


A Profile of Gender-Based Violence Research in Europe: Findings From a Focused Mapping Review and Synthesis

TRAUMA, VIOLENCE, & ABUSE
1-14
© The Author(s) 2017
Reprints and permission:
sagepub.com/journalsPermissions.nav
DOI: 10.1177/1524838017719234
journals.sagepub.com/home/tva


Caroline Bradbury-Jones¹, Jane V. Appleton², Maria Clark¹,
and Eija Paavilainen³

Abstract

This article reports the findings from a new form of review: a focused mapping review and synthesis. The aim was to create a contemporary, snapshot profile of the nature and scope of gender-based violence (GBV) studies conducted in Europe. GBV is one of the most prevalent human rights violations in the world affecting mainly women and girls. The policy context of GBV in Europe has gathered momentum in recent years, but we do not have a clear picture of how this relates to research activity. Thirteen journals were purposively selected on their likelihood to publish GBV research. All articles published in these journals during 2015 and meeting our inclusion criteria were retrieved. Data were extracted according to (1) types of methodologies used, (2) geographical location of research, and (3) patterns of research activity/interest. Thirty-two articles met the inclusion criteria. Many titles and abstracts were not explicit about the gendered nature of the research which made retrieval and analysis difficult. A range of methodologies were reported, with single-country research conducted more than international collaborations. Intimate partner violence and sexual abuse attracted most research interest. No studies explored female genital mutilation/cutting and only one investigated early and forced marriage. The findings have implications regarding GBV research in Europe, and we explore them in relation to relevant European policy. Researchers can help raise the profile of the gendered nature of most violence-related research by being explicit about this in their publications. Increasing opportunities for cross-national research will help address the global nature of GBV. Tackling GBV requires synergy of empirical evidence and policy to drive the agenda.

Keywords

intervention/treatment, domestic violence, cultural contexts, intergenerational transmission of trauma, stalking, hate crimes, domestic violence

Violence against women and girls is one of the most prevalent human rights violations in the world (United Nations Population Fund, 2016). As enshrined within the Beijing Declaration of 1995, this refers to any act of gender-based violence (GBV) that results in—or is likely to result in—physical, sexual, or psychological harm to women, including coercion and deprivation of liberty (United Nations, 1995).

The terms “gender-based violence” and “violence against women” tend to be used synonymously. The reason for this interchangeability is recognition that most GBV is perpetrated by men against women. However, they are not the same. Bloom’s (2008) definition incorporates three components of GBV: It occurs as a result of normative role expectations associated with each gender, it is based on unequal power relationships between the two genders, and it operates within the context of a specific society. Social constructions of gender (on which GBV are based) are described by the World Health Organization (WHO, 2017); thus, people are born female or male but learn to be girls and boys who then grow into women and men. That said, it is important to recognize the wider spectrum of sex and gender

development which challenges the binary notion of two sexes: blurring traditional male–female boundaries and including “intersex” characteristics (Ainsworth, 2015; Reardon, 2016).

Men and boys can be victims of GBV and so too can those who identify as lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender, and queer (LGBTQ) (Carlton, Bennett Cattaneo, & Gebhard, 2016). However, it is widely acknowledged that the majority of people affected by GBV are women and girls (Council of Europe, 2011). Moreover, women and girls as victims of GBV suffer

¹ College of Medical and Dental Sciences, University of Birmingham, Birmingham, United Kingdom

² Faculty of Health and Life Sciences, Oxford Brookes University, Oxford, United Kingdom

³ School of Health Sciences, University of Tampere, Tampere, Finland

Corresponding Author:

Caroline Bradbury-Jones, College of Medical and Dental Sciences, University of Birmingham, Birmingham, United Kingdom.

Email: c.bradbury-jones@bham.ac.uk

Table 1. Forms of Gender-Based Violence.

-
- Intimate partner violence, stalking
 - Sexual violence (including rape, sexual assault, and harassment)
 - Trafficking, slavery and sexual exploitation
 - Early and forced marriage, forced sterilization, forced abortion, female genital mutilation/cutting, and crimes committed in the name of so-called honor
 - Emerging forms of violations such as online harassment, sexual abuse facilitated through the use of information and communication technologies and cyberbullying
-

specific, long-term consequences of gender discrimination (Health-genderviolence.org, 2016). GBV can therefore be regarded as a structural mechanism used to sustain male dominance, and there can be no real equality between women and men when women experience GBV (European Union [EU], 2012). Hence, the importance of any efforts through policy, practice, or research to tackle the issue.

Reflecting on these definitions, GBV can be conceptualized as a broad issue of which violence against women constitutes a part (Bloom, 2008). Defining violence against women as a form of GBV is helpful. It emphasizes that violence is directed at a woman *because* she is a woman (Council of Europe, 2011; Women against Violence Europe [WAVE], 2017).

In this article, we use the term “gender-based violence” with a focus on violence against women and girls. This is in line with others who seek to emphasize the gendered nature of the issue (Health-genderviolence.org, 2016). Also, although we are aware of the semantic debates regarding “victim” and “survivor” (Samelius, Thapar-Björkert, & Binswanger, 2014), we tend to use the term victim, as one that highlights the enduring and harmful nature of GBV (while accepting the importance of survivorship).

Forms of GBV

GBV takes many forms including, for example, sexual harassment, sexual violence (including rape), intimate partner violence (IPV), stalking, forced marriage, forced sterilization, forced abortion, and female genital mutilation/cutting (FGM/C; Council of Europe, 2011). It also includes emerging forms of “technological violence,” such as online harassment (European Institute for Gender Equality [EIGE], 2016). An overview of the forms of GBV is presented in Table 1.

GBV has potential to occur at every point in the life cycle of women and girls. We are inspired by the notion of the female life cycle of GBV as proposed by Heise, Pitanguy and Germain (1994). We have modified this slightly to incorporate contemporary forms of GBV, such as online grooming and cyberbullying (Table 2), which reflects the emerging forms of violations as captured already in Table 1. The life-cycle approach helps to illustrate the potential cumulative impact of violence experienced by girls and women. The WHO (2015) advocates a life-course approach as one that emphasizes how as a health determinant, gender cuts across four age stages—the girl child, adolescent girl, adult women and older women. We argue, that

importantly, this approach highlights the risks of GBV from cradle (and even “pre-cradle”) to grave: age offers no protection from GBV.

Background

The Council of Europe’s (2011) Convention in Istanbul on preventing GBV against women and girls was the first legally binding regional instrument to address different forms of violence, such as psychological violence, stalking, physical violence, sexual violence and sexual harassment. During 2014–2016, further important policy drivers regarding GBV came out of Europe. The European Union Agency for Fundamental Rights (FRA) reported on the first survey of its kind on violence against women across the 28 member states of the EU (FRA, 2014). Across the region, 42,000 women were asked about their experiences of physical, sexual and psychological violence; stalking; sexual harassment; and the role played by new technologies in women’s experiences of abuse. The survey results revealed extensive abuse affecting many women in Europe. Moreover, it showed how most of this remains unreported.

In 2015, the WHO Regional Office for Europe published *Beyond the Mortality Advantage: Investigating Women’s Health in Europe*. This investigation showed that although women in the WHO European Region have better health compared to many countries of the world, gender inequities are increasing within and between countries in the region. They concluded that gender and socioeconomic determinants affect opportunities for girls and women in the region, threatening their right to health, and well-being across the life course (WHO, 2015). This was followed by the *Strategy on Women’s Health and Well-being in the WHO European Region* (WHO, 2016) which as the name suggests, laid out the strategic actions required to tackle GBV.

At a similar time, the European Parliament for Citizen’s Rights and Constitutional Affairs (2016) reported on a study that identified the various types of violence perpetrated against women, and the interrelated factors that impinge upon women’s gender equality. The study illuminated the difficulty in gathering data that help to prevent violence against women in Europe. This included problems with comparison of data between EU member states due to differences in legal definition; not all member states have criminalized all forms of violence against women (European Commission, 2016b).

The background policy and research had already established the challenges involved in undertaking research on GBV in Europe, reflecting the significant socioeconomic, legal, and geopolitical differences in how violence is conceptualized and actioned in low-income versus middle-income countries, including war, conflict and poverty in developing countries (Council of Europe, 2011; European Commission, 2016b, 2017). As researchers of GBV in England and Finland, the wave of interest at policy level in Europe piqued our interest. We questioned what was happening in the field from a research perspective. We knew of a significant amount of research taking place, but we did not have a clear impression of its nature and scope. Given the emergent policy interest in GBV in the

Table 2. Life Cycle of Violence.

Life-Cycle Phase	Type of Violence
Prenatal	Prenatal sex selection, physical assault during pregnancy, coerced/forced pregnancy (rape and sexual assault). Forced and missed abortion as a result of physical violence
Infancy	Female infanticide, sexual, emotional and physical abuse, living with domestic violence, neglect, mental abuse and trafficking
Childhood	Sexual, emotional, mental and physical abuse, living with domestic violence, neglect, early and forced marriage, FGM/C, femicide, online grooming and cyberbullying and gang affiliation
Adolescence	FGM/C, early and forced marriage, prostitution, pornography, trafficking, sexual harassment, IPV, crimes in the name of "honor," rape and sexual assault, online grooming and cyberbullying, coercive control and gang affiliation
Adulthood	Sexual harassment, IPV, rape and sexual assault, femicide, forced pregnancy, dowry and bride price abuse, crimes in the name of honor, sexual exploitation, trafficking, stalking, maternal online grooming and cyberbullying, coercive control, financial/economic abuse and gang affiliation
Old age	Elder abuse, IPV, rape, abuse of widows, sexual harassment, institutional abuse and coercive control financial/economic abuse

Note. Adapted from Heise, Pitanguy and Germain (1994). IPV = intimate partner violence; FGM/C = female genital mutilation/cutting.

region, we considered it timely to undertake a review that profiled research activity in Europe.

There are limitations to focusing on Europe that we will explore later. But we argue that capturing research activity at this level might identify potential trends and neglected areas of research across the region that could be considered in relation to the policy context. Such insights have potential to inform the direction of future research activities, producing evidence on how to address the enduring impacts of GBV on women and girls across the life course.

Review Method

The aim of the project was to identify clusters of research interest (where researchers are focusing their attention) and gaps and neglected areas of GBV research. Specifically, we wanted to answer the following review questions in relation to GBV research in Europe:

- (1) What types of methodologies are being used?
- (2) Where is research being conducted geographically?
- (3) What patterns of research activity/interest can be discerned across Europe?

We undertook a comprehensive literature review that we refer to as a "focused mapping review and synthesis." This is an emerging form of review that we describe in detail here, for the processes to be understood and associated judgments about rigor to be made. Also, the level of detail will help readers who are interested in undertaking this form of review themselves. Grant and Booth (2009) described 14 review types and associated methodologies, presenting these as a typology. Appraised against that typology, our approach aligns closely with a mapping review/systematic map, where:

Mapping reviews enable the contextualization of in-depth systematic literature reviews within broader literature and identification of gaps in the evidence base . . . [They] may characterize studies . . . according to theoretical perspective, population group or the setting within which studies were undertaken. (Grant & Booth, 2009, p. 97)

In addition to mapping, we conducted a focused synthesis to examine one particular issue: GBV research in Europe. This methodological approach to reviewing literature is becoming a popular way of investigating a range of issues, for example, theory in qualitative research (Bradbury-Jones, Taylor, & Herber, 2014) and vicarious trauma in child protection research (Taylor, Bradbury-Jones, Breckenridge, Jones, & Herber, 2016). Recently, Jones et al. (2016) used this approach to scope United Kingdom (UK) child protection research between 2010 and 2014. They mapped the topics investigated, maltreatment types, and the research approaches used. Authors who use this approach advocate it as a means of mapping and categorizing existing literature to determine patterns and gaps in a contemporary area of social concern; hence its relevance to our review.

The focused mapping review and synthesis is unique in that it focuses on (1) targeted journals, (2) a specific subject, and (3) a defined time period. Some forms of review—such as systematic reviews—strive toward extensive searches in order to retrieve all relevant literature on a subject. The focused mapping review, however, searches within specific, predetermined journals that are selected on their likelihood to contain articles relevant to the field of inquiry. Exhaustive database searches are not required to provide the snapshot profile. In sum, it is the purposive selection of journals that sets a focused mapping review and synthesis apart from other types of review. It has the benefit of taking a phenomenon (in this case GBV research in Europe) and drawing "attention to its completeness within the literature" (Taylor et al., 2016, p. 3). It is not better than other forms of review; it simply forms a different purpose.

Selection of Journals

Journals were selected purposively on their likelihood to publish research relevant to GBV. Using the international Scopus (2017) *SCImago Journal and Country Rank*, we searched for "violence" and "abuse" to identify the highest ranked journals in the field. Excluding journals that were not directly related to our area of interest (e.g., those with a focus on drug abuse, conflict, and injury), we ended up with 13 journals targeted

Table 3. Journals Targeted for Review.

Journal Number	Journals Selected as a Result of "Abuse" Search	Abbreviation	Country
1	<i>Child Abuse and Neglect</i>	CAN	United Kingdom
2	<i>Sexual Abuse: A Journal of Research and Treatment</i>	SAJRT	United States
3	<i>Trauma, Violence, & Abuse</i> ^a	TVA	United States
4	<i>Journal of Child Sexual Abuse</i>	JCSA	United Kingdom
5	<i>Journal of Elder Abuse and Neglect</i>	JEAN	United Kingdom
6	<i>Journal of Aggression, Maltreatment & Trauma</i> ^b	JAMT	United States
7	<i>Child Abuse Review</i>	CAR	United Kingdom
	Journals Selected as a Result of "Violence" Search	Abbreviation	Country
8	<i>Journal of Interpersonal Violence</i>	JIV	United States
9	<i>Violence Against Women</i>	VAW	United States
10	<i>Violence and Victims</i>	VV	United States
11	<i>Journal of Family Violence</i>	JFV	United States
12	<i>Journal of School Violence</i>	JSV	United Kingdom
13	<i>Psychology of Violence</i>	PV	United States

^aTrauma, Violence, & Abuse appeared in both searches. ^bJournal of Aggression, Maltreatment & Trauma previously Journal of Emotional Abuse & Journal of Psychological Trauma.

Table 4. Inclusion and Exclusion Criteria for Article Selection.

Inclusion	Exclusion
Reporting primary research; systematic and other reviews; published in 2015; focus on gender-based violence; research undertaken in Europe (partially or exclusively); research undertaken by European researchers (partially or exclusively)	Editorials, discussion papers, opinions; not published in 2015; no clear focus on gender-based violence; included mixed samples (male and female); not related to Europe

for the review (Table 3). We debated extensively whether to include journals that are disciplinary based, for example, nursing or social work because we know that these types of journals provide an outlet for such work. However, accepting the limitations, this was a "focused" review, hence the target journals. We recognized that our journal choice meant that only articles published in English made it into the review. We discuss the limitations of this later.

Retrieval of Articles

Each team member was responsible for three (or in some cases four) specific journals. A key decision in a focused mapping review and synthesis is the time period. In our previous reviews, the time frame has varied from 3 months (Bradbury-Jones et al., 2014) to 6 years (Taylor et al., 2016), with the main criterion being the ability to answer the review question. Like many other forms of review, we undertook an initial scoping to determine the feasibility and parameters of the project (Grant & Booth, 2009). The lead reviewer (Bradbury-Jones) accessed each journal to determine the likely amount of relevant articles. We had initially set a 6-month time frame, but the scoping

identified that this was likely to yield insufficient data. Extending the time frame to several years would have overcome this but was beyond the time resources of the small review team and may have compromised depth and quality. So although there were inherent limitations, we decided on a time period of 1 year.

Journal archives for 2015 were systematically searched for all articles that met the inclusion criteria as detailed in Table 4. A key discussion point among the team was what we considered to be "Europe." We debated whether it should include the 47 countries as per the Council of Europe (<http://www.coe.int/en/web/portal/47-members-states>), 28 countries (https://europa.eu/european-union/about-eu/countries_en), or 51 (<https://www.countries-of-the-world.com/countries-of-europe.html>). For the sake of breadth and to glean insights from as many countries as possible, we chose the latter and set the parameters at the 51 included countries. Retrieval of articles involved a stepped process. This began with chronological scrutiny of every issue within in each included journal. Titles, abstracts, and key words were searched for "women," "girls," "mothers," and "gender." We also searched for "men" and "boys" to retrieve articles that had perpetration as the focus. Full-text download of eligible articles was then undertaken. We also obtained full-text articles where the inclusion eligibility was unclear. As a mechanism to enhance rigor, we worked in pairs to check each other's retrieval processes to confirm interrater consistency. This allowed any areas of uncertainty to be discussed and agreed. The lead reviewer (Bradbury-Jones) appraised all articles against the inclusion criteria to agree those for final inclusion.

Data Abstraction (Mapping)

Articles meeting the inclusion criteria were read in full, and each reviewer loaded predefined details onto a mapping pro forma developed for the study (Table 5). The pro forma reflects most of the forms of GBV as shown in Table 1 and the life-

Table 5. Mapping Pro forma for Each Journal.

Title of Article	Country/Countries in Which Research Conducted
Authors	Country/Countries of Researchers
Issue, Volume	Study Methodology
Participants	
Older women	
Women/mothers	
Young people and adolescents	
Children	
Professionals' perspectives	
Focus	
Focus on victims	
Focus on perpetrators	
Focus on prevention	
Issue investigated	
Broad issues of gender-based violence	
Cyberbullying	
Early and forced marriage	
Female genital mutilation/cutting	
Harassment	
"Honor" crimes	
Intimate partner violence	
Rape	
Sexual assault	
Sexual abuse	
Slavery	
Stalking	
Trafficking	

cycle approach to violence (Table 2). In effect, we mapped theoretically to the framework for the review. Working in pairs, we checked the mapping process to ensure accuracy in data abstraction. We did not critically appraise the included studies for quality because our purpose was to profile what was happening in the field rather than to draw conclusions from the included studies' findings.

Data Analysis

We approached the review with a priori understanding of the potential nature and scope of GBV, reflected in the article retrieval and data abstraction. This led to a largely deductive analysis, framed by our predetermined categorizations of GBV and life-course stages. However, during analysis, we were open to the inductive emergence of new categories. Mirroring the paired processes described for other parts of the review, we double-checked the analysis to ensure that the final results (synthesis) provide an accurate and robust account.

Results

An important finding of this review is that in their reporting, researchers do not always make clear the GBV nature of their studies. This made retrieval of relevant articles more difficult

than we had anticipated. In many articles, the gendered issue was obscured and implicit rather than explicit. However, after close scrutiny of full-text articles and agreement across the team, 32 articles met the inclusion criteria and were included in the review. As a result, a comprehensive profile of GBV research in Europe, mapped to the journals included in the review was produced (Table 6). Key findings are presented here in relation to the review questions.

Research Approaches and Methodologies Being Used

An array of approaches and research designs were used. From the 32 articles, 16 reported the use of quantitative methodologies (including three trials, three self-report questionnaires and three surveys) and there were 12 articles reporting on qualitative study types. There was also one documentary analysis (Anitha & Gill, 2015), two mixed-method studies (Holt, 2015; Schneider, Banholzer, & Albarracin, 2015) and one systematic review (Ali, Naylor, Croot, & O'Cathain, 2015). These findings reflect what can be considered a "healthy mix" of methodologies being used in the field of GBV research in Europe. This is entirely congruent with the plethora of research questions being addressed.

Geographical Location of Research

Most studies were undertaken by researchers from the UK ($n = 8$), followed by Spain ($n = 5$), Sweden ($n = 4$), Germany ($n = 4$), Finland ($n = 3$), Ireland ($n = 2$), and Serbia ($n = 2$). Other contributions came from Czech Republic, Greece, Italy and the Netherlands. Most studies were conducted within single countries (although some of these involved multiple organizations from within that country). Given the significant investment of European funding bodies such as Horizon 2020 and DAPHNE (Welcomeurope, 2016) on pan-European research, we were surprised that only seven studies involved cross-country collaborations. Of these, five were with collaborators from outside Europe with no other participating European country (Kyegombe et al., 2015 [UK and Uganda]; Keeling & Fisher, 2015 [UK and Australia]; Bellows, Lemke, Jenderedjian, & Scherbaum, 2015 [Germany and United States]; Dyer, Feldmann, & Borgmann, 2015 [Germany and United States]; Vézina et al., 2015 [Ireland and Canada]). There were just two included articles that involved pan-European collaborations: Tiwari et al. (2015; UK, Sweden, and Hong Kong) and Djikanovic et al. (2015; Serbia and the Netherlands). So our review findings suggest that researchers are tending to turn to collaborators outside Europe—rather than collaborate within it. We consider this a point of interest rather than significance. The important finding is that collaborations *are* taking place (and are being published), although they are in the minority in comparison to single-country studies.

Three studies were undertaken by researchers from within Europe, focusing on countries outside Europe—we could term this: European researchers "looking outward." These were a systematic review undertaken by a UK team investigating IPV

Table 6. Mapping Across Journals.

Distribution of Themes	CAN	CAR	JAMT	JCSA	JEAN	JFV	JIV	JSV	PV	SAJRT	TVA	VAW	VV	Total
Number of articles	3	3	1	1	1	6	7	0	0	0	1	7	2	32
Theme 1: participant focus														
Victims/survivors	2	3	—	1	1	6	6	—	—	—	1	4	1	25
Male perpetrators	—	1	1	—	—	0	1	—	—	—	1	2	1	7
Professionals	—	1	—	—	—	1	1	—	—	—	—	1	—	4
Theme 2: violence across the life course														
Children/parenting	2	3	—	—	—	2	0	—	—	—	—	1	1	9
Young people and adolescents	—	—	—	—	—	—	2	—	—	—	—	1	—	3
Older women	—	—	—	—	1	—	1	—	—	—	—	—	—	2
Theme 3: type of gender-based violence														
Intimate partner violence	2	3	1	—	1	6	5	—	—	—	1	3	2	24
Sexual abuse	1	—	1	1	—	—	3	—	—	—	—	—	—	6
Prevention	1	—	—	—	—	1	—	—	—	—	—	2	—	4
Broad issues (war crimes/structural violence)	—	—	—	—	—	—	1	—	—	—	—	2	—	3
Physical violence	1	—	—	—	—	—	1	—	—	—	—	—	—	2
Stalking	—	1	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	1	2
Rape	—	—	1	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	1	—	2
Early and forced marriage	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	1	—	1

Note. VAW = Violence Against Women; CAN = Child Abuse and Neglect; SAJRT = Sexual Abuse: A Journal of Research and Treatment; TVA = Trauma, Violence, & Abuse; JCSA = Journal of Child Sexual Abuse; JEAN = Journal of Elder Abuse and Neglect; JAMT = Journal of Aggression, Maltreatment & Trauma; CAR = Child Abuse Review; VV = Violence and Victims; JFV = Journal of Family Violence; JSV = Journal of School Violence; PV = Psychology of Violence; JIV = Journal of Interpersonal Violence.

in Pakistan (Ali et al., 2015), an analysis of men's discourses of IPV in Nicaragua by Swedish researchers (Salazar & Öhman's, 2015) and a German study analyzing rape in the Democratic Republic of the Congo (Schneider et al., 2015). Conversely, Carlson et al. (2015) were the only authors included in the review who were outside Europe "looking inward." Their study involved in-depth interviews with representatives from different continents including Africa, Asia and Europe. Initially, we had questioned whether these three publications met the inclusion criteria for the review. Did they constitute "research in Europe"? After some debate, we retained them on the basis that they assist in creating the profile of what is happening in Europe, responding directly to review Question 2.

Patterns of Research Activity/Interest Across Europe

There were three distinct groups of articles that unsurprisingly mapped to our inclusion criteria (see Table 6 for tabulation of themes). The first related to participant focus: women and girls as victim/survivors or men and boys as perpetrators. Of these, the majority investigated victimization and survivorship among women and girls ($n = 25$) compared to perpetration by men and boys ($n = 7$). Four articles investigated professional perspectives of dealing with GBV and these are reported later. The second theme linked to violence across the life course, capturing violence and abuse against children ($n = 9$); young people and adolescent girls ($n = 3$); and older women ($n = 2$). The third category was type of GBV, with IPV being the most widely researched issue in the included articles ($n = 24$) with studies from countries including Spain (Montero, Martín - Baena, Escribà -Agüir, Vives -Cases, & Ruiz -Pérez 2015); Serbia (Djikanovic, Wong, Simic, Marinkovic, Van Weel, &

Largo-Janssen 2015); and the UK (Keeling & Fisher 2015). The results are structured around the first two themes, with the third theme interwoven. This is because type of GBV straddles both themes and separating them further risks over reduction of data.

Theme 1: Participant Focus

Women and girls as victims/survivors. Myhill (2015) reported that some research evidence has pointed to gender symmetry in IPV prevalence. He argued, however, that many IPV studies have small, underrepresentative samples, with research designs that make it difficult to distinguish between different types of abuse. Reporting on a UK national population survey, he showed that coercive controlling abuse is highly gendered and asymmetrical, with women overwhelmingly the victims.

We were surprised that we did not find any articles addressing FGM/C and similarly, there was only one study on early and forced marriage (Anitha & Gill, 2015). This article examined British media's constructions of forced marriage as portrayed in newspapers. The authors reported a "moral panic" that constructs forced marriage as a cultural problem that threatens Britain's social order. They argue that this type of discourse undermines attempts to tackle forced marriage as a form of violence against women.

The issue investigated most was IPV, with 24 of the articles having this as the primary focus. Sexual abuse ($n = 6$) and stalking ($n = 2$) were also investigated, mostly (but not exclusively) in the context of IPV. One article (Mamo et al., 2015) reported on a retrospective study concerning emergency department visits of women who died as a consequence of femicide. They found that, in most cases, death was preceded

by episodes of physical violence that could be documented and identified by admissions in emergency departments. This article reinforces the importance of timely and assiduous interventions in the detection and prevention of femicide.

There was a grouping of papers that focused on IPV and postseparation issues. Forssell and Cater (2015) interviewed mothers in Sweden regarding their children's ($n = 165$) patterns of contact with their fathers postseparation. The mothers had all experienced IPV from the children's father. The results showed that children who had witnessed most violence were less likely to have contact with their father than those who had witnessed less. These findings are important when considering postseparation risks to women and children. For example, Morrison (2015) reported continued abuse of women and children following parental separation, linked to contact arrangements. Similarly, Holt (2015) provided clear evidence of postseparation contact facilitating continued abuse of women and children.

Nikupeteri, Tervonen and Laitinen (2015) interviewed Finnish women/mothers and 13 children. They identified that in cases of postseparation stalking of the family, children's security can be eroded. They suggest that practitioners can play a significant role in facilitating "safety talk" between mothers and their children. Another article by members of the same team (Nikupeteri & Laitinen, 2015) highlighted that children's lives are shadowed by postseparation stalking. The study shows how the mother-child bond can be impacted negatively; a point that will be explored further in the next section. Collectively, these groups of articles emphasize the enduring risks to women and children constituted by IPV that extend way beyond the point of separation.

Several studies highlighted the impacts of GBV on well-being and health. In their analysis of the relationship between child sexual abuse, attachment style, and depression among young female adult victims, Cantón-Cortés, Cortés and Cantón (2015) found a correlation between secure attachments and low depression scores and corresponding anxious attachment styles and high depression scores. Their findings confirm that characteristics of child sexual abuse such as type of abuse, relationship with the perpetrator and continuity of abuse can impact on attachment style and depression symptomology. Kelmendi's (2015) study on domestic violence against women in Kosovo illuminated the impact on women's experiences of issues such as poverty, patriarchal culture, and strictly defined gender roles. Such stark gendered inequalities are by no means restricted to certain countries, but Kelmendi's study provides a reminder that the legal and socioeconomic status of women across Europe might vary considerably between countries.

In terms of strategies to address IPV, the randomized controlled trial of Michalopoulou, Tzamalouka, Chrouros and Darviri (2015) in Greece evaluated the impact of interventions to reduce the psychological impacts of IPV such as stress, depression, locus of control and coping. Their study showed a moderate effect of a stress management program on stress (but none of the other outcomes). Learning from such studies across the rest of Europe regarding interventions that work in one context

is important. Holt (2015) reported on a mixed-method study in Ireland that included a survey of 219 mothers and interviews with children, mothers, fathers and professionals. She argued that men need not be excluded from their children's lives but can be supported to be "good enough" fathers. Their findings show how important it is for abusive men to take responsibility for their behavior on children and ex-partners; an issue that connects with the following section.

Men and boys as perpetrators. Articles that investigated perpetration hold some important findings about discourses of violence. For example, Salazar and Öhman (2015) investigated how young Nicaraguan men ($n = 91$) express their understandings of IPV and sexual abuse toward women. Discourses ranged from challenging gender inequality to supporting patriarchy and male dominance. The authors argue that the discourse supporting gender equality and men's responsibility for violence is struggling to achieve recognition compared to the dominant discourse that justifies and perpetuates violence against women.

Diaz-Aguardo and Martinez (2015) also studied male perpetration. They investigated types of adolescent male dating violence against women, with 4,147 participating violent and nonviolent boys in Spain aged 14–18 years. Violent boys showed lower self-esteem and greater justification of male dominance and IPV against women and greater justification of aggression in conflict resolution. They have also received more dominance and violence messages from adults in their families—indicating the significant intergenerational impacts of violence.

Studies investigating broader issues of GBV (such as war crimes) did not feature highly in the review. One exception was that of Schneider, Banholzer and Albarracín (2015) who reported the findings from a survey of Congolese ex-soldiers, on ordered rape (i.e., rape under command). They highlighted soldiers' fear of punishment and commanders' distribution of stimulant drugs. Such findings bring to attention perpetrators' own vulnerability in a context of hierarchy and power relations and underscore the complexity of GBV. Like the boys in the study by Diaz-Aguardo and Martinez (2015), violence breeds violence and it is important to bear in mind the intergenerational impacts of violence for all concerned, whether victim or perpetrator.

In terms of interventions, psychological treatment programs with male perpetrators of IPV have shown promising results (Fernández-Montalvo, Echauri, Martinez, Azcarate, & Lopez-Goñi, 2015). Also with a focus on intervention and bringing an additional global perspective to our review, Carlson et al. (2015) reported on findings from interviews with 29 representatives from across the world that included Europe. The representatives were drawn from organizations that self-identified as implementing efforts to engage men and boys in violence prevention, for example, university programs and governmental organizations. This article contains important messages for tackling GBV internationally by emphasizing how strategies to engage men and boys in violence prevention need to be

responsive to cultural, economic and contextual concerns. This is particularly relevant to our review given its focus on multiple countries and contexts.

Professional responses to GBV. Four articles focused on professional attitudes and responses. Virkki (2015) investigated social and health-care professionals' views on the division of responsibility between perpetrator and victim on ending IPV. Similarly, Djikanovic et al. (2015) measured attitudes and perceived preparedness of physicians in Serbia to deal with IPV against women. Their survey of 435 physicians drawn from primary health-care settings showed that their attitudes toward IPV were better than preparedness to deal with the issue. The study highlighted education as a moderate predictor of preparedness. In relation to responses, Keeling and Fisher (2015) from the UK conducted interviews with 15 women who had disclosed domestic violence to a health professional. They reported on how some professionals had failed to act upon the disclosure, which the authors argue, is analogous with the behavior of the perpetrator. Collectively, this group of articles highlight the importance of appropriate professional attitudes and responses in dealing with GBV.

Theme 2: Violence Across the Life Course

The life-cycle approach was reflected in our findings, with coverage of GBV research focusing on children and adolescent girls, through to older women. Additionally, many articles implicitly or explicitly captured intergenerational aspects of violence and abuse that we present later. Nine articles focused on children, such as those of Morrison (2015), Nikupeteri et al. (2015) and Holt (2015). Adolescents and young girls were the subject of gender-based research in three articles, including those of Vézina et al. (2015) and Diaz-Aguardo and Martinez (2015). Holt (2016) investigated the issue of adolescent-to-parent abuse, which she argues, is becoming recognized as a significant social problem in the Global North. Holt's study is a reminder that abusive relationships are complex and multidimensional.

Older women featured in two articles. In these, Petrusic, Todorovic, Vracevic and Jankovic (2015) highlighted the significantly hidden issue of financial abuse, and Stöckl and Penhale (2015) explored a range of different types of abuse experienced by older women, reporting on the physical and mental health issues associated with IPV. Both these articles underscore the importance of viewing IPV as a problem that does not discriminate according to age.

Intergenerational violence was evident in many included articles. Exploring the impact of maternal childhood abuse on women's own mothering, Fuchs, Möhler, Resch and Kaess (2015) showed that the period in a child's life when child locomotion develops is a critical time for mothers with a history of abuse. The authors suggest that targeted interventions during this period are needed to break intergenerational cycles of abuse. Vézina et al. (2015) evaluated dating victimization among 443 adolescent girls and young women. Their study

showed how a history of violence, childhood behavior problems and adolescent high-risk behaviors were associated with increased risk of being victimized psychologically and/or physically/sexually in their adolescent and early adult dating relationships.

Izaguirre and Calvete (2015) interviewed 30 Spanish mothers to assess the impact of IPV on children's emotional and behavioral problems. Results showed that most children had witnessed IPV and as a result of exposure to violence, children develop psychological, social and school problems. Their learning of aggressive behaviors is remarkable and is sometimes directed toward their mother. This study highlighted how women therefore experience twofold victimization: by their partner and children. Pels, van Rooij and Distelbrink (2015) conducted interviews with 100 mothers in the Netherlands, who had experienced IPV. Most reported negative experiences with parenting. Similarly, in the context of postseparation stalking, Nikupeteri and Laitinen (2015) show clearly the negative impacts on the mother-child bond which have potential to become intergenerational. This group of included articles point to the impacts of IPV on children, adolescents and women, that while not inevitable, can lead to cycles of abuse that are difficult to break.

Overall, our findings reflect an interest in GBV research in Europe that focuses on girls and women across the life course. Given the cradle-grave nature of GBV and its intergenerational impacts, these studies are crucial. It is important to recognize, however, that intergenerational transmission of abuse is not inevitable. As illustrated by Fuchs et al. (2015), strategies can be developed to promote resilience and as Mauritzson, Bergendahl Odby, Holmqvist and Nilsson (2015) express it: The fog can lift, and recovery is possible.

Discussion

The complexity of GBV across the life course involves interconnected aspects of violence, including structural state-sanctioned inequalities, ritual abuse and torture (Barron, Miller, & Kelly, 2015), hate crimes, war crimes and child sexual exploitation more generally. These forms of GBV, however, did not feature highly in our review. The most frequently researched issues were IPV and sexual abuse. This is entirely congruent with overall significance of these issues globally (Ali et al., 2015). IPV is one of the most serious and pervasive forms of GBV, with an estimated 35% of women worldwide having experienced either physical and/or sexual IPV or sexual violence by a nonpartner at some point in their lives (WHO, Department of Reproductive Health and Research, London School of Hygiene and Tropical Medicine, South African Medical Research Council, 2013). Moreover, patterns of abuse are invariably interconnected, with association between IPV and substance use both in its perpetration (Choenni, Hammink, & van de Mheen, 2017) and victimization (Sullivan, McPartland, Armeli, Jaquier, & Tennen, 2012).

Patterns of abuse are known to be intergenerational and our findings have pointed to connections between childhood and

later life experiences that support other research. For example, Namy et al. (2017) report how IPV is often associated with violence against children in the same household. Similarly, in their investigation of teen dating behavior, Jouriles, Mueller, Rosenfield, McDonald and Dodson (2012) demonstrated how teens' exposure to severe IPV and recent harsh parenting were both positively associated with teen dating violence perpetration.

In the context of Europe, IPV exists in all Council of Europe member states and occurs at all levels of society (Council of Europe, 2016). An estimated one fifth to one quarter of all women have experienced physical violence at least once during their adult lives and more than one tenth have suffered sexual violence involving the use of force (Council of Europe, 2016). Forty-three percent of women within the EU area have experienced some form of psychological violence by an intimate partner in their lifetime (FRA, 2014). Of all women who were the victims of homicide globally in 2012, almost half were killed by intimate partners or family members (FRA, 2014). Femicide as a devastating outcome of IPV was highlighted in one of our included studies (Mamo et al., 2015) and underscores the life threatening nature of this issue.

We were surprised at the lack of studies focusing on FGM/C. The issue has attracted a great deal of debate (Dustin, 2010) and has become the subject of policies and legal frameworks in Europe and across the globe FGM/C is internationally considered an affront to human rights and a direct act of violence against women and girls (Ruiz, Martínez & Belchi 2017). Across EU member states, there has been a trend to recognize FGM/C as a criminal act (EIGE, 2013). In the UK, the Female Genital Mutilation Act 2003 was amended in the Serious Crime Act 2015 to protect actual or potential victims under civil law. There is limited prevalence data around FGM/C across Europe (EIGE, 2013), but an analysis of FGM/C prevalence across 30 countries reported that at least 200 million women and girls alive today have undergone the procedure and in most of these countries, the majority of girls were cut before the age of five (UNICEF, 2016). These statistics point to the significance of the problem.

Similarly, "honor"-based violence has become a pressing issue across the world (Gill & Brahm, 2014), yet studies investigating the issue were not visible within our review. The same can be applied to early and forced marriage and human trafficking. Worldwide, more than 700 million women alive today were married as children (below 18 years of age). Of those women, more than 1 in 3—or some 250 million—were married before 15 (UNICEF, 2014a). Around 120 million girls worldwide (slightly more than 1 in 10) have experienced forced intercourse or other forced sexual acts at some point in their lives. By far, the most common perpetrators of sexual violence against girls are current or former husbands, partners, or boyfriends (United Nations Children's Fund [UNICEF], 2014b). Adult women account for almost half of all human trafficking victims detected worldwide and collectively, women and girls account for about 70% (United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime [UNODC], 2014).

Table 1 shows emerging forms of violation such as online harassment, bullying, and abusive use of information and

communication technologies. One in 10 women in the EU has experienced cyber harassment since the age of 15 (FRA, 2014). This type of harassment includes receiving unwanted, offensive, and sexually explicit e-mails; text messages; or advances on social networking sites. However, such forms of GBV were not particularly visible in our review. One study on cyberbullying nearly made it into the review, but it did not focus specifically on violence against women (Bayraktar, Machackova, Dedkova, Cerna, & Sevcikova, 2015).

There are a number of explanations why some issues seem underrepresented in our review. It may reflect the relative newness of certain phenomena as issues of empirical study in Europe (e.g., cyberbullying and FGM/C), with a body of evidence yet to be built. Early and forced marriage is by no means a new issue globally, nor is FGM/C, but in the context of Europe, only recent decades have seen these issues attract policy and research attention. We find it difficult to conceive that studies on these issues are not taking place. As a major European grant funding program, DAPHNE III had an annual budget of €18.5 million for the period 2007–2013 to fund European projects on violence prevention (http://www.welcomeurope.com/european-funds/daphne-iii-fight-violence-102+2.html#tab=onglet_details).

Latterly, the Rights, Equality and Citizenship Programme 2014–2020 (European Commission, 2016a) has a budget of €439 million. It is likely that publication outputs from grants funded through these programs simply did not make their way into our review. In itself, this raises interesting questions about publication trends and where researchers from such studies are publishing their results. This is perhaps a line of further inquiry. A search of the open-access databases of such research programs would no doubt retrieve final publications in the form of reports, books and conference proceedings. These maybe of value for inclusion in future reviews that adopt a more integrative methodology.

An interesting phenomenon that we encountered when undertaking the review was the "hidden" nature of GBV within many articles. For example, Hellems, Loeys, Buysse and de Smet's (2015) study of IPV among an ethnic minority population was retrieved because we considered that it would meet the inclusion criteria as outlined in Table 4. Findings from the study showed that women were more likely to report physical violence than men. Similarly, the review undertaken by Kloppen, Mæhle, Kvello, Haugland and Breivik (2015) on the prevalence of intrafamilial child maltreatment in the Nordic countries reported that markedly more girls than boys were exposed to sexual abuse. However, we excluded these articles (and articles like them) because the gendered issue was buried within the body of the article as an implicit rather than explicit problem. This was particularly the case for studies that included both male and female participants (such as Hellems and colleagues). Almost all such studies reported disproportionate effects of abuse and violence on women, highlighting a gender inequality, but we were unable to include them because they lacked an overt GBV lens. A key message for researchers is to foreground the gendered nature of their

research, expressed in key words, title, or abstract. This will help in the retrieval of their articles and ensure that the issue of GBV remains visible within published literature. Additionally, there is a need for synergizing efforts. Collaborations are essential to address the global issue of GBV and to enable researchers and professionals across Europe to consider how they can work together more effectively to improve victims/survivors safety and longer term well-being, through enhanced legislative frameworks and service improvements.

The costs of GBV in Europe are based on estimate. Walby and Olive (2013) extrapolated the cost from the UK to the rest of the EU states, calculating it at €228 billion a year. It is noteworthy that spending on specialized services to mitigate the harms and prevent the repetition of violence—in the case of IPV—is a mere 3% of the cost of IPV against women (EIGE, 2014). Hence, the pressing need for practice, research, and policies that can tackle the issue.

It is promising that the GBV policy context in Europe is gaining momentum. For example, in 2017, the European Commission announced that violence against women is a brutal form of discrimination and violation of women's fundamental human rights; launching the *NON.NO.NEIN* campaign (see #SayNoStopVAW). The campaign promotes collaborative actions to put an end to violence against women and girls across Europe, involving local authorities, national governments and international organizations. The time is ripe for research to feed into the policy agenda. This review article may offer a useful contribution when juxtaposed with such policies, ensuring that efforts to tackle GBV in Europe utilize empirical evidence to inform policies—and vice versa.

Review Limitations

The aim of this focused mapping review and synthesis was to provide insights into a previously uninvestigated issue. Other types of review were possible, but a focused mapping review and synthesis allowed us to develop the snapshot profile that we had intended. There are however several limitations. We found that the complexity of GBV had implications for the scope of our search and related findings. We justified focusing on violence against women as this is the most frequent and serious form of GBV. We recognize that GBV affects men, boys, and LGBTQ people, and future reviews that include their perspectives will provide a fuller picture. This will make way for greater understanding of couple violence and informed actions that benefit both genders (Espinoza & Warner, 2016) and address the need for further research in this area (Badenes-Ribera, Bonilla-Campos, Frias-Navarro, Pons-Salvador & Montere-i-Bort, 2016). Similarly, we only included articles meeting the inclusion criterion regarding Europe because this was the first step within this line of inquiry. However, a number of potentially useful articles were excluded because they were undertaken elsewhere—most often North America. Future reviews that look across more countries may therefore be useful.

We only included 13 journals and this might be regarded as limiting. Previous focused mapping reviews and syntheses

have included only five (Bradbury-Jones et al., 2014) and six (Taylor et al., 2016) journals, so the number of included journals is not in itself a limitation. It is the ability to answer the research question that is important. However, including more journals would almost certainly have revealed further interesting patterning than our review was able to provide. It is acknowledged that choice of journal introduces inherent bias. For example, we found a number of studies on IPV in comparison to other issues and this may be an artifact of the selected journals (*Journal of Interpersonal Violence* and *Journal of Family Violence* in particular). However, even removing these journals from the data presented in Table 6, there are still more articles focusing on IPV than any other form of violence.

We targeted journals that have explicit focus on violence and abuse. We know, however, that authors publish their GBV-related research in an array of other journals, particularly those that are discipline specific: nursing, social work, and so on. Another inherent problem associated with our journal choice is that they are English-only publications. It is likely that there are many useful studies in Europe published in other languages that were excluded. The limitations of this are acknowledged and future reviews could usefully address this issue. Overall, readers need to bear in mind the limitations of our methodology and scope when interpreting the findings of this article. That said, by definition a snapshot captures a certain point in time rather than creating a comprehensive profile. Larger analyses may follow.

Conclusions

Like Europe itself, the landscape of GBV is changing, and our review has provided a snapshot profile of one point in time. Future analyses will provide different insights and allow for interesting comparisons. From our review, we are able to suggest some implications regarding GBV research in Europe. At an individual-level researchers can help to raise the profile of the gendered nature of most violence and abuse-related research by being explicit about this in their publications. Most studies in the review were conducted from individual countries—only seven involved cross-country collaborations. Increasing opportunities for cross-national research will be helpful in addressing the global issue of GBV. This can contribute to efforts that tackle enduring gender-based inequalities experienced by women and girls in Europe and across the world.

Critical Findings

- Many titles and abstracts are not explicit about the gendered nature of the research, and researchers need to be more explicit about this in their publications.
- A range of methodologies are reported, with single-country research conducted more than international collaborations. Increasing opportunities for cross-national research will help address the global nature of GBV.

- IPV and sexual abuse are the focus of most studies, but no studies explore FGM/C and only one investigates early and forced marriage.
- The life-cycle approach is reflected in our findings, with coverage of GBV research focusing on children and adolescent girls, through to older women.
- Tackling GBV requires synergy of empirical evidence and policy to drive the agenda.

Implications for Practice, Policy, and Research

- Findings make a contribution to knowledge for an academic audience who want to inform the direction of their own studies.
- Researchers and practitioners can use the review findings to explain gaps in evidence which will help them justify applications for funding.
- A recommendation is for replication of this review with a global rather than European focus. This will create a fuller, international profile of GBV research.
- Acknowledging that men and boys are also victims of abuse, future reviews that focus on the issues affecting them are needed. This would contribute to a wider understanding of GBV rather than one from a solely gendered—violence against women—perspective. It would also respond to concerns that research on males as victims has been ignored (Espinoza & Warner, 2016).
- The potential to engage in more collaboration; combining expertise and interest across different countries is needed. Although this is happening to some degree, our review has highlighted the scope for greater international cooperation regarding GBV in Europe.

Declaration of Conflicting Interests

The author(s) declared no potential conflicts of interest with respect to the research, authorship, and/or publication of this article.

Funding

The author(s) received no financial support for the research, authorship, and/or publication of this article.

References

References marked with an asterisk indicate studies included in the included in the focused mapping review and synthesis.

- Ainsworth, C. (2015). Sex redefined. *Nature*, *518*, 288–291.
- *Ali, P. A., Naylor, P. B., Croot, E., & O’Cathain, A. (2015). Intimate partner violence in Pakistan: A systematic review. *Trauma, Violence, & Abuse*, *16*, 299–315.
- *Anitha, S., & Gill, A. K. (2015). A moral panic? The problematization of forced marriage in British newspapers. *Violence Against Women*, *21*, 1123–1144.
- Badenes-Ribera, L., Bonilla-Campos, A., Frias-Navarro, D., Pons-Salvador, G., & Monterde-i-Bort, H. (2016). Intimate partner violence in self-identified lesbians: A systematic review of its prevalence and correlates. *Trauma, Violence, & Abuse*, *17*, 284–297.

- Barron, I. G., Miller, D. J., & Kelly, T. B. (2015). School-based child sexual abuse prevention programs: Moving toward resiliency-informed evaluation. *Journal of Child Sexual Abuse*, *24*, 77–96.
- Bayraktar, F., Machackova, H., Dedkova, L., Cerna, A., & Sevcikova, A. (2015). Cyberbullying: The discriminant factors among cyberbullies, cybervictims, and cyberbully-victims in a Czech adolescent sample. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, *30*, 3192–3216.
- *Bellows, A. C., Lemke, S., Jenderedjian, A., & Scherbaum, V. (2015). Violence as an under-recognized barrier to women’s realization of their right to adequate food and nutrition: Case studies from Georgia and South Africa. *Violence Against Women*, *21*, 1194–1217.
- Bloom, S. (2008). *Violence against women and girls. A compendium of monitoring and evaluation indicators*. Retrieved April 4, 2016, from <http://www.cpc.unc.edu/measure/tools/gender/violence-against-women-and-girls-compendium-of-indicators>
- Bradbury-Jones, C., Taylor, J., & Herber, O. (2014). How theory is used and articulated in qualitative research: Development of a new typology. *Social Science & Medicine*, *120*, 135–141.
- *Cantón-Cortés, D., Cortés, M. R., & Cantón, J. (2015). Child sexual abuse, attachment style, and depression: The role of characteristics of abuse. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, *30*, 420–436.
- *Carlson, J., Casey, E., Edleson, J. L., Tolman, R. M., Walsh, T. B., & Kimball, E. (2015). Strategies to engage men and boys in violence prevention: A global organizational perspective. *Violence Against Women*, *21*, 1406–1425.
- Carlton, J. M., Bennett Cattaneo, L., & Gebhard, K. T. (2016). Barriers to help seeking for lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender, and queer survivors of intimate partner violence. *Trauma, Violence, & Abuse*, *17*, 585–600.
- Choenni, V., Hammink, A., & van de Mheen, D. (2017). Association between substance use and the perpetration of family violence in industrialized countries: A systematic review. *Trauma, Violence, & Abuse*, *18*, 37–50.
- Council of Europe. (2011). *Convention on preventing and combating violence against women and domestic violence Council of Europe Treaty Series No. 210 Istanbul, 11.V.201*. Retrieved from <https://rm.coe.int/168008482e>
- Council of Europe. (2016). *Stop domestic violence against women*. Retrieved April 6, 2016, from https://www.coe.int/t/dg2/equality/domesticviolencecampaign/Aboutdomesticvio_en.asp
- *Diaz-Aguardo, M. J., & Martinez, R. (2015). Types of adolescent male dating violence against women, self-esteem, and justification of dominance and aggression. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, *30*, 2636–2658.
- *Djikanovic, B., Wong, S. L. F., Simic, S., Marinkovic, J., Van Weel, C., & Largo-Janssen, A. (2015). Physician’s attitudes and preparedness to deal with intimate partner violence against women in Serbia. *Journal of Family Violence*, *30*, 445–452.
- Dustin, M. (2010). Female genital mutilation/cutting in the UK: Challenging the inconsistencies. *European Journal of Women’s Studies*, *17*, 7–23.
- *Dyer, A. S., Feldmann, R. E., & Borgmann, E. (2015). Body-related emotions in posttraumatic stress disorder following childhood sexual abuse. *Journal of Child Sexual Abuse*, *24*, 627–640.

- Espinoza, R., & Warner, D. (2016). Where do we go from here?: Examining intimate partner violence by bringing male victims, female perpetrators, and psychological sciences into the fold. *Journal of Family Violence*. doi:10.1007/s10896-016-9881-4
- European Commission. (2016a). *Rights, equality and citizenship programme 2014-2020*. Retrieved from http://ec.europa.eu/justice/grants1/programmes-2014-2020/rec/index_en.htm
- European Commission. (2016b). *Special Eurobarometer 449: Gender based violence, European open data portal*. Retrieved from http://data.europa.eu/euodp/en/data/dataset/S2115_85_3_449_ENG
- European Commission. (2017). *Say no. Stop violence against women*. Retrieved from <http://ec.europa.eu/justice/saynostopvaw/>
- European Parliament Policy Department Citizens Rights and Constitutional Affairs. (2016). *The issue of violence against women in the European Union*. Retrieved from [http://www.europarl.europa.eu/RegData/etudes/STUD/2016/556931/IPOL_STU\(2016\)556931_EN.pdf](http://www.europarl.europa.eu/RegData/etudes/STUD/2016/556931/IPOL_STU(2016)556931_EN.pdf)
- European Institute for Gender Equality. (2013). *Female genital mutilation in the European Union and Croatia—Report*. Retrieved from <http://eige.europa.eu/rdc/eige-publications/female-genital-mutilation-european-union-report>.
- European Institute for Gender Equality. (2014). *Estimating the costs of gender-based violence in the European Union. Report*. Luxembourg City, Luxembourg: Publications Office of the European Union. Retrieved from <http://eige.europa.eu/sites/default/files/documents/MH0414745EN2.pdf>
- European Institute for Gender Equality. (2016). *Forms of gender-based violence*. Retrieved April 4, 2016, from <http://eige.europa.eu/gender-based-violence/what-is-gender-based-violence>
- European Union. (2012). *Convention on preventing and combating violence against women and domestic violence*. Retrieved April 4, 2016, from http://europa.eu/epic/news/2012/20121010_convention_on_preventing_and_combating_violence_against_women_and_domestic_violence_en.htm
- European Union Agency for Fundamental Rights. (2014). *Violence against women: An EU-wide survey, European Union agency for fundamental rights*. Retrieved July 4, 2016, from <http://fra.europa.eu/en/publication/2014/violence-against-women-eu-wide-survey-main-results-report>
- *Fernández-Montalvo, J., Echauri, J. A., Martínez, M., Azcarate, J. M., & Lopez-Goñi, J. J. (2015). Impact of a court-referred psychological treatment program for intimate partner batterer men with suspended sentences. *Violence and Victims*, 30, 3–15.
- *Forsell, A. M., & Cater, Å. (2015). Patterns in child-father contact after parental separation in a sample of child witnesses to intimate partner violence. *Journal of Family Violence*, 30, 339–349.
- *Fuchs, A., Möhler, E., Resch, F., & Kaess, M. (2015). Impact of a maternal history of childhood abuse on the development of mother-infant interaction during the first year of life. *Child Abuse & Neglect*, 48, 179–189.
- Gill, A. K., & Brah, A. (2014). Interrogating cultural narratives about ‘honour’ based violence. *European Journal of Women’s Studies*, 21, 72–86.
- Grant, M. J., & Booth, A. (2009). A typology of reviews: An analysis of 14 review types and associated methodologies. *Health Information & Libraries Journal*, 26, 91–108.
- Health-genderviolence.org. (2016). *Defining gender-based violence*. Retrieved November 13, 2016, from <http://www.health-genderviolence.org/training-programme-for-health-care-providers/facts-on-gbv/defining-gender-based-violence/21>
- Heise, L., Pitanguy, J., & Germain, A. (1994). *Violence against women: The hidden health burden* (World Bank Discussion Paper, No. 255, p. 5). Washington, DC: The World Bank.
- Hellemans, S., Loeys, T., Buysse, A., & de Smet, O. (2015). Prevalence and impact of intimate partner violence (IPV) among an ethnic minority population. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 30, 3389–3418.
- Holt, A. (2016). Adolescent-to-parent abuse as a form of ‘domestic violence’: A conceptual review. *Trauma, Violence, & Abuse*, 17, 490–499.
- *Holt, S. (2015). Post-separation fathering and domestic abuse: Challenges and contradictions. *Child Abuse Review*, 24, 210–222.
- *Izaguirre, A., & Calvete, E. (2015). Children who are exposed to intimate partner violence: Interviewing mothers to understand its impact on children. *Child Abuse & Neglect*, 48, 58–67.
- Jones, C., Taylor, J., MacKay, K., Soliman, F., Clayton, E., Gadda, A. M., . . . Jones, D. (2016). The landscape of UK child protection research 2010 to 2014: A mapping review of substantive topics, maltreatment types and research designs. *Child Abuse Review*. doi: 10.1002/car.2429
- Jouriles, E. N., Mueller, V., Rosenfield, D., McDonald, R., & Dodson, M. C. (2012) Teens’ experiences of harsh parenting and exposure to severe intimate partner violence: Adding insult to injury in predicting teen dating violence. *Psychology of Violence*, 2, 125–138.
- *Keeling, J., & Fisher, C. (2015). Health professionals’ responses to women’s disclosure of domestic violence. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 30, 2363–2378.
- *Kelmendi, K. (2015). Domestic violence against women in Kosovo: A qualitative study of women’s experiences. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 30, 680–702.
- Kloppen, K., Mæhle, M., Kvello, Ø., Haugland, S., & Breivik, K. (2015). Prevalence of intrafamilial child maltreatment in the Nordic countries: A review. *Child Abuse Review*, 24, 51–66.
- *Kyegombe, N., Abramsky, T., Devries, K. M., Michau, L., Nakuti, J., Starman, E., . . . Watts, C. (2015). What is the potential for interventions designed to prevent violence against women to reduce children’s exposure to violence? Findings from the SASA! study, Kampala, Uganda. *Child Abuse & Neglect*, 50, 128–140.
- *Mamo, C., Bianco, S., Dalmasso, M., Giroto, M., Mondo, L., & Penasso, M. (2015) Are emergency department admissions in the past two years predictors of femicide? Results from a case-control study in Italy. *Journal of Family Violence*, 30, 853–858.
- *Mauritzson, M., Bergendahl Odby, E., Holmqvist, R., & Nilsson, D. (2015). The fog is lifting: Veils of mist come and go: An interpretive phenomenological analysis of the experiences of six women recovering from pathological dissociation. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 30, 45–61.
- *Michalopoulou, E., Tzamalouka, G., Chrouros, G., & Darviri, C. (2015). Stress management and intimate partner violence: A randomized controlled trial. *Journal of Family Violence*, 30, 795–802.

- *Montero, I., Martín-Baena, D., Escribà-Agüir, V., Vives-Cases, C., & Ruiz-Pérez, I. (2015). Factors associated with the cessation of intimate partner violence in women attending primary care in Spain. *Journal of Family Violence, 30*, 453–460.
- *Morrison, F. (2015). ‘All over now?’ The on-going relational consequences of domestic abuse through children’s contact arrangements. *Child Abuse Review, 24*, 274–284.
- *Myhill, A. (2015). Measuring coercive control: What can we learn from national surveys? *Violence Against Women, 21*, 355–375.
- Namy, S., Carlson, C., O’Hara, K., Nakuti, J., Bukuluki, P., Lwanyaga, J., . . . Michau, L. (2017). Towards a feminist understanding of intersecting violence against women and children in the family. *Social Science & Medicine, 184*, 40–48. doi:10.1016/j.socscimed.2017.04.042
- *Nikupeteri, A., & Laitinen, M. (2015). Children’s everyday lives shadowed by stalking: Postseparation stalking narratives of Finnish children and women. *Violence and Victims, 30*, 830–845.
- *Nikupeteri, A., Tervonen, H., & Laitinen, M. (2015). Eroded, lost or reconstructed? Security in Finnish children’s experiences of post-separation stalking. *Child Abuse Review, 24*, 285–296.
- *Pels, T., van Rooij, F. B., & Distelbrink, M. (2015). The impact of intimate partner violence (IPV) on parenting by mothers within an ethnically diverse population in the Netherlands. *Journal of Family Violence, 30*, 1055–1067.
- *Petrusic, N., Todorovic, N., Vraccvic, M., & Jankovic, B. (2015). Financial abuse of older women in Serbia. *Journal of Elder Abuse & Neglect, 27*, 410–421.
- Reardon, S. (2016). The spectrum of sex development: Eric Vilain and the intersex controversy. *Nature, 533*, 160–163.
- Ruiz, I. J., Martínez, P. A., & Belchí, C. A. (2017). Dismantling the man-made myths upholding female genital mutilation. *Health Care for Women International, 38*, 478–491. doi:10.1080/07399332.2017.1289211.
- *Salazar, M., & Öhman, A. (2015). Negotiating masculinity, violence, and responsibility: A situational analysis of young Nicaraguan men’s discourses on intimate partner and sexual violence. *Journal of Aggression, Maltreatment & Trauma, 24*, 131–149.
- Samelius, L., Thapar-Björkert, S., & Binswanger, C. (2014). Turning points and the ‘everyday’: Exploring agency and violence in intimate relationships. *European Journal of Women’s Studies, 21*, 264–277.
- *Schneider, G., Banholzer, L., & Albarracin, L. (2015). Ordered rape: A principal-agent analysis of wartime sexual violence in the DR Congo. *Violence Against Women, 21*, 1341–1363.
- Scopus. (2017). *SCImago Journal and Country Rank*. Retrieved May 17, 2017, from http://www.scimagojr.com/journalrank.php?area=2900&category=2901&country=all&year=2013&order=sjr&min=0&min_type=cd
- *Stöckl, H., & Penhale, B. (2015). Intimate partner violence and its association with physical and mental health symptoms among older women in Germany. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 30*, 3089–3111.
- Sullivan, T. P., McPartland, T. S., Armeli, S., Jaquier, V., & Tennen, H. (2012). Is it the exception or the rule? Daily co-occurrence of physical, sexual, and psychological partner violence in a 90-day study of substance-using, community women. *Psychology of Violence, 2*, 154–164.
- Taylor, J., Bradbury-Jones, C., Breckenridge, J., Jones, C., & Herber, O. R. (2016). Risk of vicarious trauma in nursing research: A focused mapping review and synthesis. *Journal of Clinical Nursing, 25*, 2768–2777.
- *Tiwari, A., Fong, D. Y. T., Chan, K. L., Yan, E. C. W., Lam, G. L. L., Tang, D. H. M., & Graham-Kevan, N. (2015). Evaluating the Chinese revised controlling behaviors scale. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 30*, 314–332.
- UNICEF. (2014a). *Ending child marriage: Progress and prospects*. UNICEF Norge. Retrieved July 4, 2016, from https://issuu.com/unicefnorge/docs/child_marriage_data_brochure_july_2
- UNICEF. (2014b). *Hidden in plain sight: A statistical analysis of violence against children*. Author. Retrieved July 4, 2016, from http://www.unicef.org/publications/index_74865.html
- UNICEF. (2016). *Female genital mutilation/cutting: A global concern*. Retrieved July 4, 2016, from http://www.unicef.org/media/files/FGMC_2016_brochure_final_UNICEF_SPREAD.pdf
- UNODC. (2014). *Global report on trafficking in persons*. Author. Retrieved July 4, 2016, from http://www.unodc.org/documents/data-and-analysis/glotip/GLOTIP_2014_full_report.pdf
- United Nations. (1995). *The Beijing declaration and platform for action*. Retrieved April 4, 2016, from <http://www.un.org/womenwatch/daw/beijing/beijingdeclaration.html>
- United Nations Population Fund. (2016) *Gender-based violence*. Retrieved from www.unfpa.org
- *Vézina, J., Hébert, M., Poulin, F., Lavoie, F., Vitaro, F., & Tremblay, R. E. (2015). History of family violence, childhood behavior problems, and adolescent high-risk behaviors as predictors of girls’ repeated patterns of dating victimization in two developmental periods. *Violence Against Women, 21*, 435–459.
- *Virkki, T. (2015). Social and health care professionals’ views on responsible agency in the process of ending intimate partner violence. *Violence Against Women, 21*, 712–733.
- Walby, S., & Olive, P. (2013). *Economic aspects and legal perspectives for action at EU level*. Brussels, Belgium: Report for European Parliament. Retrieved from [http://www.europarl.europa.eu/RegData/etudes/etudes/join/2013/504467/IPOL-JOIN_ET\(2013\)504467\(ANN02\)_EN.pdf](http://www.europarl.europa.eu/RegData/etudes/etudes/join/2013/504467/IPOL-JOIN_ET(2013)504467(ANN02)_EN.pdf)
- Welcomeurope.com. (2016). *DAPHNE III fight against violence*. Retrieved from http://www.welcomeurope.com/european-funds/daphne-iii-fight-violence-102+2.html#tab=onglet_details
- Women against Violence Europe (2017). What is violence against women? Retrieved June 27, 2017, from <http://www.wave-network.org>
- World Health Organization. (2017). *Gender: Definitions*. Retrieved May 2, 2017, from <http://www.euro.who.int/en/health-topics/health-determinants/gender>
- World Health Organization, Department of Reproductive Health and Research, London School of Hygiene and Tropical Medicine, South African Medical Research Council. (2013). *Global and regional estimates of violence against women: Prevalence and health effects of intimate partner violence and non-partner sexual violence*. World Health Organization. Retrieved July 4, 2016, from

http://apps.who.int/iris/bitstream/10665/85241/1/WHO_RHR_HRP_13.06_eng.pdf?ua=1

- World Health Organization Regional Office for Europe. (2015). *Beyond the mortality advantage: Investigating women's health in Europe*. Retrieved from <http://www.euro.who.int/en/health-topics/health-determinants/gender/publications/2015/beyond-the-mortality-advantage.-investigating-womens-health-in-europe>
- World Health Organization Regional Office for Europe. (2016). *Strategy on women's health and well-being in the WHO European Region*. Retrieved from http://www.euro.who.int/__data/assets/pdf_file/0003/333912/strategy-womens-health-en.pdf

Author Biographies

Caroline Bradbury-Jones is a reader in nursing at the University of Birmingham where she leads the Risk, Abuse and Violence Research Programme. She is a registered nurse, midwife and health visitor. Her research interests are focused on issues of family violence and child abuse and neglect, particularly health professionals' responses to them. She has led or been actively involved in securing funding for a number of research projects relevant to these areas. She has a particular interest in exploring new ways to investigate gender-based violence.

Jane V. Appleton is a professor of primary and community care at Oxford Brookes University where she leads the Children and Families Research Group. As a registered nurse and health visitor Jane has a long-standing professional practice and research interest in child protection issues and work with vulnerable families. Recent research work includes the health visiting and school nursing roles in safeguarding and child protection, work on child protection conferences, child sexual exploitation, and children who miss their health-care appointments.

Maria Clark is a lecturer in nursing/research and a registered nurse, midwife, and health visitor. Her research interests are broadly focused on public health/nursing, social determinants of health and health-care pluralism. She is involved in a number of research projects allied to these areas including risk, abuse, and violence prevention.

Eija Paavilainen is a professor in nursing science and a registered nurse and public health nurse. Her research interests lie within challenging life situations of families, especially families with children, family violence and child maltreatment issues. She leads a research team within these themes. Her latest research projects include, for example, validating and implementing an assessment tool for identifying child maltreatment.