INTIMATE PARTNER VIOLENCE: GENDER SYMMETRY

AND THE VICTIM PERPETRATOR OVERLAP

Kirsten Jane Robertson

UNIVERSITY
of
OTAGO

Te Whare Wānanga o Otāgo

A thesis submitted for the degree of

Doctor of Philosophy

At the University of Otago, Dunedin

New Zealand.

December 1, 2005

INTIMATE PARTNER VIOLENCE:

GENDER SYMMETRY AND THE VICTIM

PERPETRATOR OVERLAP

Kirsten Jane Robertson

A thesis submitted for the Degree of

Doctor of Philosophy

at the University of Otago, Dunedin

New Zealand

December 1, 2005

ABSTRACT

This study addressed substantial limitations in the literature pertaining to intimate partner violence (IPV). In particular, I addressed the gender symmetry debate, and identified factors associated with the dynamics of violent relationships by examining the correlates related to perpetrating and suffering IPV for both men and women. Finally, I examined attitudes towards IPV, communication behaviour, and conflict management techniques as a function of abuse history. Participants were recruited from three samples of the New Zealand population (student, general, and incarcerated). The inclusion of an incarcerated sample enabled the examination of more severe, frequent and injurious violence than is typically experienced within the student and general samples.

There were three phases to the study. The first phase explored incidence rates and psychological correlates of IPV. As expected, the incidence of IPV was highest within the incarcerated sample (Chapter 5). Of greater significance, the incidence of IPV was similar for males and females, with the majority of violence being bi-directional (Chapters 4 & 5). Moreover, the psychological correlates associated with IPV were similar for perpetrators and victims, and males and females (Chapters 4 & 5).

Due to the bi-directional nature of IPV, analyses presented in Chapters 4 and 5 were limited by the categorisation of participants as both perpetrators and victims. In Chapter 6, I overcame this limitation. The attitudes of victims were examined separately to individuals experiencing bi-directional violence. Validating the findings of Chapters 4 and 5, the attitudes and behaviours of victims and perpetrators were similar. These included being more hostile and negative towards others and ones'

partner, being more controlling, and reporting more communication problems. I also further explored gender symmetry in IPV. Male and female IPV was found to be similar in frequency, severity, and similarly associated with control. However, the type of acts perpetrated differed across gender.

During the second and third phase of the study, I further examined participants' communication behaviour (Chapter 7), conflict behaviour, and attitudes (Chapter 8). Findings revealed that perpetrators and victims employed less facilitative and polite linguistic devices (Chapter 7) and reported fewer skills for dealing with conflict (Chapter 8) than did other individuals. An examination of attitudes towards IPV revealed males and females had similar attitudes and were more condoning of female, than male-perpetrated IPV. Moreover, individuals with a history of IPV were the most condoning of violence. Additionally, a number of correlates associated with experiencing IPV were also associated with attitudes condoning IPV (Chapter 8).

Overall, the findings revealed IPV to be bi-directional and gender symmetrical. Male and female IPV was similar in incidence, severity, and injury. Furthermore, the psychological correlates associated with IPV were similar for men and women, and perpetrators and victims. Individuals with a history of IPV were more controlling, hostile towards others, more condoning of IPV, employed less positive communication styles, and lacked skills for dealing with conflict. In light of these findings, suggestions are offered for violence prevention initiatives in the discussion sections of each chapter and in the final chapter (Chapter 9).

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Firstly, I am forever grateful to my supervisor Tamar Murachver for her invaluable assistance, wisdom, encouragement, and friendship. Since our first meeting in Language Psychology in 1996, you have inspired my continued education and future career aspirations in the field of psychology. I would also like to offer a sincere thanks to my lab colleagues for their helpful assistance. To my colleague and friend Anna Janssen for her assistance with data collection, reliability coding and for her continued encouragement, support, friendship, and wisdom. Also a very special thanks to my colleague and friend James Green for his proofing and invaluable statistical assistance – I have no doubt that my little book of handy statistical notes that I compiled during your many informal tutorials will assist me throughout my academic career.

I am also very grateful to Ben McEachen, Vincent Waide, Natasha Pomeroy, and Kirsty Pinder for their assistance with data collection. Thank you also to Amanda Jones for her very much appreciated assistance with transcribing. I would also like to thank the New Zealand Department of Corrections for their assistance with data collection and the many individuals who gave up their time to take part in the study.

I would sincerely like to thank my husband Tony Doig for his assistance with computer programming, data collection, proofing, and most of all for believing in me. To my family, in particular my sister, for her continued support and encouragement. Finally, I am also extremely grateful to Brian for proofing the PhD in its entirety and to both Garner and Brian Doig for their generous support with minding our two-year-old daughter Emily in the weekends to allow me to finish writing.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

CHAPTER 1

Overview of Intimate Partner Violence

Intimate partner violence (IPV) has been a topical area of research since the 1960s when feminist activists framed domestic violence as a serious issue deserving both public and official attention. Since this time, IPV research has tended towards one of two directions. Initial research stemmed from a feminist perspective founded within a belief system that saw partner violence as being perpetrated primarily by men. To substantiate these claims, feminist researchers have tended to present findings drawn from interviews with female victims. Following the widely held perspective that males are the primary perpetrators of IPV, other researchers turned their attention towards identifying the correlates associated with male perpetrated IPV. However, alongside the growing awareness of the severity, motivations, and consequences of male violence, researchers conducting gender-neutral surveys within wider community samples identified that both males and females perpetrate IPV. These findings were both surprising and controversial, although they have been replicated in numerous community-based surveys.

Although there is now a vast amount of research documenting the similar incidence of male- and female-perpetrated IPV, very little attention has been directed towards examining the causes and correlates associated with female violence. In order to better understand the dynamics of violent relationships and to design and implement effective violence prevention programs, the risk factors associated with female IPV must also be identified. The current thesis provides a more comprehensive understanding of IPV by examining the equivalence and correlates of

both male and female violence. To set the context, this chapter provides a general overview of the theories surrounding IPV and the research stemming from the different standpoints, and addresses the gender symmetry debate.

Definition of IPV

Two main terms have been used to refer to partner violence, *'domestic violence'*, and *'intimate partner violence'*. Historically, the term *domestic violence* has predominated discourse surrounding partner violence. Embedded within this term is the connotation that men are the primary perpetrators of partner violence. The term has been used broadly to define a pattern of behaviours and beliefs that have been used to subordinate women. Alternatively, *intimate partner violence* was a term coined by community-based researchers to refer to partner violence perpetrated by either a man or a woman.

The present thesis is concerned with both male and female violence and therefore uses the term *intimate partner violence*. The term *domestic violence* is only used if it assists in reflecting another author's position. Based on the findings of past research revealing a high correlation between psychological and physical violence (Follingstad, Rutledge, Berg, Hause, & Polek, 1990; Hyden, 1995; Magdol, Moffitt, Caspi, & Silva, 1998) both forms of violence were examined in the present study. The importance of considering psychological violence alongside physical violence is also emphasised by research that has found psychological violence often precedes later physical violence (Stets, 1990). In a 30-month longitudinal study of recently married individuals with no previous history of IPV, Murphy and O'Leary (1989) found that the use of psychological violence predicted the later use of physical violence. Schumacher and Leonard (2005) found a similar association in a more

recent longitudinal study. Moreover, the consequences and impact of psychological violence have been found to be comparable to that of physical violence (O'Leary, 1999).

Who are the Perpetrators of IPV?

Incidence rates of IPV vary between studies due to different sampling procedures and differing interpretations of what constitutes partner violence. In general, research can be classified into three broad categories: 1) crime studies investigating court records, 2) studies investigating targeted samples of women in shelter populations or men attending violence prevention programs, and 3) community-based research measuring incidence of IPV within student or general sample populations. Based on crime statistics, IPV is relatively infrequent, is primarily perpetrated by men, and involves serious violence that leads to injury or death. The greater number of male offenders is influenced by the fact that male violence is more likely than female violence to come to the attention of officials. This can be attributed to two reasons. Firstly, because of males' greater physical size there is a greater chance that their violence will lead to injury that requires outsider intervention. Secondly, male victims of female perpetrated IPV might also be less inclined to report the abuse because of societal attitudes that view female IPV less seriously than male IPV (Arias & Johnson, 1989; Bethke & DeJoy, 1993; Harris & Cook, 1994; Koski & Mangold, 1988).

The second type of research has been conducted within a feminist framework examining IPV in clinical samples of female victims or samples of known male batterers. This research typically finds domestic violence to be primarily perpetrated by men. In most cases, female perpetrated IPV is not investigated. Research is

generally qualitative with women being asked about their experiences of victimisation (Dobash & Dobash, 1980).

The final type of data collection has involved measuring the incidence of IPV within the wider community (see Straus, 2005). Male and female participants are generally asked about their use and suffering of physical and psychological violence within the past year. Past community-based research has found IPV to be relatively frequent. In a large-scale investigation of university samples across 31 states, Straus (2004a) found approximately 29% of the participants reported having perpetrated IPV within the past year with a range of 17% to 45% across the universities. Similarly, Straus and Yodanis (1996) found that the incidence of IPV was approximately 34% among a sample of 232 university students. Incidence rates vary across samples. For example, Pedersen and Thomas (1992) found that 45.8% of a Canadian university sample reported having experienced IPV. Similar incidence rates have been obtained within New Zealand. In an examination of a birth cohort of 21 year olds, Magdol et al. (1998) found IPV to be relatively frequent with 37.2% of women and 31.8% of men having perpetrated physical violence within the past year.

Each of the three research strategies have enlightened and informed theories pertaining to IPV and various interventions arising from them. The present study was concerned with examining IPV perpetrated by both men and women. Thus, the research methodology most closely resembles that employed in previous community-based research.

Theories of Partner Violence

Many theories have been developed to explain IPV. These have stemmed from biological, psychological, social learning, social skills deficits, and feminist

theories (Pryke & Thomas, 1998). It is now generally accepted that no single theory can adequately explain IPV, with factors such as the societal context, family dynamics, and characteristics of the individual perpetrator needing to be considered. This section of the chapter provides a brief overview of the different theories. There is a particular focus on theories arising from a feminist perspective because these have been the most influential in shaping societal attitudes and responses to IPV.

Biological theories of IPV have focused on the relationship of genes, organic causes, and testosterone and other hormonal influences on the perpetration of IPV. Male-to-female violence has also been explained within the context of natural selection. According to this perspective, males use IPV to ensure that their partner remains faithful, ultimately fulfilling their biological need to reproduce and to ensure the survival of the species. Biological causes of IPV have not had a large influence in shaping violence intervention initiatives (Johnson, 1996).

Psychological approaches focus on characteristics of the individual such as personality characteristics, psychopathology, and substance abuse of victims and perpetrators. For instance, research has found an association between borderline and antisocial personality characteristics and the perpetration of IPV (Dutton & Golant, 1995). Psychological approaches also attribute certain characteristics to victims, such as learned helplessness, and have been criticised for diverging responsibility away from the perpetrator (Chornesky, 2000).

There are many sociological theories of IPV, however, the social learning perspective (Bandura, 1977) has been the most influential in shaping research and interventions. This theory assumes that children learn which behaviours lead to desired outcomes though observation. O'Leary (1988) applied this theory to partner violence by arguing that children learn that violence is an instrumental behaviour by

witnessing their parent's violence lead to personal gain. They may also learn that the people who use violence are often the people who love them. Moreover, when violence is modelled as a problem solving behaviour there is often an absence of other non-violent constructive problem solving techniques being modelled. Interventions based on social learning perspectives focus on removing children from violent homes and teaching individuals who have been exposed to violence more effective conflict management, problem solving, and communication skills.

Research has generally supported the association between witnessing violence in one's family of origin and later perpetration of partner abuse (Hotaling & Sugarman, 1986). In fact, in a review of the literature, Hotaling and Sugarman (1986) found exposure to violence during childhood to be one of the major predictors for perpetrating or suffering IPV as an adult. Similarly, O'Hearn and Margolin (2000) examined the relationship between history of IPV in the home while growing up, attitudes towards IPV, and males' later perpetration of IPV. They found that witnessing IPV during childhood was directly related to perpetrating IPV and that this relationship was moderated by attitudes towards IPV.

Although a strong association has been found between childhood experience of IPV and later perpetration, researchers only recently have begun to examine the mechanisms behind this association. Skuja and Halford (2004) found that family of origin violence was related to later negative conflict communication. Similarly, Wolf and Foshee (2003) found that witnessing violence during childhood was associated with the development of more destructive anger expression styles.

Proponents of social skill deficit theories argue that violence arises out of a lack of skills for dealing with conflict and problem situations in non-violent ways. This theory has been very influential in guiding responses to IPV, with many violence

prevention programs incorporating skills training into their curriculum. Research has generally supported the notion that perpetrators lack social skills. For instance, Holtzworth-Munroe and Anglin (1991) found that in comparison to non-violent men, violent men demonstrated fewer skills for dealing with relationship problems, especially in relation to situations where they might be challenged or rejected by their partner.

Feminist Theories

A number of feminist theories have been formulated to explain domestic violence. They share the common goal to identify why men use violence towards women within a historical and cultural context. They argue that an examination of characteristics of individuals will not help in reducing violence (Dobash & Dobash, 1980). Therefore, they do not seek to explain why a particular man might use violence, but rather focus on males' and females' positions in society to explain male-to-female violence. Male perpetrated partner violence is thought to be situated within the history of the family, that gave men the right to dominate their home and to subordinate their partners (Bogard, 1988). Women were seen as the property of the man, and they were to obey his wishes (Dobash & Dobash, 1980). Even the law permitted men to use violence against their wives; laws regulated the degree of force rather than the existence of force (Dobash & Dobash, 1979). Although the law no longer permits men to hit their wives, feminists argue that men still chose to use violence within the home to dominate and control their wives (Dobash & Dobash, 1999). Although not all men use violence, all men benefit from wife abuse because it serves to make women subordinate and dependent on men (Dutton, 1994).

Research examining shelter samples supports the notion that males are the primary perpetrators of IPV (Pagelow, 1992; Saunders, 1988; Walker, 1979). Similar findings have been observed when IPV is framed as violence that leads to fear or injury. De Vries Robbè, March, Vinen, Horner, and Roberts (1996) examined the incidence of IPV within a random sample of men and women attending an emergency department in Sydney. Participants were asked whether they had experienced persistent violence resulting in fear or injury. Based on this line of questioning women were far more likely than males to report being the victim of IPV. However, it is likely that these conclusions were shaped by the methodology employed. Questions pertaining to fear are much more likely to measure male- than female-perpetrated IPV because males are far less likely to report feeling afraid of their partner (Henning & Feder, 2004) and are also more likely to inflict serious injury (Busch & Rosenberg, 2004).

Feminist views concerning IPV have been very influential in shaping the mainstream belief that IPV is primarily perpetrated by men (Dobash & Dobash, 1992). They have also been influential in how IPV is treated. Feminist activists have played a large role in setting up shelters for female victims, in instituting mandatory arrest and prosecution of perpetrators, and in shaping violence prevention programs (Mills, 2003). Because of feminist influence, violence prevention programs typically share a common aim to hold the male perpetrator accountable while protecting women and children (Dobash & Dobash, 2000). Two of the most widely used models in batterer intervention programs, the cycle theory of violence and the power and control wheel, arose from feminist theory (Yllo, 1993).

Although feminist views have been prominent in shaping attitudes and responses to IPV, research advocating these views has often been limited to female

samples, the findings from which cannot be generalised to the wider population. The validity of feminist research methodologies is further brought to question by researchers who have based their findings on women's accounts of others' attitudes. Smith (1990), for instance, reported an association between male patriarchal beliefs and IPV, but this was based on women's accounts of their husband's attitudes. Similarly, Smith (1991) concluded that there is an association between patriarchal beliefs and IPV based on women's perceptions of the attitudes of their husband's friends. Men's attitudes were never directly assessed.

Female Violence According to the Feminist Theory

According to feminist theory, female violence usually occurs in retaliation to prior abuse or in self-defence (Dobash & Dobash, 2000; Saunders, 1988). This conclusion, however, has been based largely on theory rather than on empirical evidence. Moreover, research provided as evidence for supporting these claims has been biased by sampling procedures that have focused on female participants selected by their experience as victims, or samples selected by the males' use of violence (e.g. Jacobson et al., 1994). Saunders (1986), for instance, concluded female violence is self-defensive, based on a sample of 52 female victims of battering. Similarly, Dobash and Dobash (2004) concluded that males are the primarily perpetrators of IPV, based on a sample of men and women identified by the males' use of violence. According to Johnson (1999), there are different forms of IPV occurring within different samples, and conclusions drawn from targeted samples cannot be generalised to the wider population. It is possible, therefore, that within different samples women may use violence for reasons other than self-defence. This suggestion is in line with empirical research that has found men and women to be

equally likely to initiate IPV. Straus (1997), for instance, found women reported initiating violence first (53.1%) more frequently than they reported that their partner initiated the violence (42.3%).

Feminist theories have been criticised for their lack of empirical support and sampling biases. Moreover, interventions arising from these theories have questionable success rates. Mandatory arrest, for instance, has not been very effective in reducing IPV. In fact, it might serve to discourage some women from seeking assistance for fear that their partner will be arrested (Mills, 2003). Feminist theories also fail to explain community-based findings that women are as likely as men to perpetrate IPV (Magdol et al., 1997).

In conclusion, feminist activists must be credited for their many contributions to IPV, especially in the areas of public awareness and founding interventions. However, their view of IPV has been too simplistic and cannot explain the dynamic nature of IPV or the finding that the majority of violence occurring within the wider community is bi-directional, i.e. individuals were both the victim and perpetrator of abuse. Mills (2003) also argued that by defining domestic violence as male-perpetrated physical violence, feminist theory also took away any language where men could talk about the abuse that they might have suffered.

Community-Based Research

Contrary to traditional beliefs, gender-neutral surveys conducted within larger and more generalisable samples have found that women also perpetrate IPV. In fact, the National Family Violence survey of 2,143 cohabitating couples in 1975 (Straus & Gelles, 1986) and of 6,000 couples in 1985 (Straus & Gelles, 1990) found women and men to be equally likely to perpetrate IPV (see Straus & Gelles, 1986). Since this

time, research examining both partners' use of violence often finds women to be as likely or more likely to perpetrate IPV (Bookwala, Frieze, Smith, & Ryan, 1992; Foshee, 1996; Magdol et al., 1998; O'Leary et al., 1989; Pedersen & Thomas, 1992). In a meta-analytic review of 82 studies, comprised mainly of community and student samples, Archer (2000) found similar evidence for gender symmetry in the incidence of IPV perpetrated by men and women.

It is now commonly accepted, at least within samples not specifically targeted for the males' use of violence, that the majority of IPV is bi-directional (Brush, 1990). This pattern is the same regardless of whether the relationship status is dating or cohabitating (Mills, 2003). Moreover, bi-directional violence might be more concerning than one-sided violence. In an examination of IPV within a sample of high school students, Gray and Foshee (1997) found violence and injury occurred more frequently in mutually violent compared to one-sided violent relationships.

Theoretical Explanation for Female Perpetrated IPV

Straus (1999) offered one of the first theoretical frameworks from which to consider female-perpetrated IPV. His theory also helps to explain the anomaly between the high frequency of female-perpetrated violence within the home and the lower incidence rate of female violence outside of the home. Straus suggests that females' lesser involvement in violence outside of the home is partly attributable to the social world in which they interact. Compared to men, women are less likely to be involved in violent occupations, and are more likely to solve their disagreements through discussions. Moreover, societal expectations discourage women from using violence outside of the home by viewing it as unfeminine. Men on the other hand are more likely to work in violent occupations such as the military or in heavy labour

occupations. Societal expectations also support male-to-male violence. However, within the home there are fewer constraints on women's than men's use of violence. Females are less likely to be arrested for violence and society views female-perpetrated violence within the home less seriously than male-perpetrated violence. Straus also suggests that women are equally likely as men to gain their identity from within the home. However, within a patriarchal society men are ascribed more power than women, therefore, women might be more likely than men to turn to violence to try and assert their power.

Different Forms of IPV

The finding that women perpetrate IPV as frequently as men do has been controversial. It contradicts widespread beliefs concerning violence and has received a great deal of criticism, especially from supporters of feminist theories. To explain the conflicting research, Johnson (1999) argued that there are different forms of IPV that differ in frequency depending on the sampling procedure.

Johnson identified four forms of IPV distinguished from each other by the pattern of violence within the relationship (one-sided versus mutual) and the degree of other controlling behaviours being used in conjunction with violence. Research examining samples selected by their experience with IPV (shelter samples, batterers, and court records) are more likely to measure *intimate terrorism*. Intimate terrorism involves violent and controlling behaviour used to subordinate and control one's partner. This form of IPV is primarily perpetrated by men, often increases in severity, and most closely fits mainstream beliefs concerning IPV. In most instances where intimate terrorism is occurring, the violence is thought to be one-sided. However, in some instances a partner might use *violent resistance* in response to the violence.

Violent resistance is primarily perpetrated by women and involves non-controlling violence. According to Johnson, intimate terrorism occurs more frequently within shelter samples because it is only when the violence becomes frequent, severe, and terrorising that individuals seek assistance. The victim and other bystanders (neighbours, or family) are also more likely to call officials for assistance when the violence is very severe.

Within community samples, however, Johnson argues that there is often another type of violence occurring known as *situational violence*. This arises out of conflict situations, is not associated with other controlling behaviours, and is equally likely to be perpetrated by a man or a woman. In comparison to intimate terrorism, situational violence is often less severe, less likely to lead to injury, and less likely to escalate. Community-based research is more likely to measure situational violence because individuals experiencing intimate terrorism would be less likely to respond to surveys for fear that the perpetrator would find out. Perpetrators themselves would not be inclined to voluntarily own up to their violent and harmful actions.

To test his theory, Johnson re-analysed data collected in the 1970's that had measured both physical violence and the use of other control tactics. The sample included females contacted through shelter populations and through the wider community. Johnson found preliminary support for his theory. Intimate terrorism was more likely to lead to injury, to escalate, and to be perpetrated by men. Situational violence was more prevalent within the community sample and was more gender symmetrical than was intimate terrorism. Contrary to expectation, however, female victims of intimate terrorism also used violence, although less frequently than did their male counterparts. Johnson concluded that the different typologies were more frequent within certain samples.

Other researchers have supported the notion that the frequency and form of male- and female-perpetrated IPV varies depending on the sample surveyed. In his extensive review of the literature, Archer (2000) found gender symmetry within community samples, however, amongst samples identified by their high use of violence or for their victimisation, men were the primary perpetrators of IPV. In a later investigation Graham-Kevan and Archer (2003) replicated and extended Johnson's findings by examining the incidence of the different forms of IPV across a variety of samples (women contacted through a shelter sample, known male batterers, incarcerated men, and students). Similar to Johnson, they found that intimate terrorism occurred primarily within the selected samples, although given a large enough sample it was possible to measure less frequent intimate terrorism within a community or incarcerated sample. As predicted, they also found that intimate terrorism was perpetrated primarily by males, was more frequent, and was more likely to lead to injury than violence in relationships experiencing situational violence. However, when they omitted the shelter sample, intimate terrorism was found to be gender symmetrical, which is similar to situational violence. These findings suggest that the inclusion of shelter samples may severely skew outcomes.

Research examining the hypothesis that males are more likely than females to use a pattern of controlling and violent behaviour has been inconclusive. Archer and Graham-Kevan (2003) found a strong relationship between IPV and control. The more an individual viewed their aggression as instrumental, the more they used physical aggression, injured their partner, or tried to control their partner. Contrary to Johnson's predictions, however, both males and females viewed violence as instrumental. Moreover, other research has found both perpetrators and victims of

IPV to be more condoning of the use of controlling behaviours (Ehrensaft & Vivian, 1999).

Equivalence of Male and Female Violence

The finding that men and women are equally likely to perpetrate IPV has lead to a further controversy surrounding the equivalence of male and female IPV. Researchers have begun to compare the frequency, motivations, and consequences of male and female IPV. Presently, there is not enough empirical research to form any strong conclusions and research outcomes have not been consistent across studies.

One method that has been employed to compare male- and female-perpetrated IPV is to examine whether or not the motivations for perpetrating IPV differ as a function of gender. Hamberger, Lohr, Bonge, and Tolin (1997) found that amongst a sample of males and females attending violence prevention programs, males were more likely to mention perpetrating abuse to control and dominate their partner, whereas females were more likely to mention self-defence or retaliation as the reason behind their violence. Barnett, Lee, and Thelen (1997) found similar findings. However, their research outcomes may have been influenced by their sampling procedure, which included battered women and male batterers.

In contrast, other research has found many similarities between the motivations of male and female IPV. In an examination of students' attributions for IPV, Follingstad, Wright, Lloyd, and Sebastian (1991) found frequent attributions were common for both male- and female-perpetrated abuse including expressing anger, retaliation, and for being hurt. Interestingly, female perpetrators acknowledged

using violence for power and control, whereas male perpetrators did not. Furthermore, male perpetrators and female victims both acknowledged that males were more likely to be retaliating after being hit first. Foo and Margolin (1995) also found gender similarities in the motivations for IPV. Both male and female students who had perpetrated IPV believed that violence is justified when humiliated by your partner.

Research comparing the equivalence of male and female IPV as a function of injury has also been inconsistent. The view that male violence leads to more severe injury than female violence is widely held within feminist-based research (see Mills, 2003). Examination of homicide rates supports this notion. Women are far more likely to be killed by their partner than are men (Saunders & Browne, 2000). Community-based research has also found male violence to be more likely to lead to injury, although the gender disparity is far less within community samples. For instance, both Archer (2000) and Straus (2004a) in their reviews of the research qualified gender differences in injury rates by concluding that the difference between genders in the incidence of injury is relatively small.

In yet other research, men and women have been found to be equally likely to inflict injury. Busch and Rosenberg (2004) found men and women convicted of IPV were equally likely to have inflicted severe injuries on their partners. Similarly, McFarlane, Willson, Malecha, and Lemmey (2000) found similarities between the frequency, severity, and consequences of male and female IPV within a study examining assault charges, although men made only ten percent of the claims. Research has also found further gender similarities in IPV with both male- and female-perpetrators justifying, denying, and minimising their use of violence (Henning, Jones, & Holdford, 2005).

Another way to examine the equivalence of male and female IPV is to compare the type of abusive acts perpetrated. Although not widely investigated, researchers have generally found a number of gendered differences. For instance, in an examination of criminal justice records, Melton and Belknap (2003) found men were more likely to strangle their partner, and that women were more likely to use an object or to hit their partner with a car. Male and female IPV was also qualitatively different with males being more likely to use threats and frequent more severe violence, whereas females were more likely to suffer fear and to lay a complaint against their partner at the time of their arrest.

Finally, researchers have examined the consequences of IPV to compare the equivalence of male and female IPV and found them to be more severe for females than males. For instance, Barnett et al. (1997) found male perpetrators were more likely than female perpetrators to report that their partner was frightened because of the violence. Similarly, Jacobson et al. (1994) found that women experienced fear as a result of their partner's violence, whereas men did not. Women have also been found to be more likely than men to report reduced relationship satisfaction as a result of IPV (Katz, Kuffel, & Coblentz, 2002).

Overall, the research would seem to support the notion that male and female IPV is similar in frequency and severity, although the consequences of IPV may be more severe for female victims than male victims. Researchers often use the finding that male violence has more severe consequences than female violence to argue that IPV is asymmetrical. However, even if male violence does lead to more injury, it should not be used to dismiss female IPV altogether.

CHAPTER 2

Correlates of IPV

Researchers have begun to examine the risk factors associated with IPV, to better understand the processes behind IPV, and to design evidence-based violence prevention programs that are informed by empirical research.   Early research examining the risk factors associated with IPV focused on singular explanations. However researchers now find a combination of variables best explains IPV. Factors that have been examined include upbringing, psychopathology, psychological characteristics, and societal factors such as a cultural climate condoning patriarchy. Many of the correlates associated with male-perpetrated IPV have been summarised by Schumacher, Feldbau-Kohn, Slep, and Heyman (2001) in a comprehensive review of the risk factors for male-to-female violence. Due to the predominant belief that IPV is a male behaviour, far less research has focused on identifying the correlates associated with female-perpetrated IPV.   This chapter summarises the correlates associated with male and female IPV, with a particular focus on correlates that have been instrumental in shaping violence prevention programs.

Gendered Beliefs and Power Distributions

Due to feminist claims that male violence arises out of a patriarchal society, a considerable amount of research has examined the association between traditional gender role beliefs and the acceptance and perpetration of male-to-female violence. Some research has supported the notion that traditional gender role beliefs are related to attitudes condoning males' use of violence (Finn, 1986).   Good, Hepper,

Hillenbrand-Gunn, and Wang (1995) found that for college men, holding traditional beliefs regarding male masculinity was related to more condoning attitudes towards sexual and psychological violence. Research has also shown that traditional gendered beliefs and attitudes towards male dominance are directly related to the perpetration of IPV. In a nationally representative sample of South Korea, Kim and Emery (2003) concluded that patriarchal beliefs support males' use of violence. This was based on the finding that male-dominant relationships experienced more IPV than did relationships with reversed or equal power distributions.

Researchers have found the relationship between dominance attitudes and IPV to vary based on the severity of the violence. Crossman, Stith, and Bender (1990) found severe, but not moderate violence, to be associated with less egalitarian beliefs. The frequency of violence has also been found to differ as a function of dominance attitudes. Within a sample of violent males, Mauricio and Gormely (2001) observed males with more dominant attitudes perpetrated more frequent IPV.

Traditional gendered beliefs have also been associated with males' increased feelings of anger. In an interesting study Gold, Fultz, Burke, Prisco, and Willett (1992) examined how males' gender identity influenced their behaviour during an emotional situation. College males were asked to watch three video tapes of a baby. In one the baby was very quiet, in another the baby smiled and cooed, and in the third the baby cried for the entire two minutes. They found that males who were assessed as being more macho were more likely than other males to respond to the crying baby with anger rather than empathy.

Despite feminist claims that male violence arises out of patriarchal beliefs, some research has found evidence for a converse relationship. Burke, Stets, and Pirog-Good (1988) found that men and women with more feminine than masculine

identities were the most likely to perpetrate and suffer IPV. Similarly, Bookwala et al. (1992) found that men with less traditional gender role beliefs and females with more traditional gender role beliefs were the most likely to engage in dating violence.

Other research has found that relationships in which power is distributed unevenly are more likely to experience IPV, regardless of the dominant partner's gender. In a large-scale community-based study of 2,143 couples Coleman and Straus (1986) observed that egalitarian couples were the least likely to experience IPV. Couples where either partner was dominant were the most likely to experience IPV. This effect, however, was mediated by individuals' beliefs. The greater the couples' level of consensus concerning the power distribution in their relationship, the less likelihood there was of violence.

Later research has found supporting evidence that perception and satisfaction with one's power in the relationship may be more instrumental in IPV than is power per se. For example, Ronfeldt, Kimerling, and Arias (1998) found that dissatisfaction with relationship power was related to male students' use of IPV. This relationship has also been associated with female perpetrated IPV. Sagrestano, Heavey, and Christensen (1999) found that amongst a sample of married couples, males' perception of lesser power and females' perception of greater power were associated with both male- and female-perpetrated IPV. Similarly, Kaura and Allen (2004) found that male and female students' dissatisfaction with their power in the relationship was associated with IPV, although having witnessed their parents using violence was the strongest predictor of IPV.

The culmination of findings from past research suggests that the relationship between IPV, gendered beliefs, and power distributions may be more complicated than once thought. In fact, individuals' perceptions and satisfaction with the power in

their relationship may be more important risk factors for IPV than is male dominance. Furthermore, rather than being solely associated with one-sided male-perpetrated IPV, power distributions might actually determine the form of IPV, i.e. one-sided violence perpetrated by either gender versus bi-directional violence. Olson (2002) found that relationships where the power was balanced were more likely to experience mutual violence, whereas relationships with a power imbalance were more likely to experience one-sided violence with the less powerful individual suffering but not perpetrating IPV.

Anger / Hostility and IPV

The association between male-perpetrated IPV and the expression of anger has been widely investigated. Moreover, research outcomes have been fairly consistent. In a recent review of 33 studies, Norlander and Eckhardt (2005) concluded that violent men express more anger than do non-violent men, although it is still unclear whether they experience greater anger. Other research has found that both female-and male-perpetrated IPV is associated with an increased tendency towards expressing anger. Dye and Eckhardt (2000) found that male and female students who had perpetrated IPV were more likely to direct their anger towards others and were less likely to use anger control strategies than were non-violent students. This lack of anger management skills may partially explain perpetrators' tendencies towards violence.

Researchers have also begun to examine the process behind violent males' anger arousal. Eckhardt, Barbour, and Davison (1998) compared violent and non-violent males' cognitions while listening to an anger arousing audio tape. The men were asked to imagine that they were part of the scenario and to articulate their

thoughts at different intervals. They found that men who perpetrated IPV showed a more hostile attribution bias and fewer anger control statements. In fact, a number of studies have found violent males to hold hostile attribution biases towards their partner. Holtzworth-Munroe and Hutchinson (1993) examined violent and non-violent men's responses to nine conflict videos. They found violent men were more likely than non-violent men to view the female partners' behaviour as intentional and responsible for the conflict. Similarly, Tonizzo, Howells, Day, Reidpath, and Froyland (2000) found male perpetrators were more likely to interpret their partners' negative behaviour as intentional; and ultimately responded violently. They were also more likely to view their partner's behaviour as deserving of blame, and unchangeable. Further research has found that violent males not only attribute hostile attributions to females' behaviour, but they are also less able to accurately interpret females' actual thoughts and feelings (Schweinle, Ickes, & Bernstein, 2002).

Although there is strong support for the relationship between male perpetrated IPV and hostility, research outcomes have not been unanimous. Straus and Yodanis (1996) found hostility towards the opposite gender to be related to females' but not males' use of violence. Little other research has examined the link between female hostility and male violence, although research has found women's hostility towards women to be related to lower self-worth, lower life satisfaction, lower collective self-esteem, hostility towards men, and an acceptance of IPV (Cowan, Neighbors, DeLaMoreaux, & Behnke, 1998).

Attitudes Condoning Partner Violence

Attitudes that condone partner violence have also been associated with the perpetration of IPV. Russell and Hulson (1992) found that males' attitudes condoning

IPV were the strongest predictors of their use of violence. Similarly, Stith and Farley (1993) found that attitudes condoning violence were strongly associated with the use of severe violence amongst a sample of men attending violence and alcohol-related programmes. Although less widely studied, attitudes condoning violence have also been associated with female perpetrated IPV and with the victimisation of IPV. Arias and Johnson (1989), for example, found male and female victims and perpetrators of IPV to have more condoning attitudes towards the use of violence.

The association between IPV and attitudes towards violence has also been found to vary according to the pattern of violence within the relationship. Gray and Foshee (1997), for instance, found that individuals in mutually violent relationships were the most accepting of IPV. Perpetrators from one-sided violent relationships were also accepting of IPV, although they were less accepting than were individuals from mutually violent relationships. Victims were the least accepting of violence. Gray and Foshee concluded that this greater acceptance of IPV within mutually violent relationships might be instrumental in contributing to the violence.

Communication and Conflict Behaviour

Researchers have begun to examine the conversations of violent couples to identify dynamic relationship factors that might be associated with IPV. This research has typically examined the conflict communication of couples identified by the husbands' use of violence. In common with other IPV research, very little attention has been directed towards examining female-perpetrated IPV.

Relationships experiencing male-to-female IPV have been characterised by dysfunctional demand / withdraw communication patterns (Babcock, Waltz, Jacobson, & Gottman, 1993; Feldman & Ridley, 2000; Holtzworth-Munroe, Smutzler,

& Stuart, 1998). Couples experiencing male IPV have also been found to be more likely to express anger, to reciprocate their partners' negative communication patterns, and to use fewer positive communication devices (Burman, Margolin, & John, 1993; Jacobson et al., 1994). Research has also found that relationships where both spouses lack communication skills are characterised by increased violence (Babcock et al., 1993).

Cordova, Jacobson, Gottman, Rushe, and Cox (1993) observed the communication behaviour of violent, distressed, and happily married couples while discussing issues of conflict within their relationship. Conversations were coded for aversive language such as disagreements and put downs, and facilitative language which signalled agreement, acceptance, and humour. They found that violent couples used fewer facilitative and more aversive language features. Violent couples were also more likely than other couples to reciprocate the negative behaviour of their spouse. Similarly, Feldman and Ridley (2000) found violent males to report that their relationships were characterised by demand / withdraw interaction patterns, less positive communication, and less problem solving behaviour. Violent males were more likely than non-violent males to blame their partner, use emotional abuse, and avoid discussing problems. Moreover, they reported that this behaviour was often mutual. These types of interaction patterns would increase the frequency of unresolved issues and recurring problems, and serve to increase resentment and hostility within the relationship.

Although the majority of past research has tended to be limited to conflict discussions, more recently Ronan, Dreer, Dollard, and Ronan (2004) examined how the emotional content of the conversational topic influenced communication behaviour. They found that amongst a sample of couples selected by the husbands'

use of violence, ineffective communication devices only outweighed effective communication devices during discussions of high conflict topics.

Violent couples have also been observed to use less effective problem solving skills (Date & Ronan, 2000). Anglin and Holtzworth-Munroe (1997) recruited violent, distressed, and happily married couples through the newspaper. Couples came into the lab where they were presented with both marital and non-marital problems and asked to describe what their response would be to each situation. Compared to non-violent couples, violent couples provided less effective solutions to problems both within and outside of the relationship (Anglin & Holtzworth-Munroe, 1997). Similarly, other research has found that violent couples perceive themselves as being less able to solve problems (Boyle & Vivian, 1996).

Although less widely researched, relationships identified by the females' use of IPV have also been characterised by more negative communication patterns and poorer problem solving skills. Ridley and Feldman (2003) asked females recruited from a public health clinic to complete a range of questionnaires, one of which asked about their communication behaviour. They found that relationships where women used frequent or severe IPV were characterised by negative and hostile conflict communication such as criticism and partner blame.

Multiple Variables Related to IPV

Many researchers find a combination of variables to best predict IPV. For instance, in an meta-analytic review of 85 studies, Stith, Smith, Penn, Ward, and Tritt (2004) identified 16 variables related to perpetrating IPV and nine related to suffering IPV. Of particular relevance the focus of the present study, Stith et al. found that attitudes condoning violence, emotional abuse, traditional gender role beliefs, and

hostility were associated with perpetrating IPV. Similarly, in a large review of the literature examining the correlates associated with male perpetrated IPV, Schumacher et al. (2001) found anger, hostility, depression, drug use, and attitudes condoning violence to be strongly related to IPV.

Sugarman and Hotaling (1989) in an analysis of the 1975 National Family Violence Study found a number of factors differentiated severely violent men from men using no or lesser violence. These included lower socio-economic status, marital conflict, and having witnessed greater violence in their family of origin. Similarly, Margolin, John, and Foo (1998) found a number of variables that could both uniquely predict IPV and in combination with other variables could account for IPV within a sample of community-based men. In particular, being dissatisfied with their relationship, condoning violence, employment status, and negative life events all uniquely predicted the use of IPV. The link between some of these variables and IPV was increased with the co-existence of alcohol impairment. Hostility was also associated with IPV, although it did not interact with any of the other variables.

Boyle and Vivian (1996) examined the relationship between IPV and hostility, problem solving skills, depression, relationship satisfaction, and assertiveness by comparing men attending marital therapy to a community sample. They found that violent men were more angry and hostile towards their partner. General hostility towards others was not associated with IPV. Problem solving skills, relationship satisfaction, depression, and assertiveness were related to IPV, however, they were also related to relationship dissatisfaction. They also found that the relationship between the correlates and IPV varied as a function of the level of violence.

Although less widely investigated, some research has found a combination of correlates to be associated with female IPV. Magdol et al. (1997) found that a

number of factors were related to perpetrating and suffering IPV for both men and women, including less education, unemployment, drug and alcohol use, and mental illnesses including depression and anxiety. However, male perpetrators rated higher overall on the risk factors than did female perpetrators.

In conclusion, the correlates associated with male perpetrated IPV have received a considerable degree of attention, although research outcomes have not always been unanimous. Of greater concern, however, is the lack of attention directed towards examining the risk factors associated with female perpetrated IPV. Given that IPV is predominantly bi-directional, it seems imperative that researchers identify factors associated with female-perpetrated IPV. Moreover, with the increasing incidence and awareness of female-perpetrated IPV, women are beginning to be court mandated to prevention programs originally designed for men. There is, however, little empirical research to show whether the factors implemented into these programs are of relevance to female perpetrators. Identifying the correlates associated with female-perpetrated abuse and comparing these correlates with those associated with male perpetrated-abuse would also help to address the gender symmetry debate by identifying whether similar factors are related to both male and female IPV.

CHAPTER 3

The Present Study

There are now over one hundred studies finding that women are as likely to perpetrate IPV as men (Straus, 1999). However, these findings have been controversial, and there is much debate concerning the equivalence of male and female-perpetrated abuse. Moreover, as a consequence of the widespread belief that violence is primarily a male behaviour, research has tended to focus on identifying the risk factors associated with male-perpetrated IPV. Very little is known about the risk factors associated with female-perpetrated IPV. Researchers have tended to explain female-perpetrated IPV as self-defensive, although there is very little empirical research supporting this notion.

To extend past research I examined the incidence of, and risk factors for both male- and female-perpetrated IPV. Additionally, I compared the equivalence of male and female IPV with regards to the incidence, frequency, severity, associated injury, and nature of abuse. I recruited participants from three samples within New Zealand (student, general, and incarcerated). IPV is a serious and pervasive problem in New Zealand and it is not limited to any particular social or economic group (Ministry of Health, New Zealand, 2002). The diverse sampling procedure employed in the present study allowed an examination of a number of factors, e.g., age and relationship status, that could potentially influence IPV. The inclusion of an incarcerated sample also enabled an exploration of more severe, frequent, and injurious violence. I examined both psychological and physical violence because past research has found psychological abuse often precedes physical abuse (Stets, 1990) or

that the two forms of IPV often co-exist (Follingstad et al., 1990; Hyden, 1995; Magdol et al., 1998; Straus, Hamby, Boney-McCoy, & Sugarman, 1996).

The risk factors I was most interested in were those that have been associated with male-perpetrated abuse and have been influential in shaping violence prevention programs. These included power and control, traditional gendered beliefs, negative attitudes towards women, partner blame, anger management, and communication skills. The present study extended past work by examining whether these risk factors would also help to explain female-perpetrated IPV. To better understand the dynamics of violent relationships I also examined whether these psychological correlates were associated with being the victim of IPV. Although many different risk factors have been associated with IPV, I focused specifically on psychological characteristics and attitudes that individuals bring into a relationship, because these factors can be targeted when implemented into violence prevention programs.

My reasons for deciding to examine previous correlates associated with male-perpetrated IPV were two-fold. In the first instance, women are beginning to be arrested and court mandated to programs that were traditionally designed for men. It therefore is important to examine whether the grounding principles behind these programs are also relevant to women. Moreover, examining whether the risk factors behind male and female IPV are similar helps to address the gender-symmetry debate. I employed both explicit and implicit attitude measures in the present study to overcome social desirability responding associated with explicit measures. The use of explicit measures alone may partially explain inconsistencies in past research findings.

The findings presented in this thesis pertain to one large study. However, the analyses are presented over five chapters (Chapters 4 – 8). These chapters, although

modified slightly, are all papers that have been accepted for publication or are currently under review. There is therefore some repetition and redundancy across chapters, particularly with regards to the method sections. There is also some variability in the number of participants included in each chapter, because not all participants completed all three sections of the study.

In Chapters 4 & 5, I present initial analyses examining the incidence and correlates associated with perpetrating and suffering IPV for both men and women. Chapter 4 pertains to the student and general sample; Chapter 5 pertains to the incarcerated sample. I also discuss a comparison of attitudes between the incarcerated and non-incarcerated sample in Chapter 5.

In Chapter 6, I further addressed the gender symmetry debate by comparing the equivalence of male and female IPV in more detail. In particular, I compared the frequency, severity, and nature of male and female physical IPV. I also classified participants as either having no history of IPV, suffering IPV, or both perpetrating and suffering IPV, to ensure that similarities between the attitudes of victims and perpetrators were not driven by individuals who had both perpetrated and suffered abuse. Finally, I present analyses examining the co-existence of control and IPV, based on Johnson's (2000) suggestion that there may be different forms of IPV that are distinguished from each other by the degree of controlling behaviours used in conjunction with violence.

In Chapter 7, I describe analyses comparing the conversational behaviour of individuals with and without a history of IPV during separate low-conflict interactions with a male and female researcher. Additionally, I compared individuals' accommodation behaviour to a facilitative and non-facilitative speech style, as a function of abuse history. Past research has found that relationships identified by the

males' use of violence are characterised by more negative conflict communication behaviour (Burman et al., 1993; Jacobson et al., 1994). Although research has found that in these relationships both the victim and the perpetrator reciprocate this negative behaviour, the male perpetrator is assumed to shape these interaction styles.

To extend research that has focused on male violent relationships, I examined the conversational behaviour of both male- and female-perpetrators and victims of IPV. I also extended research on two other levels. Firstly, by examining the conversational behaviour of perpetrators and victims independently of each other I tested the assumption that both perpetrators and victims use negative styles. Secondly, rather than focusing on couples' conflict interactions, I examined whether this negative conversational style extends into everyday low-conflict interactions with others outside of the relationship. I asked participants to discuss six different topics, one of which focused on how they dealt with difficult people. This conversation topic allowed for an examination of conflict management techniques as a function of abuse history, presented in Chapter 7. To the best of my knowledge, this is one of the first studies to examine perpetrators' and victims' conversational behaviour with others outside of the relationship.

The final phase of the study, presented in Chapter 8 involved an open-ended interview examining general attitudes towards IPV and how these attitudes varied as a function of participants' abuse history. Attitudes towards IPV are important because they shape individuals attitudes towards using IPV and communities' responses to dealing with IPV. I also further examined individuals' attitudes towards men and women and conflict resolution strategies through the interview. This study is exemplary in its field for examining the attitudes, conflict behaviour, and communication behaviour of both male- and female-perpetrators and victims of IPV.

Each chapter is presented as a stand-alone paper. The culmination of findings and recommendations for future research and violence prevention initiatives are discussed in the final chapter (Chapter 9).

CHAPTER 4

Prevalence Rates and Psychological Correlates of IPV within a Non-Clinical Sample of Women and Men[1]

In this chapter, I examined the prevalence rates and psychological correlates of IPV for men and women within the student and general sample. Men have traditionally been considered to be the perpetrators of IPV. However, recent research, in particular family violence research examining community samples, has found IPV to be bi-directional, with men and women being equally likely to perpetrate abuse (Archer, 2000; Magdol et al., 1997; Schumacher & Leonard, 2005; Straus, 2004). The finding that women perpetrate IPV has been very controversial because it contradicts traditional beliefs, and there is a concern that identifying females as perpetrators might lead to funding being redirected away from female victims. Feminist researchers, in particular, have criticised both the findings and research methods of studies reporting gender symmetry in IPV. Feminist theory, which has been very influential in shaping violence prevention programs, assumes that IPV is predominantly perpetrated by men. According to this theory, IPV arises out of a patriarchal social system in which men feel entitled to control women (Dobash & Dobash, 1979). IPV is one means for men to gain and maintain this control. Adherence to traditional gender role beliefs is identified as one of the main contributors to IPV because it reinforces males' superior and females' inferior position in society (Harway & O'Neil, 1999).

---

[1] A version of this paper is under review as Robertson, K., & Murachver, T. (2005). Prevalence rates and psychological correlates of IPV within a non-clinical sample of women and men. Manuscript submitted for publication.

Johnson (1999) offers some insight into the conflicting viewpoints pertaining to IPV. According to Johnson, family violence and feminist researchers come to different conclusions because they actually measure two distinct types of IPV because of their different sampling procedures. Feminist research has tended to focus on clinical samples of men who batter, or women who have been identified as the victims of abuse. Their research is therefore more likely to measure the systematic male perpetrated abuse that has dominated domestic violence research and theory coined by Johnson as "intimate terrorism". According to Johnson, intimate terrorism is violence used to dominate and control one's partner. Although this type of violence is usually one sided and most likely perpetrated by a man, victims of this type of abuse may also use violence in self-defence. Family violence research on the other hand, tends to use act-based measures such as the conflict tactics scale (CTS) to measure levels of violence within the wider community. Within this sample, they often find 'situational violence', which is characterised by occasional violent outbursts perpetrated by either a man or a woman, and which usually arises out of conflict situations.

Social learning theory (Bandura, 1977) helps to explain the development of mutually violent relationships observed within community samples. This theory assumes that people learn violent behaviours through observing positive outcomes of others' violent behaviour. Through witnessing violence, they are also more likely to develop positive attitudes and beliefs towards the use of violence and to construct aggressive scripts (O'Leary, 1988). Therefore, one-sided violent relationships would eventually become mutually violent as the victim learns that violence is an instrumental behaviour and comes to condone the violence.

Although social learning theory helps to explain the bi-directional nature of IPV, it does not explain all cases. To understand why some people who witness

violence do not go on to perpetrate abuse, researchers have begun to focus on the personality characteristics of perpetrators, and to a lesser extent those of victims of IPV. Although a number of attitudes and beliefs have been postulated to be related to abuse, the research is mixed and inconclusive. This chapter presents a set of analyses examining the relationship between 14 psychological correlates to the perpetration and victimisation of IPV for both men and women. In particular, I focused on traditional gender role beliefs, attitudes towards violence, gender hostility, attitudes towards dominance, and communication problems. These factors have been the main focus of previous research, and have been highly influential in the implementation of violence prevention programs.

Gender role beliefs and attitudes towards violence have received a considerable degree of attention because of their respective implications with regards to the feminist and social learning theories. Research has found gendered beliefs to be related to females' (Bookwala et al., 1992) and males' (Stith & Farley, 1993; Stith et al, 2004) perpetration of abuse; however, other research has found no relationship (Yick, 2000; see Hotaling & Sugarman, 1986 for a review). Similarly, the research linking violence attitudes to domestic violence is mixed. Although attitudes condoning violence have been linked to the perpetration of IPV for both men (Reitzel-Jaffe & Wolfe, 2001; Russell & Hulson, 1992; Stith & Farley, 1993; Stith et al., 2004) and women (Gray & Foshee, 1997), other research has found no relationship (Bookwala et al., 1992; Kane, Staiger, & Ricciardelli, 2000).

Researchers have also examined the psychological correlates associated with attitudes condoning violence (Finn, 1986; Truman, Tokar, & Fischer, 1996), rather than the perpetration of violence per se, with the assumption that approving of violence is tantamount to perpetrating abuse. To clarify this relationship I

investigated whether or not violence approval attitudes were directly related to violent behaviour. The link between violence approval and the perpetration of violence is important because many intervention programs focus on changing cognitions about violence as a means to reduce violence (Bennett & Williams, 2001).

A number of other psychological variables have received varying support regarding their relationship with IPV. In particular, gender hostility has frequently been associated with male violence (Holtzworth-Munroe & Hutchinson, 1993; Margolin et al., 1998; Parrott & Zeichner, 2003; Reitzel-Jaffe & Wolfe, 2001) and although less well established, some research has also found a relationship between hostility and female violence (Straus & Yodanis, 1996). Relationships that experience struggles over power, where one partner tries to control the other or where one partner is dissatisfied with their relationship power are also more likely to experience IPV (Babcock et al., 1993; Coleman & Straus, 1986; Ehrensaft & Vivian, 1999; Kaura & Allen, 2004). Negative communication behaviour has also been linked to the perpetration of IPV, particularly male violence (Murphy & O'Farrell, 1997; Ronan et al, 2004).

The analyses presented in the present chapter extend our understanding of the dynamics of violent relationships by examining both male- and female-perpetrators and victims of abuse, and identifying the psychological correlates associated with both the perpetration and victimisation of abuse. There is a dearth of research examining the correlates associated with victimisation, particularly male victims. However, because of the bi-directional nature of IPV, it is important to examine the personal characteristics of individuals both suffering and perpetrating abuse. Both a student and general sample of the New Zealand population were included in the present investigation. This sampling procedure enabled a comparison of the

prevalence of IPV across different age groups and across different relationship contexts. It also allowed an examination of whether the correlates associated with IPV are constant across a more diverse sample. I employed both explicit and implicit attitude measures. It was hoped that the inclusion of implicit measures would help to clarify the inconsistent findings of past research, because participants would be less able to shape their responses to be more socially desirable.

Method

Participants

The analyses presented in this chapter pertain to one hundred and thirty-three participants. The sample included 67 New Zealand university students (female = 36, male = 31) and 66 general population participants (female = 36, male = 30). Participants were recruited through notices displayed at the university, within the community, and in local organisations' newsletters. The notice asked for volunteers to take part in a study looking at beliefs about men and women, communication behaviour and attitudes towards and experiences of partner violence. Participants were required to be over 18 years of age and have been in a relationship that lasted at least one month in the past five years. An example of an information sheet given to participants appears in Appendix A.

Demographic data revealed the student sample to be younger than the general sample, with the majority of the student sample being between 18-19 years of age (73.1%), and the majority of the general sample being between 20-40 years of age (72.7%). Educational demographics revealed that the majority of the general sample had obtained a diploma, degree, or higher (63.1%). Participants from the general sample were more likely to be cohabiting than dating ($M_{cohabiting}$ = 60.6%, M_{dating}

= 16.7%). Participants from the student sample were more likely to be dating than cohabitating ($M_{cohabitating}$ = 7.5%, M_{dating} = 49.3%). Participants were primarily Pākehā (Caucasian) ($M_{student}$ = 83.5%, $M_{general}$ = 92.5%). The remaining participants identified themselves as Māori ($M_{student}$ = 4.5%, $M_{general}$ = 1.5%), Pacific Island ($M_{student}$ = 3.0%), East Asian ($M_{student}$ = 4.5%, $M_{general}$ = 1.5%), Indian ($M_{general}$ = 3.0%), or identified as 'other' ($M_{student}$ = 4.5%, $M_{general}$ = 1.5%).

Measures

There were 14 measured predictor variables: anger management skills, communication problems, attitudes towards dominance, hostility to men, hostility to women, negative attribution, the belief that there is no alternative to violence, attitudes towards male privilege, the belief that male violence is justified, egalitarian beliefs, violence approval, and three implicit attitudes. The individual dominance subscales (authority, restrictiveness, disparagement) were also examined to clarify findings. These variables were used to predict participants' use and experience of physical and psychological IPV as measured by the conflict tactics scale. The actual questionnaires completed by participants can be found in Appendix B.

Conflict Tactics Scale. Perpetration and victimisation of physical and psychological violence were measured using the Revised Conflict Tactics Scale (CTS2) (Straus et al, 1996). The CTS2 is a 39-item self-report measure that asks about violent behaviour and negotiation techniques for participants and their partners. For the current analyses, participants' responses on the 12-item physical assault scale (including both the minor and severe scale), and the eight-item severe psychological aggression scale were used. The minor psychological abuse scale was not used because the incidence of minor psychological abuse was extremely high. Participants

were asked to report about both their own and their partners' behaviour with regards to their current or most recent relationship. Responses were made on a seven-point scale ranging from, "this has never happened," to "it has happened more than 20 times in the past year." To be classified as perpetrating or suffering abuse participants had to indicate one or more instances on the respective scale. The CTS is a widely used self-report instrument with evidence of validity and reliability.

Personal Relationships Profile. Anger management, communication problems, dominance (including the three subscales: restrictiveness, authority, disparagement), gender hostility to men, gender hostility to women, violence approval, and negative attribution were measured using the Personal and Relationships Profile (PRP; Straus & Mouradian, 1999). The PRP was designed to measure personal characteristics and relationship qualities in violent relationships. Participants responded to questions on a 4-point scale ranging from "strongly disagree" to "strongly agree." To score the PRP, reverse scored items were adjusted and then all items were summed for each scale. With the exception of anger management skills, higher scores on each variable measured by the PRP reflect more negative attitudes. The PRP has preliminary reliability and validity (Straus & Mouradian, 1999).

Pacific Attitudes Towards Gender Scale. Egalitarian attitudes were measured using the Pacific Attitudes Toward Gender Scale (Vaillancourt & Leaper, 1997). The PATG is a 28-item questionnaire designed to assess attitudes towards gender roles and gendered behaviour. Participants are asked to indicate how much they agree or disagree with gendered statements on a 6 point scale from "1= strongly disagree" to "6= strongly agree." Higher scores reflect attitudes that are more egalitarian.

Revised Attitude Toward Wife Abuse Scale. Male privilege, perceived lack of alternatives, and the belief that male violence is justified were measured using the Revised Attitudes Toward Wife Abuse Scale (Yoshioka, DiNoia, & Ullah, 2001). The RAWA is a 14-item scale that assesses attitudes towards a mans' right to use violence, beliefs concerning males' right to power and control, and attitudes towards alternatives women could use rather than remaining in the abusive relationship. The RAWA was rated on the same scale as the PATG. Higher scores in the current study reflect greater acceptance of violence.

Implicit Association Test. Implicit attitudes were measured using the implicit association test (IAT; Rudman, Greenwald, & McGhee, 2001). The IAT is a widely used measure that assesses implicit stereotypes and prejudice. Because the IAT measures implicit associations, it is not subject to social desirability responding (Rudman et al., 2001). Participants categorise stimuli from two different categories (e.g., violence, non-violence) and stimuli from two different attribute categories (e.g., good, bad) by pressing one of two keys on a computer. For example, the same key might be used to categorize both violence and bad words. The faster participants respond, the more closely they associate the stimulus (violence) with the attribute (bad).

The results from three implicit association tasks were used in the present set of analyses. The first assessed gender role beliefs and paired *career* and *domestic*, with *male* and *female*. The second test looked at gender trait beliefs; *submissive* and *dominant* were paired with *male* and *female*. Higher scores on the above two variables reflect more traditional beliefs. The third test measured participants' implicit attitudes towards violence and paired *violence* and *non-violence* terms with *good* and *bad*. A higher score on this variable reflects less accepting attitudes towards violence. For

each of the three IAT tasks there were ten blocks and two practice trials. The lists of stimulus and attribute categories for each IAT task are listed in Appendix D.

Based on the recommendations of Greenwald, Nosek, & Banaji (2003), D scores were used in the present analyses. D scores are calculated by taking the mean latency difference between trials of the two possible pairings of stimulus and attribute and dividing this by the pooled standard deviation from these trials. Error trials were omitted along with the first two trials from each test block, and latencies outside of lower (300 ms) and upper (3500 ms) boundaries were recoded to those boundaries respectively. Four participants did not complete the IAT task. Scores for these participants were estimated using SPSS expectation maximisation.

Procedure

In this phase of the study participants came into a research laboratory at the University of Otago where they completed a battery of questionnaires presented to them on a computer. Results presented in this set of analyses were derived from participants' responses on a brief demographic questionnaire, the CTS2, PRP, PATG, RAWA, and the three IAT tasks.

Results

Preliminary Analyses

A series of initial chi-square tests were conducted; (1) to compare incidence rates of IPV between the student and general sample; (2) to determine whether

perpetration or victimisation of IPV varied as a function of demographic variables[2]; (3) to determine whether incidence rates varied as a function of gender; and (4) to determine the relationship between the perpetration and victimisation of IPV.

Initial chi-square analyses revealed that the perpetration and victimisation of IPV did not vary between the student and general samples. Sample was therefore omitted from all further analyses examining the incidence of IPV as a function of demographic variables. A further series of chi-square analyses revealed that incidence rates of IPV did not vary as a function of participants' age, or relationship status (single, dating, or cohabitating). There was, however, one significant difference as a function of gender. Men were significantly more likely to report suffering physical violence than were women ($\chi^2(1) = 4.603$, $p < .05$). No other significant differences were detected between men's and women's reports of suffering or perpetrating violence. Both men and women overestimated their suffering of abuse relative to the other gender's perpetration of abuse, keeping in mind of course that these men and women were not reporting on the same relationships. The prevalence rates for perpetrating and suffering psychological and physical violence as a function of sample, gender, and demographic variables can be seen in Table 4.1.

Chi-square analyses revealed that in every instance there was a clear relationship between the use and suffering of physical and psychological violence. For example, of the people who used psychological abuse, 76.9% also reported suffering psychological abuse. Of those who did not use psychological abuse, only 17.8% were victims of it. Whilst it is evident that the use and experience of psychological and physical violence are significantly related, they are analysed

---

[2] To ensure that I was not misrepresenting the data by classifying participants as violent or non-violent, I conducted additional analyses using continuous violence variables and found similar results to those obtained using categorical variables.

separately in the following analyses because the relationship does not explain all cases. The prevalence rates for perpetrating and experiencing physical or psychological abuse can be seen in Table 4.2.

Table 4.1: Mean Percentage of Abuse as a Function of Gender, Sample, and Demographic Variables

	Used Physical Violence	Used Psychological Violence	Suffered Physical Violence	Suffered Psychological Violence
Sample				
Student	26.9%	19.4%	29.9%	22.4%
General	24.2%	19.7%	30.3%	36.4%
Gender				
Males	19.7%	18.0%	39.3%	31.3%
Females	30.6%	20.8%	22.2%	27.8%
Age				
18-19 years	28%	30%	20%	20%
20-30 years	26.8%	26.8%	22%	36.6%
30-40 years	20%	32%	12%	28%
>40 years	23.5%	35.3%	23.5%	41.2%
Rela. Status				
Separated	29.5%	22.7%	25.0%	34.1%
Dating	18.2%	18.2%	31.8%	25.0%
Cohabitating	28.9%	17.8%	33.3%	28.9%

The following analyses examined the relationship of 14 psychological variables to the perpetration and victimisation of IPV. Sample and gender were included as independent factors to examine whether the relationship between IPV and

Table 4.2: Percentages of Participants using and/or Experiencing Physical and Psychological Abuse

		Physical Abuse				Psychological Abuse			
		Use	Don't use	Receive	Don't Rec.	Use	Don't use	Receive	Don't Rec.
Physical	**Use**			**22 (64.7%)**	**12 (35.3%)**	16 (47.1%)	18 (52.9%)	20 (58.8%)	14 (41.2%)
Abuse	**Don't use**			**18 (18.2%)**	**81 (81.8%)**	10 (10.1%)	89 (89.9%)	19 (19.2%)	80 (80.8%)
	χ^2				**26.05*****		21.98***		19.18***
	Receive	**22 (55.0%)**	**18 (45.0%)**			18 (45.0%)	22 (55.0%)	27 (67.5%)	13 (32.5%)
	Don't receive	**12 (12.9%)**	**81 (87.1%)**			8 (8.6%)	85 (91.4%)	12 (12.9%)	81 (87.1%)
	χ^2		**26.05*****				23.56***		40.23***
Psychological	**Use**	16 (61.5%)	10 (38.5%)	18 (69.2%)	8 (30.8%)			**20 (76.9%)**	**6 (23.1%)**
	Don't use	18 (16.8%)	89 (83.2%)	22 (20.6%)	85 (79.4%)			**19 (17.8%)**	**88 (82.2%)**
	χ^2		21.98***		23.56***				**35.33*****
	Receive	20 (51.3%)	19 (48.7%)	27 (69.2%)	12 (30.8%)	**20 (51.3%)**	**19 (48.7%)**		
	Don't receive	14 (14.9%)	80 (85.1%)	13 (13.8%)	81 (86.2%)	**6 (6.4%)**	**88 (93.6%)**		
	χ^2		19.18***		40.23***	**35.33*****			

*** $p < .001$

the psychological correlates differed for males and females, or between the two samples. Sample was included as an independent factor because the student sample differed from the general sample in both age and relationship status (dating versus cohabitating). The relevant means for these analyses are presented in Table 4.3.

Table 4.3: Mean Values for Psychological Factors as a Function of Abuse

Explicit Measures	Perpetrated Physical		Suffered Physical		Perpetrated Psychological		Suffered Psychological	
	Yes	No	**Yes**	No	**Yes**	No	**Yes**	No
Anger Management	**17.45**	18.54	**17.70**	18.61	**16.99**	18.62	**17.30**	18.75
Communication Problems	**8.18**	6.84	**8.05**	6.68	**8.40**	6.87	**8.55**	6.57
Dominance	**7.64**	6.20	**7.23**	6.14	**8.00**	6.20	**7.53**	5.91
Hostility to men	**6.28**	4.99	**6.17**	4.89	**5.93**	5.14	**5.83**	5.06
Hostility to women	**5.34**	3.74	**4.67**	3.75	**5.65**	3.83	**4.87**	3.79
Blame Partner	**4.01**	2.71	**4.12**	2.53	**4.41**	2.74	**4.20**	2.48
Violence Approval	**7.93**	7.30	**7.81**	7.18	**8.95**	7.07	**8.29**	6.91
No alternative to violence	**3.91**	3.0	**3.99**	2.90	**4.02**	3.02	**3.52**	3.19
Male privilege	**3.24**	1.96	**2.74**	1.90	**3.96**	1.82	**2.82**	1.95
Male violence justified	**3.55**	1.54	**2.30**	1.75	**3.09**	1.72	**2.64**	1.65
Egalitarian	**98.20**	101.69	**98.42**	102.34	**92.73**	102.75	**98.29**	102.75
Implicit Measures								
Gender role Beliefs	**.57**	.36	**.50**	.37	**.48**	.38	**.50**	.36
Gender Trait Beliefs	**.30**	.33	**.34**	.29	**.40**	.30	**.31**	.31
Violence Approval	**1.18**	1.24	**1.18**	1.25	**1.17**	1.25	**1.23**	1.26

Perpetration and Victimisation of IPV as a Function of the Psychological

Factors

I performed four Multivariate analyses of variance (MANOVA), each a 2 (sample) x 2 (participant gender) x 2 (yes / no for abuse category). The MANOVAs revealed that in each instance a multivariate main effect was found. The 14 psychological variables differed depending on whether or not participants perpetrated physical abuse ($F(14, 112) = 2.18$, $p < .05$, $\eta^2 = .21$), suffered physical abuse ($F(14, 112) = 2.081$, $p < .05$, $\eta^2 = .21$), perpetrated psychological abuse ($F(14, 112) = 1.80$, $p < .05$, $\eta^2 = .18$) or suffered psychological abuse ($F(14, 112) = 1.97$, $p < .05$, $\eta^2 = .20$). There was only one interaction. The psychological variables associated with perpetrating psychological abuse differed as a function of gender. In all other instances, the relationship between IPV and the 14 psychological variables was the same regardless of sample or gender.

Perpetration of Physical Abuse as a Function of the Psychological

Factors

Univariate analyses revealed that participants who perpetrated physical abuse were significantly more likely than participants who did not perpetrate physical abuse to report communication problems in their relationship ($F(1, 112) = 5.22$, $p < .05$, $\eta^2 = .04$), to see themselves as being dominant in their relationship ($F(1, 112) = 4.67$, $p < .05$, $\eta^2 = .04$), to report hostility towards men ($F(1, 112) = 9.05$, $p < .01$, $\eta^2 = .07$), to report hostility towards women ($F(1, 112) = 11.16$, $p < .01$, $\eta^2 = .08$), to blame their partner for their problems ($F(1, 112) = 9.98$, $p < .01$, $\eta^2 = .07$), to be supportive of male privilege ($F(1, 112) = 4.87$, $p < .05$, $\eta^2 = .04$), to believe male violence is justified ($F(1, 112) = 8.91$, $p < .01$, $\eta^2 = .07$), and to show stronger traditional implicit

gender role beliefs (*i.e.,* associating *females* with *domestic* and *males* with *career*, $F(1, 112) = 5.96$, $p < .05$, $\eta^2 = .05$).

The dominance score was calculated by combining three separate dominance constructs together: disparagement, authority, and restrictiveness. A separate 2-stage (yes / no suffered physical abuse) between subjects MANOVA was performed for the three dominance constructs to see which aspect contributed to the effect. This did not reveal a significant multivariate main effect ($F(3, 129) = 2.10$, $p > .05$, $\eta^2 = .05$). There was, however, a significant univariate effect for disparagement. Perpetrators of physical violence were more disparaging ($M = 1.94$) than participants who did not perpetrate physical violence ($M = 1.33$, $F(1, 129) = 4.51$, $p < .05$, $\eta^2 = .03$).

Psychological Factors Associated with Suffering Physical Abuse

Univariate analyses revealed that victims of physical violence were more likely to report communication problems in their relationship ($F(1, 112) = 6.47$, $p < .05$, $\eta^2 = .05$), greater hostility towards men ($F(1, 112) = 10.33$, $p < .01$, $\eta^2 = .08$), greater hostility towards women ($F(1, 112) = 4.25$, $p < .05$, $\eta^2 = .03$), believing that there is no alternative to violence ($F(1, 112) = 4.19$, $p < .05$, $\eta^2 = .03$), and blaming their partner for their problems ($F(1, 112) = 18.65$, $p < .001$, $\eta^2 = .13$), than did non-victims.

Perpetration of Psychological Abuse as a Function of the Psychological Factors

The next MANOVA revealed how the psychological factors differentiated between participants who did or did not use psychological abuse. Participants who used psychological abuse reported fewer anger management skills ($F(1, 112) = 4.57$,

$p < .05$, $\eta^2 = .04$), more communication problems in their relationship ($F(1, 112) = 5.12$, $p < .05$, $\eta^2 = .04$), and less egalitarian beliefs ($F(1, 112) = 5.96$, $p < .05$, $\eta^2 = .05$), than participants who did not use psychological abuse. Participants who used psychological abuse were also more hostile towards woman ($F(1, 112) = 11.17$, $p < .01$, $\eta^2 = .08$), more dominant ($F(1, 112) = 5.83$, $p < .05$, $\eta^2 = .05$), more likely to blame their partner for their problems ($F(1, 112) = 12.64$, $p < .01$, $\eta^2 = .09$), and more supportive of male privilege ($F(1, 112) = 10.94$, $p < .01$, $\eta^2 = .08$), than participants who did not use psychological abuse.

A 2 (yes / no used psychological abuse) between subjects MANOVA was performed on the three dominance constructs. As expected there was a significant main effect for use of psychological abuse ($F(3, 129) = 3.43$, $p < .05$, $\eta^2 = .07$). Univariate analysis showed that participants who used psychological abuse were significantly more likely to be disparaging ($M = 2.27$) than participants who did not use psychological abuse ($M = 1.30$, $F(1, 129) = 9.86$, $p < .01$, $\eta^2 = .07$).

The MANOVA also revealed a significant interaction between the use of psychological abuse and gender ($F(14, 112) = 1.86$, $p < .05$, $\eta^2 = .19$). Univariate analyses by gender revealed significant interactions for dominance, violence approval, male privilege, egalitarian beliefs, and implicit gender trait beliefs (*i.e.*, associating *male* with *dominance* and *female* with *submissiveness*). The mean frequencies and the corresponding *F* values for these interactions are shown in Table 4.4.

Separate analyses of variance (ANOVA) for the five dependent variables as a function of perpetrating psychological abuse were performed for males and females. The analyses revealed that the five dependent variables were all significantly related to men's use of psychological abuse. Females' use of psychological abuse was not predicted by any of the five variables. To identify the relationship between males'

attitudes towards dominance and the perpetration of psychological abuse I tested which of the dominance subscales were contributing to the effect. Males who used psychological abuse were significantly more likely than males who did not use psychological abuse to report more dominance authority (M_{used} = 3.00, $M_{did\ not\ use}$ = 1.66, $F(1, 57)$ = 9.44, $p < .01$, η^2 = .14), dominance disparagement (M_{used} = 2.55, $M_{did\ not\ use}$ = 1.32, $F(1, 57)$ = 6.79, $p < .05$, η^2 = .10), and dominance restrictiveness (M_{used} = 3.55, $M_{did\ not\ use}$ = 2.48, $F(1, 57)$ = 4.67, $p < .05$, η^2 = .07).

Table 4.4: Mean Frequencies of Psychological Factors as a Function of Psychological Abuse and Gender

	Gender							
	Male					Female		
	Psychological Abuse					Psychological Abuse		
	Use	**Don't**				Use	**Don't**		
		Use	*F*	η^2			**Use**	*F*	η^2
Variable									
Dominance	8.85	**5.47**	10.87	**.16****		7.15	**6.93**	.08	**.01**
Male Privilege	6.27	**2.10**	14.78	**.20*****		1.70	**1.55**	.76	**.00**
Egalitarian	79.17	**100.20**	8.98	**.13****		106.30	**105.29**	.50	**.01**
Violence Approval	11.54	**6.95**	6.22	**.10***		6.35	**7.20**	.01	**.00**
Gender Trait[i]	.69	**.32**	8.27	**.12****		.11	**.27**	.61	**.01**

*$p < .05$, **$p < .01$, ***$p < .001$, [i]Implicit

Factors Associated with being the Victim of Psychological Abuse

The final MANOVA revealed how the 14 psychological variables varied depending on whether participants were or were not the victim of psychological abuse. Participants who reported suffering psychological abuse were significantly more likely to report communication problems in their relationship ($F(14, 112) = 13.88$, $p < .001$, $\eta^2 = .10$), fewer anger management skills ($F(14, 112) = 5.34$, $p < .05$, $\eta^2 = .04$), wanting to be dominant in their relationship ($F(14, 112) = 7.23$, $p < .01$, $\eta^2 = .06$), hostility towards women ($F(14, 112) = 5.60$, $p < .05$, $\eta^2 = .04$), and blaming their partner for their problems ($F(14, 112) = 21.92$, $p < .001$, $\eta^2 = .15$), than were participants who did not report suffering psychological abuse.

A 2 (yes / no suffered psychological) between subjects MANOVA of the three separate dominance constructs found a significant main effect of psychological abuse ($F(3, 129) = 5.38$, $p < .01$, $\eta^2 = .11$). Univariate analyses showed that participants who suffered psychological abuse were significantly more likely to be disparaging ($M = 2.23$) than participants who did not suffer psychological abuse ($M = 1.18$, $F(1, 129) = 15.87$, $p < .001$, $\eta^2 = .11$).

Summary of Abuse as a Function of the Psychological Factors

The MANOVA revealed a number of factors that were frequently associated with both the perpetration and victimisation of IPV. These included communication problems in the relationship, hostility to women, blaming a partner for one's problems, and attitudes towards dominance, especially dominance disparagement. Male privilege and implicit gendered beliefs were associated with the perpetration of both physical and psychological violence. Hostility to men was associated with both

the perpetration and victimisation of physical violence, whereas fewer anger management skills were associated with psychological abuse.

The 14 Psychological Factors as a Function of Gender and Sample

My final analyses examined how the 14 psychological variables varied as a function of gender and sample. A 2 (sample) x 2 (participant gender) between subjects MANOVA on the 14 psychological variables revealed a significant main effect of gender ($F(14, 116) = 5.25$, $p < .001$, $\eta^2 = .39$), and sample ($F(14, 116) = 2.74$, $p < .01$, $\eta^2 = .25$). Univariate analyses revealed little variation in attitudes as a function of gender or sample. In comparison to females, males reported using more anger management strategies ($F(1, 116) = 8.88$, $p < .01$, $\eta^2 = .06$), were more supportive of male privilege ($F(1, 116) = 6.83$, $p < .05$, $\eta^2 = .05$), and had less egalitarian beliefs ($F(1, 116) = 8.35$, $p < .01$, $\eta^2 = .06$). Univariate analyses by sample showed that participants from the student sample were more approving of violence ($F(1, 116) = 8.76$, $p < .01$, $\eta^2 = .06$), were more likely to believe that male violence is justified ($F(1, 116) = 4.24$, $p < .05$, $\eta^2 = .03$), and were less egalitarian ($F(1, 116) = 10.58$, $p < .01$, $\eta^2 = .08$). The relevant means are shown in Table 4.5.

Table 4.5: Mean Values of Psychological Factors as a Function of Gender and
Sample

Variable	Gender		Sample	
	Male	Female	Student	General
Anger Management	19.09	17.42**	18.49	18.01
Communication Problems	7.33	7.03	7.37	6.99
Dominance	6.12	6.94	6.46	6.61
Hostility to men	5.58	4.97	5.27	5.28
Hostility to women	3.89	4.35	4.08	4.15
Blame Partner	3.05	3.03	3.07	3.02
Violence Approval	7.75	7.10	8.51	6.34**
No alternatives to violence	3.29	3.19	2.97	3.51
Male privilege	2.94	1.60*	2.52	2.01
Male violence justified	1.72	2.32	2.62	1.43*
Egalitarian	96.10	105.13**	95.55	105.67**
Gender role Beliefs[i]	.37	.45	.40	.42
Gender Trait Beliefs[i]	.38	.25	.31	.33
Violence Approval[i]	1.18	1.28	1.20	1.27

$*p < .05, **p < .01, ***p < .001,$ [i]Implicit

Discussion

The examination of incidence rates and psychological correlates for male and female IPV within the student and general sample were reported in this chapter. There were a number of main findings. In particular, IPV was bi-directional, with men and women being equally likely to perpetrate IPV. The incidence of IPV did not vary as a function of sample or relationship status, suggesting that IPV is equally likely to occur within dating and cohabiting relationships. Moreover, the attitudes and beliefs associated with IPV were similar for men and women, and perpetrators and victims.

The present findings revealed that a history of IPV was characterised by traditional and hostile attitudes towards others, a lack of skills, and more condoning attitudes towards violence. In particular, hostility towards others, being disparaging of one's partner, and blaming one's partner for one's problems, were the main psychological correlates associated with IPV for both men and women. These findings extend past research that has found IPV to be linked to hostility towards members of the other gender (Margolin et al., 1998; Parrott & Zeichner, 2003; Reitzel-Jaffe & Wolfe, 2001; Straus & Yodanis, 1996), to reveal a more general hostility directed towards both one's own and other gender. Perpetrators and victims of IPV seemed to display a hostile attribution bias (Dodge, 1980) whereby they interpreted the motivations of others' behaviour as hostile, serving to increase the likelihood that they would retaliate aggressively. Indeed, some research has found distressed couples to hold hostile attribution biases towards one another (Holtzworth-Munroe & Jacobson, 1985). Future research could examine whether the hostile attributions of individuals perpetrating IPV extends towards others outside of the relationship.

A lack of relationship skills, in particular communication and anger management skills, was also associated with IPV. Perpetrators and victims of IPV consistently reported experiencing communication problems in their relationship. These findings both corroborate and extend past research that has tended to focus on male violent relationships (Burman et al., 1993; Cordova et al., 1993; Murphy & O'Farrell, 1997), to show that relationships experiencing bi-directional violence are also characterised by communication problems. A lack of anger management skills was also associated with psychological abuse. These findings highlight the importance of incorporating skills training into any violence prevention program. As Babcock and colleagues (1993) argue, positive communication skills are essential to negotiate with a partner in a non-physical way. The present findings showed individuals perpetrating and suffering IPV were more hostile not only towards their own partner but towards others in general. This raises the question; do individuals reporting IPV also display negative communication styles when interacting with people outside of the relationship? Chapter 7 addresses this question.

The present findings also showed condoning attitudes towards violence, especially male violence, to be related to both the perpetration and victimisation of IPV. Although violence approval was only related to the perpetration of psychological abuse, participants who perpetrated physical and psychological violence were more likely than others to approve of male privilege – a belief that justifies males' use of violence. Suffering physical violence was also related to the belief that there is no alternative to violence. I can only speculate as to why female perpetrated abuse was related to the approval of male violence. It is possible that females who condone male violence are more likely to remain in or enter into a relationship with a violent man than are females who do not condone male violence.

According to social learning theory, mutual violence may develop as the female partner learns to use violence from experiencing the violent actions of her partner. An alternative explanation is that condoning male violence simply shows an approval of violence in general, as violence has traditionally been considered a male behaviour. The link between suffering abuse and approval of violence also deserves speculation. It is possible that individuals who experience violence may come to accept the abuse. These findings suggest that to reduce IPV, violence prevention programs need to address both individual and societal attitudes that condone violence.

In accordance with past research (Stith & Farley, 1993; Stith et al., 2004; Truman et al., 1996), traditional gender role beliefs were related to the perpetration of violence. Explicit traditional gender role beliefs were related to the use of psychological abuse for males, and implicit traditional gender role beliefs were linked to the perpetration of physical violence for both males and females. Although past research has found gendered beliefs to be a factor in males' violence, the present findings suggest that gendered beliefs may also partially explain females' violence. The relationship between gendered attitudes and IPV has been a topic of much debate, and research findings have been conflicting. The present study helped to clarify this relationship by employing both explicit and implicit measures. The present culture of Western society emphasises egalitarian beliefs. It is possible that participants feel pressured to respond accordingly. Implicit measures assess beliefs and attitudes outside of conscious control and can measure attitudes that participants may otherwise try to hide. Indeed, in the present investigation the use of implicit measures revealed a relationship between perpetrating violence and traditional beliefs that participants, especially females, masked on the explicit questionnaire.

The psychological correlates associated with male and female IPV were very similar. Nonetheless, some of the psychological correlates related to perpetrating psychological abuse were specifically related to male violence. This was not surprising given that I examined correlates that have previously been associated with male IPV. Although this method might have limited the predictability of some correlates to female IPV, it seemed a reasonable place to begin given that very few correlates of female IPV have been identified in the past. Researchers have tended to examine the motivations behind female violence to ascertain whether the abuse was perpetrated in self-defence (Hamberger et al., 1997), rather than to identify the correlates of the abuse. Although not reported here, an examination concerning the motivations for violence are presented in Chapter 8. Self-defence was sometimes given as a reason to explain female perpetrated abuse. However, there were also a number of more frequent explanations given, including not having the skills to deal with anger. It is therefore important to acknowledge that some of the female violence may have been perpetrated in self-defence, although it is unlikely that this would explain the majority of the cases. Nor does it explain why the psychological correlates of perpetrating and suffering abuse were similar for men and women.

In addition to looking at the relationship between the psychological correlates and IPV, I also examined how these attitudes varied as a function of gender and across the two samples. Overall, I found the psychological correlates to be more strongly associated with IPV than with gender or sample. There were however a few findings worth discussing. It was not surprising to find males to support beliefs that privilege their gender. One interesting relationship, however, was that males reported using more anger management strategies than females. One explanation for this finding is that anger has traditionally been associated with males more so than

females, and males, therefore, have had more opportunity to develop these skills, whereas females have been encouraged to suppress their anger and in turn have had less opportunity to practice anger management strategies.

Analyses as a function of sample revealed that the student sample held more traditional gendered beliefs and were more accepting of violence than were participants from the general sample. There are a number of possible explanations for the students' more negative and traditional beliefs. The first is to take the results at face value. The students' more condoning attitudes towards violence may suggest that society as a whole is becoming more violent, and the students' attitudes reflect those of future generations. A less concerning explanation is that these negative and traditional attitudes may gradually decline as individuals move through the educational process. Indeed this suggestion is in keeping with those of Bryant (2003), who observed students' traditional beliefs to decline during college as attitudes become more liberal. In the present study, the majority of the general sample had obtained a university degree or higher, which may explain their fewer negative and traditional beliefs.

The current findings shed some light on the bi-directional nature of violent relationships and the personal characteristics associated with males' and females' perpetration and victimisation of IPV. One of the most noteworthy findings was that IPV was often mutual and that women were as likely to perpetrate violence as men were. I did not look at who initiated the violence nor did I clarify the causality between hostility and IPV. For instance, it is unclear whether people who are more negative and hostile are more likely to enter into an abusive relationship, or whether being in an abusive relationship leads to greater hostility and negativity. Further research is required here.

The current findings have a number of implications for violence prevention initiatives. Firstly, they provided supporting evidence for the inclusion of many factors that are already implemented into violence prevention programs including addressing hostile negative attitudes towards others and attitudes condoning violence, and focusing on teaching effective communication skills. More importantly, the similar incidence of male and female IPV and the similar processes behind this violence suggests that both men and women might benefit from stopping violence education programs. Furthermore, the bi-directional nature of IPV, and similar attitudes of victims and perpetrators suggests that working with one partner, traditionally the male, may not be sufficient to reduce IPV. In many instances, it may be more beneficial to work with both partners in the relationship, provided it is safe to do so. The present findings also revealed that IPV occurs frequently within the wider community and does not discriminate between dating and cohabitating relationships. For instance, within this non-clinical, non-court mandated sample, one in four student relationships had experienced at least one instance of physical violence. These findings are very concerning and stress the need for violence prevention initiatives to be directed at the wider community as well as towards court-mandated individuals.

CHAPTER 5

Correlates of Partner Violence for

Incarcerated Women and Men[3]

In Chapter 4, I examined the incidence and psychological correlates associated with male and female IPV within the student and general sample. In this chapter, I present analyses examining IPV within the incarcerated sample. The inclusion of an incarcerated sample allowed the examination of more severe, frequent, and injurious violence.

Historically, IPV has been framed as male-to-female violence. As a consequence, the causes of male perpetrated abuse have been investigated extensively, whereas female perpetrated abuse has received very little attention. Recent research, however, has found IPV to be bi-directional with women and men being equally likely to perpetrate violence (see Archer, 2000 for a review; Schumacher & Leonard, 2005; Straus, 2004a). There is also evidence to suggest that both partners in violent relationships may lack necessary social skills. Relationships experiencing IPV, for example, have been characterised by reciprocal negative communication styles (Cordova et al., 1993; Ronan et al, 2004). These findings suggest that to move forward in our understanding of IPV we need to identify the correlates associated with IPV for both men and women and to examine the attitudes and behaviours of both perpetrators and victims.

A number of attitudes and behaviours have been correlated with male perpetrated IPV, either individually or in combination with other factors, including a

---

[3] A version of this paper is published as Robertson, K., & Murachver, T. (in press). Correlates of partner violence for incarcerated women and men. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence.*

greater expression of anger (Norlander & Eckhardt, 2005; Schumacher et al, 2001; Stith et al, 2004), negative attitudes and hostility towards women (Parrott & Zeichner, 2003; Reitzel-Jaffe & Wolfe, 2001; Schumacher et al., 2001), blaming partner for problems (Henning et al., 2005), dissatisfaction with relationship power (Babcock et al., 1993; Kaura & Allen, 2004; Ronfeldt et al, 1998), adherence to traditional gender role beliefs (Stith & Farley, 1993; Stith et al., 2004), and attitudes condoning violence (Bookwala et al., 1992; Reitzel-Jaffe & Wolfe, 2001; Russell & Hulson, 1992; Stith & Farley, 1993; Stith et al., 2004).

Although research has only just begun to examine the characteristics associated with female perpetrated abuse, there is some evidence that the variables related to male violence may also help to explain female violence. Similar to male violence, female violence has been associated with higher levels of anger expression and less anger control (Dye & Eckhardt, 2000), traditional gendered beliefs (Bookwala et al., 1992), a dissatisfaction with relationship power (Kaura & Allen, 2004), dominance (Penn, 2002), partner blame and use of tactics of minimisation, denial, and blame (Henning et al., 2005). Female violent relationships have also been characterised by negative communication (Ridley & Feldman, 2003) and hostility towards men (Straus & Yodanis, 1996). Women's hostility towards their own gender has been associated with a greater acceptance of IPV (Cowan et al., 1998). The analyses of the non-incarcerated sample presented in Chapter 4 also revealed the correlates associated with male and female IPV to be similar.

The analyses presented in this chapter extend those of Chapter 4 by comparing the severity and associated injury of male and female IPV. Furthermore, I compared rates of IPV and attitudes within the incarcerated sample to those of the non-incarcerated sample (student and general sample). Based on past research and the

findings presented in Chapter 4, I hypothesised that men and women would report similar rates of perpetration and victimisation of partner violence. However, research examining the severity of IPV has found women may report being the victim of severe violence more often than men (Field & Caetano, 2005). I also expected that the incarcerated sample would report experiencing and perpetrating more violence than would participants from the non-incarcerated sample. Similarly, the incarcerated sample was expected to be more likely than the non-incarcerated sample to hold attitudes and beliefs that were associated with violence.

I also wanted to identify variables related to perpetrating and suffering IPV for both males and females. I was most interested in characteristics that have been influential in shaping violence prevention programs including power and control, traditional gendered beliefs, negative attitudes towards women, partner blame (Pence & Paymar, 1993), anger management, and communication skills (Holtzworth-Munroe, 1992). These programs were designed to prevent men's violent behaviours towards women (Bennett & Williams, 2001). However, female perpetrators are now beginning to be referred to programs based on those originally designed for men. I was therefore particularly interested in whether or not these variables could help to explain female perpetrated violence. Preliminary research has found these programs to have some success in modifying females' behaviour (Carney & Buttell, 2004), but little is known about the actual psychological factors that are related to female perpetrated abuse. Additionally, I investigated the relationship of the psychological correlates to violence approval attitudes to identify factors that shape peoples' attitudes towards violence.

Although a substantial body of research has investigated the relationship of psychological correlates to male perpetrated IPV, the findings have not always been

unanimous. There is some debate, for example, over the relationship of gendered beliefs and violence approval attitudes to IPV, with some researchers finding no such relationship. Bookwala et al. (1992) for example, found that less accepting attitudes towards violence were related to female perpetrated abuse and less traditional gender role beliefs were related to male perpetrated abuse. One explanation for these conflicting results is that individuals may feel pressured to mask beliefs that are less socially desirable. The present study aimed to clarify the relationship between attitudes and violence by employing implicit attitude measures that were not subject to desirability responding.

Method

Participants

The findings from one hundred and seventy-two participants are reported in this chapter. The study sample included 39 incarcerated participants (24 males, 15 females). The incarcerated females were all inmates at Christchurch Women's Prison. The incarcerated males were either inmates at Rolleston Prison (n=14) or finishing their sentence at a community-based rehabilitation facility (n=10). To gain access to the prisons, I sought ethical approval for external research from the New Zealand Department of Corrections Head Office in Wellington. Once ethical approval was granted, security clearance forms were completed for all of the researchers entering the prisons. The Department of Corrections informed individuals at Rolleston prison of the study and asked whether they would like to take part. Due to ethical considerations the Department of Corrections decided not to ask inmates who had been convicted of sexual offences to take part. I was granted access to one wing at Christchurch Women's Prison. I personally visited the prison and asked

individuals whether they would like to participate. All of the individuals who were informed of the study wished to take part. The one hundred and thirty-three non-incarcerated participants served as the comparison sample, including 67 students (36 females, 31 males) and 66 individuals from the community (36 females, 30 males). The non-incarcerated sample were recruited through notices displayed at the university, within the community, and in local organisations' newsletters. An example of an information sheet is presented in Appendix A.

The majority of participants were currently in a relationship ($M_{incarcerated}$ = 38.4%, $M_{non-incarcerated}$ = 64.7%) or had been in a relationship within the past year ($M_{incarcerated}$ = 35.9%, $M_{non-incarcerated}$ = 27.1%). Participants were primarily Pākehā (Caucasian) ($M_{incarcerated}$ = 64.1%, $M_{non-incarcerated}$ = 88%). The remaining participants identified themselves as Māori ($M_{incarcerated}$ = 28.2%, $M_{non-incarcerated}$ = 3%), Pacific Island ($M_{non-incarcerated}$ = 1.5%), East Asian ($M_{non-incarcerated}$ = 3%), Indian ($M_{non-incarcerated}$ = 1.5%), or identified as 'other' ($M_{incarcerated}$ = 7.7%, $M_{non-incarcerated}$ = 3%).

Demographic data revealed that the majority of the incarcerated participants were at least thirty years of age. For the female participants, one was between 20-30 years of age, five were between 30-40 years of age, and nine were 40 years or older. For the male participants two were between 18-19 years of age, eight were between 20-30 years of age, seven were between 30-40 years of age, and seven were 40 years or older. Demographic data for education revealed that the majority of the female participants had not completed school certificate n= 10 (66.7%), three (20%) had school certificate or university entrance, and two (13.3%) had a diploma or degree. Education demographics for the incarcerated males revealed that 10 (41.7%) had not gained school certificate, eight (33.3%) had gained school certificate or university entrance, two (8.3%) had a trades certificate, and four (16.7%) had gained a diploma

or degree. Demographic data for the non-incarcerated sample is reported in Chapter 4.

Measures

Perpetration and victimisation of partner violence and injury were measured using the Revised Conflict Tactics Scale (CTS2) (Straus et al, 1996). The CTS2 is a 39-item self-report measure that asks about violent behaviour and negotiation techniques for participants and their partners. For the present set of analyses, participants completed the 12-item physical assault scale, the eight-item psychological aggression scale, and the six-item injury scale. Participants were asked to respond to each item with regards to their current or most recent relationship on a seven-point scale ranging from, "this has never happened," to "it has happened more than 20 times in the past year." The CTS (Straus, 1990) and CTS2 (Straus, 2004b) are widely used measures with evidence of both validity and reliability. The CTS2 was scored two ways for the current analyses. Continuous violence scores (without mid-points) were entered into regression models. Larger scores reflect a higher frequency of violence. For chi-square analyses, participants were classified as perpetrating or suffering physical or psychological violence or injury if they reported one or more instances of violence on the respective scale. Classification was based on participants' scores on the minor and severe physical violence and injury scales and severe psychological scale. Minor psychological violence was not analysed because it occurred frequently for all participants.

Anger management, communication problems, dominance, gender hostility to men, gender hostility to women, violence approval, and negative attribution were measured using the relevant scales from the Personal and Relationships Profile (PRP)

(Straus & Hamby, 1999). The PRP was designed to measure personal characteristics and relationship qualities in violent relationships. Participants responded to questions on a 4-point scale ranging from "strongly disagree" to "strongly agree." To score the PRP I adjusted reverse scored items and summed items for each scale. The PRP has preliminary reliability and validity (Straus & Mouradian, 1999).

Gender role beliefs were measured using the Pacific Attitudes Toward Gender Scale (Vaillancourt & Leaper, 1997). The PATG is a 28-item questionnaire that assesses attitudes towards gender roles. Statements are rated on a 6-point scale from "strongly disagree" to "strongly agree." The PATG was scored by summing items after adjusting reverse scored items. Higher scores reflect attitudes that are more egalitarian. The PATG is a relatively new measure without published reliability and validity. However, it has been shown to predict convergence to gendered language (Hughes, 2004).

Male privilege, perceived lack of alternatives to violence, and the belief that male violence is justified were measured using the Revised Attitudes Toward Wife Abuse Scale (RAWA) (Yoshioka et al, 2001). The RAWA is a 14-item scale that assesses attitudes towards a mans' right to use violence, beliefs concerning males' right to power and control, and attitudes towards alternatives women could use rather than remaining in the abusive relationship. The RAWA was rated on the same scale as the PATG. Higher scores in the current study reflect a greater acceptance of partner violence. The questionnaires given to participants can be found in Appendix B.

Implicit attitudes were measured using the implicit association test (IAT) (Rudman et al, 2001). The IAT is a widely used measure that assesses implicit stereotypes and prejudice. Because the IAT measures implicit associations, it is not

subject to social desirability responding (Rudman et al., 2001). Participants categorise stimuli from two different subject categories (e.g., man, woman) and stimuli from two different attribute categories (e.g., pleasant, unpleasant) by pressing one of two keys. For example, the same key may be used to categorise both men and pleasant things. The faster participants respond, the more closely they associate the stimulus with the attribute.

Five implicit association tasks were used in the present set of analyses. The first assessed gender role beliefs and paired *career* and *domestic*, with *male* and *female*. The second test looked at gender trait beliefs; *submissive* and *dominant* were paired with *male* and *female*. Higher scores on these first two measures reflect more traditional gendered beliefs. The third test tapped participants' attitudes towards violence and paired *violence* and *non-violence* terms with *good* and *bad*. A higher score reflects less approval of violence. The last two tests examined attitudes towards men and women. The fourth test was evaluative and paired *female* and *male* with *negative* and *positive*. The final test assessed affective gendered attitudes and paired *female* and *male* with *pleasant* and *unpleasant*. Higher scores on these last two tests reflect more positive attitudes towards females and more negative attitudes towards males. For each of the five IAT tasks there were ten blocks and two practice trials. Based on the recommendations of Greenwald et al. (2003), *D* scores were used to score the IAT in the present analyses. *D* scores are calculated by taking the mean latency difference between trials of the two possible pairings of stimulus and attribute and dividing this by the pooled standard deviation from these trials. An example of two possible pairings would be trials where violence is paired with good and trials where violence is paired with bad. Error trials were omitted along with the first two trials from each test block, and latencies outside of lower (300 ms) and upper (3, 500

ms) boundaries were recoded to those boundaries respectively. The lists of stimulus and attribute words used in each IAT task are listed in Appendix D.

Procedure

To take part in the study, the non-incarcerated sample were required to come into a research laboratory at the University; the incarcerated participants were visited at their respective facility. For this phase of the study participants completed a battery of questionnaires on a computer. Analyses in the present chapter are based on participants' responses on a brief demographic questionnaire, the CTS2, PRP, PATG, RAWA, and five IAT tasks. Five of the 172 participants did not complete the IAT. Scores for these participants were estimated using SPSS expectation maximisation.

Results

Chi-square analyses were performed to compare prevalence rates of IPV between the incarcerated and non-incarcerated comparison sample. The analyses revealed that participants from the incarcerated sample perpetrated significantly more physical ($M_{incarcerated}$ =56.4%, $M_{control}$ = 25.6%, $\chi^2(1)$ = 13.07, p < .001), and psychological violence ($M_{incarcerated}$ =64.1%, $M_{control}$ =19.5%, $\chi^2(1)$ = 28.70, p < .001), and suffered significantly more physical ($M_{incarcerated}$ =66.7%, $M_{control}$ = 30.1%, $\chi^2(1)$ = 17.08, p < .001), and psychological violence ($M_{incarcerated}$ = 61.5%, $M_{control}$ = 29.3%, $\chi^2(1)$ = 13.48, p < .001) than did the non-incarcerated sample. Participants from the incarcerated sample also reported suffering more injury ($M_{incarcerated}$ = 51.3%, $M_{control}$ = 6.8%, $\chi^2(1)$ = 42.63, p < .001), and inflicting more injury ($M_{incarcerated}$ = 43.6%, $M_{control}$ = 6%, $\chi^2(1)$ = 34.28, p < .001) than did participants from the non-incarcerated sample.

To examine the nature of IPV within the incarcerated sample, chi-square analyses were performed to determine: (1) whether or not prevalence rates varied by gender; (2) the relationship between physical and psychological violence; and (3) the relationship between perpetrating and suffering IPV. The analyses showed no significant differences between men and women's perpetration of overall physical violence (M_{men} =54.2%, M_{women} = 60.0%, $\chi^2(1)$ = .128, p = .721), severe physical violence (M_{men} =41.7%, M_{women} = 46.7%, $\chi^2(1)$ = .094, p = .759), or psychological violence (M_{men} = 58.3%, M_{women} = 73.3%, $\chi^2(1)$ = .903, p = .342). There were also no significant gender differences for suffering overall physical violence (M_{men} = 66.7%, M_{women} = 66.7%, $\chi^2(1)$ = .000, p = 1.0), severe physical violence (M_{men} = 41.7%, M_{women} = 60.0%, $\chi^2(1)$ = 1.24, p = .265), or psychological violence (M_{men} = 54.2%, M_{women} = 73.3%, $\chi^2(1)$ = 1.433, p = .231). Chi-square analyses examining injury yielded no significant difference between men's and women's reported infliction of injury (M_{men} = 45.8%, M_{women} = 40.0%, $\chi^2(1)$ = .128, p = .721), or reported experience of injury (M_{men} = 50.0%, M_{women} = 53.3%, $\chi^2(1)$ = .041, p = .839).

As shown in Table 5.1, psychological and physical violence often occurred together, and the majority of the violence was bi-directional. For example, of the individuals who reported using physical violence, 95.5% also reported using psychological violence. Similarly, of the participants who reported using psychological violence, 84% also perpetrated physical violence. Chi-square analyses revealed that participants reporting a history of IPV often reported both perpetrating and suffering abuse. The frequencies of other violence were always significantly higher for those in the use/suffer columns than for those in the don't use/don't suffer columns. For example, of the participants who used physical violence, 90.9% also

Table 5.1: Percentages of Participants using and/or Experiencing Physical and Psychological Abuse

		Physical Abuse				Psychological Abuse			
		Use	Don't use	Receive	Don't Rec.	Use	Don't use	Receive	Don't Rec.
Physical Abuse	**Use**			**20 (90.9%)**	**2 (9.1%)**	21 (95.9%)	1 (4.5%)	19 (86.4%)	3 (13.6%)
	Don't use			**6 (35.3%)**	**11 (64.7%)**	4 (23.5%)	13 (76.5%)	5 (29.4%)	12 (70.6%)
	χ^2				**13.35***		21.56***		13.14***
	Receive	**20 (76.9%)**	**6 (23.1%)**			23 (88.5%)	3 (11.5%)	23 (88.5%)	3 (11.5%)
	Don't receive	**2 (15.4%)**	**11 (84.6%)**			2 (15.4%)	11 (84.6%)	1 (7.7%)	12 (92.3%)
	χ^2		**13.35***				20.11***		23.89***
Psychological	**Use**	21 (84.0%)	4 (16.0%)	23 (92.0%)	2 (8.0%)			**22 (88.0%)**	**3 (12.0%)**
	Don't use	1 (7.1%)	13 (92.9%)	3 (21.4%)	11 (78.6%)			**2 (14.3%)**	**12 (85.7%)**
	χ^2		21.56***		20.11***				**20.60***
	Receive	19 (79.2%)	5 (20.8%)	23 (95.8%)	1 (4.2%)	**22 (91.7%)**	**2 (8.3%)**		
	Don't receive	3 (20.0%)	12 (80.0%)	3 (20.0%)	12 (80.0%)	**3 (20.0%)**	**12 (80.0%)**		
	χ^2		13.14***		23.89***		**20.60***		

*** $p < .001$

reported suffering physical violence. Similarly, of the participants who suffered physical violence, 76.9% also reported perpetrating physical violence.

Comparison of Attitudes Between the Incarcerated and Non-incarcerated Sample

A MANOVA was performed to examine whether or not participants' attitudes varied as a function of sample. A 2 (sample) MANOVA on the 16 psychological factors revealed a significant effect for sample, $F(16, 155) = 2.730$, $p < .01$, $\eta^2 = .22$. The relevant means and corresponding F values are shown in Table 5.2. In comparison to the non-incarcerated sample, the incarcerated sample reported fewer anger management skills, more communication problems, more dominance attitudes, more hostility towards both men and women, a stronger belief in male privilege, more implicit acceptance of violence, more partner blame, and held less egalitarian beliefs.

Psychological Predictors of Partner Violence within the Incarcerated Sample

Continuous violence scores were used to examine the relationship between psychological factors and violence. To test whether there were different relationships for men and women, I entered each predictor, a dummy-coded gender variable, and their product term into a regression model. Significant gender differences were found between implicit violence approval attitudes with perpetrating psychological violence ($R^2 = .313$, $F(1, 35) = 8.17$, $p < .01$, $B = -2.85$, $t(35) = -2.86$, $p < .01$), and suffering physical violence ($R^2 = .264$, $F(1, 35) = 5.41$, $p < .05$, $B = -6.90$, $t(35) = -2.33$, $p < .05$). Post-hoc probing (see Aiken & West, 1991, for details)

Table 5.2: Mean Values for Psychological Factors as a function of Sample

| | Sample | | | |
	Non-Incar	Incar	F	η^2
Variable				
Anger Management	18.19	16.36	9.334	.052**
Communication Problems	7.17	8.95	9.401	.052**
Dominance	6.56	8.54	10.49	.058**
Hostility to Men	5.25	7.10	19.50	.103***
Hostility to Women	4.14	5.26	6.72	.038*
Negative Attribution	3.04	4.08	7.22	.041**
Lack Alternatives	3.23	4.44	3.83	.022
Male Privilege	2.21	4.54	14.76	.080***
Male Violence Justified	2.05	3.31	3.12	.018
Gendered Beliefs	100.96	89.77	10.75	.059**
Violence Approval	7.41	8.87	3.66	.021
Gender Role Beliefs[i]	.415	.372	.292	.002
Gender Trait Beliefs[i]	.312	.319	.008	.000
Violence Approval[i]	1.24	1.09	4.82	.028*
Evaluative gendered att.[i]	.248	.169	.646	.004
Affective gendered att.[i]	.400	.355	.161	.001

*$p<.05$, **$p<.01$, ***$p<.001$ [i]Implicit

revealed that in each case the less women associated 'bad terms' with 'violence terms', the greater the amount of violence they experienced and perpetrated. This pattern was driven by two women who had very high levels of violence and a low association between violence and bad on the IAT. No other relationships differed as a function of gender; therefore, gender was omitted from subsequent analyses.

Pearson's correlations were performed to determine which psychological factors were associated with IPV. A conservative alpha of $p < .025$ yielded six psychological factors associated with abuse. As shown in Table 5.3, four of these psychological factors (more communication problems, greater dominance attitudes, greater hostility towards women, and a stronger belief that there is no alternative to violence) were consistently associated with IPV. Negative attribution was associated with suffering physical and psychological violence and perpetrating physical violence. Implicit violence approval was associated with suffering physical violence.

Four stepwise regressions were performed to assess the relationship of the six psychological factors to the use of and suffering of physical and psychological IPV. A one factor model was selected for perpetrating physical violence. Greater hostility towards women was identified as the most significant predictor ($R^2 = .243$, $F(1, 37) = 11.89$, $p < .01$, $B = 1.97$, $t (37) = 3.447$, $p < .01$). Similarly, hostility towards women was identified as the strongest correlate for perpetrating psychological violence ($R^2 = .200$, $F(1, 37) = 9.23$, $p < .01$, $B = .710$, $t (37) = 3.039$, $p < .01$). The stepwise regression for suffering physical violence selected a two factor model ($R^2 = .477$, $F(2, 36) = 16.42$, $p < .001$). Suffering of physical violence was predicted by greater hostility towards women ($B = 2.75$, $t (36) = 4.89$, $p < .001$), and implicit approval of violence ($B = -6.21$, $t (36) = -2.03$, $p = .05$). The stepwise regression for suffering psychological abuse selected a one factor model identifying more communication

Table 5.3: Correlation of Psychological Factors to Partner Violence

Variable	Use Physical	Suffer Physical	Use Psyc.	Suffer Psyc.
Communication problems	.334*	.479**	.390*	.482**
Dominance	.416**	.406*	.404*	.403*
Hostility to Women	.493**	.646***	.447**	.460**
Negative attribution	.359*	.549***	.286	.365*
Lack alt to violence	.398*	.370*	.399*	.373*
Implicit violence approval	-.248	-.361*	-.268	-.266

*$p < .025$, **$p < .01$, ***$p < .001$

problems as the strongest correlate ($R^2 = .232$, $F(1, 37) = 11.17$, $p < .01$, $B = .533$, $t(37) = 3.342$, $p < .01$).

Psychological Factors Associated with Violence Approval

I was also interested in the relationship between the psychological factors and attitudes condoning violence. Pearson's correlations with a conservative alpha of $p <$ .025 were performed to select those variables that were significantly related to implicit and explicit violence approval attitudes. Eight factors were correlated with explicit violence approval (less anger management skills, more communication problems, more dominance attitudes, greater hostility towards men and women, greater negative attribution, greater acceptance of male privilege, and a belief that male violence is justified). These variables were then entered into a stepwise regression, which selected a one factor model ($R^2 = .350$, $F(1, 37) = 19.95$, $p < .001$).

Greater hostility to women was the strongest predictor for attitudes condoning violence ($B = .923$, $t(37) = 4.467$, $p < .001$).

Pearson's correlations between implicit violence approval attitudes and the psychological factors identified two factors (a greater belief that there is no alternative to violence, and implicit affective attitudes viewing women as unpleasant and men as pleasant) that were positively correlated with violence approval. Stepwise regression selected a one factor model that identified the belief that there is no alternative to violence to be the most significant predictor of implicit violence approval ($R^2 = .132$, $F(1, 37) = 5.64$, $p < .05$, $B = -.034$, $t(37) = -2.374$, $p < .05$).

Pearson's correlations yielded seven factors (more violence approval, less anger management, more communication problems, greater hostility to women, a stronger belief that there is no alternative to violence, beliefs condoning male privilege, and implicit evaluative beliefs viewing women negatively and men positively) that were positively correlated with the belief that male violence is justified. Stepwise regression selected a three factor model ($R^2 = .515$, $F(3, 35) = 12.38$, $p < .001$). The belief that male violence is justified was associated with greater hostility towards women ($B = .565$, $t(35) = 2.156$, $p < .05$), a belief that there is no alternative to violence ($B = .433$, $t(35) = 3.233$, $p < .01$), and implicit evaluative beliefs viewing females negatively and males positively ($B = -3.810$, $t(35) = -3.091$, $p < .01$).

Discussion

In this phase of the study, I examined prevalence rates and correlates of IPV within a sample of incarcerated men and women. There were a number of main findings. As expected, rates of IPV were higher for the incarcerated than the non-

incarcerated sample. More interestingly, IPV was bi-directional with men and women equally likely to report being both the perpetrator and victim of violence. Moreover, the severity of violence and injury perpetrated and suffered was similar for men and women. In addition, the two forms of violence co-existed, with individuals perpetrating and suffering both physical and psychological violence. Of particular importance was the finding that the attitudes associated with IPV were the same for men and women, and were similar for both victims and perpetrators. Specifically, hostility and negative attitudes towards women were strong predictors for perpetrating, suffering and condoning IPV. In comparison to the non-incarcerated sample, the incarcerated sample also reported more negative attitudes, communication problems, and fewer anger management skills.

The bi-directional nature of violence evident in both the present and past research (Archer, 2000; Magdol et al., 1998; Schumacher & Leonard, 2005; Straus, 2004a) suggests that both partners may hold attitudes instrumental in IPV. Further support comes from the finding that perpetrators and victims in the present investigation held many similar attitudes including attitudes towards dominance, hostility towards women, a belief that female victims should stay in a violent relationship, and communication problems. Moreover, the strongest predictor for suffering psychological violence was victims' self-reported lack of communication skills. Because I could not examine cause and effect in the current analyses, it is unclear whether lack of communication skills lead to victimisation, or whether victims choose not to communicate with their partner for fear of experiencing further violence. Future research is required here.

The present set of analyses also revealed the severity of IPV to be the same for men and women. This finding should be interpreted with caution, however, because

other research has found that women are more likely to be injured (Archer, 2000), to suffer severe violence (Field & Caetano, 2005), to experience psychological damage and to perpetrate IPV in self-defence (Saunders, 2002). Moreover, Busch & Rosenberg (2004) found that although the severity of IPV was similar for men and women, women were more likely to be victimised, and it was possible that their use of IPV was in self-defence. The current study did not examine self-defence, nor did I measure the consequences of IPV other than reported injury rates.

Although a number of factors were associated with IPV, viewing women negatively was one of the strongest correlates. Hostility towards women was the strongest predictor for perpetrating IPV. It was also associated with suffering physical violence, in combination with an implicit approval of violence. Furthermore, hostility to women was strongly associated with violence approval, uniquely predicting explicit attitudes condoning violence. It was also associated with the belief that male violence is justified, in combination with implicit attitudes viewing women negatively, and a belief that women should stay in violent relationships.

Hostility to women has been identified as an important correlate of male-to-female violence (Parrott & Zeichner, 2003; Reitzel-Jaffe & Wolfe, 2001; Schumacher et al., 2001). However, little is known about this association with female perpetrated violence. As with the current investigation, Cowan et al. (1998) found women's hostility towards their own gender was associated with the acceptance of IPV. They argued that women's hostility towards other women might help to sustain myths that justify violence against women. What is more confusing, however, is the association between hostility to women and females' violence towards males. One possible explanation comes from an extension of the conclusions of Cowan et al. (1998). They suggested that for women to be hostile to other women they are rejecting themselves.

I speculate that this rejection of themselves is part of a wider negative attitude and hostility towards others in general that includes the acceptance and use of partner violence. However, because society has traditionally devalued women, this hostility is directed primarily towards females because it is more socially acceptable to display negative attitudes towards a lesser valued group.

The present set of analyses did not find an association between perpetrating IPV, gendered beliefs, and violence approval attitudes. One possible reason for this lack of association is derived from the comparison of attitudes between the incarcerated and non-incarcerated sample. Compared to the non-incarcerated sample, the incarcerated sample were less egalitarian and held more implicit violence approval attitudes. The lack of association between gendered beliefs and IPV within the incarcerated sample might therefore be explained by the more traditional beliefs held within this sample, regardless of their abuse history. The use of implicit and explicit attitude measures helped to clarify this relationship. Whereas the implicit violence approval measure found the incarcerated sample to have somewhat more tolerant attitudes towards violence, the two samples' attitudes towards violence were more similar when measured explicitly. The disparity between the incarcerated samples' implicit and explicit violence approval attitudes exemplifies the need to include implicit measures when measuring attitudes that are not publicly accepted. The implicit violence approval measure also revealed victims of physical violence to be more condoning of violence, and suggests that individuals who experience IPV may come to accept the abuse.

Although this study was limited by a small sample size, it is among one of the first to examine how attitudes differentiate women who do or do not perpetrate violence. I also looked at both psychological and physical abuse and included

victimisation of IPV. Furthermore, the current study employed both explicit and implicit attitude measures to help overcome social desirability responding.

The findings suggest that within this sample, violence was bi-directional and the correlates associated with violence were the same for men and women. Hostility towards women, in particular, may be one of the main factors associated with the perpetration and victimisation of partner violence. These findings suggest that some female perpetrated violence may be motivated for reasons other than self-defence and provided preliminary support and direction for further research, examining whether factors that have been traditionally associated with male perpetrated IPV may also be helpful in understanding female perpetrated violence. The bi-directional nature of violence and similar attitudes of perpetrators and victims also add support to the idea that in some situations where there is mutual violence, the attitudes and behaviours of both partners may inflate the likelihood of violence occurring. Although this was a preliminary investigation, the findings are consistent with past research and add further support to the idea that there may be some cases in which it is necessary to work with both partners within a relationship experiencing IPV (Anglin & Holtzworth-Munroe, 1997; Schumacher & Leonard, 2005; Skuja & Halford, 2003).

Along with the growing body of research finding IPV to be bi-directional, findings of the present investigation suggest that a cultural shift is needed in the way we view IPV. I believe that IPV has many different forms including systematically perpetrated violence to control others, IPV perpetrated in self-defence, and in other cases, such as those in the present investigation, couples use bi-directional violence. The findings from the present set of investigations suggest that this mutual violence may be associated with a greater dislike and distrust of others, especially women.

CHAPTER 6

It Takes Two to Tangle:

Gender Symmetry in Intimate Partner Violence[4]

This chapter validates and extends findings pertaining to the similarities of male and female IPV presented in Chapters 4 & 5. The equivalence of male- and female-perpetrated IPV is the most controversial debate occurring within IPV research. It is a pervasive cultural belief that males are more aggressive than females. This belief has been supported by research examining police records (Melton & Belknap, 2003) or shelter samples (Saunders, 1986). Where examined, female violence within these samples has been viewed largely as self-defensive (Melton & Belknap, 2003). However, over 100 community- or student-based studies have found males and females to be equally likely to perpetrate violence (e.g., Archer, 2000; Magdol et al., 1997; Straus, 2004a). Moreover, contrary to feminist assertions that female violence is self-defensive, males and females have been found to be equally likely to initiate violence (Stets & Straus, 1990). Researchers have also found male and female IPV to be driven by similar motivations such as retaliation or anger (Follingstad et al., 1991).

The finding that women can and do perpetrate IPV stimulated further debate surrounding the comparability of male and female violence. Researchers have generally found male violence to have more severe consequences than female violence. This disparity is amplified within feminist research (Saunders, 2002), and is

---

[4] A version of this paper is under review as Robertson, K., & Murachver, T. (2005). It takes two to tangle: Gender symmetry in intimate partner violence. Manuscript submitted for review.

far less prominent within family violence research where researchers conclude that similar to male violence, the injury inflicted by females is also concerning (Archer, 2000; Straus, 2004a). Moreover, an examination of individual incidents in judiciary records reveals female and male IPV to be comparable in frequency, severity, and injury (McFarlane et al, 2000).

The aim of the present investigation was to address the gender symmetry debate by examining the frequency and nature of IPV perpetrated by men and women. Previous analysis of IPV within these samples (Chapters 4 & 5) revealed IPV to be bi-directional and provided preliminary evidence for similarities in the incidence of IPV perpetrated by males and females. Within the incarcerated sample for instance, males and females were equally likely to have perpetrated at least one instance of physical violence (Men = 54.2%, Women = 60%), severe physical violence (Men = 41.7%, Women = 46.7%), or have inflicted injury (Men = 45.8%, Women = 40%) within the past year. Incidence rates for perpetrating physical violence were also similar for males and females within the student and general sample (Men = 19.7%, Women = 30.6%).

Although the above findings provide evidence for similarities between male and female IPV, researchers have argued that classifying participants as violent or non-violent based on whether or not they have used IPV may over-exaggerate women's use of IPV (Melton & Belknap, 2003). To overcome this limitation I considered the frequency of abuse in the present investigation. I also examined the type of abuse acts perpetrated and suffered, because researchers have argued that male and female IPV may be qualitatively different. For instance, a slap to the arm is substantially different to a punch to the face (Dobash & Dobash, 2004).

Further evidence for the equivalence of male and female IPV came from analyses presented in Chapters 4 & 5 revealing that the correlates associated with IPV were similar for males and females and victims and perpetrators. A limitation of these analyses however, was that many of the individuals identified as being victims were also perpetrators. The present set of analyses overcame this limitation by separating participants into three groups; 1) no violence; 2) victims; and 3) perpetrators or perpetrators and victims, to clarify whether victims and perpetrators share similar attitudes. The variables I was interested in were those that have been found to be related to IPV in the past including communication problems (Ronan et al, 2004), disparagement (Chapter 4), hostility (Parrott & Zeichner, 2003; Reitzel-Jaffe & Wolfe, 2001; Straus & Yodanis, 1996), and partner blame (Henning et al., 2005).

I also examined the relationship between control and IPV, following Johnson's (2000) argument, outlined in Chapter 1, that suggests that there are different forms of IPV that can largely be distinguished by the degree of other controlling behaviours used in conjunction with violence. By examining the co-existence of violent and controlling behaviours, I was also able to examine the belief that males are more likely to use violence as a form of control and intimidation than are females (Nazroo, 1995).

Method

Participants

The findings from one hundred and seventy-two participants are included in this set of analyses. The sample included 67 university students (female = 36, male = 31), 66 general sample participants (female = 36, male = 30), and 39 incarcerated

participants (female = 15, male = 24). The participants were primarily Pākehā (Caucasian) ($M_{student}$ = 83.5%, $M_{general}$ = 92.5%, $M_{incarcerated}$ = 64.1%). An example of an information sheet appears in Appendix A.

Measures

Participants were classified as perpetrating or suffering IPV based on their responses to the Revised Conflict Tactics Scale (CTS2) (Straus et al, 1996). Communication problems, disparagement, gender hostility to men, gender hostility to women, and negative attribution were measured using the relevant scales from the Personal and Relationships Profile (PRP) (Straus & Hamby, 1999). The wording was modified in the current study to be gender neutral. Controlling behaviour was measured using 14 questions taken from the Psychological Maltreatment of Women Inventory (PMWI) (Tolman, 1989). The questions that were included in the computer-based questionnaire are listed in Appendix B.

Procedure

Participants completed a range of questionnaires on the computer. Analyses in the present study are based on participants' responses on a brief demographic questionnaire, the CTS2, PRP, and PMWI.

Results

Pattern and Frequency of IPV as a Function of Gender and Sample

Chi-square analyses were performed to examine whether the pattern of victimisation or perpetration of IPV varied as a function of gender and sample. Using

the CTS2, participants were classified as either; (a) having no history of abuse; (b) suffering but not perpetrating abuse; (c) suffering and perpetrating abuse; or (d) perpetrating but not suffering abuse. Analyses revealed that males were significantly more likely than females to report being a victim only ($\chi^2(1) = 5.18$, $p < .05$). Females were significantly more likely than males to report being a perpetrator only ($\chi^2(1) = 7.53$, $p < .01$). The incidence of bi-directional violence did not vary as a function of gender.

Analyses across the three samples revealed that the percentage of participants reporting being a victim, or perpetrator did not vary as a function of sample. The incarcerated sample, however, was significantly more likely to report engaging in bi-directional violence than were participants from the student ($\chi^2(1) = 17.77$, $p < .001$), or general sample ($\chi^2(1) = 11.35$, $p < .01$). The relevant means for the pattern of victimisation and perpetration as a function of gender and sample can be seen in Table 6.1.

Table 6.1: Percentage of Individuals Classified as Victim, Perpetrator, or Experiencing Bi-directional Violence as a Function of Gender and Sample

Pattern of IPV	Gender		Sample		
	Male	Female	Student	General	Incar.
Victim Only	20%	8.0%	16.4%	10.6%	15.4%
Perpetrate Only	2.4%	13.8%	13.4%	4.5%	5.1%
Bi-directional	27.1%	21.8%	13.4%	19.7%	51.3%

To examine whether the frequency of IPV perpetrated and suffered differed as a function of gender I performed four ANOVAS examining participants' continuous

CTS2 violence scores as a function of gender. The ANOVAS revealed that in each instance there was no significant difference in males' and females' perpetration of physical abuse (M_{male} = 2.04, M_{female} = 2.29, $F(1, 170)$ = .09, p = .77, η^2 = .00), suffering of physical violence (M_{male} = 3.69, M_{female} = 2.37, $F(1, 170)$ = 1.57, p = .21, η^2 = .01), perpetration of severe physical violence (M_{male} = .79, M_{female} = .63, $F(1, 170)$ = .19, p = .67, η^2 = .00), or suffering of severe physical violence (M_{male} = 1.22, M_{female} = .84, $F(1, 170)$ = .71, p = .40, η^2 = .00).

Physical Abuse Acts Perpetrated and Suffered as a Function of Gender and Sample

A MANOVA was performed to examine the nature of violence as a function of gender and sample. A 3 (sample) x 2 (participant gender) MANOVA, on the 24 violence variables revealed a significant main effect of gender ($F(24,143)$ = 2.31, p < .01, η^2 = .28), and sample ($F(48, 286)$ = 1.93, p < .01, η^2 = .25). Univariate analyses revealed that females were more likely than males to throw something that could hurt at their partner ($M_{females}$ = 0.82, M_{males} = 0.21, $F(1, 286)$ = 7.28, p < .01, η^2 = .04), push or shove their partner ($M_{females}$ = 1.42, M_{males} = 0.59, $F(1, 286)$ = 5.10, p < .05, η^2 = .03), and kick their partner ($M_{females}$ = 0.76, M_{males} = 0.56, $F(1, 286)$ = 5.20, p < .05, η^2 = .03). Males were more likely to choke their partner ($M_{females}$ = 0, M_{males} = 0.18, $F(1, 286)$ = 6.24, p < .05, η^2 = .04). Post Hoc Student Newman Keuls tests revealed that in all but one instance the significant effect of sample was due to participants from the incarcerated sample being more likely to perpetrate or suffer the abuse act than were participants from the student or general sample. The physical abuse act "I kicked my partner" revealed a significant univariate effect of sample; however, Post Hoc Student Newman Keuls tests did not reveal any significant

differences between the three samples. Although the incarcerated sample perpetrated and suffered a greater frequency of each abuse act the most frequently perpetrated acts were common to all samples.

Psychological Correlates as a Function of Participants Abuse Status

To examine whether the psychological correlates varied as a function of participants' abuse status, participants were classified as (a) having no history of abuse, (b) being the victim of abuse, or (c) perpetrating or perpetrating and suffering abuse. It was not possible to compare the attitudes of perpetrators separately to participants experiencing bi-directional aggression because very few participants were classified as perpetrating and not suffering abuse (n = 14). A 3 (abuse category) MANOVA, on the 5 psychological correlates revealed a significant main effect of abuse category ($F(10, 330) = 6.14$, $p < .001$, $\eta^2 = .16$). The relevant means and corresponding F values as a function of abuse category are shown in Table 6.2. Post Hoc Student Newman Keuls tests revealed that for all five variables participants without a history of violence had significantly different attitudes than participants with a history of violence. Moreover, the attitudes of victims were not significantly different to those of perpetrators.

Relationship Between Control and IPV

Following Johnson's (2000) recommendations I examined the relationship between control and violence. Participants were classified as either low or high controllers using K-means cluster analyses. Chi-square analyses revealed controlling behaviour to be bi-directional ($\chi^2(1) = 31.13$, $p < .001$). For instance, eighty percent of participants who reported being high controllers also reported that their partners

were high controllers. Analyses revealed no significant gender difference in

Table 6.2: Mean Values for Psychological Correlates as a Function of Participant

Abuse History

	Abuse Category				
Variable	No history	Victims Only	Mutual or Perp. only	F	η^2
Comm. Problems	6.37	8.92	8.96	15.58	.16***
Disparagement	1.21	2.17	2.18	9.35	.10***
Hostility to women	3.61	4.75	5.52	12.73	.13***
Hostility to men	4.84	6.79	6.55	13.38	.14***
Partner blame	2.32	4.58	4.29	25.06	.23***

*p < .05, **p < .01, ***p < .001*

participants' reports of their own controlling behaviour ($M_{high-men}$ = 24.7%, $M_{high-women}$ = 16.1%, χ^2 (1) = 1.97, p = .161) or their partners' controlling behaviour ($M_{high-men}$ = 40%, $M_{high-women}$ = 37.9%, χ^2 (1) = .077, p = .781).

Analyses examining the relationship between control and violence revealed that participants who perpetrated IPV were more likely to be high controllers (35.7%), than were participants who did not perpetrate IPV (12.9%, χ^2 (1) = 12.10, p < .01). To further explore the relationship between violence and control, I performed a between subjects ANOVA on participants' continuous control score with abuse category (no violence, victim, bi-directional) as the independent variable. A significant effect of abuse category was found (F(2, 169) = 17.96, p < .001, η^2 = .18). Post Hoc Student Newman Keuls tests revealed that participants without a history of

violence were significantly less controlling (M = 3.26), than were victims (M = 8.33), or participants experiencing bi-directional IPV (M = 11.11).

I also performed separate chi-square analyses for males and females to examine whether the relationship between control and violence was similar for males and females. The analyses showed striking similarity. For females, individuals perpetrating IPV were more likely to be classified as a high controller (29%), than were individuals who did not perpetrate IPV (8.9%, χ^2 (1) = 5.97, $p < .05$). Similarly, for males, individuals who perpetrated IPV were more likely to be high controllers (44%), than were individuals who did not perpetrate IPV (16.7%, χ^2 (1) = 7.09, $p < .01$). Unfortunately it was not possible to examine the different typologies of IPV identified by Johnson (2000) due to the relatively small sample size of the present study.

Discussion

It is now generally accepted that females can and do perpetrate IPV, although there is still wide debate surrounding the equivalence of abuse perpetrated by males and females. The present findings revealed that male and female IPV was similar in frequency and although the nature of IPV varied as a function of gender, there were many similarities. Moreover, both male and female IPV was associated with the use of other controlling behaviours. The comparison of IPV as a function of sample revealed that although the incarcerated sample experienced more IPV, the nature of IPV was similar across the three samples. Finally, victims and perpetrators were differentiated from participants with no history of abuse by their similar attitudes and greater use of controlling behaviours.

The similar frequency of male and female IPV, taken together with the previous findings reported in Chapters 4 and 5 revealing likeness in severity and injury, provide strong support for gender symmetry in IPV. Moreover, when I examined the pattern of perpetration and victimisation I found women were more likely to be perpetrators, and men were more likely to be victims. This similar incidence of male and female IPV should be interpreted with caution, however, because Archer (1999) found that within non-matched samples there is a tendency for men to be more likely than women to under-report their use of abuse. Although this study did not examine couple data, male and female reports concerning males' greater victimisation and females' greater perpetration were in line with each other. These findings do not support the belief that female IPV is primarily perpetrated in self-defence. Within the present sample 13.8% of females reported using physical violence in the absence of abuse perpetrated against them.

An examination of the nature of abuse acts perpetrated and suffered revealed that overall there was much similarity in the type of abuse acts perpetrated and suffered by men and women. However, men were more likely than women to choke their partner, whereas women were more likely to use less lethal acts such as hitting their partner with an object, pushing, shoving, or kicking their partner. Melton & Belknap (2003) found similar gender differences in an examination of criminal justice records. These findings are in accordance with research finding males to be more likely than females to commit homicide (Saunders & Browne, 2000). It is not possible to deduce from the present set of analyses whether the difference in lethal and non-lethal actions employed by males and females is an intentional difference or due to physical strength differences between the sexes.

Further support for gender symmetry was evidenced by the finding that both male and female IPV was associated with the use of other controlling behaviours. Similarly to IPV, the use of controlling behaviours was bi-directional in the present analysis. These findings contradict popular belief that a fundamental difference between male and female IPV is that male violence is more likely to be associated with a desire to control one's partner (e.g., Nazroo, 1995). However, there is some recent empirical support that both male and female IPV are associated with a belief that aggression can be instrumental (Archer & Graham-Kevan, 2003).

Finally, the present investigation found victims and perpetrators shared similar hostile attitudes towards others, lacked communication skills, and were more controlling than participants without a history of IPV. The current findings suggest that violence prevention initiatives focusing solely on perpetrators may be less effective than interventions directed towards both partners that address the dynamics of the relationship.

Where do we go from here? I suggest that a radical shift in the way we view and treat IPV is necessary if we are to reduce incidence rates. Researchers frequently find women's violence to be viewed less harshly, as less illegal, and less likely to need intervention such as arrest than male violence (e.g., Sorenson & Taylor, 2005). The present findings strongly suggest that male and female IPV should be treated equally seriously and that both partners within violent relationships, regardless of their perpetrator or victim status, should be targeted for intervention. Contrary to past research and popular belief, male IPV in the present set of analyses was no more frequent or likely to be associated with control than was female IPV. Furthermore, the attitudes and behaviours of both perpetrators and victims were instrumental in

IPV. Based on the finding that the nature of IPV was similar across the diverse samples studied I also suggest a need for widespread intervention programs.

Researchers have only recently begun to examine female perpetrated IPV. Much of this research qualifies findings of female perpetrated IPV as being self-defensive. There is no doubt that IPV sometimes occurs in self-defence. However, I argue that in order to further our understanding of IPV, researchers should keep an open mind to the possibility that female and male IPV may be more similar than once thought. The frequent attempt to quantify female IPV as self-defensive, to satisfy unfounded beliefs, ultimately hinders our progress in targeting and reducing IPV.

CHAPTER 7

Intimate Partner Violence:

Linguistic Features and Accommodation Behaviour of

Perpetrators and Victims[5]

The analyses presented in Chapters 4 – 6 showed participants' self-reported communication problems to be related to the perpetration and victimisation of IPV. In this chapter, I further examined participants' communication behaviour as a function of their abuse history (IPV). Specifically, I compared the use of six linguistic features and accommodation towards a facilitative and non-facilitative speech style among individuals with and without a history of IPV.

Community-based research, including that presented in the present study (Chapters 4 - 6), has found IPV to be equally likely to be perpetrated by men and women (see Archer, 2000; Straus, 2004a, for reviews). The growing body of research finding IPV to be bi-directional and the realisation that the processes behind IPV are far more complex than once thought suggests a need to gain a better understanding of the dynamics of violent relationships.

Although IPV research has tended to focus on the individual psychological characteristics of perpetrators and to a lesser extent those of victims, one interaction characteristic that has been investigated is the conversational behaviour of couples experiencing IPV. Researchers have typically used very similar methodologies. Couples identified by the husbands' use of violence are asked to come into a

---

[5] A version of this paper has been submitted as Robertson, K., & Murachver, T. (2005). Intimate partner violence: Linguistic features and accommodation behavior of perpetrators and victims.

laboratory where they are observed discussing topics of conflict within their relationships. Research findings have been fairly consistent. Relationships experiencing male to female IPV have been characterised by dysfunctional interaction patterns. Although the pattern of interaction is mediated by the level of relationship distress, the most common pattern observed within these relationships is husband demands and wife withdraws (Feldman & Ridley, 2000; Holtzworth-Munroe et al., 1998).

The conflict discussions of couples from husband violent relationships have also been characterised by fewer positive (Berns, Jacobson, & Gottman, 1999; Burman, John, & Margolin, 1992) and facilitative language features (Cordova et al., 1993), and greater use of negative linguistic features (Berns et al., 1999). Moreover, these couples are more likely than non-violent couples to reciprocate their partner's negative behaviour, known as negative reciprocity (Cordova et al., 1993). Although less widely studied, this pattern of negative reciprocity and ineffective communication behaviour is also evident within relationships experiencing bi-directional violence (Burman et al., 1993).

The communication behaviour of couples experiencing IPV has received a great deal of attention. However, research has tended to be limited to samples selected by the males' use of violence and to methodologies focusing on conflict discussions. One study that did examine communication behaviour across both low and high conflict topics found that this negative reciprocity may only be evident during conflict discussions (Ronan et al, 2004). Moreover, although past research has generally found the male perpetrator and female victim to use ineffective communication behaviour, it has been assumed that the negative interaction styles observed within these relationships are shaped by the perpetrator's behaviour. This

assumption, however, has never been tested. The analyses reported in Chapter 6 showed perpetrators and victims of IPV to be equally likely to report lacking communication skills. To further our understanding of the factors associated with IPV it is therefore necessary to observe the conversational behaviours of perpetrators and victims independently of each other. There is also a need for further research examining conversational behaviour across a wider range of topics and contexts.

To extend past research, the present study compared the conversational behaviour of victims, perpetrators, and individuals without a history of IPV during low-conflict interactions with a male and a female researcher. This methodology extended past research by examining; 1) the conversational styles of male- and female-perpetrators and victims of IPV; 2) whether individuals with a history of IPV, regardless of their abuse status (perpetrator or victim), employ a conversational style that differentiates them from others without a history of IPV; and 3) whether the conversational behaviour observed during conflict discussions with a spouse is also evident during low-conflict interactions with others outside of the relationship.

A further aim of the present study was to explore the processes behind the negative reciprocity characteristic of violent relationships. To better understand the tendency of couples experiencing IPV to reciprocate their partners' negative behaviour I turned to communication accommodation theory (CAT, Giles, Coupland, & Coupland, 1991). CAT embraces the dynamic nature of conversational interactions and helps to explain how individuals modify their behaviour in response to that of their speech partner. Like all behaviour, communication accommodation behaviour occurs along a continuum. However, for simplification it is separated into three processes. Convergence occurs when individuals modify their speech to become more similar to that of their speech partner, maintenance occurs when individuals

maintain their style regardless of the style of their speech partner, and finally divergence occurs when individuals modify their speech style to become more dissimilar to that of their speech partner.

Whether or not an individual converges, maintains, or diverges their speech to that of their speech partner is assumed to depend on their perceived social distance from each other. Convergence reflects closeness and minimal social distance. The more similar, or the more they like the person they are conversing with, the more an individual will try to match their speech partners behaviour. Maintenance and divergence on the other hand reflect or are used to create social distance (Giles et al., 1991). Based on CAT, intimate partners are likely to modify their speech to become more similar to that of their spouse because of their closeness and minimal social distance. This helps to explain the negative reciprocity that is characteristic of violent relationships in which each spouse accommodates to the other's negative behaviour.

Accommodation behaviour in the present study was measured by examining participants' speech behaviour when conversing with a female researcher using a facilitative speech style stereotypical of females, and a male researcher using a non-facilitative speech style stereotypical of males. Gender-preferential speech behaviour was employed because it is relatively easy to manipulate and has been extensively researched in the past (Bilous & Krauss, 1988; Fitzpatrick, Mulac, & Dindia, 1995; Hannah & Murachver, 1999; Mulac, Wiemann, Widenmann, & Gibson, 1988; Thomson, Murachver, & Green, 2001).

Although males and females use similar language during mixed-sex interactions where their language styles often converge, during same-sex interactions a number of linguistic features have been found to be associated with one gender more so than the other (Mulac et al., 1988). The gender-preferential styles

characteristic of males and females reflect their differing motivations for engaging in conversational interactions. Females use language to maintain and create relationships with others. Their language style therefore is polite and tentative, and they use devices such as minimal responses, empathy, and laughter to gain rapport and to facilitate the interaction. Males, on the other hand, are described as using conversations to gain information and to maintain status or power. Their style of talk is often more direct, aversive, and non-facilitative (see Fitzpatrick et al., 1995; Maccoby, 1990; Maltz & Borker, 1982; Mulac & Lundell, 1986; Tannen, 1990).

This study is, to the best of my knowledge, the first to examine the conversational behaviour of perpetrators and victims of IPV separately to each other, during low-conflict interactions with others outside of the relationship. To extend past research that has primarily focused on male violent relationships, participants in the present sample were not selected by their use of violence. Participants were recruited from three separate samples (student, general, and incarcerated), following which they were categorised as perpetrators or victims of IPV, or as having no history of IPV. Based on past research, it was expected that individuals with a history of IPV might employ fewer positive language features and be more likely to accommodate to a non-facilitative style than would individuals without a history of IPV. Based on the findings reported in Chapters 4 – 6, I also predicted a similar pattern for perpetrators and victims.

Method

Participants

The responses from one hundred and sixty participants were included in this set of analyses. The sample included 81 males and 79 females, including 36 incarcerated participants, 62 university students, and 62 individuals from the general

population. The ratio of males to females was equal within each sample. The incarcerated sample was recruited with the ethical approval and assistance of the New Zealand Department of Corrections, who informed inmates of the study. The non-incarcerated samples were recruited through newsletters placed within the community and the university. The newsletters asked for volunteers to take part in a study looking at violence and communication. The participants were primarily Pākehā (Caucasian, n = 135). The remaining participants identified themselves as Māori (n = 14), Pacific Island (n = 2), East Asian (n = 3), or identified as 'other' (n = 6). An example of an information sheet appears in Appendix A.

Measures

The Revised Conflict Tactics Scale (CTS2, Straus et al., 1996) was used to categorise participants as violent or non-violent. Participants were classified as perpetrating or suffering physical violence if they reported one or more instances of violence on the 12-item physical violence scale (minor and severe subscale). Participants were classified as perpetrating or suffering psychological violence if they reported one or more instances of violence on the eight-item severe psychological scale. Minor psychological violence was not analysed because it occurred too frequently to categorise participants. Participants were asked to respond to each item with regards to their current or most recent relationship on a seven-point scale ranging from, "this has never happened," to "it has happened more than 20 times in the past year." The questions asked about both their own and their partners' behaviour. The CTS (Straus, 1990) and CTS2 (Straus, 2004b) are widely used measures with evidence of both validity and reliability. An example of the CTS2 is presented in Appendix B.

Researcher Speech Style Manipulations

Four researchers (2 male, 2 female), were trained to use a gendered speech style consistent with their gender. The female-preferential speech style was facilitative and consisted of more relationship building speech (empathy, agreements, compliments, self-derogatory statements, and statements that conveyed similarity to their speech partner), tentative speech, laughter, and minimal responses. The male-preferential speech style was non-facilitative and consisted of more direct aversive speech (disagreements, swear words, focus adverbs, and generalisations), and opinions. Two researchers of each gender were employed to reduce characteristics of individual researchers influencing participants' speech behaviour.

Procedure

To participate in the study, the non-incarcerated sample came into a research laboratory at the University; the incarcerated participants were visited at their respective facilities. Prior to taking part in the conversations, participants completed the CTS2 on a computer to identify any history of IPV during their most recent relationship. Participants' communication behaviour was examined during two nine-minute interactions, one with a male researcher employing a non-facilitative speech style, and the other with a female researcher employing a facilitative speech style. The researchers were trained to use a language style stereotypical of their gender. Six gender neutral, low-conflict topics were selected for discussion. These were separated into two conversation blocks. Block one consisted of discussions surrounding what they would do if they won lotto, favourite films, and getting along with difficult people. The second block consisted of discussions surrounding favourite foods, recreational activities and differences between men and women.

Each topic was discussed for three minutes. The first topic from each block (what they would do if they won lotto and favourite foods) served as a warm up only and was not analysed. The gender of the first researcher and the conversation block to be discussed were counterbalanced.

Coding

The conversations were transcribed in full, following which both the participants' and researchers' speech was coded for the six manipulated speech variables. All but two of the linguistic features were coded manually. To check coding reliability, twenty-five percent of the transcripts were coded by two coders. Cronbach's alpha reliabilities for speech variables ranged between .80 and 1. Tentative language and swear words were coded using a computerised text analysis program known as the Linguistic Inquiry and Word Count (LIWC, Pennebaker & Francis, 1999). The LIWC analyzes files by comparing them to a dictionary containing 2290 words that are organised into over 70 language categories. The two categories used in the present study were modified slightly to fit the New Zealand dialect. All variables were collapsed across each topic for the female and male researcher respectively and are presented as frequencies per 100 words.

Results

Researcher Speech Style Manipulations

To examine whether or not the gender-preferential speech styles had been manipulated successfully I performed a 2 (gender-preferential speech style) within subjects factor x 2 (participant gender) x 3 (participant sample) between subjects repeated measures MANOVA on the six language variables coded in researchers'

speech. The desired effect for gender-preferential style was present overall ($F(6, 149)$ = 62.58, $p < .001$, $\eta^2 = .72$), and separately for each of the manipulated language variables. The mean frequencies and corresponding F values are shown in Table 7.1.

There was also a significant main effect of participant gender ($F(6, 149)$ = 2.28, $p < .05$, $\eta^2 = .08$) and sample ($F(12, 298) = 4.12$, $p < .001$, $\eta^2 = .14$) on the researchers' use of gender-preferential language. Univariate analyses revealed that the researcher laughed more when conversing with a female than when conversing with a male participant ($M_{female} = .77$, $M_{male} = .58$, $F(1, 149) = 6.79$, $p < .05$, $\eta^2 = .04$).

Univariate analyses for sample revealed significant effects for the use of minimal responses ($F(1, 298) = 5.05$, $p < .01$, $\eta^2 = .06$), opinions ($F(1, 298) = 6.67$, $p < .01$, $\eta^2 = .08$), and direct language ($F(1, 298) = 5.02$, $p < .01$, $\eta^2 = .06$). Post hoc Newman Keuls tests showed that the researchers used fewer of each of the following language variables: minimal responses ($M_{incarcerated} = 1.31$, $M_{student} = 1.68$, $M_{general}$ =2.07), opinions ($M_{incarcerated} = 1.31$, $M_{student} = 1.73$, $M_{general} = 1.52$), and direct

Table 7.1: Mean Frequencies for Researcher Language as a Function of Researcher Speech Style

Variable	Female-Preferential	Male-Preferential	F	η^2
Laughter	1.10	0.25	150.11	.49***
Minimal Responses	2.23	1.15	30.66	.17***
Opinions	1.18	1.86	78.74	.34***
Tentative	2.00	1.39	32.45	.17***
Facilitative	0.82	0.26	124.15	.45***
Direct	0.51	1.01	73.01	.32***

***$p < .001$, **$p < .01$, *$p < .05$

language ($M_{incarcerated}$ = .62, $M_{student}$ = .87, $M_{general}$ = .78), when conversing with the incarcerated compared to the student or general sample.

There was also a significant interaction between researcher speech style manipulations and participant sample ($F(12, 298)$ = 3.39, p < .001, η^2 = .12). Univariate analyses revealed significant interaction effects for laughter ($F(1, 298)$ = 4.56, p < .05, η^2 = .06) and minimal responses ($F(1, 298)$ = 12.75, p < .001, η^2 = .14). Post hoc Newman Keuls tests showed that although laughter was successfully manipulated for all three samples, the degree to which it was manipulated differed between the student ($M_{female-preferential}$ = 1.23, $M_{male-preferential}$ = .15), general ($M_{female-preferential}$ = .93, $M_{male-preferential}$ = .31), and incarcerated sample ($M_{female-preferential}$ = 1.16, $M_{male-preferential}$ = .28). Post hoc probing for the manipulation of minimal responses revealed that this language variable was only successfully manipulated for the general sample ($M_{female-preferential}$ = 3.27, $M_{male-preferential}$ = .88). Although in the correct direction, minimal responses were not successfully manipulated with the student ($M_{female-preferential}$ = 1.91, $M_{male-preferential}$ = 1.45), or incarcerated sample ($M_{female-preferential}$ = 1.51, $M_{male-preferential}$ = 1.11). These findings show that with the exception of minimal responses, the gender-preferential speech styles were manipulated successfully. The researchers did modify their speech slightly between the three samples; however, these differences reflect a degree of change rather than an absence of change.

Participants' Speech Behaviour

I performed a repeated measures MANOVA to examine whether or not participants modified their speech in response to the gender-preferential speech style employed by the researchers. A 2 (gender-preferential speech style) within subjects

factor x 2 (participant gender) x 3 (participant sample) between subjects repeated measures MANOVA on the six language variables revealed the desired effect for researcher gender-preferential speech style ($F(6, 149) = 6.76$, $p < .001$, $\eta^2 = .21$). The relevant means and corresponding F values for participant language as a function of researcher gender-preferential speech style are shown in Table 7.2.

Table 7.2: Mean Frequencies for Participant's Language as a Function of Researcher Speech Style

Variable	Female-Preferential	Male-Preferential	F	η^2
Laughter	0.80	0.52	14.14	.08***
Minimal Responses	2.61	1.85	21.90	.12***
Opinions	1.55	1.42	2.39	.02
Tentative	1.82	1.96	2.25	.01
Facilitative	0.54	0.34	14.59	.08***
Direct	0.70	0.82	5.63	.04*

***$p < .001$, **$p < .01$, *$p < .05$

When conversing with a female researcher, participants were more likely to laugh, emitted more minimal responses, and used more friendly language features than when conversing with a male researcher. When conversing with a male researcher, participants employed more direct language features. These findings support my hypotheses that participants would modify their speech to become more similar to the gendered styles employed by the researchers.

There was also a significant main effect for participant gender ($F(6, 149) = 3.67$, $p < .01$, $\eta^2 = .13$). Univariate analyses for gender revealed that females were more likely than males to laugh ($M_{female} = 0.82$, $M_{male} = 0.50$, $F(1, 149) = 6.80$, $p <$

.05, $\eta^2 = .04$), and males were more likely than females to use tentative speech ($M_{female} = 1.64$, $M_{male} = 2.14$, $F(1, 149) = 10.24$, $p < .01$ $\eta^2 = .06$).

A significant main effect for sample was also found ($F(12, 298) = 6.37$, $p < .001$, $\eta^2 = .20$). Univariate analyses revealed significant effects for laughter ($F(1, 298) = 10.81$, $p < .001$, $\eta^2 = .12$), minimal responses ($F(1, 298) = 22.67$, $p < .001$, $\eta^2 = .23$), opinions ($F(1, 298) = 11.72$, $p < .001$, $\eta^2 = .13$), tentative speech ($F(1, 298) = 9.57$, $p < .001$, $\eta^2 = .11$), and friendly speech ($F(1, 298) = 8.50$, $p < .001$, $\eta^2 = .10$). Post hoc Newman Keuls tests showed that participants in the incarcerated sample were less likely to use tentative speech than were the student or general sample ($M_{incarcerated} = 1.41$, $M_{student} = 2.23$, $M_{general} = 2.00$). The student sample was more likely than the incarcerated or general sample to laugh ($M_{student} = 1.07$, $M_{incarcerated} = 0.42$, $M_{general} = 0.57$), use minimal responses ($M_{student} = 3.62$, $M_{incarcerated} = 1.22$, $M_{general} = 1.86$), and to use friendly linguistic features ($M_{student} = 0.62$, $M_{incarcerated} = 0.37$, $M_{general} = 0.35$). There was no interaction between style and sample or between style and gender.

Participants' Speech Behaviour as a Function of their Abuse History

The following analyses examined whether or not participants' use of linguistic features or accommodation behaviour varied as a function of their abuse history. Four repeated measures MANOVAs, each a 2 (gender-preferential speech style) within subjects factor x 2 (participant gender) x 2 (yes / no for abuse category) between subjects factors, were performed on the six language variables. The MANOVAs revealed that participants' speech behaviour varied as a function of their abuse history. However, there was only one instance where participants' abuse history interacted with their accommodation behaviour. Findings from the four MANOVAs

are discussed below. The relevant means for participants' use of the six language variables as a function of their abuse history are presented in Table 7.3[6].

The first MANOVA examined how participants' speech behaviour varied as a function of whether or not they had perpetrated physical abuse. There was a main effect of perpetrating physical violence on the use of the six language variables ($F(6, 151) = 2.24$, $p < .05$, $\eta^2 = .08$). Univariate analyses revealed that participants who perpetrated physical violence were significantly less likely than participants who did not perpetrate physical violence to use opinions ($F(1, 151) = 5.82$, $p < .05$, $\eta^2 = .04$), and tentative speech ($F(1, 151) = 9.23$, $p < .01$, $\eta^2 = .06$). There was also a trend for participants who perpetrated physical violence to be less likely than others to use friendly linguistic features ($F(1, 151) = 3.61$, $p = .06$, $\eta^2 = .02$).

There was also a significant interaction between participant gender and abuse history on the frequency of the six language variables ($F(6, 151) = 2.62$, $p < .05$, $\eta^2 = .09$). Univariate analyses revealed a trend for the use of direct speech ($F(1, 151) = 3.82$, $p = .05$, $\eta^2 = .02$). Post hoc probing showed that violent males were more likely than violent females to use direct language ($M_{males} = 0.88$, $M_{females} = 0.61$). Non-violent males and females did not differ in their use of direct language ($M_{males} = 0.76$, $M_{females} = 0.76$).

The second MANOVA revealed how participants' use of the six linguistic features differed based on whether or not they had suffered physical violence. There was no main effect of abuse history on the six linguistic features, however, there was a significant interaction between participants' gender and abuse history ($F(6, 151) = 2.56$, $p < .05$, $\eta^2 = .09$). Univariate analyses revealed a significant interaction for

---

[6] Due to our limited sample size it was not possible to include sample as a between subjects factor. Examination of the language features characteristic of each sample, and the variation in communication behavior as a function of abuse history suggests that sample was not influencing these findings.

Table 7.3: Mean Frequencies for the Six Language Variables as a Function of

Participants Abuse History

Variable	Perpetrate Physical		Suffer Physical		Perpetrate Psychological		Suffer Psychological	
	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No	Yes	No
Laughter	0.60	0.80	0.60	0.76	0.48	0.82	0.54	0.82
Minimal Response	2.02	2.57	2.06	2.64	1.73	2.65	1.83	2.70
Opinion	1.36	1.59	1.34	1.60	1.29	1.60	1.28	1.64
Tentative	1.63	2.12	1.77	2.08	1.63	2.09	1.71	2.10
Facil.	0.37	0.50	0.41	0.50	0.36	0.50	0.40	0.49
Direct	0.74	0.76	0.73	0.74	0.77	0.74	0.79	0.72

the use of direct language ($F(1, 151) = 4.12$, $p < .05$, $\eta^2 = .03$). Post hoc probing

revealed that males who had suffered physical violence were significantly more likely

to use direct language than were females who had suffered physical violence (M_{males}

$= 0.87$, $M_{females} = 0.60$). Males and females who had not suffered physical violence

did not differ in their use of direct language ($M_{males} = 0.73$, $M_{females} = 0.75$).

The next MANOVA examined how participants' speech behaviour varied as a

function of whether or not they had perpetrated severe psychological abuse. There

was a significant main effect for the use of psychological abuse on participants'

language use ($F(6, 151) = 3.12$, $p < .01$, $\eta^2 = .11$). Univariate analyses revealed that

participants who used psychological abuse were less likely to laugh ($F(1, 151) = 5.82$,

$p < .05$, $\eta^2 = .04$), use minimal responses ($F(1, 151) = 6.24$, $p < .05$, $\eta^2 = .04$),

opinions ($F(1, 151) = 9.65$, $p < .01$, $\eta^2 = .06$), and tentative speech ($F(1, 151) = 7.04$,

$p < .01$, $\eta^2 = .04$). There was also a trend for participants who used psychological

abuse to be less likely than others to use friendly linguistic features ($F(1, 151) = 3.61$,

$p = .06$, $\eta^2 = .02$).

There was also a significant interaction between participants' accommodation

behaviour and whether or not they had perpetrated psychological abuse ($F(6, 151) =$

2.42, $p < .05$, $\eta^2 = .09$). Univariate analyses revealed significant interactions for the

use of laughter ($F(1, 151) = 5.43$, $p < .05$, $\eta^2 = .03$), minimal responses ($F(1, 151) =$

4.34, $p < .05$, $\eta^2 = .03$), and direct language ($F(1, 151) = 4.37$, $p < .05$, $\eta^2 = .03$). Post

hoc probing showed that participants who perpetrated psychological abuse were less

likely than others to laugh and utter minimal responses when receiving a facilitative

style. An examination of direct speech revealed that participants who perpetrated

psychological abuse were more likely than others to use a non-facilitative style when

conversing with the male researcher. The relevant means can be seen in Table 7.4.

The final MANOVA examined participants' speech behaviour as a function of

whether or not they had suffered psychological abuse. There was a significant main

Table 7.4: Mean Frequencies for Participants Language as a Function of Researcher
Gender-Preferential Speech Style and Use of Psychological Abuse

	Female-Preferential		Male-Preferential	
Variable	Use Psychological	Don't Use Psychological	Use Psychological	Don't Use Psychological
Laughter	0.50	1.03	0.46	0.61
Minimal Responses	1.86	3.12	1.60	2.17
Direct	0.63	0.71	0.91	0.71

effect for participants abuse history ($F(6, 151) = 3.92$, $p < .01$, $\eta^2 = .14$). Participants who suffered psychological abuse were significantly less likely than others to laugh ($F(1, 151) = 4.68$, $p < .05$, $\eta^2 = .03$), use minimal responses ($F(1, 151) = 6.40$, $p < .05$, $\eta^2 = .04$), state opinions ($F(1, 151) = 15.15$, $p < .001$, $\eta^2 = .09$), and to use tentative language ($F(1, 151) = 5.66$, $p < .05$, $\eta^2 = .04$).

There was also an interaction between gender and participants' abuse history on their language use ($F(6, 151) = 2.40$, $p < .05$, $\eta^2 = .09$). Univariate analyses showed significant effects for laughter ($F(1, 151) = 7.39$, $p < .01$, $\eta^2 = .05$), and direct language ($F(1, 151) = 5.24$, $p < .05$, $\eta^2 = .03$). Post hoc probing revealed that females who did not suffer psychological abuse were significantly more likely to laugh ($M = 1.16$) than were males who did not suffer psychological abuse ($M = 0.47$). Males and females who suffered psychological abuse did not differ in their use of laughter ($M_{males} = 0.55$, $M_{females} = 0.53$). Post hoc probing for direct language revealed that males who suffered psychological violence were significantly more likely to use direct language ($M = 0.93$) than were females who suffered psychological violence ($M = 0.65$). Males and females without a history of suffering psychological abuse did not differ in their use of direct language ($M_{males} = 0.73$, $M_{females} = 0.75$).

Summary of Speech Behaviour and Abuse History

The MANOVAs revealed that participants' use of the six language variables varied as a function of their abuse history. In particular, participants who perpetrated IPV or suffered psychological abuse used fewer opinions and tentative language. Use of and suffering of psychological abuse was also associated with less laughter and fewer minimal responses. Participants who perpetrated psychological abuse were also

less likely to accommodate to facilitative language features, and were more likely to accommodate to non-facilitative language features. An examination of participants' language as a function of their gender and abuse history revealed that violent males were more likely to use direct speech than were violent females.

Discussion

Past research has found individuals with a history of IPV to use a negative conversational style during conflict interactions with their spouse. The present study examined whether or not this negative style extended into everyday low-conflict interactions with others from outside of the relationship. In particular, I was interested in whether victims, perpetrators, and individuals without a history of IPV would differ in their use of six linguistic features, or in their accommodation towards a facilitative or non-facilitative speech style. There were a number of main findings. In particular, perpetrators and victims were distinguished from individuals without a history of IPV by their less frequent use of facilitative and polite communication features. Moreover, males with a history of IPV were more likely than females with a history of IPV to use non-facilitative language features. Additionally, language differences were observed across the three samples, and between males and females. The examination of accommodation behaviour revealed that participants modified their speech in response to the gendered style employed by the researcher. Furthermore, accommodation behaviour varied as a function of participants' abuse history, with perpetrators of psychological abuse being less likely to accommodate to friendly facilitative language features and more likely to accommodate to aversive non-facilitative features.

The examination of individual linguistic features revealed perpetrators and victims of IPV were less likely than others to use minimal responses that encourage the other speaker, and tentative language that conveys politeness. Victims and perpetrators of IPV were also less likely to laugh during the interactions than others were. Laughter can signal many different things, including closeness with the other speaker or a sense of being comfortable, or it can be used to cover anxiety and nervousness. Laughter in the present study was generally used to convey solidarity and closeness with the other speaker. One possible explanation for the less frequent laughter of individuals with a history of IPV is that these individuals are more suspicious of others and are therefore not as likely to show solidarity and closeness with the other speaker. Although the scope of the analyses presented in this chapter did not allow testing of this hypothesis, this suggestion is in keeping with the analyses presented in Chapter 6 which showed victims and perpetrators of IPV to be more hostile towards others. Less expected, however, was the finding that participants with a history of IPV used fewer opinions than did other individuals. I can only speculate as to the reasons for this association. Opinions in the present study were coded as statements that conveyed an individual's personal beliefs. It is possible that participants with a history of IPV felt less inclined to share information about themselves.

The findings of the present study extend those of past research that has primarily focused on the conflict discussion of couples identified by the males' use of violence (Burman et al., 1993; Cordova et al., 1993; Murphy & O'Farrell, 1997). This study shows that individuals with a history of IPV, regardless of their gender or abuse status (victims or perpetrator), employ fewer positive communication devices with others. These findings contradict the assumptions of past research that has

suggested that the negative behaviour of the female victim is driven by that of the male perpetrator. Both victims and perpetrators in the present study employed a less facilitative style. It is important to note however, that while both males and females with a history of IPV were less likely to use positive facilitative language features, violent males were more likely than violent females to use direct non-facilitative language features. These findings suggest that the interactions of violent males may be even more hostile than those of violent females. The current findings also reveal that the negative styles of individuals with a history of IPV extend into low-conflict interactions with others outside of the relationship. These findings are contrary to those of Ronan et al. (2004) who found ineffective communication behaviour to be limited to high conflict discussions. It is possible, however, that the present study investigated more subtle communication variables than those examined by Ronan et al.

In keeping with past research (Hannah & Murachver, 1999; Robertson & Murachver, 2003; Thomson et al., 2001), the present study found accommodation to gender-preferential language. Participants converged towards the female researchers' facilitative speech style through their use of laughter, minimal responses, and relationship building linguistic features. Participants also accommodated to the non-facilitative speech style through their greater use of direct language when conversing with a male researcher.

More noteworthy, however, was the finding that participants who perpetrated psychological abuse were less likely to accommodate to a facilitative language style and more likely to accommodate to a non-facilitative language style. The finding that perpetrators of psychological abuse were more likely to reciprocate negative communication than others were is consistent with research observing greater

negative reciprocity within relationships experiencing IPV (Cordova et al., 1993). These findings help to explain the process behind negative reciprocity. Moreover, they suggest that individuals with a history of IPV are more likely than others to match their speech partners' negative speech style regardless of the context or their relationship to each other. Accommodation was not found to vary as a function of whether or not participants had perpetrated or suffered physical violence. It is possible, however, that differences in the accommodation behaviour of participants with a history of physical violence might have emerged within a larger sample. Future research is required here.

There was also some variation in the speech behaviour of males and females. Females were more likely than males to laugh while interacting with the female researcher. This finding is not surprising given that gender-preferential language is more prominent during same-sex interactions and that laughter is stereotypically associated with females. Moreover, the female researcher was more likely to laugh when conversing with a female participant than a male participant. The female participants' behaviour could therefore simply be explained by accommodation to the researchers' speech style. A more unexpected finding concerned the male participants' greater use of tentative speech. Tentative speech has stereotypically been viewed as a polite linguistic feature more commonly employed by females. One possible explanation, however, is that the conversational context employed in this study was more familiar to females than males. The males' greater use of tentative speech may have been associated with their greater discomfort in the conversational setting. Females, for instance, are more likely to converse in a dyad, similar to the context employed in the present study, and their conversations are more intimate than are those of males. Males, on the other hand, are more inclined to converse in a group

and their topic of conversation usually reflects the activity they are engaging in (Maccoby, 1990).

There were also a number of differences in the frequency of linguistic features observed across the three samples. In particular, participants from the student sample were more likely than individuals from the general or incarcerated sample, to use minimal responses, tentative language, friendly speech, and to laugh. The incarcerated sample was less likely than the student or general sample to use tentative speech. These findings are in keeping with the assumptions of the CAT that suggests that individuals are more likely to be motivated to use positive communication devices among others with whom they feel a close association. The researchers in the present study were postgraduate students and were therefore most similar to the participants from the student sample. It is possible that the students perceived themselves as being more similar to the researcher than did participants from the other two samples, and were therefore more motivated to facilitate the conversations through the use of positive conversational devices. On the other hand, the incarcerated sample was the most dissimilar and had the greatest social distance from the researchers. It is possible that the incarcerated sample was less concerned with how the researcher viewed them and therefore less likely to employ polite language features. It must be remembered, however, that although there were some differences observed across the three samples, there was no interaction between sample and accommodation to gender-preferential language.

The present findings extend our understanding of communication accommodation behaviour to show how characteristics of individuals can influence accommodation behaviour, in this instance their history of IPV. Moreover, a number of implications for violence prevention initiatives can be drawn from this study. The

present findings revealed that due to a lack of communication skills, perpetrators and victims of IPV may experience less positive interactions with others. Perpetrators of IPV may also be more likely to reciprocate others' negative interaction styles. Based on these findings I suggest violence prevention initiatives need to address the communication behaviour of both perpetrators and victims. Focusing on the behaviour of one spouse does not address the dynamic nature of conversations in which individuals accommodate to the style of their speech partner. A limitation of the present study, however, is that there is no way to determine whether individuals who use more negative communication styles are more likely to enter into violent relationships, or whether negative communication styles develop within violent relationships. Future longitudinal research would be required to answer this question. I also suggest that programs should focus on general communication behaviour rather than focusing specifically on conflict resolution techniques. The present findings suggest that the negative interaction styles observed during violent couples' conflict discussions may actually be stable features of the individual that extend into their everyday interactions.

CHAPTER 8

Factors Associated with the Acceptance of Partner Violence[7]

The analyses presented in Chapters 4 – 7 showed attitudes towards violence, traditional gender role beliefs, and a lack of conflict skills to be associated with intimate partner violence (IPV). In this chapter, I present analyses based on the 2nd and 3rd phase of the study in which I further explored participants' attitudes and conflict behaviour. Identifying attitudes towards IPV is a very important step in reducing incidence rates and designing effective violence intervention programs. Societal attitudes shape victims', professionals', and communities' responses to IPV. If attitudes within a society are not disapproving of IPV, or are tolerant of IPV under certain circumstances, then there is less likelihood of the abuse being reported, less empathy and support for victims, and less social stigma or consequence to deter perpetrators. Despite the importance of understanding societal attitudes, past research has tended to focus on the attitudes of known perpetrators. Moreover, research that has investigated the attitudes of the wider public has tended to focus on male-to-female violence. Partner violence, however, is not limited to one gender. Research finding females to be as likely as males to perpetrate abuse (Archer, 2000; Magdol et al., 1997; Schumacher & Leonard, 2005; Straus, 2004a) suggests that there is a need to focus on attitudes towards male and female IPV.

In the present chapter, I investigated attitudes towards IPV. Additionally, I examined factors that shape these attitudes. Factors known to influence attitudes towards IPV include: (1) the gender of the perpetrator; (2) the circumstances

---

[7] A version of this paper is under review as Robertson, K., & Murachver, T. (2005). Factors associated with the acceptance of partner violence. Manuscript submitted for review.

surrounding the abuse; and (3) the gender and abuse history of the individual making the judgement.

Gender of the Perpetrator

Perpetrator and victim gender has a significant influence on attitudes concerning IPV. Research has consistently found male perpetrated abuse to be viewed more harshly than female perpetrated abuse (Arias & Johnson, 1989; Carlson, 1999; Harris & Cook, 1994; Sorenson & Taylor, 2005). Bethke & DeJoy (1993) for example, found male perpetrated violence to be viewed as more serious, more criminal and more likely to cause harm than violence perpetrated by a female. There is also less empathy (Bethke & DeJoy, 1993), and more blame directed towards male than female victims (Harris & Cook, 1994).

Circumstances Surrounding the Abuse

Attitudes towards IPV also differ depending on the circumstances surrounding the violence. For instance, individuals are more condoning of violence if they believe the perpetrator was provoked (Harris & Cook, 1994). Similarly, individuals are more condoning of IPV in situations where the victim has committed adultery (Choi & Edleson, 1996), or humiliated the perpetrator (Foo & Margolin, 1995).

Characteristics of the Individual Shape Attitudes Towards IPV

Characteristics of the individual making the judgement, for instance their gender, play a large role in shaping attitudes towards IPV. In comparison to women, men have been found to be less disapproving of partner violence (Langhinrichsen-

Rohling, Shlien-Dellinger, Huss, & Kramer, 2004), to be less likely to hold the batterer responsible (Harris & Cook, 1994), and to be more likely to blame the victim (Bryant & Spencer, 2003; Nayak, Byrne, Martin, & Abraham, 2003).

Attitudes towards IPV also differ based on a participants' abuse history. Research has found both perpetrators (Reitzel-Jaffe & Wolfe, 2001; Russell & Hulson, 1992; Stith & Farley, 1993; Stith et al, 2004) and victims (Arias & Johnson, 1989) of IPV to be more condoning of violence. A limitation of past research, however, is that it has mainly focused on the attitudes of male perpetrators. Therefore, I examined the attitudes of male- and female-perpetrators and victims of IPV.

The Present Investigation

An open-ended interview technique assessing individuals' attitudes towards, and attributions for male- and female-perpetrated abuse was employed in the current set of analyses. Based on the existing literature (Arias & Johnson, 1989; Bethke & DeJoy, 1993; Carlson, 1999; Harris & Cook, 1994; Sorenson & Taylor, 2005), I hypothesised that there would be greater tolerance for female than male perpetrated abuse. I also expected that adultery (Choi & Edleson, 1996) and embarrassment (Foo & Margolin, 1995) would be common attributions for IPV.

Attitudes towards IPV were also examined as a function of participants' gender, psychological characteristics, and abuse history. I expected that men might be more approving of IPV than women are (Langhinrichsen-Rohling et al., 2004). I also hypothesised that personality characteristics that have been associated with the perpetration of IPV might also influence attitudes towards IPV including hostility towards others (Reitzel-Jaffe & Wolfe, 2001; Straus & Yodanis, 1996), traditional

gender role beliefs (Crossman et al., 1990), wanting to dominate the relationship (Coleman & Straus, 1986; Ehrensaft & Vivian, 1999), and reported communication problems (Burman et al., 1993; Cordova et al., 1993; Feldman & Ridley, 2000; Murphy & O'Farrell, 1997). Attitudes towards IPV were also expected to vary as a function of participants' abuse history. Participants were expected to be more condoning of IPV if they had perpetrated (Russell & Hulson, 1992; Stith & Farley, 1993) or suffered partner abuse (Arias & Johnson, 1989). Additionally, I hypothesised that the incarcerated sample would have experienced more violence and might therefore be more accepting of IPV.

I also examined perpetrators' attributions for their violence. Based on past research I expected that males and females might offer a number of similar explanations for their violent behaviour including: to express anger, control their partner, release tension, force communication (Hamberger et al., 1997), retaliation, self-defence, or a lack of communication skills (Follingstad et al., 1991). Past research has also found some explanations to be more strongly associated with one gender than the other, however, findings have not been consistent, and therefore hypotheses for the present set of analyses were not formed. For example, Hamberger et al. (1997) found that females were more likely to attribute their violence to self-defence, whereas males were more likely to attribute their violence to power and control. Conversely, Follingstad et al. (1991) found female perpetrators were more likely to explain their violence as a means to gain control whereas male perpetrators were more likely to attribute their violence to retaliation and to feelings of jealousy. Past research has also found perpetrators to minimise the consequences of their actions (Holtzworth-Munroe, 1992). I therefore examined attitudes towards the consequences of IPV as a function of participants' abuse history.

I was also interested in participants' expression and management of anger as a function of their abuse history. The relationship between anger expression and male-perpetrated IPV has been widely studied. In their recent review, Norlander and Eckhardt (2005) concluded that research supports the notion that violent men express more anger. Although less widely researched, other studies have found both male and female perpetrators of IPV to be more likely to direct their anger towards others than to use anger control strategies (Dye & Eckhardt, 2000). Based on past research, I hypothesised that male and female perpetrators would report fewer skills for dealing with anger than would non-violent individuals (Dye & Eckhardt, 2000). I also expected that this lack of skills might generalise outside of the relationship (Anglin & Holtzworth-Munroe, 1997). Although the conflict behaviour of male perpetrators has been reasonably well researched, far less research has examined this relationship with female perpetrators, or with the victims of IPV. Analyses presented in the present chapter extend past research by investigating the anger management skills of male- and female-perpetrators and victims of IPV, and by comparing these skills to those of individuals with no history of IPV.

Method

Participants

One hundred and sixty-two participants were included in this set of analyses. The sample included 62 students (35 females, 27 males), 61 general population participants (34 females, 27 males), and 39 incarcerated participants (15 females, 24 males). Participants from the student and general sample were recruited through notice boards and newsletters. Incarcerated participants were recruited through a letter informing them of the research and inviting their participation. Participants

were required to be over eighteen years of age and to have been in a relationship that lasted at least one month in the past five years. An example of an information sheet appears in Appendix A.

Demographic data revealed the student sample to be younger than the general or incarcerated sample, with the majority of the student sample being between 18-19 years of age (72.6%), the majority of the general sample being between 20-40 years of age (75.4%), and the majority of the incarcerated sample being between 30-50 years of age (82.8%). Relationship data revealed that 57% of the participants were currently in a relationship at the time of the research. Of those participants who were currently single, 71% of their relationships had ended within the past year. Participants identified their ethnicity as Caucasian (84.4%), Māori (8.7%), East Asian, (1.9%), Pacific Islander (1.2%) or other (3.7%).

Measures

The Revised Conflict Tactics Scale (CTS2) (Straus et al, 1996) was used to classify participants as violent or non-violent. Participants were classified as suffering or perpetrating abuse if they indicated one or more instance of abuse on either the minor or severe physical abuse scale or the severe psychological abuse scale. The minor psychological abuse scale was not used because minor abuse occurred too frequently to classify participants. The CTS2 is a widely used measure of conflict behaviour, with evidence of validity and reliability from many investigations. Participants were asked to report about both their own and their partners' behaviour on a seven-point scale ranging from, "this has never happened," to "it has happened more than 20 times in the past year."

The relevant sub-scales from the Personal Relationships Profile (PRP) (Straus & Mouradian, 1999) were used to measure anger management, communication

problems, dominance, gender hostility to men, gender hostility to women, and violence approval. With the exclusion of anger management, higher scores reflect attitudes that are more negative. Higher anger management scores reflect greater use of conflict management skills. The PRP is designed to measure personal characteristics and relationship qualities in relationships experiencing partner violence. Responses were made on a four-point scale ranging from "strongly disagree" to "strongly agree". The PRP has preliminary reliability and validity (Straus & Mouradian, 1999).

The Pacific Attitudes Towards Gender Scale (PATG) (Vaillancourt & Leaper, 1997) was used to measure gendered beliefs. The PATG is a 28-item questionnaire designed to assess attitudes towards gender roles and gendered behaviours. Participants rate statements on a six-point scale from "strongly disagree" to "strongly agree". Higher scores reflect attitudes that are more egalitarian.

The Revised Attitude Toward Wife Abuse Scale (RAWA) (Yoshioka et al, 2000) was used to measure attitudes towards IPV. The RAWA is a 14-item scale that measures attitudes towards male privilege, alternatives to violence, and the belief that male violence is justified. Participants responded on a six-point scale ranging from "strongly disagree" to "strongly agree". Higher scores in the current study reflect a greater acceptance of IPV. The questions presented to participants are listed in Appendix B.

Procedure

Analyses reported in this chapter pertain to sub-sections of data collected during all three phases of the study. During the first phase of the study, as previously described in Chapters 4 – 7, participants completed questionnaires administered on a computer (demographic questionnaire, CTS2, PRP, RAWA, and PATG). The

questionnaires were used to identify whether participants had perpetrated or suffered IPV during their current or most recent relationship. They also assessed participants' psychological characteristics and their attitudes towards violence, men and women, and gender roles. In the second phase, participants' communication behaviour was examined during conversations with a male and female researcher. For the present analyses, I examined the content of one of the topics discussed; *dealing with difficult people*.

During the third phase of the research, participants took part in an open-ended interview in which they were questioned about their attitudes towards, and attributions for IPV perpetrated by men and women. Participants were asked, "How do you feel about a man / women using violence in the home?", "When do you think a man / woman would use violence in the home?", "Why do you think some people do not use violence in the home?" Participants' attitudes concerning the consequences of IPV were examined by asking about the effects of violence on the perpetrator, victim, and relationship. Conflict management behaviours were examined by asking participants to report on one thing that made them angry in their relationship and what they did when they got angry. I also assessed participants' conflict behaviour outside of the relationship from their conversation during phase two of the study where they discussed dealing with difficult people. Additionally, there were a number of questions assessing participants' attitudes towards gender roles. I conducted all of the interviews. I employed a facilitative non-judgemental conversation style, and ensured that I did not reveal my own beliefs or attitudes, either verbally or inadvertently through body language. The interviews were audio-recorded and transcribed verbatim. Each interview took approximately one hour.

Coding

The coding process involved searching through the transcripts and finding common themes and categories. All categories arose out of the transcriptions; I did not have pre-existing themes that I was trying to find evidence for. These categories were then used to group interview answers for analysis.

Results

Frequencies of answers for each question were calculated. Some of the responses occurred too infrequently to be grouped into a meaningful category. Therefore the total number of participants providing responses for each question varies. Chi-square analyses were performed to test whether participants' responses varied as a function of the gender of the perpetrator, or as a function of the characteristics of the participants including their gender, abuse history, or sample. I also examined whether there were different relationships for male- and female-perpetrators and victims of IPV. Results for analyses as a function of gender and abuse history are only reported where they add new information that was not evident from the separate analyses of abuse history or gender. I also performed individual samples t-tests to see whether or not a number of main attitudes (acceptance of violence, conflict skills, and gender role beliefs) varied as a function of psychological characteristics (attitudes towards dominance, hostility to men, hostility to women, gender roles, reported communication problems, and anger management skills).

Classification of Perpetrators and Victims

Thirty-five percent of the participants reported using physical abuse (M_{female} =36.9%, M_{male} = 32.1%). This included 18 (29%) students, 16 (26.2%) general

sample participants, and 22 (56.4%) incarcerated participants. Thirty-eight percent of the participants suffered physical abuse (M_{female} = 28.9%, M_{male} = 47.4 %), consisting of 17 (27.4%) students, 18 (29%) general sample participants, and 26 (68.4%) incarcerated participants. Twenty-nine percent of the participants reported using severe psychological abuse (M_{female} = 28.9%, M_{male} = 29.4%). This included 11 (17.7%) students, 11 (17.7%) general sample participants, and 25 (65.8%) incarcerated participants. Thirty-seven percent of the participants suffered severe psychological abuse (M_{female} = 34.9%, M_{male} = 39.7%), consisting of 15 (24.2%) students, 21 (33.9%) general sample participants, and 24 (63.2%) incarcerated participants.

Attitudes Towards Male-Perpetrated Abuse

The first research question assessed participants' attitudes towards male perpetrated IPV (n=161). The majority of participants were opposed (95.7%) to males perpetrating IPV. Attitudes towards male perpetrated IPV were very negative and the violence was frequently described as repulsive and disgusting. Chi-square analyses revealed that participants from the incarcerated sample and participants with a history of IPV were more approving of male perpetrated abuse than were other participants. Participants from the incarcerated sample were less disapproving of a man using IPV (86.8%) than were participants from the general sample (100.0%, $\chi^2(1)$ = 8.45, p < .05), and were more accepting of male perpetrated abuse (13%), than were participants from the student sample (1.6%, $\chi^2(1)$ = 5.57, p < .05). Participants with a history of IPV were also more accepting of male perpetrated abuse than were other participants. Participants were more condoning of male perpetrated abuse if they had perpetrated physical assault (M_{use} =10.7%, $M_{don't\ use}$ = 1.9%, $\chi^2(1)$ = 6.00, p < .05), suffered physical assault (M_{suffer} = 9.8%, $M_{don't\ suffer}$ = 2.0%, $\chi^2(1)$ =

4.93, $p < .05$), or used severe psychological abuse ($M_{use} = 10.6\%$, $M_{don't\ use} = 2.6\%$, $\chi^2(1) = 4.52$, $p < .05$).

To further explore attitudes towards male perpetrated IPV, participants were asked whether a woman ever deserves to be hit. The majority of participants (90.3%, n =155) believed that a woman should not be hit. Chi-square analyses revealed that women were more likely to say that a woman deserves to be hit than men were ($M_{women} = 8.8\%$, $M_{men} = 1.3\%$, $\chi^2(1) = 4.35$, $p < .05$). The analyses showed no other significant differences as a function of sample, or whether or not an individual was the perpetrator or victim of abuse.

Attitudes Towards Female-Perpetrated Abuse

Participants were also strongly opposed to female perpetrated IPV, with 78.2% (n =156) stating that it should not happen. Chi-square analyses revealed that males were significantly less disapproving of female perpetrated IPV (71.1%) than were females (85.0%, $\chi^2(1) = 4.45$, $p < .05$). Attitudes towards female IPV did not vary as a function of sample or abuse history.

When asked whether a man deserves to be hit (total n=149), 65.8% of the participants said "no". Chi-square analyses revealed a sample effect with participants from the general sample being more disapproving of a man being hit (80.4%) than were participants from the student (59.3%, $\chi^2(1) = 5.687$, $p < .05$), or incarcerated sample (56.4%, $\chi^2(1) = 6.53$, $p < .05$).

Analysis by gender revealed that females were more disapproving of a male being hit (74.4%) than were males (56.3%, $\chi^2(1) = 5.36$, $p < .05$). There was also an effect of participant abuse history. Participants who suffered physical assault were more likely to believe that a man deserves to be hit (37.5%) than were participants

who did not suffer abuse (18.3%, $\chi^2(1) = 6.80$, $p < .01$). Additionally, women were significantly more likely to laugh when asked whether a man deserves to be hit (15.4%) than were men (4.2%, $\chi^2(1) = 5.11$, $p < .05$).

Comparison of Attitudes Towards Male- and Female-Perpetrated Abuse

Paired t-tests were performed to see whether participants' attitudes towards male- and female-perpetrated abuse varied either as a function of their own gender, or the gender of the perpetrator or victim. Analyses revealed that participants were more opposed to IPV perpetrated by a male than a female, $t(154) = 4.89$, $p < .001$. This greater tolerance of female perpetrated abuse was often associated with the belief that females cannot do as much physical damage as males and that males are more able to take the violence. The following interview excerpt exemplifies participants' attitudes towards female perpetrated IPV:

"(laughter) uh yeah I don't know it's funny because you

know I had this immediate hesitation…I would have to be

honest I'd have less issue about a guy being hit because I

guess there's this idea that a guy can take it".

Participants were significantly more likely to say that a man as opposed to a woman deserves to be hit, $t(147) = -5.74$, $p < .001$. Analyses also revealed that participants were significantly more likely to laugh when asked about a man rather than a women being hit, $t(147) = -3.76$, $p < .001$).

Attributions for Female Perpetrated Abuse

Participants were asked about the circumstances in which they thought a female would use IPV (n=100). The two most frequent reasons given to explain female

perpetrated IPV included a lack of skills for dealing with anger (24%) or that the violence would be in response to their partner committing adultery (20%). Other less frequent reasons included; to gain control and power in the relationship (16%); self-defence (16%); stress (15%); a past history of violence in the family (14%); frustration (10%); annoyance at partner (9%); alcohol related (9%).

Chi-square analyses revealed that students were significantly more likely to attribute female perpetrated IPV to their partner committing adultery (34.0%) than were participants from the general sample (3.4%, $\chi^2(1) = 9.67$, $p < .01$). There was also a trend for students to be more likely to attribute female partner violence to partner's adultery (34.0%) than were participants from the incarcerated sample (12.5%, $\chi^2(1) = 3.76$, $p = .052$). Participants from the general sample were significantly more likely to attribute female perpetrated violence to a lack of skills for dealing with anger (44.8%) than were participants from the student (14.9%, $\chi^2(1) = 8.29$, $p < .01$), or the incarcerated sample (16.7%, $\chi^2(1) = 4.78$, $p < .05$). Participants from the general sample were also more likely to attribute female perpetrated violence to stress (30.0%) than were participants from the student (8.5%, $\chi^2(1) = 6.03$, $p < .05$), or incarcerated sample (8.3%, $\chi^2(1) = 3.86$, $p < .05$). Moreover, participants who suffered physical violence were more likely to attribute female partner violence to self-defence (27.5%) than were participants who did not suffer physical violence (7.8%, $\chi^2(1) = 7.33$, $p < .01$). Analyses by gender and abuse revealed that females who suffered physical abuse were significantly more likely to attribute female violence to a lack of skills for dealing with anger (54.4%) than were males who suffered physical abuse (18.5%, $\chi^2(1) = 4.93$, $p < .05$).

Attributions for Male Perpetrated Abuse

Participants were asked about the circumstances in which they thought a man would use violence in the home (n=116). The most frequent reasons given included: to gain power and control (25%); alcohol related (24.1%); a lack of skills for dealing with anger (23.3%); stress (19.8%); past history of violence in the family (18.1%); partner committing adultery (18.1%); partner disgraced them (17.2%); frustration (6.9%); anger (6.9%). The following two interview excerpts were typical responses to the question "why do you think a man would use violence in the home?"

> "To scare people, to feel more powerful, to get what they
>
> want pretty much"

> "If his wife's been cheating on him or basically if he's
>
> drunk"

Chi-square analyses revealed that participants who suffered severe psychological abuse were more likely to attribute male partner violence to frustration (13.6%) than were participants who did not suffer severe psychological abuse (2.8%, $\chi^2(1) = 5.02$, $p < .05$). Analyses by sample also revealed a number of differences. The general sample were more likely to attribute male partner violence to a lack of skills for dealing with anger (37.1%) than were participants from the incarcerated sample (13.3%, $\chi^2(1) = 4.74$, $p < .05$). Participants from the student sample were more likely to suggest that males are violent because their partner embarrassed them (24.9%) than were participants from the general sample (2.9%, $\chi^2(1) = 9.665$, $p < .01$). Participants from the incarcerated sample were less likely to attribute male perpetrated abuse to alcohol (6.7%) than were participants from the general sample (31.4%, $\chi^2(1) = 6.19$, $p < .05$), or the student sample (29.4%, $\chi^2(1) = 5.89$, $p < .05$). A paired t-test revealed that participants were significantly more likely to attribute male

perpetrated violence to alcohol (24.1%) than they were to attribute female perpetrated violence to alcohol (9%, $t(98) = -4.06$, $p < .001$).

Participants' Beliefs Concerning the Effects of Violence

To further examine beliefs regarding IPV, I asked participants what effects they thought IPV has on the relationship, victim, and perpetrator (n=132). The most frequently mentioned effect of violence on the relationship was the establishment of dominant and submissive roles, with 36.4% of respondents mentioning this as a consequence of the violence. Other frequent answers included: the relationship would be destroyed or negative (19.9%); there would be no trust (9.1%); a cycle of violence would be established (9.1%). Chi-square analyses revealed that participants from the incarcerated sample were significantly less likely to say that violence destroys the relationship (18.2%) than were participants from the student (50.0%, $\chi^2(1) = 7.84$, $p < .01$), or general sample (37.7%, $\chi^2(1) = 3.83$, $p < .05$).

Attitudes concerning the effects of violence also varied as a function of participants' own abuse history. Participants who suffered severe psychological abuse were significantly less likely to say that partner violence would destroy the relationship (25.5%) than were participants who did not suffer severe psychological abuse (43.2%, $\chi^2(1) = 4.25$, $p < .05$).

When asked about the effects of violence for the perpetrator, 27.3% of participants mentioned guilt and remorse, and 23.5% of the participants said that the perpetrator would gain control and power in the relationship. Although less frequent, participants also mentioned that using violence would reinforce the perpetrator's use of violent behaviour (9.8%), that the perpetrator would experience a release of tension as a result of the violence (8.3%), and may also suffer a loss of self-esteem (6.1%).

The main effects of violence on the victim were a loss of self-esteem (34.8%), feeling scared (24.2%), suffering physical damage (18.2%), feeling trapped and helpless (8.3%), being destroyed (7.6%), starting to condone the violence (6.1%), and blaming themselves for the violence (6.1%). Chi-square analyses showed that females were more likely to report that the victim would lose self-esteem as a result of the violence (45.5%) than were males (24.2%, $\chi^2(1) = 6.54$, $p < .05$). Analyses by abuse revealed that participants who used physical violence were less likely to report that the victim would suffer physical harm as a result of IPV (8.0%) than were participants who did not use physical violence (24.4%, $\chi^2(1) = 5.61$, $p < .05$).

Participants' Gender Role Beliefs

To explore participants' attitudes regarding gender roles I asked participants what society expects of men and women today (n=126). The three most frequent responses included; traditional gender roles (34.9%); gender equality (22.2%); traditional roles with the exception of the female working part-time to add to the family income (17.5%). These attitudes are exemplified in the following interview excerpt:

> "Um yeah there's hopefully a changing stereotype but…
> there's like the sort of lone kiwi bushman ideal but at the
> same time he's rugged and he's tough and he likes a beer
> with his mates and he loves rugby and yeah. (What about a
> woman?). I guess still there are lots of ideas about the um
> domesticity um she should aspire to be a good mother,
> good wife um I mean have a career too but um to some
> extent um looks up to her husband at the same time

> managing his dinner and his laundry and things and looking
>
> after the kids"

Other less frequent responses included: society expects males to be traditional and females to be career women (7.1%); and males today are confused because of the changing roles (7.1%). Chi-square analyses revealed that the general sample were less likely to believe society expects traditional gender roles (19.3%) than were participants from the incarcerated (40.0%, $\chi^2(1) = 4.70$, $p < .05$) or student sample (55.9%, $\chi^2(1) = 12.90$, $p < .001$). Participants from the student sample were less likely to believe that society expects gender equality (2.9%) than were participants from the incarcerated (31.4%, $\chi^2(1) = 9.74$, $p < .01$), or general sample (28.1%, $\chi^2(1) = 8.85$, $p < .01$). The following interview excerpt exemplifies the belief that in today's society the male gender role is confusing:

> "Ok, oh well, I would say that it's not easy to be a male
>
> today in New Zealand. They should be ambitious
>
> professionally, not necessarily in a management position
>
> but at least ambitious going somewhere professionally.
>
> They should take, um oh, active part in family life, take the
>
> kids to the sports activities, ah go to school interviews, all
>
> that. They should be very sensitive about the needs of their
>
> female partner, their wife or partner, um and ah yeah at the
>
> same time they should still be interested in sports, still be
>
> able to go to the pub on Friday afternoon, and have a
>
> couple of drinks with the fellas without ever letting that
>
> mask go away, and its bloody hard".

Participants' answers differed depending on whether they had suffered abuse or not. Participants were less likely to report that society expects traditional gender roles if they suffered physical assault (M_{suffer} =19.2%, $M_{\text{don't suffer}}$ = 45.9%, $\chi^2(1)$ = 9.59, p < .01), or suffered severe psychological abuse (M_{suffer} = 21.2%, $M_{\text{don't suffer}}$ = 44.6%, $\chi^2(1)$ = 7.38, p < .01). There was also a trend for participants who suffered severe psychological abuse to be more likely to report that society expects gender equality (30.8%) than were participants who did not suffer severe psychological abuse (16.2%, $\chi^2(1)$ = 3.74, p =.053). Analyses by gender and abuse revealed that females who perpetrated psychological abuse were significantly more likely to report that society expects traditional gender roles (40.9%), than were males who perpetrated psychological abuse (9.5%, $\chi^2(1)$ = 5.56, p < .05). Similarly, females who suffered psychological abuse were significantly more likely to report that society expects traditional gender roles (36.9%) than were males who suffered psychological abuse (7.4%, $\chi^2(1)$ = 6.36, p < .05). Females who perpetrated physical abuse were significantly more likely to believe that society expects women to fulfil traditional roles and work (32%) than were males who perpetrated physical abuse (8.7%, $\chi^2(1)$ = 3.95, p < .05).

To further explore gender role expectations I asked participants whether they agreed with society's expectations (n=113). The majority of the participants (80.5%) did not approve of traditional gender roles. Analyses by gender and abuse revealed that males who perpetrated physical abuse were significantly more likely to believe in traditional gender roles (38.9%) than were females who perpetrated physical abuse (7.7%, $\chi^2(1)$ = 6.36, p < .05). Similarly, males who perpetrated and suffered psychological abuse were significantly more likely to believe in traditional gender roles than were females who perpetrated (M_{males} = 46.7%, M_{females} = 9.1%, $\chi^2(1)$ =

6.84, $p < .01$), or suffered psychological abuse ($M_{males} = 35\%$, $M_{females} = 8.3\%$, $\chi^2(1) = 4.77, p < .05$).

I also asked participants whether they thought being tough was part of the male gender role (n=135). Of the responses, 25.2% of the participants thought that being tough was still part of the male gender role, and 24.4% of the respondents thought that it was not. Chi-square analyses revealed that females were more likely to believe that society expects men to be tough (33.3%) than were males (16.7%, $\chi^2(1) = 5.05, p < .05$).

Reasons Given to Explain why People Refrain from Partner Violence

To further explore participants beliefs regarding IPV I asked participants why they thought some people refrained from using partner violence (n=158). The most frequent reasons given to explain why people refrain from violence in the home included: good communication skills (25.9%); violence does not solve anything (22.2%); solve problems other ways (20.3%); understand and love each other (19.0%); have no history of violence growing up (15.2%); respect and trust each other (12.7%); can control their anger (12.0%); have a good sense of what is right and wrong (9.5%); it sets a bad example for the children (7.6%); it would destroy the relationship (6.3%). The following interview excerpts exemplify participants' attitudes as to why people refrain from violence:

"Because they can openly just express themselves and like

talk things through without like I don't know getting

physically violent or anything".

"'Cos they don't need to, there's no requirement for it at all

and I think a normal healthy relationship there is just no

component of violence that even fits in anywhere it doesn't make any sense to, you don't bash your dog to teach it to love you. It's just really silly to there's nothing that violence can contribute to a relationship".

Chi-square analyses revealed an effect of abuse, with participants who perpetrated or suffered abuse being less likely to mention that violence doesn't solve anything (Muse physical = 12.3%, Mdon't use physical = 27.7%, $\chi^2(1) = 5.04$, $p < .05$), (Msuffer physical =13.1%, Mdon't suffer physical = 27.8%, $\chi^2(1) = 4.71$, $p < .05$), (Muse psychological = 10.4%, Mdon't use psychological = 27.3%, $\chi^2(1) = 5.51$, $p < .05$), (Msuffer psychological = 11.7%, Mdon't suffer psychological = 28.6%, $\chi^2(1) = 6.17$, $p < .05$). Participants who used severe psychological abuse were less likely than other participants to report that people solve problems other ways (Muse psychological = 10.4%, Mdon't use psychological = 24.5%, $\chi^2(1) = 4.13$, $p < .05$) or that people refrain from violence because they respect and trust each other (Muse psychological = 4.2%, Mdon't use psychological = 16.4%, $\chi^2(1) = 4.50$, $p < .05$).

Analyses by gender and abuse revealed that men who suffer psychological abuse were significantly more likely to attribute non-violence to good communication skills (35%) than were females who suffered psychological abuse (8.3%, $\chi^2(1) = 4.81$, $p < .05$). Analyses by gender revealed that women were more likely to attribute non-violence to no history of violence (21.0%) than were men (9.1%, $\chi^2(1) = 4.34$, $p < .05$).

Participants' Attributions for Anger in their Relationship

I was also interested in participants' attributions for anger in their relationship (n=100). The majority of reasons given by participants to explain why they became angry in their relationship were other-focused (75%). These included things such as; partner deliberately doing things to "piss me off"; partner being stubborn; partner bringing up the past; partner not doing things they said they would do. Self-focused explanations included things such as; not being understood; not being believed; being ignored.

Participants identified negative communication as the most frequent reason to explain why they became angry in their relationship (30%). These included things such as; bringing up the past; not letting the other partner know something important; not letting on what they want; always agreeing and not putting their own point across; not listening to a different point of view. Participants also attributed their anger to; partner not performing responsibilities (12%); partners' bad behaviour (10%); not getting enough attention (6%); and partner being controlling (5%). The following interview excerpt shows the emphasis on negative communication:

"Um probably when he wouldn't let me know something

you know like um something important you know like um

lacking in communication in other words and I'm going

you didn't tell me and I've made other plans and I might

have to try and juggle this or yeah that, that would be the

main thing lack of communication"

Participants' Anger Management Behaviour

To explore anger management skills I asked participants what they did when they became angry (n=103). When asked how they deal with their anger, over half of the participants (54.4%) said that they used an 'anger-out' expression style consisting of yelling and taking their anger out on their partner. A smaller percentage of the participants said that they used an 'anger-control' response such as talking things through or using "time out" (35.5%) or used an 'anger-in' response to anger whereby they withdrew and internalised the anger (31.1%).

Chi-square analyses revealed a significant effect of abuse, with participants being less likely to report using 'anger-control' if they suffered physical violence (M_{suffer} = 25.0%, $M_{don't\ suffer}$ = 43.6%, $\chi^2(1)$ = 3.92, p < .05), used severe psychological abuse (M_{use} = 18.4%, $M_{don't\ use}$ = 44.6%, $\chi^2(1)$ = 7.24, p < .01), or suffered severe psychological abuse (M_{suffer} = 24.4%, $M_{don't\ suffer}$ = 43.1%, $\chi^2(1)$ = 3.88, p < .05). Similarly, participants were more likely to report an 'anger-out' response if they suffered physical abuse (M_{suffer} = 68.8%, $M_{don't\ suffer}$ = 41.8%, $\chi^2(1)$ = 7.49, p < .01), used severe psychological violence (M_{use} = 73.7%, $M_{don't\ use}$ = 43.1%, $\chi^2(1)$ = 9.06, p < .01), or suffered severe psychological abuse (M_{suffer} = 66.7%, $M_{don't\ suffer}$ = 44.8%, $\chi^2(1)$ = 4.87, p < .05). Chi-square analyses also revealed that participants from the incarcerated sample were more likely to report using an 'anger-out' response such as yelling or hitting when angry (71.8%) than were participants from the general sample (42.4%, $\chi^2(1)$ = 7.33, p < .01).

Participants' Behaviour when Dealing with Difficult People

This section of the results describes participants' behaviour when dealing with difficult people (n=107). Three types of behavioural responses were identified: (1) avoiding the situation; (2) confrontation; (3) conflict resolution. Avoiding the situation included responses such as walking away, avoiding the person, switching off, and clamming up. Confrontation included things such as 'telling them to piss off', arguing, retaliating, becoming abusive, and hitting people. Examples of conflict resolution included listening and then trying to work out what is going on, making an effort to be polite, talking it out, tactfully saying something, or using time out.

Results revealed that participants were more likely to avoid the situation (51.4%) or confront the person (47.7%) than they were to use conflict resolution strategies (27.1%). I also performed chi-square analyses for each grouped answer to test whether interview responses varied as a function of sample, gender, or participants' abuse history. Chi-square analyses revealed that participants from the student sample were more likely to report avoiding the situation (64.9%) than were participants from the general sample (36.6%, $\chi^2(1) = 6.22$, $p < .05$). There was also a sample difference for the use of conflict resolution strategies. Participants from the general sample were more likely to use conflict resolution strategies (43.9%) than were participants from the incarcerated (17.2%, $\chi^2(1) = 5.47$, $p < .05$) or student sample (16.2%, $\chi^2(1) = 7.00$, $p < .01$).

Chi square analyses also revealed an effect for abuse history with participants being more likely to report being confrontational when dealing with difficult people if they perpetrated physical abuse ($M_{use} = 61.1\%$, $M_{don't\ use} = 40.8\%$), $\chi^2(1) = 3.93$, $p < .05$, suffered physical abuse ($M_{suffer} = 67.5\%$, $M_{don't\ suffer} = 35.8\%$, $\chi^2(1) = 10.08$, $p < .01$), or used severe psychological abuse ($M_{use} = 66.7\%$, $M_{don't\ use} = 40.3\%$, $\chi^2(1) =$

6.04, $p < .05$). Analyses by gender and abuse revealed that males who used and suffered psychological abuse were significantly more likely to report being confrontational when dealing with difficult people than were females who used severe psychological abuse ($M_{male} = 85.7\%$, $M_{female} = 50\%$, $\chi^2(1) = 4.29$, $p < .05$), or suffered severe psychological abuse ($M_{male} = 77.8\%$, $M_{female} = 42.1\%$, $\chi^2(1) = 4.88$, $p < .05$). Chi-square analyses revealed that participants suffering physical abuse were less likely to report using conflict resolution strategies (15.0%) than were participants who did not suffer physical abuse (34.3%, $\chi^2(1) = 4.74$, $p < .05$). Analyses by gender and abuse revealed that females who suffered severe psychological abuse were significantly more likely to report using conflict resolution strategies (31.6%) than were males who suffered severe psychological abuse (5.6%, $\chi^2(1) = 4.08$, $p < .05$).

Interview Themes as a Function of Personality Characteristics

Independent samples t-tests were performed to determine the relationship between a number of attitudes assessed during the interview (attitudes towards the acceptability of violence, behaviours when angry and gender role beliefs) and six psychological characteristics measured through the questionnaires (hostility, attitudes towards dominance, attitudes towards the approval of violence, attitudes towards gender roles, anger management skills, and communication problems). The relevant means and corresponding *t* values can be seen in Table 8.1.

Table 8.1: Interview Responses as a Function of Personality Characteristics

Attitude	Correlate	Agree with Attitude		t-test (df)
		No	Yes	
Condone male perpetrated IPV	Host. to women	4.39	6.88	-2.87 (159)**
	Viol. approval	7.71	11.25	-2.30 (159)*
	Lack alt. to viol.	3.36	6.63	-1.91 (159)**
	Anger manag.	17.75	14.38	2.65 (159)**
Disapprove female perpetrated IPV	Comm. prob.	9.03	7.25	2.90 (154)**
	Dominance	8.38	6.56	2.96 (154)**
	Host. to men	6.97	5.29	3.19 (154)**
	Viol. approval	9.94	7.34	3.26 (154)**
	Egalitarian	92.74	100.76	-2.19 (154)*
Condone female perpetrated IPV	Host. to men	5.40	6.50	-2.44 (154)*
Disapprove of a female being hit	Host. to women	6.53	4.37	3.31 (153)**
	Viol. approval	10.53	7.75	2.45 (153)*
	Lack alt to viol	5.13	3.29	2.00 (153)*
Condone a female being hit	Host. to women	4.42	7.50	-3.55 (153)**
	Viol. approval	7.80	12.13	-5.42 (153)***
	Lack alt. to viol.	3.33	6	-2.17 (153)*
	Anger manag.	17.61	14.50	2.46 (153)*

Disapprove of a man being hit	Dominance	7.29	6.65	2.39 (147)*
	Host. to men	6.47	5.49	2.39 (147)*
	Host. to women	5.24	4.22	2.38 (147)*
	Viol. approval	10.73	6.46	6.52 (147)***
	Egalitarianism	89.65	103.06	-4.16 (147)***
	Male privilege	3.88	2.26	2.71 (147)**
Condones a man being hit	Dominance	6.60	8.50	-3.58 (147)**
	Host. to men	5.54	6.66	-2.51 (147)*
	Host. to women	4.20	5.66	-3.20 (147)**
	Viol. approval	6.97	10.68	-4.96 (147)***
	Egalitarian	101.41	89.87	3.22 (147)**
	Male privilege	2.36	4.13	-2.71 (147)**
Woman dominant & man submissive	Male privilege	2.72	7.60	-2.72 (121)**
Condones traditional gender roles	Viol. approval	6.93	9.10	-2.22 (111)*
	Egalitarianism	103.96	88.71	3.50 (111)**
	Male privilege	2.10	4.43	-2.88 (111)**
Disapproves of traditional gender roles	Viol. approval	9.41	6.84	2.72 (111)**
	Egalitarianism	88.14	104.26	-3.81 (111)***
	Male privilege	4.50	2.05	2.55 (111)*
	Male viol. Just.	4.77	1.51	2.30 (111)*

Uses 'anger-control'	Comm. Prob.	8.33	6.14	3.18 (101)**
	Dominance	7.33	5.72	2.24 (101)*
	Host. to men	6.30	5.00	2.57 (101)*
	Anger manage.	16.63	18.69	-2.76 (101)**
Uses 'anger-out'	Comm. Prob.	6.47	8.48	-3.04 (101) **
	Dominance	5.77	7.61	-2.71 (101)**
	Host. to men	5.06	6.50	-3.01 (101)**
	Anger manage.	18.60	16.30	3.24 (101)**
Uses conflict resolution	Host. to women	4.90	3.52	2.64 (105)*
	Viol. Approval	8.15	5.97	2.49 (105)*
	Male privilege	2.85	1.38	2.50 (105)*

***$p < .001$, **$p < .01$, *$p < .05$

Participants who reported being more approving of a man perpetrating abuse and more accepting of a women being hit during the interview were more likely to be hostile to women, approve of violence, believe that there is no alternative to violence and to report fewer anger management skills on the questionnaires. Participants who were approving of a female perpetrating violence were more hostile towards men. Participants who were more approving of a man being hit were more hostile towards men, hostile towards women, more dominant, more approving of violence, more likely to believe in male privilege and had less egalitarian gender role beliefs.

Participants who were disapproving of a female being hit were less hostile towards women, were less likely to believe that there is no alternative to violence and were less approving of violence. Participants who were more disapproving of a female perpetrating violence reported fewer communication problems, were less

dominant, were less hostile towards men, were less approving of violence and were more egalitarian. Participants who were more disapproving of a man being hit were less dominant, less hostile towards men, less hostile towards women, less approving of violence, had beliefs that were more egalitarian and were less likely to believe in male privilege.

Attitudes towards gender roles as assessed through the interview were also related to a number of psychological characteristics measured through the questionnaires. Participants who believed in traditional gender roles were more accepting of violence, less egalitarian, and were more likely to believe in male privilege. Participants who were less approving of traditional gender roles were less approving of violence, less likely to believe that male violence is justified, were more egalitarian and less likely to believe in male privilege. Participants who believed that women are now dominant and men submissive were more likely to believe in male privilege.

Responses to anger also varied as a function of the psychological correlates. Participants who reported using an unhealthy response to anger were more dominant, hostile to men, reported more communication problems and fewer anger management skills. Participants reporting a healthy response to anger were less likely to report communication problems, dominance attitudes, hostility to men, and were more likely to report using anger management strategies. Participants who reported using conflict resolution strategies when dealing with difficult people were less hostile to women, less approving of violence and less likely to believe in male privilege.

Discussion

The present set of analyses investigated attitudes towards IPV. Specifically, I identified how attitudes varied as a function of the gender of the perpetrator or victim, or as a function of the gender, psychological characteristics, or abuse history of the participant. I also examined the relationship between IPV and participants' attitudes towards gender roles, and their conflict resolution strategies. Overall, participants were disapproving of IPV, commonly viewing it as destroying the relationship, or leading to the establishment of dominant and submissive roles. There was, however, greater tolerance for female than male perpetrated abuse. The attitudes of males and females were very similar. Participants' abuse history and psychological characteristics were more influential in shaping attitudes than was their gender. Attitudes and behaviours also varied across the three samples, with the student and incarcerated sample demonstrating more negative attitudes and fewer conflict skills than the general sample.

Characteristics of the Perpetrator

In support of my hypotheses and in accordance with past research (Arias & Johnson, 1989; Bethke & DeJoy, 1993; Carlson, 1999; Harris & Cook, 1994; Sorenson & Taylor, 2005), participants were more accepting of female than male perpetrated abuse and showed less empathy towards male victims. Participants were less disapproving of a woman using violence, were more accepting of a man being hit than a woman, and were more likely to laugh when asked if a man deserves to be hit. Very few people laughed when asked whether a woman deserves to be hit. Participants' responses suggest that female perpetrated violence is not considered as serious as male perpetrated IPV.

Although participants viewed female violence less seriously than male violence, they believed that the motivations and causes of male- and female-perpetrated abuse were similar. Themes common to both genders included a lack of skills for dealing with anger, partner committing adultery, to gaining power and control, stress, frustration, alcohol, and a history of violence. However, there were three important gender differences. Male violence was more likely than female violence to be attributed to alcohol and to their partner disgracing them, whereas female violence was more likely to be attributed to self-defence. Moreover, self-defence was never given as an explanation for male perpetrated IPV. The findings of the present set of analyses suggest that in some instances female violence is perpetrated for similar reasons to male violence whereas in other instances females may use IPV in self-defence.

Gender of the Participant

Contrary to past research finding males to be more condoning of IPV than females (Harris & Cook, 1994; Langhinrichsen-Rohling et al., 2004), the present set of analyses found that males and females were similarly opposed to violence. However, individuals viewed violence perpetrated by members of their own gender more harshly than did members of the other gender. For instance, females were more opposed to female perpetrated abuse than males and males were more opposed to male perpetrated abuse than females. Although women were disapproving of female perpetrated abuse, their behaviour was not always consistent with their attitudes. For example, they often laughed when asked if a man deserves to be hit. One possible explanation for females' behaviour was that this laughter was a reflection of their attitudes towards males in relationships rather than a reflection of their attitudes

towards IPV. It became evident during the interviews that females often viewed men as 'hopeless' when it came to relationships. There was a general stereotype of men as being less relationship focused, reliable, faithful, or communicative than females, and that humour was one mechanism females employed for coping with this stereotype. Males and females also held similar attitudes towards the consequences of violence, although females were more likely than males to mention that a victim may experience loss of self-esteem. This difference is possibly due to traditional male and female stereotypes that have associated females with emotional sensitivity more so than men. Overall, the current findings suggest that the gender of the perpetrator has a stronger influence on attitudes towards the acceptability and attributions for partner violence than does the gender of the person making the judgements.

Attitudes Across the Three Samples

Attitudes varied across the three samples, with the general sample being the most disapproving of violence, reporting more anger management skills, and being more likely to attribute IPV to a lack of conflict skills than were other participants. In comparison, the student sample reported fewer skills for dealing with anger and conflict. They were also more likely to attribute violence to adultery or embarrassment, which is consistent with past research (Choi & Edleson, 1996; Foo & Margolin, 1999). This difference between the attitudes and skills of the general and student samples suggests that conflict resolution strategies develop with age and experience. Moreover, the findings suggest that the causes of IPV may vary as a function of age. For older couples, partner violence may primarily arise out of a lack of skills for dealing with conflict. For younger couples, partner violence may be partially attributed to a need to retaliate and to protect one's personal self-image.

The incarcerated sample was the most approving of violence. They also reported fewer skills for dealing with anger, and stated fewer consequences of IPV. The attitudes of the incarcerated sample overlap with those of perpetrators, because the majority of the incarcerated sample had a history of IPV. According to the social learning theory (Bandura, 1977), this greater exposure to violence explains the incarcerated sample having more condoning attitudes towards violence. The tendency of the incarcerated sample to view violence as less destructive could also be due to this sample having experienced or witnessed more relationships that have continued despite the presence of IPV. Additionally, participants from the incarcerated sample were less likely to mention alcohol as a cause of male violence. It is quite possible that the violence this sample has witnessed is frequently alcohol related, and therefore they do not separate the violence from the alcohol.

Attitudes of Perpetrators and Victims of IPV

Attitudes towards IPV were most strongly influenced by a participant's abuse history. Moreover, findings revealed that the attitudes of perpetrators and victims were similar. This conclusion must be treated with caution, however, because IPV was often bi-directional and many participants were both perpetrators and victims. In keeping with past research (Arias & Johnson, 1989; Russell & Hulson, 1992; Stith & Farley, 1993), participants with a history of abuse were more condoning of male perpetrated IPV. Attitudes towards female perpetrated abuse did not vary as a function of abuse history, possibly because participants did not feel as strongly about female perpetrated abuse and therefore there was less variation in attitudes. Participants with a history of abuse were also less likely to state that violence does not

solve anything than others. It is possible that some individuals do use IPV to solve their problems, albeit through the use of power and control.

Based on previous research (Holtzworth-Munroe, 1992), I expected that perpetrators of IPV might describe fewer consequences of violence. In support of my hypotheses, participants who used physical violence were less likely than others to report that the victim suffers physical harm. This finding suggests that perpetrators of physical violence try to minimise or deny the seriousness of their violent acts, in accordance with past research (Henning et al., 2005). Additionally, participants who suffered psychological abuse were also less likely to say that partner violence destroys the relationship. These findings suggest that victims of IPV may come to accept the abuse and remain in relationships despite the presence of violence. It was also interesting to find that people who used psychological abuse did not attribute non-violence to trust and respect. As would be expected, these results suggest that people who use emotional abuse have less trust in, or respect for, their partner.

The present findings revealed a strong relationship between IPV and a lack of skills for dealing with conflict. Participants with a history of abuse were more likely to use an 'anger out' response, venting their anger towards their partner than others. Furthermore, the present findings suggest that individuals who perpetrate violence in the home are also more likely to enter into hostile interactions with others outside of the relationship. This correlation may be stronger for males than females. While both males and females with a history of physical violence reported being confrontational towards others outside of the home, only men with a history of psychological violence reported being confrontational outside of the home. These findings align with those of Anglin and Holtzworth-Munroe (1997) who concluded that women are socialised to handle problems outside of the home more so than men are. The present findings

extend past research that has predominantly focused on the anger management behaviour of male perpetrators to reveal that females also lack skills for dealing with conflict, especially relationship conflict.

The examination of attributions for IPV as a function of participant abuse history revealed that although violence was often bi-directional, the motivations behind the violence were not always the same for both partners. For instance, the finding that participants who suffered abuse were more likely to attribute female partner violence to self-defence suggests female victims' use of IPV may, in some instances, be self-defensive. The finding that participants who suffered severe psychological abuse were more likely than others to attribute male partner violence to frustration suggests male victims' use of IPV may sometimes be driven by feelings of frustration. In addition to being the victim of emotional abuse, the present findings suggest that this frustration may also be attributed to a lack of communication skills. Men who suffered psychological abuse were more likely than others to attribute non-violence to good communication skills. It is possible that some male perpetrators cannot articulate themselves during verbal conflicts and out of frustration turn to violence. Indeed, this is in keeping with the findings presented in Chapter 5 that showed victims of psychological abuse reported more communication problems than did other individuals.

Attitudes Towards Gender Roles

Finally, within this chapter I examined attitudes towards gender roles, and how these varied as a function of sample or participant abuse history. The findings revealed that although there is a growing awareness of and desire for gender equality, these attitudes have not yet become mainstream practice. The majority of participants

perceived that society still expects traditional roles of men and women, often in addition to the female working to provide a second income. This movement towards equality does not seem to be consistent throughout society, with the student sample reporting less egalitarian beliefs than the general sample, suggesting a need to target education specifically towards younger individuals. It also became evident during the interviews that there are still many expectations of men that could potentially increase the likelihood that they will engage in violence, including the association of males with beer drinking, violent sport, and being tough. This expectation that males should be tough was primarily endorsed by women and suggests that females may be responsible for maintaining part of the traditional male gender role, and should be challenged about this belief. The current findings also revealed that some men feel confused and frustrated by the changing male gender role. On the one hand, men are expected to uphold the macho male identity of being the 'tough' protector and provider, and on the other hand, they are supposed to be sensitive and caring. Overall, the findings presented in the present chapter reveal that there still needs to be a major shift in the way we view the roles of males and females.

Traditional gender role beliefs also varied as a function of participant abuse history, however this relationship varied for males and females. Females with a history of IPV believed society expects traditional gender roles, whereas males with a history of IPV condoned traditional gender roles. It is possible that females who perpetrate abuse are rebelling against the expectation that they should fulfil traditional gender roles, whereas males who perpetrate abuse are trying to maintain traditional gender roles.

Psychological Characteristics Associated with Attitudes Condoning IPV

The present findings supported my hypothesis that psychological characteristics that have been related to the perpetration of IPV are also associated with attitudes condoning violence. Participants who reported more condoning attitudes towards IPV were also more hostile towards men, more hostile towards women, wanted to be dominant in the relationship, were less egalitarian, supported male privilege, and reported having fewer anger management skills. Further support for the relationship between traditional gendered beliefs and violence approval came from the finding that approval of traditional gender roles, as measured through the interview, was positively related to greater acceptance of violence as measured through the questionnaire. These findings suggest that participants who were more condoning of violence were also more hostile towards others, had fewer skills for dealing with conflict, held traditional gendered beliefs, and wanted to control their relationships.

The current findings also revealed a complex relationship between skill deficits and attitudes, suggesting that violence prevention initiatives that focus primarily on teaching social skills may not be effective in reducing IPV. Overall, participants who reported fewer anger management skills were also more likely to report communication problems, wanting to control the relationship, and being hostile to men. On the other hand, the use of conflict resolution strategies was associated with less hostility towards women, less approval of violence, and less support of male privilege. It was an interesting finding that the use of conflict skills was associated with less support of male privilege. One possible explanation for this association is that conflict resolution techniques are associated more with traditional female stereotypes than traditional male stereotypes.

Limitations

It is important to mention a number of limitations of the present research. Firstly, I relied solely on participants self-reports of their attitudes and behaviour and the behaviour of their partner. The present results did show consistency between attitudes measured through questionnaires and during the interview (anger management, violence approval, and gendered beliefs), providing construct validity for the methods employed. A further limitation was the high degree of overlap between participants identified as perpetrators and victims. Because of the bi-directional nature of the violence, I was unable to distinguish whether or not the attitudes of perpetrators and victims were actually similar, or whether the similarities in findings were driven by participants who both suffered and perpetrated abuse. However, the set of analyses in Chapter 6 revealed that individuals who suffer but do not perpetrate violence have similar attitudes to individuals who both perpetrate and suffer IPV.

Conclusions

Despite these limitations, a number of suggestions for violence prevention initiatives can be drawn from the current analyses. Most notably, I suggest that the grounding principles behind violence education programs designed for males may also be relevant to female perpetrators. The present findings showed that males and females have similar attitudes towards violence; moreover, the characteristics associated with perpetrating and suffering abuse were similar for men and women. In particular, the findings of the present chapter provide support for addressing perpetrators' condoning attitudes towards violence, hostile attitudes towards others, traditional gender role beliefs, attitudes towards dominance, and tendency to deny or

minimise the consequences of their actions. The current findings also support teaching perpetrators effective conflict resolution techniques in combination with challenging negative attitudes. Furthermore, the similar conflict behaviours of perpetrators and victims would suggest that in some instances both partners may require education in dealing with conflict in a constructive and non-harmful way. Finally, the present findings support considering the dynamics and motivations for IPV within each relationship. Not all perpetrators of IPV use violence for similar reasons, and in some instances, this violence might be self-defensive.

The present findings also suggest that violence prevention initiatives need to be targeted to members of the wider community as well as to individuals with a history of IPV. Community initiatives need to challenge condoning attitudes towards violence, traditional gender role beliefs, and to teach effective communication and conflict resolution techniques. Although individuals were generally disapproving of IPV, there was some tolerance for female perpetrated abuse. While the physical and emotional consequences of female perpetrated abuse are less than those of male-perpetrated abuse (Saunders, 2002), there are still many potentially negative consequences of female violence. Condoning attitudes may deter male victims from reporting the abuse or receiving adequate empathy and support. Furthermore, the male victim may begin to use violence himself, or children may witness or experience the violence. The present findings also revealed that specific samples may require greater attention than others might. The incarcerated sample in particular was somewhat condoning of violence, and the student sample held many concerning attitudes including viewing violence as a response to embarrassment or adultery. Moreover, the current research revealed a need for teaching effective communication and conflict resolution skills at a societal level. The finding that the majority of

participants either withdrew or became confrontational when dealing with conflict rather than employing a conflict resolution strategy is a serious concern. The current results also found communication problems to be associated with less effective conflict resolution behaviour. Moreover, negative communication was the most frequent reason given to explain participants' anger in their relationships. It is imperative that we address these skill deficits, as it is possible that they are partially responsible for the initiation, maintenance, and escalation of IPV.

CHAPTER 9

General Discussion

Activists from a feminist perspective have been credited with bringing partner violence to the forefront of public attention. However, their theoretical framework defining IPV as an exclusively male behaviour has slowed our understanding of the processes behind violent relationships. Although our knowledge of the correlates associated with male-perpetrated IPV has increased substantially, very little research has been directed towards examining the correlates associated with female-perpetrated IPV or with examining the processes behind mutually violent relationships.

The present study was designed to extend past IPV research by identifying the risk factors associated with male and female IPV. Furthermore, I addressed the gender symmetry debate by comparing the incidence, frequency, severity, and associated injury of IPV as a function of gender (Chapters 4 - 6). To gain a greater insight into the dynamics of violent relationships, I also examined the psychological correlates associated with suffering IPV. Additionally, I investigated the communication behaviour (Chapter 7), conflict resolution strategies (Chapters 7 & 8), and attitudes towards violence (Chapter 8) in individuals with and without a history of IPV. In this chapter, I discuss the overarching findings, limitations, and recommendations for future research and violence prevention initiatives arising from this study.

Incidence of IPV

IPV occurred frequently within all three of the samples examined. For instance, within the student sample, one in four participants had perpetrated physical IPV at least once within the past year of their relationship (Chapter 4). Moreover, in common with past research, the majority of IPV in the present study was bi-directional (Brush, 1990). Within the incarcerated sample, for example, 76.9% of the participants who reported suffering physical violence also reported perpetrating physical violence (Chapter 5). As expected, the incarcerated sample perpetrated and suffered significantly more IPV and injury than did participants from the non-incarcerated sample (Chapter 5), although the pattern of violence and the actual acts perpetrated and suffered were similar across the three samples (Chapter 6). The incidence of IPV was similar within the student and general sample and did not vary as a function of age or relationship status (Chapter 4).

In accordance with past research, the present findings also revealed that physical and psychological violence frequently co-existed (Follingstad et al., 1990; Hyden, 1995; Magdol et al., 1998; Straus et al., 1996). For instance, within the incarcerated sample 84% of participants reported perpetrating both psychological and physical violence (Chapter 5). Past research has found psychological violence to precede physical violence (Murphy & O'Leary, 1989; Schumacher & Leonard, 2005; Stets, 1990), however, it was not possible to ascertain directionality in the present analyses. Future longitudinal research is required here to draw similar conclusions.

Gender Symmetry in IPV

Of particular interest, the present study provides substantial evidence for gender symmetry in IPV. Male and female IPV was similar in injury (Chapter 5),

incidence, frequency, severity, and was also similarly associated with control (Chapter 6). In fact, in line with a growing body of research, women were found to be even more likely than men to perpetrate IPV (see Archer, 2000 for a review). The analysis of the pattern of IPV perpetrated and suffered by men and women revealed that men were more likely to report being the victim of physical abuse, and that women were more likely to report being the perpetrator of physical abuse (Chapter 6).

One argument that has been offered to explain the higher incidence of female than male-perpetrated IPV is that women may be more inclined than men to disclose their violence because society views female violence less harshly than male violence. Indeed, the present findings supported the notion that individuals are more tolerant of female-perpetrated abuse than male-perpetrated abuse (Chapter 8). However, this association between society's attitudes and females' greater reporting of IPV is only speculative. Furthermore, research examining individuals' expectations regarding using and suffering abuse, which would be less susceptible to reporting bias, has corroborated the findings of the present study. Milardo (1998) found that individuals expected women to be more likely than men to perpetrate IPV and that men would be more likely than women to suffer IPV. Furthermore, men and women's reports of perpetrating and suffering IPV were in line with each other in the present study, suggesting that the higher incidence of female than male-perpetrated IPV is not an artefact of a reporting bias.

To further compare male and female IPV, I examined the type of acts perpetrated and suffered as a function of gender (Chapter 6). Although there was some variation in the types of violence perpetrated, these were largely attributable to strength differences between the sexes, with men being more likely to choke their partner, and women being more likely to kick, push, or throw something at their

partner. Furthermore, as previously mentioned, male and female IPV did not differ in severity (Chapter 6) or associated injury (Chapter 5). Overall, the comparison of the nature of acts perpetrated and suffered as a function of gender revealed more similarities than differences.

Correlates Associated with IPV

A number of correlates were found to be related to the perpetration and victimisation of IPV. The analyses of the student and general sample revealed that individuals with a history of IPV were more hostile towards others, more disparaging of their partner, lacked communication and anger management skills, held traditional gender role beliefs, and were more approving of violence (Chapter 4). The analyses presented in Chapter 8 further elucidated the association between IPV and traditional gender role beliefs, revealing that females who perpetrate IPV may be rebelling against traditional gender roles, whereas males who perpetrate IPV may be trying to enforce traditional gender roles.

Examining correlates within the incarcerated sample (Chapter 5) revealed that hostility to women was an important factor in perpetrating physical and psychological violence and in condoning violence. Victims' self-reported lack of communication skills and implicit attitudes condoning IPV were also associated with suffering psychological violence. Additionally, the analyses presented in Chapter 8 revealed that many of the correlates associated with perpetrating and suffering IPV were also related to attitudes condoning IPV (Chapter 8). In particular, participants who were more condoning of violence were also more hostile towards others, had fewer skills for dealing with conflict, held traditional gendered beliefs, and exercised greater control in their relationship.

Chapter 6 validated these findings by ensuring that individuals who both perpetrated and suffered abuse did not influence similarities found between the attitudes of victims and perpetrators. These analyses confirmed my previous findings that perpetrators and victims have similar attitudes and behaviours that distinguish them from other individuals without a history of IPV. These include being more hostile towards others, employing more controlling behaviours in their intimate relationship, and reporting more communication problems.

Past research has associated males' violence with hostile (Parrott & Zeichner, 2003) and negative attitudes towards women (Jacobson et al., 1996). The present research extended these findings to show negative attitudes towards others and ones' partner to be associated with both male and female victimisation and perpetration of IPV. This hostility was directed towards women in particular, regardless of participant gender. Hostility towards women was also related to attitudes condoning violence (Chapter 5). To recap the argument offered in Chapter 5, this greater hostility towards women might reflect hostility towards others in general. However, it may be more acceptable to direct negative attitudes towards women because they have traditionally been the lesser valued gender.

How does the notion that men and women both use controlling violence fit the typologies of IPV identified by Johnson (1999, 2000)? In light of the present work, I suggest that individuals using mutual violence may employ control tactics similar to those that Johnson associated with intimate terrorism. I speculate, however, that the motivations behind this use of controlling behaviours may differ as a function of the typology of violence (intimate terrorism versus situational violence). The present finding showing a lack of skills to be associated with IPV suggests that controlling behaviours might be employed in the absence of a lack of other resources for

influencing one's partner in a non-violent way. This might be true of all violent controlling relationships. Men perpetrating intimate terrorism may also use control because of their belief that men have the right to dominate and subordinate their partner. Therefore, the distinction between intimate terrorism and situational violence may depend on the motivations behind the use of control rather than the use of control per se. I was unable to examine this hypothesis because very few of the participants in the present study matched Johnson's description of intimate terrorists. Future research would need to include a sample of men selected by their use of violence. If a targeted sample of male perpetrators had been included in the study, it is also possible that they would have been distinguished from the present participants by their greater use of control. Further research is required before drawing any strong conclusions.

Participants' anger management skills and communication behaviour were further examined during the second and third phases of the study. To explore the relationship between a lack of skills and IPV, individuals discussed their strategies for dealing with difficult people, attributions for anger in their relationship, and strategies for dealing with conflict in their relationship (Chapter 8). Analyses revealed that individuals with a history of IPV lacked both relationship-specific and generalised skills for dealing with conflict non-confrontationally. Compared to individuals without a history of IPV, victims and perpetrators were more likely to be confrontational with difficult people, and to direct their anger outwardly towards their partner (Chapter 8).

The examination of communication behaviour reported in Chapter 7 revealed that individuals with a history of IPV used fewer positive linguistic devices during everyday interactions than individuals without a history of IPV (Chapter 7). These findings extend past research that has focused on couples' conflict communication

(e.g., Cordova et al., 1993) to show that these negative interaction patterns may be more stable features, regardless of the emotional content of the conversational topic. Moreover, contrary to the assertions of past research that has speculated that victims' negative style is simply a reaction to that of their spouse, the present study revealed that victims employ a less positive conversational style independently of that of their partner. The analyses presented in Chapter 7 also provided partial support for the notion that individuals who perpetrate IPV are more likely to modify their speech to become more similar to someone employing a negative speech style and less likely to modify their speech to become more similar to a positive speech style. These findings help to explain the negative reciprocity characteristic of violent relationships (Burman et al., 1993).

Addressing Inconsistencies Across Analyses

The relationship between the psychological correlates and IPV was not always consistent across the analyses. For instance, gender role beliefs were associated with IPV within the non-incarcerated sample (Chapter 4), but no association was found in the incarcerated sample (Chapter 5). As discussed in Chapter 5, one reason for the lack of association between gender role beliefs and IPV within the incarcerated sample arises from the finding that regardless of abuse history, individuals within the incarcerated sample held more traditional gendered beliefs than did individuals within the non-incarcerated samples. This lack of variability in attitudes towards gendered beliefs would reduce the predictive power of distinctions based on gendered beliefs.

The relationship between attitudes condoning violence and the actual perpetration and victimisation of IPV was also mixed across analyses. These inconsistencies can be attributed largely to participants guarding their attitudes to be

socially desirable. This is evidenced by the finding that although there was only a weak association between explicit violence approval and the experience of IPV, many of the more indirect or implicit violence approval measures were related to IPV. This was further demonstrated during the interview phase of the study where attitudes condoning violence were associated with IPV. This may be because participants felt safer disclosing their condoning attitudes in a context where they could also justify their attitudes (Chapter 8). The culmination of findings presented in Chapters 4 - 8 clarifies the inconsistencies in past research by suggesting that attitudes condoning violence are related to the perpetration and victimisation of IPV, but that these attitudes may be best measured indirectly or implicitly.

Dynamic Nature of IPV – Similarities between Victims and Perpetrators

The present research indicated that the risk factors associated with IPV were similar for males and females, and victims and perpetrators. These findings provided further evidence for gender symmetry in IPV, because similar processes may drive female and male IPV. Moreover, our understanding of the dynamics of violent relationships has also been enhanced by showing that both spouses, regardless of their victim or perpetrator status, may hold attitudes that actively contribute to the hostility within the relationship, and may ultimately result in the use of violence. In particular, victims and perpetrators were differentiated from individuals without a history of IPV by their similarly negative and hostile attitudes towards others (Chapter 6). They were also more condoning of the use of IPV than were other individuals (Chapter 8). Further, the analysis of individuals' communication (Chapter 7) and conflict management behaviour (Chapter 8) showed that both victims and perpetrators of IPV used fewer positive conversational features than other individuals and were more

likely to direct their anger towards others. Overall, these findings suggest that the behaviour and attitudes of both partners, regardless of their victim or perpetrator status, may be instrumental in the initiation and maintenance of violence.

Limitations

There were a number of limitations of the current study. Firstly, I did not measure the consequences of IPV other than to examine the incidence of injury, as reported in Chapter 5. Past research has argued that the consequences of IPV are more serious for females than males. For instance, females are more likely than males to experience fear as a consequence of the violence (Barnett et al., 1997). Although I believe that these factors are important, I do not think they should be the focus of comparisons between male and female IPV, as they are a consequence of the violence rather than a motivation for the violence.

My reliance on the CTS2 to measure IPV is also not without limitation. Feminist researchers, in particular, have criticised the CTS for failing to consider whether or not the violence was perpetrated in self-defence (e.g., Dobash & Dobash, 2004). Accordingly, I have limited information on who initiated the violence. I caution, however, that it would be extremely difficult to classify acts as being defensive or not, based on individuals' self-reports, because interpretations of what counts as self-defence can vary between individuals. Although I am unable to rule out self-defence conclusively as a motive, the analyses of the pattern of IPV described in Chapter 6 do not support the notion that female IPV is regularly perpetrated out of self-defence. As already mentioned, women were more likely than men to be the perpetrator of one-sided violent relationships. In fact, 13.8% of the women in the

present study reported perpetrating IPV in the absence of physical abuse used against them.

The present study was reliant on participants' self-reports of both their own and their partners' behaviour. It would have been ideal to examine the accounts of couples in the present study; however the collection of data from individuals is in keeping with past research methodologies. Furthermore, past research has found the reliability of individuals' accounts of their partners' behaviour to be satisfactory. For example, Moffitt and Caspi (1999) found that although couples' reports regarding the type of abuse act perpetrated may not always be consistent, couples generally do agree on whether or not violence has actually occurred. Further support for the validity and reliability of participants' self-reports was evidenced by the present finding that both females' and males' accounts of the type and frequency of violence perpetrated and suffered were generally in line with each other.

The cross-sectional design of the present study did not allow for an examination of directionality between the correlates and IPV. Thus, I was not able to determine whether individuals who are hostile towards others are more likely to enter into a relationship with a similarly hostile individual, or whether these hostile attitudes develop as a consequence of dysfunctional relationships. A longitudinal study could shed further light on such questions.

Strengths of the Present Study

The present study addressed a number of limitations in the IPV literature. Firstly, I extended past research by examining whether or not correlates associated with male-perpetrated IPV are also related to female-perpetrated IPV. The dynamics of violent relationships were also explored by comparing the attitudes and behaviours

of victims and perpetrators. Furthermore, I also examined the frequency of IPV to extend past research that has been criticised for relying solely on categorisations based on whether or not individuals had perpetrated one act of violence within the past year. I further extended past research by considering the type of abusive acts perpetrated and suffered. The use of implicit measures also clarified inconsistencies in the literature that have tended to rely solely on explicit measures. For instance, the use of implicit gender role and violence approval measures employed in Chapters 4 and 5 revealed relationships with IPV that were not evident using the explicit measures. Therefore, it may be necessary to employ implicit methods to better measure attitudes that are open to social evaluation.

Conclusions and Implications

The present research suggests that IPV arises out of dysfunctional relationships in which both partners hold negative and hostile attitudes towards others, condone traditional gender role beliefs, blame their partner for their problems, lack relationship and social skills, condone violence, and are more likely to try to control each other. The analyses presented in Chapter 8 also suggest that both male and female perpetrators try to minimise the consequences of their violence. Many of these factors are already targeted within programs designed for male perpetrators. The present findings suggest that these factors might also be relevant for programs designed for female perpetrators, or victims of IPV.

Although the present study supports the inclusion of many correlates already implemented within programs directed towards men, the findings also suggest that a radical change is necessary in how we treat IPV. Firstly, given the bi-directional nature of IPV, and similar frequencies of male and female violence, initiatives need to

be targeted towards both males and females. The present findings strongly question the usefulness and validity of violence prevention initiatives aimed solely at males. Secondly, the similar negative attitudes and lack of skills characteristic of both victims and perpetrators suggests that interventions aimed solely at perpetrators would be insufficient to address the dynamics of violent relationships. Program initiatives need to offer education programs to both partners, either conjointly or independently in situations where there are safety issues. Finally, the analyses presented in Chapter 8 also revealed a complex relationship between skill deficits and attitudes, suggesting that programs need to take a multi-dimensional approach by teaching effective conflict resolution techniques in combination with challenging negative attitudes.

The present findings support a restorative justice approach to IPV described by Mills (2003). Acknowledging the bi-directional nature of IPV, she suggests that we should turn away from the shame or blame based unilateral view of violence and turn towards treatments that include everyone involved in the healing process, as long as both partners are willing and safety issues are considered. Moreover, rather than applying a one size fits all approach, the violence within each relationship should be examined to clarify issues specific to that couple. The approach is aimed at finding out what each couple wants, and helping them to decide on an intervention that best suits them and the dynamics of their relationship.

A Need for Widespread Intervention

Along with a need to rethink how we address IPV, the findings of the present study suggest a need for widespread interventions aimed at addressing conflict management skills and attitudes towards IPV at a community level. For instance, Chapter 8 showed that participants, regardless of whether or not they had a history of

IPV, were more likely to withdraw or became confrontational when faced with a conflict situation than they were to employ positive conflict resolution techniques. Furthermore, interventions need to begin early, preferably in high schools. The findings reported in Chapter 4 showed that skills for dealing with conflict might develop with age and education. Early interventions may be able to reduce the incidence of IPV by educating individuals with the skills for non-violent conflict resolution before they enter into intimate relationships.

Analyses examining attitudes towards gender roles (Chapter 8) also revealed a need for community interventions challenging traditional gender role beliefs. Individuals still held many traditional beliefs concerning the male gender role that could be partially responsible for maintaining males' use of violence. These included associating men with beer drinking, violent sport, and being tough. Moreover, the analyses presented in Chapter 8 also revealed struggles over enforcing and rebelling against traditional gender roles to be implicated in males' and females' use of IPV respectively.

Addressing Attitudes Towards Female Violence

To reduce the incidence of IPV, a cultural shift in how we view female-perpetrated IPV is necessary. In common with the findings of past research (Arias & Johnson, 1989; Carlson, 1999; Harris & Cook, 1994; Sorenson & Taylor, 2005), the present study found female IPV to be viewed less seriously than male violence. In fact, in many instances female IPV was described as justified or humorous. There was also less empathy directed towards male than female victims (Chapter 8). The finding that female IPV is viewed as humorous is very concerning given that female-perpetrated IPV in the present study was as frequent, severe, and as likely to be

associated with negative attitudes, control, and injury as was male violence. Condoning attitudes towards female IPV may also increase prevalence rates of IPV given that there is little to deter females from perpetrating IPV. Moreover, given society's attitudes, male victims may not feel justified in seeking assistance.

The tendency of researchers to attribute female-perpetrated IPV to self-defence in the absence of empirical evidence also hinders attempts to reduce incidence rates. Describing female IPV as self-defensive may protect females' collective self-esteem; however, it also contributes to their continued use of violence. Moreover, because IPV is largely bi-directional, it may also contribute to their suffering of violence. Langhinrichsen-Rohling (2005) postulates that attitudes towards female violence might be partially responsible for the development of bi-directionally violent relationships and for violence used against women. Due to society's attitudes towards female violence, females may perpetrate violence against their partner because they do not see their actions as serious. Her partner might initially view the violence as humorous and inconsequential, again based on societal attitudes. Because of his indifference to her aggression, the female partner's use of violence may continue or even escalate. Over time, her partner may feel that his gender identity is being threatened and he may eventually hit back in an attempt to maintain his masculinity. Furthermore, because of his greater physical size, and frustration at being attacked, his violence might be more severe.

Dismissing female IPV as self-defensive is ultimately denying females the assistance necessary to develop their own personal skills to aid in stopping violence within their relationships. Although it is definitely necessary to acknowledge that female-perpetrated IPV may arise out of self-defence, it is somewhat paradoxical that male-perpetrated IPV is never considered self-defensive especially given the analyses

presented in Chapter 6 finding males to be more likely than females to be the victims of IPV. Due to popular stereotypes, researchers have been more inclined to accept male-perpetrated violence at face value. Female-perpetrated IPV goes against popular belief, consequently we keep trying to dismiss it as self-defensive or to attribute it to a reporting bias. While we fail to acknowledge the existence and severity of female IPV, we fail to address the processes behind violent relationships and ultimately, we will be able to do little to reduce IPV.

My conclusions surrounding the violence in the present study are that within a non-targeted sample IPV is mutual, worryingly frequent, and in need of widespread intervention. I am well aware, however, that there is a more severe but less frequent form of violence that is usually one-sided, perpetrated primarily by men, and until recently has been the main focus of our thoughts surrounding 'domestic violence'. The present suggestions for interventions are only applicable to the type of mutual violence described in the present study. Over the past five years, I have worked as a facilitator for a court ordered men's stopping violence programme based largely on feminist theory. During this time, I have become increasingly aware that one typology does not fit all male perpetrators. Although many of these men have met the expected typology; condoning traditional gender roles and using violence to subordinate, humiliate, and control their partner, this has not been true of all of the men. Even within this sample, I became aware that there were instances in which the violence was mutual. In some cases, these men seemed to be immersed in a mutually volatile, hostile, and suspicious relationship with their partner.

The present study provides a strong foundation for further research examining male and female IPV. Researchers need to put aside preconceived beliefs concerning IPV and begin to look more closely at the dynamics of these violent relationships. I

believe that we are only just beginning to understand some of the processes occurring within intimate relationships. The present study identified a number of attitudes and correlates that both partners bring into the relationship and could ultimately be instrumental in IPV. Future research needs to examine when and how these attitudes develop. Do individuals enter into the relationship with hostile attitudes or do they develop as a function of a dysfunctional relationship characterised by a lack of communication and problem solving skills? More importantly how can we persuade government organisations, and the wider community to cast aside their preconceived beliefs to acknowledge the gender symmetry, bi-directional nature, and similar dysfunctional attitudes of victims and perpetrators so that we can design more informed and effective interventions?

REFERENCES

Aiken, L. S., & West, S. G. (1991). *Multiple regression: testing and interpreting interactions.* Newbury Park, CA. Sage Publications.

Anglin, K., & Holtzworth-Munroe, A. (1997). Comparing the responses of maritally violent and nonviolent spouses to problematic marital and nonmarital situations: Are the skill deficits of physically aggressive husbands and wives global? *Journal of Family Psychology, 11,* 301-313.

Archer, J. (1999). Assessment of the reliability of the conflict tactics scale: A meta-analytic review. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 14,* 1263-1289.

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

Archer, J., & Graham-Kevan, N. (2003). Do beliefs about aggression predict physical aggression to partner. *Aggressive Behavior, 29,* 41-54.

Arias, I., & Johnson, P. (1989). Evaluations of physical aggression among intimate dyads. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 4*, 298-307.

Babcock, J. C., Waltz, J., Jacobson, N. S., & Gottman, J. M. (1993). Power and violence: The relation between communication patterns, power discrepancies, and domestic violence. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 61,* 40-50.

Bandura, A. (1977). *Social learning theory.* Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Pretice-Hall.

Barnett, O.W., Lee, C.Y., & Thelen, R.E. (1997). Gender difference in attributions of self-defense and control in interpartner aggression. *Violence Against Women, 3,* 462-479.

Bennett, L. W., & Williams, O.J. (2001). Intervention programs for men who batter.

In C.M. Renzetti, J.L. Edleson, & F.K. Bergen, (Eds.) *Sourcebook on Violence Against Women*, pp.261-277. London: Sage Publications.

Berns, S.B., Jacobson, N.S., & Gottman, J.M. (1999). Demand-withdraw interaction in couples with a violent husband. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 67,* 666-674.

Bethke, T.M., & DeJoy, D.M. (1993). An experimental study of factors influencing the acceptability of dating violence. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 8,* 36-51.

Bilous, F.R., & Krauss, R.M. (1988). Dominance and accommodation in the conversational behaviors of same and mixed-gender dyads. *Language and Communication, 8,* 183-194.

Bogard, M. (1988). Feminist perspectives on wife abuse: An introduction, in M. Bograd & K. Yllo (Eds.). *Feminist Perspectives on wife abuse.* Beverly Hills: Sage.

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

Boyle, D.J., & Vivian, D. (1996). Generalized versus spouse-specific anger/hostility and men's violence against intimates. *Violence and Victims, 11,* 293-317.

Brush, L.D. (1990). Violent acts and injurious outcomes in married couples: Methodological issues in the National Survey of Families Households. *Gender & Society, 4,* 56-67.

Bryant, A.N. (2003). Changes in attitudes toward women's roles: predicting gender-role traditionalism among college students. *Sex Roles, 48,* 131-142.

Bryant, S.A., & Spencer, G.A. (2003). University students' attitudes about attributing blame in domestic violence. *Journal of Family Violence, 18*, 369-376.

Burke, P.J., Stets, J.E., & Pirog-Good, M.A. (1988). Gender identity, self-esteem, and physical and sexual abuse in dating relationships. *Social Psychology Quarterly, 51,* 272-285.

Burman, B., John, R.S., & Margolin, G. (1992). Observed patterns of conflict in violent, nonviolent, and nondistressed couples. *Behavior Assessment, 14,* 15-37.

Burman, B., Margolin, G., & John, R.S. (1993). America's angriest home videos: Behavioral contingencies observed in home reenactments of marital conflict. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 61*, 28-39.

Busch, A.L., & Rosenberg, M.S. (2004). Comparing women and men arrested for domestic violence: A preliminary report. *Journal of Family Violence, 19*, 49-57.

Carlson, B.E. (1999). Student judgments about dating violence: A factorial vignette analysis. *Research in Higher Education, 40,* 201-220.

Carney, M.M., & Buttell, F.P. (2004). A multidimensional evaluation of a treatment program for female batterers: A pilot study. *Research on Social Work Practice, 14*, 249-258.

Choi, A., & Edleson, J.L. (1996). Social disapproval of wife assaults: a national survey of Singapore. *Journal of Comparative Family Studies, 27,* 73-88.

Chornesky, A. (2000). The dynamics of battering revisited. *Affilia, 15,* 480-501.

Coleman , D. H., & Straus, M. A. (1986). Marital power, conflict, and violence in a nationally representative sample of American couples. *Violence and Victims, 1,* 141-157.

Cordova, J.V., Jacobson, N.S., Gottman, J.M., Rushe, R., & Cox, G. (1993).

Negative reciprocity and communication in couples with a violent husband. *Journal of Abnormal Psychology, 102*, 559-564.

Cowan, G., Neighbors, C., DeLaMoreaux, J, & Behnke, C. (1998). Women's hostility toward women. *Psychology of Women Quarterly, 22*, 267-284.

Crossman, R.K., Stith, S.M., & Bender, M.M. (1990). Sex role egalitarianism and marital violence. *Sex Roles, 22,* 293-304.

Date, A.L., & Ronan, G.F. (2000). An examination of attitudes and behaviors presumed to mediate partner abuse: A rural incarcerated sample. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 15,* 1140-1155.

De Vries Robbè, M., March, L., Vinen, J., Horner, D., & Roberts, G. (1996). Prevalence of domestic violence among patients attending a hospital emergency department. *Australian and New Zealand Journal of Public Health, 20,* 364-368.

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

Dobash, R.E., & Dobash, R.P. (1980). *Violence Against Wives: A Case Against the Patriarchy,* Open Books Publishing Limited, Somerset, England.

Dobash, R.E., & Dobash, R.P. (1992). *Women, Violence and Social Change,* London: Routledge.

Dobash, R.E., & Dobash, R.P. (1999). 'Violent men and violent contexts', in R.E. Dobash and R.P. Dobash (eds) *Rethinking Violence Against Women,* Thousand Oaks: Sage, (pp 141-168).

Dobash, R.E., & Dobash, R.P. (2000). The politics and policies of responding to violence against women, in Hanmer, J., & Itzin, C. (eds) Home Truths about

Domestic Violence: *Feminist Influences on Policy and Practice - a Reader* (pp. 187-205), Routledge, London.

Dobash, R.E., & Dobash, R.P. (2004). Women's violence to men in intimate relationships. *British Journal of Criminology, 44,* 324-349.

Dodge, K.A. (1980). Social cognition and children's aggressive behaviour. *Child Development, 51*, 162-170.

Dutton, D.G. (1994). Patriarchy and wife assault: The ecological fallacy. *Violence and Victims, 9,* 125-140.

Dutton, D.G., & Golant, S.K. (1995). The Batterer: A Psychological Profile. New York, NY: Basic Books, Inc.

Dye, M.L., & Eckhardt, C.I. (2000). Anger, irrational beliefs, and dysfunctional attitudes in violent dating relationships. *Violence and Victims, 15*, 337-350.

Eckhardt, C.I., & Jamison, R.T. (2002). Articulated thoughts of male dating violence perpetrators during anger arousal. *Cognitive Therapy and Research, 26,* 289-308.

Eckhardt, C.I., Barbour, K.A., & Davison, G.C. (1998). Articulated thoughts of maritally violent and non-violent men during anger arousal. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 66*, 259-269.

Ehrensaft, M. K., & Vivian, D. (1999). Is partner aggression related to appraisals of coercive control by a partner? *Journal of Family Violence, 14,* 251-266.

Feldman, C.M., & Ridley, C.A. (2000). The role of conflict-based communication responses and outcomes in male domestic violence toward female partners. *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships, 17,* 552-573.

Field, C.A., & Caetano, R. (2005). Intimate partner violence in the U.S. general population: progress and future directions. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence,*

20, 463-469.

Finn, J. (1986). The relationship between sex role attitudes and attitudes supporting marital violence. *Sex Roles, 14*, 235-243.

Fitzpatrick, M., Mulac, A., & Dindia, K. (1995). Gender-preferential language use in spouse and stranger interaction. *Journal of Language and Social Psychology, 14,* 18-39.

Follingstad, D.R., Rutledge, L.L., Berg, B.J., Hause, E.S., & Polek, D.S. (1990). The role of emotional abuse in physically abusive relationships. *Journal of Family Violence, 5,* 107-120.

Follingstad, D.R., Wright, S., Lloyd, S., & Sebastian, J.A. (1991). Sex differences in motivations and effects in dating violence. *Family Relations, 40,* 51-57.

Foo, L., & Margolin, G. (1995). A multivariate investigation of dating aggression. *Journal of Family Violence, 10,* 351-377.

Foshee, V.A. (1996). Gender differences in adolescent dating prevalence, types and injuries. *Health Education Research, 11,* 275-286.

Giles, H., Coupland, J., & Coupland, N. (1991). Accommodation theory: Communication context, and consequence. In H. Giles, J. Coupland, & N. Coupland (Eds.), *Contexts of accommodation: Developments in applied sociolinguistics* (pp. 1-68). New York: Cambridge University Press.

Gold, S.R., Fultz, J., Burke, C.H., Prisco, A.G., & Willett, J.A. (1992). Vicarious emotional responses of macho college males. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 7,* 165-174.

Good, G.E., Hepper, M.J., Hillenbrand-Gunn, T., & Wang, L. (1995). Sexual and psychological violence: An exploratory study of predictors in college men. *The Journal of Men's Studies, 4,* 59-71.

Graham-Kevan, N., & Archer, J. (2003). Intimate terrorism and common couple violence: A test of Johnson's predictors in four British samples. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 18,* 1247-1270.

Gray, H. M., & Foshee, V. (1997). Adolescent dating violence: differences between one-sided and mutually violent-profiles. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 12,* 126-141.

Greenwald, A. G., Nosek, B .A., & Banaji, M. R. (2003). Understanding and using the Implicit Association Test: 1. An improved scoring algorithm. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 85,* 197-216.

Hamberger, L.K., Lohr, J.M., Bonge, D., & Tolin, D.F. (1997). An empirical classification of motivations for domestic violence. *Violence Against Women, 3,* 401-423.

Hannah, A., & Murachver, T. (1999). Gender and conversational style as predictors of conversational behavior. *Journal of Language and Social Psychology, 18,* 153-174.

Harris, R.J., & Cook, C.A. (1994). Attributions about spouse abuse: It matters who the batterers and victims are. *Sex Roles, 30,* 553-565.

Harway, M. & O'Neil, J.M. (Eds.) (1999). *What causes men's violence against women?* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Henning, K., & Feder, L. (2004). A comparison of men and women arrested for domestic violence: Who presents the greatest threat? *Journal of Family Violence, 19,* 69-80.

Henning, K., Jones, A.R., & Holdford, R. (2005). "I didn't do it, but if I did I had a good reason": Minimization, denial, and attributions of blame among male and female domestic violence offenders. *Journal of Family Violence, 20,* 131-139.

Holtzworth-Munroe, A. (1992). Attributions and maritally violent men: The role of cognitions in marital violence. In J. Harvey, T. L. Orbuch, & A. L. Wever (Eds), *Attributions, accounts, and close relationships* (pp. 165-175). New York: Springer-Verlag.

Holtzworth-Munroe, A. (1992). Social skill deficits in maritally violent men: Interpreting the data using a social information processing model. *Clinical Psychology, Review, 12*, 605-617.

Holtzworth-Munroe, A., & Anglin, K. (1991). The competency of responses given by maritally violent versus nonviolent men to problematic marital situations. *Violence and Victims, 6*, 257-269.

Holtzworth-Munroe, A., & Hutchinson, G. (1993). Attributing negative intent to wife behavior: The attribution of martially violent versus non-violent men. *Journal of Abnormal Psychology, 102*, 206-211.

Holtzworth-Munroe, A., & Jacobson, N.S. (1985). Causal attributions of married couples: When do they search for causes? What do they conclude when they do? *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 48,* 1398-1412.

Holtzworth-Munroe, A., Smutzler, N., & Stuart, G.L. (1998). Demand and withdraw communication among couples experiencing husband violence. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 66,* 731-743.

Hotaling, G.T., & Sugarman, D.B. (1986). An analysis of risk markers in husband to wife violence: The current state of knowledge. *Violence and Victims, 1,* 101-124.

Hughes, J. (2004). Predicting language convergence to gendered language: The influence of individual differences. Unpublished thesis manuscript, University of Otago, Dunedin, New Zealand.

Hyden, M. (1995). Verbal aggression as a prehistory of woman battering. *Journal of Family Violence, 10,* 55-71.

Jacobson, N.S., Gottman, J.M., Waltz, J., Rushe, R., & Babcock, J., & Holtzworth-Munroe, 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, J. (1996). Violence and biology: A review of the literature. *Families in Society, 77,* 3-18.

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. (1999). *Two types of violence against women in the American family: Identifying patriarchal terrorism and common couple violence.* Paper presented at the annual meetings of the National Council on Family Relations, Irvine, CA, November.

Johnson, M.P. (2000). *Conflict and control: gender symmetry and asymmetry in domestic violence.* Revision of a paper prepared for the National Institute of Justice Gender Symmetry Workshop, Arlington, Virginia. Available at http://www.personal.psy.edu/faculty/m/p/mpj/02VAW.html.

Kane, T. A., Staiger, P. K., & Ricciardelli, L. A. (2000). Male domestic violence: attitudes, aggression, and interpersonal dependency. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 15,* 16-29.

Katz, J., Kuffel, S.W., & Coblentz, A. (2002). Are there gender differences in sustaining dating violence? An examination of frequency, severity, and relationship satisfaction. *Journal of Family Violence, 17,* 247-271.

Kaura, S.A., & Allen, C.M. (2004). Dissatisfaction with relationship power and dating violence perpetration by men and women. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 19,* 576-588.

Kim, J., & Emery, C. (2003). Marital power, conflict, norm consensus, and marital violence in a nationally representative sample of Korean couples. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 18,* 197-219.

Koski, P.R., & Mangold, W.D. (1988). Gender effects in attitudes about family violence. *Journal of Family Violence, 3,* 225-237.

Langhinrichsen-Rohling, J. (2005). Top 10 greatest 'hits': Important findings and future directions for intimate partner violence research. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 20,* 108-118.

Langhinrichsen-Rohling, J., Shlien-Dellinger, R.K., Huss, M.T., & Kramer, V.L. (2004). Attributions about perpetrators and victims of interpersonal abuse: Results from an analogue study. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 19,* 484-498.

Maccoby, E.E. (1990). Gender and relationships: A developmental account. *American Psychologist, 45,* 513-520.

Magdol, L., Moffitt, T. E., Caspi, A., Fagan, J., Newman, D. L., & Silva, P. A. (1997). Gender differences in partner violence in a birth cohort of 21-year-olds: bridging the gap between clinical and epidemiological approaches. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 65,* 68-78.

Magdol, L., Moffitt, T.E., Caspi, A., & Silva, P.A. (1998). Developmental antecedents of partner abuse: A prospective-longitudinal study. *Journal of Abnormal Psychology, 107,* 375-389.

Maltz, D.N., & Borker, R.A. (1982). A cultural approach to male-female miscommunication. In J.A. Gumperz (Ed.), *Language and social identity* (pp. 195-216). New York: Cambridge University Press.

Margolin, G., John, R. S., & Foo, L. (1998). Interactive and unique risk factors for husbands' emotional and physical abuse of their wives. *Journal of Family Violence, 13*, 315-344.

Mauricio, A.M., & Gormley, B. (2001). Male perpetration of physical violence against female partners: The interaction of dominance needs and attachment insecurity. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 16,* 1066-1081.

McFarlane, J., Willson, P., Malecha, A., & Lemmey, D. (2000). Intimate partner violence: A gender comparison. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 15,* 158-169.

Melton, H.C., & Belknap, J. (2003). He hits, she hits. Assessing gender differences and similarities in officially reported intimate partner violence. *Criminal Justice and Behavior, 30,* 328-348.

Milardo, R.M. (1998). Gender asymmetry in common couple violence. *Personal Relationships, 5,* 423-438.

Mills, L.G. (2003). *Insult to injury: Rethinking our responses to intimate abuse.* Princeton University Press, Princeton, New Jersey.

Ministry of Health (2002). *Family Violence Intervention Guidelines: Child and Partner Abuse*. Wellington, New Zealand.

Moffitt, T.E., & Caspi, A. (1999). Findings about partner violence from the Dunedin multidisciplinary health and development study. National Institute of Justice: Research in Brief. [Available Online] http://www.ojp.usdoj.gov/nij

Mulac, A., & Lundell, T.L. (1986). Linguistic contributors to the gender-linked language effect. *Journal of Language and Social Psychology, 5,* 81-101.

Mulac, A., Wiemann, J.M., Widenmann, S.J., & Gibson, T.W. (1988). Male/female language differences and effects in same-sex and mixed-sex dyads: The gender-linked language effect. *Communication Monographs, 55,* 315-335.

Murphy, C.M., & O'Farrell, T.J. (1997). Couple communication patterns of maritally aggressive and non-aggressive male alcoholics. *Journal of Studies on Alcohol, 58,* (1), 83-90.

Murphy, C.M., & O'Leary, K. D. (1989). Psychological aggression predicts physical aggression in early marriage. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 57,* 579-582.

Nayak, M.B., Byrne, C.A., Martin, M.K., & Abraham, A.G. (2003). Attitudes towards violence against women: A cross-national study. *Sex Roles, 49,* 333-342.

Nazroo, J. (1995). Uncovering gender differences in the use of marital violence: The effect of methodology. *Sociology, 29,* 475-494.

Norlander, B., & Eckhardt, C. (2005). Anger, hostility, and male perpetrators of intimate partner violence: A meta-analytic review. *Clinical Psychology Review, 25,* 119-152.

O'Hearn, H.G., & Margolin, G. (2000). Men's attitudes condoning marital aggression: A moderator between family of origin abuse and aggression against female partners. *Cognitive Therapy and Research, 24,* 159-174.

O'Leary, K.D. (1988). Physical aggression between spouses: A social learning theory perspective. In Van Hasselt, V.B., Morrison, R.L., Bellack, A.S., & Hersen, M. (eds.), *Handbook of Family Violence*, Plenum Press, new York, pp

31-55.

O'Leary, K.D. (1999). Psychological abuse: A variable deserving critical attention in domestic violence. *Violence and Victims, 14,* 1-21.

O'Leary, K.D., Barling, J., Arias, I., Rosenbaum, A., Malone, J., & Tyree, A. (1989). Prevalence and stability of physical aggression between spouses: A longitudinal analysis. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 57,* 263-268.

Olson, L.N. (2002). Exploring "common couple violence" in heterosexual romantic relationships. *Western Journal of Communication, 66,* 104-128.

Pagelow, M.D. (1992). Adult victims of domestic violence: Battered women. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 7,* 87-120.

Parrott, D.J., & Zeichner, A. (2003). Effects of trait anger and negative attitudes towards women on physical assault in dating relationships. *Journal of Family Violence, 18*, 301-307.

Pedersen, P., & Thomas, C.D. (1992). Prevalence and correlates of dating violence in a Canadian university sample. *Canadian Journal of Behavioural Science, 24,* 490-501.

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

Penn, C.E. (2002). An exploratory study of female partner aggression: The role of relationship dynamics. Unpublished Master's Thesis. Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University.

Pennebaker, J.W., & Francis, M.E. (1999). *Linguistic Inquiry and Word Count: LIWC*. Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.

Pryke, J., & Thomas, M. (1998). *Domestic violence and social work*. Bookcraft (Bath) Ltd, Great Britain.

Reitzel-Jaffe, D., & Wolfe, D. A. (2001). Predictors of relationship abuse among young men. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, *16*, 99-115.

Ridley, C.A., & Feldman, C.M. (2003). Female domestic violence toward male partners: Exploring conflict responses and outcomes. *Journal of Family Violence, 18*, 157-170.

Robertson, K., & Murachver, T. (2003). Children's speech accommodation to gendered language styles. *Journal of Language and Social Psychology, 22,* 321-334.

Ronan, G.F., Dreer, L.E., Dollard, K.M., & Ronan, D.W. (2004). Violent couples: coping and communication skills. *Journal of Family Violence, 19,* 131-137.

Ronfeldt, H. M., Kimerling, R., & Arias, I. (1998). Satisfaction with relationship power and the perpetration of dating violence. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, *60,* 70-78.

Rudman, L. A., Greenwald, A. G., & McGhee, D. E. (2001). Implicit self-concept and evaluative implicit gender stereotypes: self and in-group share desirable traits. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 27,* 1164-1178.

Russell, R. J. H., & Hulson, B. (1992). Physical and psychological abuse of heterosexual partners. *Personality and Individual Differences, 13,* 457-473.

Sagrestano, L.M., Heavey, C.L., & Christensen, A. (1999). Perceived power and physical violence in marital conflict. *Journal of Social Issues, 55,* 65-79.

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', in Yllo, K. and Bogard, M. (eds) *Feminist Perspectives on Wife Abuse*, California: Sage.

Saunders, D.G. (2002). Are physical assaults by wives and girlfriends a major social

problem? A review of the literature. *Violence Against Women, 8*, 1424-1448.

Saunders, D.G., & Browne, A. (2000). Intimate partner homicide. In R.T. Ammerman & M. Hersen (Eds.), *Case studies in family violence* (2nd ed., pp. 415-449). New York: Plenum.

Schumacher, J.A., Feldbau-Kohn, S., Slep, A.M.S., & Heyman, R.E. (2001). Risk factors for male-to-female partner physical abuse. *Aggression and Violent Behavior, 6*, 281-352.

Schumacher, J.A., & Leonard, K.E. (2005). Husbands' and Wives' marital adjustment, verbal aggression, and physical aggression as longitudinal predictors of physical aggression in early marriage. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 73*, 28-37.

Schweinle, W.E., Ickes, W., & Bernstein, I.H. (2002). Empathic inaccuracy in husband to wife aggression: The overattribution bias. *Personal Relationship, 9*, 141-158.

Skuja, K., & Halford, W.K. (2004). Repeating the errors of our parents? Parental violence in men's family of origin and conflict management in dating couples. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 19*, 623-638.

Smith, M.D. (1990). Patriarchal ideology and wife beating: A test of a feminist hypothesis. *Violence and Victims, 5*, 257-273.

Smith, M.D. (1991). Male peer support of wife abuse: An exploratory study. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 6*, 512-519.

Sorenson, S.B., & Taylor, C.A. (2005). Female aggression toward male intimate partners: An examination of social norms in a community-based sample. *Psychology of Women Quarterly, 29*, 78-96.

Stets, J.E. (1990). Verbal and physical aggression in marriage. *Journal of Marriage and the Family, 52,* 501-514.

Stets, M.A., & Straus, M.A. (1990). Gender differences in reporting marital violence and its medical and psychological consequences. In Straus, M.A., & Gelles, R.J., (Eds.), *Physical violence in American families: risk factors and adaptations to violence in 8, 145 families.* New Brunswick, NJ: Transcation Publishers, pp155-165.

Stith, S. M., & Farley, S. C. (1993). A predictive model of male spousal violence. *Journal of Family Violence, 8,* 183-201.

Stith, S.M., Smith, D.B., Penn, C.E., Ward, D.B., & Tritt, D. (2004). Intimate partner physical abuse perpetration and victimization risk factors: A meta-analytic review. *Aggression and Violent Behavior, 10,* 65-98.

Straus, M. A. (1990). The conflict tactics scale and it's critics. An evaluation and new data on validity and reliability. In M.A. Straus & R.J. Gelles, *Physical Violence in American families: Risk factors and adaptations to violence in 8, 145 families* (pp 49-73). New Brunswick NJ: Transaction Publishing.

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

Straus, M. A. (1999). The controversy over domestic violence by women: A methodological, theoretical, and sociology of science analysis. In X. Arriaga & S. Oskamp (Eds.), *Violence in Intimate Relationships* (p.17-44). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Straus, M. A. (2004a). Prevalence of violence against dating partners by male and female university students worldwide. *Violence Against Women, 10,* 790-811.

Straus, M. A. (2004b). *Cross cultural reliability and validity of the revised conflict tactics scale*. Paper presented at the XVI World Meeting of ISRA, Santorini, Greece.

Straus, M. A. (2005). Women's violence toward men is a serious social problem. In D.R. Loseke, R.J. Gelles & M.M. Cavanaugh (Eds.), *Current controversies on family violence, 2nd Edition* (pp. 55-77). Newbury Park: Sage Publications.

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). *Physical violence in American families: Risk factors and adaptations to violence in 8, 145 families.* New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction.

Straus, M. A., & Hamby, S. L. (1999). *The personal and relationships profile (PRP). Form P4 copyright 1999.* [Available Online] http://pubpages.unh.edu/~mas2/PR10N.pdf

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.

Straus, M. A., & Mouradian, V. E. (1999). *Preliminary psychometric data for the personal and relationships profile (PRP): A multi-scale tool for clinical screening and research of partner violence.* [Available Online] http://pubpages.unh.edu/~mas2/prp.htm.

Straus, M. A., & Yodanis, C. L. (1996, August). *Gender hostility and violence against dating partners.* Paper presented at the XII World Meeting of the International Society For Research on Aggression, Strasbourg, France.

Sugarman, D.B., & Hotaling, G.T. (1989). Violent men in intimate relationships: An analysis of risk markers. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology, 19,* 1034-1048.

Tannen, D. (1990). *You just don't understand:* Women and men in conversation. New York: William Morrow.

Thomson, R., Murachver, T., & Green, J. (2001). Where is the gender in gendered language? *Psychological Science, 12,* 71-75.

Tolman, R.M. (1989). The development of a measure of psychological maltreatment of women by their male partner. *Violence and Victims, 4,* 159-177.

Tonizzo, S., Howells, K., Day, A., Reidpath, D., & Froyland, I. (2000). Attributions of negative partner behaviour by men who physically abuse their partner. *Journal of Family Violence, 15,* 155-167.

Truman, D.M., Tokar, D.M., & Fischer, A.R. (1996). Dimensions of masculinity: relations to date rape supportive attitudes and sexual aggression in dating situations. *Journal of Counselling and Development, 74,* 555-562.

Vaillancourt, T., & Leaper, C. (1997). *Pacific Attitudes Toward Gender Scale.* [Available Online] http://people.ucsc.edu/~cam/research/patg.html.

Walker, L.E. (1979). *The battered woman.* New York: Harper Row.

Wolf, K.A., & Foshee, V.A. (2003). Family violence, anger expression styles, and adolescent dating violence. *Journal of Family Violence, 18,* 309-316.

Yick, A.G. (2000). Predictors of physical spousal / intimate violence in Chinese American Families. *Journal of Family Violence, 15*, (3), 249-267.

Yllo, K.A. (1993). Through a feminist lens: Gender power, and violence. In R.J., Gelles, & D.R. Loseke (eds.), *Current Controversies on Family Violence* (pp. 47-62). Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications.

Yoshioka, M. R., DiNoia, J., & Ullah, K. (2001). Attitudes towards marital violence: an examination of four Asian communities. *Violence Against Women, 7*, 900-926.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A

Information Sheet for General Participants

Beliefs about Men and Women, Attitudes Towards Violence, and Communication Behaviour

Information Sheet For Participants

Thank you for showing an interest in this project. Please read this information sheet carefully before deciding whether or not to participate. If you decide to participate we thank you. If you decide not to take part there will be no disadvantage to you of any kind and we thank you for considering our request.

What is the Aim of the Project?
The aim of this project is to investigate beliefs about men and women, communication behaviour and attitudes towards and experiences of partner violence. This project is part of the requirements for a Doctorate in psychology.

What Type of Participants are being sought?
(a) Men and women from the general population are being invited to participate in this study.

• Participants must be able to read English and over 18 years of age.

What will Participants be asked to do?
Should you agree to take part in this project, you will be asked to participate on two separate occasions. At the first session, you will be invited to complete a series of anonymous questionnaires presented on a computer. The questionnaires will be looking at your attitudes towards domestic violence, history of violence, and your beliefs about men and women. This part of the study will last approximately one hour. During the second session, you will be asked to take part in two short conversations, one with a male researcher and the other with a female researcher. The conversation topics include recreational activities, winning lotto, favourite foods, favourite films, and favourite music, differences between men and women, and getting along with difficult people. On completion of the discussion, you will be asked to take part in an interview looking at your attitudes towards violence and attributions for and responses to anger in your relationship. This part of the study will be video- and audio-taped and will last approximately one hour. Please be aware that you may decide not to take part in the project without any disadvantage to yourself of any kind.

Can Participants Change their Mind and Withdraw from the Project?
You may withdraw from participation in the project at any time and without any disadvantage to yourself of any kind.

What Data or Information will be Collected and What Use will be Made of it?
Each session will be recorded and viewed only by the researchers involved in this study. Participants will be anonymous and identified by an arbitrary code. Results of this project may be published but any data included will in no way be linked to any specific participant. You are most welcome to request a detailed copy of the results of the project should you wish. The data collected will be securely stored and at the end of the project any personal information will be destroyed immediately except that, as required by the University's research policy. This policy states that any raw data on which the results of the project depend will be retained in secure storage for five years, after which it will be destroyed.

What if Participants have any Questions?
If you have any questions about our project, either now or in the future, please feel free to contact either:-

Kirsten Robertson   or   Dr Tamar Murachver

Department of Psychology   Department of Psychology

University Telephone Number:- 4795883   University Telephone Number:- 4798531

This project has been reviewed and approved by the Ethics Committee
of the University of Otago

UNIVERSITY
of
OTAGO

Te Whare Wānanga o Otāgo

APPENDIX B

Questionnaires

Part 1

Subscales from the Personal Relationships Profile
(Straus & Hamby, 1999)

Instructions
The following statements are about your beliefs about others, relationships, and violence. For each of the following statements, you will be asked to select the option that best reflects your opinion.

Please Note: For questions about your partner in a relationship:
If you are currently in a relationship that has lasted one month or more, answer about that relationship.

If you are not now in a relationship, answer about what went on during the most recent relationship that lasted one month or more.

Ratings: Strongly Disagree
              Disagree
              Agree
              Strongly Agree

1. My partner doesn't have enough sense to make important decisions
2. People usually like my partner
3. I can calm myself down when I am upset with my partner
4. Before I let myself get really mad at my partner, I think about what will happen if I lose my temper
5. A woman who has been raped probably asked for it
6. Men are more dishonest than women
7. My partner is basically a good person
8. I can't bring myself to say nice things to my partner even when I'm thinking them
9. I often feel resentful of women
10. I can feel my blood pressure rising when I start to get mad at my partner
11. I make excuses when I've said something to my partner that I shouldn't have
12. Men treat women badly
13. A boy who is hit by another boy should hit back
14. My partner does things just to annoy me
15. Men irritate me a lot
16. Men respect women
17. Women treat men badly
18. Once sex gets past a certain point, a man can't stop himself until he is satisfied

19. I don't tell my partner when I disagree about important things
20. I have a right to know everything my partner does
21. I can usually tell when I am about to lose my temper at my partner
22. I can think of a situation when I would approve of a wife slapping a husband's face
23. If a wife refuses to have sex, there are times when it may be okay to make her do it
24. When a boy is growing up, it's important for him to have a few fist fights
25. There is nothing I can do to control my feelings when my partner hassles me
26. I can think of a situation when I would approve of a husband slapping a wife's face
27. I am easily frustrated by women
28. My partner likes to make me mad
29. I recognise when I am beginning to get angry at my partner
30. My partner needs to remember that I am in charge
31. When my partner says something mean, I usually say something mean back
32. It is usually my partner's fault when I get mad
33. I generally have the final say when my partner and I disagree
34. Women irritate me a lot
35. I can set up a time out break during an argument with my partner
36. Men are rude
37. A man should not walk away from a physical fight with another man
38. When I feel myself getting angry at my partner, I try to tell myself to calm down
39. It is sometimes necessary for parents to slap a teen who talks back or is getting into trouble
40. I have a right to be involved with anything my partner does
41. When I don't understand what my partner means I ask for more explanation
42. When my partner and I have problems, I blame them
43. Women are rude
44. When my partner is nice to me I wonder what my partner wants
45. When my partner wants to talk about our problems, I try to avoid talking about them
46. I insist on knowing where my partner is at all times
47. When I'm mad at my partner, I say what I think without thinking about the consequences
48. I say mean things to my partner, but then tell him or her "I'm only kidding"
49. It is sometimes necessary to discipline a child with a good, hard spanking
50. Sometimes I have to remind my partner of who is boss

Part 2

The Revised Attitudes Toward Wife Abuse Scale
(Yoshioka, DiNoia, & Ullah, 2000)

Instructions
People have different opinions about violence towards women. For each of the
following statements, you will be asked to select the option that best reflects your
opinion.

Ratings: Strongly Disagree
Mostly Disagree
Slightly Disagree
Slightly Agree
Mostly Agree
Strongly Agree

1. A woman should move out of the house if her partner hits her
2. A man is never justified in hitting his partner
3. A man should have the right to discipline his partner
4. A man is the ruler of the home
5. A man should be arrested if he hits his partner
6. A man is entitled to sex with his partner whenever he wants it
7. Wife beating is grounds for divorce
8. Some women seem to ask for beatings from their partners
9. Women could avoid being battered by their husbands if they knew when to stop
   talking

Part 3

Instructions
Now we would like to know under what circumstances you believe a man would be
justified in hitting his partner. Enter the option that best fits how you feel.

Ratings: Strongly Disagree
Mostly Disagree
Slightly Disagree
Slightly Agree
Mostly Agree
Strongly Agree

1. If their partner had sex with another man
2. If their partner refused to cook and keep the house clean
3. If their partner constantly refused to have sex with them
4. If their partner made fun of them at a party
5. If their partner told friends that they were sexually pathetic
6. If their partner nags them too much

Part 4

The Pacific Attitudes Towards Gender Scale,
(Vaillancourt, & Leaper, 1997)

Instructions
People have different opinions about desirable roles for girls and boys and for women and men. For each of the following statements, you will be asked to select the option that best reflects your opinion.

> Ratings: Strongly Disagree
> Mostly Disagree
> Slightly Disagree
> Slightly Agree
> Mostly Agree
> Strongly Agree

1. I believe it is better for a daycare or a preschool teacher to be a woman than to be a man
2. I believe the husband should have primary responsibility for the financial support of the family
3. I believe using obscene language is worse for a girl than for a boy
4. I believe women are too easily offended by certain jokes.
5. I believe feminists are making entirely reasonable demands of men
6. I believe only men should be allowed to engage in military combat
7. I believe a man should be expected to pay the expenses on a date with a woman
8. I believe sexual harassment is a serious problem in the workplace
9. I believe it should be equally acceptable for girls and boys to play rough sports like soccer or rugby
10. I believe it is all right for a woman to take the first steps to start a relationship with a man
11. I believe a woman employed outside of the home can establish as warm and secure a relationship with her children as a mother who is not employed outside the home
12. I believe discrimination against women in the labour force is no longer a problem
13. I believe it should be equally acceptable for a man or a woman to stay home and care for the children while the other spouse works
14. I believe feminists exaggerate problems faced by women in today's society
15. I believe it should be equally acceptable for women and men to have sex with casual acquaintances
16. I believe it is wrong for boys to play with dolls
17. I believe a woman should be careful not to appear smarter than the man she is dating
18. I believe there are certain jobs that are inappropriate for women
19. I believe girls should have greater limits placed on them than boys when they go out of the house
20. I believe that many women in the paid workforce are taking jobs away from men who need the jobs more

21. I believe that when men show special courtesies only to women (like holding open the door), it reinforces the stereotype that women are helpless
22. I believe it is more difficult to work for a woman than a man
23. I believe men and women should be able to make choices about their lives without being restricted by their gender
24. I believe women should be more concerned with clothing and appearance than men
25. I believe it should be equally acceptable for men and women to cry in front of other people
26. I believe when both parents are employed and their child gets sick at school, the school should call the mother first rather than the father
27. I believe it should be equally acceptable for a woman to go to a bar alone as it is for a man
28. I believe society has reached a point where women and men have equal opportunity for achievement

Part 5

The Revised Conflict Tactics Scale
(Straus, Hamby, Boney-McCoy, & Sugarman, 1996)

Instructions
No matter how well a couple gets along, there are times when they disagree. Couples have many different ways of trying to settle their differences. The following is a list of things that might happen when you have differences. Please indicate how many times in the past year you and your partner have experienced each of the following.

Please Note:
- If you are currently in a relationship that has lasted one month or more, answer about that relationship.
- If you are not in a relationship now, answer these questions about the last relationship that you were in that lasted more than one month.
- If the relationship lasted for more than one year, please only answer about the last year of the relationship.

Ratings: This has never happened before
            Not in the past year, but it has happened
            Once in the past year
            2-5 times in the past year
            6-10 times in the past year
            11-20 times in the past year
            More than 20 times in the past year

1. I showed my partner I cared even though we disagreed
2. My partner showed care for me even though we disagreed
3. I explained my side of a disagreement to my partner
4. My partner explained his or her side of a disagreement to me

5. I insulted or swore at my partner
6. My partner insulted or swore at me
7. I threw something at my partner that could hurt
8. My partner threw something that could hurt at me
9. I twisted my partner's arm or hair
10. My partner twisted my arm or hair
11. I had a sprain, bruise, or small cut because of a fight with my partner
12. My partner had a sprain, bruise, or small cut because of a fight with me
13. I showed respect for my partner's feelings about an issue
14. My partner showed respect for my feelings about an issue
15. I pushed or shoved my partner
16. My partner pushed or shoved me
17. I used a knife or gun on my partner
18. My partner used a knife or gun on me
19. I passed out from being hit on the head by my partner in a fight
20. My partner passed out from a hit on the head in a fight with me
21. I called my partner fat or ugly
22. My partner called me fat or ugly
23. I punched or hit my partner with something that could hurt
24. My partner punched or hit me with something that could hurt
25. I destroyed something belonging to my partner
26. My partner destroyed something belonging to me
27. I went to a doctor because of a fight with my partner
28. My partner went to a doctor because of a fight with me
29. I choked my partner
30. My partner choked me
31. I shouted or yelled at my partner
32. My partner shouted or yelled at me
33. I slammed my partner against a wall
34. My partner slammed me against a wall
35. I said I was sure we could work out a problem
36. My partner was sure we could work out a problem
37. I needed to see a doctor because of a fight with my partner, but I didn't
38. My partner needed to see a doctor because of a fight with me, but didn't
39. I beat up my partner
40. My partner beat me up
41. I grabbed my partner
42. My partner grabbed me
43. I stomped out of the room or house or yard during a disagreement
44. My partner stomped out of the room or house or yard during a disagreement
45. I slapped my partner
46. My partner slapped me
47. I had a broken bone from a fight with my partner
48. My partner had a broken bone from a fight with me
49. I suggested a compromise to a disagreement
50. My partner suggested a compromise to a disagreement
51. I burned or scalded my partner on purpose
52. My partner burned or scalded me on purpose
53. I accused my partner of being a lousy lover
54. My partner accused me of being a lousy lover

55. I did something to spite my partner
56. My partner did something to spite me
57. I threatened to hit or throw something at my partner
58. My partner threatened to hit or throw something at me
59. I felt physical pain that still hurt the next day because of a fight with my partner
60. My partner still felt physical pain the next day because of a fight with me
61. I kicked my partner
62. My partner kicked me
63. I agreed to try a solution to a disagreement my partner suggested
64. My partner agreed to try a solution I suggested

Part 6

A modified version of the Psychological Maltreatment of Women Inventory
(Tolman, 1995)

Instructions
This questionnaire asks about actions you may have taken or experienced in your personal relationships. Please select the option corresponding to how many times in the past year you and your partner experienced each of the following.

Please Note:
- If you are currently in a relationship that has lasted one month or more, answer about that relationship.
- If you are not in a relationship now, answer these questions about the last relationship that you were in that lasted more than one month.
- If the relationship lasted for more than one year, please answer about the last year of the relationship.

Ratings: This has never happened before
Not in the past year, but it has happened
Once in the past year
2-10 times in the past year
11-20 times in the past year
More than 20 times in the past year
Not Applicable

1. I put down my partner's physical appearance
2. My partner put down my physical appearance
3. I insulted or shamed my partner in front of others
4. My partner insulted or shamed me in front of others
5. I treated my partner like thy were stupid
6. My partner treated me like I was stupid
7. I told my partner that they couldn't manage or take care of themselves without me
8. My partner told me that I couldn't manage or take care of myself without them
9. I treated my partner like an inferior
10. My partner treated me like an inferior

11. I ordered my partner around
12. My partner ordered me around
13. I monitored my partners' time and made them account for their whereabouts
14. My partner monitored my time and made me account for my whereabouts
15. I was jealous or suspicious of my partners' friends
16. My partner was jealous or suspicious of my friends
17. I was jealous of my partner being around others of the opposite gender
18. My partner was jealous of me being around other people of the opposite gender
19. I did not want my partner to go to school or other self improvement activities
20. My partner didn't want me to go to school or other self improvement activities
21. I did not want my partner to socialise with their friends
22. My partner did not want me to socialise with my friends
23. I accused my partner of having an affair with somebody
24. My partner accused me of having an affair with somebody
25. I interfered in my partners' relationship with other family members
26. My partner interfered in my relationships with other family members
27. I tried to keep my partner from doing things to help themselves
28. My partner tried to keep me from doing things to help myself
29. I restricted my partners' use of the car
30. My partner restricted my use of the car
31. I restricted my partners' use of the telephone
32. My partner restricted my use of the telephone
33. I did not allow my partner to leave the house
34. My partner did not allow me to leave the house
35. I did not allow my partner to work
36. My partner did not allow me to work
37. I told my partner their feelings were crazy or irrational
38. My partner told me my feelings were crazy or irrational
39. I tried to turn my partners' family against them
40. My partner tried to turn my family against me
41. I tried to convince my partner that they were crazy
42. My partner tried to convince me I was crazy
43. I threatened to hurt myself if my partner left
44. My partner threatened to hurt myself if I left
45. I threatened to hurt myself if my partner didn't do what I wanted them to do
46. My partner threatened to hurt themselves if I didn't do what they wanted me to do
47. I threatened to have an affair
48. My partner threatened to have an affair
49. I threatened to leave the relationship
50. My partner threatened to leave the relationship
51. I threatened to take the children away from my partner
52. My partner threatened to take the children away from me
53. I threatened to commit my partner to an institution
54. My partner threatened to commit me to an institution

APPENDIX C

Interview Questions

Instructions

People have different opinions about violence. I am going to ask a number of questions to find out your opinions of different sorts of violence

1. What do you think of violence on the rugby field?
2. Why do you think it occurs?
3. What about violence in a pub, why do you think that occurs?
4. How do you feel about a man being violent towards his partner in the home?
5. What about a woman being violent towards her partner in the home, how do you feel about that?
6. In what situation do you think that a man would use violence in the home?
7. In what situation do you think woman would use violence in the home?
8. Do you think a woman ever deserves to be hit?
9. What about a man, do they ever deserve to be hit?
10. Is there a difference between violence in a pub and violence at home?
11. Do you think violence towards ones partner is controllable or a reaction?
12. What do you think the effects of violence are on the person using the violence, the victim and the couple?
13. Do you think there is very much violence in New Zealand homes?
14. According to our society what do you think the qualities or characteristics of a typical man and a typical woman are?
15. Do you agree with societies expectations?
16. Do you think being tough is part of what it is to be a man in New Zealand society?
17. Do you think domestic violence has anything to do with power differences between the sexes?
18. Do you think men and women should have equal power in a relationship?
19. Why do you think that most men and women don't use violence in the home?
20. What do you think is different about those people who do use violence in the home and those people that don't?
21. Everybody gets angry with their partner sometimes. What makes you angry at your partner or in your relationship? Or if you are no longer in a relationship what was it that made you angry in your relationship?
22. What do you do when you get angry?

APPENDIX D

Lists of Words used in the Implicit Association Tasks

Affective Gendered Attitudes

Attribute Category		Subject Category	
Pleasant	**Unpleasant**	**Male**	**Female**
Happy	Corpse	Man	Women
Laughter	Death	Boy	Girl
Sunshine	Stink	Son	Daughter
Smile	Filth	Brother	Sister
Paradise	Vomit	Male	Female

Implicit Attitudes Towards Violence

Attribute Category		Subject Category	
Good	**Bad**	**Violence**	**Non-violence**
Great	Bad	Threaten	Hug
Fantastic	Horrible	Push	Embrace
Pleasant	Awful	Choke	Soothe
Good	Disgusting	Kick	Comfort
Wonderful	Terrible	Hit	Support

Evaluative Attitudes Towards Men and Women

Attribute Category		Subject Category	
Positive	**Negative**	**Male**	**Female**
Smart	Stupid	Man	Women
Loved	Useless	Boy	Girl
Competent	Vile	Son	Daughter
Worthy	Hated	Brother	Sister
Honest	Awful	Male	Female

Gender Role Beliefs

Attribute Category		Subject Category	
Work	**Home**	**Male**	**Female**
Career	Domestic	Man	Women
Job	Cooking	Boy	Girl
Salary	Home	Son	Daughter
Work	Child care	Brother	Sister
Occupation	Family	Male	Female

Gender Trait Beliefs

Attribute Category		Subject Category	
Dominate	**Submit**	**Male**	**Female**
Dominate	Submissive	Man	Women
Superior	Obey	Boy	Girl
Rule	Inferior	Son	Daughter
Power	Yield	Brother	Sister
Control	Surrender	Male	Female