

Authors: Esquivel-Santoveña, Esteban Eugenio; Lambert, Teri L.; Hamel, John**Source:** [Partner Abuse](#), Volume 4, Number 1, January 2013, pp. 6-75(70)**Publisher:** [Springer Publishing Company](#)[< previous article](#) | [view table of contents](#) | [next article >](#)

Buy & download fulltext article:

OR

Price: \$25.00 plus tax ([Refund Policy](#))**Abstract:**

Research on partner abuse has lagged in much of the world where attention has been on other problems (such as famine and war) and other crimes against women (e. g., honor killings, genital mutilation). We conducted a sweeping review of scholarly articles published in **peer-reviewed journals** and by government agencies **outside of the United States and English-speaking developed nations** that provided quantitative data on physical, psychological, and sexual abuse of intimate partners as well as consequences, risk factors, and attitudes. **One hundred sixty-two articles reporting on more than 200 studies in Asia, the Middle East, Africa, Latin America, and Europe** met the inclusion criteria from various types of samples. Most of the studies reported on female victimization only, but 73 reported on both male and female victimization.

We also conducted an analysis of data from our literature review, including 1 major cross-national study, to determine the relationship among prevalence of abuse, social factors, and women's empowerment. **Results indicate that partner abuse is a widespread problem around the world, with multiple causes.** Overall prevalence of abuse is higher in Third World countries compared to the United States, and rates for physical and psychological abuse are comparable across gender in most countries when all types of samples are considered. No significant association was found between rates of partner violence (PV) and a nation's level of human development. However, **a significant relationship was found between a nation's level of gender empowerment and rates of PV by both males and females** but only for university dating samples from the International Dating Violence Study (IDVS). In addition, an analysis of the IDVS indicates that **efforts by 1 partner to dominate the other are positively correlated with physical abuse perpetration for women, but not for men.** Among the limitations of this review was the relatively few numbers of large population studies that ask about both male and female perpetration and victimization and the consequences and context of PV. Implications of the findings include the need for a broader conceptualization of PV as not merely a gender problem but also (and perhaps primarily) a human problem.

Keywords: [INTIMATE PARTNER ABUSE](#); [DOMESTIC VIOLENCE](#); [WORLDWIDE IPV](#); [UNDERDEVELOPED NATIONS](#); [THIRD WORLD](#)**Document Type:** Research article**DOI:** <http://dx.doi.org/10.1891/1946-6560.4.1.6>

Publication date: 2013-01-01

[More about this publication?](#)[Related content](#)

Website © 2013 Publishing Technology. Article copyright remains with the publisher, society or author(s) as specified within the article.

#14 Partner Abuse Worldwide

Esteban Eugenio Esquivel-Santoveña, Teri Lambert, and John Hamel

Full article available in *Partner Abuse*, Volume 4, Issue 1, 2013.

In most of the world, research on partner abuse has lagged behind the United States. Especially in Third World countries, attention has been on other problems (such as famine and war) and other crimes against women (e.g., honor killings, genital mutilation).

Purpose of Study and Method

The purpose of this study was twofold. First, we conducted a sweeping review of scholarly articles published in peer-reviewed journals and by government agencies outside of the United States and English-speaking developed nations that provided quantitative data on physical, psychological and sexual abuse of intimate partners, as well as consequences, risk factors and attitudes. Most of the studies reported on female victimization only, but 73 reported on both male and female victimization. Secondly, we conducted an analysis of data from large community and national surveys, including from one multi-country study of dating violence, to determine the relationship between prevalence of abuse, social factors and women's empowerment.

We sought to answer a few basic questions, as suggested by the body of research evidence, as well as current theories:

1. What are the rates of physical, psychological and sexual abuse and controlling behaviors between intimate partners higher in countries outside of the United States and other English-speaking developed nations?
2. How do these rates compare across gender?
3. What is the impact of partner abuse on victims and families?
4. What are the risk factors for partner abuse?
5. On a societal level, what is the association between a country's level of human development and rates of partner abuse?
6. What is the association between the status of women and their rates of partner abuse victimization?

7. On a relationship level, is dominance by one partner correlated with rates of partner violence against the other partner in the rest of the world, as it is in the United States?

Results of Literature Review

A total of 162 articles reporting on over 200 studies met the inclusion criteria and were summarized in the online tables for Asia (see table 1), the Middle East (see table 2), Africa (see table 3, Latin America and the Caribbean (see table 4) and Europe and the Caucasus (see table 5). Summaries of studies that were part of various multi-country studies can be found in table 6. In each region, the summaries are organized first by country, then by year, and then by author.

Gender Inclusive Studies

Across all five world regions, we identified 40 articles (total of 73 studies) in 49 countries containing data on both male and female IPV. The majority of the studies (44) reported on results based on dating student, adolescent or clinical samples; 29 of the studies were based on large population or community samples.

There were a total of 117 direct comparisons across gender for physical PV. Rates of physical PV were higher for female perpetration /male victimization compared to male perpetration/female victimization, or were the same, in 73 of those comparisons, or 62%. There were 54 comparisons made for psychological abuse including controlling behaviors and dominance, with higher rates found for female perpetration /male victimization, in 36 comparisons (67%). Of the 19 direct comparisons were made for sexual PV, rates were found to be higher for female perpetration /male victimization in 7 comparisons (37%). Higher rates for any female perpetration /male victimization were found in only 2 of 8 comparisons (25%). In total, there were 198 direct comparisons across gender, for all types of partner abuse. The rates were higher for female perpetration /male victimization, or the same, in 118 comparisons, or 60%. A higher number of comparisons indicating greater female victimization/ male perpetration was found in 18 countries. Greater female perpetration/male victimization was found in 23 countries, and an equal number of comparisons was found in 8 countries.

Given that several of the IDVS studies were based on very small samples, the limitations of clinical samples, and the superiority of more representative community and large population samples, we also looked separately at the 44 large population and community samples that reported on adult, non-student abuse. Together, these yielded 81 direct comparisons across gender. The percentage of partner abuse that was higher for female perpetration /male

victimization compared to male perpetration/female victimization, or were the same, were as follows: Physical abuse – 22/44 (50%); Psychological abuse/control/ dominance – 10/19 (53%); Sexual abuse – 4/13 (31%); Any abuse – 0/5 (0%). The overall percentage was 44% for adult IPV. However, it should be noted that in many comparisons, the differences were slight. For example, past year physical victimization rates in Namibia were 15% for men and 17% for women; lifetime physical abuse perpetration in South Africa was reported at 26.5% for men and 25.2% for women; and in Portugal wives reported insulting and humiliating partners at a rate of 16.2% compared to husbands at 18.6%). When these close percentages are taken into account, then the overall percentage of adult IPV that is symmetrical – comparable across gender, or higher in the direction of male victimization/female perpetration – constitutes the majority of IPV throughout the world. In 11 countries women were found to be predominantly victims and males were found to be primarily perpetrators. There were 14 countries in which rates of partner abuse from larger populations were found to be symmetrical across gender: China, Hong Kong, Philippines, Thailand, Botswana, Namibia, Swaziland, Zimbabwe, Barbados, Brazil, Jamaica, Trinidad/Tobago, Portugal and Ukraine.

Emerging research

The International Parenting Study (IPS), conducted by consortium of researchers with a total sample of 11,408 university students in 15 countries (mostly Europe, but also the U.S. and Canada, Hong Kong, Taiwan and Israel.) The students reporting on physical assaults between their parents when they were 10 years old. Preliminary results indicate that fathers assault mothers at a rate ranging from 0.3% in Norway to 9.9% in Slovenia, with a median rate of 3.8%; and mothers assault fathers at an overall higher rate (median = 8%), and ranging from 1.7% (Spain) to 24.9% (Poland). However, the mean number of parental assaults was found to be higher for fathers.

Studies Reporting only Female IPV Victimization

Across the major regions of the world the lowest reported past year rates for physical abuse victimization reported in the female victimization-only studies were found in a large population study in Georgia (2%) and a community survey in Japan (3.1%). Lifetime rates were lowest again in Georgia (5%), and in a community survey in Nigeria (5.3%). The highest rates of physical IPV victimization were found in a community survey in Ethiopia (72.5% past year)

and among a rural population in Bangladesh (67% lifetime). On the higher end, rates of physical PV far exceed the average found in the United States.

The lowest rates of past year psychological victimization were found in large population studies in Haiti (10.8%) and India (12%); lifetime rates were lowest again in Haiti (13.2%), as well as in large population studies in Columbia (11.5%) and Georgia (19%). The highest past year psychological abuse prevalence was 98.7% in Bangkok, Thailand (past year), and lifetime rates were the highest in a clinical population in Iran (82.6%) and in a Brazilian slum (80.2%). Unlike physical IPV, the highest rates of psychological abuse throughout the world are about the same as those found in the United States (80%).

Rates of sexual abuse victimization differed widely across regions, with past year rates as low as 1% in Georgia (large population) and 1.3% in Japan (urban community), and lifetime rates of 0.6% in Egypt (large population), 1% found in (large population) and 1.1% in Honduras (large population). In contrast, the rates for the past year were as high as 53.4% in Pakistan (community survey) and 58% in Ethiopia (large population). In Pakistan, lifetime rates were found to be 54.5% in a community survey, and the highest rates of all were found in a study of secondary school students in Ethiopia, at an astounding 68%.

Impact on victims

The various regions reported similar kinds of consequences for victims who have experienced IPV. Surprisingly, a relatively small number of studies focused on the physical consequences of partner violence. Those that did either did not specify the types of injuries, or identified bruises and broken bones. Physical injuries were compared across gender in two studies. As expected, abused women were found to experience higher rates of physical injuries compared to men both for the past year in a Chilean student population (15.9% vs. 6.98%) and since age 14 (19.5% vs. 13.3%), and in a large population study from Uganda (43% vs. 33%.) Far more frequently mentioned were the psychological and behavioral effects of abuse, and these included PTSD symptomology, stress, depression, irritability, feelings of shame and guilt, poor self-esteem, flashbacks, sexual dissatisfaction and unwanted sexual behavior, changes in eating behavior, and aggression. Two studies compared mental health symptoms across gender. In Botswana, women were found to evidence significantly more of these than men; whereas in a clinical study in Pakistan male and female IPV victims suffered equally (60% of men and women reported depression, 67% anxiety.)

A variety of health-related outcomes were also found to be associated with IPV victimization, including overall poor physical health, more long-term illnesses, having to take a larger number of prescribed drugs, STDs, and disturbed sleeping patterns. Abused mothers experienced poorer reproductive health, respiratory infections, induced abortion and complications during pregnancy; and in a few studies their children were found to experience diarrhea, fever and prolonged coughing.

Risk factors

The most common risk factors found in this review of IPV in Asia, Africa, the Middle East, Latin America and Europe have also been found to be significant risk factors in the U.S. and other English-speaking industrialized nations. Most often cited are the risk factors related to low income household income and victim/perpetrator unemployment, at 36. An almost equally high number of studies (35) reported victim's low education level. Alcohol and substance abuse by the perpetrator was a risk factor in 26 studies. Family of origin abuse, whether directly experienced or witnessed, was cited in 18 studies. Victim's younger age was also a major risk factor, mentioned in 17 studies, and perpetrator's low education level was mentioned in 16. Less frequently mentioned were victim's substance abuse (8 studies), victim living in a rural environment (5 studies), and victim having married at a younger age and being HIV positive (4 studies each).

Attitudes about IPV

By 1994 approval in the U.S. of a husband slapping his wife for any reason was endorsed by only 10% of the population. In contrast, there is a much higher tolerance by both men and women for IPV in other parts of the world, with rates of approval depending on the country and the type of justification. Between 28% and 41% of men agreed that it is sometimes necessary for a man to beat his wife, and in Nigeria a remarkable 79% of women said that wife-beating is sometimes justified. Reasons given for why violence against wives might be justified include her infidelity, refusing him sex, arguing, burning his food, leaving without his permission and wasting money. Given the high rates of female-to-male abuse found in this review, it is noteworthy that none of the studies asked respondents about their views on husband-beating. Nonetheless, perpetrator pro-violent and gender-based beliefs are a serious problem, identified risk factors in 12 studies (mostly in Africa and Asia).

Results of Data Analysis

Regression analyses indicated that a country's level of human development (as measured by HDI) was not a significant predictor of male or female physical partner abuse perpetration, neither in studies using general population/large community samples nor in studies conducted with dating samples. Similarly, regression analyses did not find HDI level to be a significant predictor of female partner abuse victimization in studies that used population or large community samples.

Additional regression analyses indicated that a nation's gender inequality level, as measured by the Gender Inequality Index (GII), was not predictive of either male or female perpetrated physical partner abuse or female-only victimization in studies conducted with general population or community samples. However, separate regression analyses on data from the IDVS with dating samples indicate that higher gender inequality levels significantly predict higher prevalence of male and female physical partner abuse perpetration. GII level explained the variance for 17% of male partner abuse and 19% of female partner abuse perpetration.

A final analysis examined the association between dominance by one partner and partner violence perpetrated against a partner in dating samples using data from the IDVS, because this was the only multi-country study to consistently provide data for men and women on dominance scores. Male dominance scores were not found to be predictive of male partner violence perpetration; however, female dominance scores were found to significantly predict scores of partner violence perpetration by women. Female dominance scores explained 47% of the variance of female partner violence perpetration.

Results of this review suggest that partner abuse can no longer be conceived as merely a gender problem, but also (and perhaps primarily) as a human and relational problem, and should be framed as such by everyone concerned.

About the Authors

Esteban E. Esquivel-Santoveña, BSc is a PhD candidate at the Centre for Forensic and Criminological Psychology, School of Psychology, University of Birmingham, United Kingdom. He has a BSc in Psychology from the Universidad Autónoma del Estado de México-UAEM, and has worked as a research assistant at UAEM in a project (“Clinical Psychology of the Vital Cycle”) investigating different health aspects related to individual and family life of users of healthcare services with Drs. Patricia Balcázar Nava and Gloria Margarita Gurrola before undertaking his PhD under the supervision of Dr. Louise Dixon at the University of Birmingham. His research has focused on how attitudes and other salient partner violence risk factors impact on young dating relationships. Recently he has specifically investigated how certain mental health correlates (such as depression, PTSD, psychological flooding, etc.) and other proximal variables (attitudes about aggression, relationship adjustment, jealousy, etc.) relate to different types of aggressive and/or controlling behavior in men and women (e.g. Johnson’s typology) in dating relationships. Esteban believes that professionals working in prevention and treatment of partner violence can benefit from insights derived from empirically-tested typological approaches to tailor prevention and treatments efforts targeting specific kinds of victims and perpetrators.

Contact:

eee871@bham.ac.uk

Teri Lambert, M.A., is a member of the American Counselor’s Association and is currently the Mental Health Specialist for the Family Violence Council and the Southwestern Judicial District Court in Americus, Georgia. Ms. Lambert began her work in the field of violence against women in 1999 as a volunteer advisory board member and president for the domestic violence shelter in Yuma, Arizona. In 2001 she began working as the Domestic Violence Paralegal for the Yuma County Attorney’s Office. She completed her Bachelor’s Degree in Criminal Justice from Northern Arizona University – Yuma Branch Campus in 2003. While working with the prosecutor’s office, Ms. Lambert coordinated a Dating/Domestic and Sexual Violence

Prevention Program for the local junior and senior high schools. She also provided training in domestic violence response to local law enforcement agencies. In 2008-2009, Ms. Lambert was the Coordinator for the Arizona Western College/Northern Arizona University-Yuma Branch Campus Violence Prevention Program. She then worked as Executive Director of the Arizona Sexual Assault Network. Ms. Lambert received her Master's in Community Counseling from NAU-Yuma in 2011, completing her practicum and internship at Catholic Community Services (CCS) emphasizing her studies in trauma counseling. Ms. Lambert was then hired as a counselor at CCS, counseling trauma victims and substance abuse clients. Through her experience, Ms. Lambert has established herself as an expert in the area of domestic and sexual violence, including abuse against Native American women for which she produced a training video. She has spoken locally and nationally on domestic violence, addressing audiences including law enforcement agents, advocates, prosecutors and educators.

Contact:

illambert59@gmail.com

John Hamel, LCSW, has a Masters in Social Welfare from U.C.L.A., and has conducted batterer intervention and parent programs in the San Francisco Bay Area since 1992. He is the author or editor of several books on family violence, including *Gender-Inclusive Treatment of Intimate Partner Abuse* (Springer, 2005), and is Editor-in-Chief of the peer-reviewed professional journal, *Partner Abuse*, published quarterly by Springer Publishing. Mr. Hamel regularly speaks at conferences on domestic violence, and has provided consultation and training to mental health professionals, victim advocates and shelter workers, social service organizations, teachers, attorneys, judges and law enforcement officers. He also provides case consultation and expert witness testimony.

Contact:

johnmhamel@comcast.net

PASK#14 Online Tables – Table 1: Partner abuse in Asia

Study	N	Sample Characteristics	Method and Design	Results
-------	---	------------------------	-------------------	---------

Table 1. Partner abuse in Asia

Studies are organized by year of publication oldest to current. Multiple publications in the same year are alphabetized.

Bangladesh:				
Schuler, S.R., & Islam, F. (2008). Women’s acceptance of intimate partner violence within marriage in rural Bangladesh. <i>Studies in Family Planning</i> , 39, 1, 49-58.	1,212 Women 239 Men	The sample was taken from a 1994 survey of 841 women, which 608 were re-interviewed for this study. Another 604 women within the six villages below the age of 50 were also included. Of the original sample, 129 women over the age of 50 were interviewed. Another section of the study involved 239 married sons of the women participants.	The study utilized both a quantitative and qualitative design. This survey was conducted in six villages in two segments. The designs were a structured survey, in-depth interview, and group discussions. The entire sample was first administered a questionnaire where only physical violence was addressed. Psychological and sexual violence were addressed in the qualitative segments, but sexual violence discussions was not readily accepted or pursued.	Most of both the men and women surveyed were accepting of the use of violence by husbands, ranging between 75 and 100 percent of responders. Prevalence of physical violence: 67% reporting being “beaten by their husbands” 35% within the last year: The highest being 47%; The lowest being 16%. Prevalence of ever beaten: The highest being 79%; The lowest being 46%. The overall attitude from the qualitative study was mixed, although the perception is that women have resigned to the abuse that is so prevalent.
Dalal, K., Rahman, F., & Jansson, B. (2009). Wife abuse in rural Bangladesh. <i>Journal of Biosocial Science</i> , 41, 561-573.	4,411 women	Married women of reproductive age (14-49) living in the catchment areas of community clinics of two sub-districts (Savar and Dhamrai) in Dhaka district in Bangladesh. It	Cross-section design. Random sample from 5 community health clinics in Savar and Shamrai in Dhaka district, Bangladesh, conducted by Institute of Child and Mother Health by female interviewers.	<u>Prevalence Rates of PV</u> 79% exposed to verbal abuse, 41% physical abuse, and 5% to food restriction in past month <u>Risk Factors</u> Women being in a polygamous marriage or having paid a dowry

PASK#14 Online Tables – Table 1: Partner abuse in Asia

Study	N	Sample Characteristics	Method and Design	Results
		is a selected sample	<p>Asked about sociodemographic information and PV victimization (for preceding month).</p> <p>Verbal abuse defined as use of discriminatory language, threats</p> <p>Physical abuse defined as having been hit with fists</p> <p>Food restriction abuse defined as husband restricting amount of food to respondent</p>	<p>correlated with all three forms of abuse; husband's alcoholism associated with physical and verbal abuse</p> <p>Verbal abuse victimization increases with woman's age and is correlated with being Muslim as compared to non-Muslims</p>
<p>Silverman, J. G., Decker, M. R., Gupta, J., Kapur, N., Raj, A., & Naved, R. T. (2009). Maternal Experiences of Intimate Partner Violence and Child Morbidity in Bangladesh: Evidence from a National Bangladeshi Sample. <i>Archives of Pediatrics & Adolescent Medicine</i>, 163(8), 700-705</p>	1,592 women	<p>Married women with at least a child 5 year of age of younger with their husbands. Women were divided in 3 age groups:</p> <p>13-20</p> <p>21-30</p> <p>31-40</p> <p>>40</p>	<p>The analysis uses data from the 2004 Bangladesh Demographic Health Survey. Cross-sectional study. Used multi-stage cluster sampling. Face-to-face interviews. 12-month IPV (minor and severe physical-5 items, sexual-1 item) perpetrated by husbands.</p>	<p>IPV (physical and sexual): 12-month = 42.4%</p> <p>Mothers who experienced IPV were more likely to report recent acute respiratory tract infection (19.2%), and diarrhea (11.6%) among their young children compared with those who did not experience IPV. Large numbers of married Bangladeshi women with young children experience IPV. Associations of maternal experiences of IPV with 2 leading causes of childhood mortality strongly suggest that such abuse threatens not only the health of women but also that of their children.</p>
<p>Sambisa, W., Angeles, G., Lance, P. M., Naved, R.T., &</p>	8,320 men	<p>Married men aged 15-49 years from the community. It was a</p>	<p>Representative cross sectional 2006 Urban Health Survey. Face-to-face interviews (in their</p>	<p>Physical IPV: Lifetime = 55% / 12-month = 23%</p> <p>Sexual IPV: Lifetime = 20%</p>

PASK#14 Online Tables – Table 1: Partner abuse in Asia

Study	N	Sample Characteristics	Method and Design	Results
<p>Curtis, S. L. (2010). Physical and Sexual Abuse of Wives in Urban Bangladesh: Husbands' Reports. <i>Studies in Family Planning</i>, 41(3), 165-178.</p>		<p>subset of the 2006 Urban health Survey in Bangladesh conducted by MEASURE DHS to whom the domestic violence and household decision-making part of the questionnaire was administered.</p>	<p>households) Multi-stage cluster sampling design. Lifetime and 12-month physical (5 items-minor and severe) and 12-month sexual IPV perpetration (1 item) prevalence was assessed</p>	<p>Overall IPV: Lifetime = 60%</p> <p>Low socioeconomic levels were associated with men's increased likelihood of perpetrating IPV. Alcohol and drug use, sexually transmitted disease infection, poor mental health, and holding attitudes supportive of wife beating were predictive of IPV perpetration</p>
<p>Rahman, M., Hoque, M.A., & Makinoda, S. (2011). Intimate partner violence against women: is women empowerment a reducing factor? A study from a national Bangladeshi sample. <i>J Fam Viol</i>, 26:411-420.</p>	<p>4,181 women</p>	<p>Stratified, multistage cluster sample of rural and urban eligible women ages 15-49 and men from every second household, all living in private dwellings were used for the BDHS survey.</p> <p>4,181 currently married women were included for analyses in this study.</p>	<p>The 2007 Bangladesh Demographic Health Survey (BDHS) was used for the study which included the following:</p> <p>Five questionnaires were used. Separate domestic violence questionnaires were used for men and women with only one eligible respondent per household chosen, whether male or female in order to protect the respondent's privacy.</p> <p>Demographic questions included age, education, place of residence, & household wealth.</p> <p>Questionnaires had 6 domestic</p>	<p><u>Prevalence of IPV:</u></p> <p>Currently married women experiencing both physical and/or sexual violence in the 12 months preceding the survey:</p> <p>24%; experiencing sexual and or physical IPV</p> <p>10.5%; experiencing sexual violence</p> <p>19.4%; physical IPV</p> <p>Most common form of physical violence was being slapped w/18% reporting positively.</p> <p><u>Risk Factors:</u></p> <p>All forms of violence decreased with increased age of victim. Sexual IPV was lower in urban areas than rural areas. Lower education and wealth</p>

PASK#14 Online Tables – Table 1: Partner abuse in Asia

Study	N	Sample Characteristics	Method and Design	Results
			<p>violence questions and one sexual IPV question. Currently married women answering any question positively were then asked for frequency of the act in the preceding 12 mos.</p> <p>This study then used this experience of the past year IPV among currently married women.</p>	<p>resulted in higher frequency of both physical and sexual violence.</p> <p>Women who participated in making household decisions were more empowered but more likely to be subjected to violence. Sexual and/or physical violence increased with the increase of decision-making. All IPV's were less when women accepted or justified beatings by spouses for one or more reasons.</p>
<p>Rahman, M., Sasagawa, T, Fujii, R., Tomizawa, H., & Makinoda, S. (2012). Intimate partner violence and unintended pregnancy among Bangladeshi women. <i>Journal of Interpersonal Violence</i>, 27(15), 2999-3015.</p>	<p>4,695 Women</p>	<p>Married women between the ages of 15 and 40 years old who had experienced one pregnancy in the 59 months immediately prior to the survey.</p>	<p>A sample was selected from a survey conducted by the National Institute for Population Research and Training of the Ministry of health and Family Welfare of Bangladesh in 2007.</p>	<p><u>Pregnancy circumstances:</u></p> <p>31% of pregnancies were unintended</p> <p>Commonalities of unintended pregnancies were: age, parity, education, religion, autonomy, contraception.</p> <p>Muslim women experience more unintended pregnancies.</p> <p><u>Prevalence of IPV among all married women:</u></p> <p>Between 15-19: 32% physical, 14% sexual, 37% physical and/or sexual;</p> <p>Between 20-29: 25% physical, 13% sexual, 30% physical and/or sexual</p> <p>Between 30-40: 20% physical, 11% sexual, 25% physical and/or sexual.</p>

PASK#14 Online Tables – Table 1: Partner abuse in Asia

Study	N	Sample Characteristics	Method and Design	Results
				<p>Minor physical IPV ranged between 48.2% and 49.1%. Severe physical IPV ranged between 13% and 18.4%.</p> <p><u>Prevalence of abuse for those who reported unintended pregnancy:</u> Physical IPV: 35% Sexual IPV: 40% Physical and/or sexual IPV: 35% Minor IPV: 35% Severe IPV: 41%</p> <p><u>Risk factors:</u> Early marriages; Age; Less education; Muslim; Low income.</p>
Cambodia				
<p>Kishor, S., & Johnson, K. (2004). <i>Profiling domestic violence: A multi-country study</i>. Calverton, Maryland: ORC Macro</p>	<p>2,403 women</p>	<p>Ever-married women from the community in reproductive age (15-49) in Cambodia. Since the DHS had slight variations in variables it assessed there were some differences in the inclusion criteria for the administration of the domestic violence module from country to country.</p>	<p>Data from national DHS conducted in Cambodia in 2000 by National Institute of Statistics/Ministry of Health. One ever-married woman randomly selected from each household, asked about demographic characteristics, PV victimization Administered a modified CTS including emotional and sexual abuse items</p>	<p><u>Physical female victimization:</u> Physical: 16.4% lifetime, 14.6% past year (36.0% of the latter assaulted 5 times or more) Sexual: 3.6% lifetime, 3.2% past year Emotional: 13.5% lifetime, 12.1% past year 10.0% of women who ever experienced physical abuse by husband, and 2.1% who had never been physically abused, reported having been physically abusive themselves 36.5% who reported violence suffered bruises and aches, 6.5% injury or</p>

PASK#14 Online Tables – Table 1: Partner abuse in Asia

Study	N	Sample Characteristics	Method and Design	Results
				broken bones, 6.3% had to get medical treatment
China:				
So-kum Tang, C. (1994). Prevalence of spouse aggression in Hong Kong. <i>Journal of Family Violence</i> ,9(4), 347.	246 females 136 males	Undergraduate students at Chinese University of Hong Kong Age range: 17-30, mean = 18.89 No gender differences in age, income, parent’s education Half of subjects’ fathers finished secondary school, half of mothers finished primary education	Administered Conflict Tactics Scale; reported on witnessed parental aggression	<u>Prevalence Rates of Partner Violence</u> 75% witnessed verbal aggression, 14% witnessed physical violence. Rate of observed father on mother and mother on father aggression comparable overall; but fathers more verbally abusive
So-Kum Tang, C. (1999). Marital power and aggression in a community sample of Hong Kong Chinese families. <i>Journal of Interpersonal Violence</i> , 14: 586-602	518 men, 752 women	Married or cohabitating partners from First Community Survey on Family Violence of Hong Kong. Mean age: 41.66 (men), 40.28 (women). Education, occupation type, income levels representative of Hong Kong general population.	Phone interviews in Chinese. Used Conflict Tactics Scales, marital satisfaction measure, and measure of marital power (based on who made final decisions regarding family entertainment, interacting with relatives, amount of money spent on food, major financial decisions, working outside family, having a child.	<u>Distribution of marital power (Men’s reports)</u> 54.1% of relationships equalitarian, 7.5% female dominant, 23.2% male dominant, 15.2% divided power <u>(Women’s reports)</u> 58.6% equalitarian, 13.2% female dominant, 13.3% male dominant, 14.9% divided power Marital (verbal and physical) aggression victimisation inversely related to equalitarian relationships. Highest rates of verbal aggression and minor physical violence in

PASK#14 Online Tables – Table 1: Partner abuse in Asia

Study	N	Sample Characteristics	Method and Design	Results
				relationships dominated by one partner; severe violence most frequent in male dominated relationships
<p>Xu, X., Zhu, F., O'Campo, P., Koenig, M. A., Mock, V., & Campbell, J. (2005). Prevalence of and Risk Factors for Intimate Partner Violence in China. <i>American Journal of public Health, 95</i>(1), 78- 85</p>	600 women	Women aged 18-60 attending an urban outpatient gynaecological clinic at a major teaching hospital in Fuzhou, China. Mean age: 31.3 years. Clinical sample	<p>Cross-sectional study. Face-to-face interviews. Data was assessed using the World Health Organization (WHO) Multi-country Study on Women's Health and Life Experiences Questionnaire. The IPV (psychological, physical, and sexual) section was developed based on a variety of scales such as the Conflict Tactic Scales and the Index of Spouse Abuse.</p> <p>Physical IPV was assessed via 11 items, psychological IPV via 6 items, and sexual IPV via 3 items</p>	<p><u>Prevalence Rates of Partner Violence</u> Physical IPV: Lifetime 38% -Past year 21% Sexual IPV: Lifetime 16%- Past year 12% Psychological IPV is not reported</p> <p>Total IPV (physical, psychological, and sexual): Lifetime 43%- Past year 26%</p> <p>For lifetime intimate partner violence, partners who had extramarital affairs and who refused to give respondents money were the strongest independent predictors. For intimate partner violence taking place within the year before the interview, frequent quarrelling was the strongest predictor.</p>
<p>Ying Lau (2005). Does pregnancy provide immunity from intimate partner abuse among Hong Kong Chinese women? <i>Social Science & Medicine, 61, 2, 365-</i></p>	1,200 women	Chinese Hong Kong women from a public hospital's postnatal ward were requested to participate in this study. Twelve hundred agreed to participate and completed a questionnaire. The	<p>The Abuse Assessment Screen Questionnaire was utilized to identify if the women in the study were classified as abused. The <i>Revised Conflict Tactics Scale (CTS-2)</i> was used to define the forms of the intimate partner abuse. Also examined were the victims' psychosocial</p>	<p><u>Prevalence Rates of Partner Violence</u> 11% experienced abuse during pregnancy The forms of abuse were as follows: 79% psychological aggression 49% sexual abuse 82% of the abusers were the women's husbands.</p>

PASK#14 Online Tables – Table 1: Partner abuse in Asia

Study	N	Sample Characteristics	Method and Design	Results
377		women were community based and sample representative of pregnant women within the population.	predictors of abuse during pregnancy.	<u>Risk factors:</u> Younger women Born in Hong Kong Single or cohabiting, Poor socio-economic status Poor partner relationship Unplanned pregnancy.
Wang, T., Parish, W., Laumann, E., & Luo, Y. (2009). Partner violence and sexual jealousy in China. <i>Violence against Women</i> , 15(7), 774-798. + Parish, W., Wang, T., Laumann, E., Pan, S., & Luo, Y. (2004). Intimate partner violence in China: National prevalence, risk factors and associated health problems. <i>International Family Perspectives</i> , 30(4), 174-181.	1,658 men 1,665 women	1,658 men and 1,665 women from mainland China who had steady sexual partner. Ages 20-64	Data from 1999-2000 Chinese Health and Family Life Survey of adults. Probabilistic sample drawn from 14 strata and 48 counties and city districts, selected according to size down the four sampling steps to the level of the individual. Respondents interviewed by same-sex interviewer at private hotel room or meeting facility. Respondents asked if their partner had ever hit them, not including in a joking or playful way, whether they had hit their partner Respondents also asked about sexual jealousy, attitudes about men's rights to control women, and socioeconomic status. Negative outcomes: 15	<u>Prevalence Rates of Partner Violence</u> 19% reported male to female (MF) violence, 3% reported female to male (FM). Bilateral violence reported by 15% of respondents. 12% of women and 5% of men reported to have been hit hard. Targets of partner violence tend to report less hitting than perpetrators – e.g., 11% of men reported hitting a female partner in past year, but only 5% of women said they'd been hit At age 30 in urban areas, 6.8% of men and 7.7% of women reported partner violence victimization. <u>Risk Factors</u> Higher rates of MF and FM violence among younger populations Bilateral violence most common in relationships of 6-15 years Significantly higher rates of MF

PASK#14 Online Tables – Table 1: Partner abuse in Asia

Study	N	Sample Characteristics	Method and Design	Results
			<p>questions included on respondents' self-reported unhappiness, mental distress, poor health, sexual anxiety and disturbed sexual performance, and presence of STDs. The analysis of risk factors drawn from the urban samples</p>	<p>violence in rural area compared to urban areas (21% vs. 14%) MF violence correlated with male partner's low SES status and woman contributing less than 30% of household income, and FM violence negatively correlated with woman earning more than 45% of family income. Any alcohol use predicted FM violence, inebriation predicted MF violence Sexual jealousy from either partner, or both, correlated with MF, FM and bilateral violence MF violence positively correlated with beliefs that men should take lead in sexual activity; FM violence negatively correlated with these beliefs</p> <p><u>Impact of Violence</u> 11% of women who reported to never having been hit said they were unhappy, compared to 29% who had been hit MF violence also significantly correlated with following impact on women: mental distress, sexual dissatisfaction, unwanted sexual behavior, and recent genitourinary symptoms.</p>

PASK#14 Online Tables – Table 1: Partner abuse in Asia

Study	N	Sample Characteristics	Method and Design	Results
				<p>FM violence significantly correlated with sexual dissatisfaction and unwanted sexual behavior; hard FM violence correlated with unhappiness, mental distress, poor health, and recent genitourinary symptoms</p>
<p>Mak, W.S., Chong, E.K., & Kwong, M.F. (2010). Prevalence of same-sex intimate partner violence in Hong Kong. <i>Public Health, 124</i>,3, 149-152.</p>	<p>339 both</p>	<p>The study included 398 individuals. The vast majority of participants were Chinese (95.9%). Participants were either homosexual (79.6%) or bisexual. Of those, 339 reported either currently being in a same-sex relationship (79.4%), or within the last two years had been in a same-sex relationship (20.6%). The average age of participants was 26.2 years, and 64.3% were female.</p>	<p>This study utilized the Chinese Revised Conflict Tactics Scale to measure intimate partner violence among same-sex relationships. The scale measures psychological aggression, physical assault, injury and sexual coercion from the perspectives of victim and perpetrator. The questions determined what percentage of participants experience at least one act of any form of abuse within the entire length of their relationship.</p>	<p>Results reflect abuse during the length of the relationship.</p> <p><u>Prevalence Rates of Partner Violence</u> 48.1% more than one type of abuse; 93.6% sexual coercion; 98.0% physical assault and experiencing psychological abuse; 32.7% of isolated psychological abuse; 0.6% isolated physical abuse; 1.2% sexual abuse; 12.7% all three forms of abuse.</p> <p>Participants also reported abuse they inflicted on another, as follows: 47.2% more than one type of abuse; 94.2% sexual coercion; 97.1% physical assault combined with psychological abuse; 38.4% of perpetrators reported isolated psychological abuse; 0.9% physical abuse;</p>

PASK#14 Online Tables – Table 1: Partner abuse in Asia

Study	N	Sample Characteristics	Method and Design	Results
				<p>0.9% sexual abuse. 12.1% reported inflicting all three. Study outcome indicated same-sex IPV in Hong Kong is comparative to Western countries.</p> <p>The outcome results showed that the rate of abuse within same-sex relationships was higher than those in heterosexual relationships.</p>
<p>Hou, J., Li Yu, Siu-Man Raymond Ting, Yee Tak Sze, & Xiaoyi Fang (2011). The status and characteristics of couple violence in China. <i>Journal of Family Violence</i>, 26: 81-92.</p>	<p>194 couples</p>	<p>Married couples from the community in Beijing, China.</p> <p>Wives were aged 20-59 years (mean age = 36.6 years).</p> <p>Husbands were aged 21-59 years (mean age = 38.3).Community sample It was a combination of a community sample (couples recruited from different neighbourhoods) and a selected sample (couples selected at a family therapy course)</p>	<p>Participants were recruited by the Judicial Office personnel who distributed questionnaires in different neighborhoods, and by students at a family therapy course at the Beijing Normal University.</p> <p>3 subscales of the CTS-2 used (physical, psychological and sexual abuse)</p> <p>Couples asked about perpetration and victimization in past 4 months</p> <p>Administered to couples in various parts of Beijing by neighborhood committees (n=84)and by students at Beijing Normal University</p>	<p><u>Demographics:</u> 172 first marriages 50 without children 119 with one child Age range (wives): 20-59 Age range (husbands) 21-59 32.2% of husbands and 8.2% of wives had advanced degree. Respondents above the national average in income.</p> <p><u>Physical violence perpetration:</u> 29.4% of wives, 24.6 % of husbands <u>Physical violence victimization:</u> 22.0% of wives, 25.8% of husbands</p> <p>Psychological abuse perpetration: 44.4% of wives, 42.2% of husbands Psychological abuse victimization: 41.6% of wives, 45.4% of husbands</p>

PASK#14 Online Tables – Table 1: Partner abuse in Asia

Study	N	Sample Characteristics	Method and Design	Results
			(n=110)	Sexual violence perpetration: 15.0% of wives, 20.9% of husbands Sexual violence victimization: 23.0% of wives, 14.4% of husbands 31.8% of couples both violent; 11.7% wife only violent; 10.6% husband only violent
Yanqiu, G., Yan, W., & Lin, A. (2011). Suicidal Ideation and the Prevalence of Intimate Partner Violence Against Women in Rural Western China. <i>Violence Against Women</i> , 17(10), 1299-1312.	1,771 women	Married women aged 64 or younger (Mean age = 42.1 years) from the community in Ningxia Hui Autonomous Region, Western China. Participating women took part in a community-based intervention aimed at IPV and women's suicidal ideation (a common correlate in that region of China where women attempt suicide impulsively with poisonous pesticides kept at home after an episode of physical assault by their partner. Eligible women had to have been living in their current village for at least 6 months. Selected sample	Cross-sectional study. Face-to-face interviews. The study derived from a follow-up study assessing the effect of a community-based intervention program aimed at reducing IPV and suicide. The study collected data until an estimated quota was met. Examined the prevalence and likelihood of physical, psychological, and sexual IPV; and suicidal ideation amongst victims of IPV. IPV (physical, psychological, and sexual) was examined with the CTS2	<u>Prevalence Rates of Partner Violence</u> Physical IPV: Lifetime 34%-Past year 8% Psychological IPV: Lifetime 68%-Past year 32% Sexual coercion: Lifetime 4%-Past year-None Physical abuse victims were at more than four times greater risk of having suicidal ideation than those who had not suffered physical assault

PASK#14 Online Tables – Table 1: Partner abuse in Asia

Study	N	Sample Characteristics	Method and Design	Results
<p>Chan, Ko Ling (2012). Gender symmetry in the self-reporting of intimate partner violence. <i>Journal of Interpersonal Violence</i>, 27 (2), 263-286.</p>	<p>1,870 couples</p>	<p>Adult couples aged 16 or older from the community living in Hong Kong that were married or cohabiting. The sample used in this study was a subset of a representative household survey in Hong Kong carried out in 2004.</p>	<p>Subsample of 2004 Hong Kong representative household survey. Survey on PV perpetration and demographics administered in Cantonese, Mandarin and English. Measures used: Revised CTS-2; Personal and Relationship Profile (risk factors); Acquisitive Face Orientation Scale (measures need for saving face)</p>	<p><u>Prevalence Rates of Partner Violence</u> Lifetime Perpetration: Physical abuse: 9.4% male, 10.5% female (severe: 3.4% male, 3.5% female) Psychological abuse/control: 53.9% male, 54.4% female (severe 18.3% male, 19.7% female) Sexual abuse: 7.8% male, 5.9% female)</p> <p>No significant differences across gender for all PV perpetration categories lifetime or preceding year, except severe psychological aggression (higher by females) and sexual abuse (higher by males)</p> <p>Injuries caused: 3.3% and female (1.5% severe injury male and female)</p> <p><u>Factors in Agreement/Disagreement</u> Violence approval, need to save face and negative attribution all correlated with disagreement in PV reporting between man and wife. Social desirability negatively correlated with disagreement</p>
<p>Chiung-Tao Shen, A., Yu-Lung Chiu, M., & Gao, J. (2012).</p>	<p>976 both</p>	<p>Male and female students (49% boys) at 42 middle and high schools in Taiwan, Hong Kong and</p>	<p>Cross sectional, correlational study. Examined perpetration and</p>	<p><u>Prevalence Rates of Partner Violence</u> 27.3% reported perpetration of any dating violence (including physical, sexual abuse, controlling behaviors);</p>

PASK#14 Online Tables – Table 1: Partner abuse in Asia

Study	N	Sample Characteristics	Method and Design	Results
<p>Predictors of dating violence among Chinese adolescents: the role of gender-role beliefs and justification of violence. <i>Journal of Interpersonal Violence</i> (27 (6), 1066-1089.</p>		<p>Shanghai, China. Mean age =15.9 years</p>	<p>victimization. Measures used: Dating Violence Scale: 9 physical violence items, 2 sexual violence, 4 controlling behaviors/stalking items. Attitudes Toward Women Scale. Attitudes Justifying Dating Violence Scale Chinese Hostility Inventory</p>	<p>39% reported dating violence victimization; 46.7% were in bilaterally-violent relationships</p> <p><u>Gender comparison:</u></p> <p>Boys reported higher rates of sexual violence perpetration, and physical violence victimization, compared to girls</p> <p>No gender differences in prevalence of physical violence perpetration, controlling behaviors and sexual violence victimization</p> <p>Both male and female participants more accepting of partner violence by girls than by boys</p> <p>Boys’ attitudes justifying their violence was the most significant predictor of physical violence perpetration</p>
<p>East Timor</p>				
<p>Hynes, M., Ward, J., Robertson, K., & Crouse, C. (2004). A determination of the prevalence of gender-based violence</p>	<p>256 women</p>	<p>Women in East Timor age 18-49 in partnership with a man 55.9% in 25-39 year range 95.8% ethnic Timorese</p>	<p>Non-representative sample drawn from districts of Dili and Alieu selected by International Rescue Committee, which provided services to the population following the war.</p>	<p><u>Prevalence Rates</u> 52.7% reported PV in one or both sample periods; of these, 41.5% reported physical injuries, and of these 30.4% sought medical treatment 67.3% and 62.7% reported being</p>

PASK#14 Online Tables – Table 1: Partner abuse in Asia

Study	N	Sample Characteristics	Method and Design	Results
<p>among conflict-affected populations in East Timor. <i>Disasters</i>, 28 (3), 294-321.</p>		<p>and Catholic 53.8% able to read and write easily; 51% unemployed 36% provided main source of family income</p>	<p>Survey administered by all female team, used items from WHO Demographic and Health Survey and examined women's experiences of physical and sexual violence victimization, including PV, for previous 12-month period prior to the war (1998) and after (2002) PV defined as: Physical: pull hair, slap, twist arm, hit with fist or something else, push down, kick and choke Intimidation/control: forbid to see friends or family, keep away from medical care or refused money for food Verbal: insult or swear, threaten to hurt, threaten with weapons Sexual abuse: threat of physical harm or force to obtain sex, forcing one to have sex with other people</p>	<p>insulted (pre and post war);34.4% and 30.5% reported any verbal abuse; 40.4% and 43.1% report being slapped or having arm twisted. 40% of the women who had been abused reported that partner had demanded sex after perpetrating abuse Sexual coercion 16.4% and 15.7%</p> <p><u>Risk Factors</u> Women who married younger 3 times as likely to report being intimidated and controlled; and women who reported having been violent themselves to their husbands were also 3 times more likely to be controlled Rural women twice as likely to experience verbal abuse Illiterate women 3 times at risk for sexual abuse victimization; women who themselves were abusive to partner 4 times as likely to be sexually abuse Correlation between childhood physical abuse by parent and physical and verbal PV and control in current marriage</p>
<p>India:</p>				
<p>Kishor, S., & Johnson, K. (2004). <i>Profiling domestic</i></p>	<p>90,303 women</p>	<p>Ever-married women age from the community 15-49 in India. Since the</p>	<p>Data from DHS conducted in India nationally 1998-2000 by International Institute for</p>	<p><u>Prevalence Rates of Partner Violence</u> Physical victimization: 18.9% lifetime,</p>

PASK#14 Online Tables – Table 1: Partner abuse in Asia

Study	N	Sample Characteristics	Method and Design	Results
<p><i>violence: A multi-country study.</i> Calverton, Maryland, USA: ORC Macro</p>		<p>DHS had slight variations in variables it assessed there were some differences in the inclusion criteria for the administration of the domestic violence module from country to country.</p>	<p>Population Sciences. One randomly-selected ever-married (or non-married in some countries) woman per household aged 15-49 was interviewed. Respondents asked about demographic characteristics, PV victimization (single question on whether they had ever been beaten)</p>	<p>10.3% past year (of the latter, 14.4% were assaulted 5 or more times)</p>
<p>Varma, D., Chandraa, P.S., Thomasa, T., & Carey, M.P. (2007). Intimate partner violence and sexual coercion among pregnant women in India: Relationship with depression and post-traumatic stress disorder. Special issue: Depression and anxiety in women across cultures. <i>Journal of Affective Disorders, 102, 1-3, 227-235.</i></p>	<p>203 women</p>	<p>Over a 2 month period, 203 pregnant patients at an urban obstetric center of an outpatient clinic were who met the study criteria were recruited for this study. Participants were married women between the ages of 16 to 34 years with the average age 23 years. The women could speak English or Kannada. They could not have a past history of severe mental illness were excluded. The religious breakdown was 55% Hindu, 39% Muslim, and 6% Christian. Education</p>	<p>This study used a structured questionnaire administered to the participants a private cubicle. Questions asked about demographics, history of domestic violence and history of depression and anxiety. Depression and anxiety scales were collected through standardized self-rating. The purpose of the study was to determine the relationship between intimate partner violence victimization and mental health, including depression and PTSD, and life satisfaction.</p>	<p><u>Prevalence Rates of Partner Violence:</u> 14% physical violence (all of which also reported psychological violence); 15% psychological violence.</p> <p><u>Ongoing violence during pregnancy:</u> 50% of those that reported abuse outside of pregnancy. In 9% of the women, sexual violence through force or coercion was reported during pregnancy.</p> <p><u>Religious significance:</u> Hindu families represented 19% of those reporting abuse; Other religions were 8%.</p> <p><u>Risk factors:</u> Perpetrator’s alcohol use was present in 82%</p>

PASK#14 Online Tables – Table 1: Partner abuse in Asia

Study	N	Sample Characteristics	Method and Design	Results
		<p>levels were: (76%) either primary or high school education; 13% no formal schooling; and 10% had attended college. Most women lived in the urban areas (77%); 89%, were homemakers; 50% lived in joint families; 47% lived in nuclear families.</p>		<p>Those with a history of abuse or sexual coercion were more likely to suffer with depression, somatic, and PTSD symptoms. Any form of violence reduced life satisfaction.</p>
<p>Santhya, K.G., Haberland, N., Ram, F., Sinha, R.K., & Mohanty, S.K. (2007). Consent and coercion: Examining unwanted sex among married young women in India. <i>International Family Planning Perspectives</i>, 33(3), 124-132.</p>	<p>1,664 women</p>	<p>Study setting was rural where in the two states. In those two states the illiteracy rate of girls between 15 and 19 years of age are 23 and 25%. It was conducted in 49 villages totally a population of approx. 88,000. It included young women who were married within the prior 2 years, were pregnant with their first child, or who had given birth within the prior 18 months. From a household listing 2,862 women were identified and 2,115 were interviewed. Less than</p>	<p>This study was both quantitative and qualitative, using a survey and in-depth interviews. The survey portion measured, “transition to marriage; work experience; access to and control over resources; mobility; social connections; spousal communication and support; experience of physical abuse and unwanted sex; and reproductive health knowledge and practices.” The questionnaires were administered at the respondent’s homes and in private. Unwanted sex was the focus of the subsample, which made up 79% of the full sample, leaving 1,664</p>	<p><u>Prevalence Rates of Partner Violence Within Marriage</u> Nearly four out of five women reported telling their husbands they did not want to have sex (80.3% at least 18 years old). 44% experienced sex against their will. 12% experienced repeated unwanted sex experiences; 32% reported occasional unwanted sexual experiences; Newly married women without children were less likely to verbalize their desire not to have sex (60.9% 19 years old and below). <u>Risk Factors:</u> These women had less education; Likely to live with extended families, Were Hindu;</p>

PASK#14 Online Tables – Table 1: Partner abuse in Asia

Study	N	Sample Characteristics	Method and Design	Results
		<p>1% of the women identified refused, and 25% were not available due to the culture of frequent relocation during early marriage days.</p>	<p>participants who told their husbands no, but there were another 442 women who did not want sex, but did not vocalize that to their husbands. In-depth interviews were conducted with 69 women from the survey to gain further insight.</p>	<p>Lower socioeconomic living environment.</p> <p><u>Self definitions:</u> One woman reported that “rarely” did her husband force sex on her, elaborating to her that meant 4 to 5 times a month; Another woman described that same number as “often.”</p> <p>The western term of “physical and emotional abuse” is referred to here as “physical and emotional harassment.” Of women who expressed their desire not to have sex, 36% were also physically and emotionally “harassed.”</p>
<p>Kamat, U., Ferreira, AMA, Motghare, D.D., Kamat, N., & Pinto, NR. (2010). A cross-sectional study of physical spousal violence against women in Goa. <i>Healthline</i>, 1 (1), 34-40.</p>	<p>345 women</p>	<p>Married women aged 18-49 years selected by systematic random sampling based on the latest voter’s list at the moment of the study to obtain a minimum of 345 married women. Community sample</p>	<p>Random sample of married women in the Caranzalem ward of Tiswadi taluka in the state of Goa, India. Face-to-face interviews by female interviewers. Semi structured questionnaire asked about sociodemographic information and PV (according to WHO guidelines) for the previous 3 month period.</p>	<p><u>Prevalence Rates</u> 26.6% of respondents reported physical victimization for previous 3-month period</p> <p><u>Risk Factors</u> PV victimization correlated significantly with woman’s employment; but women with higher incomes than husband at lesser risk for PV Higher education associated with lesser risk Primary triggers for husband’s</p>

PASK#14 Online Tables – Table 1: Partner abuse in Asia

Study	N	Sample Characteristics	Method and Design	Results
<p>Raj, A., Saggurti, N., Lawrence, D., Balaiah, D., & Silverman, J., G. (2010). Association between adolescent marriage and marital violence among young adult women in India. <i>International Journal of Gynecology and Obstetrics</i>, 110, 35-39.</p>	<p>10,514 women</p>	<p>Married women aged 20-24 years in the community. The sample reported in this study is a subset of the 2005/2006 Indian Family Health Survey. Participants included in this analysis were restricted to that particular age range because it was representative of more recent adolescent marriage practices</p>	<p>Subset of the cross-sectional multi-stage 2006 Indian national Family Health Survey. It assessed lifetime and 12-month physical IPV victimization via 7 items (8 minor and severe), and sexual IPV victimization via 2 items.</p>	<p>violence: woman objected to his alcohol use, husband jealous/suspicious, or dowry related</p> <p><u>Prevalence Rates of Partner Violence</u> Physical IPV: Lifetime = 32% / 12-month = 23.8% Severe physical IPV: Lifetime = 11.9% / 12-month = 8.9% Sexual IPV: Lifetime = 10.3% / 12-month = 8.7% Overall IPV (physical and sexual): Lifetime = 34.9% / 12-month = 27%</p> <p>Women who were married as adolescents remain at increased risk of IPV into young adulthood.</p>
<p>Gaikwad, V., Madhukumar, S., & Sudeepa D (2011). An epidemiological study of domestic violence against women and its association with sexually transmitted infections in Bangalore Rural. <i>Online Journal of Health and Allied Sciences</i>, 10 (3).</p>	<p>257 women</p>	<p>Women of reproductive age (15-49) interviewed for current and experience of domestic violence within 12-months, and were screened for sexually transmitted infections using WHO guidelines. The sample size ($n = 257$) was pre-determined by a formula used for sample calculation in cross-sectional studies.</p>	<p>Cross sectional study, using random sample of women in rural Bangalore, India – Kolathur and Parvathipura villages</p> <p>Administered questionnaire on physical, psychological and sexual PV for past 12 month period.</p>	<p><u>Prevalence Rates</u> 29.5% reported any PV victimization Physical victimization: 31.58% Verbal abuse: 81.58% Sexual abuse: 10.53%</p> <p><u>Risk Factors</u> PV victimization associated with younger age, less education, being a housewife compared to working, married at a young age. High significant correlation between PV victimization and husband's alcohol use</p>

PASK#14 Online Tables – Table 1: Partner abuse in Asia

Study	N	Sample Characteristics	Method and Design	Results
<p>Mahapatro, M., Gupta, R.N., Gupta, V., & Kundu, A.S. (2011). Domestic violence during pregnancy in India. <i>Journal of Interpersonal Violence</i>, 26(15), 2973-2990.</p>	<p>28,615 women</p>	<p>The study took place in 6 zones of India, totaling 18 states. The sample included 14,507 currently married women between the ages of 15 and 35, and 14,108 married men below the age of 50.</p>	<p>This was an analytical cross sectional study. Semi-structured questionnaires, focus group discussions, and case studies were used to collect data. The semi-structured questionnaires focused on, “socioeconomic variable, empowerment indicators, violence experience, treatment, and support received by the battered women and coping strategy.” Because of the male dominated society in India, more open-ended cultural structure was necessary to obtain open discussion.</p>	<p>PV victims also likely to report sexually transmitted diseases</p> <p><u>Lifetime Prevalence Rates of Partner Violence</u> 63% of the female participants reported psychological violence victimization; 26% reported physical violence; 22% reported sexual violence during their last pregnancies.</p> <p><u>Geographic Risk Factors:</u> Women in poorer northern regions faced 50% sexual violence. In the southern area 43% of the women reported physical violence. Psychological violence was reported an alarming 90% by the women in the central, northeast and northern zones. In the Northeast zone 62% of women reported domestic violence during pregnancy.</p> <p>Findings show that women who report domestic violence are less likely to receive antenatal care. There is also a strong correlation between the demand for a male child and domestic abuse across the zones.</p>
<p>Chokkanathan, S. (2012). Wife abuse in Tamil Nadu.</p>	<p>3,446 women</p>	<p>Women in Tamil Nadu region of India, ages 15-49, currently or</p>	<p>Data obtained from survey of women’s reproductive health. Sample in urban areas first</p>	<p><u>12-month Rates of Violence</u> 25.8% of respondents reported any physical IPV abuse in past year (similar</p>

PASK#14 Online Tables – Table 1: Partner abuse in Asia

Study	N	Sample Characteristics	Method and Design	Results
<p><i>Journal of Family Violence</i>, 27, 275-285.</p>		<p>previously married. Mean age: 32.49 77.2% had some schooling; 56.2% not working outside home and same number had low socioeconomic status.</p>	<p>drawn from wards (large areas of housing units), then from census block, then households. In rural areas, sample began with selection of villages, then household using random sampling. Partner violence measured by adapted version of CTS. Intergenerational violence measured according to having witnessed father on mother violence. Respondents also asked about their level of financial independence, education and extent of patriarchal ideology</p> <p>Findings analyzed according to ecological model of risk factors: ontogenetic/individual, micro (relationship),exo (immediate social structures and neighborhood), and macro(society)</p>	<p>between urban and rural areas) 12% reported emotional abuse. <u>Risk Factors</u> Having witnessed father hit mother (ontogenetic factor) significantly correlated with partner violence victimization. Micro factors (husband’s alcohol use, emotional abuse, family size) accounted for 24% of the variance in violence for urban areas, and 25% for rural areas. Violence positively correlated with husband’s primary and secondary education (exo level) Patriarchal beliefs accounted for 5% and 3% of the variance in violence for urban and rural samples, respectively</p>
<p>Japan:</p>				
<p>Yoshihama, M., Horrocks, J., & Kamano, S. (2009). The role of emotional abuse in intimate</p>	<p>1,371 women</p>	<p>An official resident roster was used to collect a random sample from Yokohama of women between the ages of 18</p>	<p>Although this study was originally set up as a qualitative interview study, due to the small housing quarters it was converted to a self-reporting</p>	<p><u>Lifetime Prevalence Rates of Partner Violence</u> 15.1% physical or sexual violence victimization; 12.6% physical violence; 6.4% sexual violence;</p>

PASK#14 Online Tables – Table 1: Partner abuse in Asia

Study	N	Sample Characteristics	Method and Design	Results
<p>partner violence and health among women in Yokohama, Japan. <i>American Journal of Public Health</i>, 99(4), 647-653.</p>		<p>and 49, the mean age of respondents was 35.2 years. Education averaged 13.7% year of school, with 63.1% with some postsecondary education. Married respondents represented 70.7% and 64.4% had 1 or more children.</p>	<p>questionnaire to protect the privacy of the respondents. The questionnaire for the Core Questionnaire version 9.9 developed by the WHO Violence Against Women Study Core Research Team. Letters were sent out to women on the roster stating this was a women’s health and life experiences study in order to not put women in danger if it was discovered she was reporting on violence in the home. Then a trained interviewer went to the residence of the respondents to administer the questionnaire.</p>	<p>43.9% emotional abuse; 27.8% being insulted 16.8% being threatening or intimidating.</p> <p>Those who experience physical or sexual abuse also experienced emotional abuse (89.3%).</p> <p>Being slapped or objects thrown, being pushed, or forced sexual intercourse were the most common forms of physical or sexual abuse.</p>
<p>Yoshihama, M., & Horrocks, J. (2010). Risk of intimate partner violence: Role of childhood sexual abuse and sexual initiation in women in Japan. <i>Children and Youth Services Review</i>, 32, 28-37</p>	<p>1,371 women</p>	<p>Women aged 18-49 living in the city of Yokohama. Mean age: 35.46 years</p>	<p>Stratified survey. Cluster sampling, face-to-face interview. The study was part of the World Health Organization Multi-country Study of Women’s Health and Domestic Violence. By means of the WHO standardized Core Questionnaire Version 9.9 lifetime physical (6 items: 2 items for minor IPV and 4 for severe IPV) and sexual 3 items) IPV victimization was assessed.</p>	<p><u>Lifetime Prevalence Rates of Partner Violence</u> Physical IPV: 17.7% Sexual IPV: 8.5%</p> <p>Childhood sexual abuse by known perpetrators, exposure to IPV against the mother, and early sexual initiation, independently contributed to an elevated probability of experiencing IPV in adulthood. In addition, risk of sexual IPV does not change significantly after marriage</p>

PASK#14 Online Tables – Table 1: Partner abuse in Asia

Study	N	Sample Characteristics	Method and Design	Results
<p>Mayumi Ohnishi, Rieko Nakao, Satomi Shibayama, Yumi Matsuyama, Kazuyo Oishi, & Harumi Miyahara (2011). Knowledge, experience, and potential risks of dating violence among Japanese university students: a cross-sectional study. <i>BMC Public Health</i>, 11:339.</p>	<p>148 women 126 men</p>	<p>The study sample included freshmen students recruited from non-medical health faculties. Some attended a lecture on domestic and dating violence and/or attended the same type of lecture during high school.</p>	<p>This is a cross-sectional self-administered questionnaire study. Information gathered were demographic characteristics, experience of harassment toward a boy/girlfriend, receiving harassment, actions after receiving harassment, termination of relationship, recognizing dating violence. Knowledge was measured by responding to dating violence scenarios. Questions were based on a booklet titled, “Do you know about dating violence?” published by DV Prevention Nagasaki. In this study, harassment is the term used to describe coercive behavior physical, psychological, sexual dating violence. Severe physical IPV victimisation was assessed via 1 item, and severe physical IPV perpetration was assessed via 1 item.</p>	<p><u>Sample Demographics</u> Students were between 18 and 20 years old; 126 males and 148 females; 63.5 of males and females were currently in a relationship.</p> <p><u>Prevalence Rates of Partner Violence</u> Approximately half of the respondents had either harassed or been harassed by an intimate partner.</p> <p>More than half did not recognize verbal harassment, control, or unprotected sex as violence.</p>
<p>Nepal:</p>				
<p>Adhikari, R., & Tamang, J. (2010). Sexual coercion of</p>	<p>1,536 women</p>	<p>Married women between age 15-49, of reproductive age from</p>	<p>Cross sectional survey on Domestic Violence in Nepal, using two-staged stratified</p>	<p><u>Lifetime Sexual Victimization Rates</u> Forced intercourse reported by 58% of the women; 45% had unwanted</p>

PASK#14 Online Tables – Table 1: Partner abuse in Asia

Study	N	Sample Characteristics	Method and Design	Results
<p>married women in Nepal. <i>BMC Women's Health</i>, 10:31.</p>		<p>Nepal's 75 districts representing the Eastern and Western, and far Western regions of Nepal. Community sample.</p>	<p>random sample of 4 out of 75 nationwide districts. Face-to-face interviews. Only one woman per household was interviewed. Whenever there were more than one woman participants were randomly selected. Interviews were conducted in a private space without the presence of a third party.</p> <p>Structured questionnaire asked about sociodemographic information and sexual coercion Sexual coercion defined as having been forced to have sexual intercourse when respondent did not want to, have sexual intercourse out of fear of what husband might do, and forced to do something sexual that respondent found degrading</p>	<p>intercourse because they were afraid of husband; and 3% said they had to do something sexually degrading</p> <p><u>Risk Factors</u> Sexual victimization correlated with woman's illiteracy, earning an income, making own health care decisions or in-laws' decision, husband agricultural or blue collar worker, husband's low education and alcohol use, high patriarchal control by husband and woman's perception of having low relationship power</p>
<p>Lamichhane, P., Puri, M., Tamang, & Dulal, B. (2011). <i>Women's Status and Violence against Young Married Women in Rural</i></p>	<p>1,296 women</p>	<p>Married women aged 15-24 in four districts Dolkha, Sindhupalchowk, Dang and Kapilvastu, of Nepal</p>	<p>Two-stage cross-sectional survey. Face-to-face interviews. Lifetime and 12-month IPV victimisation was assessed via 10 items. Physical IPV was examined by 6 items, and sexual IPV (coercion) was</p>	<p><u>Prevalence Rates of Partner Violence</u> Lifetime physical IPV: 25.3% / 12-month: 17.4% Lifetime sexual IPV: 46.2% / 12-month: 31.3% Overall lifetime IPV: 51.9% (12-month: 35.8%</p>

PASK#14 Online Tables – Table 1: Partner abuse in Asia

Study	N	Sample Characteristics	Method and Design	Results
Nepal. <i>BMC Women's Health</i> , 11: 19			assessed via 4 items	<u>Risk Factors</u> It is concluded that no or little inter-spousal communication and low autonomy of women significantly increases the odds of experiencing violence among married women in rural Nepal
Oshiro, A., Poudyal, A. K., Poudel, K. C., Jimba, M., & Hokama, T. (2011). Intimate Partner Violence Among General and Urban Poor Populations in Kathmandu, Nepal. <i>Journal of Interpersonal Violence</i> , 26(10), 2073-2092.	906 women	Ever-married Women aged 15-49 years. 680 were from the general population, and 225 women from urban poor population. Mean age general population: 31 years. Mean age urban poor population: 29 years	Multi-stage (cluster) community-based cross-sectional study randomly selected. It assessed lifetime physical IP victimisation via 6 items (World Health Organisation questionnaire)	Lifetime IPV: General population = 19.9% Urban poor population = 33.8% Total (both samples) = 23.3% Several factors were significantly associated with physical IPV in both populations: the frequency of the husband's drinking, polygyny, and lower household economic status. However the husband's lower educational level and early marriage compared to the general population, the urban poor population showed a significantly higher prevalence of physical IPV and differences in the associated risk factors
Papua new Guinea:				
Lewis, I., Maruia, B., & Walker, S. (2008). Violence against women in Papua New Guinea. <i>Journal of Family Studies</i> , 14:	415 women	The sample came from the regions NCD, Western Highlands, Western Province and Morobe. It included 415 women attending 17	This is a mixed approach study combining quantitative and qualitative methods. The quantitative portion is used to measure intimate partner violence and HIV and STI	<u>Sample Demographics</u> Most women participating were between 20 – 30 years old (although women often had to estimate their ages). 88.6% were married, had a partner or

PASK#14 Online Tables – Table 1: Partner abuse in Asia

Study	N	Sample Characteristics	Method and Design	Results
183-197.		antenatal and Voluntary Counseling and Testing clinics. Sample ages were between 15 and 60 years.	status. Interviewers were provided 37 qualitative and quantitative questions to ask participants about violence, sexual practices, and HIV. They were then given an HIV test. The interview process was necessary due to the high illiteracy rates.	<p>was currently separated. Education results showed that 58.7% had no more than a 6th grade education, and 14.2 had no education at all. Only 5.9% had beyond a 11th grade education. Employed participants consisted of 17.8%.</p> <p><u>Lifetime Prevalence Rates of Partner Violence</u> 58% physical violence (including beatings and weapons used, such as coffee sticks, knives, bush knives and hot water); 44.5% sexual abuse (52.2% stated they could not say no), with a strong association between sexual assault and HIV; 58% emotional abuse; 38% social isolation and control; 47% financial abuse.</p>
Philippines:				
Ansara, D.L., & Hindin, M.J. (2009). Perpetration of intimate partner aggression by men and women in the Philippines. <i>Journal of Interpersonal</i>	1,861 women	Data obtained from the 2002 Cebu Longitudinal Health and Nutrition Survey, a community cohort of women and their children in and around Cebu, Philippines. Mostly	<p>Respondents administered modified Conflict Tactics Scale, subjects interviewed by in private by women interviewers</p> <p>Sexual coercion by husband measured by how often wives reported “ever have sex with</p>	<p><u>Past year</u> Physical aggression perpetration: 9.9% woman only; 5.9% man only; 10.3% both partners</p> <p>Frequent psychological aggression perpetration: 9.8% woman only; 4.2% man only; 18.0% both partners</p>

PASK#14 Online Tables – Table 1: Partner abuse in Asia

Study	N	Sample Characteristics	Method and Design	Results
<i>Violence, 24(9).</i>		urban, but also rural sample. All respondents married or cohabited with partner. Most women in their mid-40s, wage earners.	their husband when they did not want to because they were afraid of what he might do” Psychological aggression measured by verbal and symbolic aggression (breaking things) and threat items on CTS “Frequent” psychological aggression: average once or more per month	Argument that led to most recent episode of violence initiated by man 56.5% of the time, and by woman 43.5% of the time Partner’s alcohol use most commonly cited reason for both female and male perpetrated violence; jealousy also common. Partner nagging cited as reason for men’s violence <u>During entire relationship</u> 9.2% of men used or threatened to use a weapon on partner 22.0% of men sexually coerced 7.3 % of women and 3.4% of men required medical attention for injuries
Fehringer, J., & Hindin, M. (2009). Like parent, like child: Intergenerational transmission of partner violence in Cebu, the Philippines. <i>Journal of Adolescent Health, 44</i> , 363-371.	472 couples	Married or cohabitating young pregnant women in Cebu province, Philippines and their male partners. Average age: 21	Data from Cebu Longitudinal Health and Nutrition Survey, a longitudinal study, at one of the follow-ups. PV perpetration and victimization measured with adapted version of CTS, for previous 12-month period Questionnaire also inquired about maternal and household characteristics, individual characteristics and family of origin violence	<u>PV Prevalence</u> Significantly higher rates of PV perpetration reported by women: (55.8% versus 25.1%) Victimization rates more similar (30.5% male, 27.7% female) 45% of the women and 50% of the men reported having witnessed violence between their parents <u>Risk Factors</u> Higher PV perpetration correlated with

PASK#14 Online Tables – Table 1: Partner abuse in Asia

Study	N	Sample Characteristics	Method and Design	Results
				rural residence, being with partner 25-36 months PV victimization correlated with witnessing mother to father PV as a child and low joint decision making by the parents
South Korea:				
Kim, J., & Emery, C. (2003). Marital power, conflict, norm consensus, and marital violence in a nationally representative sample of Korean couples. <i>Journal of Interpersonal Violence</i> , 18 (2), 197-219.	1,523 men	Married and cohabiting men in South Korea, age 20 years and older. Community sample. Sample size was pre-determined by a formula that needed about 1500 participants.	Stratified national representative sample survey. Regions selected from 1995 census data. Respondents contacted by telephone. Survey asked about partner violence in past year, conflict and relationship power. CTS used to measure partner violence. Relationship power measured according to which partner has the final say in making major decisions. Conflict measured according to extent of agreement on control of the money, cleaning and cooking, and problems with the children.	<u>Prevalence Rates of Partner Violence</u> Any male to female (MF) violence past year: 27.8% Any female to male (FM) violence past year: 15.8% Highest levels of marital conflict and violence (both MF and FM) in male-dominated households Highest degree of consensus among equalitarian relationships, lowest among female-dominant ones
Kim, B., & Titterington, V.B. (2009). Domestic violence and South Korean women: The cultural	315 women	Ninety-three female inmates (in the fall of 2004) incarcerated for murdering their spouses and being held in Cheng-Ju Women’s Correctional	This is a study comparison using two previous studies - women incarcerated for murdering their intimate partners and women living in shelters that have been abused -	<u>Education</u> Incarcerated women: 54.3% did not graduate high school; 31.2% were high school graduates; 14% had some

PASK#14 Online Tables – Table 1: Partner abuse in Asia

Study	N	Sample Characteristics	Method and Design	Results
<p>context and alternative experiences. <i>Violence and Victims</i>, 25(6).</p>		<p>Institution and were available for participation in the study. before being incarcerated. Ages 24-46 yrs.</p> <p>Community sample of 179 women attending one of five Korean universities during the spring and fall semesters of 2007 and participating in childhood teacher training at the third level of certification. This sampling included women in registered marriages or common law marriages, cohabiting, separated or divorced. Included a wide range of ages but whose mean age was 35.74 years.</p> <p><u>Demographics</u> 75.5% were legally married 13.8% were in common law marriages 4.3% were divorced or</p>	<p>with a current study of women in general.</p> <p>A questionnaire was used to study socio-demographic and background characteristics for all groups of women. Self-reporting was used for gathering information on economic class for the incarcerated women and the community sampling; the self-report on economic class was not available for the sheltered women.</p> <p>Jung and Kim’s 1996 Conjugal Psychological and Physical Abuse Scale, Straus’s 1979 Conflict Tactics Scale, and Hudson and McIntosh’s 1981 Index of Spouse Abuse were each used to measure abuse in this study.</p> <p>Patriarchal attitudes and risk-taking preferences, social structure influences, levels of education and employment are compared within the three groups of women.</p>	<p>college.</p> <p>Sheltered women: 30.2% did not graduate high school; 46.5% were high school graduates; 23.2% had some college.</p> <p>Community sampling: 100% graduated high school; 100% were in college.</p> <p><u>Economic Status</u></p> <p>Incarcerated women: 53.2% middle class; 28.7% lower class; 18.1% upper class.</p> <p>Sheltered women: 39.5% were employed; 53.5% lower class.</p> <p>Community sampling: 30.2% were employed; 70.4% middle class; 21.8% lower class; 7.8% upper class.</p> <p><u>Marital Status</u></p> <p>Sheltered women: 93% legally married; 7% common law.</p> <p><u>Summaries</u></p> <p>Group reporting most severe abuse history came from the sheltered women; next were the incarcerated</p>

PASK#14 Online Tables – Table 1: Partner abuse in Asia

Study	N	Sample Characteristics	Method and Design	Results
		<p>widowed 2.1% were separated</p> <p>43 women residing in 3 shelters during 2004</p>		<p>women. Similar patriarchal attitudes were displayed by the sheltered and incarcerated groups and were stronger than the community sampling.</p> <p>The sheltered group was the strongest risk takers. The community group followed and then the incarcerated group.</p> <p>Incarcerated and sheltered women had significantly higher abuse scores than the community sampling. Less serious histories of abuse were reported by women with higher levels of education.</p> <p>Significantly stronger views of patriarchal attitudes came from the incarcerated and sheltered groups. Both age and education are related to patriarchal attitudes.</p> <p>Sheltered women are greater risk-takers than either the incarcerated women or the community sampling, which showed no difference.</p> <p>More severe abuse histories were reported by those without a high school diploma.</p>
Kim, J., Park, S., &	1,079	South Korean women	Data from a study on the effects	<u>Prevalence Rates of Partner Violence</u>

PASK#14 Online Tables – Table 1: Partner abuse in Asia

Study	N	Sample Characteristics	Method and Design	Results
<p>Emery, C. (2009). The incidence and impact of family violence on mental health among South Korean women: Results of a national survey. <i>Journal of Family Violence</i>, 24, 193-202/</p>	<p>women</p>	<p>age 20 and over, currently married. Average age = 42.39. 27.7% had completed equivalent of middle school or less; 48.1% high school graduates, 24.2% had higher level of education</p>	<p>of violence against women sponsored by Ministry of Health and Welfare in South Korean. National sample of 1,500 married women identified from urban and rural areas; final sample was of 1,079 women currently living with husbands.</p> <p>Respondents interviewed by phone by college students about violence from husbands and husband in family of origin. Verbal abuse defined as “my husband insulted me.” Physical violence measured by 8 items from the Conflict Tactics Scale. Sexual violence defined as “I had sex forcefully against my will.”</p> <p>Respondents also asked about mental health symptoms; depression measured by Korean version of Beck Inventory</p>	<p>Annual rate of husband to wife in past year: 26.4% verbal 29.5% physical 3.7% sexual 6.7% of respondents experienced severe violence (e.g., punched, beat up)</p> <p><u>Risk Factors</u> Women who reported verbal abuse were three times more likely to also have experienced physical abuse, and ten times more likely to have experienced sexual abuse; having been physically abused puts woman at 3 times the risk of sexual abuse. Having experienced verbal child and physical abuse associated with a 1.6 and 1.5 times higher rate of physical violence from husbands.</p> <p><u>Impact of Abuse</u> Having experienced verbal or physical aggression by husband (but not sexual aggression) significantly correlated with depression, stress, poor self-esteem and aggressive tendencies</p>
<p>Sri Lanka:</p>				
<p>Jayasuriya, V., Wijewardena, K., & Axemo, P. (2011).</p>	<p>728 women</p>	<p>The sample population was picked from a mostly Sinhalese and Buddhist</p>	<p>The WHO women’s health and life events questionnaire was translated to fit the population</p>	<p><u>Prevalence Rates of Partner Violence</u> The responses were to apply within the previous 12 months.</p>

PASK#14 Online Tables – Table 1: Partner abuse in Asia

Study	N	Sample Characteristics	Method and Design	Results
<p>Intimate partner violence against women in the capital province of Sri Lanka: Prevalence, risk factors, and help seeking. <i>Violence Against Women</i>, 17(8), 1086-1102.</p>		<p>community, although other religious groups were also represented. Included in the study were ever-married women, including cohabitation, between the ages of 18 and 49.</p>	<p>(Garcia-Moreno, Heise, & Ellsberg, 2001). Data was collected in the participants' homes or a primary health clinic. Questions also included atypical questions such as nature of marital relationship and dowry agreements and ability to meet those agreements, violence in the community and her response to the violence. The Standard of Living Index was used to measure available utilities and vehicle ownership. Ten more in-depth interviews were also conducted to obtain more detailed information regarding the violence and perceptions.</p>	<p>Physical violence 251(n), 34.4%; Controlling behaviors 218(n), 30.1%; Emotionally abusive 140(n), 19.3%; Sexual violence 37(n), 5%.</p> <p>57% of physical abuse was reported as being severe; 62% were multiple abuses; 77% were repeated acts over time. 68% of sexual violence were repeat acts.</p> <p>The low level of reported sexual violence is suspected to be due to underreporting.</p> <p>There was no significance reported between ethnic or religious populations.</p>
<p>Jayatileke, A., Poudel, K., Sakisaka, K., Yasuoka, J., Jayatileke, A., & Jimba, M. (2011). Wives' attitudes toward gender roles and their experience of intimate partner violence by husbands in Central Province,</p>	<p>624 women</p>	<p>Married women between 15-49 Median age: 31 years 61.5% Sinhalese, 21.1% Muslim, 16.7% Tamil Average length of marriage: 23 years Median years of education 11 for both wives and husbands</p>	<p>Community-based cross-sectional survey in three main cities in Central Province, Sri Lanka. Respondents selected from each of the 19 PHM (Public Health Midwife) health care areas. Structured questionnaire asked about demographic characteristics, PV victimization for past 12</p>	<p><u>PV Prevalence</u> Any lifetime abuse reported by 36.2% of respondents, any in past year reported by 19.4%. 7.8% reported all three types of abuse lifetime, and 4.6% for past year</p> <p><u>Risk Factors</u> Negative correlations between woman's PV victimization and 11+ years of education for wife or husband,</p>

PASK#14 Online Tables – Table 1: Partner abuse in Asia

Study	N	Sample Characteristics	Method and Design	Results
<p>Sri Lanka. <i>Journal of Interpersonal Violence</i>, 26 (3), 414-432.</p>			<p>months and lifetime, and attitudes on gender roles. Interviews conducted in woman's home or at one of the primary health care clinics. Physical abuse measured with 6 items; psychological abuse measured with 11 items (e.g., intimidation, humiliation, prevented from seeing her family); sexual abuse measured with 3 items</p>	<p>23+ years marriage, and non-consumption of alcohol by husband Positive correlations found for having more than two children and being married more than 7 years PV victimization also correlated with wife disagreeing that family problems should only be discussed by people in the family</p>
<p>Thailand:</p>				
<p>Aekplakorn, W., & Kongsakon, R. (2007). Intimate partner violence among women in slum communities in Bangkok, Thailand. <i>Singapore Medical Journal</i>, 48 (8), 763-768.</p>	<p>580 women</p>	<p>Married women 15 years and older. Mean age: 42.9 years Most women had primary school education or higher; 46.1% had incomes not adequate for daily expenses</p>	<p>Sample from population of 1,164 households in 7 slum communities in Bangkok, Thailand. Women interviewed face to face without husbands present. Asked about sociodemographic characteristics and PV in past 12 month period. Physical abuse items from modified CTS; psychological abuse defined as intimidation, belittlement and humiliation; sexual abuse defined as forced intercourse</p>	<p><u>Prevalence Rates</u> 27.2% reported by some type of PV in past year 98.7% psychological victimization, 22.1% physical, 4.4% sexual Severity: 53.8% mild abuse (verbal), 12% moderate (higher verbal assaults) and 34.2% severe (any verbal or physical assault most days) 1.2% suffered all 3 types of abuse <u>Risk Factors</u> Women 35 years or younger 3 times more likely to be victimized; victimization also correlated with low education and low income Factors among the couples reported to</p>

PASK#14 Online Tables – Table 1: Partner abuse in Asia

Study	N	Sample Characteristics	Method and Design	Results
				<p>have triggered abuse incidents primarily bad temper 89.9%) and being grumpy (83.5%), financial problems (74.7%) and suspicions of adultery (28.5%)</p>
<p>Pradubmook-Sherer, P. (2009). Prevalence and correlates of adolescent dating violence in Bangkok, Thailand. <i>Journal of Sociology & Social Welfare</i>, 36 (1).</p>	<p>1,296 both</p>	<p>Random sampling was used to select participants from out-of-school adolescents, adolescents attending vocational schools, and adolescents attending academic high schools. A stratified clustered random sampling process was used. The sample were from 10th and 11th grade classes in each school, 582 from nine high schools, 613 from ten vocational schools, and 101 who were not in school. Participants were between the ages of 14 and 19 years.</p>	<p>A questionnaire was tested and used. Several instruments were used to measure individual attributes, including demographics, self-reported delinquency behavior, alcohol and drug use, self-esteem (using the Rosenberg’s Self-Esteem Scale), family relations and dynamics, interpersonal relationships, and dating violence, relations, partner characteristics and level of commitment (using the Conflict in Adolescent Dating Relationships Inventory).</p>	<p><u>Prevalence Rates of Partner Violence</u> Threatened by partners 49.2% males and 46.7 females; Verbally or emotionally abused 49.2% males and 46.7% of females; Experienced relational abuse 65.8% males and 59% females; Been physically abused 41.9% males and 41.2% females; Sexually abused 43.2% males and 46.7% females.</p> <p><u>Risk Factors:</u> (Rates are listed respectively in order of out-of-school adolescents, vocational school, and high school students) Use of alcohol 22%, 13%, 1.8%; Started dating 55 females and 25 males, 157 females and 167 males, 203 females and 69 males;</p> <p><u>Delinquent Behaviors:</u> 42% getting into group fights; 36% intentionally destroying property; 10% arrested in connection with</p>

PASK#14 Online Tables – Table 1: Partner abuse in Asia

Study	N	Sample Characteristics	Method and Design	Results
				<p>criminal activity.</p> <p><u>Having Friends Who Commit IPV:</u> Psychological abuse 58.8%; Physical and sexual violence against partners 29% (out-of-school and vocational students were significantly higher).</p>
<p>Kerley, K. R., Xu, X., Sirisunyaluck, B., & Alley, J. M. (2010). Exposure to Family Violence in Childhood and Intimate Partner Perpetration or Victimization in Adulthood: Exploring Intergenerational Transmission in Urban Thailand. <i>Journal of Family Violence</i>, 25(3), 337-347.</p>	<p>816 women</p>	<p>Married women from the Wife Abuse in Urban Thailand Project in Bangkok, Thailand; subjects selected via multistage probability cluster sampling.</p>	<p>Subjects given CTS-2 physical and psychological aggression scales, administered face-to-face in Thai language; asked about perpetration and victimization in past year (dependent variables)</p> <p>Also asked about witnessing parental violence in childhood, and experiencing child abuse (independent variables)</p>	<p>39.6% reported any physical perpetration, 66.3% psychological perpetration, 62.7% psychologically victimized, 34.8% physically victimized</p> <p>Correlation between exposure to both forms of childhood abuse and perpetration of psychological and physical abuse against adult partner; however, relationship is indirect, mediated by physical and psychological abuse victimization from partner</p> <p>Indirect relationship between experiencing child abuse and psychological victimization by partner; however, there is a direct relationships between witnessing parental violence and being psychologically victimized by partner</p>

PASK#14 Online Tables – Table 1: Partner abuse in Asia

Study	N	Sample Characteristics	Method and Design	Results
				Direct relationship between witnessing parental violence in childhood and being physically victimized by partner
Vietnam:				
<p>Dang Vung, N., Ostergren, P., & Krantz, G. (2008). Intimate partner violence against women in rural Vietnam - different socio-demographic factors are associated with different forms of violence: Need for new intervention guidelines? <i>BMC Public Health</i>, 8:55</p>	883 women	Married women aged 17-60 from the community in Bavi District, Ha Tay Province, called FilaBavi, situated in northern rural Vietnam.	Cross-sectional representative household survey of the Bavi District. Used random sampling of villages in FilaBavi. Face-to-face interview. It assessed lifetime and 12-month prevalence of physical, psychological, sexual, and overall IPV victimization prevalence via the World Health Organization Multi-country Study on Women's Health and life Experiences questionnaire. The Domestic violence module was based on several violence scales (e.g. The Index of Spouse Abuse, the CTS).	<p>Physical IPV: Lifetime = 30.9% / 12-month = 8.3% Psychological IPV: Lifetime = 55.4% / 12-month = 33.7% Sexual IPV: Lifetime = 6.6% / 12-month = 2.2%</p> <p>Overall IPV: Lifetime = 60.6% / 12-month = 34.5%</p> <p>Woman's low educational level, husband's low education, low household income and the husband having more than one wife/partner were risk factors for lifetime and past year physical/sexual violence. Husband's low professional status and women's intermediate level of education appeared as risk factors. pure psychological abuse is different from physical/sexual violence in terms of differing characteristics of the perpetrators. Men's violence against women in intimate relationships is commonly occurring in rural Vietnam</p>
Multi-Country:				

PASK#14 Online Tables – Table 1: Partner abuse in Asia

Study	N	Sample Characteristics	Method and Design	Results
<p>Straus, M.A. (2008) Dominance and symmetry in partner violence by male and female university students in 32 nations. <u><i>Children and Youth Services Review</i></u> Volume 30(3), 252-275.</p>	<p>2,022 (Asia)</p>	<p>Data from the International Violence Study regarding dating violence were collected from a convenience sample of 13,601 students at 68 universities in 32 nations. The subgroup of those reporting more than one incident of assault included 4,239 students. In this table segment, the samples were collected from Asian countries, including India (84), Japan (120), South Korea (183), Hong Kong (521), China (763), Taiwan (152) and Singapore (199), original respondents totaled 2,022 student sample population The average responding gender in this region was 66.1% female. (Percentages are rounded to the nearest whole.) Students included in the study either currently were, or</p>	<p>A consortium of researchers from all major regions of the world took part in this International Dating Violence Study. This section summarizes the research data for Asian countries only. The core questions are the same in every region where the research was conducted. Students who participated in the study were advised of their rights to refuse participation and the purpose of the study. Most universities had a participation rate of 85% to 95%. Dominance was measured by items from the Personal and Relationships Profile – e.g., “I generally have the final say when my partner and I disagree,” and “My partner needs to remember that I am in charge.” Impression management was controlled by using The Limited Disclosure Scale of the PRP.</p>	<p>Prevalence of overall assault reported (past year perpetration) in Asian countries is as follows: India: males at 35%, females 31%; Japan: males 25%, females 18%; South Korea: males 24%, females 37%; Hong Kong: males 23%, females 43%; China: males 22%, females 42%; Taiwan: males 18%, females 42%; and Singapore: males 10%, females 28%. Prevalence of severe assault are as follows: India: males 7%, females 14%; Japan: males 7%, females 10%; South Korea: males 8%, females 19%; Hong Kong: males 7%, females 19%; China: males 9%, females 20%; Taiwan: males 16%, females 26%; and Singapore: males 0%, females 7%. Prevalence of any mutual overall assault are as follows: India: 32%; Japan: 21%; South Korea: 32%; Hong Kong: 37%; China: 35%; Taiwan: 36% and Singapore: 23%. Prevalence of mutual severe physical violence are as follows: India: 12%; Japan: 8%; South Korea: 15%; Hong Kong: 15%; China: 16%; Taiwan: 23% and Singapore: 5%. T Dominance: Taiwan: 2.23M, 2.28 F</p>

PASK#14 Online Tables – Table 1: Partner abuse in Asia

Study	N	Sample Characteristics	Method and Design	Results
		had been in a relationship for one month or more.		China: 2.22 M, 2.15 F Hong Kong 2.10 M, 2.16 F India 2.10 M, 2.18 F Japan 1.90 M, 1.97 F Singapore 1.96 M, 2.03 F South Korea 2.17 M, 2.25 F

PASK#14 Online Tables – Table 2: Partner abuse in the Middle East

Study	N	Sample Characteristics	Method and Design	Results
-------	---	------------------------	-------------------	---------

Table 2. Partner abuse in the Middle East

Studies are organized by year of publication oldest to current. Multiple publications in the same year are alphabetized.

Iran:				
<p>Faramarzi, M., Esmailzadeh, S., & Mosavi, S. (2005). Prevalence and determinants of intimate partner violence in Babol City, Islamic Republic of Iran. <i>La Revue de Sante de la Mediterranee Orientale</i>, 11 (5/6), 870-879.</p>	<p>2,400 women</p>	<p>Women who were married in past year Mean age: 28.2 years 71.3% seen for family planning, the rest for gynecology and prenatal care visits</p>	<p>Sample of women attending public obstetrics, gynecology and family planning clinics in Babol city, Iran (both low and higher SES areas) Women asked about sociodemographic characteristics and about physical, psychological and sexual PV victimization Physical PV items similar to those in CTS; sexual abuse defined as any forced sexual behavior; psychological abuse scale consisted of 15 items ranging from shouting, insulting threats and showing contempt in public to various controlling behaviors</p>	<p><u>PV Prevalence</u> 15.0% reported physical violence, 42.4% sexual abuse, 81.5% psychological abuse/control (and 9.1%, 36.3% and 82.3% during pregnancy) Most common physical abuse reported: slapping, pushing; most common psychological: shouting insulting criticizing, preventing woman's employment, claiming ownership of wife and showing contempt in public <u>Risk Factors</u> Significant associations between PV victimization and low income, woman's unemployment, being below 20 years of age, low education, not being pregnant and not being a house owner</p>
<p>Ghazizadeh, A. (2005). Domestic violence: A cross-sectional study in an Iranian city. <i>La Revue de Sante de la Mediterranee</i></p>	<p>1,000 women</p>	<p>Married adult women in Sanandaj city, Iran. Community sample.</p>	<p>Cross sectional survey of married women in Sanandaj city, Iran, selected by multistage cluster random sampling procedure. Locally constructed questionnaire asked subjects</p>	<p><u>PV Prevalence</u> 15% physical PV past year, 38% lifetime; 15% of women exposed to PV in previous year experienced 1-5 episodes <u>Risk Factors</u></p>

PASK#14 Online Tables – Table 2: Partner abuse in the Middle East

Study	N	Sample Characteristics	Method and Design	Results
<i>Oriental</i> , 11 (5/6), 880-884.			about demographic information, PV victimization in past year and lifetime, and attitudes on PV. Participants were interviewed by students of the Faculty of Medical Sciences of Kurdistan University who had been specifically trained for the Task. The study was conducted in Iran to determine the prevalence of male-to-female IPV and socioeconomic factors that predict it as Iranian women are subject to many kinds of violence which is exacerbated by specific traditions and laws.	<p>PV victimization higher among women who were 30-39 years old and 40+ years old, had been previously married, worked as housewives, and whose husbands were piece workers and drivers. PV victimization also correlated with not having a child or having only a girl</p> <p><u>Attitudes on PV</u> 71.0% of illiterate women and 57.4% of housewives said remaining silent was best way to cope with PV Women cited economic problems, patriarchal laws and distrust as the main cause of PV</p>
Vakili, M., Nadrian, H., Fathipoor, M. Boniadi, F., & Morowatisharifabad, M.A. (2010). Prevalence and determinants of intimate partner violence against women in Kazeroon, Islamic Republic of Iran. <i>Violence and Victims</i> , 25(1), 116-127.	702 women	This was a multistage cluster sampling. The study included 702 women who had visited public obstetrics, gynecology, and family planning services in Kazeroon County, Iran. The sample was women who had been married in the last year between the ages of 15 and 64. The results show the sample was primarily low income, lower educated,	This was a descriptive cross sectional designed study using the Abuse Assessment Screening tool. Some questions on sexual violence were left out due to the cultural sensitivity to openly discussing sexual matters. Although interviews were conducted, the questionnaire was structured. The primary reason for some of the participants being interviewed was due to illiteracy or lower education. Some participants were capable	<p><u>Prevalence Rates of Partner Violence</u> 82.6% reported psychological violence victimization; 43.7% reported physical violence; 30.9% reported sexual violence; 31.9% reported being afraid of their husbands.</p> <p><u>Witnesses of the abuse</u> Children (66.2%); Husband's family (27.3%); Woman's family (5.9%); Woman's friends (.5%).</p> <p><u>Risk Factors</u></p>

PASK#14 Online Tables – Table 2: Partner abuse in the Middle East

Study	N	Sample Characteristics	Method and Design	Results
		unemployed women. 41.5% of the women and 47.4% of men had less than a high school education; Women were primarily housewives (81.3%); A moderate to substantial religious commitment was 97.4% for women and 86.5% for men.	of completing the questionnaire independently.	PV correlated with low income, man's unemployment, rural residence, man and woman's low education, man or woman being previously married, man and woman's weak religious commitment, and husband's mental illness or addiction
Ardabili, H., Moghadam, Z., Salsali, M., Ramezanzadeh, F., & Nedjat, S. (2011). Prevalence and risk factors for domestic violence against infertile women in an Iranian setting. <i>International Journal of Gynecology and Obstetrics</i> , 112, 15-17.	400 women	Infertile women at clinic in Teheran, Iran	Sample of women who were referred to the Valiasr Reproductive Health Research Center, Tehran, Iran. Women administered sociodemographic questionnaire and CTS-2 in Farsi, without their male partners present	<p><u>Prevalence of abuse:</u> 61.8% of the women reported PV victimization in past 12 months; 14% physical, 33.8% psychological, 8% sexual; (6% received injuries)</p> <p><u>Risk factors:</u> Significant correlations found between husband unemployment and physical and psychological abuse; between husband without secondary education and physical and sexual abuse; and between coercive behaviors and all three types of violence with injuries</p>
Abadi, M., Ghazinour, M.,	600 women	Convenience sample of 600 mothers, age 15-29	Data collection assisted by two midwives between June, 2009	<p><u>Rates of Abuse</u> Verbal: 26.0%</p>

PASK#14 Online Tables – Table 2: Partner abuse in the Middle East

Study	N	Sample Characteristics	Method and Design	Results
<p>Nojomi, M., & Richter, J. (2012). The buffering effect of social support between domestic violence and self-esteem in pregnant women in Tehran, Iran. <i>Journal of Family Violence</i>, 27, 225-231.</p>		<p>years, who had recently given birth at a hospital in Tehran, Iran. Only women who had gone full term and who did not have physical diseases prior to delivery.</p>	<p>and November, 2010. Respondents administered questionnaire during a non-stressful time. They were asked about sociodemographic characteristics, given the Rosenberg Self-Esteem Scale and asked about partner abuse in their marriage. Verbal abuse defined as “the use of words to cause harm”. Physical abuse items based on modified version of Conflict Tactics Scale. Sexual abuse defined as “any unwanted, unreciprocated, and unwelcomed behavior of a sexual nature that is offensive to the person involved, and causes that person to feel threatened, humiliated, or embarrassed.”</p>	<p>Physical: 4.8% Sexual: 5.5%</p> <p><u>Risk Factors and Impact</u> Partner abuse victimization correlated with increased drug use during pregnancy, husbands not having their own income, and giving birth earlier than non-abused women; also correlated with woman smoking during pregnancy, younger in age, and having been married for a short time. Low self-esteem and dissatisfaction with social support correlated with all three forms of abuse. Physical violence inversely correlated with husband’s education level; sexual abuse inversely correlated with mother’s education and having her own income</p>
<p>Nouri, R., Nadrian, H., Yari, A., Bakri, G., Ansari, B., & Ghazizadeh, A. (2012). Prevalence and determinants of intimate partner violence against women in Marivan County, Iran. <i>J Fam Viol</i>, 27: 391-399.</p>	<p>770 women</p>	<p>Multi-cluster sampling of 770 women ranging from 15-75 yrs. of age attending public obstetrics, gynecology, and family planning health services from 14 centers throughout the county; all women were married and had a spouse during the</p>	<p>Intimate Partner Abuse Questionnaire (IPAQ) used was developed by the authors which included: personal characteristic of respondent, witnesses of violence, & experience with physical abuse, psychological/emotional abuse, & sexual abuse; collection of data included age, job, education level, number of</p>	<p><u>Prevalence Rates of Partner Violence</u> Psychological (614) 79.7%; Physical (462) 60%; Sexual (254) 32.9%; Women reporting fear from spouse’s rage (554) 71.9%; Violence witnessed most frequently by children 69.2%; Witnessed by spouse’s family 11%; Witnessed by woman’s family 1%; Witnessed by woman’s friends 1.3%.</p>

PASK#14 Online Tables – Table 2: Partner abuse in the Middle East

Study	N	Sample Characteristics	Method and Design	Results
		previous year, and gave written consent to participate in the study	children, age of woman & spouse at time of marriage, number of previous marriages of woman & spouse, spouse's smoking, addiction, mental illness status, total monthly income, existing rival wife in the home, religious commitment. Statistical Package for the social Sciences (SPSS) was used for data entry, manipulation, and analysis.	<p><u>Risk Factors</u></p> <p>Spouse's unemployment; Previous marriage of woman & spouse; Woman's low education level; Weak level of religious commitment from woman; Having a rival wife at home; Spouse's smoking & addiction.</p> <p>Predictors most common were abuser's weak religious persuasion, mental illness, smoking, and drug addictions.</p>
Iraq:				
<p>Laftal, Riyadh K., Al-Saffar, Atheer J., Eissa, Sahar A., & Al-Nuaimi, Maha A. (2008). Gender-based violence: A study of Iraqi women. <i>International Social Science Journal</i>, 59 (192), 309–316. DOI: 10.1111/j.1468-2451.2009.00700.x</p>	<p>1100 Women</p> <p>100 men</p>	<p>Random sampling of married and single women (no young girls) from both rural and urban areas of Baghdad and Ninawa Province, and of differing socio-economic strata.</p> <p>Random sampling of men ages 17-73 of varying occupations and educational levels and locations.</p> <p><u>Demographics:</u></p>	<p>House to house survey. Questions included general information about the women and their spouses and exposure to violence and items related to that exposure. No questions were raised regarding sexual abuse.</p> <p>For men's study:</p> <p>Using a confidential questionnaire, interviewers asked questions regarding their opinions about violence against women, whether they used</p>	<p><u>Prevalence of abuse:</u></p> <p>61.6% had been exposed to violence; 30.7% by their spouses; 11.2% by their brothers; 6.2% by their fathers; 12% by more than one source.</p> <p>Beliefs behind the reasons for violence were related as follows: 43.5% due to life stress; 18.5% due to psychological stress; 13.9% due to social stress; 12.7% due to financial stress.</p> <p>Frequency of violence to the women:</p>

PASK#14 Online Tables – Table 2: Partner abuse in the Middle East

Study	N	Sample Characteristics	Method and Design	Results
		<p>91% of women (1000) responded to the questionnaire. Of those responding: 48% were married; 45.2% were single; 3.8% were widowed; 2.4% were divorced. 6.8% were poor; 58.5% were of medium income; 31.1% were of good income; 3.6% were of very good income. 44% of the women were financially independent.</p>	<p>violence currently or had done so prior to the interview and their reasons for doing so.</p> <p>Statistical Package for Social Scientists version II (SPSS) was used for analyzing data.</p>	<p>23.3% on a regular basis (daily and/or weekly); 76.7% sometimes or irregularly.</p> <p>Women’s reaction to violence: 35.9% silence; 26.8% rejection; 15.6% self-defense; 2.9% became violent; 44.6% sought help from family; 14.9% sought help from friends.</p> <p>Women’s opinions regarding violence against them: 70% hate/rejected it; 21% stated it was uncivilized; 50%+ stated the solution was to educate men; 10% stated the problem needed solved by law; 12.8% said there was no solution.</p> <p><u>Men’s study results:</u> Men’s opinions regarding violence against women: 50% were strongly against it; 25% were against it; 25% state it was sometimes necessary.</p> <p>Regarding practiced violence: 61% stated they never did it; 39% admitted to it; 16% said they did so frequently;</p>

PASK#14 Online Tables – Table 2: Partner abuse in the Middle East

Study	N	Sample Characteristics	Method and Design	Results
				<p>14% said they did so infrequently; 9% said they had recently adopted the practice.</p> <p>Reasons men gave for practicing violence against women: 59% said disobedience of women; 36% said due to poverty and unemployment; 5% said due to sexual reasons.</p>
Israel:				
Haj-Yahia, M. M., & Dawud-Noursi, S. (1998). Predicting the use of different conflict tactics among Arab siblings in Israel: A study based on social learning theory. <i>Journal of Family Violence</i> , 13(1), 81-103.	832 both	Arab adolescents in central and northern Israel, ages 16-18; 92% Muslim, 8% Christian. 26% of their fathers and 22% of mothers had some secondary education; 15% of their fathers and 9% of mothers had some post-secondary education	Modified Conflict Tactics Scale, translated into Arabic, administered to 12 th grade classes, randomly chosen; subjects asked about abuse perpetrated by family members in the past year	<p><u>Prevalence of abuse:</u> 30% of fathers and 24% of mothers ridiculed their partner; 76% of fathers and 53% of mothers had verbally and/or psychologically abused their partner</p> <p>23% of fathers and 5% of mothers perpetrated moderate physical aggression on partner; 10% of fathers and 2% of mothers perpetrated severe physical aggression</p> <p>Significant correlation between use of reasoning to resolve conflicts and lessened rates of partner abuse</p> <p>The more fathers or mothers abused their partners, the more likely they were to also abuse the children</p>
Haj-Yahia, M. M.	362	The population sample	Patriarchal ideology was	<u>Prevalence of attitudes on abuse:</u>

PASK#14 Online Tables – Table 2: Partner abuse in the Middle East

Study	N	Sample Characteristics	Method and Design	Results
<p>(2003). Beliefs about wife beating among Arab men from Israel: The influence of their patriarchal ideology. <i>Journal of Family Violence</i>, 18(4), 193-206.</p>	<p>men</p>	<p>included 500 married men from three Arab local councils, three Arab municipalities, and one mixed Jewish–Arab municipality. The number who completed the self-administered questionnaire was 362 (72.4%). The average age of the respondents was 36.9 years. The religious make-up of the sample were as follows: 82% Muslim; 13% Christian; 5% Druze. The average family size was 4.94.</p>	<p>studied by distributing a survey to the sample study to examine. Beliefs about domestic violence. The self-administered assessment questionnaire measured the following: “1) Tendency to justify wife beating; 2) Tendency to blame wives for violence; 3) Tendency to hold violent husbands responsible; 4) Negative attitudes toward women; 5) Rigid and masculine sex role stereotypes; 6) Sexual conservatism; 7) Religiosity; 8) Patriarchal beliefs, and 9) Nonegalitarian marital role expectations.”</p>	<p>58% there is no excuse for a man to beat his wife; 28% sometimes it is OK.</p> <p>Between 15% and 62% justified on certain occasions (based on strongly agreed or agreed responses that a wife “deserves to be beaten”):</p> <p>62% an unfaithful wife; 37% a woman who “insults her husband in front of his friends”; 29% a woman who, “constantly disobeys her husband”;</p> <p>Family disrespect is also a justification for wife beating but as a lesser degree, as follows: 43% treats her husband inappropriately; 39% takes care of her children inadequately; 22% does not respect his parents or siblings; 21% lies to her husband; 15% does not respect his relatives.</p> <p>Age, education level, and patriarchal ideology were also indicators for justification of partner violence. 33% Arab men tended to blame the</p>

PASK#14 Online Tables – Table 2: Partner abuse in the Middle East

Study	N	Sample Characteristics	Method and Design	Results
				<p>wife for the violence committed against her 66% also agreed that men who beat their wives are responsible for their own behavior. Most stated that the husband’s behavior should be understood because of it is “often caused by pressure at work or home.”</p>
<p>Eisikovits, Z., Winstok, Z., & Fishman, G., (2004). The first Israeli national survey on domestic violence. <i>Violence Against Women</i>, 10 (7), 729-748.</p>	<p>904 both</p>	<p>National probability sample of Israelis, mostly women. Men age of women = 43.1 71.9% of women Jewish (rest Muslim, Christian or Druze); 85.5% married; 38.6% non-religious; average 12.3 years of education; 44% worked outside home, and 9.6% reported family income less than \$444.00 per month</p>	<p>Sample from the Israeli National Survey of Family Violence conducted in 200/2001 by Domestic Violence Research Group at the University of Haifa, Israel. Survey used a stratified probability sample, with dwelling units randomly selected by socioeconomic characteristics. Inclusion criteria: woman had to be living with male partner minimum of 1 year within the past 5 years; at every fifth residence, male partner also interviewed, if available.</p> <p>Structured interview questionnaire inquired about physical, psychological and sexual abuse in past year and</p>	<p><u>Rates of Abuse</u> Physical: 13% ever exposed, 6% past year Psychological (past year): 56% incurred shouting and screaming; 20.8% to cursing and humiliation; 10% experienced threats; and 56% reported being controlled 25.9% of women not physically abused in past year reported being controlled, whereas 55.4% of women who experienced physically abused reported controlling behaviors by male partner</p> <p><u>Risk Factors</u> Compared to non-violent couples, victimized women and their partners both tended to be younger with a lower level of education, and to suffer from economic hardship. Lowest levels of partner violence among the Jewish families, highest</p>

PASK#14 Online Tables – Table 2: Partner abuse in the Middle East

Study	N	Sample Characteristics	Method and Design	Results
			<p>before. Psychological abuse defined as verbal abuse and various threatening and controlling behaviors; sexual abuse defined as forced intercourse</p> <p>Respondents also asked about sociodemographic characteristics, conflict topics, role division at home, social support an attitudes about violence; and asked about impact of abuse (physical, psychological and behavioral)</p>	<p>among the Muslims. Higher percentage of religious men in violent group Lower years of marriage, higher percentage of divorce/separation in violent households Violence by the men excused by a relatively high number of men and women, especially when woman is abusive or unfaithful About half of the men and women agreed that the man should not be held solely responsible for the violence</p>
<p>Sherer, M. (2009). The nature and correlates of dating violence among Jewish and Arab youths in Israel. <i>Journal of Family Violence</i>, 24:11-26.</p>	<p>Jewish: 332 women 308 men</p> <p>Arab: 434 women 283 men</p>	<p>Students were selected from 8 Arab Moslem and 8 Jewish junior and senior high schools, from 9th to 12th grades. Jewish: 640 students (308 males and 332 females). Arab: 717 students (283 males and 434 females). <u>Demographics:</u> Jewish average age was 12.54 for males and 13.84 for females. Male Arab average age was 13.5 and 14.59 for</p>	<p>A self-administered questionnaire was provided to the students to be completed anonymously. Undergraduate students administered the questionnaires and offered to assist the participants if they had difficulty. Three questions were carefully and repeatedly translated to Hebrew and Arabic. Questions regarding demographics, family dynamics, education achievements, alcohol and drug use, self-esteem (measured by the Rosenberg’s Self-esteem</p>	<p><u>Prevalence of abuse:</u> Of those that were dating, 42.3% males and 26.4 females were threatened by people they were dating; 35.3% males and 13.3% females were relationally abused; 41.4% males and 32.8% females were physically abused; 46.4% males and 21.7% females were sexually abused; 88.9% males and 86.7% females were verbally abused.</p> <p><u>Risk factors:</u> Having violent friends and having a</p>

PASK#14 Online Tables – Table 2: Partner abuse in the Middle East

Study	N	Sample Characteristics	Method and Design	Results
		females. A total of 57% participating dated. Number of dating relationships for Jewish males averaged 5.09, Jewish females averaged 5.31; Arab males averaged 3.86, Arab females averaged 2.86.	Scale), and intimate partner violence characteristics (measured by the Conflict in Adolescent Dating Relationship Survey).	friend who is a victim of violence influenced all four groups. The more significant the relationship the higher the likelihood of dating violence within the Jewish participants, but had no effect on the Arab students.
Jordan:				
Araji, S. K., & Carlson, J. (2001). Family violence including crimes of honor in Jordan. <i>Violence Against Women</i> , 7(5), 586-621.	625 both	Male and female students at University of Jordan and Philadelphia University, Jordan. Students asked about current and future lives. All students single and 92% Muslim	Questionnaire developed in English, then translated into Arabic. Students asked the extent to which they thought the following types of family violence were a problem: parents physically harming children; parents using harsh discipline; husbands physically harming their wives; wives physically harming their husbands; crimes of honor; emotional abuse by family members	17% of males and 16% of females reported having been exposed to violence by father on mother 13% of males and 10% of females witnessed mother-on-father violence Father on mother violence considered “not much of a problem” by 7.6% of respondents, and “very much a problem by 70% Mother on father violence considered “not much of a problem” by 10.3%, and “very much a problem by 59.6%.
Al-Nsour, M., Khawaja, M., & Al-Kayyali, G. (2009). Domestic violence against women in	356 women	Sample was selected from nine health centers run by Ministry of Health, and included ever-married women	A structured questionnaire was used to determine prevalence of abuse and attitudes towards domestic violence. Questionnaires were presented	<u>Prevalence of abuse in past year:</u> 87% some form of abuse in last year 47% emotional abuse 20% “wife-beating” 12% neglect

PASK#14 Online Tables – Table 2: Partner abuse in the Middle East

Study	N	Sample Characteristics	Method and Design	Results
<p>Jordan: Evidence from health clinics. <i>J Fam Viol</i>, 24:569-575.</p>		<p>between the ages of 18 and 49. 74% married before 25 years old 4% were illiterate 42% completed more than secondary education. 18% were unmarried 84% from urban areas 64% were unemployed</p>	<p>in face to face interviews at the health centers.</p>	<p>33% justified beating as discipline <u>Women who justify abuse:</u> 35% of those over age 35 33% married younger than age 25 36% with less than secondary education 32% of those living in urban areas 19% of those living in rural areas 73% of those not working 60% of those working Having other wives or not did not have a significant difference.</p>
<p>Clark, C., Silverman, J., Shahrouri, M., Everson-Rose, S., & Groce, N. (2010). The role of the extended family in women’s risk of intimate partner violence in Jordan. <i>Social Science & Medicine</i>, 70, 1, 144-151.</p>	<p>523 women</p>	<p>Women of childbearing age who attended participating programs between August and October 2003, were asked to participate in this study. The participating programs included Sisterhood is Global Institute, Young Women’s Christian Association, United Nations Relief and Works Agency for Palestinian Refugees in the Near East, University of Jordan Faculty of Nursing and</p>	<p>This was a combined quantitative and qualitative study. In the qualitative portion focus groups with 6 participants in each were utilized. The quantitative portion was a clinic-based survey. Open coding methodology and mapping was used with transcripts of the interviews. A sample of 517 was selected from the population of those fitting the criteria of literate never married women from seven reproductive health clinics. The analytic sample was limited to 418 participants due to missing data on the</p>	<p><u>Prevalence of abuse:</u> 38% of the sample reported some form of physical and/or sexual violence 52% physical violence only; 24% sexual violence only; 24% reported both forms of violence. <u>Risk factors:</u> childhood exposure to violence within the family; family interference; residing with the husband’s family (but showing more mixed effects). Although a supportive family showed a somewhat positive protective role, it was not reliable or effective as a</p>

PASK#14 Online Tables – Table 2: Partner abuse in the Middle East

Study	N	Sample Characteristics	Method and Design	Results
		Community Service Office, and the Single Parents' Club, and health clinics The sample were an average of 31 years of age, every socio economic level, but mostly low to middle class.	surveys. The studies examined the prevalence and relationship of intimate partner violence to “residence, family interference, family violence, exposure to violence as a child, and family support.”	resource.
Okour, A., & Badarneh, R. (2011). Spousal violence against pregnant women from a Bedouin community in Jordan. <i>Journal of Women's Health</i> , 20 (12), 1853-1859.	303 women	Data drawn from pregnant Bedouin women who attended antenatal clinics in Jordan. Mean age = 28.3 years	Study based on the WHO 2005 Multi-country Study. Arabic Questionnaire to two city and two rural maternity and child health clinics in northern desert area. Interviews conducted by female nurses in private rooms. Respondents asked about sociodemographic characteristics, childbearing and family planning, exposure to partner violence during pregnancy, consequences of experiencing partner violence, husband characteristics, and the women's reasons for staying. Physical violence items based on a version of the CTS. Psychological abuse defined as husband insulting, making her feel dissatisfied with herself,	<u>Rates of Abuse</u> Any violence by husband was reported by 40.9% of the women. <u>Risk Factors</u> Violence correlated with longer marriage, number of pregnancies, number of children, high marital conflict, pressure to have a son, and the current pregnancy not having been planned.

PASK#14 Online Tables – Table 2: Partner abuse in the Middle East

Study	N	Sample Characteristics	Method and Design	Results
			<p>frightening her, ridiculing or humiliating her in front of others, and controlling where she goes and whom she sees. Sexual abuse defined as being forced to have intercourse against her will.</p>	
<p>Lebanon: Usta, J., Farver, J. A. N., & Pashayan, N. (2007). Domestic violence: The Lebanese experience. <i>Public Health</i>, 121, 208-219.</p>	<p>1,418 women</p>	<p>Women aged 14-65 years presenting to four primary health care centres in different geographic areas of Lebanon. Mean age: 35.1 years</p>	<p>Cross-sectional survey. Face-to-face interviews. The questionnaire was designed and reviewed for the study. It assessed violence by family members, and strangers. Lifetime physical (1 item), psychological (2 items) IPV was assessed.</p>	<p><u>Prevalence of partner violence:</u> 35% of women experienced domestic violence by family members. From those offenders 65% were the husbands of the victim. 23% of domestic violence was physical IPV victimisation).</p> <p>Women who were exposed to domestic violence had higher frequencies of reported physical symptoms than those who were not exposed. Generally, the perpetrators were spouses who had demographic backgrounds comparable to their wives. Women's education levels, work status, health status, and familial violence predicted domestic violence. The rate of domestic violence is high among Lebanese women and is a significant health issue</p>
<p>Pakistan:</p>				

PASK#14 Online Tables – Table 2: Partner abuse in the Middle East

Study	N	Sample Characteristics	Method and Design	Results
<p>Niaz, U., Hassan, S., & Tariq, Q. (2002). Psychological consequences of intimate partner violence: Forms of domestic abuse in both genders. <i>Pakistan Journal of Medical Science</i>, 18, 3, 205-214.</p>	<p>140 both</p>	<p>The sample was collected from patients who visited the outpatient departments of Psychiatry, Liaquat National Hospital PNS Shifa and Sobraj Hospital in Karachi, Pakistan. It included 140 both male and female participants who were within the middle-age range. The majority were married, with a few being separated or divorced.</p>	<p>The instrument used was the Named Karachi Domestic Violence Screening Scale (KDVSS). Depression and anxiety scales were collected through standardized self-rating, comparing results of both victims and non-victims.</p>	<p><u>Prevalence Rates of Partner Violence</u> 63% identified as domestic violence victims; 36% were males; 64% were females.</p> <p><u>Forms of abuse</u> 35% physical abuse; 52% psychological abuse; 30% sexual abuse.</p> <p><u>Psychological consequences:</u> 60% suffered from depression; 67% suffered with anxiety. Both men and women suffered equally from the psychological consequences of abuse.</p>
<p>Ali, T. S., Asad, N., Mogren, I., & Krantz, G. (2011). Intimate partner violence in urban Pakistan: prevalence, frequency, and risk factors. <i>International Journal of Women's Health</i>, 3, 105-115.</p>	<p>759 women</p>	<p>Married women aged 25-60 years from the community in Karachi, Pakistan</p>	<p>Cross-sectional multi-stage survey. Face-to-face interviews. Lifetime and 12-month physical (minor-4 items, severe-6 items), psychological (4 items), and sexual (1 item) IPV was assessed with the WHO Multi-country Study on Women's Health and Life Experiences Questionnaire</p>	<p><u>Prevalence of partner violence:</u> Physical IPV: Lifetime = 57.6% / 12-month = 56.3% Psychological IPV: Lifetime = 83.6% / 12-month = 81.8% Sexual IPV: Lifetime = 54.5% / 12-month = 53.4%</p> <p>Risk factors for physical violence related mainly to the husband, his low educational attainment, unskilled worker status, and five or more family members living in one household. For sexual violence, the risk factors were</p>

PASK#14 Online Tables – Table 2: Partner abuse in the Middle East

Study	N	Sample Characteristics	Method and Design	Results
				the respondent's low educational attainment, low socioeconomic status of the family, and five or more family members in one household. For psychological violence, the risk factors were the husband being an unskilled worker and low socioeconomic status of the family
Zakar, R., Zakar, M. Z., Mikolajczyk, R., & Krämer, A. (2012). Intimate partner violence and its association with women's reproductive health in Pakistan. <i>International Journal of Gynecology and Obstetrics</i> , 117, 10-14.	373 women	Women aged 15-49 attending tertiary-care hospitals in the cities of Lahore and Sialkot in Pakistan. Mean age: 31.9 years	Cross-sectional study. Face-to-face interviews. Physical, psychological, and sexual IPV (coercion) was examined using a modified version of the CTS2. Physical IPV was assessed via 13 items, psychological IPV via 14 items, and sexual IPV via 4 items	Severe physical IPV: Lifetime 31.9% Severe psychological IPV: Lifetime 75.9% Severe sexual IPV: Lifetime 34.6% Women who experienced severe physical violence were more likely to have their husband's noncooperation in using contraceptives, unplanned pregnancies, and poor self-reported reproductive health compared with non-abused women. Similar associations existed for psychological and sexual IPV victimisation
Turkey:				
Karaoglu, L., Celbis, O., Ercan, C., Ilgar, M., Pehlivan, E., Gunes, G., Genc, M., & Egri, M. (2005). Physical, emotional	824 women	Pregnant women living in Malatya province, Turkey (580 in urban areas, 240 in rural areas) Average age = 26.5	Stratified probability-proportional to size sample methodology used. Women asked about sociodemographic and fertility characteristics and violence	<u>PV Prevalence</u> Victimization rates before pregnancy: 36.3% overall, 16.3% physical, 30.8% emotional and 8.5% sexual; and during pregnancy rates were 31.7%, 8.1%, 26.7% and 9.7%

PASK#14 Online Tables – Table 2: Partner abuse in the Middle East

Study	N	Sample Characteristics	Method and Design	Results
<p>and sexual violence during pregnancy in Malatya, Turkey. <i>European Journal of Public Health</i>, 16 (2), 149-156.</p>		<p>10.2% illiterate, 55.1% completed only 5 years of primary school education</p>	<p>victimization PV definitions: Physical: Hit, pushed, slapped, kicked or physically hurt Emotional: humiliated, scorned, insulted, threatened with violence, left, parted from her children, or shouted at loudly</p>	<p>respectively Husband perpetrator in 97.0% of physical violence cases, 81.4% of emotional abuse <u>Risk Factors</u> Violence victimization correlated with partner's low education, and low family income, pregnancy in second trimester, unwanted pregnancy, having three or more children, married 4 or more years</p>
<p>Kocacik, F., Kutlar, A., & Erselcan, F. (2007). Domestic violence against women: A field study in Turkey. <i>The Social Science Journal</i>, 44, 698-720.</p>	<p>695 women</p>	<p>Sample was from Sivas, Adiyaman, Denizli and Kirklareli cities, 200 households in Sivas, 137 in Kirklareli, 306 in Adiyaman, 66 in Denizli. 54% over the age of 35 90% were married 93% had at least one child 10% had a college education 50%+ had very low education (16% of above had no education) 74% were housewives</p>	<p>Conducted using questionnaires through face-to-face interviews, including 30 questions.</p>	<p><u>Prevalence of abuse:</u> 28% reported physical or psychological violence 25% refused to answer the question 89% of abusers were partners 50%+ experienced violence in last 4 or more years</p> <p><u>Physical violence by area:</u> Sivas – 66% (38% a few times a year) Adiyaman – 46% (46% a few times a month) Denizli – 56% (44% a few times a month) Kirklareli – 39% (35% a few times a week) (Only Denizli reported sexual abuse, which was 7 %.)</p> <p><u>Most common reasons as reported by</u></p>

PASK#14 Online Tables – Table 2: Partner abuse in the Middle East

Study	N	Sample Characteristics	Method and Design	Results
				<p><u>women:</u> Failure to fulfill domestic duties Failure to fulfill husband’s sexual will No reason at all Other</p>
<p>Yildizhan, R., Adali, E., Kolusari, A., Kurdoglu, M., Yildizhan, B., & Sahin, G. (2008). Domestic violence against infertile women in a Turkish setting. <i>International Journal of Gynecology and Obstetrics</i>, 104, 110-112.</p>	<p>122 women</p>	<p>Women aged 22-39 years with primary infertility attending an obstetrics and gynaecology outpatient clinic of Yuzuncu Yil University Training and Research Hospital</p>	<p>Cross-sectional study. Face-to-face interviews. Lifetime and 12-month (and since infertility) IPV (physical) victimisation via 2 items taken from the Abuse Assessment Screen Questionnaire</p>	<p>Lifetime IPV: 33.6% Lifetime verbal abuse: 63.4% 78% reported IPV victimisation after their infertility diagnosis.</p> <p>The percentage of non-abused and abused infertile women who were mostly satisfied with their sexual lives was 56.87% and 29.2%, respectively</p>
<p>Marshall, G. A. & Furr, L.A. (2010). Factors that affect women’s attitudes toward domestic violence in Turkey. <i>Violence and Victims</i>, 25 (2), 265-277.</p>	<p>8,075 women</p>	<p>Random sampling of women aged 15-49 from both rural and urban areas.</p>	<p>Data taken from 2003 Turkey Demographic and Health Survey.</p> <p>Dependent variable – attitudinal tolerance for wife battering. The women were asked if the following items justified a husband beating his wife with a yes or no: burning food, wasting money, neglecting children, refusing sex, arguing with the husband. A yes answer</p>	<p><u>Prevalence of partner violence:</u></p> <p>41% of women answered yes to at least one of dependent variables; 3.5% answered yes to all five; 13.4% agreed to one; 9.8% agreed to two; 8.2% agreed to three; 6.1% agreed to four. 59% did not agree with any justification for wife beating.</p> <p>Justification for violence:</p>

PASK#14 Online Tables – Table 2: Partner abuse in the Middle East

Study	N	Sample Characteristics	Method and Design	Results
			<p>= 1; no answer = 0. The higher the score the greater acceptance of DV.</p> <p>Nine independent variables were used including frequency of reading magazines and/or newspapers, women’s attitudes toward roles of men, wealth, and demographics.</p>	<p>6% burns food; 29% argues with husband; 17% refuses sex; 23% neglects children; 28% wastes money; 41% any situation.</p> <p>Negative factors associated with violence tolerance: frequency of magazine and newspaper reading, literacy, age first married, educational level, and wealth.</p> <p>Positive factors associated with violence tolerance: patriarchal values, receiving bride’s money, rural residency, older age, and household size.</p>
<p>Nur, N. (2012). The Effect of intimate partner violence on mental health status among women of reproductive ages: A population-based study in a middle Anatolian city. <i>Journal of Interpersonal Violence</i>, 20 (10), 1-</p>	<p>1,844 women</p>	<p>A sample was drawn from Sivia city center. Eleven quarters of Sivia were randomly selected. One woman from each household was selected for the study.</p>	<p>The first questionnaire was relevant to demographic information. The second questionnaire was adapted from the WHO studies. The Conflict Tactic Scales-2 was used to measure intimate partner violence to determine prevalence of physical, sexual and emotional violence. Two timeframes of abuse were measured, one within one year,</p>	<p><u>Demographics:</u> 33% were 15 – 24 years old 13% were over 44 years old 72% did not have a college education 63% were married in the year prior 26% were employed</p> <p><u>Prevalence of IPV:</u> 34% overall IPV 10% physical violence over lifetime 6% physical violence past 12 months.</p>

PASK#14 Online Tables – Table 2: Partner abuse in the Middle East

Study	N	Sample Characteristics	Method and Design	Results
16.			the other beyond the past year. Mental health was measured using the 12-item General Health Questionnaire to determine emotional disorder and self-perceived health status.	7% sexual violence over lifetime 4% sexual violence past 12 months. <u>Risk factors:</u> Lower level of education, unemployment and low income, having 4 or more household members, higher rates of mental distress and bad self-perceived health overall.
Multi-Country				
Straus, M.A. (2008) Dominance and symmetry in partner violence by male and female university students in 32 nations. <u><i>Children and Youth Services Review</i></u> Volume 30(3), 252-275.	378 (Middle East)	Data from the International Violence Study regarding dating violence were collected from a convenience sample of 13,601 students at 68 universities in 32 nations. The subgroup of those reporting more than one incident of assault included 4,239 students. In this table segment, the samples were collected from the Middle East countries included are: Iran (91; 75.8% F) and Israel (287; 81.5% F). Students included in the study either currently	A consortium of researchers from all major regions of the world took part in this International Dating Violence Study. This section summarizes the research data for the Middle Eastern countries of Iran and Israel only. The core questions are the same in every region where the research was conducted. Students who participated in the study were advised of their rights to refuse participation and the purpose of the study. Most universities had a participation rate of 85% to 95%. Dominance was measured by items from the Personal and Relationships Profile – e.g., “I generally have the final say	Prevalence of overall assault perpetration for the past year reported in Middle Eastern countries are as follows: Iran: males at 96%, females 71%; Israel: males 21%, females 18%. Prevalence of severe assault reported are as follows: Iran: males 18%, females 16%; Israel: males 9%, females 7%. Prevalence of any mutual physical violence reported are as follows: Iran: 77%; Israel: 19%. Prevalence of mutual severe physical violence reported are as follows: Iran: 16; Israel: 7%. Dominance Scores: Iran: 2.27 M, 2.32 F Israel: 1.81 M, 1.86 F

PASK#14 Online Tables – Table 2: Partner abuse in the Middle East

Study	N	Sample Characteristics	Method and Design	Results
		<p>were, or had been in a relationship for one month or more.</p>	<p>when my partner and I disagree,” and “My partner needs to remember that I am in charge.” Impression management was controlled by using. The Limited Disclosure Scale of the PRP.</p>	

PASK#14 Online Tables – Table 3: Partner abuse in the Africa

Study	N	Sample Characteristics	Method and Design	Results
-------	---	------------------------	-------------------	---------

Table 3. Partner abuse in the Africa

Studies are organized by year of publication oldest to current. Multiple publications in the same year are alphabetized.

Botswana:				
Zungu, I. I., Salawu, A. O., & Ogunbanjo, G. A. (2010). Reported intimate partner violence amongst women attending a public hospital in Botswana	320 women	Women aged 21 years or older attending a public hospital for consultation.	Cross-sectional survey. Randomised sampling. Face-to-face interviews. Lifetime and 12-month IPV (described as any form of abuse from an intimate partner) victimisation was assessed following World Health Organisation criteria and recommendations for researching domestic violence. The questionnaire was not described.	Lifetime IPV: 49.7% 12-month: 21.2% Experiences of IPV were predominantly reported by women aged 21 – 30 years (38%). Most of the allegedly abused participants were single (54%) and unemployed (44%). Significant associations were found between alcohol use by participants' male intimate partners and IPV, as well as cigarette smoking
Jankey, O., Prospero, M., & Fawson, P. (2011). Mutually violent attitudes: effects on intimate partner violence and mental health symptoms among couples in Botswana, Africa. <i>Journal of Aggression, Conflict and Peace Research</i> , 3(1).	562 both	Students at Botswana University (71% female, 29% male) Mean age = 23.9 years In intimate relationship minimum of 3 months during past year	Measures administered: Conflict Tactics Scale-2 (physical and sexual violence); Revised Controlling Behavior Scale (measures threats, intimidation and emotional abuse); Revised EXPAGG (attitudes about use of violence for instrumental reasons); Mental Health Symptom Questionnaire (PTSD, depression)	Males significantly reported higher rates of sexual perpetration and pro-violent attitudes; no significant differences across gender in physical perpetration or use of controlling behaviors Sexual violence perpetration correlated significantly with respondent coercion and pro-violent attitudes, sexual violence victimization. Gender not significantly related to sexual violence perpetration. Females reported significantly more mental health symptoms than males

PASK#14 Online Tables – Table 3: Partner abuse in the Africa

Study	N	Sample Characteristics	Method and Design	Results
				Mental health symptoms correlated with respondent being coerced or sexually abused by partner, and partner having pro-violent attitudes.
Cameroon:				
<p>Alio, A., Salihu, H., Nana, P. Clayton, H., Mbah, A., & Marty, P. (2011). Association between intimate partner violence and induced abortion in Cameroon. <i>International Journal of Gynecology and Obstetrics</i>, 112, 83-87.</p>	2,570 women	Women of childbearing age, 15-49 years	<p>Data from Cameroon Demographic Health Survey (DHS), sample from each region of the country; two stage sampling design. Questionnaire administered under conditions of privacy, and asked about demographic characteristics, reproductive history and lifetime PV victimization. Physical PV items similar to CTS items Emotional abuse defined as verbal abuse, threats and public humiliation; sexual abuse defined as being forced to have sex or perform sexual acts</p>	<p><u>Prevalence of abuse:</u> Lifetime victimization: 38.7% physical, 30.7% emotional, 14.8% sexual</p> <p>Physical and sexual PV, but not emotional PV, increased risk for induced abortion</p>
Democratic Republic of Congo:				
Peterman, A., Palermo, T., & Bredenkamp, C.	3,436 women	The sample population came from 11 provinces and included 9,995	This study was a cross-country population-level household survey. It used the 2007	<p><u>Prevalence Rates of Partner Violence</u> The total population of women within the study reported 221 out of 1000</p>

PASK#14 Online Tables – Table 3: Partner abuse in the Africa

Study	N	Sample Characteristics	Method and Design	Results
<p>(2011). Estimates and determinants of sexual violence against women in the Democratic Republic of Congo. <i>American Journal of Public Health</i>, 101(6).</p>		<p>women ages 15 to 49 years old. A subsample of 3,436 was selected to measure sexual assault within intimate partner relationships.</p>	<p>Demographic and Health Survey for the DRC for their data collection. The purpose was to prove the collected facility data was agencies such as police departments and clinics were underestimated. They also measured specific areas of Nord-Kivu and Sud-Kivu. Data was also collected to compare intimate partner sexual assault from other forms of sexual violence.</p>	<p>were sexually assaulted by an intimate partner, 121 reported being raped throughout their lifetime, and 29 out of 1000 reported being raped in the last 12 months.</p> <p>This shows that IPVS is nearly twice as high as rape by strangers or in war conflict tactics. DRC women experience a rate of sexual violence of 35%, compared to 12 to 15% in neighboring countries. Nord-Kivu was the highest for a lifetime history of rape and rape within the last 12 months, while Bandundu was significantly higher for IPSV.</p> <p>There were few background factor predictors. The study reports the limitations of this study are that there was no on migrated, internally displaced, or fatalities resulting from the violence, which are predicted to be a significant missing population.</p>
<p>Egypt:</p>				
<p>Kishor, S., & Johnson, K. (2004). <i>Profiling domestic violence: A multi-country study</i>. Calverton, Maryland,</p>	<p>7,123 women</p>	<p>Ever-married women age from the community 15-49 in Egypt. Since the DHS had slight variations in variables it</p>	<p>Data from DHS conducted in Egypt 1995-1996 by National Population Council; one randomly selected ever-married woman in each household;</p>	<p>Women physically victimized at rate of 34.4% lifetime, 12.5% past year (of the latter, 9.1% reported 5 or more assaults) 18.0% reported bruises and aches,</p>

PASK#14 Online Tables – Table 3: Partner abuse in the Africa

Study	N	Sample Characteristics	Method and Design	Results
USA: ORC Macro		assessed there were some differences in the inclusion criteria for the administration of the domestic violence module from country to country (e.g. ever-married women vs. all women). Community sample	asked women about PV victimization (one question on having being beaten, other questions on sexual abuse)	10.2% required medical attention
Akmatov, M., Mikolajczyk, R., Labeeb, S., Dhaher, E., & Khan, M. (2008). Factors associated with wife beating in Egypt: Analysis of two surveys (1995 and 2005). <i>BMC Women's Health</i> , 8:15.	12, 736 women	Married Egyptian women aged 15-49 years from the community representative of the female population in Egypt.	Data from DHS representative surveys in Egypt in 1995 and 2005. Face-to-face interviews conducted in Arabic in respondents' households asked about woman's reproductive health, sociodemographic characteristics and PV victimization by husband in past 12 months. In 1995, PV defined as having been beaten; 2005 survey defined PV according to CTS items Sexual abuse defined as being forced to have intercourse when woman did not want to	<u>PV Prevalence</u> 17.5% in 1995, 18.9% in 2005 (16% when PV defined as in 1995, as beating) 2.3% of women experienced extreme levels of PV, 52.5% scored low on all forms of violence <u>Risk Factors</u> Women more likely to be beaten in rural regions compared to urban areas, if they had no education, married at a young age or were younger in age
Yount, K.M. & Li Li (2010). Domestic violence against	5,272 women	Ever-married women between 15 and 49 years of age from 26	A household survey gathering demographics, reproductive history, health knowledge and	<u>Prevalence of abuse:</u> Physical violence victimization: 33% ever, 18% prior year

PASK#14 Online Tables – Table 3: Partner abuse in the Africa

Study	N	Sample Characteristics	Method and Design	Results
<p>married women in Egypt. <i>Sex Roles</i>, 63:332-347.</p>		<p>governorates of Egypt.</p>	<p>practices, and history of female genital cutting. The Revised Conflict Tactics Scale was used. Questions were asked regarding lifetime experiences and frequency of psychological, physical and sexual abuse by her current or last husband. Two questions were asked regarding the women's perpetration of abuse on their husbands in the prior year. The also answered question regarding any physical abuse since they were 15 years old.</p>	<p>Minor violence: 32% ever, 18% prior year Severe violence: 14% even, 8% prior year</p> <p><u>Risk factors:</u> 23% - Physical punishment by a parent after the age of 15. 96% - Experienced genital mutilation 29% - high risk childhood exposure 39% - dependence on marital resources</p>
Ethiopia:				
<p>Deyessa, N., Berhane, Y., Alem, A., Ellsberg, M., Emmelin, M., Hogberg, U., & Kullgren, G. (2009). Intimate partner violence and depression among women in rural Ethiopia: A cross-sectional study. <i>Clinical Practice and Epidemiology in Mental Health</i>, 5:8.</p>	<p>1,994 women</p>	<p>Respondents married women age 15-49 Mean age = 31,6 85% of women illiterate 73% Muslim, 87% from rural communities; 31.3% in polygamous marriage</p>	<p>Community-based cross-sectional survey conducted in Meskan and Mareko districts of Ethiopia, part of WHO multi country study on women's health. Sample conducted within the Butajira Rural Health Programme demographic surveillance site. 85% of sample recruited from rural areas, corresponding with population. Depression measured by the Amharic language version of the Composite International</p>	<p><u>Lifetime PV victimization rates:</u> 49.5% physical, 59.5% sexual; 18.9% mild emotional violence (one form only); 8.9% severe (two or more forms).</p> <p>More than half reported to be partially or completely restricted in what they could do by their husband</p> <p>After adjusting for age and other factors, depression in previous 12 months correlated with any form of PV, especially physical violence</p>

PASK#14 Online Tables – Table 3: Partner abuse in the Africa

Study	N	Sample Characteristics	Method and Design	Results
<p>Philpart, M., Goshu, M., Gelaye, B., Williams, M.A., & Merhane, Y. (2009). Prevalence and risk factors of gender-based violence committed by male college students in Awassa, Ethiopia. <i>Violence and Victims</i>, 24(1).</p>	<p>1,378 men</p>	<p>Male college students in Awassa, Ethiopia</p>	<p>Diagnostic Interview. Sociodemographic</p> <p>A self-administered questionnaire was used.</p> <p>2 groups of physical violence were used and designated as moderate or severe:</p> <p>Moderate physical violence – shoving, pushing, throwing things, and slapping;</p> <p>Severe physical violence – using a weapon or threatening with a weapon, choking, burning, kicking, strangling, and dragging.</p> <p>3 items of abuse toward female intimate partners and non-partners included unwanted sexual touching, attempting and failing to rape the partner or non-partner, and raping the partner/non-partner. Lifestyle questions included the use of that and other sociodemographic items.</p> <p>Questionnaire was translated to</p>	<p><u>Prevalence of committed violence:</u></p> <p>24.4% admitted performing gender-based violence during the current term; 15.8% admitted to physically abusing a partner/non-partner during the current term with pushing and shoving being the most common at 9.5%; 17% admitted to acts of sexual violence with unwanted sexual touching being the most common at 12.9% followed by attempted rape at 4.6% and rape at 3.2%. 37% admitted to physical violent acts only; 42.1% admitted to sexual violent acts only; 20.9% admitted to both sexual and physical violent acts.</p> <p>Factors that increased the likelihood of committing acts of either sexual or physical violence were one year in college, having a female partner but unmarried, having an urban childhood upbringing, being a smoker of cigarettes, that and alcohol use, and witnessing parental violence as a child.</p>

PASK#14 Online Tables – Table 3: Partner abuse in the Africa

Study	N	Sample Characteristics	Method and Design	Results
			<p>Amharic.</p> <p>The definition for gender-based violence was defined as committing one or more acts of sexual or physical abuse of a female partner/non –partner during the current term.</p>	
<p>Abeya, S., Afework, M.F., & Yalew, A.W. (2011). Intimate partner violence against women in western Ethiopia: prevalence, patterns, and associated factors; <i>BMC Public Health</i>. http://www.biomedcentral.com/1471-2458/11/913, retrieved July 7, 2012.</p>	<p>1,540 women</p>	<p>A systematic random sample representing the urban and rural population of the country (15% and 85% respectively) was used to select households that had two or more eligible participants.</p>	<p>The standard WHO multi-country study questionnaire was used for this study. Although the data were collected through interview, the WHO questionnaire is a structured survey tool. The four questions to assess psychological abuse involved insults, belittlement, teasing and threats. Physical violence included slapping, throwing things, pushing or shoving, to more severe forms of hitting, kicking, beating, choking, burning or use of a weapon. Sexual violence was assessed by forced sex, for consent in response to fear or retaliation, or humiliating sexual acts.</p>	<p><u>Demographics</u> 84.2% lived in a rural setting; 78.6% were between 20 and 34 years (mean of 28.4 year); 98.7% were ever married; 97.5% Christian and 96.4% Oromo; 59.7% no formal education; 83.3% unemployed; 59.5% moved to the area for marriage or employment; 63.1% married between the ages of 15 and 19 years, and 2.3% married before the age of 15; 26.3% of marriages were arranged; 7.2% were abducted into the marriage.</p> <p><u>Prevalence Rates of Partner Violence</u> 62% moderate abuse, i.e. slapped and shoved in their lifetime; 54.2% severe abuse, i.e. burning and choking in their lifetime; 49.2% severe abuse in the past 12</p>

PASK#14 Online Tables – Table 3: Partner abuse in the Africa

Study	N	Sample Characteristics	Method and Design	Results
				<p>months. 76.5% experienced some form of IPV in their lifetime, and 72.5% experience IPV in the last 12 months. All acts were reported as being repeated acts.</p> <p><u>Sexual Violence</u> 59% forced sexual intercourse in their lifetime; 51% forced sexual intercourse in the last 12 months; 46.2% sexual coercion through fear in a lifetime; 40.4% in current relationships; 8.3% during a lifetime and 7.0% in the past 12 months experienced humiliating sexual acts.</p>
<p>Belachew Bekele, A., M.A.G. van Aken, & Dubas, J.S. (2011). Sexual violence victimization among female secondary school students in Eastern Ethiopia. <i>Violence and Victims</i>, 26(5).</p>	<p>764 women</p>	<p>Random sampling of female students from 3 secondary schools (Jijiga, Harar, and Dire Dawa) during the school year 2008-2009 whose mean age was 16.81.</p>	<p>Participants responded to questionnaires translated into the Amharic language. Verbal consent was obtained from all participants as well as approval from school officials and education bureaus. 14 teachers and 4 supervisors helped to administer the questionnaires in sessions lasting 1 hour and 20 minutes. Sexual violence victimization</p>	<p><u>Demographics</u> 68.8% were below 18 yrs; 31.2% had had sexual intercourse at the time of the study; Mean age for 1st time sexual encounter was 15.9 yrs; 89.1% of these were with men 18 yrs and older; of the sexually active females; 22.7% used a condom at least once; 8.4% said they used a condom every time.</p>

PASK#14 Online Tables – Table 3: Partner abuse in the Africa

Study	N	Sample Characteristics	Method and Design	Results
			<p>(SVV) was classified into 4 forms: sexual assault, coercion, offence, and aggression. A “yes” or “no” answer was required for 21 items. Study incorporated focus discussion groups using 3 professionals and the first author guiding the discussion and interviews using school employees and female club members to obtain qualitative data.</p>	<p><u>Sexual Violence</u> 68% experienced a minimum of one experience of sexual violence; 52% had at least one experience of sexual offense, 55.8% of sexual assault, 25% of sexual coercion, 14.7% of sexual aggression.</p> <p><u>Risk Factors</u> More sexual violence was reported by females who began having sexual intercourse at an early age; Females who had a tolerant attitude toward sexual violence and were sensitive to their partner’s rejection; Sexual forwardness and self-esteem were not linked; Multiple partners, substance use, risky behaviors, & watching pornography; Pressure from female friends; Those with a fearful attachment to parents .</p> <p><u>Findings from Interviews and group discussions:</u> It’s common for older men to seek out relationships with girls 3-5 yrs younger; the males’ persistent pressure resulted in the relationships; males use the girls’ female friends to pressure the girls into relationships; males feel that</p>

PASK#14 Online Tables – Table 3: Partner abuse in the Africa

Study	N	Sample Characteristics	Method and Design	Results
				the responsibility to maintain the relationship is the responsibility of the females; regular weekend leisurely activities include drinking alcohol, smoking shisha, chewing khat, as well as watching pornographic films; most males desire short-term relationships.
Feseha, G., G/mariam, A., & Gerbaba, M. (2012). Intimate partner physical violence among women in Shimelba refugee camp, northern Ethiopia. <i>BMC Public Health</i> , 12:125.	422 women	Women in a refugee camp in northern Ethiopia with intimate partner	Community-based cross-sectional study. Subjects selected through random sampling. Subjects administered a questionnaire adapted from the WHO domestic violence protocol, defined physical PV with items similar to CTS, asked about past year and lifetime victimization, and socio-demographic characteristics.	<p><u>Victimization Rates of Physical PV</u> 31.0% lifetime, 25.5% past year Slapping most common form of PV, experienced by 61.6% of abused women.</p> <p><u>Risk Factors</u> Working as a farmer, being Muslim, and partner’s alcohol abuse</p>
Ghana:				
Próspero, M., Dwumah, P., & Ofori-Dua, K. (2009). Violent attitudes and mental health symptoms among mutually violent Ghanaian couples. <i>Journal of Aggression, Conflict and Peace</i>	358 both	Classroom surveys given to students at Kwame Nkrumah University of Science and Technology in Kumasi, Ghana (51% female, 49% male) Mean age = 26.98. Had intimate	Measures administered: Conflict Tactics Scale-2 (physical and sexual violence); Revised Controlling Behavior Scale (measures threats, intimidation and emotional abuse) ; Revised EXPAGG (attitudes about use of violence for instrumental reasons); Mental Health Symptom	No significant differences across gender for physical/sexual violence victimization, controlling behaviors perpetration or victimization, or attitudes justifying violence. Males reported significantly greater physical/sexual violence perpetration. Significant predictors of physical/sexual violence perpetration:

PASK#14 Online Tables – Table 3: Partner abuse in the Africa

Study	N	Sample Characteristics	Method and Design	Results
<i>Research</i> , 1(2), 16-23.		relationships in past year for minimum three months	Questionnaire (PTSD, depression and conduct disorder)	(Females) High coercion perpetration, attitudes justifying violence, alcohol abuse (Males) Attitudes justifying violence, conduct disorder For both males and females, mental health symptoms significantly correlated with partner's pro-violent attitudes and childhood abuse
Kenya:				
Fonck, K., Els, L., Kidula, N., Ndinya-Achola, J., & Temmerman, M. (2005). Increased risk of HIV in women experiencing physical partner violence in Nairobi, Kenya. <i>AIDS and Behavior</i> , 9 (3), 335-339.	520 women	Women using health clinic. Mean age of those reporting any PV = 27. 64% married or cohabitating More than half with no income; 60% had only 5-8 years of education	Convenience sample of women recruited from health clinic in Nairobi, Kenya Trained nurse administered questionnaire in English or Swahili. Respondents asked about ever being beaten or raped	<u>PV Prevalence</u> 26% of respondents reported to having ever been physically beaten, and 6% to have every been raped; majority of those having been physically beaten, 74% were beaten by a partner. <u>Risk Factors</u> PV victimization correlated with lower education level, having first sexual experience before age 15, high number of pregnancies and children born
Simister, J.G. (2010). Domestic violence and female genital mutilation in Kenya: Effects of ethnicity and education. <i>Journal of Family Violence</i> ,	17,262 both	Sample from three surveys of Kenyan adults – single, married or cohabitating; includes 10 most prominent ethnic groups:	Data collected from all three surveys on partner abuse – definitions, prevalence, attitude; and female circumcision. DHS and WAS used modified Conflict Tactics Scale, with some differences between them	<u>WAS data</u> - Men and women reporting having experienced physical and psychological abuse with their partner (“experienced” could mean either perpetration or victimization): Slap during an argument: 33% male,

PASK#14 Online Tables – Table 3: Partner abuse in the Africa

Study	N	Sample Characteristics	Method and Design	Results
25j, 247-257.		<p>Demographic & Health Survey (DHS): a large, nationally representative survey of 11,773 urban and mostly rural households (70% women)</p> <p>Work, Attitudes & Spending Survey (WAS): Stratified sample from all regions (1,564 women, 1,527 men)</p> <p>Afrobarometer Survey: 2,398 adults across the country</p>		<p>37% female Physical beating: 34% male, 37% female Verbal abuse: 46% male, 48% female Denial of conjugal rights: 25% male, 24% female Non-provision of financial support: 28% male, 35% female Cold war: 46% male, 46% female Humiliation in front of others: 23% male, 29% female Chasing spouse from home: 27% male, 27% female</p> <p>35% of men, 28% of women agreed with statement, “There are situations when it is justified for a man to beat his wife”</p> <p><u>GBV data</u> – Women reporting on 10 items of physical and psychological abuse victimization: Highest rates: slapped during argument(32%); pushed, shaken, had something thrown at them (22%); humiliated in front of others (18%)</p>
Abuya, B.A., Onsomu, E.O., Moore, D., & Piper, C.M. (2012). Association between education and	5,729 women	This study sample included 5,729 women between the age of 15 and 49 years who were offered HIV test and	This study utilized the Kenya Demographic and Health Survey (KDHS-2003) and was a cross-sectional study. Only women were included because	<p><u>Prevalence Rates of Partner Violence during marriage:</u> 85% were currently married, reported: 40% physical violence; 13% sexual violence;</p>

PASK#14 Online Tables – Table 3: Partner abuse in the Africa

Study	N	Sample Characteristics	Method and Design	Results
<p>domestic violence among women being offered an HIV test in urban and rural areas in Kenya. <i>Journal of Interpersonal Violence</i>, XX(X), 1-17.</p>		<p>were tested. All participants were married or formerly married.</p>	<p>of the domestic violence questions included. Socioeconomic questions were asked, as well as questions about religion, perceived risk of HI, and questions about domestic violence, using the Conflict Tactics Scale.</p>	<p>22% emotional violence. The women who were formerly married reported: 63% physical abuse; 27% sexual violence; 49% emotional violence. <u>Risk Factors</u> Domestic violence was highest among those with limited education: 64% physical; 65% sexual; 62% emotional, compared to those with a college education, which all fell below 5%.</p>
<p>Malawi:</p>				
<p>Pelser,E., Gondwe, L., Mayamba,C., Mhango,T., Phiri, W., & Burton, P. (2005). <i>Intimate partner violence: Results from a national gender-based violence study in Malawi</i>. Pretoria, South Africa: Institute for Security Studies.</p>	<p>3,546 women 2,246 men</p>	<p>3,546 female, 2,246 male 88% of women from rural areas, 54% married, 31% cohabitating; 27.5% had no schooling54% self-employed Male partner controlled finances in 71% of households</p>	<p>Multi-stage probability sample drawn from 1998 Malawi Population and Housing Census, divided into regional and district samples Respondents asked about lifetime PV victimization PV definitions: Physical abuse items from CTS Emotional: prevented from communicating with others, having movements limited outside house, humiliated, told</p>	<p><u>PV Prevalence</u> 30% of women reported some lifetime physical abuse victimization 28% economic abuse 25% emotional abuse 18% sexually abused 49% experienced any partner abuse during lifetime Economic abuse reported to be ongoing; most women reported other forms of abuse to have occurred only once <u>Risk Factors</u></p>

PASK#14 Online Tables – Table 3: Partner abuse in the Africa

Study	N	Sample Characteristics	Method and Design	Results
			<p>you are crazy, threatened with being taken to mental facility or threatened with harm, or threats against children, and threats of suicide</p> <p>Economic: forced to hand over partner money or to ask others for money or goods, prevented from having access or knowing about income, prevented from having one's own income</p> <p>Sexual: Being sexually touched against your will, forced to watch others have sex, or forced to have sex for money</p>	<p>Partner's alcohol intoxication present in 18% of economic abuse cases, 36% physical abuse cases</p> <p>Women reporting physical or sexual victimization more likely to be dependent on money from friends, family or partner</p> <p>31%-42.5% of abused women were unemployed</p> <p>Perpetrators age 21-39 perpetrated 36% of economic abuse, 43% of physical abuse; however, most sexual abuse committed by men under 20 years old</p> <p><u>Impact of Abuse</u></p> <p>73% of economic abuse victims reported depression; 54% of all victims reported irritability, and slightly less than half reported sleep disturbance</p> <p>Four-fifths of emotional abuse (mostly public humiliation) victims reported flashbacks, and 69% experienced depression</p> <p>52% of physical abuse victims reported irritability, 43% disturbed sleeping patterns</p> <p>Victims of sexual abuse were the most impacted: 74% reported flashbacks, 73% changes in eating patterns, 62% depressed</p>

PASK#14 Online Tables – Table 3: Partner abuse in the Africa

Study	N	Sample Characteristics	Method and Design	Results
Nigeria:				
<p>Owoaje, E.T., & Ol, F. M. (2006). Intimate partner violence among women in a migrant community in southwest Nigeria. <i>International Quarterly of Community Health Education</i>, 25(4), 337-349.</p>	400 women	<p>Women aged 15-49 years living in Sabo (a migrant community in southwest Nigeria). Mean age: 26.5 years</p>	<p>Cross-sectional survey used random sampling. Face-to-face interviews. Examined lifetime and 12-month minor and severe physical IPV victimisation. Questionnaire was designed for the study. No specific details about the domestic violence section of the questionnaire are provided</p>	<p>Lifetime physical IPV 5.3% (Minor = 3.3% / Severe = 2%) 12-month physical IPV: Minor = 1.5% / Severe = 0.3% Most common types of lifetime abuse was verbal abuse experienced by 75.5%, followed by verbal threats, reported by 26%. Overall IPV: Lifetime = 87% / 12-month = 20% Regarding attitudes to IPV, 79.5% of women believed that wife beating was justified in at least one of seven situations. Respondents who were not living with a male partner were more likely than their counterparts who were married/cohabiting to accept IPV</p>
<p>Obi, S.N., & Ozumba, B.C. (2007). Factors associated with domestic violence in south-east Nigeria. <i>Journal of Obstetrics and Gynaecology</i>, 27(1): 75-78.</p>	600 men	<p>Married men seen at General Outpatient Clinics of two tertiary health institutions in Abakaliki and Enugu, southern Nigeria; from Ibo-speaking tribe Mean age = 38 years 98.1% Christians</p>	<p>Sample from first 600 men to enter clinics who were married and willing to participate in study. Asked about their opinions on domestic violence, reasons for such violence and ways of reducing it. (No definition of domestic violence given)</p>	<p>70% reported a history of abuse in their family; female partners the victims in 92% of the cases, the man in 8% of cases Most common forms of abuse: Verbal (92.9%) Slapping or pushing (76.9%) Punching or kicking (45.7%) Domestic violence correlated with low social class, alcohol consumption, age disparity and spouse unemployment</p>

PASK#14 Online Tables – Table 3: Partner abuse in the Africa

Study	N	Sample Characteristics	Method and Design	Results
				<p>Injuries: Sore muscles (91.4%) Lacerations (63.4%) Black eyes (51.7%) Swollen lips (28.2%) Burns (1.4%) Deep muscle injuries (1.1%)</p> <p>Major physical injuries (deep knife cut, burns) occurred among the male victims</p>
<p>Okenwa, L.E., Lawoko, S., & Jansson, B. (2009). Exposure to intimate partner violence amongst women of reproductive age in Lagos, Nigeria: Prevalence and predictors. <i>Journal of Family Violence</i>, 24: 517-530.</p>	<p>934 Women</p>	<p>Systematic sample of women aged 14-49 years old that attended the obstetrics and gynecological clinics located in the Lagos University Teaching Hospital</p>	<p>A demographic and health issues questionnaire covering both the women’s and spouses backgrounds, history of reproduction, types of family planning methods used including fertility, knowledge of STD’s, mortality of children, attitudes and opinions regarding IPV, with the main issues of interest being domestic violence, social indicators and demographics.</p> <p>A modified version of the Conflict Tactic Scale (CTS) was used to evaluate whether respondents experienced physical, psychological, and</p>	<p><u>Prevalence Rates of Partner Violence</u> 8.6% Physical abuse; 22.8% Psychological abuse; 8.3% Sexual abuse.</p> <p>29.1% Women reporting at least one of the above abuses in one year.</p> <p><u>Risk Factors:</u> Demographics –Physical abuse decreased with education and literacy; Catholic women experienced a higher incident of sexual abuse than other religions; women with at least one child were more likely to report psychological abuse and women in polygamous relationships more likely to report physical abuse.</p>

PASK#14 Online Tables – Table 3: Partner abuse in the Africa

Study	N	Sample Characteristics	Method and Design	Results
			<p>sexual abuse by the spouse or partner during the last year or at any other time.</p> <p>Risk factors under investigation were classified as demographics, financial problems, participation in finances, participation in decision making, behavioral factors, and access to information such as newspapers, television, etc.</p>	<p>Finances - unemployment increased the likelihood of physical abuse as did working from home; financial problems were associated with an increase of all abuse.</p> <p>Participation in financial decisions – increased likelihood of abuse.</p> <p>Participation in other areas of decision making – women who had complete say over visitations to family and friends were more exposed to physical abuse than their colleagues who did not make those decisions.</p> <p>Women who made their own decisions about the number of children to have and when to have them were more likely to report physical abuse.</p> <p>Behavioral – consumption of alcohol by both women and spouses increased exposure to abuse; women with spouses who smoked were also more likely to experience abuse.</p> <p>Access to information – highest proportion of abused women were those that seldom or never read newspapers, although those that did</p>

PASK#14 Online Tables – Table 3: Partner abuse in the Africa

Study	N	Sample Characteristics	Method and Design	Results
				<p>read also report abuse.</p> <p>Women ages 15-24 years old were more likely to experience abuse than that of 25-44 year old.</p>
<p>Odimegwu, C., Okemgbo, C.N., & Ayila, R. (2010). Dynamics of gender-based violence among the Tivs of North Central Nigeria. <i>African Population Studies</i>, 24 (3).</p>	<p>648 women</p>	<p>Random sampling of women from urban town of Gboko and rural town of Gwer.</p>	<p>There were 10 interviews of women abused by their partners and focused on attitudes and perceptions of gender-based violence.</p> <p>Five community opinion leaders were chosen as key informants who conversed about prevalence, incidence, causes, consequences, and perceptions of gender-based violence.</p> <p>Information from the interviews, key informants, and six focus groups were used to develop the questionnaire.</p> <p>Four dependent variables were used for the questionnaire: lifetime physical violence, forced sexual intercourse, current intimate partner violence, and psychological abuse.</p>	<p><u>Demographics:</u> 56.7% from urban areas 43.3% from rural area.</p> <p><u>Perception of sexuality and gender roles including reproductive rights</u> 33% said women have a right to decide when to bear children; four of every 10 said women should have a right to decide when to have sex: 94% agreed that men should hold the final say in the home; more than 2/3 said partner should not be expected to help with household chores; four out of 10 said it is necessary for partner to beat his wife.</p> <p><u>Prevalence of gender-based violence</u> 66.5% reported being physically assaulted by someone sometime in their lifetime; 75.9% reported being physically assaulted by their partner;</p>

PASK#14 Online Tables – Table 3: Partner abuse in the Africa

Study	N	Sample Characteristics	Method and Design	Results
				<p>21% reported being raped; 17% reported being raped by their partner; 66.4% reported lifetime psychological abuse.</p> <p><u>Risk factors:</u> Lifetime physical violence –as age increases odds of experiencing abuse decreases by 6%;</p> <p>The longer the marriage the longer the abuse;</p> <p>Urban area women more likely to experience abuse than those in rural area.</p> <p>As family size increases, odds of abuse decrease by 5%.</p> <p>Rape – Urban women are more likely to report it than those in rural areas; women with lower educational levels are more likely to experience it; those that stick with gender stereotypes are more likely to experience it.</p> <p>Psychological – the lower the educational level, the less likelihood of abuse; women who have experienced physical abuse are more likely to</p>

PASK#14 Online Tables – Table 3: Partner abuse in the Africa

Study	N	Sample Characteristics	Method and Design	Results
				experience it.
<p>Antai, D. (2011). Controlling behavior, power relations within intimate relationships and intimate partner physical and sexual violence against women in Nigeria. <i>BMC Public Health</i>, 11:511.</p> <p>+</p>	2,877 women	Women aged 15-49 residing or visiting the sampled households at the time of the study in Nigeria. Community sample.	<p>Data from 2008 Nigeria DHS, a cross-sectional nationally representative study using two-stage cluster sample design. Face-to-face interviews. Asked about sociodemographic characteristics, lifetime exposure to PV</p> <p>Physical and sexual PV measured with modified CTS</p> <p>Controlling behaviors defined as: partner jealous if she talks with other men, accuses her of being unfaithful, limits contact with friends and family, insists on knowing where she is, doesn't trust her with money</p>	<p><u>PV Prevalence</u> 63% reported any lifetime experience of being controlled, 15% physical violence, 3% sexual abuse 79% of controlled women also reported physical abuse and 85% sexual abuse</p> <p><u>Risk Factors</u> PV victimization associated with being from a rural area, having decision-making autonomy, and being in a monogamous relationship; partner's secondary or higher level of education, agricultural employee or self-employed or unskilled laborer</p>
<p>Brisibe, S., Ordinioha, B., & Dienye, P. (2012). Intersection between alcohol abuse and intimate partner's violence in a rural Ijaw Community in Bayelsa State, South-South Nigeria. <i>Journal of Interpersonal</i></p>	159 Women 187 men	Married or cohabitating adults ages 16-65 (males = 187; females = 159) ages 16-65 years old Mean age = 41.4 91.9% Christians, 52.3% farmers or fishermen	<p>Cross-sectional design</p> <p>Data collected from Okoloba, a rural community in Bayelsa State, Nigeria; chosen because it is a typical Ijaw community. Interviews in Ijwa language, asked about sociodemographic information, alcohol use, and PV for previous 12 months, based loosely on CTS items</p> <p>PV questions asked in privacy.</p>	<p>Rates of PV victimization for past year: 55.78% (83.42% male on female, 23.7% female on male) 36% were alcohol abusers 77.2% of abusers reported to having been under influence of alcohol when abusive</p>

PASK#14 Online Tables – Table 3: Partner abuse in the Africa

Study	N	Sample Characteristics	Method and Design	Results
<i>Violence, 27 (3), 513-522.</i>				
Rwanda:				
Ntaganira, J., Muula, A., Masaisa, F., Dusabeyezu, F., Siziya, S., & Rudatsikira, E. (2008). Intimate partner violence among pregnant women in Rwanda. <i>BMC Women's Health, 8</i> :17	600 women	Pregnant women aged 18-47 years, attending either of two antenatal clinics in Kigali and North Province, Rwanda. Mean age: 30.2 years	Cross-sectional study. Convenience sample of 300 HIV positive and 300 HIV negative women. Face-to-face interviews. It assessed 12-month prevalence of physical IPV via 6 items (behavioral acts: 1 item was mild physical IPV, and the other 5 items were severe physical IPV related)	Physical IPV: 35.1% HIV (+) women = 46% HIV (-) women = 24.7% HIV+ pregnant women had higher rates of all acts of IVP violence than HIV- pregnant women. Other factors positively associated with physical IPV included sexual abuse before the age of 14 years, having an alcohol drinking male partner, for occasional drinkers, and having a male partner with other sexual partners
Kayabanda, J., Bitera, R., & Alary, M. (2012). Violence toward women, men's sexual risk factors and HIV infection among women: Findings from a national household survey in Rwanda. <i>Journal of Acquired Immune Deficiency Syndrome, 59 (3), 300-307.</i>	2,715 Women 2,461 men	Women age 15-49 and their male partners using a 2-stage cluster sampling based on 2002 housing census.	Data from Rwanda third DHS. Face-to-face interviews in Kinyarwanda language, asked about HIV risk factors, sociodemographic characteristics, PV victimization, and attitudes on PV PV definitions: Physical: push, shake, thrown something at you, slap, twist arm, punch with fist, hit with something that could hurt, kick or drag you, try to strangle or	<u>PV Prevalence</u> Lifetime PV victimization by women: 29.2% physical, 22.2% psychological, 12.4% sexual; and 52.1% reported having been controlled <u>Impact of PV and Risk Factors</u> Higher PV victimization significantly correlated with HIV status, or having being controlled

PASK#14 Online Tables – Table 3: Partner abuse in the Africa

Study	N	Sample Characteristics	Method and Design	Results
			burn you Psychological: threaten to harm, do something to humiliate in front of others, spit on you Control: partner angry when you talk to other men, accuses you of being unfaithful, tries to limit contact with friends or family, insisting on knowing where you are, doesn't trust you with money Sexual: physically force you to have sexual intercourse or to perform other sexual acts you did not want to do	
South Africa:				
Mwamwenda, T. S. (1998). Reports of husband battering from an undergraduate sample in Umtata. <i>Psychological Reports</i> , 82, 517-518.	138 women 81 men	Sample of first-year students (138 women, 81 men) enrolled in psychology classes at University of Transkei, Umtata, South Africa	Respondents asked to give "yes" or "no" answer to whether they had ever witnessed husbands beaten by their wives – their own father at home, or other husbands at homes of relatives or neighbors Term "beaten" not further defined	<u>Prevalence:</u> 2% reported to have seen their fathers beaten by their mothers 18% witnessed male relatives beaten by their wives 26% witnessed neighbor husbands beaten by their wives Author suggests that low incidence of reported father victimization may be due to respondents' reluctance to embarrass themselves or insult their family
Jewkes, R., Levin J., & Penn-Kekana, L.	1279	Randomly selected women aged 18-49 ever	DV definition used is physical violence by a current or ex-	<u>Prevalence of physical violence:</u> 24.6% Lifetime prevalence;

PASK#14 Online Tables – Table 3: Partner abuse in the Africa

Study	N	Sample Characteristics	Method and Design	Results
<p>(2002). Risk factors for domestic violence: findings from a South African cross-sectional study. <i>Social Science & Medicine</i>, 55, 1603-1617.</p>	<p>women</p>	<p>having had a boyfriend or husband and with 1164 having a partner in the previous year, and residing in Eastern Cape, Mpumalanga, and the Northern Province. 1,166 women had a partner the previous year.</p>	<p>husband or boyfriend.</p> <p>Questionnaires translated into 9 languages were used to collect data on women’s partners in the past year and type of relationship.</p> <p>To determine types of DV women were asked if they had in the last year been slapped, threatened, punched, beaten, bitten, kicked, burned, choked, threatened or injured with a weapon or other object.</p> <p>Women answering no to the above were then asked if they had <u>ever</u> been beaten by a boyfriend or ex-husband.</p> <p>All women were asked if they were victims of violence during pregnancy.</p>	<p>9.5% in the past year; 11.6% threats of DV in the past year.</p> <p>Of the total of women reporting DV, 45.9% reported having an injury in the past year.</p> <p><u>Risk Factors:</u> Women were more likely to consume alcohol; less likely to live in Northern Province; more likely to be African; more likely to have been victims of childhood violence and to have witnessed violence to their mothers; more likely to have grown up in urban areas; more likely to have multiple partners in the previous year; to be a sole wife and to know about their partners other girlfriends.</p> <p>Male partners were less educated than total sample; lived in rural areas during childhood; more likely to be unemployed; more likely to drink alcohol. Factors associated with abuse in all models: women not having post-school education, alcohol consumption, having no confidence, having more</p>

PASK#14 Online Tables – Table 3: Partner abuse in the Africa

Study	N	Sample Characteristics	Method and Design	Results
				liberal ideas or women’s roles, violence in childhood.
Swart, L.A., Seedat, M., Stevens, G., & Ricardo, I. (2002). Violence in adolescents' romantic relationships: findings from a survey amongst school-going youth in a South African community. <i>Journal of Adolescence</i> , 25(4), 385-395.	928 both	Sample from 3-nation study of HIV/AIDS risk factors. South African sample comprised grades 9-12 students (53% female) attending seven secondary schools in Eldorado Park, south of Johannesburg. Average age for boys = 17; average for girls = 16	Students administered adapted version of CTS-2 on experience with physical, psychological and sexual violence in current dating relationship during past year Also asked about experiencing or witnessing violence in their family, witnessing violence among other couples the use of alcohol, and beliefs about the use of violence	<p><u>Dating violence rates</u> 35.3% of males and 43.5% of females reported at least one incident of physical violence perpetration; 37.8% of males and 41.7% of females reported any physical victimization</p> <p><u>Beliefs</u> 25.0% of males and 19.6% of females endorsed statement, “Physical aggression is part of a romantic relationship”</p> <p><u>Risk factors</u> Experiences with violence in the family correlated with dating violence for males only; witnessing friends fighting with partner correlated with dating violence for both males and females</p>
Abrahams, N., Jewkes, R., Laubscher, R., & Hoffman, M. (2006). Intimate Partner Violence: Prevalence	1,368 men	Random sampling of men working in Cape Town municipalities	Study was conducted between June 1998 and February 1999. Face to face interviews were conducted in the language of the participants’ choice.	<u>Demographics and background:</u> Men identified 2,056 total partners; Men’s ages were between 20-76 years; 64.3% of the men were classified as colored under apartheid.

PASK#14 Online Tables – Table 3: Partner abuse in the Africa

Study	N	Sample Characteristics	Method and Design	Results
<p>and Risk Factors for Men in Cape Town, South Africa. <i>Violence and Victims</i>, 21 (2).</p>			<p>Sociodemographic data was collected.</p> <p>Childhood variables included – discipline used, presence of father in the home, physical abuse of mother.</p> <p>Respondents were to answer acceptable or unacceptable to 18 scenarios of violence.</p> <p>Sexual violence was defined as forcing partner to have sex or trying to force to have sex.</p> <p>Emotional abuse defined as threats to leave the relationship, damaging partner’s possessions, breaking or kicking objects, humiliation in front of others, evicting partner, threats with a weapon or other object.</p> <p>Physical abuse defined as grabbing, hitting, pushing, smacking, throwing object at partner.</p>	<p><u>Prevalence of abuse:</u> 67.55 current partners; 28.5% on current and previous partners; 3.9% on previous only. 42.3% reported using physical violence against partner in past 10 years; 8.8% hit partner in past year; 15.3% reported sexual abuse; 42.2% reported emotional abuse; 55.0% reported verbal abuse; 33.8% reported none of the five; 49.3% reported using more than one type. 31.1% reported using physical, emotional and sexual abuse. 59.7% men who had reported physical abuse reported a severe incident with 21% reporting that partner had to seek medical attention.</p> <p>Men more likely to have been violent over past 10 years were younger, colored or Indian, low education and skill level, had more than one partner, alcohol and drug users, had witnessed in childhood and experienced in childhood violence, not religious, involved in crime, involved in fights.</p> <p>Partners that were abused had the following characteristics: cohabitation</p>

PASK#14 Online Tables – Table 3: Partner abuse in the Africa

Study	N	Sample Characteristics	Method and Design	Results
				with partner, more or less educated than partner, used alcohol.
<p>Kaminer, D., Grimsrud, A., Myer, L., Stein, D., & Williams, D. (2008). Risk for post-traumatic stress disorder associated with different forms of interpersonal violence in South Africa. <i>Social Science and Medicine</i>, 67, 1589-1595.</p>	4,351 both	<p>South African adults, Female: 58.6% Male: 41.4% Ethnicity: 79.7% Black Mean age: 37 years 50.1% married 69.2% unemployed 62.7% had less than 12 years education 61.6% lived in urban areas</p>	<p>Data from South Africa Stress and Health Study (SASH). National probability sample of adult South Africans living in households and youth hostels. Three-stage sample design; last stage: random selection of adult in each sampled housing unit. Asked about various forms of violence Physical partner abuse measured by question: “Were you ever badly beaten up by a spouse or romantic partner?”</p> <p>Interviews conducted face-to-face using language preferred by the respondent</p>	<p><u>Partner Violence Prevalence Rates</u> Lifetime rate of any severe partner violence victimization reported by 14.0% of women, 3.5% of men <u>Risk Factors</u> Sever partner violence victimization second most strongly associated type of violence with PTSD, after rape, For men, PTSD most strongly associated with childhood abuse and criminal assault</p>
<p>Gass, J. D., Stein, D. J., Williams, D. R., & Seedat, S. (2010). Gender Differences in risk for intimate partner violence among South African adults. <i>Journal of Interpersonal</i></p>	1,715 both	<p>Data came from South Africa Stress and Health Study, a nationally-representative survey. Participants randomly selected from three-stage clustered area probability sample.</p>	<p>Survey administered in person, in one of seven languages: English, Afrikaans, Zulu, Xhosa, Northern Sotho, Southern Sotho, and Tswana. Respondents asked about perpetration and victimization of partner abuse during disagreement in current or most</p>	<p><u>Victimization rates</u> 29.3% (women), vs. 20.9% (men) Perpetration rates: 25.2% (women), vs. 26.5% (men)</p> <p><u>Risk factors</u> Males reporting perpetration more likely than non-violent men to be in cohabitating (vs. married); 3.5 times as</p>

PASK#14 Online Tables – Table 3: Partner abuse in the Africa

Study	N	Sample Characteristics	Method and Design	Results
<p><i>Violence</i>, 25(12), 1-26.</p>		<p>78% married; 63% women; 73% Black, 57% urban dwellers. Mean age = 42 Majority unemployed</p>	<p>recent marriage or cohabitating relationship: pushing, grabbing, slapping or hitting partner</p> <p>Respondents also asked about demographic characteristics risk factors, childhood of origin risk factors and adult risk factors</p>	<p>likely to have being physically abused as children and 4 times as likely to have witness parental violence; 7 times more likely to have experienced Intermittent Explosive Disorder as children or adolescents. In adulthood, were twice as likely to have been abusing alcohol or have a mood disorder.</p> <p>Males reporting victimization more likely to be young and earn a low income; twice as likely to have been physically abused as children and 3.5 times as likely to have witnessed violence between parents; and 3 times as likely to not having been close to primary female caregiver as children</p> <p>Women reporting perpetration likely to be of Indian heritage and in a cohabitating relationship; 3 times more as likely to have either been abused as a child or witness parental violence, and more likely to have not been close to primary female caregiver; as adults, 7 times as likely to abuse alcohol and twice as likely to have an anxiety disorder.</p> <p>Women reporting victimization more</p>

PASK#14 Online Tables – Table 3: Partner abuse in the Africa

Study	N	Sample Characteristics	Method and Design	Results
				likely to be young and Indian, in a cohabitating relationship and have lower educational and economic achievement; 4 times as likely to have been abused as children and 3 times as likely to have witnessed parental violence, and twice as likely to report not having been close to primary male caregiver as children; also more likely to report anxiety disorder as adults.
Tanzania:				
McCloskey, L.A., Williams, C., & Larsen, U. (2005). Gender inequality and intimate partner violence among women in Moshi, Tanzania. <i>International Family Planning Perspectives</i> , 31 (3), 124-130.	1,444 women	Women age 20-44 with a partner, living in the Moshi district of Tanzania and from various ethnic groups. Three quarters were under 35; two-thirds Christian, rest Muslim. Most had 1-4 children.	Respondents identified through random cluster sampling procedure, interviewed face to face and asked about demographic and social characteristics, as well as PV in past year with a shortened CTS, but including items on insulting, threatening, “hit, slap or otherwise physically hurt”, and several questions on sexual PV	21% reported any victimization in past year PV correlated with lower education, being in a polygamous marriage, partner making minimal financial contribution, trouble conceiving a child and having 5 or more children
Prabhu, M., Mchome, B., Ostermann, J., Itemba, D., Njau, B., & Thielman, N. (2011). Prevalence and correlates of intimate partner	2,436 women	Women attending clinic 18 years and over	Cross-sectional study of women obtaining services at HIV clinic in Moshi, Tanzania between 2005 and 2008. Subjects asked about demographic information, sexual behavior and lifetime experiences of PV	17.7% reported physical or sexual PV lifetime victimization PV correlated with low education, unemployment, having children and being older and being married. 22.4% of single women who reported PV were HIV seropositive, compared

PASK#14 Online Tables – Table 3: Partner abuse in the Africa

Study	N	Sample Characteristics	Method and Design	Results
<p>violence among women attending HIV voluntary counseling and testing in northern Tanzania, 2005-2008. <i>International Journal of Gynecology and Obstetrics</i>, 113, 63-67.</p>			<p>victimization. Physical PV defined as partner doing something to physically hurt; sexual PV as being forced to have sexual intercourse when subject did not want to</p>	<p>to 15.1% who reported no PV</p>
Uganda:				
<p>Karamagi, C., Tumwine, J., Tylleskar, T., & Heggenhougen, K. (2003). Intimate partner violence and infant morbidity: Evidence of an association from a population-based study in Eastern Uganda in 2003. <i>BMC Pediatrics</i>, 7:34</p>	<p>457 women</p>	<p>Women age 15-45 (mean age = 25) 58% rural, 62% Muslim, 91% married, 71% with less than 8 years of schooling, 88% worked in agriculture</p>	<p>Cross sectional household survey of women with infants (one year of less) in Mbale district of Uganda, using WHO/EPI cluster survey method Respondents asked in Lumasaba language about sociodemographic characteristics, infant health and PV, defined as being beaten by husband, or threatened with weapon, had weapon used against you, or been kicked, bitten or hit (Sexual abuse defined as being raped or otherwise sexually abused by husband)</p>	<p>Lifetime PV victimization: 43% PV victimization significantly correlated with infant illnesses (e.g., diarrhea, fever, and cough).</p>
<p>Uganda Bureau of Statistics & Macro International (2007).</p>	<p>2,087 women</p>	<p>2,087 women (age 15-49) and 1,844 men (age 15-54) living in the</p>	<p>Nationwide representative survey (Uganda Demographic and Health Survey -UDHS).</p>	<p><u>Partner Abuse Rates</u> Women: 48.0% ever victimized physically,</p>

PASK#14 Online Tables – Table 3: Partner abuse in the Africa

Study	N	Sample Characteristics	Method and Design	Results
<p><i>Uganda demographic and health survey</i> 2006. Calverton, Maryland, USA: UBOS and Macro International Inc.</p>	<p>1,844 men</p>	<p>sampled households in Uganda. Community sample</p>	<p>Probability sample from 9,864 households in all 80 districts, rural and urban; 2-stage sampling design; focused on family violence. Surveyed ever-married women and men Asked about spousal violence after age 15.</p> <p>Spousal violence questionnaire based on CTS; sexual abuse defined as “physically force you to have sexual intercourse with him/her even when you did not want to”; emotional abuse defined as saying or doing something to humiliate, threatening to hurt or harm victim or someone else, and insulting or making victim feel bad about themselves</p>	<p>36% sexually, 49% emotionally 68% have experienced any kind of partner abuse Slapping most common, experienced by 40% of women 7% report ever physically abusing current or previous husbands</p> <p>Men: 20% ever victimized physically, 7% sexually, 35% emotionally Being pushed , shaken or having something thrown at them reported by 10% of men Compared to women, men who sustain partner violence do so less often 41% of men report ever initiating physical violence against current or previous wives</p> <p><u>Risk Factors</u> Women: Younger age; divorced, separated or widowed; live in rural area; husband’s infrequent alcohol use or alcohol abuse (moderate drinking not a stress factor)</p> <p>Men: Older age; having three or more children; being divorced, separated or widowed; living in rural area risk</p>

PASK#14 Online Tables – Table 3: Partner abuse in the Africa

Study	N	Sample Characteristics	Method and Design	Results
				<p>factor for physical violence only; having a primary level education (having no education not a risk factor)</p> <p><u>Impact of Abuse</u> 43% of physically abused women reported injuries, and 33% of men</p>
<p>Zablotska, I. B., Gray, R. H., Koenig, M. A., Serwadda, D., Nalugoda, F., Kigozi, D., Sewankambo, N., Lutalo, T., Wabwire Mangen, F., & Wawer, M. (2009). Alcohol Use, Intimate Partner Violence, Sexual Coercion and HIV among Women Aged 15–24 in Rakai, Uganda. <i>AIDS and Behavior</i>, 13, 225-233</p>	<p>3,422 women</p>	<p>Women aged 15-24 years from a cohort in Rakar, Uganda</p>	<p>Cross-sectional study that used census data. It assessed lifetime and 12-month physical (7 items: 3 for minor IPV and 4 items for severe IPV) and sexual IPV (coercion- 1 item) victimization</p>	<p><u>Prevalence of abuse:</u> Physical IPV: Lifetime = 50.2% / 12-month = 26.9% Sexual IPV: Lifetime = 22.4% / 12-month = 13.4%</p> <p><u>Influence of alcohol use:</u> Alcohol use before sex was associated with physical violence and sexual coercion, and both are jointly associated with HIV infection risk in young women. Similar proportions of women reported physical IPV and sexual coercion regardless of who was drinking alcohol before sex: a woman, her partner or both</p>
<p>Tumwesigye, N., Kyomuhendo, G., Kennedy Greenfield, T., & Wanyenze, R. (2012). Problem drinking and physical intimate partner violence against</p>	<p>1,743 women</p>	<p>Women aged 15-49 from the community</p>	<p>Demographic health survey. Cross sectional study. Face-to-face interviews. The Domestic violence module of this survey examined prevalence of female physical intimate partner violence and male problem drinking (as reported by</p>	<p><u>Prevalence of intimate partner violence and risk factors:</u> 48% experienced physical IPV. 49.5% reported that their partners got drunk at least sometimes. Women whose partners got drunk often were 6 times more likely to report physical IPV than those whose partners</p>

PASK#14 Online Tables – Table 3: Partner abuse in the Africa

Study	N	Sample Characteristics	Method and Design	Results
women: evidence from a national survey in Uganda. <i>BMC Public Health</i> , 12:399			women). It examined the probability of examining female physical IPV by different sociodemographics. Physical (minor and severe) IPV in the previous 12 months was assessed by 7 items	never drank alcohol. The higher the education level and wealth status of the women the less the likelihood of experiencing physical IPV. Problem drinking among male partners is a strong determinant of physical IPV among women in Uganda
Zambia:				
Kishor, S., & Johnson, K. (2004). <i>Profiling domestic violence: A multi-country study</i> . Calverton, Maryland, USA:ORC Macro	5,029 women	Ever-married and non-married women age 15-49 in Zambia. Since the DHS had slight variations in variables it assessed there were some differences in the inclusion criteria for the administration of the domestic violence module from country to country (e.g. ever-married women vs. all women). Community sample	DHS survey conducted in Zambia in 2001-2002 by the Central Statistical Office, sampled one woman in each household; examined demographic characteristics and PV victimization (one question asking about being beaten, other questions on forced sex)	Lifetime physical PV victimization rate of 48.4%, 26.5% past year (of the latter, 4.3% assaulted 5 times or more) Sexual abuse: 5.1% lifetime, 3.9% past year
Okenwa, L., & Lawoko, S. (2010). Social Indicators and physical abuse	3,969 women	One randomly selected currently married or partnered woman between the ages of 15	Comprehensive questionnaire, in compliance with the WHO recommendations, including demographic and health	<u>Social prevalence of IPV exposure in past year:</u> 42% exposed to IPV Lowest age exposed to violence was

PASK#14 Online Tables – Table 3: Partner abuse in the Africa

Study	N	Sample Characteristics	Method and Design	Results
<p>of women by intimate partners: A study of women in Zambia. <i>Violence and Victims</i>, 25(2).</p>		<p>and 49 years who were residents or visitors of the households..</p>	<p>questions. Only the domestic violence questions and social indicators were reported in this study.</p>	<p>15-19 (32%) Highest age exposed to violence was 25-29 (47%) 47% Urban rate of exposure 40% Rural rate of exposure 80% of victims had a primary or lower level of education 84% never read the newspaper 78% never watch TV</p>
<p>Multi-Country: Andersson, N., Ho-Foster, A., Mitchell, S., Scheepers, E., & Goldstein, S. (2007). Risk factors for domestic physical violence: national cross-sectional household surveys in eight southern African countries. <i>MNC Women's Health</i>, 7:11.</p>	<p>20,639 both</p>	<p>Adults 16-60 years old (58% female, 42% male) in 8 southern-African countries: Botswana, Lesotho, Malawi, Mozambique, Namibia, Swaziland, Zambia and Zimbabwe. Sample from all areas: Rural (63%), Urban (22.1%), Capital/metro habitants (14.8%)</p>	<p>Cross-sectional design; respondents identified from stratified urban/rural random sample of enumerated areas from latest national census in each country. Questionnaire in 29 languages; Respondents interviewed at home (without partner present), asked about demographic information, HIV, attitudes towards partner violence. Partner violence measured from answers to question, "In the last year, have you and your partner had violent arguments where your partner beat, kicked or slapped you?" (Severity or frequency not measured)</p>	<p><u>Prevalence of partner violence</u> Across all 8 countries, 18% of women and 14% of men reported to have been physically abused by their partner at least once in past year. Countries in which rates similar across gender: Botswana: 19% female victims, 21% male Lesotho: 16% female victims, 12% male Namibia: 17% female victims, 15% male Swaziland: 21% female victims, 21% male Zimbabwe: 17% female victims, 17% male Countries in which females</p>

PASK#14 Online Tables – Table 3: Partner abuse in the Africa

Study	N	Sample Characteristics	Method and Design	Results
				<p>experienced significantly more partner violence:</p> <p>Malawi: 11% female victims, 6% male victims Mozambique: 11% female victims, 8% male Zambia: 36% female victims, 27% male victims</p> <p><u>Men’s attitudes about sex and partner violence</u> Across all countries, 47% of male respondents endorsed statement, “Women do not have the right to refuse to have sex with their husbands or boyfriends”; 41% agreed that “Women sometimes deserve to be beaten”; and 34% agreed that “Forcing your partner to have sex is NOT rape”</p> <p><u>Risk factors</u> Higher rates of partner violence among 30-39 year olds, compared to younger and older respondents Mixed findings for education level No significant effect of rural vs. urban dwellers Correlation in Namibia and Zambia between income gap between wife’s and total household income and partner</p>

PASK#14 Online Tables – Table 3: Partner abuse in the Africa

Study	N	Sample Characteristics	Method and Design	Results
<p>Straus, M.A. (2008) Dominance and symmetry in partner violence by male and female university students in 32 nations. <i>Children and Youth Services Review</i> Volume 30(3), 252-275.</p>	<p>215 (Africa)</p>	<p>Data from the International Violence Study regarding dating violence were collected from a convenience sample of 13,601 students at 68 universities in 32 nations. The subgroup of those reporting more than one incident of assault included 4,239 students. In this table segment, the samples were collected from the African continent: South Africa (85; 94.1% F) and Tanzania (130; 45.4% F). Students included in the study either currently were, or had been in a relationship for one month or more.</p>	<p>A consortium of researchers from all major regions of the world took part in this International Dating Violence Study. This section summarizes the research data for the African countries of South Africa and Tanzania only. The core questions are the same in every region where the research was conducted. Students who participated in the study were advised of their rights to refuse participation and the purpose of the study. Most universities had a participation rate of 85% to 95%. Dominance was measured by items from the Personal and Relationships Profile – e.g., “I generally have the final say when my partner and I disagree,” and “My partner needs to remember that I am in charge.” Impression management was controlled by using. The Limited Disclosure Scale of the PRP.</p>	<p>violence</p> <p>Prevalence of overall assault (past year perpetration) reported in African countries are as follows: South Africa: males 43%, females 39% ; Tanzania: males 32%, females 44% Prevalence of severe assault reported are as follows: South Africa: males 43%, females 14%; Tanzania: males 15%, females 26% Prevalence of any mutual physical violence are as follows: South Africa: 40%; Tanzania: 38% Prevalence of mutual severe physical violence reported are as follows: South Africa: 16%; Tanzania: 20% Dominance Scores: South Africa: 2.01 M., 2.08 F Tanzania: 2.38 M, 2.38 F</p>
<p>Lawoko, S. (2008).</p>	<p>3578</p>	<p>Sampling of households</p>	<p>Subsample from a two-stage</p>	<p><u>Social differences:</u></p>

PASK#14 Online Tables – Table 3: Partner abuse in the Africa

Study	N	Sample Characteristics	Method and Design	Results
<p>Predictors of attitudes toward intimate partner violence : A comparative study of men in Zambia and Kenya. <i>J Interpers Violence</i>, 23: 1056-1074.</p>	<p>men</p>	<p>from Zambia and Kenya. Sample were men from the ages of 15 to 55 years old chosen from every second household.</p>	<p>sampling design from the Dept of Health Services. A comprehensive questionnaire developed by the MEASURE DHS program was used, including social status, empowerment indicators, attitudes towards wife beating, issues concerning marriage, sexual activity, and STD's. This study focused on partner abuse issues.</p>	<p>Zambian men were older; more likely to be married; less educated; agricultural workers; less access to information; more conservative regarding “shared partner decision.” Zambian men were more likely to justify beating their wives on issues of going out “without telling her husband or burned the food.”</p> <p>Kenya men were more likely to justify abuse of the wives for, “neglecting the children or argued with their husband.”</p> <p>Zambian men justified IPV more frequently than Kenyan men.</p> <p><u>Predictors of attitudes toward IPV:</u> 68% of both live in rural areas; 54 % Zambian, 54% Kenyan have only a primary education; 79% Zambian, 94% Kenyan read newspapers or magazines; Attitudes towards women’s autonomy and access to information were strong indicators of attitude towards justification of beatings.</p>
<p>Manchikanti Gómez, A., & Speizer, I. S. (2010). Community-level intimate partner</p>	<p>16232 Liberia= 2463 Zimbab</p>	<p>Women aged 20-29 years from the community from 5 African countries</p>	<p>Community-based representative cross-sectional multi-stage survey. This study reports on a subset from recent</p>	<p>Lifetime IPV (physical and sexual):</p> <p>Liberia = 39% Zimbabwe = 29%</p>

PASK#14 Online Tables – Table 3: Partner abuse in the Africa

Study	N	Sample Characteristics	Method and Design	Results
<p>violence and the circumstances of first sex among young women from five African countries. <i>Reproductive Health, 7:11</i></p>	<p>we= 2916 Mali = 5032 Congo (DRC)= 3171 Kenya= 2650</p>		<p>Demographic Health Survey (2003-2007). Face-to-face interviews. Lifetime physical (6 items) and sexual (2 items) IPV victimization was assessed.</p>	<p>Mali = 21% Congo (DRC) = 64% Kenya = 41%</p>
<p>Hung, K., Scott, J., Ricciotti, H., Johnson, T., & Tsai, A. (2012). Community-level and individual-level influences of intimate partner violence on birth spacing in Sub-Saharan Africa. <i>Obstetrics & Gynecology, 119 (5), 975-982.</i></p>	<p>46,697 women</p>	<p>Married women with children in various African nations Median birth interval across countries: 29 months</p>	<p>Data obtained from Demographic and Health Surveys conducted from 2004-2008 in various African countries: Cameroon, Democratic Republic of the Congo, Ghana, Kenya, Liberia, Malawi, Nigeria, Rwanda, Uganda, Zambia and Zimbabwe. Lifetime PV exposure measured by CTS; sexual abuse defined s forced intercourse or other forced sexual acts</p>	<p><u>Prevalence of partner abuse:</u> 25.1% reported physical PV victimization; 10.6% reported sexual victimization. PV victimization associated with shorter interval between births</p>

PASK#14 Online Tables – Table 4: Partner abuse in Latin America and the Caribbean

Study	N	Sample Characteristics	Method and Design	Results
-------	---	------------------------	-------------------	---------

Table 4. Partner abuse in Latin America/Caribbean

Studies are organized by year of publication oldest to current. Multiple publications in the same year are alphabetized.

North and Central America				
Curacao				
Van Wijk, J.Ph.L, & de Bruijn, J.G.M. (2012). Risk factors for domestic violence in Curacao. <i>Journal of Interpersonal Violence</i> , 27(15), 3032-3053.	491 Women 325 men	Convenient sample of men and women entering one of four public waiting rooms.	Standardized questionnaire distributed over 2 months in public waiting rooms at the governmental registry office, health insurance company, governmental food handling permit distribution unit and a medical facility.	<p><u>Prevalence of abuse:</u> Physical abuse: 22% female, 11% male; Psychological abuse: 32% female, 20% male; Sexual abuse: 9% female, 1% male Any abuse: 38% female, 25% male</p> <p><u>Risk factors:</u> Lower than professional education (69%) Divorced (42%) Single parent (53%) Childhood victimization (63% psychological; 52% physical; 76% sexual)</p>
Dominican Republic				
Kishor, S., & Johnson, K. (2004). <i>Profiling domestic violence: A multi-country study</i> . Calverton, Maryland, USA: ORC Macro.	8,746 women	Ever-married and non-married women age 15-49 in the Dominican Republic. Since the DHS had slight variations in variables it assessed there were some differences in the	Data from DHS conducted in Dominican Republic in 2002 by CESDEM; one woman randomly selected per household, asked about demographic characteristics and PV victimization based on modified CTS	<p><u>Prevalence of partner violence:</u> Physical victimization: 18.4% lifetime, 9.8% past year (of the latter, 42.3% assaulted 5+ times) Sexual: 6.4% lifetime, 4.2% past year Emotional: 17.7% lifetime, 11.3% past year</p>

PASK#14 Online Tables – Table 4: Partner abuse in Latin America and the Caribbean

Study	N	Sample Characteristics	Method and Design	Results
		inclusion criteria for the administration of the domestic violence module from country to country(e.g. ever-married women vs. all women). Community sample		Of the women who reported any lifetime victimization, 29.3% reported any violence against husband; 16.1% said they had been violent towards him in past year; 47.5% of physically victimized women reported bruises or aches; 12.9% injuries or broken bones; 20.7% sought medical attention
Guatemala				
Johri, M., Morales, R., Boivin, J., Samayoa, B., Hoch, J., Grazioso, C., . . . Arathoon, G. (2011). <i>BMC Pregnancy and Childbirth</i> , 11:49.	1,897 women	Pregnant women, age 15-49 attending a maternity ward in Guatemala City	Cross section study use sample of women visiting maternity ward in Guatemala City, Guatemala, as part of an HIV reduction project. Women asked about demographic information, risk behaviors, medical history and PV in past year. PV questions based on WHO Multi-country Study on Women’s Health and Domestic Violence, and focused on physical, verbal and sexual forms of abuse	<u>Prevalence of partner violence:</u> 18% reported an PV victimization for past year (16% verbal, 10% physical, 3% sexual). 86% of women experiencing physical PV also experienced another form of abuse PV victimization correlated with low income, low education, being married, use of alcohol or illegal drugs, and having been sexually abused as a child PV also correlated with having a miscarriage
Haiti:				
Kishor, S., & Johnson, K. (2004). <i>Profiling domestic violence: A multi-country study.</i>	10,159 women	Ever-married and non-married women age 15-49 in Haiti. Since the DHS had slight variations in variables it	Data from DHS conducted in Haiti in 2000 by Institut Haitien de L’enfance, one randomly selected woman per household. Asked about demographic	<u>Prevalence of partner violence:</u> Physical PV victimization: 17.3% lifetime, 12.5% past year (of the latter, 41.8% assaulted 5 times or more) Sexual: 17.0% lifetime, 14.8% past

PASK#14 Online Tables – Table 4: Partner abuse in Latin America and the Caribbean

Study	N	Sample Characteristics	Method and Design	Results
Calverton, Maryland, USA: ORC Macro		assessed there were some differences in the inclusion criteria for the administration of the domestic violence module from country to country(e.g. ever-married women vs. all women). Community sample	characteristic about PV victimization with modified version of CTS including items on sexual abuse	year Emotional: 13.2% lifetime, 10.8% past year Among women who had ever been physically abused by husband, 14.5% had ever assaulted him lifetime, and 11.9% in past year Among physically victimized women, 15.5% reported bruises and aches, 7.7% injuries or broken bones, and 9.2% sought medical attention
Gage, A. (2005). Women’s experience of intimate partner violence in Haiti. <i>Social Science & Medicine</i> , 61, 2, 343-364.	3,389 women	The survey was distributed to a nationally representative sample. All women were included in the questions regarding violence committed by family members, while partner abuse questions were only directed to ever married or cohabitating women between ages 15 – 49. Every other household was included for the domestic violence module. If more than one woman lived in the household, one was randomly selected, otherwise the	Combined qualitative and quantitative. This was a two-stage stratified cluster design used to collect data on socioeconomic, demographic and health indicators, meant to measure individual, partner, and community characteristics associated with the occurrence of intimate partner violence. The four questionnaires used from the 2000 Haiti Demographic and Health Survey conducted from February to July 2000 by the Institut Haïtien de l’Enfance were: the Household Questionnaire, the Women's Questionnaire, the Men's Questionnaire, and the	<u>Prevalence of partner violence:</u> 29% experienced some form of intimate partner violence in the past 12 months; 13% experienced at least two different forms of violence. <u>Risk factors:</u> Lack of “completion of primary school; history of violence exposure in women's families of origin either through witnessing violence between parents while growing up; direct experience of physical violence perpetrated by family members; partner's jealousy; partner's need for control; partner's history of drunkenness; female-dominated financial decision-making. Additional risks for sexual violence

PASK#14 Online Tables – Table 4: Partner abuse in Latin America and the Caribbean

Study	N	Sample Characteristics	Method and Design	Results
		only woman in the house was asked to participate.	Community Questionnaire.	included: Neighborhood poverty; male unemployment; number of children living at home; women's acceptance of the abuse; male-dominated financial decision-making. The sample education level was 41.2% having no education and 1/5th having some primary school.
Mexico:				
<p>Rivera-Rivera, L., Allen-Leigh, B., Rodriquez-Ortega, G., Chavez-Ayala, R., & Lazcano-Ponce, E. (2007). Prevalence and correlates of adolescent dating violence: Baseline study of a cohort of 7960 male and female Mexican public school students. <i>Preventive Medicine</i>, 44:477-484.</p>	7,960 both	<p>Male (42%) and female (585) students in junior high, high school and college, from a systematic, random sample in urban, suburban and rural areas of Mexico. Ages: 11-24</p>	<p>Respondents administered written questionnaire in the classroom; asked about demographic characteristics. Health risk behaviors, intra-family violence, dating violence Administered modified Conflict Tactics Scale, in Spanish . Asked about violence perpetrated against them by other family members; and asked if their most recent dating partner had made them feel inferior, insulted them, forced to commit an illegal act, pushed or punched them; then asked if they perpetrated each on partner.</p>	<p><u>Prevalence rates of dating violence</u> Victimization: 9.37% of girls and 8.57% of boys reported to have been psychologically abused at least once by dating partner; 9.88% of girls and 22.71% of boys said they were physically abused; 8.6% of girls and 15.15% of boys reported both Perpetration: 4.21% of girls and 4.33% of boys reported psychological abuse perpetration against a dating partner; 20.99% of girls and 19.54% of boys reported physical abuse; and 7.48% of girls and 5.51% of boys reported both <u>Risk factors</u> Female dating violence victimization correlated with: physical victimization by other family members; high number of sexual partners; alcohol</p>

PASK#14 Online Tables – Table 4: Partner abuse in Latin America and the Caribbean

Study	N	Sample Characteristics	Method and Design	Results
				<p>consumption; living in a rural area Male dating violence victimization correlated with: physical victimization by other family members; high number of sexual partners; gang membership.</p> <p>Correlated with dating violence perpetration: high number of sexual partners, illegal drug use, and gang membership (both genders); alcohol consumption (girls), middle to high socioeconomic level (boys)</p>
<p>Salazar, M., Valladares, E., Ohman, A., & Hogberg, U. (2009). Ending intimate partner violence after pregnancy: Findings from a community – based longitudinal survey in Nicaragua. <i>BMC Public Health</i>, 9: 350.</p>	<p>478 women</p>	<p>Pregnant women in Leon, Nicaragua.</p>	<p>Longitudinal study conducted with sample of pregnant women in Leon, Nicaragua. Women interviewed first in 2002-2003, then again in 2007.</p> <p>Partner violence measured according to WHO multi-country study. Also measured: sociodemographic variables, emotional distress, partner control, social resources, and women’s views on partner violence and help-seeking</p>	<p><u>Prevalence of partner violence:</u> 64.6% partner violence at some time – lifetime, during pregnancy, or at follow up</p> <p>Of those reporting violence at pregnancy, 51% reported continued violence at follow-up</p> <p>Women who stopped being abused were significantly more likely to be either alone or with new partner at follow-up; or experienced no partner control and high social support. Ending abuse also correlated with lessening approval by women of violence or rigid gender roles</p>
<p>Nicaragua</p>				
<p>Kishor, S., &</p>	<p>8,507</p>	<p>Ever-married women</p>	<p>Data obtained from DHS</p>	<p><u>Prevalence of partner violence:</u></p>

PASK#14 Online Tables – Table 4: Partner abuse in Latin America and the Caribbean

Study	N	Sample Characteristics	Method and Design	Results
<p>Johnson, K. (2004). <i>Profiling domestic violence: A multi-country study</i>. Calverton, Maryland, USA: ORC Macro</p>	<p>women</p>	<p>from the community in reproductive age (15-49) in Nicaragua. Since the DHS had slight variations in variables it assessed there were some differences in the inclusion criteria for the administration of the domestic violence module from country to country(e.g. ever-married women vs. all women). Community sample</p>	<p>conducted in Nicaragua from 1997-1998 by Instituto Nacional de Estadísticas y Censos. One randomly selected woman per household; asked respondents about demographic characteristics and PV victimization, based on modified CTS, including questions on sexual abuse</p>	<p>Physical victimization: 27.6% lifetime, 11.9% past year (of the latter, 29.3% assaulted 5 times or more) Sexual abuse: 10.2% lifetime, 3.9% past year Emotional: 29.0% lifetime, 15.9% past year Of those women who reported lifetime physical victimization, 15.1% reported ever physically hitting him Among physically assaulted women, 22.7% reported bruises or aches, 4.9% injuries or broken bones, and 4.9% had to seek medical attention</p>
<p>Salazar, M., Valladares, E., Öhman, A., & Högberg, U. (2009). Ending Intimate Partner Violence after pregnancy: Findings from a community-based longitudinal study in Nicaragua. <i>BMC Public Health</i>, 9:350</p>	<p>Wave 1= 478 Wave 2= 398</p>	<p>Pregnant women (at the time of the first wave) aged 18-50 years at time of wave 2 from the community in León, Nicaragua</p>	<p>Data was selected from the 2002-2003 León Health and Demographic Surveillance System. Longitudinal multi-cluster sampling design. Face-to-face interviews. (Physical, psychological, and sexual) IPV victimisation at wave 1 was assessed as lifetime prevalence, and as 12-month in wave 2 via the WHO multi-country study questionnaire.</p>	<p><u>Prevalence of partner violence:</u> Results for wave 2 were reported. 65.6% of women were victimised at either during wave 1 or wave 2 53% were also exposed during pregnancy Lifetime IPV: 32% / 12-month: 31% Of the women exposed to lifetime or pregnancy IPV, 59% reported that their abuse ended. This finding took place in a context of a substantial shift in women's normative attitudes</p>

PASK#14 Online Tables – Table 4: Partner abuse in Latin America and the Caribbean

Study	N	Sample Characteristics	Method and Design	Results
South America				towards not tolerating abuse
Bolivia:				
<p>Diaz-Olavarrieta, C., Wilson, K.S., Garcia, S.G., Revollo, R., Richmond, K., Paz, F., & Chavez, L.P., (2009). The co-occurrence of intimate partner violence and syphilis among pregnant women in Bolivia. <i>Journal of Women's Health</i>, 18(12), 2077-2086.</p>	6,002 women	<p>Women were recruited from a larger study measuring issues addressing syphilis. Only women who had completed the ICS rapid text and agreed to complete the violence questionnaire were included.</p>	<p>This was a nested cross-sectional study. After recruiting a sample from the ICS test, a quantitative interview regarding abuse was conducted in the participants' languages of Spanish, Aymara, or Quechua. Various socioeconomic questions were asked about themselves and their partners. The Abuse Assessment Screen (AAS) was used to measure abuse. Only 4 of the 5 questions from the AAS were used.</p>	<p><u>Prevalence of partner violence:</u> 20.4% physical or sexual violence. Of those, the break down is: 52.2% physical violence only; 29.2% sexual violence only; 18.1% both sexual and physical violence; 0.3% only sexual violence by partner and physical violence by some other person; 0.2% only physical violence by partner and sexual violence by someone else.</p> <p>No violence in the past 12 months was reported by 77.6%.</p> <p><u>Risk factors:</u> 50.5% Women reporting any violence were most commonly between the ages of 20 and 29; 91.2% had high school or less education (49.4% had secondary or less); 87% were married or in a consensual reunion; 63.3% were homemakers; 62.8% were low income.</p>

PASK#14 Online Tables – Table 4: Partner abuse in Latin America and the Caribbean

Study	N	Sample Characteristics	Method and Design	Results
				<p>Partner’s characteristics were: 50.7% between 20 and 29 years of age; 92.8% unemployed; 74.3% high school or less education.</p>
<p>Brazil: Reichenheim, M., Moraes, C., Szklo,A., Hasselmann, M., de Souza, E., Lozana, J., & Figueiredo, V. (2006). The magnitude of intimate partner violence in Brazil: Portraits from 15 capital cities and the Federal District. <i>Cad.Saude Publica</i>, Rio de Janeiro, 22(2), 425-437</p>	<p>26,003 women</p>	<p>Sample of women from national survey in Brazil, the Household Survey on Risk Behaviors and Reported Morbidity from Non-Communicable Diseases. From target population of 24, 426, 350, the final sample was comprised of 26,003 women ages 15-69 in 15 cities, who were married, co-habiting with partner, or had dating relationship of 3months minimum in past year. All of Brazil’s regions were represented.</p>	<p>Questionnaire included items on several topics, including: demographics, risk behaviors, quality of life and partner violence. Partner violence section based on Conflict Tactics Scale – Form R, translated into Portuguese. Survey administered in private by only female interviewers.</p>	<p><u>Prevalence rates of abuse</u> Across all locations, the percentage of any physical partner abuse perpetrated in past year was 19.7% by females, and 14.6% by males.</p> <p>However, females perpetrated lesser number of physical assaults (average = 1.70) compared to males (average 2.31).</p> <p>About 75% of respondents reported to have experienced some psychological abuse in past year (no data on respondent perpetration rates)</p> <p><u>Risk factors</u> Younger women more likely to be involved in abusive relationships than older women; correlations also found between partner violence and woman’s low educational level and living in the North or Northeast sections of the country</p>
<p>Schraiber, L. B.,</p>	<p>940</p>	<p>Women aged 15-49</p>	<p>Multi-stage (cluster) cross-</p>	<p><u>Prevalence of partner violence:</u></p>

PASK#14 Online Tables – Table 4: Partner abuse in Latin America and the Caribbean

Study	N	Sample Characteristics	Method and Design	Results
<p>D'Oliveira, A. F. P. L., França-Junior, I., Diniz, S., Portella, A. P., Ludermir, A. B., Valença, O., & Couto, M. T. (2007). Prevalence of intimate partner violence against women in regions of Brazil. <i>Revista de Saúde Pública</i>, 41(5), 1-10.</p>	<p>women</p>	<p>years from the city of São Paulo and 15 municipalities in a rural region of the northeast, the Zona da Mata de Pernambuco</p>	<p>sectional population-based representative survey. It was part of the World Health Organization (WHO) Multi-country Study on Women's Health and Domestic Violence. Face-to-face interviews. Lifetime physical (6 items- three items assessed mild IPV and three severe IPV) , psychological (4 items) , and sexual (3 items) IPV victimization via the WHO standardized multi-country questionnaire</p>	<p>Physical IPV: 27.2% Psychological IPV: 41.8% Sexual IPV: 10.1%</p> <p>There was significant overlapping among the types of violence, which seemed to be associated with the most severe types of violence. The findings reiterate previous international studies results with regard to high magnitude and overlapping of types of intimate partner violence.</p>
<p>Moura, L., Gandolfi, L, Vasconcelos, A., & Pratesi, R. (2009). Intimate partner violence against women in an economically vulnerable urban area, Central-West Brazil. <i>Rev Saude Publica</i>, 43 (6).</p>	<p>278 women</p>	<p>Women between 15-49 with male partner Mean age = 30 years 62% did not complete primary school 28% had been married more than once Median age of partners = 32 years, with 71% not completing primary education 12% of women reported partners drank almost every day and 11% said partners were illicit drug</p>	<p>Cross-sectional survey of women in Varjao, an economically impoverished metropolitan area of Brasilia, Brazil PV measured according to WHO standards into moderate or serious physical, emotional/psychological and sexual abuse lifetime and in past 12 months</p>	<p><u>Prevalence of partner violence:</u> Highest PV victimization was for psychological (80.2% lifetime, 50% in past year). 36% were prevented from seeing friends, 22% had contact with family limited, 45% said their husbands needed to know where they were at all times, and 52% became angry when they talked to other men</p> <p>Physical violence: 58.6% lifetime, 32.4% past year Sexual violence: 28,8% lifetime, 15.5% previous year</p>

PASK#14 Online Tables – Table 4: Partner abuse in Latin America and the Caribbean

Study	N	Sample Characteristics	Method and Design	Results
		users 36% of households headed by the woman, 15% by both partners		Most common forms of physical PV: pushing partner 45% of women said wives should obey husbands, but 96% disagreed that disobedience in a valid reason for PV victimization
Gomez, A. M., Speizer, I. S., & Moracco, K. E. (2011). Linkages between gender equity and intimate partner violence among urban Brazilian youth. <i>Journal of Adolescent Health, 49</i> (4), 393-399.	198 women 240 men	This study involved participants that were between the ages of 15 and 24 years living in Rio de Janeiro, Brazil. Of the sample 240 were males and 198 were females.	A survey was distributed to measure the association between IPV and gender equality. The time frame measured was the last 6 months at the time of the survey.	<u>Prevalence of partner violence:</u> 32% any victimization; 40% any perpetration; 22% both victimization and perpetration. 18% male youth reported recent perpetration; Gender equality support was protector against IPV victimization and male IPV perpetration. The most frequent response to abuse by the females was to leave but later return. For males retaliation with violence was the most common response. Females reported jealousy as the most common motivation for their violent acts.
Chile:				
Lehrer, J.A., Lehrer, E.L., & Zhao, Z. (2009). Physical and psychological dating	484 women 466	This study was conducted in Santiago, Chile at a large public university. All students	This study utilized the 2005 Survey of Student Well-Being created to collect quantitative data. Questions regarding	<u>Prevalence of partner violence:</u> 67.3% of women and 79.9% of men reported at least one psychological abuse within the last 12 months; 15.1%

PASK#14 Online Tables – Table 4: Partner abuse in Latin America and the Caribbean

Study	N	Sample Characteristics	Method and Design	Results
<p>violence in young men and women in Chile: results from a 2005 survey of university students. <i>International Journal of Injury Control and Safety Promotion</i>, 16(4), 205-214.</p>	<p>men</p>	<p>attending the general education classes conducted in the Winter of 2005 were included in the study. There were 484 women and 466 men. No age requirement was set, but the ages of participants ranged from 17 to 30 years of age, with a median age of 20 years.</p>	<p>psychological dating violence, physical violence victimization in the last 12 months and since the age of 14, severity of abuse and injury were asked. Respondents were to answer questions that involved a date or romantic relationship in the testing period. Assaults or injuries were omitted if the partner was acting in self-defense.</p>	<p>of women and 26.6% of men reported some form of physical violence in the last 12 months; 25.4% of women and 37.9% of men reported physical abuse since the age of 14 years.</p> <p>Most reported mild to moderate violence, while the question of “most severe” was left unanswered by a significant number of respondents (50-53% of women and 34-43% of men).</p> <p>The subsample of those reporting violence reported injury as follows: 15.9% women and 6.9% men in the past 12 months of violence; 19.5% of women and 13.3% of men since the age of 14 years. There was no external reporting of the abuse in 33% of the women, and 42.7% of men.</p>
<p>Lehrer, J.A., Lehrer, E.L., & Z. Zhao, Z. (2010). Physical dating violence victimization in college women in Chile. <i>Journal of Women’s Health</i>, 19(5).</p>	<p>441 women</p>	<p>Females enrolled in a public university in Santiago, Chile, winter term of 2005 who had had a date or romantic relationship since age 14. Age range 18-30.</p>	<p>Questionnaire was used that included 3 questions to determine physical victimization: 1. No incident; 2, at least one but no physical injury; 3. At least one resulting in physical injury.</p> <p>Also included were questions</p>	<p><u>Prevalence of partner violence:</u> 36% reporting having witnessed DV before 14 yrs; 20.9% reported sexual abuse before 14 yrs; 21% reported one or more incidents of being physically violated with no resulting injury; 5% reported at least one resulting in</p>

PASK#14 Online Tables – Table 4: Partner abuse in Latin America and the Caribbean

Study	N	Sample Characteristics	Method and Design	Results
			<p>regarding sexual activity before age 14, and since age 14, whether willfully or unwillfully and by whom, types of physical violence experienced, types of injuries incurred.</p> <p>Five models were used to show results of survey using the following headings: Socioeconomic and demographic variable only</p>	<p>injury.</p> <p><u>Risk factors:</u> Sexual abuse, witnessing DV in childhood, low parental education, living outside of parent’s home during college, urban residence, participation in sexual intercourse.</p>
Colombia:				
<p>Kishor, S., & Johnson, K. (2004). <i>Profiling domestic violence: A multi-country study</i>. Calverton, Maryland, USA: ORC Macro</p>	<p>11,536 women</p>	<p>Ever-married and non-married women age 15-49 in Colombia. Since the DHS had slight variations in variables it assessed there were some differences in the inclusion criteria for the administration of the domestic violence module from country to country (e.g. ever-married women vs. all women). Community sample</p>	<p>Data obtained from national Demographic and Health Survey (DHS) conducted in Columbia in 2000, by PROFAMILIA. Asked about demographic characteristics and PV victimization based on modified CTS</p>	<p><u>Prevalence of partner abuse:</u> Lifetime victimization: 40.0% physical, 11.0% sexual, 11.5% emotional.</p> <p>13.4% of women having experienced physical violence said they had ever physically assaulted husband. 53% of physically victimized reported bruises and aches, 10.2% injury or broken bones, 2.5%</p>

PASK#14 Online Tables – Table 4: Partner abuse in Latin America and the Caribbean

Study	N	Sample Characteristics	Method and Design	Results
Peru:				
<p>Kishor, S., & Johnson, K. (2004). <i>Profiling domestic violence: A multi-country study</i>. Calverton, Maryland, USA: ORC Macro</p>	<p>27,259 women</p>	<p>Ever-married and non-married women from the community in reproductive age (15-49) in Peru. Since the DHS had slight variations in variables it assessed there were some differences in the inclusion criteria for the administration of the domestic violence module from country to country (e.g. ever-married women vs. all women). Community sample</p>	<p>DHS conducted in Peru in 2000 by Instituto Nacional de Estadística e Informática, asked one randomly selected woman in each household about demographic characteristics and about physical PV, based on CTS items</p>	<p><u>Prevalence of partner violence:</u> 42.4% reported any lifetime physical PV victimization</p>
<p>Sanchez, S. E., Qiu, C., Perales, M. T., Lam, N., Garcia, C., & Williams, M. A. (2008). Intimate partner violence (IPV) and preeclampsia among Peruvian women. <i>European Journal of Obstetrics & Gynecology and Reproductive</i></p>	<p>676 women</p>	<p>339 pregnant women with preeclampsia/337 controls (pregnant women) identified by medical records and recruited during their stay in two hospitals in Lima, Perú. They were identified in three age groups: <20 years, 20-34, and >34</p>	<p>Case-control cross-sectional study. Physical (3 items- one item referred to severe IPV and two to mild IPV) and psychological (4 items) IPV and controlling behaviour (5 items) victimisation was assessed within the pregnancy period. The items were taken from the Abuse Assessment Scale and the Psychological maltreatment of Women Inventory- short form.</p>	<p><u>Prevalence of partner violence during pregnancy:</u> Women with Preeclampsia = 43.1% Women without Preeclampsia = 24.3% Compared with those reporting never exposure to IPV during pregnancy, women reporting any exposure had a 2.4-fold increased risk of preeclampsia. Emotional abuse in the absence of physical violence was associated with a 3.2-fold increased risk of preeclampsia.</p>

PASK#14 Online Tables – Table 4: Partner abuse in Latin America and the Caribbean

Study	N	Sample Characteristics	Method and Design	Results
<i>Biology</i> , 137, 50-55.				Emotional and physical abuse during pregnancy was associated with a 1.9-fold increased risk of preeclampsia. IPV among pregnant women is common and is associated with an increased risk of preeclampsia
Perales, M.T., Cripe, S.M., Lam, N., Sanchez, S., Sanchez, E., & Williams, M.A. (2009). Prevalence, types and pattern of intimate partner violence among pregnant women in Lima, Peru. <i>Violence against Women</i> , 15 (2), 224-250.	2,131 women	Women who gave birth at INMP hospital, Lima, Peru between 2005-2006, age 15-49 (analysis only includes women reporting PV and current pregnancy)	Subjects administered structured questionnaire in private, asked about sociodemographic characteristics, mental health symptoms and PV victimization. Physical PV measured according to modified CTS; emotional abuse defined as saying or doing something to humiliate or threatening her or someone close with harm; sexual PV defined as being physically forced to have intercourse when women did not want to, or forcing other sexual acts against her wishes	<u>Lifetime PV Victimization:</u> Physical: 34.2% Emotional: 28.4% Sexual: 8.7% PV victimization correlated with being older (30 years or more), single, employed but economically disadvantaged, and having had a poor education
Multi Country for all Latin America:				

PASK#14 Online Tables – Table 4: Partner abuse in Latin America and the Caribbean

Study	N	Sample Characteristics	Method and Design	Results
<p>Straus, M.A. (2008) Dominance and symmetry in partner violence by male and female university students in 32 nations. <u><i>Children and Youth Services Review</i></u>, 30, 3, 252-275.</p>	<p>803 Latin America</p>	<p>Data from the International Violence Study regarding dating violence were collected from a convenience sample of 13,601 students at 68 universities in 32 nations. The subgroup of those reporting more than one incident of assault included 4,239 students. In this table segment, the samples were collected from the Latin countries of Brazil (236), Guatemala (168), Mexico 190), and Venezuela (209); The average responding gender in this region was 65.9% female. Students included in the study either currently were, or had been in a relationship for one</p>	<p>A consortium of researchers from all major regions of the world took part in this International Dating Violence Study. This section summarizes the research data for North America’s region of Mexico, and South American countries of Brazil, Guatemala and Venezuela. The core questions are the same in every region where the research was conducted. Students who participated in the study were advised of their rights to refuse participation and the purpose of the study. Most universities had a participation rate of 85% to 95%. Dominance was measured by items from the Personal and Relationships Profile – e.g., “I generally have the final say when my partner and I disagree,” and “My partner needs to remember that I am in charge.” Impression management was controlled by using the Limited Disclosure Scale of the PRP.</p>	<p>Prevalence of overall assault (past year perpetration) reported in the Latin American countries surveyed are as follows: Brazil males at 22%, females 23%; Guatemala males at 17%, females 32%, Mexico: males 27%, females 47% Venezuela: males 25%, females 24%. Prevalence of severe assault reported in the Latin American countries surveyed are as follows: Brazil: males 7%, females 6%; Guatemala: males 6%, females 9%, Mexico: males 13%, females 17% Venezuela: males 15%, females 10%. Prevalence of any mutual physical violence reported in the Latin American countries surveyed are as follows: Brazil: 22%, Guatemala: 24%, Mexico: 44% Venezuela: 24%. Prevalence of mutual severe violence reported in the Latin American countries surveyed are as follows: Brazil: 6%, Guatemala: 7%, Mexico: 17% Venezuela: 11%. Dominance Scores: Brazil: 1.96 M, 1.94 F Guatemala: 1.97 M, 1.98 F Mexico: 2.03 M, 2.10 F Venezuela: 2.03 M, 1.93 F</p>

PASK#14 Online Tables – Table 4: Partner abuse in Latin America and the Caribbean

Study	N	Sample Characteristics	Method and Design	Results
		month or more.		
<p>Le Franc, E., Samms-Vaughan, M., Hambleton, I., Fox, K., & Brown, D. (2008). Interpersonal violence in three Caribbean countries: Barbados, Jamaica, and Trinidad and Tobago. <i>Pan American Journal of Public Health</i>, 24(6), 409-421.</p>	<p>3,401 Barbados: 1,003, Jamaica: 1,402, Trinidad and Tobago: 996</p>	<p>Men and women aged 15-30 years living in the community of the three nations.</p>	<p>Stratified (3-level) cross sectional sampling was used. Mimicked national census methodology from each country. Face-to-face interviews. Lifetime physical, psychological, and sexual IPV perpetration and victimization by partners, acquaintances, and strangers was assessed via the CTS2</p>	<p><u>Physical IPV Perpetration</u> Barbados: 53.9% women, 48.8% men Jamaica: 52.4% women, 39.9% men Trinidad and Tobago: 48.2% women, 45% men <u>Psychological IPV Perpetration</u> Barbados: 74.6% women, 76.5% men Jamaica: 76.6% women, 69.8% men Trinidad and Tobago: 77.4% women, 70.5% men <u>Sexual IPV Perpetration</u> Barbados: 47.4% women, 42.1% men Jamaica: 67.9% women, 60% men Trinidad and Tobago: 49.9% women, 52.9% men <u>Physical IPV Victimization</u> Barbados: 50% women, 44.7% men Jamaica: 45.3% women, 40.4% men Trinidad and Tobago: 45.2% women, 47.7% men <u>Psychological IPV Victimization</u> Barbados: 70.7% women, 76.1% men Jamaica: 69.4% women, 66.5% men Trinidad and Tobago: 69.3% women, 66.6% men</p>

PASK#14 Online Tables – Table 4: Partner abuse in Latin America and the Caribbean

Study	N	Sample Characteristics	Method and Design	Results
				<p>Sexual IPV Victimization Barbados: 52.8% women, 39.6% men Jamaica: 72.6% women, 57.2% men Trinidad and Tobago: 51.6% women, 52.5% men</p> <p>Very high levels of reported IPV indicate very high levels of tolerance among victims in these countries, and suggest a culture of violence and of adversarial intimate relationships may be well entrenched. The findings support the view that co-occurrence of general interpersonal violence and partner violence may be limited, and that one may not necessarily be a predictor of the other. They also reveal that, among partners, not only are there no gender differentials in victimization by physical violence, but more women than men are self-reporting as perpetrators of IPV.</p>

PASK#14 Online Tables – Table 5: Partner abuse in Europe

Study	N	Sample Characteristics	Method and Design	Results
-------	---	------------------------	-------------------	---------

Table 5. Partner abuse in Europe

Studies are organized by year of publication oldest to current. Multiple publications in the same year are alphabetized.

Albania:				
<p>Burazeri, G., Roshi, E., Jewkes, R., Jordan, S., Bjegovic, V., & Laaser, U (2005). Factors associated with spousal physical violence In Albania: Cross sectional study. <i>BMJ: British Medical Journal</i>, 331, 7510, 197-20.</p>	<p>1,039 women</p>	<p>A population sample of 1039 married women between the ages of 25-65 living in Tirana, Albania was included in the study. The sample was selected from the 2001 census.</p>	<p>The women were asked to complete a questionnaire on intimate partner violence and social and demographic characteristics to measure their experience of being hit, slapped, kicked, or otherwise physically hurt by the husband within the past year.</p>	<p><u>Prevalence of partner violence:</u> 37%; experienced violence.</p> <p><u>Risk factors:</u> Women at higher risk of violence were women aged 25-34; women with a higher education than their husbands; those with tertiary education; women working in white collar jobs; women married to men raised in rural areas. Results show that contrary to most developed countries, women who were more educated and self-sufficient were at a higher risk of abuse.</p>
Belgium:				
<p>Roelens, K., Hans Verstraelen, H., Van Egmond, K., & Temmerman, M. (2008). Disclosure and health-seeking behavior following intimate partner violence before and during pregnancy in</p>	<p>537 women</p>	<p>The sample included pregnant women attending five large hospitals in the province of East Flanders, Belgium. From that selection 537 women returned the information. The average age of</p>	<p>An anonymous questionnaire was provided to the participants. They were asked to complete the questionnaire at home and to return it anonymously by mail. The questionnaires included the Abuse Assessment Screen (AAS) plus questions about the most recent episode of physical</p>	<p><u>Prevalence of partner violence:</u> 10.1% lifetime prevalence of IPV; 3.4% IPV during pregnancy and/or in the year preceding pregnancy.</p> <p>Whether the women’s partners attended the appointment with her made a significant difference in lifetime reporting rates. Attending with a partner was 6.8%, and without</p>

PASK#14 Online Tables – Table 5: Partner abuse in Europe

Study	N	Sample Characteristics	Method and Design	Results
Flanders, Belgium: A survey surveillance study. <i>European Journal of Obstetrics & Gynecology and Reproductive Biology</i> , 137, 1, 37-42.		respondents was 29.4 years.	or sexual violence, if abuse had ever been reported to the police, and if they approved of house IPV is screened at clinics and hospitals.	was 13.9%. Women experiencing physical or sexual abuse were less likely to seek medical care, resulting between 6.6% and 19.2%. It was largely accepted by the participants for the medical professional to conduct a routine screening for IPV.
Finland:				
Heiskanen, M., & Piispa, M. (1998). <i>Faith, hope, battering – A survey of men’s violence against women in Finland</i> . Helsinki: Statistics Finland	4,955 women	Swedish and Finnish-speaking women in Finland. 55% married, 15.5% cohabitating	Representative sample of 7,100 women 18-74, drawn from Central Population Registry. Questionnaire administered by mail. Sought to obtain information on violence against women, including violence by partners, and sexual harassment. Partner physical violence section of questionnaire contained 8 items, from “preventing from moving” to “armed violence”; also asked about sexual violence	<u>Rates of Partner Abuse</u> 22% of women reported any physical violence, threats, or sexual violence (lifetime rate), and 9% reported any for the past year. Most common form of violence: being grabbed and prevented from leaving 36% said that current partner first perpetrated violence on them more than 10 years earlier. Of the men who had been violent for the first time 10 or more years earlier, 41% were no longer violent at time of survey 50% of women who reported violence had also been abused in a previous relationship <u>Risk Factors</u> Most common risk factors (victim): Young age, cohabitation, relationship

PASK#14 Online Tables – Table 5: Partner abuse in Europe

Study	N	Sample Characteristics	Method and Design	Results
				<p>2 years or more, woman’s alcohol abuse, witnessing violence by father against mother in childhood, those who went out regularly (e.g., dancing) and those earning a low income Most common characteristics of perpetrator: man’s younger age, alcohol abuse, tendency to be controlling.</p> <p><u>Impact of Abuse</u> 49% who had experienced physical abuse reported suffering a physical injury; 10% sought medical care, 2% hospitalized Emotional consequences (depression, low self-esteem, sleeping disturbance, shame, guilt) suffered by 67% of victims</p>
<p>Leppäkoski, T., Paavilainen, E., & Åstedt-Kurki, P. (2011). Experiences of emergency care by the women exposed to acute physical intimate partner violence from the Finnish perspective. <i>International Emergency Nursing</i>,</p>	<p>35 women</p>	<p>Women aged 18 and older who had been exposed to acute physical IPV and sought help for their injuries and symptoms at 24-hr.emergency departments. Mean age: 39 years</p>	<p>Cross-sectional multicenter study that included 28 emergency departments in 13 Finnish hospital districts. Face-to-face interviews. Physical, psychological, and sexual IPV were assessed via questionnaire designed to obtain IPV victimization experiences, and experiences of care when visiting health care clinics. Number of items is not</p>	<p><u>Prevalence of partner violence:</u></p> <p>Lifetime physical IPV: 94% Lifetime physical and psychological: 97% Physical and sexual victimization by current husband: 17% 33% sought help for injuries</p> <p>Women highlighted individual needs for care, including appropriate medical care of injuries, and psychological and</p>

PASK#14 Online Tables – Table 5: Partner abuse in Europe

Study	N	Sample Characteristics	Method and Design	Results
19, 27-36.			specified.	tangible support. The women worried about their children and partners and regarded supporting the whole family as important
Germany:				
<p>Stockl, H., Heise, L., & Watts, C. (2011). Factors associated with violence by a current partner in a nationally representative sample of German women. <i>Sociology of Health & Illness</i>, 22 (5), 694-709</p>	10,264 women	<p>Representative sampling of women between 16 and 86 yrs of age selected randomly from 250 communities throughout Germany for the original survey.</p> <p>A subset of 3866 currently in a relationship and between the ages of 16 to 49 at the time of the original survey was used in this analysis.</p>	<p>Most of the interviews were conducted in the women’s homes with 12% taking place outside of the homes to preserve privacy.</p> <p>Survey had 2 parts: a face to face interview focused on experiences of violence by any perpetrator and a written questionnaire that focused on violence by a partner including psychological abuse, physical and sexual violence in the women’s childhood as well as with an intimate partner.</p> <p>If a women disclosed experiencing any sexual and physical violence in either parts of the survey, they were considered to have experienced partner violence.</p> <p>A modified version of the conflict tactics scale was used</p>	<p><u>Prevalence of partner violence:</u> Using the subset of 3866 women: 17% reported sexual or physical violence by current partner; 15% experiencing only physical; 1% only sexual; 1% experiencing both.</p> <p><u>Demographics:</u> Mean age was 35; 91% were German nationals; 96% completed secondary education; 26% had A-level or university degree; 4% had no education; 2/3 of respondents were employed.</p> <p><u>Risk factors:</u> Higher risk of experiencing partner violence in the current relationship if the following factors were present: exposure to violence as children; drug use within the previous 5 yrs.; experience of violence with non partners; physical disabilities or chronic illness of the women; if both partners lacked vocational education</p>

PASK#14 Online Tables – Table 5: Partner abuse in Europe

Study	N	Sample Characteristics	Method and Design	Results
			<p>to measure physical and sexual violence</p> <p>Comparisons were made between women reporting experiencing no violence to those that experienced any violence.</p>	<p>and/or training or if the woman had but the partner had no vocational ed and/or training; if the man along or both drank heavily the previous month; if the woman had more than 3 children; if the woman had been in the current relationship between 3-5 yrs; and if the women felt socially excluded.</p>
<p>Stockl, H., Watts, C., & Penhale, B. (2012). Intimate partner violence against older women in Germany: Prevalence and risk factors. <i>Journal of Interpersonal Violence</i>, XX (X), 1-20.</p>	<p>2,805 older women</p>	<p>Only women with current partners included 2,030 age 50-65; 11% had high school or more education; 81% had occupational training 79 women age 66-86 ; 6% had high school or greater education, 62% had occupational training In both groups, 77% said they were religious, and more than 83% in relationships more than 20 years</p>	<p>Health, Well-Being and Personal Safety of Women in Germany Survey – national survey of 10,264 women between ages 16-86; response rate of 52%</p> <p>Administered by female interviewers in respondent’s home</p> <p>Partner violence measured by modified version of CTS – certain items modified to include “so that it hurt or I became frightened,” or “that it could have injured me”; sexual violence defined as forced or attempted forced sexual intercourse, forced petting, forced watching or re-enacting pornography</p>	<p><u>Prevalence Rates</u> 50-65 age group: 23% rate of any physical or sexual abuse; 60% of these reported lower level violence</p> <p>66 + age group: 10% prevalence rate for any physical, sexual abuse; 82% reported lower level violence</p> <p><u>Risk Factors</u> Both age groups: experienced partner violence correlated with having witnessed father-on-mother violence in childhood, physical or sexual child abuse Among 65 year old and older group, heavy drinking by both partners correlated significantly with partner violence</p>

PASK#14 Online Tables – Table 5: Partner abuse in Europe

Study	N	Sample Characteristics	Method and Design	Results
<p>Norway: Neroien, A., Schei, B. (2008). Partner violence and health: Results from the first national study on violence against women in Norway. <i>Scandinavian Journal of Public Health</i>, 36, 161-168.</p>	<p>2,143 women</p>	<p>Women 20-55 years who were married or cohabitated with current or a previous partner</p>	<p>National random sample surveyed on health and experience with partner violence Questions adapted from previous surveys in Sweden and Finland, a modified version of the CTS, with violence divided between mild (e.g., grab), moderate (e.g., slap) and severe (e.g., strangling); sexual abuse defined as “tried to force you to have sex”</p>	<p><u>Abuse Rates and Injuries</u> 26.8% reported violence by current partner, 5.5% in past year Sexual abuse reported by 9.4% of women, and by 35% who had reported any physical abuse 8.8% reported severe violence by current or previous partner 30.8% of those who reported any violence also reported physical injuries; of those reporting injuries, 42.9% said the injuries led them to miss work or school <u>Risk Factors</u> Following correlated significantly with partner violence: low education;, or being unmarried, divorced or separated Also correlated: getting social security, unemployment benefits or welfare, or were unemployed, classified as poor, or had no children <u>Impact on Health</u> Violence victims more likely than non-victims to report longstanding illness, to be taking prescribed drugs,</p>

PASK#14 Online Tables – Table 5: Partner abuse in Europe

Study	N	Sample Characteristics	Method and Design	Results
				being depressed or having anxiety, or to report psychosomatic complaints
Portugal:				
Machado, C., Goncalves, M., Matos, M., & Dias, A. (2007). Child and partner abuse: Self-reported prevalence and attitudes in the north of Portugal. <i>Child Abuse & Neglect, 31, 6, 657-670.</i>	1,334 women 1,057 men	2,391 parents from North Portugal between the ages of 20 – 67 who were either married or co-habiting participated in this study. The families were two-parent families with children under the age of 18 years old. Eight regions were included. One parent was selected from each family. The end sample included 1,057 males and 1,334 females.	Between October and April 2004 by select sampling through the local psychologists. No Ethics Committee was utilized, as they do not exist in Portugal. Selected participants were contacted personally. Ten percent of those contacted refused to participate in the study. Questionnaires were provided to the participants to complete. Information on just one child in the household was included. Four scales were used, the IPE (Inventory of Educational practices), the ECPF (Scale of Beliefs about Physical Punishment), the IVC (Marital Violence Inventory), and the ECVC (Scale of Beliefs about Marital Violence).	<u>Prevalence of partner violence:</u> 26.2% of participants reported at least one act of abuse within the prior year; 12% reported physically abuse; 23.7% reported committing emotional abuse. Physical abuse included slapping, pushing, throwing objects, pulling hair, punching, threatening use of a weapon, and strangulation. Emotional abuse included insulting or humiliating, yelling or threatening, breakings objects or throwing food, and isolation. Women had a higher percentage of committing abuse against their children, while men had a higher rate of committing abuse against their partners.
Machado, C., Caridade, S., & Martins, C. (2010). Violence in juvenile dating relationships self-reported	4,667 both	Secondary school students, professional school students (same age as secondary students), and university students were included	Two questionnaires were distributed in this study to measure behavioral inventory and attitudinal scale. The questionnaires used were The Marital Violence Inventory and	<u>Prevalence of partner violence:</u> 31% in dating relationships reported committing one or more abusive acts during the preceding year; 18.1% committed physical abuse; 22.4% committed emotional abuse;

PASK#14 Online Tables – Table 5: Partner abuse in Europe

Study	N	Sample Characteristics	Method and Design	Results
<p>prevalence and attitudes in a Portuguese sample. <i>Journal of Family Violence</i>, 25: 43-52.</p>		<p>in the study. Participants were between the ages of 13 and 29 years, comprising of 42.2% males and 57.7% females. A subsample of 56.6% of the respondents reported being in a relationship at the time of the study.</p>	<p>the Scale of Beliefs about Marital Violence.</p>	<p>10.6% committed both forms of abuse; 7.3% committed severe physical violence.</p> <p>Victim reports were reported as follows: 25.4% one or more acts of abuse; 13.4% physical abuse; 19.5% emotional abuse; 8% both forms of abuse; 6.7% severe physical abuse.</p> <p>It was reported that 20.9% were both perpetrators and victims. A significant percentage of perpetrators and victims left off too much information to be classified as a “perpetrator” or a “victim” (48.3% and 55.6% respectively).</p>
<p>Russia:</p>				
<p>Lysova, A. V. (2007). Dating Violence in Russia. <i>Russian Education and Society</i>, 49(4), 43-59.</p>	<p>338 Men:15 6 Women: 182 Mean age men:19. 8 years Mean</p>	<p>Students from three universities in Russia</p>	<p>Cross-sectional study part of the International Dating Violence Study. Assessed 12-month overall and severe physical IPV and overall sexual coercion via the CTS2. Face-to-face interview</p>	<p>Perpetration Physical IPV: Overall = 20.5% men and 37.9% women/ Severe = 8.4% men and 15.4% women Sexual IPV: 23.2% men and 25.7% women</p> <p>Victimization Physical IPV: Overall = 25.6% men and 24.8% women/ Severe= 8.5% men</p>

PASK#14 Online Tables – Table 5: Partner abuse in Europe

Study	N	Sample Characteristics	Method and Design	Results
	age women: 19.5 years			<p>and 8.9% women Sexual IPV: 14.5% men and 36.6% women</p> <p>Prevalence in this study is in agreement with those of most similar studies in the United States and Canada. More violence is committed by women.</p>
<p>Stickley, A., Kislitsyna, O., Timofeeva, I., & Vagero, D. (2008). Attitudes toward intimate partner violence against women in Moscow, Russia. <i>J Fam Viol</i>, 23:447-456.</p>	510 men 680 women	<p>Using sex and age, random sampling of greater Moscow. Ages chosen were 18 and over.</p>	<p>Data was taken from the Moscow Health Survey 2004. A questionnaire was used in face to face interviews. Participants were asked to answer 2 questions: 1) did they think violence against women was a serious problem in Russia, and 2) in what situations was this violence justified. For question 2 seven scenarios were given for consideration. For both questions 3 alternatives were give as answers – agree, disagree, difficult to say. Demographic information was also collected.</p>	<p><u>Prevalence of attitudes towards partner violence:</u> 53% of participants had a high level of education. Responses for whether violence against women is a serious problem in Russia today: Agree – men 33.3%, women 52.9%, all 44.5%; Disagree – men 19%, women 10.9%, all 14.4%; Difficult to say – men 47.6%, women 36.2%, all 41.1%. Responses to scenarios that justify wife beatings: Man not satisfied with her housework performance – men 2.5%, women .9%, all 1.6%; She is disobedient – men 2%, women .7%, all 1.3%; Refusal of sex – men 1.4%, women .4%, all .8%;</p>

PASK#14 Online Tables – Table 5: Partner abuse in Europe

Study	N	Sample Characteristics	Method and Design	Results
				<p>She questions him about other girlfriends – men .8%, women .7%, all .8%;</p> <p>He thinks she is unfaithful – men 4.1%, women 2.1%, all 2.9%;</p> <p>He discovers she has been unfaithful – men 18.6%, women 7.4%, all 12.2%;</p> <p>She argues with him – men 3.3%, women 1%, all 2.0%.</p> <p>Men who were heavy drinkers felt violence was less of a problem; younger women were more likely to think violence against women was more of a problem than those age 70 or more; women with a mid-level education saw it more of a problem; both men and women of low-level education were more likely to support men being able to hit his wife; men facing financial difficulty were twice as likely to support violence.</p>
<p>Lokhmatkina, N. V., Kuznetsova, O. Y., & Feder, G. S. (2010). Prevalence and associations of partner abuse in women attending Russian general practice. <i>Family</i></p>	<p>1,232 women</p>	<p>Women patients aged 15-70 attending general practices in 12 administrative districts (24 general practices) in St. Petersburg, Russia. Mean age: 43.6 years</p>	<p>Multi-center cross-sectional survey. Assessed 12-month IPV victimization prevalence via a Russian version of the Composite Abuse Scale (CAS). Face-to-face interview</p>	<p><u>Prevalence of partner violence:</u> Physical IPV: 6.4% Emotional/psychological: 9.2% Harassment: 4% Overall IPV (combination of the 3): 7.2%</p> <p>Cohabiting women were 1.9 times more likely and divorced women were</p>

PASK#14 Online Tables – Table 5: Partner abuse in Europe

Study	N	Sample Characteristics	Method and Design	Results
<i>Practice</i> , 27, 625-631.				2.3 times more likely to be abused than married respondents. Only 34.7% of women would agree to GPs asking about partner abuse. The high prevalence of partner abuse is consistent with international findings in general practice-based studies
Zhan, W., Shabolts, A. V., Skochilov, R. V., Kozlov, A. P., Krasnoselskikh, T. V., & Abdala, N. (2011). Alcohol misuse, drinking contexts and intimate partner violence in St. Petersburg, Russia: results from a cross-sectional study. <i>BMC Public Health</i> , 11: 629.	440 both	Consecutive adult patients aged 18 years and older who reported genitourinary complaints or had a need for STI-related services in a clinic in Saint. Petersburg, Russia.	Cross-sectional study. IPV (compound measure of physical and sexual IPV perpetration within the previous 3 months was assessed via the CTS2	<u>Prevalence of partner violence:</u> 7.2% of participants perpetrated IPV. No significant gender differences were found. <u>Risk factors:</u> Participants with alcohol misuse were 3.28 times as likely as those without alcohol misuse to perpetrate IPV. Among participants who had consumed alcohol in the past three months, those who usually drank on the streets or in parks were more likely to perpetrate IPV. Both alcohol misuse and certain drinking contexts were associated with IPV perpetration.
Spain:				
Ruiz-Perez, I., Plazaola-Castano, J., Alvarez-Kindelan, M., Palomo-Pinto, M., Arnalte-Barrera, A., Bonet-Pla, A., The Gender Violence	1,402 women	Mean age = 38.83 years 32.8% had two children 65% married, 51% employed. 65.4% lacked a university degree	Convenience sample of women participants recruited from 23 general medical practices in three regions of Spain; had to be 18-65 years of age and seeking medical care. Participants administered 21-	<u>Abuse Prevalence</u> 32% reported any victimization - 14.3% physical violence, 30.8% emotional abuse, 8.9% sexual abuse <u>Risk Factors</u> Having 3 or more children

PASK#14 Online Tables – Table 5: Partner abuse in Europe

Study	N	Sample Characteristics	Method and Design	Results
<p>Study Group (2006). Sociodemographic associations of physical, emotional and sexual intimate partner violence in Spanish women. <i>AEP Journal</i>, 16 (5), 357-363.</p>			<p>item written questionnaire at clinic, on partner violence, sociodemographic variables and health status. Partner violence questions based on previous WHO Multi-Country Study on Women’s Health and Life Events, and asked about current partner. Physical violence defined as being hit, slapped, kicked or pushed; emotional abuse defined as having been threatened, insulted or humiliated; sexual abuse defined as being forced to have sexual activities against her will</p>	<p>significantly correlated with physical and sexual abuse; being separated, divorced or widowed significantly correlated with all three forms of abuse; unemployment significantly correlated with physical and emotional abuse, but employment correlated with ever experiencing any partner violence Lower education significantly correlated with emotional and sexual abuse; women with low family income significantly more likely to experience all types of violence, as were women who lacked social support</p>
<p>Zorrila, B., Pires, M., Lasheras, L., Morant, C., Seoane, L., Sanchez, L. M., Galán, I., Aguirre, R., Ramírez, R., & Durbán, M. (2009). Intimate partner violence: last year prevalence and association with socio-economic factors among</p>	<p>2,136 women</p>	<p>Women aged 18–70 years, living in the Madrid region for a period of 12 months or more with a partner or who had been in contact with an ex-partner in the previous year.</p>	<p>Stratified cross-sectional representative study of violence against women in Madrid. Telephone interviews by female interviewers. Physical IPV was assessed with the CTS-R. Psychological and sexual IPV was assessed with a validated module used in the National violence against women survey in France. Sexual IPV was assessed via two items that implied sexual abuse. The study</p>	<p><u>Prevalence of partner violence:</u> Physical IPV = 2.4% Psychological IPV = 8.6% Sexual IPV = 1.1% Overall IPV = 10.1% Women experienced past year partner violence at a similar level as in other industrialized countries. Unemployment and low occupational status are associated with physical and psychological-only violence,</p>

PASK#14 Online Tables – Table 5: Partner abuse in Europe

Study	N	Sample Characteristics	Method and Design	Results
women in Madrid, Spain. <i>European Journal of Public Health</i> , 20(2), 169-175.			assessed IPV victimisation within a 12-month timeframe.	respectively
Rodriguez Franco, L., de los Angeles Antuna Bellerin, M., Lopez-Cepero Borrego, J., Rodriguez Dias, F.J., & Bringas Molleda, C. (2012). Tolerance towards dating violence in Spanish adolescents. <i>Psicothema</i> , 24(n° 2), 236-242	2,205 women	Women ages 15-25 from secondary schools and universities that had been in a relationship for more than 1 month.	DVQ/CUVINO was used; self-labeling with the purpose of identifying most frequent violent behaviors and the degree of tolerance or acceptance and attitude the women have toward this behavior. Statistics software used was SPSS 18.0.	<p><u>Demographics:</u> 989 women were from secondary schools and 1208 were from universities.</p> <p>Average age of male partners was 20.6.</p> <p><u>Prevalence of partner violence:</u> 125 women (5.7%) had felt abused in their relationship.</p> <p><u>Outcome:</u> 4% of women were little or not bothered at all by criticisms, insults, and yelling by their partner.</p> <p>5-8% were not bothered by being hit, unwanted touches, being treated as a sexual object, being humiliated, ridiculed.</p>
Sweden:				
Rådested, I., Rubertsson, C.,	2,563 women	Postnatal clinics in Sweden recruited	This study measures the likely prevalence and indicators of	<u>Prevalence of partner violence:</u> 2% reported being hit within the first

PASK#14 Online Tables – Table 5: Partner abuse in Europe

Study	N	Sample Characteristics	Method and Design	Results
<p>Ebeling, M., & Hildingsson, I. (2004). What factors in early pregnancy indicate that the mother will be hit by her partner during the year after childbirth? A nationwide Swedish survey. <i>Birth: Issues in Perinatal Care</i>, 31(2), 84-92.</p>		<p>Swedish speaking postnatal women. There were 2,563 women who returned questionnaires. The Swedish Medical Birth Register showed approximately 5500 live births during the timeframe of the study. A follow-up questionnaire was also sent, and 2,534 women responded.</p>	<p>women in their early pregnancy being abused by her partner during the first year after giving birth. Women who agreed to participate provided their addresses and were mailed the first questionnaire after giving permission to participate, and another 1 year after childbirth. The questionnaires provided a sealed envelope with a unique code number to preserve anonymity.</p>	<p>year after childbirth; of those, 61% were hit once; 23% twice; and 15% three or more times.</p> <p><u>Risk factors:</u> Unmarried women 24 years or younger were at a higher risk of abuse.</p> <p>Women who suffered from various somatic disorders after childbirth were more likely to be hit than women who did not.</p>
<p>Ukraine:</p>				
<p>Dude, A. (2007). Intimate partner violence and increased lifetime risk of sexually transmitted infection (STI) among women in Ukraine. <i>Studies in Family Planning</i>, 38, 2, 89-100</p>	<p>3,587 women</p>	<p>The sample was selected from the 1999 Ukraine Reproductive Health Survey (RHS) of ever married women. The participating sample was between the ages of 17-44 years married at least once.</p>	<p>This was a self-reporting study. The women were asked several questions to determine the type of abuse they have experienced, if any. The information gained is the prevalence of abuse by an intimate partner in the last 12 months, abuse by their sexual partners, and prevalence of abuse in her lifetime excluding the last 12 months. This information was correlated with the participants have been infected with a sexually transmitted disease by her</p>	<p><u>Prevalence of partner violence:</u> 39% physical abuse; 17% physical violence at the hands of a sexual partner; 7% experienced violence within the past year; 30% were physically abused as a child; 10% were physically abused during childhood and adulthood. 4% reported having more than one sexual partner in the past 12 months.</p> <p><u>Outcome:</u> 50% reporting having contracted an</p>

PASK#14 Online Tables – Table 5: Partner abuse in Europe

Study	N	Sample Characteristics	Method and Design	Results
			<p>partner. Questions about sexual behavior, total number of sexual partners in the last 12 months, protection used to prevent pregnancy and disease were also asked.</p>	<p>STI. Women who reported experiencing abuse by a sexual partner within the last 12 months were significantly less likely to use condoms in their current sexual relationships, and were more likely to report having multiple sexual partners in the past year.</p>
<p>O'Leary, K., Tintle, N., Bromet, E., & Gluzman, S. (2008). Descriptive epidemiology of intimate partner aggression in Ukraine. <i>Social Psychiatry and Psychiatric Epidemiology</i>, 43(8), 619-626.</p>	<p>558 women 558 men</p>	<p>Part of World Mental Health Survey Consortium; used nationally representative sample of adults who were married or cohabitating with partner (558 men, 558 women) from Ukraine's 24 states, and the Republic of Crimea; urban and rural areas proportionately represented. Average age: mid-40s; half had post-high school education; men and women had comparable income level</p>	<p>Survey administered in booklet form, to minimize embarrassment, in Russian and Ukrainian; respondents asked how often they had been pushed, grabbed or shoved; had something thrown at them; and slapped or hit; and how many times they had done these to a partner. Asked about lifetime and past year.</p> <p>Survey also asked about demographic characteristics, early life risk factors and adult risk factors</p>	<p><u>Partner violence rates</u> <u>Victimization:</u> 8.6% of men and 20.1% of women reported to have ever been physically abused by their partner; and 5.8% of men and 12.7% of women said they were abused in past year <u>Perpetration:</u> 18.7% of men and 18.5% of women said they had ever been violent toward their partner; 11.4% of men, 11.3% of women said they had been violent in past year</p> <p><u>Risk factors</u> Male perpetrated partner violence correlated with: being married only once; witnessed parental aggression in childhood; show signs of Intermittent Explosive Disorder (IED); abuse alcohol; and report more marital problems Female perpetrated violence correlated</p>

PASK#14 Online Tables – Table 5: Partner abuse in Europe

Study	N	Sample Characteristics	Method and Design	Results
				with: unemployment; live in a rural area; have early onset anxiety or depression; show signs of IED; abuse alcohol; and report high levels of marital problems
Multi-Country:				
Center for Disease Control and ORC Macro DHS (2003). <i>Reproductive, maternal and child health in Eastern Europe and Eurasia: A comparative report.</i> Atlanta, USA: U.S. Department of Health and Human Services.	40,898 women	<p>Sample of women in 6 countries in Eastern Europe (Moldova, Romania, Russia and Ukraine) and the Caucasus (Azerbaijan and Georgia); from the Reproductive Health Surveys between 1993 and 2001.</p> <p>Sample size ranged from a low of 5,412 in Moldavia to a high of 7,798 in Georgia.</p> <p>Eastern Europe: Majority urban population in Eastern European sample; age of women between 15-44 years; two-thirds currently married or cohabitating with partner;</p>	<p>Subjects drawn from national probability samples of women of reproductive age regardless of marital status; subjects interviewed in person at their homes</p> <p>Surveys used modified Conflict Tactics Scale that includes verbal and physical violence; sexual abuse by intimate partner defined by asking subjects if “a partner ever physically forced you to have sex against your will.” (Subjects asked about abuse victimization, not perpetration.)</p>	<p><u>Physical abuse victimization reported:</u> Moldavia: 15% lifetime, 8 % current Romania: 29% lifetime, 10% current Russia: 19% lifetime; 6% current Ukraine: 19% lifetime, 7% current Azerbaijan: 20% lifetime, 8% current Georgia: 5% lifetime, 2% current</p> <p><u>Verbal abuse victimization reported:</u> Moldavia: 23% lifetime, 14% current Romania: 45% lifetime, 23% current Russia: 20% lifetime; 7% current Ukraine: 19% lifetime, 6% current Azerbaijan: 30% lifetime, 14% current Georgia: 19% lifetime, 13% current</p> <p><u>Sexual abuse victimization reported (3 countries):</u> Romania: 7% lifetime, 2% current Azerbaijan: 10% lifetime, 5% current Georgia: 3% lifetime, 1% current</p>

PASK#14 Online Tables – Table 5: Partner abuse in Europe

Study	N	Sample Characteristics	Method and Design	Results
		<p>low proportion of women without secondary education</p> <p>Caucasus: Somewhat more urban dwellers than rural; higher proportion never married; majority have completed secondary school</p>		
<p>Copic, S. (2004). Wife abuse in the countries of the former Yugoslavia. <i>Feminist Review</i>, 76, 46-64.</p>	<p>2,092 women</p>	<p>Women in age range 25-48 years the largest group in all three samples. 49.4% employed in Serbia, 26.4% in Macedonia, 26% in Bosnia-Herzegovina</p>	<p>Three separate, large population surveys conducted in three countries formerly part of Yugoslavia: Serbia, Macedonia and Bosnia-Herzegovina (700 in Serbia, 850 in Macedonia, and 542 in Bosnia-Herzegovina)</p> <p>Face to face interviews conducted with adult women, asked about partner violence and other forms of violence</p> <p>“Violence” in all surveys defined as psychological, physical, and sexual violence against women</p>	<p><u>Prevalence Rates of Abuse</u></p> <p>Serbia: 46.1% psychologically abused, 30.6% physically (plus 25.3% victim of threats), 8.7% sexually victimized 27% of women suffered violence more than five times 8.7% sexual victimization</p> <p>Macedonia: 23.9% physically abused 26.2% victimized more than 20 times 61.5% psychologically abused and controlled 5% sexual victimization</p> <p>Bosnia-Herzegovina: 23% physically abused, of which 77% involved repeat violence</p> <p><u>Risk Factors</u> Alcohol abuse correlated with partner violence in 51.5% of cases in</p>

PASK#14 Online Tables – Table 5: Partner abuse in Europe

Study	N	Sample Characteristics	Method and Design	Results
				Macedonia, and 37.2% in Serbia Having witness father-on-mother violence in childhood correlated with partner violence in about a third of cases in Serbia and Macedonia
Straus, M.A. (2008) Dominance and symmetry in partner violence by male and female university students in 32 nations. <i>Children and Youth Services Review</i> Volume 30(3), 252-275.	4,732 Europe	Data from the International Violence Study regarding dating violence were collected from a convenience sample of 13,601 students at 68 universities in 32 nations. Sample participation of those reporting one or more incident of assault totaled 4,239. In this table segment, the samples were collected from the European countries of United Kingdom, Greece, Netherlands, Malta, Romania, Belgium (686), Switzerland (310), Hungary (152), Germany (483), Russia (398),	A consortium of researchers from all major regions of the world took part in this International Dating Violence Study. This section summarizes the research data for the European countries of United Kingdom, Greece, Netherlands, Malta, Romania, Belgium, Switzerland, Hungary, Germany, Russia, Lithuania, Sweden, and Portugal. The core questions are the same in every region where the research was conducted. Students who participated in the study were advised of their rights to refuse participation and the purpose of the study. Most universities had a participation rate of 85% to 95%. Dominance was measured by items from the Personal and Relationships Profile – e.g., “I generally have the final say when my partner and I	Prevalence of overall assault reported(past year perpetration) in these European countries surveyed are as follows: United Kingdom (not provided); Greece: males 39%, females 26 %; Netherlands: males 31%, females 32 %; Malta: males 30%, females 16%; Romania: males 29%, females 32%; Belgium: males 29%, females 35 %; Switzerland: males 27 %, females 24%; Hungary: males 27%, females 21%; Germany: males at 24 %, females 28%; Russia: males at 24 %, females 38 %; Lithuania: males at 22%, females 39%; Sweden: males at 19%, females 18%; Portugal: males at 14%, females 18%. Prevalence of severe assault reported in these European countries surveyed are as follows: United Kingdom: not provided; Greece: males 18%, females 14%; Netherlands: males 8%, females 5%; Malta: males 0%, females 5 %; Romania: males 9%, females 11%;

PASK#14 Online Tables – Table 5: Partner abuse in Europe

Study	N	Sample Characteristics	Method and Design	Results
		<p>Lithuania (347), Sweden (671) and Portugal (352). The original sample totaled 4,732 students. The average responding gender in this region was 65.9% female. Students included in the study either currently were, or had been in a relationship for one month or more.</p>	<p>disagree,” and “My partner needs to remember that I am in charge.”</p> <p>Impression management was controlled by using The Limited Disclosure Scale of the PRP.</p>	<p>Belgium: males 7%, females 12 %; Switzerland: males 7%, females 5 %; Hungary: males 12%, females 11%; Germany: males 6%, females 8%; Russia: males 9%, females 15%; Lithuania: males 5%, females 11%; Sweden: males 1 %, females 2%; Portugal: males 5%, females 5 %. Prevalence of overall mutual assault reported in these European countries surveyed are as follows: United Kingdom: not provided; Greece: 29%; Netherlands: 32%; Malta: 19 %; Romania: 32%; Belgium: 34%; Switzerland: 25 %; Hungary: 23%; Germany: 27%; Russia: 32%; Lithuania: 34%; Sweden: 18 %; Portugal: 17%. Prevalence of severe mutual assault reported in these European countries surveyed are as follows: United Kingdom: not provided; Greece: 15%; Netherlands: 5%; Malta: 4%; Romania: 11%; Belgium 11%; Switzerland: 6 %; Hungary: 11%; Germany: 7%; Russia: 12%; Lithuania: 9%; Sweden: 2%; Portugal: 5%. Dominance Scores: Greece: 2.17 M, 1.98 F Netherlands: 1.67 M, 1.70 F</p>

PASK#14 Online Tables – Table 5: Partner abuse in Europe

Study	N	Sample Characteristics	Method and Design	Results
				Malta: 1.75 M, 1.95 F Romania: 2.00 M, 2.01 F Belgium: 1.77 M, 1.80 F Switzerland: 1.73 M, 1.76 F Hungary: 2.08 M, 1.93 F Germany: 1.82 M, 1.90 F Russia: 2.37 M, 2.21 F Lithuania: 2.11 M, 2.20 F Sweden: 1.65 M, 1.68 F Portugal: 1.89 M, 1.89 F

PASK#14 Online Tables – Table 6: International comparative research

Study	N	Sample Characteristics	Method and Design	Results
-------	---	------------------------	-------------------	---------

Table 6. International comparative research

<p>Archer, J. (2006) Cross-Cultural differences in physical aggression between partners: a social-role analysis. <i>Personality and social psychology review</i> Volume 10(2), 133-153</p>	<p>N/A</p>	<p>Meta-analysis of data from several countries:</p> <p>ASIA Bangladesh, Cambodia, China, India, Japan, Korea, Malaysia, Pakistan, Papua New Guinea, Philippines, Russia, South Korea, Sri Lanka, Thailand</p> <p>AFRICA Egypt, Nigeria, South Africa, Zambia, Zimbabwe</p> <p>MIDDLE EAST Israel, Jordan, Kuwait, Turkey</p> <p>LATIN AMERICA Barbados, Bolivia, Brazil, Chile, Columbia, Costa Rica, Dominican Republic, El Salvador, Guatemala, Haiti, Honduras,</p>	<p>The author sought to determine if rates of partner violence differ in non-Western countries from those in the industrialized West, and if so, if gender differences could be explained by societal factors – according to either Social Role Theory or Feminist Patriarchal Theory. Author conducted two analyses, one of 16 countries, the other of 52 countries.</p> <p>In addition to rates of verbal and physical PV (measured by the CTS), the author looked at the extent to which women in each country are empowered vis-à-vis men, using two United Nations measures – the GEM and GDI; attitudes towards women’s roles (Sex Role Ideology Scale, and Ambivalent Sexism Inventory); attitudes towards wife-beating; cross-national variables (extent to which a country is collectivistic or values individual rights, and extent of masculinity versus femininity); and also overall violence in each country</p>	<p>The higher the GEM in a nation, the higher the proportion of female-perpetrated PV Highest rates of female perpetrated PV, and lowest male-perpetrated, in individualistic societies (e.g., U.S., Western Europe) Gender empowerment negatively correlated with both hostile sexism and benevolent sexism. A strong correlation was found between societal approval of husband slapping his wife and female PV victimization High correlation between high scores on Sex Role Ideology Scale and GEM; and there was a negative correlation between SRIS scores and women’s PV victimization – i.e., modern gender role attitudes associated with lower rates of female victimization A country’s degree of masculinity or femininity unrelated to GEM or women’s PV victimization GEM strongly correlated with individualism; collectivism was the strongest predictor of women’s PV victimization Author concluded that the data supports</p>
--	------------	---	--	--

PASK#14 Online Tables – Table 6: International comparative research

Study	N	Sample Characteristics	Method and Design	Results
		<p>Mexico, Nicaragua, Paraguay, Peru, Uruguay</p> <p>U.S. AND EUROPE Belgium, Canada, Finland, France, Germany, Lithuania, New Zealand, Ireland, Poland, Switzerland, U.K., U.S.A.</p>		<p>a link between patriarchal values and PV by husbands; however the author also found that husbands are frequently assaulted even in nations where women’s empowerment is low, and that the data is thus best explained according to Social Role Theory rather than Feminist Theory</p>
<p>World Health Organization (2005). Summary report: WHO multi-country study on women’s health and domestic violence. Geneva, Switzerland: WHO</p> <p>+ Garcia-Moreno, C., Jansen, H., Ellsberg, M., Heise, L., & Watts, C. (2006). Prevalence of intimate partner violence: Findings from the WHO multi-country study</p>	<p>20,497 women</p>	<p>20,497 women at 15 sites in 10 countries between the ages of 15-49 years who had ever had a relationship with a man. The countries involved with the study included; Bangladesh, Brazil, Ethiopia, Japan, Namibia, Peru, Samoa, Serbia, Montenegro, Thailand, and Tanzania.</p>	<p>There were between 1172 and 1837 interviews per site, with the exception of Ethiopia which had over twice the women completing interviews. Totaling 3,016. Research institution or government agency who have experience conducting population surveys, and an organization experienced in providing services to abused women were utilized to complete this cross cultural study.</p> <p>Surveys asked about physical and sexual PV and controlling behaviors victimization for past year and lifetime, based on</p>	<p>Ethiopia Province Ever/Past Year Physical: 48.7, 29.0 Ever/Past Year Sexual: 58.6, 44.4 Ever/ Past Year Combined Phys. and Sexual: 70.9, 53.7</p> <p>Japan City Ever/Past Year Physical: 12.9, 3.1 Ever/Past Year Sexual: 6.2, 1.3 Ever/ Past Year Combined Phys. and Sexual: 15.4, 3.8</p> <p>Namibia City Ever/Past Year Physical: 30.6, 15.9 Ever/Past Year Sexual: 16.5, 9.1 Ever/ Past Year Combined Phys. and Sexual: 35.9, 19.5</p> <p>Peru City</p>

PASK#14 Online Tables – Table 6: International comparative research

Study	N	Sample Characteristics	Method and Design	Results
<p>on women's health and domestic violence. <i>The Lancet</i>, 368, 9543, 1260-1269.</p>			<p>Conflict Tactics Scales. PV definitions: Physical – slapped or something thrown at you (moderate); hit with fist or something that could hurt, kicked, dragged, or beaten up, choked or burned, had weapon used or threatened to be used on you Sexual – Physically forced to have sexual intercourse when you didn't want to or when you were afraid, forced to do something sexual that was degrading Control – Kept from seeing friends, restricted in contact with friends or family, he insisted on knowing where you are at all times, ignored and treated indifferently, he got angry if you talked to another man, he was often suspicious, he expected you to get permission before seeking health care</p> <p>Conducted in the capital (or other large city) and also one representative province with an urban and rural population in</p>	<p>Ever/Past Year Physical: 48.6, 16.9 Ever/Past Year Sexual: 22.5, 7.1 Ever/ Past Year Combined Phys. and Sexual: 51.2, 19.2</p> <p>Peru Province Ever/Past Year Physical: 61.0, 24.8 Ever/Past Year Sexual: 46.7, 22.9 Ever/ Past Year Combined Phys. and Sexual: 69.0, 34.2</p> <p>Samoa Ever/Past Year Physical: 40.5, 17.9 Ever/Past Year Sexual: 19.5, 11.5 Ever/ Past Year Combined Phys. and Sexual: 46.1, 22.4</p> <p>Serbia and Montenegro City Ever/Past Year Physical: 22.8, 3.2 Ever/Past Year Sexual: 6.3, 1.1 Ever/ Past Year Combined Phys. and Sexual: 23.7, 3.7</p> <p>Thailand City Ever/Past Year Physical: 22.9, 7.9 Ever/Past Year Sexual: 29.9, 17.1 Ever/ Past Year Combined Phys. and Sexual: 41.1, 21.3</p> <p>Thailand Province Ever/Past Year Physical: 33.8, 13.4</p>

PASK#14 Online Tables – Table 6: International comparative research

Study	N	Sample Characteristics	Method and Design	Results
			<p>Bangladesh, Brazil, Peru, Thailand and Tanzania. A rural province was selected for the Ethiopia study. The samples for Japan, Namibia, Serbia and Montenegro were drawn from a large city in each country. In Samoa, the whole country was sampled.</p> <p>RESULTS</p> <p><u>% PV Victimization Rates</u></p> <p>Bangladesh City Ever/Past Year Physical: 39.7, 19.0 Ever/Past Year Sexual: 37.4, 20.2 Ever/Past Year Combined Phys. and Sexual: 53.4, 30.2</p> <p>Bangladesh Province Ever/Past Year Physical: 41.7, 15.8 Ever/Past Year Sexual: 49.7, 24.2 Ever/ Past Year Combined Phys. and Sexual: 61.7, 31.9</p> <p>Brazil City Ever/Past Year Physical: 27.2,</p>	<p>Ever/Past Year Sexual: 28.9, 15.6 Ever/ Past Year Combined Phys. and Sexual: 47.4, 22.9</p> <p>Tanzania City Ever/Past Year Physical: 32.9, 14.8 Ever/Past Year Sexual: 23.0, 12.8 Ever/ Past Year Combined Phys. and Sexual: 41.3, 21.5</p> <p>Tanzania Province Ever/Past Year Physical: 46.7, 18.7 Ever/Past Year Sexual: 30.7, 18.3 Ever/ Past Year Combined Phys. and Sexual: 55.9, 29.1</p> <p>According to the authors, “the study results show that the proportion of women who reported instigating violence against their partner was small” (p. 1267), but no statistical data was provided and men were not interviewed.</p> <p>Controlling behaviors: The percentage of women reporting having experienced at least 1 controlling behavior ranged from 21% in Japan to nearly 90% in Tanzania City. Across all countries, women who had been subjected to physical or</p>

PASK#14 Online Tables – Table 6: International comparative research

Study	N	Sample Characteristics	Method and Design	Results
			<p>8.3 Ever/Past Year Sexual: 10.1, 2.8 Ever/ Past Year Combined Phys. and Sexual: 28.9, 9.3</p> <p>Brazil Province Ever/Past Year Physical: 33.8, 12.9 Ever/Past Year Sexual: 14.3, 5.6 Ever/ Past Year Combined Phys. and Sexual: 36.9, 14.8</p>	<p>sexual PV were more likely than those who were not to experience more than 4 incidents of control.</p>
<p>Straus, M.A. (2008) Dominance and symmetry in partner violence by male and female university students in 32 nations. <i>Children and Youth Services Review</i> Volume 30(3), 252-275.</p>	<p>13,601 both</p>	<p>Male and female students in dating relationships for minimum of one month, at 68 universities in 32 countries, representing all major world regions. Age range: 18-40 (mean = 23) 9.7% of students had been in relationship 1 month, 38% 1 month to one year</p>	<p>Data from the International Dating Violence Study, conducted by a worldwide consortium of researchers.</p> <p>The same basic questionnaire was administered at each site; partner violence with the CTS-2 (measuring physical, psychological and sexual abuse, and rates of injury); questions were added at various sites to reflect issues of specific local or theoretical interest.</p> <p>Dominance was measured by items from the Personal and Relationships Profile – e.g., “I</p>	<p>Across the 32 countries, nearly one-third of the female as well as male students physically assaulted a dating partner in the previous 12 months. The most frequent pattern was bidirectional (both partners violent), followed by female-only PV; the least common patterns was male-only, as reported by both male and female participants.</p> <p>The predominance of bidirectional violence, even in countries that are male-dominant, are consistent with results from the ongoing Global School-based Health Survey conducted by the World Health Organization (WHO) among students 13 to 15 years old.</p>

PASK#14 Online Tables – Table 6: International comparative research

Study	N	Sample Characteristics	Method and Design	Results
			<p>generally have the final say when my partner and I disagree,” and “My partner needs to remember that I am in charge.”</p> <p>Students were also given a Social Desirability scale, which resulted in 6.2% of the respondents being dropped from the sample.</p>	<p>The mean dominance score across countries for men was 1.98 and it was 1.99 for women - essentially equal across gender, but higher for women in 24 of the 32 countries. For men, high dominance scores are consistent with low women’s empowerment as measured by the U.N. Gender Empowerment Measure</p> <p>Dominance by either males or females is correlated with higher rates of physical PV, and especially severe PV, by either gender – that is, dominance increases likelihood of that person being violent as well as the partner.</p>
<p>Devries, K. M., Kishor, S., Johnson, H., Stöckl, H., Bacchus, L., Garcia-Moreno, C. & Watts, C. (2010). Intimate partner violence during pregnancy: Analysis of prevalence data from 19 countries. <i>Reproductive Health Matters</i>, 18, 36, 158-170.</p>	<p>316 women</p>	<p>Since this was a secondary analysis of data obtained from the various surveys across 19 countries regarding IPV during pregnancy, the samples varied and are not listed in this summary. Ever pregnant women were the subject sample of these surveys.</p>	<p>This is a secondary analysis of the Demographic and Health Surveys (DHS) examining intimate partner violence during pregnancy, with cross-sectional data obtained through 20 surveys in 15 countries); and the International Violence against Women Surveys (IVAWS, 4 surveys in 4 countries). These surveys were collected for 9 years between 1998 and 2007.</p>	<p>African and Latin American countries showed a higher prevalence of IPV during pregnancy than most European and Asian countries surveyed. <u>Lifetime</u> prevalence varied greatly from 10.7% in the Philippines to 64.4% in the Democratic Republic of Congo (DRC). Another area of great variance was in IPV within the <u>past year</u>, which ranged from 1% in Denmark to 63% in the DRC. Severe IPV over a lifetime ranged from 5% in Azerbaijan to 39% in Uganda.</p>

PASK#14 Online Tables – Table 6: International comparative research

Study	N	Sample Characteristics	Method and Design	Results																																	
				<p>Azerbaijan maintained the same rate of severe IPV whether the woman was pregnant as well as lifetime experiences.</p> <p>However, other areas showed a vast difference, with <u>severe</u> IPV rates much higher than IPV during pregnancy: Uganda 39% vs. 13%; DRC 38% vs. 9%; and Mozambique 34% vs. 7%.</p>																																	
<p>Harling, G., Msisha, W., & Subramanian, S.V. (2010). No association between HIV and intimate partner violence among women in 10 developing countries. <i>Plos One</i>, 5 (12).</p>	<p>60,114 women</p>	<p>Women 15-49 in 10 countries: Dominican Republic, Haiti, India, Kenya, Liberia, Malawi, Mali, Rwanda, Zambia and Zimbabwe</p>	<p>Analysis of data from Demographic and Health Surveys, conducted between 2003 (Kenya) to 2007 (Dominican Republic, Liberia and Zambia); focused on PV physical and sexual victimization and correlation with HIV status</p>	<p>Lifetime PV Victimization:</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="1411 616 1939 1078"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th colspan="2">%Physical/Sexual</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Dom. Rep.</td> <td>15.7</td> <td>5.5</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Haiti</td> <td>11.9</td> <td>10.6</td> </tr> <tr> <td>India</td> <td>34.1</td> <td>6.9</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Kenya</td> <td>39.9</td> <td>14.4</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Liberia</td> <td>35.9</td> <td>9.2</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Mali</td> <td>16.2</td> <td>3.5</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Malawi</td> <td>21.6</td> <td>14.0</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Rwanda</td> <td>31.1</td> <td>13.9</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Zambia</td> <td>45.0</td> <td>17.0</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Zimbabwe</td> <td>30.2</td> <td>13.9</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>Significant positive correlation found between both physical and sexual PV victimization and HIV infection, with strongest effects for both forms of PV</p>		%Physical/Sexual		Dom. Rep.	15.7	5.5	Haiti	11.9	10.6	India	34.1	6.9	Kenya	39.9	14.4	Liberia	35.9	9.2	Mali	16.2	3.5	Malawi	21.6	14.0	Rwanda	31.1	13.9	Zambia	45.0	17.0	Zimbabwe	30.2	13.9
	%Physical/Sexual																																				
Dom. Rep.	15.7	5.5																																			
Haiti	11.9	10.6																																			
India	34.1	6.9																																			
Kenya	39.9	14.4																																			
Liberia	35.9	9.2																																			
Mali	16.2	3.5																																			
Malawi	21.6	14.0																																			
Rwanda	31.1	13.9																																			
Zambia	45.0	17.0																																			
Zimbabwe	30.2	13.9																																			
<p>Rico, E., Fenn, B., Abramsky, T., &</p>	<p>Adult Women</p>	<p>All respondents were recruited from the</p>	<p>National representative demographic health surveys</p>	<p><u>Egypt</u> Physical IPV = 29.2%</p>																																	

PASK#14 Online Tables – Table 6: International comparative research

Study	N	Sample Characteristics	Method and Design	Results
<p>Watts, C. (2011). Associations between maternal experiences of intimate partner violence and child nutrition and mortality: findings from Demographic and Health Surveys in Egypt, Honduras, Kenya, Malawi and Rwanda. <i>Journal of Epidemiology and Community Health</i>, 65, 360-367.</p>	<p>Egypt: 5,711 Honduras 14,371 Kenya: 4,679 Malawi: 8,787 Rwanda: 2,871</p>	<p>community (households) Women aged 15-49 Men aged 15-54 (15-59 in the Rwanda sample)</p>	<p>conducted face-to-face. Multi-stage samples using national census data. Cross-sectional studies. Domestic violence was one of several modules assessed. Studies generally used a modified/shortened version of the CTS-R to assess physical and/or psychological, and/or sexual violence victimisation. Experiences of IPV were assessed as “since 15 years of age”. Study reports female victimisation only.</p>	<p>Sexual IPV = 0.6% Overall IPV = 36.2% <u>Honduras</u> Physical = 10.6% Sexual IPV = 1.1% Overall IPV = 15.5% <u>Kenya</u> Physical IPV = 29.3% Sexual IPV = 3.2% Overall IPV = 46.2% <u>Malawi</u> Physical IPV = 14.5% Sexual IPV = 6.5% Overall IPV = 28.5% <u>Rwanda</u> Physical IPV = 25.7% Sexual IPV = 3.1% Overall IPV = 40.2%</p> <p>IPV and under-2-year old mortality and child stunting in these nations seems to contribute to child malnutrition and mortality. As such results encourage including IPV to be included in maternal and child health programs.</p>