IS THERE AN INTIMATE PARTNER VIOLENCE VICTIM’S PROFILE?
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Abstract: Intimate partner violence (IPV) is a significant worldwide problem. Because risk factors vary across different settings and cultures, it is a priority to improve their knowledge so as to formulate better evidence-based policy responses. The aim of the present study was to investigate the characteristics of abused women from a medico-legal and criminological perspective in order to define a victim’s profile. A retrospective analysis of IPV court proceedings with a final judgment was accomplished. Most IPV victims were young adult women, either married or single, with children, living in an urban environment and with a low family income level. The majority had a long-term relation-
ship with their abuser and lived with him at the time of assault and, in many cases, also shared the family home with children or other family members. Taking into account the outcome of the court rulings, five age-dependent profiles of abused women could be highlighted.
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**Resumen:** La violencia de género constituye un importante problema internacional. Dado que los factores de riesgo varían en diferentes contextos y culturas, es una prioridad mejorar su conocimiento para diseñar medidas basadas en la evidencia. El objetivo de este estudio fue investigar las características de las mujeres maltratadas desde un punto de vista médico-legal y criminológico con la finalidad de definir un perfil de víctima. Se realizó un estudio retrospectivo de expedientes judiciales por violencia de género con sentencia firme. La mayoría de las víctimas eran mujeres jóvenes, casadas o solteras, con hijos, residentes en un entorno urbano y con un bajo nivel de ingresos familiares. La mayoría mantuvo una relación duradera con el maltratador y vivía con él en el momento de la agresión. En algunos casos también convivía con hijos u otros familiares. Teniendo en cuenta el fallo judicial, hemos podido destacar cinco perfiles de mujer maltratada según la edad.
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1. INTRODUCTION

Intimate partner violence (IPV) is one of the most common forms of violence against women. It is considered a major public health problem worldwide, with significant socio-economic and familiar impact. It has serious short and long-term consequences on victims’ health, the most extreme being the victims’ homicide. The term IPV refers to “physical, psychological and/or sexual violence carried out by whoever is or has been an intimate partner of the victim, in a context of coercive control that often worsens over time”.

According to a report published by the World Health Organization (WHO) in 2013, it is estimated that 30% of women have experienced some kind of violence from their partner at some point in their lives. This is a universal problem that affects all sectors of society. However, several international studies have identified different factors that increase the likelihood of victimization of women, such as age, low level of education, low family income and unemployment. It has also been highlighted

---

4 See different studies as: CANAVAL GE, GONZÁLEZ MC, SÁNCHEZ MO.: “Perfil sociodemográfico de las mujeres que denuncian maltrato de pareja en la ciudad de Cali”, en Inv Enf, Vol.9, Nº2, 2007, p.159-176,
the particular vulnerability of female immigrants⁵. Furthermore, it has been reported that a higher educational and occupational status of women as well as social support are protective factors against IPV and its consequences⁶. In Spain, recent studies have confirmed these findings and found significant associations between marital status (separation or divorce appeared as potential risk factors), the age of the woman (the older the woman, the more protection against IPV), the number of children (women with more than three dependent children are more at risk for IPV), low educational level and the fact of being an immigrant⁷.


Other studies have shown increased likelihood of IPV and death among immigrant women, as well as a different response to the problem. The most common form of violence suffered by women is a combination of physical and psychological abuse. The violence often appears quite early on at the start of the relationship and usually persists for years.

The risk factors for intimate partner violence vary in different contexts and cultures, with social, political and healthcare consequences. Prevention and intervention strategies to combat this problem are now a priority in Spain, where different guides and protocols for clinicians and forensic practitioners have been implemented. For the purpose of locate and prevent this vic-
timization it is essential to get to know the characteristics of women who suffer this violence. In recent years, numerous studies have been conducted in order to increase awareness of this problem and propose evidence-based policy responses. Many of these studies focus on one of the most controversial issues of IPV, that is, the possibility of a victim profile. The aim of this study is to investigate the characteristics of abused women from a medical-legal and criminological perspective in order to define whether or not there is an IPV victim’s profile.

2. MATERIAL AND METHODS\(^\text{12}\)

A retrospective analysis of files classified as gender violence in the Department of Public Prosecution of Santiago de Compostela (Galicia, NW Spain) was carried out. Cases of IPV were selected and other cases of violence against women were excluded from the sample. Only court proceedings with a final judgment between January 2005 and December 2012 were included in the investigation.

The information was collected on index cards previously designed for this purpose and completed with data from the court proceedings, thus providing the following socio-demographic information: age, marital status, descendants, nationality, place of residence, employment status, educational level and economic status. Data on the characteristics of the relationship between victim and perpetrator were also obtained: time spent together, duration of abuse and cohabitation or not with the abuser or others at the time of the attack. All data were subsequently

---

\(^{12}\) This project was supported by Grants from Ministerio de Ciencia e Innovación (FEM 2010-22350-C02-01 and FEM 2010-22350-C02-02) and from Ministerio de Sanidad, Servicios Sociales e Igualdad (181/12).
included in a digital database (Microsoft Office Excel 2007 ®). From these variables a descriptive analysis was performed, using the mean and standard deviation for quantitative variables, and the percentage distribution of frequencies for qualitative variables. Descriptive statistics was performed using R (R Core Team 2014) software. Classification trees were carried out using the “tree” package (Brian Ripley, 2014: version 1.0-35).

3. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

A total of 580 judicial files of intimate partner violence processed during 2005-2012 were included in the investigation. Only those cases with a final judgment were selected, with conviction in 68.6% of cases (N=398) and acquittal in the remainder (N=182, 31.4%) (Figure 1).

Figure 1. Judgment sentence

---


3.1. Sociodemographic characteristics of victims.

This section shows the socio-demographic characteristics of victims, that is to say, those cases where the court judgment confirms a proven crime and finds the defendant guilty. Although with a broad age range (min=16, max=82), the average in our series was 36.67 years, with 80% of cases ranging between 21-50 years (Table 1). These data are consistent with other studies, both nationally and internationally, which demonstrate that women who are part of the workforce and of childbearing age are those who are primarily subjected to IPV, with fewer cases of abuse in the younger and older ages\textsuperscript{15}.

Table 1. Age of victims (N=398)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age (years)</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>16-20</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>6.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21-30</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>23.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31-40</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>36.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41-50</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>18.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51-64</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>9.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(\geq65)</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>3.27</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Age: mean (min-max, SD*)

36.67 (16-82, 11.95)

*SD=Standard Deviation

In relation to marital status (Table 2), in our series a high proportion of abused women were married (39.7%) or single (34.42%), although a significant number of them were separated or divorced. Recent studies have shown that formal marriage was a protective factor, while being single, separated / divorced, were risk factors for abuse.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 2. Marital status (N=398)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Married</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Common-law partners</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Separated/Divorced</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Widow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Regarding the domicile of the victims, more than half (55.78%) resided in an urban environment, while 30.65% did so in rural areas (Figure 2). These results are similar to those obtained in previous studies indicating greater likelihood of abuse in urban areas\textsuperscript{19}, although other studies have shown a higher prevalence of abuse in rural areas\textsuperscript{20}.

![Figure 2. Place of residence](image)

\begin{itemize}
\item PETRIDOU E, BROWNE B, LICHTER E, DEDOUKOU X, ALEXE D, DESSYPRIS, N.: “What distinguishes unintentional injuries from injuries
\end{itemize}
Although partner violence affects women of all social groups, it has been shown that a low socio-economic status is a risk factor for abuse. Most of the victims included in our study had a family income of less than 900 € per month, which is consistent with data obtained previously\(^21\) (Figure 3).

![Figure 3. Monthly family income](image)

As for the work activity of the victim, it is very difficult to make a comparison with other studies because of methodological differences in defining this variable. Furthermore, data from different cultural contexts show divergent results. Some indicate an association between IPV and paid work, particularly if the woman has a more regular and higher level of employment than her husband\(^22\), while other studies link violence with


unemployment\textsuperscript{23}. In our study (Table 3), 35.43\% of the victims had a paid work and 23.12\% were unemployed. The unemployment rate for Galician age-matched women ranged between 6 and 20.9\% in the same period\textsuperscript{24}. The percentage of housewives was lower than in other studies\textsuperscript{25}.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 3. Employment status (N=398)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unemployed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housewife</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retired</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Concerning the cultural level of victims (Table 4), we found similar percentages for women with university education,
secondary or primary education, although this information was available in a small part of the sample. Several studies have shown that a low educational level is a risk factor for abuse\textsuperscript{26}. On the other hand, increasing women’s levels of education and proximate educational context are important factors in reducing this public health burden\textsuperscript{27}.

The nationality of victims is shown in Figure 4. Most cases concerned Spanish women (82.91%), which is in agreement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 4. Education level (N=398)</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>University</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>3.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>3.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>3.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>354</td>
<td>88.94</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 4. Nationality


\textsuperscript{27} ACKERSON LK, KAWACHI I, BARBEAU EM, SUBRAMANIAN SV.: “Effects of individual and proximate educational context on intimate partner
with most studies in Spain. About 15% were foreigners, mostly from South American countries (12.56%). This is a significant percentage when compared with the proportion of immigrants in our community, which was 4% in 2013. It is considered that being immigrant involves an accumulation of risk factors (more precarious work, family uprooting, language difficulties, lack of access to resources), which leaves women more vulnerable to IPV and death from this cause. It is important to take this into account when planning strategies of support for this group of women who are particularly vulnerable.

### 3.2. Characteristics of offspring and parenthood

Table 5 shows the characteristics of offspring and parenthood of victims’ children. Most women had offspring (69.1%), with 3 or more children in 16.08% of cases and only 20% of victims had no children. Mainly, they had children with the life of violence: a population-based study of women in India”, en *Am J Public Health*, Vol.98, 2008, p.507-514.


partner aggressor (N=229, 57.54%), but also with another life partner (N=74, 18.51%) or with both, the aggressor and another romantic partner (N=25, 13.74%). Seven women (1.76%) were pregnant at abuse. Several studies argue that partner violence is more common in large families and that number of children (three or more) is a risk factor associated with violence and the response to it\(^{31}\).

\begin{table}
\centering
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|}
\hline
\textbf{Number of children (N=398)} & \textbf{N} & \textbf{\%} \\
\hline
0 & 84 & 21.11\% \\
1 & 114 & 28.64\% \\
2 & 100 & 25.13\% \\
3 or more & 64 & 16.08\% \\
Unknown & 36 & 9.05\% \\
\hline
\textbf{Parenthood*} & & \\
None & 84 & 21.11\% \\
Aggressor & 229 & 57.54\% \\
Another partner & 74 & 18.59\% \\
Both (aggressor and another partner) & 25 & 6.28\% \\
Pregnant at abuse & 7 & 1.76\% \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
\end{table}

*Categories are not mutually exclusive (not adding up to n = 398 or 100%)

3.3. Characteristics of the intimate relationship

The characteristics of the relationship are described in Table 6. Most of the victims lived with the perpetrator at the time of the abusive event and, in many cases, also shared the family home with children or other family members. Several studies also emphasise that partner violence is more common when the victim resides with the aggressor and indicate children as the main group living with the victim at the time of the abusive event.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Years living together</th>
<th>11.04 (min: 0.02 – max: 61)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Years of abuse</td>
<td>7.61 (min: 0.01 – max: 45)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Living with aggressor at abusive event</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>224</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>174</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other people at home* (N= 224)</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children</td>
<td>140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other family members</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No family members</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Categories are not mutually exclusive (not adding up to n = 224 or 100%)

assault\textsuperscript{33}, consequently they are at least indirect victims of the violent environment. This important finding demonstrated that abuse does not only have a negative impact on women, but also has negative consequences on children’ health and development, as pointed out by other authors\textsuperscript{34}. The results of this study support the recurrent nature of the problem. The relationship lasted an average of 11 years and the abuse an average of 7 years, which is consistent with other studies\textsuperscript{35}.

### 3.4. Classification tree

Using the demographic characteristics of the victims, characteristics of offspring and the final judgment of the court a classification tree was constructed, which provides, with a classification error of 20\%, different profiles of an abused woman


according to age (Figure 5). Starting from the premise that the woman is legally recognised as a victim of IPV when there is a guilty verdict, five different age-dependent profiles of abused women have been found.

Figure 5. Classification tree of IPV victims’ profile

- Woman ≤ 20 years, with a medium-high cultural level.
- Woman > 29 years, single or cohabitating.
- Woman ≤ 35, married / separated / divorced or widowed, with ≥ 2 children.
- Woman ≤ 53 years, married / separated / divorced or widowed, with ≤ 1 child.
- Woman > 53 years, married / separated / divorced or widowed.

With this tree, the combination of characteristics that define 5 groups of women most affected by this problem can
be visualised graphically. Three of the profiles correspond to young adult women (under 35 years), another to women under 53, which is consistent with the relationship already mentioned above between this type of abuse and the age of the victim. The profile is completed with other characteristics such as marital status and having children, which as discussed above, are also risk factors for IPV. Surprisingly, the last profile corresponds to women over 53 years married, separated, divorced or widowed. As stated above, elderly women are less likely to suffer violence\textsuperscript{36}. This profile found in our series could be explained by the population aging in Galicia. In 2012, 46% of Galician women were over 50 and of these, nearly 60% were over 65 years\textsuperscript{37}.

3.5. Limitations of the study

The present study has certain limitations that should be taken into account. Firstly, due to the retrospective nature of the study, data on some variables, especially in relation to the cultural level of the victims, are lacking. Another limitation is that this research is focused on the records from the prosecution office, and limited to reported cases with a final judgment and sentence. This could lead to an underestimation of the problem since it excludes all cases that go unreported. Therefore, future studies should check whether the characteristics of the victims are replicated in other judicial districts and in those cases unreported. It would also be essential to conduct case-control studies to confirm the risk factors.


Despite the limitations of this study, we believe it provides fundamental data, which extend awareness of this problem. Five profiles of IPV victims could be identified from the analysis of court cases. Yet we consider it essential to further analyse this problem in order to obtain reliable epidemiological data to be applied in prevention and treatment of this socio-political-health problem.

4. CONCLUSIONS

Young, married or unmarried women with children, living in an urban environment with low socio-economic status are the group most affected by the IPV in our community. Most victims had a long-term relationship with their abuser and lived with him at the time of assault and, in many cases, also shared the family home with children or other family members. Taking into account the outcome of the court rulings, five age-dependent profiles of abused women could be highlighted. Knowing the characteristics of IPV victims enables to identify their needs and contribute to the design of future strategies against such violence and evaluation of existing measures.
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