

Prevalence and Consequences of Intimate Partner Violence in Canada as Measured by the National Victimization Survey

Alexandra Lysova, PhD 

*School of Criminology, Simon Fraser University, Burnaby, Canada
Far Eastern Federal University, Vladivostok, Russia*

Eugene Emeka Dim, MA 

University of Toronto, Toronto, Canada

Donald Dutton, PhD

University of British Columbia, Vancouver, Canada

National victimization surveys that conceptualize intimate partner violence (IPV) as crime can contribute to a better understanding of the most severe forms of victimization in the intimate partner relationship. Based on the 2014 Canadian General Social Survey on Victimization, this study examined the prevalence of victimization resulted from physical and/or sexual IPV, controlling behaviors and also consequences of IPV for both men and women in a sample representative of the Canadian population. Given the paucity of research on male victims of IPV at the national population level, this article specifically discussed the experiences of men who reported violence perpetrated by their female intimate partners. Results showed that 2.9% of men and 1.7% of women reported experiencing physical and/or sexual IPV in their current relationships in the last 5 years. In addition, 35% of male and 34% of female victims of IPV experienced high controlling behaviors—the most severe type of abuse known as intimate terrorism. Moreover, 22% of male victims and 19% of female victims of IPV were found to have experienced severe physical violence along with high controlling behaviors. Although female victims significantly more often than male victims reported the injuries and short-term emotional effects of IPV (e.g., fear, depression, anger), there was no significant difference in the experience

of the most long-term effects of spousal trauma—posttraumatic stress disorder (PTSD)-related symptoms. This article argues that future research should explain the increased gap in reporting of the IPV victimization among men compared to women.

KEYWORDS: Canadian General Social Survey; intimate terrorism; PTSD-related effects of IPV; male victimization

INTRODUCTION

Intimate partner violence (IPV) remains a serious problem in Canada (Burczycka, 2016, 2017; Sinha, 2013) and many other countries in the world (Desmarais, Reeves, Nicholls, Telford, & Fiebert, 2012a, 2012b; World Health Organization, 2013). National surveys provide a distinct opportunity to measure prevalence and consequences of IPV using large representative samples. National victimization surveys framed as crime studies are particularly relevant for collecting information on the most serious types of intimate partner assaults compared to family conflict studies (Straus, 1999). Moreover, findings based on crime studies provide a realistic basis for programs designed to help the victims and prevent and stop specific types of IPV.

While IPV scholarship has traditionally focused on the experiences of female victims, it has recently shown increasing interest in examining men's victimization in intimate relationships (Carmo, Grams, & Magalhães, 2011; Hines, Brown, & Dunning, 2007; McCarrick, Davis-McCabe, & Hirst-Winthrop, 2016; Morgan & Wells, 2016). Criminological IPV-related research, however, appears to lag behind in exploring men's particular experiences of partner violence (Stanko & Hobdell, 1993). According to Walklate (2004, p. 77), "[M]uch victimological work implicitly leaves us with the impression that victims are not likely to be male. It renders female victimization visible and male victimization invisible."

The "gender paradigm" conceptualization of IPV (with the focus on violence against women; Dutton, 2010, 2011), men's hesitation to disclose vulnerability due to shame and strict norms of masculinity (Addis & Mahalik, 2003; Goodey, 1997; Stanko & Hobdell, 1993), and higher rates of injury and overall more severe consequences of IPV for women (Ellsberg, Jansen, Heise, Watts, & Garcia-Moreno, 2008; Tjaden & Thoennes, 2000) provide some explanation for the apparent invisibility of male victims of IPV in the criminological research. In addition, findings that come from studies based on clinical samples of battered women (Johnson, 2008) or surveys that focused on violence against women (Dobash, Dobash, Wilson, & Daly, 1992; Tjaden & Thoennes, 2000) create an impression that only a negligible number of men are abused by their intimate partners and, if abused, the negative effects of IPV are minor.

Studies based on general population surveys (Breiding, 2014; Straus & Gelles, 1990) as well as those from meta-analyses (Archer, 2000a; Desmarais et al., 2012a) have, however, suggested a similar prevalence of IPV among male and female victims. Contrary to the notion of men as unlikely victims of severe violence, especially

in the context of coercive control (Johnson, 2006; Johnson & Leone, 2005), men have been found to experience so-called “intimate terrorism (IT)” at a greater scale than was previously argued (Hines & Douglas, 2010; Jasinski, Blumenstein, & Morgan, 2014). In addition, men have been found to experience considerable negative effects from IPV, including anxiety and depression, serious injuries, and suicidal thoughts (Brooks, Martin, Broda, & Poudrier, 2017; Coker et al., 2002; Hines & Douglas, 2011; Randle & Graham, 2011). At the same time, male victims are typically less likely than female victims to look for help and report incidences of IPV victimization to the police (McCarrick et al., 2016). Although the current study examines victimization experiences of both male and female victims of IPV in a recent national victimization survey in Canada, it specifically discusses the experiences of IPV reported by men.

This study contributes to the IPV literature by drawing on a random sample of 33,000 Canadians surveyed in the 2014 Canadian General Social Survey on Victimization (hereafter, GSS). Quantitative studies on IPV in Canada tend to employ the 1999 or 2004 GSS data (Ansara & Hindin, 2010; Brownridge, 2009, 2010; Daigneault, Hebert, & McDuff, 2009; LaRoche, 2005; Romans, Forte, Cohen, Du Mont, & Hyman, 2007), as very little is known about the current realities of IPV, including comparative aspects of the experience of IPV by gender in Canada. Also, there is a paucity of national population-level research on the consequences of IPV with the focus on male victims in Canada. First, our study will determine the prevalence of male and female victimization from physical and sexual violence in the current partner relationships. Since nonphysical forms of coercion and controlling behavior can be particularly damaging for victims of IPV (e.g., Johnson, 2006; McFeely, Lombard, & Burman, 2013; Pence & Paymar, 1993), the study will examine the experiences of emotional and financial abuse against both partners. Given how essential the context of IPV is for differentiating between types of IPV (Johnson, 2008; Myhill, 2017), we will use controlling behavior for examining the different types of IPV experienced by male and female partners. Then we will examine both short- and long-term effects of physical IPV on men and women.

PREVIOUS RESEARCH

Prevalence of IPV Victimization

General population surveys of the incidence of domestic violence have found victimization rates reported by males to be similar to those reported by females (e.g., Archer, 2000a; Desmarais et al., 2012a). On the 1985 National Family Violence Survey (NFVS), Stets and Straus (1990) reported any violence victimization rates of 7.6% for men and 8.1% for women. Males and females reported initiating violence equally. The U.S. National Intimate Partner and Sexual Violence Survey (NISVS) found that the annual prevalence of physical IPV victimization was 4.0% among women compared to 4.7% among men. However, the annual prevalence of severe physical IPV victimization was higher for women than men (2.7% and 2.0% respectively; Breiding, 2014).

Crime victimization surveys, especially those that focus on violence against women tend to report that women are at significantly greater risk of IPV than men. The U.S. Bureau of Justice Statistics' National Crime Victimization Survey (NCVS), which focused on violence against women, estimated that the average annual rate of victimization by intimate partners was 9.3 per 1,000 women aged 12 or older and 1.4 per 1,000 men aged 12 or older (Bachman & Saltzman, 1995). The data from the U.S. National Violence Against Women Survey (NVAWS; Tjaden & Thoennes, 1998) showed that of 8,000 men and 8,000 women surveyed, 22.1% of women and 7.4% of men reported a physical assault by an intimate partner across the lifetime; 1.3% of women and 0.9% of men reported a physical assault by a partner in the previous 12 months. In the 2001 British Crime Survey, 4% of women and 2% of men reported being victims of nonsexual domestic threats or force in the 12 months prior to interview, while 21% of women and 10% of men reported experiencing IPV in their lifetime (Walby & Allen, 2004). This difference in gender rates on crime victimization and general population surveys seems to stem from the respondents' definition of assault as a crime. Straus (1999) found that incidence rates increased when the "crime filter" was removed from reporting criteria (which he ascribed to a "contextual message" that the respondents should only report assaults resulting in criminal actions). Also, the focus on "violence against women" may have prevented some men from revealing their experiences of victimization (Dutton & Nicholls, 2005).

Statistics Canada (2000) attempted to overcome the under-detection of IPV in earlier crime victim surveys. First, for the first time in 1999, Statistics Canada measured the prevalence of IPV in both men and women. Secondly, it did not "filter" or discourage male victims from reporting their victimization by presenting the survey as a study of victimization of women (as both NCVS and NVAWS did). Although the overall prevalence of both male and female victims of IPV in current and former relationships declined between 1999 and 2014 (i.e., from 7% to 4.2% for male victims and from 8% to 3.5% for female victims), the number of male victims of IPV was significantly higher than the number of female victims of IPV for the first time in 2014 (Bunge, 2000; Burczycka, 2016). At the same time, Statistics Canada does not provide a detailed breakdown of the percentages of male and female victims by specific behaviors of physical and sexual IPV, which limits our understanding of the most prevalent forms of IPV among male victims. The current study fills this gap. It also extends analyses to other forms of abuse, including controlling behaviors, and to consequences of IPV for both male and female victims.

Controlling Behaviors

Controlling behaviors emphasize the perpetrator's motivation rather than the impact such behaviors have on the victim. Controlling behaviors often include economic deprivation, jealous and possessive behavior, insults and name-calling, threats, and intimidation (Graham-Kevan, 2007). Studies on nonclinical samples found no differences in the overall use of controlling behaviors by men and women (Felson & Outlaw, 2007; Fitzpatrick, Salgado, Suvak, King, & King, 2004; Graham-Kevan & Archer,

2003; Stets, 1991; Straus, 2008). However, studies based on clinical samples often suggest that nonphysical controlling behaviors are experienced disproportionately by women at the hands of men (Myhill, 2015; Stark, 2007). Another study reported men and women used different types of controlling behavior. For example, Hamby and Sugarman (1999) found that men more frequently called their partners fat or ugly, destroyed partner's property, and made fun of their inability to do things. Women more frequently insulted and swore at their partners, stomped off during a disagreement, or shouted and yelled at them. Statistics Canada (2000) found that women were more likely to report being subjected to emotional, threatening, intimidating, and economic control. Also, the rates for isolating control were similar for men and women. In summation, no consistent sex differences in the overall use of controlling behavior have been found.

Context of IPV According to the Johnson's Typology

Johnson (2008) has argued that there were at least two distinct forms of IPV: "IT" and "situational couple violence (SCV)." These two types of relationship aggression differed mainly on the use of controlling behaviors. Perpetrators in the IT type attempt to dominate one's partner by using a wide range of power and control tactics, including violence. Partners in the SCV type, however, are not believed to use physical violence within a general control framework. Using cluster analysis, Johnson (2001) categorized relationships involving physical aggression and found clear gender differences; that is, IT is 97% male (3% of ITs are women) and SCV is only 56% male (45% are females). An analysis by Johnson and Leone (2000), based on the data from the NVAWS (Tjaden & Thoennes, 1998) using only women's reports, found a surprisingly high number of ITs, with 35% of husbands' violence being classified so. The same NVAWS data, analyzed by Jasinski et al. (2014), revealed nearly equal rates of male and female victims of IT (35% and 36% respectively). However, the effects of IT were more serious and had greater consequences for female than male victims of IPV. Drawing on the Canadian 1999 GSS data, LaRoche (2005) measured the prevalence of IPV according to the Johnson's typology and found that IT in the current relationships was prevalent among 26% of female victims and 19% of male victims.

Consequences of IPV

Research based on police and hospital records consistently shows that women are overwhelmingly the injured parties in domestic conflicts and report fear much more often than male victims (Ibrahim, 2016; Sinha, 2013). Population survey studies, however, provide mixed findings regarding the severity of consequences of IPV for male and female victims. Both genders reported physical and psychological consequences of IPV victimization in the 1985 U.S. National Survey (Stets & Straus, 1990), although these were more frequent for women. In his meta-analytic review, Archer (2000a) found only a 1/6 of a standard deviation difference for female versus male injuries from IPV. The U.S. NVAWS found that women who were physically assaulted by a partner were significantly more likely than their male counterparts to report that

they sustained an injury, received medical treatment, or were hospitalized (Tjaden & Thoennes, 2000). However, when the effects of physical violence were considered along with the effects of psychological IPV during their lifetime, both genders suffered long-term psychological consequences (depression, anxiety, substance abuse) from IPV victimization (Coker et al., 2002). NVAWS data also show that compared to nonvictims, male victims have poorer overall health (Pimlott-Kubiak & Cortina, 2003) and more functional disabilities (Carbone-López, Kruttschnitt, & Macmillan, 2006). Research shows that health problems for victims of severe IPV are much worse than for victims of minor IPV and that this is true of both women (Follingstad, Brennan, Hause, Polek, & Rutledge, 1991) and men (Hines, Brown, & Dunning, 2007; Hines & Douglas, 2016).

DATA AND METHODS

Data

The Canadian GSS (victimization) data of 2014 was employed for the analysis. Access to the 2014 GSS (victimization) data was granted by the Simon Fraser University Research Data Center (SFU-RDC). The 2014 GSS surveyed a random sample of 33,127 noninstitutionalized persons aged 15 years and older living in the 10 Canadian provinces. The survey employed a complex, multistage sampling design (Statistics Canada, 2016). Respondents completed in-depth telephone interviews concerning the nature and extent of their criminal victimization, including experiences of IPV. The interviewer from Statistics Canada introduced the study as a crime-related study that would help “better understand how safe people feel, what they think of the justice system and their experiences of crime” (Statistics Canada, 2015, p. 15). Although the initial framing of the IPV data collection was in the context of crime, the preamble to the section on physical and sexual IPV presented it as “the serious problem of violence in the home” (Statistics Canada, 2015, p. 122). Questions to measure emotional and financial abuse by spouse/partner were introduced as merely “. . . a list of statements that some people have used to describe their spouse/partner” (Statistics Canada, 2015, p. 118). Therefore, the design of the Canadian victimization survey helps reduce the demand characteristics that account for “the extremely low prevalence rate, the implausibly high injury rate, and the high ratio of male to female assault [perpetrations]” on the traditional crime studies (Straus, 1999, p. 8).

Because this study concerned IPV in heterosexual relationships and the sex of the intimate partner was identifiable only in the current relationships, we selected a subsample of respondents using the inclusion criteria, that is, heterosexual respondents who reported being in married/common-law relationships at the time of the survey. On GSS, only respondents who reported being in married/common-law relationships were asked questions about IPV within the 5 years preceding the interview. This brought the subsample down to about 44% of the total population (51% of men).¹ According to the rules for the release of data at the RDC, all the results must

be weighted. Consequently, unweighted results and the model N sizes are prohibited from being released from the RDC or published.²

Measures

Victimization. Physical violence was defined as behavior that threatens, attempts, or actually inflicts physical harm. The measurement of physical, including sexual, violence by Statistics Canada follows the revised version of the Conflict Tactics Scales (CTS2; Straus, Hamby, Boney-McCoy, & Sugarman, 1996). Physical (including sexual) violence was created by using 11 binary items (i.e., yes/no) that asked the respondents whether their spouses or partners: *Threatened to hit you with their fist? Threw anything at you that could have hurt you? Pushed/grabbed/shoved? Slapped? Kicked/bit/hit? Hit with something that could have hurt? Beaten? Choked? Used/threatened to use a gun/knife? Forced into any unwanted sexual activity? Forced into sexual activity/not able to consent?* The reliability of this scale using Cronbach's alpha was 0.78. If the respondent answered positively to at least one of the last seven items, the acts of physical violence were classified as "severe violence" (Johnson & Leone, 2005; LaRoche, 2005). Cronbach's alpha for severe physical violence scale was 0.63. Additionally, we measured the frequency of physical victimization. Respondents who disclosed at least one act of physical or sexual violence were asked whether their partner had been violent on more than one occasion in the past 5 years. A dichotomous variable was created for those who experienced violence once or more.

Controlling Behaviors. The emotional and financial abuse module included nine binary items (i.e., yes/no) assessing various forms of abuse and control. No timeframe was imposed for this module. For those reporting about a current partner, the items were worded in the present tense. Respondents were asked if their current partner perpetrated any of the following acts: *Tries to limit contact with family or friends? Puts you down/calls you names to make you feel bad? Jealousy/doesn't want you to talk to other men/women? Harms, or threatens to harm, someone close to you? Harms or threatens to harm pet(s)? Demands to know who you are with/where you are? Damages/destroys possessions or property?* The questions asked about economic control were: *Prevents you from having access to family income? Forces you to give money, possessions, or property?* All the respondents who answered "Yes" to at least one of these questions for emotional and financial abuse were coded as having experienced controlling behaviors, whereas those who answered "No" to all nine indicators were coded as having experienced no controlling behaviors. The reliability of this scale using Cronbach's alpha was estimated as 0.99. Consistent with previous studies (Jasinski et al., 2014; Johnson & Leone, 2005; LaRoche, 2005), respondents were divided into categories of "low control" and "high control," as respondents who answered "Yes" to two or less of the control questions were grouped into the "low control" category while those who answered "Yes" to three or more were categorized as "high control."

Consequences of Victimization. Respondents who reported at least one incident of victimization from physical or sexual violence in the past 5 years were asked detailed questions about the injuries, emotional consequences and long-term impact

of this violence. These items also had a binary response format (i.e., yes/no). To measure injuries, respondents were asked whether during incident/s they were ever physically injured in any way and received, for example, bruises, cuts, broken bones, or other types of injury. To measure emotional reaction *at the time* of the IPV incident/s (emotional impact module), respondents were asked whether they *felt angry; upset / confused / frustrated; hurt / disappointed; depressed / ashamed / low self-esteem; shock / disbelief; or fearful / victimized / afraid for children*. Finally, to measure the long-term impact of IPV (spousal trauma module), for the first time in the 2014 GSS, respondents were asked questions from the Primary Care posttraumatic stress disorder (PTSD) screening tool designed to assess the PTSD-related symptoms. Specifically, they were asked whether *in the past month* they had *nightmares about it or thought about it when they did not want to; felt numb or detached from others, activities, or their surroundings; tried hard not to think about it or went out of their way to avoid situations that reminded them of it; and felt constantly on guard, watchful, or easily startled*.

Analytic Techniques

To examine the prevalence and consequences of IPV and the help-seeking behavior by gender, we conducted descriptive analyses using cross-tabulations and unadjusted odds ratios (*ORs*). To ensure that the sample was representative of the Canadian population and to account for the complex sampling design of the 2014 GSS, the results in all analyses were weighted and bootstrapped using STATA 13 with the personal and bootstrap weights provided by Statistics Canada. Any estimates that were based on 10 or fewer responses were deemed unreliable and therefore were neither tested for statistically significant differences between groups nor presented in the tables. Logistic regression was used to generate *ORs*.

RESULTS

Characteristics of the Respondents

Men and women in the sample did not significantly differ on most of the sociodemographic and relationship variables. In other words, men and women were similar in age, race, education level, place of residence, years lived together, and presence of children in the household. The only difference between men and women in the sample was in relation to the personal income with three times as many men than women earning \$100,000 or more. At the same time, the household income did not significantly differ between men and women in the sample.

Prevalence of Physical and Sexual IPV

The study found that men were significantly more likely than women to report being victimized by a current heterosexual partner in the past 5 years. As Table 2 shows, 2.9% of the men and 1.7% of the women reported being physically and/or sexually

TABLE 1. Sociodemographic and Relationship Characteristics of Men and Women in the Subsample (44% of the Total Sample)

Sociodemographic and Relation- ship Variables	Female (49%)	Male (51%)	Chi- Square	<i>p</i>-Value
	Weighted (%)			
Age			91.6	.402
15–29	6.6	3.8		
30–44	29.9	28.0		
45–59	34.1	34.4		
60–74	23.1	25.3		
75+	6.4	8.6		
Race			2.16	.836
White	82.3	81.4		
Non-White	17.7	18.6		
Education			10.2	.887
High school	31.8	34.2		
College	35.6	33.9		
University	32.6	31.9		
Personal income			1091.1	<.001
Below \$40,000	59.9	33.0		
\$40,000–\$99,999	34.2	48.5		
Above \$100,000	5.9	18.5		
Household income			2.25	.970
Below \$40,000	10.2	10.3		
\$40,000–\$99,999	42.9	41.5		
Above \$100,000	46.9	48.2		
Place of residence			0.65	.886
Urban	83.3	83.8		
Rural	16.7	16.2		
Years lived together			9.05	.997
0–9	21.0	21.5		
10–19	22.2	23.0		
20–29	18.7	19.6		
30–39	17.7	16.5		
40–49	12.7	12.6		
50+	7.7	6.8		
Presence of children in the household			0.63	.896
None	47.0	46.4		
One or more	53.0	53.6		

assaulted, and 1.1% of the men and 0.5% of the women reported experiencing severe forms of IPV. Although none of the men reported being sexually assaulted in the current intimate relationships, men were more likely than women to report being slapped, kicked, bit, hit, threatened with battery, or that something dangerous was thrown at them. The odds of men reporting that they were physically assaulted were 1.7 times that of women ($\chi^2 = 12.7, p < .001$) and the odds of men reporting that they experienced severe physical assault were 2.1 times that of women ($\chi^2 = 9, p < .01$). In terms of the frequency of assaults among the victims, 40% of these respondents experienced more than two incidents of physical assaults within the past five years. However, the frequency of violence suffered at the hands of current partners did not differ significantly between male and female victims (42% and 39%, respectively, $\chi^2 = 0.17, p > .05$).

Prevalence of Controlling Behaviors

Table 3 reveals that men were significantly more likely than women to report being victims of at least one of the forms of controlling behaviors (10.1% and 6.8%

TABLE 2. Victims of Self-Reported Physical and Sexual Intimate Partner Violence in the Current Opposite Sex Relationships Within the Past 5 Years, by Sex, 2014

Type of Violence	Female	Male	Total	OR ^a	Chi-Square
	Weighted (%)				
Threatened to hit	0.8	1.6	1.2	1.9	9.46**
Threw anything	0.4	1.2	0.8	3.3	23.6***
Pushed, grabbed, shoved	1.2	1.2	1	0	1
Slapped	0.3	1.4	0.9	4.3	26.3***
Kicked/hit/bit	0.3	0.8	0.6	3.3	13.2***
Hit with object	0.2	0.3	0.3	1.9	2.2
Beat up/choked/use of or threat of use of gun/knife	0.2	0.2	0.2	1.2	0.1
Being forced into sexual activity/not able to consent	0.1	0	0.1		
Total physical/sexual IPV	1.7	2.9	2.3	1.7	12.7***
Severe physical IPV	0.5	1.1	0.8	2.1	9.0**

^aOdds ratio (OR) in this table refers to female as the reference category.
* $p < .05$. ** $p < .01$. *** $p < .001$.

respectively, $\chi^2 = 13.4$, $p < .001$). The odds of men reporting that they experienced being limited from contacting their family or friends by their female partners were 1.8 times that of women and the odds of having experienced acts of jealousy by their female partners (i.e., did not want the respondent to talk to other men or women) was 2.1 times that of women. Also, men were more likely to experience their female partners demanding their whereabouts than women (4.6% and 2.5% respectively, $\chi^2 = 28$, $p < .001$). Conversely, men were less likely to have their close ones or pets harmed or threatened by their female partners than women ($\chi^2 = 10.3$, $p < .01$) and were also less likely to be prevented access to the family income by their female partners than women ($\chi^2 = 6.6$, $p < .05$).

Victims of Low and High Controlling Behavior

The results in Table 4 show that about two-thirds of cases of IPV involving the current spouse/partner reported by both male and female victims in this sample could be classified as SCV and 35% as IT. This large percentage of IT victims and the

TABLE 3. Victims of Self-Reported Emotional and Financial Intimate Partner Abuse (Controlling Behaviors) Among Victims of Physical and Sexual Intimate Partner Violence in the Current Opposite Sex Relationships Within the Past 5 Years, by Sex, 2014

Variables	Female	Male	Total	OR ^a	Chi-Square
Weighted (%)					
Emotional IPV					
Limit contact	1.3	2.3	1.8	1.81	11.4**
Calls names	3.3	2.7	3.0	0.81	2.7
Jealousy	2.1	4.2	3.2	2.11	29.3***
Harms others and/or pets	0.6	0.2	0.4	0.29	10.3**
Demands whereabouts	2.5	4.6	3.6	1.88	28.0***
Damages your property	0.4	0.4	0.4	0.97	0.01
Financial IPV					
Prevents your access to family income	0.9	0.4	0.6	0.43	6.6*
Forces you to give money, possession, or property	0.3	0.3	0.3	0.82	0.2
Total emotional and financial IPV	6.8	10.1	8.5	1.54	13.4***

Odds ratio (OR) in this table refers to female as the reference category.

* $p < .05$. ** $p < .01$. *** $p < .001$.

TABLE 4. Type of Controlling Behavior Reported by the Victim of a Current Spouse/Partner, by Severity of Violence and Sex of Victim

Sex of Victim and Severity of Violence	Situational Couple Violence, %	Intimate Terrorism, %	Total %
Male	65	35	100
Minor violence	40	13	53
Severe violence	25	22	47
Female	66	34	100
Minor violence	50	15	65
Severe violence	16	19	35

similarity in the rates of male and female victims of IT (35% and 34% respectively) is consistent with findings based on the NVAWS (Jasinski et al., 2014; Johnson & Leone, 2000). Moreover, consistent with Johnson’s typology, physical violence embedded in a general pattern of control (IT) appears to be more associated with severe than with minor violence for both male and female victims. However, more men reported severe violence in the context of IT than women (22% and 19% respectively).

Short-Term and Long-Term Effects of IPV

Table 5 shows that male victims were significantly less likely than female victims to report physical injuries and short-term emotional impacts of IPV. At the same time, 12% of male victims had experienced physical injury resulting from a physical assault (compared to 27% of female victims of IPV). About one quarter of male victims reported that they felt angry and another quarter of men reported feeling upset, confused, and frustrated during the IPV incidents. About 11% of male victims felt hurt or disappointed at the time of the IPV incidents. About 6% of men felt victimized, fearful for themselves or for their children. Moreover, there were similar rates for several long-term effects of spousal trauma associated with the PTSD-related symptoms among both male and female victims. These effects include the feeling of numbness or detachment due to the IPV experience, avoidance of situation that reminds one of the IPV experience, and being on guard and easily startled due to the IPV experience. However, female victims of IPV were significantly more likely to experience nightmares or obsessive thoughts about IPV than male victims.

DISCUSSION

The data from this study revealed that men were significantly more likely than their female counterparts to report experiencing physical IPV by an intimate partner in a current relationship in the last 5 years. High rates of male victimization comparable with victimization rates of women have been detected in several other studies based on different samples and designs, including meta-analyses (Archer, 2000a; Desmarais

TABLE 5. Consequences of Intimate Partner Violence for Male and Female Victims

Type of Consequences	Female	Male	Total	OR ^a	Chi-Square
Weighted (%)					
Injuries					
Respondent was injured in any way in the past 5 years	27.2	12.3	17.8	0.38	7.5**
Emotional impact at the time of the IPV incidents					
Angry	36.8	24.1	28.7	0.54	3.5*
Upset, confused, frustrated	42.9	26.8	32.6	0.49	5.4*
Hurt or disappointed	26.2	10.5	16.1	0.33	6.81**
Depressed/ashamed/low self-esteem	20.8	8	12.6	0.33	4.36***
Shocked/disbelief	22.7	8.4	13.5	0.31	5.49*
Fearful, victimized and/or afraid for the children	30.4	6.1	14.8	0.15	12.5***
Spousal trauma (long-term effects of IPV)					
Had nightmares or thought about IPV when I did not want to	19.9	6.7	13.1	0.29	6.62*
Felt numb or detached from others/activities as a result of IPV	18.6	10.5	14.4	0.51	1.35
Avoid situations that reminded me of IPV	29	19.4	24.1	0.59	1.40
Constantly on guard, watchful and easily startled	14.7	15.7	15.2	1.1	0.02

^a Odds ratio (OR) in this table refers to female as the reference category.

* $p < .05$. ** $p < .01$. *** $p < .001$.

et al., 2012a; Jasinski et al., 2014; Straus, 2008; Whitaker, Haileyesus, Swahn, & Saltzman, 2007). Most of these studies examined IPV on the basis of current or previous relationship combined, while the current study focused on IPV experiences only in the current relationships, which can explain the somewhat different gender dynamics with higher rates of male victimization in our study (Ansara & Hindin, 2010).

Higher rates of male than female IPV victimization in the current large-scale population survey appear to be inconsistent with the information provided by the police-reported data on IPV-related offenses. That is, police statistics in Canada (and other countries) consistently show that women are much more likely to become victims of IPV-related offenses than men. In 2015, four out of five victims of IPV-related offenses in Canada were women (79%), representing about 72,000 female victims (compared to 19,000 male victims; Burczycka, 2016). Women were more likely than men to be reported as victims of intimate partner homicide, sexual assaults, criminal harassment, and uttering threats in the intimate relationship. This clearly indicates the severity of IPV against women.

At the same time, research studies suggest that men hardly report being abused to the police, even if they experience severe IPV (Douglas & Hines, 2011). According to the 2009 Canadian GSS data, female victims of IPV were three times more likely to report violent incidents to the police than male victims of IPV (Brennan, 2011). In 2014, 76% of male victims reported that the IPV had not been brought to the attention of police compared to 64% of female victims (Burczycka, 2016). Furthermore, male victims of IPV were more likely to mention that they were more dissatisfied with the response of the police to their abusive experience than female victims (Burczycka, 2016). The 2014 GSS also revealed that female victims of IPV were almost four times more likely than male victims of IPV to report having a restraining order enacted against their current or former spouse. These findings did not differ in any significant way from the 2009 GSS findings (Burczycka, 2016). Capaldi et al. (2009) found in a longitudinal study in Oregon, United States that mutually violent couples whose violence level increased on one occasion and who called police resulted in arrest of the male in 85% of cases, despite the records of prior violence by both parties.

Thus, the *chiffre noir* of crime is a major and persistent problem of the police data. Police statistics reflect only the crimes that came to the attention of the police, and these crimes are likely to be particularly serious. Victimization surveys capture many other assaults that did not come to the attention of police and thus provide a complementary aspect of IPV, especially with data on men's victimization experiences.

Another noteworthy finding of this study relates to the context of IPV experienced by male victims. This study is one of few that examined types of controlling behavior (i.e., low and high control) by severity of physical IPV for both female and male victims. Most of the previous studies examined the context of female victimization only and found that about 35% of female victims of IPV in the general population were victims of the most severe type of abuse known as IT (Johnson & Leone, 2000). Our study found that about the same number of male and female victims had experienced high controlling behavior in the context of IPV in Canada (35% and 34% respectively).

These findings are consistent with few other studies that examined the context of male victimization (Bates, Graham-Kevan, & Archer, 2014; Jasinski et al., 2014). The finding that needs to be examined in further studies is the large number of male victims (22%) compared to 19% of female victims who were found to have experienced severe physical violence along with high controlling behaviors. Although previous studies suggested that the effects of IT on male victims can be nearly as detrimental on female victims of IT (Hines & Douglas, 2010), IT represents a different phenomenon when it affects men (Jasinski et al., 2014).

Another important finding of the current study pertains to the long-term effects of IPV on male victims. Although female victims more often than male victims reported the injuries and short-term emotional effects of IPV (which is consistent with Archer, 2000a; Sillito, 2012; Stets & Straus, 1990; Straus & Gozjolko, 2014), most of the long-term effects of IPV associated with PTSD-related symptoms (e.g., feeling numb or detached from others and activities, avoiding situations that reminded the victims of IPV, being constantly on guard, watchful and easily startled) did not differ significantly between male and female victims of IPV. While there is some debate in the literature about gender effects in reactions to abuse, Coker et al. (2002), in an analysis of the U.S. NVAWS data, found similar negative physical and psychological effects of abuse victimization for both genders. Men's lower short-term emotional reactions to IPV may be due to gender differences in the perception of abuse (Jasinski et al., 2014) or to male socialization that dictate men to not look weak (Addis & Mahalik, 2003; Stanko & Hobdell, 1993) or disclose fear or anxiety (Brooks et al., 2017). Further research is required to ascertain and explore which mechanisms are at work. Overall, the findings of this study support the view that IPV is a serious problem for both male and female victims.

Limitations and Potentials for Future Research

Several limitations of this study must be borne in mind when extrapolating from the results. This study focused on the current spouse/partner relationships and previous studies suggest that the prevalence and dynamics of IPV can be different in both men and women's prior relationships (e.g., Ansara & Hindin, 2010). Also, Statistics Canada framed its survey in a crime context, which could suppress the incidence of reporting of abuse and produce high ratio of male to female assault perpetrations (Straus, 1999). However, these limitations of crime studies seem irrelevant for the Canadian GSS. As explained earlier, Statistics Canada attempted to overcome the under-detection of IPV in its crime victim surveys. Although the general frame of the survey focused on safety of Canadians and their experiences of crime, the specific questions about physical and sexual IPV were introduced as "serious problem of violence in the home" (Statistics Canada, 2015, p. 122). This framing may explain higher rates of IPV in current and previous relationships detected by GSS (i.e., 3.9% in 2014 and 6.2% in 2009, Burczycka, 2016) than expected in traditional crime studies (0.2%–2.0%, Straus, 1999). Also, crime studies typically produced a higher ratio of male to female assault perpetrations than family violence studies (Straus, 1999). However,

the current study found higher rates of IPV victimization for men than women. Therefore, the design that also includes the “family conflict” framework and the findings suggest that the Canadian victimization survey is not a typical crime study but rather a hybrid survey design study.

One of the limitations of the 2014 GSS is that the respondents were asked only about the IPV victimization experiences, so it was not possible to establish the extent to which IPV was bidirectional using this data. A growing body of IPV literature, however, suggests that bidirectionality is a characteristic of most couples that experience violence and that this mutual violence is associated with severe injuries to partners (Charles, Whitaker, Le, Swahn, & DiClemente, 2011; Dim & Ogunye, 2017; Madsen, Stith, Thomsen, & McCollum, 2012; Melander, Noel, & Tyler, 2010; Palmetto, Davidson, Breirbart, & Rickert, 2013; Whitaker et al., 2007). A meta-analysis of 25 peer-reviewed studies by Park and Kim (2017) revealed that there is a significant overlap between IPV victimization and perpetration. Thus, it is possible that the majority of male and female victims of IPV in this study were involved in perpetrating IPV as well. However, victims who were identified as experiencing IT were the least likely to be involved in bidirectional violence (Johnson, 2008; Johnson & Leone, 2005).

In addition, several claims have been made regarding the validity of the CTS, with which the 2014 GSS collected its data (Ackerman, 2016; Kimmel, 2002). For example, Ackerman (2016) claimed that the male participants were more likely to misinterpret the contents of the CTS, in that the event was an accident or was not taken seriously. However, these arguments about male “over use” of the CTS are contradicted by results of national surveys reported by Desmarais et al. (2012a, 2012b) which show that male self-reports of victimization are lower than female reports of perpetration. Specifically, summed across large-scale surveys, the average reported victimization rate by men was 18% but the average perpetration rate reported by women was 23%. Moreover, many other researchers have argued that the revised CTS2 properly accounts for the context of violence and separates incidents of play fighting and actual assault (Archer, 2000b; Felson, 2002; Jouriles & Kamata, 2016; Straus, 2016). Also, the use of a 5-year timeframe combined with the relative salience of IPV rendered recall bias unlikely to have contributed to underreporting IPV in the current study.

CONCLUSION

This study found a large number of men in Canada who suffered from IT and experienced long-term traumatic effects of IPV. The subject of addressing IPV, especially within the criminal justice system, requires an inclusive framework for both male and female victims. Addressing IPV should not be a zero-sum game, in which addressing male victims will deny female victims attention or resources. While this study drew attention to the problem of male IPV victimization, it did find women experienced higher chances of injuries from IPV that necessitates the continuing efforts to address violence against women in the relationships. Thus, the debate on IPV should be inclusive of both genders, which points to the nuanced nature and complexity of IPV (Hamel & Nicholls, 2007;). As our study suggests, we need to be considerate of

the experiences of male victims of IPV that can be both similar to and different from those of women.

NOTES

1. Respondents who were married or in common-law relationships involved about 46% of the total sample population. To include respondents only in heterosexual relationships, the variable was generated by combining respondents who self-identified as heterosexuals and mentioned to be living with an opposite sex partner or spouse. People who identified themselves as homosexual or bisexual were about 2%.
2. One of the weights allowed for the release of descriptive and bivariate data in the RDC is the “svy” weight through which the general population can be reflected in the results of the data. Researchers in the RDC are prohibited to reveal the unweighted N sizes because of the sensitivity of the reported information and the potential threat to data confidentiality.

REFERENCES

- Ackerman, J. M. (2016). Over-reporting intimate partner violence in Australian survey research. *British Journal of Criminology*, 56(4), 646–667. doi:10.1093/bjc/azv066
- Addis, M. E., & Mahalik, J. R. (2003). Men, masculinity, and the contexts of help seeking. *American Psychologist*, 58(1), 5–14. doi:10.1037/0003-066X.58.1.5
- Ansara, D. L., & Hindin, M. J. (2010). Exploring gender differences in the patterns of intimate partner violence in Canada: A latent class approach. *Journal of Epidemiology and Community Health*, 64(10), 849–854. doi:10.1136/jech.2009.095208
- Archer, J. (2000a). Sex differences in aggression between heterosexual partners: A meta-analytic review. *Psychological Bulletin*, 126(5), 651–680. doi:10.1037/0033-2909.126.5.651
- Archer, J. (2000b). Sex differences in partner aggression: A reply to Frieze (2000), O’Leary (2000) and White, Smith, Koss, and Figueredo (2000). *Psychological Bulletin*, 126(5), 697–702. doi:10.1037/0033-2909.126.5.697
- Bachman, R., & Saltzman, L. E. (1995). *National crime victimization survey. Violence against women: Estimates from the redesigned survey*. Washington, DC: Bureau of Justice Statistics Special Report, U.S. Department of Justice. (No. NCJ-154348).
- Bates, E., Graham-Kevan, N., & Archer, J. (2014). Testing predictions from the male control theory of men’s partner violence. *Aggressive Behaviour*, 40(1), 42–55. doi:10.1002/ab.21499
- Breiding, M. J. (2014). Prevalence and characteristics of sexual violence, stalking, and intimate partner violence victimization—National Intimate Partner and Sexual Violence Survey, United States, 2011. Morbidity and mortality weekly report. *Surveillance Summaries*, 63(8), 1–18.
- Brennan, S. (2011). Self-reported spousal violence, 2009. In P. Bunge & D. Locke (Eds.), *Family violence in Canada: A statistical profile* (pp. 8–19). Ottawa, Canada: Canadian Centre for Justice Statistics.
- Brooks, C., Martin, S., Broda, L., & Poudrier, J. (2017). “How many silences are there?” Men’s experience of victimization in intimate partner relationships. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*. doi:10.1177/0886260517719905. Advance online publication.

- Brownridge, D. A. (2009). Cohabitation, marriage, victimization and men's intimate partner violence. *The Open Criminology Journal*, 2, 10–17. doi:10.2174/1874917800902010010
- Brownridge, D. A. (2010). Does the situational couple violence–intimate terrorism typology explain cohabitators' high risk of intimate partner violence? *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 25(7), 1264–1283. doi:10.1177/0886260509340544
- Bunge, V. P. (2000). Spousal violence. In P. Bunge & D. Locke (Eds.), *Family violence in Canada: A statistical profile* (No. 85-224-XIE) (pp. 11–26). Ottawa, Canada: Canadian Centre for Justice Statistics.
- Burczycka, M. (2016). Section 1: Trends in self-reported spousal violence in Canada, 2014. In *Juristat, family violence in Canada: A statistical profile, 2014* (pp. 3–20). Retrieved from <https://www150.statcan.gc.ca/n1/pub/85-002-x/2016001/article/14303-eng.htm>
- Burczycka, M. (2017). Section 3: Police-reported intimate partner violence. In *Juristat, family violence in Canada: A statistical profile, 2015* (pp. 47–55). Retrieved from <https://www150.statcan.gc.ca/n1/pub/85-002-x/2016001/article/14303-eng.htm>
- Capaldi, D. M., Wu Shortt, J., Kim, H. K., Wilson, J., Crosby, L., & Tucci, S. (2009). Official incidents of domestic violence: Types, injury and associations with nonofficial couple aggression. *Violence and Victims*, 24(4), 502–519. doi:10.1891/0886-6708.24.4.502
- Carbone-López, K., Kruttschnitt, C., & Macmillan, R. (2006). Patterns of intimate partner violence and their associations with physical health, psychological distress, and substance use. *Public Health Reports*, 121(4), 382–392. doi:10.1177/003335490612100406
- Carmo, R., Grams, A., & Magalhães, T. (2011). Men as victims of intimate partner violence. *Journal of Forensic and Legal Medicine*, 18(8), 355–359. doi:10.1016/j.jflm.2011.07.006
- Charles, D., Whitaker, D. J., Le, B., Swahn, M., & DiClemente, R. J. (2011). Differences between perpetrators of bidirectional and unidirectional physical intimate partner violence. *Partner Abuse*, 2(3), 345–364. doi:10.1891/1946-6560.2.3.344
- Coker, A., Davis, K., Arias, I., Desai, S., Sanderson, M., Brandt, H., . . . Smith, P. (2002). Physical and mental health effects of intimate partner violence for men and women. *American Journal of Preventive Medicine*, 23(4), 260–268. doi:10.1016/S0749-3797(02)00514-7
- Daigneault, I. I., Hébert, M. M., & McDuff, P. P. (2009). Men's and women's childhood sexual abuse and victimization in adult partner relationships: A study of risk factors. *Child Abuse & Neglect*, 33(9), 638–647. doi:10.1016/j.chiabu.2009.04.003
- Desmarais, S. L., Reeves, K. A., Nicholls, T. L., Telford, R. P., & Fiebert, M. S. (2012a). Prevalence of physical violence in intimate relationships, part 1: Rates of male and female victimization. *Partner Abuse*, 3(2), 140–169. doi:10.1891/1946-6560.3.2.140
- Desmarais, S. L., Reeves, K. A., Nicholls, T. L., Telford, R. P., & Fiebert, M. S. (2012b). Prevalence of physical violence in intimate relationships, part 2: Rates of male and female perpetration. *Partner Abuse*, 3(2), 170–198.
- Dim, E. E., & Ogunye, O. (2017). Perpetration and experience of intimate partner violence among residents in Bariga local community development area, Lagos state, Nigeria. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*. doi:10.1177/0886260517737555. Advance online publication.

- Dobash, R. P., Dobash, R. E., Wilson, M., & Daly, M. (1992). Myth of sexual symmetry in marital violence. *Social Problems*, 39(1), 71–91. doi:10.2307/3096914
- Douglas, E. M., & Hines, D. A. (2011). The helpseeking experiences of men who sustain intimate partner violence: An overlooked population and implications for practice. *Journal of Family Violence*, 26(6), 473–485. doi:10.1007/s10896-011-9382-4
- Dutton, D. G. (2010). The gender paradigm and the architecture of anti-science. *Partner Abuse*, 1(1), 5–25. doi:10.1891/1946-6560.1.1.5
- Dutton, D. G. (2011a). *Rethinking domestic violence*. Vancouver, BC, Canada: UBC Press.
- Dutton, D. G. (2011b). The case against the role of gender in intimate partner violence. *Aggression and Violent Behaviour*, 17(1), 99–104. doi:10.1016/j.avb.2011.09.002
- Dutton, D. G., & Nicholls, T. L. (2005). The gender paradigm in domestic violence research and theory: Part 1—The conflict of theory and data. *Aggression and Violent Behaviour*, 10(6), 680–714. doi:10.1016/j.avb.2005.02.001
- Ellsberg, M., Jansen, H. A., Heise, L., Watts, C. H., & Garcia-Moreno, C. (2008). Intimate partner violence and women's physical and mental health in the WHO multi-country study on women's health and domestic violence: An observational study. *Lancet*, 371(9619), 1165–1172. doi:10.1016/S0140-6736(08)60522-X
- Felson, R. B. (2002). *Violence and gender reexamined*. Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.
- Felson, R. B., & Outlaw, M. C. (2007). The control motive and marital behaviour. *Violence and Victims*, 22(4), 387–407. doi:10.1891/088667007781553964
- Fitzpatrick, M. K., Salgado, D. M., Suvak, M. K., King, L. A., & King, D. W. (2004). Associations of gender and gender-role ideology with behavioural and attitudinal features of intimate partner aggression. *Psychology of Men & Masculinity*, 5(2), 91–102. doi:10.1037/1524-9220.5.2.91
- Follingstad, D. R., Brennan, A. F., Hause, E. S., Polek, D. S., & Rutledge, L. L. (1991). Factors moderating physical and psychological symptoms of battered women. *Journal of Family Violence*, 6(1), 81–95. doi:10.1007/BF00978527
- Goodey, J. (1997). Boys don't cry: Masculinities, fear of crime, and fearlessness. *The British Journal of Criminology*, 37(3), 401–418. doi:10.1093/oxfordjournals.bjc.a014177
- Graham-Kevan, N. (2007). Power and control in relationship aggression. In J. Hamel & T. Nicholls (Eds.), *Family interventions in domestic violence: A handbook of gender-inclusive theory and treatment* (pp. 87–108). New York, NY: Springer Publishing.
- Graham-Kevan, N., & Archer, J. (2003). Intimate terrorism and common couple violence: A test of Johnson's predictions in four British samples. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 18(11), 1247–1270. doi:10.1177/0886260503256656
- Hamby, S. L., & Sugarman, D. B. (1999). Acts of psychological aggression against a partner and their relation to physical assault and gender. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, 61(4), 959–970. doi:10.2307/354016
- Hamel, J., & Nicholls, T. L. (2007). *Family interventions in domestic violence*. New York, NY: Springer Publishing.
- Hines, D. A., Brown, J., & Dunning, E. (2007). Characteristics of callers to the domestic abuse helpline for men. *Journal of Family Violence*, 22(2), 63–72. doi:10.1007/s10896-006-9052-0
- Hines, D. A., & Douglas, E. M. (2010). A closer look at men who sustain intimate terrorism by women. *Partner Abuse*, 1(3), 286–313. doi:10.1891/1946-6560.1.3.286

- Hines, D. A., & Douglas, E. M. (2011). The reported availability of U.S. Domestic violence services to victims who vary by age, sexual orientation, and gender. *Partner Abuse*, 2(1), 3–30. doi:10.1891/1946-6560.2.1.3
- Hines, D. A., & Douglas, E. M. (2016). Relative influence of various forms of partner violence on the health of male victims: Study of a help seeking sample. *Psychology of Men & Masculinity*, 17(1), 3–16. doi:10.1037/a0038999
- Ibrahim, D. (2016). Section 3: Police-reported intimate partner violence. In *Juristat, family violence in Canada: A statistical profile, 2014* (p. 23). Retrieved from <https://www150.statcan.gc.ca/n1/pub/85-002-x/2016001/article/14303/03-eng.htm>
- Jasinski, J., Blumenstein, L., & Morgan, R. (2014). Testing Johnson's typology: Is there gender symmetry in intimate terrorism. *Violence and Victims*, 29(1), 73–88. doi:10.1891/0886-6708.VV-D-12-00146
- Johnson, M. P. (2001). Conflict and control: Symmetry and asymmetry in domestic violence. In A. Booth, A. C. Crouter, & M. Clements (Eds.), *Couples in conflict* (pp. 95–104). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Johnson, M. P. (2006). Conflict and control: Gender symmetry and asymmetry in domestic violence. *Violence Against Women*, 12(11), 1003–1018. doi:10.1177/1077801206293328
- Johnson, M. P. (2008). *A typology of domestic violence: Intimate terrorism, violent resistance and situational couple violence*. Boston, MA: Northwestern University Press.
- Johnson, M. P., & Leone, J. M. (2000). *The differential effects of patriarchal terrorism and common couple violence: Findings from the national violence against women survey*. Paper presented at the Tenth International Conference on Personal Relationships, Brisbane, Australia.
- Johnson, M. P., & Leone, J. M. (2005). The differential effects of intimate terrorism and situational couple violence: Findings from the national violence against women survey. *Journal of Family Issues*, 26(3), 322–349. doi:10.1177/0192513X04270345
- Jouriles, E. N., & Kamata, A. (2016). Advancing measurement of intimate partner violence. *Psychology of Violence*, 6(2), 347–351. doi:10.1037/vio0000014
- Kimmel, M. S. (2002). "Gender symmetry" in domestic violence: A substantive and methodological research review. *Violence Against Women*, 8(11), 1332–1363. doi:10.1177/107780102237407
- LaRoche, D. (2005). *Aspects of the context and consequences of domestic violence—situational couple and intimate terrorism in Canada in 1999*. Quebec, CA: Institut de la statistique du Quebec.
- Madsen, C., Stith, S. M., Thomsen, C., & McCollum, E. (2012). Violent couples seeking therapy: Bilateral and unilateral violence. *Partner Abuse*, 3(1), 43–58. doi:10.1891/1946-6560.3.1.43
- McCarrick, J., Davis-McCabe, C., & Hirst-Winthrop, S. (2016). Men's experiences of the criminal justice system following female perpetrated intimate partner violence. *Journal of Family Violence*, 31(2), 203–213. doi:10.1007/s10896-015-9749-z
- McFeely, C., Lombard, N., & Burman, M. (2013, August). *Domestic abuse and gender inequality: An overview of the current debate*. A briefing 69 presented at the Center for Research on Families and Relationships, University of Edinburgh
- Melander, L. A., Noel, H., & Tyler, K. A. (2010). Bidirectional, unidirectional, and non-violence: A comparison of the predictors among partnered young adults. *Violence and Victims*, 25(5), 617–630. doi:10.1891/0886-6708.25.5.617

- Morgan, W., & Wells, M. (2016). "It's deemed unmanly": Men's experiences of intimate partner violence (IPV). *The Journal of Forensic Psychiatry & Psychology*, 27(3), 404–418. doi:10.1080/14789949.2015.1127986
- Myhill, A. (2015). Measuring coercive control: What can we learn from national population surveys? *Violence Against Women*, 21(3), 355–375. doi:10.1177/1077801214568032
- Myhill, A. (2017). Measuring domestic violence: Context is everything. *Journal of Gender-Based Violence*, 1(1), 33–44. doi:10.1332/239868017X14896674831496
- Palmetto, N., Davidson, L., Breirbart, V., & Rickert, V. (2013). Predictors of physical intimate partner violence in the lives of young women: Victimization, perpetration, and bidirectional violence. *Violence and Victims*, 28(1), 103–121. doi:10.1891/0886-6708.28.1.103
- Park, S., & Kim, S. (2017). Who are the victims and who are the perpetrators in dating violence?: Sharing the role of victim and perpetrator. *Trauma, Violence, Abuse*. doi:10.1177/1524838017730648. Advance online publication.
- Pence, E., & Paymar, M. (1993). *Education groups for men who batter: The Duluth model*. New York, NY: Springer Publishing.
- Pimlott-Kubiak, S., & Cortina, L. M. (2003). Gender, victimization, and outcomes: Reconceptualizing risk. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology*, 71(3), 528–539. doi:10.1037/0022-006X.71.3.528
- Randle, A., & Graham, C. A. (2011). A review of the evidence on the effects of intimate partner violence on men. *Psychology of Men and Masculinity*, 12(2), 97–111. doi:10.1037/a0021944
- Romans, S., Forte, T., Cohen, M. M., Du Mont, J., & Hyman, I. (2007). Who is most at risk for intimate partner violence? A Canadian population-based study. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 12(12), 1495–1514. doi:10.1177/0886260507306566
- Sillito, C. (2012). Gendered physical and emotional health consequences of situational couple violence for heterosexual married and cohabiting couples. *Feminist Criminology*, 7(4), 255–281. doi:10.1177/1557085111431695
- Sinha, M. (2013). *Family violence in Canada: A statistical profile*, 2011. Retrieved from <http://www.statcan.gc.ca/pub/85-002-x/2013001/article/11805-eng.pdf>
- Stanko, E. A., & Hobdell, K. (1993). Assault on men: Masculinity and male victimization. *The British Journal of Criminology*, 33(3), 400–415. doi:10.1093/oxfordjournals.bjc.a048333
- Stark, E. (2007). *Coercive control: The entrapment of women in personal life*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press.
- Statistics Canada. (2000). *Family violence in Canada: A statistical profile*. Ottawa, Canada: Canadian Centre for Justice Statistics.
- Statistics Canada. (2015). *General social survey – 2014. Cycle 28 Canadians' safety and security (Victimization)*. Ottawa, Canada: Statistics Canada.
- Statistics Canada. (2016). *General social survey, 2014: Microdata user guide*. Ottawa, Canada: Statistics Canada.
- Stets, J. (1991). Psychological aggression in dating relationships: The role of interpersonal control. *Journal of Family Violence*, 6(1), 97–114. doi:10.1007/BF00978528
- Stets, J. E., & Straus, M. A. (1990). Gender differences in reporting of marital violence and its medical and psychological consequences. In M. A. Straus & R. J. Gelles (Eds.), *Physical violence in American families: Risk factors and adaptations to violence in 8,145 families* (pp. 151–166). New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction.

- Straus, M. A. (1990). Injury and frequency of assault and the “representative sample fallacy” in measuring wife beating and child abuse. In M. A. Straus & R. J. Gelles (Eds.), *Physical violence in American families: Risk factors and adaptations to violence in 8,145 families* (pp. 75–91). New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction.
- Straus, M. A. (1999). The controversy over domestic violence by women: A methodological, theoretical and sociology of science analysis. In X. Arriaga & S. Oskamp (Eds.) *Violence in intimate relationships* (pp. 17–44). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Straus, M. A. (2008). Dominance and symmetry in partner violence by male and female university students in 32 nations. *Children and Youth Services Review*, 30(3), 252–275. doi:10.1016/j.childyouth.2007.10.004
- Straus, M. A. (2016). Gender-violence, dyadic violence, and dyadic concordance types: A conceptual and methodological alternative to Hamby (2016) that incorporates both the gendered and dyadic interaction aspects of violence to enhance research and the safety of women. *Psychology of Violence*, 6(2), 336–346. doi:10.1037/a0039616
- Straus, M. A., & Gelles, R. J. (1990). *Physical violence in American families*. New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction.
- Straus, M. A., & Gozjolko, K. L. (2014). “Intimate terrorism” and gender differences in injury of dating partners by male and female university students. *Journal of Family Violence*, 29(1), 51–65. doi:10.1007/s10896-013-9560-7
- Straus, M. A., Hamby, S. L., Boney-McCoy, S., & Sugarman, D. B. (1996). The revised conflict tactics scales (CTS2) development and preliminary psychometric data. *Journal of Family Issues*, 17(3), 283–316.
- Tjaden, P., & Thoennes, N. (1998). *Prevalence, incidence, and consequences of violence against women: Findings from the national violence against women survey*. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Justice.
- Tjaden, P., & Thoennes, N. (2000). Prevalence and consequences of male-to-female and female-to-male intimate partner violence as measured by the national violence against women survey. *Violence Against Women*, 6(2), 142–161. doi:10.1177/10778010022181769
- Walby, S., & Allen, J. (2004). *Domestic violence, sexual assault and stalking: Findings from the British Crime Survey*. Retrieved from <http://nomsintranet.org.uk/roh/official-documents/HomeOfficeResearchStudy276.pdf>
- Walklate, S. L. (2004). *Gender, crime and criminal justice* (2nd ed.). Cullompton: William Publishing.
- Whitaker, D. J., Haileyesus, T., Swahn, M., & Saltzman, L. (2007). Differences in frequency of violence and reported injury between relationships with reciprocal and non-reciprocal intimate partner violence. *American Journal of Public Health*, 97(5), 941–947. doi:10.2105/AJPH.2005.079020
- World Health Organization. (2013). *Global and regional estimates of violence against women: prevalence and health effects of intimate partner violence and non-partner sexual violence*. Washington, DC: Author.

Disclosure. This research was supported by funds to the Canadian Research Data Centre Network (CRDCN) from the Social Science and Humanities research Council (SSHRC), the Canadian Institute for Health Research (CIHR), the Canadian Foundation for Innovation (CFI) and Statistics Canada. Although the research and

analysis are based on data from Statistics Canada, the opinions expressed do not represent the views of Statistics Canada or the Canadian Research Data Centre Network (CRDCN).

Correspondence regarding this article should be directed to Alexandra Lysova, Simon Fraser University, School of Criminology, 8888 University Drive, Burnaby, V5A1S6, BC, Canada.

Copyright of Partner Abuse is the property of Springer Publishing Company, Inc. and its content may not be copied or emailed to multiple sites or posted to a listserv without the copyright holder's express written permission. However, users may print, download, or email articles for individual use.