

www.stat.gouv.qc.ca  
Institut de la statistique du Québec

LIVING CONDITIONS

Aspects of the Context  
and Consequences of  
Domestic Violence –  
Situational Couple  
Violence and Intimate  
Terrorism in Canada in  
1999

*By Denis Laroché*

Québec 

For information concerning the ISQ  
and the statistics available,  
please contact:

**Institut de la statistique du Québec**  
**200, chemin Sainte-Foy**  
**Québec (Québec)**  
**G1R 5T4**  
**Telephone : (418) 691-2401**

**or**

**Telephone : 1 800 463-4090**  
**(toll-free)**

**Website : [www.stat.gouv.qc.ca](http://www.stat.gouv.qc.ca)**

Legal deposit  
National Library of Canada  
Bibliothèque nationale du Québec  
Second quarter 2005  
ISBN 2-550-43747-0  
ISBN 2-550-44392-6

© Gouvernement du Québec

Reproduction is prohibited  
without the express authorization  
of the Institut de la statistique du Québec.

**May 2005**

## Table of Contents

Definition and Measurement of Domestic Violence .....	5
Prevalence of Domestic Violence .....	6
Age of Victims of Domestic Violence .....	7
The Severity and Frequency of Violence and its Consequences .....	8
Victims' Reactions to Domestic Violence .....	9
Johnson's Typology – Situational Couple Violence and Intimate Terrorism .....	9
Prevalence of Domestic Violence According to the Johnson Typology .....	10
Context of Violence According to the Johnson Typology .....	11
Johnson's Typology and the Consequences of Domestic Violence Perpetrated by a Previous Spouse/Partner .....	12
Johnson's Typology and the Consequences of Domestic Violence Perpetrated by Current and Previous Spouse/Partners .....	14
Discussion .....	18
References .....	20

---

### Symbols

..	Data not available
...	Not applicable
–	Nil or zero
—	Negligible
e	Estimate
p	Preliminary figure
r	Revised figure
x	Confidential

### Abbreviations

%	Percentage
n	Number
k	In thousands
M	In millions
\$	Dollars

## List of Tables

Table 1	
Prevalence of Domestic Violence by a Current or Previous Spouse/Partner in the 12 Months and 5 Years Preceding the Survey, by Severity of Violence and Sex of Victim, Canada, 1999	6
Table 2	
Prevalence of Domestic Violence by a Current or Previous Spouse/Partner in the 5 Years Preceding the Survey, by Age Group and Sex of Victim, Canada, 1999	7
Table 3	
Number and Proportion of Victims of a Single Violent Act or More than 10 Violent Acts, in the 5 Years Preceding the Survey, by Certain Physical Consequences, Severity of Violence and Sex of Victim, Canada, 1999	8
Table 4	
Type of Controlling Behaviour Reported by the Victim of a Current or Previous Spouse/Partner, by Severity of Violence and Sex of Victim, Canada, 1999	11
Table 5	
Mean Number of Physical Violence and Controlling Behaviour Items Reported by Victims of a Current or Previous Spouse/Partner in the 5 Years Preceding the Survey, by Severity of Violence, Type (Situational Couple Violence or Intimate Terrorism) and Sex of Victim, Canada, 1999	12
Table 6	
Consequences of Domestic Violence by a Current or Previous Spouse/Partner in the 5 Years Preceding the Survey, by Type in Johnson's Typology, Severity of Violence and Sex of Victim, Canada, 1999	13
Table 7	
Rate per 1,000 of Consequences of Domestic Violence by a Current or Previous Spouse/Partner in the 5 Years Preceding the Survey, by Type in Johnson's Typology, Severity of Violence and Sex of Victim, Canada, 1999	15

Table 8	
Consequences of Domestic Violence by a Previous Spouse/Partner in the 5 Years Preceding the Survey, by Type in Johnson's Typology, Severity of Violence and Sex of Victim, Canada 1999	16

Table 9	
Rate per 1,000 of Consequences of Domestic Violence by a Previous Spouse/Partner in the 5 Years Preceding the Survey, by Type in Johnson's Typology, Severity of Violence and Sex of Victim, Canada 1999	17

## List of figures

Figure 1	
Items of the Conflict Tactics Scales (CTS10) Perpetrated by a Current or Previous Spouse/Partner in the 12 Months and 5 Years Preceding the Survey <i>General Social Survey 1999</i> , sections D and F	5
Figure 2	
Statements About Controlling Behaviours Describing a Current or Previous Spouse/Partner <i>General Social Survey 1999</i> , sections C and E	10

## Acknowledgments

This study was produced under the supervision of Hervé Gauthier from the Unité des conditions de vie, and the direction of Camille Courchesne from the Direction des statistiques économiques et sociales.

Publishing was carried out by the Direction de l'édition et des communications : Elizabeth Tucker proofread the English translation, Claudette D'Anjou did the layout and Jocelyne Tanguay supervised the publishing.

# Aspects of the Context and Consequences of Domestic Violence – Situational Couple Violence and Intimate Terrorism in Canada in 1999

By Denis Laroche  
Translated by James Lawler

For the first time in Canada, a large-scale study representative of the population 15 years of age and over measured the prevalence of domestic violence in both men and women. The sample of the General Social Survey (GSS) on victimization and spousal violence, conducted by Statistics Canada in 1999, comprised 25,876 respondents residing in all 10 Canadian provinces, 11,607 men and 14,269 women.

In addition to prevalence, the survey covered various qualitative aspects of domestic violence, such as sociodemographic characteristics of the victims and their spouse/partner, physical and psychological effects of violence on the victims, and the help they sought from family, police and support organizations.

A detailed report on the results of the survey, entitled *La violence conjugale envers les hommes et les femmes au Québec et au Canada, 1999*, (Laroche, 2003) was published in 2003 by the Institut de la statistique du Québec. It presents data on the prevalence of domestic violence observed among men and women in both Quebec and Canada as a whole.

The first five sections of this paper present a brief summary of certain results contained in the 2003 report. The remaining sections describe and discuss the context and consequences of domestic violence in more detail, following the typology of domestic violence suggested by Michael P. Johnson (1995).

## Definition and Measurement of Domestic Violence

Statistics Canada defines domestic (or spousal) violence measured in the GSS as “experiences of physical or sexual assault that are consistent with Criminal Code definitions of these offences and could be acted upon by a police officer” (Bunge, 2000: 12).

In the 1999 GSS, the prevalence of domestic violence was measured by using a version of the Conflict Tactics Scales<sup>1</sup> conceived by Murray A. Straus and modified by Statistics Canada (Figure 1). It comprised 10 items related to physical violence experienced by the respondent and perpetrated by a spouse/partner during the five years preceding the survey. In isolation, the items on

the CTS<sub>10</sub> do not define specific events of domestic violence, unless there is a single event to which a single item refers. The items identify qualitative aspects related to one or more domestic violence events.

Precise items on specific acts leave little room for the subjective definition of each individual respondent as to what constitutes an act of violence or not, which could be the case if a single question were asked about “violence” or “assault” (Bunge, 2000: 13). Indeed, specific items on domestic violence stimulate the respondent’s memory with regards to a wide range of the forms physical assault can take, and contribute to mitigating the problem of recalling events that could have happened a long time before the interview. Therefore, using the CTS<sub>10</sub> helped eliminate, or at least reduce, subjectivity and arbitrariness, hence individual variability, in the definition and measurement of violence.

Figure 1  
Items of the Conflict Tactics Scales (CTS<sub>10</sub>) Perpetrated by a Current or Previous Spouse/Partner in the 12 Months and 5 Years Preceding the Survey  
*General Social Survey 1999, sections D and F*

---

### Minor violence

1. Has your current spouse/partner (or ex-partner) threatened to hit you with his/her fist or anything else that could have hurt you?
2. Has he/she thrown anything at you that could have hurt you?
3. Has he/she pushed, grabbed or shoved you in a way that could have hurt you?
4. Has he/she slapped you?

### Severe Violence

5. Has he/she kicked you, bit you, or hit you with his/her fist?
  6. Has he/she hit you with something that could have hurt you?
  7. Has he/she beaten you?
  8. Has he/she choked you?
  9. Has he/she used or threatened to use a gun or knife on you?
  10. Has he/she forced you into any unwanted sexual activity, by threatening you, holding you down, or hurting you in some way?
- 

Source : Statistics Canada (2000) : 31-32 et 37-38.

1. Hereinafter, CTS<sub>10</sub> will be used to designate the version of the Conflict Tactics Scales employed in the GSS.

A single event may encompass all the items of the CTS<sub>10</sub>, while another event may cover only one. A series of events could relate to several items, but the items could differ from one event to another. In the 1999 GSS questionnaire, the number of events of domestic violence was the subject matter of a series of questions<sup>2</sup> asked of respondents who had previously answered "Yes" to at least one of the items in the CTS<sub>10</sub>.

The degree of severity was indicated by the rank of each item on the CTS<sub>10</sub> (Figure 1). Acts of physical aggression were classified as "minor violence" if the respondent answered positively to not more than the first four items on the CTS<sub>10</sub>, and as "severe violence" if the respondent answered positively to at least one of items 5 to 10 shown in Figure 1. The prevalence and the prevalence rate indicate the number and proportion respectively of respondents who reported an act of aggression corresponding to the wording of at least one of the 10 items in the CTS<sub>10</sub>, thereby revealing at least one domestic violence event in the five years preceding the survey.

### Prevalence of Domestic Violence

The 1999 GSS data indicate that in Canada physical aggression on the part of a current or previous spouse/partner was reported by men and women in "similar" proportions (Bunge, 2000: 11) (Table 1). The five-year prevalence rates per 1,000 for domestic violence committed by a current or previous spouse/partner were 70 in women (685,900 victims) and 61 in men (542,900 victims). The similarity in prevalence rates may in large part be due to the fact that violence between spouses constitutes a largely bidirectional or mutual phenomenon, as indicated by a number of studies (Ehrensaft et al., 2003: 745, 749-750; Kwong et al., 2003: 294-295; Capaldi & Owen, 2001: 431; Kwong et al., 1999: 155; Magdol et al., 1997: 73; Morse, 1995: 263; Straus, 1993: 74; Brush, 1990: 61). However, the 1999 GSS did not ask respondents whether they themselves had used physical violence with a current or previous partner. Therefore, data are unavailable for establishing the degree to which domestic violence was bidirectional.

Table 1  
Prevalence of Domestic Violence by a Current or Previous Spouse/Partner in the 12 Months and 5 Years Preceding the Survey, by Severity of Violence and Sex of Victim, Canada, 1999

Severity of Violence	Male				Female			
	12-Month Prevalence <sup>1</sup>		5-Year Prevalence <sup>2</sup>		12-Month Prevalence <sup>1</sup>		5-Year Prevalence <sup>2</sup>	
	n	Rate per 1,000	n	Rate per 1,000	n	Rate per 1,000	n	Rate per 1,000
<b>Victim of Current Spouse/Partner</b>	<b>123 700</b>	<b>17</b>	<b>293 700</b>	<b>40</b>	<b>119 100</b>	<b>17</b>	<b>255 500</b>	<b>36</b>
Minor violence	...	...	153 700	21	...	...	171 300	24
Severe violence	...	...	140 000	19	...	...	84 200	12
<b>Victim of a Previous Spouse/Partner</b>	<b>47 800</b>	<b>17</b>	<b>259 200</b>	<b>94</b>	<b>100 600</b>	<b>25</b>	<b>437 400</b>	<b>108</b>
Minor violence	...	...	71 500	26	...	...	142 100	35
Severe violence	...	...	187 700	68	...	...	295 300	73
<b>Victim of a Current or Previous Spouse/Partner</b>	<b>173 100</b>	<b>19</b>	<b>542 900</b>	<b>61</b>	<b>218 200</b>	<b>22</b>	<b>685 900</b>	<b>70</b>
Minor violence	...	...	218 500	25	...	...	308 700	31
Severe violence	...	...	319 000	36	...	...	375 000	38
People with a current spouse/partner (denominator)	7 429 200	...	7 429 200	...	7 179 800	...	7 179 800	...
People with a previous spouse/partner (denominator)	2 763 900	...	2 763 900	...	4 034 300	...	4 034 300	...
People with a current or previous spouse/partner (denominator)	8 882 300	...	8 882 300	...	9 820 000	...	9 820 000	...

1. At least one incident of domestic violence experienced in the 12 months preceding the survey.  
 2. At least one incident of domestic violence experienced in the 5 years preceding the survey. Among victims of violence on the part of a current or ex-spouse/partner in the 5 years preceding the survey, we can estimate there were approximately 5,400 men and 2,300 women whose response was categorized as «Not stated/path uncertain.» These should be added to the estimates of victims of minor or severe violence to arrive at the total number of victims.  
 3. Estimates have been rounded to the nearest hundred.

Source: Statistics Canada, General Social Survey 1999, microdata file

2. The series comprised questions D11-D13 and F11-F13.

The majority of the victims of violence perpetrated by the current spouse/partner, 52% of men and 67% of women, reported having experienced minor violence. In contrast, an even larger majority of victims of a previous spouse/partner, 72% of men and 68% of women, reported having suffered severe violence. The prevalence rate per 1,000 of violence by the current spouse/partner was higher in men (40) than in women (36), whereas the prevalence rate per 1,000 of violence by a previous spouse/partner was higher in women (108) than in men (94).

The finding that the prevalence was higher in men than in women among victims of a current spouse/partner, while it was higher in women than in men among victims of a previous spouse/partner, could be due to the fact that men tend to remain longer in a union in which domestic violence is occurring (Laroche, 2003: 37). Other results support this hypothesis. In Canada in 1999, 54% of all male victims over the five years preceding the survey were assaulted by their current spouse/partner versus 37% of all female victims. A similar phenomenon was observed in the 12 months preceding the survey; 71% of male victims were assaulted by their current spouse/partner as opposed to 55% of female victims. However, the 1999 GSS did not collect the data required to directly verify whether men remained in a relationship longer than women from the time they became a victim of domestic violence.

Table 2  
Prevalence of Domestic Violence by a Current or Previous Spouse/Partner in the 5 Years Preceding the Survey, by Age Group and Sex of Victim, Canada, 1999

Age Group	Male			Female			Denominator	
	n	Rate per 1,000	%	n	Rate per 1,000	%	Male	Female
<b>Victim of Current Spouse/Partner</b>								
15-24 yrs	24 700	130	8	26 600	90	10	189 200	296 700
25-34 yrs	111 200	86	38	88 400	60	35	1 289 900	1 482 800
35-54 yrs	136 500	37	46	119 300	34	47	3 691 800	3 510 000
55 yrs and over	21 300	9	7	21 300	11	8	2 258 200	1 890 300
<b>Total</b>	<b>293 700</b>	<b>40</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>255 500</b>	<b>36</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>7 429 200</b>	<b>7 179 800</b>
<b>Victim of a Previous Spouse/Partner</b>								
15-24 yrs	32 300	300	12	65 600	389	15	107 800	168 800
25-34 yrs	88 400	191	34	160 000	254	37	461 600	630 300
35-54 yrs	129 900	90	50	198 600	117	45	1 442 300	1 700 100
55 yrs and over	—	—	—	13 200	9	3	752 200	1 535 100
<b>Total</b>	<b>259 200</b>	<b>94</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>437 400</b>	<b>108</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>2 763 900</b>	<b>4 034 300</b>
<b>Victim of a Current or Previous Spouse/Partner</b>								
15-24 yrs	57 000	205	10	92 200	223	13	277 800	413 800
25-34 yrs	192 600	125	35	246 400	137	36	1 539 200	1 797 500
35-54 yrs	263 500	60	49	313 400	71	46	4 355 600	4 416 800
55 yrs and over	29 900	11	6	33 900	11	5	2 709 700	3 191 900
<b>Total</b>	<b>542 900</b>	<b>61</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>685 900</b>	<b>70</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>8 882 300</b>	<b>9 820 000</b>

Source: Statistics Canada, General Social Survey 1999, microdata file

## Age of Victims of Domestic Violence

Domestic violence occurred much more frequently in younger adults than in older ones. The 1999 GSS revealed that 46% of male and 49% of female victims (of a current or previous partner) were under 35 years of age, but men and women in this age group comprised only 20% and 23% respectively of the population 15 years of age and over with a current or previous spouse/partner. In addition, 49% of male and 46% of female victims were in the 35-54 age category. Men and women in this age category constituted 49% and 45% respectively of all people living with a current or previous spouse/partner (Laroche, 2003: 117-118).

In the 15-24 age category, the prevalence rate per 1,000 of domestic violence perpetrated by a current or previous spouse/partner in the five years preceding the survey was 205 and 223 in men and women respectively (Table 2). Similar high rates have been observed in other surveys in comparable age groups, but over a 12-month period preceding the survey (Magdol et al., 1997: 73; Moffitt & Caspi, 1999: 4). In the 25-34 age category, the rates per 1,000 were 125 in men and 137 in women. In people 35-54 years of age, the rates were lower, 60 and 71 per 1,000 respectively, and in the over-55 category, they were 11 for both sexes.

### The Severity and Frequency of Violence and its Consequences

Male and female victims differed in terms of the physical consequences of violence perpetrated by a current or previous spouse/partner (Table 3). Women were much more likely than men to experience injury (40% vs. 13%), to receive medical attention or follow-up from a doctor or nurse (15% vs. 3%) or to have their normal everyday activities disrupted (32% vs. 10%).

Severe violence and a high number of violent events were two factors that when combined significantly increased the victim's risk of injury, of receiving immedi-

ate medical care or follow-up, of missing work or of being incapable of carrying on normal everyday activities (Table 3). Among women, approximately 61% of victims of severe violence suffered injuries compared to 16% of victims of minor violence. Among men, these percentages were 20% and 4% respectively. Similarly, the risk of suffering injury was associated with the number of violent incidents reported by victims. Among victims who had experienced a single violent incident, 22% of women reported suffering injuries and a minimal percentage of men. However, in victims having reported more than 10 incidents of violence, 63% of women and 28% of men reported suffering injuries.

Table 3  
Number and Proportion of Victims of a Single Violent Act or More than 10 Violent Acts, in the 5 Years Preceding the Survey, by Certain Physical Consequences, Severity of Violence and Sex of Victim, Canada, 1999

Physical consequences	Severity of Violence					
	Minor			Severe		
	n			%		
	Minor	Severe	Total <sup>1</sup>	Minor	Severe	Total
<b>Total Victims of Violent Acts</b>						
<b>Male</b>	<b>218 500</b>	<b>319 000</b>	<b>542 900</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>100</b>
Injury	—	62 300	71 900	4	20	13
Medical care at a hospital	—	—	—	—	—	—
Medical care or follow-up by a doctor or nurse	—	13 400	14 800	—	4	3
Missed work, stopped daily activities	11 700	39 700	53 200	5	12	10
<b>Female</b>	<b>308 700</b>	<b>375 000</b>	<b>685 900</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>100</b>
Injury	50 200	227 400	277 600	16	61	40
Medical care at a hospital	11 700	60 800	72 600	4	16	11
Medical care or follow-up by a doctor or nurse	16 900	87 200	104 100	5	23	15
Missed work, stopped daily activities	47 400	171 600	219 700	15	46	32
<b>Victim of a Single Act of Violence</b>						
<b>Male</b>	<b>145 100</b>	<b>79 500</b>	<b>224 600</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>100</b>
Injury	—	—	—	—	—	—
Medical care at a hospital	—	—	—	—	—	—
Medical care or follow-up by a doctor or nurse	—	—	—	—	—	—
Missed work, stopped daily activities	—	—	—	—	—	—
<b>Female</b>	<b>165 100</b>	<b>58 500</b>	<b>223 600</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>100</b>
Injury	21 500	26 800	48 200	13	46	22
Medical care at a hospital	—	—	—	—	—	—
Medical care or follow-up by a doctor or nurse	—	—	13 500	—	—	6
Missed work, stopped daily activities	12 900	22 300	35 200	8	38	16
<b>Victim of More than 10 Acts of Violence</b>						
<b>Male</b>	<b>16 900</b>	<b>68 700</b>	<b>91 000</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>100</b>
Injury	—	24 600	25 300	—	36	28
Medical care at a hospital	—	—	—	—	—	—
Medical care or follow-up by a doctor or nurse	—	—	—	—	—	—
Missed work, stopped daily activities	—	22 200	25 100	—	32	28
<b>Female</b>	<b>34 200</b>	<b>158 500</b>	<b>195 000</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>100</b>	<b>100</b>
Injury	—	113 700	121 900	—	72	63
Medical care at a hospital	—	32 500	35 100	—	21	18
Medical care or follow-up by a doctor or nurse	—	47 500	51 100	—	30	26
Missed work, stopped daily activities	—	85 000	94 500	26	54	48

1. Among victims of violence on the part of a current or previous spouse/partner in the 5 years preceding the survey, we can estimate there were approximately 5,400 men and 2,300 women whose response was categorized as «Not stated/path uncertain.» These should be added to the estimates of victims of minor or severe violence to arrive at the total number of victims.

2. Estimates have been rounded to the nearest hundred.



According to Straus & Gelles (1990: 98,104,120,163), the difference in consequences reported by men and women can in large part be explained by the greater average size, height, weight and strength of men, thereby increasing the risk of injury among women. Furthermore, men's physical characteristics allow them to fend off assaults from their female partners when they are the victims of aggression. However, additional factors may contribute to the different outcomes of assault in men and women. Moffitt et al (1999: 10) show that in the Dunedin longitudinal cohort, men who perpetrated severe physical abuse at 21 years of age were more deviant in their personal characteristics than women perpetrators. Ehrensaft et al. (2004: 264) observed that male perpetrators in the same cohort, involved in clinically abusive relationships at 26 years of age, presented with statistically significant deviance traits on half of the 10 personality scales at age 18, whereas female perpetrators showed deviance only on the aggression scale.

### **Victims' Reactions to Domestic Violence**

In the 1999 GSS, men and women also differed in the way they reacted to domestic violence. As indicated previously, there is reason to believe that, in general, women terminated a union marked by violence more quickly than men. Indeed, more women than men brought their situation to the attention of the police (37% vs. 15%), confided in family or friends (81% vs. 56%), and had a greater propensity to seek support services (48% vs. 17%). In addition, women who were victims of severe violence were more likely than men to report devastating psychological effects that ensue from physical abuse (Laroche, 2003: 107-111).

The reason most often mentioned by both women and men for having reported domestic violence to the police was to put an end to it and seek protection (72% and 39% respectively). The duty to call the police in such circumstances was reported as the second reason. Significantly fewer women than men, 16% versus 32%, indicated that the violence was not severe enough or they did not require help as reasons for explaining not contacting the police or support services (Laroche, 2003: 190-198).

Nevertheless, many male victims of their current or previous spouse/partner reported suffering harmful physical and psychological consequences of domestic violence. The differences between men and women were less pronounced in terms of the psychological effects compared to the physical ones. Approximately

35% of male and 11% of female victims of domestic violence did not call the police, seek help from support services or talk to anyone close to them about it (Laroche, 2003: 218-219). The fact that men are less likely to confide in a family member or friend, to report their situation to the police or seek assistance from a support organization, in the few instances in which such help is available, constitute an additional factor of vulnerability and, if the violence is recurring, increase the risk of their resorting to physical violence as well (Langhinrichsen-Rohling, 2005: 115; Ehrensaft et al.; 2004: 267; Kwong et al., 1999: 157; Straus & Gelles, 1990: 501).

### **Johnson's Typology – Situational Couple Violence and Intimate Terrorism**

The typology suggested by Michael P. Johnson (1995) attempts to reconcile the apparent contradiction between the results on the prevalence of domestic violence obtained by surveys conducted on representative samples using the Conflict Tactics Scales developed by Murray A. Straus, and those obtained through clinical observation, recruited for example in shelters for battered women (Johnson, 1999: [3]). Though it has four categories, the simplest version of this typology distinguishes two main types of domestic violence, namely situational couple violence and intimate terrorism (Johnson, 1995: 284-285; Johnson, 1999: [3]; Johnson & Ferraro, 2000: 949; Johnson & Leone, 2005: 322) (the other two types are violent resistance and mutual violent control).

According to Johnson, situational couple violence erupts during conflicts or specific arguments that get out of control. However, this type of violence is less likely to escalate over time and to cause injury. It is more likely to be mutual between the partners (Johnson, 1999: [5]). Intimate terrorism denotes the will or compulsion of the aggressor to exert general control over the partner, and physical violence is only one element embedded in a general pattern of controlling behaviours (Johnson, 1999: [4]). In other words, the distinguishing feature of intimate terrorism is the existence of a pattern of both violent and non-violent behaviours rooted in the attempt to dominate the partner (Johnson & Ferraro, 2000: 949). Physical violence tends to be recurring in this type, escalating over time to assume severe forms, thereby strongly increasing the risk of injury or physical effects. This is why there is a greater chance that this type of domestic violence would be brought to the attention of third parties (Johnson, 1999: [5]).

## Prevalence of Domestic Violence According to the Johnson Typology

Johnson and Leone (2005) describe findings related to these two types of domestic violence based on the data of an American survey conducted in 1995-1996 by Tjaden and Thoennes (1998: 14). The National Violence Against Women Survey (NVAWS) comprised a representative sample of 8,005 men and 8,000 women, 18 years of age and over. The aim of the Johnson and Leone analysis of a sub-sample of 4,967 married women in this survey was to verify whether intimate terrorism and situational couple violence differed in terms of their consequences.

In order to determine the existence of a general pattern of control, Johnson and Leone used a seven-item scale<sup>3</sup> covering controlling behaviours exerted by the respondent's husband. The authors calculated a variety score comprising the number of items to which the respondent answered "Yes." Cluster analysis was used to determine whether there was Low Control or High Control. Respondents who answered "Yes" to two or fewer items (96% of the sample) had husbands categorized as exerting Low Control, while those who answered "Yes" to three or more items (4% of the sample) had husbands categorized as exerting High Control. The cutting point

Figure 2  
Statements About Controlling Behaviours Describing a  
Current or Previous Spouse/Partner  
*General Social Survey 1999, sections C and E*

1. He/She tries to limit your contact with family or friends.
2. He/She puts you down or calls you names to make you feel bad.
3. He/She is jealous and doesn't want you to talk to other men/women.
4. He/She harms, or threatens to harm, someone close to you.
5. He/She demands to know who you are with and where you are at all times.
6. He/She damages or destroys your possessions or property.
7. He/She prevents you from knowing about or having access to the family income, even if you ask.

Source : Statistics Canada (2000) : 29-30 et 35-36.

between these two groups corresponded to two standard deviations above the mean variety score for all respondents in the survey with a current husband (Johnson & Leone, 2005: 329).

A score of Low Control was defined as "situational couple violence," while a score of High Control was defined as "intimate terrorism." The study showed that 65% of cases of domestic violence involving the current spouse reported by the wives in the sample could be classified as situational couple violence and 35% as intimate terrorism. As a possible explanation for this large percentage of intimate terrorism, Johnson and Leone state that, as Straus had already suggested, the framing of the interviews in the NVAWS had overtones of "crime," violence and personal safety, rather than those reflecting a survey on family conflict (Johnson & Leone, 2005: 330; Straus, 1999: 26-27).

The 1999 GSS also involved a controlling behaviours scale that had seven items (Figure 2). Using the same cutting point as Johnson and Leone, it is possible to determine in which category of Johnson's typology the victims of domestic violence in Canada can be classified.

In Table 4, the results show that the majority of cases of domestic violence reported by victims, both male (81%) and female (74%), of the current spouse/partner, could be categorized as situational couple violence. In contrast, the majority of cases of domestic violence reported by victims, both male (67%) and female (79%), of a previous spouse/partner, could be categorized as intimate terrorism. Though similar proportions of male (53%) and female (57%) victims of a previous spouse/partner reported severe violence in the context of intimate terrorism, a much higher number of women (249,400) reported this compared to men (138,000).

Though the majority of male victims of their current or a previous spouse/partner reported having experienced severe violence (59%), situational couple violence was the most frequent type (57%). The majority of female victims of their current or a previous spouse/partner also reported having experienced severe violence (55%). However, intimate terrorism was the most frequent type

3. The introduction and questions were the following: "I would like to read to you some statements that some women have used to describe their husband/partner. Thinking about your current husband/partner would you say he/she: (E3) Is jealous or possessive? (E5) Tries to limit your contact with family and friends? (E6) Insists on knowing who you are with at all times? (E7) Calls you names or puts you down in front of others? (E8) Makes you feel inadequate? (E10) Shouts or swears at you? (E12) Prevents you from knowing about or having access to the family income even when you ask?" (Johnson & Leone, 2005: 329; Tjaden & Thoennes, 1999: [61-62]). The 1993 Violence Against Women Survey (five items) and the 1999 General Social Survey (seven items) had similar introductions and items that corresponded to questions E3, E5, E6, E7 and E12 of the questionnaire employed by Tjaden and Thoennes in 1995-1996.

Table 4  
Type of Controlling Behaviour Reported by the Victim of a Current or Previous Spouse/Partner,<sup>1</sup> by Severity of Violence and Sex of Victim, Canada, 1999

Sex of Victim and Severity of Violence	Type of Controlling Behaviour					
	Situational Couple Violence	Intimate Terrorism	Total <sup>2</sup>	Situational Couple Violence	Intimate Terrorism	Total
	n			%		
<b>Victim of Current Spouse/Partner</b>						
<b>Male</b>	<b>237 900</b>	<b>55 900</b>	<b>293 700</b>	<b>81</b>	<b>19</b>	<b>100</b>
Minor violence	133 900	19 800	153 700	46	7	52
Severe violence	104 000	36 100	140 000	35	12	48
<b>Female</b>	<b>188 900</b>	<b>66 600</b>	<b>255 500</b>	<b>74</b>	<b>26</b>	<b>100</b>
Minor violence	147 200	24 100	171 300	58	9	67
Severe violence	41 700	42 500	84 200	16	17	33
<b>Victim of a Previous Spouse/Partner</b>						
<b>Male</b>	<b>86 600</b>	<b>172 600</b>	<b>259 200</b>	<b>33</b>	<b>67</b>	<b>100</b>
Minor violence	36 900	34 600	71 500	14	13	28
Severe violence	49 700	138 000	187 600	19	53	72
<b>Female</b>	<b>90 900</b>	<b>346 500</b>	<b>437 400</b>	<b>21</b>	<b>79</b>	<b>100</b>
Minor violence	45 000	97 100	142 100	10	22	32
Severe violence	45 900	249 400	295 300	10	57	68
<b>Victim of a Current or Previous Spouse/Partner</b>						
<b>Male</b>	<b>311 700</b>	<b>231 300</b>	<b>542 900</b>	<b>57</b>	<b>43</b>	<b>100</b>
Minor violence	165 100	53 400	218 500	30	10	40
Severe violence	144 200	174 900	319 000	27	32	59
<b>Female</b>	<b>270 300</b>	<b>415 600</b>	<b>685 900</b>	<b>39</b>	<b>61</b>	<b>100</b>
Minor violence	187 000	121 600	308 700	27	18	45
Severe violence	82 400	292 500	375 000	12	43	55

1. Data in this table come from the victims, who provided information on controlling behaviours used by a current or previous spouse/partner, i.e. the perpetrator.

2. Among victims of violence on the part of a current or ex-spouse/partner in the 5 years preceding the survey, we can estimate there were approximately 5,400 men and 2,300 women whose response was categorized as «Not stated/path uncertain.» These should be added to the estimates of victims of minor or severe violence to arrive at the total number of victims.

3. Estimates have been rounded to the nearest hundred.

Source: Statistics Canada, General Social Survey 1999, microdata file

among women (61%). These findings suggest the possibility that even though all types of violent partners can be found in both sexes, the relative proportions of the various types of perpetrators can significantly differ between men and women.<sup>4</sup>

### Context of Violence According to the Johnson Typology

Recent analyses have indicated that a variety score provides a more reliable measure of domestic violence (Moffitt et al., 2001: 55-56; Ehrensaft et al., 2004: 262) or controlling behaviours than simple prevalence, which reports in dichotomous fashion whether a respondent answered “Yes” or “No” to at least one of the items on a scale. A variety score represents the total number of

items on the physical violence scale (CTS<sub>10</sub>) or controlling behaviours scale to which the respondent answered “Yes.” The higher the score on the scale, the greater the risk that the violent and controlling situation being experienced by the victim will become oppressive and harmful.

Table 5 shows the mean scores for the physical violence and controlling behaviours scales for all victims of a current or previous spouse/partner in the 1999 GSS, by type (situational couple violence or intimate terrorism) and severity of violence. Both men (4.2) and women (4.5) answered yes to a significantly higher mean number of items (out of 10) of physical violence in intimate terrorism than in situational couple violence (2.4 and 2.3 respectively). Severe violence was characterized by a

4. Statistics Canada seems not to have published any analysis of the psychometric properties of the controlling behaviours scale used in the 1999 GSS (Riou, Rinfret-Raynor & Cantin, 2003: 63). The items in the scale closely resemble those used in the 1989 Psychological Maltreatment of Women Survey conducted by Tolman (Johnson & Leone, 2005: 329). It is possible that this scale was less appropriate for measuring controlling behaviours experienced by men, as indicated by the lower Cronbach coefficients in male victims compared to female victims, notably among respondents with a current spouse/partner, for which they were 0.56 and 0.70 respectively (Laroche, 2003: annex, p. 225). The large proportion of male victims of severe situational couple violence on the part of a current spouse/partner (35%) compared to that observed in female victims (16%), may result from an inadequate assessment of controlling behaviours suffered by men. With an improved scale, some of these cases might then fall into the category of “intimate terrorism” and severe violence. Steps should be taken to perhaps clarify the psychometric characteristics of this scale.

Table 5  
 Mean Number of Physical Violence and Controlling Behaviour Items Reported by Victims of a Current or Previous Spouse/  
 Partner in the 5 Years Preceding the Survey, by Severity of Violence, Type (Situational Couple Violence or Intimate Terrorism)  
 and Sex of Victim, Canada, 1999

Sex of Victim and Severity of Violence	Type of Domestic Violence					
	Physical Violence Items on the CTS <sub>10</sub>			Controlling Behaviour Items		
	Situational Couple Violence	Intimate Terrorism	Total	Situational Couple Violence	Intimate Terrorism	Total
	n					
<b>Male</b>	<b>2,4</b>	<b>4,2</b>	<b>3,2</b>	<b>0,9</b>	<b>4,1</b>	<b>2,2</b>
Minor violence	1,4	1,8	1,5	0,7	3,6	1,4
Severe violence	3,5	4,9	4,3	1,1	4,3	2,8
<b>Female</b>	<b>2,3</b>	<b>4,5</b>	<b>3,6</b>	<b>0,8</b>	<b>4,9</b>	<b>3,3</b>
Minor violence	1,6	1,8	1,7	0,7	4,3	2,1
Severe violence	4,0	5,6	5,3	1,1	5,1	4,2

Source: Statistics Canada, General Social Survey 1999, microdata file

higher mean number of items for men (4.3) and women (5.3) than minor violence (1.5 and 1.7). Male and female victims of severe physical violence in intimate terrorism answered "Yes" to a much greater number of items (4.9 and 5.6) than victims of minor situational couple violence (1.4 and 1.6).

The same table shows analogous results with regards to the variety of controlling behaviours reported by victims. Both male and female victims of severe violence and intimate terrorism answered "Yes" to a mean of 4.3 and 5.1 items respectively (out of 7) compared to a mean of 0.7 items for victims of both sexes of minor situational couple violence.

### Johnson's Typology and the Consequences of Domestic Violence Perpetrated by Current and Previous Spouse/Partners

To establish whether Johnson's typology can indeed distinguish between various categories of victims, we examined whether the prevalence of the physical and clinical consequences of domestic violence was different in situational couple violence and intimate terrorism.

Table 6 presents the proportions of victims of a current or previous spouse/partner by type and severity of violence according to victims reporting various physical or clinical consequences of domestic violence.

The majority of both male and female victims of domestic violence who suffered physical or clinical consequences appear to have been in the type of relationship that can be classified as intimate terrorism associated with severe violence (cells outlined in bold in Table 6). This was the case for men and women who suffered injuries (65% and 67% respectively), received care in a hospital or medical attention or follow-up from a doctor or nurse (73% and 72%), received help from a crisis centre or shelter (57% and 69%), feared for their lives (79% and 72%), and whose situation was notified to the police (64% and 60%).

Though the percentages of all male and female victims suffering physical consequences in intimate terrorism were comparable, it must be emphasized that the number of female victims was significantly higher in virtually every category.

Among the victims in the GSS of what can be defined as a "clinically abusive relationship I"<sup>5</sup> (Ehrensaft et al., 2004: 262; Moffitt et al., 2001: 60), 60% of men and 59% of women were victims of intimate terrorism and severe violence. This was also the case for a "clinically abusive relationship II"<sup>6</sup> (52% and 53% respectively) as defined by Ehrensaft et al. (2004: 262). These results are in accordance with those of Ehrensaft et al. (2004: 263, Table 2) which, in the Dunedin sample, showed

5. Clinically abusive relationship I: Victim experienced one or more of the following: suffered injury, received care in a hospital, received care or follow-up from a doctor or nurse, notified police, obtained help from a men's support centre, received help from a women's centre or women's shelter.  
 6. Clinically abusive relationship II: Includes clinically abusive relationship I, plus victim did one or more of the following: contacted a crisis centre or called a help line, contacted a community services or family centre, spoke about it with a doctor or nurse, lawyer, counsellor or psychologist.

Table 6  
Consequences<sup>1</sup> of Domestic Violence by a Current or Previous Spouse/Partner in the 5 Years Preceding the Survey, by Type in Johnson's Typology, Severity of Violence and Sex of Victim, Canada, 1999

Category of Victim	Situational Couple Violence		Intimate Terrorism		Denominator
	Minor	Severe	Minor	Severe	
	%				n
<b>Male</b>					
<b>Total Victims of a Current or Previous Spouse/Partner</b>	<b>30</b>	<b>27</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>32</b>	<b>542 900</b>
Victim with injuries	—	21	—	65	71 900
Victim received care in a hospital or medical attention or follow-up from a doctor or nurse	—	—	—	73	14 800
Police were notified	—	19	—	64	81 700
Victim received help from a crisis centre or shelter	—	—	—	57	12 200
Victim consulted a counsellor or psychologist	—	29	—	48	81 600
Victim had everyday activities disrupted	—	—	—	62	53 200
Victim feared for his life	—	—	—	79	41 000
Clinically abusive relationship I <sup>2</sup>	—	22	—	60	125 200
Clinically abusive relationship II <sup>3</sup>	12	25	9	52	194 600
Victim reported more than 10 events or Don't know/Not stated	—	—	—	66	91 000
Victim reported 4 to 10 events	12	37	10	42	125 300
Victim reported 2 to 3 events	20	37	8	34	102 100
Victim reported a single event	54	23	10	13	224 600
Victim 35 years of age and over	31	24	11	33	293 400
Victim 25 to 35 years of age	31	31	6	31	192 600
Victim under 25 years of age	27	26	—	34	57 000
<b>Female</b>					
<b>Total Victims of a Current or Previous Spouse/Partner</b>	<b>27</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>18</b>	<b>43</b>	<b>685 900</b>
Victim with injuries	10	15	9	67	277 600
Victim received care in a hospital or medical attention or follow-up from a doctor or nurse	—	12	—	72	104 100
Police were notified	14	14	11	60	254 500
Victim received help from a crisis centre or shelter	11	—	—	69	100 900
Victim consulted a counsellor or psychologist	15	9	19	56	260 100
Victim had everyday activities disrupted	8	9	14	69	219 700
Victim feared for her life	6	9	13	72	258 700
Clinically abusive relationship I <sup>2</sup>	15	14	11	59	402 700
Clinically abusive relationship II <sup>3</sup>	18	13	16	53	507 200
Victim reported more than 10 events or Don't know/Not stated	7	8	11	73	195 000
Victim reported 4 to 10 events	—	15	19	59	136 900
Victim reported 2 to 3 events	31	15	26	28	130 500
Victim reported a single event	55	11	19	15	223 600
Victim 35 years of age and over	26	12	17	44	347 300
Victim 25 to 35 years of age	28	12	17	43	246 400
Victim under 25 years of age	29	12	22	37	92 200

1. The dash indicates that the small sample size did not allow for a valid estimate.

2. Clinically abusive relationship I: The victim experienced one or more of the following: suffered injury, received care in a hospital, received care or follow-up from a doctor or nurse, notified police, obtained help from a men's support centre, received help from a women's centre or women's shelter.

3. Clinically abusive relationship II: Includes clinically abusive relationship I, plus victim did one or more of the following: contacted a crisis centre or called a telephone help line, contacted a community services or family centre, spoke about it with a doctor or nurse, lawyer, counsellor or psychologist. This is a descriptive classification largely inspired by Ehrensaft et al. (2004: 262).

Source: Statistics Canada, General Social Survey 1999, microdata file



that a “clinically abusive relationship” was associated with a higher level of controlling behaviours as measured by the Controlling Abuse Scale, which provided contextual information about domestic violence (Ehrensaft, 2004: 262).

The type of domestic violence appeared to be associated with the frequency of violence. Among those reporting more than 10 violent acts, 66% of men and 73% of women were victims of intimate terrorism and severe violence. Conversely, if the victim reported a single violent act, 54% of men and 55% of women were victims of minor situational couple violence. The age of the victim did not seem to be associated with the type of domestic violence.

Table 7 presents the rates per 1,000 of the physical and clinical consequences of domestic violence, by Johnson’s typology. In both men and women, the prevalence rates of both types of domestic violence markedly decreased with the victim’s age. The prevalence rates for victims of intimate terrorism with severe violence increased with the number of events reported by the victims. Conversely, the prevalence rates for victims of minor situational couple violence significantly increased when the victim reported only one violent event.

The prevalence rate (per 1,000) of victims having suffered physical or clinical consequences in intimate terrorism with severe violence was significantly higher in women compared to men. This was the case for victims who suffered injuries (19 for women vs. 5 for men), received hospital care or medical attention or follow-up from a doctor or nurse (8 vs. 1), notified the police (16 vs. 6), received help from a crisis centre or shelter (7 vs. 1), or feared for their lives (19 vs. 4).

### **Johnson’s Typology and the Consequences of Domestic Violence Perpetrated by a Previous Spouse/Partner**

Among victims of domestic violence by a previous spouse/partner, a large majority of both men and women who experienced physical or clinical consequences appear to have been in the category of intimate terrorism and severe violence according to Johnson’s typology (cells outlined in bold in Table 8).

This was the case for 77% of men and women who suffered injuries, and 84% of men and women who received care in a hospital or medical attention or follow-up from a doctor or nurse. Among those who notified

police, 76% of male victims and 71% of female victims were in the category of intimate terrorism with severe violence. This was also the case for 80% of male and 74% of female victims whose daily activities were disrupted, and 83% and 77% of those who feared for their lives.

It should be noted that the number of female victims who experienced such consequences was significantly higher in every category, even though the overall proportions of all male and female victims of intimate terrorism with severe violence were similar.

The prevalence rates (per 1,000) of physical and clinical consequences among victims of a previous spouse/partner were significantly higher in women compared to men (Table 9). This was the case for victims who suffered injuries (41 vs. 15), received hospital care or medical attention from a doctor or nurse (16 vs. 4), notified the police (33 vs. 18), received help from a crisis centre or shelter (14 vs. 2), or feared for their lives (39 vs. 10).

It should also be noted that, among victims of a previous spouse/partner, the prevalence rates for the physical consequences of intimate terrorism and severe violence were 4 to 20 times higher than those observed for minor situational couple violence. However, among victims of a current spouse/partner, the prevalence rates of the two types of domestic violence were more comparable (results not shown). This suggests that victims of a previous spouse/partner were more likely to report intimate terrorism and severe violence than those of a current spouse/partner, and/or that victims of intimate terrorism and severe violence were more likely to terminate the relationship with a current partner.

Victims of intimate terrorism are mostly to be found among victims of a previous spouse/partner. Indeed, among women, intimate terrorism with severe violence perpetrated by a previous partner comprised 85% of all cases of intimate terrorism perpetrated by either a current or previous partner. The proportion among men was 79%. The proportions for intimate terrorism with minor violence were 80% in women and 65% in men. In contrast, among women, minor situational couple violence perpetrated by a previous partner comprised 24% of all such cases perpetrated by either a current or previous spouse/partner. The proportion among men was 22%. For severe situational couple violence, the proportions were 56% and 34% for women and men respectively.

Table 7  
Rate<sup>1</sup> per 1,000 of Consequences of Domestic Violence by a Current or Previous Spouse/Partner in the 5 Years Preceding the Survey, by Type in Johnson's Typology, Severity of Violence and Sex of Victim, Canada, 1999

Category of Victim	Situational Couple Violence		Intimate Terrorism		Total
	Minor	Severe	Minor	Severe	
Rate per 1,000					
<b>Male</b>					
<b>Total Victims of a Current or Previous Spouse/Partner</b>	<b>19</b>	<b>16</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>20</b>	<b>61</b>
Victim with injuries	—	2	—	5	8
Victim received care in a hospital or medical attention or follow-up from a doctor or nurse	—	—	—	—	2
Police were notified	—	2	—	6	9
Victim received help from a crisis centre or shelter	—	—	—	—	1
Victim consulted a counsellor or psychologist	—	3	—	4	9
Victim had everyday activities disrupted	—	—	—	4	6
Victim feared for his life	—	—	—	4	5
Clinically abusive relationship I <sup>2</sup>	—	3	—	8	14
Clinically abusive relationship II <sup>3</sup>	3	6	2	11	22
Victim reported more than 10 events or Don't know/Not stated	—	—	—	7	10
Victim reported 4 to 10 events	2	5	1	6	14
Victim reported 2 to 3 events	2	4	—	4	11
Victim reported a single event	14	4	3	3	25
Victim 35 years of age and over	13	10	5	14	42
Victim 25 to 35 years of age	38	38	8	39	125
Victim under 25 years of age	56	53	—	70	205
<b>Female</b>					
<b>Total Victims of a Current or Previous Spouse/Partner</b>	<b>19</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>12</b>	<b>30</b>	<b>70</b>
Victim with injuries	3	4	2	19	28
Victim received care in a hospital or medical attention or follow-up from a doctor or nurse	—	1	—	8	11
Police were notified	4	4	3	16	26
Victim received help from a crisis centre or shelter	—	—	—	7	10
Victim consulted a counsellor or psychologist	4	2	5	15	26
Victim had everyday activities disrupted	2	2	3	15	22
Victim feared for her life	1	2	3	19	26
Clinically abusive relationship I <sup>2</sup>	6	6	5	24	41
Clinically abusive relationship II <sup>3</sup>	9	7	8	27	52
Victim reported more than 10 events or Don't know/Not stated	1	2	2	14	20
Victim reported 4 to 10 events	—	2	3	8	14
Victim reported 2 to 3 events	4	2	3	4	13
Victim reported a single event	13	3	4	3	23
Victim 35 years of age and over	12	6	8	20	46
Victim 25 to 35 years of age	39	16	24	59	137
Victim under 25 years of age	64	27	49	82	223
People with a current or previous spouse/partner (denominator)	Male	Female	...	...	...
People 35 years of age and over with a current or previous spouse/partner (denominator)	7 065 300	7 608 700	...	...	...
People 25 to 34 years of age with a current or previous spouse/partner (denominator)	1 539 200	1 797 500	...	...	...
People 15 to 24 years of age with a current or previous spouse/partner (denominator)	277 800	413 800	...	...	...

1. The dash indicates that the small sample size did not allow for a valid estimate.

2. Clinically abusive relationship I: The victim experienced one or more of the following: suffered injury, received care in a hospital, received care or follow-up from a doctor or nurse, notified police, obtained help from a men's support centre, received help from a women's centre or women's shelter.

3. Clinically abusive relationship II: Includes clinically abusive relationship I, plus victim did one or more of the following: contacted a crisis centre or called a telephone help line, contacted a community services or family centre, spoke about it with a doctor or nurse, lawyer, counsellor or psychologist. This is a descriptive classification largely inspired by Ehrensaft et al. (2004: 262).

Source: Statistics Canada, General Social Survey 1999, microdata file

Table 8  
**Consequences<sup>1</sup> of Domestic Violence by a Previous Spouse/Partner in the 5 Years Preceding the Survey, by Type in Johnson's Typology, Severity of Violence and Sex of Victim, Canada 1999**

Category of Victim	Situational Couple Violence		Intimate Terrorism		Denominator  n
	Minor	Severe	Minor	Severe	
	%				
<b>Male</b>					
<b>Total Victims of a Previous Spouse/Partner</b>	<b>14</b>	<b>19</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>53</b>	<b>259 200</b>
Victim with injuries	—	—	—	77	53 900
Victim received care in a hospital or medical attention or follow-up from a doctor or nurse	—	—	—	84	12 800
Police were notified	—	—	—	76	65 000
Victim received help from a crisis centre or shelter	—	—	—	52	11 100
Victim consulted a counsellor or psychologist	—	—	—	62	52 300
Victim had everyday activities disrupted	—	—	—	80	39 900
Victim feared for his life	—	—	—	83	34 000
Clinically abusive relationship I <sup>2</sup>	—	14	—	73	93 200
Clinically abusive relationship II <sup>3</sup>	10	14	11	64	132 200
Victim reported more than 10 events or Don't know/Not stated	—	—	—	81	57 200
Victim reported 4 to 10 events	—	20	—	61	60 000
Victim reported 2 to 3 events	—	28	—	48	55 600
Victim reported a single event	24	22	20	34	75 700
Victim 35 years of age and over	16	17	17	50	138 500
Victim 25 to 35 years of age	13	21	—	57	88 400
Victim under 25 years of age	—	—	—	57	32 300
<b>Female</b>					
<b>Total Victims of a Previous Spouse/Partner</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>10</b>	<b>22</b>	<b>57</b>	<b>437 400</b>
Victim with injuries	—	10	9	77	212 900
Victim received care in a hospital or medical attention or follow-up from a doctor or nurse	—	—	—	84	79 600
Police were notified	7	10	12	71	191 000
Victim received help from a crisis centre or shelter	—	—	—	77	75 100
Victim consulted a counsellor or psychologist	9	7	22	63	188 400
Victim had everyday activities disrupted	—	7	14	74	173 400
Victim feared for her life	—	6	15	77	207 800
Clinically abusive relationship I <sup>2</sup>	6	10	13	70	292 000
Clinically abusive relationship II <sup>3</sup>	7	11	18	63	358 100
Victim reported more than 10 events or Don't know/Not stated	—	—	11	84	148 700
Victim reported 4 to 10 events	—	13	18	66	101 900
Victim reported 2 to 3 events	15	15	33	38	82 600
Victim reported a single event	27	13	35	26	104 300
Victim 35 years of age and over	10	11	19	60	211 700
Victim 25 to 35 years of age	11	10	23	57	160 000
Victim under 25 years of age	—	—	31	49	65 600

1. The dash indicates that the small sample size did not allow for a valid estimate.

2. Clinically abusive relationship I: The victim experienced one or more of the following: suffered injury, received care in a hospital, received care or follow-up from a doctor or nurse, notified police, obtained help from a men's support centre, received help from a women's centre or women's shelter.

3. Clinically abusive relationship II: Includes clinically abusive relationship I, plus victim did one or more of the following: contacted a crisis centre or called a telephone help line, contacted a community services or family centre, spoke about it with a doctor or nurse, lawyer, counsellor or psychologist. This is a descriptive classification largely inspired by Ehrensaft et al. (2004: 262).

Source: Statistics Canada, General Social Survey 1999, microdata file



Table 9  
Rate<sup>1</sup> per 1,000 of Consequences of Domestic Violence by a Previous Spouse/Partner in the 5 Years Preceding the Survey, by Type in Johnson's Typology, Severity of Violence and Sex of Victim, Canada 1999

Category of Victim	Situational Couple Violence		Intimate Terrorism		Denominator
	Minor	Severe	Minor	Severe	
Rate per 1,000					
<b>Male</b>					
<b>Total Victims of a Previous Spouse/Partner</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>18</b>	<b>13</b>	<b>50</b>	<b>94</b>
Victim with injuries	—	—	—	15	19
Victim received care in a hospital or medical attention or follow-up from a doctor or nurse	—	—	—	4	5
Police were notified	—	—	—	18	24
Victim received help from a crisis centre or shelter	—	—	—	—	4
Victim consulted a counsellor or psychologist	—	—	—	12	19
Victim had everyday activities disrupted	—	—	—	12	14
Victim feared for his life	—	—	—	10	12
Clinically abusive relationship I <sup>2</sup>	—	5	—	25	34
Clinically abusive relationship II <sup>3</sup>	5	7	5	31	48
Victim reported more than 10 events or Don't know/Not stated	—	—	—	17	21
Victim reported 4 to 10 events	—	4	—	13	22
Victim reported 2 to 3 events	—	6	—	10	20
Victim reported a single event	7	6	5	9	27
Victim 35 years of age and over	10	11	11	31	63
Victim 25 to 35 years of age	26	41	—	109	191
Victim under 25 years of age	—	—	—	171	300
<b>Female</b>					
<b>Total Victims of a Previous Spouse/Partner</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>11</b>	<b>24</b>	<b>62</b>	<b>108</b>
Victim with injuries	—	6	5	41	53
Victim received care in a hospital or medical attention or follow-up from a doctor or nurse	—	—	—	16	20
Police were notified	3	5	6	33	47
Victim received help from a crisis centre or shelter	—	—	—	14	19
Victim consulted a counsellor or psychologist	4	3	10	29	47
Victim had everyday activities disrupted	—	3	6	32	43
Victim feared for her life	—	3	8	39	52
Clinically abusive relationship I <sup>2</sup>	4	8	10	51	72
Clinically abusive relationship II <sup>3</sup>	7	10	16	56	89
Victim reported more than 10 events or Don't know/Not stated	—	—	4	31	37
Victim reported 4 to 10 events	—	3	4	17	25
Victim reported 2 to 3 events	3	3	7	8	20
Victim reported a single event	7	3	9	7	26
Victim 35 years of age and over	6	7	13	39	65
Victim 25 to 35 years of age	27	25	58	144	254
Victim under 25 years of age	—	—	119	189	389
<b>People with a previous spouse/partner (denominator)</b>	<b>Male</b>	<b>Female</b>	...	...	...
<b>People 35 years of age and over with a previous spouse/partner (denominator)</b>	<b>2 194 500</b>	<b>3 235 200</b>	...	...	...
<b>People 25 to 34 years of age with a previous spouse/partner (denominator)</b>	<b>461 600</b>	<b>630 300</b>	...	...	...
<b>People 15 to 24 years of age with a previous spouse/partner (denominator)</b>	<b>107 800</b>	<b>168 800</b>	...	...	...

1. The dash indicates that the small sample size did not allow for a valid estimate.

2. Clinically abusive relationship I: The victim experienced one or more of the following: suffered injury, received care in a hospital, received care or follow-up from a doctor or nurse, notified police, obtained help from a men's support centre, received help from a women's centre or women's shelter.

3. Clinically abusive relationship II: Includes clinically abusive relationship I, plus victim did one or more of the following: contacted a crisis centre or called a telephone help line, contacted a community services or family centre, spoke about it with a doctor or nurse, lawyer, counsellor or psychologist. This is a descriptive classification largely inspired by Ehrensaft et al. (2004: 262).

Source: Statistics Canada, General Social Survey 1999, microdata file

## Discussion

Firstly, Johnson's typology provides a relatively simple technique for revealing distinctly different types of domestic violence. Contrasts between various categories of victims likely presupposes an etiology of violence specific to each (Macmillan & Kruttschnitt, 2005: 16-17; Straus, 1999: 29) and the heterogeneity of the types of violent spouses (Langhinrichsen-Rohling, 2005: 111; Cavanaugh & Gelles, 2005: 157-158; Kruttschnitt et al., 2004: 84; Holtzworth-Munroe & Meehan, 2004: 1370; Delsol, Margolin & John, 2003: 635).

According to Johnson & Ferraro (2000: 950), the heterogeneity of the causes of domestic violence could, in the case of intimate terrorism, correspond to two distinct psychological profiles of perpetrators resulting from different developmental histories. The first type of perpetrator has mainly sociopathic and violent characteristics, the second a deep emotional dependency on the relationship with the partner.

Using data from longitudinal surveys, a number of researchers, (Ehrensaft et al.: 2004; Ehrensaft et al.: 2003; Moffitt et al.: 2001; Capaldi & Owen: 2001; Magdol et al.: 1998) have begun to empirically determine the developmental antecedents and individual pathways likely to lead to domestic violence.

Johnson and Ferraro (2000) believe it is possible to establish a link between Johnson's typology of domestic violence and the typology of perpetrators developed by Holtzworth-Munroe et al. (2000). According to Holtzworth-Munroe, "family only" perpetrators seem to be more likely involved in situational couple violence, whereas "generally violent-antisocial" and "borderline/dysphoric" perpetrators seem to mainly engage in intimate terrorism (Johnson & Ferraro, 2000: 950). Other researchers have also suggested a relationship between Johnson's typology of domestic violence and Holtzworth-Munroe's typology of violent spouses (Cavanaugh & Gelles, 2005: 161-162; Holtzworth-Munroe & Meehan, 2004: 1370; Delsol, Margolin & John, 2003: 647).

An empirical test of Holtzworth-Munroe's typology on a non-representative sample recruited through flyers in public locations, radio public service announcements and word of mouth, indicated that in terms of dominating their partner, generally violent/psychologically distressed perpetrators were more controlling than all other types of perpetrator (Delsol, Margolin & John, 2003: 644). They observed that they were the only type of vio-

lent spouse who scored high on psychological control, on psychopathology, and attitudes condoning violence against women. Indeed, a primary difference between them and other types of perpetrator was their high score on psychological control, which included jealousy, suspicion, monitoring their partner's schedule and limiting contact and activities with other people (Delsol, Margolin & John, 2003: 646).

Such typologies of violent spouses are of great utility from many perspectives, for example, in targeting effective prevention programs, screening high-risk domestic violence situations, and developing appropriate, type-specific treatments that have a greater chance of success (Macmillan & Kruttschnitt, 2005: 41; Cavanaugh & Gelles, 2005: 164; Holtzworth-Munroe & Meehan, 2004: 1383). However, typologies of violent spouses require data on the severity and frequency of domestic violence, the generality of violence on the part of the perpetrator (marital only or also extrafamilial), and the batterer's psychopathology or personality disorder characteristics (Holtzworth-Munroe & Meehan, 2004: 1371; Kruttschnitt et al., 2004: 85; Delsol, Margolin & John, 2003: 635).

In comparison, the distinction between intimate terrorism and situational couple violence in Johnson's typology only requires knowledge of the controlling behaviours of the victim's current or previous spouse/partner. With additional data on the directionality and initiation of violence, it is possible to differentiate the four types of domestic violence suggested by Johnson. It seems easier to collect this kind of data, as was done in the 1999 GSS, than to collect data on the psychopathology of current and previous spouses and the generality of their violent behaviour.

Secondly, the data from the GSS do not seem to corroborate Johnson's hypothesis that intimate terrorism is almost the exclusive domain of male perpetrators (Johnson, 1999: [9]). In addition, the GSS data do not provide evidence for Johnson's suggestion that population surveys suffer from a sampling bias due to high rates of non-response, resulting in the exclusion of the majority of victims of intimate terrorism who can only be detected with some validity in clinical populations (Johnson, 1999: [5]).

As Ehrensaft et al. have emphasized (2004: 258-259), such a hypothesis seems to contradict long-established epidemiological research methodology, by stating that

real cases of a significantly clinical phenomenon cannot be found by well-designed epidemiological research conducted on large representative samples. Indeed, the GSS data not only revealed a large number of cases of intimate terrorism, but also provided a means of estimating with a certain level of accuracy various clinical populations, such as the number of cases in which police were notified or the number of women who sought refuge in shelters in 1999 (Laroche, 2003: 187-189, 215).

The 1999 GSS showed that a very large sample is required to be able to establish the annual prevalence of cases of domestic violence that we typically find in shelters for battered women. We can estimate that 32,100 of the 218,000 female victims of domestic violence in the 12 months preceding the survey received help from a women's centre or shelter in 1999 in Canada, indicating a prevalence rate of slightly over 3 per 1,000. Approximately 59% (18,900) of women in shelters had suffered intimate terrorism with severe violence in the 12 months preceding the survey, for a prevalence rate of under 2 per 1,000.

Given these results, it is not surprising that the NFVS conducted in 1985 by Straus on a sample four times smaller than that of the 1999 GSS, was unable to detect a large number of cases of violence that would be typical of that found among women in shelters (Johnson, 1995: 289-290).

Lastly, one of the surprising aspects of the 1999 GSS was the fact the annual prevalence rates measured by the CTS<sub>10</sub> were lower than those observed in a large number of surveys using the version of the CTS conceived by Straus. This is perhaps due to the fact that the 1999 GSS was a survey on criminal victimization. Straus (1999: 19) distinguishes two types of surveys on domestic violence – family studies and crime studies. Each presents a completely different portrait of the prevalence of domestic violence, since a large number of victims, even if they consider domestic violence unacceptable, are reluctant to report it as a crime (Straus, 1999: 18, 23). It has been demonstrated that participants' responses in the same survey can significantly vary

when the description of the situation preceding the questions on acts of violence puts emphasis on either criminal victimization or on conflict with the spouse/partner (Moffitt et al., 2001: 61-62).

In the 1999 GSS, the annual prevalence rates per 1,000 of domestic violence in Canada were 22 in women and 19 in men, significantly higher than those observed in studies of criminal victimization conducted in Canada in 1982 and 1988, and in police statistics (Laroche, 2003: 50-53). However, these rates were significantly lower than those observed in studies conducted by Straus and Gelles (1990: 116, 118) and Kwong, Bartholomew & Dutton (1999: 153-154), which were based on surveys using the CTS, but in a context of conflict resolution with the spouse/partner.

This would seem to indicate that the sections on domestic violence in the 1999 GSS constituted a hybrid measurement instrument. They were part of a survey on criminal victimization, but the CTS was used in distinct sections focusing on domestic violence. The CTS, which enumerated precise acts or threats of physical abuse in the sections of the survey on violence perpetrated by a current or previous partner, revealed comparable prevalence rates between men and women, as is normally the case with this instrument. However, these rates were lower than those usually obtained when the specified context is conflict resolution or disagreements between partners.

In conclusion, applying Johnson's typology to the 1999 GSS data provided a means of revealing the relationship between the physical and clinical consequences of domestic violence and the type of violence being perpetrated. Identifying the type of violence and its effects, and whether the perpetrator is a current or previous spouse, can contribute to gaining a better understanding of factors underlying prevalence rates, and help target prevention and treatment programs in a more precise fashion.

## References

- BRUSH, Lisa D. (1990). "Violent Acts and Injurious Outcomes in Married Couples: Methodological Issues in the National Survey of Families and Households," *Gender & Society*, vol. 4, n° 1, p. 56-67.
- BUNGE, Valerie Pottie (2000). "Spousal Violence", in *Family Violence in Canada: A Statistical Profile, 2000*, Ottawa, Statistics Canada (85-224-XIE), Canadian Centre for Justice Statistics, p. 11-21.
- CAPALDI, Deborah M., & Lee D. OWEN (2001). "Physical Aggression in a Community Sample of At-Risk Young Couples. Gender Comparisons for High Frequency, Injury, and Fear," *Journal of Family Psychology*, vol. 15, n° 3, p. 425-440.
- CAVANAUGH, Mary M., & Richard J. GELLES (2005). "The Utility of Male Domestic Violence Offender Typologies. New Directions for Research, Policy, and Practice," *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, vol. 20, n° 2, p. 155-166.
- DELSOL, Catherine, Gayla MARGOLIN & Richard S. JOHN (2003). "A Typology of Maritally Violent Men and Correlates of Violence in a Community Sample," *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, vol. 65, August, p. 635-651.
- EHRENSAFT, Miriam K, Terrie E. MOFFITT & Avshalom CASPI (2004). "Clinically Abusive Relationships in an Unselected Birth Cohort. Men's and Women's Participation and Developmental Antecedents," *Journal of Abnormal Psychology*, vol. 113, n° 2, p. 258-271.
- EHRENSAFT, Miriam K, Patricia COHEN, Jocelyn BROWN, Elizabeth SMAILES, Henian CHEN & Jeffrey G. JOHNSON (2003). "Intergenerational Transmission of Partner Violence. A 20-Year Prospective Study," *Journal of Clinical and Consulting Psychology*, vol. 71, n° 4, p. 741-753.
- HOLTZWORTH-MUNROE, Amy, & Jeffrey C. MEEHAN (2004). "Typologies of Men Who Are Maritally Violent. Scientific and Clinical Implications," *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, vol. 19, n° 12, December, p. 1369-1389.
- HOLTZWORTH-MUNROE, Amy, Jeffrey C. MEEHAN, Gregory L. STUART, Catherine HERRON & Uzma REHMAN (2000). "Testing the Holtzworth-Munroe and Stuart (1994) Batterer Typology," *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology*, vol. 68, n° 6, p. 1000-1019.
- JOHNSON, Michael P. (1999). *Two Types of Violence Against Women in the American Family. Identifying Patriarchal Terrorism and Common Couple Violence*, paper presented at the annual meeting of the National Council on Family Relations, Irvine (CA), November, 34 p., [Online]: <http://www.personal.psu.edu/mpj/ncfr99paper.html> (page consulted January 25, 2005).
- JOHNSON, Michael P. (1995). "Patriarchal Terrorism and Common Couple Violence. Two Forms of Violence Against Women," *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, May, p. 283-294, [Online]: <http://www.personal.psu.edu/mpj/JMF1995.pdf> (page consulted January 25, 2005).
- JOHNSON, Michael P., & Janel M. LEONE (2005). "The Differential Effects of Intimate Terrorism and Situational Couple Violence. Findings from the National Violence Against Women Survey," *Journal of Family Issues*, vol. 26, n° 3, p. 322-349.
- JOHNSON, Michael P., & Kathleen J. FERRARO (2000). "Research on Domestic Violence in the 1990s. Making Distinctions," *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, vol. 62, November, p. 944-963, [Online]: <http://www.personal.psu.edu/mpj/2000%20Johnson%20&%20Ferraro.pdf> (page consulted January 25, 2005).
- KRUTTSCHNITT, Candace, Brenda L. McLAUGHLIN & Carol V. PETRIE (2004). *Advancing the Federal Research Agenda on Violence Against Women*, National Research Council, The National Academies Press, Washington, D. C., 131 p. [Online]: <http://books.nap.edu/books/0309091098/html/index.html> (page consulted January 25, 2005).
- KWONG, Marilyn J., Kim BARTHOLOMEW, Antonia J. Z. HENDERSON & Shanna J. TRINKE (2003). "The Intergenerational Transmission of Relationship Violence," *Journal of Family Psychology*, vol. 17, n° 3, p. 288-301.
- KWONG, Marilyn J., Kim BARTHOLOMEW & Donald G. DUTTON (1999). "Gender Differences in Patterns of Relationship Violence in Alberta," *Canadian Journal of Behavioral Science*, vol. 31, n° 3, p. 150-160, [Online]: <http://fact.on.ca/Info/dom/kwong99.pdf> (page consulted January 25, 2005).
- LAROCHE, Denis (2003). *La violence conjugale envers les hommes et les femmes, au Québec et au Canada, 1999*, Québec, Institut de la statistique du Québec, 235 p., [Online]: [http://stat.gouv.qc.ca/publications/conditions/violence\\_h-f99\\_pdf.htm](http://stat.gouv.qc.ca/publications/conditions/violence_h-f99_pdf.htm).
- LANGHINRICHSEN-ROHLING, Jennifer (2005). "Top 10 Greatest "Hits". Important Findings and Future Directions for Intimate Partner Violence Research," *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, vol. 20, n° 1, p. 108-118.

- MACMILLAN, ROSS, & Candace KRUTTSCHNITT (2005). *Patterns of Violence Against Women: Risk Factors and Consequences*, U.S. Department of Justice, National Institute of Justice, January, 51 p., [Online]: <http://www.ncjrs.org/pdffiles1/nij/grants/208346.pdf> (page consulted March 25, 2005).
- MAGDOL, Lynn, Terrie E. MOFFITT, Avshalom CASPI, Denise L. NEWMAN, Jeffrey FAGAN & Phil A. SILVA (1997). "Gender Differences in Partner Violence in a Birth Cohort of 21-Years-Old. Bridging the Gap Between Clinical and Epidemiological Approaches," *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology*, vol. 65, n° 1, p. 68-78.
- MAGDOL, Lynn, Terrie E. MOFFITT, Avshalom CASPI & Phil A. SILVA (1998). "Developmental Antecedents of Partner Abuse. A Prospective-Longitudinal Study," *Journal of Abnormal Psychology*, vol. 107, n° 3, p. 375-389.
- MOFFITT, Terrie E., Avshalom CASPI, Michael RUTTER & Phil A. SILVA (2001). "Sex Differences in Physical Violence and Sex Similarities in Partner Abuse," in *Sex Differences in Antisocial Behavior. Conduct Disorder, Delinquency, and Violence in the Dunedin Longitudinal Study*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge (U. K.), chap. 5, p. 53-70.
- MOFFITT, Terrie E., & Avshalom CASPI (1999). *Findings about Partner Violence, from the Dunedin Multidisciplinary Health and Development Study*, U.S. Department of Justice, National Institute of Justice, July, 12 p., [Online]: <http://ncjrs.org/pdffiles1/170018.pdf> (page consulted January 25, 2005).
- MORSE, Barbara J. (1995). "Beyond the Conflict Tactics Scale: Assessing Gender Differences in Partner Violence," *Violence and Victims*, vol. 10, n° 4, p. 251-272.
- RIOU, Diane Ariane, Maryse RINFRET-RAYNOR & Solange CANTIN (2003). *La violence envers les conjointes dans les couples québécois, 1998*, Institut de la statistique du Québec, 162 p.
- STATISTICS CANADA (2000). *General Social Survey, 1999, Cycle 13 Victimization : User's Guide, Appendix B: Questionnaire Package*, [Online]: <http://sherlock.mcgill.ca/ENQ-10205/doc/gssc1399que.pdf> (page consulted January 25, 2005).
- STRAUS, Murray A. (1999). "The Controversy over Domestic Violence by Women. A Methodological, Theoretical, and Sociology of Science Analysis," in X. B. ARRIAGA & S. OSKAMP (dir.), *Violence in Intimate Relationships*, Thousand Oaks (CA), Sage Publications, p. 17-44., [Online]: <http://pubpages.unh.edu/~mas2/CTS21.pdf> (page consulted January 25, 2005).
- STRAUS, Murray A. (1993). "Physical Assaults by Wives. A Major Social Problem," in Richard J. GELLES & Donileen R. LOSEKE (dir.), *Current Controversies on Family Violence*, Newbury Park (CA), Sage Publications, p. 67-87.
- STRAUS, Murray A., & Richard J. GELLES (dir.) (1990). *Physical Violence in American Families. Risk Factors and Adaptations to Violence in 8,145 Families*, New Brunswick (U.S.), Transaction Publishers, 621 p.
- TJADEN, Patricia, & Nancy THOENNES (1998). *Prevalence, Incidence and Consequences of Violence Against Women. Findings from the National Violence Against Women Survey*, November, National Institute of Justice, U.S. Department of Justice, Washington (DC), 16 p.
- TJADEN, Patricia, & Nancy THOENNES (1999). *Violence and Threats of Violence Against Women and Men in the United States, 1994-96*, ICPRS 2556, Data collection Instruments, National Institute of Justice, Data Resources Program, Department of Justice, Washington (DC), 305 p.







*"The mission of the Institut is to provide reliable and objective statistical information on the situation of Québec as regards all aspects of Québec society for which such information is pertinent. The Institut shall be the central authority for the production and dissemination of statistical information for the government departments and bodies, except information produced for administrative purposes. The Institut shall be responsible for the carrying out of statistical surveys of general interest."*

*Act respecting the Institut de la statistique du Québec (R.S.Q. c. I-13.011), passed by the National Assembly of Québec on 19 June 1998.*

**Institut  
de la statistique**

**Québec** 