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My introduction into male victims of IPV

- A study of 272 respondents in Bariga LCDA
- Association between sex and physical/and sexual IPV

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Not abused</th>
<th>Abused</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Female</strong></td>
<td>88 (63.77%)</td>
<td>50 (36.23%)</td>
<td>138 (100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Male</strong></td>
<td>72 (54.14%)</td>
<td>61 (45.86%)</td>
<td>133 (100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>160 (59.04%)</td>
<td>111 (40.96%)</td>
<td>271 (100%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$\chi^2 = 2.5987$  
d.o.f. = 1  
`p' value = 0.107

- Possibility of bilateral patterns of IPV

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Experience of abusive behaviour</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Exhibition of abusive behaviour</strong></td>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.567**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2 tailed)</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>N</strong></td>
<td>268</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Psychological Violence

- The use of verbal and non-verbal communication with the intent to harm another person mentally or emotionally (Sinha, 2013).

- **Expressive** forms & **Coercive** forms.

Case 1 - Malcolm Appelgate

Case 2 - Lawrence John Ripple

Conceptualizing & re-conceptualizing Psychological IPV

- Conceptualizing psychological IPV:
  - **Psy IPV**: Limiting contact; puts one down; jealousy; harms those close to one; harms pets; demands to know whereabouts; harms property;
  - **Eco IPV**: Prevents access to family income; forces one to give out money or property.

- Johnson’s (1995) typologies:
  - Low or High controlling behaviour
Theoretical underpinnings


2. **Family Conflict** – IPV from unresolved tensions (Davis, 2001; Straus, 2005; Lawson, 2012).

3. **Social learning** – IPV from learned behaviour from childhood (Straus, 2006; Capaldi et. al. 2012; Dibal, 2014; Nwabunike & Tenkorang, 2015).

4. **Control Theory** – How they cope; behaviour adaptation and modification during IPV experience.
Methodology

GSS (Victimization) 2014 data
Analysis of lifetime rates of Psychological and economic IPV with the current partner)

- **Data analysis** – Descriptive statistics & binary logistics regression analysis.

- **Weighting:** `WGHT_PER`; `svy` weights and sample weights.
Data findings

- Lifetime rates of Psychological and/or economic violence in with current partner

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Psychological and/or economic violence (additive variable) by gender</th>
<th>Not abused</th>
<th>Abused</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>7,763,000 (93.2%)</td>
<td>569,000 (6.8%)</td>
<td>8,332,000 (100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>7,809,000 (89.9%)</td>
<td>879,000 (10.1%)</td>
<td>8,688,000 (100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>15,572,000 (91.5%)</td>
<td>1,448,000 (8.5%)</td>
<td>17,020,000 (100%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Prevalence of controlling behaviour with current partner

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Controlling behaviour by gender (among victims only)</th>
<th>Low Control</th>
<th>High Control</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>472,000 (83%)</td>
<td>97,000 (17%)</td>
<td>569,000 (100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>797,000 (90.7%)</td>
<td>82,000 (9.3%)</td>
<td>879,000 (100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1,269,000 (87.6%)</td>
<td>179,000 (12.4%)</td>
<td>1,448,000 (100%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Risk factors of IPV

- **Factors tested:** Age, Education, Personal income, Household income, Marital status, Childhood victimization, Witness of DV among parents, Years of living with current partner, Employment status, Alcohol consumption and Marijuana use.

**Logistic factors:** Age; Years of living; Childhood victimization; Witness of DV among parents; Marijuana use; Personal income; Household income; & Educational attainment.

- **Risk factors of Psychological and/or economic IPV with current partners**
  
  **Childhood victimization:** few times (51% more); Often (77% times more) with Never (RC)  
  
  **Witness of DV among parents:** Yes (47% more) with Never (RC)  
  
  **Marijuana use:** Yes (89% times more) with Never (RC)  
  
  **Household income:** $40k - $99k (45% less); Above $100k (57% less) with Below $40k (RC)
CONCLUSION

- According to the GSS (Victimization) data, rates of psychological and economic violence is gender symmetric.
- However, there is gender asymmetry in terms of controlling behaviour. Levels of control for psychological and/or economic violence was more for female victims than male victims.

Risk factors:
- Childhood victimization and witnessing DV between parents a significant factors. Importance of childhood experience of domestic abuse.
- Importance of marijuana use.
- Identify sites of tension within low income households.
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