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Intimate Partner Violence (IPV)

- IPV involves physical and/or sexual assault or threat of such from current or previous romantic partners – usually in a context of coercive control
  - Mostly affects women as victims and men as perpetrators, globally in 5 - 10:1 ratios
  - IPV Prevalence differs by nation, ranging from 15% to 70%

- Globally, IPV is most likely to occur:
  - In the context of marriage, though those separated and divorced report higher rates of IPV than those married.
  - In rural, less educated and adolescent girls; linked with girl child marriage.
  - From controlling and emotionally abusive male partners exposed to violence as children

*WHO Multi-country Study on Women’s Health & Domestic Violence Against Women ‘05
Framework for Understanding IPV – Social Ecological Model

Society and Community Factors
- Social & Economic Inequities
- Gender Inequities
- Community Violence & Instability
- Social Norms on-
  - Gender Equity, Gender Roles
  - IPV Acceptability

Family-Level Factors
- Family Violence
- Gender Inequities
- Status Inconsistency
- Social Norms on-
  - Gender Equity, Gender Roles
  - IPV

Individual and Relationship Factors
- Behavior, Biology, State
- Gender inequities
- Social Norms on-
  - Gender Equity, Gender Roles
  - IPV

Social inequities * Gender inequities * Context/History of Violence * Social Norms
Social & Economic Determinants

- Within the family
  - Across power differentials
  - Status inconsistency
- From community
  - From peer and community influence/norms of acceptability of IPV to male IPV perpetration
  - Community levels of violence
- By ecological level
  - Community or societal violence & attitudes

Social, gender & economic inequity

Koenig, Stephenson, Ahmed, Jejeebhoy & Campbell AJPH ’06; WHO Multicountry Study ‘05
## CDC NISVS Survey Results on IPV weighted prevalence & Health Outcomes (2011)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Females lifetime</th>
<th>Females Past Year</th>
<th>Males Lifetime</th>
<th>Males Past Year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Physical violence</td>
<td>32.9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>28.2</td>
<td>4.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rape</td>
<td>9.4</td>
<td>.6</td>
<td>*</td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stalking</td>
<td>10.7</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rape, physical violence, &amp;/or stalking</td>
<td>35.6</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>28.5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>With IPV-related impact (fear, PTSD Sx, Injury, pregnancy, STI, missed work, need for services)</td>
<td>28.8</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>9.9</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Severe physical violence (vs. pushing/shoving/slapping)</td>
<td>24.3</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>13.8</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any psychological aggression (expressive or coercive control)</td>
<td>48.8</td>
<td>13.9</td>
<td>48.4</td>
<td>18.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Injury/needed medical care from IPV</td>
<td>14.8/7.9</td>
<td>4/1.6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Cell size too small or standard error too large

[www.cdc.gov/ViolencePrevention/NISVS](www.cdc.gov/ViolencePrevention/NISVS)
Social Determinants in US

- CDC NSVS
  - weighted lifetime prevalence for women by ethnicity 35.2; Hispanic; 31.7 White; 40.9 Black; 45.9 AI/NA; 50.4 Multiracial;
  - wide state variations – yet to be unpacked; education, income, not reported

- Women’s health outcomes of IPV often those associated with racial/ethnic health inequities (e.g. Campbell 2002; Sharps & Campbell 05) – but proportion attributable to IPV undetermined

- BRFSS ‘05 - Lifetime IPV – 11.5% for men; 23.6% for women (MMWR ‘08)
  - Significantly higher among multiracial, non-Hispanic & AI/AN women; & lower-income respondents

- Other smaller studies show associations with
  - Unstable housing – Rollins, Glass et al 2011
  - Male perpetrator education level, unemployment (e.g. Walton-Moss, Campbell et al ‘05)

- Inconsistent relationships with status inconsistency, neighborhood inequality; collective efficacy- may be related to different types of IPV (e.g. Johnson ’05)
Prevention/Intervention Strategies Based on Social Determinants:

- Housing stability – Glass – SHARE study
- Economic resources for women coupled with social norm change – Image – Watts et al, 2010
- Preventing child abuse, community violence

“I want to be able to see my daughter grow. I want her to be able to be a little girl. I don’t want to keep the cycle going. I want her to see good things while she grows up & not abuse.”

(abused woman)
Public Policies Underlying Social and Economic Determinants of Public Health: The Example of Violence
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Determinants of Violence Operate at Multiple Levels

- **Societal**: distribution of power, opportunities, income, and status; cultural values
- **Community**: concentrated disadvantage (unemployment, economic and racial segregation, single-parent families) informal social controls, social norms
- **Individual**: addiction, cognitive abilities
- **Situational**: gun availability, drug and alcohol use, drug sales, disrespect
Effects of redevelopment of dense public housing projects on crime Cahill et al. (2011)

- Large, densely-populated housing projects redeveloped into “mixed income” low-rise apartments in Washington, DC and Milwaukee.

- Significant declines in crime all 3 neighborhoods studied during and after redevelopment including border areas.
Baltimore’s violence portrayed in “The Wire”

- “The corner” main economic opportunity for most poor Blacks due to loss of manufacturing jobs, failures of schools and families to prepare youth to participate in the legal economy.

Meta-analysis of effects of policing strategies to combat illegal drugs, Mazerolle et al, 2006

Examined 3 general strategies:

- hot spots policing
- problem-oriented policing / partnerships (e.g., drug nuisance abatement, civil remedies)
- community-wide policing (e.g., Weed & Seed)

• **none had any effect on crimes of violence**

• Kennedy’s High Point, NC “Focused Deterrence”
  – gather evidence for prosecution, use family and community persuasion, opportunities to change – shown to reduce drug and violent crime.
Deterring Illegal Gun Possession Works

- Gun carrying suppression units reduced shootings in Kansas City (-49%), Indianapolis, and Pittsburgh (-71%).

- Boston’s Operation Ceasefire – focused deterrence with highest risk offenders. Call-ins with carrot (services) and stick (federal prosecution). Coordinate with parole and probation. Homicides dropped 63%.

- Subsequent replications of Boston model and national study of intensity of PSN show it usually reduces violence.
Baltimore’s Focus on “Bad Guys with Guns”

- **Goals** changed from arresting drug dealers to reducing gun violence.
- **Strategies** – arrest “bad guys with guns” and deter illegal gun possession, especially in “hot spots.”
  - Exile call-ins and federal prosecution
  - Violent Crime Impact Units
  - Gun Offender Registry (greater monitoring of gun offenders)

Baltimore City Police Commissioner Fredrick Bealefeld, along with Baltimore City Mayor Stephanie Rawlings-Blake
Deterring illegal gun possession in Baltimore with targeted enforcement

- Homicides 30% lower in 2011 vs. 2007, much larger reduction than national ave.
- ~9,000 fewer drug arrests
- Federal defendants +79% from pre-Exile
- Exile call-ins -30% in gun violence
- Violent Crime Impact Section deployment -18% in gun violence
Focus on Prevention – Interrupting Violence and Changing Social Norms

- Baltimore’s Safe Streets Program – former gang members mediate disputes, mentor and redirect youth, change social norms.

- Reduced gun violence in 3 of 4 neighborhoods (-33% to -56%) with benefits in some border areas.

- Reduced acceptance of using guns to resolve disputes (Webster et al., 2012).