



Psychometric properties of the WHO Violence Against Women instrument in a female population-based sample in Sweden

Journal:	<i>BMJ Open</i>
Manuscript ID:	bmjopen-2012-002053
Article Type:	Research
Date Submitted by the Author:	03-Sep-2012
Complete List of Authors:	Nybergh, Lotta; Institute of Medicine, The Sahlgrenska Academy at University of Gothenburg, Department of Public Health and Community Medicine; The Västra Götaland Region Competence Centre on Intimate Partner Violence, Taft, Charles; Institute of Health and Care Sciences, The University of Gothenburg Centre for Person-centred Care, Krantz, Gunilla; Institute of Medicine, The Sahlgrenska Academy at University of Gothenburg, Department of Public Health and Community Medicine; The Västra Götaland Region Competence Centre on Intimate Partner Violence,
Primary Subject Heading:	Public health
Secondary Subject Heading:	Epidemiology, Public health, Research methods
Keywords:	PUBLIC HEALTH, STATISTICS & RESEARCH METHODS, EPIDEMIOLOGY

SCHOLARONE™
Manuscripts

only

1
2
3 **Psychometric properties of the WHO Violence Against Women instrument in a female**
4 **population-based sample in Sweden**
5
6

7
8 Lotta Nybergh (Corresponding author) ^{a), b)}

9
10 Email: lotta.nybergh@socmed.gu.se
11

12
13 Charles Taft ^{c)}

14
15 Email: charles.taft@medicine.gu.se
16

17
18 Gunilla Krantz ^{a), b)}

19
20 Email: gunilla.krantz@socmed.gu.se
21

22
23 ^{a)} Department of Public Health and Community Medicine, Institute of Medicine, The
24 Sahlgrenska Academy at University of Gothenburg, Gothenburg, Sweden.

25
26 Address: Arvid Wallgrens Backe 7, PO Box 453, SE-405 30 Gothenburg, Sweden
27

28
29 ^{b)} The Västra Götaland Region Competence Centre on Intimate Partner Violence, Gothenburg,
30 Sweden
31

32
33 Address: Kungsgatan 12, floor 6, 411 19 Gothenburg, Sweden
34

35
36 ^{c)} Institute of Health and Care Sciences, The University of Gothenburg Centre for Person-
37 centred Care, Gothenburg, Sweden
38

39
40 Address: Arvid Wallgrens Backe, PO Box 457, SE-405 30 Gothenburg, Sweden
41

42 **Keywords**
43

44 Intimate Partner Violence * Sweden * WHO VAW instrument * Psychometric properties *
45

46
47 Women
48

49 **Word count**

50
51 3,109
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

ABSTRACT

Objective: To explore psychometric properties of the Violence Against Women instrument in a randomly selected national sample of women ($N=573$) aged 18-65 years and residing in Sweden. **Design:** Cross-sectional survey study. **Setting:** Sweden. **Participants:** A postal survey was sent to 1006 women between January and March 2009, during which 624 women (62.0%) returned the questionnaire. Fifty-one women who did not answer any of the violence items were excluded from the analyses, resulting in a final sample of 573 women. **Primary and secondary outcome measures:** Self-reported exposure to psychological, physical and sexual intimate partner violence. **Results:** Cronbach's alphas were 0.79 (psychological scale), 0.80 (physical scale), 0.72 (sexual scale) and 0.88 (total scale). A pre-determined three-component solution largely replicated the explored three component conceptual model of the Violence Against Women instrument. The instrument was able to discriminate between groups known from previous studies to differ in exposure to physical and/or sexual violence, that is, respondents with poor vs. good self-rated health and witnessed vs. not witnessed physical violence at home when growing up. Past-year prevalence of physical (8.1%; 95% CI 5.9 – 10.3) and sexual (3.0%; 1.6 – 4.4) violence was similar to that reported in other Nordic studies; however, earlier-in-life prevalence was lower in the current study (14.3%; 95% CI 11.4 – 17.2 and 9.2%; 95% CI 6.8 – 11.6 respectively). Reported exposure rates were higher than those obtained from a concurrently administered instrument (NorVold Abuse Questionnaire). **Conclusion:** The Violence Against Women instrument demonstrated good construct validity and internal reliability in an adult female population in Sweden. However, further studies examining these and other psychometric properties need to be conducted in other countries.

ARTICLE SUMMARY

Article focus

- The World Health Organization's Violence Against Women instrument (VAWI) has been used in several countries around the world in order to investigate violence against women by their intimate male partners, but aspects of reliability and validity have seldom been investigated.
- The aim of the current study was to explore selected psychometric properties of the VAWI in a randomly selected national population ($n=573$) of women.

Key messages

- The current study provides preliminary support for the VAWI subscales of psychological, physical and sexual violence in a Swedish, adult female population.
- This adds to the knowledge of the instrument's cross-cultural validity and reliability, which is of significance when comparing intimate partner violence prevalence rates between countries.

Strengths and limitations

- Randomly selected national sample with good socio-demographic representation
- Lower response rates were found among those 18-29 years old, unmarried, foreign born and with low yearly income

Keywords

Intimate partner violence * Sweden * Validation * WHO VAW instrument * Psychometric properties * Women

INTRODUCTION

While prevalence studies investigating violence against women perpetrated by intimate male partners have become more frequent,(1-4) sizeable differences in reported exposure occur both between and within study sites. These differences may in part be explained by differences in questionnaire administration methods (e.g. personal interviews vs. self-administration), questionnaire content, target populations, or definitions and severity of the violence assessed; however, such differences may also reflect true variation and cultural differences in violence perpetration.(1, 4) Standardized methodologies for assessing intimate partner violence (IPV) may help to enhance the reliability of results obtained from such studies and aid in comparing prevalence rates from diverse settings.

With this in mind, the World Health Organization (WHO) constructed a questionnaire for the WHO Multi-country Study on Women's Health and Domestic Violence against Women.(5) The study questionnaire includes the Violence Against Women instrument (henceforth referred to as "VAWI") assessing exposure to psychological, physical and sexual IPV. The VAWI was developed in collaboration with several networks and expert groups and was based partly on the original(6) and revised Conflict Tactics Scales,(7) as well as on work that originated from its critics.(8) Extensive pre-testing and back-translations of the questionnaire were conducted. The prevalence rates from the ten countries included in the multi-country study vary greatly, with life-time estimates ranging between 20-75% for psychological violence, 13-61% for physical violence and 6-59% for sexual violence.(5) Since the Multi-country Study was performed, the VAWI has been used in several more countries.(9-14)

Despite the VAWI's relatively wide use, few peer-reviewed studies have evaluated its psychometric properties. Internal reliability (Cronbach's α) was assessed and confirmed in the

1
2
3 Multi-Country Study;(15) however, only one study, conducted in Brazil, has explored aspects
4
5 of validity.(16) In that study, analyses of data from two female populations, one urban (São
6
7 Paulo; $n=940$) and one combined urban and rural area (Zona da Mata; $n=1,188$) supported the
8
9 construct validity and internal reliability of the instrument.
10

11
12
13
14 The aim of this study was to explore psychometric properties of the VAWI in a randomly
15
16 selected national population ($n=573$) of women aged 18-65 years residing in Sweden. Sweden
17
18 provides an interesting comparative context due to its linguistic, cultural and socio-economic
19
20 differences to Brazil.
21

22 23 24 25 **METHODS**

26 27 **Procedure, study population and response rate**

28
29 A sample of 1006 women, aged 18-65 years and residing in Sweden, was randomly selected
30
31 by Statistics Sweden from the national population register. Data collection took place between
32
33 January and March 2009. The response rate was 62.0% ($n=624$). Women who did not respond
34
35 to any of the violence items ($n=51$) were excluded from the analyses, resulting in a total
36
37 sample of 573 women.
38
39

40
41
42
43 Criterion validity was explored by comparing prevalence reported in the VAWI versus the
44
45 NorVold Abuse Questionnaire (NorAQ).[16] A second data collection was performed for this
46
47 purpose. Statistics Sweden sent out the VAWI and NorAQ to 20% ($n=125$) of the respondents
48
49 from the initial data collection between November 2009 and January 2010. NorAQ was
50
51 chosen since it is the only questionnaire measuring violence that has been validated in
52
53 Sweden in both a female and male (see companion article) population-based sample. The
54
55 response rate was 65.6% ($n=82$) for the VAWI and 63.2% ($n=79$) for NorAQ.
56
57
58
59
60

Drop-out analysis

A two-proportion z-test was used to assess statistical significance between the drop-out and the final sample regarding age, country of birth, civil status and the respondents' yearly income before tax. A Bonferroni adjustment to the alpha level was applied.

Comparing those who did not return the questionnaire ($n=382$) with the final sample of analysis ($n=573$) revealed that significantly lower response rates were found among non-respondents who were 18-29 years old, unmarried, foreign born and had low yearly income of 0 – 159,999 Swedish Kronor (SEK) before tax. Internal drop-out rates, that is respondents who did not endorse any violence item ($n=51$), were significantly higher among men who were 18-29 years old, unmarried and had a low yearly income in comparison to the final sample of analysis.

Of those who did not return the questionnaire during the second data collection ($n=46$), significantly lower response rates were found for women who were unmarried, widowed or divorced.

Assessment instruments: VAWI and NorAQ

The VAWI consists of behaviour-specific items related to psychological (four items), physical (six items) and sexual violence (three items). The physical violence items are further divided into “moderate” (the two first items) and “severe” (the following four items) violence based on the likelihood of physical injury.⁽⁵⁾ For each question, respondents were asked whether they had experienced the specific act during the *past year* and *earlier in life*. The VAWI's items were translated and adapted to Swedish by an expert panel in IPV.

1
2
3
4
5 NorAQ has been validated in a Swedish context(17) and measures emotional (three items),
6
7 physical (three items) and sexual (four items) abuse, including different perpetrators, as well
8
9 as abuse in the health care system. The NorAQ violence items applicable to an intimate
10
11 partnership (Figure 1) were included with the intention to compare prevalence rates with those
12
13 obtained by use of the VAWI. The second sexual violence item was adapted for use in both a
14
15 male and female population, as the questionnaire constructed for this study was sent to a male
16
17 population as well (see companion).
18
19

20 21 22 23 **Statistical analyses**

24
25 Principal components analysis (PCA) was conducted to explore the internal construct validity
26
27 of the violence items. A promax rotation was chosen due to high inter-component correlations
28
29 (e.g. $r=0.49-0.61$ for the three dimensions). Decisions on the number of components to extract
30
31 were based on parallel analysis, Kaiser's eigenvalue-greater-than-one rule, total proportion of
32
33 variance explained and Cattell's scree plot. This was followed by a pre-determined solution
34
35 with three components as conceptualized in the VAWI.
36
37
38
39

40
41 The internal reliability of the VAWI was assessed with the Cronbach's alpha for each
42
43 subscale and for the total violence scale. An alpha of 0.70 or higher was considered
44
45 satisfactory.(18)
46
47
48

49
50 Known-groups comparisons were performed to investigate the VAWI's external construct
51
52 validity. The aim was to see if the instrument was able to differentiate between groups known
53
54 to differ in exposure to IPV.(19) The following hypotheses were postulated: women who are
55
56 exposed to physical and/or sexual IPV (life-time exposure, "yes/no") would have poorer self-
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 perceived health(2, 20-24) and have grown up in a home where they witnessed physical
4
5 violence between their parents.(9, 25-27) The Mantel-Haenszel test was used controlling for
6
7 age, income, civil status, education and country of birth.
8
9

10
11 *Self-perceived health* was assessed by “How would you say that your general health has been
12
13 during the past year?”. Response options were dichotomized into “very good/good” and
14
15 “neither good nor bad/bad/very bad”. *Childhood exposure to violence* was assessed with the
16
17 question: When you were growing up, did you see your parents (or equivalent) regularly
18
19 physically hurt one another? (“no” and “yes/unsure”).
20
21
22
23

24
25 Prevalence of psychological, physical and sexual violence was calculated for the past year and
26
27 for earlier in life, for comparisons with prevalence rates presented in other studies.
28
29

30
31 In addition, life-time prevalence of IPV was compared between the VAWI and the NorAQ
32
33 and Fisher’s exact test was used to test for statistically significant differences at the 95% CI
34
35 level. Only those respondents who had answered both the VAWI and NorAQ were included
36
37 ($n=77$) in this analysis.
38
39
40
41

42 **Ethical considerations**

43
44 The Regional Ethics Review Board located in Gothenburg gave approval for this study (Dnr:
45
46 527-08) and the WHO ethical and safety recommendations for research on domestic violence
47
48 against women were followed.(28)
49
50
51

52 **RESULTS**

53 **Study population**

54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Nearly half of the women had at least three years of university education ($n = 270$; 47.2%) and the mean age was 43 years ($SD=13$). Of the total sample, 85.1% ($n=484$) were currently in a relationship (i.e. boyfriend or girlfriend, married, registered partnership or cohabiting), of which the majority were heterosexual relationships ($n = 566$; 98.8%). The rest of the sample was single, widowed or divorced, but had previously been in a relationship (see Table 1).

Table 1. *Socio-demographic and psychosocial factors of the total sample. N=573*

	<i>N (%)</i>
Age groups	
18-29	107 (18.7)
30-39	138 (24.1)
40-49	125 (21.8)
50-59	136 (23.7)
60-65	67 (11.7)
Partner status	
Single/widowed/divorced	85 (14.9)
Boyfriend/girlfriend	64 (11.2)
Married/cohabitant/registered partnership	420 (73.8)
Heterosexual relationship	566 (98.8)
Same-sex relationship	7 (1.2)
Educational level (highest)	
University	270 (47.2)
High school (10-12 yrs)	211 (36.9)
Compulsory (≤ 9 yrs)	91 (15.9)
Annual income (before tax, SEK)	
0 – 159,999	168 (29.3)
160,000 - 234,999	175 (30.5)
235,000 - 309,999	143 (25.0)
310,000 or more	87 (15.2)
Employment status	
Employed	396 (69.7)
Student	35 (6.2)
Retired	47 (8.3)
Sick leave (more than 3 months)	8 (1.4)
Parental leave or leave of absence	35 (6.2)
Unemployed	23 (4.0)
Other	24 (4.2)

Country of Birth	
Sweden	519 (90.6)
Other Nordic country	15 (2.6)
Other European country	18 (3.1)
Country outside Europe	21 (3.7)
Self-rated health	
Very good/good	511 (90.0)
Neither good nor bad/bad/very bad	57 (10.0)
Grown up in a home where there occurred physical violence	
No	542 (94.6)
Yes/Unsure	31 (5.4)

Internal validity

The Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin measure of sampling adequacy was 0.89 and Bartlett's test of sphericity was significant ($p < 0.05$), verifying a good fit of the data to the PCA. Parallel analysis, Kaiser's criterion and Cattell's scree test suggested two components (not in Table), explaining 57.4% of the total variance. The first component consisted of all physical and sexual violence items in the VAWI conceptual model, except the two items representing the least severe forms of physical and sexual violence. In addition, the component included the psychological violence item referring to threat of injury. The second component comprised the remaining three psychological violence items as well as the first physical and sexual violence items.

A three-component solution (Table 2) explained 64.4% of the total variance. The third component had an initial eigenvalue close to one (0.9) and comprised two of the three sexual violence items; otherwise the structure was identical to the two component solution and largely mirrored the VAWI's physical, psychological and sexual violence subscales.

Table 2. *Three-component solution for the VAWI psychological, physical and sexual violence items.*
N=534

Conceptual model	Three-component solution		
	C1	C2	C3
Psychological Violence			
1		.89	
2		.74	
3		.64	
4	.43	.33	
Physical Violence			
1		.71	
2	.38		.31
3	.80		
4	.85		
5	.67		
6	.88		
Sexual Violence			
1			.81
2	.56		.55
3			.88
<i>Accumulated variance %</i>	<i>46.1</i>	<i>57.4</i>	<i>64.4</i>
<i>Eigenvalues</i>	<i>6.0</i>	<i>1.5</i>	<i>0.9</i>

^a Loadings greater 0.30 are shown and highest loadings are boldfaced. List-wise deletion was used.

Internal reliability

The Cronbach's alpha coefficient (Table 3) was satisfactory for all subscales in the VAWI conceptual model: 0.79 (psychological scale), 0.80 (physical scale), 0.72 (sexual scale) and 0.88 (total scale). Alpha for the sexual violence scale increased from 0.72 to 0.77 after deleting the item "Demanded to have sex with me even though I did not want to (but did not use physical force)".

Table 3. *Cronbach's α of the VAWI psychological, physical and sexual violence scales and total scale, life-time.* N=573

Scales	Alpha if Item Deleted
Psychological violence	

Insulted me in a way that made me feel bad about myself	.75
Belittled and humiliated me in front of other people	.71
Tried to scare and intimidate me on purpose (e.g. by the way he/she looked at you, by yelling or smashing things)	.72
Threatened to hurt me or someone I care about	.76
Total	.79
Physical violence	
Pushed or shoved me	.81
Thrown something at me that could have hurt me	.75
Hit me with his/her fist or with some other object that could have hurt me	.73
Kicked and dragged me and beat me up	.75
Choked me or burnt me on purpose	.76
Hurt me with a knife, a gun or some other weapon	.80
Total	.80
Sexual violence	
Demanded to have sex with me even though I did not want to (but did not use physical force)	.77
Forced me to have sex against my will by using his/her physical strength (by hitting, holding me firmly or threatening me with a weapon)	.64
Forced me to perform sexual acts that I experienced as degrading and/or humiliating	.54
Total	.72
Violence scale, total	.88

External validity

Known-groups comparison

As hypothesized, VAWI scores were significantly associated with self-rated health and having witnessed parental (or equivalent) physical violence. Specifically, those who reported exposure to violence also reported worse health and having witnessed parental physical violence to a higher extent.

Comparison of prevalence rates to other studies

As assessed with the VAWI, 23.6% ($n=123$) of the respondents reported exposure to psychological violence, 8.4% ($n=43$) to physical violence and 3.0% ($n=16$) to sexual violence

during the past year. Corresponding percentages for exposure to violence earlier in life were 23.6% ($n=135$), 14.3% ($n=82$) and 9.2% ($n=53$; Table 4). Similar 12-month violence exposure rates for physical and sexual violence have been reported in two population-based studies – one in Finland ($n=4,464$) and one in Sweden ($n=4,771$) – using comparable methodologies and definitions.^(29, 30) However, the present study found lower prevalence for physical and sexual violence experienced earlier in life. The aforementioned studies did not report psychological violence.

Table 4. *Past-year and earlier-in-life exposure to IPV as assessed with the VAWI.*
N=573

	Past year			Earlier in life		
	N	%	95 % CI	N	%	95 % CI
Psychological violence	123	23.6 ^a	20.1 – 27.1	135	23.6	20.1 – 27.1
Physical violence	43	8.1	5.9 – 10.3	82	14.3	11.4 – 17.2
Sexual violence	16	3.0	1.6 – 4.4	53	9.2	6.8 – 11.6

^a Percentage is given in valid percent.

VAWI and NorAQ

Higher prevalence was found by the VAWI compared to NorAQ (see Table 5). However, only the difference for psychological IPV was statistically significant (17.1% vs. 2.6%; $p<0.05$). This difference owed principally to the VAWI items “Insulted me in a way that made me feel bad about myself” (16.9%), for which NorAQ has no corresponding item, and “Belittled and humiliated me in front of other people” (6.5%). Prevalence rates for the two other items on this scale were similar to corresponding items in the NorAQ (see Figure 1).

Table 5. *Life-time prevalence of exposure to IPV as assessed with the VAWI versus NorAQ.* N=77

	VAWI		NorAQ	
	N	% ^a	N	% ^a
Psychological violence	13	17.1	2	2.6
Physical violence	5	6.8	3	3.9
Sexual violence	7	9.3	5	6.5

^a Percentage is given in valid percent.

DISCUSSION

The VAWI subscales of psychological, physical and sexual violence showed good internal consistency. Principal components analysis yielded a two-component solution and a three-component solution largely reflected the VAWI's conceptual model. External validity was supported in that the VAWI was able to discriminate between groups known to differ in exposure to physical and/or sexual IPV, that is, respondents with poor vs. good self-rated health and witnessed vs. not witnessed physical violence at home when growing up. Similar past-year prevalence to other Nordic studies was found. Differences in exposure rates of psychological IPV reported in the VAWI and NorAQ exemplify the need for standardized instruments when comparing prevalence of IPV between and within countries.

Internal validity

A two-component solution was suggested by the parallel analysis and the Kaiser and Cattell's scree criterion (one psychological and one combined physical and sexual component). This solution is understandable in that physical and sexual violence are more likely to occur in conjunction. In contrast, psychological violence may occur in isolation of physical and/or sexual violence.(22)

Despite cultural and linguistic differences between Sweden and Brazil, results from the three-component solution in the current study were similar to those derived in the study conducted in Brazil, where a pre-determined three component solution was investigated.(16) In the Brazilian study, the question "Threatened to hurt me or someone I care about" did not load on any component in Zona da Mata, although it loaded in its explored psychological violence component in São Paulo. In the current study the item loaded both in the physical and

1
2
3 psychological violence components. These findings indicate that threat of physical violence
4
5 might not belong as clearly as expected to the psychological violence component, which has
6
7 in fact been a point of debate among researchers.(29) Threats of violence may both precede
8
9 and follow violent acts themselves, either escalating into a violent act or, especially if the
10
11 victim has been exposed to physical violence prior to the threat, the threat of violence might
12
13 frighten the victim just as much as the violent act itself.(29) This could explain the finding
14
15 that threat of violence belonged to both psychological and physical violence. Moreover, both
16
17 in Zona da Mata and in the present study, the item “Has your partner pushed or shoved you?”
18
19 loaded on the psychological violence component rather than the physical violence scale in the
20
21 WHO conceptual model. The observed cross-loadings of individual items as well as items that
22
23 belonged to other domains than in the conceptual model may reflect that female victims often
24
25 are not exposed to one form of violence in isolation of the other.(31) For example, the sexual
26
27 violence item “Forced me to have sex against my will by using his/her physical strength (by
28
29 hitting, holding me firmly or threatening me with a weapon)” which loaded in both the
30
31 physical and sexual IPV components is hard to divide into one or the other category.
32
33
34
35
36
37

38 **Internal reliability**

39
40 The Cronbach’s alpha coefficients reported for the subscales in this study are very similar to
41
42 those found in other studies.(15, 16) For example, for all sites combined in the WHO multi-
43
44 country study, the reliability coefficient was 0.81 for physical and 0.66 for sexual IPV,(15)
45
46 compared to 0.80 and 0.72 respectively in the current study. These similarities indicate a
47
48 consistency in the internal reliability of the VAWI across countries despite cultural and socio-
49
50 economic differences between the countries.
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 In the current study, deleting the item “Demanded to have sex with me even though I did not
4 want to (but did not use physical force)” would increase alpha for the sexual violence scale
5 from 0.72 to 0.77. However, given that the current study is explorative and hypothesis-
6 generating, further studies are needed to determine whether this item needs to be revised or
7 not.
8
9
10
11
12
13

14 15 16 **External validity**

17 18 **Known-groups comparison**

19
20 Of the two known-groups used in the comparison, the strongest relationship found in the
21 literature regards exposure to physical and/or sexual IPV and poorer self-rated health.(2, 20-
22 24) There is also strong evidence that those who are exposed to physical and/or sexual IPV
23 have witnessed their father use physical violence against the mother during childhood.(9, 25-
24 27) We found support that the combined VAWI subscales of physical and/or sexual violence
25 could discriminate between respondents who had poor vs. good self-rated health and between
26 those who had witnessed vs. not witnessed their parents engaged in physical violence. There
27 is only scant knowledge about how these variables relate to psychological violence, hence
28 these analyses were not deemed appropriate for the purpose of assessing validity.
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42

43 **Comparison of prevalence rates to other studies**

44
45 Comparisons of our prevalence rates with those in other studies are challenged by differences
46 between methodologies, definitions and reporting styles. Nevertheless, our 12-month violence
47 exposure rates for physical and sexual violence were similar to those reported previously in
48 population-based studies in Finland and Sweden(29, 30) using similar definitions and
49 methodologies. However, we found lower rates for earlier-in-life estimates of physical and
50 sexual IPV. The Swedish study found that 28% of women were exposed to physical and 16%
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 to sexual violence by a former partner, compared to 14.3% for physical and 9.2% for sexual
4
5 IPV during the earlier-in-life timeframe in the current study. The figures for the Finnish study
6
7 were 29% for severe physical and 16% for sexual IPV. These differences are likely due to
8
9 some minor differences in the definitions between the studies as well as to changes in
10
11 prevalence rates over time and actual differences between countries. However, they may also
12
13 owe to an oversight in the questionnaire layout, where the box for ticking violence
14
15 experienced earlier in life was somewhat unclearly placed. Studies assessing psychological
16
17 violence in a Nordic context using similar definitions as in the current study could not be
18
19 found.
20
21
22
23
24

25 VAWI and NorAQ

26
27 As the type and number of acts assessed in the VAWI and the NorAQ varied at the outset,
28
29 some differences in the results from the two instruments were expected. The two
30
31 questionnaires have also been developed with different aims in mind. NorAQ was developed
32
33 for investigations in health care settings and for comparisons in the Nordic countries of
34
35 various forms of violence, not specifically IPV. On the other hand, the VAWI was developed
36
37 for global comparisons on IPV specifically. For example, the NorAQ psychological violence
38
39 items reflect a more systematic form of violence experienced during a longer time-period or
40
41 under fear or threat. Although these seem to capture similar levels of exposure as the more
42
43 severe psychological violence items of the VAWI, milder forms of psychological violence are
44
45 also represented in the VAWI and thus the instrument captures a broader range of
46
47 psychologically violent acts. The sample size used in this comparison prohibits any strong
48
49 conclusions; however, it further illustrates the importance of using standardized
50
51 questionnaires when comparing prevalence, as results may vary to a large extent depending
52
53 on the instrument used.
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Methodological considerations

As under-reporting is common in surveys assessing IPV,(3, 32) estimates of IPV in the current study are probably rather under- than over-estimated. Reasons for under-reporting IPV include forgetting violent acts that took place further back in life,(33) normalizing the violence, blaming the violence on oneself(34) and being fearful of a violent and controlling partner.(35) Moreover, non-responders were over-represented by young and unmarried women, women with lower income and by those born outside of Sweden. Exposure rates to IPV have been found to be especially high in these groups,(21, 25) which may further contribute to under-estimated prevalence rates and less robust component solutions in our study.

CONCLUSION

Our analysis indicated that the VAWI has good construct validity and internal reliability in a Swedish context. The results obtained were similar to those reported in the Brazilian study, which implies that the VAWI has good cross-cultural construct validity and internal reliability in an adult female population. However, further studies examining these and other psychometric properties need to be conducted in other countries.

COMPETING INTERESTS

The authors declare that they have no competing interests.

CONTRIBUTORSHIP STATEMENT

LN conducted all analyses, wrote the first draft of the manuscript and rewrote new drafts based on input from co-authors. CT planned the analyses, gave input on manuscript drafts.

GK designed the project, planned the analyses, gave input on manuscript drafts. All authors read and approved the final manuscript.

FUNDING

This work was supported by a grant from the Swedish Research Council grant number 527-08.

DATA SHARING STATEMENT

The dataset is available from the corresponding author at lotta.nybergh@socmed.gu.se. Consent for sharing the dataset was not obtained but the presented data are anonymised and risk of identification is low.

Figure 1. *The NorAQ violence items.*

Psychological Violence

Has your partner systematically and for a longer period tried to repress, degrade or humiliate you?

Have you experienced living in fear because your partner systematically and for a longer period threatened you or somebody close to you?

Has your partner systematically and under threat or force tried to limit your contacts with others, or totally control what you may and may not do?

Physical Violence

Has your partner hit you, smacked your face or held you firmly against your will?

Has your partner hit you with his/her fist(s) or with a hard object, kicked you, pushed you violently, given you a beating, trashed you or done anything similar to you?

Has your partner threatened your life by, for instance, trying to strangle you, showing a weapon or knife or by any other similar act?

Sexual Violence

Has your partner against your will touched your genitals, used your body to satisfy him/herself sexually or forced you to touch your partner's genitals?

Has your partner against your will forced intercourse on you?

Has your partner against your will touched parts of your body other than the genitals in a 'sexual way' or forced you to touch other parts of his or her body in a 'sexual way'?

Have you any other way been sexually humiliated; e.g. by being forced to watch a porno movie or similar, forced to participate in a porno movie or similar, forced to show your body naked or forced to watch when your partner showed his/her body naked?

References

1. Alhabib S, Nur U, Jones R. Domestic Violence Against Women: Systematic Review of Prevalence Studies. *J Fam Violence* 2010;**25**:369-82.
2. Ellsberg M, Jansen HA, Heise L, et al. Intimate partner violence and women's physical and mental health in the WHO multi-country study on women's health and domestic violence: an observational study. *The Lancet* 2008;**371**:1165-72.
3. Watts C, Zimmerman C. Violence against women: global scope and magnitude. *The Lancet* 2002;**359**:1232-7.
4. Kury H, Obergfell-Fuchs J, Woessner G. The extent of family violence in Europe: Comparison of national surveys. *Violence Against Women* 2004;**10**:749-69.
5. WHO. Multi-Country Study on Women's Health and Domestic Violence against Women. Initial results on prevalence, health outcomes and women's responses. In: WHO/WHD, ed. Geneva 2005.
6. Straus MA. Measuring intrafamily conflict and violence: The conflict tactics (CT) scales. *J Marriage Fam* 1979;**41**:75-88.
7. Straus MA, Hamby SL, Boney-McCoy S, et al. The revised conflict tactics scales (CTS2). *J Fam Issues* 1996;**17**:283-316.
8. Dobash RP, Dobash RE, Wilson M, et al. The myth of sexual symmetry in marital violence. *Soc Probl* 1992;**39**:71-91.
9. Yüksel-Kaptanoğlu İ, Türkyılmaz AS, Heise L. What Puts Women at Risk of Violence From Their Husbands? Findings From a Large, Nationally Representative Survey in Turkey. *J Interpers Violence* 2012;**27**:2743-69.

10. Abeya SG, Afework MF, Yalew AW. Intimate partner violence against women in western Ethiopia: prevalence, patterns, and associated factors. *BMC Public Health* 2011;**11**:913.
11. Ali TS, Asad N, Mogren I, et al. Intimate partner violence in urban Pakistan: prevalence, frequency, and risk factors. *Int J Women's Health* 2011;**3**:105-15.
12. Jayasuriya V, Wijewardena K, Axemo P. Intimate Partner Violence Against Women in the Capital Province of Sri Lanka. *Violence Against Women* 2011;**17**:1086-102.
13. Vung N, Ostergren P, Krantz G. Intimate partner violence against women, health effects and health care seeking in rural Vietnam. *Eur J Public Health* 2009;**19**:178-82.
14. Xu X, Zhu F, O'Campo P, et al. Prevalence of and risk factors for intimate partner violence in China. *Am J Public Health* 2005;**95**:78-85.
15. Garcia-Moreno C, Jansen HA, Ellsberg M, et al. Prevalence of intimate partner violence: findings from the WHO multi-country study on women's health and domestic violence. *The Lancet* 2006;**368**:1260-9.
16. Schraiber L, Latorre M, França Jr I, et al. Validity of the WHO VAW study instrument for estimating gender-based violence against women. *Rev Saúde Pública* 2010;**44**:658-66.
17. Swahnberg I, Wijma B. The NorVold Abuse Questionnaire (NorAQ): validation of new measures of emotional, physical, and sexual abuse, and abuse in the health care system among women. *Eur J Public Health* 2003;**13**:361-6.
18. Nunnally JC, Bernstein IH. Chapter: 7: The assessment of reliability. In *Psychometric theory*. New York: McGraw 1994:264-5.
19. Cronbach LJ, Meehl PE. Construct validity in psychological tests. *Psychol Bull* 1955;**52**:281-302.

- 1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
20. Vives-Cases C, Ruiz-Cantero MT, Escribà-Agüir V et al. The effect of intimate partner violence and other forms of violence against women on health. *J Public Health* 2011;**33**:15-21.
21. Nerøien A, Schei B. Partner violence and health: results from the first national study on violence against women in Norway. *Scand J Public Health* 2008;**36**:161-8.
22. Romans S, Forte T, Cohen MM, et al. Who Is Most at Risk for Intimate Partner Violence? *J Interpers Violence* 2007;**22**:1495-514.
23. Fanslow JL, Robinson EM. Violence against women in New Zealand: prevalence and health consequences. *N Z Med J* 2004;**117**(1206).
24. Kramer A, Lorenzon D, Mueller G. Prevalence of intimate partner violence and health implications for women using emergency departments and primary care clinics. *Womens Health Issues* 2004;**14**:19-29.
25. Abramsky T, Watts C, Garcia-Moreno C, et al. What factors are associated with recent intimate partner violence? findings from the WHO multi-country study on women's health and domestic violence. *BMC Public Health* 2011;**11**:109.
26. Wood SL, Sommers MS. Consequences of Intimate Partner Violence on Child Witnesses: A Systematic Review of the Literature. *J Child Adolesc Psychiatr Nurs* 2011;**24**:223-36.
27. Paterson J, Faibairn-Dunlop P, Cowley-Malcolm ET, et al. Maternal childhood parental abuse history and current intimate partner violence: data from the Pacific Islands Families Study. *Violence Vict* 2007;**22**:474-88.
28. Watts C, Heise L, Ellsberg M, et al. Putting women first: ethical and safety recommendations for research on domestic violence against women. *Geneva: World Health Organization* 2001.

- 1
2
3 29. Lundgren E, Heimer G, Westerstrand J, et al. *Slagen Dam: Mäns våld mot*
4 *kvinnor i jämställda Sverige-en omfattningsundersökning. (Captured queen - men's violence*
5 *against women in "equal" Sweden - a prevalence study)*: Brottsoffermyndigheten 2001.
6
7
8
9 30. Piispa M, Heiskanen M, Kääriäinen J, et al. *Naisiin kohdistunut väkivalta 2005.*
10 *(Violence Against Women in Finland)*: Oikeuspoliittinen tutkimuslaitos 2006.
11
12
13 31. Jewkes R. Intimate partner violence: causes and prevention. *The Lancet*
14 2002;**359**:1423-9.
15
16
17 32. Ellsberg M, Heise L, Peña R, et al. Researching domestic violence against
18 women: methodological and ethical considerations. *Stud Fam Plann* 2001;**32**:1-16.
19
20
21 33. Wijma B, Schei B, Swahnberg K, et al. Emotional, physical, and sexual abuse in
22 patients visiting gynaecology clinics: a Nordic cross-sectional study. *The Lancet*
23 2003;**361**:2107-13.
24
25
26
27 34. Chan KL. Gender differences in self-reports of intimate partner violence: A
28 review. *Aggress Violent Behav* 2011;**16**:167-75.
29
30
31 35. Johnson MP. Conflict and control: Gender symmetry and asymmetry in
32 domestic violence. *Violence Against Women* 2006;**12**:1003-18.
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Figure 1. *The NorAQ violence items.*

Psychological Violence

Has your partner systematically and for a longer period tried to repress, degrade or humiliate you?

Have you experienced living in fear because your partner systematically and for a longer period threatened you or somebody close to you?

Has your partner systematically and under threat or force tried to limit your contacts with others, or totally control what you may and may not do?

Physical Violence

Has your partner hit you, smacked your face or held you firmly against your will?

Has your partner hit you with his/her fist(s) or with a hard object, kicked you, pushed you violently, given you a beating, trashed you or done anything similar to you?

Has your partner threatened your life by, for instance, trying to strangle you, showing a weapon or knife or by any other similar act?

Sexual Violence

Has your partner against your will touched your genitals, used your body to satisfy him/herself sexually or forced you to touch your partner's genitals?

Has your partner against your will forced intercourse on you?

Has your partner against your will touched parts of your body other than the genitals in a 'sexual way' or forced you to touch other parts of his or her body in a 'sexual way'?

Have you any other way been sexually humiliated; e.g. by being forced to watch a porno movie or similar, forced to participate in a porno movie or similar, forced to show your body naked or forced to watch when your partner showed his/her body naked?

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60STROBE Statement—Checklist of items that should be included in reports of *cross-sectional studies*

	Item No	Recommendation
Title and abstract	1	(a) Indicate the study's design with a commonly used term in the title or the abstract (b) Provide in the abstract an informative and balanced summary of what was done and what was found
Introduction		
Background/rationale	2	Explain the scientific background and rationale for the investigation being reported
Objectives	3	State specific objectives, including any prespecified hypotheses
Methods		
Study design	4	Present key elements of study design early in the paper
Setting	5	Describe the setting, locations, and relevant dates, including periods of recruitment, exposure, follow-up, and data collection
Participants	6	(a) Give the eligibility criteria, and the sources and methods of selection of participants
Variables	7	Clearly define all outcomes, exposures, predictors, potential confounders, and effect modifiers. Give diagnostic criteria, if applicable
Data sources/ measurement	8*	For each variable of interest, give sources of data and details of methods of assessment (measurement). Describe comparability of assessment methods if there is more than one group
Bias	9	Describe any efforts to address potential sources of bias
Study size	10	Explain how the study size was arrived at
Quantitative variables	11	Explain how quantitative variables were handled in the analyses. If applicable, describe which groupings were chosen and why
Statistical methods	12	(a) Describe all statistical methods, including those used to control for confounding (b) Describe any methods used to examine subgroups and interactions (c) Explain how missing data were addressed (d) If applicable, describe analytical methods taking account of sampling strategy (e) Describe any sensitivity analyses
Results		
Participants	13*	(a) Report numbers of individuals at each stage of study—eg numbers potentially eligible, examined for eligibility, confirmed eligible, included in the study, completing follow-up, and analysed (b) Give reasons for non-participation at each stage (c) Consider use of a flow diagram
Descriptive data	14*	(a) Give characteristics of study participants (eg demographic, clinical, social) and information on exposures and potential confounders (b) Indicate number of participants with missing data for each variable of interest
Outcome data	15*	Report numbers of outcome events or summary measures
Main results	16	(a) Give unadjusted estimates and, if applicable, confounder-adjusted estimates and their precision (eg, 95% confidence interval). Make clear which confounders were adjusted for and why they were included (b) Report category boundaries when continuous variables were categorized (c) If relevant, consider translating estimates of relative risk into absolute risk for a meaningful time period
Other analyses	17	Report other analyses done—eg analyses of subgroups and interactions, and sensitivity analyses

Discussion		
Key results	18	Summarise key results with reference to study objectives
Limitations	19	Discuss limitations of the study, taking into account sources of potential bias or imprecision. Discuss both direction and magnitude of any potential bias
Interpretation	20	Give a cautious overall interpretation of results considering objectives, limitations, multiplicity of analyses, results from similar studies, and other relevant evidence
Generalisability	21	Discuss the generalisability (external validity) of the study results
Other information		
Funding	22	Give the source of funding and the role of the funders for the present study and, if applicable, for the original study on which the present article is based

*Give information separately for exposed and unexposed groups.

Note: An Explanation and Elaboration article discusses each checklist item and gives methodological background and published examples of transparent reporting. The STROBE checklist is best used in conjunction with this article (freely available on the Web sites of PLoS Medicine at <http://www.plosmedicine.org/>, Annals of Internal Medicine at <http://www.annals.org/>, and Epidemiology at <http://www.epidem.com/>). Information on the STROBE Initiative is available at www.strobe-statement.org.

1
2
3 **Psychometric properties of the WHO Violence Against Women instrument in a male**
4 **population-based sample in Sweden**
5
6

7
8 Lotta Nybergh (Corresponding author) ^{a), b)}

9
10 Email: lotta.nybergh@socmed.gu.se
11

12
13 Charles Taft ^{c)}

14
15 Email: charles.taft@medicine.gu.se
16

17
18 Gunilla Krantz ^{a), b)}

19
20 Email: gunilla.krantz@socmed.gu.se
21

22
23 ^{a)} Department of Public Health and Community Medicine, Institute of Medicine, The
24 Sahlgrenska Academy at University of Gothenburg, Gothenburg, Sweden.

25
26 Address: Arvid Wallgrens Backe 7, PO Box 453, SE-405 30 Gothenburg, Sweden
27

28
29 ^{b)} The Västra Götaland Region Competence Centre on Intimate Partner Violence, Gothenburg,
30 Sweden
31

32
33 Address: Kungsgatan 12, floor 6, 411 19 Gothenburg, Sweden
34

35
36 ^{c)} Institute of Health and Care Sciences, The University of Gothenburg Centre for Person-
37 centred Care, Gothenburg, Sweden
38

39
40 Address: Arvid Wallgrens Backe, PO Box 457, SE-405 30 Gothenburg, Sweden
41

42
43 **Keywords**
44

45 Intimate Partner Violence * Sweden * WHO VAW instrument * Psychometric properties *
46

47
48 Men
49

50
51 **Word count**

52 2,986
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

ABSTRACT

Objectives: To explore the psychometric properties of the World Health Organization's Violence Against Women instrument (VAWI) in a randomly selected national sample of Swedish men. **Design:** Cross-sectional survey study. **Setting:** Sweden. **Participants:** A postal survey was sent to 1009 men between January and March 2009, during which 458 men (45.4%) returned the questionnaire. Fifty-nine men who did not answer any of the violence items were excluded from the analyses, resulting in a final sample of 399 men. **Primary and secondary outcome measures:** Self-reported exposure to psychological, physical and sexual intimate partner violence. **Results:** Cronbach's alphas were 0.74 (psychological scale), 0.86 (physical scale), 0.82 (sexual scale) and 0.88 (total scale). Principal components analysis did not corroborate the conceptual three-dimensional model of the VAWI and other constructs were found. Past-year prevalence of physical (7.6%; 95% CI 5.0 – 10.2) and sexual (2.3%; 95% CI 0.8 – 3.8) violence was higher than in other Nordic studies; earlier-in-life prevalence of physical violence (6.8%; CI 95% 4.3 – 9.3) was lower and sexual violence (2.5%; 95% CI 1.0 – 4.0) was higher. Reported exposure rates were generally higher than those obtained from a concurrently administered instrument (NorVold Abuse Questionnaire). **Conclusion:** The VAWI conceptual model was only partially replicated and boundaries between psychological, physical and sexual acts of violence were indistinct among men exposed to intimate partnership violence. This finding suggests that there is need for research instruments assessing intimate partner violence to be validated separately in male and female samples in order to ensure their suitability for the respective groups. Furthermore, theoretical frameworks for understanding men's exposure to intimate partner violence need to be advanced and should serve to guide in the development and evaluation of gender-specific IPV assessment instruments.

ARTICLE SUMMARY

Article focus

- Differences in self-reported exposure to intimate partner violence among women and men have often been found regarding motives for using violence, the context in which the violence occurs and its consequences; however, psychometric properties of instruments assessing intimate partner violence among women and men are seldom investigated in male populations.
- The aim of this study was therefore to examine aspects of the validity and reliability of the Violence Against Women instrument (VAWI) in a randomly selected national population of men

Key messages

- The VAWI conceptual model was only partially replicated and boundaries between psychological, physical and sexual acts of violence were indistinct. This could indicate that different conceptual models, and possibly different assessment instruments, are needed in order to accurately assess men's experiences of IPV in heterosexual relationships.
- Research instruments assessing intimate partner violence need to be validated separately in male and female samples in order to ensure their suitability for the respective groups.
- Theoretical models for understanding men's experiences of violence in heterosexual relationships need to be advanced and should serve to guide in the development and evaluation of gender-specific IPV assessment instruments.

Strengths and limitations

- Randomly selected national male sample with good socio-demographic representation

- Lower response rates were found among those 18-29 years old, unmarried, foreign born and with low yearly income

INTRODUCTION

Most prevalence surveys on intimate partner violence (IPV) have focused on violence perpetrated against women by men. However, a burgeoning literature in mainly high-income countries has begun to assess IPV victimization also among men.(1-5) While such studies often use instruments that have primarily been developed for IPV perpetrated against women, few studies have evaluated their psychometric properties in male populations.

Although research findings on prevalence are inconclusive, they generally find that women and men report similar levels of violence when the contexts, motives, and consequences are not considered.(6) When they are considered, studies assessing IPV perpetrated by men compared to women often report gender differences regarding the types of violence, reasons for the violence, context in which the violence occurs and consequences of the violence.(6, 7) For example, studies assessing differences in IPV find men's violence against women to be more severe, threatening and controlling(8-10) and involve longer lasting victimization, fear of bodily injury or death, more injuries and more adverse health effects.(5, 11, 12) It has also been found that women tend to use physical violence out of anger, not being able to get the partner's attention or in self-defense and retaliation,(11) whereas men often use it as a means to exercise coercive control.(13, 14)

Given that studies find women's and men's IPV exposure to differ in certain aspects, it seems important to investigate whether the instruments that have been developed to assess IPV against women by men in heterosexual relationships are as suitable for assessing women's use

1
2
3 of violence against men. It has been proposed that if violence etiologies differ for women
4
5 compared to men, it may be that research instruments need to be adjusted as well.(15)
6
7

8
9
10 Most studies evaluating the psychometric properties of violence assessment instruments for
11
12 use in men have focused on instruments assessing men's perpetration,(16) recidivism(17) or
13
14 attitudes to violence.(18) Focusing specifically on instruments assessing exposure to violence,
15
16 studies have been conducted with regards to screening IPV in emergency department
17
18 settings,(19, 20) assessing childhood experiences of abuse or neglect(21, 22) or violence by
19
20 several perpetrators.(23, 24) Additionally, many of these instruments were validated in
21
22 specific populations, such as patients in emergency clinics,(19) psychiatric clinics,(22)
23
24 alcohol treatment programs(24) or health care settings,(23) or they combined women and men
25
26 in the same sample instead of conducting these analyses separately.(22, 25) There is a scarcity
27
28 of instruments assessing specifically IPV exposure and that have been validated for use in
29
30 male general population studies.
31
32
33
34
35

36 The World Health Organization (WHO) developed a questionnaire to assess violence
37
38 victimization in population-based samples in the Multi-Country Study on Women's Health
39
40 and Domestic Violence Against Women.(26) Included in this questionnaire is the Violence
41
42 Against Women instrument (henceforth "VAWI") assessing psychological, physical and
43
44 sexual IPV. Although the VAWI was developed to assess violence primarily against women,
45
46 WHO originally also planned to use it in a sub-population of men to assess their experiences
47
48 of IPV exposure. To date, the VAWI has been used in one male population of the ten
49
50 countries in the Multi-Country Study, i.e. in Samoa.(26) More recently, a study conducted in
51
52 Brazil assessed sexual IPV using the VAWI among men.(27)
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 To our knowledge, the psychometric properties of the VAWI have not previously been
4
5 evaluated in a male population. The aim of this study was therefore to examine aspects of the
6
7 validity and reliability of the VAWI in a randomly selected national population of men aged
8
9 18-65 residing in Sweden.
10

11 12 13 **METHODS**

14
15 Data collection procedures, questionnaires and statistical analyses were the same as those
16
17 used in the companion paper and are described in greater detail there. A brief description of
18
19 the statistical analyses specific to the male sample is presented below.
20
21
22
23
24

25 **Procedure, study population and response rate**

26
27 Statistics Sweden randomly selected 1009 men, aged 18-65 years and residing in Sweden,
28
29 from the national population register. Data collection took place between January and March
30
31 2009, during which 45.4% ($n=458$) returned the questionnaire. However, those who did not
32
33 answer any of the violence items ($n=59$) were excluded from the analyses, resulting in a final
34
35 sample of 399 men.
36
37
38
39
40

41 A second data collection was performed to examine the criterion validity of the VAWI against
42
43 the NorVold Abuse Questionnaire (NorAQ).^(23, 28) Statistics Sweden sent out the VAWI
44
45 and NorAQ between November 2009 and January 2010 to 20% ($n=92$) of the respondents
46
47 from the initial data collection. The response rate was 69.6% ($n=64$) for the VAWI and 59.8%
48
49 ($n=54$) for NorAQ.
50
51
52
53

54 **Drop-out analysis**

55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 Differences between non-responders and respondents regarding age, country of birth, civil
4 status and the respondents' yearly income before tax were tested with the two-proportion z-
5 test with Bonferroni adjustment.
6
7
8
9

10
11 Comparing those who did not return the questionnaire ($n=551$) with the final sample of
12 analysis ($n=399$) revealed that non-respondents were 18-29 years old, unmarried, foreign born
13 and had low yearly income of 0 – 159,999 Swedish Kronor (SEK) before tax. Internal drop-
14 out rates, that is, respondents who did not endorse any violence item ($n=59$), differed in a
15 similar pattern from the final sample of analysis: they were 18-29 years old, unmarried and
16 had a low yearly income in comparison to the final sample of analysis.
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26

27 In the second data collection ($n=92$), response rates were lowest among men who were
28 unmarried, divorced or widowed.
29
30
31
32

33 **Assessment instruments: VAWI and NorAQ**

34 The VAWI consists of behavior-specific items related to psychological (four items), physical
35 (six items) and sexual IPV (three items). The physical violence items are further divided into
36 “moderate” (the two first items) and “severe” (the following four items) violence based on the
37 likelihood of physical injury.⁽²⁶⁾ NorAQ was developed to measure abuse in the health care
38 system as well as emotional (three items), physical (three items) and sexual (four items) abuse
39 by different perpetrators (see Figure 1). NorAQ has been shown to have good validity and
40 reliability in a Swedish context.^(23, 28)
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53

54 **Statistical analyses**

55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 Principal components analysis (PCA) with a promax rotation was conducted to explore the
4
5 internal construct validity of the violence items. Two component solutions were examined: 1)
6
7 component extraction based on a parallel analysis, proportion of variance explained, Kaiser's
8
9 eigenvalue-greater-than-one rule and on the examination of Cattell's scree plot and; 2) a
10
11 three-component solution as originally conceptualized in the VAWI.
12
13

14
15
16 The internal reliability of the VAWI was assessed with the Cronbach's alpha for each
17
18 subscale (psychological, physical and sexual violence) and for the total violence scale.
19
20

21
22
23 Prevalence of psychological, physical and sexual violence was calculated for the past year and
24
25 for earlier in life, for comparisons with prevalence rates presented in other studies.
26
27

28
29 Furthermore, life-time prevalence of IPV was compared between the VAWI and the NorAQ.
30
31 Only those respondents who had answered both the VAWI and NorAQ were included ($n=50$)
32
33 in this analysis. Fisher's exact test (95% CI level) was used to test for differences in
34
35 prevalence found between the two instruments.
36
37
38
39

40 **Ethical Considerations**

41
42 The Regional Ethics Review Board located in Gothenburg gave approval for this study (Dnr:
43
44 527-08) and the WHO ethical and safety recommendations for research on domestic violence
45
46 against women were followed.(29)
47
48
49

50 **RESULTS**

51 **Study population**

52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Nearly half of the men had completed high-school ($n=173$; 43.7%) and the mean age was 45 years ($SD=13$). Of the total sample, 87.9% ($n=349$) were currently in a relationship (i.e. boyfriend or girlfriend, married, registered partnership or cohabiting), of which the majority were heterosexual ($n=394$; 98.7%). The rest of the sample was single, widowed or divorced. These and other socio-demographic characteristics of the sample are described in Table 1.

Table 1. *Socio-demographic and psychosocial factors of the total sample. N=399*

	<i>N (%)</i>
Age groups	
18-29	57 (14.3)
30-39	77 (19.3)
40-49	96 (24.1)
50-59	98 (24.6)
60-65	71 (17.8)
Partner status	
Single/widowed/divorced	48 (12.1)
Boyfriend/girlfriend	53 (13.4)
Married/cohabitant/registered partnership	296 (74.6)
Heterosexual relationship	394 (98.7)
Same-sex relationship	5 (1.3)
Educational level (highest)	
University	156 (39.4)
High school (10-12 yrs)	173 (43.7)
Compulsory (≤ 9 yrs)	67 (16.9)
Annual income (before tax, SEK)	
0 - 159,999	77 (19.3)
160,000 - 234,999	52 (13.0)
235,000 - 309,999	107 (26.8)
310,000 or more	163 (40.9)
Employment status	
Employed	329 (83.3)
Student	20 (5.1)
Retired	23 (5.8)
Sick leave (more than 3 months)	5 (1.3)
Parental leave or leave of absence	2 (0.5)
Unemployed	11 (2.8)
Other	5 (1.3)

Country of Birth

Sweden	356 (89.2)
Other Nordic country	7 (1.8)
Other European country	10 (2.5)
Country outside Europe	26 (6.5)

Internal validity

The Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin measure of sampling adequacy was 0.89 and Bartlett's test of Sphericity was significant ($p < 0.05$), verifying a good fit of the data to the PCA. The parallel analysis and Kaiser's criterion suggested two components; however, the third component had an eigenvalue equal to one after decimal rounding and Cattell's scree test suggested three components.

The two component solution (not in Table) explained 68.6% of the total variance: the first component contained the item assessing threat of physical violence ("Threatened to hurt me or someone I care about"), the last three physical violence items and all sexual violence items. This component predominantly included items describing acts that presumably would lead to physical injury. The second component consisted of the three first psychological and the three first physical violence items.

A three-component solution (Table 2) explained 76.0% of the total variance. The first component (C1), explaining 55.4% of the variance, consisted of all the VAWI's sexual violence items as well as the three (out of four) physical violence items conceptualized to reflect severe forms of violence likely to produce physical injury.[11] This component was labeled "Injury inducing violence". The second component (C2) was called "Intimidation and moderate violence" and consisted of the remaining three physical violence items mainly reflecting milder forms of violence and the last two psychological violence items ("Tried to scare and intimidate me on purpose" and "Threatened to hurt me or someone I care about").

The last component (C3) was named “Humiliation” and comprised the two first psychological violence items “Insulted me in a way that made me feel bad about myself” and “Belittled and humiliated me in front of other people”. The question assessing threat of psychological violence loaded on both the first (0.51) and the second (0.49) components. All other items loaded higher on their main components than on other components and main component loadings were all above 0.60.

Table 2. *The two- and three-component solutions for the VAWI psychological, physical and sexual violence items. N=386*

Conceptual model	Three-component solution		
	C1	C2	C3
Psychological Violence			
1		.32	.73^a
2			.87
3		.80	
4	.49	.51	
Physical Violence			
1		.77	
2		.61	
3		.85	
4	.85		
5	.91		
6	.83		
Sexual Violence			
1	.69		.43
2	.97		
3	.94		
<i>Accumulated variance %</i>	55.4	68.6	76.0
<i>Eigenvalues</i>	7.2	1.7	1.0

^a Loadings > 0.30 are shown and highest loadings are boldfaced. List-wise deletion was used.

Internal reliability

Cronbach’s alpha coefficients (Table 3) showed satisfactory internal reliability for all conceptualized VAWI scales: 0.74 for psychological violence, 0.86 for physical violence and

0.82 for sexual violence. Alpha for the sexual violence scale would augment from 0.82 to 0.92 by deletion of the first item (“Demanded to have sex with me even though I did not want to (but did not use physical force)”). Cronbach’s alpha for the total scale was 0.88.

Table 3. Cronbach’s α of the VAWI psychological, physical and sexual violence scales and total scale, life-time. N=399

Scales	Alpha if Item Deleted
Psychological violence	
1 Insulted me in a way that made me feel bad about myself	.66
2 Belittled and humiliated me in front of other people	.64
3 Tried to scare and intimidate me on purpose (e.g. by the way he/she looked at you, by yelling or smashing things)	.64
4 Threatened to hurt me or someone I care about	.64
Total	.74
Physical violence	
1 Pushed or shoved me	.87
2 Thrown something at me that could have hurt me	.82
3 Hit me with his/her fist or with some other object that could have hurt me	.81
4 Kicked and dragged me and beat me up	.82
5 Choked me or burnt me on purpose	.83
6 Hurt me with a knife, a gun or some other weapon	.85
Total	.86
Sexual violence	
1 Demanded to have sex with me even though I did not want to (but did not use physical force)	.92
2 Forced me to have sex against my will by using his/her physical strength (by hitting, holding me firmly or threatening me with a weapon)	.71
3 Forced me to perform sexual acts that I experienced as degrading and/or humiliating	.68
Total	.82
Violence scale, total	.88

External validity

Comparison of prevalence rates to other studies

As assessed with the VAWI, 24.0% ($n=92$) of the respondents reported exposure to psychological violence, 7.6% ($n=29$) to physical violence and 2.3% ($n=9$) to sexual violence during the past twelve months. Earlier-in-life exposure was 13.8% ($n=55$) for psychological, 6.8% ($n=27$) for physical and 2.5% ($n=10$) for sexual violence (Table 4).

Table 4. *Past-year and earlier-in-life exposure to IPV as assessed with the VAWI.*
N=399

	Past year			Earlier in life		
	N	% ^a	CI %	N	% ^a	CI %
Psychological violence	92	24.0 ^a	19.8 – 28.2 ^b	55	13.8	10.4 – 17.2
Physical violence	29	7.6	5.0 – 10.2	27	6.8	4.3 – 9.3
Sexual violence	9	2.3	0.8 – 3.8	10	2.5	1.0 – 4.0

^a Percentage is given in valid percent.

^b The confidence interval was set at 95%.

VAWI and NorAQ

A comparison between VAWI and NorAQ was conducted to assess criterion validity ($N=50$; see Table 5). NorAQ was chosen as it is the only questionnaire measuring violence that has been validated in Sweden in both a male and female (see companion article) population-based sample. The VAWI yielded higher prevalence rates than the NorAQ in relation to all three violence scales. However, only the difference in psychological IPV was statistically significant (30.6% vs. 10.2%; $p<0.05$). This difference owed principally to the VAWI items “Insulted me in a way that made me feel bad about myself” (24%) and “Belittled and humiliated me in front of other people” (16%). Prevalence rates for the other items on this scale were similar to corresponding items in the NorAQ (see Figure 1).

Table 5. *Life-time prevalence of exposure to IPV as assessed with the VAWI versus NorAQ.* N=50

	VAWI		NorAQ	
	N	% ^a	N	% ^a
Psychological violence	15	30.6	5	10.2
Physical violence	7	14.3	6	12.5
Sexual violence	4	8.2	3	6.1

^a Percentage is given in valid percent.

DISCUSSION

The VAWI conceptual model was only partially replicated and boundaries between psychological, physical and sexual acts of violence were indistinct. This finding underlines the importance of investigating psychometric properties of instruments assessing IPV separately for male and female populations. Although the dimensionality of the VAWI was not supported, items composing the three sub-scales, i.e. psychological, physical and sexual violence, showed good internal consistency. Higher prevalence rates for past-year physical and sexual violence were found than those reported in the literature, and than those yielded by a concurrently administered violence questionnaire (NorAQ).

Internal validity

Extraction criteria suggested both a two- and a three-component solution; however, a three-component solution was chosen for comparison with the VAWI conceptual model. In general, the VAWI model was not replicated by PCA in the three-component model and other constructs were found which reflected more the severity rather than the types (psychological, physical and sexual) of violence. Although the three-component structure obtained in the female sample (companion article) also reflected the severity of the acts of violence to a certain extent, the PCA structure in that sample conformed better to the VAWI conceptual model of psychological, physical and sexual violence. Another study that conducted exploratory factor analysis on a different instrument assessing psychological and physical IPV among high school students, also found that the boundaries of psychological and physical IPV were indistinct for men whereas they were generally distinct for women.(30)

1
2
3 Our finding that the underlying constructs differ for women versus men needs to be
4 investigated further. Several researchers have hypothesized that men's experiences of partner
5 violence are qualitatively different from those of women,(12, 31) although few qualitative
6 studies exist that would have investigated this in depth. Previous research has argued that
7 violent acts are not as fearsome or injury inducing to men as they are to women, and it is
8 indeed possible that men and women are both exposed to and experience IPV in different,
9 gendered ways.(31) This could indicate that different conceptual models, and possibly
10 different assessment instruments, are needed in order to accurately assess men's experiences
11 of IPV in heterosexual relationships.(19) However, further studies, especially qualitative ones,
12 are needed in order to explore this further.
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26

27 **Internal reliability**

28 All three subscales showed acceptable internal reliability. Alpha of the sexual violence scale
29 would augment from .82 to .92 by deletion of the first item ("Demanded to have sex with me
30 even though I did not want to (but did not use physical force)"). However, given that the
31 current study is explorative and hypothesis generating, further studies are needed to assess
32 whether the scale would need to be revised or not.
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42

43 **External validity**

44 Comparison of prevalence rates to other studies

45 Comparisons of our prevalence rates with those from previous studies are hampered by the
46 fact that there exist few Nordic, population-based studies focusing on men's self-reported
47 exposure to IPV. A recent population-based study conducted in Finland ($n=1,119$), which
48 used similar definitions to the VAWI found lower prevalence for physical (4.4% versus 7.6%)
49 and sexual (0.3% versus 2.3%) IPV experienced during the past year.[9] For earlier in life
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 (n=1,423), the same study found a higher prevalence for physical IPV (19.5% versus 6.8%)
4
5 than the current study, but a lower prevalence for sexual IPV (1.6% versus 2.5%). The study
6
7 did not measure psychological violence.
8
9

10
11 Although it was expected that IPV reported for the past year would be less than for earlier in
12
13 life, similar levels of physical and sexual violence were reported for both periods in the
14
15 current study. Furthermore, psychological violence was also reported to a considerably lesser
16
17 extent for earlier in life than for the past year. These results are likely due to a pattern
18
19 observed in other studies where men report significantly lower prevalence for IPV
20
21 experienced earlier in life when compared to women.(1, 5, 10) One possibility is that if men
22
23 experience less severe and threatening violence, it may not be salient enough for them to
24
25 recall later in life. However, the results may also be due to an oversight in the questionnaire
26
27 layout, where the box for ticking violence experienced earlier in life was somewhat unclearly
28
29 placed.
30
31
32
33
34
35

36 VAWI and NorAQ

37
38 The items comprising the VAWI seem to capture a broader spectrum of violent acts,
39
40 especially psychological violence, than the more systematic types of abuse reflected in the
41
42 NorAQ. Given the small sample used in this analysis, we cannot draw any conclusions as to
43
44 which questionnaire is more useful for assessing IPV; however, since they tap a different
45
46 range of such experiences, the choice of instrument should be made in accordance with the
47
48 researcher's aim.
49
50

51 52 53 54 **Methodological considerations**

1
2
3 The overall non-response rate was high (54.6%) and response rates were lower among young
4 men, unmarried men, men with a lower annual income and men born outside Sweden, which
5 compromises the generalizability of our results. Little is known about men's response patterns
6 in surveys on violence exposure perpetrated by their intimate partners. A recent review of
7 gender differences in self-reported IPV cites some studies in which men underreport their
8 experiences of IPV,(6) whereas another review found studies pointing to the contrary.(7)
9
10 Future research investigating men's patterns and reasons for responding or not responding to a
11 postal survey on IPV, especially in a Nordic context, would shed more light on these matters.
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21

22
23 Studies on validity assess the extent to which an instrument measures what it is intended to
24 measure.(32) Future research should consider concerns raised by researchers as to the validity
25 of instruments assessing IPV among men in view of the lack of a common definition for what
26 constitutes male victimization of partner violence in intimate heterosexual relationships.(19)
27
28 Although there exist official and widely used definitions of violence against women by their
29 intimate partners, such as the United Nation's definition of violence against women,(33) there
30 is little consensus about what constitutes violence against men in an intimate relationship.(31,
31
32 34) Even when the same act of violence is assessed, the experiences of these acts can be
33 different due to various cultural definitions of femininity and masculinity and to how they are
34 informed by gender hierarchy and power.(7) Definitions need to be clarified so that they
35 adequately capture men's experiences of being abused in an intimate relationship.(34)
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48

49 **CONCLUSION**

50
51 The VAWI conceptual model was only partially replicated and boundaries between
52 psychological, physical and sexual acts of violence were indistinct among men exposed to
53 IPV. This finding suggests that research instruments assessing intimate partner violence need
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 to be validated separately in male and female samples in order to ensure their suitability for
4
5 the respective groups. However, more and larger studies with better response rates are needed
6
7 in order to verify the results. Furthermore, theoretical frameworks for understanding men's
8
9 exposure to intimate partner violence need to be advanced and should serve to guide in the
10
11 development and evaluation of gender-specific IPV assessment instruments.
12
13

14 15 16 **COMPETING INTERESTS**

17
18 The authors declare that they have no competing interests.
19
20

21 22 23 **CONTRIBUTORSHIP STATEMENT**

24
25 LN conducted all analyses, wrote the first draft of the manuscript and rewrote new drafts
26
27 based on input from co-authors. CT planned the analyses and gave input on manuscript
28
29 drafts. GK designed the project, planned the analyses and gave input on manuscript drafts. All
30
31 authors read and approved the final manuscript.
32
33

34 35 36 **FUNDING**

37
38 This work was supported by a grant from the Swedish Research Council (grant number 527-
39
40 08).
41
42

43 44 45 **DATA SHARING STATEMENT**

46
47 The dataset is available from the corresponding author at lotta.nybergh@socmed.gu.se.
48
49 Consent for sharing the dataset was not obtained but the presented data are anonymised and
50
51 risk of identification is low.
52

53
54 Figure 1. *The NorAQ violence items.*

55 56 57 **Psychological Violence**

58
59 Has your partner systematically and for a longer period tried to repress, degrade
60
or humiliate you?

1
2
3 Have you experienced living in fear because your partner systematically and for a
4 longer period threatened you or somebody close to you?

5 Has your partner systematically and under threat or force tried to limit your
6 contacts with others, or totally control what you may and may not do?
7

8 **Physical Violence**

9 Has your partner hit you, smacked your face or held you firmly against your will?

10 Has your partner hit you with his/her fist(s) or with a hard object, kicked you,
11 pushed you violently, given you a beating, trashed you or done anything similar
12 to you?

13 Has your partner threatened your life by, for instance, trying to strangle you,
14 showing a weapon or knife or by any other similar act?
15

16 **Sexual Violence**

17 Has your partner against your will touched your genitals, used your body to
18 satisfy him/herself sexually or forced you to touch your partner's genitals?

19 Has your partner against your will forced intercourse on you?

20 Has your partner against your will touched parts of your body other than the
21 genitals in a 'sexual way' or forced you to touch other parts of his or her body in
22 a 'sexual way'?

23 Have you any other way been sexually humiliated; e.g. by being forced to watch
24 a porno movie or similar, forced to participate in a porno movie or similar, forced
25 to show your body naked or forced to watch when your partner showed his/her
26 body naked?
27

28 **References**

- 29
30
31
32
33 1. Heiskanen M, Ruuskanen E. Men's Experiences of Violence in Finland 2009.
34 Report by The European Institute for Crime Prevention and Control, affiliated with the United
35 Nations. Helsinki: Hakapaino Oy 2011:71.
36
37
38
39 2. Straus MA. Dominance and symmetry in partner violence by male and female
40 university students in 32 nations. *Child Youth Serv Rev* 2008;**30**:252-75.
41
42
43 3. Romans S, Forte T, Cohen MM, et al. Who Is Most at Risk for Intimate Partner
44 Violence? *J Interpers Violence* 2007;**22**:1495-514.
45
46
47
48 4. Archer J. Sex differences in physically aggressive acts between heterosexual
49 partners: A meta-analytic review. *Aggress Violent Behav* 2002;**7**:313-51.
50
51
52 5. Tjaden P, Thoennes N. Prevalence and consequences of male-to-female and
53 female-to-male intimate partner violence as measured by the National Violence Against
54 Women Survey. *Violence Against Women* 2000;**6**:142-61.
55
56
57
58
59
60

- 1
2
3 6. Chan KL. Gender differences in self-reports of intimate partner violence: A
4 review. *Aggress Violent Behav* 2011;**16**:167-175.
- 5
6
7 7. Kimmel MS. "Gender Symmetry" in Domestic Violence. *Violence Against*
8
9
10 *Women* 2002;**8**:1332-63.
- 11
12 8. Tanha M, Beck CJA, Figueredo AJ, et al. Sex differences in intimate partner
13 violence and the use of coercive control as a motivational factor for intimate partner violence.
14
15
16 *J Interpers Violence* 2010;**25**:1836-54.
- 17
18 9. Selin KH. *Våld mot kvinnor och män i nära relationer. Våldets karaktär och*
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
offrens erfarenheter av kontakter med rättsväsendet. (Violence against women and men in intimate relationships. The nature of the violence and the victims' experience of contacts with the criminal justice). Stockholm: Swedish National Council for Crime Prevention, 2009. Report no. 2009:12.
10. Haaland T, Clausen S-E & Schei, B (red). *Vold i parforhold – ulike*
perspektiver. Resultater fra den første landsdekkende undersøkelsen i Norge. (Couple Violence - different perspectives. Results from the first national survey in Norway) NIBR-rerport 2005:3. Oslo: Nordberg A.S. 2005.
11. Bair-Merritt MH, Shea Crowne S, Thompson DA, et al. Why Do Women Use Intimate Partner Violence? A Systematic Review of Women's Motivations. *Trauma Violence Abuse* 2010;**11**:178-89.
12. Dobash RP, Dobash RE. Women's violence to men in intimate relationships. *Br J Criminol* 2004;**44**:324-49.
13. Johnson MP. Conflict and control: Gender symmetry and asymmetry in domestic violence. *Violence Against Woman* 2006;**12**:1003-18.
14. Swan SC, Gambone LJ, Caldwell JE, et al. A review of research on women's use of violence with male intimate partners. *Violence Vict* 2008;**23**:301-14.

- 1
2
3
4
5 15. Rabin RF, Jennings JM, Campbell JC et al. Intimate partner violence screening
6 tools: a systematic review. *Am J Prev Med* 2009 May;**36**:439-45.
- 7
8
9 16. Loinaz I, Echeburúa E, Ortiz-Tallo M et al. Psychometric properties of the
10 Conflict Tactics Scales (CTS-2) in a Spanish sample of partner-violent men. *Psicothema*
11 2012;**24**:142-8.
- 12
13
14 17. Wakeling HC, Howard P, Barnett G. Comparing the validity of the RM2000
15 scales and OGRS3 for predicting recidivism by internet sexual offenders. *Sex Abuse*
16 2011;**23**:146-68.
- 17
18
19 18. Yun SH, Vonk ME. Development and Initial Validation of the Intimate
20 Violence Responsibility Scale (IVRS). *Res Social Work Prac* 2011;**21**:562-71.
- 21
22
23 19. Mills TJ, Avegno JL, Haydel MJ. Male Victims of partner violence: Prevalence
24 and accuracy of screening tools. *J Emerg Med* 2006;**31**:447-52.
- 25
26
27 20. Shakil A, Donald S, Sinacore JM et al. Validation of the HITS domestic
28 violence screening tool with males. *Fam Med* 2005;**37**:193-8.
- 29
30
31 21. Thombs BD, Bernstein DP, Lobbestael J et al. A Validation Study of the Dutch
32 Childhood Trauma Questionnaire-Short Form: Factor Structure, Reliability, and Known-
33 Groups Validity. *Child Abuse Negl* 2009;**33**:518-23.
- 34
35
36 22. Kooiman C, Ouwehand A, Ter Kuile M. The Sexual and Physical Abuse
37 Questionnaire (SPAQ). A screening instrument for adults to assess past and current
38 experiences of abuse. *Child Abuse Negl* 2002;**26**:939-53.
- 39
40
41 23. Swahnberg K. NorVold Abuse Questionnaire for Men (m-NorAQ): Validation
42 of New Measures of Emotional, Physical, and Sexual Abuse and Abuse in Health Care in
43 Male Patients. *Gend Med* 2011;**8**:69-79.
- 44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

- 1
2
3 24. Langeland W, Draijer N, van den Brink W. Assessment of lifetime physical and
4 sexual abuse in treated alcoholics. Validity of the Addiction Severity Index. *Addict Behav*
5 2003;**28**:871-81.
6
7
8
9
10 25. Kapur NA, Windish DM. Optimal Methods to Screen Men and Women for
11 Intimate Partner Violence: results from an Internal Medicine Residency Continuity Clinic. *J*
12 *Interpers Violence* 2011;**26**:2335-52.
13
14
15
16 26. WHO. Multi-Country Study on Women's Health and Domestic Violence against
17 Women. Initial results on prevalence, health outcomes and women's responses. In:
18 WHO/WHD, ed. Geneva 2005.
19
20
21
22
23 27. Schraiber LB, D'Oliveira AFPL, França Junior I. Intimate partner sexual
24 violence among men and women in urban Brazil, 2005. *Rev Saúde Pública* 2008;**42**:127-37.
25
26
27 28. Swahnberg K, Hearn J, Wijma B. Prevalence of perceived experiences of
28 emotional, physical, sexual, and health care abuse in a Swedish male patient sample. *Violence*
29 *Vict* 2009;**24**:265-79.
30
31
32
33
34 29. Watts C, Heise L, Ellsberg M, et al. Putting women first: ethical and safety
35 recommendations for research on domestic violence against women. *Geneva: World Health*
36 *Organization* 2001.
37
38
39
40 30. Cascardi M, Avery-Leaf S, O'Leary KD, et al. Factor structure and convergent
41 validity of the Conflict Tactics Scale in high school students. *Psychol Assess* 1999;**11**:546-55.
42
43
44
45 31. Stark E. Do violent acts equal abuse? Resolving the gender parity/asymmetry
46 dilemma. *Sex Roles* 2010;**62**:201-11.
47
48
49
50 32. Streiner DL, Norman GR. Chapter 10: Validity. In *Health measurement scales: a*
51 *practical guide to their development and use*. Fourth Edition. New York: Oxford University
52 Press: 2008:247-76.
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 33. Assembly UNG. *Declaration on the elimination of violence against women.*

4
5 A/RES/48/104. 1993.

6
7 34. Randle AA, Graham CA. A review of the evidence on the effects of intimate

8
9 partner violence on men. *Psychol Men Masc* 2011;**12**:97-111.
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

For peer review only



Psychometric properties of the WHO Violence Against Women instrument in a female population-based sample in Sweden

Journal:	<i>BMJ Open</i>
Manuscript ID:	bmjopen-2012-002053.R1
Article Type:	Research
Date Submitted by the Author:	26-Dec-2012
Complete List of Authors:	Nybergh, Lotta; Institute of Medicine, The Sahlgrenska Academy at University of Gothenburg, Department of Public Health and Community Medicine; The Västra Götaland Region Competence Centre on Intimate Partner Violence, Taft, Charles; Institute of Health and Care Sciences, The University of Gothenburg Centre for Person-centred Care, Krantz, Gunilla; Institute of Medicine, The Sahlgrenska Academy at University of Gothenburg, Department of Public Health and Community Medicine; The Västra Götaland Region Competence Centre on Intimate Partner Violence,
Primary Subject Heading:	Public health
Secondary Subject Heading:	Epidemiology, Public health, Research methods
Keywords:	PUBLIC HEALTH, STATISTICS & RESEARCH METHODS, EPIDEMIOLOGY

SCHOLARONE™
Manuscripts

only

1
2
3 **Psychometric properties of the WHO Violence Against Women instrument in a female**
4 **population-based sample in Sweden**
5
6

7
8 Lotta Nybergh (Corresponding author) ^{a), b)}

9
10 Email: lotta.nybergh@socmed.gu.se
11

12
13 Charles Taft ^{c)}

14
15 Email: charles.taft@medicine.gu.se
16

17
18 Gunilla Krantz ^{a), b)}

19
20 Email: gunilla.krantz@socmed.gu.se
21

22
23 ^{a)} Department of Public Health and Community Medicine, Institute of Medicine, The
24 Sahlgrenska Academy at University of Gothenburg, Gothenburg, Sweden.

25
26 Address: Arvid Wallgrens Backe 7, PO Box 453, SE-405 30 Gothenburg, Sweden
27

28
29 ^{b)} The Västra Götaland Region Competence Centre on Intimate Partner Violence, Gothenburg,
30 Sweden
31

32
33 Address: Kungsgatan 12, floor 6, 411 19 Gothenburg, Sweden
34

35
36 ^{c)} Institute of Health and Care Sciences, The University of Gothenburg Centre for Person-
37 centred Care, Gothenburg, Sweden
38

39
40 Address: Arvid Wallgrens Backe, PO Box 457, SE-405 30 Gothenburg, Sweden
41

42 **Keywords**
43

44 Intimate Partner Violence * Sweden * WHO VAW instrument * Psychometric properties *

45
46 Women
47

48
49 **Word count**

50
51 3,449
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

ABSTRACT

Objective: To explore psychometric properties of the Violence Against Women instrument in a randomly selected national sample of women ($N=573$) aged 18-65 years and residing in Sweden. **Design:** Cross-sectional survey study. **Setting:** Sweden. **Participants:** A postal survey was sent to 1006 women between January and March 2009, during which 624 women (62.0%) returned the questionnaire. Fifty-one women who did not answer any of the violence items were excluded from the analyses, resulting in a final sample of 573 women. **Primary and secondary outcome measures:** Self-reported exposure to psychological, physical and sexual intimate partner violence. **Results:** Cronbach's alphas were 0.79 (psychological scale), 0.80 (physical scale), 0.72 (sexual scale) and 0.88 (total scale). A pre-determined three-component solution largely replicated the explored three component conceptual model of the Violence Against Women instrument. The instrument was able to discriminate between groups known from previous studies to differ in exposure to physical and/or sexual violence, that is, respondents with poor vs. good self-rated health and witnessed vs. not witnessed physical violence at home when growing up. Past-year prevalence of physical (8.1%; 95% CI 5.9 – 10.3) and sexual (3.0%; 1.6 – 4.4) violence was similar to that reported in other Nordic studies; however, earlier-in-life prevalence was lower in the current study (14.3%; 95% CI 11.4 – 17.2 and 9.2%; 95% CI 6.8 – 11.6 respectively). Reported exposure rates were higher than those obtained from a concurrently administered instrument (NorVold Abuse Questionnaire). **Conclusion:** The Violence Against Women instrument demonstrated good construct validity and internal reliability in an adult female population in Sweden. However, further studies examining these and other psychometric properties need to be conducted in other countries.

ARTICLE SUMMARY

Article focus

- The World Health Organization's Violence Against Women instrument (VAWI) has been used in several countries around the world in order to investigate violence against women by their intimate male partners, but aspects of reliability and validity have seldom been investigated.
- The aim of the current study was to explore selected psychometric properties of the VAWI in a randomly selected national sample ($n=573$) of women.

Key messages

- The current study provides preliminary support for the VAWI subscales of psychological, physical and sexual violence in a Swedish, adult female population.
- This adds to the knowledge of the instrument's cross-cultural validity and reliability, which is of significance when comparing intimate partner violence prevalence rates between countries.

Strengths and limitations

- Cross-sectional study design.
- Further aspects of validity and reliability need to be explored and studies from a diverse range of countries are needed for further cross-cultural assessment.

Keywords

Intimate partner violence * Sweden * Validation * WHO VAW instrument * Psychometric properties * Women

INTRODUCTION

While prevalence studies investigating violence against women perpetrated by intimate male partners have become more frequent,(1-4) sizeable differences in reported exposure occur both between and within study sites. These differences may in part be explained by differences in questionnaire administration methods (e.g. personal interviews vs. self-administration), questionnaire content, target populations, or definitions and severity of the violence assessed; however, such differences may also reflect true variation and cultural differences in violence perpetration.(1, 4) Standardized methodologies for assessing intimate partner violence (IPV) may help to enhance the reliability of results obtained from such studies and aid in comparing prevalence rates from diverse settings.

With this in mind, the World Health Organization (WHO) constructed a questionnaire for the WHO Multi-country Study on Women's Health and Domestic Violence against Women.(5) The study questionnaire includes the Violence Against Women instrument (henceforth referred to as "VAWI") assessing exposure to psychological, physical and sexual IPV. The VAWI was developed in collaboration with several networks and expert groups and was based partly on the original(6) and revised Conflict Tactics Scales,(7) as well as on work that originated from its critics.(8) Extensive pre-testing, independent back-translations and piloting of the questionnaire were conducted.(9) The prevalence rates from the ten countries included in the multi-country study vary greatly, with life-time estimates ranging between 20-75% for psychological violence, 13-61% for physical violence and 6-59% for sexual violence.(5) Since the Multi-country Study was performed, the VAWI has been used in several more countries.(10-15)

1
2
3 Despite the VAWI's relatively wide use, few peer-reviewed studies have evaluated its
4
5 psychometric properties. Internal reliability (Cronbach's α) was assessed and confirmed in the
6
7 Multi-Country Study;(9) however, only one study, conducted in Brazil, has explored aspects
8
9 of validity.(16) In that study, analyses of data from two female populations, one urban (São
10
11 Paulo; $n=940$) and one combined urban and rural area (Zona da Mata; $n=1,188$) supported the
12
13 construct validity and internal reliability of the instrument.
14
15

16
17
18 The aim of this study was to explore psychometric properties of the VAWI in a randomly
19
20 selected national sample ($n=573$) of women aged 18-65 years residing in Sweden. Sweden
21
22 provides an interesting comparative context due to its linguistic, cultural and socio-economic
23
24 differences to Brazil.
25
26

27 28 29 **METHODS**

30 31 **Procedure, study population and response rate**

32
33 A sample of 1006 women, aged 18-65 years and residing in Sweden, was randomly selected
34
35 by Statistics Sweden from the national population register. Data was collected by means of a
36
37 postal survey between January and March 2009. A requirement for the sample selection was
38
39 that the respondent was currently or had previously been in an intimate relationship. The
40
41 response rate was 62.0% ($n=624$). Women who did not respond to any of the violence items
42
43 ($n=51$) were excluded from the analyses, resulting in a total sample of 573 women.
44
45
46
47

48
49 Criterion validity was explored by comparing prevalence reported in the VAWI versus the
50
51 NorVold Abuse Questionnaire (NorAQ).[16] A second data collection was performed for this
52
53 purpose. Statistics Sweden sent out the VAWI and NorAQ to 20% ($n=125$) of the respondents
54
55 from the initial data collection between November 2009 and January 2010. NorAQ was
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 chosen since it is the only questionnaire measuring violence that has been validated in
4
5 Sweden in both a female and male (see companion article) population-based sample. The
6
7 response rate was 65.6% ($n=82$) for the VAWI and 63.2% ($n=79$) for NorAQ.
8
9

10 11 **Drop-out analysis**

12
13 A two-proportion z-test was used to assess statistical significance between the drop-out and
14
15 the final sample regarding age, country of birth, civil status and the respondents' yearly
16
17 income before tax. A Bonferroni adjustment to the alpha level was applied.
18
19

20
21
22 Comparing those who did not return the questionnaire ($n=382$) with the final sample of
23
24 analysis ($n=573$) revealed that significantly lower response rates were found among non-
25
26 respondents who were 18-29 years old, unmarried, foreign born and had low yearly income of
27
28 0 – 159,999 Swedish Kronor (SEK) before tax. Internal drop-out rates, that is respondents
29
30 who did not endorse any violence item ($n=51$), were significantly higher among women who
31
32 were 18-29 years old, unmarried and had a low yearly income in comparison to the final
33
34 sample of analysis.
35
36

37
38
39 Of those who did not return the questionnaire during the second data collection ($n=46$),
40
41 significantly lower response rates were found for women who were unmarried, widowed or
42
43 divorced.
44
45
46

47 48 **Assessment instruments: VAWI and NorAQ**

49
50 The VAWI consists of behaviour-specific items related to psychological (four items), physical
51
52 (six items) and sexual violence (three items). The physical violence items are further divided
53
54 into “moderate” (the two first items) and “severe” (the following four items) violence based
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 on the likelihood of physical injury.(5) For each question, respondents were asked whether
4 they had experienced the specific act during the *past year* and *earlier in life*. The VAWI items
5 were translated and adapted to a Swedish context by a senior researcher (third author) with
6 extensive knowledge about intimate partner violence
7
8
9
10

11
12
13
14 NorAQ has been validated in a Swedish context(17) and measures emotional (three items),
15 physical (three items) and sexual (four items) abuse, including different perpetrators, as well
16 as abuse in the health care system. The NorAQ violence items applicable to an intimate
17 partnership (Appendix 1) were included with the intention to compare prevalence rates with
18 those obtained by use of the VAWI. The second sexual violence item was adapted for use in
19 both a male and female population, as the questionnaire constructed for this study was sent to
20 a male population as well (see companion paper entitled ‘Psychometric properties of the
21 WHO Violence Against Women instrument in a male population-based sample in Sweden’).
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33

34 **Statistical analyses**

35
36 Principal components analysis (PCA) was conducted to explore the internal construct validity
37 of the violence items. A promax rotation was chosen due to high inter-component correlations
38 (e.g. $r=0.49-0.61$ for the three dimensions). Decisions on the number of components to extract
39 were based on parallel analysis, Kaiser’s eigenvalue-greater-than-one rule, total proportion of
40 variance explained and Cattell’s scree plot. This was followed by a pre-determined solution
41 with three components as conceptualized in the VAWI.
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50

51
52 The internal reliability of the VAWI was assessed with the Cronbach’s alpha for each
53 subscale and for the total violence scale. An alpha of 0.70 or higher was considered
54 satisfactory.(18)
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4
5 Known-groups comparisons were performed to investigate the VAWI's external construct
6
7 validity. The aim was to see if the instrument was able to differentiate between groups known
8
9 to differ in exposure to IPV.(19) The following hypotheses were postulated: women who are
10
11 exposed to physical and/or sexual IPV (life-time exposure, "yes/no") would have poorer self-
12
13 perceived health(2, 20-24) and have grown up in a home where they witnessed physical
14
15 violence between their parents(10, 25-27). The Mantel-Haenszel test was used controlling for
16
17 age, income, civil status, education and country of birth. Statistical significance was set at
18
19 $p < 0.05$.
20
21
22
23
24

25 *Self-perceived health* was assessed by "How would you say that your general health has been
26
27 during the past year?". Response options were dichotomized into "very good/good" and
28
29 "neither good nor bad/bad/very bad". *Childhood exposure to violence* was assessed with the
30
31 question: When you were growing up, did you see your parents (or equivalent) regularly
32
33 physically hurt one another? ("no" and "yes/unsure").
34
35
36
37

38 Prevalence of psychological, physical and sexual violence was calculated for the past year and
39
40 for earlier in life, for comparisons with prevalence rates presented in other studies.
41
42
43
44

45 In addition, life-time prevalence of IPV was compared between the VAWI and the NorAQ
46
47 and Fisher's exact test was used to test for statistically significant differences at the 95% CI
48
49 level. Only those respondents who had answered both the VAWI and NorAQ were included
50
51 ($n=77$) in this analysis.
52
53
54
55

56 **Ethical considerations**

57
58
59
60

The Regional Ethics Review Board located in Gothenburg gave approval for this study (Dnr: 527-08) and the WHO ethical and safety recommendations for research on domestic violence against women as applicable to a postal survey were followed.⁽²⁸⁾ For example, a letter was sent to prospective respondents in advance to inform them about the upcoming survey; this provided them with the opportunity to decline the survey before receiving it. Also, although the sampling frame was based on registered individuals, only one survey per household was sent for ethical and safety reasons. Additionally, full anonymity and confidentiality were guaranteed and contact information to a general practitioner (third author on this study), a psychologist and a contact person at Statistics Sweden was provided for additional information and/or referral. The survey was entitled “A study on conflicts, relationships and health”. The study description that followed the title stated that the study assesses IPV.

RESULTS

Study population

Nearly half of the women had at least three years of university education ($n=270$; 47.2%) and the mean age was 43 years ($SD=13$). Of the total sample, 85.1% ($n=484$) were currently in a relationship (i.e. boyfriend or girlfriend, married, registered partnership or cohabiting), of which the majority were heterosexual relationships ($n=566$; 98.8%). The rest of the sample was single, widowed or divorced, but had previously been in a relationship (see Table 1).

Table 1. *Socio-demographic and psychosocial factors of the total sample. $N=573$*

<u>Age groups</u>	<i>N (%)</i>
18-29	107 (18.7)
30-39	138 (24.1)
40-49	125 (21.8)
50-59	136 (23.7)
60-65	67 (11.7)

Partner status

Single/widowed/divorced	85 (14.9)
Boyfriend/girlfriend	64 (11.2)
Married/cohabitant/registered partnership	420 (73.8)
Heterosexual relationship	477 (83.2)
Same-sex relationship	7 (1.2)

Educational level (highest)

University	270 (47.2)
High school (10-12 yrs)	211 (36.9)
Compulsory (≤ 9 yrs)	91 (15.9)

Annual income (before tax, SEK)

0 – 159,999	168 (29.3)
160,000 - 234,999	175 (30.5)
235,000 - 309,999	143 (25.0)
310,000 or more	87 (15.2)

Employment status

Employed	396 (69.7)
Student	35 (6.2)
Retired	47 (8.3)
Sick leave (more than 3 months)	8 (1.4)
Parental leave or leave of absence	35 (6.2)
Unemployed	23 (4.0)
Other	24 (4.2)

Country of Birth

Sweden	519 (90.6)
Other Nordic country	15 (2.6)
Other European country	18 (3.1)
Country outside Europe	21 (3.7)

Self-rated health

Very good/good	511 (90.0)
Neither good nor bad/bad/very bad	57 (10.0)

Grown up in a home where there occurred physical violence

No	542 (94.6)
Yes/Unsure	31 (5.4)

Internal validity

The Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin measure of sampling adequacy was 0.89 and Bartlett's test of sphericity was significant ($p < 0.05$), verifying a good fit of the data to the PCA. Parallel analysis, Kaiser's criterion and Cattell's scree test suggested two components (not in Table), explaining 57.4% of the total variance. The first component consisted of all physical and sexual violence items in the VAWI conceptual model, except the two items representing the least severe forms of physical and sexual violence. In addition, the component included the psychological violence item referring to threat of injury. The second component comprised the remaining three psychological violence items as well as the first physical and sexual violence items.

A three-component solution (Table 2) explained 64.4% of the total variance. The third component had an initial eigenvalue close to one (0.9) and comprised two of the three sexual violence items; otherwise the structure was identical to the two component solution and largely mirrored the VAWI's physical, psychological and sexual violence subscales.

Table 2. *Three-component solution for the VAWI psychological, physical and sexual violence items.*
N=534

Conceptual model	Three-component solution		
	C1	C2	C3
Psychological Violence			
1 Insulted me in a way that made me feel bad about myself		.89	
2 Belittled and humiliated me in front of other people		.74	
3 Tried to scare and intimidate me on purpose (e.g. by the way he/she looked at you, by yelling or smashing things)		.64	
4 Threatened to hurt me or someone I care about	.43	.33	
Physical Violence			
1 Pushed or shoved me		.71	
2 Thrown something at me that could have hurt me	.38		.31
3 Hit me with his/her fist or with some other object that could have hurt me	.80		
4 Kicked and dragged me and beat me up	.85		
5 Choked me or burnt me on purpose	.67		
6 Hurt me with a knife, a gun or some other weapon	.88		
Sexual Violence			

1 Demanded to have sex with me even though I did not want to (but did not use physical force)		.81	
2 Forced me to have sex against my will by using his/her physical strength (by hitting, holding me firmly or threatening me with a weapon)	.56		.55
3 Forced me to perform sexual acts that I experienced as degrading and/or humiliating		.88	
<i>Accumulated variance %</i>	<i>46.1</i>	<i>57.4</i>	<i>64.4</i>
<i>Eigenvalues</i>	<i>6.0</i>	<i>1.5</i>	<i>0.9</i>

^a Loadings > 0.30 are shown and highest loadings are boldfaced. List-wise deletion was used.

Internal reliability

The Cronbach's alpha coefficient (Table 3) was satisfactory for all subscales in the VAWI conceptual model: 0.79 (psychological scale), 0.80 (physical scale), 0.72 (sexual scale) and 0.88 (total scale). Alpha for the sexual violence scale increased from 0.72 to 0.77 after deleting the item "Demanded to have sex with me even though I did not want to (but did not use physical force)".

Table 3. Cronbach's α of the VAWI psychological, physical and sexual violence scales and total scale, life-time. N=573

Scales	Alpha if Item Deleted
Psychological violence	
Insulted me in a way that made me feel bad about myself	.75
Belittled and humiliated me in front of other people	.71
Tried to scare and intimidate me on purpose (e.g. by the way he/she looked at you, by yelling or smashing things)	.72
Threatened to hurt me or someone I care about	.76
Total	.79
Physical violence	
Pushed or shoved me	.81
Thrown something at me that could have hurt me	.75
Hit me with his/her fist or with some other object that could have hurt me	.73
Kicked and dragged me and beat me up	.75
Choked me or burnt me on purpose	.76
Hurt me with a knife, a gun or some other weapon	.80
Total	.80

Sexual violence		
Demanded to have sex with me even though I did not want to (but did not use physical force)		.77
Forced me to have sex against my will by using his/her physical strength (by hitting, holding me firmly or threatening me with a weapon)		.64
Forced me to perform sexual acts that I experienced as degrading and/or humiliating		.54
Total		.72
<hr/>		
Violence scale, total		.88
<hr/>		

External validity

Known-groups comparison

As hypothesized, exposure to violence as assessed by VAWI was significantly associated with self-rated health and having witnessed parental (or equivalent) physical violence when growing up. Specifically, a significantly larger proportion of respondents who reported exposure to violence also reported worse health (Chi-Square (1, N=573) = 26.1, $p < 0.05$) and having witnessed parental physical violence (Chi-Square (1, N=573) = 11.5, $p < 0.05$) than did those not reporting exposure.

Comparison of prevalence rates to other studies

As assessed with the VAWI, 23.6% ($n=123$) of the respondents reported exposure to psychological violence, 8.4% ($n=43$) to physical violence and 3.0% ($n=16$) to sexual violence during the past year. Corresponding percentages for exposure to violence earlier in life were 23.6% ($n=135$), 14.3% ($n=82$) and 9.2% ($n=53$; Table 4). Similar 12-month violence exposure rates for physical and sexual violence have been reported in two population-based studies – one in Finland ($n=4,464$) and one in Sweden ($n=4,771$) – using comparable methodologies and definitions.(29, 30) However, the present study found lower prevalence for physical and sexual violence experienced earlier in life. The aforementioned studies did not report psychological violence.

Table 4. *Past-year and earlier-in-life exposure to IPV as assessed with the VAWI.*
N=573

	Past year			Earlier in life		
	N	%	95 % CI	N	%	95 % CI
Psychological violence	123	23.6 ^a	20.1 – 27.1	135	23.6	20.1 – 27.1
Physical violence	43	8.1	5.9 – 10.3	82	14.3	11.4 – 17.2
Sexual violence	16	3.0	1.6 – 4.4	53	9.2	6.8 – 11.6

^a Percentage is given in valid percent.

VAWI and NorAQ

Higher prevalence was found by the VAWI compared to NorAQ (see Table 5). However, only the difference for psychological IPV was statistically significant (17.1% vs. 2.6%; $p < 0.05$). This difference owed principally to the VAWI items “Insulted me in a way that made me feel bad about myself” (16.9%), for which NorAQ has no corresponding item, and “Belittled and humiliated me in front of other people” (6.5%). Prevalence rates for the two other items on this scale were similar to corresponding items in the NorAQ (see Appendix 1).

Table 5. *Life-time prevalence of exposure to IPV as assessed with the VAWI versus NorAQ.* N=77

	VAWI		NorAQ	
	N	% ^a	N	% ^a
Psychological violence	13	17.1	2	2.6
Physical violence	5	6.8	3	3.9
Sexual violence	7	9.3	5	6.5

^a Percentage is given in valid percent.

DISCUSSION

The VAWI subscales of psychological, physical and sexual violence showed good internal consistency. Principal components analysis yielded a two-component solution and a three-component solution largely reflected the VAWI’s conceptual model. External validity was supported in that the VAWI was able to discriminate between groups known to differ in exposure to physical and/or sexual IPV, that is, respondents with poor vs. good self-rated

1
2
3 health and witnessed vs. not witnessed physical violence at home when growing up. Similar
4
5 past-year prevalence to other Nordic studies was found. Differences in exposure rates of
6
7 psychological IPV reported in the VAWI and NorAQ exemplify the need for standardized
8
9 instruments when comparing prevalence of IPV between and within countries.
10
11

12 13 14 **Internal validity**

15
16 A two-component solution was suggested by the parallel analysis and the Kaiser and Cattell's
17
18 scree criterion (one psychological and one combined physical and sexual component). This
19
20 solution is understandable in that physical and sexual violence occur to a lesser extent in
21
22 comparison with psychological violence, which generally is the most prevalent form of IPV
23
24 .(22, 31)
25
26
27
28

29
30 Despite cultural and linguistic differences between Sweden and Brazil, results from the three-
31
32 component solution in the current study were similar to those derived in the study conducted
33
34 in Brazil, where a pre-determined three component solution was investigated.(16) In the
35
36 Brazilian study, the question "Threatened to hurt me or someone I care about" did not load on
37
38 any component in Zona da Mata, although it loaded in its explored psychological violence
39
40 component in São Paulo. In the current study the item loaded both in the physical and
41
42 psychological violence components. These findings indicate that threat of physical violence
43
44 might not belong as clearly as expected to the psychological violence component, which has
45
46 in fact been a point of debate among researchers.(29) Threats of violence may both precede
47
48 and follow violent acts themselves, either escalating into a violent act or, especially if the
49
50 victim has been exposed to physical violence prior to the threat, the threat of violence might
51
52 frighten the victim just as much as the violent act itself.(29) This could explain the finding
53
54 that threat of violence belonged to both psychological and physical violence. Moreover, both
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 in Zona da Mata and in the present study, the item “Has your partner pushed or shoved you?”
4
5 loaded on the psychological violence component rather than the physical violence scale in the
6
7 WHO conceptual model. The observed cross-loadings of individual items as well as items that
8
9 belonged to other domains than in the conceptual model may reflect that female victims often
10
11 are not exposed to one form of violence in isolation of the other.(32) For example, the sexual
12
13 violence item “Forced me to have sex against my will by using his/her physical strength (by
14
15 hitting, holding me firmly or threatening me with a weapon)” which loaded in both the
16
17 physical and sexual IPV components is hard to divide into one or the other category.
18
19
20
21
22

23 **Internal reliability**

24
25 The Cronbach’s alpha coefficients reported for the subscales in this study are very similar to
26
27 those found in other studies.(9, 16) For example, for all sites combined in the WHO multi-
28
29 country study, the reliability coefficient was 0.81 for physical and 0.66 for sexual IPV,(9)
30
31 compared to 0.80 and 0.72 respectively in the current study. These similarities indicate a
32
33 consistency in the internal reliability of the VAWI across countries despite cultural and socio-
34
35 economic differences between the countries.
36
37
38
39
40

41 In the current study, deleting the item “Demanded to have sex with me even though I did not
42
43 want to (but did not use physical force)” would increase alpha for the sexual violence scale
44
45 from 0.72 to 0.77. However, given that the current study is explorative and hypothesis-
46
47 generating, further studies are needed to determine whether this item needs to be revised.
48
49
50

51 **External validity**

52
53 Known-groups comparison
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 Of the two known-groups used in the comparison, the strongest relationship found in the
4 literature regards exposure to physical and/or sexual IPV and poorer self-rated health.(2, 20-
5 24) There is also strong evidence that those who are exposed to physical and/or sexual IPV
6 have witnessed their father use physical violence against the mother during childhood.(10, 25-
7 27) We found support that the combined VAWI subscales of physical and/or sexual violence
8 could discriminate between respondents who had poor vs. good self-rated health and between
9 those who had witnessed vs. not witnessed their parents engage in physical violence. There is
10 only scant knowledge about how these variables relate to psychological violence, hence these
11 analyses were not deemed appropriate for the purpose of assessing validity.
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24

25 Comparison of prevalence rates to other studies

26
27 Comparisons of our prevalence rates with those in other studies are challenged by differences
28 between methodologies, definitions and reporting styles. Nevertheless, our 12-month violence
29 exposure rates for physical and sexual violence were similar to those reported previously in
30 population-based studies in Finland and Sweden(29, 30) using similar definitions and
31 methodologies. However, we found lower rates for earlier-in-life estimates of physical and
32 sexual IPV. The Swedish study found that 28% of women were exposed to physical and 16%
33 to sexual violence by a former partner, compared to 14.3% for physical and 9.2% for sexual
34 IPV during the earlier-in-life timeframe in the current study. The figures for the Finnish study
35 were 29% for severe physical and 16% for sexual IPV. These differences are likely due to
36 some minor differences in the definitions between the studies as well as to changes in
37 prevalence rates over time and actual differences between countries. However, they may also
38 owe to an oversight in the questionnaire layout, where the box for ticking violence
39 experienced earlier in life was somewhat unclearly placed. Studies assessing psychological
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 violence in a Nordic context using similar definitions as in the current study could not be
4
5 found.
6
7

9 10 VAWI and NorAQ

11 As the type and number of acts assessed in the VAWI and the NorAQ varied at the outset,
12
13 some differences in the results from the two instruments were expected. The two
14
15 questionnaires have also been developed with different aims in mind. NorAQ was developed
16
17 for investigations in health care settings and for comparisons in the Nordic countries of
18
19 various forms of violence, not specifically IPV. On the other hand, the VAWI was developed
20
21 for global comparisons on IPV specifically. For example, the NorAQ psychological violence
22
23 items reflect a more systematic form of violence experienced during a longer time-period or
24
25 under fear or threat. Although these seem to capture similar levels of exposure as the more
26
27 severe psychological violence items of the VAWI, milder forms of psychological violence are
28
29 also represented in the VAWI and thus the instrument captures a broader range of
30
31 psychologically violent acts. The sample size used in this comparison prohibits any strong
32
33 conclusions; however, it further illustrates the importance of using standardized
34
35 questionnaires when comparing prevalence, as results may vary to a large extent depending
36
37 on the instrument used.
38
39
40
41
42
43
44

45 **Methodological considerations**

46
47 The VAWI was designed for and is primarily used in face-to-face interviews(5), whereas the
48
49 current study administered the VAWI via a postal survey. The implications of different modes
50
51 of data collection are difficult to assess due to multiple influencing factors, including the
52
53 method of initial contact with the respondents, visual versus oral presentation of response
54
55 choices, method of sampling as well as differing cultural and social contexts.(33) Previous
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 studies have found disclosure of sensitive topics to be higher in self-administered modes
4
5 compared to face-to-face interviews,(33) also when assessing IPV(34). However, there is a
6
7 scarcity of experimental or randomized study designs comparing different modes of data
8
9 collection.(33)
10

11
12
13
14 Nonetheless, the main known limitation of postal surveys is lowered response rates.(34) The
15
16 current study included two reminders in an effort to minimize drop-out rates. Non-responders
17
18 were over-represented by young and unmarried women, women with low annual income and
19
20 by those born outside of Sweden. Exposure rates of IPV have been found to be especially high
21
22 in these groups,(21, 25) which may further contribute to under-estimated prevalence rates and
23
24 less robust component solutions in our study. Furthermore, the earlier-in-life estimates may
25
26 have been underestimated due to a minor detail on the questionnaire lay-out. In addition, the
27
28 under-reporting common in surveys assessing IPV(3, 35) has probably contributed to further
29
30 underestimation of IPV prevalence rates. Reasons for under-reporting IPV include forgetting
31
32 violent acts that took place further back in life,(36) normalizing the violence, blaming the
33
34 violence on oneself(37) and being fearful of a violent and controlling partner.(38) Finally, the
35
36 sub-sample of respondents who answered both the VAWI and the NorAQ is small, which
37
38 limits our ability to draw conclusions or generalize to the target population.
39
40
41
42
43
44

45 **CONCLUSION**

46
47 Our analysis indicated that the VAWI has good construct validity and internal reliability in a
48
49 Swedish context. The results obtained were similar to those reported in the Brazilian study,
50
51 which implies that the VAWI has good cross-cultural construct validity and internal reliability
52
53 in an adult female population. However, further studies examining these and other
54
55 psychometric properties need to be conducted in other countries.
56
57
58
59
60

COMPETING INTERESTS

The authors declare that they have no competing interests.

CONTRIBUTORSHIP STATEMENT

LN conducted all analyses, wrote the first draft of the manuscript and rewrote new drafts based on input from co-authors. CT planned the analyses and gave input on manuscript drafts. GK designed the project, planned the analyses and gave input on manuscript drafts. All authors read and approved the final manuscript.

FUNDING

This work was supported by a grant from the Swedish Research Council grant number 527-08.

DATA SHARING STATEMENT

The dataset is available from the corresponding author at lotta.nybergh@socmed.gu.se. Consent for sharing the dataset was not obtained but the presented data are anonymised and risk of identification is low.

Appendix 1. *The NorAQ violence items.*

Psychological Violence

Has your partner systematically and for a longer period tried to repress, degrade or humiliate you?

Have you experienced living in fear because your partner systematically and for a longer period threatened you or somebody close to you?

Has your partner systematically and under threat or force tried to limit your contacts with others, or totally control what you may and may not do?

Physical Violence

Has your partner hit you, smacked your face or held you firmly against your will?

Has your partner hit you with his/her fist(s) or with a hard object, kicked you, pushed you violently, given you a beating, thrashed you or done anything similar to you?

Has your partner threatened your life by, for instance, trying to strangle you, showing a weapon or knife or by any other similar act?

Sexual Violence

Has your partner against your will touched your genitals, used your body to satisfy him/herself sexually or forced you to touch your partner's genitals?

Has your partner against your will forced intercourse on you?

Has your partner against your will touched parts of your body other than the genitals in a 'sexual way' or forced you to touch other parts of his or her body in a 'sexual way'?

Have you any other way been sexually humiliated; e.g. by being forced to watch a porno movie or similar, forced to participate in a porno movie or similar, forced to show your body naked or forced to watch when your partner showed his/her body naked?

References

1. Alhabib S, Nur U, Jones R. Domestic Violence Against Women: Systematic Review of Prevalence Studies. *J Fam Violence* 2010;**25**:369-82.
2. Ellsberg M, Jansen HA, Heise L, et al. Intimate partner violence and women's physical and mental health in the WHO multi-country study on women's health and domestic violence: an observational study. *The Lancet* 2008;**371**:1165-72.
3. Watts C, Zimmerman C. Violence against women: global scope and magnitude. *The Lancet* 2002;**359**:1232-7.
4. Kury H, Obergfell-Fuchs J, Woessner G. The extent of family violence in Europe: Comparison of national surveys. *Violence Against Women* 2004;**10**:749-69.
5. WHO. Multi-Country Study on Women's Health and Domestic Violence against Women. Initial results on prevalence, health outcomes and women's responses. In: WHO/WHD, ed. Geneva 2005.
6. Straus MA. Measuring intrafamily conflict and violence: The conflict tactics (CT) scales. *J Marriage Fam* 1979;**41**:75-88.
7. Straus MA, Hamby SL, Boney-McCoy S, et al. The revised conflict tactics scales (CTS2). *J Fam Issues* 1996;**17**:283-316.

- 1
2
3 8. Dobash RP, Dobash RE, Wilson M, et al. The myth of sexual symmetry in
4 marital violence. *Soc Probl* 1992;**39**:71-91.
5
- 6
7 9. Garcia-Moreno C, Jansen HA, Ellsberg M, et al. Prevalence of intimate partner
8 violence: findings from the WHO multi-country study on women's health and domestic
9 violence. *The Lancet* 2006;**368**:1260-9.
10
- 11
12 10. Yüksel-Kaptanoğlu İ, Türkyılmaz AS, Heise L. What Puts Women at Risk of
13 Violence From Their Husbands? Findings From a Large, Nationally Representative Survey in
14 Turkey. *J Interpers Violence* 2012;**27**:2743-69.
15
- 16
17 11. Abeya SG, Afework MF, Yalew AW. Intimate partner violence against women
18 in western Ethiopia: prevalence, patterns, and associated factors. *BMC Public Health*
19 2011;**11**:913.
20
- 21
22 12. Ali TS, Asad N, Mogren I, et al. Intimate partner violence in urban Pakistan:
23 prevalence, frequency, and risk factors. *Int J Women's Health* 2011;**3**:105-15.
24
- 25
26 13. Jayasuriya V, Wijewardena K, Axemo P. Intimate Partner Violence Against
27 Women in the Capital Province of Sri Lanka. *Violence Against Women* 2011;**17**:1086-102.
28
- 29
30 14. Vung N, Ostergren P, Krantz G. Intimate partner violence against women,
31 health effects and health care seeking in rural Vietnam. *Eur J Public Health* 2009;**19**:178-82.
32
- 33
34 15. Xu X, Zhu F, O'Campo P, et al. Prevalence of and risk factors for intimate
35 partner violence in China. *Am J Public Health* 2005;**95**:78-85.
36
- 37
38 16. Schraiber L, Latorre M, França Jr I, et al. Validity of the WHO VAW study
39 instrument for estimating gender-based violence against women. *Rev Saúde Pública*
40 2010;**44**:658-66.
41
- 42
43 17. Swahnberg I, Wijma B. The NorVold Abuse Questionnaire (NorAQ): validation
44 of new measures of emotional, physical, and sexual abuse, and abuse in the health care system
45 among women. *Eur J Public Health* 2003;**13**:361-6.
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

- 1
2
3 18. Nunnally JC, Bernstein IH. Chapter: 7: The assessment of reliability. In
4 Psychometric theory. New York: McGraw 1994:264-5.
5
6
7 19. Cronbach LJ, Meehl PE. Construct validity in psychological tests. *Psychol Bull*
8 1955;**52**:281-302.
9
10
11 20. Vives-Cases C, Ruiz-Cantero MT, Escribà-Aguir V et al. The effect of intimate
12 partner violence and other forms of violence against women on health. *J Public Health*
13 2011;**33**:15-21.
14
15
16 21. Nerøien A, Schei B. Partner violence and health: results from the first national
17 study on violence against women in Norway. *Scand J Public Health* 2008;**36**:161-8.
18
19
20 22. Romans S, Forte T, Cohen MM, et al. Who Is Most at Risk for Intimate Partner
21 Violence? *J Interpers Violence* 2007;**22**:1495-514.
22
23
24 23. Fanslow JL, Robinson EM. Violence against women in New Zealand:
25 prevalence and health consequences. *N Z Med J* 2004;**117**(1206).
26
27
28 24. Kramer A, Lorenzon D, Mueller G. Prevalence of intimate partner violence and
29 health implications for women using emergency departments and primary care clinics.
30 *Womens Health Issues* 2004;**14**:19-29.
31
32
33 25. Abramsky T, Watts C, Garcia-Moreno C, et al. What factors are associated with
34 recent intimate partner violence? findings from the WHO multi-country study on women's
35 health and domestic violence. *BMC Public Health* 2011;**11**:109.
36
37
38 26. Wood SL, Sommers MS. Consequences of Intimate Partner Violence on Child
39 Witnesses: A Systematic Review of the Literature. *J Child Adolesc Psychiatr Nurs*
40 2011;**24**:223–36.
41
42
43 27. Paterson J, Faibairn-Dunlop P, Cowley-Malcolm ET, et al. Maternal childhood
44 parental abuse history and current intimate partner violence: data from the Pacific Islands
45 Families Study. *Violence Vict* 2007;**22**:474-88.
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

- 1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
28. Watts C, Heise L, Ellsberg M, et al. Putting women first: ethical and safety recommendations for research on domestic violence against women. *Geneva: World Health Organization* 2001.
29. Lundgren E, Heimer G, Westerstrand J, et al. *Slagen Dam: Mäns våld mot kvinnor i jämställda Sverige-en omfattningsundersökning. (Captured queen - men's violence against women in "equal" Sweden - a prevalence study)*: Brottsoffermyndigheten 2001.
30. Piispa M, Heiskanen M, Kääriäinen J, et al. *Naisiin kohdistunut väkivalta 2005. (Violence Against Women in Finland)*: Oikeuspoliittinen tutkimuslaitos 2006.
31. Vung N, Ostergren P, Krantz G. Intimate partner violence against women in rural Vietnam - different socio-demographic factors are associated with different forms of violence: Need for new intervention guidelines? *BMC Public Health* 2008;**8**:55.
32. Jewkes R. Intimate partner violence: causes and prevention. *The Lancet* 2002;**359**:1423-9.
33. Bowling A. Mode of questionnaire administration can have serious effects on data quality. *J Public Health* 2005;**27**:281-91.
34. Walby S. Improving the statistics on violence against women. *Stat J UN Econ Comm Eur.* 2005;**22**:193-216.
35. Ellsberg M, Heise L, Peña R, et al. Researching domestic violence against women: methodological and ethical considerations. *Stud Fam Plann* 2001;**32**:1-16.
36. Wijma B, Schei B, Swahnberg K, et al. Emotional, physical, and sexual abuse in patients visiting gynaecology clinics: a Nordic cross-sectional study. *The Lancet* 2003;**361**:2107-13.
37. Chan KL. Gender differences in self-reports of intimate partner violence: A review. *Aggress Violent Behav* 2011;**16**:167-75.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

38. Johnson MP. Conflict and control: Gender symmetry and asymmetry in domestic violence. *Violence Against Women* 2006;**12**:1003-18.

For peer review only

1
2
3
4
5
6
7 **Psychometric properties of the WHO Violence Against Women instrument in a female**
8 **population-based sample in Sweden**
9

10 Lotta Nybergh (Corresponding author)^{a), b)}

11 Email: lotta.nybergh@socmed.gu.se
12
13

14 Charles Taft^{c)}

15 Email: charles.taft@medicine.gu.se
16
17

18 Gunilla Krantz^{a), b)}

19 Email: gunilla.krantz@socmed.gu.se
20
21
22
23

24 ^{a)} Department of Public Health and Community Medicine, Institute of Medicine, The
25 Sahlgrenska Academy at University of Gothenburg, Gothenburg, Sweden.

26 Address: Arvid Wallgrens Backe 7, PO Box 453, SE-405 30 Gothenburg, Sweden
27
28

29 ^{b)} The Västra Götaland Region Competence Centre on Intimate Partner Violence, Gothenburg,
30 Sweden

31 Address: Kungsgatan 12, floor 6, 411 19 Gothenburg, Sweden
32
33
34

35 ^{c)} Institute of Health and Care Sciences, The University of Gothenburg Centre for Person-
36 centred Care, Gothenburg, Sweden

37 Address: Arvid Wallgrens Backe, PO Box 457, SE-405 30 Gothenburg, Sweden
38
39
40

41 **Keywords**

42 Intimate Partner Violence * Sweden * WHO VAW instrument * Psychometric properties *
43
44

45 Women
46
47

48 **Word count**

49 | 3,449+109
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

ABSTRACT

Objective: To explore psychometric properties of the Violence Against Women instrument in a randomly selected national sample of women ($N=573$) aged 18-65 years and residing in Sweden. **Design:** Cross-sectional survey study. **Setting:** Sweden. **Participants:** A postal survey was sent to 1006 women between January and March 2009, during which 624 women (62.0%) returned the questionnaire. Fifty-one women who did not answer any of the violence items were excluded from the analyses, resulting in a final sample of 573 women. **Primary and secondary outcome measures:** Self-reported exposure to psychological, physical and sexual intimate partner violence. **Results:** Cronbach's alphas were 0.79 (psychological scale), 0.80 (physical scale), 0.72 (sexual scale) and 0.88 (total scale). A pre-determined three-component solution largely replicated the explored three component conceptual model of the Violence Against Women instrument. The instrument was able to discriminate between groups known from previous studies to differ in exposure to physical and/or sexual violence, that is, respondents with poor vs. good self-rated health and witnessed vs. not witnessed physical violence at home when growing up. Past-year prevalence of physical (8.1%; 95% CI 5.9 – 10.3) and sexual (3.0%; 1.6 – 4.4) violence was similar to that reported in other Nordic studies; however, earlier-in-life prevalence was lower in the current study (14.3%; 95% CI 11.4 – 17.2 and 9.2%; 95% CI 6.8 – 11.6 respectively). Reported exposure rates were higher than those obtained from a concurrently administered instrument (NorVold Abuse Questionnaire). **Conclusion:** The Violence Against Women instrument demonstrated good construct validity and internal reliability in an adult female population in Sweden. However, further studies examining these and other psychometric properties need to be conducted in other countries.

ARTICLE SUMMARY

Article focus

- The World Health Organization's Violence Against Women instrument (VAWI) has been used in several countries around the world in order to investigate violence against women by their intimate male partners, but aspects of reliability and validity have seldom been investigated.
- The aim of the current study was to explore selected psychometric properties of the VAWI in a randomly selected national population-sample ($n=573$) of women.

Key messages

- The current study provides preliminary support for the VAWI subscales of psychological, physical and sexual violence in a Swedish, adult female population.
- This adds to the knowledge of the instrument's cross-cultural validity and reliability, which is of significance when comparing intimate partner violence prevalence rates between countries.

Strengths and limitations

- Cross-sectional study design.
- Further aspects of validity and reliability need to be explored and studies from a diverse range of countries are needed for further cross-cultural assessment.

Keywords

Intimate partner violence * Sweden * Validation * WHO VAW instrument * Psychometric properties * Women

INTRODUCTION

While prevalence studies investigating violence against women perpetrated by intimate male partners have become more frequent,(1-4) sizeable differences in reported exposure occur both between and within study sites. These differences may in part be explained by differences in questionnaire administration methods (e.g. personal interviews vs. self-administration), questionnaire content, target populations, or definitions and severity of the violence assessed; however, such differences may also reflect true variation and cultural differences in violence perpetration.(1, 4) Standardized methodologies for assessing intimate partner violence (IPV) may help to enhance the reliability of results obtained from such studies and aid in comparing prevalence rates from diverse settings.

With this in mind, the World Health Organization (WHO) constructed a questionnaire for the WHO Multi-country Study on Women's Health and Domestic Violence against Women.(5) The study questionnaire includes the Violence Against Women instrument (henceforth referred to as "VAWI") assessing exposure to psychological, physical and sexual IPV. The VAWI was developed in collaboration with several networks and expert groups and was based partly on the original(6) and revised Conflict Tactics Scales,(7) as well as on work that originated from its critics.(8) Extensive pre-testing ~~and~~ independent back-translations and piloting of the questionnaire were conducted.(9) The prevalence rates from the ten countries included in the multi-country study vary greatly, with life-time estimates ranging between 20-75% for psychological violence, 13-61% for physical violence and 6-59% for sexual violence.(5) Since the Multi-country Study was performed, the VAWI has been used in several more countries.(10-15)(9-14)

1
2
3
4
5
6
7 Despite the VAWI's relatively wide use, few peer-reviewed studies have evaluated its
8 psychometric properties. Internal reliability (Cronbach's α) was assessed and confirmed in the
9 Multi-Country Study;⁽⁹⁾⁽¹⁵⁾ however, only one study, conducted in Brazil, has explored
10 aspects of validity.⁽¹⁶⁾ In that study, analyses of data from two female populations, one urban
11 (São Paulo; $n=940$) and one combined urban and rural area (Zona da Mata; $n=1,188$)
12 supported the construct validity and internal reliability of the instrument.
13
14
15
16
17
18
19

20 The aim of this study was to explore psychometric properties of the VAWI in a randomly
21 selected national ~~population-sample~~ ($n=573$) of women aged 18-65 years residing in Sweden.
22 Sweden provides an interesting comparative context due to its linguistic, cultural and socio-
23 economic differences to Brazil.
24
25
26
27
28
29

30 METHODS

31 Procedure, study population and response rate

32 A sample of 1006 women, aged 18-65 years and residing in Sweden, was randomly selected
33 by Statistics Sweden from the national population register. Data was collected by means of a
34 postal survey between January and March 2009~~Data collection took place between January~~
35 and March 2009. A requirement for the sample selection was that the respondent was
36 currently or had previously been in an intimate relationship. The response rate was 62.0%
37 ($n=624$). Women who did not respond to any of the violence items ($n=51$) were excluded
38 from the analyses, resulting in a total sample of 573 women.
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48

49 Criterion validity was explored by comparing prevalence reported in the VAWI versus the
50 NorVold Abuse Questionnaire (NorAQ).[16] A second data collection was performed for this
51 purpose. Statistics Sweden sent out the VAWI and NorAQ to 20% ($n=125$) of the respondents
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4
5
6
7 from the initial data collection between November 2009 and January 2010. NorAQ was
8
9 chosen since it is the only questionnaire measuring violence that has been validated in
10
11 Sweden in both a female and male (see companion article) population-based sample. The
12
13 response rate was 65.6% ($n=82$) for the VAWI and 63.2% ($n=79$) for NorAQ.

14 15 16 **Drop-out analysis**

17
18 A two-proportion z-test was used to assess statistical significance between the drop-out and
19
20 the final sample regarding age, country of birth, civil status and the respondents' yearly
21
22 income before tax. A Bonferroni adjustment to the alpha level was applied.

23
24
25
26 Comparing those who did not return the questionnaire ($n=382$) with the final sample of
27
28 analysis ($n=573$) revealed that significantly lower response rates were found among non-
29
30 respondents who were 18-29 years old, unmarried, foreign born and had low yearly income of
31
32 0 – 159,999 Swedish Kronor (SEK) before tax. Internal drop-out rates, that is respondents
33
34 who did not endorse any violence item ($n=51$), were significantly higher among ~~men~~-women
35
36 who were 18-29 years old, unmarried and had a low yearly income in comparison to the final
37
38 sample of analysis.

39
40
41 Of those who did not return the questionnaire during the second data collection ($n=46$),
42
43 significantly lower response rates were found for women who were unmarried, widowed or
44
45 divorced.

46 47 48 **Assessment instruments: VAWI and NorAQ**

49
50 The VAWI consists of behaviour-specific items related to psychological (four items), physical
51
52 (six items) and sexual violence (three items). The physical violence items are further divided
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4
5
6
7 into “moderate” (the two first items) and “severe” (the following four items) violence based
8 on the likelihood of physical injury.(5) For each question, respondents were asked whether
9 they had experienced the specific act during the *past year* and *earlier in life*. [The VAWI items](#)
10 [were translated and adapted to a Swedish context by a senior researcher \(third author\) with](#)
11 [extensive knowledge about intimate partner violence](#)~~The VAWI's items were translated and~~
12 ~~adapted to Swedish by an expert panel in IPV.~~
13
14
15
16
17
18
19

20 NorAQ has been validated in a Swedish context(17) and measures emotional (three items),
21 physical (three items) and sexual (four items) abuse, including different perpetrators, as well
22 as abuse in the health care system. The NorAQ violence items applicable to an intimate
23 partnership (Appendix 1) were included with the intention to compare prevalence rates with
24 those obtained by use of the VAWI. The second sexual violence item was adapted for use in
25 both a male and female population, as the questionnaire constructed for this study was sent to
26 a male population as well (see companion [paper entitled ‘Psychometric properties of the](#)
27 [WHO Violence Against Women instrument in a male population-based sample in Sweden’](#)).
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37

38 **Statistical analyses**

39 Principal components analysis (PCA) was conducted to explore the internal construct validity
40 of the violence items. A promax rotation was chosen due to high inter-component correlations
41 (e.g. $r=0.49-0.61$ for the three dimensions). Decisions on the number of components to extract
42 were based on parallel analysis, Kaiser’s eigenvalue-greater-than-one rule, total proportion of
43 variance explained and Cattell’s scree plot. This was followed by a pre-determined solution
44 with three components as conceptualized in the VAWI.
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4
5
6
7 The internal reliability of the VAWI was assessed with the Cronbach's alpha for each
8 subscale and for the total violence scale. An alpha of 0.70 or higher was considered
9 satisfactory.(18)
10

11
12
13
14 Known-groups comparisons were performed to investigate the VAWI's external construct
15 validity. The aim was to see if the instrument was able to differentiate between groups known
16 to differ in exposure to IPV.(19) The following hypotheses were postulated: women who are
17 exposed to physical and/or sexual IPV (life-time exposure, "yes/no") would have poorer self-
18 perceived health(2, 20-24) and have grown up in a home where they witnessed physical
19 violence between their parents(10, 25-27)(9, 25-27). The Mantel-Haenszel test was used
20 controlling for age, income, civil status, education and country of birth. Statistical
21 significance was set at p<0.05.
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29

30
31 *Self-perceived health* was assessed by "How would you say that your general health has been
32 during the past year?". Response options were dichotomized into "very good/good" and
33 "neither good nor bad/bad/very bad". *Childhood exposure to violence* was assessed with the
34 question: When you were growing up, did you see your parents (or equivalent) regularly
35 physically hurt one another? ("no" and "yes/unsure").
36
37
38
39
40
41

42
43 Prevalence of psychological, physical and sexual violence was calculated for the past year and
44 for earlier in life, for comparisons with prevalence rates presented in other studies.
45
46
47

48
49 In addition, life-time prevalence of IPV was compared between the VAWI and the NorAQ
50 and Fisher's exact test was used to test for statistically significant differences at the 95% CI
51
52
53
54

level. Only those respondents who had answered both the VAWI and NorAQ were included ($n=77$) in this analysis.

Ethical considerations

The Regional Ethics Review Board located in Gothenburg gave approval for this study (Dnr: 527-08) and the WHO ethical and safety recommendations for research on domestic violence against women as applicable to a postal survey were followed.⁽²⁸⁾ For example, a letter was sent to prospective respondents in advance to inform them about the upcoming survey; this provided them with the opportunity to decline the survey before receiving it. Also, although the sampling frame was based on registered individuals, only one survey per household was sent for ethical and safety reasons. Additionally, full anonymity and confidentiality were guaranteed and contact information to a general practitioner (third author on this study), a psychologist and a contact person at Statistics Sweden was provided for additional information and/or referral. The survey was entitled “A study on conflicts, relationships and health”. The study description that followed the title stated that the study assesses IPV.

Formatted: English (U.S.)

RESULTS

Study population

Nearly half of the women had at least three years of university education ($n=270$; 47.2%) and the mean age was 43 years ($SD=13$). Of the total sample, 85.1% ($n=484$) were currently in a relationship (i.e. boyfriend or girlfriend, married, registered partnership or cohabiting), of which the majority were heterosexual relationships ($n=566$; 98.8%). The rest of the sample was single, widowed or divorced, but had previously been in a relationship (see Table 1).

Table 1. *Socio-demographic and psychosocial factors of the total sample. N=573*

	<i>N (%)</i>
Age groups	
18-29	107 (18.7)
30-39	138 (24.1)
40-49	125 (21.8)
50-59	136 (23.7)
60-65	67 (11.7)
Partner status	
Single/widowed/divorced	85 (14.9)
Boyfriend/girlfriend	64 (11.2)
Married/cohabitant/registered partnership	420 (73.8)
Heterosexual relationship	566 477
	(98.8) 83.2
Same-sex relationship	7 (1.2)
Educational level (highest)	
University	270 (47.2)
High school (10-12 yrs)	211 (36.9)
Compulsory (≤ 9 yrs)	91 (15.9)
Annual income (before tax, SEK)	
0 – 159,999	168 (29.3)
160,000 - 234,999	175 (30.5)
235,000 - 309,999	143 (25.0)
310,000 or more	87 (15.2)
Employment status	
Employed	396 (69.7)
Student	35 (6.2)
Retired	47 (8.3)
Sick leave (more than 3 months)	8 (1.4)
Parental leave or leave of absence	35 (6.2)
Unemployed	23 (4.0)
Other	24 (4.2)
Country of Birth	
Sweden	519 (90.6)
Other Nordic country	15 (2.6)
Other European country	18 (3.1)
Country outside Europe	21 (3.7)
Self-rated health	
Very good/good	511 (90.0)
Neither good nor bad/bad/very bad	57 (10.0)

Grown up in a home where there occurred physical violence

No	542 (94.6)
Yes/Unsure	31 (5.4)

Internal validity

The Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin measure of sampling adequacy was 0.89 and Bartlett's test of sphericity was significant ($p < 0.05$), verifying a good fit of the data to the PCA. Parallel analysis, Kaiser's criterion and Cattell's scree test suggested two components (not in Table), explaining 57.4% of the total variance. The first component consisted of all physical and sexual violence items in the VAWI conceptual model, except the two items representing the least severe forms of physical and sexual violence. In addition, the component included the psychological violence item referring to threat of injury. The second component comprised the remaining three psychological violence items as well as the first physical and sexual violence items.

A three-component solution (Table 2) explained 64.4% of the total variance. The third component had an initial eigenvalue close to one (0.9) and comprised two of the three sexual violence items; otherwise the structure was identical to the two component solution and largely mirrored the VAWI's physical, psychological and sexual violence subscales.

Table 2. *Three-component solution for the VAWI psychological, physical and sexual violence items.* N=534

Conceptual model	Three-component solution		
	C1	C2	C3
Psychological Violence			
<u>1 Insulted me in a way that made me feel bad about myself</u> ¹		.89	
<u>2 Belittled and humiliated me in front of other people</u> ²		.74	
<u>3 Tried to scare and intimidate me on purpose (e.g. by the way he/she looked at you, by yelling or smashing things)</u> ³		.64	
<u>4 Threatened to hurt me or someone I care about</u> ⁴	.43	.33	

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Physical Violence				
<u>1 Pushed or shoved me</u> ¹			.71	Formatted: Font: 12 pt
<u>2 Thrown something at me that could have hurt me</u> ²			.38	Formatted: Font: 12 pt
<u>3 Hit me with his/her fist or with some other object that could have hurt me</u> ³			.80	Formatted: Font: 12 pt
<u>4 Kicked and dragged me and beat me up</u> ⁴			.85	Formatted: Font: 12 pt
<u>5 Choked me or burnt me on purpose</u> ⁵			.67	Formatted: Font: 12 pt
<u>6 Hurt me with a knife, a gun or some other weapon</u> ⁶			.88	Formatted: Font: 12 pt
Sexual Violence				
<u>1 Demanded to have sex with me even though I did not want to (but did not use physical force)</u> ¹				Formatted: Font: 12 pt
<u>2 Forced me to have sex against my will by using his/her physical strength (by hitting, holding me firmly or threatening me with a weapon)</u> ²			.56	Formatted: Font: 12 pt
<u>3 Forced me to perform sexual acts that I experienced as degrading and/or humiliating</u> ³				Formatted: Font: 12 pt
Accumulated variance %	46.1	57.4	64.4	
Eigenvalues	6.0	1.5	0.9	
* Loadings >greater 0.30 are shown and highest loadings are boldfaced. List-wise deletion was used.				

Internal reliability

The Cronbach's alpha coefficient (Table 3) was satisfactory for all subscales in the VAWI conceptual model: 0.79 (psychological scale), 0.80 (physical scale), 0.72 (sexual scale) and 0.88 (total scale). Alpha for the sexual violence scale increased from 0.72 to 0.77 after deleting the item "Demanded to have sex with me even though I did not want to (but did not use physical force)".

Table 3. Cronbach's α of the VAWI psychological, physical and sexual violence scales and total scale, life-time. N=573

Scales	Alpha if Item Deleted
Psychological violence	
Insulted me in a way that made me feel bad about myself	.75
Belittled and humiliated me in front of other people	.71
Tried to scare and intimidate me on purpose (e.g. by the way he/she looked at you, by yelling or smashing things)	.72
Threatened to hurt me or someone I care about	.76
Total	.79

Physical violence

Pushed or shoved me	.81
Thrown something at me that could have hurt me	.75
Hit me with his/her fist or with some other object that could have hurt me	.73
Kicked and dragged me and beat me up	.75
Choked me or burnt me on purpose	.76
Hurt me with a knife, a gun or some other weapon	.80
Total	.80
<hr/>	
Sexual violence	
Demanded to have sex with me even though I did not want to (but did not use physical force)	.77
Forced me to have sex against my will by using his/her physical strength (by hitting, holding me firmly or threatening me with a weapon)	.64
Forced me to perform sexual acts that I experienced as degrading and/or humiliating	.54
Total	.72
<hr/>	
Violence scale, total	.88
<hr/>	

External validity

Known-groups comparison

As hypothesized, exposure to violence as assessed by VAWI was significantly associated with self-rated health and having witnessed parental (or equivalent) physical violence when growing up. Specifically, a significantly larger proportion of respondents who reported exposure to violence also reported worse health (Chi-Square (1, N=573) = 26.1, p<0.05) and having witnessed parental physical violence (Chi-Square (1, N=573) = 11.5, p<0.05) than did those not reporting exposure. VAWI scores were significantly associated with self-rated health and having witnessed parental (or equivalent) physical violence. Specifically, those who reported exposure to violence also reported worse health and having witnessed parental physical violence to a higher extent.

Comparison of prevalence rates to other studies

As assessed with the VAWI, 23.6% ($n=123$) of the respondents reported exposure to psychological violence, 8.4% ($n=43$) to physical violence and 3.0% ($n=16$) to sexual violence

during the past year. Corresponding percentages for exposure to violence earlier in life were 23.6% ($n=135$), 14.3% ($n=82$) and 9.2% ($n=53$; Table 4). Similar 12-month violence exposure rates for physical and sexual violence have been reported in two population-based studies – one in Finland ($n=4,464$) and one in Sweden ($n=4,771$) – using comparable methodologies and definitions.^(29, 30) However, the present study found lower prevalence for physical and sexual violence experienced earlier in life. The aforementioned studies did not report psychological violence.

Table 4. *Past-year and earlier-in-life exposure to IPV as assessed with the VAWI.*
N=573

	Past year			Earlier in life		
	N	%	95 % CI	N	%	95 % CI
Psychological violence	123	23.6 ^a	20.1 – 27.1	135	23.6	20.1 – 27.1
Physical violence	43	8.1	5.9 – 10.3	82	14.3	11.4 – 17.2
Sexual violence	16	3.0	1.6 – 4.4	53	9.2	6.8 – 11.6

^a Percentage is given in valid percent.

VAWI and NorAQ

Higher prevalence was found by the VAWI compared to NorAQ (see Table 5). However, only the difference for psychological IPV was statistically significant (17.1% vs. 2.6%; $p<0.05$). This difference owed principally to the VAWI items “Insulted me in a way that made me feel bad about myself” (16.9%), for which NorAQ has no corresponding item, and “Belittled and humiliated me in front of other people” (6.5%). Prevalence rates for the two other items on this scale were similar to corresponding items in the NorAQ (see Appendix 1).

Table 5. *Life-time prevalence of exposure to IPV as assessed with the VAWI versus NorAQ.* N=77

	VAWI		NorAQ	
	N	% ^a	N	% ^a
Psychological violence	13	17.1	2	2.6
Physical violence	5	6.8	3	3.9
Sexual violence	7	9.3	5	6.5

* Percentage is given in valid percent.

DISCUSSION

The VAWI subscales of psychological, physical and sexual violence showed good internal consistency. Principal components analysis yielded a two-component solution and a three-component solution largely reflected the VAWI's conceptual model. External validity was supported in that the VAWI was able to discriminate between groups known to differ in exposure to physical and/or sexual IPV, that is, respondents with poor vs. good self-rated health and witnessed vs. not witnessed physical violence at home when growing up. Similar past-year prevalence to other Nordic studies was found. Differences in exposure rates of psychological IPV reported in the VAWI and NorAQ exemplify the need for standardized instruments when comparing prevalence of IPV between and within countries.

Internal validity

A two-component solution was suggested by the parallel analysis and the Kaiser and Cattell's scree criterion (one psychological and one combined physical and sexual component). This solution is understandable in that physical and sexual violence occur to a lesser extent in comparison with psychological violence, which generally is the most prevalent form of IPV are more likely to occur in conjunction. In contrast, psychological violence may occur in isolation of physical and/or sexual violence. (22, 31)(22)

Despite cultural and linguistic differences between Sweden and Brazil, results from the three-component solution in the current study were similar to those derived in the study conducted in Brazil, where a pre-determined three component solution was investigated.(16) In the Brazilian study, the question "Threatened to hurt me or someone I care about" did not load on any component in Zona da Mata, although it loaded in its explored psychological violence

1
2
3
4
5
6
7 component in São Paulo. In the current study the item loaded both in the physical and
8
9 psychological violence components. These findings indicate that threat of physical violence
10
11 might not belong as clearly as expected to the psychological violence component, which has
12
13 in fact been a point of debate among researchers.⁽²⁹⁾ Threats of violence may both precede
14
15 and follow violent acts themselves, either escalating into a violent act or, especially if the
16
17 victim has been exposed to physical violence prior to the threat, the threat of violence might
18
19 frighten the victim just as much as the violent act itself.⁽²⁹⁾ This could explain the finding
20
21 that threat of violence belonged to both psychological and physical violence. Moreover, both
22
23 in Zona da Mata and in the present study, the item “Has your partner pushed or shoved you?”
24
25 loaded on the psychological violence component rather than the physical violence scale in the
26
27 WHO conceptual model. The observed cross-loadings of individual items as well as items that
28
29 belonged to other domains than in the conceptual model may reflect that female victims often
30
31 are not exposed to one form of violence in isolation of the other.⁽³²⁾⁽³⁴⁾ For example, the
32
33 sexual violence item “Forced me to have sex against my will by using his/her physical
34
35 strength (by hitting, holding me firmly or threatening me with a weapon)” which loaded in
36
37 both the physical and sexual IPV components is hard to divide into one or the other category.

38 39 **Internal reliability**

40
41 The Cronbach’s alpha coefficients reported for the subscales in this study are very similar to
42
43 those found in other studies.^{(9, 16)(15, 16)} For example, for all sites combined in the WHO
44
45 multi-country study, the reliability coefficient was 0.81 for physical and 0.66 for sexual
46
47 IPV.⁽⁹⁾⁽¹⁵⁾ compared to 0.80 and 0.72 respectively in the current study. These similarities
48
49 indicate a consistency in the internal reliability of the VAWI across countries despite cultural
50
51 and socio-economic differences between the countries.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7 In the current study, deleting the item “Demanded to have sex with me even though I did not
8 want to (but did not use physical force)” would increase alpha for the sexual violence scale
9 from 0.72 to 0.77. However, given that the current study is explorative and hypothesis-
10 generating, further studies are needed to determine whether this item needs to be revised ~~or~~
11 ~~not~~.
12
13
14
15
16

17 18 **External validity**

19 20 Known-groups comparison

21
22 Of the two known-groups used in the comparison, the strongest relationship found in the
23 literature regards exposure to physical and/or sexual IPV and poorer self-rated health.(2, 20-
24 24) There is also strong evidence that those who are exposed to physical and/or sexual IPV
25
26 have witnessed their father use physical violence against the mother during childhood.(10, 25-
27 27)(9, 25-27) We found support that the combined VAWI subscales of physical and/or sexual
28
29 violence could discriminate between respondents who had poor vs. good self-rated health and
30
31 between those who had witnessed vs. not witnessed their parents engaged in physical
32
33 violence. There is only scant knowledge about how these variables relate to psychological
34
35 violence, hence these analyses were not deemed appropriate for the purpose of assessing
36
37 validity.
38
39
40
41
42

43 44 Comparison of prevalence rates to other studies

45
46 Comparisons of our prevalence rates with those in other studies are challenged by differences
47
48 between methodologies, definitions and reporting styles. Nevertheless, our 12-month violence
49
50 exposure rates for physical and sexual violence were similar to those reported previously in
51
52 population-based studies in Finland and Sweden(29, 30) using similar definitions and
53
54 methodologies. However, we found lower rates for earlier-in-life estimates of physical and
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4
5
6
7 sexual IPV. The Swedish study found that 28% of women were exposed to physical and 16%
8 to sexual violence by a former partner, compared to 14.3% for physical and 9.2% for sexual
9 IPV during the earlier-in-life timeframe in the current study. The figures for the Finnish study
10 were 29% for severe physical and 16% for sexual IPV. These differences are likely due to
11 some minor differences in the definitions between the studies as well as to changes in
12 prevalence rates over time and actual differences between countries. However, they may also
13 owe to an oversight in the questionnaire layout, where the box for ticking violence
14 experienced earlier in life was somewhat unclearly placed. Studies assessing psychological
15 violence in a Nordic context using similar definitions as in the current study could not be
16 found.
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27

28 VAWI and NorAQ

29
30 As the type and number of acts assessed in the VAWI and the NorAQ varied at the outset,
31 some differences in the results from the two instruments were expected. The two
32 questionnaires have also been developed with different aims in mind. NorAQ was developed
33 for investigations in health care settings and for comparisons in the Nordic countries of
34 various forms of violence, not specifically IPV. On the other hand, the VAWI was developed
35 for global comparisons on IPV specifically. For example, the NorAQ psychological violence
36 items reflect a more systematic form of violence experienced during a longer time-period or
37 under fear or threat. Although these seem to capture similar levels of exposure as the more
38 severe psychological violence items of the VAWI, milder forms of psychological violence are
39 also represented in the VAWI and thus the instrument captures a broader range of
40 psychologically violent acts. The sample size used in this comparison prohibits any strong
41 conclusions; however, it further illustrates the importance of using standardized
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4
5
6
7 questionnaires when comparing prevalence, as results may vary to a large extent depending
8
9 on the instrument used.

10 11 12 **Methodological considerations**

13
14 The VAWI was designed for and is primarily used in face-to-face interviews(5), whereas the
15 current study administered the VAWI via a postal survey. The implications of different modes
16 of data collection are difficult to assess due to multiple influencing factors, including the
17 method of initial contact with the respondents, visual versus oral presentation of response
18 choices, method of sampling as well as differing cultural and social contexts.(33) Previous
19 studies have found disclosure of sensitive topics to be higher in self-administered modes
20 compared to face-to-face interviews,(33) also when assessing IPV(34). However, there is a
21 scarcity of experimental or randomized study designs comparing different modes of data
22 collection.(33)

23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34 Nonetheless, the main known limitation of postal surveys is lowered response rates.(34) The
35 current study included two reminders in an effort to minimize drop-out rates. Non-responders
36 were over-represented by young and unmarried women, women with low annual income and
37 by those born outside of Sweden. Exposure rates of IPV have been found to be especially high
38 in these groups.(21, 25) which may further contribute to under-estimated prevalence rates and
39 less robust component solutions in our study. Furthermore, the earlier-in-life estimates may
40 have been underestimated due to a minor detail on the questionnaire lay-out. In addition,
41 theAs under-reporting is common in surveys assessing IPV,(3, 35)(3, 32)-has probably
42 contributed to estimates of IPV in the current study are probably further rather under than
43 over-estimated estimation of IPV prevalence rates. Reasons for under-reporting IPV include
44 forgetting violent acts that took place further back in life,(36)(33) normalizing the violence,
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

blaming the violence on oneself⁽³⁷⁾~~(34)~~ and being fearful of a violent and controlling partner.⁽³⁸⁾~~(35)~~ Finally, the sub-sample of respondents who answered both the VAWI and the NorAQ is small, which limits our ability to draw conclusions or generalize to the target population. Moreover, non-responders were over-represented by young and unmarried women, women with lower income and by those born outside of Sweden. Exposure rates to IPV have been found to be especially high in these groups,^(21, 25) which may further contribute to under-estimated prevalence rates and less robust component solutions in our study.

CONCLUSION

Our analysis indicated that the VAWI has good construct validity and internal reliability in a Swedish context. The results obtained were similar to those reported in the Brazilian study, which implies that the VAWI has good cross-cultural construct validity and internal reliability in an adult female population. However, further studies examining these and other psychometric properties need to be conducted in other countries.

COMPETING INTERESTS

The authors declare that they have no competing interests.

CONTRIBUTORSHIP STATEMENT

LN conducted all analyses, wrote the first draft of the manuscript and rewrote new drafts based on input from co-authors. CT planned the analyses and gave input on manuscript drafts. GK designed the project, planned the analyses and gave input on manuscript drafts. All authors read and approved the final manuscript.

FUNDING

This work was supported by a grant from the Swedish Research Council grant number 527-08.

DATA SHARING STATEMENT

The dataset is available from the corresponding author at lotta.nybergh@socmed.gu.se. Consent for sharing the dataset was not obtained but the presented data are anonymised and risk of identification is low.

Appendix 1. *The NorAQ violence items.*

Psychological Violence

Has your partner systematically and for a longer period tried to repress, degrade or humiliate you?

Have you experienced living in fear because your partner systematically and for a longer period threatened you or somebody close to you?

Has your partner systematically and under threat or force tried to limit your contacts with others, or totally control what you may and may not do?

Physical Violence

Has your partner hit you, smacked your face or held you firmly against your will?

Has your partner hit you with his/her fist(s) or with a hard object, kicked you, pushed you violently, given you a beating, thrashed you or done anything similar to you?

Has your partner threatened your life by, for instance, trying to strangle you, showing a weapon or knife or by any other similar act?

Sexual Violence

Has your partner against your will touched your genitals, used your body to satisfy him/herself sexually or forced you to touch your partner's genitals?

Has your partner against your will forced intercourse on you?

Has your partner against your will touched parts of your body other than the genitals in a 'sexual way' or forced you to touch other parts of his or her body in a 'sexual way'?

Have you any other way been sexually humiliated; e.g. by being forced to watch a porno movie or similar, forced to participate in a porno movie or similar, forced to show your body naked or forced to watch when your partner showed his/her body naked?

References

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1. Alhabib S, Nur U, Jones R. Domestic Violence Against Women: Systematic Review of Prevalence Studies. *J Fam Violence* 2010;**25**:369-82.
2. Ellsberg M, Jansen HA, Heise L, et al. Intimate partner violence and women's physical and mental health in the WHO multi-country study on women's health and domestic violence: an observational study. *The Lancet* 2008;**371**:1165-72.
3. Watts C, Zimmerman C. Violence against women: global scope and magnitude. *The Lancet* 2002;**359**:1232-7.
4. Kury H, Oberfell-Fuchs J, Woessner G. The extent of family violence in Europe: Comparison of national surveys. *Violence Against Women* 2004;**10**:749-69.
5. WHO. Multi-Country Study on Women's Health and Domestic Violence against Women. Initial results on prevalence, health outcomes and women's responses. In: WHO/WHD, ed. Geneva 2005.
6. Straus MA. Measuring intrafamily conflict and violence: The conflict tactics (CT) scales. *J Marriage Fam* 1979;**41**:75-88.
7. Straus MA, Hamby SL, Boney-McCoy S, et al. The revised conflict tactics scales (CTS2). *J Fam Issues* 1996;**17**:283-316.
8. Dobash RP, Dobash RE, Wilson M, et al. The myth of sexual symmetry in marital violence. *Soc Probl* 1992;**39**:71-91.
9. Garcia-Moreno C, Jansen HA, Ellsberg M, et al. Prevalence of intimate partner violence: findings from the WHO multi-country study on women's health and domestic violence. *The Lancet* 2006;**368**:1260-9.
10. Yüksel-Kaptanoğlu İ, Türkyılmaz AS, Heise L. What Puts Women at Risk of Violence From Their Husbands? Findings From a Large, Nationally Representative Survey in Turkey. *J Interpers Violence* 2012;**27**:2743-69.

11. Abeya SG, Afework MF, Yalew AW. Intimate partner violence against women in western Ethiopia: prevalence, patterns, and associated factors. *BMC Public Health* 2011;**11**:913.
12. Ali TS, Asad N, Mogren I, et al. Intimate partner violence in urban Pakistan: prevalence, frequency, and risk factors. *Int J Women's Health* 2011;**3**:105-15.
13. Jayasuriya V, Wijewardena K, Axemo P. Intimate Partner Violence Against Women in the Capital Province of Sri Lanka. *Violence Against Women* 2011;**17**:1086-102.
14. Vung N, Ostergren P, Krantz G. Intimate partner violence against women, health effects and health care seeking in rural Vietnam. *Eur J Public Health* 2009;**19**:178-82.
15. Xu X, Zhu F, O'Campo P, et al. Prevalence of and risk factors for intimate partner violence in China. *Am J Public Health* 2005;**95**:78-85.
16. Schraiber L, Latorre M, França Jr I, et al. Validity of the WHO VAW study instrument for estimating gender-based violence against women. *Rev Saúde Pública* 2010;**44**:658-66.
17. Swahnberg I, Wijma B. The NorVold Abuse Questionnaire (NorAQ): validation of new measures of emotional, physical, and sexual abuse, and abuse in the health care system among women. *Eur J Public Health* 2003;**13**:361-6.
18. Nunnally JC, Bernstein IH. Chapter: 7: The assessment of reliability. In *Psychometric theory*. New York: McGraw 1994:264-5.
19. Cronbach LJ, Meehl PE. Construct validity in psychological tests. *Psychol Bull* 1955;**52**:281-302.
20. Vives-Cases C, Ruiz-Cantero MT, Escribà-Agüir V et al. The effect of intimate partner violence and other forms of violence against women on health. *J Public Health* 2011;**33**:15-21.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

21. Nerøien A, Schei B. Partner violence and health: results from the first national study on violence against women in Norway. *Scand J Public Health* 2008;**36**:161-8.
22. Romans S, Forte T, Cohen MM, et al. Who Is Most at Risk for Intimate Partner Violence? *J Interpers Violence* 2007;**22**:1495-514.
23. Fanslow JL, Robinson EM. Violence against women in New Zealand: prevalence and health consequences. *N Z Med J* 2004;**117**(1206).
24. Kramer A, Lorenzon D, Mueller G. Prevalence of intimate partner violence and health implications for women using emergency departments and primary care clinics. *Womens Health Issues* 2004;**14**:19-29.
25. Abramsky T, Watts C, Garcia-Moreno C, et al. What factors are associated with recent intimate partner violence? findings from the WHO multi-country study on women's health and domestic violence. *BMC Public Health* 2011;**11**:109.
26. Wood SL, Sommers MS. Consequences of Intimate Partner Violence on Child Witnesses: A Systematic Review of the Literature. *J Child Adolesc Psychiatr Nurs* 2011;**24**:223–36.
27. Paterson J, Faibairn-Dunlop P, Cowley-Malcolm ET, et al. Maternal childhood parental abuse history and current intimate partner violence: data from the Pacific Islands Families Study. *Violence Vict* 2007;**22**:474-88.
28. Watts C, Heise L, Ellsberg M, et al. Putting women first: ethical and safety recommendations for research on domestic violence against women. *Geneva: World Health Organization* 2001.
29. Lundgren E, Heimer G, Westerstrand J, et al. *Slagen Dam: Mäns våld mot kvinnor i jämställda Sverige-en omfattningsundersökning. (Captured queen - men's violence against women in "equal" Sweden - a prevalence study)*: Brottsoffermyndigheten 2001.

- 1
2
3
4
5
6
7 30. Piispa M, Heiskanen M, Kääriäinen J, et al. *Naisiin kohdistunut väkivalta 2005.*
8 *(Violence Against Women in Finland): Oikeuspoliittinen tutkimuslaitos 2006.*
9
10 31. Vung N, Ostergren P, Krantz G. Intimate partner violence against women in
11 rural Vietnam - different socio-demographic factors are associated with different forms of
12 violence: Need for new intervention guidelines? *BMC Public Health* 2008;**8**:55.
13
14 32. Jewkes R. Intimate partner violence: causes and prevention. *The Lancet*
15 2002;**359**:1423-9.
16
17 33. Bowling A. Mode of questionnaire administration can have serious effects on
18 data quality. *J Public Health* 2005;**27**:281-91.
19
20 34. Walby S. Improving the statistics on violence against women. *Stat J UN Econ*
21 *Comm Eur.* 2005;**22**:193-216.
22
23 35. Ellsberg M, Heise L, Peña R, et al. Researching domestic violence against
24 women: methodological and ethical considerations. *Stud Fam Plann* 2001;**32**:1-16.
25
26 36. Wijma B, Schei B, Swahnberg K, et al. Emotional, physical, and sexual abuse in
27 patients visiting gynaecology clinics: a Nordic cross-sectional study. *The Lancet*
28 2003;**361**:2107-13.
29
30 37. Chan KL. Gender differences in self-reports of intimate partner violence: A
31 review. *Aggress Violent Behav* 2011;**16**:167-75.
32
33 38. Johnson MP. Conflict and control: Gender symmetry and asymmetry in
34 domestic violence. *Violence Against Women* 2006;**12**:1003-18.
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Figure 1. *The NorAQ violence items.*

Psychological Violence

Has your partner systematically and for a longer period tried to repress, degrade or humiliate you?

Have you experienced living in fear because your partner systematically and for a longer period threatened you or somebody close to you?

Has your partner systematically and under threat or force tried to limit your contacts with others, or totally control what you may and may not do?

Physical Violence

Has your partner hit you, smacked your face or held you firmly against your will?

Has your partner hit you with his/her fist(s) or with a hard object, kicked you, pushed you violently, given you a beating, trashed you or done anything similar to you?

Has your partner threatened your life by, for instance, trying to strangle you, showing a weapon or knife or by any other similar act?

Sexual Violence

Has your partner against your will touched your genitals, used your body to satisfy him/herself sexually or forced you to touch your partner's genitals?

Has your partner against your will forced intercourse on you?

Has your partner against your will touched parts of your body other than the genitals in a 'sexual way' or forced you to touch other parts of his or her body in a 'sexual way'?

Have you any other way been sexually humiliated; e.g. by being forced to watch a porno movie or similar, forced to participate in a porno movie or similar, forced to show your body naked or forced to watch when your partner showed his/her body naked?

STROBE Statement—Checklist of items that should be included in reports of *cross-sectional studies*

	Item No	Recommendation
Title and abstract	1	(a) Indicate the study's design with a commonly used term in the title or the abstract (b) Provide in the abstract an informative and balanced summary of what was done and what was found
Introduction		
Background/rationale	2	Explain the scientific background and rationale for the investigation being reported
Objectives	3	State specific objectives, including any prespecified hypotheses
Methods		
Study design	4	Present key elements of study design early in the paper
Setting	5	Describe the setting, locations, and relevant dates, including periods of recruitment, exposure, follow-up, and data collection
Participants	6	(a) Give the eligibility criteria, and the sources and methods of selection of participants
Variables	7	Clearly define all outcomes, exposures, predictors, potential confounders, and effect modifiers. Give diagnostic criteria, if applicable
Data sources/ measurement	8*	For each variable of interest, give sources of data and details of methods of assessment (measurement). Describe comparability of assessment methods if there is more than one group
Bias	9	Describe any efforts to address potential sources of bias
Study size	10	Explain how the study size was arrived at
Quantitative variables	11	Explain how quantitative variables were handled in the analyses. If applicable, describe which groupings were chosen and why
Statistical methods	12	(a) Describe all statistical methods, including those used to control for confounding (b) Describe any methods used to examine subgroups and interactions (c) Explain how missing data were addressed (d) If applicable, describe analytical methods taking account of sampling strategy (e) Describe any sensitivity analyses
Results		
Participants	13*	(a) Report numbers of individuals at each stage of study—eg numbers potentially eligible, examined for eligibility, confirmed eligible, included in the study, completing follow-up, and analysed (b) Give reasons for non-participation at each stage (c) Consider use of a flow diagram
Descriptive data	14*	(a) Give characteristics of study participants (eg demographic, clinical, social) and information on exposures and potential confounders (b) Indicate number of participants with missing data for each variable of interest
Outcome data	15*	Report numbers of outcome events or summary measures
Main results	16	(a) Give unadjusted estimates and, if applicable, confounder-adjusted estimates and their precision (eg, 95% confidence interval). Make clear which confounders were adjusted for and why they were included (b) Report category boundaries when continuous variables were categorized (c) If relevant, consider translating estimates of relative risk into absolute risk for a meaningful time period
Other analyses	17	Report other analyses done—eg analyses of subgroups and interactions, and sensitivity analyses

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Discussion		
Key results	18	Summarise key results with reference to study objectives
Limitations	19	Discuss limitations of the study, taking into account sources of potential bias or imprecision. Discuss both direction and magnitude of any potential bias
Interpretation	20	Give a cautious overall interpretation of results considering objectives, limitations, multiplicity of analyses, results from similar studies, and other relevant evidence
Generalisability	21	Discuss the generalisability (external validity) of the study results
Other information		
Funding	22	Give the source of funding and the role of the funders for the present study and, if applicable, for the original study on which the present article is based

*Give information separately for exposed and unexposed groups.

Note: An Explanation and Elaboration article discusses each checklist item and gives methodological background and published examples of transparent reporting. The STROBE checklist is best used in conjunction with this article (freely available on the Web sites of PLoS Medicine at <http://www.plosmedicine.org/>, Annals of Internal Medicine at <http://www.annals.org/>, and Epidemiology at <http://www.epidem.com/>). Information on the STROBE Initiative is available at www.strobe-statement.org.



Psychometric properties of the WHO Violence Against Women instrument in a female population-based sample in Sweden

Journal:	<i>BMJ Open</i>
Manuscript ID:	bmjopen-2012-002053.R2
Article Type:	Research
Date Submitted by the Author:	16-Apr-2013
Complete List of Authors:	Nybergh, Lotta; Institute of Medicine, The Sahlgrenska Academy at University of Gothenburg, Department of Public Health and Community Medicine; The Västra Götaland Region Competence Centre on Intimate Partner Violence, Taft, Charles; Institute of Health and Care Sciences, The University of Gothenburg Centre for Person-centred Care, Krantz, Gunilla; Institute of Medicine, The Sahlgrenska Academy at University of Gothenburg, Department of Public Health and Community Medicine; The Västra Götaland Region Competence Centre on Intimate Partner Violence,
Primary Subject Heading:	Public health
Secondary Subject Heading:	Epidemiology, Public health, Research methods
Keywords:	PUBLIC HEALTH, STATISTICS & RESEARCH METHODS, EPIDEMIOLOGY

SCHOLARONE™
Manuscripts

only

1
2
3 **Psychometric properties of the WHO Violence Against Women instrument in a female**
4 **population-based sample in Sweden**
5
6

7
8 Lotta Nybergh (Corresponding author) ^{a), b)}

9
10 Email: lotta.nybergh@socmed.gu.se
11

12
13 Charles Taft ^{c)}

14
15 Email: charles.taft@medicine.gu.se
16

17
18 Gunilla Krantz ^{a), b)}

19
20 Email: gunilla.krantz@socmed.gu.se
21

22
23 ^{a)} Department of Public Health and Community Medicine, Institute of Medicine, The
24 Sahlgrenska Academy at University of Gothenburg, Gothenburg, Sweden.

25
26 Address: Arvid Wallgrens Backe 7, PO Box 453, SE-405 30 Gothenburg, Sweden
27

28
29 ^{b)} The Västra Götaland Region Competence Centre on Intimate Partner Violence, Gothenburg,
30 Sweden
31

32
33 Address: Kungsgatan 12, floor 6, 411 19 Gothenburg, Sweden
34

35
36 ^{c)} Institute of Health and Care Sciences, The University of Gothenburg Centre for Person-
37 centred Care, Gothenburg, Sweden
38

39
40 Address: Arvid Wallgrens Backe, PO Box 457, SE-405 30 Gothenburg, Sweden
41

42 **Keywords**
43

44 Intimate Partner Violence * Sweden * WHO VAW instrument * Psychometric properties *
45

46
47 Women
48

49 **Word count**

50
51 3,449
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

ABSTRACT

Objective: To explore psychometric properties of the Violence Against Women instrument in a randomly selected national sample of women ($N=573$) aged 18-65 years and residing in Sweden.

Design: Cross-sectional survey study.

Setting: Sweden.

Participants: A postal survey was sent to 1006 women between January and March 2009, during which 624 women (62.0%) returned the questionnaire. Fifty-one women who did not answer any of the violence items were excluded from the analyses, resulting in a final sample of 573 women.

Primary and secondary outcome measures: Self-reported exposure to psychological, physical and sexual intimate partner violence.

Results: Cronbach's alphas were 0.79 (psychological scale), 0.80 (physical scale), 0.72 (sexual scale) and 0.88 (total scale). A pre-determined three-component solution largely replicated the explored three component conceptual model of the Violence Against Women instrument. The instrument was able to discriminate between groups known from previous studies to differ in exposure to physical and/or sexual violence, that is, respondents with poor vs. good self-rated health and witnessed vs. not witnessed physical violence at home when growing up. Past-year prevalence of physical (8.1%; 95% CI 5.9 – 10.3) and sexual (3.0%; 1.6 – 4.4) violence was similar to that reported in other Nordic studies; however, earlier-in-life prevalence was lower in the current study (14.3%; 95% CI 11.4 – 17.2 and 9.2%; 95% CI 6.8 – 11.6 respectively). Reported exposure rates were higher than those obtained from a concurrently administered instrument (NorVold Abuse Questionnaire).

1
2
3 **Conclusion:** The Violence Against Women instrument demonstrated good construct validity
4
5 and internal reliability in an adult female population in Sweden. However, further studies
6
7 examining these and other psychometric properties need to be conducted in other countries.
8
9

10 11 12 13 14 **ARTICLE SUMMARY**

15 16 **Article focus**

- 17
18 • The World Health Organization's Violence Against Women instrument (VAWI) has
19
20 been used in several countries around the world in order to investigate violence against
21
22 women by their intimate male partners, but aspects of reliability and validity have
23
24 seldom been investigated.
- 25
26 • The aim of the current study was to explore selected psychometric properties of the
27
28 VAWI in a randomly selected national sample ($n=573$) of women.
29
30

31 32 **Key messages**

- 33
34 • The current study provides preliminary support for the VAWI subscales of
35
36 psychological, physical and sexual violence in a Swedish, adult female population.
- 37
38 • This adds to the knowledge of the instrument's cross-cultural validity and reliability,
39
40 which is of significance when comparing intimate partner violence prevalence rates
41
42 between countries.
43
44

45 46 **Strengths and limitations**

- 47
48 • Cross-sectional study design.
- 49
50 • Further aspects of validity and reliability need to be explored and studies from a
51
52 diverse range of countries are needed for further cross-cultural assessment.
53
54

55 56 **Keywords** 57 58 59 60

1
2
3 Intimate partner violence * Sweden * Validation * WHO VAW instrument * Psychometric
4
5 properties * Women
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

For peer review only

INTRODUCTION

While prevalence studies investigating violence against women perpetrated by intimate male partners have become more frequent,(1-4) sizeable differences in reported exposure occur both between and within study sites. These differences may in part be explained by differences in questionnaire administration methods (e.g. personal interviews vs. self-administration), questionnaire content, target populations, or definitions and severity of the violence assessed; however, such differences may also reflect true variation and cultural differences in violence perpetration.(1, 4) Standardized methodologies for assessing intimate partner violence (IPV) may help to enhance the reliability of results obtained from such studies and aid in comparing prevalence rates from diverse settings.

With this in mind, the World Health Organization (WHO) constructed a questionnaire for the WHO Multi-country Study on Women's Health and Domestic Violence against Women.(5) The study questionnaire includes the Violence Against Women instrument (henceforth referred to as "VAWI") assessing exposure to psychological, physical and sexual IPV. The VAWI was developed in collaboration with several networks and expert groups and was based partly on the original(6) and revised Conflict Tactics Scales,(7) as well as on work that originated from its critics.(8) Extensive pre-testing, independent back-translations and piloting of the questionnaire were conducted.(9) The prevalence rates from the ten countries included in the multi-country study vary greatly, with life-time estimates ranging between 20-75% for psychological violence, 13-61% for physical violence and 6-59% for sexual violence.(5) Since the Multi-country Study was performed, the VAWI has been used in several more countries.(10-15)

1
2
3 Despite the VAWI's relatively wide use, few peer-reviewed studies have evaluated its
4
5 psychometric properties. Internal reliability (Cronbach's α) was assessed and confirmed in the
6
7 Multi-Country Study;(9) however, only one study, conducted in Brazil, has explored aspects
8
9 of validity.(16) In that study, analyses of data from two female populations, one urban (São
10
11 Paulo; $n=940$) and one combined urban and rural area (Zona da Mata; $n=1,188$) supported the
12
13 construct validity and internal reliability of the instrument.
14
15

16
17
18 The aim of this study was to explore psychometric properties of the VAWI in a randomly
19
20 selected national sample ($n=573$) of women aged 18-65 years residing in Sweden. Sweden
21
22 provides an interesting comparative context due to its linguistic, cultural and socio-economic
23
24 differences to Brazil.
25
26

27 28 29 **METHODS**

30 31 **Procedure, study population and response rate**

32
33 A sample of 1006 women, aged 18-65 years and residing in Sweden, was randomly selected
34
35 by Statistics Sweden from the national population register. Data was collected by means of a
36
37 postal survey between January and March 2009. A requirement for the sample selection was
38
39 that the respondent was currently or had previously been in an intimate relationship. The
40
41 response rate was 62.0% ($n=624$). Women who did not respond to any of the violence items
42
43 ($n=51$) were excluded from the analyses, resulting in a total sample of 573 women.
44
45
46
47

48
49 Criterion validity was explored by comparing prevalence reported in the VAWI versus the
50
51 NorVold Abuse Questionnaire (NorAQ).[16] A second data collection was performed for this
52
53 purpose. Statistics Sweden sent out the VAWI and NorAQ to 20% ($n=125$) of the respondents
54
55 from the initial data collection between November 2009 and January 2010. NorAQ was
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 chosen since it is the only questionnaire measuring violence that has been validated in
4
5 Sweden in both a female and male (see companion article) population-based sample. The
6
7 response rate was 65.6% ($n=82$) for the VAWI and 63.2% ($n=79$) for NorAQ.
8
9

10 11 12 **Drop-out analysis**

13
14 A two-proportion z-test was used to assess statistical significance between the drop-out and
15
16 the final sample regarding age, country of birth, civil status and the respondents' yearly
17
18 income before tax. A Bonferroni adjustment to the alpha level was applied.
19
20

21
22
23 Comparing those who did not return the questionnaire ($n=382$) with the final sample of
24
25 analysis ($n=573$) revealed that significantly lower response rates were found among non-
26
27 respondents who were 18-29 years old, unmarried, foreign born and had low yearly income of
28
29 0 – 159,999 Swedish Kronor (SEK) before tax. Internal drop-out rates, that is respondents
30
31 who did not endorse any violence item ($n=51$), were significantly higher among women who
32
33 were 18-29 years old, unmarried and had a low yearly income in comparison to the final
34
35 sample of analysis.
36
37

38
39
40 Of those who did not return the questionnaire during the second data collection ($n=46$),
41
42 significantly lower response rates were found for women who were unmarried, widowed or
43
44 divorced.
45
46

47 48 49 **Assessment instruments: VAWI and NorAQ**

50
51
52 The VAWI consists of behaviour-specific items related to psychological (four items), physical
53
54 (six items) and sexual violence (three items). The physical violence items are further divided
55
56 into “moderate” (the two first items) and “severe” (the following four items) violence based
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 on the likelihood of physical injury.(5) For each question, respondents were asked whether
4 they had experienced the specific act during the *past year* and *earlier in life*. The VAWI items
5 were translated and adapted to a Swedish context by a senior researcher (third author) with
6 extensive knowledge about intimate partner violence
7
8
9
10

11
12
13
14 NorAQ has been validated in a Swedish context(17) and measures emotional (three items),
15 physical (three items) and sexual (four items) abuse, including different perpetrators, as well
16 as abuse in the health care system. The NorAQ violence items applicable to an intimate
17 partnership (Appendix 1) were included with the intention to compare prevalence rates with
18 those obtained by use of the VAWI. The second sexual violence item was adapted for use in
19 both a male and female population, as the questionnaire constructed for this study was sent to
20 a male population as well (see companion paper entitled ‘Psychometric properties of the
21 WHO Violence Against Women instrument in a male population-based sample in Sweden’).
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33

34 **Statistical analyses**

35
36 Principal components analysis (PCA) was conducted to explore the internal construct validity
37 of the violence items. A promax rotation was chosen due to high inter-component correlations
38 (e.g. $r=0.49-0.61$ for the three dimensions). Decisions on the number of components to extract
39 were based on parallel analysis, Kaiser’s eigenvalue-greater-than-one rule, total proportion of
40 variance explained and Cattell’s scree plot. This was followed by a pre-determined solution
41 with three components as conceptualized in the VAWI.
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50

51
52 The internal reliability of the VAWI was assessed with the Cronbach’s alpha for each
53 subscale and for the total violence scale. An alpha of 0.70 or higher was considered
54 satisfactory.(18)
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4
5 Known-groups comparisons were performed to investigate the VAWI's external construct
6
7 validity. The aim was to see if the instrument was able to differentiate between groups known
8
9 to differ in exposure to IPV.(19) The following hypotheses were postulated: women who are
10
11 exposed to physical and/or sexual IPV (life-time exposure, "yes/no") would have poorer self-
12
13 perceived health(2, 20-24) and have grown up in a home where they witnessed physical
14
15 violence between their parents(10, 25-27). The Mantel-Haenszel test was used controlling for
16
17 age, income, civil status, education and country of birth. Statistical significance was set at
18
19 $p < 0.05$.
20
21
22
23
24

25 *Self-perceived health* was assessed by "How would you say that your general health has been
26
27 during the past year?". Response options were dichotomized into "very good/good" and
28
29 "neither good nor bad/bad/very bad". *Childhood exposure to violence* was assessed with the
30
31 question: When you were growing up, did you see your parents (or equivalent) regularly
32
33 physically hurt one another? ("no" and "yes/unsure").
34
35
36
37

38 Prevalence of psychological, physical and sexual violence was calculated for the past year and
39
40 for earlier in life, for comparisons with prevalence rates presented in other studies.
41
42
43
44

45 In addition, life-time prevalence of IPV was compared between the VAWI and the NorAQ
46
47 and Fisher's exact test was used to test for statistically significant differences at the 95% CI
48
49 level. Only those respondents who had answered both the VAWI and NorAQ were included
50
51 ($n=77$) in this analysis.
52
53
54
55

56 **Ethical considerations**

57
58
59
60

1
2
3 The Regional Ethics Review Board located in Gothenburg gave approval for this study (Dnr:
4 527-08) and the WHO ethical and safety recommendations for research on domestic violence
5 against women as applicable to a postal survey were followed.(28) For example, a letter was
6 sent to prospective respondents in advance to inform them about the upcoming survey; this
7 provided them with the opportunity to decline the survey before receiving it. Also, although
8 the sampling frame was based on registered individuals, only one survey per household was
9 sent for ethical and safety reasons. Additionally, full anonymity and confidentiality were
10 guaranteed and contact information to a general practitioner (third author on this study), a
11 psychologist and a contact person at Statistics Sweden was provided for additional
12 information and/or referral. The survey was entitled “A study on conflicts, relationships and
13 health”. The study description that followed the title stated that the study assesses IPV.
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

29 RESULTS

30 Study population

31
32 Nearly half of the women had at least three years of university education ($n=270$; 47.2%) and
33 the mean age was 43 years ($SD=13$). Of the total sample, 85.1% ($n=484$) were currently in a
34 relationship (i.e. boyfriend or girlfriend, married, registered partnership or cohabiting), of
35 which the majority were heterosexual relationships ($n=566$; 98.8%). The rest of the sample
36 was single, widowed or divorced, but had previously been in a relationship (see Table 1).
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46

47 Table 1. *Socio-demographic and psychosocial factors of*
48 *the total sample. N=573*

49	50	51
		<i>N (%)</i>
<u>Age groups</u>		
52	18-29	107 (18.7)
53	30-39	138 (24.1)
54	40-49	125 (21.8)
55	50-59	136 (23.7)
56	60-65	67 (11.7)

Partner status

Single/widowed/divorced	85 (14.9)
Boyfriend/girlfriend	64 (11.2)
Married/cohabitant/registered partnership	420 (73.8)
Heterosexual relationship	477 (83.2)
Same-sex relationship	7 (1.2)

Educational level (highest)

University	270 (47.2)
High school (10-12 yrs)	211 (36.9)
Compulsory (≤ 9 yrs)	91 (15.9)

Annual income (before tax, SEK)

0 – 159,999	168 (29.3)
160,000 - 234,999	175 (30.5)
235,000 - 309,999	143 (25.0)
310,000 or more	87 (15.2)

Employment status

Employed	396 (69.7)
Student	35 (6.2)
Retired	47 (8.3)
Sick leave (more than 3 months)	8 (1.4)
Parental leave or leave of absence	35 (6.2)
Unemployed	23 (4.0)
Other	24 (4.2)

Country of Birth

Sweden	519 (90.6)
Other Nordic country	15 (2.6)
Other European country	18 (3.1)
Country outside Europe	21 (3.7)

Self-rated health

Very good/good	511 (90.0)
Neither good nor bad/bad/very bad	57 (10.0)

Grown up in a home where there occurred physical violence

No	542 (94.6)
Yes/Unsure	31 (5.4)

Internal validity

The Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin measure of sampling adequacy was 0.89 and Bartlett's test of sphericity was significant ($p < 0.05$), verifying a good fit of the data to the PCA. Parallel analysis, Kaiser's criterion and Cattell's scree test suggested two components (not in Table), explaining 57.4% of the total variance. The first component consisted of all physical and sexual violence items in the VAWI conceptual model, except the two items representing the least severe forms of physical and sexual violence. In addition, the component included the psychological violence item referring to threat of injury. The second component comprised the remaining three psychological violence items as well as the first physical and sexual violence items.

A three-component solution (Table 2) explained 64.4% of the total variance. The third component had an initial eigenvalue close to one (0.9) and comprised two of the three sexual violence items; otherwise the structure was identical to the two component solution and largely mirrored the VAWI's physical, psychological and sexual violence subscales.

Table 2. *Three-component solution for the VAWI psychological, physical and sexual violence items.*
N=534

Conceptual model	Three-component solution		
	C1	C2	C3
Psychological Violence			
1 Insulted me in a way that made me feel bad about myself		.89	
2 Belittled and humiliated me in front of other people		.74	
3 Tried to scare and intimidate me on purpose (e.g. by the way he/she looked at you, by yelling or smashing things)		.64	
4 Threatened to hurt me or someone I care about	.43	.33	
Physical Violence			
1 Pushed or shoved me		.71	
2 Thrown something at me that could have hurt me	.38		.31
3 Hit me with his/her fist or with some other object that could have hurt me	.80		
4 Kicked and dragged me and beat me up	.85		
5 Choked me or burnt me on purpose	.67		
6 Hurt me with a knife, a gun or some other weapon	.88		
Sexual Violence			

1 Demanded to have sex with me even though I did not want to (but did not use physical force)			.81
2 Forced me to have sex against my will by using his/her physical strength (by hitting, holding me firmly or threatening me with a weapon)	.56		.55
3 Forced me to perform sexual acts that I experienced as degrading and/or humiliating			.88
<i>Accumulated variance %</i>	<i>46.1</i>	<i>57.4</i>	<i>64.4</i>
<i>Eigenvalues</i>	<i>6.0</i>	<i>1.5</i>	<i>0.9</i>

^a Loadings > 0.30 are shown and highest loadings are boldfaced. List-wise deletion was used.

Internal reliability

The Cronbach's alpha coefficient (Table 3) was satisfactory for all subscales in the VAWI conceptual model: 0.79 (psychological scale), 0.80 (physical scale), 0.72 (sexual scale) and 0.88 (total scale). Alpha for the sexual violence scale increased from 0.72 to 0.77 after deleting the item "Demanded to have sex with me even though I did not want to (but did not use physical force)".

Table 3. Cronbach's α of the VAWI psychological, physical and sexual violence scales and total scale, life-time. N=573

Scales	Alpha if Item Deleted
Psychological violence	
Insulted me in a way that made me feel bad about myself	.75
Belittled and humiliated me in front of other people	.71
Tried to scare and intimidate me on purpose (e.g. by the way he/she looked at you, by yelling or smashing things)	.72
Threatened to hurt me or someone I care about	.76
Total	.79
Physical violence	
Pushed or shoved me	.81
Thrown something at me that could have hurt me	.75
Hit me with his/her fist or with some other object that could have hurt me	.73
Kicked and dragged me and beat me up	.75
Choked me or burnt me on purpose	.76
Hurt me with a knife, a gun or some other weapon	.80
Total	.80

Sexual violence	
Demanded to have sex with me even though I did not want to (but did not use physical force)	.77
Forced me to have sex against my will by using his/her physical strength (by hitting, holding me firmly or threatening me with a weapon)	.64
Forced me to perform sexual acts that I experienced as degrading and/or humiliating	.54
Total	.72
<hr/>	
Violence scale, total	.88
<hr/>	

External validity

Known-groups comparison

As hypothesized, exposure to violence as assessed by VAWI was significantly associated with self-rated health and having witnessed parental (or equivalent) physical violence when growing up. Specifically, a significantly larger proportion of respondents who reported exposure to violence also reported worse health (Chi-Square (1, N=573) = 26.1, $p < 0.05$) and having witnessed parental physical violence (Chi-Square (1, N=573) = 11.5, $p < 0.05$) than did those not reporting exposure.

Comparison of prevalence rates to other studies

As assessed with the VAWI, 23.6% ($n=123$) of the respondents reported exposure to psychological violence, 8.4% ($n=43$) to physical violence and 3.0% ($n=16$) to sexual violence during the past year. Corresponding percentages for exposure to violence earlier in life were 23.6% ($n=135$), 14.3% ($n=82$) and 9.2% ($n=53$; Table 4). Similar 12-month violence exposure rates for physical and sexual violence have been reported in two population-based studies – one in Finland ($n=4,464$) and one in Sweden ($n=4,771$) – using comparable methodologies and definitions.^(29, 30) However, the present study found lower prevalence for physical and sexual violence experienced earlier in life. The aforementioned studies did not report psychological violence.

Table 4. *Past-year and earlier-in-life exposure to IPV as assessed with the VAWI.*
N=573

	Past year			Earlier in life		
	N	%	95 % CI	N	%	95 % CI
Psychological violence	123	23.6 ^a	20.1 – 27.1	135	23.6	20.1 – 27.1
Physical violence	43	8.1	5.9 – 10.3	82	14.3	11.4 – 17.2
Sexual violence	16	3.0	1.6 – 4.4	53	9.2	6.8 – 11.6

^a Percentage is given in valid percent.

VAWI and NorAQ

Higher prevalence was found by the VAWI compared to NorAQ (see Table 5). However, only the difference for psychological IPV was statistically significant (17.1% vs. 2.6%; $p < 0.05$). This difference owed principally to the VAWI items “Insulted me in a way that made me feel bad about myself” (16.9%), for which NorAQ has no corresponding item, and “Belittled and humiliated me in front of other people” (6.5%). Prevalence rates for the two other items on this scale were similar to corresponding items in the NorAQ (see Appendix 1).

Table 5. *Life-time prevalence of exposure to IPV as assessed with the VAWI versus NorAQ.* N=77

	VAWI		NorAQ	
	N	% ^a	N	% ^a
Psychological violence	13	17.1	2	2.6
Physical violence	5	6.8	3	3.9
Sexual violence	7	9.3	5	6.5

^a Percentage is given in valid percent.

DISCUSSION

The VAWI subscales of psychological, physical and sexual violence showed good internal consistency. Principal components analysis yielded a two-component solution and a three-component solution largely reflected the VAWI’s conceptual model. External validity was supported in that the VAWI was able to discriminate between groups known to differ in exposure to physical and/or sexual IPV, that is, respondents with poor vs. good self-rated

1
2
3 health and witnessed vs. not witnessed physical violence at home when growing up. Similar
4
5 past-year prevalence to other Nordic studies was found. Differences in exposure rates of
6
7 psychological IPV reported in the VAWI and NorAQ exemplify the need for standardized
8
9 instruments when comparing prevalence of IPV between and within countries.
10
11

12 13 14 **Internal validity**

15
16 A two-component solution was suggested by the parallel analysis and the Kaiser and Cattell's
17
18 scree criterion (one psychological and one combined physical and sexual component). This
19
20 solution is understandable in that physical and sexual violence occur to a lesser extent in
21
22 comparison with psychological violence, which generally is the most prevalent form of IPV
23
24 .(22, 31)
25
26
27
28

29
30 Despite cultural and linguistic differences between Sweden and Brazil, results from the three-
31
32 component solution in the current study were similar to those derived in the study conducted
33
34 in Brazil, where a pre-determined three component solution was investigated.(16) In the
35
36 Brazilian study, the question "Threatened to hurt me or someone I care about" did not load on
37
38 any component in Zona da Mata, although it loaded in its explored psychological violence
39
40 component in São Paulo. In the current study the item loaded both in the physical and
41
42 psychological violence components. These findings indicate that threat of physical violence
43
44 might not belong as clearly as expected to the psychological violence component, which has
45
46 in fact been a point of debate among researchers.(29) Threats of violence may both precede
47
48 and follow violent acts themselves, either escalating into a violent act or, especially if the
49
50 victim has been exposed to physical violence prior to the threat, the threat of violence might
51
52 frighten the victim just as much as the violent act itself.(29) This could explain the finding
53
54 that threat of violence belonged to both psychological and physical violence. Moreover, both
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 in Zona da Mata and in the present study, the item “Has your partner pushed or shoved you?”
4
5 loaded on the psychological violence component rather than the physical violence scale in the
6
7 WHO conceptual model. The observed cross-loadings of individual items as well as items that
8
9 belonged to other domains than in the conceptual model may reflect that female victims often
10
11 are not exposed to one form of violence in isolation of the other.(32) For example, the sexual
12
13 violence item “Forced me to have sex against my will by using his/her physical strength (by
14
15 hitting, holding me firmly or threatening me with a weapon)” which loaded in both the
16
17 physical and sexual IPV components is hard to divide into one or the other category.
18
19
20
21
22

23 **Internal reliability**

24
25 The Cronbach’s alpha coefficients reported for the subscales in this study are very similar to
26
27 those found in other studies.(9, 16) For example, for all sites combined in the WHO multi-
28
29 country study, the reliability coefficient was 0.81 for physical and 0.66 for sexual IPV,(9)
30
31 compared to 0.80 and 0.72 respectively in the current study. These similarities indicate a
32
33 consistency in the internal reliability of the VAWI across countries despite cultural and socio-
34
35 economic differences between the countries.
36
37
38
39
40

41 In the current study, deleting the item “Demanded to have sex with me even though I did not
42
43 want to (but did not use physical force)” would increase alpha for the sexual violence scale
44
45 from 0.72 to 0.77. However, given that the current study is explorative and hypothesis-
46
47 generating, further studies are needed to determine whether this item needs to be revised.
48
49
50

51 **External validity**

52
53 Known-groups comparison
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 Of the two known-groups used in the comparison, the strongest relationship found in the
4 literature regards exposure to physical and/or sexual IPV and poorer self-rated health.(2, 20-
5 24) There is also strong evidence that those who are exposed to physical and/or sexual IPV
6 have witnessed their father use physical violence against the mother during childhood.(10, 25-
7 27) We found support that the combined VAWI subscales of physical and/or sexual violence
8 could discriminate between respondents who had poor vs. good self-rated health and between
9 those who had witnessed vs. not witnessed their parents engage in physical violence. There is
10 only scant knowledge about how these variables relate to psychological violence, hence these
11 analyses were not deemed appropriate for the purpose of assessing validity.
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24

25 Comparison of prevalence rates to other studies

26
27 Comparisons of our prevalence rates with those in other studies are challenged by differences
28 between methodologies, definitions and reporting styles. Nevertheless, our 12-month violence
29 exposure rates for physical and sexual violence were similar to those reported previously in
30 population-based studies in Finland and Sweden(29, 30) using similar definitions and
31 methodologies. However, we found lower rates for earlier-in-life estimates of physical and
32 sexual IPV. The Swedish study found that 28% of women were exposed to physical and 16%
33 to sexual violence by a former partner, compared to 14.3% for physical and 9.2% for sexual
34 IPV during the earlier-in-life timeframe in the current study. The figures for the Finnish study
35 were 29% for severe physical and 16% for sexual IPV. These differences are likely due to
36 some minor differences in the definitions between the studies as well as to changes in
37 prevalence rates over time and actual differences between countries. However, they may also
38 owe to an oversight in the questionnaire layout, where the box for ticking violence
39 experienced earlier in life was somewhat unclearly placed. Studies assessing psychological
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 violence in a Nordic context using similar definitions as in the current study could not be
4
5 found.
6
7

9 10 VAWI and NorAQ

11 As the type and number of acts assessed in the VAWI and the NorAQ varied at the outset,
12
13 some differences in the results from the two instruments were expected. The two
14
15 questionnaires have also been developed with different aims in mind. NorAQ was developed
16
17 for investigations in health care settings and for comparisons in the Nordic countries of
18
19 various forms of violence, not specifically IPV. On the other hand, the VAWI was developed
20
21 for global comparisons on IPV specifically. For example, the NorAQ psychological violence
22
23 items reflect a more systematic form of violence experienced during a longer time-period or
24
25 under fear or threat. Although these seem to capture similar levels of exposure as the more
26
27 severe psychological violence items of the VAWI, milder forms of psychological violence are
28
29 also represented in the VAWI and thus the instrument captures a broader range of
30
31 psychologically violent acts. The sample size used in this comparison prohibits any strong
32
33 conclusions; however, it further illustrates the importance of using standardized
34
35 questionnaires when comparing prevalence, as results may vary to a large extent depending
36
37 on the instrument used.
38
39
40
41
42
43
44

45 **Methodological considerations**

46
47 The VAWI was designed for and is primarily used in face-to-face interviews(5), whereas the
48
49 current study administered the VAWI via a postal survey. The implications of different modes
50
51 of data collection are difficult to assess due to multiple influencing factors, including the
52
53 method of initial contact with the respondents, visual versus oral presentation of response
54
55 choices, method of sampling as well as differing cultural and social contexts.(33) Previous
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 studies have found disclosure of sensitive topics to be higher in self-administered modes
4
5 compared to face-to-face interviews,(33) also when assessing IPV(34). However, there is a
6
7 scarcity of experimental or randomized study designs comparing different modes of data
8
9 collection.(33)
10

11
12
13
14 Nonetheless, the main known limitation of postal surveys is lowered response rates.(34) The
15
16 current study included two reminders in an effort to minimize drop-out rates. Non-responders
17
18 were over-represented by young and unmarried women, women with low annual income and
19
20 by those born outside of Sweden. Exposure rates of IPV have been found to be especially high
21
22 in these groups,(21, 25) which may further contribute to under-estimated prevalence rates and
23
24 less robust component solutions in our study. Furthermore, the earlier-in-life estimates may
25
26 have been underestimated due to a minor detail on the questionnaire lay-out. In addition, the
27
28 under-reporting common in surveys assessing IPV(3, 35) has probably contributed to further
29
30 underestimation of IPV prevalence rates. Reasons for under-reporting IPV include forgetting
31
32 violent acts that took place further back in life,(36) normalizing the violence, blaming the
33
34 violence on oneself(37) and being fearful of a violent and controlling partner.(38) Finally, the
35
36 sub-sample of respondents who answered both the VAWI and the NorAQ is small, which
37
38 limits our ability to draw conclusions or generalize to the target population.
39
40
41
42
43
44

45 **CONCLUSION**

46
47 Our analysis indicated that the VAWI has good construct validity and internal reliability in a
48
49 Swedish context. The results obtained were similar to those reported in the Brazilian study,
50
51 which implies that the VAWI has good cross-cultural construct validity and internal reliability
52
53 in an adult female population. However, further studies examining these and other
54
55 psychometric properties need to be conducted in other countries.
56
57
58
59
60

COMPETING INTERESTS

The authors declare that they have no competing interests.

CONTRIBUTORSHIP STATEMENT

LN conducted all analyses, wrote the first draft of the manuscript and rewrote new drafts based on input from co-authors. CT planned the analyses and gave input on manuscript drafts. GK designed the project, planned the analyses and gave input on manuscript drafts. All authors read and approved the final manuscript.

FUNDING

This work was supported by a grant from the Swedish Research Council grant number 527-08.

DATA SHARING STATEMENT

The dataset is available from the corresponding author at lotta.nybergh@socmed.gu.se. Consent for sharing the dataset was not obtained but the presented data are anonymised and risk of identification is low.

References

1. Alhabib S, Nur U, Jones R. Domestic Violence Against Women: Systematic Review of Prevalence Studies. *J Fam Violence* 2010;**25**:369-82.
2. Ellsberg M, Jansen HA, Heise L, et al. Intimate partner violence and women's physical and mental health in the WHO multi-country study on women's health and domestic violence: an observational study. *The Lancet* 2008;**371**:1165-72.
3. Watts C, Zimmerman C. Violence against women: global scope and magnitude. *The Lancet* 2002;**359**:1232-7.
4. Kury H, Obergfell-Fuchs J, Woessner G. The extent of family violence in Europe: Comparison of national surveys. *Violence Against Women* 2004;**10**:749-69.
5. WHO. Multi-Country Study on Women's Health and Domestic Violence against Women. Initial results on prevalence, health outcomes and women's responses. In: WHO/WHD, ed. Geneva 2005.
6. Straus MA. Measuring intrafamily conflict and violence: The conflict tactics (CT) scales. *J Marriage Fam* 1979;**41**:75-88.
7. Straus MA, Hamby SL, Boney-McCoy S, et al. The revised conflict tactics scales (CTS2). *J Fam Issues* 1996;**17**:283-316.
8. Dobash RP, Dobash RE, Wilson M, et al. The myth of sexual symmetry in marital violence. *Soc Probl* 1992;**39**:71-91.
9. Garcia-Moreno C, Jansen HA, Ellsberg M, et al. Prevalence of intimate partner violence: findings from the WHO multi-country study on women's health and domestic violence. *The Lancet* 2006;**368**:1260-9.

- 1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
10. Yüksel-Kaptanoğlu İ, Türkyılmaz AS, Heise L. What Puts Women at Risk of Violence From Their Husbands? Findings From a Large, Nationally Representative Survey in Turkey. *J Interpers Violence* 2012;**27**:2743-69.
 11. Abeya SG, Afework MF, Yalew AW. Intimate partner violence against women in western Ethiopia: prevalence, patterns, and associated factors. *BMC Public Health* 2011;**11**:913.
 12. Ali TS, Asad N, Mogren I, et al. Intimate partner violence in urban Pakistan: prevalence, frequency, and risk factors. *Int J Women's Health* 2011;**3**:105-15.
 13. Jayasuriya V, Wijewardena K, Axemo P. Intimate Partner Violence Against Women in the Capital Province of Sri Lanka. *Violence Against Women* 2011;**17**:1086-102.
 14. Vung N, Ostergren P, Krantz G. Intimate partner violence against women, health effects and health care seeking in rural Vietnam. *Eur J Public Health* 2009;**19**:178-82.
 15. Xu X, Zhu F, O'Campo P, et al. Prevalence of and risk factors for intimate partner violence in China. *Am J Public Health* 2005;**95**:78-85.
 16. Schraiber L, Latorre M, França Jr I, et al. Validity of the WHO VAW study instrument for estimating gender-based violence against women. *Rev Saúde Pública* 2010;**44**:658-66.
 17. Swahnberg I, Wijma B. The NorVold Abuse Questionnaire (NorAQ): validation of new measures of emotional, physical, and sexual abuse, and abuse in the health care system among women. *Eur J Public Health* 2003;**13**:361-6.
 18. Nunnally JC, Bernstein IH. Chapter: 7: The assessment of reliability. In *Psychometric theory*. New York: McGraw 1994:264-5.
 19. Cronbach LJ, Meehl PE. Construct validity in psychological tests. *Psychol Bull* 1955;**52**:281-302.

- 1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
20. Vives-Cases C, Ruiz-Cantero MT, Escribà-Agüir V et al. The effect of intimate partner violence and other forms of violence against women on health. *J Public Health* 2011;**33**:15-21.
21. Nerøien A, Schei B. Partner violence and health: results from the first national study on violence against women in Norway. *Scand J Public Health* 2008;**36**:161-8.
22. Romans S, Forte T, Cohen MM, et al. Who Is Most at Risk for Intimate Partner Violence? *J Interpers Violence* 2007;**22**:1495-514.
23. Fanslow JL, Robinson EM. Violence against women in New Zealand: prevalence and health consequences. *N Z Med J* 2004;**117**(1206).
24. Kramer A, Lorenzon D, Mueller G. Prevalence of intimate partner violence and health implications for women using emergency departments and primary care clinics. *Womens Health Issues* 2004;**14**:19-29.
25. Abramsky T, Watts C, Garcia-Moreno C, et al. What factors are associated with recent intimate partner violence? findings from the WHO multi-country study on women's health and domestic violence. *BMC Public Health* 2011;**11**:109.
26. Wood SL, Sommers MS. Consequences of Intimate Partner Violence on Child Witnesses: A Systematic Review of the Literature. *J Child Adolesc Psychiatr Nurs* 2011;**24**:223–36.
27. Paterson J, Faibairn-Dunlop P, Cowley-Malcolm ET, et al. Maternal childhood parental abuse history and current intimate partner violence: data from the Pacific Islands Families Study. *Violence Vict* 2007;**22**:474-88.
28. Watts C, Heise L, Ellsberg M, et al. Putting women first: ethical and safety recommendations for research on domestic violence against women. *Geneva: World Health Organization* 2001.

- 1
2
3 29. Lundgren E, Heimer G, Westerstrand J, et al. *Slagen Dam: Mäns våld mot*
4 *kvinnor i jämställda Sverige-en omfattningsundersökning. (Captured queen - men's violence*
5 *against women in "equal" Sweden - a prevalence study)*: Brottsoffermyndigheten 2001.
6
7
8
9 30. Piispa M, Heiskanen M, Kääriäinen J, et al. *Naisiin kohdistunut väkivalta 2005.*
10 *(Violence Against Women in Finland)*: Oikeuspoliittinen tutkimuslaitos 2006.
11
12
13 31. Vung N, Ostergren P, Krantz G. Intimate partner violence against women in
14 rural Vietnam - different socio-demographic factors are associated with different forms of
15 violence: Need for new intervention guidelines? *BMC Public Health* 2008;**8**:55.
16
17
18 32. Jewkes R. Intimate partner violence: causes and prevention. *The Lancet*
19 2002;**359**:1423-9.
20
21
22 33. Bowling A. Mode of questionnaire administration can have serious effects on
23 data quality. *J Public Health* 2005;**27**:281-91.
24
25
26 34. Walby S. Improving the statistics on violence against women. *Stat J UN Econ*
27 *Comm Eur.* 2005;**22**:193-216.
28
29
30 35. Ellsberg M, Heise L, Peña R, et al. Researching domestic violence against
31 women: methodological and ethical considerations. *Stud Fam Plann* 2001;**32**:1-16.
32
33
34 36. Wijma B, Schei B, Swahnberg K, et al. Emotional, physical, and sexual abuse in
35 patients visiting gynaecology clinics: a Nordic cross-sectional study. *The Lancet*
36 2003;**361**:2107-13.
37
38
39 37. Chan KL. Gender differences in self-reports of intimate partner violence: A
40 review. *Aggress Violent Behav* 2011;**16**:167-75.
41
42
43 38. Johnson MP. Conflict and control: Gender symmetry and asymmetry in
44 domestic violence. *Violence Against Women* 2006;**12**:1003-18.
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4
5
6
7 **Psychometric properties of the WHO Violence Against Women instrument in a female**
8 **population-based sample in Sweden**
9

10 Lotta Nybergh (Corresponding author)^{a), b)}

11 Email: lotta.nybergh@socmed.gu.se
12
13

14 Charles Taft^{c)}

15 Email: charles.taft@medicine.gu.se
16
17

18 Gunilla Krantz^{a), b)}

19 Email: gunilla.krantz@socmed.gu.se
20
21
22
23

24 ^{a)} Department of Public Health and Community Medicine, Institute of Medicine, The
25 Sahlgrenska Academy at University of Gothenburg, Gothenburg, Sweden.

26 Address: Arvid Wallgrens Backe 7, PO Box 453, SE-405 30 Gothenburg, Sweden
27
28

29 ^{b)} The Västra Götaland Region Competence Centre on Intimate Partner Violence, Gothenburg,
30 Sweden

31 Address: Kungsgatan 12, floor 6, 411 19 Gothenburg, Sweden
32
33
34

35 ^{c)} Institute of Health and Care Sciences, The University of Gothenburg Centre for Person-
36 centred Care, Gothenburg, Sweden

37 Address: Arvid Wallgrens Backe, PO Box 457, SE-405 30 Gothenburg, Sweden
38
39
40

41 **Keywords**

42 Intimate Partner Violence * Sweden * WHO VAW instrument * Psychometric properties *

43
44 Women
45
46

47 **Word count**

48 | 3,449+109
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

ABSTRACT

Objective: To explore psychometric properties of the Violence Against Women instrument in a randomly selected national sample of women ($N=573$) aged 18-65 years and residing in Sweden. **Design:** Cross-sectional survey study. **Setting:** Sweden. **Participants:** A postal survey was sent to 1006 women between January and March 2009, during which 624 women (62.0%) returned the questionnaire. Fifty-one women who did not answer any of the violence items were excluded from the analyses, resulting in a final sample of 573 women. **Primary and secondary outcome measures:** Self-reported exposure to psychological, physical and sexual intimate partner violence. **Results:** Cronbach's alphas were 0.79 (psychological scale), 0.80 (physical scale), 0.72 (sexual scale) and 0.88 (total scale). A pre-determined three-component solution largely replicated the explored three component conceptual model of the Violence Against Women instrument. The instrument was able to discriminate between groups known from previous studies to differ in exposure to physical and/or sexual violence, that is, respondents with poor vs. good self-rated health and witnessed vs. not witnessed physical violence at home when growing up. Past-year prevalence of physical (8.1%; 95% CI 5.9 – 10.3) and sexual (3.0%; 1.6 – 4.4) violence was similar to that reported in other Nordic studies; however, earlier-in-life prevalence was lower in the current study (14.3%; 95% CI 11.4 – 17.2 and 9.2%; 95% CI 6.8 – 11.6 respectively). Reported exposure rates were higher than those obtained from a concurrently administered instrument (NorVold Abuse Questionnaire). **Conclusion:** The Violence Against Women instrument demonstrated good construct validity and internal reliability in an adult female population in Sweden. However, further studies examining these and other psychometric properties need to be conducted in other countries.

ARTICLE SUMMARY

Article focus

- The World Health Organization's Violence Against Women instrument (VAWI) has been used in several countries around the world in order to investigate violence against women by their intimate male partners, but aspects of reliability and validity have seldom been investigated.
- The aim of the current study was to explore selected psychometric properties of the VAWI in a randomly selected national population-sample ($n=573$) of women.

Key messages

- The current study provides preliminary support for the VAWI subscales of psychological, physical and sexual violence in a Swedish, adult female population.
- This adds to the knowledge of the instrument's cross-cultural validity and reliability, which is of significance when comparing intimate partner violence prevalence rates between countries.

Strengths and limitations

- Cross-sectional study design.
- Further aspects of validity and reliability need to be explored and studies from a diverse range of countries are needed for further cross-cultural assessment.

Keywords

Intimate partner violence * Sweden * Validation * WHO VAW instrument * Psychometric properties * Women

INTRODUCTION

While prevalence studies investigating violence against women perpetrated by intimate male partners have become more frequent,(1-4) sizeable differences in reported exposure occur both between and within study sites. These differences may in part be explained by differences in questionnaire administration methods (e.g. personal interviews vs. self-administration), questionnaire content, target populations, or definitions and severity of the violence assessed; however, such differences may also reflect true variation and cultural differences in violence perpetration.(1, 4) Standardized methodologies for assessing intimate partner violence (IPV) may help to enhance the reliability of results obtained from such studies and aid in comparing prevalence rates from diverse settings.

With this in mind, the World Health Organization (WHO) constructed a questionnaire for the WHO Multi-country Study on Women's Health and Domestic Violence against Women.(5) The study questionnaire includes the Violence Against Women instrument (henceforth referred to as "VAWI") assessing exposure to psychological, physical and sexual IPV. The VAWI was developed in collaboration with several networks and expert groups and was based partly on the original(6) and revised Conflict Tactics Scales,(7) as well as on work that originated from its critics.(8) Extensive pre-testing ~~and~~ independent back-translations and piloting of the questionnaire were conducted.(9) The prevalence rates from the ten countries included in the multi-country study vary greatly, with life-time estimates ranging between 20-75% for psychological violence, 13-61% for physical violence and 6-59% for sexual violence.(5) Since the Multi-country Study was performed, the VAWI has been used in several more countries.(10-15)(9-14)

1
2
3
4
5
6
7 Despite the VAWI's relatively wide use, few peer-reviewed studies have evaluated its
8 psychometric properties. Internal reliability (Cronbach's α) was assessed and confirmed in the
9 Multi-Country Study;⁽⁹⁾⁽¹⁵⁾ however, only one study, conducted in Brazil, has explored
10 aspects of validity.⁽¹⁶⁾ In that study, analyses of data from two female populations, one urban
11 (São Paulo; $n=940$) and one combined urban and rural area (Zona da Mata; $n=1,188$)
12 supported the construct validity and internal reliability of the instrument.
13
14
15
16
17
18
19

20 The aim of this study was to explore psychometric properties of the VAWI in a randomly
21 selected national ~~population-sample~~ ($n=573$) of women aged 18-65 years residing in Sweden.
22 Sweden provides an interesting comparative context due to its linguistic, cultural and socio-
23 economic differences to Brazil.
24
25
26
27
28
29

30 METHODS

31 Procedure, study population and response rate

32 A sample of 1006 women, aged 18-65 years and residing in Sweden, was randomly selected
33 by Statistics Sweden from the national population register. Data was collected by means of a
34 postal survey between January and March 2009~~Data collection took place between January~~
35 and March 2009. A requirement for the sample selection was that the respondent was
36 currently or had previously been in an intimate relationship. The response rate was 62.0%
37 ($n=624$). Women who did not respond to any of the violence items ($n=51$) were excluded
38 from the analyses, resulting in a total sample of 573 women.
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48

49 Criterion validity was explored by comparing prevalence reported in the VAWI versus the
50 NorVold Abuse Questionnaire (NorAQ).[16] A second data collection was performed for this
51 purpose. Statistics Sweden sent out the VAWI and NorAQ to 20% ($n=125$) of the respondents
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4
5
6
7 from the initial data collection between November 2009 and January 2010. NorAQ was
8 chosen since it is the only questionnaire measuring violence that has been validated in
9 Sweden in both a female and male (see companion article) population-based sample. The
10 response rate was 65.6% ($n=82$) for the VAWI and 63.2% ($n=79$) for NorAQ.
11
12
13

14 15 16 **Drop-out analysis**

17 A two-proportion z-test was used to assess statistical significance between the drop-out and
18 the final sample regarding age, country of birth, civil status and the respondents' yearly
19 income before tax. A Bonferroni adjustment to the alpha level was applied.
20
21
22
23

24
25 Comparing those who did not return the questionnaire ($n=382$) with the final sample of
26 analysis ($n=573$) revealed that significantly lower response rates were found among non-
27 respondents who were 18-29 years old, unmarried, foreign born and had low yearly income of
28 0 – 159,999 Swedish Kronor (SEK) before tax. Internal drop-out rates, that is respondents
29 who did not endorse any violence item ($n=51$), were significantly higher among ~~men~~-women
30 who were 18-29 years old, unmarried and had a low yearly income in comparison to the final
31 sample of analysis.
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39

40
41 Of those who did not return the questionnaire during the second data collection ($n=46$),
42 significantly lower response rates were found for women who were unmarried, widowed or
43 divorced.
44
45
46
47

48 49 **Assessment instruments: VAWI and NorAQ**

50 The VAWI consists of behaviour-specific items related to psychological (four items), physical
51 (six items) and sexual violence (three items). The physical violence items are further divided
52
53
54
55

1
2
3
4
5
6
7 into “moderate” (the two first items) and “severe” (the following four items) violence based
8 on the likelihood of physical injury.(5) For each question, respondents were asked whether
9 they had experienced the specific act during the *past year* and *earlier in life*. [The VAWI items](#)
10 [were translated and adapted to a Swedish context by a senior researcher \(third author\) with](#)
11 [extensive knowledge about intimate partner violence](#)~~The VAWI's items were translated and~~
12 [adapted to Swedish by an expert panel in IPV.](#)
13
14
15
16
17
18
19

20 NorAQ has been validated in a Swedish context(17) and measures emotional (three items),
21 physical (three items) and sexual (four items) abuse, including different perpetrators, as well
22 as abuse in the health care system. The NorAQ violence items applicable to an intimate
23 partnership (Appendix 1) were included with the intention to compare prevalence rates with
24 those obtained by use of the VAWI. The second sexual violence item was adapted for use in
25 both a male and female population, as the questionnaire constructed for this study was sent to
26 a male population as well (see companion [paper entitled ‘Psychometric properties of the](#)
27 [WHO Violence Against Women instrument in a male population-based sample in Sweden’](#)).
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37

38 **Statistical analyses**

39 Principal components analysis (PCA) was conducted to explore the internal construct validity
40 of the violence items. A promax rotation was chosen due to high inter-component correlations
41 (e.g. $r=0.49-0.61$ for the three dimensions). Decisions on the number of components to extract
42 were based on parallel analysis, Kaiser’s eigenvalue-greater-than-one rule, total proportion of
43 variance explained and Cattell’s scree plot. This was followed by a pre-determined solution
44 with three components as conceptualized in the VAWI.
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4
5
6
7 The internal reliability of the VAWI was assessed with the Cronbach's alpha for each
8 subscale and for the total violence scale. An alpha of 0.70 or higher was considered
9 satisfactory.(18)
10

11
12
13
14 Known-groups comparisons were performed to investigate the VAWI's external construct
15 validity. The aim was to see if the instrument was able to differentiate between groups known
16 to differ in exposure to IPV.(19) The following hypotheses were postulated: women who are
17 exposed to physical and/or sexual IPV (life-time exposure, "yes/no") would have poorer self-
18 perceived health(2, 20-24) and have grown up in a home where they witnessed physical
19 violence between their parents(10, 25-27)(9, 25-27). The Mantel-Haenszel test was used
20 controlling for age, income, civil status, education and country of birth. Statistical
21 significance was set at p<0.05.
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29

30
31 *Self-perceived health* was assessed by "How would you say that your general health has been
32 during the past year?". Response options were dichotomized into "very good/good" and
33 "neither good nor bad/bad/very bad". *Childhood exposure to violence* was assessed with the
34 question: When you were growing up, did you see your parents (or equivalent) regularly
35 physically hurt one another? ("no" and "yes/unsure").
36
37
38
39
40
41

42
43 Prevalence of psychological, physical and sexual violence was calculated for the past year and
44 for earlier in life, for comparisons with prevalence rates presented in other studies.
45
46
47

48
49 In addition, life-time prevalence of IPV was compared between the VAWI and the NorAQ
50 and Fisher's exact test was used to test for statistically significant differences at the 95% CI
51
52
53
54

1
2
3
4
5
6
7 level. Only those respondents who had answered both the VAWI and NorAQ were included
8
9 ($n=77$) in this analysis.

12 Ethical considerations

14 The Regional Ethics Review Board located in Gothenburg gave approval for this study (Dnr:
15 527-08) and the WHO ethical and safety recommendations for research on domestic violence
16 against women as applicable to a postal survey were followed.⁽²⁸⁾ For example, a letter was
17 sent to prospective respondents in advance to inform them about the upcoming survey; this
18 provided them with the opportunity to decline the survey before receiving it. Also, although
19 the sampling frame was based on registered individuals, only one survey per household was
20 sent for ethical and safety reasons. Additionally, full anonymity and confidentiality were
21 guaranteed and contact information to a general practitioner (third author on this study), a
22 psychologist and a contact person at Statistics Sweden was provided for additional
23 information and/or referral. The survey was entitled “A study on conflicts, relationships and
24 health”. The study description that followed the title stated that the study assesses IPV.
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35

Formatted: English (U.S.)

37 RESULTS

39 Study population

41 Nearly half of the women had at least three years of university education ($n=270$; 47.2%) and
42 the mean age was 43 years ($SD=13$). Of the total sample, 85.1% ($n=484$) were currently in a
43 relationship (i.e. boyfriend or girlfriend, married, registered partnership or cohabiting), of
44 which the majority were heterosexual relationships ($n=566$; 98.8%). The rest of the sample
45 was single, widowed or divorced, but had previously been in a relationship (see Table 1).
46
47
48
49
50
51
52

53 Table 1. *Socio-demographic and psychosocial factors of*
54 *the total sample. N=573*

	<i>N (%)</i>
Age groups	
18-29	107 (18.7)
30-39	138 (24.1)
40-49	125 (21.8)
50-59	136 (23.7)
60-65	67 (11.7)
Partner status	
Single/widowed/divorced	85 (14.9)
Boyfriend/girlfriend	64 (11.2)
Married/cohabitant/registered partnership	420 (73.8)
Heterosexual relationship	566 477
	(98.8) 83.2
Same-sex relationship	7 (1.2)
Educational level (highest)	
University	270 (47.2)
High school (10-12 yrs)	211 (36.9)
Compulsory (≤ 9 yrs)	91 (15.9)
Annual income (before tax, SEK)	
0 – 159,999	168 (29.3)
160,000 - 234,999	175 (30.5)
235,000 - 309,999	143 (25.0)
310,000 or more	87 (15.2)
Employment status	
Employed	396 (69.7)
Student	35 (6.2)
Retired	47 (8.3)
Sick leave (more than 3 months)	8 (1.4)
Parental leave or leave of absence	35 (6.2)
Unemployed	23 (4.0)
Other	24 (4.2)
Country of Birth	
Sweden	519 (90.6)
Other Nordic country	15 (2.6)
Other European country	18 (3.1)
Country outside Europe	21 (3.7)
Self-rated health	
Very good/good	511 (90.0)
Neither good nor bad/bad/very bad	57 (10.0)

Grown up in a home where there occurred physical violence

No	542 (94.6)
Yes/Unsure	31 (5.4)

Internal validity

The Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin measure of sampling adequacy was 0.89 and Bartlett's test of sphericity was significant ($p < 0.05$), verifying a good fit of the data to the PCA. Parallel analysis, Kaiser's criterion and Cattell's scree test suggested two components (not in Table), explaining 57.4% of the total variance. The first component consisted of all physical and sexual violence items in the VAWI conceptual model, except the two items representing the least severe forms of physical and sexual violence. In addition, the component included the psychological violence item referring to threat of injury. The second component comprised the remaining three psychological violence items as well as the first physical and sexual violence items.

A three-component solution (Table 2) explained 64.4% of the total variance. The third component had an initial eigenvalue close to one (0.9) and comprised two of the three sexual violence items; otherwise the structure was identical to the two component solution and largely mirrored the VAWI's physical, psychological and sexual violence subscales.

Table 2. *Three-component solution for the VAWI psychological, physical and sexual violence items.* N=534

Formatted Table

Conceptual model	Three-component solution		
	C1	C2	C3
Psychological Violence			
<u>1 Insulted me in a way that made me feel bad about myself¹</u>		.89	
<u>2 Belittled and humiliated me in front of other people²</u>		.74	
<u>3 Tried to scare and intimidate me on purpose (e.g. by the way he/she looked at you, by yelling or smashing things)³</u>		.64	
<u>4 Threatened to hurt me or someone I care about⁴</u>	.43	.33	

Formatted: Font: 12 pt

Formatted: Font: 12 pt

Formatted: Font: 12 pt

Formatted: Font: 12 pt

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Physical Violence				
<u>1 Pushed or shoved me</u> ¹			.71	Formatted: Font: 12 pt
<u>2 Thrown something at me that could have hurt me</u> ²			.38	Formatted: Font: 12 pt
<u>3 Hit me with his/her fist or with some other object that could have hurt me</u> ³			.80	Formatted: Font: 12 pt
<u>4 Kicked and dragged me and beat me up</u> ⁴			.85	Formatted: Font: 12 pt
<u>5 Choked me or burnt me on purpose</u> ⁵			.67	Formatted: Font: 12 pt
<u>6 Hurt me with a knife, a gun or some other weapon</u> ⁶			.88	Formatted: Font: 12 pt
Sexual Violence				
<u>1 Demanded to have sex with me even though I did not want to (but did not use physical force)</u> ¹				Formatted: Font: 12 pt
<u>2 Forced me to have sex against my will by using his/her physical strength (by hitting, holding me firmly or threatening me with a weapon)</u> ²			.56	Formatted: Font: 12 pt
<u>3 Forced me to perform sexual acts that I experienced as degrading and/or humiliating</u> ³				Formatted: Font: 12 pt
Accumulated variance %	46.1	57.4	64.4	
Eigenvalues	6.0	1.5	0.9	
* Loadings >greater 0.30 are shown and highest loadings are boldfaced. List-wise deletion was used.				

Internal reliability

The Cronbach's alpha coefficient (Table 3) was satisfactory for all subscales in the VAWI conceptual model: 0.79 (psychological scale), 0.80 (physical scale), 0.72 (sexual scale) and 0.88 (total scale). Alpha for the sexual violence scale increased from 0.72 to 0.77 after deleting the item "Demanded to have sex with me even though I did not want to (but did not use physical force)".

Table 3. Cronbach's α of the VAWI psychological, physical and sexual violence scales and total scale, life-time. N=573

Scales	Alpha if Item Deleted
Psychological violence	
Insulted me in a way that made me feel bad about myself	.75
Belittled and humiliated me in front of other people	.71
Tried to scare and intimidate me on purpose (e.g. by the way he/she looked at you, by yelling or smashing things)	.72
Threatened to hurt me or someone I care about	.76
Total	.79

Physical violence

Pushed or shoved me	.81
Thrown something at me that could have hurt me	.75
Hit me with his/her fist or with some other object that could have hurt me	.73
Kicked and dragged me and beat me up	.75
Choked me or burnt me on purpose	.76
Hurt me with a knife, a gun or some other weapon	.80
Total	.80
<hr/>	
Sexual violence	
Demanded to have sex with me even though I did not want to (but did not use physical force)	.77
Forced me to have sex against my will by using his/her physical strength (by hitting, holding me firmly or threatening me with a weapon)	.64
Forced me to perform sexual acts that I experienced as degrading and/or humiliating	.54
Total	.72
<hr/>	
Violence scale, total	.88
<hr/>	

External validity

Known-groups comparison

As hypothesized, exposure to violence as assessed by VAWI was significantly associated with self-rated health and having witnessed parental (or equivalent) physical violence when growing up. Specifically, a significantly larger proportion of respondents who reported exposure to violence also reported worse health (Chi-Square (1, N=573) = 26.1, p<0.05) and having witnessed parental physical violence (Chi-Square (1, N=573) = 11.5, p<0.05) than did those not reporting exposure. VAWI scores were significantly associated with self-rated health and having witnessed parental (or equivalent) physical violence. Specifically, those who reported exposure to violence also reported worse health and having witnessed parental physical violence to a higher extent.

Comparison of prevalence rates to other studies

As assessed with the VAWI, 23.6% ($n=123$) of the respondents reported exposure to psychological violence, 8.4% ($n=43$) to physical violence and 3.0% ($n=16$) to sexual violence

during the past year. Corresponding percentages for exposure to violence earlier in life were 23.6% ($n=135$), 14.3% ($n=82$) and 9.2% ($n=53$; Table 4). Similar 12-month violence exposure rates for physical and sexual violence have been reported in two population-based studies – one in Finland ($n=4,464$) and one in Sweden ($n=4,771$) – using comparable methodologies and definitions.^(29, 30) However, the present study found lower prevalence for physical and sexual violence experienced earlier in life. The aforementioned studies did not report psychological violence.

Table 4. *Past-year and earlier-in-life exposure to IPV as assessed with the VAWI.*
N=573

	Past year			Earlier in life		
	N	%	95 % CI	N	%	95 % CI
Psychological violence	123	23.6 ^a	20.1 – 27.1	135	23.6	20.1 – 27.1
Physical violence	43	8.1	5.9 – 10.3	82	14.3	11.4 – 17.2
Sexual violence	16	3.0	1.6 – 4.4	53	9.2	6.8 – 11.6

^a Percentage is given in valid percent.

VAWI and NorAQ

Higher prevalence was found by the VAWI compared to NorAQ (see Table 5). However, only the difference for psychological IPV was statistically significant (17.1% vs. 2.6%; $p<0.05$). This difference owed principally to the VAWI items “Insulted me in a way that made me feel bad about myself” (16.9%), for which NorAQ has no corresponding item, and “Belittled and humiliated me in front of other people” (6.5%). Prevalence rates for the two other items on this scale were similar to corresponding items in the NorAQ (see Appendix 1).

Table 5. *Life-time prevalence of exposure to IPV as assessed with the VAWI versus NorAQ.* N=77

	VAWI		NorAQ	
	N	% ^a	N	% ^a
Psychological violence	13	17.1	2	2.6
Physical violence	5	6.8	3	3.9
Sexual violence	7	9.3	5	6.5

* Percentage is given in valid percent.

DISCUSSION

The VAWI subscales of psychological, physical and sexual violence showed good internal consistency. Principal components analysis yielded a two-component solution and a three-component solution largely reflected the VAWI's conceptual model. External validity was supported in that the VAWI was able to discriminate between groups known to differ in exposure to physical and/or sexual IPV, that is, respondents with poor vs. good self-rated health and witnessed vs. not witnessed physical violence at home when growing up. Similar past-year prevalence to other Nordic studies was found. Differences in exposure rates of psychological IPV reported in the VAWI and NorAQ exemplify the need for standardized instruments when comparing prevalence of IPV between and within countries.

Internal validity

A two-component solution was suggested by the parallel analysis and the Kaiser and Cattell's scree criterion (one psychological and one combined physical and sexual component). This solution is understandable in that physical and sexual violence occur to a lesser extent in comparison with psychological violence, which generally is the most prevalent form of IPV are more likely to occur in conjunction. In contrast, psychological violence may occur in isolation of physical and/or sexual violence. (22, 31)(22)

Despite cultural and linguistic differences between Sweden and Brazil, results from the three-component solution in the current study were similar to those derived in the study conducted in Brazil, where a pre-determined three component solution was investigated.(16) In the Brazilian study, the question "Threatened to hurt me or someone I care about" did not load on any component in Zona da Mata, although it loaded in its explored psychological violence

1
2
3
4
5
6
7 component in São Paulo. In the current study the item loaded both in the physical and
8
9 psychological violence components. These findings indicate that threat of physical violence
10
11 might not belong as clearly as expected to the psychological violence component, which has
12
13 in fact been a point of debate among researchers.⁽²⁹⁾ Threats of violence may both precede
14
15 and follow violent acts themselves, either escalating into a violent act or, especially if the
16
17 victim has been exposed to physical violence prior to the threat, the threat of violence might
18
19 frighten the victim just as much as the violent act itself.⁽²⁹⁾ This could explain the finding
20
21 that threat of violence belonged to both psychological and physical violence. Moreover, both
22
23 in Zona da Mata and in the present study, the item “Has your partner pushed or shoved you?”
24
25 loaded on the psychological violence component rather than the physical violence scale in the
26
27 WHO conceptual model. The observed cross-loadings of individual items as well as items that
28
29 belonged to other domains than in the conceptual model may reflect that female victims often
30
31 are not exposed to one form of violence in isolation of the other.⁽³²⁾⁽³⁴⁾ For example, the
32
33 sexual violence item “Forced me to have sex against my will by using his/her physical
34
35 strength (by hitting, holding me firmly or threatening me with a weapon)” which loaded in
36
37 both the physical and sexual IPV components is hard to divide into one or the other category.

38 39 **Internal reliability**

40
41 The Cronbach’s alpha coefficients reported for the subscales in this study are very similar to
42
43 those found in other studies.^{(9, 16)(15, 16)} For example, for all sites combined in the WHO
44
45 multi-country study, the reliability coefficient was 0.81 for physical and 0.66 for sexual
46
47 IPV.⁽⁹⁾⁽¹⁵⁾ compared to 0.80 and 0.72 respectively in the current study. These similarities
48
49 indicate a consistency in the internal reliability of the VAWI across countries despite cultural
50
51 and socio-economic differences between the countries.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7 In the current study, deleting the item “Demanded to have sex with me even though I did not
8 want to (but did not use physical force)” would increase alpha for the sexual violence scale
9 from 0.72 to 0.77. However, given that the current study is explorative and hypothesis-
10 generating, further studies are needed to determine whether this item needs to be revised ~~or~~
11 ~~not~~.

12 13 14 15 16 17 18 **External validity**

19 20 Known-groups comparison

21
22 Of the two known-groups used in the comparison, the strongest relationship found in the
23 literature regards exposure to physical and/or sexual IPV and poorer self-rated health.(2, 20-
24 24) There is also strong evidence that those who are exposed to physical and/or sexual IPV
25 have witnessed their father use physical violence against the mother during childhood.(10, 25-
26 27) We found support that the combined VAWI subscales of physical and/or sexual
27 violence could discriminate between respondents who had poor vs. good self-rated health and
28 between those who had witnessed vs. not witnessed their parents engaged in physical
29 violence. There is only scant knowledge about how these variables relate to psychological
30 violence, hence these analyses were not deemed appropriate for the purpose of assessing
31 validity.
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42

43 44 Comparison of prevalence rates to other studies

45
46 Comparisons of our prevalence rates with those in other studies are challenged by differences
47 between methodologies, definitions and reporting styles. Nevertheless, our 12-month violence
48 exposure rates for physical and sexual violence were similar to those reported previously in
49 population-based studies in Finland and Sweden(29, 30) using similar definitions and
50 methodologies. However, we found lower rates for earlier-in-life estimates of physical and
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4
5
6
7 sexual IPV. The Swedish study found that 28% of women were exposed to physical and 16%
8
9 to sexual violence by a former partner, compared to 14.3% for physical and 9.2% for sexual
10
11 IPV during the earlier-in-life timeframe in the current study. The figures for the Finnish study
12
13 were 29% for severe physical and 16% for sexual IPV. These differences are likely due to
14
15 some minor differences in the definitions between the studies as well as to changes in
16
17 prevalence rates over time and actual differences between countries. However, they may also
18
19 owe to an oversight in the questionnaire layout, where the box for ticking violence
20
21 experienced earlier in life was somewhat unclearly placed. Studies assessing psychological
22
23 violence in a Nordic context using similar definitions as in the current study could not be
24
25 found.

26 27 28 VAWI and NorAQ

29
30 As the type and number of acts assessed in the VAWI and the NorAQ varied at the outset,
31
32 some differences in the results from the two instruments were expected. The two
33
34 questionnaires have also been developed with different aims in mind. NorAQ was developed
35
36 for investigations in health care settings and for comparisons in the Nordic countries of
37
38 various forms of violence, not specifically IPV. On the other hand, the VAWI was developed
39
40 for global comparisons on IPV specifically. For example, the NorAQ psychological violence
41
42 items reflect a more systematic form of violence experienced during a longer time-period or
43
44 under fear or threat. Although these seem to capture similar levels of exposure as the more
45
46 severe psychological violence items of the VAWI, milder forms of psychological violence are
47
48 also represented in the VAWI and thus the instrument captures a broader range of
49
50 psychologically violent acts. The sample size used in this comparison prohibits any strong
51
52 conclusions; however, it further illustrates the importance of using standardized
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3
4
5
6
7 questionnaires when comparing prevalence, as results may vary to a large extent depending
8
9 on the instrument used.

10 11 12 **Methodological considerations**

13
14 The VAWI was designed for and is primarily used in face-to-face interviews(5), whereas the
15 current study administered the VAWI via a postal survey. The implications of different modes
16 of data collection are difficult to assess due to multiple influencing factors, including the
17 method of initial contact with the respondents, visual versus oral presentation of response
18 choices, method of sampling as well as differing cultural and social contexts.(33) Previous
19 studies have found disclosure of sensitive topics to be higher in self-administered modes
20 compared to face-to-face interviews.(33) also when assessing IPV(34). However, there is a
21 scarcity of experimental or randomized study designs comparing different modes of data
22 collection.(33)

23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34 Nonetheless, the main known limitation of postal surveys is lowered response rates.(34) The
35 current study included two reminders in an effort to minimize drop-out rates. Non-responders
36 were over-represented by young and unmarried women, women with low annual income and
37 by those born outside of Sweden. Exposure rates of IPV have been found to be especially high
38 in these groups.(21, 25) which may further contribute to under-estimated prevalence rates and
39 less robust component solutions in our study. Furthermore, the earlier-in-life estimates may
40 have been underestimated due to a minor detail on the questionnaire lay-out. In addition,
41 theAs under-reporting is common in surveys assessing IPV,(3, 35)(3, 32)-has probably
42 contributed to estimates of IPV in the current study are probably further rather under than
43 over-estimated estimation of IPV prevalence rates. Reasons for under-reporting IPV include
44 forgetting violent acts that took place further back in life,(36)(33) normalizing the violence,
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

blaming the violence on oneself~~(37)(34)~~ and being fearful of a violent and controlling partner.~~(38)(35)~~ Finally, the sub-sample of respondents who answered both the VAWI and the NorAQ is small, which limits our ability to draw conclusions or generalize to the target population. Moreover, non-responders were over-represented by young and unmarried women, women with lower income and by those born outside of Sweden. Exposure rates to IPV have been found to be especially high in these groups,(21, 25) which may further contribute to under-estimated prevalence rates and less robust component solutions in our study.

CONCLUSION

Our analysis indicated that the VAWI has good construct validity and internal reliability in a Swedish context. The results obtained were similar to those reported in the Brazilian study, which implies that the VAWI has good cross-cultural construct validity and internal reliability in an adult female population. However, further studies examining these and other psychometric properties need to be conducted in other countries.

COMPETING INTERESTS

The authors declare that they have no competing interests.

CONTRIBUTORSHIP STATEMENT

LN conducted all analyses, wrote the first draft of the manuscript and rewrote new drafts based on input from co-authors. CT planned the analyses ~~and~~ gave input on manuscript drafts. GK designed the project, planned the analyses ~~and~~ gave input on manuscript drafts. All authors read and approved the final manuscript.

FUNDING

This work was supported by a grant from the Swedish Research Council grant number 527-08.

DATA SHARING STATEMENT

The dataset is available from the corresponding author at lotta.nybergh@socmed.gu.se. Consent for sharing the dataset was not obtained but the presented data are anonymised and risk of identification is low.

Appendix 1. *The NorAQ violence items.*

Psychological Violence

Has your partner systematically and for a longer period tried to repress, degrade or humiliate you?

Have you experienced living in fear because your partner systematically and for a longer period threatened you or somebody close to you?

Has your partner systematically and under threat or force tried to limit your contacts with others, or totally control what you may and may not do?

Physical Violence

Has your partner hit you, smacked your face or held you firmly against your will?

Has your partner hit you with his/her fist(s) or with a hard object, kicked you, pushed you violently, given you a beating, thrashed you or done anything similar to you?

Has your partner threatened your life by, for instance, trying to strangle you, showing a weapon or knife or by any other similar act?

Sexual Violence

Has your partner against your will touched your genitals, used your body to satisfy him/herself sexually or forced you to touch your partner's genitals?

Has your partner against your will forced intercourse on you?

Has your partner against your will touched parts of your body other than the genitals in a 'sexual way' or forced you to touch other parts of his or her body in a 'sexual way'?

Have you any other way been sexually humiliated; e.g. by being forced to watch a porno movie or similar, forced to participate in a porno movie or similar, forced to show your body naked or forced to watch when your partner showed his/her body naked?

References

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1. Alhabib S, Nur U, Jones R. Domestic Violence Against Women: Systematic Review of Prevalence Studies. *J Fam Violence* 2010;**25**:369-82.
2. Ellsberg M, Jansen HA, Heise L, et al. Intimate partner violence and women's physical and mental health in the WHO multi-country study on women's health and domestic violence: an observational study. *The Lancet* 2008;**371**:1165-72.
3. Watts C, Zimmerman C. Violence against women: global scope and magnitude. *The Lancet* 2002;**359**:1232-7.
4. Kury H, Oberfell-Fuchs J, Woessner G. The extent of family violence in Europe: Comparison of national surveys. *Violence Against Women* 2004;**10**:749-69.
5. WHO. Multi-Country Study on Women's Health and Domestic Violence against Women. Initial results on prevalence, health outcomes and women's responses. In: WHO/WHD, ed. Geneva 2005.
6. Straus MA. Measuring intrafamily conflict and violence: The conflict tactics (CT) scales. *J Marriage Fam* 1979;**41**:75-88.
7. Straus MA, Hamby SL, Boney-McCoy S, et al. The revised conflict tactics scales (CTS2). *J Fam Issues* 1996;**17**:283-316.
8. Dobash RP, Dobash RE, Wilson M, et al. The myth of sexual symmetry in marital violence. *Soc Probl* 1992;**39**:71-91.
9. Garcia-Moreno C, Jansen HA, Ellsberg M, et al. Prevalence of intimate partner violence: findings from the WHO multi-country study on women's health and domestic violence. *The Lancet* 2006;**368**:1260-9.
10. Yüksel-Kaptanoğlu İ, Türkyılmaz AS, Heise L. What Puts Women at Risk of Violence From Their Husbands? Findings From a Large, Nationally Representative Survey in Turkey. *J Interpers Violence* 2012;**27**:2743-69.

11. Abeya SG, Afework MF, Yalew AW. Intimate partner violence against women in western Ethiopia: prevalence, patterns, and associated factors. *BMC Public Health* 2011;**11**:913.
12. Ali TS, Asad N, Mogren I, et al. Intimate partner violence in urban Pakistan: prevalence, frequency, and risk factors. *Int J Women's Health* 2011;**3**:105-15.
13. Jayasuriya V, Wijewardena K, Axemo P. Intimate Partner Violence Against Women in the Capital Province of Sri Lanka. *Violence Against Women* 2011;**17**:1086-102.
14. Vung N, Ostergren P, Krantz G. Intimate partner violence against women, health effects and health care seeking in rural Vietnam. *Eur J Public Health* 2009;**19**:178-82.
15. Xu X, Zhu F, O'Campo P, et al. Prevalence of and risk factors for intimate partner violence in China. *Am J Public Health* 2005;**95**:78-85.
16. Schraiber L, Latorre M, França Jr I, et al. Validity of the WHO VAW study instrument for estimating gender-based violence against women. *Rev Saúde Pública* 2010;**44**:658-66.
17. Swahnberg I, Wijma B. The NorVold Abuse Questionnaire (NorAQ): validation of new measures of emotional, physical, and sexual abuse, and abuse in the health care system among women. *Eur J Public Health* 2003;**13**:361-6.
18. Nunnally JC, Bernstein IH. Chapter: 7: The assessment of reliability. In *Psychometric theory*. New York: McGraw 1994:264-5.
19. Cronbach LJ, Meehl PE. Construct validity in psychological tests. *Psychol Bull* 1955;**52**:281-302.
20. Vives-Cases C, Ruiz-Cantero MT, Escribà-Agüir V et al. The effect of intimate partner violence and other forms of violence against women on health. *J Public Health* 2011;**33**:15-21.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

21. Nerøien A, Schei B. Partner violence and health: results from the first national study on violence against women in Norway. *Scand J Public Health* 2008;**36**:161-8.
22. Romans S, Forte T, Cohen MM, et al. Who Is Most at Risk for Intimate Partner Violence? *J Interpers Violence* 2007;**22**:1495-514.
23. Fanslow JL, Robinson EM. Violence against women in New Zealand: prevalence and health consequences. *N Z Med J* 2004;**117**(1206).
24. Kramer A, Lorenzon D, Mueller G. Prevalence of intimate partner violence and health implications for women using emergency departments and primary care clinics. *Womens Health Issues* 2004;**14**:19-29.
25. Abramsky T, Watts C, Garcia-Moreno C, et al. What factors are associated with recent intimate partner violence? findings from the WHO multi-country study on women's health and domestic violence. *BMC Public Health* 2011;**11**:109.
26. Wood SL, Sommers MS. Consequences of Intimate Partner Violence on Child Witnesses: A Systematic Review of the Literature. *J Child Adolesc Psychiatr Nurs* 2011;**24**:223-36.
27. Paterson J, Faibairn-Dunlop P, Cowley-Malcolm ET, et al. Maternal childhood parental abuse history and current intimate partner violence: data from the Pacific Islands Families Study. *Violence Vict* 2007;**22**:474-88.
28. Watts C, Heise L, Ellsberg M, et al. Putting women first: ethical and safety recommendations for research on domestic violence against women. *Geneva: World Health Organization* 2001.
29. Lundgren E, Heimer G, Westerstrand J, et al. *Slagen Dam: Mäns våld mot kvinnor i jämställda Sverige-en omfattningsundersökning. (Captured queen - men's violence against women in "equal" Sweden - a prevalence study)*: Brottsoffermyndigheten 2001.

- 1
2
3
4
5
6
7 30. Piispa M, Heiskanen M, Kääriäinen J, et al. *Naisiin kohdistunut väkivalta 2005.*
8 *(Violence Against Women in Finland): Oikeuspoliittinen tutkimuslaitos 2006.*
9
10 31. Vung N, Ostergren P, Krantz G. Intimate partner violence against women in
11 rural Vietnam - different socio-demographic factors are associated with different forms of
12 violence: Need for new intervention guidelines? *BMC Public Health* 2008;**8**:55.
13
14 32. Jewkes R. Intimate partner violence: causes and prevention. *The Lancet*
15 2002;**359**:1423-9.
16
17 33. Bowling A. Mode of questionnaire administration can have serious effects on
18 data quality. *J Public Health* 2005;**27**:281-91.
19
20 34. Walby S. Improving the statistics on violence against women. *Stat J UN Econ*
21 *Comm Eur.* 2005;**22**:193-216.
22
23 35. Ellsberg M, Heise L, Peña R, et al. Researching domestic violence against
24 women: methodological and ethical considerations. *Stud Fam Plann* 2001;**32**:1-16.
25
26 36. Wijma B, Schei B, Swahnberg K, et al. Emotional, physical, and sexual abuse in
27 patients visiting gynaecology clinics: a Nordic cross-sectional study. *The Lancet*
28 2003;**361**:2107-13.
29
30 37. Chan KL. Gender differences in self-reports of intimate partner violence: A
31 review. *Aggress Violent Behav* 2011;**16**:167-75.
32
33 38. Johnson MP. Conflict and control: Gender symmetry and asymmetry in
34 domestic violence. *Violence Against Women* 2006;**12**:1003-18.
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Figure 1. *The NorAQ violence items.*

Psychological Violence

Has your partner systematically and for a longer period tried to repress, degrade or humiliate you?
 Have you experienced living in fear because your partner systematically and for a longer period threatened you or somebody close to you?
 Has your partner systematically and under threat or force tried to limit your contacts with others, or totally control what you may and may not do?

Physical Violence

Has your partner hit you, smacked your face or held you firmly against your will?
 Has your partner hit you with his/her fist(s) or with a hard object, kicked you, pushed you violently, given you a beating, trashed you or done anything similar to you?
 Has your partner threatened your life by, for instance, trying to strangle you, showing a weapon or knife or by any other similar act?

Sexual Violence

Has your partner against your will touched your genitals, used your body to satisfy him/herself sexually or forced you to touch your partner's genitals?
 Has your partner against your will forced intercourse on you?
 Has your partner against your will touched parts of your body other than the genitals in a 'sexual way' or forced you to touch other parts of his or her body in a 'sexual way'?
 Have you any other way been sexually humiliated; e.g. by being forced to watch a porno movie or similar, forced to participate in a porno movie or similar, forced to show your body naked or forced to watch when your partner showed his/her body naked?

112x90mm (300 x 300 DPI)

STROBE Statement—Checklist of items that should be included in reports of *cross-sectional studies*

	Item No	Recommendation
Title and abstract	1	(a) Indicate the study's design with a commonly used term in the title or the abstract (b) Provide in the abstract an informative and balanced summary of what was done and what was found
Introduction		
Background/rationale	2	Explain the scientific background and rationale for the investigation being reported
Objectives	3	State specific objectives, including any prespecified hypotheses
Methods		
Study design	4	Present key elements of study design early in the paper
Setting	5	Describe the setting, locations, and relevant dates, including periods of recruitment, exposure, follow-up, and data collection
Participants	6	(a) Give the eligibility criteria, and the sources and methods of selection of participants
Variables	7	Clearly define all outcomes, exposures, predictors, potential confounders, and effect modifiers. Give diagnostic criteria, if applicable
Data sources/ measurement	8*	For each variable of interest, give sources of data and details of methods of assessment (measurement). Describe comparability of assessment methods if there is more than one group
Bias	9	Describe any efforts to address potential sources of bias
Study size	10	Explain how the study size was arrived at
Quantitative variables	11	Explain how quantitative variables were handled in the analyses. If applicable, describe which groupings were chosen and why
Statistical methods	12	(a) Describe all statistical methods, including those used to control for confounding (b) Describe any methods used to examine subgroups and interactions (c) Explain how missing data were addressed (d) If applicable, describe analytical methods taking account of sampling strategy (e) Describe any sensitivity analyses
Results		
Participants	13*	(a) Report numbers of individuals at each stage of study—eg numbers potentially eligible, examined for eligibility, confirmed eligible, included in the study, completing follow-up, and analysed (b) Give reasons for non-participation at each stage (c) Consider use of a flow diagram
Descriptive data	14*	(a) Give characteristics of study participants (eg demographic, clinical, social) and information on exposures and potential confounders (b) Indicate number of participants with missing data for each variable of interest
Outcome data	15*	Report numbers of outcome events or summary measures
Main results	16	(a) Give unadjusted estimates and, if applicable, confounder-adjusted estimates and their precision (eg, 95% confidence interval). Make clear which confounders were adjusted for and why they were included (b) Report category boundaries when continuous variables were categorized (c) If relevant, consider translating estimates of relative risk into absolute risk for a meaningful time period
Other analyses	17	Report other analyses done—eg analyses of subgroups and interactions, and sensitivity analyses

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

Discussion		
Key results	18	Summarise key results with reference to study objectives
Limitations	19	Discuss limitations of the study, taking into account sources of potential bias or imprecision. Discuss both direction and magnitude of any potential bias
Interpretation	20	Give a cautious overall interpretation of results considering objectives, limitations, multiplicity of analyses, results from similar studies, and other relevant evidence
Generalisability	21	Discuss the generalisability (external validity) of the study results
Other information		
Funding	22	Give the source of funding and the role of the funders for the present study and, if applicable, for the original study on which the present article is based

*Give information separately for exposed and unexposed groups.

Note: An Explanation and Elaboration article discusses each checklist item and gives methodological background and published examples of transparent reporting. The STROBE checklist is best used in conjunction with this article (freely available on the Web sites of PLoS Medicine at <http://www.plosmedicine.org/>, Annals of Internal Medicine at <http://www.annals.org/>, and Epidemiology at <http://www.epidem.com/>). Information on the STROBE Initiative is available at www.strobe-statement.org.

1
2
3 Appendix 1. *The NorAQ violence items.*
4
5

6 **Psychological Violence**

7 Has your partner systematically and for a longer period tried to repress,
8 degrade or humiliate you?
9

10 Have you experienced living in fear because your partner systematically and
11 for a longer period threatened you or somebody close to you?

12 Has your partner systematically and under threat or force tried to limit your
13 contacts with others, or totally control what you may and may not do?
14

15
16 Has your partner hit you, smacked your face or held you firmly against your
17 will?

18 Has your partner hit you with his/her fist(s) or with a hard object, kicked you,
19 pushed you violently, given you a beating, thrashed you or done anything
20 similar to you?
21

22 Has your partner threatened your life by, for instance, trying to strangle you,
23 showing a weapon or knife or by any other similar act?
24

25 Has your partner against your will touched your genitals, used your body to
26 satisfy him/herself sexually or forced you to touch your partner's genitals?
27

28 Has your partner against your will forced intercourse on you?

29 Has your partner against your will touched parts of your body other than the
30 genitals in a 'sexual way' or forced you to touch other parts of his or her body
31 in a 'sexual way'?

32 Have you any other way been sexually humiliated; e.g. by being forced to
33 watch a porno movie or similar, forced to participate in a porno movie or
34 similar, forced to show your body naked or forced to watch when your partner
35 showed his/her body naked?
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60