

Is It Coercive Controlling Violence? A Cross-Sectional Domestic Violence and Abuse Survey of Men Attending General Practice in England

Marianne Hester, Cassandra Jones, Emma Williamson, Eldin Fahmy, and Gene Feder
University of Bristol

Objective: Surveys that examine prevalence of domestic violence and abuse (DVA) without consideration of impact, severity or context have limitations. The article uses results from the first survey of a European clinical male population, the largest such study internationally, that measured a range of emotional, physical and sexual behaviors that could be construed as DVA, including experience and perpetration, and a range of impacts. The article asks to what extent the behavior reported by the men can be characterized as coercive controlling violence. **Method:** A survey was administered to male patients in 16 general practices (family medicine clinics) in England. Of 1,368 respondents who completed 4 screening questions regarding behavior consistent with DVA, 707 (52%) completed detailed questions on lifetime experience of possibly harmful emotional, physical and sexual behaviors, perpetration, and impacts, and if they had ever been in a domestically violent or abusive relationship. One-way analysis of variance was used to establish optimal thresholds across abuse and impact scales in order to ascertain severity of men's reported experiences. **Results:** More than half (52.5%; 95% confidence interval: 48.7% to 55.9%) the men reported experiencing potentially harmful physical, emotional or sexual behavior from a partner, however only 4.4% of the men experienced coercive controlling violence and of those nearly half also reported perpetration against their partner. **Conclusions:** Although a large minority of men presenting to general practice experience or perpetrate DVA behavior in relationships, only a small minority experience coercive controlling violence and only 1 in 40 have experienced such violence as victims only.

Keywords: domestic violence and abuse, coercive controlling violence, male victims and perpetrators, male patients, survey

Since the 1990s there has been extensive debate regarding the nature of domestic violence and abuse (DVA) as measured by general population and clinical surveys. Although research, policy, and practice concerning DVA has tended to focus on heterosexual women victimized by male partners, as the largest victim group (Britton, 2012), it is increasingly recognized that domestic abuse occurs across all population groups, including men (Hester et al., 2015; Britton, 2012). The question remains how men are affected, whether they may be affected differently to women, and how this may differ in heterosexual and same sex relationships (Donovan & Hester, 2014; Buller, Devries, Howard, & Bacchus, 2014). In this article, we focus on the findings from a large sample of heterosexual male patients in primary care in England, situating these within the wider literature on the epidemiology of DVA, and asking whether their

experiences of DVA can be characterized as coercive controlling violence.

It has become apparent that the nature of the DVA and those it affects may appear different depending on the samples used, types of violence asked about, and the extent to which consequences and effects are taken into account. The evidence tends to suggest that different populations—whether general population or agency (e.g., police, health, DVA agency) samples—provide different answers, with population surveys more likely to include individuals experiencing situational couple violence and agency samples more likely to involve the more harmful coercive controlling violence that constitutes “real domestic violence and abuse” (Johnson et al., 2014). Moreover, although questionnaire-based surveys tend to assume that participants interpret questions in similar ways, this is not necessarily the case (McCarty, Hester, & Donovan, 2008). Men and women have been found to answer differently: men tending to underreport their perpetration of violence and may overreport victimization (Hearn, 1996; Gadd et al., 2002). General population prevalence data may provide greater semblance of gender symmetry, with gender asymmetries more apparent if incidence and impact are also included (Myhill, 2015). Questions about incidence and impact are more likely to capture the ongoing and particularly harmful, fear-inducing elements that make up coercive controlling violence and abuse (Stark, 2007). The types of violence and abuse asked about also shape the forms of DVA identified. Focus on physical violence and aggression provides more gender symmetry (Archer, 2002), while including questions

This article was published Online First April 10, 2017.

Marianne Hester, Cassandra Jones, and Emma Williamson, Centre for Gender and Violence Research, School for Policy Studies, University of Bristol; Eldin Fahmy, Centre for Poverty and Social Justice, School for Policy Studies, University of Bristol; Gene Feder, Centre for Academic Primary Care, School of Social and Community Medicine, University of Bristol.

Correspondence concerning this article should be addressed to Marianne Hester, Centre for Gender and Violence Research, School for Policy Studies, University of Bristol, 8 Priory Road, Bristol BS8 1TZ, United Kingdom. E-mail: marianne.hester@bristol.ac.uk

about sexual violence and coercively controlling behaviors provides greater gender asymmetry, as these are more likely to be experienced by women from men and in the context of coercive controlling violence (Johnson, 2006; Graham-Kevan & Archer, 2003; Hamby, 2015).

The term *domestic violence and abuse* can mean many things, which in the context of intimate relationships may be characterized by a continuum from, at one end, “negative behavior” that involves one off-events and longer lasting situational couple violence, to the particularly harmful, inequality producing, liberty constraining, coercive controlling violence abuse at the other (Hester et al., 2015; Stark, 2007). Although any negative behavior in relationships should not be condoned, we nonetheless have to differentiate between these different forms of intimate partner behavior, as they require different types and levels of support and intervention. Coercive controlling violence requires particular attention to the safety of victims, including understanding of the effects of living in an ongoing context of fear (Stark, 2007; Williamson, 2010). In December 2015, legislation was enacted in England and Wales, regarding a new criminal offense of controlling or coercive behavior in intimate or familial relationships, as part of the *Serious Crime Act*, section 76. The new offense draws on Stark and Johnson’s work, and defines *coercive control* as “a purposeful pattern of behavior which takes place over time in order for one individual to exert power, control or coercion over another” (Home Office, 2015, p. 3). It includes any combination of physical, sexual or emotional DVA behaviors such as “assault, threats, humiliation and intimidation or other abuse that is used to harm, punish, or frighten their victim” (Home Office, 2015, p. 3). The offense involves behavior on the part of the perpetrator which must have had a “serious effect” on the victim, meaning that it has caused the victim to fear violence will be used against them on “at least two occasions,” or it has had a “substantial adverse effect on the victims’ day to day activities” (Home Office, 2015, p. 3). It is the only DVA-specific offense in England and Wales and useful for the purposes of this article because it defines what is deemed particularly severe, dangerous and harmful DVA.

As a means of differentiating between DVA behaviors, researchers have used the notion of severity, although attempting to assess this in a variety of ways. Most surveys use some form of act-based questions and scales, but how these are rated, combined, and analyzed will affect measures of severity. Severity may be assessed via the type of violence used, usually based on physical violence being rated as more severe, and/or using incidence to differentiate levels of severity (e.g., Statistics Canada, 2004). The Conflict Tactics Scale (CTS) provides a classic example of this, rating physical violence, physical injuries sustained and frequency of tactics used as indicators of severity (Straus, Gelles, & Steinmetz, 1980; Straus, 1999; and see Hamby, 2015). However, the CTS provides no consideration of the context, for instance no differentiation between a push and severe physical violence leading to hospitalization. Using physical injury as a key measure of severity also has particular limitations, as some of the most injurious violence involves women using weapons against their male partners in protection and/or self-defense (Johnson et al., 2014; Hester, 2013), and precludes impact of a wider range of potentially abusive behaviors. Qualitative interviews with female survivors have consistently shown that the psychological, emotional, coercive behaviors they experience have greater impact and

are more harmful long term than the physical violence (Glass, 1995), as also reflected in the English offense of coercive control. Moreover, frequency or incidence does not in and of itself indicate severity. Frequency may indicate what Stark called regular “fights” (Stark, 2007) rather than ongoing coercive control.

Some population surveys have attempted to move beyond these criticisms by including questions about what could be construed as coercively controlling behaviors (e.g., the U.S. National Violence Against Women survey [NVAW] and U.K. Crime Survey England and Wales [CSEW]). None the less, population surveys using CTS-type questions will almost inevitably overestimate what might be deemed “intentional harmful behavior.”

One of the most oft-quoted analysis of types of DVA in survey data, is that alluded to earlier, by Johnson and colleagues, providing distinctions between situational couple violence and coercive controlling violence. Johnson and Leone (2005) argued that it was possible to find both types of abuse in a nationally representative survey with a large sample, such as the U.S. NVAWS. More recently Johnson et al. (2014) reworked their analysis of the NVAWS survey using data on past, rather than current, intimate relationships to provide an operationalization of coercive controlling and situational couple violence, their rationale being that as current perpetrators fear exposure and victims fear retribution from their abuser, both groups are likely to be underrepresented in general population samples. This echoes other European studies, where individuals currently in relationships are less likely to report DVA than in relationships they have already left (Donovan and Hester, 2014; Hester et al., 2015; Nybergh, Taft, Enander, & Krantz, 2013).

In Johnson et al. (2014)’s reanalysis of the U.S. NVAWS, physical violence was assessed by responses to a 12-item version of the CTS with respondents categorised into “nonviolent” if they reported “no” on all of the items, and as “violent” if they reported “yes” (p. 193). Severity was assessed via a severe violence scale based on the items which they deemed to have been conventionally identified as severe violence. The Coercive Control Scale was constructed from a subset of nine survey items that dealt with nonviolent control tactics used by the respondent’s partner. Using cluster analysis involving the Coercive Control Scale with a threshold of five revealed two clusters: high control, which the authors equated with coercive controlling violence, and low control, which they equated with situational couple violence. Although confirming patterns in previous findings (Johnson, 2006, Graham-Kevan & Archer, 2003), the results were deemed more accurate, showing that 22% of women experienced coercive controlling violence from ex-husbands, whereas only 5.4% of men experienced coercive controlling violence from their ex-wives. Situational couple violence was perpetrated more equally by men and women (7.4% of ex-husbands, 3.9% of ex-wives). Coercive controlling violence was found to involve a wider variety of acts of violence, more frequent violence, and more injuries and psychological distress than situational couple violence. It should be noted, however, that impact data in the NVAWS was limited to physical injuries sustained in the most recent incident of partner violence.

In the United Kingdom, the CTS approach also underpins the CSEW where it is used in the interpersonal violence module to assess frequency of domestic violence. Despite limitations regarding impact, the CSEW interpersonal violence module includes questions that may reflect the impact of coercively controlling

behavior. Myhill (2015) reanalyzed the CSEW data using these questions to provide a measure of severity and typology of coercive controlling violence for intimate partners. Respondents were characterized as having experienced coercive control if they said their partner had both “Repeatedly belittled you to the extent that you felt worthless” and “frightened you, by threatening to hurt you or someone close to you” (p. 362), deemed to reflect abuse that was ongoing, denigrating, perceived as threatening, and had caused a degree of fear. By contrast, all other respondents who reported physical violence or acts of emotional or psychological abuse were classified as having experienced only situational violence. Myhill’s analysis involved the people who had experienced only one abusive relationship since the age of 16 ($n = 3,544$). Of these, about one in 20 men (6%, $n = 52$) who reported some form of DVA were found to experience what could be termed coercive controlling violence and nearly a third (30%, $n = 791$) of the DVA reported by women could be classified similarly (as compared to general prevalence figures from the 2008/2009 CSEW which estimated 24% of women and 12% of men had experienced non-sexual DVA). Experience of coercive controlling violence was found to involve more severe and more frequent physical violence, and was more likely to persist over time than situational violence. Myhill (2015) using past and current relationship data thus ends up with similar, albeit slightly higher, results regarding exposure to coercive controlling violence to those of Johnson et al. (2014) using past relationship data.

In the current study we used clinical, rather than general population, samples. Clinical samples, such as those in health, criminal justice, and DVA agency settings, generally show a higher degree of DVA experience than the general population (Ramsey, Dunne, Rose, Arsene, & Norman, 2009, Hamberger & Larsen, 2015). Although clinical studies have largely focused on female victim-survivors, increased prevalence also appears to be relevant for men in health settings (Hamberger & Larsen, 2015; Hester et al., 2015). A small number of studies of DVA have samples of male patients, but mostly in the United States and with a few European studies. A review by Randle and Graham (2011), mainly U.S.-based, found some evidence of male victims in agency samples subjected to life-threatening violence and fearing their female partner’s aggression and attempts at controlling their behaviors, but data on health settings was limited. A study of 712 men in the U.S. attending an emergency department, found 20% disclosed physical, sexual, or emotional abuse from a partner in the past year (Rhodes et al., 2009), but there were no attempts to assess severity or measure impacts beyond health-related associations. In England, a survey of female and male patients in four general practices (family medicine clinics) included responses from 178 men (Westmarland et al., 2004), finding 15% of men experiencing DVA behaviors over their lifetime (compared with 27% for women). A question about feeling frightened was used to elicit impact. Just over one in 10 of the men (11%) said that they had occasionally or often felt frightened because of the behavior of a partner or someone at home (as compared to 25% of women). However, the study did not otherwise assess severity of DVA behaviors. A Slovenian study looked at DVA experience of women and men in the past 5 years in a family health clinic (Selic et al., 2011). Of the men, 8.0% reported exposure to physical and psychological violence, compared to

20% of women. However, data on consequences were not included in the analysis and impact was therefore not assessed.

The PROVIDE Study

To overcome the problems associated with limited impact data in surveys, and to develop a more “realist” measure of severity, we devised the COHSAR survey and analysis in an earlier study (McCarry et al., 2008; Hester, Donovan, & Fahmy, 2010). Like Myhill (2015) we were concerned to reflect the lived experience of victim-survivors in the construction of survey questions. The COHSAR has good internal consistency reliability, and has been used in health care settings, although it has not been tested against other measures. In the current study (the PROVIDE study), we applied the COHSAR approach to a sample of male patients in order to ask:

- To what extent can the intimate relationship behavior reported by the men be characterized as behavior commensurate with coercive controlling violence?

Method

The study used a cross-sectional survey approach with male patients in the waiting rooms of general practices in England.

Sample and Data Collection

A stratified random sample of general practices in south west England was used to reflect the profile of practice populations in England in respect of the proportion of patients from ethnic minorities (postcode level census data), levels of deprivation (index of multiple deprivation), and population density (city, town, village; see Hester et al., 2015, for more details). From September 2010 to June 2011 members of the research team administered a paper questionnaire to unaccompanied male patients in the waiting rooms of 16 clinics. Only those 18 years or older and able to read English were included, and men were not approached if they were unwell or appeared distressed. A total of 1,368 heterosexual men answered the questionnaire, of whom 707 answered the detailed questions on experience and perpetration of DVA behavior reported in this paper. Of 371 who reported experiencing one or more DVA behaviors, 219 also answered questions regarding impact of those behaviors. The attrition in responses (1,368 to 707, and 371 to 219) appears to be largely due to participants not having the time to complete the questionnaire before being called in to their appointment with a clinician.

Questionnaire

The questionnaire had two main sections, with questions of particular relevance for this article as follows. Part 1 included questions on demographic characteristics consistent with CSEW (age in years, ethnicity, income, education and housing status; Osborne, 2011), four “screening” questions about experience of behaviors that might be construed as DVA (Hester et al., 2015), and participants were asked if they were currently or had been in a relationship that could be described as “domestically violent or abusive.” Part 2 elicited more detailed questions about experience of potentially harmful physical, emo-

Table 1
Respondents Sociodemographics

Sociodemographics	Participants (<i>N</i> = 707)		
	<i>n</i>	%	95% Confidence interval
Mean age (<i>SD</i>), range, <i>n</i>	47.6 (17.8), 18–90, 688		
White	661	96.0%	(94.5%, 97.4%)
Mixed	8	1.1%	(.4%, 2.0%)
Asian or Asian British	9	1.3%	(.6%, 2.2%)
Black or Black British	8	1.3%	(.4%, 2.1%)
Chinese or other	2	.3%	(–.1%, .8%)
Currently has partner	584	83.3%	(80.4%, 86.1%)
Currently has no partner	117	16.7%	(13.9%, 19.6%)
Lives with this partner	499	85.7%	(82.9%, 88.4%)
Does not live with this partner	83	14.3%	(11.6%, 17.1%)
Is a parent	382	65.9%	(62.1%, 69.7%)
Is not a parent	198	34.1%	(30.3%, 37.9%)
Up to £10,000	146	25.2%	(21.7%, 28.9%)
£11,000–20,000	171	29.5%	(25.9%, 33.2%)
£21,000–30,000	128	22.1%	(18.8%, 25.0%)
£31,000–40,000	66	11.4%	(8.9%, 13.9%)
£41,000–50,000	40	6.9%	(5.0%, 9.1%)
£51,000–60,000	13	2.2%	(1.2%, 3.6%)
More than £60,000	16	2.8%	(1.5%, 4.1%)
No education	76	11.1%	(8.7%, 13.7%)
GCSE/O level (age 16 exam)	111	16.3%	(13.4%, 19.1%)
A level (age 18 exam)	119	17.4%	(14.7%, 20.2%)
NVQ (technical exam)	71	10.4%	(8.1%, 12.9%)
Professional qualification	121	17.7%	(14.6%, 20.5%)
Undergraduate degree	116	17.0%	(14.4%, 19.8%)
Postgraduate degree	68	10.0%	(7.8%, 12.4%)
Private owned	405	59.4%	(56.0%, 63.0%)
Private rented	164	24.0%	(20.9%, 27.1%)
Council housing	76	11.1%	(8.8%, 13.6%)
Other	37	5.4%	(3.8%, 7.2%)

Note. GCSE/O = General Certificate of Secondary Education/O; A level = Advanced level; NVQ = National Vocational Qualifications.

tional and sexual behaviors (multiresponse with 47 questions—see Table 2) and their perceived impacts (multiresponse with 25 questions—see Table 3) based largely on the COHSAR measure (Williamson et al., 2014). The questionnaire booklet included a detachable information sheet with contact details of support services and national help lines.

Analysis—Identifying Coercive Controlling Violence

Data were entered into an Access database and cleaned, then imported to an SPSS database for analysis in the current paper. Only individuals who responded to all four screening questions in Part 1, who were heterosexual and who also answered all the abuse and impact questions in Part 2 regarding intimate partner DVA were included in the subsample for this paper (707 of 1368). Exposure was calculated and Pearson's chi-square with continuity correction was used to differentiate between sociodemographic groups and experience of DVA behavior.

A particular strength of the COHSAR research is the possibility for exploring the intersection of DVA behaviors and impact that the approach provides. Thus, it is possible to begin to statistically differentiate between experiences that constitute coercive controlling violence on the one hand, and those apparent DVA behavior experiences without the harmful impact that coercive controlling violence and abuse involves, on the other. Given that coercive controlling violence

is a pattern of behavior over time, we set out with the assumption that where individuals experience higher levels of DVA behavior from a partner, this may be assumed to be associated with a greater impact upon respondents. By combining statistically both DVA behaviors and impact in the earlier COHSAR study, this association was indeed found to be the case, reflected in the relationship between the frequency of incidents of DVA and their impact on respondents' lives (Hester et al., 2010). This analytical approach was replicated in the current paper.

Because the frequency of incidents and impacts of DVA can be assumed to be theoretically interdependent (coercive controlling violence involves behavior over time and harmful impact), establishing the optimal threshold for any set of impacts and DVA items was achieved by maximizing the statistical "fit" between these scales using one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA). This is represented graphically in the results section below, plotting values for the impact and DVA scales at any unspecified point in the respondents' lives. Through ANOVA we identified the optimal fit between these two variables, resulting in four distinct groups with high or low experience of DVA behaviors reported and high or low impact. This was carried out using a combined emotional, physical and sexual abuse scale, as we have previously found that a combined scale is more effective in targeting the more extreme end of the DVA

Table 2
Experience of Emotional, Physical and Sexual Domestic Violence and Abuse Behaviors

Behavior	<i>n</i> = 707	%	95% Confidence interval
Emotional			
Isolated you from friends or relatives	103	14.6	(12.2 to 17.4)
Been jealous or accused you of cheating	175	24.8	(21.6 to 27.7)
Regularly insulted or put you down	130	18.4	(15.7 to 21.4)
Controlled your spending	128	18.1	(15.5 to 20.9)
Told what to do or who to see	129	18.2	(15.4 to 21.2)
Used your age against you	41	5.8	(4.1 to 7.6)
Used your education against you	29	4.1	(2.7 to 5.6)
Used your religion against you	16	2.3	(1.3 to 3.4)
Used your disability against you	24	3.4	(2.1 to 4.7)
Used your race against you	10	1.4	(.6 to 2.2)
Used your sexuality against you	14	2.0	(1.0 to 3.1)
Damaged or burned your possessions	30	4.2	(2.9 to 5.8)
Abused your pet	6	.8	(.3 to 1.5)
Made you do most of the housework	65	9.2	(7.0 to 11.1)
Threatened to harm someone close to you	18	2.5	(1.4 to 3.7)
Made or sent pestering or threatening messages, such as phone calls, texts, emails or Facebook	44	6.2	(4.4 to 8.0)
Blamed you for their use of alcohol or drugs	31	4.4	(2.9 to 5.9)
Blamed you for their self-harm or suicide attempt	18	2.5	(1.4 to 3.8)
Frightened you by things they say or do	94	13.3	(11.0 to 16.0)
Withheld your medicines	4	.6	(.1 to 1.2)
Driven too fast while you are in the car	62	8.8	(6.7 to 10.8)
Drink-driving while you are in the car	16	2.3	(1.3 to 3.5)
Stopped you from working	38	5.4	(3.7 to 7.0)
Any form of emotional violence	347	50.9	(47.2 to 54.7)
Physical			
Slapped, pushed or shoved you	82	11.6	(9.2 to 14.2)
Kicked or punched you	50	7.1	(5.2 to 8.9)
Beaten you up	13	1.8	(.9 to 2.9)
Burned you	4	.6	(.1 to 1.1)
Bitten you	23	3.3	(2.0 to 4.5)
Restrained, held down or tied you up	11	1.6	(.7 to 2.5)
Choked, strangled or suffocated you	6	.8	(.3 to 1.6)
Physically threatened you	35	5.0	(3.4 to 6.7)
Hit you with an object or weapon	36	5.1	(3.6 to 6.8)
Threatened you with an object or weapon	34	4.8	(3.3 to 6.5)
Prevented you from getting help for injuries	4	.6	(.1 to 1.2)
Stalked or followed you	21	3.0	(1.8 to 4.3)
Locked you in house or room	7	1.0	(.4 to 1.8)
Threatened to kill you	17	2.4	(1.4 to 3.6)
Any form of physical abuse	103	14.6	(12.1 to 17.1)
Sexual			
Touched you in a way that caused fear, alarm or distress	6	.8	(.3 to 1.6)
Forced you into sexual activity	10	1.4	(.7 to 2.4)
Hurt you during sex (without your consent)	4	.6	(.1 to 1.2)
Refused your request for safer sex (i.e. use a condom)	12	1.7	(.7 to 2.8)
Disrespected your safe words or boundaries	7	1.0	(.4 to 1.9)
Sexually assaulted or abused you in any way	4	.6	(.4 to 1.9)
Threatened to sexually assault or abuse you	2	.3	(.0 to .8)
Raped you	5	.7	(.1 to 1.4)
Forced you to look at pornography	6	.8	(.3 to 1.6)
How often have you had sex with your partner for the sake of peace or a quiet life?	33	4.7	(3.2 to 6.5)
Any form of sexual abuse	49	6.9	(5.1 to 8.9)

spectrum, and thus more likely to identify coercive controlling violence (Hester et al., 2010, 2015). Respondents were consequently deemed to have experienced coercive controlling violence if they reported both high levels of DVA experience and reported that this had a significant impact upon their lives.

To determine reliability of the items relating to DVA experiences both separate and combined scales were developed. Three separate scales relating to emotional, physical, and sexual abuse

were created, as well as a combined scale including the three items. An impact scale with 25 of the 27 impact items was also created (leaving out two “positive” items: “didn’t have an impact,” “made you feel loved/wanted”). All scales were found to be reliable as follows:

- Emotional abuse—These items can be reliably scaled ($\alpha = .84$) producing a 23-item scale with achieved values between 0 and 16.

Table 3
Impact of Domestic Violence and Abuse Behaviours

Behavior	N	%	95% Confidence interval
Lost respect for your partner	36/157	22.9	(17.1 to 29.2)
Emotional or sleeping problems, or depression	36/157	22.9	(16.2 to 29.4)
Stopped trusting people	18/157	11.5	(6.6 to 16.3)
Stopped trusting partner	34/157	21.7	(15.3 to 28.7)
Felt worthless or lost confidence	33/157	21.0	(14.9 to 27.4)
Felt anxious, panicked or lost concentration	34/158	21.5	(15.2 to 27.5)
Felt isolated or stopped going out	17/157	10.8	(6.1 to 16.0)
Self-harmed or felt suicidal	9/157	5.7	(2.4 to 9.6)
Retaliated by shouting at your partner	38/157	24.2	(17.9 to 31.1)
Affected sexual side of your relationship	42/157	26.8	(20.0 to 33.3)
You worked harder to stop making mistakes	24/157	15.3	(9.9 to 20.6)
Made you want to leave your partner	34/157	49.3	(37.7 to 61.4)
Felt unable to cope	24/157	15.3	(9.7 to 21.0)
Felt sad	51/157	32.5	(25.3 to 40.0)
Felt embarrassed or stupid	21/157	30.4	(20.0 to 41.5)
Felt angry or shocked	34/157	21.7	(15.6 to 28.1)
Felt worried your partner might leave you	23/157	14.6	(9.3 to 20.9)
Feared for your life	7/157	4.5	(1.7 to 7.9)
Worked harder to make partner happy	33/157	21.0	(15.1 to 28.0)
Felt you had to watch what you say or do	44/157	28.0	(21.1 to 35.1)
Negatively affected your children or your relationship with your children	15/158	9.5	(5.1 to 14.4)
Defended yourself, your property, children or pets	14/157	8.9	(4.7 to 13.7)
Retaliated by hitting your partner	9/157	5.7	(2.6 to 9.7)
Lost contact with your children	4/157	2.5	(.6 to 5.1)
Injuries that required medical treatment	16/129	12.4	(7.0 to 17.7)

- Physical behavior—These items can be reliably scaled ($\alpha = .89$) producing a 14-items scale with achieved values between 0 and 13.
- Sexual behavior—These items can be reliably scaled ($\alpha = .81$) producing a 10-item scale with achieved values between 0 and 9.
- Combined behavior—These items can be reliably scaled ($\alpha = .92$) producing a 47-item scale with achieved values between 0 and 34.
- Combined impact—These items can be reliably scaled ($\alpha = .92$) producing a 25-item scale with achieved values between 0 and 23.

Results

Demographic Characteristics

Of 2,431 men in the general practices who were eligible and invited to complete the survey, 1,368 (56%) completed the Part 1 questions and of these 707 (52%) answered the questions in Part 2 relevant to this article. Participants were aged between 19 and 90 years of age, mostly between 45–64 or 25–44 years, with a sizable minority over 65 (see Table 1). The vast majority had an intimate partner and lived with them. Most were employed with an income of £30,000 or less. More than half were educated to at least A level (the exam required for university entrance) and toward two thirds owned their own property.

Experience of DVA Behavior From an Intimate Partner

Experience of potentially harmful emotional behaviors was reported to be more widespread than physical and sexual behaviors, with just over half (50.9%; 95% confidence interval CI [47.2 to 54.7]) reporting any such emotional, 14.6% (95% CI [12.1 to 17.1]) reporting any such physical, and 6.9% (95% CI [5.1 to 8.9]) reporting any such sexual behavior at some time (see Table 2). A quarter (24.8%; 95% CI [21.6 to 27.7]) of men reported their partners had “been jealous or accused them of cheating,” more than one in 10 (11.6%; 95% CI [9.2 to 14.2]) had been “slapped, pushed or shoved,” and about one in 20 (4.7%; 95% CI [3.2 to 6.5]) had had “sex for the sake of a quiet life.”

Using Pearson’s chi-square with continuity correction, marked social differences in experiences of DVA behavior were evident in relation to men’s age group, self-reported income band, and employment (for those under the age of 65). Experience of any type of potentially harmful emotional behaviors across the lifetime were significantly more frequent for men who were younger (18 to 24; 25 to 44 years), but also more highly educated (degree level and above). Experiencing any type of potentially harmful physical behaviors were significantly more frequent across the lifetime among the young (25 to 44 years) and unemployed men under the age of 65, and experiencing any type of negative sexual behavior was significantly more frequent across the lifetime for the younger age groups (25 to 44 years) in particular.

Fifty-nine (8.5%; 95% CI [6.4 to 10.5]) of the 697 men who answered the question whether they had ever been in a DVA relationship, reported that they had. For these men, younger age (25 to 44 years) was again a significant predictor associated with higher scores on the emotional DVA scale and combined DVA scale, using Spearman's rank.

Perceived Impact

Of the 219 men who completed the impact items (see Table 3), 115 reported they did not experience any of the items on the impact scale (52.5%; 95% CI [45.9 to 59.4]). Sixty-nine out of 160 who answered the impact query "Did not have an impact" reported no impact from their experiences of potentially harmful emotional, physical or sexual behaviors. Most of those who reported an impact felt sad as a result of their experience (32.5%; 95% CI [25.3 to 40.0]), felt they had to watch what they said or did (28.0%; 95% CI [21.1 to 35.1]), or it affected the sexual side of their relationship (26.8%; 95% CI [20.0 to 33.3]).

In relation to the individual items the impact over their lifetime was significantly more prevalent among younger men, those without degree-level education and those on low incomes.

Incidence, Impact, and Coercive Controlling Violence

As indicated earlier, in our research it was possible to test whether the relationship between the frequency of behaviors and their impact on respondents' lives reflected the assumption that higher levels of abuse should be associated with a greater impact upon respondents (Walby & Allen, 2004). Overall, the empirical (Spearman's rank) correlation between scores on the impact scales and DVA scales relating to the lifetime period supported this

assertion with strong correlations evident between impact and the combined behavior scale (.47, $p < .001$). Using one-way ANOVA to maximize the statistical 'fit' between the impact and combined behavior scales resulted in a threshold for behavior items of 8 on the y-axis and 6 for impact on the x-axis. This can be represented graphically, as illustrated by Figure 1.

Out of the 707 men, 371 (52.5%; 95% CI [48.7 to 55.9]) men experienced at least one form of DVA behavior during their lifetime. Of the 371 men, 250 (67.4%; 95% CI [62.5 to 72.1]) experienced potentially harmful emotional behaviors only; 62 such emotional and physical behaviors (16.7%; 95% CI [12.9 to 20.4]); 31 (8.4%; 95% CI [5.8 to 11.4]) such emotional, physical, and sexual behaviors; 17 (4.6%; 95% CI [2.6 to 6.8]) such emotional and physical behaviors; 10 (2.7%; 95% CI [1.1 to 4.3]) only such physical behaviors; and one (0.3%; 95% CI [0.0 to 0.8]) only such sexual behavior.

Of the 219 men who answered the impact questions, 31 can be classified as experiencing high abuse and high impact (14.2%; 95% CI [9.7 to 19.0]); 17 as experiencing low abuse and high impact (7.8%; 95% CI [4.3 to 11.5]); 29 as experiencing high abuse and low impact (13.2%; 95% CI [8.8 to 18.2]); and the largest proportion, 142 as experiencing low abuse and low impact (64.8%; 95% CI [58.6 to 71.6]; see Table 4). Given the general assumption that experiencing high abuse and high impact are commensurate with coercive controlling violence, the 31 men can thus be classified as experiencing such DVA. This is 4.4% of the entire sample of 707 men. This group of men experienced combinations of mainly emotional and physical behaviors that might be harmful or combinations of such emotional, physical and sexual behaviors.




Figure 1. Analysis of domestic violence and abuse and impact. See the online article for the color version of this figure.

Table 4
 Thresholds by Experienced Emotional, Physical, and Sexual DVA Behavior

Behavior	High abuse, high impact			High abuse, low impact			Low abuse, high impact			Low abuse, low impact			Self-defined		
	n	%	95% CI	n	%	95% CI	n	%	95% CI	n	%	95% CI	n	%	95% CI
Emotional only	1	3.2	(.6 to 16.2)	3	10.3	(3.6 to 26.4)	8	53.3	(30.1 to 75.2)	80	70.2	(61.2 to 77.8)	10	19.6	(11.0 to 32.5)
Physical only	0	0	—	0	0	—	0	0	—	5	4.4	(1.9 to 9.9)	1	2.0	(.4 to 10.3)
Sexual only	0	0	—	0	0	—	0	0	—	0	0	—	0	0	—
Emotional and physical	12	38.7	(23.7 to 56.2)	14	48.3	(31.4 to 65.6)	3	20.0	(7.0 to 45.2)	18	15.8	(10.2 to 23.6)	21	41.2	(28.8 to 54.8)
Emotional and sexual	2	6.5	(1.8 to 20.7)	0	0	—	4	26.7	(10.9 to 52.0)	8	7.0	(3.6 to 13.2)	1	2.0	(.4 to 10.3)
Physical and sexual	0	0	—	0	0	—	0	0	—	0	0	—	0	0	—
Emotional, physical and sexual	16	51.6	(34.8 to 68.0)	12	41.4	(25.5 to 59.3)	0	0	—	3	2.6	(.9 to 7.4)	18	35.3	(23.6 to 49.0)
Total	31	100		29	100		15	100		114	100		51	100	

Nearly three-quarters ($n = 21$, 70.0%; 95% CI [52.1 to 83.3]) of the men deemed to have experienced coercive controlling violence also self-defined as having been in a relationship that they characterized as DVA. A further 20 men who self-defined in this way can be classified as having experienced less severe emotional behaviors rather than coercive controlling violence as they are in the low DVA and low impact category.

Perpetration

The men were asked if they had used any of the potentially harmful physical, emotional or sexual behaviors (as listed in Table 2) against a partner. Of the 707 respondents, 199 (28.1%; 95% CI [25.0 to 31.6]) reported perpetrating at least one of the items during their lifetime. The largest groups of respondents, about one in 10, said they had driven too fast when their partner was in the car (9.8%; 95% CI [7.6 to 12.0]) or accused their partner of cheating (9.2%; 95% CI [7.1 to 11.3]). When asked for reasons as to why they used the behaviors, most said it was because they loved or cared for their partner (35.1%; 95% CI [23.6 to 46.2]), because the partner had hit them first (33.3%; 95% CI [21.1 to 46.3]), or because they were unhappy in the relationship (29.8%; 95% CI [18.6 to 41.8]).

As indicated above, thirty-one of the men met the threshold of experiencing coercive controlling violence, that is, only 4.4% of the entire sample. We used this calculated frequency to establish a threshold for perpetration on the ever-perpetrated scale. The top 4.4% on the scale were considered to be perpetrators. Thus, 38 men constituted the top 4.4%. This group of men used five or more (from four to 17) different forms of violence during their lifetime. When we incorporate reports of perpetration against a partner alongside the victim categories, derived from the combined DVA behavior scale and impact scale, almost half ($n = 15$, 48.9%; 95% CI [32.0 to 65.2]) of the 31 men in the coercive controlling violence category also reported using DVA behavior of some sort against their partner. Thus, the men who reported experiencing but not perpetrating coercive controlling violence (i.e., victims only) constituted 2.3% of the total sample. In the low abuse and low impact category, nine of the 142 men also reported perpetration (6.3%; 95% CI [3.4 to 11.6]; see Table 4).

Discussion

Limitations

Although this article uses data from the first large-scale survey of men in general practices, not all men in the practices were included in the survey. We excluded men under the age of 18, those who did not speak English or who were too ill to answer the questions. We do not know the absolute number of eligible men in the practice who were waiting to see a clinician and therefore cannot calculate a true recruitment rate. The study is cross-sectional and can only report associations. As it is a clinical sample the findings cannot be generalized to the wider population.

Men with higher education were overrepresented in the overall sample of 1,368, and the subsample of 707 used in this article had higher numbers of younger men, private house owners, and those in relationships. However, the proportion of men who reported experience, perpetration, or both did not differ across the main and subsamples. Only 219 of the 371 men (59%) who experienced one or more DVA behaviors answered the impact questions, which may have limited this aspects of the data.

Research Implications

We set out to answer the question: To what extent can the intimate relationship behavior reported as experienced by the male patients in our survey of primary care practices be characterized as behavior commensurate with coercive controlling violence? The answer is that just under one in 20 (heterosexual) male patients in primary care clinics in England may be deemed to have experienced coercive controlling violence, in the sense of experiencing both high levels of DVA behavior and high levels of impact, although at least half of these men are also using some form of violence or abuse against their partners.

Our overall finding that 4.4% of men experienced behavior commensurate with coercive controlling violence is lower than the findings of Johnson et al. (2014) of 5.4%, and Myhill (2015) of 6% whereas we might expect a higher frequency in our sample given the clinical setting of our study. Our slightly lower proportion of men experiencing coercive controlling violence may be explained by our approach, with greater emphasis on impact. It could also be

influenced by the sample consisting of only heterosexual men, whereas the NVAS (Johnson et al., 2014) and CSEW (Myhill, 2015) also include some men in same sex relationships. There is some evidence to suggest that men in same sex relationships report higher prevalence of potential DVA experience than heterosexual men (Donovan & Hester, 2014). Overall, however, our approach possibly echoes more closely the meaning of Coercive Control in the U.K. legislation, than Johnson or Myhill's approaches.

By including perpetration in our analysis it is apparent that less than one in 40 (2.3%) of the men experiencing coercive controlling violence could be deemed to be just victims. We thus appear to have a subgroup of men ($n = 15$, 2.3%) who might fit Johnson's categories of 'violent resisters' or of using 'mutual controlling violence.' Indeed 13 of these 15 men did respond affirmatively to the question 'retaliated by shouting at your partner,' suggesting some form of retaliatory or mutually abusive behavior. Myhill (2015) did not include perpetration in his analysis, and therefore could not differentiate men who might only be victims.

The largest category of men in our study who experienced DVA behaviors were found to experience low levels of DVA behavior and low impact. The vast majority of these (133 of 142, Table 5) may possibly be experiencing situational couple violence, which is characterized by sporadic, isolated episodes of DVA behaviors and low impact (Johnson & Leone, 2005).

In our previous analysis using a more limited set of four screening questions (Hester et al., 2015), we found that nearly a quarter of the men reported ever having experienced one or more of these DVA behaviors. Most reported experiencing the 'emotional abuse' screening item of ever having felt frightened of the behavior of a partner. In the analysis presented here, we were able to look at more detailed answers. Although potentially harmful emotional behaviors was still reported as the most prevalent experience, most of the men reported that their partners had been jealous or accused them of cheating rather than that they were frightened of their partners. Thus, while fear may be deemed as a key characteristic of coercive controlling violence, this was by no means the main form of behavior reported by the men. Only one in eight (13.3%) reported being frightened by things their partner said or did. Our findings appear to echo those of Ansara and Hindin (2010), who found, using latent class analysis regarding the national Canadian survey data, that most men experienced 'jealousy and verbal abuse' from partners.

Nybergh (2014), based on interviews with men who experienced DVA behavior from partners, found the men talked about

the greater impact of emotional behavior, rather than fear, in particular aspects of being belittled and humiliated, which their female partners were reported as using to control them. To some extent our survey data reflects this, with only a small number of our respondents reporting experience of fear, while about one in five of the men did report controlling behaviors involving being regularly insulted or put down, being told what to do or who to see, and having their spending controlled. Also of the men in our survey who answered both behavior and impact questions and also self-defined as experiencing DVA, a fifth ($n = 10$, 19.6%) reported only emotional behaviors used against them. However, in our threshold analysis only one of these 10 men were categorized as experiencing coercive controlling violence, and the remaining nine were subject to little or no impact as a result of the behavior.

Although many of the men's experiences were not fear inducing or dangerous, they still appeared to leave the men feeling sad, having to watch what they said or did, and/or affected the sexual aspect of their relationships. In other words, while most of the men in our survey were not experiencing the fear and danger characteristic of coercive controlling violence, they might still be experiencing negative impacts. We found previously that the men experiencing DVA behaviors exhibit anxiety and depression two to three times greater than those without such DVA experiences (Hester et al., 2015), and this is also reflected in the current analysis by the many men responding that they felt anxious or sad (see Table 2). The question that Nyberg raises (as do Ansara & Hindin, 2010) is whether we need another way of categorising men's experiences of DVA relationships that places greater emphasis on emotional abuse. In some ways our analysis would suggest that another categorization might be useful, but only if this makes clear that such emotional DVA for heterosexual men tends not to involve fear and danger (in the way it can do for heterosexual women survivors), and does not in the vast majority of cases constitute coercive controlling violence. It may perhaps be argued that the emotional behavior the men themselves defined as experiencing DVA was situated in a wider patriarchal context where, as a consequence, the men felt their positioning as men slighted or undermined, and their entitlement dented but did not feel in fear or danger of their life (Hester, 2010).

The younger men in our sample reported greatest likelihood of experiencing DVA behaviors, and there was some association with low income. This echoes findings from U.K. population surveys. However, whereas U.K. population surveys show

Table 5
Thresholds by Coercive Controlling Violence (CCV), Victim, and Perpetrator Status

Status	High abuse, high impact			High abuse, low impact			Low abuse, high impact			Low abuse, low impact			Self-defined		
	<i>n</i>	%	95% CI	<i>n</i>	%	95% CI	<i>n</i>	%	95% CI	<i>n</i>	%	95% CI	<i>n</i>	%	95% CI
CCV victim only	16	51.6	(34.8 to 68.0)	0	0	—	0	0	—	0	0	—	9	15.3	(8.2 to 26.5)
Perpetration only	0	0	—	8	27.6	(14.7 to 45.7)	3	17.6	(6.2 to 41.0)	9	6.3	(3.4 to 11.6)	5	8.5	(3.7 to 18.4)
Victim and perpetrator	15	48.4	(32.0 to 65.2)	0	0	—	0	0	—	0	0	—	12	20.3	(12.0 to 32.3)
Non-CCV	0	0	—	21	72.4	(54.2 to 85.3)	14	82.4	(59.0 to 93.8)	133	93.7	(88.4 to 96.7)	33	55.9	(43.3 to 67.9)
Total	31	100		29	100		17	100		142	100		59	100	

greatest risk to the age of 25, the risk for the men in our survey tended to extend to their mid-40s. This may be explained by our study focusing on life time exposure, where there would be an expectation of increase in exposure over time, although that would also suggest that older men would report the highest levels of DVA, which is not the case in our findings. This is an area that requires further investigation.

Clinical and Policy Implications

DVA behavior in heterosexual relationships is experienced or perpetrated by a considerable number of heterosexual men presenting to general practices, with a very small minority deemed to have experienced (and possibly perpetrated) coercive controlling violence. Heterosexual men may (erroneously) perceive that they have experienced real DVA (coercive controlling violence) if they are experiencing less dangerous or severe forms of DVA behavior, and may express concerns such as jealousy, belittling, or humiliation. With regard to the U.K. legislation on coercive control, only DVA experience involving ongoing fear, threat, and control, might attain the threshold of an offense, and most cases would not require intervention by the criminal justice system. Instead, clinicians and other support services may be better placed to provide intervention and support. The men in our survey were already engaging with primary care clinicians, who might be able to ask initial questions about DVA relationships and to refer the men to specific services with expertise regarding male DVA victims or perpetrators (Williamson et al., 2014). Heterosexual men may have a range of needs of support and intervention depending on the severity of their experiences of DVA behavior or coercive controlling violence and whether they are/have been using violence and abuse against their partners.

Clinicians also need to be aware that heterosexual men aged between 18–44 (or younger) are at greater risk of experiencing DVA behavior in intimate relationships, and high educational attainment is associated with men self-reporting risk of experiencing emotional DVA behaviors.

Conclusion

Surveys that examine prevalence of DVA without consideration of impact or severity have limitations. The article uses results from the first survey of a European clinical male population, and the largest such primary care study internationally, that measured a range of emotional, physical and sexual behaviors that could be construed as DVA, including experience as well as perpetration, and a range of impacts. Using the COHSAR approach allowed us to analyze both behavior and impacts and to disaggregate the experience of merely DVA behavior from coercive controlling violence and abuse. Our finding that 4.4% of the male patients reported experience of what may be deemed coercive controlling violence concurs with the results from Johnson et al. (2014) and Myhill (2015), indicating, as Hamby has also pointed out, the possibility to compare and explore “the impact of different operationalizations on rates” (Hamby, 2015, p. 8). However, our approach also shows the importance of taking into account both impact and perpetration alongside experience of DVA behavior if we are to understand the nature of DVA and coercive controlling violence for men and implications for clinicians and DVA agencies.

References

- 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*, 849–854. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1136/jech.2009.095208>
- Archer, J. (2002). Sex differences in physically aggressive acts between heterosexual partners: A meta-analytic review. *Aggression and Violent Behavior, 7*, 313–351. [http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S1359-1789\(01\)00061-1](http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S1359-1789(01)00061-1)
- Britton, A. (2012). Intimate violence. In K. Smith (Eds.) *Homicides, firearm offences and intimate violence* (Suppl. Vol. 2, pp. 83–115). London, UK: Home Office.
- Buller, A. M., Devries, K. M., Howard, L. M., & Bacchus, L. J. (2014). Associations between intimate partner violence and health among men who have sex with men: A systematic review and meta-analysis. *PLoS Medicine, 11*(3), e1001609. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1371/journal.pmed.1001609>
- Donovan, C., & Hester, M. (2014). *Domestic Violence and sexuality – what's love got to do with it?* Bristol, UK: Policy Press.
- Gadd, D., Farrall, S., Dallimore, D., & Lombard, N. (2002). *Domestic abuse against men in Scotland*. Retrieved from <http://www.scotland.gov.uk/Publications/2002/09/15201/9609>
- Glass, D. D. (1995). *All My Fault*. London, UK: Virago.
- 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*, 1247–1270. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/0886260503256656>
- Hamberger, L. K., & Larsen, S. E. (2015). Men's and women's experience of intimate partner violence: A review of ten years of comparative studies in clinical samples—Part I. *Journal of Family Violence, 30*, 699–717. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s10896-015-9732-8>
- Hamby, S. (2015). A scientific answer to a scientific question: The gender debate on intimate partner violence. *Trauma, Violence and Abuse, 10*, 1–10. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/1524838015596963>
- Hearn, J. (1996). Men's violence to known women: Men's accounts and men's policy development. In B. Fawcett, B. Featherstone, J. R. Hearn, & C. Toft (Eds.), *Violence and gender relations: Theories and interventions* (pp. 99–114). London, UK: Sage.
- Hester, M. (2010). Gender and sexuality. In C. Itzin & A. Taket (Eds.), *Sexual and domestic violence and abuse: Tackling the health and mental health effects* (pp. 99–113). London, UK: Routledge.
- Hester, M. (2013). Who does what to whom? Gender and domestic violence perpetrators in English police records. *European Journal of Criminology, 10*, 623–637.
- Hester, M., Donovan, C., & Fahmy, E. (2010). Feminist epistemology and the politics of method – surveying same sex domestic violence. *International Journal of Social Research Methodology, 13*, 251–263.
- Hester, M., Ferrari, G., Jones, S. K., Williamson, E., Bacchus, L. J., Peters, T. J., & Feder, G. (2015). Occurrence and impact of negative behaviour, including domestic violence and abuse, in men attending UK primary care health clinics: A cross-sectional survey. *BMJ Open, 5*, 5.
- Home Office. (2015). *Crime prevention*. Retrieved from <http://www.crimereduction.homeoffice.gov.uk/violentcrime/dv01.htm>
- Home Office Affairs Select Committee. (2008). *Domestic violence, forced marriage and “honour”-based violence*. London, UK: House of Commons.
- Johnson, M. P. (2006). Conflict and control: Gender symmetry and asymmetry in domestic violence. *Violence Against Women, 12*, 1003–1018. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/1077801206293328>
- 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*, 322–349. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/0192513X04270345>

- Johnson, M. P., Leone, J. M., & Xu, Y. (2014). Intimate terrorism and situational couple violence in general surveys: Ex-spouses required. *Violence Against Women, 20*, 186–207. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/1077801214521324>
- Langhinrichsen-Rohling, J. (2010). Controversies involving gender and intimate partner violence in the United States. *Sex Roles, 62*, 179–193. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s11199-009-9628-2>
- McCarry, M., Hester, M., & Donovan, C. (2008). Researching same sex domestic violence: Constructing a survey methodology. *Sociological Research Online, 13*, 1.
- Myhill, A. (2015). Measuring coercive control: What can we learn from national population surveys? *Violence Against Women, 21*, 355–375. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/1077801214568032>
- Nybergh, L. (2014). *Exploring intimate partner violence among adult women and men in Sweden*. Gothenburg, Sweden: University of Gothenburg.
- Nybergh, L., Enander, V., & Krantz, G. (2016). Thoretical considerations of men's experiences intimate partner violence: An interview-based study. *Journal of Family Violence, 31*, 191–202. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s10896-015-9785-8>
- Nybergh, L., Taft, C., Enander, E., & Krantz, G. (2013). Self-reported exposure to intimate partner violence among women and men in Sweden: Results from a population-based survey. *BMC Public Health, 13*, 845.
- Osborne, S. (2011). Crime in England and Wales 2010/11 findings from the British Crime Survey and police recorded crime. In R. Chaplin, J. Flatley, & K. Smith (Eds.), *Statistical bulletins* (65th ed., pp. 9–25). London, UK: Home Office.
- Ramsey, J., Dunne, D., Rose, M., Arsene, C., & Norman, R. (2009). How far does screening women for domestic (partner) violence in different health-care settings meet criteria for a screening programme? Systematic reviews of nine UK National Screen Committee criteria. *Health Technology Assessment, 13*, 6.
- Randle, A. A., & Graham, C. A. (2011). A review of the evidence on the effects of intimate partner violence on men. *Psychology of Men & Masculinity, 12*, 97–111. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/a0021944>
- Rhodes, K. V., Houry, D., Cerulli, C., Straus, H., Kaslow, N. J., & McNutt, L. A. (2009). Intimate partner violence and comorbid mental health conditions among urban male patients. *Annals of Family Medicine, 7*, 47–55. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1370/afm.936>
- Selic, P., Pesjak, K., & Kersnik, J. (2011). The prevalence of exposure to domestic violence and the factors associated with co-occurrence of psychological and physical violence exposure: A sample from primary care patients. *BMC Public Health, 11*, 621. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1186/1471-2458-11-621>
- Serious Crime Act, 2015.
- Stark, E. (2007). *Coercive control: How men entrap women in personal life*. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.
- Statistics Canada. (2004). *General social survey on victimisation*. Ottawa, Canada: Statistics Canada.
- Straus, M. S. (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. <http://dx.doi.org/10.4135/9781452204659.n2>
- Straus, M. A., Gelles, R. J., & Steinmetz, S. K. (1980). *Behind closed doors: Violence in the American family*. Piscataway, NJ: Transaction Publishers.
- Tjaden, P., & Thoennes, N. (2000). *Full report of the prevalence, incidence, and consequences of violence against women: Findings from the National Violence Against Women survey*. Washington, DC: US Department of Justice. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/e514172006-001>
- Walby, S., & Allen, J. (2004). *Domestic violence, sexual assault and stalking: Findings from the British Crime Survey*. Retrieved from <http://www.homeoffice.gov.uk/rds/pdfs04/hors276.pdf>
- Westmarland, N., Hester, M., & Reid, P. (2004). *Routine enquiry about domestic violence in GP practices: A pilot study*. Bristol, UK: University of Bristol & South Tyneside PCT.
- Wilcox, P. (2012). Is parent abuse a form of domestic violence? *Social Policy and Society, 11*, 277–288. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1017/S1474746411000613>
- Williamson, E. (2010). Living in the world of the domestic violence perpetrator: Negotiating the unreality of coercive control. *Violence Against Women, 16*, 1412–1423.
- Williamson, E., Agnew-Davies, R., Bacchus, L., Buller, A. M., Hester, M., Howard, L. M., . . . Feder, G. (2014). *Developing the PROVIDE Measure of Potentially Abusive Behaviours* (Working Paper). University of Bristol, Bristol, England.

Received April 7, 2016

Revision received January 31, 2017

Accepted February 3, 2017 ■