

Strategic responses to intimate partner violence against women in Spain: a national study in primary care

Isabel Montero,^{1,2} Isabel Ruiz-Pérez,^{2,3} Vicenta Escribà-Agüir,^{2,4}
Carmen Vives-Cases,^{2,5} Juncal Plazaola-Castaño,^{2,3} Marta Talavera,¹
David Martín-Baena,² Rosana Peiró^{2,4}

¹University of Valencia,
Valencia, Spain

²Epidemiology and Public Health
Network Biomedical Research
Consortium (CIBERESP), Spain

³Andalusian School of Public
Health, Granada, Spain

⁴Public Health Research Centre,
Valencia, Spain

⁵University of Alicante, Alicante,
Spain

Correspondence to

Isabel Montero, University of
Valencia, Psychiatric Unit, Avda
Blasco Ibañez 15, 46010
Valencia, Spain;
isabel.montero@uv.es

Accepted 11 October 2010

ABSTRACT

Background Research on women's responses to intimate partner violence (IPV) has largely been limited to women who have been exposed to severe physical violence with scarce generalisation. This study aimed to analyse how Spanish abused women from different backgrounds and with different IPV characteristics respond to violence.

Method Women experiencing IPV before the previous year (1469) were selected from a large cross-sectional national survey of adult women recruited during 2006–7 among female patients seeking medical care for whatever reason in primary healthcare services. The outcome variables were women's responses to IPV and the predictor variables were personal and social resources profiles and characteristics of the abuse (type, duration and women's age at onset). Stepwise logistic regression models were fitted.

Results 87.5% of abused women took some kind of action to overcome IPV. Significant differences on personal and social profile and type and duration of the abuse were detected between the three strategic responses: distancing, in process and inhibition. The probability of a woman responding with a distancing strategy (seeking outside help or leaving temporarily) is almost three times greater if she is employed, was young when the abuse began, had experienced physical and psychological abuse and when the abuse was under 5 years.

Conclusions The results of this study show that personal and social resources and the specific circumstances of the abuse should be taken into account to understand women's responses to IPV. Well-validated interventions targeted at abused women's needs and the circumstances of IPV remain a priority.

Research on women's responses to intimate partner violence (IPV) has shifted in more recent times from victim blaming to examining various macro and micro barriers to leaving a violent relationship.¹ Although economic dependency is ranked as the primary reason for women not leaving, problems within the justice system are believed to rank second.² Safety concerns may also be relevant, as it is a particularly dangerous time due to the increased risk of violence and stalking.³

Qualitative studies performed with women who have ended a violent relationship suggest that overcoming IPV should be viewed as a complex

process rather than a discrete incident.^{4–5} Different conceptual frameworks^{6–8} were proposed to describe the process of change in abused women, and one of the most used has been the trans-theoretical model of behaviour change (TTM). According to this conceptual framework, a woman's awareness of and response to violence might therefore be expected to vary according to the stage of the violent relationship she is in at a given point in time. However, findings of recent studies suggested that movement between stages generally proceed in a non-linear direction and the interplay between both internal and external factors could better explain this process of change towards safety.^{9–10}

Quantitative research^{11–15} indicates that most abused women do eventually leave their abusers, although they may initially try a variety of other strategies to overcome the violence by resorting to a range of healthcare, legal or sociocommunity services. As most of these studies have recruited small samples of women from shelters and services for battered women, which are probably likely to represent the most severely abused women,¹¹ little is known about the responses of women to overcome IPV whose experiences are less severe.

The search for outside help has been conditioned by diverse competing factors that go beyond women's control: social attitudes and available community resources;¹⁶ access to financial resources and social support¹⁷ and context.¹⁸ Therefore, the specific circumstances in which a woman is living must be taken into account when understanding her response to violence.

In 2004 the Spanish government passed a groundbreaking law proposing an exhaustive approach to the problem, involving a significant increase in educational measures, social and healthcare resources for women, along with other legal measures.¹⁹

In order to improve and provide better help to women in an abusive relationship we need to acquire greater knowledge of how women from different backgrounds and with different IPV characteristics responded to violence in this new context. We aim to describe the response strategies adopted by women faced with IPV, analyse the association between women's personal resources, IPV characteristics (type, duration and women's age at onset) and the response strategies adopted by women.

METHODS

Data source

This study used data from a national cross-sectional survey of adult women recruited during 2006–7 from female patients seeking medical care for whatever reason in primary care services around the country. The objective of the original data collection was to estimate the prevalence of different kinds of violence against Spanish women and associated factors.

During the study period 989 randomly selected health professionals by a multistage cluster sampling scheme were asked for collaboration, and 605 (61.2%) in 547 primary healthcare services across the country accepted.

The number of women invited to participate in the study was 16419 and 27% of them refused. After excluding 1153 questionnaires of women who had never had a partner and 467 incomplete or not meeting the inclusion criteria, the final sample consisted of 10322. For the purposes of this study and taking into consideration that for women experiencing IPV making changes towards safety can be a difficult and lengthy process⁹ we only included in the sample women who reported IPV in the past that was before the previous year. A final sample of 1469 (14.5%) women was included in the analyses.

Procedure and data collection

Women were considered ineligible if they were illiterate, did not understand Spanish or had severe cognitive disabilities that impaired the completion of a written questionnaire. Following the ethical and safety recommendations for research on domestic violence against women,²⁰ women who attended the practice accompanied by a male partner were also considered non-eligible. Women who met the eligibility criteria were invited by the physician to participate once the consultation was finished and, if they gave informed consent for participation, were given the questionnaire in an envelope. The envelope also contained information on available community resources for battered women in the area.

Data were collected by a self-administered questionnaire specifically developed for this study containing 27 domains, and it can be answered in approximately 15 min. Both confidentiality and anonymity were guaranteed at all times. This study was approved by the ethics committee of the University of Valencia.

Variables selected

Violence-related variables

Those women who answered that they had had a partner in the past, at least 1 year ago, were asked if they had been abused physically (hit, slapped or pushed, etc), psychologically (insulted, humiliated in front of other people, scared, shouted at or controlled by not being allowed to visit family and friends, etc), and/or sexually (forced to engage in sexual activities against her will or forced to carry out a sexual act considered unpleasant, etc). These questions have three possible responses: 'many times', 'sometimes' or 'never'. A woman was considered to have experienced IPV in the past if she answered 'sometimes' or 'many times' to any of the questions. These three questions were also used in previous studies conducted by this research group showing high comprehensibility and acceptability by female patients in primary healthcare services.²¹ Because there is usually considerable overlap between IPV types, we created mutually exclusive hierarchical categories of IPV for the analysis.

Women's age at onset of IPV and the length of time women were exposed to IPV were dichotomised into two categories using the median as the cut-off point.

Personal and social resources

Social support was measured with a question that appraises the availability of specific help for a particular situation.²² ('How many people can you really turn to when you have a problem or difficulty?'). Answers were coded as a dichotomous variable of value 0=no ('no-one to turn to for support'); 1=yes ('one person or more'). The following sociodemographics were considered: age, marital status, employment, education, monthly family income and children in the household.

Responses to IPV

Information on the responses of women faced with an abusive relationship included nine non-mutually exclusive closed-ended questions that were defined based on a literature review and consultation with professionals who work with battered women: (1) I have not tried to resolve the situation; (2) I would like to resolve the situation but do not know how; (3) I have tried to solve things by talking with my partner; (4) I have asked my family and/or friends for advice; (5) I am looking for work so I can be financially independent from my partner; (6) I have visited an association or service for battered women; (7) I have resorted to healthcare providers; (8) I have reported my partner to the police; (9) I have ended the relationship. A pilot study was used to check the accuracy of the responses.

Statistical analysis

To understand better the conditions that could influence the responses adopted by abused women we grouped their responses into strategies that reflected similar actions. A factorial analysis was conducted using the analysis of principal components as the extraction method. Those factors with auto values over 1 were rotated using a varimax rotation and we retained three factors (distancing, in process and inhibition) that were categorised into 'yes' and 'no', through a k-means cluster analysis.

To ascertain the associations of each strategy with socio-demographic variables and characteristics of abuse χ^2 tests were used ($p < 0.05$). To identify the independent predictors for strategies response we performed multivariate stepwise logistic regression analysis as we considered this an exploratory analysis in which the emphasis is on identifying a subgroup of possible risk factors rather than testing the relationship of each in the presence of well-known effects. Also concern over collinearity favours a forward stepwise approach regression analysis. Each model was built using a combination of forced entry and forward stepwise procedures: the criterion for entry was $p < 0.05$ and for removal $p > 0.10$. The significance of each predictor variable was generally assessed by the likelihood ratio test, but for forward stepwise entry, the score test was used. All the data were analysed with the statistical software SPSS, version 15.0.

RESULTS

The sociodemographic characteristics and the frequency and types of abuse of women with past IPV are shown in table 1. The mean age of the sample was 42 years (SD 11.7); there were as many married (37.2%) as separated or divorced women (36.5%), also outnumbering the single women group (21.9%), and more than half had children in their care. 42.8% had completed primary education and 21.4% had a college or university degree. Over half the women were employed with a monthly household income of between €901 and €1800. Almost all the women (91.1%) reported having someone

Table 1 Sociodemographic and abuse characteristics in women who reported violence in the past

| | n | % |
|------------------------------------|------|------|
| Total | 1469 | 100 |
| Sociodemographic characteristics | | |
| Marital status | | |
| Married | 541 | 37.2 |
| Unmarried | 319 | 21.9 |
| Separated/divorced | 531 | 36.5 |
| Widowed | 63 | 4.3 |
| Age, years | | |
| <35 | 405 | 27.8 |
| 35–44 | 429 | 29.5 |
| 45–54 | 363 | 24.9 |
| ≥55 | 258 | 17.7 |
| Level of education | | |
| Primary | 617 | 42.8 |
| Secondary | 517 | 35.9 |
| University degree | 308 | 21.4 |
| Children | | |
| No | 586 | 40.7 |
| Yes | 855 | 59.3 |
| Employment status | | |
| Housewife | 321 | 22.2 |
| Employed | 829 | 57.3 |
| Unemployed/student/retired | 297 | 20.5 |
| Household income (€) | | |
| ≤900 | 477 | 33.8 |
| 901–1800 | 657 | 46.6 |
| >1800 | 276 | 19.6 |
| Social support | | |
| None | 119 | 8.9 |
| Yes | 1215 | 91.1 |
| Abuse characteristics | | |
| Women's age at onset of IPV, years | | |
| <25 | 620 | 50.8 |
| ≥25 | 601 | 49.2 |
| Duration of IPV, years | | |
| ≤5 | 559 | 46.7 |
| >5 | 637 | 53.3 |
| One type of IPV | | |
| Physical | 38 | 2.6 |
| Psychological | 439 | 29.9 |
| Sexual | 141 | 9.6 |
| Two types of IPV | | |
| Physical and psychological | 154 | 10.5 |
| Physical and sexual | 7 | 0.5 |
| Sexual and psychological | 161 | 11.0 |
| Three types of IPV | | |
| Physical, psychological and sexual | 463 | 31.5 |

IPV, intimate partner violence.

they could really depend on when they had a problem or difficulty. The mean age at the first experience of a violent relationship was 26 years and the mean duration of this relationship was 10 years. Psychological abuse was more frequently reported by women, alone or together with physical or sexual abuse. One out of every three women reported a combination of physical, psychological and sexual abuse. A small number of women, 66 (4.5%) did not specify an answer about the type of abuse, so they were not classified into any of the categories.

Women's responses to IPV are displayed in table 2. As questions were not posed as mutually exclusive, 57.9% of women answered only one, 20.6% two and 5.2% had three responses.

Table 2 Women's response to IPV (n=1250):* factor analysis

| Items | Coefficients | Responses† n (%) | Strategies n (%) |
|--|--------------|------------------|------------------|
| Factor 1. Inhibition strategy (12.7% of variance) | | | |
| 1. I have not tried to resolve the situation | 0.73 | 121 (9.7) | 156 (12.5) |
| 2. I would like to resolve the situation but do not know how | 0.55 | 160 (12.8) | |
| Factor 2. In-process strategy (18.2% of variance) | | | |
| 3. I have tried by talking with my partner | 0.80 | 403 (32.2) | 187 (15.0) |
| 4. I have sought advice from family and/or friends | 0.68 | 241 (19.3) | |
| 5. I'm looking for work to become financially independent | 0.35 | 104 (8.3) | |
| Factor 3. Distancing strategy (21.3% of variance) | | | |
| 6. I have sought help from services for battered women | 0.79 | 150 (12.0) | 907 (72.5) |
| 7. I have reported my partner to the police | 0.75 | 180 (14.4) | |
| 8. I have sought help from healthcare professionals | 0.56 | 264 (21.1) | |
| 9. I have left my partner | 0.19 | 752 (60.2) | |

The total variance percentage explained is of 52.3.

*Women who did not answer questions about their responses to intimate partner violence (IPV), n=219 (14.9%).

†Responses to IPV were not mutually exclusive.

Women who did not answer the questions (15%) were not included in the analyses although no differences were detected in demographic and violence characteristics between those who did and did not answer. The factor analysis identified three factors labelled as strategies: distancing (seeking help from battered women's services, calling the police, visiting healthcare professionals, ending the relationship); in process (speaking to their partner, seeking advice from family or friends, looking for work); and inhibition (have not tried; I do not know how). The distancing strategy was the most common strategy used by women (72.5%); only 15% of women had initiated an in-process strategy and the remaining women (12.5%) had not tried any action, so they were classified into the inhibition strategy.

Women included in distancing strategies are mainly separated or divorced, aged 35–44 years, mothers and employed; those who carried out an in-process strategy were older (45–55 years), married, mothers and employed. The strategy classified as inhibition was instigated by women who are currently married, aged 55 years or over, mothers and mainly housewives. A significant association was detected between the violence-related variables, that is, type, women's age at onset of abuse and duration in time. The association between the distancing strategy and shorter duration of IPV is of particular note compared with in-process and inhibition strategies, in which the abuse lasted more than 5 years (table 3).

Table 4 shows the results of the three models adjusted by variables that reached significance in bivariate analysis and the p value of the forward end models. Having a job, being young when abuse began and the combination of physical and psychological IPV was significantly associated with a distancing strategy. For women who respond with an in-process strategy, having dependent children and monthly incomes exceeding €900 were significant variables. Finally, the variables related to an inhibition strategic response were for women with a lower educational level, housewives and when IPV was a combination

Table 3 Association between sociodemographic and abuse characteristics and strategic responses to IPV

| Characteristics | Distancing | | Process | | Inhibition | |
|---|------------|---------|------------|---------|------------|---------|
| | n (%) | p Value | n (%) | p Value | n (%) | p Value |
| Marital status | | | | | | |
| Married | 216 (24.0) | | 138 (75.0) | | 106 (68.4) | |
| Separated/divorced | 450 (49.9) | <0.001 | 11 (6.0) | <0.001 | 12 (7.7) | <0.001 |
| Others | 235 (26.1) | | 35 (19.0) | | 37 (23.9) | |
| Age, years | | | | | | |
| <35 | 259 (28.7) | | 44 (23.8) | | 31 (20.0) | |
| 35–44 | 292 (32.3) | <0.001 | 45 (24.3) | 0.053 | 43 (27.7) | <0.001 |
| 45–54 | 229 (25.4) | | 57 (30.8) | | 35 (22.6) | |
| ≥55 | 123 (13.6) | | 39 (21.1) | | 46 (29.7) | |
| Educational level | | | | | | |
| Primary education | 349 (38.9) | | 98 (53.0) | | 92 (61.3) | |
| Secondary education | 342 (38.1) | <0.001 | 50 (27.0) | 0.012 | 47 (31.3) | <0.001 |
| University degree | 207 (23.1) | | 37 (20.0) | | 11 (7.3) | |
| Children | | | | | | |
| No | 380 (42.4) | | 55 (29.9) | | 55 (36.4) | |
| Yes | 516 (57.6) | <0.001 | 129 (70.1) | 0.001 | 96 (63.6) | 0.195 |
| Employment status | | | | | | |
| Housewife | 123 (13.7) | | 64 (34.8) | | 80 (52.6) | |
| Employed | 579 (64.5) | <0.001 | 79 (42.9) | <0.001 | 49 (32.2) | <0.001 |
| Unemployed/student/retired | 195 (21.7) | | 41 (22.3) | | 23 (15.1) | |
| Monthly family income (€) | | | | | | |
| ≤900 | 315 (35.8) | | 39 (21.7) | | 60 (40.8) | |
| 901–1800 | 390 (44.3) | 0.189 | 97 (53.9) | 0.004 | 63 (42.9) | 0.080 |
| >1800 | 175 (19.9) | | 44 (24.4) | | 24 (16.3) | |
| Social support | | | | | | |
| No | 74 (8.8) | | 16 (9.4) | | 19 (13.1) | |
| Yes | 767 (91.2) | 0.231 | 154 (90.6) | 0.814 | 126 (86.9) | 0.040 |
| Women's age at onset of IPV, years | | | | | | |
| <25 | 459 (52.8) | | 81 (46.3) | | 68 (45.3) | |
| ≥25 | 419 (47.2) | 0.032 | 94 (53.7) | 0.149 | 82 (54.7) | 0.144 |
| Duration of IPV, years | | | | | | |
| ≤5 | 455 (52.2) | | 62 (36.5) | | 40 (27.0) | |
| >5 | 416 (47.8) | <0.001 | 108 (63.5) | <0.001 | 108 (73.0) | <0.001 |
| Physical IPV only | | | | | | |
| No | 430 (94.1) | | 81 (96.4) | | 58 (98.3) | |
| Yes | 27 (5.9) | 0.142 | 3 (3.6) | 0.553 | 1 (1.7) | 0.230 |
| Psychological IPV only | | | | | | |
| No | 101 (28.6) | | 11 (16.2) | | 14 (30.4) | |
| Yes | 252 (71.4) | 0.162 | 57 (83.8) | 0.011 | 32 (69.6) | 0.628 |
| Sexual IPV only | | | | | | |
| No | 411 (85.4) | | 76 (90.5) | | 36 (75.0) | |
| Yes | 70 (14.6) | 0.863 | 8 (9.5) | 0.054 | 12 (25.0) | 0.052 |
| Physical and psychological IPV | | | | | | |
| No | 461 (78.3) | | 84 (85.7) | | 60 (95.2) | |
| Yes | 128 (21.7) | 0.001 | 14 (14.3) | 0.243 | 3 (4.8) | 0.002 |
| Physical and sexual IPV | | | | | | |
| No | 589 (99.3) | | 100 (100) | | 62 (98.4) | |
| Yes | 4 (0.7) | 0.932 | 0 (0.0) | 0.353 | 1 (1.6) | 0.390 |
| Sexual and psychological IPV | | | | | | |
| No | 485 (81.9) | | 84 (85.7) | | 49 (77.8) | |
| Yes | 107 (18.1) | 0.841 | 14 (14.3) | 0.282 | 14 (22.2) | 0.307 |
| Physical, psychological and sexual IPV | | | | | | |
| No | 485 (62.9) | | 84 (51.5) | | 49 (36.0) | |
| Yes | 286 (37.1) | <0.001 | 79 (48.5) | 0.025 | 87 (64.0) | <0.001 |

IPV, intimate partner violence.

of physical, psychological and sexual abuse. The duration of abuse was significantly associated for the three strategies: a duration over more than 5 years increased the probability of women to respond with an in-process (OR 1.82, 95% CI 1.26 to

2.64) or inhibition (OR 1.99, 95% CI 1.26 to 3.15) strategy, whereas a duration of less than 5 years increased the likelihood of responding with a distancing strategy (OR 1.66, 95% CI=1.12 to 2.46).

Table 4 Significant predictors for the distancing, in-process and inhibition strategy: logistic regression

| Predictor variables | Distancing n = 907 | | Process n = 187 | | Inhibition n = 156 | |
|--|-----------------------|----------|---------------------|----------|-----------------------|----------|
| | AOR (95% CI) | p Value* | AOR (95% CI) | p Value* | AOR (95% CI) | p Value* |
| Educational level | | | | | | |
| Primary education | 1 | | 1 | | 2.66 (1.25 to 5.66) | 0.011 |
| Secondary education | 1.49 (0.82 to 2.70) | | 0.70 (0.34 to 1.43) | | 2.17 (1.00 to 4.71) | 0.049 |
| University degree | 1.84 (1.12 to 3.03) | | 0.31 (0.15 to 0.61) | | 1 | |
| Children | | | | | | |
| No | 1 | | 1 | | 1 | |
| Yes | 0.87 (0.56 to 1.34) | | 1.78 (1.20 to 2.62) | 0.003 | 0.49 (0.26 to 0.94) | |
| Employment status | | | | | | |
| Housewife | 1 | | 1 | | 3.50 (2.20 to 5.58) | <0.001 |
| Employed | 3.36 (2.02 to 5.58) | <0.001 | 0.54 (0.26 to 1.13) | | 1 | |
| Unemployed/student/retired | 1.88 (1.07 to 3.32) | 0.028 | 1.20 (0.55 to 2.65) | | 0.95 (0.52 to 1.74) | 0.882 |
| Monthly family income (€) | | | | | | |
| ≤900 | 1 | | 1 | | 1 | |
| 901–1800 | 0.68 (0.41 to 1.12) | | 2.12 (1.37 to 3.27) | 0.001 | 0.55 (0.27 to 1.11) | |
| >1800 | 0.52 (0.28 to 0.96) | | 2.14 (1.27 to 3.62) | 0.001 | 0.56 (0.21 to 1.44) | |
| Women's age at onset of IPV, years | | | | | | |
| <25 | 2.02 (1.35 to 3.01) | 0.001 | 0.64 (0.38 to 1.08) | | 1 | |
| ≥25 | 1 | | 1 | | 2.33 (1.21 to 4.46) | |
| Duration of IPV, years | | | | | | |
| ≤5 | 1.66 (1.12 to 2.46) | 0.011 | 1 | | 1 | |
| >5 | 1 | | 1.82 (1.26 to 2.64) | 0.001 | 1.99 (1.26 to 3.15) | 0.003 |
| Physical and psychological IPV | | | | | | |
| No | 1 | | 1 | | 1 | |
| Yes | 2.11 (1.18 to 3.76) | 0.011 | 0.76 (0.38 to 1.51) | | 4.04 (1.19 to 13.70) | |
| Physical, psychological and sexual IPV | | | | | | |
| No | 1 | | 1 | | 1 | |
| Yes | 2.11 (1.61 to 2.77) | | 1.48 (1.05 to 2.10) | | 2.24 (1.45 to 3.46) | <0.001 |

AOR, adjusted by variables significant in bivariate analyses for each strategy.

*Only significant in final forward stepwise models.

IPV, intimate partner violence.

DISCUSSION

Our results indicate that 87% of abused women took action to try to overcome IPV. This finding is consistent with recent research^{11–14 23} and differs from the previous common perception of abused women as passive victims.²⁴

Different sociodemographic characteristics and specific circumstances of the abuse were detected between the three strategic responses. Women were more able to seek outside help or leave the partner if they were employed, were younger when the abuse began and when the duration of the abuse was shorter. Women with fewer personal resources, usually housewives and with a lower educational level and with a long-lasting duration of physical, psychological and sexual abuse are less able to try any action to cope with the violent relationship. As abuse persists over time women's mental health may be affected by several emotional responses such as hopelessness and low self-esteem²⁵ and by the building emotional barriers against creating an independent life. The implementation of gender empowerment measures should be a priority. Policies and programmes to support women on low incomes should offer greater financial support to assist abused women better.

Children constituted a problem for leaving if women were financially dependent on their partner. These women are more likely to use their personal and social resources by defending themselves verbally, looking for work or seeking advice from family or friends than by resorting to formal outside help. These women are likely to remain with a violent partner for a longer period of time. It is striking that although a vast majority of women reported having someone available for help few women

sought help from their social network. As the acceptability of violence against women plays an important part in shaping the social environment,²⁶ changing social attitudes could make an important contribution to preventing male partner violence.

In spite of the increase in the number of governmental and non-governmental services for battered women in Spain, our results suggested that the use of these services is far below expectations, although the percentage of women who use them has increased from 7% to 12% according to a previous Spanish study.¹³ To promote the use of these services media campaigns should better inform about the help they could provide.

In our study more women seek help from healthcare providers than from services for battered women. Given that the recognition of abuse may influence the evaluation of the patients' health complaints as well as the outcomes of care,²⁷ guidelines for managing victims of IPV recommend screening and identification, safety planning and referral.²⁸ These interventions are generally targeted at women who are seeking options to end the abuse.^{29 30} For women who acknowledge their abuse but are not prepared for disclosure physicians could provide an opportunity for them to be heard and receive the message that the office is a safe place to talk and that help is available.

Despite the fact that in recent years abused women have been encouraged to report their abusers it was not the most frequent response by women in our study. A similar observation has been detected in other studies.^{11 17} One possible explanation could be that many women might deter from such a decision as serious violence may increase after it is reported.³¹ In fact, 20% of women killed by their partner during 2008 in Spain had

What is already known on this subject

- ▶ Most abused women may try a variety of strategies to overcome IPV by resorting to a range of healthcare, legal or sociocommunity services.
- ▶ However, research into women's responses to IPV has largely been limited to women who have been exposed to the most severe forms of violence.
- ▶ Therefore, little is known about the responses of women to overcome IPV whose experiences are less severe.

What this study adds

- ▶ This study included a sample of women from different socioeconomic backgrounds and with a variety of types and durations of IPV.
- ▶ Women opted for different responses to overcome IPV depending on their own personal and social resources as well as the circumstances linked to the violent situation.
- ▶ The results of this study help to increase our knowledge of the importance of taking into account the specific needs and circumstances of abused women with a view to providing more and better help for such women.

previously reported their abuser to the police, with an average time lapse of approximately 22 months between reporting and the fatal outcome.³² It is therefore a priority to improve the response of the legal institutions so that when women do decide to report their partner they receive appropriate and timely support as well as lasting court safety measures.

The more long-lasting IPV women experience the less likely women are to seek outside help. Disclosure and reaching out to others for help are critical steps along the pathway of change for abused women.³³ So, it is important that women understand that violence will probably only escalate, making it safer to leave earlier rather than later,³⁴ although ending the relationship does not necessarily guarantee an end to IPV³⁵ as many men become even more violent towards women who separate or attempt to separate.

This study has a series of limitations, some common to self reported surveys. By excluding women who attend the healthcare services accompanied by a male partner, we may have left out an undetermined number of women exposed to greater control and abuse by their partners than those who attend alone. The association detected between IPV and low socioeconomic levels and the exclusion of illiterate women could have led to an underestimation of some associations. Despite the limitations described above, we should underline that this study was performed on a sample of women from different socioeconomic backgrounds and with a variety of types and durations of IPV. By identifying subgroups of women with different characteristics, resources and needs, a better application could be made of the existing measures in current plans and policies.

Acknowledgements The authors would like to thank all the physicians who voluntarily participated in this study, and also all the women who gave their time to complete the questionnaire and shared their violence experiences. Without them, this study would not have been possible. The authors gratefully acknowledge the research assistants who collaborated in this study, who all worked with immense dedication and commitment to ensure the successful completion of the study.

Funding This study was partly supported with funding from the Health Institute Carlos III (1/06-36) (Ministry of Health, Spain) and Feder Funds (CTS-177).

Competing interests None.

Patient consent Obtained.

Ethics approval This study was approved by the ethics committee of the University of Valencia.

Contributors IM led the conception, statistical analysis, interpretation of data and writing of the study. All the other authors contributed to the design of the study and IM, IR-P, CV-C, MT and RP contributed to the data gathering and recollection. DM-B, VE-A and JP-C participated in the analysis of the data, and all the authors participated in their interpretation. All the authors reviewed the different drafts of the paper and approved the final version.

Provenance and peer review Not commissioned; externally peer reviewed.

REFERENCES

1. **Anderson D**, Saunders DG. Leaving an abusive partner: an empirical review of predictors, the process of leaving, and psychological well-being. *Trauma Violence Abuse* 2003;**4**:163–91.
2. **Barnett OW**. Why battered women do not leave. Part 2: External inhibiting factors, social support and internal inhibiting factors. *Trauma Violence Abuse* 2001;**2**:3–35.
3. **Langhinrichsen-Rohling J**. Top 10 greatest "hits" important findings and future directions for intimate partner violence research. *J Interpers Violence* 2005;**20**:108–18.
4. **Meritt-Gray M**, Wuest J. Counteracting abuse and breaking free: the process of leaving revealed through women's voices. *Health Care Women Int* 1995;**16**:399–412.
5. **Moss VA**, Pitula CR, Campbell JC, et al. The experience of terminating an abusive relationship from an Anglo and African-American perspective: a qualitative descriptive study. *Issues Ment Health Nurs* 1997;**18**:433–54.
6. **Liang B**, Goodman L, Tummala-Narra P, et al. A theoretical framework for understanding help-seeking processes among survivors of intimate partner violence. *Am J Community Psychol* 2005;**36**:71–84.
7. **Cluss PA**, Chang JC, Hawker L, et al. The process of change for victims of intimate partner violence: support for a psychosocial readiness model. *Womens Health Issues* 2006;**16**:262–74.
8. **Landenburger K**. A process of entrapment in and recovery from an abusive relationship. *Issues Ment Health Nurs* 1989;**10**:209–27.
9. **Chang JC**, Dado D, Ashton S, et al. Understanding behaviour change for women experiencing intimate partner violence: mapping the ups and downs using the stages of change. *Patient Educ Couns* 2006;**62**:330–9.
10. **Burke JG**, Mahoney P, Gielen A, et al. Defining appropriate stages of change for intimate partner violence survivors. *Violence Vict* 2009;**24**:36–51.
11. **Elsberg MC**, Winkvist A, Peña R, et al. Women's strategic responses to violence in Nicaragua. *J Epidemiol Community Health* 2001;**55**:547–55.
12. **Sagot M**. *Ruta crítica de las mujeres afectadas por la violencia intrafamiliar en América Latina: estudios de caso de diez países*. Washington: Organización Panamericana de la Salud, 2000.
13. **Ruiz-Pérez I**, Plazaola-Castaño J, Del Rio-Lozano M, et al. How do women in Spain deal with an abusive relationship? *J Epidemiol Community Health* 2006;**60**:706–11.
14. **Shanon L**, Logan TK, Cole J, et al. Help seeking and coping strategies for IPV in rural and urban women. *Violence Vict* 2006;**21**:167–81.
15. **Ingram EM**. A comparison of help seeking between Latino and non-Latino victims of intimate partner violence. *Violence Against Women* 2007;**13**:159–71.
16. **Gondolf EW**. Services barriers for battered women with male partners in battered programs. *J Interpers Violence* 2002;**17**:217–27.
17. **Ruiz-Pérez I**, Mata-Pariente N, Plazaola-Castaño J. Women's response to intimate partner violence. *J Interpers Violence* 2006;**21**:1156–68.
18. **Logan T**, Shannon L, Walker R. *Partner violence and stalking of women: context, consequences and coping*. New York: Springer, 2005.
19. **Bosch X**. Spain's government puts domestic violence protection plan as top priority. *Lancet* 2001;**357**:1682.
20. **World Health Organisation**. *Putting women's safety first: ethical and safety recommendations for research on domestic violence against women*. Global Programme on Evidence for Health Policy. Geneva: World Health Organisation, 1999.
21. **Ruiz-Pérez I**, Plazaola-Castaño J, Alvarez-Kindelan M, et al. Sociodemographic associations of physical, emotional, and sexual intimate partner violence in Spanish women. *Ann Epidemiol* 2006;**16**:357–63.
22. **Blake RL Jr**, McKay DA. A single-item measure of social support as a predictor of morbidity. *J Fam Pract* 1986;**22**:82–4.
23. **Burkitt KH**, Larkin GL. The transtheoretical model in intimate partner violence victimization: stage changes over time. *Violence Vict* 2008;**23**:411–31.
24. **Strube M**. The decision to leave an abusive relationship: empirical evidence and theoretical issues. *Psychol Bull* 1988;**104**:236–50.
25. **Clements C**, Sabourin CM, Spiby L. Dysphoria and hopelessness following battering: the role of perceived control, coping, and self-esteem. *J Fam Violence* 2004;**19**:25–36.
26. **Gracia E**, Herrero J. Acceptability of domestic violence against women in the European Union: a multilevel analysis. *J Epidemiol Community Health* 2006;**60**:123–9.

27. **Rhodes KV**, Levinson W. Interventions for intimate partner violence against women: clinical applications. *JAMA* 2003;**289**:601–5.
28. **Campbell CP**, Abrahams N, Martin L. Perpetration of violence against intimate partners: health care implications from global data. *Can Med Assoc J* 2008;**179**:511–12.
29. **Zink T**, Elder N, Jacobson J, *et al*. Medical management of intimate partner violence considering the stages of change: precontemplation and contemplation. *Ann Fam Med* 2004;**2**:231–9.
30. **Chang JC**, Cluss PA, Ranieri L, *et al*. Health care interventions for intimate partner violence: what women want? *Women's Health Issues* 2005;**15**:21–30.
31. **McFarlane J**, Campbell JC, Watson K. Intimate partner stalking and femicide: urgent implications for women's safety. *Behav Sci Law* 2002;**20**:51–68.
32. **Consejo General del Poder Judicial**. Domestic and gender violence mortality in Spain during 2008. <http://www.poderjudicial.es/eversuite/GetRecord7template=cpgi/principal.htm> (accessed Mar 2009).
33. **Short L**. Survivor's identification of protective factors and early warning signs in intimate partner violence. *Third Annual Meeting of the International Research Network on violence Against Women. Washington, DC, 9–11 January 1998*. Takoma Park, MD: Center for Health and Gender Equity, 1998: 27–31.
34. **Kim J**, Gray KA. Leave or stay? Battered women's decision after intimate partner violence. *J Interpers Violence* 2008;**23**:1465–82.
35. **Fleury RE**, Sullivan CM, Bybee DI. When ending the relationship does not end the violence: women's experience of violence by former partners. *Violence Against Women* 2000;**6**:1363–83.