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Introduction: Code for merging CSEW/BCS

Combining the multiple years of the survey can be tedious, at times complex, and mistakes are easily made.

Purpose of this was to make it easier to combine the datafiles

By combining multiple survey sweeps, researchers and analysts can examine:
- Temporal trends
- Low prevalence offences
- Smaller population groups
- Rarer consequences

Only in Stata
Specifying the merging for your specific needs

1. Post 2001 CSEW/BCS
2. Pre 2001 BCS
3. Adolescent youth samples
4. Ethnic minority boost samples
5. Bolton surveys
6. Last year of post 2001 included
7. First year of post 2001 included
8. Specify data folders (temporary and raw data)
9. Specific data location (same as downloaded excluding random symbols at the end)
Code

Results in the datasets

Leads to data sets

• Post2001_nvf.dta
• Post2001_vf.dta
• Pre2001_nvf.dta
• Pre2001_vf.dta
• Post2001_adolescent_youth_nvf.dta
• Post2001_adolescent_youth_vf.dta
• Post2001_emboost_nvf.dta
• Post2001_emboost_vf.dta
• Pre2001_emboost_nvf.dta
• Pre2001_emboost_vf.dta

• Saved in the folder specified under Temp
What is does and doesn’t do

Does:
• Merge the files, providing saving time merging them all manually.
• Flexible, only need to download the files you need.

Does NOT harmonize variables.
• For the far majority this will not be an issue, as new variables get new name.
• A few variables change, but they have the same variable name (for instance for household income variables such as tothhin2).
• Check all variables carefully.

Next, this code does not work in the secure researcher environment of UKDS (probably also ONS) because the datasets in these environments:
• Have different names
• The structure of the folders is different
• A year is missing (2009/2010 nvf file)

It is Stata code
Example: Different types of intimate partner perpetrators

Different partner relationships included in IPVA

- Intimate partner violence and abuse (IPVA)
  - negative consequences on physical and mental health (e.g. Dutton et al., 2006; Wong & Mellor, 2014).
  - Is partly defined by the relationship between victim and perpetrator

- There are many in intimate partner violence perpetrators
  - E.g. Spouses, cohabiters, dating
  - Former or current partners at the time of the violence

- We study
  - different wellbeing/health impact for different intimate partner perpetrator types
  - physical violence/abuse, sexual violence/abuse, threats, and economic crimes (e.g. theft)
Data and Analyses


- Annual victimisation survey ~40k respondents per year of 16+ living in households
- Face-to-face section, because only there specific types of intimate partner are recorded
- IPVA is very underreported
- 3.6k records of IPVA among women, 475 of IPVA among men
- Respondents are asked about crime experience in last 12 months

- Ordered Logit models & Marginal Effects at the Means
- Analyses separate by for women and men

**Controlled for:**
- Whether it was an individual incident or not
- Age
- Ethnicity
- Relationship status
- Number of children
- Disability status
- Education
- Employment status
- Survey year
## Key Measurements

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Emotional wellbeing</th>
<th>Physical Injury</th>
<th>Perpetrator relationship to victim at time of incident</th>
<th>Offence categories (separate analyses)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Emotional reactions after the incident (e.g. anger, shock, depression, anxiety)</td>
<td>• Did perpetrator use any force</td>
<td>1. Husband, wife, or partner</td>
<td>Physical violence and abuse (e.g. serious wounding, common assault)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• How much affected?</td>
<td>• Sustained any injury.</td>
<td>2. Current boy/girlfriend</td>
<td>Sexual violence and abuse (e.g. rape, indecent assault)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. ‘No’</td>
<td>1. No force was used</td>
<td>3. Former husband, wife, or partner</td>
<td>Threats (e.g. threats to kill/assault)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. ‘A little’</td>
<td>2. Force was used, did not lead to injury</td>
<td>4. Former boy/girlfriend</td>
<td>Economic crimes (theft, criminal damage, burglary)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. ‘Quite a lot’</td>
<td>3. Injury</td>
<td>5. Any other person or unknown</td>
<td>We can’t include coercive &amp; economic control or stalking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. ‘Very much’</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Off all types of violence and abuse types, 69.5% is by (formerly) marrieds/partners and 43.6% current partners.
Descriptives (2)

Per intimate partner type, which **offences** are committed?

**Threats and economic offences more among former partners**

*sexual violence/abuse against men is excluded due to very low incidence*
Results (1)

Women’s predicted probability of ‘very much’ **emotionally affected** by IPVA

Ordered Logit Models, Marginal effects at the Means, controlled for all control variables. ‘No’ or ‘A little’ emotional response not presented for clarity.
Results (2)

Women’s predicted probability of physical injury by IPVA

Ordered Logit Models, Marginal effects at the Means, controlled for all control variables. ‘No’ or ‘A little’ emotional response not presented for clarity.
Conclusion and Discussion

• Combining multiple years is useful for looking at rare events, consequences, and/or specific populations.

• All IPVA has a higher emotional wellbeing and physical health impact than offences by others.
  • Both women and men

For physical and economic IPVA against women:
  • Emotional wellbeing impact: current and former spouses/partners had more impact than boy/girlfriends
    • Injuries: more likely IPVA by current partners compared to former partners.

• Research and Policy could account for differences in IPVA by intimate partner perpetrator.
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Results (2)

Women’s predicted probability of ‘very much’ emotionally affected by IPVA

Ordered Logit Models, Marginal effects at the Means, controlled for all control variables. ‘No’ or ‘A little’ emotional response not presented for clarity.
Per intimate partner type, which **offences** are committed?

*sexual violence/abuse against men is excluded due to very low incidence*