California State University, San Bernardino
CSUSB ScholarWorks

Theses Digitization Project | John M. Pfau Library

2003

Instrumental and expressive violence: Motive for women's use of violence and their perception of their partner's use of violence

Lisa Claire Maisano Kennedy

Follow this and additional works at: https://scholarworks.lib.csusb.edu/etd-project

Part of the Domestic and Intimate Partner Violence Commons, and the Psychology Commons

Recommended Citation

Kennedy, Lisa Claire Maisano, "Instrumental and expressive violence: Motive for women's use of violence and their perception of their partner's use of violence" (2003). *Theses Digitization Project*. 4337.
https://scholarworks.lib.csusb.edu/etd-project/4337

This Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by the John M. Pfau Library at CSUSB ScholarWorks. It has been accepted for inclusion in Theses Digitization Project by an authorized administrator of CSUSB ScholarWorks. For more information, please contact scholarworks@csusb.edu.

INSTRUMENTAL AND EXPRESSIVE VIOLENCE: MOTIVE FOR WOMEN'S USE OF VIOLENCE AND THEIR PERCEPTION OF THEIR PARTNER'S USE OF VIOLENCE

A Thesis

Presented to the

Faculty of

California State University,

San Bernardino

In Partial Fulfillment

of the Requirements for the Degree

Master of Science

in

Psychology:

Clinical/Counseling

---

by

Lisa Claire Maisano Kennedy

September 2003

INSTRUMENTAL AND EXPRESSIVE VIOLENCE: MOTIVE FOR WOMEN'S USE OF VIOLENCE AND THEIR PERCEPTION OF THEIR PARTNER'S USE OF VIOLENCE

A Thesis

Presented to the

Faculty of

California State University,

San Bernardino

---

by

Lisa Claire Maisano Kennedy

September 2003

Approved by:

Gloria Cowan, Chair, Psychology

8/21/03
Date

David V. Chavez

Yu-Chin Chien

ABSTRACT

Although the rates of violent behaviors between men and women have been reported to be similar, the motivation for intimate partner violence has yet to be fully investigated, specifically as it relates to highly abusive relationships. This study examined the motivation for intimate partner violence, in terms of instrumental, expressive, and self-defense motives. Thirty-four women were recruited from four Southern California domestic violence agencies to report on their own motivation for violence and on their perceptions of their partner's motivation for violence.

A modified version of the Relationship Abuse Questionnaire was utilized to assess the motivation for intimate violence. Repeated measures Analysis of Variance indicated a significant interaction between type of motive and whether the participants were rating their own versus their partner's violence. Women were more likely to report their partner's violence as instrumental than expressive, and more likely to report their partner's violence as expressive than self-defense. On the other hand, women were significantly more likely to report their own violence as self-defense than instrumental and significantly more likely to report their partner's violence as instrumental than self-defense. No significant difference was found between women's use of expressive violence and their partner's use of expressive

violence. Frequencies were calculated for the thirteen forms of abuse. A brief history of the symmetry of violence debate and feminist theory is presented. Implications for prevention, application, and research are discussed.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I would like to take this opportunity to thank my thesis committee for all their support, patience, and guidance as I completed this project. I would like to especially thank the Chair of the committee, Dr. Gloria Cowan, who has been so helpful and patient throughout the entire process. Thank you for all the valuable input, ideas, and suggestions. I will truly miss our Tuesday afternoon meetings. I would also like to recognize Dr. David Chavez, not only for his input in this thesis, but also for his role as a supportive and compassionate instructor in the Clinical/Counseling program. Additionally, I would like to thank Dr. Yu-Chin Chien for her assistance in helping me to conceptualize the design for this thesis and for providing the foundation necessary in Psychology 311 and Psychology 640 to develop and complete this type of project. The contributions from *each* of these three professors has helped this thesis evolve into its final form.

I would like to thank my family and friends who have remained so supportive of me throughout my time in graduate school. Their offerings of support and encouragement over the last few years have been more valuable than they realized. I would like to especially thank my mother, Lucille Maisano Stokes, for her abiding encouragement and support. I would also like to thank my mother, Lucille, and my mother-in-law, Gloria J. Kennedy, for helping me to take

care of the two most important people in the world to me: my children. A special thank you to my husband, Bruce Kennedy, who has been especially supportive and helpful as I completed my graduate studies. And, a very special thank you to my son Bailey and daughter Rachel, who have been very helpful and patient while I completed graduate school and this project. I can finally say what they have been longing to hear, "Yes, *now* I am done with my thesis."

Finally, I would like to thank the domestic violence agencies and the women who volunteered to complete our questionnaires for this thesis. Without their willingness to participate in this study, I would not have been able to complete this project.

I offer my sincerest appreciation
and gratitude to you
all!

DEDICATION

To my grandfather, Arthur Maisano, Sr., who truly valued education and encouraged me to pursue a college education.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ABSTRACT iii

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS v

LIST OF TABLES ix

CHAPTER ONE: LITERATURE REVIEW 1

Mutuality of Assault: Family Researchers Versus Feminist Researchers 2

Controversy over the Conflict Tactics Scale . . . 6

Distinguishing Between Types of Violent Couples 14

Expressive Versus Instrumental Violence 19

Motivation for Women's use of Violence 21

Women's Perception of their Partner's Motivation for Violence 29

Hypotheses 38

CHAPTER TWO: METHODOLOGY

Design 40

Participants 40

Measures 42

Demographic Sheet 42

Relationship Abuse Questionnaire (RAQ) 42

Procedure 46

Analyses 46

CHAPTER THREE: RESULTS

Reliability of Items 48

Motivation for Abuse 49

Frequency of Abuse 52

CHAPTER FOUR: DISCUSSION 56

Motivation for Violence: Self-Reports and Perception of Partner 57

Patterns of Responses 58

Forms of Abuse 60

Distinguishing Between Types of Violent Couples 61

Theoretical Implications 62

Applied Implications 63

Limitations 65

Future Research 66

Conclusion 69

APPENDIX A: INFORMED CONSENT 71

APPENDIX B: DEMOGRAPHIC QUESTIONNAIRE 73

APPENDIX C: MODIFIED VERSION OF THE RELATIONSHIP ABUSE QUESTIONNAIRE 75

APPENDIX D: DEBRIEFING STATEMENT 90

APPENDIX E: FOOTNOTE 92

REFERENCES 94

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1. Motivation for Violence by Self-Reports and Reports on Partner's Violence 51

Table 2. Frequency and Percentages of Forms of Abuse by Abuser 54

CHAPTER ONE

LITERATURE REVIEW

The problem of violence against women in the home first gained national attention in the 1970s. Though unbelievable at the time, it appeared that the most dangerous place for a women to be could be in her own home (Myers, 1995). As a result of the dedicated work of feminist advocates and social science researchers, domestic violence transitioned from a "private matter" to a major social problem. As a result, shelters for abused women and their children were organized all over the world and were quickly filled to capacity. Consequently, researchers shifted their focus from questioning the existence of intimate partner violence to investigating its etiologies, outcomes, attributions and treatment solutions (Ferraro & Johnson, 1983).

Though men were initially seen as the primary perpetrators of partner violence, researchers began questioning the frequency of violent acts perpetrated by women. In fact, some experts, who relied heavily on the Conflict Tactics Scale (CTS)(Straus, 1979), argued that women engaged in violence as often as, or even more often than their male partners (e.g., Straus, 1977; Straus, Gelles, & Steinmetz, 1980). Not surprisingly, these findings have been fiercely contested by feminists who advocate for abused women (e.g., Kurz, 1997). Consequently, polarized

camps of researchers have spent more than twenty years debating whether men and women are equally violent in their intimate relationships.

Unfortunately, the symmetry of violence controversy has often overshadowed the importance of investigating the function of intimate partner violence, or more specifically, what motivates a man or woman to use violence against their partner. Identifying why an individual uses violence is a critical component of understanding intimate partner violence and lies at the center of the gender debate. Surely, there is an important distinction between an individual who uses violence as a means of controlling their partner versus someone who uses violence as a means of self-defense. Thus, if we are to understand the nature of intimate violence, we must be willing to address the gender debate and explore the motivation for violence.

Mutuality of Assault: Family Researchers Versus Feminist Researchers

Two dominant groups conduct research on intimate partner violence: the feminist researchers and the family violence researchers. Over the last two decades, a major debate has evolved between these two groups of scholars. This controversy questions whether women are victims of male-perpetrated abuse or are mutual combatants.

Family violence researchers, led by social scientists such as Straus (1971; 1990) and Gelles (1974), have consistently reported that men and women engage in similar amounts of physical violence in both their marital (Gelles, 1974; Straus & Gelles, 1986) and dating relationships (Bookwala, Frieze, Smith, & Ryan, 1992; Lane & Gwartney-Gibbs, 1985; Laner & Thompson, 1982; Makepeace, 1986). Methodologically, such conclusions are based on data gathered from large random samples of the adult population who respond to Straus's (1979) Conflict Tactic Scale (CTS). For example, the National Family Violence Survey (NFVS) contained data from 2,143 married and cohabiting couples in 1975 (Straus, Gelles, Steinmetz, 1980) and 6002 couples in 1985 (Straus & Gelles, 1986). In the 1975 survey, 12.1% of wives and 11.6% of husbands reported using violence within their relationship (Gelles & Straus, 1988). In 1985, 12.1% of women and 11.3% of men reported engaging in violence against their partner (Straus & Gelles, 1990). In addition, a reexamination of only severe violence found that in the 1975 survey 4.6% of women and 3.8% of men engaged in injury-related violence; in 1985 the comparable data was 4.4% for women and 3.0% for men (Straus & Gelles, 1990).

Using the same survey evidence, Steinmetz (1980) argued that women were both victims and perpetrators of couple violence. In fact, Steinmetz (1978) proposed that the plight

of "battered husbands" was a major social problem that was largely ignored by feminist researchers. In addition, Straus (1997) claimed that feminist researchers intentionally suppressed data which would confirm female-perpetrated violence. Though often controversial, these proposals led researchers to conduct a variety of studies which have investigated the gender symmetry of partner violence.

Recently, Archer (2000) conducted a meta-analysis of sex differences in aggression. He reviewed 82 studies of marital and dating violence, 76 of which were based on a version of the CTS. After examining these studies, Archer concluded that women were more likely to use aggression in their intimate relationships than men. Additionally, young women were found to be significantly more aggressive during courtship than young men. Statistics such as these have been used to support the symmetry of violence theory. As a result, it has become increasingly common for family violence researchers to argue that women are as violent as men (e.g., Stacey, Hazelwood, & Schupe, 1994).

While some feminist researchers have acknowledged that women use physical aggression in intimate relationships (e.g., Frieze & Brown, 1989), others have argued vehemently against the symmetry of violence theory proposed by family researchers (e.g., Kurz, 1997; Yllo, 1988). In contrast to

the family theorists, feminist researchers rely predominately on victim data collected from law enforcement agencies, hospitals, and domestic violence organizations. These surveys typically find that women are overwhelmingly the injured partner in domestic disputes. For example, after reviewing the National Crime Survey (NCS) between 1973-75, researchers found that 97% of victims of partner violence were women (Johnson, 1995). In addition, in 1982, the NCS reported that 91% of victims assaulted by spouses, or former spouses, were women (Brown, 1987). Schwartz (as cited in Kurz, 1997) supported these findings with his evaluation of the NCS in 1987. In his review, 96% of the victims of domestic violence were female and only 4% were male. More recently, NCVS data revealed that of the 960,000 reports filed against a spouse, former spouse, boyfriend or girlfriend for acts of violence, approximately 85% of victims were women (Greenfeld et al., as cited in McFarlane & Wilson, 2000). Furthermore, even in cases where both men and women are injured during a domestic dispute, women's injuries are almost 3 times as severe as injuries sustained by men (Berk, Berk, Loseke, & Rauma, 1983).

Hospital and shelter data provides further evidence that women are more often the victims of violent male partners. Research shows that approximately 20%-50% of all female patients using emergency room services are victims of

spousal abuse (Barnett & LaViolette, 1993). For example, in 1977, Crisis Centers located in New York City hospitals treated 490 women who had experienced partner violence and only 2 men who had experienced similar abuse (Fields & Kirchner, as cited in Johnson, 1995). Additionally, approximately 88,000 women and children utilized shelter services and crisis centers between 1993 and 1997 in Oklahoma (Nation's Health, 2000). For feminist researchers, female victim data is evidence that males are more likely to be perpetrators of partner violence.

Controversy over the Conflict Tactics Scale

The symmetry of violence theory is based primarily on data collected from the CTS. Such conclusions are made solely on a participant's response that at least one time during their relationship they engaged in a "violent" act (e.g., push, hit, bit, kick, beat up, etc.). Therefore, a respondent need only respond to a single act to be deemed violent, in which case, an individual would be considered "violent" whether they had thrown a pillow or "beat up" their partner (Dobash, Dobash, Wilson & Daly, 1992). Researchers have reported that when results are based on the "tallying" of acts of aggression, women use physical aggression more often than men (See Archer, 2000).

Feminist researchers have consistently challenged sole reliance on the CTS as an appropriate measure of

interpartner violence and claim that the data obtained from the CTS is "misleading and flawed" (Kurz, 1997, p. 226) because it fails to address certain important issues (e.g., Dobash & Dobash, 1998; Kurz, 1997; Margolin, 1987; Yllo, 1988). In support of the CTS, Straus (1997) has refuted these criticisms and argued that the CTS has been used by many researchers throughout the world who affirm its validity. In fact, the authors of the CTS (Gelles & Straus, 1988) have admitted that the scale does have some limitations; however, they refer to the CTS as "the most widely used measure of family violence available" (Gelles & Straus, 1988, p. 211). While the CTS is fiercely debated among experts for a variety of reasons, areas of controversy include: 1)failure to distinguish among violent "tactics;" 2)failure to account for prevalence of injury; and 3)failure to consider motive or the context of the violence (i.e., self-defense).

The first major criticism of the CTS is that it fails to distinguish among violent "tactics." More specifically, the CTS does not discriminate among different kinds of violent tactics and only presents a limited list of violent acts (threw something; pushed, grabbed, or shoved; slapped; kicked, bit, hit; hit or tried to hit with something; beat-up; choked; burned or scalded; forced sex; threatened with knife or gun; used knife or gun)(Kurz, 1997). As a

result, the list may be confusing because the "tactics" provided are too general (Dobash & Dobash, 1979). For instance, the act of "throwing something at my partner" could mean throwing a pillow or throwing a vase. These two actions could be intended to have two different outcomes; however, the CTS does not differentiate between them. Second, violent acts such as biting, kicking, or hitting with a fist are considered equal whether perpetrated by a man or woman (Myers, 1995). Therefore, if a woman hits a man with her fist, that act would be equivalent with a man who hits a woman with his fist. Since there is a substantial difference in the physical size and strength of men and women, a man would undoubtedly cause greater harm to a woman. Also, researchers have argued that the CTS fails to account for additional forms of abuse such as sexual violence (Dobash & Dobash, 1998). Finally, focusing on only the "tallying" of acts obscures the existence of patterns of violence which may include psychological abuse, intimidation, sexual abuse and stalking (Dobash & Dobash, 1998; Frieze, 2000).

Another major criticism of the CTS is that it does not account for injury rates. The prevalence of injury in domestic violence disputes is a critical factor for feminist researchers in determining if women are equally as violent as men because previous studies have found that women are

more likely to be repeatedly abused, injured, or to die as a result of intimate partner violence (Koss, Goodman, Browne, Fitzgerald, Keita, & Russo, as cited in Hamberger & Lohr, 1997). The same data used to allege an equality of violence in couples also finds that women are much more likely to be injured during attacks by male partners (Archer, 2000) because men are more likely to use severe forms of aggression and engage in multiple violent actions during a single incident (Stets & Straus, 1990; Straus et al., 1980). In fact, when a man hits a woman it typically results in injury to the woman; however, when a woman hits a man it generally does not cause an injury and is often not taken seriously by the man (Saunders, 1988). Furthermore, when the CTS is readjusted to assess for injuries, the adjusted rate reveals assaults by men to be 6 times greater than the rates of assaults by women (Straus, 1997).

Feminist researchers argued that female injury rates have supported their claim that women are more often the victimized partner and less often the violent abuser (Kurz, 1997). Straus (1997) agreed that men are less likely to be injured than women in incidents of intimate violence. However, he contended that if an injury adjusted rate were adopted, 97% of the male-perpetrated non-injury assaults would be excluded from the data. As a result, NFVS annual estimates of severe assaults against women would be reduced from 1.8 million to 188,000.

Another criticism of the CTS is that it fails to capture the intent of the perpetrator (Flynn, 1990). Feminist researchers argue that when "tactics" are viewed in isolation, researchers are unable to capture the motivation for violence. For example, if a participant indicates on the CTS that they "pushed" their partner, there is no way of determining the reason why they pushed their partner. Thus, an intentional "push" to intimidate and control an individual is not distinguishable from a "push" in self-defense (DeKeseredy & Saunders, 1997). According to the CTS, both of these actions would be equivalent. However, if one partner uses a CTS "tactic" (e.g., push) in self-defense, or as a means to get away, can that be equated with an individual who uses the same "tactic" as a means of intentionally hurting their partner? Therefore, when the CTS is used in isolation, self-defense could be labeled as abuse!

Similarly, motivation has typically been ignored when assessing initiation of violence. Family violence researches have reported that women initiate violence as frequently, or more often than men (e.g., Straus, 1997). Evidence for this conclusion is based on data obtained from the NFVS which found that 53% of women reported that they initiated violence, while 42% of men reported striking first (Straus, 1997). Critics of this finding point out that data pertaining to initiation of violence usually relies on a

single question of which partner hit first (Kurz, 1997). According to feminist researchers, a single question regarding initiation of violence is not sufficient to capture meaning and intent of a first strike. For example, research has found that a woman may strike first if she fears that her partner is about to physically or sexually abuse her (Hamner & Saunders, as cited in Kurz, 1997). In fact, Gelles (Gelles & Straus, 1988) has suggested that a preemptive strike may be used as a means of protection. Therefore, for advocates of abused women, understanding the perpetrator's motivation for violence is critical. In order to understand feminist perspective of motivation, it is helpful to briefly examine their theoretical viewpoint.

From a feminist perspective, violence against women is rooted in a long history of patriarchal tradition which indoctrinates male power as a means of maintaining personal and social control of women (Barnett & LaViolette, 1993; Marin & Russo, 1999; Yllo, 1993). This includes patriarchal values which are passed down through the generations, perpetuated by societal structures, reinforced culturally, and then incorporated at the individual level. This type of violence is "goal-oriented" and maintains an imbalance of power within the relationship (Barnett & LaViolette, 1993).

Most professionals in the field of family violence refer to the issues of power and control as the primary motivating force for men's violence against women

(e.g. Barnett & LaViolette, 1993). The need for a man to demonstrate his power in the relationship could be the result of patriarchal traditions, personal insecurity, sexist needs, or dependency needs (Barnett & LaViolette, 1993). To maintain control he will use intimidation, threats, isolation, male privilege, physical violence or a combination of these tactics (Carden, 1994).

Gelles & Straus (1988) support the feminist position in their description of a "typical wife beater" (p. 88). This type of man struggles with status inconsistency as he tries to dominate his family by maintaining his "manly" role in the family, but has neither the economic or social resources to do so (Gelles & Straus, 1980). However, research has revealed that men of all economic, social, and racial backgrounds engage in violent behaviors in their families (Kurz, 1997). "For the person doing the controlling, the reward is not just control or power, but also self-esteem. Being in control, being master...increases one's self-worth" (Gelles & Straus, 1988, p. 34). Straus agreed that partner violence is used as a means of demonstrating power within the family; however, he contended that powerful family figures can include women (Schupe, Stacey, & Hazelwood, 1987; Straus, 1980).

In sum, feminist researchers reject the symmetry of violence theory. In support of their position, they argue

that the CTS, when used in isolation, may not reflect the realities of intimate partner violence. Furthermore, they fear that a misrepresentation of CTS data may result in the arrest of more women in domestic disputes and jeopardize funding to social programs and domestic violence organizations (Ferraro & Johnson, 1983).

In rebuttal, Straus asserts that the CTS was not designed to measure such thing as injuries, causes, and outcomes (Straus, 1997). However, family violence researchers acknowledge that their research has been used to provide testimony against battered women in court cases and to minimize the needs for shelters (Straus & Gelles, 1986). Nevertheless, they argue that this is less costly than the "denial and suppression" of female aggression (Straus & Gelles, 1986, p.471).

In 1996, Straus and his colleagues (Straus, Hamby, Boney-McCoy, & Sugarman, 1996) revised and expanded the CTS in their development of the CTS2. The first CTS contained 3 scales which were designed to measure reasoning, verbal agression, and physical violence within the family. The revised version includes five major scales: Negotiation, Psychological Aggression, Physical Assault, Sexual Coercion, and Physical Injury from Partner Assaults. However, while the CTS2 has been defined as a better measure than the

original CTS (Newton, Connelly, & Landsverk, 2001), the CTS2 still does not assess for motivations for violence.

Distinguishing Between Types of Violent Couples

The opinions presented above may lead a reader to conclude that feminist and family violence researchers are drawing different conclusions based on the same phenomenon of couple violence. However, M. Johnson (1995) offered an alternative to explain their seemingly dichotomous viewpoints. He proposed that feminist and family violence researchers were actually reporting on two separate and non-overlapping populations of violent relationships which he identified as common couple violence and patriarchal terrorism.

Johnson (1995) suggested that patriarchal terrorism was the focus of feminist researchers. This form of abuse addresses women's historically oppressed role in society and includes the more severe forms of intimate partner violence. Consequently, violent acts are more likely to be initiated and perpetrated by men. Within this population male perpetrators use a *pattern* of physical abuse to control, dominate, and even terrorize their female partners. In addition to the systematic use of violence, perpetrators utilize forms of intimidation, isolation, psychological abuse and economic subjugation as a means of exerting power and control over their partners (Pense & Paymar, 1993).

Violence within this relationship is typically frequent, severe, and results in more injuries to women than men.

On the other hand, Johnson (1995; Johnson & Ferraro, 2000) identified common couple violence as the work of the family violence researchers. He defined common couple violence as violence that occurs as the result of a *specific* incident or argument and not as part of a pattern of abuse and control. Instead, violence within this relationship is typically minor and is the result of occasional conflict that gets "out of hand." Therefore, a single act of a push, or an exchange of minor hits would not constitute a pattern of violence or qualify as patriarchal terrorism (Dobash & Dobash, 1998; O'Leary, 2000). Under these conditions violence may be initiated and perpetrated by either partner. Furthermore, unlike patriarchal terrorism, common couple violence is less likely to be frequent, less likely to escalate over time, and less likely to result in severe injuries.

In an attempt to explain the different research findings of feminist and family researchers, Johnson (1995) exposed the sampling bias that exists between the two groups of experts. He argues that gender difference *will* exist depending on whether one is looking at a clinical or researchers use large representative samples such as the NFVS which surveys the general population. These results

find that men and women are equally aggressive. However, it is a common belief that men who systematically abuse their partners will repeatedly deny or minimize the abuse and that the women in these relationships are typically afraid to disclose the abuse in fear of retaliation (Edleson & Brygger, 1986). Therefore, survey samples of the general population are less likely to include couples who engage in patterns of physical abuse as a means of power and control.

On the other hand, feminist researchers rely on clinical data from crime surveys, hospitals, and domestic violence organizations which find that women are more often the victim of an abusive partner. It is this subpopulation of individuals that are exposed to more severe and systematic forms of abuse and require higher levels of service and intervention. Therefore, it is not surprising that shelter populations are unlikely to include individuals who experience common couple violence, because individuals who engage in situational violence are less likely to require or seek out the services of a shelter (Johnson, 1995).

Johnson & Ferraro (2000) expanded on the distinctions among types of violent relationships. The expanded categories included: 1)common couple violence (situational violence); 2) intimate terrorism (pattern of violence to control partner); 3) violent resistance (self-defense); and

4)mutual violent control (both partners are violent). Johnson's definition of common couple violence did not change from the original conceptualization (see Johnson, 1995). However, the term patriarchal terrorism was replaced by intimate terrorism. Intimate terrorism was characterized similarly to patriarchal terrorism: a *pattern* of violent and nonviolent behaviors that include more violent incidents, are more likely to escalate, are less likely to be mutual, and more likely to involve serious injury. However, intimate terrorism suggests that the violence can be inflicted by either a man or woman. Common couple violence and patriarchal (intimate) terrorism are the two types of violent relationships that are discussed in this study.

Like Johnson (1995), O'Leary (2000) suggested that much of the disagreement that exists regarding the gender symmetry of violence is due to the failure of the researchers to clearly distinguish between different types of populations and different types of violence. As an example, O'Leary (2000) argued that Archer's (2000) metaanalysis, which concluded that women are as aggressive or more aggressive than men, failed to adequately differentiate survey populations. Of the 82 studies included in Archer's review, only 2 of the studies used shelter populations and only 7 studies consisted of couples that were referred to treatment programs. When examined in

isolation, these 9 studies found that violence was very high in the male direction and women were much less aggressive than their husbands. O'Leary (2000) cautioned that the failure of researchers to limit their conclusions to sample populations may result in faulty generalizations that could have significant impact on social programs and services. Therefore, it is critical for researchers to acknowledge that representative samples are not reflective of shelter populations and clinical data are not representative of the general population.

According to Johnson (1995; Johnson & Ferraro, 2000), intimate partner violence cannot be understood without acknowledging the important distinction among types of partner violence. Couples who engage in minor, or situational forms of violence must be distinguished from those who are involved in a pattern of more severe behavior. One way to distinguish between common couple violence and patriarchal terrorism is to examine the motivation for violence (Johnson, 1995). Therefore, Johnson (1995) concluded, if we are truly to understand the nature of intimate partner violence, we must move beyond the symmetry of violence debate and investigate the motives behind partner violence.

Expressive Versus Instrumental Violence

There are a series of theories that have been explored as a means of understanding the function of violence within intimate relationships. Common theoretical approaches have included individual pathology (e.g., biological, personality traits, alcoholism), societal influence (e.g., cultural norms, sex-role socialization, socioeconomic status), and learned behaviors (e.g., via observation and reinforcement within the family, society, and relationships) as etiologies of relationship violence. Additionally, theorists have examined the use of violence for instrumental or expressive purposes. In fact, both feminist and family violence researchers have conceptualized motivation for partner violence as an *expression* of inner tension and as an *instrumental* power strategy.

In accordance with the frustration-aggression models proposed by Freud (1915) and Lorenz (1966), O"Neil (1998) defined expressive violence as "violent acts which are driven from impulsive forces that are used as ends in themselves...and usually cause injury and pain to the source of the distress" (O'Neill, 1998, p. 463). Sometimes characterized as an anger management problem, this form of violence is perceived to be an expression of stress and tension and is seen as a medium through which energy is dissipated. Expressive violence is viewed as impulsive in nature and characterized by familiar metaphors such as

"Flew into a rage and just lost control," "Under a lot of pressure," "She really upsets him," "Temper problem," "or "I just couldn't take it anymore" (O'Neill, 1998, p. 465).

In contrast, "*instrumental violence* is defined as a means to an end" (O'Neill, 1998, p. 465). In this context violence is functional and purposeful. While instrumental violence may also be used to resolve conflicts and remove stressors, it is an intentional act that is predominately used to get one's way, assert dominance, gain power over people, punish or avoid losing face in a conflict, win peer approval or enhance the perpetrator's self-worth (O'Neill, 1998). In addition, a perpetrator may inflict pain or injury as a punishment to persuade another person to either carry out an act or refrain from an act. Individuals engaging in instrumental violence have been found to be fully conscious and in control of their behavior (Ptacek, 1988). Instrumental violence has been described as "I was trying to make a point...getting her/him to listen," "I couldn't back down," "She/He had been warned," "A man's home is his castle," "I had to teach her/him a lesson," and "Might is right," (O'Neill, 1998, p. 467).

Relationship experts have suggested that while women tend to engage in forms of expressive violence (Emery et al., as cited in Kurz, 1997), it is more common for men to engage in instrumental violence (e.g., Campbell, 1993). From a feminist perspective, instrumental violence serves to

create and maintain male dominance and power which is supported by the social system at large. Men who abuse their partners physically and sexually are trying to exercise complete domination to feel more powerful and secure (DeMaris & Swinford, 1996). In contrast to men's violence, women's violence has been found to be used for expressive purposes: to release frustration or express their anger for being emotionally or physically assaulted (Jacobsen, Gottman, Waltz, Rushe, Babock, & Holtzworth-Monroe, 1994).

Motivation for Women's use of Violence

Unfortunately, there are few studies which help professionals to understand why women use violence against their partners, specifically in contexts where the expectable results would be far more detrimental to women (i.e., patriarchal terrorism). Historically, research has found that women who are exposed to very severe abuse by their partners generally do not fight back, simply out of fear of their partner's reaction (DeMaris & Swinford, 1996). Instead, women attempt to alter their own behavior to avoid further conflict and abuse.

Interviews with abused women (N = 109) residing in a domestic violence shelter revealed that once an argument had begun the women used various techniques and strategies to attempt to resolve the problem (Dobash & Dobash, 1984). In

an attempt to avert violence, women would withdraw (14% first incident; 17% worst incident; and 26% last incident), try to reason (33% first; 29% worst; 25% last), or argue (16% first; 17% worst; 28% last). When physical responses were used they included trying to push partner away (8%); trying to protect oneself with something (8%); and hitting back (10%). During a typical assault, 2% of the women almost always hit back; 24% hit back sometimes; and 74% seldom or never hit back. Most women continued through the attack to try to appease their male partners or stop the violence in some way.

If research indicates that most women who are exposed to repeated and/or severe abuse rarely initiate or retaliate by physically assaulting their partners, then what is the motivation for these women when they do use force against their partners? Previous research has provided some answers to this question. For example, some women claimed to have used violence because they had become angered by their husband's assaultive behavior or because of the injustice of the attack (Hamberger & Lohr, 1997; Dobash & Dobash, 1984). Other women engaged in violent behaviors because they believed the act of hitting might end (Dobash & Dobash, 1984) or prevent their partner's attacks (Saunders, 1989). However, most research indicates that when women use violence in their intimate relationships it is in self-defense. For example, some women used violence as a means of

escaping, or breaking away from a partner's grasp (Hamberger & Lohr, 1997; Flynn, 1990; Saunders, 1986; Cascardi & Vivian, 1995; Makepeace, 1986). Additionally, L. Walker's (1984) work with abused women found that some women actually would initiate an attack when they "sensed impending violence in order to alleviate the overwhelming build-up of tension in their partner or in fear of being beaten or raped" (DeKeseredy & Saunders, 1997, p. 11). In fact, many researchers have stated that women's aggression in the context of an abusive relationship is "...seen as a survival response - a response to circumstances, not a manifestation of personal pathology" (White & Kowalski, 1994, p. 400).

Saunders (1988) conducted an exploratory study with 52 abused women who were successively admitted to shelters or counseling agencies. Each woman completed the CTS along with two identical sets of questions pertaining to motivation. One set followed three relatively nonsevere forms of violence (threw something; pushed, grabbed, or shoved; and, slapped) and the other followed the items reflecting more severe forms of violence (kicked, bit, or hit with a fist, or used a knife or a gun). The questions were: 1)What percentage of these times do you estimate that you acted in self-defense, that is, protecting yourself from immediate physical harm?" 2)"What percentage of these times were you trying to fight back?" and 3)"What percentage of these times

did you assault your partner before he actually attacked you or threatened you with a weapon?" After each question there was a line with 0% to 100% at either end and percentage points spaced equally and numbered by 10s.

Results found that 75% of the participants engaged in some form of nonsevere violence and 50% to 60% of the women engaged in some form of severe violence. About 30% of the women who were violent said that all of their nonsevere violence was in self-defense; another 23% described all their violence as "fighting back". Approximately 40% of the women who used severe violence reported that all of this violence was in self-defense, another third of the women said that all of their severe violence was "fighting back." Interestingly, only a few women reported that they ever initiated an attack (3% severe and 11 % nonsevere).

It is important to note that previous research has revealed that women may not differentiate between self-defense and "fighting back" (e.g. Saunders, 1986); therefore, the author hypothesized that results would show a positive relationships between these two concepts. In fact, for both severe and non severe violence, results revealed a positive relationship between self defense and "fighting-back." Saunders (1988) hypothesized that women may not distinguish between self-defense and "fighting back" because women are frequently taught to "fight back" (e.g., inflict

pain) in the event they need to defend themselves in an attack (e.g., sexual assault); therefore, these two concepts may be very similar to women.

In a similar study, DeKeseredy & Saunders (1997) questioned 1,835 female Canadian college students regarding their motivation for violence within their dating relationships. Using a slightly modified version of the CTS, authors listed 9 items which were divided into two sets: "non-severe" (minor) acts of violence and "severe" acts of violence. After each set of items, participants were asked what percentage of the time they used violence as a means of either self-defense (protecting self from harm), "fighting-back," or had initiated violence before they were attacked by their partner. After each question there was a line with 0% to 100% at either end and percentage points spaced equally and numbered by 10s.

The majority of women in this study did not report using violence. Still, the authors reported that a substantial number of women reported self-defense (minor: 38%; severe: 44%) and "fighting-back" (minor: 46%; severe: 51%) as motives for the use of violence. Additionally, 37% of women (n = 663) reported initiating minor forms of violence and 43% (n = 359) reported initiating severe forms of violence. These percentages are higher than those reported in the previous study (3% severe and 11%

nonsevere). However, these variances may be an example of the differences between surveying a dating population (common couple violence) and a shelter population (patriarchal terrorism).

As found in the previous study, the concepts of self-defense and "fighting-back" were significantly correlated. In addition, the authors found a linear relationship between women's use of self-defense and victimization. Simply stated, the higher the level of women's victimization (e.g., having sexual intercourse because of threats, or exposure to multiple types of abuse), the higher the use of self-defense. For example, when the authors considered only those women who claimed to use self-defense 100% of the time (non-severe, n = 47; severe, n = 31), they found very high rates of victimization: approximately 75% had been threatened and 85% had been pushed, grabbed, or shoved. In addition, over half of the women who used severe violence to defend themselves had been choked, kicked, or hit with a fist and 25% had been threatened with a weapon. Interestingly, many women did not choose either of the motives that were included in this study. The authors hypothesized that there must be other reasons why women engage in violence against their partner. Thus, it is important to consider other possible motivations for partner violence.

Barnett & Cheok (1997) conducted a study comparing 34 men arrested for spousal abuse and 30 women who were utilizing the services of a battered women's shelter. In an attempt to understand the nature of interpartner aggression by moving beyond the itemized list of acts contained in the CTS, these researchers considered an expanded list of attributions for partner aggression. Each participant completed the Relationship Abuse Questionnaire (RAQ) which is a modified version of the CTS and was developed by the authors. After each of the 28 forms-of-abuse (subscales: verbal-4; psychological-7; threats-6; physical-10), participants were given nine attributions for abuse which were: 1)You were teasing your partner, just playing around; 2) You were letting out your violent feelings; 3) You were teaching your partner a lesson; 4)You were trying to upset your partner emotionally; 5)You were showing your partner who is the boss; 6)You were protecting yourself from physical harm; 7) You were trying to get your partner's attention; 8)You were unaware of any particular intention; and 9)You were trying to hurt your partner physically. Participants recorded their answers on an a scale with choices ranging from 1 = never to 7 = more than once a week.

The total frequency of physical abuse scores did not produce significant result across the four categories of

abuse for gender. Therefore, men and women reported engaging in similar levels of violent acts. However, women significantly reported "punching the other" and "kicking the other" more often than men. The authors hypothesized that these results could be due to women's use of self-defense, the possibility that women would be more likely to engage in "kicking" or "punching" behaviors than men, or men's tendency to underreport.

Results for men and women did not differ significantly in several motivations for abuse: letting out violent feelings, getting the other person's attention, teaching the other a lesson, (i.e., revenge), just teasing the other (i.e., just playing around), and trying to emotionally upset the other. However, results found that all attributions for abuse were lower for the women than the men, except in the case of protection of self.

Further analyses found that men were significantly more likely than women to report that they used violence to "show who was the boss," and that they were "unaware of their intentions." The authors hypothesized that men's admission to the use of abuse to control their partners supported the finding that male violence is typically goal-oriented and is used an attempt to control, intimidate, and dominate their partner. Even more significant in comparison, was that men were much more likely than women to report that they were "unaware of their intentions" when they engaged in abusive

behavior. The authors suggested that this finding may support the concept that batterers who engage in repeated abuse may eventually become unaware of the intent of their violence because the actions become automatic.

Conversely, women were significantly more likely to report protection of self. As a result of their findings, the authors concluded that women exposed to severe patterns of physical abuse will reciprocate with violence. The authors hypothesized that due to a high level of fear of the abusive partner, women are placed in a situation of fight or flight. Citing previous research, the authors argued that abused women generally are unable to escape and, therefore, are in a situation in which they must decide to fight or submit.

Women's Perception of their Partner's Motivation for Violence

Many relationship experts believe that the function of male violence is to intimidate, dominate and control women (Hamberger, as cited in Jacobsen et al., 1994). However, there are relatively few studies which focus on the *woman's perception* of her partner's violence. Perception is important because researchers have learned that as the woman's perception changes, it may encourage her to leave an abusive relationship. In fact, women who have successfully left abusive partners cite the importance of learning about

themselves, the truth of their victimization, and the perpetrator's responsibility for the violence (Ulrich, as cited in Short, 2000; Ferraro & Johnson, 1983). Therefore, investigating women's perception of their partners' violence is a critical component of understanding intimate partner violence, as well as helping women leave violent relationships.

Eisikovits (1999) conducted in-depth interviews with 25 women who were living with abusive partners. Interviews focused on the women's perceptions of the violent events that occurred in their relationships. Findings were based on the metaphors that the women used to describe the violent events. Central to the women's description of violence was the element of "control."

The women identified their male partners as being in a constant "heroic struggle" for self-control ("...anger bursts out like a volcano," "He loses his way," "accident," "...state of craziness."). The women revealed that once the man loses control there is nothing the women can do to stop it. Additionally, women perceived violence as unpredictable and beyond the man's control ("[The anger] caught us by surprise...you can never understand why these things happen," "There must be a fight to make the tension explode."). Still, other women consider their partners to be "strangers" during violent events ("He loses control and becomes a stranger...I see something in his eyes, something

different and scary...an expression on his face that is unfamiliar," "It's not really him, I know how good he is...deep inside he doesn't think about what he is doing"). Based on these remarks the author concluded that the women see a "split" in their partner: the uncontrollable violent man and the "good" man she lives with. Eisikovits proposed that the women attempt to distance themselves from their partners "uncontrollable violent side," thereby giving them a sense of control over the violent events.

Eisikovits also found that women's perception of their partner's attempt at self-control was related to an attempt by the women to maintain their own self-control in an effort to stop the violence ("I know he is going to lose control...I try to be quiet...locking myself totally away. At these moments I am frightened. I tell myself, 'Get it out nicely'...I am like a pressure-cooker about to explode...I have no control over my mouth...I can bring on real stormy fights."). The women also see physical force as gender-related ("Men have no real control over themselves ...women can talk them into craziness."). However, women also reported that their partner's provoked them and deliberately tried to get them to lose control ("He makes me get to that point...to lose control...to be helpless...I swore I wouldn't let him provoke me and lose control with his violence."). The author hypothesized that as the women attempt to strengthen their own self-control and create a

sense of power, they are increasing their ability to survive in a situation that would otherwise be unbearable.

Eisikovits proposed that the women in this study were most likely in a precontemplative stage. During this stage, women tend to deny the problem, accept the batterers' definition of responsibility and refuse outside help. The precontemplative stage may also explain why some women mistake an abuser's attempt to isolate her from her support system as a sign of his love for her (Lloyd, 2000). Conversely, when women enter into the contemplative stage they begin to seek outside support, because they recognize that violence is unacceptable and that they are not responsible for it. The women interviewed in this study did not yet reach the contemplative position.

Follingstad & Wright (1991) conducted a study which investigated the sex differences in motivations for dating violence. In the total sample of 495 college students (207 males and 288 females), 115 participants (33 males and 82 females) reported being a victim of dating violence. Using the Motivation and Effects Questionnaire (MEQ), each of these respondents was asked to check off each of 13 possible motivations for their partner's use of violence against them. Motivations for abuse included: 1)to show anger; 2)inability to express self verbally; 3)to feel more powerful; 4)to get control over the other person; 5)in

retaliation for being hit first; 6)to protect self; 7)in retaliation for emotional hurt; 8)anger displaced onto partner; 9)punish person for wrong behavior; 10)prove love; 11)because it was sexually arousing; 12)to get attention; and 13) jealousy. Next, participants were asked to check the one motive they believed was the strongest reason for their partner's motivation for violence.

Results indicated that female students were more likely than male students to report that their partner's motivation for violence was an attempt to get control over them and in retaliation for being hit first. However, female students also reported using violence as a means of control. These latter findings are not typically found to be the motivation for male and female violence. However, this difference may be the result of the contrast between dating violence (common couple violence) and a pattern of abuse (patriarchal/intimate terrorism). Unfortunately, this study did not differentiate between occasional violence and a pattern of violence.

Since there are few studies which have investigated women's perception of their partner's motivation for violence, it is helpful to consider men's explanation for partner violence. When abusive men describe their motivation for violence against their partners, they often claim maintaining dominance and control as their primary motivators (Cascardi & Vivian, 1995; Hamberger, Lohr &

Bonge, 1994; & Ptacek, 1988). This is the result of what the men believe to be a function of male privilege. Male perpetrators have also described their use of violence as a release of anger (Henton, Cate, Koval, Lloyd, & Christopher, 1983), or as a loss of control resulting from substance abuse ("blackening out") or severe tension (Ptacek, 1988). Additionally, research has found that men are most likely to become physically violent when the partner is perceived as questioning their authority, challenging their behavior, or when asserting herself in some way (Campbell, 1993; Dobash & Dobash, 1984). Thus, male violence seems to center around issues of power and control: dominance, coercion, control of physical/verbal behavior, and punishment of unwanted behavior. Unlike female perpetrators, factors related to self-defense, escape, and retaliation are not often reported as motivations for male violence (Hamberger et al., 1997).

In a small sample of 18 batterers, Ptacek (1988) separated the men's self-reports for violence into two categories: excuses and justifications. Excuses for violence included the denial of responsibility for violence and victim-blaming. For example, men deny responsibility by claiming they were provoked either physically ("She hit me, it hurt...I slapped, kicked, punched, knocked her down, and let her have it"), or verbally (44%) ("Women can really verbally abuse you. They can rip your clothes off without even touching you. [I]resorted to violence, I had to get

through her words"). "The provocation argument implies that [verbal abuse is equivalent to physical force] and that there is a proper way a wife can address her husband that the husband is empowered to maintain" (Ptacek, 1988, p. 145). In addition, 67% of the men reported a loss of control due to a build-up of frustration ("Can't tolerate it anymore"), while 56% report being beyond rational control ("...outburst of rage").

On the other hand, justifications are considered denials of wrongdoing: denial of injuries and failure to fulfill obligations of a wife. Forty-four percent of the men denied or minimized their partner's injuries ("She bruises easily"). In addition, 78% of the men justified their abuse of their partners when the women failed to fulfill her "wifely" obligations such as cooking, availability of sex, deferential treatment, not knowing when to be silent, and not being faithful.

Ptacek (1988) argued that while men excused and justified their abusive actions, their own verbal accounts demonstrated that their use of violence was deliberate and was intended to intimidate and frighten their partners. "The hostile manner in which these men terrorized their wives suggests a deliberate strategy to control behavior directed at achieving or maintaining dominance and as ways of obscuring the benefits that the violence provides" (Ptacek, 1988, p. 151).

While a majority of intimate partner violence research has focused on exploring which gender is more aggressive, an obvious limitation in the data is a clear understanding of what motivates individuals to use violence within their intimate relationships (Gordon, 2000; Johnson, 1995; Browne, 1993; Dobash, Dobash, Wilson, & Daly, 1992; Flynn, 1990; Saunders, 1988). As illustrated by researchers such as Johnson (1995) and O'Leary (2000), it is difficult to comment on whether one gender is more aggressive than the other, because previous research has often generalized findings from one population (e.g., general population) to another (e.g., abused women). Unfortunately, such conclusions may result in inappropriate generalizations and prevent researchers from developing a deeper understanding of the nature of intimate partner violence.

Additionally, a majority of the intimate partner violence research has been based on an overwhelming reliance on the CTS. As previously noted, the CTS was designed to simply tally the number of aggressive acts perpetrated by an individual. Some researchers have argued that the mere counting of acts does not provide a clear picture of which gender is more violent. While there are no superior alternatives to the CTS, several researchers have acknowledged its limitations and included questions about motivation to supplement CTS items (e.g., Barnett & Cheok,

1997; Bookwala et al., 1992; Follingstead & Wright, 1991; Makepeace, 1986).

Due to limited research, it is difficult to identify why women use violence within their intimate relationships, particularly in abusive relationships where the outcomes could be severe for the women (e.g., injury). Some studies found that women typically attempt to avoid or withdraw from partner violence (DeMaris & Swinford, 1996). Other studies found that women used violence when they become angered by their husband's assaultive behavior or because of the injustice of an attack (e.g., Hamberger & Lohr, 1997). These motivations for abuse are often characterized as expressive forms of violence. However, researchers have overwhelmingly reported that women use violence as a means of self-defense or "fighting-back" (e.g. Saunders, 1986). Still, it is important to note that Saunders (1988) found that a number of women in a dating sample did not choose either self-defense or fighting-back as motives for violence, thus suggesting the need for an extended list of motivations. Barnett & Cheok (1997) have provided a list of expanded items in their development of the Relationship Abuse Questionnaire (RAQ). The RAQ is a relatively new measurement tool; therefore, further investigation is necessary.

Another area of intimate partner violence that requires further investigation is a woman's perception of her partner's motivation for violence. As previously stated,

perception is important because researchers have learned that as the woman's perception changes, it may encourage her to leave an abusive relationship. A review of the literature reveals that both men and women overwhelmingly report that men use violence in their intimate relationships as a means to control, dominate, and intimidate women (e.g. Follingstad, 1991). Each of these motivations for abuse is considered goal-oriented and are characterized as instrumental forms of violence. Additionally, researchers acknowledge that unlike women, men rarely report their violence as means of self-defense.

This study was designed to determine the extent to which women will characterize their violence, as well as their partner's violence, in terms of expressive violence, instrumental violence, or self-defense. Participants will include women attending peer-support groups organized by domestic violence agencies.

Hypotheses

Therefore, our hypotheses are as follows:

1. Women will be more likely to report their motivation for violence as self defense than expressive, and more likely to report their violence as expressive than instrumental. In addition, women will be more likely to report their partner's use of violence as instrumental

than expressive, and more likely to report their partner's violence as expressive than as self-defense.

2. Women will be more likely to report that their partner's violence is more instrumental than their own violence. In addition, women will be more likely to report that their violence is for self-defense than their partner's. No differences expected to be found for men and women's use of expressive violence.

3. Although not the main purpose of this paper, comparisons will be conducted between the participants' report on their behavior and on their partner's behavior for each of the thirteen forms of specific violent acts.

Finally, though not stated as a one of our hypotheses, we will examine the differences in motivation between the participants who are still with the abusive partner and those who are no longer with their partner. This examination is dependent on whether we receive enough responses from both groups.

CHAPTER TWO

METHODOLOGY

Design

A 2x3 factorial within-subjects design was used to test the proposed hypotheses. The design consisted of two independent variables (IV): 1) source of abusive behavior, and 2) type of motivation for intimate partner violence. The first IV has two levels (self and partner) and the second IV has three levels (self-defense, expressive, and instrumental motives). The dependent variable was the degree that the abusive behaviors are characterized as self-defense, expressive, or instrumental motivations for violence for partner or self.

Participants

Thirty-four female participants were recruited from four Southern California domestic violence agencies. More specifically, participants included women attending peer support groups and outreach programs. Group attendees included women from the general community and shelter residents. All participants identified themselves as having been involved in an abusive relationship and all partners were identified as men. A total of 41 women participated in the study; however, 7 surveys were excluded due to incompleteness.

Demographic data collected from the women indicated that there were 11 (32.4%) Hispanic, 10 (29.4%) Caucasian, 9 (26.5%) African-American, and 1 (2.9%) Asian participant. Two (6.1%) participants identified themselves as from a different ethnic group. Participants' ages ranged from 19 to 47, with a mean age of 32 years (SD = 7.96). Twelve (45%) participants were high school graduates, 2 did not complete high school (5.9), 13 had attended some college (38.2%), and 2 had received either an associates (5.9) or bachelors degree (5.9). Twenty-five participants reported being unemployed (73%) while nine reported being employed (26.5%). The mean length of employment was 2.7 years (SD = 2.1; range minimum 2 weeks to maximum 6 years). The mean yearly income reported was $26,000 (SD = 29717.09; range 0 to $108,000).

All of the participants reported that they were not currently living with their abusive partner. The minimum amount of time the women reported staying in their abusive relationships was 2 months and the maximum was 28 years (M = 8 years, SD = 6.3). More than half of the women (n = 20) reported that they were currently residing in a shelter. The minimum amount of time spent at the shelter was 2 days and maximum time was one year (M = 94 days, SD = 125.12). Eighty-five percent of the women reported having 3 or less children, while the remaining 15% of the women reported having four to six children.

Measures

The instruments used were as follows: an informed consent form (See Appendix A), a demographic sheet (See Appendix B), a modified version of the Relationship Abuse Questionnaire (RAQ)(Barnett, 1989)(See Appendix C), and a debriefing statement (See Appendix D).

Demographic Sheet

The demographic sheet (See Appendix B) contained the following information: age, ethnicity, education, employment, length of time with current employer, yearly income, sex of partner, current status of abusive relationship; length of time in abusive relationship, currently living with abusive partner; shelter residence; time at shelter; and number of children.

Relationship Abuse Questionnaire (RAQ)

The Relationship Abuse Questionnaire (RAQ: Barnett, 1989)(See Appendix C) is a 28-item questionnaire which is a modification of the CTS (Straus, 1979). The CTS measures acts of physical violence. The RAQ consists of four subscales; however, only a modified version of the Physical Subscale items was used for the purposes of this study. The twelve physical abuse items included were: threw something that could hurt; twisted partner's arm or hair; pushed or shoved; grabbed; slapped; used a knife or gun; punched or

hit with something that could hurt; choked; slammed against a wall; beat-up; burned or scalded on purpose; and kicked. A major criticism of the original CTS was that the Physical Abuse Scale failed to include an item on sexual violence (Dobash, et al., 1998; Frieze, 2000; Weisz & Tolman, 2000). However, the CTS2 (Straus, et al., 1996) does examine sexual coercion and the consequential physical injuries. Therefore, an additional item of forced sex was added. There was a total of thirteen physical abuse items included. Barnett and Cheok (1997) found that the CTS Violence subscale correlated positively and significantly with the RAQ physical subscale ($r = .65$, $p < .01$) for battered women's group.

Participants were asked to respond either "Yes" or "No" to each form-of-abuse question. For example, participants were asked to respond either "Yes" or "No" to the question: "Has your partner ever thrown something at you that could hurt?" A "Yes" response was scored as a "1" and a "No" response was scored as a "0". If a participant answered "No" then they were instructed to move on to the next form-of-abuse question; however, if they answered "Yes" they were instructed to respond to the attributions-for-abuse questions.

In contrast to the CTS, which does not measure the motivation for violence, the RAQ includes a series of nine

attributions-for-abuse questions. Attributions were slightly modified to more accurately reflect the purpose of this study which was to investigate the extent to which women characterize their violence, as well as the violence of their partners, in terms of expressive violence, instrumental violence, or self-defense. Therefore, the attributions-for-abuse were developed to be consistent with our understanding of expressive and instrumental forms of violence (see O'Neill, 1998).

The nine attributions-for-abuse questions followed each of the 13 CTS forms-of-abuse items. Motivations for abuse included: retaliation for being physically hurt; retaliation for being emotionally hurt; to prevent further harm; to teach a lesson; in self defense, to protect myself or others; to let out violent feelings; to show who is boss; to fight back; to get control over the other person. Additionally, each motivation for abuse was characterized as expressive, instrumental, or self-defense. The expressive set included: retaliation for being physically hurt; retaliation for being emotionally hurt; and to let out violence. The instrumental set included: to show who is boss; to teach a lesson; and to get control over the other person. Finally, the self-defense set included: to prevent further harm; the act of self-defense, to protect myself or others; and to fight back. The response scale was modified

to more adequately assess the motivation for violence. The scale ranged from 1 = strongly disagree to 6 = strongly agree.

For each specific form of abuse, a score for expressive, instrumental, and self-defense was calculated. The score for expressive violence was obtained by averaging the ratings of the three expressive attributions; the score for instrumental violence was obtained by averaging the ratings of the three instrumental attributions; and the score for self-defense was obtained by averaging the ratings of the three self-defense attributions. Then each of the three sets, expressive, instrumental, and self-defense was averaged across items with a "Yes" response. These final expressive, instrumental, and self-defense scores constituted the raw scores for further analyses (See Appendix E).[1]

In an attempt to control for sequencing effects, questionnaires were organized in two different formats so that half of the participants received each order of the scale. More specifically, half of the participants were first asked to answer abuse and attribution questions on their own use of violence and then using the same 13 forms of abuse and nine attributions for abuse, these participants were asked to report on their perception of their partner's motivation for violence. In the second format, participants

were first asked to report on the perception of their partner's motivation for violence and then on their own use of violence.

Procedure

Female participants were recruited from four peer support groups and outreach programs offered by Southern California domestic violence organizations. Participants who were attending peer group sessions were introduced to the study and offered the opportunity to complete a questionnaire by the group leader. For those attendees who chose to participate in the study, they were instructed to complete the questionnaire and return it to the group leader. Participants were also recruited from a variety of outreach programs that were offered by the domestic violence agencies. Those who agreed to participate completed the questionnaires and returned them to the appropriate program directors.

Analyses

The following statistical analyses were performed to test the proposed hypotheses. Mean scores were calculated for the average of abuser's (self and partner) motivation for violence in terms of self-defense, expressive, and instrumental motives. Repeated measures ANOVA and paired t-tests were used to test the first and second hypotheses.

Frequency scores and percentages were calculated for the thirteen forms of specific violent acts that participants reported on their behavior and their partners behavior. Chi-squares analyses were used to test the difference in frequency of each behavior as reported for the self compared to the partner. A significance level of $p = .01$ was used for all analyses.

CHAPTER THREE

RESULTS

Reliability of Items

Reliability analyses were conducted for internal consistency on the three items that comprised each of the three sets of motivations. Specifically, analyses were conducted to determine the internal consistency of items for the expressive scale (in retaliation for being physically hurt; in retaliation for being emotionally hurt; and to let out violent feelings), instrumental scale (to teach a lesson; to show who is boss; and to get control over), and self-defense scale (to prevent further harm; in self-defense; and to fight back). Analyses were conducted for both women's self-reports and their reports on their partners.

In terms of women's self-reports, internal consistency was found for the expressive items (alpha = .97), for the instrumental items (alpha = .88), and for self-defense items (alpha = .97). Internal consistency was also found for two of the sets for partner violence: instrumental items (alpha = .88) and self-defense items (alpha = .82). However, expressive items resulted in a alpha of .58. Further examination found that the item "to let out violent feelings" decreased the reliability. In fact, when this item

was removed from the expressive set, the alpha coefficient was .65.

To further explore this issue, correlations were calculated for the following items: to teach you a lesson; to let out violent feelings; to show you who is boss; and to control you. Results indicated a significant relationship between the item "to let out violent feelings" and each of the other three items from the instrumntal set at the .01 level. Reliability analysis was calculated for the four items. Results found internal consistency for these four items (alpha = .97). Therefore, the item "to let out violent feelings" was more highly correlated with the instrumental set than the expressive set. However, to maintain the comparability for self and partner, the item "to let out violent feelings" remained in the expressive set.

Motivation for Abuse

Repeated measures ANOVA found no significant main effect for abuser (self and partner) $F(1,28) = .121$, $p > .05$. In addition, no significant main effect was found for motivation (self-defense, expressive, instrumental) $F(2,56) = 1.73$, $p > .05$. However, a significant interaction was found between abuser and motivation $F(2,56) = 79.58$, $p < .01$. The effect size (partial eta squared) for the interaction was .74, power = 1.00.

Table 1 lists the means for the motivation for violence based on women's self-reports of violence for self and partner. Paired t-tests were calculated to compare the averages for the 3 sets of motivations for abuse (self-defense, expressive, and instrumental) by abuser (self or partner). Women were significantly more likely to report their own violence as self-defense than expressive $t(28) = 4.17$, $p < .01$; as self-defense than instrumental $t(28) = 10.40$, $p < = .01$; and as expressive than instrumental $t(28) = 5.81$, $p < .01$. As indicated in Table 1, self-defense scores were significantly higher than expressive scores, and expressive scores were significantly higher than instrumental scores. In addition, women were significantly more likely to report their partner's violence as expressive than self-defense $t(33) = 7.65$, $p < .01$; as instrumental than self-defense $t(33) = 9.82$ $p < .01$; and as instrumental than expressive $t(33) = 6.58 = p < .01$. As indicated in Table 1, instrumental scores were significantly higher than expressive scores, and expressive scores were significantly higher than self-defense.

Table 1. Motivation for Violence by Self-Reports and Reports on Partner's Violence

Motivation	Self		Partner	
	M	SD	M	SD
Self-Defense	13.43	3.34	5.31	3.66
Expressive	10.79	4.16	9.55	3.71
Instrumental	5.82	2.56	14.51	4.64

Paired t-tests were calculated to test the second hypothesis (see Table 1). Women were significantly more likely to report the motivation for their partner's violence as instrumental than their own, $t(27) = 7.96$, $p < .01$. In addition, women were significantly more likely to report that their own motivation for violence was for self-defense than their partner's, $t(27) = 9.09$, $p < .01$. Furthermore, there was no significant difference between the women's use of expressive violence and their partners' use of expressive violence, $t(27) = 1.22$, $p > .01$. In summary, perceptions of partner's use of instrumental were significantly higher than women's self-report of instrumental; women's self-report of self-defense was significantly higher than perception of partner's use of self-defense; and no significant difference

between perceptions of partner's use of expressive violence and women's use of expressive violence.

Due to the unexpected findings within the expressive sets for self and partner regarding the item "to let out violent feelings," additional paired t-tests were calculated. For this set of tests we removed the item "to let out violent feelings" from the expressive set and compared the scores for both self and partner using only the following two items: 1) in retaliation for being physically hurt; and 2) in retaliation for being emotionally hurt. Results indicated that women were significantly more likely to report that their own motivation for violence was for expressive purposes ($M = 8.07$; $SD = 3.52$) than their partner's ($M = 4.50$; $SD = 3.15$), $t(27) = 3.75$, $p < .01$. Therefore, when comparing only these two forms of expressive motivations for violence, women were significantly more likely to report their motivation for violence as expressive than they reported their partner's motivation for violence.

Frequency of Abuse

Frequency of abuse characteristics are presented in Table 2. The most common forms of violence used against the women included the following: 91% of women reported being pushed/shoved, 91% were grabbed, and 85% were slapped by their partner. The majority of women reported that the more severe forms of violence had been used against them.

Sixty-eight percent of women reported that their partner had beat them, another 68% had been choked by their partner, and 50% had a knife/gun used against them. Additionally, 53% of women reported having been forced to have sex with their partner.

In contrast, women reported engaging in milder forms of abuse. Fifty-six percent of women reported that they threw something at their partner 53% of women reported that they had pushed/shoved their partner, and 32% of women reported punching their partner. None of the women reported using a knife/gun against their partner, burning/scalding their partner, or forcing sex on their partner.

Table 2. Frequency and Percentages of Forms of Abuse by Abuser

	Abuser						
	Woman			Partner			
Forms of abuse	Yes[a]	No	%	Yes[a]	No	%	χ2
Threw something at partner	19	15	55.9	23	11	67.6	1.00
Twisted partner's arm or hair	5	29	14.7	26	8	76.5	26.14
Pushed or shoved	18	16	52.9	31	3	91.2	
Grabbed partner	9	25	26.5	31	3	91.2	29.39
Slapped partner	9	25	26.5	29	5	85.3	23.86
Used knife or gun against partner	0	34	00.0	17	17	50.0	
Punched/hit partner with something that could hurt	11	23	32.4	23	11	67.6	8.47
Choked partner	2	32	5.9	23	11	67.6	27.89
Slammed partner against a wall	2	32	5.9	21	13	61.8	23.72
Beat-up partner	2	32	5.9	23	11	67.6	27.89
Burned/scalded partner	0	34	00.0	3	21	8.8	
Kicked partner	9	25	26.5	18	16	52.9	4.98
Forced sex	0	34	00.0	18	16	52.9	

[a]Frequency scores were calculated by adding together the number of participants who responded "Yes" for each of the 13 forms of violent acts for their own abuse and their partner's abuse.

A χ^2 test was computed to compare each of the 13 forms of abuse for partner and self (Table 2). Compared to their reports of their own abuse, the women more frequently reported that their abuser engaged in the following behaviors: twisted, grabbed, slapped, punched/hit, choked, slammed, beat-up, and kicked. There were no significant differences found for throwing something.

Finally, we had suggested that if we received enough participants from both a sample of women still living with their partners and a sample that was no longer living with partner we would compare the two groups. Since all of the participants were no longer living with their abusive partner we were unable to make any comparisons between these groups.

CHAPTER FOUR

DISCUSSION

Feminist and family researchers have spent more than 20 years debating whether men and women are equally violent in their intimate relationships. Critics of the debate have suggested that limitations of current research include the failure to clearly distinguish between types of violent couples, the generalizations of CTS results from one population to another (e.g., clinical vs. representative sample), and the lack of research on the motivation for intimate partner violence (Johnson, 1995; O'Leary, 2000). To expand on the current literature, this study focused on a specific population of abused women, while utilizing a modified version of the Relationship Abuse Questionnaire (RAQ: Barnett, 1989) in an attempt to examine the motivation for violence. In that endeavor, two main hypotheses were developed to address the following questions: How would women, who self-identified as being in a highly abusive relationship, (1) conceptualize their own motivation for violence, and (2) conceptualize their partner's motivation for violence? For the purpose of this study, motivation was conceptualized as instrumental (goal-oriented: to control), expressive (release of frustration or tension), and self-defense (protection of self).

Motivation for Violence: Self-Reports and Perception of Partner

Results supported our first hypothesis. As predicted, women were significantly more likely to report their violence was due to self-defense motives than expressive motives, and more likely to report their violence was due to expressive motives than instrumental motives. In contrast, women were significantly more likely to report their partner's violence was due to instrumental motives than expressive motives, and more likely to report their partner's violence was due to expressive motives than self-defense.

Results also supported our second hypothesis. As predicted women were significantly more likely to report self-defense motives for their own violence than for their partner's violence. In addition, women were significantly more likely to report instrumental motives for their partner's violence than they reported instrumental motives for their own violence.

In summary, our results found that the participants, who were recruited from domestic violence agencies and had been severely abused, characterized their motivation for violence differently than they characterized their partner's motivation for violence. While women reported that their violence was motivated by self-defense, they reported that

their partner's motivation for violence was the result of instrumental motives.

The data also suggest that a particular pattern of violence may exist within these participants' relationships. In these relationships men use violence to control their partners and women use violence as a means of self-protection. These patterns may have future implications for distinguishing between types of violent couples.

These findings are in agreement with previous research which has found that women engage in relationship violence as a means of self-defense (DeKersedy & Saunders, 1997; Makepeace 1986), specifically in highly abusive relationships (Cascardi & Vivian, 1995; Flynn, 1990; Hamberger & Lohr, 1997; Saunders, 1988). These findings are also consistent with numerous studies which have found that male violence is goal-oriented and used as a means to control one's partner and maintain power in the relationship (Campbell, 1993; Hamberger et al., 1994; Johnson, 1995; Martin & Russo, 1999; Ptacek, 1988).

Patterns of Responses

During the course of this study, we found that many participants were responding in similar patterns to some of the attribution-for-abuse questions as they related to their partner's use of violence. The most common pattern that emerged pertained to the following items: to teach you a

lesson; to let out violent feelings; to show who is boss; and to get control over you. Thirteen participants responded that they "strongly agreed" that their partner engaged in violence for all four of these attributions-for-abuse. Seven additional participants scored "to let out violent feelings" with at least one of the other three items (to teach lesson; to show who is boss; to get control). Reliability tests found internal consistency for all four items.

Evidence of a pattern of responding may suggest that participants conceptualized their partner's violence the same, regardless of what form of violence was being used against them. For example, participants may not have identified "letting out violent feelings" as a form of releasing inner tension (expressive violence), because they may have experienced this behavior as their partner's way of showing them "how angry he is at them." Therefore, this behavior may be seen as a means of control, which would fit more appropriately with the instrumental set.

Interestingly, a similar pattern of responding was *not* found for women's report on their own motivation for violence. In addition, when participants reported on their own violence, they conceptualized "letting out violent feelings" as expressive; however, when they reported on their partner's behavior, they reported the same item as instrumental. Therefore, our results found that women

conceptualized their motivation for expressive violence differently for themselves than for their partner.

Our study did not expect to find significant differences between women's reports of expressive motives for self or partner. In fact, our initial tests found no significant differences between women's reports of expressive motivation for self or partner. However, the lack of significant results may have been due to the discrepancies between the item "to let out violent feelings" which reduced the internal consistency scores for partner. Therefore, the item "to let out violent feelings" was removed from the expressive set and additional analyses were conducted for the two remaining items (retaliation for physical hurt and retaliation for emotional hurt) for both self and partner. These additional analyses found that women were significantly more likely to report expressive motives for their own violence than they reported expressive motives for their partner's violence. Therefore, when comparing only the two expressive items for self and partner, women were more likely to conceptualize their own violence as expressive than their partner. These additional analyses have implications for future research.

Forms of Abuse

The participants in this study reported that their partners engaged in significantly more forms of abuse

then they did themselves. In fact, more participants reported that men twist, grab, slap, use a knife/gun, punch/hit, choke, slam, beat-up, or force sex upon them than they did the same to their partners. This is consistent with studies of clinical populations which report that men engage in more types of violence than their partners (Koss et al., as cited in Hamberger & Lohr, 1997). In addition, these findings may also be consistent with research which suggests that women in abusive relationships use various techniques and strategies to avert violence (Dobash & Dobash, 1984).

Distinguishing Between Types of Violent Couples

Finally, it is important to consider this study's findings in their totality. For example, women reported that their partner's engaged in violence as a means of teaching them a lesson, controlling them, showing them who was boss, and letting out violent feelings. On the other hand, women reported that they utilized violence as a means of self-defense, fighting-back, and protecting themselves from harm. In addition, we speculated that the women's patterned responses to specific items suggested that a substantial number of women conceptualized their partner's violence the same (i.e., controlling), regardless of the form of abuse used against them. Furthermore, the women reported partners engaged in numerous forms of violence.

When analyzed together, these findings may represent a pattern that exists in a specific type of violent relationship. In fact, research has found that data collected from shelter populations are very different from the general population (Washburn & Frieze, 1981). Clearly, the pattern that emerged in this study is very different than Johnson's (1995) characterization of common couple violence. Therefore, the women in this study may represent a sub-population of violent couples that are distinctly different from other violent couples (i.e., common couple violence).

Theoretical Implications

There are theoretical benefits to examining the motivation for violence and distinguishing between types of violent couples. Chornesky (2000) argued that in order to assist perpetrators and victims, experts must be willing to consider a variety of theories that attempt to explain intimate partner violence. Expanding our explanations for intimate partner violence provides the opportunity to conceptualize couple violence through more than one lens and generate proposals for future education and prevention. In this study we characterized the motivation for violence as instrumental, expressive, and self-defense. Conceptualizing motivation in these terms helps us to develop a more thorough understanding of a perpetrator's motivation

for violence and a victim's characterization of violence. Classifying motivations for violence may help theorists to distinguish between types of violence and types of violent couples. Furthermore, enriching our understanding of the motivation for intimate partner violence helps move experts beyond the tallying of violent acts and the gender symmetry debate.

Applied Implications

The findings in this study suggest some implications for practice. First, in our study we found that a majority of women reported that their motivation for violence was in self-defense. In contrast, women reported that their partner's motivation for violence was instrumental (i.e, control). Understanding the difference between these two types of motivation is crucial to developing treatment plans, educational programs, and prevention services. Surely a counselor would develop two very different treatment plans for an individual who uses violence as a means of self-defense versus someone who uses physical violence in order to control, dominate, or intimidate their partner. Therefore, understanding the motivation for intimate partner violence is critical.

Second, this study also investigated women's perception of their partner's motivation for violence. Assessing perception is important for two reasons: 1) it offers

insight into the client's reasoning for the violence (i.e., "It's my fault;" "He just needed to release some tension;" or "He tries to control me."); and 2) it offers insight into the dynamics of the relationship. Understanding a client's perception of their partner's violence allows the counselor the opportunity to develop an appropriate treatment plan for the client. For example, an individual who thinks "it's their fault" that they were hit by their partner is going to have a very different treatment plan than a client who recognizes that the violence is due to power and control issues. In fact, women who have successfully left abusive partners cite the importance of learning about the perpetrator's responsibility for the violence (Ulrich, as cited in Short, 2000; Ferraro & Johnson, 1983). Therefore, understanding the client's perception is a critical component of developing an effective plan.

Finally, this study supports Johnson's (1995; 2000) position that distinguishing between types of violent relationships (i.e., patriarchal/intimate terrorism vs. common couple violence) is essential in the treatment of violent couples. The participants in our study would be more likely to be identified with couples engaging in patriarchal/intimate terrorism versus common couple violence due to the motivation for violent behavior identified by the participants (men: control; women: self-defense). As a

result, these couples would be counseled using very different techniques. For example, experts have argued that couples involved in patriarchal terrorism, where the woman is severely beaten and the man engages in intimidating and dominating behaviors, should not attend couples counseling (Walker 1979; 1984). Joint counseling is inappropriate for this couple because the woman is typically afraid of repercussions, and potentially in danger, for revealing information regarding the abusive relationship.

Limitations

There are a few limitations to this study which suggest caution when generalizing results to other populations. First, we relied on self-reports for the collection of data. Research has found that abused women often underreport the violence in their relationships (Edelson & Brygger, 1996). It is also important to note that self-reports may be impacted by the actor/observer effect (Jones & Nisbett, 1971). Applying this theory, participants may perceive or explain their own behaviors differently than the behaviors of others. More specifically, individuals are more likely to attribute their own behavior to situational causes and other people's behavior to dispositional causes. Therefore, participants may attribute internal motives (i.e. control) to their partners' behaviors and dispositional motives (i.e. self-defense) to their own behavior. Second, we had a small

sample size. However, we had a large effect size and strong power. Next, our study focused on a specific population of women who had been exposed to high levels of abuse. Researchers have found that the uniqueness of the "battered women" population may have an effect on the generalizability of the results (i.e., low income, education, high severity of violence)(Washburn & Frieze, 1981). Finally, data was collected from 41 participants; however, we had to exclude seven of the questionnaires due to incompleteness. Therefore, some participants may not have understood parts of the questionnaires. Despite these limitations, our research has contributed to the understanding of the motivation for violence and furthered the importance of distinguishing between types of violent relationships.

Future Research

Given that this study utilized a small sample size and because the Relationship Abuse Questionnaire (RAQ) is still a relatively new measurement tool, this study should be replicated to verify results. Additionally, it would be beneficial to modify this study to include a sample of male batterers to develop a more thorough understanding of the nature of intimate partner violence. Continuing this research is important for understanding the motivation for violence and distinguishing between types of violent couples.

To further distinguish between types of violent relationships, additional research could be designed to compare the motivation for violence among different types of violent couples (e.g., common couple violence; intimate terrorism; mutual combat, etc.). Conceptualizing the motivation for partner violence in self-defense, expressive, and instrumental terms will help in that endeavor. The extent to which a couple engages in instrumental or self-defense motives tells us something about the dynamics of that relationship. For example, a couple engaging in high levels of instrumental and self-defense will be differentiatied from a couple using low levels of expressive motives for violence. These distinctions have serious implications for treatment.

To expand on our understanding of expressive and instrumental motives for violence, future research could explore what "let out violent feelings" means to women, specifically women exposed to high levels of partner violence. As previously stated, there were some discrepencies in women's choice of the item "to let out violent feelings." Specifically, participants may have conceptualized the term differently for themselves than for their partner. This phenomena generates two ideas for further research. First, it would be helpful to further explore women's conception of "letting out violent feelings"

possibly through the use of interviews with women. Second, to further explore the concept of expressive motivation, it would be beneficial to develop additional items for the expressive set which may include: to let out tension; to release frustration; or to express anger. Items for instrumental set may include: to show how angry he/I was; to show how powerful he/I was; or because I/he wouldn't do what he/I wanted.

An unexpected finding in this study was the pattern of responding that emerged for many of the participant's reports of their partner's motivation for violence. We found that women characterized their partner's violence the same, regardless of the form of violence that was used against them. Therefore, it would be interesting to test these findings and to compare how women conceptualize their own violence differently than their partner's violence.

One of the things we were hoping to examine were the differences in motivation as a function of whether the participant is still with the abusive partner or is no longer with the partner. We were particularly interested in women's perception of their partner's violence because research has found that women's perception of violence changes depending on the stage she is in (precontemplative vs. contemplative)(Eiskovits, 1999) or when she leaves the relationship (Ulrich, as cited in Short, 2000; Ferraro &

Johnson, 1983). Therefore, we would expect to see significant differences between these groups.

Finally, future research might also examine whether the conceptualization of partner violence as instrumental is specific to abused women or is applicable to other victims of relationship violence. For example, it would be interesting to compare a sample of "abused men" and "abused women" to determine if the men identified their partner's violence as instrumental. If so, the results may tell us something about a victim's perception of violence instead of a phenomena related specifically to abused women (intimate terrorisim).

Conclusion

In this study we learned that women perceive their own motivation for violence differently than they perceive their partner's motivation for violence. Additionally, motivation for this population of participants was found to be somewhat different than those found in other populations (i.e, dating population/common couple violence). This supports the theory that the motivation for violence may be unique to specific types of violent relationships. Therefore, identifying the motivation for intimate partner violence helps us to distinguish between types of violent couples.

Unfortunately, after more than 2 decades of research, we still have not adequately addressed the importance of

(1) identifying the motivation for violence, and

(2) developing distinctions between types of violent couples. Clearly, if we do not understand *why* individuals engage in partner violence, then can we truly articulate if one gender is more violent than another? In fact, at what point do we as researchers become so focused on the debate, that we lose sight of the goal? Therefore, we must be willing to move beyond the gender controversy so that we can continue to help the people who are both victims and perpetrators of intimate partner violence.

APPENDIX A

INFORMED CONSENT

Informed Consent

This study is being conducted by Lisa Kennedy under the supervision of Dr. Gloria Cowan, Professor of Psychology, California State University, San Bernardino. The purpose of this study is to investigate women's behaviors and perceptions within intimate relationships. More specifically, we hope to more fully understand: (1) why women utilize violence within their private relationships; and (2) why women believe their partner's use violence against them. Participation will involve completing a demographic questionnaire, as well as a questionnaire regarding your behaviors and your perception of your partner's behaviors. In total, the questionnaires should take approximately 15 minutes to complete.

Please be advised of the following before consenting to participate:

1. All of your responses will be held anonymously by the researchers. Your name will not be reported with your responses. Therefore, please do not write your been provided and seal the envelope before returning it to the group leader. All data will be reported in group format only.

2. Your participation is totally voluntary. You are free to withdraw your participation at any time during this study without penalty. You may also choose to answer, or not to answer any question within the survey. Should you choose not to participate in this study, you will *not* jeopardize your standing in the group sessions or at the shelter.

This study has been approved by the Institutional Review Board, California State University at San Bernardino. There are no foreseeable risks. However, completing the questionnaire may evoke certain feelings such as sadness. If you would like to talk to someone about an abusive relationship, referral and support hotlines are provided at the end of the questionnaire. Please remember that your participation is totally voluntary and you are free to stop at any time. If you have any questions regarding this study, you may contact Dr. Cowan at (909) 880-5575.

Please check in the space provided below to acknowledge that understand the nature and purpose of this study. Further, by marking the space below, you are acknowledging that you are at least 18 years old and have freely given your consent to participate in this study.

Please place check mark here: _____ Today's date: ____________

APPENDIX B:

DEMOGRAPHIC QUESTIONNAIRE

Background Information

Age:_____

Ethnicity: _____ African-American _____ American Indian
_____ Asian _____ Caucasian/White
_____ Hispanic/Latino _____Other (please specify)
____

Education: _____ High school graduate _____ Some college
_____ Associates Degree _____ Bachelors Degree
_____ Masters Degree

Work History: _____ Employed _____ Unemployed

If Employed, Length of Time with Current Employer: _____

Yearly Income: _____

Sex of Partner: _____ Male _____ Female

Current Status of Abusive Relationship: _____ Never married _____ Married
_____ Cohabitating _____ Separated
_____ Divorced _____ Widowed

Length of Time in Abusive Relationship: _____

Are you Presently Living with your Abusive Partner? _____Yes _____No

Are You Currently Residing in a Shelter: _____ Length of Time at Shelter: _____

Number of Children: _____

APPENDIX C

MODIFIED VERSION OF THE RELATIONSHIP ABUSE QUESTIONNAIRE

Instructions: We would like to ask you some questions about your relationships. Please indicate if *your partner* has ever used the following methods to settle disputes with you. First, read and answer the bolded question. If you answer "Yes" then answer the second part of the question. Please respond by circling the number that best represents your answer according to the 6-point scale. If you answer "No" then go on to the next question. Remember: This survey is anonymous.

1 = strongly disagree	4 = slightly agree
2 = somewhat disagree	5 = somewhat agree
3 = slightly disagree	6 = strongly agree

1. Has your partner ever thrown something at you that could hurt? ___Yes ___ No

Why did your partner throw something that could hurt you?

	strongly disagree					strongly agree
a. in retaliation for being physically hurt?	1	2	3	4	5	6
b. in retaliation for being emotionally hurt?	1	2	3	4	5	6
c. to prevent further harm?	1	2	3	4	5	6
d. to teach you a lesson?	1	2	3	4	5	6
e. in self-defense, to protect themselves or others?	1	2	3	4	5	6
f. to let out violent feelings?	1	2	3	4	5	6
g. to show who is boss?	1	2	3	4	5	6
h. to fight back?	1	2	3	4	5	6
i. to get control over you?	1	2	3	4	5	6

2. Has your partner ever twisted your arm or hair? ___ Yes ___ No

Why did your partner twist your arm or hair?

	strongly disagree					strongly agree
a. in retaliation for being physically hurt?	1	2	3	4	5	6
b. in retaliation for being emotionally hurt?	1	2	3	4	5	6
c. to prevent further harm?	1	2	3	4	5	6
d. to teach you a lesson?	1	2	3	4	5	6
e. in self-defense, to protect themselves or others?	1	2	3	4	5	6
f. to let out violent feelings?	1	2	3	4	5	6
g. to show who is boss?	1	2	3	4	5	6
h. to fight back?	1	2	3	4	5	6
i. to get control over you?	1	2	3	4	5	6

1 = strongly disagree	4 = slightly agree
2 = somewhat disagree	5 = somewhat agree
3 = slightly disagree	6 = strongly agree

3. Has your partner ever pushed or shoved you? ___ Yes ___ No

Why did your partner push or shove you?

	strongly disagree						strongly agree
a. in retaliation for being physically hurt?	1	2	3	4	5	6	
b. in retaliation for being emotionally hurt?	1	2	3	4	5	6	
c. to prevent further harm?	1	2	3	4	5	6	
d. to teach you a lesson?	1	2	3	4	5	6	
e. in self-defense, to protect themselves or others?	1	2	3	4	5	6	
f. to let out violent feelings?	1	2	3	4	5	6	
g. to show who is boss?	1	2	3	4	5	6	
h. to fight back?	1	2	3	4	5	6	
i. to get control over you?	1	2	3	4	5	6	

4. Has your partner ever grabbed you? ___ Yes ___ No

Why did your partner grab you?

	strongly disagree						strongly agree
a. in retaliation for being physically hurt?	1	2	3	4	5	6	
b. in retaliation for being emotionally hurt?	1	2	3	4	5	6	
c. to prevent further harm?	1	2	3	4	5	6	
d. to teach you a lesson?	1	2	3	4	5	6	
e. in self-defense, to protect themselves or others?	1	2	3	4	5	6	
f. to let out violent feelings?	1	2	3	4	5	6	
g. to show who is boss?	1	2	3	4	5	6	
h. to fight back?	1	2	3	4	5	6	
i. to get control over you?	1	2	3	4	5	6	

1 = strongly disagree	4 = slightly agree
2 = somewhat disagree	5 = somewhat agree
3 = slightly disagree	6 = strongly agree

5. Has your partner ever slapped you? ___ Yes ___ No

Why did your partner slap you?

	strongly disagree					strongly agree
a. in retaliation for being physically hurt?	1	2	3	4	5	6
b. in retaliation for being emotionally hurt?	1	2	3	4	5	6
c. to prevent further harm?	1	2	3	4	5	6
d. to teach you a lesson?	1	2	3	4	5	6
e. in self-defense, to protect themselves or others?	1	2	3	4	5	6
f. to let out violent feelings?	1	2	3	4	5	6
g. to show who is boss?	1	2	3	4	5	6
h. to fight back?	1	2	3	4	5	6
i. to get control over you?	1	2	3	4	5	6

6. Has your partner ever used a knife or gun against you? ___ Yes ___ No

Why did your partner use a knife or gun against you?

	strongly disagree					strongly agree
a. in retaliation for being physically hurt?	1	2	3	4	5	6
b. in retaliation for being emotionally hurt?	1	2	3	4	5	6
c. to prevent further harm?	1	2	3	4	5	6
d. to teach you a lesson?	1	2	3	4	5	6
e. in self-defense, to protect themselves or others?	1	2	3	4	5	6
f. to let out violent feelings?	1	2	3	4	5	6
g. to show who is boss?	1	2	3	4	5	6
h. to fight back?	1	2	3	4	5	6
i. to get control over you?	1	2	3	4	5	6

1 = strongly disagree
2 = somewhat disagree
3 = slightly disagree

4 = slightly agree
5 = somewhat agree
6 = strongly agree

7. Has your partner ever punched or hit you with something that could hurt?
___ Yes ___ No

Why did your partner punch you or hit you with something that hurt?

	strongly disagree					strongly agree
a. in retaliation for being physically hurt?	1	2	3	4	5	6
b. in retaliation for being emotionally hurt?	1	2	3	4	5	6
c. to prevent further harm?	1	2	3	4	5	6
d. to teach you a lesson?	1	2	3	4	5	6
e. in self-defense, to protect themselves or others?	1	2	3	4	5	6
f. to let out violent feelings?	1	2	3	4	5	6
g. to show who is boss?	1	2	3	4	5	6
h. to fight back?	1	2	3	4	5	6
i. to get control over you?	1	2	3	4	5	6

8. Has your partner ever choked you? ___ Yes ___ No

Why did your partner choke you?

	strongly disagree					strongly agree
a. in retaliation for being physically hurt?	1	2	3	4	5	6
b. in retaliation for being emotionally hurt?	1	2	3	4	5	6
c. to prevent further harm?	1	2	3	4	5	6
d. to teach you a lesson?	1	2	3	4	5	6
e. in self-defense, to protect themselves or others?	1	2	3	4	5	6
f. to let out violent feelings?	1	2	3	4	5	6
g. to show who is boss?	1	2	3	4	5	6
h. to fight back?	1	2	3	4	5	6
i. to get control over you?	1	2	3	4	5	6

1 = strongly disagree
2 = somewhat disagree
3 = slightly disagree

4 = slightly agree
5 = somewhat agree
6 = strongly agree

9. Has your partner ever slammed you against a wall? ___ Yes ___ No

Why did your partner slam you against the wall?

	strongly disagree					strongly agree
a. in retaliation for being physically hurt?	1	2	3	4	5	6
b. in retaliation for being emotionally hurt?	1	2	3	4	5	6
c. to prevent further harm?	1	2	3	4	5	6
d. to teach you a lesson?	1	2	3	4	5	6
e. in self-defense, to protect themselves or others?	1	2	3	4	5	6
f. to let out violent feelings?	1	2	3	4	5	6
g. to show who is boss?	1	2	3	4	5	6
h. to fight back?	1	2	3	4	5	6
i. to get control over you?	1	2	3	4	5	6

10. Has your partner ever beat you up? ___ Yes ___ No

Why did your partner beat you up?

	strongly disagree					strongly agree
a. in retaliation for being physically hurt?	1	2	3	4	5	6
b. in retaliation for being emotionally hurt?	1	2	3	4	5	6
c. to prevent further harm?	1	2	3	4	5	6
d. to teach you a lesson?	1	2	3	4	5	6
e. in self-defense, to protect themselves or others?	1	2	3	4	5	6
f. to let out violent feelings?	1	2	3	4	5	6
g. to show who is boss?	1	2	3	4	5	6
h. to fight back?	1	2	3	4	5	6
i. to get control over you?	1	2	3	4	5	6

1 = strongly disagree	4 = slightly agree
2 = somewhat disagree	5 = somewhat agree
3 = slightly disagree	6 = strongly agree

11. Has your partner ever burned or scalded you on purpose? ___ Yes ___ No

Why did your partner burn or scald you?

	strongly disagree					strongly agree
a. in retaliation for being physically hurt?	1	2	3	4	5	6
b. in retaliation for being emotionally hurt?	1	2	3	4	5	6
c. to prevent further harm?	1	2	3	4	5	6
d. to teach you a lesson?	1	2	3	4	5	6
e. in self-defense, to protect themselves or others?	1	2	3	4	5	6
f. to let out violent feelings?	1	2	3	4	5	6
g. to show who is boss?	1	2	3	4	5	6
h. to fight back?	1	2	3	4	5	6
i. to get control over you?	1	2	3	4	5	6

12. Has your partner ever kicked you? ___ Yes ___ No

Why did your partner kick you?

	strongly disagree					strongly agree
a. in retaliation for being physically hurt?	1	2	3	4	5	6
b. in retaliation for being emotionally hurt?	1	2	3	4	5	6
c. to prevent further harm?	1	2	3	4	5	6
d. to teach you a lesson?	1	2	3	4	5	6
e. in self-defense, to protect themselves or others?	1	2	3	4	5	6
f. to let out violent feelings?	1	2	3	4	5	6
g. to show who is boss?	1	2	3	4	5	6
h. to fight back?	1	2	3	4	5	6
i. to get control over you?	1	2	3	4	5	6

1 = strongly disagree
2 = somewhat disagree
3 = slightly disagree
4 = slightly agree
5 = somewhat agree
6 = strongly agree

13. Has your partner ever forced you to have sex? ___ Yes ___ No

Why did your partner force you to have sex?

	strongly disagree					strongly agree
a. in retaliation for being physically hurt?	1	2	3	4	5	6
b. in retaliation for being emotionally hurt?	1	2	3	4	5	6
c. to prevent further harm?	1	2	3	4	5	6
d. to teach you a lesson?	1	2	3	4	5	6
e. in self-defense, to protect themselves or others?	1	2	3	4	5	6
f. to let out violent feelings?	1	2	3	4	5	6
g. to show who is boss?	1	2	3	4	5	6
h. to fight back?	1	2	3	4	5	6
i. to get control over you?	1	2	3	4	5	6

We would like to ask you some additional questions about your relationships. Please indicate if *you* have ever used the following methods to settle disputes with your partner. First, read and answer the bolded question. If you answer "Yes" then answer the second part of the question. Please respond by circling the number that best represents your answer according to the 6-point scale. If you answer "No" then go on to the next question. Remember: This survey is anonymous.

1 = strongly disagree	4 = slightly agree
2 = somewhat disagree	5 = somewhat agree
3 = slightly disagree	6 = strongly agree

1. Have you ever thrown something at your partner that could hurt your partner?
___Yes ___ No

Why did you throw something at your partner that could hurt?

	strongly disagree					strongly agree
a. in retaliation for being physically hurt?	1	2	3	4	5	6
b. in retaliation for being emotionally hurt?	1	2	3	4	5	6
c. to prevent further harm?	1	2	3	4	5	6
d. to teach your partner a lesson?	1	2	3	4	5	6
e. in self-defense, to protect yourself or others?	1	2	3	4	5	6
f. to let out violent feelings?	1	2	3	4	5	6
g. to show your partner who is boss?	1	2	3	4	5	6
h. to fight back?	1	2	3	4	5	6
i. to get control over your partner?	1	2	3	4	5	6

2. Have you ever twisted your partner's arm or hair? ___Yes ___ No

Why did you twist your partner's arm or hair?

	strongly disagree					strongly agree
a. in retaliation for being physically hurt?	1	2	3	4	5	6
b. in retaliation for being emotionally hurt?	1	2	3	4	5	6
c. to prevent further harm?	1	2	3	4	5	6
d. to teach your partner a lesson?	1	2	3	4	5	6
e. in self-defense, to protect yourself or others?	1	2	3	4	5	6
f. to let out violent feelings?	1	2	3	4	5	6
g. to show your partner who is boss?	1	2	3	4	5	6
h. to fight back?	1	2	3	4	5	6
i. to get control over your partner?	1	2	3	4	5	6

1 = strongly disagree
2 = somewhat disagree
3 = slightly disagree

4 = slightly agree
5 = somewhat agree
6 = strongly agree

3. Have you ever pushed or shoved your partner ? ___ Yes ___ No

Why did you push or shove your partner?

	strongly disagree					strongly agree
a. in retaliation for being physically hurt?	1	2	3	4	5	6
b. in retaliation for being emotionally hurt?	1	2	3	4	5	6
c. to prevent further harm?	1	2	3	4	5	6
d. to teach your partner a lesson?	1	2	3	4	5	6
e. in self-defense, to protect yourself or others?	1	2	3	4	5	6
f. to let out violent feelings?	1	2	3	4	5	6
g. to show your partner who is boss?	1	2	3	4	5	6
h. to fight back?	1	2	3	4	5	6
i. to get control over your partner?	1	2	3	4	5	6

4. Have you ever grabbed your partner? ___ Yes ___ No

Why did you grab your partner?

	strongly disagree					strongly agree
a. in retaliation for being physically hurt?	1	2	3	4	5	6
b. in retaliation for being emotionally hurt?	1	2	3	4	5	6
c. to prevent further harm?	1	2	3	4	5	6
d. to teach your partner a lesson?	1	2	3	4	5	6
e. in self-defense, to protect yourself or others?	1	2	3	4	5	6
f. to let out violent feelings?	1	2	3	4	5	6
g. to show your partner who is boss?	1	2	3	4	5	6
h. to fight back?	1	2	3	4	5	6
i. to get control over your partner?	1	2	3	4	5	6

1 = strongly disagree
2 = somewhat disagree
3 = slightly disagree

4 = slightly agree
5 = somewhat agree
6 = strongly agree

5. Have you ever slapped you partner? ___ Yes ___ No

Why did you slap your partner?

	strongly disagree					strongly agree
a. in retaliation for being physically hurt?	1	2	3	4	5	6
b. in retaliation for being emotionally hurt?	1	2	3	4	5	6
c. to prevent further harm?	1	2	3	4	5	6
d. to teach your partner a lesson?	1	2	3	4	5	6
e. in self-defense, to protect yourself or others?	1	2	3	4	5	6
f. to let out violent feelings?	1	2	3	4	5	6
g. to show your partner who is boss?	1	2	3	4	5	6
h. to fight back?	1	2	3	4	5	6
i. to get control over your partner?	1	2	3	4	5	6

6. Have you ever used a knife or gun against your partner ? ___ Yes ___ No

Why did your use a knife or gun against your partner?

	strongly disagree					strongly agree
a. in retaliation for being physically hurt?	1	2	3	4	5	6
b. in retaliation for being emotionally hurt?	1	2	3	4	5	6
c. to prevent further harm?	1	2	3	4	5	6
d. to teach your partner a lesson?	1	2	3	4	5	6
e. in self-defense, to protect yourself or others?	1	2	3	4	5	6
f. to let out violent feelings?	1	2	3	4	5	6
g. to show your partner who is boss?	1	2	3	4	5	6
h. to fight back?	1	2	3	4	5	6
i. to get control over your partner?	1	2	3	4	5	6

1 = strongly disagree	4 = slightly agree
2 = somewhat disagree	5 = somewhat agree
3 = slightly disagree	6 = strongly agree

7. Have you ever punched or hit your partner with something that could hurt?
___ Yes ___ No

Why did you punch or hit your partner with something that could hurt?

	strongly disagree					strongly agree
a. in retaliation for being physically hurt?	1	2	3	4	5	6
b. in retaliation for being emotionally hurt?	1	2	3	4	5	6
c. to prevent further harm?	1	2	3	4	5	6
d. to teach your partner a lesson?	1	2	3	4	5	6
e. in self-defense, to protect yourself or others?	1	2	3	4	5	6
f. to let out violent feelings?	1	2	3	4	5	6
g. to show your partner who is boss?	1	2	3	4	5	6
h. to fight back?	1	2	3	4	5	6
i. to get control over your partner?	1	2	3	4	5	6

8. Have you ever choked your partner ? ___ Yes ___ No

Why did you choke your partner?

	strongly disagree					strongly agree
a. in retaliation for being physically hurt?	1	2	3	4	5	6
b. in retaliation for being emotionally hurt?	1	2	3	4	5	6
c. to prevent further harm?	1	2	3	4	5	6
d. to teach your partner a lesson?	1	2	3	4	5	6
e. in self-defense, to protect yourself or others?	1	2	3	4	5	6
f. to let out violent feelings?	1	2	3	4	5	6
g. to show your partner who is boss?	1	2	3	4	5	6
h. to fight back?	1	2	3	4	5	6
i. to get control over your partner?	1	2	3	4	5	6

1 = strongly disagree
2 = somewhat disagree
3 = slightly disagree

4 = slightly agree
5 = somewhat agree
6 = strongly agree

9. Have you ever slammed your partner against a wall? ___ Yes ___ No

Why did you slam your partner against a wall?

	strongly disagree					strongly agree
a. in retaliation for being physically hurt?	1	2	3	4	5	6
b. in retaliation for being emotionally hurt?	1	2	3	4	5	6
c. to prevent further harm?	1	2	3	4	5	6
d. to teach your partner a lesson?	1	2	3	4	5	6
e. in self-defense, to protect yourself or others?	1	2	3	4	5	6
f. to let out violent feelings?	1	2	3	4	5	6
g. to show your partner who is boss?	1	2	3	4	5	6
h. to fight back?	1	2	3	4	5	6
i. to get control over your partner?	1	2	3	4	5	6

10. Have you ever beat up your partner ? ___ Yes ___ No

Why did you beat up your partner?

	strongly disagree					strongly agree
a. in retaliation for being physically hurt?	1	2	3	4	5	6
b. in retaliation for being emotionally hurt?	1	2	3	4	5	6
c. to prevent further harm?	1	2	3	4	5	6
d. to teach your partner a lesson?	1	2	3	4	5	6
e. in self-defense, to protect yourself or others?	1	2	3	4	5	6
f. to let out violent feelings?	1	2	3	4	5	6
g. to show your partner who is boss?	1	2	3	4	5	6
h. to fight back?	1	2	3	4	5	6
i. to get control over your partner?	1	2	3	4	5	6

1 = strongly disagree	4 = slightly agree
2 = somewhat disagree	5 = somewhat agree
3 = slightly disagree	6 = strongly agree

11. Have you ever burned or scalded your partner on purpose? ___ Yes ___ No

Why did you burn or scald your partner on purpose?

	strongly disagree					strongly agree
a. in retaliation for being physically hurt?	1	2	3	4	5	6
b. in retaliation for being emotionally hurt?	1	2	3	4	5	6
c. to prevent further harm?	1	2	3	4	5	6
d. to teach your partner a lesson?	1	2	3	4	5	6
e. in self-defense, to protect yourself or others?	1	2	3	4	5	6
f. to let out violent feelings?	1	2	3	4	5	6
g. to show your partner who is boss?	1	2	3	4	5	6
h. to fight back?	1	2	3	4	5	6
i. to get control over your partner?	1	2	3	4	5	6

12. Have you ever kicked your partner? ___ Yes ___ No

Why did you kick your partner?

	strongly disagree					strongly agree
a. in retaliation for being physically hurt?	1	2	3	4	5	6
b. in retaliation for being emotionally hurt?	1	2	3	4	5	6
c. to prevent further harm?	1	2	3	4	5	6
d. to teach your partner a lesson?	1	2	3	4	5	6
e. in self-defense, to protect yourself or others?	1	2	3	4	5	6
f. to let out violent feelings?	1	2	3	4	5	6
g. to show your partner who is boss?	1	2	3	4	5	6
h. to fight back?	1	2	3	4	5	6
i. to get control over your partner?	1	2	3	4	5	6

1 = strongly disagree	4 = slightly agree
2 = somewhat disagree	5 = somewhat agree
3 = slightly disagree	6 = strongly agree

13. Have you ever forced your partner to have sex? ___ Yes ___ No

Why did you force your partner to have sex?

	strongly disagree 1	2	3	4	5	6 strongly agree
a. in retaliation for being physically hurt?	1	2	3	4	5	6
b. in retaliation for being emotionally hurt?	1	2	3	4	5	6
c. to prevent further harm?	1	2	3	4	5	6
d. to teach your partner a lesson?	1	2	3	4	5	6
e. in self-defense, to protect yourself or others?	1	2	3	4	5	6
f. to let out violent feelings?	1	2	3	4	5	6
g. to show your partner who is boss?	1	2	3	4	5	6
h. to fight back?	1	2	3	4	5	6
i. to get control over your partner?	1	2	3	4	5	6

APPENDIX D

DEBRIEFING STATEMENT

Debriefing Statement

Thank you for taking the time to participate in this survey. The purpose of this survey is assess the motivation for violence in intimate relationships. More specifically, we hope to more fully understand: (1) why women utilize violence within their private relationships; and (2) why women believe their partners use violence against them. By understanding the motivation for violence, we may be able to better understand the nature of intimate partner violence. As researchers develop a better understanding of the motivation for intimate partner violence, then mental health professionals, as well as domestic violence organizations will be better able to respond be providing appropriate services, treatment, and solutions for abused women and their families.

If completing the questionnaire has caused you any distress, or if you have any questions or concerns regarding the study or your participation in it, you may contact Dr. Cowan at (909) 880-5575. If you would like to talk with somebody regarding a current abusive relationship you may call (800) 333-SAFE or (800) 700-SAFE for information or referrals. Locally you may call (760) 949-4357, (760) 955-8010, or (760) 955-8723.

At the completion of the study, you may obtain the group results from Dr. Cowan. Please note that this study will not be complete until the end of 2003. If you would like more information about the study prior to its completion, you may contact Dr. Cowan at any time.

You May Remove and Keep This Page.

Thank you for your participation.

APPENDIX E

FOOTNOTE

FOOTNOTE

[1]It is important to note that there were instances when participants neglected to answer one of the nine items from the attribution-for-abuse scales (i.e. in retaliation for being emotionally hurt). When this occurred the researchers examined the questionnaire to see if the participant's responses had followed a pattern (see Results section for further explanation) in that particular part of the questionnaire (self/partner). If a pattern was discovered, then a score reflecting the pattern was entered to replace the missing value. However, if no specific pattern in the participants' responses can be detected, then the following procedure was used: (1)determining the attribution set to which the missing attribution belonged (i.e. expressive, instrumental, or self-defense) and (2)once this was determined, the researcher found the other two items from the set and calculated the average. This averaged score was then entered to replace the missing value.

REFERENCES

Archer, J. (2000). Sex differences in aggression between heterosexual partners: A meta-analytic review. *Psychological Bulletin, 126*, 651-680.

Barnett, O., & Cheok, Y. (1997). Gender differences in attributions of self-defense and control. *Violence Against Women, 3*, 462-482.

Barnett, O., & LaViolette, G. (1993). *It could happen to anyone*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage

Berk, R. A., Berk, S. F., Loseke, D. R., & Rauma, D. (1983). Mutual combat and other family myths. In D. F. Finkelhor, R. J. Gelles, G. T. Hoalting, & M. A. Straus (Eds.), *The dark side of families* (pp 197-212). Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.

Bookwala, J., Frieze, I., Smith, C., & Ryan, K. (1992). Predictors of dating violence: A multivariate analysis. *Violence and Victims, 7*, 297-311.

Browne, A. (1987). *When battered women kill*. New York, NY: Free Press.

Browne, A. (1993). Violence against women by male partners. *American Psychologist, 48*, 1077-1086.

Campbell, A. (1993). *Men, women and aggression*. New York, NY: BasicBooks.

Carden, A. P. (1994). Wife abuse and the wife abuser: Review and recommendations. *The Counseling Psychologists, 22,* 539-582.

Cascardi, M., & Vivian, D. (1995). Context for specific episodes of marital violence: Gender & severity of violence differences. *Journal of Family Violence, 10,* 265-293.

DeKeseeredy, W. S., & Saunders, D. G. (1997). The meanings and motives for women's use of violence in Canadian college dating relationships. *Sociological Spectrum, 17,* 199-123.

DeMaris, A., & Swinford, S. (1996). Female victims of spousal violence: Factors influencing their level of fearfulness. *Family Relations, 45,* 98-106.

Dobash, R. E., & Dobash, R. P. (1979). *Violence against wives.* New York: Free Press.

Dobash, R. E., & Dobash, R. P. (1984). The nature and antecedents of violent events. *British Journal of Criminology, 24,* 269-288.

Dobash, R. P., & Dobash, R. E. (1998). Seperate and intersecting realities. *Violence Against Women, 4,* 382-415.

Dobash, R. P., Dobash, R. E., Wilson, M., & Daly, M. (1992). The myth of sexual symmetry in marital violence. *Social Problems, 39,* 71-87.

Edleson. J. L., & Brygger, P. (1986). Gender differences in reporting of battering incidents. *Family Relations, 35*, 377-382.

Eisikovits, Z. (1999). Talking control metaphors used by battered women. *Violence Against Women, 5*, 845-869.

Ferraro, K. J. & Johnson, J. M. (1983). How women experience battering: The process of victimization. *Social Problems, 30*, 325-339.

Flynn, C. P. (1990). Relationship violence by women: Issues and implications. *Family Relations, 39*, 194-204.

Follingstad, D. R., & Wright, S. (1991). Sex differences in motivations and effects in dating relationships. *Family Relations, 40*, 571-578.

Freud, S. (1915). Instincts and vicissitudes. In E. Jones (Ed.), *The collected papers of Sigmund Freud.* New York: Basic Books.

Frieze, I. H. (2000). Violence in close relationships-Development of a research area: Comment on Archer (2000). *Psychological Bulletin, 126*, 681-684.

Frieze, I. H., & Browne, A. (1989). Violence in marriage. In L. Ohlin & M. Tonry (Eds.), Family violence (pp. 163-218). Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Gelles, R. J. (1974) *The violent home: A study of physical aggression between husbands and wives.* Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.

Gelles, R. J. (1999). Male offenders: Our understanding from the data. In M. Haraway & J. O'Neill (Eds.), *What causes men's violence against women* (pp. 36-47). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Gelles, R. J., & Straus, M. A. (1980). *Behind closed doors.* New York, NY: Doubleday.

Gelles, R. J., & Straus, M. A. (1988). *Intimate violence: The causes and consequences of abuse in the American family.* New York, NY: Simon & Schuster.

Gordon, M. (2000). Definitional Issues in Violence against women. *Violence Against Women, 6,* 747-784.

Hamberger, L. K., Lohr, J. M. (1997). An empirical classification of motivations for domestic violence. *Violence Against Women, 3,* 401-424.

Hamberger, L. K., Lohr, J. M., & Bonge, D. B. (1994). The intended function of domestic violence is different for arrested male and female perpetrators. *Family Violence & Sexual Assault Bulletin,* 10, 40-44.

Henton, J., Cate, R., Koval, J., Lloyd, S. & Christopher, S. (1983). Romance & violence in dating relationships. *Journal in Family Issues, 4,* 465-482.

Jacobsen, N. S., Gottman, J. M., Waltz, J., Rushe, R., Babock, J., & Holtzworth-Monroe, A., (1994). Affect, verbal content, and psychophysiology in the arguments of couples with a violent husband. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 62,* 982-988.

Johnson, M. P. (1995). Patriarchal terrorism and common couple violence: Two forms of violence against women. *Journal of Marriage and the Family, 57,* 283-294.

Johnson, M. P. & Ferraro, K. J. (2000). Research on domestic violence in the 1990s: Making distinctions. *Journal of Marriage and the Family, 62,* 948-964..

Jones, E. E., & Nisbett, R. E. (1971). *The actor and the observer: Divergent Perceptions of the Causes of Behavior.* Movestow, NJ: General Learning Press.

Kurz, D. (1997). Physical assaults by male partners: A major social problem. In M. R. Walsh (Eds.), *Women, men, and gender: Ongoing debates* (pp.222-231). Haven, CT: Yale University Press.

Lane, K. E., & Gwartney-Gibbs, P. A. (1985). Violence in the context of dating and sex. *Journal of Family Issues, 6,* 45-59.

Laner, M. R., & Thompson, J. (1982). Abuse & aggression in courting couples. *Deviant Behavior: An International Journal, 3,* 229-244.

Lloyd, S. A. (2000). Intimate Violence. *National Forum, 80,* 19-22.

Lorenz, K. (1966). *On aggression.* New York: Harcourt.

Makepeace, J. (1986). Gender differences in courtship violence victimization. *Family Relations, 35,* 383-388.

Margolin, G. (1987). The multiple forms of aggressiveness between marital partners. How do we identify them? *Journal of Marriage & Family Therapy,* 13, 77-84.

Marin, A. J., & Russo, N. F. (1999). Preliminary multivariate model explaining the causes of men's violence against women. In M. Haraway & J. M. O' Neil (Eds.), *What causes men's violence against women?* (pp. 18-35). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

McFarlane, J., & Wilson, P. (2000). Intimate partner violence. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 15,* 158-180.

Myers, D. L. (1995). Eliminating the battering of women by men: Some considerations for behavior analysis. *Journal of Applied Behavior Analysis, 28,* 493-507.

Newton, R. R., Connelly, D. D. & Landsverk, J. A. (2001). An examination of measurement characteristics and factorial validity of scores on the revised conflict tactics scale. *Educational & Psychological Measurement, 61,* 317-336.

Oklahoma monitors intimate partner violence. (March, 2000). *Nation's Health,* 30, 9.

O'Leary, K. D. (2000). Are women really more aggressive than men in intimate relationships? Comment on Archer (2000). *Psychological Bulletin, 126,* 685-689.

O'Neil, D. (1998). A post-structural review of the theoretical literature surrounding wife abuse. *Violence Against Women, 4*, 457-591.

Pence, E., & Paymar, M. (1993). *Education groups for men who batter: The Duluth model*. New York: Springer.

Ptacek, J. (1988). Why do men batter their wives? In K. Yllo & M. Bograd (Eds.), *Feminist Perspectives on Wife Abuse*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications.

Saunders, D. G. (1986). When battered women use violence: Husband-abuse or self-defense. *Violence and Victims, 1*, 47-60.

Saunders, D. G. (1988). Wife abuse, husband abuse, or mutual combat? A feminist perspective on the empirical findings. In K. Yllo & M. Bograd (Eds.), *Feminist Perspectives on Wife Abuse*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications.

Saunders, D. G. (1989). Cognitive & behavioral interventions with men who batter: Applications & outcomes. In P. L. Caesar & L. k. Hamberger (Eds.), *Treating men who batter: Theory, practice & programs* (pp. 77-100). New York: Springer.

Schupe, A. Stacey, W., & Hazelwood, R. (1987). *Violent men, violent couples: The dynamics of domestic violence.* Lexington, Mass: Lexington.

Short, L. (2000). Survivors' identification of protective factors and early warning signs for intimate partner violence. *Violence Against Women, 6,* 272-286.

Stacey, W. A., Hazelwood, L. R., & Schupe, A. (1994). *The violent couple.* Westport, CT: Prager.

Steinmetz, S. K. (1978). The battered husband syndrome. *Victimology: An International Journal, 2,* 499-509.

Steinmetz, S. K. (1980). Women and violence: Victims and perpetrators. *American Journal of Psychotherapy, 34,* 334-350.

Stets J. E., & Straus, M. A. (1990). Gender differences in reporting marital violence and its medical and psychological consequences. In M.A. Straus & R. J. Gelles (Eds.), *Physical violence in American families: risk factors and adaptations in violence in 8,145 families.* New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction.

Straus, M. A. (1971). Some social antecedents of physical punishment: A linkage theory interpretation. *Journal of Marriage & the Family, 33,* 658-663.

Straus, M. A. (1977). Wife beating: How common and why? *Victimology, 2,* 443-459.

Straus, M. A. (1979). Measuring intrafamily conflict and violence: The Conflict Tactics Scale. *Journal of Marriage and the Family, 41,* 75-88.

Straus, M. A. (1990). Injury & frequency of assault & the "representative fallacy" in measuring wife battering &

child abuse. In M. A. Straus & R. J. Gelles (Eds.), *Physical violence in American families: Risk factors & adaptations to violence in 8,145 families (pp. 75-91)*. New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction Publishers.

Straus, M. A. (1997). Physical assault by women partners: A major social problem. In M. R. Walsh (Eds.), *Women, men, and gender: Ongoing debates* (pp.210-221). Haven, CT: Yale University Press.

Straus, M. A, & Gelles, R. J. (1986). Societal change and change in family violence from 1975 to 1985 as revealed by two national surveys. Journal of Marriage and the Family, 48, 465-479.

Straus, M. A, & Gelles, R. J. (1990). Societal change & change in family violence from 1975-1985 as revealed by two national surveys. In M. A. Straus & R. J. Gelles (Eds.), *Physical violence in American families* (pp. 113-131). New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction Publishers.

Straus, M. A., Gelles, R. J., & Steinmetz, S. K. (1980). *Behind closed doors: Violence in the American family*. Garden City, NY: Anchor.

Straus, M. A., Hamby, S. L., Boney-McCoy, S., & Sugarman, D. B. (1996). The Revised Conflict Tactics Scales (CTS2): Development and preliminary psychometric data. *Journal of Family Issues, 17,* 283-316.

Walker, L. E. (1979). *The Battered Woman*. New York; Harper & Row.

Walker, L. E. (1984). *The Battered Women Syndrome*. New York: Springer.

Weisz, A. N. & Tolman, R. M. (2000). Assessing the risk of severe domestic violence. *Journal of Family Issues, 15*, 75-91.

White, J W., & Kowalski, R. M. (1994). Deconstructing the myth of the nonaggresive woman: A feminist analysis. In D. L. Anselmi & A. L. Law (Eds.), *Questions of gender: Perspectives and paradoxes*. Boston, MA: McGraw Hill.

Yllo, K. (1988). Political and methodological debates in wife abuse research. In K. Yllo & M. Bograd (Eds.), *Feminist perspectives on wife abuse*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Yllo, K. (1993). Through a feminist lens: Gender, power, and violence. In R. J. Gelles & D. R. Loeske (Eds.), *Current controversies on family violence* (pp. 47-62). Newberry park, CA: Sage.