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Abstract

Objectives: to compare and contrast how midwives working in either hospital- or community-based settings address domestic violence by evaluating their views on: prevalence of domestic violence; their role in addressing domestic violence; the acceptability of routine enquiry; and barriers encountered in asking clients questions about violence and abuse in pregnancy.

Design: a postal survey questionnaire.

Setting: Northern Ireland.

Study population: 983 hospital and community midwives.

Findings: overall, 488 midwives returned a completed questionnaire; a 57% response rate. Comparisons were made using descriptive, inferential statistics and cross-tabulation. Although there were significant differences between hospital- and community-based midwives in relation to domestic violence, both groups of midwives tended to underestimate its prevalence.

Key conclusions: the findings suggest that midwives per se identify and respond to a fraction of the cases of domestic abuse in pregnancy, due to lack of confidence, education and training. This reinforces the need for both hospital and community midwives to gain further confidence and an understanding of the many psychosocial factors that surround domestic violence.

Implications for practice: healthy settings theory can be used effectively to identify good practice with women who experience domestic violence. Effective investment for health care requires the gaps between hospital- and community-based practice to be bridged, and for work to be integrated.

© 2007 Elsevier Ltd. All rights reserved.
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Introduction

Violence is a major public health issue internationally, and domestic violence (DV), in particular, represents a serious public health issue for women and children all over the world (Tjaden and Tjaden, 2000; World Health Organization, 2000, 2002). In the UK, one in four women experience DV at some point in their lives (Bacchus et al., 2002; Jasinski, 2004), and this violence accounts for almost one-quarter of all crime (Home Office, 2003). Disturbingly, the violence is hidden in many instances (Gazmararian et al., 1996; Jewkes et al., 2002). Women remain silent and excluded; however, what is clear from the literature is that it is likely to escalate in frequency and intensity over time, and may increase at specific points, especially during pregnancy.

Pregnancy is seen as a high-risk period for DV and may prompt the initial episode or an escalation of a pre-existing abusive relationship (Stewart and Cecutti, 1993; Baird, 2002; Bradley et al., 2002; Johnson et al., 2003; Shadigian and Bauer, 2004). This abuse may not only produce physical injuries but also a range of psychosocial effects upon the mother such as alcohol and drug dependence, unemployment, homelessness, suicide attempts, depression, anxiety and post-traumatic stress disorder (Amaro et al., 1990; Martin et al., 2001; Lemon et al., 2002; Richardson et al., 2002).

The risk for the unborn fetus is also considerable as violence may increase rates of miscarriage, premature birth, low birth weight, chorioamnionitis, fetal injury and fetal death (Connolly et al., 1996; Mezey and Bewley, 1997; Shumway et al., 1999; Bacchus et al., 2002; Craig, 2003). It is beyond doubt that intimate partner violence has a profound effect on women’s pregnancies and pregnancy-related decisions (Lutz, 2005). To the authors’ knowledge, this is the first study to provide comparative data for midwives working in hospital settings and community health-care practice settings on their perceived role in addressing DV.

Midwives have always had a role in public health; however, there is now an explicit need for the profession to direct its attention to issues such as DV. Indeed, there are clear messages from government and international research to indicate that health professionals should be actively involved in tackling this significant public health issue (Department of Health and Social Services and Northern Ireland Office, 1995; Department of Health, Social Services and Public Safety, 2003; Parker et al., 1999; Department of Health, 2000, 2001; Price, 2003; Jasinski, 2004). In the UK, for example, in response to rising levels of DV towards women, many professional organisations have published recommendations or guidelines (Royal College of Midwives, 1997; British Medical Association, 1998; Community Practitioners and Health Visitors Association, 1998; Royal College of Nursing, 2000) suggesting that health professionals have a major role in helping women to disclose DV and ensuring that advice and support is available to them. Such guidance is matched in many countries. For example, in the USA, the Violence Against Women Act ensures that communities have the tools to assess and prevent violence at home (US Congress, 2005); in Australia, the Department of Health has explicit guidance for health professionals’ responses to family violence and DV (State of Western Australia and Department of Health, 2001); and in New Zealand, the Ministry of Health (2002) has produced consensus-based guidelines health setting out the principles of intervention for health professionals.

Although it is not common practice for midwives in Northern Ireland (NI) to assess or screen pregnant women for DV, research has advocated that midwives should ask all pregnant women routinely about abusive relationships (Royal College of Midwives, 1997; British Medical Association, 1998; Davidson et al., 2000; Taket et al., 2003). However, for appropriate assessment in situations where DV is known or suspected, midwives must have up-to-date knowledge and the skills required to ask questions to identify those women experiencing DV, and to offer the appropriate interprofessional help and interagency support (Paluzzi and Houde-Quimby, 1996).

Evidence suggests that although 35% of women already suffering DV experience an increase during pregnancy and the postpartum period, they are rarely identified by midwives (King and Ryan, 1996; Thompson et al., 2000; Bacchus et al., 2002, 2005; Espinosa and Osborne, 2002; Nasir and Hyder, 2003). This finding may represent a reluctance by midwives to discuss the topic of DV with their clients, arising in many cases from fears and anxieties about causing offence, revealing something that may escalate out of control, not knowing what to do if DV is disclosed, embarrassment, or, at a personal level, identification with DV either as a victim or perpetrator (Department of Health, 2000; Bacchus et al., 2002). However, this reluctance may also correspond, in general, to a lack of understanding of their perceived professional role in addressing DV, or a lack of education and available information about questioning and screening protocols (Taket et al., 2003). Importantly, at a more basic level, the opportunity to ask the question may
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not always be available, i.e. a partner or other family member may be present (Price, 2003; Taket et al., 2003; Jasinski, 2004).

It must also be remembered that victims of DV may also be reluctant to disclose abuse for a variety of reasons, including: reprisals from their partner; an outsider becoming involved; embarrassment; and, importantly, fear of losing their children if social services become involved. Research, however, has shown that these women often hope that someone will realise that something is wrong and ask them about it (Department of Health, 2000; Gielen et al., 2000; Bacchus et al., 2002; Mezey et al., 2003; Taket et al., 2003). It is therefore extremely important for midwives in both community and hospital settings to ask women routinely about DV and to offer support and information.

Healthy settings theory and practice

This paper reports on a study that identified midwives’ knowledge, attitudes and experience of DV and examined how midwives in NI address DV in their client population. Although the evidence base is rapidly expanding on midwives’ identification and management of DV, no research has evaluated differences in responses, using a healthy settings framework, between midwives working in hospitals compared with community-based practice settings. Different ideologies are linked to the practice setting in which midwives work, as hospital and community environments present fundamentally different work settings with diverse values and perspectives (Hunter, 2004). There is evidence to suggest that hospital settings produce midwives who concentrate more on the physical aspects of care rather than the provision of psychosocial support for new mothers (Henderson, 2002; Hunter, 2004). In contrast, several government publications suggest that community-based settings support midwives to work according to a ‘woman-centred’ approach within their practice setting (Department of Health, 2000; House of Commons Select Committee, 2003).

The rationale for a healthy settings approach is based on the premise that health is largely ‘produced’ outside illness and the health service, and that public health developments, such as identification of DV, require investment in the socio-ecological systems in which people actually live their lives (Baric, 1993, 1994; Grossman and Scala, 1993; Kickbusch, 1995; Freund et al., 1996; Dooris et al., 1998; Dooris, 2004). The concept and practice of healthy settings has developed over the last 15 years to become an element of public health strategy at local, national and European levels (Dooris, 2002). It is influential in shifting ‘health’ away from problem-oriented individual interventions, towards a more holistic socio-ecological model reflecting a focus on what has been described as ‘salutogenesis’ or health creation (Antonovsky, 1987), which is concerned with developing supportive contexts within the places that people live their lives (Kickbusch, 2003). It also acknowledges that each health setting is part of a greater whole, functioning as an ‘open system’ in synergistic exchange with the wider environment (Paton et al., 2005).

A holistic and multidisciplinary approach, it is underpinned by principles such as community participation, partnership, equity and empowerment, and has perspectives drawn from: Health for All (Health 21) (World Health Organization, 1998b); Ottawa Charter for Health Promotion (World Health Organization, 1986); and Agenda 21 (World Health Organization, 1998a). A common way of understanding the settings approach is by separating out its three key elements:

- creation of supportive and healthy living environments;
- integration of health promotion into the daily activities of the health setting; and
- development of links with other settings and with the wider community by recognising that people’s lives straddle various settings.

Study

The purpose of this paper is to offer for debate a framework that will promote an effective organisational infrastructure when developing and supporting midwives working with DV. The framework identifies key settings that need to work effectively in isolation, but also clearly need to integrate to ensure a ‘joined-up’ approach to organisational thinking and working. Indeed, the underpinning communications to link the systems together are often missing (Dooris, 2004).

Aims

This study, conducted between December 2002 and August 2003, aimed to compare and contrast how midwives in NI working in either hospital- or community-based health-care practice settings address DV in their client population by evaluating:

- their perceived views on the rate of DV;
- their perceived professional role in addressing DV;
their acceptability of routine screening for DV within a health-care setting; and
the barriers they encounter when asking clients questions about violence and abuse in pregnancy within their health-care settings.

Methods

Study population

A letter was sent to all registered NI midwives working in seven locations (n = 983) inviting them to participate in this study. The locations included five hospital and community settings. Following exclusion of midwives who were on maternity leave, career break or long-term sick leave, 861 midwives (n = 88%) remained. Demographic details requested included hospital/community setting, age and full- or part-time employment. Educational and training details of addressing DV in their client population were also obtained.

Ethical considerations

The Queen’s University Belfast Research Ethics Committee stated that formal ethical approval was not required. However, in the light of the new requirements of research governance, participants were asked to complete an informed research consent form and assured that their responses would be confidential and remain anonymous. All questionnaires were secured in a locked cabinet and retained for audit after data analyses. To ensure anonymity, midwives were instructed to return completed questionnaires and signed consent forms in the separate envelopes provided to a specified collection point. Whilst return of completed questionnaires perhaps implies consent, the research team chose to include a consent form to address issues of research governance and explicit participation. Distribution and collection of completed questionnaires and signed informed research consent forms to hospital and community midwives spanned a four month period from May to August 2003.

Questionnaire distribution and return

Each participant received an envelope containing a research information sheet, an informed research consent form, a six-page double-sided coded questionnaire and two blank envelopes. To ensure anonymity, midwives were instructed to return completed questionnaires and signed consent forms in the separate envelopes provided to a specified collection point. Whilst return of completed questionnaires perhaps implies consent, the research team chose to include a consent form to address issues of research governance and explicit participation. Distribution and collection of completed questionnaires and signed informed research consent forms to hospital and community midwives spanned a four month period from May to August 2003.

Statistical analysis

Data from each coded questionnaire were entered into a database and analysed using Statistical
Package for the Social Sciences Version 12.0.1. To assure anonymity, data were entered using a coded number for potential follow-up. Comparisons were made using inferential statistics, with Pearson’s \( \chi^2 \)-test of association and the \( \chi^2 \)-test for trend (Altman, 1991, pp. 261–265). To reduce the bias introduced by estimating the distribution of the discrete test statistic by a continuous \( \chi^2 \) distribution, Yates’ continuity correction was applied for all \( 2 \times 2 \) comparisons (Altman, 1991, pp. 252–253).

Findings

Overall, 488 midwives returned a completed questionnaire, giving a response rate of 57%.

Sample demographics

Midwives based in a hospital setting accounted for 80% of the cohort, with 39% employed full-time, and 57% over 40 years of age (see Table 1). Significantly more community midwives (65%) were employed full-time [continuity corrected \( \chi^2 = 20.4, \) degrees of freedom (df) = 1, \( p < 0.001 \)], and significantly more community midwives (71%) were \( >40 \) years of age (continuity corrected \( \chi^2 = 5.64, \) df = 1, \( p < 0.05 \)).

Midwives’ views on the proportion of women they perceived to be affected by DV

When enquiring about the proportion of women viewed to be affected by DV, this study found that many of the midwives were not aware of the true extent. It has been established that the true extent of DV amongst women is one in four (Bacchus et al., 2002). The midwives were given a series of options that form an ordinal scale, but one in which there was a large gap between one in eight (12.5% chance) and the next option one in four (25% chance). The scale was dichotomised between below estimate (options up to and including one in eight) and near the mark. An analysis of hospital and community midwives showed that:

- overall, the majority of midwives (66%) viewed the prevalence of DV to be well short of the ‘truth’; and
- a smaller proportion of community midwives compared with hospital midwives had this perception (54% versus 69%, \( \chi^2 = 6.56, \) \( p = 0.01 \)) (see Table 2).

Midwives’ perceived role in responding to DV and their views on routine screening

Almost all participants, irrespective of whether they were based in a hospital (92%) or community (93%) setting, felt that they had a significant role to play in responding to DV (see Table 3).

Routine screening for DV

Participants were asked for their views on routine screening. Approximately half of the midwives in both the hospital (52%) and community (55%) settings were in favour of routine screening for all pregnant women (see Table 3).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 1</th>
<th>Demographic details of midwives in hospital and community settings.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Demographic details (n = 488)</td>
<td>Hospital setting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participants</td>
<td>393</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full-time</td>
<td>153</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part-time</td>
<td>240</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age (years)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( \leq 40 )</td>
<td>168</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( &gt;40 )</td>
<td>225</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

df, degrees of freedom. Percentages in the tables were calculated after removal of the non-responders; however, for completeness, the number of non-responders is shown.
Most appropriate time to enquire about DV

When the participants were asked for their views about when they felt was the best time to ask a pregnant woman questions on DV, significant differences were observed. In all, 65% of hospital midwives and significantly fewer community midwives (44%) opted for the booking visit (continuity corrected $\chi^2 = 13.4$, df $= 1$, $p < 0.001$), whereas significantly more community midwives (29%) felt that 16+ weeks was a more appropriate time to ask questions (continuity corrected $\chi^2 = 4.33$, df $= 1$, $p = 0.037$) (see Table 3).

Table 2 Midwives’ self-reported responses to the proportion of women they perceived to be affected by domestic violence (DV).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Women affected by DV</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Cumulative percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Valid</td>
<td>1/100</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1/25</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>15.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1/10</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>27.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1/8</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>21.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1/4</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>30.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1/3</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>4.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Only one-third of midwives were realistic in their perception of DV affecting one in four women. Two-thirds of midwives considerably underestimated ‘the generally accepted’ probability of DV.

Cross-tabulation of hospital/community midwives who believe no more than one in eight women are affected by DV.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Believe no more than one in eight women affected by DV</th>
<th>Hospital/community</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>Hospital</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% within hospital/community</td>
<td>31.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>265</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% within hospital/community</td>
<td>68.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>387</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% within hospital/community</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$\chi^2 = 6.557$ continuity correction factor, $p = 0.01$.
Underestimators totalled 69% of the hospital group compared with 54% of the community group.

Confidence levels of midwives in addressing DV with their clients

Community midwives (27%) were significantly more confident in addressing DV with their clients than hospital midwives (15%) ($\chi^2$ for trend $= 7.02$, df $= 1$, $p = 0.008$). When the midwives’ confidence in recognising signs of DV in their client population was examined, an observed trend towards greater confidence was found among 28% of community midwives compared with 21% of hospital midwives, but this did not quite reach statistical significance ($\chi^2$ for trend $= 3.08$, df $= 1$, $p = 0.079$).

How many midwives actually made an enquiry?

Participants were asked how many had actually raised the issue of DV with a client, and only 38% of the cohort reported that they had done so. Significantly fewer hospital midwives (22%) had addressed the issue of DV with a client (continuity corrected $\chi^2 = 36.1$, df $= 1$, $p < 0.001$) (see Table 3).

Private facilities within health-care settings to discuss DV

A significantly higher percentage of community midwives (71%) compared with hospital midwives (54%) reported that they were aware of facilities in their practice settings that offered privacy for a woman to discuss DV confidentially (continuity corrected $\chi^2 = 8.08$, df $= 1$, $p = 0.004$).
When the participants were asked if they had tried to provide an opportunity to speak to a woman in private, cross-tabulation demonstrated a significantly higher percentage of community midwives (92%) offering privacy to the client compared with 80% of hospital midwives ($\chi^2 = 5.77$, df = 1, $p = 0.016$) (see Table 4).

Seventy-three per cent of community midwives frequently or always had an opportunity to talk to a client alone in private, while hospital midwives were significantly less likely to speak with a client alone (linear by linear association $\chi^2 = 42.7$, df = 1, $p = 0.001$) (see Table 5).

**Midwives’ awareness of private facilities and midwives’ confidence to address DV**

In the hospital setting, there was a tendency for midwives with greater confidence to be aware of the availability of private facilities to interview...
women about DV. In all, 76% of midwives reporting that they were confident in asking pregnant women questions on DV were aware of private facilities, while 50% of those who were unsure or not confident in asking questions were aware of private facilities (linear by linear association \( \chi^2 = 5.31, \text{df} = 1, \text{p} = 0.021 \) ) (see Table 6). In the community, there was no association between degree of confidence and awareness of private facilities (linear by linear association, \( \text{p} = 0.28 \), exact test).

**Barriers**

Participants were asked if they had experienced any difficulties in trying to speak to their clients on their own. Cross-tabulation demonstrated that 59% of the community midwives experienced significantly more difficulties than 44% of the hospital midwives (continuity corrected \( \chi^2 = 6.11, \text{df} = 1, \text{p} = 0.013 \) ) (see Table 4). The biggest hindrance recorded in the free-text responses for both hospital (78%) and community (89%) midwives was the reluctance of a partner to leave the consultation (see Table 7). It is acknowledged, however, that having the opportunity and acting on the opportunity are not necessarily the same.

When the midwives were asked about their current response to addressing DV in their client population, a significant trend was observed amongst the community midwives, with 13% reporting their response to be effective in addressing

### Table 4  Midwives’ knowledge and use of facilities to interview women in private.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Midwives’ self-reported response (488)</th>
<th>Hospital setting</th>
<th>Community setting</th>
<th>Chi-squared 1 df p-value ( \chi^2, \text{p-value} )</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>n</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aware of facilities to interview in private</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>207</td>
<td>54.0</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>176</td>
<td>46.0</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Used facilities to speak to client in private</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>306</td>
<td>80.3</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>19.7</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Difficulties encountered in trying to offer privacy to speak to a client in private</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>167</td>
<td>44.2</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>211</td>
<td>55.8</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current response effective</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unsure</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>28.0</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>251</td>
<td>65.7</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Percentages in the tables were calculated after removal of the non-responders; however, for completeness, the number of non-responders is shown.

### Table 5  Opportunity for midwives to speak to a pregnant woman in private.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Opportunity</th>
<th>Hospital midwives</th>
<th>Community midwives</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seldom</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sometimes</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frequently</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Always</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\( \chi^2 = 42.736, \text{degrees of freedom} = 1, \text{p}<0.001. \)
Table 6  Cross-tabulation examining privacy to interview women on domestic violence (DV) versus confident in asking pregnant women questions (Qns) about DV in hospital/community settings.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hospital/community</th>
<th>Privacy to interview women on DV</th>
<th>Confident in asking pregnant women Qns on DV</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>% Within confident in asking pregnant women Qns on DV</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Unsure</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>Unsure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>% Within confident in asking pregnant women Qns on DV</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>% Within confident in asking pregnant women Qns on DV</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>% Within confident in asking pregnant women Qns on DV</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hospital</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>% Within confident in asking pregnant women Qns on DV</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Unsure</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>Unsure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>% Within confident in asking pregnant women Qns on DV</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>% Within confident in asking pregnant women Qns on DV</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>% Within confident in asking pregnant women Qns on DV</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Hospital: linear by linear association, $\chi^2 = 5.31$, degrees of freedom = 1, $p = 0.021$. Community: linear by linear association, $p = 0.28$ (exact test).
this issue (linear by linear association $\chi^2 = 10.2$, df = 1, p < 0.01) (see Table 4).

**Discussion**

Healthy settings theory can be used effectively to identify good practice with women who experience DV, as this study goes some way to increasing our understanding of the different conflicting ideologies and knowledge base within hospital- and community-based midwifery health-care settings. Although pregnancy is a time when women come into frequent contact with the health service, and midwives have the rare opportunity to play an important public health role (Dobash et al., 1996; Protheroe et al., 2001; Lutz, 2005), the study findings suggest that identifying and supporting women experiencing DV is a complex and difficult task for midwives. Internationally, the public health role of the midwife (Henderson, 2002; Jasinski, 2004) is developing, and as it increases (Mirrlees-Black, 1999; Naumann et al., 1999; Mooney, 2000; Radestad et al., 2004). The reasons for this underestimation are varied. Often, DV is regarded as a psychosocial problem rather than a clinical issue. Professionals such as midwives often feel powerless to assess, or feel that they should not become involved in the first place (Naumann et al., 1999; Peckover, 2003). This appears to be a global phenomenon and not unique to the UK and USA, having also been reported in China (Tiwari et al., 2005), Australia (Webster and Holt, 2004; Gunn et al., 2006), Turkey (Yanikkerem et al., 2006) and Uganda (Kaye et al., 2006). Evidence suggests that a lack of basic knowledge and training can contribute to these underestimations (Parsons et al., 1995; King and Ryan, 1996; Gunn et al., 2006).

Appropriate care relies on identifying women experiencing DV, and health-care settings such as hospitals and the community are appropriate places to implement routine enquiries. Although the main findings show that almost all midwives (92%) felt that they had a significant role to play in responding to DV in their client group, data illustrate that only half of those participating were in favour of routine screening, and only 38% of the cohort had actually made an enquiry. Worryingly, 79% of hospital and 72% of community midwives were unsure or not confident about identifying DV in practice.

The present study also supports the findings of a systematic review of studies of barriers to

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Barriers/reasons for difficulty</th>
<th>Hospital midwives (n = 167) (%)</th>
<th>Community midwives (n = 55) (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Partner reluctant to leave</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overprotective partner</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>–</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No privacy in ward</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not specified</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 7 Barriers/reasons given by midwives for the difficulties experienced in speaking to a pregnant woman in private.
screening for DV (Ramsey et al., 2002), which found that health-care professionals gave a range of reasons for not asking women about DV routinely. This is despite evidence which suggests that the great majority of women are not offended when asked about DV (Renker and Tonkin, 2006). Lack of education in or experience of screening, fear of offending or endangering clients, lack of effective interventions, patients not disclosing or not complying with screening, and (the major problem) lack of time (Waalen et al., 2000) were all cited as barriers to screening in the free-text responses from all midwives. Taking these barriers into consideration, when all midwives were asked about their current response to addressing DV in their client population, a higher percentage of community midwives (13%) reported that they were effective in dealing with DV compared with their hospital counterparts (6%).

In NI, women presenting to maternity services are not screened routinely for DV. However, when participants were asked their opinion on whether or not all pregnant women should be, approximately half of the sample, in both the hospital and community settings, were in favour of this practice. Again worryingly, 84% of hospital midwives and 73% of community midwives felt that they were unsure or not confident about screening for DV in practice. However, the need and timing for routine screening did not differ between the health-care settings, as over half of the hospital midwives and 43% of the community midwives were more likely to want to enquire about DV at a booking visit. In contrast, almost one-third of community midwives were more likely than hospital midwives to say that women should not be asked about DV until 16 weeks, stating that they liked to build up a relationship with the woman before enquiring about sensitive issues such as DV. This, they felt, permitted them to work according to a ‘women-centred’ model of care, which they perceived as more natural and allowed them to demonstrate their knowledge of the psychosocial aspects of maternity care.

Although there was a difference in the responses from the hospital and community midwives regarding the best time to ask pregnant women questions about DV, when asked how many of the participants actually raised the issue of DV with a client, only 38% of both groups reported that they had done so. Interestingly, significantly fewer hospital midwives (22%) had addressed the issue of DV with a client, and free-text responses highlighted that they appeared to be driven by more medically dominant organisational structures and targets, which resulted in them using a more standardised form of care that stressed measures of efficiency, effectiveness and risk management. They felt that this health setting had an ideology that placed less emphasis on the psychosocial needs of the individual woman, and more on providing care for women experiencing complications, and thus public health issues were seen as low priorities. These findings are consistent with work by Hunter (2004), whose results suggested that the occupational ideology of the hospital midwife was ‘with the institution’ rather than with a more ‘woman-centred’ approach.

On the other hand, over half (54%) of the midwives from a community-based setting appear to follow more of the key elements of a healthy settings framework in a number of ways. Firstly, significantly more were able to create a healthy living environment for women experiencing DV by asking their clients about domestic abuse (Poland et al., 2000). Secondly, they integrate health promotion and health empowerment into the health setting by working in partnership with women in their own homes, frequently talking to them about issues such as DV, and are significantly more aware of the availability of and provision of private facilities in which woman can discuss violent relationships. Support such as this allows women to rediscover their self-esteem and confidence, and can give them the first crucial step to break the cycle of power and control exerted by their male partners. Thirdly, they develop links with other settings and with the wider community (Whitelaw et al., 2001). Free-text responses suggest that community midwives are more empowered to use a joined-up approach that includes an understanding of evidence-based research in the area; a clear knowledge of local and national multiprofessional support agencies; and interagency networks and refuges that allows them to give ongoing and appropriate information that in itself can empower women to make their own informed choices about how to deal with abuse. The Code of Professional Conduct exhorts midwives to work collaboratively to enable them to strengthen areas of practice by liaising with other professionals and learning from them (Nursing and Midwifery Council, 2004).

However, these findings need to take into consideration that 46% of community midwives and 78% of hospital midwives felt that they did not want to ask women about DV, or were unsure about how to approach the topic, and a further 50% of community midwives and 62% of hospital midwives were not confident enough to address DV with their clients. To understand why the enquiry rate was so low, the researchers assessed the barriers that midwives faced with the issue of DV. In general, midwives need more confidence in order to make an enquiry, to recognise the signs of DV,
and to know the availability of private facilities within the hospital or community during home visits in order to speak to a client in private.

No difference was observed between hospital and community midwives in relation to their confidence in recognising DV in their client population. Interestingly, less than one-third of community midwives were confident in addressing DV, although they highlighted that the community setting permitted them to develop a relationship with the woman in her own environment, which they felt enabled them to gain considerable knowledge about the client’s family and wider community. They stated that this interaction was relaxed and less formal than the hospital setting, and they could pick up clues and signs in a covert way that allowed the woman to ‘open up’ about issues such as domestic and baby abuse. This style of interaction was seen as a key skill of community-based midwifery, and corresponds to what Carper (1978) calls the ‘therapeutic use of self’ where the midwife uses all her personal skills to benefit her client in a holistic manner.

The Royal College of Gynaecology and Department of Health guidance is that women should be seen alone during their maternity care (Bewley et al., 1997; Department of Health, 2000), and the Royal College of Midwives’ position paper (1997) suggests that midwives should provide a private environment that would allow women to discuss DV discreetly. When all midwives were asked if they had tried to provide an opportunity to speak to women in private, the results demonstrated that more community midwives were aware of facilities or were able to offer privacy to the client to discuss DV confidentially than hospital midwives. Moreover, although a high percentage of both hospital and community midwives reported trying to offer privacy to the client, when asked how often they actually got to speak to a client on their own, the results demonstrated that more community midwives frequently talked to a client alone, while hospital midwives were less likely to speak alone with a client.

Interestingly, 76% of all midwives who reported that they were confident in asking pregnant women about DV were aware of private facilities, while only 50% of those unsure or not confident were aware of private facilities. When all midwives were asked if they had experienced any difficulties in trying to speak to their clients on their own, the results demonstrated that 59% of community midwives experienced more difficulties than 44% of hospital midwives. The study shows that those hospital midwives with greater confidence in asking women about DV were also more aware of private facilities.

All midwives were asked to specify the difficulties they encountered in trying to speak to their clients in private. The biggest hindrance recorded for both hospital (78%) and community (89%) midwives was the reluctance of a partner to leave the consultation. Recent changes in midwifery practice designed to demedicalise childbirth may, in reality, be reducing the possibility of effective intervention. This finding corresponds to international research evidence which highlights that maternity services are no longer woman-only spaces because women are now accompanied by their partners when attending antenatal clinics, and partners are often present in community appointments (Hester et al., 1996; Hunt and Martin, 2001; Marchant et al., 2001; Protheroe et al., 2001; Taket et al., 2003).

Conclusions

While every effort was made to ensure a rigorous and systematic approach, there are important limitations to this study. Firstly, the data are based on a sample of midwives in NI and the findings may not be generalisable to similar groups of participants outside this health setting. Secondly, the overall response rate was 57%, thus limiting the ability to extrapolate the results of this study to those who did not respond. Nevertheless, the response rate should be considered reasonable by social research standards, given the fact that it was targeted at staff working under demanding time constraints. Moreover, several of the findings are consistent with other international research studies on this topic (King and Ryan, 1996; Thompson et al., 2000; Marchant et al., 2001; Bacchus et al., 2002; Espinosa and Osborne, 2002; Mezey et al., 2003; Nasir and Hyder, 2003; Price, 2003; Jasinski, 2004; Protheroe et al., 2004).

The paper highlights that midwives per se identify and respond to a fraction of the cases of DV in pregnancy due to a lack of confidence and up-to-date knowledge and education. This finding reinforces the need for both hospital and community midwives to gain further confidence and an understanding of the psychosocial issues surrounding DV. Limited confidence is often underpinned by lack of education (Peckover, 2000; Mezey et al., 2005), and the research team recommend that to achieve joint action to deal with DV, life-long learning and education should take place within an interdisciplinary approach and using interagency expertise (Bewley et al., 1997; McMurray et al., 2004). Moreover, to increase their confidence, midwives need to learn to recognise
benign conditions that might inadvertently be mistaken for DV if unnecessary distress is to be curtailed. On the other hand, some midwives may themselves be victims of abuse, and education and skills training would be a vital support mechanism for these professionals.

However, the findings correspond to international evidence which suggests that midwives in hospital settings may be concentrating more on ‘high-tech’ maternity care and the physiological aspects of care, rather than the provision of psychosocial support for new mothers. They also feel more isolated from community agencies and interagency support services that deal with victim abuse (Henderson, 2002; Hunter, 2004; Jasinski, 2004).

On the other hand, the findings suggest that community midwives appear to be working more within a healthy settings approach.

Globally, effective investment for health care requires the gaps between health-care settings to be bridged and for work to be coordinated and integrated. Only in this way can action on DV in both hospital and community settings feed into wider public health developments for midwives and other health-care professionals. However, what is evident from the study is that there is, in reality, a diversity of midwifery practice that deals with DV and reflects not only different models of health promotion, and different analyses of the ‘problem’ and the ‘solution’, but also different organisational settings with differing degrees of opportunity and constraint. Clearly, for the potential of a healthy settings approach to be fully realised, bridges and communications must be built between midwives working in different settings. A health setting such as a maternity hospital cannot be seen in isolation as it exists within a community, and a fundamental aspect of healthy settings work is the involvement of the wider community and the development of healthy alliances and partnership working. Indeed, quite apart from the fact that one health setting can learn a lot from another, it is clear that in relation to specific topics such as DV, an issue impacting on health in one health setting can frequently have its origin or solution in another. The realisation is, as Dooris (2004) notes, ‘often what is missing is the underpinning communications to link the systems together’.
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