experience burglary.
- Females (but not males) aged 15–19 were significantly less likely to experience fraud and cybercrime offences.
- Males (but not females) aged 15–19 were significantly more likely to experience theft and damage offences compared to the New Zealand average.
- Males (but not females) aged 40–49 (5%) and aged 50–59 (5%) were significantly less likely to experience interpersonal violence offences.
- Males (but not females) who were married, in a civil union, or in a de facto relationship at the time of the survey were significantly less likely to be victimised across all offences, household offences, and personal offences.
- Females (but not males) who were separated or divorced at the time of the survey were significantly more likely to be victimised across all offences, household offences and personal offences.
- Accounting for differences in age between groups with different marital statuses:
  - Adults who were married, in a civil union, or in a de facto relationship were significantly less likely to experience interpersonal violence offences and theft and damage offences.
  - Adults who were separated or divorced had an even higher likelihood of being victimised across all offences, household offences, personal offences, burglary, and interpersonal violence offences.

- Those who were separated or divorced were still more likely to experience theft and damage offences compared with the New Zealand average, but not higher than before accounting for differences in age.
- Accounting for differences in age and deprivation between different ethnic groups:
  - There was only a small (2%) gap between Māori victimisation and the New Zealand average when age and deprivation are accounted for. This finding supports the view that the different age structure and the different level of deprivation between Māori and the New Zealand average are key contributors to the higher likelihood of victimisation for Māori.

### ***Disability status***

- Disabled adults were significantly more likely to experience crime across personal offences and household offences when differences in average age are accounted for. This also includes burglary, interpersonal violence offences and fraud and cybercrime offences.
- Looking at victimisation by disability status, groups of disabled adults who were more likely to be victimised compared to non-disabled adults include those who were:
  - younger than 60 years old (except those aged 40–49)
  - married
  - employed
  - living in a couple-with-child(ren) household
  - living in a four-or-more-people household
  - living in a household with children
  - renting a privately owned accommodation
  - living in rural areas

### **Sexual assault**

- About 2% of adults experienced sexual assault – ranging from threats and unwanted touching to forced sexual intercourse – in the previous 12 months (pooled data).
- The current year figure (Cycle 4) did not change significantly from the base year (Cycle 1) or the previous year (Cycle 3).

Section 5

- Sexual assault affected adults in all population groups, but some more than others. Compared to the national average, the following groups were more than twice as likely to be a victim of sexual assault:
  - people identifying as bisexual (16%) and people with diverse sexualities (gay, lesbian, bisexual or other) (11%)
  - adults aged 15–19 (5%) and 20–29 (4%)
  - adults who were separated (5%) and those who had never been married, in a civil union, or in a de facto relationship (4%)
  - adults who were not working because they were studying (4%)
  - adults living in a multi-person household (5%) (eg, flatting situations).
- Young females were at particularly high risk of sexual assault, with 9% of females aged 15–19 and 7% of females aged 20–29 affected in the previous 12 months.
- Sexual assault victimisation was strongly associated with psychological distress, low ratings of life satisfaction, and a poor feeling of safety.
- About two thirds (63%) of sexual assaults were perpetrated by an intimate partner, other family member, or someone else the victim already knew.
- Almost half of all sexual assaults happened in residential locations.

**Offences by family members**

- About 2.1% of New Zealand adults had experienced one or more offences by family members in the previous 12 months (pooled data).
- Offending by intimate partners has decreased significantly between the previous year (Cycle 3) and current year (Cycle 4), driven by a significant decrease in offending by current partners (as opposed to ex-partners). This rate decreased significantly both between the base year and the current year and between the previous year and the current year.
- Almost three-quarters of offences by family members were perpetrated by intimate partners.
- For every 10 offences by family members, approximately four were physical violence, three were threats and harassment, two were sexual assaults, and one was property damage.

Section 5

- Females were almost four times as likely as males to have experienced offending by an intimate partner (2.1% compared with 0.6%) and nearly twice as likely to have experienced offending by another family member (1.1% compared with 0.6%).
- The following population groups had a prevalence rate of offences by family members of 6% or higher:
  - adults who identified as bisexual (8.6%)
  - adults who were separated (11.2%)
  - adults living in a one-parent-with-child(ren) household (8.5%)
  - adults living in a household with four or more children (7.3%)
  - adults living in a government rental accommodation (6.6%).
- The prevalence rate for Māori females was just over double that for females overall (6.9% compared with 3.1%), and the rate for Māori males was about three times that for males overall (3.4% compared with 1.2%).
- Being a victim of offending by family members was strongly associated with high levels of psychological distress (12.4%), lower ratings of life satisfaction (5.8%), and a poor feeling of safety (5.1%).
- Victims were injured in 28% of offences by family members and received medical attention in relation to 16%.
- Offenders were under the influence of alcohol and/or other drugs in about half of all offences by family members (52%).
- In Cycle 4, one in six adults (17%) knew someone who had experienced a family incident during the previous 12 months, and 59% had further involvement in order to support the other person or people.

**Lifetime experience of sexual assault and intimate partner violence**

- In Cycle 4, about 26% of adults had experienced any sexual assault in their lifetime. This was significantly higher than in Cycle 3, though it has remained stable since the base year.
- In pooled data, the prevalence rate of lifetime sexual assault was 24%.
  - About 35% of females and 12% of males had experienced sexual assault in their lifetime.

Section 5

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– Sexual assault started at a young age, with 18% of adults aged 15–19 affected so far during their lives.</li> <li>• About 18% of adults who have ever had a partner had experienced IPV in their lifetime, with no statistically significant change from the base year or the previous year. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– About 23% of females and 10% of males who have ever had a partner had experienced IPV in their lifetime.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Disabled adults were at elevated risk of having experienced any sexual assault or IPV during their lifetime, especially when controlling for age (45% compared with 29% of all adults).</li> </ul>	
<p><b>Impact of the COVID-19 pandemic on victimisation</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The scale of overall victimisation has remained stable before and during the COVID-19 pandemic across all four victimisation measures.</li> <li>• Prevalence rates for burglaries, household property damage and overall household offences significantly reduced after the start of the pandemic.</li> <li>• Overall victimisation rates significantly reduced after the start of the pandemic for the following population groups: adults living in a one-person household; adults with a personal or household income of \$20,001–\$30,000; and adults living in the most deprived areas (quintile 5).</li> <li>• No statistically significant changes were observed in personal offence prevalence rates between the pre-pandemic and during-pandemic periods.</li> <li>• Prevalence rates for overall household offences and for burglaries reduced for a large number of population groups. These groups reflect a wide variety of socio-economic characteristics, and further research is needed to analyse the drivers behind the improvements observed in these groups' prevalence rates after the start of the COVID-19 pandemic.</li> </ul>	<p>Section 6</p>
<p><b>Reporting to the Police</b></p>	<p><b>Cycle 4</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Overall, 25% of all victimisations were reported to the Police in Cycle 4.</li> <li>• Motor vehicle thefts (80%) had the highest likelihood of being reported to the Police.</li> <li>• Cybercrime offences were the least likely to be reported, with 98% of incidents not reported to the Police.</li> </ul> <p><b>Changes over time</b></p>	<p>Section 7</p>

- Reporting rates have remained stable over time, with no significant changes in reporting over the last four cycles.

#### **Differences in reporting (pooled data)**

- Over the last four cycles, household offences were significantly more likely to be reported to the Police. The offences most likely to be reported were motor vehicle thefts (89%), thefts from motor vehicles (47%), bicycle thefts/conversions (47%) and burglaries (37%).
- Only 8% of sexual assaults were reported to the Police over the last four cycles.
- Only 9% of fraud and cybercrime incidents were reported to the Police over the last four cycles.
- Adults who were not employed because they were studying and adults living in the least deprived areas were significantly less likely to report victimisations to the Police.
- Only 9% of incidents that occurred online or over the phone were reported to the Police.
- Only 12% of incidents that occurred in community settings like churches, maraes, schools, hospitals and sports grounds were reported to the Police.
- Only 15% of incidents perceived to be driven by discrimination towards the victim's sexuality were reported to the Police.

#### **Reasons for not reporting (changes over time)**

- Between Cycles 1 and 4 there was a significant decrease in the use of the following reasons for not reporting an incident to the Police: "Police couldn't have done anything", "Dealt with the matter myself/ourselves", and "Police would be too busy to deal with something like this".
- In contrast, between Cycles 1 and 4 there was a significant increase in the reason for not reporting being "Private/personal/family/whānau matter" and a significant increase in the reason "Dislike/fear of police/bad experience" between Cycles 3 and 4.

#### **Reasons for not reporting (pooled data)**

- Over the last four cycles the most common reasons given for not reporting an incident to the Police were "Too trivial/no loss or damage/not worth reporting", "Police couldn't have done anything", "Didn't have enough evidence to report it" and "Dealt with the matter myself ourselves".

- The least common reasons given for not reporting were “Tried to report but not able to contact police”, “Happens as part of my job”, “Dislike/fear of police/bad experience before” and “Didn’t want to get offender into trouble”.
- Two of the most common reasons given for not reporting fraud and cybercrime offences were “Bank/credit card company dealt with issue/contacted me” and “Reported to other authorities (eg, superiors, company security staff)”.
- For interpersonal violence, sexual assault and offences by family members, the reasons given for not reporting were significantly more likely to be of a personal nature, such as “Private/personal/family or whānau matter”, “Dealt with the matter myself/ourselves”, “Fear of reprisals/would make matters worse”, “Shame/embarrassment/further humiliation” and “Didn’t want to get offender into trouble”.

**Distribution of crime**

- Just over 2% of New Zealand adults experienced 39% of all victimisations.
- 38% of victims experienced two or more incidents within the previous 12 months. These victims experienced the majority (73%) of all incidents.
- The prevalence of multiple victimisations has remained relatively constant across the cycles.
- Cycle 4 saw an increase in the proportion of incidents experienced by adults with 5 or more victimisations (39%) compared to the previous cycle. This was similar to the base year level (39%).
- Offences by family members were the most repeated type of offence. Repeat victims of offences by family members (40%) experienced 79% of all offences by family members.
- Vehicle offences were the most common one-off offence type, with 81% of incidents occurring as a one-off event.
- Repeat victimisation didn’t significantly change over time; however, burglary victimisation saw a significant increase in Cycle 4. During the current year, the proportion of burglaries that were repeat incidents was 63%, compared to 40% for the previous year and 47% in the base year.
- The groups significantly more likely to be highly victimised (ie, experience four or more crimes within a 12-month period) were:
  - younger adults (aged 15–29)

Section 8

- Māori
  - disabled people
  - people with diverse sexualities
  - those living in a one-parent-with-child(ren) household
  - those living in a household with four or more children
  - those living in a household with five-or-more-people or another multi-person household
  - those who were unemployed and not actively seeking work
  - those experiencing high levels of financial pressure
  - those renting government accommodation (local and central)
  - those with a moderate or high level of psychological distress
  - those with low life satisfaction
  - those with a low feeling of safety.
- The groups significantly less likely to be highly victimised were:
    - males
    - older adults (aged 60+)
    - Asians
    - those living in a couple-only, couple-with-child(ren) or two-person household
    - retired adults
    - those who were not under financial pressure
    - those who were not psychologically distressed
    - those with high life satisfaction
    - those with a high feeling of safety.

**Crime scene and consequences**

**Based on pooled data:**

Section 9

- More than two-thirds of all incidents (70%) happened either in residential areas or online/over the phone.
- More than half (55%) of vehicle offences, 16% of interpersonal violence offences and 21% of physical assaults/robberies happened in public areas.
- Almost a third (32%) of sexual assaults, 18% of interpersonal violence offences, and 18% of thefts/damages and vehicle offences happened in business areas.

- Almost half of personal victimisations (49%) involved a male offender and a female victim. This proportion increases to 52% for interpersonal violence, 69% for offences by family members and 73% for sexual assault.
- 12% of all non-sexual assault incidents involved the use of a weapon.
- Every 11th incident (9%) resulted in injury. This proportion increases to 21% for interpersonal violence offences, 28% for offences by family members and 49% for non-sexual assaults.
- Every 10th incident (10%) resulted in time taken off work by a victim. This proportion increases to 18% for vehicle offences, 20% for offences by family members and 22% for offences by ex-partner.

## Perceptions of safety

### General feeling of safety

Section 10

- There are no significant changes in the overall feeling of safety over time since the start of the NZCVS.
- In the current year (Cycle 4), people aged 65+, those who were retired, and those with a household income of \$20,001–\$30,000 per annum were significantly less likely to rate their feeling of safety between 0 and 6 out of 10.
- Chinese adults saw an over 50% reduction in the likelihood of feeling the most safe (10 out of 10) between the base year (Cycle 1) and the current year.
- Adults living in the Southland region were significantly more likely to feel the most safe in the current year compared to the base year and the previous year (Cycle 3).

### Feeling of safety when with family or whānau

- There are no significant changes in the overall feeling of safety when with family or whānau since the start of the NZCVS.
- Five out of six adults (83%) said they feel the most safe when they are with family or whānau in the current year.
- Adults with the lowest level of household income (\$10,000 or less per annum) were over 75% less likely to rate their feeling of safety when with family or whānau between 0 and 6 out of 10 in the current year compared to the previous year.

- Adults living in the Nelson region were significantly more likely to rate their feeling of safety when with family or whānau between 0 and 6 out of 10 in the current year compared to the previous year.
- Overall, there are no significant changes observed between the previous year and current year. In both years, at least 5% of adults had felt unsafe when with family or whānau.
- Adults living in a “one parent with child(ren) and other person(s)” household saw a 60% reduction in the likelihood of ever feeling unsafe when with family or whānau between the previous year and the current year.

### **Victimisation and safety**

- There is an association between the level of safety and victimisation measured in prevalence rates. This association is observed for overall victimisation, household offences, personal offences, burglary and interpersonal violence offences.
- Those who reported feeling the lowest levels of safety (between 0 and 6 out of 10) were victimised significantly more than the New Zealand average, and those who reported feeling the highest level of safety (10 out of 10) were victimised significantly less.
- Victims were more concerned about safety than non-victims. The level of safety concern increases with the number of crime incidents that victims experience. Highly victimised adults (those who experienced four or more incidents over the previous 12 months) have the highest level of safety concern.
- No significant differences were found between general perceptions of safety and victimisation over time.
- There is also a strong association between victimisation and the feeling of safety when with family or whānau, but no significant differences were detected between victimisation and the feeling of safety when with family or whānau over time.
- One in two adults who felt the least safe (between 0 and 6 out of 10) with their family or whānau had experienced one or more offences.

- Victims of multiple crimes and highly victimised adults were more concerned about their safety when with family or whānau. The percentage of adults who felt unsafe when with family or whānau consistently increased with higher numbers of incidents experienced by an adult.

**Perceptions of safety by population factors**

**Compared with the New Zealand average:**

Section 10

Population factors associated with **greater concern** about safety included:

- **personal factors:** aged 40–64; female; disabled; sexually diverse; New Zealand European; Chinese; non-partnered; separated or divorced
- **household factors:** living alone or in a one-parent-with-child(ren) household; living in a household with four or more children
- **economic factors:** employed; cannot meet \$500 unexpected expense; having very or quite limited ability to afford a \$300 non-essential item
- **geographic factors:** living in the Hawke’s Bay or Canterbury region; living in major urban area; living in more deprived areas (deciles 8, 9, or 10)
- **wellbeing factors:** having a moderate or high level of psychological distress; having low life satisfaction (between 0 and 7 out of 10).

Population factors associated with **less concern** about safety included:

- **personal factors:** young adults (aged 15–29); older adults (aged 65+); male; Māori; widowed; never married and never in a civil union
- **household factors:** living in self-owned accommodation; living in a couple-only household; living in a “couple with child(ren) and other person(s)” household; living in a “one parent with child(ren) and other person(s)” household; living in a large household (five or more people); living in a household with three children
- **economic factors:** retired; not under financial pressure
- **geographic factors:** living in the Gisborne, Taranaki, Wellington, Otago, Southland, Tasman, Nelson, or Marlborough region; living in a medium or small urban area; living in a rural area (rural settlement or rural other); living in less deprived areas (deciles 1, 2, 3, or 4)
- **wellbeing factors:** having a low level of psychological distress; having the highest life satisfaction score (10 out of 10).

**Perceptions of safety when with family or whānau by population factors**

**Compared with the New Zealand average:**

Section 10

Population factors associated with feeling **more concerned** about safety when with family or whānau or being **more likely** to have felt unsafe when with family or whānau included:

- **personal factors:** bisexual; female; Māori; Chinese; non-partnered; separated or divorced, disabled
- **economic factors:** not employed and not actively seeking work; experiencing high level of financial pressure
- **geographic factors:** living in the Wellington or Nelson region
- **wellbeing factors:** having a moderate or high level of psychological distress; having low life satisfaction.

Population factors associated feeling **less concerned** about safety when with family or whānau or being **less likely** to have felt unsafe when with family or whānau included:

- **personal factors:** older adults (aged 65+); male; partnered and legally registered; married, in a civil union, or in a de facto relationship; widowed
- **household factors:** living in a couple-only household
- **economic factors:** retired; not under financial pressure; personal income of \$20,001–\$30,000 per annum; household income of \$10,000 or less per annum
- **geographic factors:** living in the West Coast region; living in a rural area (rural settlement or rural other)
- **wellbeing factors:** having the highest life satisfaction score (10 out of 10).