

Statewide Prevalence of Intimate Partner Violence in Texas

June 2011

Noël Bridget Busch-Armendariz, PhD, LMSW, MPA
Principal Investigator

Laurie Cook Heffron, LMSW
Project Director

Tom Bohman, PhD
Statistician



Institute on Domestic Violence and Sexual Assault
Center for Social Work Research
School of Social Work
The University of Texas at Austin

Statewide Prevalence of Intimate Partner Violence in Texas

June 2011

Noël Bridget Busch-Armendariz, PhD, LMSW, MPA
Principal Investigator

Laurie Cook Heffron, LMSW
Project Director

Tom Bohman, PhD
Statistician

Staff and Contributors:

Karen Kalergis
Shoshi Osiatynski
Leeann Terwilliger
Elizabeth Endres

Institute on Domestic Violence and Sexual Assault
Center for Social Work Research
School of Social Work
The University of Texas at Austin

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The Institute on Domestic Violence and Sexual Assault (IDVSA) research team extends deep gratitude and appreciation to the anonymous men and women across Texas who shared their experiences with and perspectives on intimate partner violence.

Additionally, the research staff would like to thank the Public Policy Research Institute at Texas A&M University for its tremendous contributions to this project.

The staff also extends its thanks to the Texas Council on Family Violence (TCFV) and the Office of the Governor, Criminal Justice Division (CJD), for their financial support of this project and their commitment to improving services to victims and survivors of intimate partner violence in Texas.

A note about language

Throughout this report, victims and survivors of intimate partner violence may be referred to simply as “victims” or “survivors” for narrative efficiency. This is not meant to be demeaning or judgmental. The research team recognizes that at the time they are in contact with medical personnel, advocates, and/or the criminal justice system, these individuals have survived a combination of physical and emotional trauma and distress. As advocates ourselves, our aim is to honor the journey of all persons and to respect the way in which they name their experiences.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Executive Summary	9
Background	13
Review of the Literature	14
Methodology	17
Findings	25
Prevalence of Intimate Partner Violence	25
Perceptions and Awareness of Intimate Partner Violence	34
Discussion	47
References	51
Appendices	53
Interview Screening Questions for Intimate Partner Violence	53
Additional Findings	57

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1. Descriptive statistics of participants	22
<u>Victimization experiences</u>	
Table 2. Estimated percentage of participants who reported victimization, by gender	26
Table 3. Top three types of abuse by gender	26
Table 4. Percentage of participants who reported intimate partner violence, by 11-item screening questions and gender	27
Table 5. Participant relationships with abusive partner	29
Table 6. Participants who reported victimization and are currently in an abusive relationship	29
Table 7. Number of abusive partners	30
Table 8. Number of abusive partners, by gender	30
Table 9. Percentage of Texans reporting physical injury, STDs, and alcohol/drug use, by gender	31
Table 10. Percentage of Texans who experienced intimate partner abuse described by one or more of the 11-item screening questions, by gender	32
Table 11. Percentage of participants who experienced intimate partner abuse, by 50-item screening questions, type, and gender	33
Table 12. Percentage of Texans who experienced intimate partner abuse, by 50-item screening questions and age at time of interview	33
<u>Perceptions, knowledge, and attitudes</u>	
Table 13. Percentage of Texans who know someone who has been in an abusive relationship, by gender	35
Table 14. Percentage of Texans who consider intimate partner violence a problem, by gender	36
Table 15. Awareness of domestic violence hotlines, by gender	36

Table 16. Awareness of community intimate partner violence victim services, by gender	36
Table 17. Agreement with the statement: “A person can choose to stop abusing,” by gender	37
Table 18. Perceptions on the likelihood of intimate partner violence occurring	38
Table 19. If someone you knew was experiencing intimate partner violence, how likely would you be to speak to the abuser about it?	39
Table 20. If someone you knew was experiencing intimate partner violence, how likely would you be to do nothing?	39
Table 21. If you witnessed intimate partner violence happening, how likely would you be to call the police?	40
Table 22. If you witnessed intimate partner violence happening, how likely would you be to speak to the victim about it?	40
Table 23. If you witnessed intimate partner violence happening, how likely would you be to speak to the abuser about it?	41
Table 24. If you witnessed intimate partner violence happening, how likely would you be to do nothing?	41
Table 25. “Should all survivors have access to intimate partner violence services?” by gender	42
Table 26. “Should all survivors have access to services regardless of immigration status?” by gender	42
Table 27. Opinions on the level of help provided by the state of Texas, by gender	42
Table 28. Opinions on law enforcement’s response to intimate partner violence, by gender	43
Table 29. Opinions on the medical system’s response to intimate partner violence, by gender	43
Table 30. Opinions on the criminal justice system’s response to intimate partner violence, by gender	44
Table 31. Importance of having services for abusers, by gender	44

Table 32. Likelihood of voting for a political candidate who helps victims of intimate partner violence, by gender	45
Table 33. Percentage of participants reporting psychological abuse, by 50-item screening questions	57
Table 34. Percentage of participants reporting coercive control and entrapment, by 50-item screening questions	57
Table 35. Percentage of participants reporting physical abuse, by 50-item screening questions	58
Table 36. Percentage of participants reporting stalking, by 50-item screening questions	59
Table 37. Percentage of participants reporting sexual abuse, by 50-item screening questions	60
Table 38. Percentage of participants reporting types of abuse, by 50-item screening questions and gender	60

LIST OF FIGURES

Figure 1. Overlap of women’s victimization for physical and sexual violence	28
Figure 2. Overlap of men’s victimization for physical and sexual violence	28

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This project was conducted by the Institute on Domestic Violence and Sexual Assault (IDVSA) at the School of Social Work at The University of Texas at Austin in an effort to deepen our understanding of and insight into intimate partner violence. It was funded by the Office of the Governor and supported by the Texas Council on Family Violence (TCFV).

This project's purpose was to conduct a statewide assessment of the prevalence of intimate partner violence in Texas. For this project, researchers used a representative sample of adult Texans. The survey instrument was developed using the National Violence Against Women Survey, the Health Survey of Texans: A Focus on Sexual Assault, the National Intimate Partner and Sexual Violence Surveillance System, and a previous statewide prevalence study on sexual assault (Tjaden & Thoennes, 2000; Busch, Bell, DiNitto, & Neff, 2003; Centers for Disease Control and Prevention [CDC], 2010; Saurage Research, Inc, 2003).

One thousand seventy-four (n=1074) telephone interviews were conducted with adult Texans. Participants were queried about their experiences with five types of abuse perpetrated by an intimate partner: 1) psychological abuse, 2) coercive control and entrapment, 3) physical violence, 4) stalking, and 5) sexual violence.

The findings of this report highlight the seriousness of intimate partner violence in the lives of Texans. A significant minority have experienced victimization by an intimate partner. Moreover, consistent with previous research, the impact of physical and sexual violence in the lives of Texas women is profound. Women who are victimized report severe negative consequences to their health and wellbeing. Findings also suggest, contrary to popular belief, that many victims leave their abusive partners (only 19.5% reported victimization by current spouse or partner). While most Texans report that batterer intervention is important, it is unclear how many perpetrators seek or receive those services unless it is mandated by the criminal justice system.

It is clear that Texas must continue to propel intimate partner abuse onto our public agenda. It is a serious social problem that requires continuous, thoughtful, creative, and proactive responses.

Prevalence of intimate partner violence

Findings reveal that Texans are experiencing considerable abuse and violence at the hands of their current or former intimate partners. Researchers estimated prevalence using 11 items that focused on physical and sexual violence. The eleven item questions were agreed upon by an expert group of leaders and practitioners in the family violence field.

- One in three adult Texans - a total of 5,353,434 adult Texans - have experienced intimate partner violence in their lifetime.
- An estimated 3,069,421 women and 2,284,013 men (37.7% of Texas women and 26.8% of Texas men) have experienced at least one type of abuse over the course of their lifetime.
- Among Texas women, 23% reported physical violence alone, 2% reported sexual violence alone, and 13% reported both physical and sexual violence.
- Among Texas men, 24% reported physical violence alone, 1% reported sexual violence alone, and 1% reported both types of intimate partner violence.
- The most frequent three types of abuse reported by women were threats of physical harm, being slammed against something, and being choked, strangled, or suffocated.
- For men, the most frequent three types of abuse reported were being hit with a fist or something hard, threats of physical harm, and being kicked.
- More than 22% of women who experienced intimate partner violence reported becoming pregnant as a result of forced sex.

- At the time of the survey, Texans who reported experiencing abuse reported an ex-spouse (25%), ex-girlfriend (21%), and ex-boyfriend (14%) as the perpetrator of the abuse.
- Of those reporting victimization, an estimated 19.5% (21.8% of women and 16.5% of men) reported currently being in an abusive relationship. This equates to an estimated 1,044,514 Texans (5.9% of all Texans) currently in an abusive relationship.
- Overall, 43.8% of participants who reported experiencing some type of intimate partner violence had one abusive partner. More than 22% reported having had two abusive partners. A smaller percentage of participants (8.5%) reported having three or four abusive partners.

Extent of intimate partner violence

While some participants reported only one incident or type of abuse, many participants reported multiple incidences and types.

- More than 25% of women experienced two or more incidents, and more than 9% experienced six or more incidents.
- More than 14% of men reported two or more incidents of violence, and almost 1% reported six or more incidents.

Perceptions of intimate partner violence

In addition to asking survey participants about their experiences with intimate partner violence victimization and perpetration, researchers asked a series of questions about participants' perceptions of this type of violence in Texas and their opinions about appropriate responses and resources.

- More than 57% of Texans (an estimated 10,314,003 Texans) know someone – a friend, family member, or coworker – who has been in an abusive relationship. This is

equivalent to more than 62% of Texas women and 54% of Texas men who know someone who has been in an abusive relationship.

- Almost half of women (46.8%) and a quarter of men (25.6%) consider intimate partner violence a *very serious problem* in Texas. This equates to an estimated 6,463,985 Texans (36.2% of all Texans) who consider this a *very serious problem*.
- A majority of Texans (50.9% of women and 42.2% of men) thought that the level of help the state provides is not enough.
- Roughly one third of participants were not aware of toll-free domestic violence hotlines, such as the National Domestic Violence Hotline (1.800.799.SAFE).
- More than half of participants (62.9% of women and 56.4% of men) were aware of local services for victims and survivors of intimate partner violence.
- Almost all participants (97.8% of women and 97% of men) reported that all survivors of intimate partner violence should have access to support services. Additionally, a majority of participants (85.2% of women and 79.8% of men) believed that, regardless of immigration status, all survivors should have access to these services.
- Almost all participants (89.4% of women and 83.2% of men) agreed that services for abusers are *important* or *very important*.

BACKGROUND

The Office of the Governor, with support from the Texas Council on Family Violence (TCFV), funded an assessment of Texans' experiences with intimate partner violence in an effort to deepen our understanding and insight. Family violence continues to affect a significant minority of women, children, and families in Texas, and policymakers need accurate and complete information to create responses and solutions.

Agencies such as the Texas Department of Public Safety (DPS) and the Texas Health and Human Services Commission (HHSC) collect data on these incidences, measuring the number of new cases over a specified period of time. These data provide a glimpse into the pervasiveness of intimate partner violence, but without deeper analysis, policymakers do not have a full picture of this problem. An updated prevalence project will further efforts to strengthen continuums of care in Texas communities for victims of intimate partner violence. These new findings will continue to help Texas's criminal and civil justice systems, legislature, and administration address this problem on a daily basis.

Researchers conducted a statewide quantitative survey assessing the prevalence of intimate partner violence in Texas. A representative sample of adult Texans was used. The survey instrument was developed using questions from the National Violence Against Women Survey, the Health Survey of Texans: A Focus on Sexual Assault, the National Intimate Partner and Sexual Violence Surveillance System, and a previous statewide prevalence study on sexual assault (Tjaden & Thoennes, 2000; Busch, Bell, DiNitto, & Neff, 2003; CDC, 2010; Saurage Research, Inc, 2003).

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

Definitions of intimate partner violence

While there is some discussion on crafting an exact definition of intimate partner violence (Saltzman, Fanslow, McMahon, & Shelly, 2002), there is consensus in the scholarly literature regarding what behaviors comprise intimate partner violence. General accord is that intimate

partner violence consists of these four domains - physical abuse, sexual abuse, threats made against the self or family, and verbal abuse (Alhabib, Nur, & Jones, 2010; Saltzman et al., 2002). Walker (1999), in conjunction with Peterman and Dixon (2001), expands on this definition by stating that the behaviors exhibited in intimate partner violence demonstrate a pattern of abuse used by one person to gain or maintain power, control, and authority over another. Alhabib et al. (2009) states that the acts involved in intimate partner violence perpetuate a violation of one's sense of self and trust. By engaging in physical, sexual, and emotional abuse, the perpetrator of intimate partner violence uses fear and intimidation to oppress another (Peterman & Dixon, 2001).

Physical abuse is defined as the act of using physical force with the intent to cause harm (Saltzman et al., 2002). Physical acts that constitute physical abuse include hitting, kicking, shoving, slapping, punching, or using a weapon against another person (Peterman & Dixon, 2001; Saltzman et al., 2002; and Garcia-Moreno et al., 2006). Emotional abuse, which includes verbal abuse, occurs through constant ridicule, insults, put-downs, humiliation, and criticism (Peterman & Dixon, 2001 and Saltzman et al., 2002). Sexual abuse is defined by Saltzman et al. (2002) as engaging in any forced sexual activity, including the threat of forced sexual activity, such as reaching toward a person's breasts.

Prevalence of intimate partner violence

Obtaining accurate rates of prevalence is difficult because intimate partner violence is often hidden and underreported (Alhabib et al., 2009; Walker, 1999; Garcia-Moreno, 2006). Nonetheless, international, national, and statewide prevalence surveys have provided an understanding of prevalence rates. In a study conducted by the World Health Organization (WHO) of 10 countries, 15% to 70% of women reported being a victim of intimate partner violence at some point in their lifetime (Garcia-Moreno et al., 2006). Of those surveyed, 15% to 30% indicated that they had been a victim of intimate partner violence within the previous 12 months. The WHO determined that violence against women is a worldwide phenomenon, and that women are more likely to be at risk of violence by an intimate partner than men. (Men are more likely to be at risk of a violent crime by a stranger.)

The National Violence Against Women Survey (NVAWS) was conducted from 1995 to 1996, and included telephone interviews with about 16,000 U.S. residents (Tjaden & Thoennes, 2000). This study found that nearly 25% of women and 7.6% of men had been raped and/or physically assaulted during their lifetime.

In a TCFV- commissioned survey conducted by Saurage Research, Inc., 1,200 Texans were interviewed on the telephone to evaluate perceptions of intimate partner violence by Texas residents (Saurage Research Inc., 2003). Forty-nine percent of participants indicated that they or a family member had been severely abused in an act of intimate partner violence, while 74% stated that they, a family member, or someone they knew had experienced some form of abuse (Saurage Research, Inc., 2003).

Perceptions and attitudes about intimate partner violence

In a 2006 national survey conducted by Murphy Marketing Research on behalf of the Allstate Foundation Domestic Violence Program and the National Network to End Domestic Violence Fund, 60% of 1,001 participants strongly agreed that intimate partner violence is a serious social problem in the United States. Furthermore, 83% strongly agreed that intimate partner violence affects people across racial, ethnic, education, social, and economic status, and 74% of participants personally knew someone who had been a victim of intimate partner violence. This study also determined that only 25% of participants were able to accurately estimate incident rates in the United States (Murphy Marketing Research, 2006).

The TCFV survey also evaluated perceptions and attitudes that Texans have regarding intimate partner violence. While 95% of participants believed that intimate partner violence was a crime—73% expressed a belief that intimate partner violence is a serious problem in Texas—the study found that Texans' definition of intimate partner violence is limited (Saurage Research Inc., 2003). The TCFV survey concluded not only that Texans blamed victims for failing to leave abusive relationships, but also that they blamed intimate partner violence on factors beyond the perpetrators' control (Saurage Research Inc., 2003). For example, 98% of participants reported that alcohol or drug use was to blame for intimate partner violence, while 54% said that people with a lower economic status are more at risk of being a victim of intimate partner violence.

Research supports the hypothesis, however, that all racial, ethnic, educational, and/or socioeconomic groups are at risk of intimate partner violence (Alhabib et al., 2009 and Garcia-Moreno et al., 2006).

Perpetrators of intimate partner violence

While Walker (1999) concludes that being a woman is the single greatest risk factor for being a victim of intimate partner violence, the aforementioned prevalence studies indicate that men are victims of intimate partner violence as well. Peterman and Dixon, however, found that in 95% of intimate partner violence incidences, men are the abusers (2001).

Peterman and Dixon (2001) define a batterer as a person who engages in physical, emotional, and sexual abuse and other behaviors that exert control and power over their intimate partner (2001). Batterers are not bound by their social, economic, ethnic, professional, education, or religious group associations; most have no criminal record (Peterman & Dixon, 2001). While the perpetrator of intimate partner violence may appear to be a good, loving partner from the outside, the batterer often displays manipulative, possessive, and jealous behaviors that are often methods to mask feelings of inadequacy and low self-esteem. Fearful of being abandoned, batterers resort to forms of abuse in order to maintain control and power in a relationship (Peterman & Dixon, 2001).

METHODOLOGY

Overview

The purpose of this project was to assess the prevalence of intimate partner violence in Texas. The project used a representative sample of adult Texans. The survey instrument was adapted from the National Violence Against Women Survey, the Health Survey of Texans: A Focus on Sexual Assault, the National Intimate Partner and Sexual Violence Survey, and a previous statewide prevalence a (Tjaden & Thoennes, 2000; Busch, Bell, DiNitto, & Neff, 2003; CDC, 2010; Saurage Research, Inc, 2003). These important findings will inform, shape, and further strengthen the service delivery system for victims in Texas.

Survey instrument

Developing the instrument to ask questions about relationship-related experiences and intimate partner violence requires sensitivity and a thorough understanding of the various ways that people view their relationships, sexual experiences, and the experience of intimate partner violence. Two national studies and two statewide studies that focused, either wholly or in part, on the incidence and prevalence of intimate partner violence were used as models for this project. They were:

- National Violence Against Women Survey (Tjaden & Thoennes, 2000)
- Health Survey of Texans: A Focus on Sexual Assault Experiences (Busch, et al., 2003)
- National Intimate Partner and Sexual Violence Survey (Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, 2010)
- Prevalence, Perceptions, and Awareness of Domestic Violence in Texas (Saurage Research, Inc., 2003)

Questions for this survey were drawn primarily from the National Intimate Partner and Sexual Violence Survey (NISVS), developed by the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC). The CDC is currently conducting a national telephone survey of adult men and women on intimate partner violence. For the purposes of the NISVS and this project, intimate partner

violence is defined as including psychological aggression, coercive control and entrapment, physical violence, stalking, and sexual violence. These measures report behavioral incidents. Many advocates and scholars purport that intimate partner violence also demonstrates a *pattern* of abuse used by one person to gain or maintain power, control, and authority over another (Walker, 1999; Peterman & Dixon, 2001).

Screening questions used to gauge experiences with psychological, control, physical violence, stalking, and sexual violence are included in Appendix A. The survey instrument also included questions about perceptions about intimate partner violence, participants' use of abuse or violence against intimate partners, and for those who reported having been abused, follow-up questions about the impact of violence.

Length of interview

On average, interviews with participants took 31 minutes, with a range of 18 to 54 minutes.

Protection of research participants

This project was approved by The University of Texas at Austin Institutional Review Board (IRB) and the Texas A&M University IRB. The sensitive nature of the questions about intimate partner violence and the possibility of retraumatizing survivors were considered by the researchers and members of the IRBs. After consulting with these review boards, several safeguards were added to the interview protocol. Participants were repeatedly informed that they could refuse to answer any question or terminate participation in the interview (see Appendix A). To assist participants who experienced distress or requested counseling after participating in the survey, an immediate patch-through system was developed with the National Domestic Violence Hotline (NDVH). The NDVH number was provided to all participants.

Selection and training of interviewers

Public Policy Research Institute (PPRI) conducted the telephone interviews, and administrators carefully selected female interviewers for this project. Interviewers were trained using existing training manuals covering the standard operating procedures at PPRI as well as training material designed specifically for this project. The NDVH staff also conducted a three-hour training

session to cover topics surrounding intimate partner violence. Specialized training included an overview of the myths and realities of intimate partner violence, post-traumatic responses to this type of violence, and why survivors may not report it. Training also covered secondary trauma and counter-transference, and how interviewers can deal with their own feelings in emotionally charged encounters with research participants, particularly if the interviewer is a survivor of abuse. Finally, interviewers were trained how to sensitively offer a referral to the NDVH.

Adverse event protocol

The research team developed procedures to address and report adverse events. For the purpose of this project, one problem might include post-traumatic responses to intimate partner violence. Certain participants might become withdrawn or quiet or take long pauses between the questions and their answer. Their voice may quiver, or they may indicate that they want to end the call. In the case of research participants becoming emotionally upset by the questions, interviewers were trained to:

- Ask participants if they would like to terminate the interview.
- Reassure participants that strong feelings are normal when reliving a traumatic experience such as intimate partner violence.
- Remind participants that many people feel better after talking with a professional about the experience.
- Tell participants about the National Domestic Violence Hotline (NDVH).
- Ask participants if they would like to be directly connected with the NDVH. If they agreed, the connection would be established at that time. If participants declined, they were given the hotline number immediately. In this case, participants were asked what they planned to do to take care of themselves; interviewers helped problem-solve as necessary (for example, call a friend).

Interviewers were required to report all adverse effects to the associate director of the PPRI during the next working day. The PPRI would then forward reports to principal investigator Dr. Noël Busch-Armendariz, who would report the incident to The University of Texas at Austin IRB within one week.

No adverse events occurred during this project.

Sampling procedures

The population of interest for this project was adults, 18 years and older, living in Texas. During the pilot period a specialized sample was initially used to obtain a larger number of Spanish-speaking individuals. The sample involved directory-listed residential telephone numbers. A total of 1,000 telephone numbers were selected randomly and over-represented counties with high percentage of Hispanic residents to ensure adequate pilot testing of both the English and Spanish survey questionnaires.

During the field data collection period, random digit dialing samples were used. Operating banks of numbers were identified using listed landline telephone numbers only. An operating bank of numbers was defined as a group of 100 sequential numbers in which at least three listed numbers are found. The sample is drawn from all the numbers in the block, whether listed or not. A total of 24,700 telephone numbers were selected using these procedures. All samples were generated by Survey Sampling International (SSI) and are described in detail on its website (www.surveysampling.com). Based on conservative American Association for Public Opinion Research (AAPOR) definitions, the overall response rate was 5.7%, which divides completed interviews by the sum of partial and complete interviews, refusal and break-offs, non-contacts, other reasons, and unknown households. Of those households contacted, 11% cooperated and completed the interview. Forty percent of households contacted declined to participate.

Researchers aimed for a sample equally divided between men and women. After 301 interviews were conducted, it was discovered that older female participants were being overrepresented. To correct this, the introduction script was modified to ask to speak first to the youngest male 18 years of age and older, then youngest female 18 years of age and older residing in the household.

Although it would be desirable to include mobile and landline telephone numbers in the sampling frame, the decision to use landline-only telephone numbers was based on two considerations. Importantly, the cost of reaching individuals via wireless/mobile telephone numbers is nearly twice as much as landline numbers, thus making it cost prohibitive. Second,

although the estimated number of cell-phone only households has increased to about 20%, the majority of households can still be reached by landline telephones. To mitigate the possible bias caused by the greater likelihood that younger participants would be reached by mobile telephone only, household screening was used to select younger individuals over older individuals in the households.

Sample weighting

In addition to refining the interview selection process, the final survey sample was weighted to represent the 2009 Texas adult population. Sample weights were created based on three factors: gender, race/ethnicity, and age. Race/ethnicity was defined as four groups: white, Hispanic, African-American, and other. Age group was defined as six categories: 18-24, 25-34, 35-44, 45-54, 55-64, and 65 and older. Weighting the sample by gender, race/ethnicity, and age reduces the possible impact of potential participant selection bias.

The sample weight was used in reporting many of the findings. The weight is the count of the population in a gender/race-ethnicity/age category divided by the count of the sample in the same gender/race-ethnicity/age category. Use of these sample weights allowed estimation of the adult Texas population who experienced different types of intimate partner violence.

Characteristics of the sample

A total of 1,074 adults participated in this project. Of those, 1,045 produced useable data. Table 1 reflects basic descriptions of the sample, including survey participants' gender, age, race/ethnicity, and income. More than 68% of survey participants were women, and nearly 32% were men. A large percentage of participants (45.1%) were ages 45 and above. A majority of participants (64.2%) identified themselves as Anglo, with the next largest group represented by Hispanics (19.3%). Almost 11% of participants identified themselves as African-American, and almost 6% identified themselves as Asian, Pacific Islander, or other. Survey participants were relatively evenly distributed among five categories of total annual household income.

Table 1. Descriptive statistics of participants (n=1045)

Descriptive Variables	Percent
Gender	
Female	68.1%
Male	31.9%
Age	
18 to 24	4.1%
25 to 34	10.9%
35 to 44	16.0%
45 to 54	22.2%
55 to 64	22.9%
Over 65	23.9%
Race/Ethnicity	
Anglo	64.2%
Hispanic	19.3%
African-American	10.6%
Other: Asian, Mixed, PI, AI	5.9%
Annual household income	
Under \$25,000	20.6%
\$25,000 to \$49,999	25.0%
\$50,000 to \$74,999	18.0%
\$75,000 to \$99,999	13.8%
\$100,000 or greater	22.5%

Limitations

There are several limitations to using a telephone survey to investigate intimate partner violence. First, telephone surveys exclude people who do not have access to a telephone or who are unable to use a telephone. These include some very low-income persons, some persons with disabilities, and persons residing in institutions. Second, telephone surveys may not be the best means to develop the trust and rapport with participants necessary for them to “tell their stories.” It is also difficult to determine whether participants (victims and non-victims) who chose to answer this telephone survey have different experiences than those who declined to participate. In addition, this survey used a landline telephone sample, which excludes Texans who use mobile phones only. Finally, although this survey was designed to clearly define a range of behavioral indicators of intimate partner violence, as

the research on this type of violence continues to evolve, we may discover that not all the experiences of victims were included. Although this project provides a comprehensive and updated investigation of intimate partner violence prevalence in Texas, many additional questions about interpersonal violence were generated as a result.

FINDINGS: PREVALENCE OF INTIMATE PARTNER VIOLENCE

Description of screening questions

Overall, the survey instrument included a total of 50 screening items about intimate partner violence, including psychological abuse, coercive control and entrapment, physical violence, stalking, and sexual violence (see Appendix A). Defining intimate partner violence for the purpose of calculating prevalence involved many considerations. First, all 50 screening items may be considered elements of intimate partner violence by survivors, advocates, and professionals in the criminal justice field. However, when it comes to the investigation and prosecution of these abuses by the criminal justice system, a narrower definition is used. For example, Chapter 71 of the Texas Family Code defines family violence as “an act by a member of a family or household against another member of the family or household that is intended to result in physical harm, bodily injury, assault, or sexual assault, or that is a threat that reasonably places the member in fear of imminent physical harm, bodily injury, assault, or sexual assault, but does not include defensive measures to protect oneself.” Furthermore, while some types of abuse may fit the state statute, law enforcement and prosecutors may determine that there is too little evidence or the crime is too difficult to prove in court.

While researchers and advocates involved in this project agreed that all 50 screening items may be included in the broad context and definition of intimate partner violence, the following 11 screening items were used to estimate the statewide prevalence rate:

11-Item Screening Tool for Estimating Prevalence Rate

Has any intimate partner ever...

1. Made threats to physically harm you?
2. Hit you with a fist or something hard?
3. Kicked you?
4. Slammed you against something?
5. Tried to hurt you by choking, strangling, or suffocating you?
6. Beaten you?
7. Burned you?
8. Used a knife or gun on you?

Has any intimate partner used physical force or threats to...

9. Make you have sex against your will?
10. Make you engage in prostitution or have sex with another person for money?
11. Make you use drugs before, after, or while having sex?

Findings using 11-item screen

Findings based on these 11 screening items reveal that Texans are experiencing considerable violence at the hands of their current or former intimate partners. Nearly 32% of participants answered yes to at least one of the 11-item screening questions. Table 2 shows that more than 37% of women and more than 26% of men have experienced intimate partner violence during their lifetime. When weighted to our state population, this equals an estimated 3,069,421 women and 2,284,013 men—or a total of 5,353,434 Texans—who have experienced at least one type of violence over the course of their lifetime.

Table 2. Estimated percentage of participants who reported victimization, by gender (n=1045)

	Percentage	Frequency*
Female	37.7%	3,069,421
Male	26.8%	2,284,013

*indicates weighted percentage to reflect 2009 Texas population

Note: Rates are based on 11 screening questions

Of those survey participants who reported at least one of the 11 screening items, the three most frequent types of abuse reported by women were threats of physical harm, being slammed against something, and being choked, strangled, or suffocated. For men, the three most frequent types of abuse were being hit with a fist or something hard, threats of physical harm, and being kicked.

Table 3. Top three types of abuse by gender (n=308)

	Female	Male
1	Threats of physical harm	Being hit with a fist or something hard
2	Being slammed against something	Threats of physical harm
3	Being choked, strangled, or suffocated	Being kicked


Table 4 lists percentages of male and female participants who reported each of the individual 11 items.

Table 4. Percentage of participants who reported intimate partner violence, by 11-item screening questions and gender (n=308)

Has any intimate partner ever...	Female	Male
Made threats to physically harm you?	25.5%	12.6%
Hit you with a fist or something hard?	18.8%	18.7%
Kicked you?	11.9%	10.0%
Slammed you against something?	24.8%	5.0%
Tried to hurt you by choking, strangling, or suffocating you?	15.9%	2.2%
Beaten you?	13.6%	4.8%
Burned you on purpose?	2.6%	0.6%
Used a knife or gun on you?	7.0%	4.0%
Has any intimate partner used physical force or threats to...	Female	Male
Make you have sex against your will?	12.8%	2.4%
Make you engage in prostitution or have sex with another person for money?	0.9%	0.2%
Make you use drugs before, after, or while having sex?	2.8%	0.3%

Figure 1 shows the percentages of female participants who reported either physical, sexual, or both types of intimate partner violence. For women, 23% reported physical violence only, 2% reported sexual violence only, and 13% reported both types of intimate partner violence. Sixty-two percent of women reported neither type of intimate partner violence.


Figure 1. Overlap of women's victimization for physical and sexual violence (n=1045)



*Percentages are of total female survey participants

Figure 2 shows the percentages of male participants who reported either physical, sexual, or both types of intimate partner violence. For men, 24% reported physical violence only, 1% reported sexual violence only, and 1% reported both types of intimate partner violence. Seventy-three percent of men reported neither type of intimate partner violence.

Figure 2. Overlap of men's victimization for physical and sexual violence (n=1045)



*Percentages are of total male survey participants

Number of abusive relationships

The survey also queried Texans about the abusive relationships that they reported. At the time of the survey, Texans who reported experiencing abuse reported an ex-spouse (25%), ex-girlfriend (21%), and ex-boyfriend (14%) as the perpetrator of the abuse. Another 12% reported abuse by their current spouse. If participants reported that more than one intimate partner had been abusive, they were asked to choose one relationship to describe in more detail.

Table 5. Participant relationships with abusive partner at time of survey (n=308)

Relationship	Percent
Ex-spouse	25%
Ex-girlfriend	21%
Ex-boyfriend	14%
Current spouse	12%

Of those reporting victimization, an estimated 19.5% (21.8% of women and 16.5% of men) reported currently being in an abusive relationship. This equates to an estimated 1,044,514 Texans (5.9% of all Texans) currently in an abusive relationship.

Table 6. Participants who reported victimization and are currently in an abusive relationship, by gender (n=308)

	Percentage	Frequency
Female	21.8%	667,720
Male	16.5%	373,794
Total	19.5%	1,044,514

*indicates weighted percentage to reflect 2009 Texas population

Multiple abusive relationships

Overall, 43.8% of participants who reported experiencing some type of intimate partner violence had one abusive partner. More than 22% reported having had two abusive partners. Smaller percentages of participants reported having three (5.3%) or four (3.2%) abusive partners. Table 7 lists the number of abusive relationships reported by participants. Women and men responded

differently in terms of the numbers of abusive partners. Greater percentages of women reported more than two abusive partners, as detailed in Table 8.

Table 7. Number of abusive partners (n=308)

Number of abusive partners	Percent
0	22.3%
1	43.8%
2	22.5%
3	5.3%
4	3.2%

Table 8. Number of abusive partners, by gender (n=308)

Number of abusive partners	Female	Male
0	6.6%	15.7%
1	23.3%	20.6%
2	11.2%	11.3%
3	4.3%	1.0%
4	2.2%	1.0%

Average age at onset of abuse

Participants were asked about their age when the abuse first began. Results were similar for both men and women. The average age when the abuse first occurred was 22 for both men and women. Across participants, the age of first occurrence ranged from 15 to 30 years old.

Health-related consequences of abuse

The health-related consequences of abuse are serious, particularly for women, which maintains intimate personal violence solidly in the realm of women’s health. Participants were queried about other physical consequences of abuse—pregnancy, injuries, and sexually transmitted diseases (STDs)—and about abusers’ alcohol and drug use. More than 22% of women reported becoming pregnant when an abusive partner made them have sex. More than 36% of women reported physical injuries resulting from the abuse, while 7.9% of men reported such injuries. Twice as many women (25%) as men (12.5%) reported contracting STDs as a result of abuse. Table 9 illustrates drug and alcohol use by abusers. A higher percentage of women reported drug and alcohol use by their abusers. Alcohol use was more common than drug use among abusers.

Table 9. Percentage of Texans reporting physical injury, STDs, and alcohol/drug use, by gender (n=308)

Were you ever physically injured?	Female	Male
Yes	36.1%	7.9%
No	58.6%	87.7%
Did you ever get an STD or other infection when this person did these things to you?	Female	Male
Yes	25.0%	12.5%
No	74.5%	71.0%
Was the abuser using alcohol, drugs, or both?	Female	Male
Alcohol	20.8%	12.8%
Drugs	8.2%	0.2%
Both	18.4%	7.0%
Neither	45.0%	69.4%

Findings on extent using 11-item screening questions

While some participants report only one incident or type of abuse, many participants reported multiple types of abuse. More than 25% of women experienced two or more incidents, and more than 9% of women experienced six or more incidents. More than 14% of men reported more than two incidents of violence, and almost 1% reported six or more incidents. Table 10 lists the percentage of women and men who experienced violence, along with the number of 11 types of abuse they reported.

Table 10. Percentage of Texans who experienced intimate partner abuse described by one or more of the 11-item screening questions, by gender (n=308)

Number of Types of Abuse Reported	Female	Male
None reported	62.3	73.2
1	10.7	12.8
2 to 3	9.9	8.6
4 to 5	7.5	4.6
More than 5	9.4	0.9

Findings using 50-item screening questions

With a broader series of 50 screening items, data illustrate a wider range of abuse and violence. Table 11 lists the percentage of men and women experiencing the five types of abuse and violence—psychological, coercive control and entrapment, physical violence, stalking, and sexual violence. Again, these data reflect summary data across all 50 screening items, which can be found in Appendix B. Only 11 of these items were used to calculate the overall prevalence. The broader set of questions (50 versus 11) may more accurately reflect a definition of intimate partner abuse that is widely accepted by practitioners and researchers. These screening questions acknowledge that relationships that are abusive are complex, and the ways in which perpetrators

achieve power and control vary. Finally, there is a recognition that the abuse may escalate over time and that non-violent abuse is harmful to victims.

Table 11. Percentage of participants who experienced intimate partner abuse, by 50-item screening questions, type, and gender (n=1045)

Type of Abuse	Female	Male
Psychological	55.7%	44.4%
Coercive control and entrapment	55.6%	59.9%
Physical violence	46.5%	49.2%
Stalking	41.0%	37.3%
Sexual violence	14.5%	2.6%

* indicates weighted percentage to reflect 2009 Texas population

Of those who experienced intimate partner violence, almost half were over the age of 45 at the time of the interview. Table 12 shows the response rate by age group.

Table 12. Percentage of Texans who experienced intimate partner abuse, by 50-item screening questions and age at time of interview (n=1045)

Age group	Percent
18 to 24	4.1%
25 to 34	10.9%
35 to 44	16.0%
45 to 54	22.2%
55 to 64	22.9%
65 and older	24.0%

* indicates weighted percentage to reflect 2009 Texas population

FINDINGS: PERCEPTIONS AND AWARENESS OF INTIMATE PARTNER VIOLENCE

In addition to asking survey participants about their experiences with intimate partner violence victimization and perpetration, researchers asked a series of questions about participants' perceptions of intimate partner violence in Texas and their opinions about appropriate responses and resources. This section presents findings in three areas:

- General perceptions and awareness of intimate partner violence in Texas
- Hypothetical intimate partner violence situations and predictions of response
- Opinions on services related to intimate partner violence

General perceptions and awareness of intimate partner violence in Texas

More than 57% of Texans (an estimated 10,314,003 Texans) know someone – a friend, family member, or coworker – who has been in an abusive relationship. This is equivalent to more than 62% of Texas women and 54% of Texas men who know someone who has been in an abusive relationship.

Table 13. Percentage of Texans who know someone who has been in an abusive relationship, by gender (n=1045)

	Female	Male
Yes	62.0%	54.1%
No	37.6%	45.8%
Don't know	0.5%	0.1%

* indicates weighted percentage to reflect 2009 Texas population

Almost half of women (46.8%) and a quarter of men (25.6%) consider intimate partner violence a *very serious problem* in Texas. This equates to an estimated 6,463,985 Texans (36.2% of all Texans) who consider this a *very serious problem*.

Table 14. Percentage of Texans who consider intimate partner violence a problem, by gender (n=1045)

	Female	Male
Not at all a problem	0.8%	1.6%
A very minor problem	3.6%	8.2%
Somewhat of a problem	17.5%	27.9%
A serious problem	23.3%	21.4%
A very serious problem	46.8%	25.6%
Don't know	8.0%	15.2%

*indicates weighted percentage to reflect 2009 Texas population

About 40% of participants were not aware of toll-free domestic violence hotlines, such as the National Domestic Violence Hotline (1.800.799.SAFE). Table 15 shows the percentage of participants' awareness of such hotlines.

Table 15. Awareness of domestic violence hotlines, by gender (n=1045)

	Female	Male
Yes	59.3%	58.3%
No	40.7%	41.7%

*indicates weighted percentage to reflect 2009 Texas population

Table 16 describes participants' awareness of community organizations that provide services to victims of intimate partner violence. Well over half of the men and women surveyed were aware of local services.

Table 16. Awareness of community intimate partner violence victim services, by gender (n=1045)

	Female	Male
Yes	62.9%	56.4%
No	37.1%	43.6%

*indicates weighted percentage to reflect 2009 Texas population

Participants also were asked about their perceptions regarding whether abusers can choose to stop abusing. Responses among both women and men clustered around moderate to strong agreement with the statement: “A person can choose to stop abusing.” Table 17 reflects participants’ responses to this statement in detail.

Table 17. Agreement with the statement: “A person can choose to stop abusing,” by gender (n=1045)

	Female	Male
Strongly agree	39.1%	45.2%
Agree	15.4%	15.3%
Neither agree nor disagree	22.1%	21.6%
Disagree	8.6%	8.6%
Strongly disagree	11.9%	7.4%
Don’t know	2.9%	1.9%

* indicates weighted percentage to reflect 2009 Texas population

Participants were queried regarding the likelihood of intimate partner violence, given a series of potential factors, such as previous abuse, level of education, or financial problems. Table 18 reflects that both women and men perceive previous violent episodes with a partner, an abuser’s childhood abuse, and an abuser’s financial, drug, and/or alcohol problems as being most likely to increase the chances of intimate partner violence.

Table 18. Perceptions on the likelihood of intimate partner violence occurring (n=1045)

Yes, this increases the chance that intimate partner violence will occur	Female	Male
An abuser using alcohol or drugs	96.3%	93.6%
Previous violent episodes with spouse or dating partner	92.2%	88.3%
The abuser was abused as a child	91.9%	91.2%
Financial problems or job loss for an abuser	89.1%	84.0%
A victim using alcohol or drugs	77.2%	74.5%
The victim was abused as a child	77.0%	71.3%
Financial problems or job loss for a victim	70.3%	53.7%
Being pregnant or getting pregnant	55.6%	47.4%
The abuser is uneducated	50.9%	55.4%
Having children	48.2%	46.7%
The victim is uneducated	47.1%	47.7%

*indicates weighted percentage to reflect 2009 Texas population

Hypothetical intimate partner violence situations and participants' predictions of likely responses

Researchers asked participants how they might respond to various intimate partner violence situations. Tables 19 and 20 depict responses to questions about what participants would do if someone they knew were experiencing intimate partner violence.

Table 19. If someone you knew was experiencing intimate partner violence, how likely would you be to speak to the abuser about it? (n=1045)

	Female	Male
Very likely	28.2%	49.0%
Likely	10.2%	17.0%
Neutral	16.5%	16.3%
Unlikely	12.2%	8.1%
Very unlikely	31.5%	9.1%
Don't know	1.4%	0.4%

*indicates weighted percentage to reflect 2009 Texas population

Table 20. If someone you knew was experiencing intimate partner violence, how likely would you be to do nothing? (n=1045)

	Female	Male
Very likely	3.7%	2.6%
Likely	2.0%	1.5%
Neutral	4.7%	4.2%
Unlikely	4.7%	10.8%
Very unlikely	84.0%	80.8%
Don't know	0.8%	0.1%

* indicates weighted percentage to reflect 2009 Texas population

Researchers also asked participants to imagine witnessing intimate partner violence. Tables 21 through 24 list participants' likelihood of intervening if they were witnesses or bystanders to intimate partner violence, by gender.

Table 21. If you witnessed intimate partner violence happening, how likely would you be to call the police? (n=1045)

	Female	Male
Very likely	85.5%	65.8%
Likely	8.2%	13.8%
Neutral	3.6%	8.7%
Unlikely	0.9%	6.5%
Very unlikely	1.5%	4.6%
Don't know	0.2%	0.6%

* indicates weighted percentage to reflect 2009 Texas population

Table 22. If you witnessed intimate partner violence, happening how likely would you be to speak to the victim about it? (n=1045)

	Female	Male
Very likely	71.3%	59.0%
Likely	11.6%	17.6%
Neutral	9.9%	12.6%
Unlikely	2.7%	5.1%
Very unlikely	3.9%	5.6%
Don't know	0.5%	0.1%

*indicates weighted percentage to reflect 2009 Texas population

Table 23. If you witnessed intimate partner violence happening, how likely would you be to speak to the abuser about it? (n=1045)

	Female	Male
Very likely	31.3%	50.8%
Likely	6.9%	16.7%
Neutral	16.6%	9.8%
Unlikely	9.5%	6.6%
Very unlikely	34.7%	16.1%
Don't know	0.9%	0.1%

*indicates weighted percentage to reflect 2009 Texas population

Table 24. If you witnessed intimate partner violence happening, how likely would you be to do nothing? (n=1045)

	Female	Male
Very likely	4.8%	3.1%
Likely	1.3%	3.0%
Neutral	6.2%	10.3%
Unlikely	3.7%	4.9%
Very unlikely	82.8%	77.3%
Don't know	1.2%	1.3%

*indicates weighted percentage to reflect 2009 Texas population

Participants' thoughts on services related to intimate partner violence

Finally, participants were asked about services related to intimate partner violence. Almost all participants (97.8% of women and 97% of men) reported that all survivors of intimate partner violence should have access to services. Additionally, a majority of participants (85.2% of

women and 79.8% of men) believed that, regardless of immigration status, all survivors should have access to these services.

Table 25. “Should all survivors have access to intimate partner violence services?” by gender (n=1045)

	Female	Male
Yes	97.8%	97.0%
No	1.9%	2.5%
Don’t know	0.3%	0.5%

*indicates weighted percentage to reflect 2009 Texas population

Table 26. “Should all survivors have access to services regardless of immigration status?” by gender (n=1045)

	Female	Male
Yes	85.2%	79.8%
No	12.5%	17.1%
Don’t know	2.3%	3.0%

*indicates weighted percentage to reflect 2009 Texas population

A majority of Texans (50.9% of women and 42.2% of men) reported that the level of help provided to victims by the state is not enough. Tables 28 and 29 show that participants generally feel positively about law enforcement and the medical system’s responses. However, there were less favorable opinions of the criminal justice system’s response, as shown in Table 30.

Table 27. Opinions on the level of help provided by the state of Texas, by gender (n=1045)

	Female	Male
Just right	14.1%	19.7%
Too much	2.1%	0.3%
Not enough	50.9%	42.2%
Don’t know	32.9%	37.9%

* indicates weighted percentage to reflect 2009 Texas population

Table 28. Opinions on law enforcement’s response to intimate partner violence, by gender (n=1045)

	Female	Male
Not at all good	7.9%	6.1%
Not very good	10.8%	7.5%
Neutral	30.0%	22.9%
Good	17.9%	27.5%
Very good	20.6%	24.3%
Don’t know	12.9%	11.7%

*indicates weighted percentage to reflect 2009 Texas population

Table 29. Opinions on the medical system’s response to intimate partner violence, by gender (n=1045)

	Female	Male
Not at all good	2.7%	1.2%
Not very good	3.6%	1.5%
Neutral	20.3%	17.8%
Good	28.0%	31.9%
Very good	29.4%	32.3%
Don’t know	15.9%	15.5%

* indicates weighted percentage to reflect 2009 Texas population

Table 30. Opinions on the criminal justice system’s response to intimate partner violence, by gender (n=1045)

	Female	Male
Not at all good	8.3%	11.1%
Not very good	15.4%	15.4%
Neutral	31.1%	25.9%
Good	17.0%	18.5%
Very good	13.7%	16.4%
Don’t know	14.5%	12.7%

*indicates weighted percentage to reflect 2009 Texas population

While services have traditionally been focused on survivors of intimate partner violence, there is increasing interest among advocates and policymakers in batterer interventions. Almost all participants (89.4% of women and 83.2% of men) agreed that services for abusers are *important* or *very important*, as described in Table 31.

Table 31. Importance of having services for abusers, by gender (n=1045)

	Female	Male
Not at all important	3.6%	3.3%
Not very important	0.6%	1.8%
Neutral	4.8%	9.1%
Important	11.1%	17.5%
Very important	78.3%	65.7%
Don’t know	1.6%	2.5%

*indicates weighted percentage to reflect 2009 Texas population

Researchers asked participants about their likelihood of voting for a political candidate who helps victims of intimate partner violence. A large majority of Texans agreed or strongly agreed (74.5% of women and 64.6% of men) that they would be more likely to vote for a political candidate who helped victims of intimate partner violence, as shown in Table 32.

Table 32. Likelihood of voting for a political candidate who helps victims of intimate partner violence, by gender (n=1045)

	Female	Male
Strongly disagree	5.2%	4.9%
Disagree	1.7%	6.4%
Neutral	16.8%	22.3%
Agree	22.2%	25.6%
Strongly agree	52.3%	39.0%
Don't know	1.8%	1.8%

*indicates weighted percentage to reflect 2009 Texas population

DISCUSSION

Findings reveal that Texas families are experiencing considerable abuse and violence at the hands of their current and former intimate partners. A total of 5,353,434 Texans, or nearly 32 percent of Texans, have experienced intimate partner violence in their lifetime. Across gender, an estimated 3,069,421 women and 2,284,013 men, (37% of women and 26% of men) are victimized. Similar numbers of Texas men and women report experiencing physical violence, although women are more likely to experience both physical and sexual violence.

These findings help us understand the types of violence and abuse Texans report, be it psychological abuse, coercive control and entrapment, physical violence, stalking, and/or sexual violence. Through this project, we also learn that a considerable number of Texans experience multiple types of abuse and violence—as many as 43 different types. In particular, Texans report high levels of psychological abuse.

Results also shed an interesting light on the relationships Texans have with abusive partners. Among Texans who reported experiencing abuse, a majority reported it happening with a former partner, with only 19.5% reporting abuse by their current spouse. In addition, almost a quarter of Texans reported having had more than one abusive partner.

The high rate of victimization reported by men is a surprising finding of this project. Our full understanding of this finding is limited, because the research in this area is limited. In the last decade, this dynamic has been explored by various scholars. However the results have been mixed, depending partly on theoretical underpinnings, methodologies, measures and instruments, and national versus community participant samples. There is no agreement either among practitioners or researchers about the underlying etiology of this problem. It is also plausible that after four decades of intimate partner violence research, it is more socially acceptable for men to report abuse and violence by an intimate partner. If this is the case and men are experiencing high rates of abuse and violence than previously thought, community services must be reevaluated to be more responsive to male victims. Currently, between 85% and 95% of victims who utilize shelters and community services are women. For the most part, these women report

victimization by a male partner. As a community, we have more to learn about the types of services and responses that would be useful to male victims. It is also possible that a subset of men who report victimization by intimate partners are overstating their victimization experiences as the primary aggressor. Research supports that men attending batterer intervention programs often deny and minimize the abuse and violence that they are perpetrating. More research is needed in this area, too.

It is important to note that this project reveals women's and men's experiences with behaviors and acts of intimate partner violence over the course of their lifetime. It does not take into account the context of that abuse. Researchers and advocates agree that intimate partner violence is a pattern of coercive behaviors aimed to control an intimate partner, and further research is necessary in order to better understand the context and patterns of abusive and violent relationships. Research has also begun to tease out if women in batterer intervention groups are seeking power and control through abusive actions or if they are acting defensively against the attacks by their intimate partners. The findings are mixed and ardently debated among researchers and practitioners.

The findings of this report highlight the seriousness of intimate partner violence in the lives of Texans. A significant minority have experienced victimization by an intimate partner. Moreover, consistent with previous research, the impact of physical and sexual violence in the lives women is profound. This is also true for Texas women. Women who are victimized report severe negative consequences to their health and wellbeing. Findings also suggest, contrary to popular belief, that many victims leave their abusive partners (only 19.5% reported victimization by current spouse or partner). While most Texans report that batterer intervention is important, it is unclear how many perpetrators seek or receive those services unless it is mandated by the criminal justice system.

We are thus left with the following questions related to perpetrators and our limited understanding of repeat offenders. Are male perpetrators of serious intimate partner violence continuous, repeat offenders? That is, after their female partners end the relationship, do men

move into their next intimate relationships and repeat the abusive behaviors? If so, as a movement, what response is needed to permanently stop the cycle? How should we respond to this subset of repeat male offenders?

It is clear that Texas must continue to propel intimate partner violence onto the public agenda. It is a persistent, serious social problem that requires continuous, thoughtful, creative, and proactive responses. Let's not settle for a "100 year plan" to eradicate this social ill. This research calls us to continue to be insistent and resolute.

REFERENCES

- Alhabib, S., Nur, U., & Jones, R. (2010). Domestic violence against women: Systematic review of prevalence studies. *Journal of Family Violence, 25*(4), 369-382.
- Busch, N., Bell, H., DiNitto, D., & Neff, J. (2003). A health survey of Texans: A focus on sexual assault experiences. Austin, TX: The University of Texas.
- Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (2010). National Intimate Partner and Sexual Violence Survey. Atlanta, GA.
- Garcia-Moreno, C., Jansen, H., Ellsberg, M., Heise, L., & Watts, C. (2006). Prevalence of intimate partner violence: Findings from the WHO multi-country study on women's health and domestic violence. *Lancet, 368*(9543), 1260-1269.
- Murphy Marketing Research. (2006). First annual Allstate Foundation national poll on domestic violence executive summary. [on-line]. Available: <http://www.ncdsv.org/images/1stAnnualAllstateNationalPollDVExecSum.pdf>.
- Peterman, L. M., & Dixon, C. G. (2001). Assessment and evaluation of men who batter women. *Journal of Rehabilitation, 67*(4), 38-42.
- Saurage Research, Inc. (2003). Prevalence, perceptions, and awareness of domestic violence in Texas. [on-line]. Available: http://www.tcfv.org/pdf/PAC_Exec_Summary.pdf.
- Saltzman, L. E., Fanslow, J. L., McMahon, P. M., & Shelley, G. A. (2002). Intimate partner violence surveillance: Uniform definitions and recommended data elements. *Centers for Disease Control and Prevention*. [on-line]. Available: http://www.cdc.gov/Ncipc/publications/ipv_surveillance/Intimate%20Partner%20Violence.pdf
- 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. [on-line]. Available: <http://www.ncjrs.gov/pdffiles1/nij/183781.pdf>.
- Walker, L. E. (1999). Psychology and domestic violence around the world. *American Psychologist, 54*(1), 21.

APPENDIX A: Interview Screening Questions for Intimate Partner Violence

The 11 screening questions used to calculate statewide prevalence estimates are underlined. Many advocates and experts in intimate partner violence would include all 50 screening items as behaviors that exist in abusive relationships. For a full copy of the survey instrument, including introductory script, please contact IDVSA@mail.utexas.edu.

PSYCHOLOGICAL SCREEN

Has any intimate partner ever...

1. Acted very angry toward you in a way that seemed dangerous?
2. Told you that you were a loser, a failure, or not good enough?
3. Called you names like “ugly”, “fat”, “crazy”, or “stupid”?
4. Insulted, humiliated, or made fun of you in front of others?
5. Told you that no one else would want you?

COERCIVE CONTROL AND ENTRAPMENT SCREEN

Has any intimate partner ever...

6. Kept you or tried to keep you from seeing or talking to your family or friends?
7. Made decisions for you that you wanted to make, such as the clothes you wear, things you eat, or the friends you have?
8. Kept track of you by demanding to know where you were and what you were doing?
9. Monitored your telephone, e-mail, or text communications by demanding your password or somehow gaining access?
10. Threatened to hurt himself or herself or commit suicide when he or she was upset with you?
11. Threatened to hurt a pet or threatened to take a pet away from you?
12. Threatened to hurt someone you love?
13. Hurt someone you love?
14. Threatened to take your children away from you?
15. Kept you from leaving the house when you wanted to go?

16. Threatened to distribute photos of you or post photos online without your permission or to people you didn't want to see them?
17. Distributed or posted photos of you online without your permission or to people you didn't want to see them?
18. Threatened to withhold sex or affection?
19. Withheld sex or affection as a form of punishment?
20. Kept you from having money for your own use?
21. Destroyed something that was important to you?
22. Said things like, "If I can't have you, then no one can"?
23. (For females) Tried to get you pregnant when you did not want to become pregnant or tried to stop you from using birth control?
24. Refused to use birth control when you wanted them to?

PHYSICAL VIOLENCE SCREEN

Has any intimate partner ever...

25. Made threats to physically harm you?
26. Slapped you?
27. Pushed or shoved you?
28. Hit you with a fist or something hard?
29. Kicked you?
30. Hurt you by pulling your hair?
31. Slammed you against something?
32. Forced you to engage in sexual activity?
33. Tried to hurt you by choking, strangling, or suffocating you?
34. Beaten you?
35. Burned you on purpose?
36. Used a knife or gun on you?

STALKING SCREEN

Has any intimate partner ever...

37. Made unwanted phone calls to you or left you messages? This includes hang-ups

and voice messages.

38. Sent you unwanted texts?
39. Sent you unwanted emails, instant messages, or sent messages through social networking websites like MySpace or Facebook?
40. Left you cards, letters, flowers, or presents when they knew or should have known you didn't want them to?
41. Watched or followed you from a distance, or spied on you with a listening device, camera, or GPS?
42. Approached you or showed up in places—such as your home, workplace, or school—when you didn't want them to be there?
43. Left strange or threatening items for you to find?
44. Sneaked into your home or car and did things to let you know they had been there?
45. Monitored your telephone or e-mail by using your password or another method?

SEXUAL VIOLENCE SCREEN

Has any intimate partner ever used physical force or threats to...

46. Make you have sex against your will?
47. Make you engage in prostitution or have sex with another person for money?
48. Make you use drugs before, after, or while having sex?
49. Make you have sex with someone you didn't want to?
50. Make you have sex while being videotaped?

APPENDIX B: Additional Findings

Table 33. Percentage of participants reporting psychological abuse, by 50-item screening questions (n=1045)

Has any intimate partner ever...	Female	Male
Acted very angry toward you in a way that seemed dangerous?	40.1%	19.4%
Told you that you were a loser, a failure, or not good enough?	36.5%	23.1%
Called you names like “ugly”, “fat”, “crazy”, or “stupid”?	40.3%	27.6%
Insulted, humiliated, or made fun of you in front of others?	32.0%	23.0%
Told you that no one else would want you?	21.2%	15.0%

Table 34. Percentage of participants reporting coercive control and entrapment, by 50-item screening questions (n=1045)

Has any intimate partner ever...	Female	Male
Kept you or tried to keep you from seeing or talking to your family or friends?	26.9%	17.6%
Made decisions for you that you wanted to make, such as the clothes you wear, things you eat, or the friends you have?	25.7%	23.8%
Kept track of you by demanding to know where you were and what you were doing?	34.9%	30.8%
Monitored your telephone, e-mail, or text communications by demanding your password or somehow gaining access?	18.0%	17.9%
Threatened to hurt himself or herself or commit suicide when he or she was upset with you?	21.2%	9.7%
Threatened to hurt a pet or threatened to take a pet away from you?	5.5%	1.4%
Threatened to hurt someone you love?	10.7%	3.8%

Hurt someone you love?	8.2%	3.5%
Threatened to take your children away from you?	12.1%	12.2%
Kept you from leaving the house when you wanted to go?	23.1%	12.4%
Threatened to distribute photos of you or post photos online without your permission or to people you didn't want to see them?	2.6%	1.7%
Distributed or posted photos of you online without your permission or to people you didn't want to see them?	0.5%	0%
Threatened to withhold sex or affection?	10.6%	21.2%
Withheld sex or affection as a form of punishment?	13.4%	24.9%
Kept you from having money for your own use?	16.1%	5.0%
Destroyed something that was important to you?	25.5%	19.7%
Said things like, "If I can't have you, then no one can"?	20.3%	12.6%
Tried to get you pregnant when you did not want to become pregnant or tried to stop you from using birth control?	8.1%	0%
Refused to use birth control when you wanted them to?	6.0%	9.4%

Table 35. Percentage of participants reporting physical abuse, by 50-item screening questions (n=1045)

Has any intimate partner ever . . .	Female	Male
Made threats to physically harm you?	25.4%	12.5%
Slapped you?	27.0%	37.0%
Pushed or shoved you?	38.9%	37.7%
Hit you with a fist or something hard?	18.8%	18.7%
Kicked you?	11.8%	9.9%
Hurt you by pulling your hair?	17.8%	10.0%
Slammed you against something?	24.8%	5.0%

Forced you to engage in sexual activity?	13.9%	5.2%
Tried to hurt you by choking, strangling, or suffocating you?	15.9%	2.2%
Beaten you?	13.6%	4.8%
Burned you on purpose?	2.6%	0.5%
Used a knife or gun on you?	7.0%	3.9%

Table 36. Percentage of participants reporting stalking, by 50-item screening questions (n=1045)

Has any intimate partner ever...	Female	Male
Made unwanted phone calls to you or left you messages? This includes hang-ups and voice messages.	29.3%	25.7%
Sent you unwanted texts?	13.6%	16.1%
Sent you unwanted emails, instant messages, or sent messages through social networking websites like MySpace or Facebook?	9.7%	9.7%
Left you cards, letters, flowers, or presents when they knew or should have known you didn't want them to?	14.2%	10.7%
Watched or followed you from a distance, or spied on you with a listening device, camera, or GPS?	14.9%	8.0%
Approached you or showed up in places—such as your home, workplace, or school—when you didn't want them to be there?	25.0%	16.1%
Left strange or threatening items for you to find?	5.5%	4.4%
Sneaked into your home or car and did things to let you know they had been there?	11.0%	5.2%
Monitored your telephone or e-mail by using your password or another method?	11.0%	8.5%

Table 37. Percentage of participants reporting sexual abuse, by 50-item screening questions (n=1045)

Has any intimate partner ever used physical force or threats to...	Female	Male
Make you have sex against your will?	12.7%	2.4%
Make you engage in prostitution or have sex with another person for money?	0.9%	0.1%
Make you use drugs before, after, or while having sex?	2.8%	0.3%
Make you have sex with someone you didn't want to?	1.1%	0.5%
Make you have sex while being videotaped?	0.7%	0.1%

Table 38. Percentage of participants reporting types of abuse, by 50-item screening questions and gender (n=1045)

Number of Types of Abuse Reported	Female	Male	Total
0	16.8384	15.6812	32.5196
1	3.0476	4.0979	7.1455
2	2.8709	2.4569	5.3278
3	1.3221	2.6017	3.9239
4	1.4752	1.5600	3.0351
5	0.9542	2.2169	3.1711
6	2.0170	2.7575	4.7745
7	0.9520	4.4068	5.3588
8	1.1128	2.8349	3.9478
9	0.3742	1.8381	2.2123
10	1.1850	1.4448	2.6299
11	1.4502	0.4235	1.8737
12	1.1622	0.8880	2.0503
13	1.4312	0.2308	1.6620

Number of Types of Abuse Reported	Female	Male	Total
14	1.7919	1.8362	3.6280
15	0.8297	0.5936	1.4232
16	0.9744	0.7519	1.7263
17	0.5131	0.7950	1.3081
18	0.4166	0.1232	0.5398
19	0.3077	0.0498	0.3574
20	0.6678	0.0918	0.7596
21	0.5287	0.6532	1.1819
22	0.5657	1.1758	1.7415
23	0.5681	0.0792	0.6473
24	0.6483	0.3003	0.9486
25	0.4147	0.7994	1.2141
26	0.5533	.	0.5533
27	0.5334	.	0.5334
28	0.1420	.	0.1420
29	0.2901	0.0302	0.3203
30	0.1269	.	0.1269
31	0.1119	0.1668	0.2787
32	1.3928	.	1.3928
33	0.0371	.	0.0371
34	0.2493	.	0.2493
35	0.4102	.	0.4102
36	0.1967	0.1710	0.3677
37	0.2557	.	0.2557
38	0.0600	.	0.0600
39	.	0.0792	0.0792

Number of Types of Abuse Reported	Female	Male	Total
40	.	.	.
41	.	.	.
42	0.0255	.	0.0255
43	0.0600	.	0.0600
Total	48.8645	51.1355	100.000

IDVSA

INSTITUTE ON DOMESTIC VIOLENCE AND SEXUAL ASSAULT

The mission of the Institute on Domestic Violence and Sexual Assault (IDVSA) is to advance the knowledge of domestic violence and sexual assault in an effort to end interpersonal violence. IDVSA accomplishes this through research, education, training and technical assistance, and collaboration with university and practitioner communities, and the community at large.

It is the vision of IDVSA that its multidisciplinary, researcher-practitioner, collaborative approach will enhance the quality and relevance of research efforts and their application in service provision. That vision has been realized in our recent research focus in the areas of human trafficking, domestic violence, sexual assault, and resiliency in service providers.

IDVSA is made possible through grants from the RGK Foundation, the Hogg Foundation for Mental Health, the Shield-Ayres Foundation, Alice Kleberg Reynolds Foundation, and Dean Barbara White of The University of Texas at Austin School of Social Work and Dean Larry Sager of The University of Texas at Austin School of Law.

IDVSA Researchers and Staff:

Noël Busch-Armendariz, PhD, LMSW, MPA Director and Principal Investigator The University of Texas at Austin School of Social Work	Karen Kalergis, MA Associate Director for Education & Communications	Leeann Terwilliger, Americorps VISTA Interpersonal Violence Education Coordinator
Regina Jones Johnson, DR PH, MSN, RN Co-Investigator The University of Texas at Austin School of Nursing	Laurie Cook Heffron, LMSW Associate Director for Research	Graduate Research Assistants: Elizabeth Endres Amy Jones Gaby Li Shoshi Osiatynski Eden Robles
Jeana Lungwitz, JD Co-Investigator The University of Texas at Austin School of Law	Shetal Vohra-Gupta, PhD Postdoctoral Fellow	
	Sapana Donde, PhD Postdoctoral Fellow	

Email us at IDVSA@mail.utexas.edu

Copies of this and other reports at <http://www.utexas.edu/research/cswr/idvsa/>