

Title: Physical and Mental Health Effects of Intimate Partner Violence for Men and Women

Authors: Ann L. Coker, PhD¹
Keith E. Davis, PhD²
Ileana Arias, PhD³
Sujata Desai, PhD³
Maureen Sanderson, PhD⁴
Heather M. Brandt, MSPH⁵
Paige H. Smith, PhD, MSPH⁶

American Journal of Preventive Medicine, 24(4), 260-268

Author Affiliations:

¹Dept of Epidemiology and Biostatistics, University of South Carolina, Columbia, SC

²Dept of Psychology, University of South Carolina, Columbia, SC

³ National Center for Injury Prevention and Control, Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, Atlanta, GA

⁴ University of Texas School of Public Health, Brownsville, TX

⁵Dept of Health Promotion, Education, and Behavior, University of South Carolina, Columbia, SC

⁶Dept of Public Health Education, University of North Carolina at Greensboro, Greensboro, NC

Corresponding / Reprint request author:

Ann L. Coker, PhD

University of Texas

School of Public Health

1200 Herman Pressler, E-1019

Houston, TX 77030

Phone (713) 500-9955 FAX (803) 777-2524

Email: ACOKER@UTH.SPHERE.TMC.EDU

Word Counts: Abstract: 254 Text: 3493 Text pages: 13 4 Tables and 1 Figure

Abstract

Background: Few population-based studies have assessed the physical and mental health consequences of both psychological and physical intimate partner violence (IPV) among women or men victims. This study estimated IPV prevalence by type (physical, sexual, and psychological) and associated physical and mental health consequences among women and men.

Methods: The study analyzed data from the National Violence Against Women Survey (NVAWS) of women and men ages 18-65. This random-digit-dial telephone survey included questions about violent victimization and health status indicators.

Results: 28.9% of 6,790 women and 22.9% of 7,122 men had experienced physical, sexual, or psychological IPV during their lifetime. Women were significantly more likely than men to experience physical or sexual IPV (relative risk [RR] =2.2, 95% confidence interval [CI] = 2.1, 2.4) and abuse of power and control (RR=1.1; 95% CI =1.0, 1.2), but less likely than men to report verbal abuse alone (RR=0.8; 95% CI = 0.7, 0.9). For both men and women, physical IPV victimization was associated with an increased risk of current poor health, depressive symptoms, substance use, and developing a chronic disease, chronic mental illness, and an injury. In general, abuse of power and control was more strongly associated with these health outcomes than was verbal abuse. When physical and psychological IPV scores were both included in logistic regression models, higher psychological IPV scores were more strongly associated with these health outcomes than were physical IPV scores.

Conclusions: Both physical and psychological IPV are associated with significant physical and mental health consequences for both male and female victims.

Keywords: (6) Spouse Abuse; Battered Women; Sexual Abuse, Epidemiologic Methods, Health; Chronic Disease

INTRODUCTION

Despite the increasingly well-documented literature on the prevalence of intimate partner violence (IPV) in clinical¹⁻¹⁵ and population-based studies¹⁶⁻²³ and its impact on mental health,²⁴⁻³⁸ little epidemiologic research has focused on its long term, physical health consequences,^{39, 40} particularly among men victims. Furthermore, with noted exceptions,^{15, 40, 41} the majority of past studies addressing the health effects of IPV measured physical assaults alone without considering co-existing chronic psychological abuse characteristic of violent relationships. This study adds to existing literature by describing the health effects of physical and psychological IPV on women and men. This is one of the first reports of a population-based study to assess associations between physical, sexual, and psychological abuse and current and long-term mental and physical health of female and male victims.

METHODS

This study analyzed data from the National Violence Against Women Survey (NVAWS) conducted by Tjaden and Thoennes.^{42, 43} This random-digit-dial telephone survey of 8,001 men and 8,005 women, sampled to be representative of the United States (U.S.) population, estimated rates of sexual assaults, physical assaults, and stalking victimization among men and women. A simple random sample of working residential phone numbers was drawn and interviews were conducted from November 1995 to May 1996. Tjaden and Thoennes report a response rate of 72.1% for women participants and 68.9% for men²². Detailed questions included the nature of the victimization, respondent's relationship with the perpetrator, and respondent's age when first assaulted. The interview also included questions to characterize the demographic profile and the health status of the respondent

Measures of Lifetime Intimate Partner Violence

IPV victimization in this study was defined as physical, sexual, or psychological abuse by an intimate partner (defined as a current or former spouse or a cohabiting intimate partner regardless of gender). In the NVAWS design, Tjaden & Thoennes²² used the 12-item Conflict Tactics Scale⁴⁴ to measure physical aggression by an adult (scale measure of internal consistency, Cronbach's alpha = 0.81), the 4-item forced sex questions from the National Women's Study⁴⁵, and the 13-item Power & Control scale⁴⁶ to measure psychological abuse by a partner. We used a cutpoint of greater than one on the CTS to define lifetime physical aggression by a partner. We defined forced sex by an intimate partner to include completed vaginal, anal, or oral sex. We excluded 23 women and five men who reported attempted sexual assault by an intimate partner to maintain consistency with other studies^{34, 40, 41} addressing IPV and health.

We used data from the 13-item Power & Control scale⁴⁶ collected in the NVAWS to create two subscales of psychological abuse: verbal abuse and abuse of power and control. We dropped the item "My partner is afraid of me" because this item is not abuse by a partner. We used exploratory principal component factor analysis to identify those items that loaded on two constructs. Five items loaded on the same factor for both women and men and were used to measure verbal abuse: "shouts or swears at you" (standard regression coefficient (SRC) = 0.81), "provokes arguments" (SRC = 0.80), "calls you names or puts you down in front of others" (SRC = 0.64), "has a hard time seeing things from your point of view" (SRC = 0.83), and "is jealous or possessive" (SRC = 0.75)". The cronbach's alpha coefficient for the verbal abuse subscale was 0.85. The five items loaded on a second factor and formed a measure of abuse of power and control: "frightens you" (SRC = 0.67), "makes you feel inadequate" (SRC = 0.42),

“prevents you from knowing about or having access to the family income even when you ask” (SRC = 0.55), “prevents you from working outside the home” (SRC = 0.86), and “insists on changing residence even when you don’t need or want to” (SRC = 0.70)”. Two remaining factors, “tries to limit your contact with family or friends” and “insists on knowing who you are with at all times” loaded with the verbal abuse factors yet we included these in the abuse of power and control subscale because these statements tap efforts by the partner to limit or control a partner and are not methods of verbal harassment. The cronbach’s alpha for 7-item subscale of abuse of power and control was 0.83. We used a cutpoint of greater than two on each subscale to dichotomously measure psychological abuse by type.

Because there is considerable collinearity between IPV types, we created a 4-level hierarchical category of IPV for the analysis of IPV and health outcomes (Table 3). The first group included respondents experiencing physical or sexual IPV; respondents may have also experienced verbal abuse or abuse of power and control. The second group included those experiencing abuse of power and control yet not sexual or physical IPV; respondents may have also experienced verbal abuse. The third group experienced verbal abuse alone and the comparison group were those never experiencing IPV.

Demographics and Other Violence Experienced

We included six demographic factors from NVAWS data: respondent’s age, ethnicity, current employment status, current marital status, education, and family income. We used the 12-item CTS⁴⁴ collected in the NVAWS to measures physical assaults during childhood (Cronbach’s alpha = 0.81). We used a cutpoint of greater than one to define physical child abuse. We also used data from the 4-item sexual assault questions and the victim–perpetrator

relationship to create a variable measuring sexual assaults by a relative; 86% of the assaults occurred when the respondent was less than 18 years old.

Health Indicators

The NVAWS is a cross-sectional study. We have used these data to address (a) current mental and physical health status and substance use and (b) development of a chronic mental illness, physical disease, or injury. To create the correct temporal sequence for the latter analysis we used data on age at first IPV experience and age at first chronic disease or injury to create measures of developing an injury or chronic illness by eliminating IPV victims whose health illness occurred before they experienced IPV. Figure 1 is an example of those with a chronic disease who were excluded from analyses because their chronic disease occurred before IPV. Among those never experiencing IPV, we excluded those developing chronic diseases, mental illnesses or injuries before age 25, as this was the mean age at first IPV victimization.

Current physical health was assessed with the following question, “In general, would you say your health was... excellent, very good, good, fair, or poor?” We then created a dichotomous variable measuring poor health (2.4%) compared with fair, good, very good, and excellent health.

Current depressive symptoms were assessed using questions contained in the SF-36 Health Survey⁴⁷ (Cronbach’s alpha = 0.78 for 8-item scale; range 8-32). These 8 questions were selected from the 13 items used by Beck & Beck⁴⁸ as the short form of the Beck Depression Inventory (BDI). It is the standard sort-form screening device in the field⁴⁹ and correlates 0.91 with the full 21-item BDI. We used a cutpoint of >20, which is more conservative than the >16 suggested by Beck & Beck⁴⁸; 10.4% reported significant depressive symptoms with this definition.

Current drug use was defined to include use within the preceding month of tranquilizers (4.3%), sedatives (4.3%), antidepressants (3.8%), prescription painkillers (9.6%), or illegal recreational drug use (3.5%). Current alcohol use over the last 12 months was measured in the NVAWS by the average days per week or month alcohol was consumed and, on days alcohol was consumed, the number of drinks per day. We used these questions to define heavy alcohol use as those using alcohol at least 3-4 times per week and drinking at least 4 drinks per day relative to those who drank less than this amount; 6.9% of men and 1.3% of women were heavy alcohol users.

Past injuries (9.0%) were identified with the following question, “Have you ever sustained a serious injury, such as a spinal cord, neck, or head injury, that is disabling or interferes with your normal activities?” Respondents were asked to describe the nature of the injury and their age at injury.

Respondents were asked to identify their chronic health conditions (9.9%) and the ages at which they first acquired these conditions: hypertension or heart disease (N=843), diabetes (N=124), arthritis or connective tissue disease (N=83), asthma or emphysema (N=80), and cancer (N=29).

Chronic mental illness (2.1%) was assessed by asking, “Do you have a chronic mental health disease or condition, such as chronic depression or schizophrenia, that is disabling or interferes with your normal activities?” Respondents were again asked to identify the mental health condition and provide the age at first diagnosis.

Finally, to provide an indicator of the impact of health conditions on everyday life, we used data from the following question: “To what extent did this disability or condition interfere with your normal activities in the past week?” We created a dichotomous indicator to include

those who responded that the condition currently impacted their life “extremely” or “quite a bit”; chronic mental illness had high impact for 0.3% of respondents and chronic diseases had high impact for 0.7%.

Exclusions

We excluded from analyses persons older than 65 (1,159 women and 840 men) and those who did not report their age, education, or marital status (52 women and 43 men). The total sample used was 6,790 women and 7,122 men.

Statistical Analyses

All analyses were conducted using SAS 8.1.⁵⁰ We chose not to weight the NVAWS data to maintain consistency with all published estimates from the NVAWS. Furthermore, as our research objective is analytical and not descriptive, our use of unweighted data is justified, as recommended by Korn and Graubard.⁵¹ We did, however, adjust all relative risk estimates for race, health insurance status, and age as a means of reducing bias associated with differing response rates by these demographic factors.

Table 1 provides point estimates for lifetime (i.e., ever) IPV by type, comparing men with women. We calculated relative risks using the Mantel-Haenszel method and test-based 95% confidence intervals for the association between each health indicator and IPV by type. All analyses were stratified by gender.

Data presented in Table 2 was used to determine confounders to be included in all multivariate logistic regression models (Table 3 and 4): childhood physical and sexual abuse by a relative were included with age, race and insurance status. We used insurance status as a proxy for income because 22% of respondents refused to provide income information and having private health insurance was strongly associated with higher income. We opted to dichotomize

health outcomes instead of using the ordinal or continuous outcome data because the relative risk for a dichotomous outcome is much easier to interpret. To explore dose-response associations between psychological and physical IPV scores and health outcomes, we created ordinal variables from the continuous scale scores (Table 4). Those experiencing no IPV were included as the comparison group for the three levels of IPV exposure. Two sets of ordinal IPV measures (for physical and psychological IPV) were included as independent variables in the same multiple logistic regression models with the health outcomes as the dependent variable.

RESULTS

The lifetime prevalence of physical IPV alone was 13.3% for women and 5.8% for men; the prevalence of sexual IPV alone was 4.3% for women and 0.2% for men; and the prevalence of psychological IPV alone was 12.1% for women and 17.3% for men (Table 1). Women were significantly more likely than men to report sexual or physical IPV during their lifetime.

Although women were significantly less likely than men to report verbal abuse alone (aRR= 0.8; 95% CI = 0.7, 0.9), women were more likely than men to report abuse of power and control issues without physical or sexual IPV (aRR=1.1; 95% CI = 1.0, 1.2)

Of those demographic variables presented in Table 2 as significantly associated with IPV, only race was no longer significantly associated with IPV after adjustment for age, race, health insurance, and childhood physical and sexual abuse for both women and men. Current employment and family income were no longer significant for male victims after similarly adjusting for confounding. The strongest risk factor for IPV in these data was being physically assaulted as a child for both men (aRR=2.5; 95% CI = 2.2, 2.8) and women (aRR=2.8; 95% CI = 2.4, 3.1). Among those in a current intimate relationship, partner's alcohol use was associated with current IPV experience for women (aRR=1.7; 95% CI = 1.4, 2.1) and men (aRR=1.9; 95% CI = 1.4, 2.6) after adjusting for childhood physical and sexual abuse (data not shown).

Table 3 presents adjusted relative risks for lifetime physical (and sexual IPV) and psychological (power / control and verbal abuse subscales) IPV victimization, and physical and mental health indicators, by gender. We begin this table with associations of lifetime IPV and current health status. Lifetime experience of either physical IPV or the power and control form of psychological IPV was significantly associated with self-reported current poor health among women and men. All forms of IPV were significantly associated with current depressive symptoms for men and women. The associations were stronger for abuse of power and control than for verbal abuse. Heavy alcohol use and “therapeutic” drug use were associated with both physical and psychological IPV. In general, association between psychological IPV and these drug use outcomes was stronger for abuse of power and control than for verbal abuse for both men and women. For men, all forms of physical and psychological IPV were associated with recreational drug use. For women, abuse of power and control was significantly associated with recreational drug use; physical IPV was not associated with this outcome

We next present association between IPV and developing a chronic health condition. Physical IPV was associated with history of a chronic disease for women and men. History of a chronic mental illness was associated with physical IPV for women and with abuse of power and control for men. Physical and psychological forms of IPV were associated with being injured among women and men; associations were stronger for physical IPV and among the two psychological IPV categories, these associations were stronger for abuse of power and control than for verbal abuse for both men and women.

Physical IPV was associated with female respondents’ perception that her chronic disease interfered with their normal activities in the past week; the power and control form of psychological IPV was associated with the same perception in men.

For both men and women, increasing psychological IPV scores were strongly associated with an increased risk of current poor health and current depressive symptoms (Table 4). Increasing physical as well as psychological IPV scores were associated with becoming injured for men and women. Increased psychological IPV scores, controlling for physical IPV scores,

were associated with history of a chronic disease for women; a similar pattern was not observed in men.

DISCUSSION

Our analyses indicate that women experiencing IPV are more likely to report poor physical and mental health. These results are consistent with those of other studies.^{25, 27, 40, 41, 52-57} Koss and Heslet (1992)⁵⁷ note that various processes may contribute to health outcomes and perceptions of both health outcomes. Resnick et al. (1997)³⁹ found that many physical symptoms reported by abused women were similar to symptoms for anxiety and depression, further indicating a relationship with mental health outcomes as a result of IPV. Negative psychological and physical health consequences of IPV have been noted in some instances.^{39, 58} Our findings corroborate the theory that IPV victimization is associated with a higher risk of negative mental and physical health outcomes.

The NVAWS exclusively addresses violence victimization among men and women. Some of the victims may also be perpetrators⁵⁹. Using a question from the NVAWS regarding who was first to use force during a physical assault, we found that 11.6% of men victims of a physical assault reported that they were the first to use or threaten to use physical force compared to 7.1% of women ($p < 0.003$). A greater proportion of men victims than women may be perpetrators as well as victims; IPV victimization may be disproportionately misclassified by gender. An alternate interpretation for our finding that men victims are more likely to report adverse health conditions may be that men who batter may be at greater risk of these adverse health outcomes.

How IPV affects health may differ depending on the health outcome. Repeated physical assaults may directly increase risk of injuries or some chronic diseases such as chronic pain, osteoarthritis, and severe headaches^{34, 36, 40, 60}. Chronic psychological stress associated with IPV may also affect other acute and chronic health conditions indirectly^{26, 40}. While our findings are consistent with both a direct and indirect impact of IPV, this study indicates that higher

psychological IPV scores were more strongly associated with the majority of health outcomes than were physical IPV scores.

This is the first large population-based study to provide estimates of psychological violence among women and men. We found that both physical and psychological IPV are associated with mental as well as physical health outcomes for male and female victims. Approximately 14% of women and nearly 18% of men experienced psychological abuse alone during their lifetime. Almost half of IPV among women and more than 78% of IPV among men was psychological IPV and would have been missed had we not included this component of partner violence in our study. Furthermore, psychological IPV was as strongly related as physical IPV to the range of health outcomes. Our data clearly show that psychological partner violence is associated with negative health outcomes. This finding deserves further study.

Several limitations of these data deserve mention. Specific chronic mental illnesses or chronic diseases could not be confirmed with medical records in this anonymous survey; therefore, health outcome data may be misclassified. Additionally, though we attempted to establish the correct temporal sequence whereby IPV would precede the health outcome, data for both age at first IPV and age at diagnosis were self-reported and may be misclassified⁶¹. Furthermore, we cannot exclude the possibility that those experiencing IPV may be more likely to seek care, and thus be diagnosed, compared with non-victims who may not seek care as often. Those who have a chronic disease or are otherwise in poor health may be more likely to become IPV victims. A larger proportion of respondents refused to provide income information. We, therefore, could not adjust our analyses for income or a poverty index but choose to adjust for private health insurance status as a proxy for income. As with all observational studies, residual confounding may still bias our relative risk estimates. Finally, we have limited statistical power to detect difference in risks for specific chronic diseases.

This research adds to existing literature strongly suggesting a health impact of psychological and physical IPV among women and men. As recommended by the National Research Council,⁶² our inclusion of psychological IPV reduced exposure misclassification, and

assessing psychological IPV allowed us to investigate its impact on health even when physical or sexual IPV were not present. We found that psychological and physical violence were associated with many of the same health outcomes. This suggests a need for clinicians to screen for psychological forms of IPV as well as for physical and sexual assault in intimate relationships. This is particularly true for male victims as they are more likely to experience psychological IPV than physical IPV.

Study power afforded by using the large population-based NVAWS is an important strength for this analysis. In contrast with past analyses of the health effects of IPV, we were able to control for the potential impact of demographic factors and childhood physical and sexual abuse on associations between IPV and health outcomes. Finally, we have used data to characterize age at first IPV and health outcomes to construct a cohort design from cross-sectional data.

CONCLUSIONS

Our finding that physical and psychological IPV may produce long-term adverse physical and mental health effects for both women and men has important implications for intervention and prevention efforts. If IPV can be identified early, interventions could be developed to reduce the impact of IPV on mental and physical health status.

Screening for IPV victimization among women has been recommended practice for several years now⁶³⁻⁷¹. Our data support the growing body of research suggesting that we need to extend screening to include physical and sexual abuse^{8,40} as well as psychological abuse or battering^{40,72-74}. The screening recommendations for male victims of IPV are more complicated. As discussed earlier, many male victims may be the primary perpetrator of IPV in the relationship rather than the victim. Hence, current recommendations and guidelines for how to treat and refer female victims of IPV would not apply to males⁶³⁻⁷¹. Published treatment and referral recommendations for males who are IPV victims do not, to our knowledge, exist. This issue deserves further careful study.

REFERENCES

1. Freund KM, Bak SM, Blackhall L. Identifying domestic violence in primary care practice. *J Gen Intern Med* 1996;11(1):44-6.
2. Gin NE, Rucker L, Frayne S, Cygan R, Hubbell F. Prevalence of domestic violence among patients in three ambulatory care internal medicine clinics. *Journal of General Internal Medicine* 1991;6:317-322.
3. Rath GD, Jarratt LG, Leonardson G. Rates of domestic violence against adult women by men partners. *J Am Board Fam Pract* 1989;2(4):227-33.
4. Bullock L, McFarlane J, Bateman LH, Miller V. The prevalence and characteristics of battered women in a primary care setting. *Nurse Pract* 1989;14(6):47, 50, 53-6.
5. Dearwater SR, Coben JH, Campbell JC, Nah G, Glass N, McLoughlin E, et al. Prevalence of intimate partner abuse in women treated at community hospital emergency departments. *Jama* 1998;280(5):433-8.
6. Abbott J, Johnson R, Koziol-McLain J, Lowenstein SR. Domestic violence against women. Incidence and prevalence in an emergency department population. *JAMA* 1995;273(22):1763-7.
7. Browne A, Miller B, Maguin E. Prevalence and severity of lifetime physical and sexual victimization among incarcerated women. *Int J Law Psychiatry* 1999;22(3-4):301-22.
8. Coker AL, Smith PH, McKeown RE, King MJ. Frequency and correlates of intimate partner violence by type: physical, sexual, and psychological battering. *Am J Public Health* 2000;90(4):553-9.
9. Hamberger LK, Saunders DG, Hovey M. Prevalence of domestic violence in community practice and rate of physician inquiry. *Fam Med* 1992;24(4):283-7.

10. Johnson M, Elliott BA. Domestic violence among family practice patients in midsized and rural communities. *J Fam Pract* 1997;44(4):391-400.
11. Marais A, de Villiers PJ, Moller AT, Stein DJ. Domestic violence in patients visiting general practitioners-- prevalence, phenomenology, and association with psychopathology. *S Afr Med J* 1999;89(6):635-40.
12. Naumann P, Langford D, Torres S, Campbell J, Glass N. Women battering in primary care practice. *Fam Pract* 1999;16(4):343-52.
13. McNutt LA, Carlson BE, Gagen D, Winterbauer N. Reproductive violence screening in primary care: perspectives and experiences of patients and battered women. *J Am Med Womens Assoc* 1999;54(2):85-90.
14. Quillian JP. Screening for spousal or partner abuse in a community health setting. *J Am Acad Nurse Pract* 1996;8(4):155-60.
15. Wagner PJ, Mongan P, Hamrick D, Hendrick LK. Experience of abuse in primary care patients. Racial and rural differences. *Arch Fam Med* 1995;4(11):956-62.
16. Buelhler J, Dixon B, Toomey K. Lifetime and annual incidence of intimate partner violence and resulting injuries - Georgia, 1995. *Morbidity and Mortality Weekly Report* 1998;47(40):849-853.
17. Coker A, Oldendick R, Derrick C, Lumpkin J. Intimate partner violence among men and women - South Carolina ,1998. *Mortality and Morbidity Weekly Report* 2000;49(30):691-694.
18. VandeCastle M, Danna J, DeCoster E, Thomas T. Physical violence during the 12 months preceding childbirth--Alaska, Maine, Oklahoma, and West Virginia, 1990-1991. *MMWR Morb Mortal Wkly Rep* 1994;43(8):132-7.

19. Hale-Carlsson G, Hulton B, Furman J, Morse D, McNutt L, Clifford A. Physical violence and injuries in intimate relationships--New York, Behavioral Risk Factor Surveillance System, 1994. *MMWR Morb Mortal Wkly Rep* 1996;45(35):765-7.
20. Gazmararian JA, Lazorick S, Spitz AM, Ballard TJ, Saltzman LE, Marks JS. Prevalence of violence against pregnant women [published erratum appears in *JAMA* 1997 Apr 9;277(14):1125]. *Jama* 1996;275(24):1915-20.
21. Schafer J, Caetano R, Clark CL. Rates of intimate partner violence in the United States. *Am J Public Health* 1998;88(11):1702-4.
22. Tjaden P, Thoennes N. Prevalence, incidence, and consequences of violence against women: findings from the National Violence Against Women Survey. Washington, D.C.: US Department of Justice, Office of Justice Programs.; 1998. Report No.: NCJ 172837.
23. Bensley L, Macdonald S, Van Eenwyk J, Simmons KW, Ruggles D. Prevalence of intimate partner violence and injuries - Washington, 1998. *MMWR* 2000;49:589-592.
24. Sackett LA, Saunders DG. The impact of different forms of psychological abuse on battered women. *Violence Vict* 1999;14(1):105-17.
25. Mullen PE, Romans-Clarkson SE, Walton VA, Herbison GP. Impact of sexual and physical abuse on women's mental health. *Lancet* 1988;1(8590):841-5.
26. Smith PH, Gittelman DK. Psychological consequences of battering. Implications for women's health and medical practice. *N C Med J* 1994;55(9):434-9.
27. Plichta S. The effects of woman abuse on health care utilization and health status: a literature review. *Womens Health Issues* 1992;2(3):154-63.
28. Haber JD. Abused women and chronic pain. *Am J Nurs* 1985;85(9):1010, 1012.

29. Bergman B, Larsson G, Brismar B, Klang M. Psychiatric morbidity and personality characteristics of battered women. *Acta Psychiatr Scand* 1987;76(6):678-83.
30. Bergman B, Brismar B, Nordin C. Utilisation of medical care by abused women. *Bmj* 1992;305(6844):27-8.
31. Ratner PA. The incidence of wife abuse and mental health status in abused wives in Edmonton, Alberta. *Can J Public Health* 1993;84(4):246-9.
32. Gleason WJ. Mental disorders in battered women: an empirical study. *Violence Vict* 1993;8(1):53-68.
33. Campbell J, Kub J, Rose L. Depression in battered women. *J Am Womens Med Assoc* 1996;51(106-110.).
34. Campbell J, Lewandowski LA. Mental and physical health effects of intimate partner violence on women and children. *Psychiatric Clinics of North America*. 1997;20:353-374.
35. Hendricks-Matthews MK. Survivors of abuse. Health care issues. *Prim Care* 1993;20(2):391-406.
36. Plichta S. Violence, health and the use of health services. In: *Women's health: Health and care seeking behavior*. Baltimore, MD: The Johns Hopkins University Press; 1997.
37. Kantor GK, Straus MA. Substance abuse as a precipitant of wife abuse victimizations. *Am J Drug Alcohol Abuse* 1989;15(2):173-89.
38. West CG, Fernandez A, Hillard JR, Schoof M, Parks J. Psychiatric disorders of abused women at a shelter. *Psychiatr Q* 1990;61(4):295-301.
39. Resnick HS, Acierno, R., and Kilpatrick, D.G. Health impact of interpersonal violence 2: Medical and mental health outcomes. *Behavioral Medicine* 1997;23:65-78.

40. Coker AL, Smith PH, Bethea L, King MR, McKeown RE. Physical health consequences of physical and psychological intimate partner violence. *Arch Fam Med* 2000;9(5):451-7.
41. Smith PH, Edwards G. Battering among reproductive age women: Prevalence and health implications. In: 4th Annual Family Violence Conference; 1997; Durham, New Hampshire.; 1997.
42. Tjaden P, Thoennes N. Prevalence and consequences of male-to-female and female-to-male partner violence as measured by the National Violence Against Women Survey. *Violence Against Women* 2000;6:142-161.
43. Tjaden P, Thoennes N. Full report of the prevalence, incidence, and consequences of violence against women. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Justice; 2000 Nov 2000. Report No.: NCJ 183781.
44. Straus MA. Measuring intrafamily conflict and violence: The Conflict Tactics (CT) Scale. *J Marriage Family* 1979;41:75-88.
45. National Victim Center and the Crime Victims Research and Treatment Center. Rape In America: A Report to the Nation. Arlington VA, 22201: 211 Wilson Boulevard Suite 300; 1992.
46. Johnson H. Dangerous Domains: Violence Against Women in Canada. Scarborough, Ontario.: International Thomas Publishing.; 1996.
47. Ware JE, Jr., Sherbourne CD. The MOS 36-item short-form health survey (SF-36). I. Conceptual framework and item selection. *Med Care* 1992;30(6):473-83.
48. Beck AT, Beck RW. Screening depressed patients in family practice: A rapid technique. *Postgraduate Medicine* 1972;52:81-85.

49. Shaver PR, Brennan KA. Measures of depression and loneliness. In: Robinson JR, Shaver PR, Wrightsman LS, editors. Measures of personality and social psychological attitudes. San Diego, CA: Academic Press; 1991. p. 195-289.
50. SAS. Statistical Analysis System (SAS) Version 8.1. Cary, NC: SAS Institute; 2000.
51. Korn EL, Graubard BI. Analysis of Health Surveys. New York NY: Wiley-Interscience Publications; 1999.
52. Jaffe P, Wolfe DA, Wilson S, Zak L. Emotional and physical health problems of battered women. *Can J Psychiatry* 1986;31(7):625-9.
53. Golding JM. Intimate partner violence as a risk factor for mental disorders: a meta-analysis. *Journal of Family Violence* 1999;14(2):99-132.
54. Golding JM. Sexual assault history and limitations in physical functioning in two general population samples. *Research in Nursing and Health* 1996;19:33-44.
55. Koss MP, and Woodruff, W.J., and Koss, P.G. Relation of criminal victimization to health perceptions among women medical patients. *Journal of Counseling and Clinical Psychology* 1990;58:147-152.
56. Kimerling R, and Calhoun, K.S. Somatic symptoms, social support, and treatment seeking among sexual assault victims. *Journal of Counseling and Clinical Psychology* 1994;62(2):333-340.
57. Koss MP, Heslet L. Somatic consequences of violence against women. *Arch Fam Med* 1992;1(1):53-9.
58. Dutton MA, Haywood, Y., and El-Bayoumi, G. Impact of violence on women's health. In: Gallant SJ, Keita, G.P., and Royak-Schaler, R., editor. Health care for women:

- Psychological, social, and behavioral influences. Washington, DC: American Psychological Association; 1997.
59. White JW, Smith PH, Koss MP, Figueredo AJ. Intimate partner aggression--what have we learned? Comment on Archer (2000). *Psychol Bull* 2000;126(5):690-6.
 60. Campbell JC, Soeken KL. Women's responses to battering: a test of the model. *Res Nurs Health* 1999;22(1):49-58.
 61. Simon GE, VonKorff M. Recall of psychiatric history in cross-sectional surveys: implications for epidemiologic research. *Epidemiol Rev* 1995;17(1):221-7.
 62. Crowell NA, Burgess AW. Understanding violence against women. Washington, D.C.: National Academy Press.; 1996.
 63. Paluzzi PA, Houde-Quimby C. Domestic violence. Implications for the American College of Nurse- Midwives and its members. *J Nurse Midwifery* 1996;41(6):430-5.
 64. Physicians. ACoE. Emergency medicine and domestic violence. *Annals of Emergency Medicine* 1995;25:442-443.
 65. American Medical Association Diagnostic and Treatment Guidelines on Domestic Violence. *Arch Fam Med* 1992;1(1):39-47.
 66. Violence against women. Relevance for medical practitioners. Council on Scientific Affairs, American Medical Association. *JAMA* 1992;267(23):3184-9.
 67. American Academy of Family Practice. Family Violence. *American Family Physician* 1994;50:1636-1646.
 68. Quillian JP. Domestic violence. *J Am Acad Nurse Pract* 1995;7(7):351-6; quiz 357-9.
 69. Emergency Nurses Association. Position Statement: Domestic Violence. Park Ridge, IL: Emergency Nurses Association.; 1996.

70. Jones RF, 3rd, Horan DL. The American College of Obstetricians and Gynecologists: a decade of responding to violence against women. *Int J Gynaecol Obstet* 1997;58(1):43-50.
71. ACOG issues technical bulletin on domestic violence. American College of Obstetricians and Gynecologists. *Am Fam Physician* 1995;52(8):2387-8, 2391.
72. Coker AL, Pope BO, Smith PH, Sanderson M, Hussey JR. Assessment of clinical partner violence screening tools. *JAMWA* 2001;56:19-23.
73. Smith PH, Tessaro I, Earp JA. Women's experience with battering: A conceptualization from qualitative research. *Womens Health Issues* 1995;5:173-182.
74. Smith PH, Smith JB, Earp JA. Beyond the Measurement Trap: A reconstructed conceptualization and measurement of woman battering. *Psychology of Women Quarterly* 1999;23:177-193.

Figure 1. Exclusions to create the correct temporal sequence for IPV and developing a chronic disease analyses




Table 1. Number, percentage, relative risk, and 95% confidence interval comparing Women and Men, aged 18-65, experiencing Intimate† Partner Violence (IPV) by Type

	Number and Percentage Reporting Violence by Type				Adjusted* RR for IPV and gender
	Among Women (N=6790)		Among Men (N=7122)		
	# IPV Prevalence		# IPV Prevalence		
Ever experienced IPV by type (victim)					
Any IPV (physical, sexual, or psychological)	2014	29.7%	1656	23.3%	1.3 (1.2, 1.4)
Physical or sexual IPV ‡	1193	17.6%	421	5.9%	2.2 (2.1, 2.4)
Sexual, no physical IPV ‡	295	4.3%	11	0.1%	16.2 (9.0, 28.8)
Physical, no sexual IPV ‡	898	13.3%	410	5.8%	1.8 (1.7, 2.0)
Psychological IPV alone	821	12.1%	1235	17.3%	0.8 (0.7, 0.9)
Abuse of Power / Control	469	6.9%	484	6.8%	1.1 (1.0, 1.2)
Verbal abuse	352	5.2%	751	10.5%	0.8 (0.7, 0.9)
No IPV (referent group)	4776	70.3%	5466	76.7%	1.0 Referent

† An intimate is defined as a current or former spouse, or live in boy or girlfriend.

‡ Majority (>90%) also report psychological IPV

* Adjusted for age, race, health insurance status, childhood physical and sexual abuse.

Legend for Table 1

IPV = Intimate Partner Violence

RR = Relative Risk

N= Number

Table 2. Demographic Correlates of Lifetime IPV Victimization among Women and Men

Characteristic Strata	Among Women		Among Men	
	# in strata	% IPV (N=2014)	# in strata	% IPV (N=1656)
Age	N	%	N	%
18-25 (Referent)	943	19.7%	1046	16.3%
26-35	1756	31.2%**	1846	23.0%**
36-45	1868	32.4%**	2033	27.3%**
46-55	1388	33.1%**	1392	25.6%**
56-65	835	25.9%**	805	18.6%
Race				
White (Referent)	5181	29.3%	5491	22.2%
African-American	657	33.0%	577	30.8%**
Hispanic	581	27.5%	557	23.9%
Asian	112	12.8%	146	11.8%**
Native American	67	38.2%*	79	41.2%**
Mixed Race	134	43.5%*	184	34.3%*
Refused	58	39.4%	88	40.0%
Education				
< High School Graduate	613	38.0%**	637	29.7%**
High School Graduate	2299	31.9%**	2209	25.1%**
Some College	2053	32.3%**	1942	26.1%**
College Graduate (ref)	1825	21.0%	2334	17.4%

Table 2. Demographic Correlates of Lifetime IPV Victimization among Women and Men
(continued)

Characteristic Strata	Among Women		Among Men	
	# in strata	% IPV (N=2014)	# in strata	% IPV (N=1656)
Current Marital Status	N	%	N	%
Divorced or Separated	954	70.8%**	762	60.1%**
Widowed	221	29.0%	52	40.4%**
Single	1175	19.3%**	1636	16.4%**
Married (Referent)	4440	23.6%	4672	19.4%
Health Insurance				
No insurance	1065	37.9%**	1021	31.5%**
Government	613	43.1%**	620	26.8%**
Private (Referent)	5052	26.6%	5382	21.5%
Don't Know/Refused	60	10.0%**	99	12.1%*
Household Income				
<\$20,000	1341	41.8%**	881	29.3%**
\$20,000-\$35,000	1147	33.7%**	1237	28.6%**
\$35,000-\$50,000	1134	26.7%**	1262	23.0%
\$50,000-\$80,000	997	26.4%*	1388	22.3%
>\$80,000 (Referent)	544	20.2%	864	20.8%
Refused	1627	23.3%	1490	17.4%

**Table 2. Demographic Correlates of Lifetime IPV Victimization among Women and Men
(continued)**

Characteristic Strata	Among Women		Among Men	
	# in strata	% IPV (N=2014)	# in strata	% IPV (N=1656)
Currently Employed (Ref)	4868	29.8%	6163	22.8%
Unemployed	1922	29.6%	959	26.5%*
Childhood physical abuse	1656	48.0%**	2488	33.9%**
No history (Referent)	5133	23.8%	4634	17.5%
Forced sex by a relative	302	55.6%**	42	40.5%**
No history (Referent)	6488	28.5%	7080	23.2%

** p value ≤ 0.01 ; * p value 0.01-0.05; Denoted correlate of increased IPV risk

Legend for Table 2

IPV = Intimate Partner Violence

N= Number

Ref = Referent group

Table 3. Lifetime Intimate Partner Violence by type (physical or psychological) and Current Perceived Health Status, among women ages 18-65

Health Outcomes	Adjusted* Relative Risk (& 95% CI)					
	IPV & Health Indicator			IPV & Health Indicator		
	Among Women (N=6790)			Among Men (N=7122)		
	Physical IPV†	Psychological IPV alone Power / Control	Verbal‡	Physical IPV†	Psychological IPV alone Power / Control	Verbal‡
Current	N=1193	N=469	N=352	N=421	N=484	N=751
Current Poor Health	2.0 (1.3, 2.9)	2.1 (1.4, 3.3)	1.5 (0.8, 2.8)	1.9 (1.0, 3.5)	2.2 (1.4, 3.4)	1.0 (0.6, 1.7)
Current Depressive symptoms	2.1 (1.8, 2.6)	2.0 (1.6, 2.6)	1.8 (1.3, 2.4)	1.9 (1.4, 2.6)	2.2 (1.7, 2.9)	1.6 (1.2, 2.0)
Heavy alcohol use	2.6 (1.6, 4.3)	2.9 (1.5, 5.8)	3.2 (1.6, 6.6)	1.4 (0.9, 2.0)	1.7 (1.2, 2.3)	1.6 (1.2, 2.1)
Tranquilizers	2.2 (1.7, 2.8)	1.9 (1.4, 2.7)	1.5 (1.0, 2.4)	1.8 (1.1, 2.9)	1.8 (1.2, 2.7)	1.6 (1.1, 2.3)
Pain killers	1.8 (1.5, 2.2)	1.8 (1.4, 2.3)	1.4 (1.0, 1.9)	1.7 (1.2, 2.3)	2.1 (1.6, 2.7)	1.4 (1.1, 1.8)
Antidepressants	2.5 (1.9, 3.2)	2.1 (1.5, 3.0)	1.8 (1.2, 2.8)	2.3 (1.3, 3.9)	1.8 (1.1, 2.9)	1.4 (0.9, 2.3)
Recreational drugs	1.4 (0.6, 2.2)	2.1 (1.3, 3.5)	0.5 (0.2, 1.3)	1.9 (1.2, 2.9)	2.6 (1.8, 3.7)	2.4 (1.7, 3.2)

Table 3. Lifetime Intimate Partner Violence by type (physical or psychological) and Current Perceived Health Status, among women ages 18-65, continued

Adjusted* Relative Risk (& 95% CI)						
IPV & Health Indicator						
Health Outcomes	Among Women (N=6790)			Among Men (N=7122)		
	Physical IPV†	Psychological IPV alone Power / Control		Physical IPV†	Psychological IPV alone Power / Control	
	N=1193	N=469	N=352	N=421	N=484	N=751
Development of a chronic health outcome						
Chronic disease	1.6 (1.3, 2.0)	1.1 (0.7, 1.6)	1.1 (0.7, 1.7)	1.5 (1.0, 2.3)	0.8 (0.6, 1.3)	0.8 (0.6, 1.1)
Chronic mental illness	3.3 (2.0, 5.3)	1.8 (0.9, 3.9)	1.9 (0.8, 4.6)	1.2 (0.4, 3.5)	2.8 (1.4, 5.5)	1.9 (1.0, 3.8)
Injury	2.8 (2.2, 3.7)	1.8 (1.3, 2.6)	1.6 (1.0, 2.5)	2.4 (1.7, 3.4)	1.8 (1.3, 2.5)	1.4 (1.0, 1.9)
Current Impact of health chronic health outcome						
Chronic Disease	3.1 (1.6, 6.0)	1.8 (0.7, 4.6)	1.6 (0.5, 5.3)	2.4 (0.9, 6.5)	3.0 (1.4, 6.3)	0.9 (0.3, 2.5)
Mental Illness	7.5 (2.8, 20.4)	4.2 (1.2, 15.2)	1.7 (0.2, 14.6)	3.1 (0.8, 11.9)	3.5 (1.1, 10.5)	1.6 (0.4, 6.0)

Legend for Table 3:

† Physical or sexual IPV; ‡ Psychological IPV without physical or sexual IPV

* Relative risk estimates adjusted for age, race, health insurance status, and childhood physical and sexual abuse

IPV = Intimate Partner Violence

RR = Relative Risk

CI = Confidence Interval

N = Number

Table 4. Severity of IPV by type (physical or psychological) and health outcomes by gender

	Women	Men
Physical Health		
Physical or Sexual IPV	Adjusted* Relative Risk (95% CI) for Current Poor Health	
High (>7)	1.4 (0.7, 2.7)	2.5 (0.9, 6.8)
Med (5-7)	1.0 (0.5, 2.0)	0.9 (0.3, 2.5)
Low (2-4)	1.0 (0.6, 1.8)	1.0 (0.3, 2.7)
Psychological IPV	Adjusted* * RR (95% CI) for Current Poor Health	
High (>7)	2.0 (1.4, 3.0)	2.6 (1.7, 4.1)
Med (4-7)	1.2 (0.7, 2.0)	1.0 (0.6, 1.8)
Low (2-3)	1.1 (0.7, 1.9)	1.8 (1.1, 2.8)
Physical or Sexual IPV	Adjusted* RR (95% CI) for Developing a Chronic Disease	
High (>7)	1.2 (0.7, 1.9)	2.2 (0.9, 5.6)
Med (5-7)	1.2 (0.8, 1.9)	2.1 (1.1, 3.8)
Low (2-4)	0.9 (0.6, 1.3)	1.5 (0.9, 2.6)
Psychological IPV	Adjusted** RR (95% CI) for Developing a Chronic Disease	
High (>7)	1.6 (1.2, 2.1)	0.9 (0.6, 1.2)
Med (4-7)	1.1 (0.8, 1.5)	1.0 (0.8, 1.4)
Low (2-3)	1.2 (0.9, 1.6)	1.0 (0.8, 1.4)

Table 4. Severity of IPV by type (physical or psychological) and health outcomes by gender (continued)

	Women	Men
Physical or Sexual IPV	Adjusted* RR (95% CI) for Injury	
High (>7)	1.7 (1.1, 2.7)	2.1 (1.1, 3.9)
Med (5-7)	1.2 (0.8, 1.8)	1.0 (0.5, 1.8)
Low (2-4)	1.2 (0.8, 1.7)	0.6 (0.3, 1.1)
Psychological IPV	Adjusted** RR (95% CI) for Injury	
High (>7)	2.5 (1.8, 3.3)	2.0 (1.5, 2.7)
Med (4-7)	1.1 (0.8, 1.7)	1.4 (1.0, 1.9)
Low (2-3)	1.4 (1.0, 2.0)	1.3 (0.9, 1.7)
Mental Health		
Physical or Sexual IPV	Adjusted* RR (95% CI) for Current Depressive Symptoms	
High (>7)	1.6 (1.1, 2.2)	1.9 (1.1, 3.2)
Med (5-7)	1.2 (0.8, 1.5)	0.8 (0.5, 1.2)
Low (2-4)	0.9 (0.7, 1.2)	1.2 (0.8, 1.8)
Psychological IPV	Adjusted** RR (95% CI) for Current Depressive Symptoms	
High (>7)	1.9 (1.6, 2.2)	1.8 (1.4, 2.2)
Med (4-7)	1.6 (1.3, 1.9)	1.6 (1.3, 1.9)
Low (2-3)	1.5 (1.2, 1.7)	1.3 (1.0, 1.5)

Legend for Table 4

* Relative risk estimates adjusted for age, race, health insurance status, childhood abuse, and psychological IPV score

** Relative risk estimates adjusted for age, race, health insurance status, childhood abuse, and physical IPV score

IPV = Intimate Partner Violence

RR = Relative Risk

CI = Confidence Interval