DISCREPANCIES IN INTIMATE VIOLENCE REPORTING FOR MEN AND WOMEN'S VIOLENCE: A META-ANALYSIS

James Leslie Herbert
Bachelor of Arts (Psychology)

This thesis is presented in fulfilment of the requirements for the degree of Master of Criminal Justice

Faculty of Business and Law
Edith Cowan University

December, 2006

EDITH COWAN UNIVERSITY

USE OF THESIS

This copy is the property of Edith Cowan University. However the literary rights of the author must also be respected. If any passage from this thesis is quoted or closely paraphrased in a paper or written work prepared by the user, the source of the passage must be acknowledged in the work. If the user desires to publish a paper or written work containing passages copied or closely paraphrased from this thesis, which passages would in total constitute an infringing copy for the purposes of the Copyright Act, he or she must first obtain the written permission of the author to do so.

ABSTRACT

The report of intimate violence is often taken on face value in research. With no gold standard existing, one partner's report is often an accepted measure of violence in the relationship. This discrepancy in reporting between intimate partners has been thoroughly examined, yet researchers still debate the reliability of single partner reporting. The current study extends upon the Archer (1999) meta-analysis of intimate violence discrepancy reporting, and includes current studies, instruments and research methods in the analysis. This study examines the discrepancy effect among thirty-four samples from studies of heterosexual intimate violence, finding that the discrepancy in general was sizeable for men's violence, and that different study conditions yield differing levels of discrepancy. This discrepancy level is a major issue when conducting quantitative research, especially typological studies, which utilise estimation and extrapolation of prevalence levels, and when violence data is used to evaluate recidivism. The current study identifies situations where the discrepancy is likely to be high and makes recommendations to improve the accuracy of the data being used to advise government policy and spending.

DECLARATION

I certify that this thesis does not, to the best of my knowledge and belief:

(i) incorporate without acknowledgment any material previously submitted for a degree or diploma in any institution of higher education.

(ii) contain any material previously published or written by another person except where due reference is made in the text; or

(iii) contain any defamatory material.

I also grant permission for the Library at Edith Cowan University to make duplicate copies of my thesis as required.

Signature: …….

Date: ……..

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Thanks go to my parents who have provided unlimited support and facilitated my extended adolescence at home enabling me to further my studies. I want to thank my supervisor Margaret Mitchell for seeing this project to its conclusion and her encouragement, Glen Ross for assistance with writing, Greg Dear for technical advice, my previous supervisors Pamela Henry and Irene Froyland for getting me started. Thanks also go to Ann-Claire Larsen. Personal thanks go to my girlfriend Michelle who made the end road of this thesis all the easier, Matt, Raffe, Owen, Ben and Dyscord management (Brad and Dyson) who have worked around my constant distraction from music, Diana Collini, Jaymie Baretto, Stephanie Herbert and Monica Petracca for always being around to discuss the weighty issues with and everyone in corridor 2.4; Nikki, Emily, Natalie, James, Sharan, Brad, W. Rupert, Mahmood, Carmel, Jenni, Karen, Katherine, Mark, Michael, Andrew, Sandra and Amanda. Thanks go to the people who help me unwind; gym buddy Drew and bar buddies Victor, Dylan and Daniel.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

USE OF THESIS ..... **ii**
ABSTRACT ..... **iii**
DECLARATION ..... **iv**
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS ..... **v**
CHAPTER 1 INTRODUCTION, DEFINITION AND HISTORICAL/CRIMINAL JUSTICE PERSPECTIVES OF INTIMATE VIOLENCE **1**
Definitions 2
The Prevalence of Intimate Violence 4
Criminal Justice Perspectives of Intimate Violence 9
A Recent History of Intimate Violence Policy in Australia 9
The Approach of the Police 10
Chapter Summary 13
CHAPTER 2 POLICY, TREATMENT AND SERVICES: APPROACHES TO ADDRESS INTIMATE VIOLENCE **14**
Intimate Violence Initiatives in Western Australia 17
Arrest/Punitive Responses to Intimate Violence and Protection Orders 17
Treatment and Peer Programs for Offenders 19
Public Awareness/Social Change Campaigns 21
Resources for Victims 22
Chapter Summary 23
CHAPTER 3 THEORETICAL EXPLANATIONS OF INTIMATE VIOLENCE **24**
Sociological Theories 24
Patriarchal/Feminist Theory 25
Psychological Theories 26
Social Learning Theory 26
Self Attitude Theory 26
Frustration/Aggression Hypothesis 27
Individual Pathology 27
Chapter Summary 28
Typologies 28
CHAPTER 4 TYPOLOGICAL STUDIES **29**
The Development of Typologies 31
The Holtzworth-Munroe and Stuart (1994) Typology 32
Tests of the Typology 35
Typologies of Violent Women 38
The Usefulness of the Types 39
Chapter Summary 40
CHAPTER 5 THE MEASUREMENT OF INTIMATE VIOLENCE **42**
The Measurement of Intimate Violence 43
Criticisms of the Conflict Tactics Scales 44
The Issue of Self Report Bias 48
The Measurement of Women's Violence 51
Meta Analysis of Men and Women's Violence 54
The Archer (1999) Meta-Analysis 55
Chapter Summary 57
CHAPTER 6 THE META-ANALYTICAL PROCESS: INSTRUMENT AND SAMPLE CHARACTERISTICS **59**
Comparisons of Measurement Variations 59

Form of the Conflict Tactics Scales/ Domestic Conflict Index 59
Social Desirability Indexes..... 64
Time Period of Violence Reporting 66
Statistical Level 67
Severity of Violence Level..... 68
Comparison of Sample Characteristics 68
Same Sex Intimate Relationships 68
The Ethnicity of the Sample..... 68
Origin of Sample 69
Nature of the Relationship..... 69
Chapter Summary..... 70
CHAPTER 7 METHOD, RESULTS AND DISCUSSION.....71
Results 76
Descriptives 76
Analysis 79
Categorical Analyses..... 80
Discussion 83
Limitations 85
Chapter Summary..... 88
CHAPTER 8 DUAL AND SINGLE PARTNER REPORT OF VIOLENCE IN TYPOLOGICAL STUDIES.....89
Single and Dual Partner Reporting in Typological Studies 90
Chapter Summary..... 94
CHAPTER 9 SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION 96
Implications and Applications 97
Future Research..... 100

CHAPTER 1
INTRODUCTION, DEFINITION AND HISTORICAL/CRIMINAL JUSTICE PERSPECTIVES OF INTIMATE VIOLENCE

The current study is concerned with the discrepancy between partners in the report of both men and women's violence on quantitative instruments such as the Conflict Tactics Scales (1979). While the Conflict Tactics Scales suggest that reports from both partners should be used in any balanced measure of violence in the family, many researchers have used only self-report, suggesting that correlation data argues the case for the validity of the use of one partner's report of their own violence. The current study involves a quantitative synthesis; a meta-analysis which will attempt to integrate the findings of studies which have obtained both self and partner reports using discrepancy level effect sizes. In addition to assessing the discrepancy level generally, the current study will compare the samples collected on a number of categorical differences. Typological studies will then be reviewed in order to examine if the discrepancy in the report of violence between partners may have affected the consistency of the profiles commonly found in research.

Chapter 1 grounds the study by examining the definitions used in the area, defining the key concepts to be considered, as well as introducing prevalence research which has evaluated the extent of intimate violence in the community. The historical/criminal justice perspective is also reviewed in this chapter, briefly examining policy and procedure concerning intimate violence from the beginning of time to the current day. Chapter 2 discusses the current state of policy in terms of intimate violence, looking at perpetrator programs, punitive responses and victim resources in Western Australia, in order to provide a context for recommendations made based on the findings from the current research. Chapter 3 examines the theoretical explanations of intimate violence, encompassing feminist theory, social learning theory, self attitude theory, the frustration/aggression hypothesis and individual pathology. Chapter 4 extends upon the previous theoretical review by examining typological studies and the profiles which are commonly used to describe different types of offenders. Chapter 5 reviews the measurement of intimate violence including the use of the Conflict Tactics Scales (Straus, 1979), criticisms of this instrument, self report bias as a research confound, the measurement of women's violence and a review of the previous meta-

analysis. Chapter 6 will precede the meta-analytic process by introducing the key concepts and variables. This will set the scope of the meta-analysis and identify why some of the categorical comparisons being completed may affect the discrepancy rates. Chapter 7 will summarise the meta-analytic research process, including data collection and the categorisation of the studies used. This chapter will then present the results of the current research, the analysis, the categorical comparisons, discussion and limitations. Chapter 8 will compare dual and single partner reporting of violence in typological studies, and will assess the possible effects that underreporting has had on the consistency of male intimate violence profiles. The final chapter will examine the findings from the current research and make recommendations for policy based on the review of literature and the results of the current study.

The problem of intimate violence has always existed, however public and government acknowledgement of the implications of this violence is comparatively new. Acknowledging violence that takes place within the home has led to criminal justice interventions for intimate violence, a developing body of research into its occurrence, the provision of resources to protect affected parties and a strong advocacy movement that seeks to provide social support to women and social sanctions to men (Fagan, 1989). This chapter defines intimate violence, reviews literature assessing its prevalence and considers the historical and criminal justice responses to the issue. Examining the diverse perspectives available provides a context and strong link to theory for the current research.

Definitions

Having a strong definition of an issue such as violence between intimate partners helps to produce a focused review of the literature and aids in the development of variables to be used in the current research. I have used the term intimate violence consistently throughout the study, highlighting the importance of the intimate relationship in the definition. This is intended to include all matter of intimate partners; married couples, cohabitating couples, dating couples, and importantly also same-sex partners.

Being that the current research is a meta-analysis, which utilises the data of previous studies, the operational definition of violence between intimate partners used in these studies is central to the definition in this study. Most of the studies being utilised measure violence using the Conflict Tactics Scales (Straus, 1979), an instrument

that asks participants to respond to a number of descriptions of acts and indicate their frequency in the relationship. A detailed discussion of this instrument, along with the criticisms that have been made about its use can be found in Chapter 5. The Conflict Tactics Scales (Straus, 1979) and the revised version, the Conflict Tactics Scales 2 (Straus, 1996) contain a number of scales including psychological aggression (Conflict Tactics Scales 2), negotiation (Conflict Tactics Scales 2), injury (Conflict Tactics Scales 2), sexual coercion (Conflict Tactics Scales 2), verbal aggression (Conflict Tactics Scales 1) and reasoning (Conflict Tactics Scales 1). While these additional forms of measurement would provide for a broader definition, especially in terms of embedding psychological and verbal abuse into the framework of physical abuse, the use of these scales in empirical studies is not particularly common, researchers typically restrict the data collection to the physical and verbal subscales, or to just the physical subscale. It is also worth noting that the Conflict Tactics Scale 1 contains a number of items concerning sexual coercion, expanded out into a full scale in the Conflict Tactics Scales 2. Researchers that utilise the Conflict Tactics Scales 2 typically include the sexual coercion subscale in examinations of physical violence, or alternately include additional items from the scale in order to reflect these; sexual violence is certainly not overlooked as a part of intimate violence.

The Conflict Tactics Scales measure concrete acts of violence varying in severity from a push or slap, all the way up to punching, kicking, choking and the use of weapons. This focus on concrete acts rather than the contextual or subjective meaning of such acts has resulted in criticism of the instrument from its inception. Examining concrete acts does not provide a complete picture of the context that victims of intimate violence live in, namely that violence is often only part of a variety of tactics used to intimidate and control an intimate partner (R. P. Dobash & Dobash 1983). While the Conflict Tactics Scales inevitably form the operational definition of intimate violence for this study, and indeed most scholarly studies of intimate violence, it is also important to recognise a definition that takes into account the pattern of violence and intimidation that occurs in intimate violence.

The National Women's Safety Agenda includes physical, sexual, emotional, verbal, social, economic and spiritual abuse in their definition of domestic violence (Office for Women, 2007a). Partnerships Against Domestic Violence (PADV), the initiative that preceded the National Women's Safety Agenda, defined domestic violence as the following:

> Domestic violence is when one partner in an intimate relationship attempts by physical or psychological means to dominate and control the other. It is generally understood as gendered violence, and is an abuse of power within a relationship or after separation. In the large majority of cases the offender is male and the victim female (Partnerships against Domestic Violence, 2001, p.1)

While this definition reflecting the dynamics of the violent intimate relationship is not useful in the current research, there is a general understanding in the literature, especially among theorists, that intimate violence is constituted by the context as well as the violent acts themselves. While recognizing the importance of the context of intimate violence, this study is concerned with examining the data of studies that have used the Conflict Tactics Scales, and it is outside the scope of this instrument to measure the context or cause of the violence, Straus (1996) has suggested that rather than this being a deficit of the instrument, it is up to researchers to develop and include context and meaning measures to include in their studies. While I will return to some of these issues in later chapters, it is sufficient to understand that the current research is focused on physical acts as intimate violence; although the Conflict Tactics Scales do include non-physical scales, these are not commonly used in the studies that will be included in the research. The non-physical elements of intimate violence are important to consider, but are outside of the current research.

The Prevalence of Intimate Violence

The prevalence of intimate violence has been heavily researched but still remains a contested topic due to the varying results found by different researchers. These inconsistencies are partially caused by differing samples, measures and definitions used by studies, but it would seem that one of the largest causes of variance is the inconsistent use of perpetrator reports, victim reports and couple reports by researchers (Weis, 1989). A recent study (Walternaurer, Ortega, & McNutt, 2003) also found that participation bias has a significant effect on the rates reported; suggesting that the sample that return questionnaires and participate in interviews are not representative of the general public which could inflate violence figures. Nonetheless, research seems to suggest that violence commonly occurs in intimate relationships; figures suggest that 23% of women who had ever been married or in a defacto relationship experienced violence by a partner (*Women's Safety Australia*, 1996).

One of the first large scale studies of the prevalence of intimate violence was that of Straus, Gelles and Steinmetz (1980) and the follow up study, which sampled the participants again after six years (Straus & Gelles, 1986). Straus, Gelles and Steinmetz

(1980) interviewed a sample of 2,103 American households found that 28% of the couples interviewed had experienced violence at some point in their marriage or co-habitation, and 16% had experienced violence in the past year. The follow up study had similar findings with only a slight decrease in the rates of battering between 1975 and 1985 (Straus & Gelles, 1986).

McCauley et al. (1995) examined 1,952 female patients at an internal medicine clinic, and found that 21.4% reported intimate violence at some point in their lives, and 5.5% reported intimate violence in the past year. The McCauley study only used two questions to assess for the existence of violence, and then followed up with participants who indicated violence had occurred concerning what type of violence was perpetrated, and how often it occurred. Participants were classed as not experiencing violence based on answering a yes/no question as to their experience of a number of violent acts. Recent research has found that participants responding in a yes/no format disclose significantly less than those indicating frequency (Hamby, Sugarman, & Boney-McCoy, 2006). Added to this problem was the lack of couple reporting; participants had less opportunity to disclose violent acts as data was limited to the women's perspective of the male's violence. This is important considering that some studies have found some cases of perpetrators, in this case men, reporting perpetrating more violence than their victims report experiencing (Archer, 1999). Women's violence was also excluded from this study. Participants in this study were recruited through internal medicine clinics rather than a household sample such as in Straus, Gelles and Steinmetz (1980), a sample which may not be representative of the general community. Also, being recruited through their general practitioner may have limited disclosure, as the situation participants were recruited in was far less confidential and provided far less anonymity than the community assessments (Straus & Gelles, 1986; Straus, Gelles, & Steinmetz, 1980). However the McCauley et al. (1995) study does not suffer from the same level of participation bias as community surveys (Straus & Gelles, 1986; Straus, Gelles, & Steinmetz, 1980) as participants were much less likely to decline participation which was a part of their medical appointment.

Despite varying methodologies and samples, there is little doubt that intimate violence is a significant problem. *Table 1* contains prevalence ratings from recent studies examining the prevalence of violence in various samples.

Table 1. Figures reporting the prevalence of violence in various populations.

Study	Sample	Past Year	Lifetime
Lundgren, Heimer, Westerstrand, & Kalliokoski (2002)	Community Sample of Swedish Women, figures varied greatly among different age groups	n/a	8%-20%
McCauley et al. (1995)	Patients at a U.S. medical clinic, female victimisation	5.5%	21.4%
Medina-Arize & Barbaret (2003)	Community sample of Spanish women's victimisation	12.9%	n/a
Mirrlees-Black, & Byron (1999)	British Community Sample of Women ever in a Relationship	n/a	23%
Morris & Rielly (2003)	Indigenous N.Z. Female Victimisation	n/a	41.9%
	European Female N.Z. Victimisation	n/a	19.5%
Rinfret-Raynor, Riou, Cantin, Drouin & Dubé (2004)	Random Canadian Households Female Victimisation	6.1%	n/a
Rollins & Oheneba-Sakyi (1990)	Utah Households (U.S. Sample), Female Victimisation of Severe Violence	3.4%	n/a
Straus, Gelles, & Steinmetz (1980)	American Households, Occurrence in the Marriage	16%	28%
Women's Safety Australia (1996)	Community sample of Australian Women who had ever been in a marriage or de-facto relationship.	n/a	23%

These figures reflect not only the difficulty in getting firm figures on the prevalence of violence due to varying instruments, methods and definitions of researchers, but also the universality of intimate violence.

One of the controversial findings of prevalence studies is the existence of high levels of violence perpetrated by women. Archer (2000) found that almost all studies looking at men and women's violence in the dyad observed that women offend at rates at least equivalent to men in composite, self report and partner studies. Straus (2004a) examined dating violence with a sample from thirty-one universities worldwide and found that at twenty-one of the universities, a larger percentage of women reported assaulting a dating partner. A more specific study looking at four universities from the Straus (2004a) study in more detail found that men and women were not significantly different in terms of the frequency and severity of violence; that men and women

offended at approximately the same rate, both in terms of acts of violence and in terms of acts of violence which are likely to injure (Straus & Ramirez, 2002). Archer (2000) found that women were slightly more likely to use an act of physical aggression against a partner, although men were more likely to inflict an injury.

Strong evidence exists to support the idea that women are as violent in intimate relationships as men (Archer, 2000; Straus, 2004a; Straus & Gelles, 1986; Straus, Gelles, & Steinmetz, 1980; Straus & Ramirez, 2002). Particularly compelling is an annotated bibliography of references finding that women are as violent, if not more violent than men in one-hundred and fifty-five scholarly investigations, one-hundred and twenty-six empirical studies and in twenty-nine review articles (Fiebert, 2004). These findings have been disputed and used as grounds to criticise the researchers and instruments involved in such research (Straus, 1999). Sociological and feminist theorists often cite the findings of criminal justice agencies, women's shelters and qualitative studies as contradicting the evidence suggesting that women are just as violent as men in a relationship. According to Dutton and Nicholls (2005, pp.689-692) these sources contain unrepresentative samples when using them to consider the prevalence of violence of men and women. Straus (1999) found that when police crime statistics are used, men represent 70-95% offenders of intimate violence, a figure that is not in proportion to the amount of severely violent acts women admit to perpetrating (Archer, 2000). It seems likely that men would be far less likely to report acts of violence perpetrated by their female partners, even when they have been injured. This may mean that criminal justice figures are not representative of the acts of violence and injuries that are occurring in intimate relationships. Johnson (1995) suggested that samples from women's shelters represent victims of a specific type of intimate violence that is much rarer in the general community. Johnson's (1995; Johnson & Ferraro, 2000) typology describing 'common couple violence' and 'intimate terrorism' has since been validated in qualitative (Rosen, Stith, Few, Daly, & Tritt, 2005) and quantitative studies (Graham-Kevan & Archer, 2003; Johnson & Leone, 2005). The implication is that samples sourced from women's shelters do not reflect the general population in terms of the characteristics of the offender and the directionality of violence in the relationship and it is not valid to generalise figures sourced from shelters to the general population. Dutton and Nicholls (2005) deliver a scathing assessment of feminist and activist research. They maintain that the qualitative studies, which contradict the data suggesting that women are as violent as men in intimate relationships, lack rigour and are highly biased

in the interests of furthering the well meaning agenda of advocating for the protection of women against intimate violence.

Some researchers downplay women's involvement in intimate violence by suggesting that their violence takes place as a response to men's abuse, mostly in the form of self defence (R. P. Dobash & Dobash, 2004; Fagan, 1989). It is also suggested that while women may well perpetrate violence in relationships, men's violence is much more likely to cause injury and hence is more salient. The fear caused by men's violence is also put forward as an important factor in comparing the violence of the genders, as women's violence has been shown to cause little fear in men (Cantos, Neidig, & O'Leary, 1994; Hamberger & Guse, 2002), and fear is suggested to be a major part of the system of control violent husbands have over their wives (R. E. Dobash & Dobash, 1992; R. P. Dobash & Dobash, 2004; Fagan, 1989). Research suggests that some violence perpetrated by women is consistent with self defence as it occurs within a multi-assaulter relationship, but this does not explain situations where women are the main or sole perpetrator of violence in the relationship. Straus and Ramierz (2002) found that where only one partner of a couple was violent, it was twice as likely to be the woman. Research has also found that women are as violent as men in terms of high severity acts of violence (Straus, 2004a) and that men and women are not significantly different in terms of the injuries inflected as a result of intimate violence, meaning that men and women's violence have a similar end result in terms of injury rates. Despite women inflicting severe violence at similar rates to men, the fear variable would seem to be a valid argument. Regardless, violence committed by women is no less relevant to the study of intimate violence. Despite the dismissive words of theorists, empirical evidence supports the existence of female violence at similar levels of frequency and severity as men. This problem is especially important considering the lack of services available for male victims, lack of treatment for female perpetrators, lack of research into women's use of violence and the strong evidence which suggests that men's violence is linked to women's violence (Feld & Straus, 1989; Gelles & Straus, 1988; S. G. O'Leary & Slep, 2006; Schumacher & Leonard, 2005; Woodin & O'Leary, 2006).

Besides self-report and partner-report survey measures, there are a great variety of other figures which give perspective to the occurrence of intimate violence. In the United States, police attend over 8 million calls relating to intimate violence per year (Sherman, Schmidt, & Rogan, 1992) and approximately 30% of all women murdered

are killed by husbands, ex-husbands or boyfriends (Federal Bureau of Investigation, 1997; Perkins & Klaus, 1996). One study found that intimate violence in the state of New South Wales alone, costs $1.5 billion annually including: Costs of pain, suffering premature mortality, health costs, production related costs, consumption related costs, administrative costs, second generational costs and transfer costs, with the victim bearing the majority of these costs (Cox & Leonard, 1991).

It having been established that intimate violence is a prevalent and serious issue; the focus then comes to be on the response to violence from the criminal justice system. The theoretical bases for many of the remedies discussed in the criminal justice response will be discussed later in chapter 3.

Criminal Justice Perspectives of Intimate Violence

The criminal justice perspective of intimate violence is primarily concerned with legislation, judicial interpretation of legislation and how the law is implemented by the police. No specific distinction is made between general assaults and assaults between intimate partners. The focus is on the offence rather than the relationship between offender and victim; however the law has not always treated assaults between intimate partners as a matter for legal intervention.

A Recent History of Intimate Violence Policy in Australia

The most fruitful beginning point of the recognition of intimate violence in Australia is 1974, in the context of very little social awareness and minimal political recognition of the issue, a group of feminists occupied a derelict house in Sydney and started 'Elsie House', the first Australian women's refuge (McFerran, 2007). This began a series of events that led to the recognition of the crime of intimate violence by both the general public and public institutions; fifteen months after 'Elsie House' began, national funding was granted for women's refuges around Australia. Over time, legislation has been passed that reflect this recognition, New South Wales (*Crimes (Domestic Violence) Amendment Act 1983*) and Victoria (*Crimes (Family Violence) Act 1987*). Much early policy was restricted to providing women in danger with an alternative to remaining at home with an abusive partner.

By the late 1980s, governments had begun to examine intimate violence as a legitimate issue, as well as participating in social reform campaigns that aimed to raise awareness of problems and reinforce the unacceptability of intimate violence (Office of

the Status of Women, 2001). The 1989 campaign "Break the Silence" utilised advertising and community education programs to confront attitudes that condoned or permitted intimate violence in particular contexts. It was thought to be a success, changing public opinion concerning provocation and domestic violence (Office for the Status of Women, 2001). The National Committee on Violence Against Women formed in 1990, Australia's first commonwealth body on intimate violence matters. The committee produced the National Strategy on Violence Against Women in 1992, which proposed a comprehensive approach to the problem of intimate violence including prevention, law enforcement, treatment and refuges for women. The 1990s saw an increased emphasis on the prevention of intimate violence, the recognition of cultural differences in addressing intimate violence among different groups, and a joint national and state level response to the issue (Office of the Status of Women, 2001). In 1997, Partnerships Against Domestic Violence (PADV) launched with much fanfare with an aim of developing effective prevention and responses to intimate violence through the cooperation of the federal government, state governments and industry. PADV funded over sixty projects between 2001-2004 including the "Violence against Women: Australia says no" and the "Freedom from Fear" media campaigns (Phillips, 2006).

Replacing the Partnerships Against Domestic Violence initiative is the current National Women's Safety Agenda. This initiative identifies prevention, health, justice and services as the primarily themes for intervention. Since its launch in 2005, the National Agenda has re-run the national "Australia says no" campaign, has distributed funding to research intimate violence and sexual assault, continued funding to mensline, and provided training to the criminal justice sector and nurses (Office for Women, 2007b).

The Approach of the Police

Social changes and research into effective approaches on the issue of intimate violence have meant changes to the roles of police. Beyond merely protecting the innocent and charging offenders, victims are increasingly dissatisfied with a purely punitive approach (Apsler, Cummins, & Carl, 2003) and it falls to the police, the face of the law, to become a resource for victims.

Police have had to tread a fine line in their prosecution and treatment of intimate violence cases. On one hand minimal policing of intimate violence can be seen as government condoning or accepting the violence, and also breaching the police's

obligation to protect. On the other hand is claims of interference and violation of privacy, not to mention the difficulty in laying charges for intimate violence partly due to limited reporting on the part of victims. In particular, mandatory arrest in the case of reports of intimate violence proved to be an ineffective policy.

Even in the 1970s, police were expanding beyond their traditional role when dealing with cases of intimate violence. When dealing with violent partners, police would separate them for a cooling off period and attempt to counsel the parties (Gosselin, 2000). A more developed form of this process is known as the family crisis model (Bard, 1970), this involves consultation and referral to social services, mediation and the removal of threat to victims, a service which the victims of violence have indicated that they feel is lacking in the current day police response (Apsler, Cummins, & Carl, 2003). This approach emphasises alternatives to arrest, an idea not particularly congruent with the political climate of the 1980s.

In 1983, the New York Times (Boffey) reported on the very preliminary findings of a study which compared outcomes for a number of different options police had with intimate violence. Sherman and Berk (1984) had studied the outcomes for victims of intimate violence when the perpetrator was arrested, when onsite counselling was offered, or if the partners were separated for a cooling off period. The finding was that when offenders were not arrested there was a 50% higher likelihood of reoccurrence, according to police and victim reports. Little more than ten days after the New York Times published the then preliminary findings of the study, mandatory arrest was instituted in Minneapolis, and within a few months mandatory arrest was the norm for intimate violence cases in the United States, some states still retaining this policy currently. Despite the immediate implementation of the findings of their study, Sherman, Schmidt and Rogan (1992) wrote that a more sound approach would be to utilise the judgement of officers making arrests for intimate violence. The policy resulted in the unnecessary widespread arrest of men and women who had perpetrated very minor acts of violence against each other, and the public being less willing to contact the police on fear of the arrest of their partner and themselves in cases of intimate violence (Sherman, Schmidt, & Rogan, 1992).

Replications of the arrest experiment yielded mixed findings, however there is criticism of the replication experiments for the non-random assignment of treatment conditions, limited definitions of a positive outcome and the lack of consideration of

participant characteristics (Maxwell, Garner, & Fagan, 2002). Controlling for these factors, Maxwell, Garner and Fagan (2002) found support for arrest as an outcome in their meta-analysis of five of the replication studies, although stating that there are more factors at play in the cessation or continuance of violence than the original action taken by the police on site.

Research seems to indicate that arrest can result in improved outcomes, but without some form of intervention this is a short sighted reaction to a large scale social problem. Although effective prosecution serves as a deterrent (Dugan, 2003) and as a means to empower victims (Miller, 2003), more needs to be done after the arrest to ensure the safety of the victim and reduce re-offending rates. Police intimate violence teams have been shown to be effective in dealing with victims; complementing arrest of perpetrators with victim empowerment, providing help seeking protection orders and other representation, facilitating intimate violence intervention as a condition of parole and providing a more coordinated community response to battering (Corcoran, Stephenson, Perryman, & Allen, 2001). These resources provide for the specialised needs that intimate violence offences require, combined with the effective prosecution of perpetrators.

Although mandatory arrest has some research support, Humphries (2002) contends that victim control of prosecution is important in empowering and providing an adequate response to the danger perceived by the victim. The prosecution of women with their attackers when reciprocal violence has occurred undermines this empowering process, and causes women to lose trust in the justice system (Bui, 2001), reducing the likelihood that they would seek criminal justice intervention again (Hirschel & Buzawa, 2002). Recent research has argued the case for an empirically validated instrument that will identify high priority offenders, who should be prosecuted and sentenced the most aggressively (Goodman, Dutton, & Bennett, 2000). The use of an instrument such as the Danger Assessment Scale (Goodman, Dutton, & Bennett, 2000) could potentially direct legal resources to cases where the need is greatest, and directing less serious cases to other forms of intervention, punitive or otherwise.

While psychology and sociology may diagnose specific remedies and theoretical explanations for problems such as intimate violence, the criminal justice system has a wealth of history and a solid pragmatic approach to addressing intimate violence. Effective policy and applied research should always consider the real world applications

of legislation, specifically the enforcement of law by police. However, addressing the problem of intimate violence extends beyond just police policy and includes the development and improvement of intervention programs, the provision of services for victims of intimate violence, public awareness campaigns and court mandated programs that complement arrest.

Chapter Summary

The first chapter introduced many of the key conflicts and issues which will be discussed in the course of this thesis. These can be summarised in the following points: Studies examining intimate violence typically utilise only physical abuse as the operational definition of the variable, however intimate violence reflects a variety of intimidating and controlling acts that cause fear. Prevalence levels vary, but average figures suggest that between 21%-25% of women have experienced intimate violence in their lifetime. Evidence exists which suggests that women, as well as men, are violent in their intimate relationships, although some researchers claim that women's violence is only ever a self defence response. Traditionally, intimate violence was seen as a private issue, however it has come to the forefront of the societal consciousness as a serious public criminal justice and public welfare issue. Police have had a changing role and have adapted to community expectations for the way in which intimate violence is handled by police officers.

CHAPTER 2
POLICY, TREATMENT AND SERVICES: APPROACHES TO ADDRESS INTIMATE VIOLENCE

The previous chapter discussed the historical and criminal justice approaches to intimate violence, mostly in terms of how the police and the courts have approached the problem. This chapter will discuss the current approaches to address intimate violence, including the use of arrest and other traditional criminal justice remedies, the treatment programs available for abusers, resources available for victims, public awareness/social change campaigns, and how these elements combined address the problem of intimate violence in Western Australia.

Any remedy to intimate violence exists as a response to a particular need that has been proposed, a need that exists on the part of the individual or of society as a whole. While the theoretical explanations concerning intimate violence will be discussed in chapter 3, it is relevant to consider the theoretical grounding of the approaches that currently exist. To put these remedies in a theoretical context, they will be considered using Gelles' (1993) proposed five theoretical recommendations to prevent battering.

Gelles (1993) reviewed studies and theories concerning intimate violence and summarised the recommendations into five points or theoretical remedies for intimate violence, remedies which may not be possible to apply totally but serve as a framework to explain the theoretical causes of violence. Gelles (1993) suggests that the norms that legitimise and glorify violence in society need to be eliminated, citing capital and corporal punishment and violence in the media as being influential on the use of violence within the family. The suggestion is that violence is shown as being an essential and useful part of society, and as a result perpetrators see violence as a viable conflict resolution tactic. Because of these norms, victims may also believe that violence is a part of a normal relationship and as a consequence may not be motivated to undertake measures to stop the violence. A change of these norms may reduce violence on the part of the perpetrator through the understanding of the unacceptability of violence, and on the part of the victim through a greater inclination to leave their abusive partners, enact criminal justice interventions and access support services. The

solution of eliminating violence condoning norms is relevant mostly in terms of public awareness/social change campaigns as well as the arrest and effective prosecution of offenders which emphasises societal disapproval of intimate violence.

Secondly, Gelles (1993) suggests the reduction of violence provoking stress that is elicited by society, specifically mentioning poverty, inequality, unemployment and other unfulfilled needs that adds to stress for individuals. The suggestion is that otherwise non-violent individuals may perpetrate acts of violence under extreme stress. This suggestion would seem relevant to a particular type of offender which offends less frequently, is less violent than other offender types and represents most perpetrators of intimate violence in a balanced sample (Hamberger, Lohr, Bonge, & Tolin, 1996; Holtzworth-Munroe, Meehan, Herron, Rehman, & Stuart, 2000; Saunders, 1992; Waltz, Babcock, Jacobson, & Gottman, 2000). Bearing in mind that the majority of offenders are low-level violent offenders who offend infrequently and during period of high stress (See Chapter 4 for a discussion on these types), a reduction of the stressors that contribute to offending could result in a significant reduction in intimate violence. Remedies that address stressors such as poverty, inequality and unemployment are predominantly economic; ensuring a society where people have the opportunity to provide for themselves and their families, and a welfare system that reduces stress during times of unemployment and other difficult situations.

The third recommendation suggests that the reduction of social isolation and the restoration of community and familiar ties and kinships will help reduce violence within families (Gelles, 1993). Strong community ties in the family and social support for the victim can reduce violence prevalence and severity (Counts, Brown, & Campbell, 1992). Strong community links expose perpetrators and victims to community values unconducive to intimate violence, which can reduce violence as well as provide social support and resources to the victim, making them more inclined to seek change from the abusive partner, empower them to leave the relationship and seek criminal justice intervention (Barnett, 2001). This recommendation relates to informal efforts to reconnect people to the community, which involves societal change campaigns and also government efforts to get the community involved in providing services and being aware of intimate violence (Family and Domestic Violence Unit, 2006c).

The fourth recommendation to reduce intimate violence is related to the traditional values concerning the dominance of men in society (Gelles, 1993).

According to Gelles (1993) the abolition of sexual inequality and the removal of sexist values would foster more equality and remove the power and control men have over women and reduce the violence used against women. This is reflective of the body of feminist theory into the area of intimate violence, which is underpinned by the assumption that violence in the family is caused by men's dominance over women (R. E. Dobash & Dobash, 1992; R. P. Dobash & Dobash, 2004; Fagan, 1989; Fagan, Stewart, & Hansen, 1983). While from a societal viewpoint many of these issues seem redundant, in terms of the individual it seems justified to suggest that much intimate violence is related to men seeking control over their relationships (Delsol, Margolin, & John, 2003; Holtzworth-Munroe, Meehan, Herron, Rehman, & Stuart, 2000; Waltz, Babcock, Jacobson, & Gottman, 2000) and dissatisfaction in the power they have in the relationship (Coleman & Straus, 1986; Sagrestano, Heavey, & Christensen, 1999). This is addressed directly by intimate violence treatment programs with a feminist component, and also through social change initiatives, reinforced by the effective prosecution of offenders by the criminal justice system. Beyond the adversarial view of genders, treatment programs and help groups promote healthy relationships and communication in the marriage, tactics which can reduce the incidence and severity of violence.

The fifth and final recommendation made by Gelles (1993) is breaking down the cycle of violence in the family. Violence in the family of origin has been shown to be strongly related to future intimate violence offending (Ehrensaft et al., 2003; Kalmuss, 1984; Kwong, Bartholomew, Henderson, & Trike, 2003). Addressing violence in the family of origin involves the provision of services for children as well as for intimate partners, in order to confront the children's distress and address values concerning the normality of violence in relationships. Arrest and prosecution plays a part in removing children from violence as well as public awareness of the effects that intimate violence has upon children.

The theoretical recommendations made by Gelles (1993) reflect the diverse theoretical explanations and remedies available in reducing the prevalence of intimate violence. Within Western Australia, many of these interventions are already in place to some degree and may already be having an effect in the reduction of intimate violence. While certain theoretical perspectives may advocate a particular tactic with which to address intimate violence, it is beneficial to evaluate all interventions and to treat the

problem as a whole, rather than assume a particular treatment or public awareness campaign will solve the problem completely.

Intimate Violence Initiatives in Western Australia

The Western Australian government has launched a number of intimate violence campaigns; the 1998 Freedom from Fear campaign emphasised the consequences of violence in the family and attempted to motivate offenders, and would-be offenders to attend treatment, or to access government services. This represents a highly innovative campaign which rather than emphasising legal threats in attempting to stop men's violence, appealed to men on the part of their families to seek help for their violence (Donovan, Paterson, & Francas, 1999). As many women do not want to leave their husbands and do not want to have their husbands incarcerated, the threat of criminal justice intervention may be moot (Donovan, Paterson, & Francas, 1999). Also the fear of the return of an incarcerated husband represents a continuation of the victimisation of the family and wife (Donovan, Paterson, & Francas, 1999). Reform has also been seen in terms of the way the criminal justice system deals with intimate violence perpetrators and victims, the *Acts Amendment (Family and Domestic Violence) Act 2004 (WA)*, has introduced police orders as well as strengthening violence restraining orders.

Arrest/Punitive Responses to Intimate Violence and Protection Orders

The *Acts Amendment (Family and Domestic Violence) Act 2004 (WA)* made changes to the *Restraining Orders Act 1997 (WA)*, the *Bail Act 1982 (WA)* and the *Criminal Code Act Compilation Act 1913 (WA)*, focusing on the removal of men from violent family environments as opposed to the removal of women and children in order to protect the victim without cutting off community support, and to reinforce the criminality of intimate violence and men's responsibility for their violence (Domestic Violence Prevention Unit, 2006). This is achieved by placing the onus on the police to investigate whenever there is a suspicion of intimate violence, rather than requiring victims to instigate proceedings, who are often reluctant to make a report. Officers are also required to make records of the action taken in a particular situation, or explain why no action was taken (Domestic Violence Prevention Unit, 2006).

Besides arrest, which occurs when violence is witnessed, the accused perpetrator is belligerent, or if strong potential of an assault exists, police can issue a violence restraining order or a police order. A police order can require a suspected offender to leave the property for twenty-four hours (seventy-two hours with victim consent), based

on an officer's suspicion of violence occurring (Domestic Violence Prevention Unit, 2006). Police orders are an effective means of eliminating the danger which victims are in for the short term, and are particularly useful in cases where there is no evidence of violence occurring but a police officer believes that there is a risk of violence. These orders are victim safety centred; police are obligated to address any complaint and to take action even if a victim is reluctant for this to occur. These orders also encourage victims to call for police intervention as the end result will not necessarily be the arrest and imprisonment of their spouse, a course of action many victims do not wish to take (Donovan, Paterson, & Francas, 1999). Although there were concerns that the men removed from their houses may enact a backlash, research suggests that most used the order as a cooling off period, staying with family or friends for the duration (Domestic Violence Prevention Unit, 2006). Police did recommend that a follow up or intervention service should be included with police orders, as the impact of the police intervention may be reduced by an offender's feelings of indignation and injustice of being removed from their own house purely on a suspicion (Domestic Violence Prevention Unit, 2006). These follow up services were limited, especially in regional areas, making police orders a short-term fix. To be more effective, offenders need to be confronted about their use of violence which may motivate them to address their problem.

Violence restraining orders are victim instigated and can be issued when: (a) a victim has been abused by the person referred to in the order and the abuse is likely to repeat, (b) that person or another party on their behalf has reasonable fears that violence will occur again, and (c) the violence restraining order is reasonable under the circumstances (Domestic Violence Prevention Unit, 2006). Orders are flexible and can require the recipient to stay away completely, desist in threatening behaviour, restrict the perpetrator's contact with the recipient and even prohibit the perpetrator from being in possession of firearms for a period of twelve months (Women's Safety After Separation, 2006). With a victim's consent, police can instigate a violence order against the perpetrator which then is heard by a magistrate, which can occur by phone or by hearing, the order is then enacted when the police serve the respondent with the order (Women's Safety After Separation, 2006). This option represents a long term response to a serious and sustained period of violence.

Both police orders and violence protection orders help to reinforce the unacceptability of intimate violence with not only the threat of criminal sanctions but also through the protection and empowerment of victims. Although reports suggest that

the referral of perpetrators to services needs to be improved (Domestic Violence Prevention Unit, 2006) these orders represent both on the spot and long term options in applying consequences to perpetrator's actions.

In terms of the arrest and prosecution of intimate violence offenders, the Western Australian policy is to monitor legislation and judicial interactions with offenders and victims, with judicial reform and the safety of victims being the main points identified (Family and Domestic Violence Unit, 2006c). One such initiative is the Joondalup Family Violence Court, a court that deals exclusively in domestic and family violence matters. From the court, offenders can be referred to services, have participation in treatment programs factored into sentencing when an early guilty plea is made, and be monitored by an interdisciplinary team of justice professionals (Domestic Violence Prevention Unit, 2006). An independent review of this system has found it to be effective (Court Services Division, Department of Justice, & Crime Prevention and Community Support Division of the Western Australian Police Service, 2002) and recommendations have been made for other courts dealing with family violence to follow many of the procedures used in the Joondalup court (Family and Domestic Violence Unit, 2006c).

The Western Australia approach to the arrest of intimate violence perpetrators fits into Gelles' (1993) recommendations in terms of providing a consequence to intimate violence, and referring perpetrators to treatment services which may help them to confront their violent values. The removal of perpetrators when they have committed or are likely to commit acts of violence ties in with Gelles' (1993) second recommendation, in that during a time of particular stress, that person is removed from the situation which may be causing or exacerbating their stress at the time, potentially avoiding the perpetration of violence. The removal of the perpetrator instead of the victim and children allows for the victim to access community resources and support, the third recommendation made by Gelles (1993). By having strong criminal justice interventions, it reinforces societal disapproval of intimate violence.

Treatment and Peer Programs for Offenders

While punitive measures and protection orders reinforce the unacceptability of intimate violence and protect victims, these measures are moot without making perpetrators confront their violence. In short, without some sort of help service for men, no significant behaviour change is likely to occur. Treatment programs address the need

for behaviour change among violent offenders, with educational programs that attempt to affect a change in a person. Men's groups usually complement or form a part of treatment and provide social support for men in an environment non-conductive to intimate violence.

In Western Australia, treatment programs typically occur over a twenty-four week period in two hour sessions and are based along the lines of the Duluth Domestic Violence Intervention Project, a pro-feminist program incorporating elements of cognitive-behavioural therapy (Domestic Violence Prevention Unit, 1999). Programs conform to the best practice model as set by the Domestic Violence Prevention Unit (1999) which emphasises responsibility on the part of the perpetrator, attempts to establish empathy for the victims, and critiques the gender values involved in abusive behaviour (Domestic Violence Prevention Unit, 2006). While programs are run within the guidelines set out by the Domestic Violence Prevention Unit (1999), recent research suggests that these groups need to cooperate more and share effective practice as well as discuss developments in research in order to develop the efficacy of treatment programs (Domestic Violence Prevention Unit, 2006). Also, measures of the effectiveness of the treatments were limited, often relying solely on self report, and were measured informally instead of with a standardised instrument (Domestic Violence Prevention Unit, 2006).

Western Australian treatment programs are relatively homogeneous compared to the variety of programs available internationally (Gondolf, 1997), and would seem to be limited in incorporating the idea that different batterers have specific needs which must be addressed for effective treatment (Holtzworth-Munroe, Meehan, Herron, Rehman, & Stuart, 2000; Saunders, 1996). Recommendations for increasing the effectiveness of treatment programs based on modern research and the findings from the current research project will be discussed in chapter 9.

Men's programs come in two distinct varieties, formal programs which discuss a variety of issues related to intimate violence in a non-adversarial environment, and informal programs which typically involve the discussion of issues relevant to the men present (Domestic Violence Prevention Unit, 2006). These programs can vary from fairly prescriptive psycho-educational courses, to religious based programs, and even groups with no specific educational goal, the group is merely a support system to help men with their violence and to advocate for changes to policy they believe will help

men be non-violent (Domestic Violence Prevention Unit, 2006). Research suggests that some perpetrators feel as though treatment programs focus purely on violence and that a wider variety of issues need to be included in an effective treatment (Domestic Violence Prevention Unit, 2006). These groups are often critical of feminist/action researchers who reinforce their pre-existing beliefs concerning intimate violence with skewed research; particularly in Western Australia these researchers are dominant in influencing modern policy (Domestic Violence Prevention Unit, 2006). While some of the claims made by these groups may be valid, such as the flaws in feminist/action researcher's theory and research (Cavanaugh & Gelles, 2005; Dutton & Nicholls, 2005), the distinction between severely violent men and "normal men" who have been violent in their marriage on a small number of occasions (Delsol, Margolin, & John, 2003; Hamberger, Lohr, Bonge, & Tolin, 1996; Holtzworth-Munroe, Meehan, Herron, Rehman, & Stuart, 2000; Saunders, 1992; Waltz, Babcock, Jacobson, & Gottman, 2000), and the significance of women's intimate violence (Archer, 2000; George, 1999; Larance, 2006; Newby et al., 2003), the advocacy of some of these groups may minimise men's own feelings of responsibility for their violence, which may undermine their treatment (Domestic Violence Prevention Unit, 2006). The Domestic Violence Prevention Unit (2006) recommends the integration of these types of groups with treatment programs and to provide training and resources to facilitators and groups rather than undermining their advocacy.

Treatment programs play a part in changing values that legitimise and glorify violence at an individual level. This process often involves peer groups, which socialise offenders, linking them to the community as well as addressing values conductive to violence in a group of men. Most treatment programs in Australia have a pro-feminist component, which addresses Gelles' (1993) fourth recommendation concerning men's dominance in society.

Public Awareness/Social Change Campaigns

While treatment programs aim to change beliefs which are thought to be related to intimate violence in individuals, public awareness/social change campaigns attempt to change beliefs concerning intimate violence on a large scale. As previously discussed, the Freedom from Fear (1998) campaign focused on motivating men to seek help rather than focusing on the punitive consequences of committing acts of violence against an intimate partner (Donovan, Paterson, & Francas, 1999). This program remains important in changing values concerning violence in intimate relationships, and

accordingly the state government has committed long term to sustaining the campaign. Since then, specific needs have been identified and addressed by further research, including initiatives targeting secondary and tertiary students, incorporating the impact on children into intimate violence treatment programs, the provision of training which addresses the risk factors involved with alcohol use and intimate violence offenders, and involvement in community institutions to make the public aware of the resources available for victims and perpetrators of intimate violence (Family and Domestic Violence Unit, 2006b). The state government strategy also involves working with agencies related to services for aboriginals, migrants, same-sex couples, the disabled and young people in order to mediate the effects of intimate violence on these specific groups.

This approach directly addresses the norms which legitimise violence in societal groups by reinforcing the consequences of violent behaviour.

Resources for Victims

Part of the process of preventing intimate violence involves empowering and protecting the victims of intimate violence, so that the consequences of violence for perpetrators include their partner leaving them and/or instigating proceedings against them. Services such as shelters and refuges provide assistance in obtaining orders against violent partners, which allows options for victims of violence, albeit in the short term. These services were traditionally run by advocacy groups on a volunteer basis but have been supported by state and federal government since the late 1970s. Thirty-five shelters and refuges are jointly funded in Western Australia, and a wide variety of government and private agencies are involved in providing resources and advocacy for victims, such as the Women's Council for Domestic and Family Violence Services, the Department of Health, Department for Community Development, the Western Australian Police Service, Legal Aid Commission, Department of Justice, Department of Education and Training, Department of Housing and Works, Ethnic Communities Council of Western Australia, Department of Indigenous Affairs and the Disability Services Commission (Family and Domestic Violence Unit, 2006c).

The most recent progress report from the Western Australian state action plan (Family and Domestic Violence Unit, 2006a) reported that services were well accessed. From April 2004 to March 2005, the Women's Domestic Violence Helpline received 3,176 calls. A similar service offered by Crisis Care had 4,770 calls related to family

and domestic violence in the same time period (Family and Domestic Violence Unit, 2006a). The Domestic Violence Advocacy Support reported assisting 1,390 people over the year with legal advice, help seeking protection orders, counselling and other needs such as housing and support for children (Family and Domestic Violence Unit, 2006a). These services represent the front line for victims, where they can be referred to or provided with more specific services as needed.

Chapter Summary

To summarise the main points of this chapter: Gelles (1993) made five theoretical recommendations to eliminate violence; the reduction of the norms that legitimise and glorify violence, reduction of violence provoking stress, reduction of social isolation and restoration of community and familiar ties, reducing the dominance of men in society and the breaking of the cycle of violence in the family. Arrest and protection order policy in Western Australia focuses on the removal of men from the home instead of the removal of the victim. Treatment programs in Western Australia generally all follow the Duluth program with a focus on empathy building and gender values. The Western Australian 'Freedom from Fear' campaign has gained international accolades for its focus on the effects of violence on the family rather than emphasising the punitive penalties. Victim resources are generally well utilised.

Western Australia has a strong program of social and political reform in regards to intimate violence, and addresses the problem with a great diversity of approaches including judicial and legislative reform, protection and police protection orders, offender programs and support groups, social reform and services for victims. Western Australian policy reflects a pragmatic and practical approach to the problem of intimate violence without an over reliance on judicial intervention and without minimising the seriousness of intimate violence by merely referring offenders to treatment. The implications of the findings of the current study and of the review of literature will be discussed in chapter 9, including the implications for policy. The next chapter is concerned with the theoretical foundations of the remedies discussed in this chapter as well as delving into specifics related to what research has found concerning intimate violence and the characteristics of offenders.

CHAPTER 3
THEORETICAL EXPLANATIONS OF INTIMATE VIOLENCE

The previous chapter covers the Western Australian response to intimate violence, including punitive punishments, social change campaigns, perpetrator treatment, support groups, victim protection and empowerment. These remedies all exist in the context of a theoretical explanation for intimate violence, in that there is something missing or malignant in the individual that is addressed by these responses. The issue is then, what are these theoretical explanations and on the face of it, how valid are their arguments? A more specific literature review of the areas concerning intimate violence typologies and the measurement of severity/frequency of violence will follow in subsequent chapters. Theoretical explanations of intimate violence can be broken down into two distinct categories, psychological theories and sociological theories. Sociological theories are concerned with the cultural forces which may influence people to commit intimate violence. Psychological theories are concerned with the characteristics of the individual which cause or predispose people to intimate violence. This chapter will discuss and critique the theories that exist within these categories.

Sociological Theories

Sociological theories explain intimate violence by considering social forces and culture. The suggestion is that people are a product of their surroundings and that positive social change will make a difference within the individual. Sociologists essentially see violence as a reflection of societal norms and social hierarchy. These theories suggest that men's contempt for women and continual oppression of women are the cause of intimate violence and that those values, including the acceptability of the use of violence to control women are transmitted through people's interactions with each other, institutions and the media. Generally though, sociologists lack explanations and are reluctant to consider women's violence beyond suggesting that women offend as self-defence. The validity of many of the theories are also questionable as a sociological theory is a person's attempt to sum up the way they think things are, and as such, people are often not particularly objective or comprehensive in their arguments. Dutton and Nicholls (2005) suggest that in this context sociological researchers have taken the idea of the protection of women and women's rights, ignored scientific accuracy and formed a research paradigm that dismisses and ignores empirical research

contrary to their theoretical perspective. While a strong perspective does not necessarily suggest that an argument is incorrect, many arguments made by sociologists involve untested or intestable hypotheses, and much of the research undertaken involves qualitative perspectives of an issue which often contain an unrepresentative sample, which should not be generalised. The main theory of interest in this review is feminist/patriarchal theory.

Patriarchal/Feminist Theory

Patriarchal theory is concerned with the structural and social inequality between men and women and the traditional sex roles that reinforce these inequalities. Lockley (1999) summarises feminist ideology concerning intimate violence by stating that partner violence should be seen as a pattern of ongoing violence and intimidation, rather than singular acts. Lockley (1999) also suggests that legal and scientific definitions are based on male perceptions of harm and that legal and scientific theory represent a patriarchal approach. This approach excludes all other research and theory concerning intimate violence and focuses on the idea that intimate violence is instrumental and used to control women. As the theory assumes that men are in a privileged position in society, aggression is supported as a normal way for men to assert their will over women.

There are two main elements of a feminist theory of intimate violence: that men are the sole instigators and perpetuators of violence in an intimate relationship, and that men's violence is widespread and related to the cultural values which privilege men over women and condone the use of violence against women. Dutton (1994) summarised the criticisms against this perspective, citing research contradicting feminist theory: that severe violence perpetrated by a wife against a non-violent husband was more common than that perpetuated by a husband against a non-violent wife (Stets & Straus, 1992; Straus & Ramirez, 2002), same sex female-female relationships have higher abuse rates than heterosexual couples (Levy & Lobel, 1998; Lie, Schilit, Bush, Montague, & Reyes, 1991), as many females as males were violent in their relationships (Straus & Gelles, 1986; Straus, Gelles, & Steinmetz, 1980), very few males approved of spousal violence in an American representative sample (R. Stark & McEnvoy, 1970), only 9.6% of men were totally dominant in their marriage (Coleman & Straus, 1986) and men's violence was not related to structural patriarchy in states in the U.S. (Yllo & Straus, 1990). The issue of female perpetuated violence and same sex female-female violence will be discussed in more detail in chapter 5.

Psychological Theories

Psychological theories are theories that focus on the individual and suggest that some deficiency or abnormality in a person's psychobiology, personality or values causes them to resort to violence in their relationships for a variety of reasons. Rather than a single discrete theory, the explanations to follow discuss perspectives on the issue involving diverse bodies of research and sometimes conflicting points of view. The theories of interest include social learning, self attitude, the frustration/aggression hypothesis and individual pathology.

Social Learning Theory

Social learning theories of intimate violence suggest that violence is learned through environmental cues and life experiences. Violent behaviour may suggest a value system that includes violence as a legitimate means to resolve one's problems. Generally this involves a behaviour being learned and acquired through observation of the behaviour and the resulting outcome. This also depends on the significance of the person the behaviour is being modelled upon (Bandura, 1973), the most well established and significant connection typically being between a person and the family of origin.

Social learning theory is also related to generational transmission theories of intimate violence, the premise being that the values and behaviour concerned with intimate violence are modelled to children through their parents and that violence is continually perpetuated through families. Strong evidence supports the idea that the abusive behaviour of parents is modelled by their children, in that children who experienced violence, both as witnesses and victims, in their family of origin are more likely to be violent themselves (Kalmuss, 1984; Kwong, Bartholomew, Henderson, & Trike, 2003). Ehrensaft et al. (2003) completed a twenty year study of the intergenerational transmission of violence and found a strong link between the experience of violence in the family of origin and the perpetration of violence.

Self Attitude Theory

Self attitude theory is a variation on social learning theory which is based on negative self attitudes derived from adverse psychosocial experiences. Kaplan (1972) theorised that persons of low self-esteem would seek to bolster their self image by acting violently, in an attempt to increase that person's sense of power. Some theorists would argue that society puts pressure on men to achieve, to not show emotions, to

conform to the rigid stereotype of masculinity, and that these pressures may result in low self esteem in some men (Faludi, 1991; Gondolf, 1985). This low self esteem in men may cause some of them to act violently in order to regain pride or control in their relationships. Research does suggest that women with higher status jobs than their husbands (Hornung, McCullough, & Sugimoto, 1981), better communication skills, education and decision making power in their relationships (Babcock, Walt, Jacobson, & Gottman, 1993) are more likely to experience violence. This theory is consistent with feminist theory in some respects, that violence is used to control women and so is deliberate and instrumental, and that power is related to violence. However the difference is that in this theory, men perceive women as having the power in the relationship. Self attitude theory describes a situation where the male may feel he has no power and no other recourse besides physical violence.

Frustration/Aggression Hypothesis

Berkowitz (1962) suggests that there are two distinct types of offenders of any sort of crime, the socialised offender who has learned crime and has come to view it as acceptable, and an individual type offender who offends out of a build up of frustration from unmet needs. Although there is some overlap in these concepts, the frustration/aggression hypothesis is concerned with the idea of the build up of stress caused by unmet needs and goals (Berkowitz, 1962). In terms of intimate violence, the violence may be caused by the build up of stress related to the family, the relationship or even external influences such as unemployment or work pressures (Gelles, 1993).

Individual Pathology

Individual pathology is less like a theory of intimate violence and more an observation of psychopathological traits of batterers. Researchers have consistently found that intimate violent men have higher rates of mental illness than the general male population (Delsol, Margolin, & John, 2003; Hamberger, Lohr, Bonge, & Tolin, 1996; Holtzworth-Munroe, Meehan, Herron, Rehman, & Stuart, 2000; Saunders, 1992; Waltz, Babcock, Jacobson, & Gottman, 2000). Intimately violent men with some psychopathology are usually described as being either highly dependant and emotionally volatile, or having antisocial personality characteristics (Delsol, Margolin, & John, 2003; Hamberger, Lohr, Bonge, & Tolin, 1996; Holtzworth-Munroe, Meehan, Herron, Rehman, & Stuart, 2000; Waltz, Babcock, Jacobson, & Gottman, 2000). Consistent with this proposed dichotomy is biological psychology research describing

men who when engaged in an argument, become calm, have a reduced heart rate and offend not out of anger but out of a need to dominate (Gottman et al., 1995). The premise is that individuals may have mental disorders that may be involved in their offending.

Chapter Summary

The theoretical perspectives of intimate violence are wide and varied, attributing intimate violence to a great variety of causes. Feminist theory suggests that intimate violence is related to men's continuing dominance over women, in society and in the home, and that men's violence is malicious, widespread and instrumental. Social learning theory asserts that violence occurs as a learned response to a situation, where the person has observed violence, had a strong relationship with the person the violence is being modelled upon and the violence achieved an outcome thought to be positive. Frustrations and stressors are the cause of intimate violence according to the frustration/aggression hypothesis and individuals can have particular disorders that predispose them to intimate violence. While some of these theories are exclusive, most of them can be integrated into cohesive models which explain intimate violence as an interaction of a number of factors within the individual, without the assumption of a single cause or type of intimate violence perpetrator.

Typologies

Defining the typical characteristics of an intimately violent person has proven to be a difficult task. Hotaling and Straus (1989) performed a review of the area and concluded that a variety of intimate violence offenders exist rather than a single type. Holtzworth-Munroe and Stuart (1994) theorised about three distinct types of batterers based on a review of literature and data concerning intimate violence. Although earlier work presented similar typologies, Holtzworth-Munroe and Stuart (1994) adapted the existing typologies into an encompassing theory which since has become a prominent area of research in intimate violence. The next chapter will discuss the typologies formulated to explain the diverse characteristics and motivations of intimate violence perpetrators.

CHAPTER 4
TYPOLOGICAL STUDIES

A typology represents an attempt to classify a sample into a number of distinct classes for some sort of theoretical or applied purpose. This process, commonly used in the behavioural sciences, involves the use of a number of defining variables that are theoretically related to the types that are being examined. Proposed types are predicted to significantly differ in a number of variables and are sorted accordingly, often incorporating statistical class models such as cluster analysis. A measure of validity is used to verify the typology, usually some kind of theoretically related variable or in some cases a goodness of fit statistic. The effectiveness of a typology is based on its ability to provide groups that are reflective of the diversity of the population the sample represents and are derived from a criterion that is consistent, takes into account individual differences and provides some sort of useful distinction between the groups. Essentially, the quality of the methods used and the appropriateness of the typological approach for the area are the primary concerns for validity. This chapter will discuss the use of typologies in the area of intimate violence, compare the findings from different typologies, and evaluate what the body of research in this area suggests about the characteristics of batterers.

A typology is a system by which participants who share common characteristics are separated into a number of distinct types as defined by other variables, or variations of the characteristic itself. Essentially what is involved is the conversion of a heterogeneous sample into a number of groups that are as homogeneous as possible based on the characteristics in question. Typologies are used in a wide variety of fields of inquiry, wherever there is need for subjects to be categorised according to some useful variable, from hydro-biology (Ferreol, Dohet, Cauchie, & Hoffman, 2005), accelerator mass spectrometry (Park, Nakamura, & Price, 2005) and accounting (Sulaiman & Mitchell, 2005), to variables involving human behaviour; organisational characteristics (Griffin & Lopez, 2005), socio-cultural sources (Holbert, 2005) and personality characteristics (Myers, 1976). While the uses of these types of categorical systems are relatively unquestioned in the realm of physical science, the human and behavioural sciences are criticised for the use of empirical methods with constructed variables.

Typologies in psychology are frequently used in the area of personality; people are classed into personality types based on their responses in an experiment. Ryckman (2000, p. 387) provides this definition of the term typology in the context of the study of personality "a means of classifying behaviour through the use of continuous, highly abstract concepts (types) that encompass clusters of correlated traits". A prominent example of this form of typology is the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator (Myers, 1976; Myers & McCaulley, 1985).

The Myers-Briggs Type Indicator (Myers, 1976; Myers & McCaulley, 1985) follows a long tradition of personality typing from Hippocrates in 420BC to the more modern theorists such as Jung (1923). The Myers-Briggs Type Indicator represents an attempt to empirically measure the concepts laid out by Jung (1923) and the other theorists who have contributed to the area. Participants indicate their preference between two options on 166 items which relate to four dichotomies and sixteen possible personality types (Myers & McCaulley, 1985). The Myers-Briggs Type Indicator involves items which give participants a choice between two options which indicate opposite preferences in each dilemma, resulting in one of sixteen combinations which all have a specific description and personality characteristics attributed to them (Myers & McCaulley, 1985).

The types of criticisms levelled at the Myers-Briggs type indicator (Myers, 1976; Myers & McCaulley, 1985) are equally valid when considering any sort of categorisation in the social sciences, that people are inevitably too complex and their characteristics too rich to be simply categorised and fitted neatly into a model. Jung made this criticism himself, suggesting that while his typology had sixteen types, there may as well be three-hundred and sixty (Jung, 1987). Despite the fact that human behaviour is rich and varied, typologies represent an attempt to simplify and understand people in a practical way. Myers (1976) designed her instrument as a means to suggest the most appropriate career for a person, and in that respect it is valid when used correctly.

Typologies in the area of intimate violence represent a move away from singular explanations of offending, and towards more dynamic treatment and policy. These sorts of typologies usually involve a number of characteristics related to violence in an intimate relationship, and the finding of distinct patterns in a particular population. To the present, typologies have been primarily concerned with heterosexual male offenders

although a small number of studies have begun to examine the diversity of female perpetrators (Babcock, Miller, & Siard, 2003), men and women in same-sex relationships (Landolt & Dutton, 1997) and violence in the dyad (Johnson, 1995; Johnson & Ferraro, 2000). The current review will be predominantly concerned with heterosexual male violence typologies.

The Development of Typologies

The shift from general characteristics of intimate violence perpetrators to the examinations of specific types occurred due to a number of findings of research which suggested that certain characteristics could not be applied to all. Previously, differences in violence levels had been attributed to different stages in the cycle of abuse and that the escalation of violence was inevitable (R. E. Dobash & Dobash, 1992). However, typological research suggests that these differences in violence are part of the characteristics that define different, distinct types of violent men. Typological studies came about through research that ended originally in a null-hypothesis due to bi-modal distributions; findings that particular characteristics were varied among violent men. Reviews of studies looking at offender attributes also supported the typological approach.

One of the key findings that lead to the current body of typological research was the finding that batterers are diverse in terms of their attitudes towards women. Saunders (1992) reported a bi-modal distribution in his study of intimately violent men's attitudes towards women, one group with very liberal attitudes about women and another with conservative attitudes. Neidig, Collins and Friedman (1986) found that violent men's attitudes towards women were no different from that of non-violent men, finding a 'U' shaped curve in the measure of patriarchy among the violent men. Tests of patriarchy suggest that the highest rates of assault occur when there are extremes of patriarchal structure; high and low results (Yllo & Straus, 1990). The suggestion is that when patriarchy is high, which was indicated by extreme structural inequality for women, women are more likely to be trapped in violent relationships and exploited, where as when it is low, men are more violent in order to maintain their dominance and control (Yllo & Straus, 1990). While these studies have their limitations, such as the suggested relationship between structural patriarchy and the experience of the sample, there is strong evidence suggesting that intimately violent men are not consistently patriarchal or hostile to women in their values, a finding contrary to feminist explanations of violence.

Holtzworth-Munroe and Stuart (1994) cite a great number of studies with similar findings of diversity within samples of intimately violent men in the variables which came to be the descriptive dimensions of the typology. The frequency/severity of violence of men was found to have a number of patterns, including men who were frequently violent and used psychological abuse, and men who were violent infrequently (Mott-McDonald Associates, 1979; Sweeney & Key, 1982, June). Some men were found to be violent outside the intimate relationship and also were likely to be more violent towards their intimate partner, while others were found to be violent only in their relationship (Cadsky & Crawford, 1988; Fagan, Stewart, & Hansen, 1983; Shields, McCall, & Hanneke, 1988). Rather than having one particular psychopathological profile, men who were intimately violent were found to have a great diversity of mental ailments, the main profiles of intimately violent men including normal, antisocial and borderline characteristics (Caesar, 1986, August; Faulk, 1974, July; Hershorn & Rosenbaum, 1991). This research also includes the personality disorders related to the psychopathological disorders.

Although some comprehensive typologies existed prior to the Holtzworth-Munroe and Stuart (1994) typology (Gondolf, 1988; Saunders, 1992), these were mainly empirical studies which included whatever variables appeared salient in a cluster analysis. Holtzworth-Munroe and Stuart (1994) built their typology on the prominent and sound findings in research, and linked together a vast etiological framework within which to consider intimate violence.

The Holtzworth-Munroe and Stuart (1994) Typology

Holtzworth-Munroe and Stuart's (1994) theoretical typology represents a significant integration of the prominent theories of the day, incorporating theories of frequency/severity of violence, generality of violence, psychopathology, experiences in the family of origin, attachment, impulsivity, social skills and attitudes towards women and violence. The theory proposed three distinct types, the Family-Only type, the Borderline-Dysphoric type and the Generally-Violent-Antisocial type.

The Family Only type man was thought to have the least frequent and least severe instances of violence, and be the least likely to engage in psychological or sexual abuse (Holtzworth-Munroe & Stuart, 1994). The Family Only type man is also unlikely to exhibit violence outside the direct family and is also unlikely to have legal problems related to violence. They show little to no psychopathology and either have no

personality disorders or some signs of a passive-dependant personality disorder. Holtzworth-Munroe and Stuart (1994) suggest that this type would constitute about 50% of a balanced study involving both participants from treatment groups and the community. In terms of attachment, one of a number of theoretically related variables examined, the Family Only type would differ little from non-batterers and be predominantly securely attached, however with more preoccupied or care seeking attributes than a control group (Holtzworth-Munroe & Stuart, 1994). This group would also have low impulsivity, moderate to high social skills, have low experience of violence in the family of origin, and low attitudes supporting violence, and low negative attributions about women compared to the other groups, although they may be significantly different from a non-violent sample (Holtzworth-Munroe & Stuart, 1994). This type was essentially proposed to be no different from non-violent husbands except for the occurrence of low levels of violence, some preoccupied characteristics and slightly lower social skills. Holtzworth-Munroe and Stuart (1994) suggest that this type offends in times of particular stress which is exacerbated by communication difficulties and that this type experiences extreme remorse and is unlikely to persist with intimate violence.

Borderline-Dysphoric type men were theorised to engage in medium to severe levels of violence, including psychological and sexual abuse (Holtzworth-Munroe & Stuart, 1994). Primarily this batterer will restrict violence to his family but will also have significant extra-familiar violence and some recorded criminal behaviour. The most significant characteristic of this type of batterer is their elevated levels of psychological distress and tendency to be emotionally volatile (Holtzworth-Munroe & Stuart, 1994). Characteristics of Borderline and Schizoid personality disorders are also likely to be evident, as well as alcohol and drug abuse. A strong preoccupied attachment type was also theorised to be observable in the Borderline-Dysphoric type as well as a moderate level of experience of violence in the family of origin and high levels of neglect, low marital social skills, low to moderate general social skills, some significant attitudes supporting violence and very hostile attitudes towards women (Holtzworth-Munroe & Stuart, 1994). This type was proposed to constitute about 25% of batterer samples and offend due to their extreme dependency and distress over feelings of real or perceived betrayals by their partners, which is intensified by their willingness to use violence, hostile feelings towards women and tendency to become emotionally volatile (Holtzworth-Munroe & Stuart, 1994).

The Generally Violent Antisocial type batterer will display medium to severe levels of violence including psychological and sexual abuse, and will have high levels of extra-familiar aggression, high levels of criminal activity and criminal involvement (Holtzworth-Munroe & Stuart, 1994). A high likelihood of drug and alcohol addiction was proposed as well as an antisocial personality disorder. A dismissing attachment type was proposed for the Generally Violent Antisocial type. This type was proposed to have a significant background of violence in the family of origin including inter-parental violence, abuse and neglect, high impulsivity, low social skills in a general and marital setting, hostile attitudes towards women, and positive attitudes towards the use of violence. Holtzworth-Munroe and Stuart (1994) proposed that this type perpetrated violence as a part of a cold and instrumental means of conflict resolution, achieving compliance through a system of intimidation. This type was proposed to feel little remorse and be extremely violent, aided by their lack of attachment to their wives, hostile attitudes towards women and positive feelings towards to use of violence. This type represents the general character of a batterer as described by feminist works; however the Generally Violent Antisocial batterer was proposed to be far from the typical batterer, Holtzworth-Munroe and Stuart (1994) suggested that this type would compose 25% of a representative sample.

This proposed typology was tested by a number of studies with a finding of general support for the typology in all studies (Delsol, Margolin, & John, 2003; Hamberger, Lohr, Bonge, & Tolin, 1996; Holtzworth-Munroe, Meehan, Herron, Rehman, & Stuart, 2000; Waltz, Babcock, Jacobson, & Gottman, 2000). A number of other studies examined the typology indirectly, or with a reduced number of variables. Hamberger, Lohr, Bonge and Tolin (1996) conducted a cluster analysis using only psychopathology data from 833 intimately violent men who had been arrested, finding that, consistent with the typology, three profiles similar to that described by Holtzworth-Munroe and Stuart (1994) were the best solution. These profiles were also validated with the use of external variables which Holtzworth-Munroe and Stuart (1994) had linked with particular types. Langhinrichsen-Rohling, Huss and Ramsey (2000) conducted a comparison of the Holtzworth-Munroe and Stuart (1994) typology, an empirical typology and clinicians' ability to replicate the type allocation. However, this study falls short of a direct test of the typology as the violence severity level was not included in the analysis. All of the other original studies evaluating the typology (Delsol, Margolin, & John, 2003; Holtzworth-Munroe, Meehan, Herron, Rehman, &

Stuart, 2000; Waltz, Babcock, Jacobson, & Gottman, 2000) conducted their analysis in the same way, using the variables severity/frequency of violence, generality of violence and psychopathology and including them into some form of cluster analysis. Although these studies had some methodological differences and some differing results, these studies generally supported the proposed typology.

Tests of the Typology

The studies that tested the Holtzworth-Munroe and Stuart (1994) typology found a number of anomalies which are problematic for the reliability of the typology. These variations suggest that some of the variables used to type these studies need adjustment, particularly the measurement of psychopathology and intimate violence level.

Holtzworth-Munroe, Meehan, Herron, Rehman and Stuart (2000) conducted the most thorough test of the typology, using both spouses' report for the measurement of violence, severity weighting for acts of violence and the most comprehensive measures of frequency/severity of violence, generality of violence and psychopathology possible. This study also examined every part of the proposed typology and had the most comprehensive set of external measures. External measures add validity to the typology by demonstrating that the types derived from the analysis are able to differentiate from each other on variables on which the types are proposed to differ. Holtzworth-Munroe, Meehan, Herron, Rehman and Stuart (2000) found that on all the measures, the different types differed as predicted, however an unexpected fourth type was found in the final cluster analysis. The Low-Level-Antisocial type was found to fall intermediate on most measures between the Family Only and Generally Violent Antisocial type. This type exhibited low levels of violence, but had significant levels of antisocial personality characteristics and had significant levels of variables related to the perpetration of intimate violence (Holtzworth-Munroe, Meehan, Herron, Rehman, & Stuart, 2000). The researchers suggest that this Low Level Antisocial type reflects a more pathological low level offender which commonly occur in clinical samples, meaning that clinical Family Only types are equivalent to community Low Level Antisocial types, and the community Family Only type is reflective of a type of batterer not previously evaluated (Holtzworth-Munroe, Meehan, Herron, Rehman, & Stuart, 2000). While the evidence offered for this does have some merit, such as the significantly lower levels of violence found in Family Only types from community samples (Holtzworth-Munroe, Meehan, Herron, Rehman, & Stuart, 2000) and the fact that none of the part of the sample which came from a violence treatment program (n =7) did not get classed as Family Only, the

antisocial personality characteristics of men from clinical samples do not seem to be at the level Holtzworth-Munroe et al. (2000) suggests. A subsequent study has demonstrated a three-type solution in a community sample and a four-type solution in a clinical sample, which supports this argument (Babcock, Costa, Green, & Eckhardt, 2004). Additionally, the Borderline-Dysphoric type was found to be high in antisocial characteristics, violence in the marriage and a variety of other variables thought to be distinct to the Generally Violent Antisocial group (Holtzworth-Munroe, Meehan, Herron, Rehman, & Stuart, 2000). However the Borderline-Dysphoric type was distinct from the Generally Violent Antisocial type in the fear of abandonment scale, generality of violence, preoccupied and fearful attachment and a number of other consistent variables.

Delsol, Margolin and John (2003) conducted a similar study, although using some different instruments and a simplified analysis method. This study found a Family Only and Generally Violent Antisocial type consistent with the model and the findings from Holtzworth-Munroe, Meehan, Herron, Rehman and Stuart (2000), however instead of a Borderline-Dysphoric type, a medium violence type with low pathology was found. Waltz, Babcock, Jacobson and Gottman (2000) also found problems with the typology in terms of psychopathology; finding that the Borderline-Dysphoric and Generally Violent Antisocial types were not distinct in terms of psychopathology. The results of these studies suggest that there are problems in defining the Borderline-Dysphoric and Generally Violent Antisocial types, particularly in terms of psychopathology.

Problems with psychopathology and the distinction between the Generally Violent Antisocial type and the Borderline-Dysphoric type may be related to methodology. Waltz et al. (2000) discusses the problems of using the Millon Clinical Multiaxial Inventory–I (Millon, 1983) and the Millon Clinical Multiaxial Inventory–II (Millon, 1987) in typology applications, pointing out that the antisocial and borderline scales of the tests had a high correlation in their study ($r = .64$ among violent participants), and a high overlap of items (53%), making discerning between the Generally Violent Antisocial and Borderline-Dysphoric types difficult. Although the Millon Clinical Multiaxial Inventory-III (Millon, 1994) has addressed this issue to some degree, reducing the overlap of items (18%), Waltz et al. (2000) suggests that antisocial and borderline characteristics are fundamentally similar (particularly impulsivity and externalising behaviour problems) both conceptually and methodologically and that

their use as a typing variable to discern between the Borderline-Dysphoric and Generally Violent Antisocial type has questionable validity.

While this review has focused on some of the inconsistencies these typological studies have yielded, generally the typing of intimately violent men has very good reliability and validity using a great variety of instruments and measures (Delsol, Margolin, & John, 2003; Hamberger, Lohr, Bonge, & Tolin, 1996; Holtzworth-Munroe, Meehan, Herron, Rehman, & Stuart, 2000; Langhinrichsen-Rohling, Huss, & Ramsey, 2000; Waltz, Babcock, Jacobson, & Gottman, 2000) a fact which suggests that strong differences exist between these types.

While the studies discussed previously directly tested elements of the typology, some studies have examined parts of this typology indirectly or inadvertently. A number of two type typologies have examined the motives of batterers, suggesting that there is simply instrumental and an expressively violent men (Chase, O'Leary, & Heyman, 2001; Tweed & Dutton, 1998). These studies describe two types of violent men, expressively violent men (or reactive) who engage in violence as a response to perceived threats (real or otherwise) or frustrations in the context of high affective-physiological arousal and minimal cognitive processing, exacerbated by personality and attachment characteristics associated with increased reactivity to perceived partner rejection or betrayal, jealousy and high anger. The other type was described as instrumentally violent men (or proactive) who offends as a planned, methodical and goal based pattern of behaviour (including other forms of abuse) with limited emotional and physiological arousal, have personality characteristics conductive to carrying out aggression for interpersonal means, and experience very little reciprocal violence (Chase, O'Leary, & Heyman, 2001; Tweed & Dutton, 1998). These types roughly translate to the Borderline-Dysphoric and Generally Violent Antisocial types, with the Family Only type engaging in predominantly expressive violence although with lower levels of violence and less factors conductive to violence than the Borderline-Dysphoric type.

Another body of research has examined the heart-rates of maritally violent men in simulated marital interactions with their wives. It was found that compared to a resting heart-rate, some men decrease their heart-rate during a simulated argument (Type 1) and some increase their heart-rate (Type 2), and that these types resembled Generally Violent Antisocial and Borderline-Dysphoric men in a number of important characteristics (Gottman et al., 1995). Although some research failed to replicate the

characteristics described, particularly the antisocial characteristics (Babcock, Green, Webb, & Graham, 2004), more recent research has found support for this distinction between types, however finding that type 1 men were more likely to have antisocial characteristics in a severely violent sample and type 2 men were more likely to have antisocial characteristics in a low level violent sample (Babcock, Green, Webb, & Yerington, 2005).

Another approach to examining different types of intimate violence is to look at the issue in the dyad. Johnson (1995) originally proposed that two types of violence existed, common couple violence and intimate terrorism. Common couple violence reflects reciprocal patterns of low level violence which occurs intermittently in the relationship, while intimate terrorism refers to one partner's domination of another using serious violence and other tactics constantly over the course of the relationship (Johnson, 1995). Two other types were later added to this typology of couples, violent resistance; where one disempowered partner uses violence and other controlling tactics in order to regain power in the relationship, and mutual control, where two intimate terrorist types compete for control of the relationship (Johnson & Ferraro, 2000). This typology has been demonstrated with both qualitative (Rosen, Stith, Few, Daly, & Tritt, 2005) and quantitative (Graham-Kevan & Archer, 2003; Johnson & Leone, 2005) methodologies and would seem to represent the wide variety of violent relationships in a more salient way than just the measurement of the male partner. Johnson and Leone (2005) found that relationships characterised by intimate terrorism had more frequent violence, victims were more likely to be injured, use drugs, have symptoms of post-traumatic stress disorder and were more likely to leave their partners. To some degree this typology of couples can be integrated with the individual typologies; Family Only men would seem to commit mainly common couple violence, while the Generally Violent Antisocial type men would seem to commit intimate terrorism, although research is needed to assess the rates of reciprocal violence among the different types outlined by Holtzworth-Munroe and Stuart (1994).

Typologies of Violent Women

Very little work has been done examining the nature of violent women. Babcock, Miller and Siard (2003) proposed a typology of violent women, suggesting that women who were generally violent had been socialised to believe that women's use of violence was acceptable and were more likely to use instrumental violence and control tactics on their husbands, while partner only women were likely to use and

experience less violence in their relationships. Partner only women were proposed to use violence for more defensive purposes, however it was found that both types had similar proportions of self defence or violence with a reactive motive (Babcock, Miller, & Siard, 2003). The trend is for women's violence to be examined in the context of men's violence (Swan & Snow, 2002), which reflects the fact that women's violence is seen as of lesser importance and inevitably tied to men's violence.

While no direct analysis of the consistency of the different types described by typological research has taken place, researchers commonly compare the types and suggest that between them, consistent profiles exist. On the face of the types being discussed in research, there is good consistency in the profiles being discussed. That is, one profile of very violent men with antisocial characteristics and high levels of general violence (Generally Violent Antisocial), one type with medium to high levels of violence in the family, borderline characteristics and low levels of general violence (Borderline-Dysphoric), a type with low levels of violence, very low generality of violence and no significant psychopathology (Family Only) and a type similar to the Family Only type except with significant antisocial characteristics and some general violence (Low Level Antisocial) which can appear distinct in a community sample or in place of a Family Only type in a clinical sample. While there are some inconsistencies in the profiles between the studies, it is outside the scope of this literature review to examine these issues in great depth. Despite these discrepancies, typological research provides an insight into the characteristics of the perpetrators of intimate violence.

The Usefulness of the Types

The main application of this typology is in terms of an improved outcome in battering treatment programs. Borderline-Dysphoric and Generally Violent Antisocial types have been found to have less positive results in any type of treatment compared to the Family Only type (Dutton, Bodnarchuk, Kropp, Hart, & Ogloff, 1997), and have the greatest need for treatment addressing their specific needs as a subtype (Delsol, Margolin, & John, 2003; Hamberger, Lohr, Bonge, & Tolin, 1996; Holtzworth-Munroe, Meehan, Herron, Rehman, & Stuart, 2000; Saunders, 1992; Tweed & Dutton, 1998; Waltz, Babcock, Jacobson, & Gottman, 2000). Gondolf (1997) completed a meta-analysis of treatment groups and found that batterers who drop out of treatment are more likely to have drug and alcohol problems and antisocial or narcissistic tendencies. Treatment drop-outs are also more likely to have committed serious domestic violence initially and are more likely to re-offend (Gondolf, 1997). The Generally Violent

Antisocial type has also been found to be less likely to complete treatment and less likely to remain violence free at 6 months as rated by their therapist (Langhinrichsen-Rohling, Huss, & Ramsey, 2000). In terms of treatment matching, Saunders (1996) found that Generally Violent Antisocial type batterers showed better outcome in feminist-cognitive behavioural group therapy, whereas Borderline-Dysphoric type batterers showed more positive outcomes in a psychodynamic-process group treatment. The Family Only type is proposed to have the best outcomes in treatment programs that deal exclusively with violence, abuse and relationship problems (Holtzworth-Munroe, Meehan, Herron, Rehman, & Stuart, 2000; Waltz, Babcock, Jacobson, & Gottman, 2000). Research into the more specific treatment needs of each type is currently being undertaken which will provide an even better framework with which to apply the typology, but for now the research suggests simply that different types of intimately violent men need different types of treatment. Female perpetrators of violence are seen as an external issue to the man's treatment; that men's wives are unlikely to remain violent when men have desisted in violence. Although research conflicts with this idea (Straus, 2004a; Straus & Ramirez, 2002), a dual response has been found to be most efficient way of approaching the issue (Feld & Straus, 1989; Gelles & Straus, 1988; S. G. O'Leary & Slep, 2006; Schumacher & Leonard, 2005; Woodin & O'Leary, 2006).

Chapter Summary

The main points from this chapter are: Studies which considered men's violence using single variables found diversity in the characteristics of violent men. Intimate violence typologies represent an attempt to classify violent men in a meaningful way using the variables of severity of violence, generality of violence and psychopathology. Three main types were theorised and found in research, the Family Only type, the Borderline-Dysphoric type and the Generally Violent Antisocial type. A number of inconsistencies have been found which can be attributed to issues with the measurement of psychopathology and possibly the measurement of violence in the relationship. The main application for intimate violence typologies is in the design of interventions tailored to the needs of each specific type.

The conclusions from typological research have implications for the way in which treatment and criminal justice remedies should be applied to particular individuals. However, the measurement of violence in these types and indeed in all violent relationships is problematic. Violence is the main variable of interest and is strongly related to the intervention likely to be taken, in that more serious types of

violence are likely to result in prosecution. The following chapter will discuss the measurement of intimate violence in research and the limitations on the accuracy of the reports which are used to manage the response to intimate violence.

CHAPTER 5
THE MEASUREMENT OF INTIMATE VIOLENCE

The variable of central importance in any study concerning intimate violence is that of severity/frequency of violence. Violence is the reason why this research exists, the types and trends of violence can tell us about the phenomena itself, and violence is often used as an indicator of the comparative success of approaches taken to address the problem. While other variables may be useful in deconstructing the offender and providing insight into motive, the level of violence will always remain as the chief factor in determining criminal justice interventions. In research however, the current focus is upon relating the level of violence with other variables such as antisociality, generality of violence and attachment, with an eye towards identifying reliable profiles of intimate violence perpetrators (Chase, O'Leary, & Heyman, 2001; Delsol, Margolin, & John, 2003; Gottman et al., 1995; Hamberger, Lohr, Bonge, & Tolin, 1996; Holtzworth-Munroe, Meehan, Herron, Rehman, & Stuart, 2000; Langhinrichsen-Rohling, Huss, & Ramsey, 2000; Saunders, 1992; Tweed & Dutton, 1998; Waltz, Babcock, Jacobson, & Gottman, 2000). The variable of severity/frequency of violence has been taken more-or-less on its face value as compared to some of the other less tangible variables used in this type of research; however there are some fundamental problems with some of the ways in which this seemingly straightforward variable is measured.

Intimate violence as an area of social research is a relatively new field; the issue was widely minimised and considered taboo until the early 1970s when advocacy groups pushed women's issues into societal consciousness. With this challenge to the existing attitude that violence in a marriage was outside the province of the law, came the need for research into the phenomena. Much early domestic violence research focused on the prevalence of battering; the seminal Straus, Gelles and Steinmetz (1980) interviewed a sample of 2,143 American households and found that 28% of the couples had experienced violence in the course of the relationship and 16% in the previous year. Despite a follow up study which yielded similar results (Straus & Gelles, 1986), the levels of violence reported in research are quite inconsistent; varying from 1.8% (Mason & Blankenship, 1987) all the way up to 56% (Gelles, 1974). The Australian Bureau of Statistics (*Women's Safety Australia*, 1996) reported that 23% of women who had ever

been married or in a de-facto relationship indicated that they had experienced violence by an intimate partner. Despite more concrete figures in terms of calls for police attendance (Sherman, Schmidt, & Rogan, 1992), proportions of assaults and murders in general (Federal Bureau of Investigation, 1997; Perkins & Klaus, 1996) and even a study detailing an estimated annual cost of intimate violence for New South Wales (Cox & Leonard, 1991), figures for proportions of violence in the population and indeed in the relationship are based purely on self report which are inevitably of questionable validity. Weis (1989) provides an in-depth critique on many of the research methods used in studies, examining prevalence of violence, suggesting that the quality of the measures, the tendency for husbands to under-report, and samples excluding non-traditional couples (i.e. same sex, common law), all skew and distort the violence prevalence figures. Similar issues come into play when measuring violence within a relationship.

The Measurement of Intimate Violence

Generally, the measurement of intimate violence is fraught with inconsistencies, much of it out of the hands of the researcher, although attempts have been made to make the measurement of violence more uniform. The most widely used and well established measure of violence is the Conflict Tactics Scales (Straus, 1979), a twenty-six item self report measure of violence which is administered as either an interview or as a survey. Depending on the needs of the researcher, the Conflict Tactics Scales can be administered in a yes/no type format referring to a specific period of time, or on an interval scale where a participant indicates the frequency of each item occurring in a specific time period. The Conflict Tactics Scales (Straus, 1979) focuses on measuring reasoning, verbal aggression and physical violence as a means of dealing with disagreements. The revised version, the Conflict Tactics Scale 2 (Straus, Hamby, Boney-McCoy & Sugarman, 1996) expanded on these scales; clarifying the language used, added additional items to enhance content validity, replaced the reasoning scale with a more effective negotiation scale[1], and added additional scales; sexual coercion and injury. The Conflict Tactics Scales 2 altered items to better differentiate between minor and severe acts of violence, the difference between them being important in a behavioural sense (Delsol, Margolin, & John, 2003; Holtzworth-Munroe, Meehan, Herron, Rehman, & Stuart, 2000; Waltz, Babcock, Jacobson, & Gottman, 2000), and also in a criminal justice sense (Straus, 2006c). The Conflict Tactics Scales and Conflict

[1] This new scale focuses on the cognitive and emotional aspects of negotiating a conflict

Tactics Scales 2 are widely used in intimate violence research as the primary instrument for measuring physical abusiveness in a relationship (Straus, Hamby, Boney-McCoy & Sugarman, 1996)[2]. Despite the refinements made to the instrument to improve its validity and reliability, there are a number of fundamental problems and inconsistencies with the measurement of severity/frequency of violence.

Criticisms of the Conflict Tactics Scales

For some researchers, the Conflict Tactics Scales reflects an effort to quantify an experience, which they feel undermines women's experience of violence and exaggerates women's perpetration of violent acts, and is only rightly examined in qualitative reports. This has led to much criticism of the instrument, some of it well founded, and some more based a general dissatisfaction with the findings it has yielded. Straus (1999) recounts the anger of feminists with his research, resulting in his being excommunicated from feminist organisations, and even a bomb threat at his office because of the findings of his studies.

Straus (2006c) identifies the prominent criticisms of the measure, stating that the majority of the criticisms are not backed up by any empirical evidence, rather the result of ideological differences of researchers criticising the instrument to mitigate their own use of it. It has been suggested that the Conflict Tactics Scales measures only violent acts in a marital conflict, that no consideration is made for the seriousness of the acts perpetrated, that the context of violence is not considered by the instrument, that it ignores who initiates the violence, that it considers only a limited range of violent acts, that it is unrealistic to expect participants to indicate some of the frequency of acts with any accuracy, that the measurement of violence is restricted to the current partner, that injuries are not linked to assaults and that underreporting is not controlled for (Straus, 2006c). A previous article by Straus (1990) identifies a number of other criticisms including that threats are counted as violence, and that distinction between minor and severe acts of violence has no real basis. This summary represents the body of criticism of the Conflict Tactics Scales (Bagshaw & Chung, 2000; R. E. Dobash & Dobash, 1992; Domestic Violence Prevention Unit, 2006).

Straus (2006c) counters some of these arguments, points out the flaws in others and accepts the limitations of the Conflict Tactics Scales in some circumstances. Many

[2] The Conflict Tactics Scales and the Conflict Tactics Scales 2 will both be referred to as the Conflict Tactics Scales unless a specific distinction is made.

of these criticisms have taken a limited view of the methods of the instrument, ignored new developments such as the Conflict Tactics Scales 2 or simply have misstated information.

Some researchers have suggested that violence occurring not in a conflict is likely to be missed by the instrument, although not presenting any empirical evidence to justify this criticism. However, the beginning statement of the Conflict Tactics Scales asks for any sort of violence in the relationship; not restricting measurable acts to conflict situations (Straus, 2006c). Straus (2006c) also cites a study which found that both conflict based and malicious violence are recorded by the Conflict Tactics Scales when the interview format is administered, a standard form of the Conflict Tactics Scales (Giles-Sims, 1983).

The Conflict Tactics Scales is criticised for not factoring in the seriousness of the violent act, where this is simply not so. The original Conflict Tactics Scales included minor and severe subscales, which were either recorded separately or integrated using a weighting system (Straus, 1979). The Conflict Tactics Scales 2 features severity weighting as well as making the distinction between minor and serious violence, and measuring sexual violence and injury (Straus, Hamby, Boney-McCoy, & Sugarman, 1996). Some researchers have designed their own severity weighting system, basing the weightings on the likelihood of the act causing injury (Holtzworth-Munroe, Meehan, Herron, Rehman, & Stuart, 2000). Straus (2006c) also suggests that as the instrument allows for the measurement of frequency, it allows for the identification of victims who have received frequent and severe violence. The Domestic Violence Prevention Unit's (2006) assertation that when using the Conflict Tactics Scales, breaking a teacup is equivalent to breaking a rib is simply wrong. Breaking a teacup comes under psychological aggression "destroyed something belonging to my partner" (Straus, Hamby, Boney-McCoy, & Sugarman, 1996, p. 311) and regardless to the fact that these variables are measured separately, the breaking of a rib would be severely weighted in the final figure and would be likely accompanied by a number of other acts of violence. A worrying trend is the lack of validation or evidence in dismissing the use of the Conflict Tactics Scales and other empirical methods that means intimate violence quantitatively. The Domestic Violence Prevention Unit's (Domestic Violence Prevention Unit, 2006) criticisms of the measure are based on a number of very brief review articles (Flood, 1999, Summer; Stephen, 2005, April) which provide no real justification or detailed explanations for Conflict Tactics Scales items not differentiating

the seriousness of the violence. Australian intimate violence professionals need to examine the validity of the Conflict Tactics Scales and Conflict Tactics Scales 2 for themselves, rather than rely on unfounded and unsubstantiated criticism based on another researcher's restrictive theoretical perspective.

One criticism of the Conflict Tactics Scales is that because the instrument does not measure the context of violence, it is ineffective. Bagshaw and Chung (2000) suggest that the Conflict Tactics Scales is limited as it does not consider if the violence is an "attack or a defence", the meaning of the violence, or if the attack had a control motive. The Domestic Violence Prevention Unit (2006) also vaguely criticises the Conflict Tactics Scales for not measuring the context of the offence. Straus (2006c) argues that the Conflict Tactics Scales measures violence in an objective manner and that context is irrelevant to the quality of the measure, likening criticisms of the test to criticising a child's reading test because it does not measure the reasons for a child's reading deficits. The measurement of the context of the violence need to be examined externally and suit the particular hypothesis the researcher is interested in. Flowing into this is the issue that the Conflict Tactics Scales does not measure which partner initiated the violence. Straus (2006c) suggests that researchers interested in the issue should include questions to assess this externally to the Conflict Tactics Scales.

Another criticism of the Conflict Tactics Scales is that the number of violent acts available to be endorsed is limited. The Conflict Tactics Scales 2 (Straus, Hamby, Boney-McCoy, & Sugarman, 1996) was developed using a factor analysis, resulting in the most important items being used in the final instrument. While some additional, more specific acts could be added, the Conflict Tactics Scales 2 represents a very comprehensive measure. All of the items Bagshaw and Chung (2000) suggest are lacking from the Conflict Tactics Scales are in the Conflict Tactics Scales 2, and as such would be included in the figures referring to the level of violence in the relationship. While theoretically unlimited numbers of items could be added to the measure, the ones that are available represent the most common forms of physical violence; any extra items are unlikely to result in a significant amount of additional violence being reported.

The Conflict Tactics Scales has been criticised for the measurement of specific numbers of acts over a time period, the suggestion being that participants are unlikely to remember exactly how many acts occurred (Straus, 2006c). This is justified by Straus (2006c) with the thousands of respondents who have provided such data. Also, the

categories the participants are asked to endorse are interval level, which allows participants to enter in the number of acts of violence approximately.

The Conflict Tactics Scales does not measure violence that was perpetrated by a different intimate partner. Although this could be perceived as a fault in the instrument, the Conflict Tactics Scales is concerned with violence in the current relationship and any measure of previous violence requires an external measure as to not confound the measurement of violence in the current relationship.

The separate measurement of injury is another common criticism of the Conflict Tactics Scales. However, researchers have used item weighting procedures which factor in the likelihood of causing injury to the score of each item (Holtzworth-Munroe, Meehan, Herron, Rehman, & Stuart, 2000). The scores on the injury scale can also be considered separately and linked to the violent acts that caused the injury in the results (Straus, 2006c). Alternately, Straus (2004b) provides a system for scoring the Conflict Tactics Scales which reflects the seriousness of the acts being perpetrated, which is a standard part of the Conflict Tactics Scales 2 (Straus, Hamby, Boney-McCoy, & Sugarman, 1996).

Some critics of the Conflict Tactics Scales assumed that the item "threatened to hit or throw something at him/her" was included in the physical subscale when this was not so (Straus, 1990). Straus (1979) clearly identified scoring instructions, yet this criticism was made and cited by others as part of the case for the invalidation of the instrument (R. P. Dobash & Dobash, 1983; E. Stark & Flitcraft, 1983).

Straus (1990) accepts the limitations of the Conflict Tactics Scales in regards to the different likelihood of injury between a man's violence and a women's violence, suggesting that the size, weight and muscle development discrepancy could be used to mitigate the violence figures. This could also be done by factoring in men and women's likelihood of inflicting an injury into severity scales such as in Holtzworth-Munroe, Meehan, Herron, Rehman and Stuart (2000) and the standard scoring system for the instrument (Straus, 2004b). However, Straus (1990) defends the distinction between severe and minor violence by suggesting that the two categories roughly correspond to simple and aggravated assault definitions, as well as reflecting different likelihoods of injury.

The main valid criticism of the Conflict Tactics Scales is that of underreporting. Although this issue is not limited to the Conflict Tactics Scales, research has found that significant underreporting occurs when using self report measures of intimate violence (Archer, 1999).

The Issue of Self Report Bias

Generally, the problems with measuring the variable of intimate violence stem from having to rely on self-report measures of private and unverifiable events. There are a wide range of effects from this, including the tendency for men to underreport their own violence (Archer, 1999; Edleson & Brygger, 1986; Heyman & Schlee, 1997; Jouriles & O'Leary, 1985; Moffitt et al., 1997; K. D. O'Leary & Arias, 1988; Schafer, Caetano, & Clark, 2002; Simpson & Christensen, 2005; Stets & Straus, 1992), particularly men who engage in very severe violence (Heyman & Schlee, 1997). This underreport effect is especially salient if there is no other source of report with which to compare. The discrepancy between partners is often not considered in the research, the use of a single partner's account is often seen as accurate enough (Straus, Hamby, Boney-McCoy, & Sugarman, 1996). Research suggests that in some cases, victims deny incidents of violence which occurred; Heckert and Gondolf (2000) found that victims (29%) were more likely to not indicate an assault on a self report inventory that had in fact occurred as verified by a police report. Additionally, Frieze and Browne (1989) concluded in a review of violence reporting studies that women who had experienced severe levels of violence tended to underreport the frequency and severity of the attacks. This has implications for studies that have used just a woman's report of violence, a measure previously assumed to be comparatively free of bias compared to men's reporting (Gottman et al., 1995; Waltz, Babcock, Jacobson, & Gottman, 2000). What this suggests is that while the victim's report is an important indicator of violence level, victims still underreport the violence inflicted upon them.

Research suggests that both male and female perpetrators underreport violence (Archer, 1999) and in some cases victims may underreport as well (Heckert & Gondolf, 2000). The measurement of violence then depends on examining the report of both victim and perpetrator. This can involve using the highest report of either partner on each item, highest report overall, or an average score between the two. This method inevitably is limited as there is no subjective source to verify the data, so the focus is the discrepancy between victim and perpetrator's report, which essentially is the only ethically feasible and practical method of researching the report of violence. While

some studies have involved the use of third party familial reporting of violence to verify the reports of husbands and wives, the use of children's report of their parent's violence is not widespread, is of questionable validity, as well as being ethically unsupportable (Grych, Seid, & Fincham, 1992). Other studies have used police reports to test the concurrent validity of participants' self report (Heckert & Gondolf, 2000), which is effective at picking up violence that occurred but was not indicated on the measure in a clinical sample. However it is not feasible for all studies to obtain arrest records for all their participants, and it is unlikely a community sample would have the extensive arrest record of a clinical sample as to make this worthwhile. The reporting of intimate violence to the police is likely also to be subject to a great many other factors which complicate the use of arrest records as a test of concurrent validity. While flawed, like any other self-report based variable, reporting of frequency/severity of violence commonly takes place in an anonymous context with the best efforts made to reduce any type of researcher bias, with participants who have volunteered to participate in the study. While the data acquired concerning frequency/severity of violence should not be taken on face value, this represents the best measure of violence available, particularly when both partners are involved in the reporting process.

Many studies use data from just the male protagonist in a violent relationship, citing the difficulty and ethical dilemmas brought into play by involving a female partner, primarily as a victim, into a study. These studies also cite correlations between husband and wife report in arguing for the validity of their method. A number of studies have explicitly examined the correlation between husband and wife reporting of violence in small samples, and have been citied as support for the independent use of husband and wife reports; however this is quite a generous interpretation considering the lack of agreement between spouses reporting identical events on identical measures (Archer & Ray, 1989; Browning & Dutton, 1986; Cantos, Neidig, & O'Leary, 1994; Moffitt et al., 1997). Jouriles and O'Leary (1985) examined the inter-spousal inter-reliability of the Conflict Tactics Scales and found that agreement between spouses concerning a husband's violent acts was 50% in a clinical sample and 38% in a community sample. This suggests that the differences in reporting could potentially be huge, especially considering typological studies, which use severity data to class their participants, often based on low levels of reported violence (Holtzworth-Munroe, Meehan, Herron, Rehman, & Stuart, 2000; Waltz, Babcock, Jacobson, & Gottman, 2000). Although the Jouriles and O'Leary (1985) study was conducted with a small

sample[3], a number of other studies have shown similarly low levels of agreement between partners. Heckert and Gondolf (2000) found that at a follow up to an intake for intimate violence treatment there was a 17% occurrence agreement between spouses that particular violent acts had occurred amongst a sample where one partner had reported an act occurring, although on entrance to the program occurrence agreement was 61%. Archer (1999) conducted a meta-analysis of severity/frequency of violence and found that studies reporting correlations between spouses concerning a husband's violence was between *.33r* and *.65r*, and in studies where Cohen's Kappa had been used[4] *.33k* and *.46k*. These figures have been used to enhance the reliability of violence reporting and also to call it into question, as the problem remains as to what is a reasonable level of discrepancy in reporting.

While the argument that husbands and wives are reporting similar levels of violence on the Conflict Tactics Scales is valid, the simple fact is that two participants reporting the same phenomena will inevitably be highly correlated; high levels of overall agreement will inevitably occur as participants are highly likely to agree on violent acts that did not occur, enhancing the overall correlation (Jouriles & O'Leary, 1985). Particularly in samples where there are a low number of violent incidents to report, correlations will likely be very high. A better measure of the discrepancy is the effect size; a statistic which indicates the standardised difference between the two figures on the final score of the Conflict Tactics Scales.

The real issues in examining underreporting are the general consistency of discrepancies in reporting, how much of a discrepancy is reasonable (i.e. can be counted to a chance forgetting), how much of a discrepancy can be attributed to researcher bias and impression management on the part of the perpetrator or shame on the part of the victim, and how much of a discrepancy can be attributed to other variables. Heyman and Schlee (1997) put a figure to the discrepancy, suggesting that single partner reports of violence by husbands concerning husband violence should be multiplied by 1.33, or 2.4 when specifically focusing on severe acts, in order to correct for socially desirable reporting in a very general way. It was also proposed that wives' reports should be multiplied by 1.2, and 1.1 when specifically focusing on severe acts (Heyman & Schlee, 1997). These figures reflect the average correction between partner reporting conducted by Heyman and Schlee (1997). Assuming all reports of violence are true, this number

[3] N=65 from the clinical sample; N=37 from the community sample.

will correct self-report figures. Short of constant observation of a couple over the reference period, there is no way to provide an objective figure of frequency/severity of violence and no way to determine between an underreporting of violence on a measure such as the Conflict Tactics Scales, or what could potentially be an over report. Therefore, the heart of the issue is to determine the extent of discrepancy in frequency/severity of violence reporting between men and women, irrespective of if the discrepancy is due to an underreport or over report. While this issue has been well addressed in terms of men's violence, less focus has been given to the measurement of women's violence and the potential discrepancies in reporting between men and women on this issue.

The Measurement of Women's Violence

Since the 1990's, one of the more controversial issues in the study of intimate violence has been how to understand and address violence perpetrated by women toward their male partners. Women's violence toward their male partners confounds the traditional feminist perspective of intimate violence, that intimate violence is a manifestation of the control that men have over women (R. E. Dobash & Dobash, 1992; Fagan, Stewart, & Hansen, 1983). Feminist theorists have been dismissive of findings that women are as violent, if not more violent in intimate relationships (Archer, 2000; Babcock, Miller, & Siard, 2003; Morris & Reilly, 2003; Newby et al., 2003; Straus & Gelles, 1986; Straus & Ramirez, 2002) suggesting that women's violence is primarily in self-defence and that the likelihood of women inflicting an injury is low (R. E. Dobash & Dobash, 1992; R. P. Dobash & Dobash, 2004; Fagan, 1989).

In terms of self defence there is a strong body of research suggesting that self-defence represents only a very small proportion of women's intimate violence (DeKeseredy & Schwartz, 1998; Fiebert & Gonzalez, 1997; Follingstad, Bradley, Heliff, & Laughlin, 2002). Large community samples of women indicate that they mostly used violence to engage their partner's attention (Fiebert & Gonzalez, 1997), to punish the other person, or to feel more powerful (Follingstad, Bradley, Heliff, & Laughlin, 2002). These women also indicated that they felt their violence was acceptable as they were unlikely to injure their partner and that their partner was unlikely to respond with violence (Fiebert & Gonzalez, 1997). This is important for a number of reasons; it suggests that some women have specific gender based values

[4] As discussed in Archer (1999) this measure is mostly used to assess the reliability between two trained,

which permit the use of violence against their partners, and that in some cases the lack of threat of men responding to a woman's abuse with violence may be related to a woman's willingness to act violently towards their partner.

A number of studies have addressed the gender issue in domestic violence directly and have consistently found that women are involved in intimate violence in high rates, not only as a part of a reciprocal pattern of violence but also as the primary perpetrator (Straus, 2004a; Straus & Ramirez, 2002). A recent study also found that while women were more likely to be the primary perpetrator in acts of minor violence, they were also more likely to be the primary perpetrator in acts of severe violence (Straus, 2004; Straus & Ramirez, 2002). However, despite the seriousness of the violence inflicted[5], research does seem to indicate that men are more likely to inflict an injury on their partner (Archer, 2000). There is a divergence in the literature, which can be related to the theoretical orientation of the researchers and origin of the sample; one side suggesting that women are independently violent in relationships in some cases and that women's violence is as valid an issue to discuss as men's violence (Archer, 2000; Heckert & Gondolf, 2000; Straus & Gelles, 1986; Straus & Ramirez, 2002), and another side suggesting that men's violence is the central issue and that any focus on women's violence detracts from the harm that men do in intimate relationships (R. P. Dobash & Dobash, 2004; Fagan, 1989).

While the relevance of women's violence as a stand-alone issue is debateable, it is somewhat less deniable that the issue of women's violence in the context of an already violent relationship is of pivotal importance. Research suggests that the cessation of a husband's violence is highly dependant on their partner also ceasing violence (Feld & Straus, 1989; Gelles & Straus, 1988; S. G. O'Leary & Slep, 2006; Schumacher & Leonard, 2005; Woodin & O'Leary, 2006), an issue largely at odds with the way in which treatment is administered, the dominant paradigm in treatment being feminist therapy.

The feminist perspective typically suggests that women's violence occurs solely as a response to their husband's violence, an extraordinarily optimistic point of view, at odds with research (Archer, 2000; Straus, 2004a; Straus & Ramirez, 2002). Many

---

independent raters.

[5] The severe scale of the Conflict Tactics Scale 2 includes: Used a knife or gun on my partner, punched or hit my partner with something that could hurt, choked my partner, slammed my partner against a wall, beat up my partner, burned or scalded my partner on purpose, kicked my partner. All these acts have an extremely high chance of causing injury to the recipient.

programs would seem to promote the acceptance of responsibility of men for all aspects of the violent relationship, including women's violence, a glaring hypocrisy of feminist rhetoric in that husbands are held responsible for their wives' behaviour. While women's use of violence in no way mitigates men's retaliation with violence, putting violent men with poor social and problem solving skills (Babcock, Costa, Green, & Eckhardt, 2004; Chase, O'Leary, & Heyman, 2001; Delsol, Margolin, & John, 2003; Holtzworth-Munroe, Meehan, Herron, Rehman, & Stuart, 2000; Saunders, 1992; Tweed & Dutton, 1998; Waltz, Babcock, Jacobson, & Gottman, 2000) into a situation where they are confronted with aggression is likely to result in an aggressive response, regardless of whatever gender sensitivity and empathy training they have received.

Johnson and Ferraro (2000) proposed a marital dyad typology, involving four different patterns of violence: common couple violence, intimate terrorism, violent resistance and mutual violent control. Common couple violence is characterised by intermittent, low level patterns of violence perpetrated by one or two partners in the course of normal marital conflict, usually with a motive to be in control of a specific situation (Johnson, 1995; Johnson & Ferraro, 2000; Johnson & Leone, 2005). In comparison, intimate terrorism is concerned with general control over a partner, incorporating frequent physical and emotional abuse. A variation on this pattern is mutual violent control which resembles two intimate terrorists vying for general control over a relationship (Johnson & Ferraro, 2000; Johnson & Leone, 2005). The other variation on these patterns is violent resistance, which involves a disempowered partner using violent and non-violent acts to attain a modicum of power in the relationship. This typology has implications for the way in which intimate violence is addressed in research and in policy, firstly in terms of conceptualising intimate violence as non-homogenous phenomena that occurs in the context of a relationship, secondly by identifying women's role in intimate violence, suggesting that although in some cases the wife's violence would potentially stop or reduce if the husband's violence stopped, in some cases a wife is a separate perpetuator of violence whose behaviour complicates any sort of intervention.

While it has been reliably shown that women participate in and in some cases perpetrate violence in a relationship, what is not known is if the report of women's own violence is affected by the same sort of face saving effects that the report of men's violence has been shown to have (Archer, 2000; Heyman & Schlee, 1997; Jouriles & O'Leary, 1985; Moffitt et al., 1997; K. D. O'Leary & Arias, 1988), or if there are

separate phenomena at play that may exacerbate a discrepancy in violence reporting. It has been suggested that women's violence is far more accepted by both men and women (Greenblat, 1983), which means that women would be likely to report low level acts of violence which are congruent with gender standards. However it is unclear if women are equally likely to report acts of severe violence, or if severe acts of violence violate standards of socially acceptable behaviour for a woman and are more likely to be under reported. Archer (1999) found that both sexes underreported their own violence, although men did so more, and that men underreport their own victimisation. This parallels the potential effects of husbands' face saving and a wife's fear and shame of reporting violence.

Meta Analysis of Men and Women's Violence

In the reporting of intimate violence, both men and women's, there are a number of effects to be taken into account which have all been well documented. A husbands' tendency to underreport violence committed by them, perhaps as a part of a denial of their abusive behaviour or a part of downplaying or dismissing the violence committed. Husbands could possibly also over report their own violence out of a sense of guilt for past violence or non-physical abuse committed, although to date this has not been researched. Wives may underreport violence out of fear and shame, to maintain the relationship or to defend the abusive partner specifically, or may over report in order to exemplify the victimisation or as a reaction to the fear caused by the other partner's behaviour. In the case of women's violence, many of the above effects may occur in a very different way; a wife may underreport or over report her own violence in a similar fashion to a husband, although it could be suggested that men are likely to under report violence committed towards them by their wives as this deviates from traditional male values; men are likely to feel shame at being victimised by a woman. Also, as women's minor violence towards men is marginally socially unacceptable, there is likely to be a large difference between the reporting of minor assaults[6] committed by wives and severe assaults[7] which are likely to be seen as extremely socially undesirable (Greenblat, 1986).

[6] Minor scale of the CTS2 include: Threw something at my partner that could hurt, twisted my partner's arm or hair, pushed or shoved my partner, grabbed my partner, slapped my partner.
[7] Severe scale of the CTS2 include: Used a knife or gun on my partner, punched or hit my partner with something that could hurt, choked my partner, slammed my partner against a wall, beat up my partner, burned or scalded my partner on purpose, kicked my partner.

Some of the discrepancies between husband and wife reporting may be related to memory and the cognitive mechanisms involved in recalling past events, particularly emotionally charged events as intimate violence. Cascardi, Langhinrichsen and Vivian (1992) found that wives are more likely to be severely affected, physically and psychologically by male violence, making recall far more likely. Research has also found that drug abuse is significantly related to disagreement over incidents of violence (Medina, Schafer, Shear, & Armstrong, 2004), primarily that recall is effected in drug using men. Straus (1977) argued that as women's violence violates gender norms, it is more likely to be memorable when completing the Conflict Tactics Scales. All these factors may have a hand in exacerbating the discrepancy between intimate's reports of violence.

While some studies have observed these effects, many of them are outside the realm of what can be researched by looking at reporting results. The effect of interest, which can readily be observed, is the discrepancy between the levels of violence reported by intimates. Many small sample studies have already examined discrepancies in violence reporting between partners, and even a meta-analysis has been performed on the subject (Archer, 1999), albeit focusing on the small number of studies that provided correlations between husband and wife reporting.

The Archer (1999) Meta-Analysis

Archer (1999) evaluated the results of eighteen studies of couples, six involving correlation data and found that both partners typically underreport their own violence and that men underreport their victimisation. One of the major points Archer (1999) concludes with is that for men and women, the types of violence listed in the Conflict Tactics Scales are very different and that it is a severe limitation of the Conflict Tactics Scales that it does not reflect the meaning of a physically violent act. This limitation was addressed in the Conflict Tactics Scales 2 (Straus, Hamby, Boney-McCoy, & Sugarman, 1996), which included an injury and sexual coercion scale as well as improved wording, extra items and improved distinction between minor and severe acts of violence. Although the Conflict Tactics Scales 2 (Straus, Hamby, Boney-McCoy, & Sugarman, 1996) was released prior to the Archer (1999) meta-analysis, its wide spread use, and subsequent availability for use in a meta-analysis was slow due to the well established validity and reliability of the previous instrument that has been used in many studies, and as a standard for as many government and clinical surveys. Archer (1999) also suggested the identification of additional acts of violence likely to be committed by

men, such as holding a partner down, shaking and spanking, suggesting that explicit mention of these acts would result in more men endorsing them. All of the additional suggested by Archer (1999) would have already been covered under the Conflict Tactics Scales item “grabbed” and “slapped”, although Archer (1999) suggests that the meaning of these acts are different, it is inevitable that these creative suggestions of variations to existing acts on the Conflict Tactics Scales will reflect similar levels of severity. The Conflict Tactics Scales 2, which was not included in Archer’s (1999) review, includes a great variety of violent acts which have been shown to be comprehensive enough for most studies. With the Conflict Tactics Scales’ shortcomings addressed and a large number of studies existing that have utilised the new version comes an opportunity to examine how these changes have affected the discrepancy in violence reporting between husbands and wives.

Inaccurate reporting is potentially a big issue in research, with theoretical knowledge, best practice and funds being laid on the foundation of intimate violence data. Current practice concerning treatment of offenders, resources for victims, prevention campaigns, case management and criminal justice interventions are all based on the information which was provided by researchers, who have defended the validity of their data, and in some cases taken steps to further improve validity. Studies that have used only one partner from a couple, especially when it is the male, have had their validity questioned due to the tendency of perpetrators of intimate violence to underreport (Archer, 1999). To improve the validity of the report of intimate violence, researchers have used independent couple reporting, with some studies using the highest report between the couples (Babcock, Green, Webb, & Graham, 2004; Delsol, Margolin, & John, 2003; Holtzworth-Munroe, Meehan, Herron, Rehman, & Stuart, 2000), an aggregate or average score and social desirability indexes (Saunders, 1992; Tweed & Dutton, 1998), a method which assesses the participant’s tendency to respond with what they feel is socially acceptable answers and omit socially unacceptable responses (Crowne & Marlowe, 1960). These methods have proven somewhat effective, but inevitably the measurement of violence in the home is an imperfect and subjective variable. The focus is now on how the measurement of one participant compares to the measurement of the dyad, as it is inevitable that in some studies only one partner be used as a source for data out of ethical and practical constraints. Research on the subject will provide an idea of the extent of the discrepancy and may provide a way to ensure the validity of the data being collected.

Chapter Summary

To summarise this chapter: The Conflict Tactics Scales are the prominent instrument in the measurement of intimate violence. A plethora of criticism has been levelled at the Conflict Tactics Scales; however the main valid criticism is that the self-report of violence results in significant underreporting. As there is no golden standard for the measurement of intimate violence, the concern is the discrepancy between self-report and partner report of violence. Women's violence is a salient issue to consider in addition to men's violence. A previous meta-analysis found significant underreporting for both men and women's violence.

There is a need for a large scale meta-analysis of couple violence reporting, incorporating current research and current instruments, making a distinction between violence scales of the Conflict Tactics Scales and the instrument as a whole. While previous research has addressed the discrepancy in violence reporting in small samples, a large scale meta-analysis encompassing new research will observe the extent of the discrepancy effects generally and will also observe any trends among different types of studies. Of particular interest is the origin of the sample, the reference period the instrument refers to in the study, if desirability of responding is controlled for in the study, the nature of the relationship of the participants, the country the study took place in, the form of the Conflict Tactics Scales used in the research, the statistical level used to measure violence and if minor or severe violence was measured separately or as a mixed measure. The findings are likely to have implications for bodies of research which have used self report, aggregate scores or highest report indiscriminately, particularly research concerned with the finding of specific types of offenders using statistical clustering methods. The research questions are:

1. What is the extent of the discrepancy between intimate partners in the reporting of intimate violence for male and female perpetrators of violence?

2. How is the discrepancy affected by the gender of the perpetrator, the origin of the sample, the relationship of the intimate partner, the reference period, the composition of the instrument, the statistical level of the measurement and the level of violence being measured in the studies?

3. Do typological studies have differing results which can be attributed to the use of self-report only, victim report only, highest report or aggregate measures of violence?

CHAPTER 6
THE META-ANALYTICAL PROCESS: INSTRUMENT AND SAMPLE CHARACTERISTICS

A meta-analysis is a process by which data drawn from existing literature can be analysed in order to observe effects between studies, and effects with summed participants from a number of studies. The meta-analysis process is closely tied to the review of literature in the area, much of the method involving the identification of key similarities and differences in the articles being included in the analysis. The analysis involves planning a comparison to research these differences, finding some way to integrate studies to minimise the effect the difference has on the dependant variable, or simply to exclude studies that are unmanageably different and irrelevant to the effect of interest. The inclusion of disparate studies is the main criticism of early meta-analytic studies (Bailar, 1997). This disparity requires interpretation on the part of the researcher; including valid studies but not excluding studies with a null finding or finding opposite to what is expected. Besides this, there is always the issue that if flawed studies are included in an analysis, the meta-analysis has the potential to be as flawed as the original studies. The onus is on the researcher to ensure a baseline of quality data, to ensure a rigorous and valid result, while taking into account the differences in the studies being used. This chapter reviews some of the distinctions this meta-analysis makes in terms of the variables of interest to compare, and identifies factors that are outside the scope of this study. For the variable of severity/frequency of violence discrepancy reporting, the issues are relevant to the form of the instrument that was administered and the sample from which the partners were derived from.

Comparisons of Measurement Variations

Form of the Conflict Tactics Scales/ Domestic Conflict Index

The form of the instrument raises a number of issues relevant to the validity of an equal comparison between studies measuring severity/frequency of violence. Of interest is the version of the instrument used, the reference period used in the study, the statistical level the instrument used, and if the instrument measured only a specific type of violence. These different variables have the potential to confound a comparison and synthesis if not controlled for, therefore the onus is on the researcher to: accept the

difference as an uncontrollable variation of the same effect, to integrate the different forms of the instrument, to undertake separate comparisons for each condition, or to exclude cases that do not fit with most of the studies being used in the analysis. The approach will be discussed in more detail in the method section.

The Conflict Tactics Scales is a behavioural measure which examines the incidence of physical violence, verbal aggression and reasoning among couples. The measure includes three items of minor physical violence, six items of severe violence, seven types of verbal aggression and three reasoning items for participants to endorse (Straus, 1979).

In 1996, Straus et al. revised the original Conflict Tactics Scales, a seminal instrument in the measurement of violence in the home. *Table 2* presents the relationship between items on the Conflict Tactics Scales 1 and the Conflict Tactics Scales 2. The problem for researchers is whether to use the old version with proven reliability and validity, used as national norms in some cases, with a strong body of literature to complement its use (Straus, 1990), or to use the new Conflict Tactics Scales 2 with its increased number of items, clearer wording of items, injury, sexual and negotiation scales, and general attentiveness to addressing the problems with these types of measures as pointed out by various researchers (Bailar, 1997; R. P. Dobash & Dobash, 1983; Domestic Violence Prevention Unit, 2006; Straus, Hamby, Boney-McCoy, & Sugarman, 1996). The end result has been that even in 2006, some researchers are still using the original Conflict Tactics Scales (e.g. Berns, Jacobson, & Gottman, 1999), or the violence only scale (Conflict Tactics Scales Form-N) (e.g. O'Farrell, Murphy, Stephan, Fals-Stewart, & Murphy, 2004), relying on its simpler form and strong reliability (Straus, 2001). Although the two versions are measuring the same variable and share many items, the two are inevitably different, mostly in terms of the injury and sexual abuse scales and the suggested weightings which takes into account the seriousness of the violence and factors that into the final score (Straus et al., 1996).

Table 2. The Conflict Tactics Scales 2 (Straus et al., 1996) Psychological Aggression & Physical Violence Scales and items that are derived from the Conflict Tactics Scale 1.

Item
Psychological Aggression
Minor
Insulted or Swore at My Partner [a]
Shouted at or Yelled at My Partner [c]
Stomped Out of the Room or House or Yard during a Disagreement [a]
Said Something to Spite My Partner [b]
Severe
Called My Partner Fat or Ugly [c]
Destroyed Something Belonging to My Partner [c]
Accused My Partner of Being a Lousy Lover [c]
Threatened to Hit or Throw Something at my Partner [a]
Physical Assault
Minor
Threw Something at My Partner that Could Hurt [b]
Twisted My Partner's Arm or Hair [c]
Pushed or Shoved My Partner [b]
Grabbed My Partner [b]
Slapped My Partner [a]
Severe
Used a Knife or Gun on My Partner [a]
Punched or Hit My Partner with Something That Could Hurt [b]
Choked My Partner [a]
Slammed My Partner against a Wall [c]
Beat Up My Partner [a]
Burned or Scalded My Partner on Purpose [c]
Kicked My Partner [b]

[a] Items From the Conflict Tactics Scales 1
[b] Items Reworded from the Conflict Tactics Scales 1
[c] New Items

No research has been done to specifically compare the results of Conflict Tactics Scales and Conflict Tactics Scales 2 reporting, making the consideration of this variable all the more important. It seems plausible to suggest that with the injuries scale, sexual abuse scale, negotiation scales, increased number of items, different wording, stronger differentiation between minor and severe levels of psychological and physical aggression, simplified format, and the interspersal of items to reduce response sets and demand characteristics the two instruments are likely to produce a different figure. Although to date there has been no comparison between the Conflict Tactics Scales and Conflict Tactics Scales 2, the latter being comprised and adapted from the Conflict Tactics Scales suggests that despite the additional scales, items and other changes, the

two are comparable. Some studies have added items onto either instrument, in some cases to improve Conflict Tactics Scales validity or to include some specific occurrence relevant to the research, these different variations on the Conflict Tactics Scales reflect attempts to make the measurement of the variable more comprehensive, by making sure any possible act of physical violence or psychological abuse is included. Although these instruments may vary in the way they measure violence, and indeed a participant filling both instruments out at the same time may yield a different result, there is nothing to suggest that these different versions will have a significant effect on the reporting discrepancy between husbands and wives (Straus, 1990). To this end, it seems valid to include studies using the Conflict Tactics Scales 1, Conflict Tactics Scales 2 and different variations in the same analysis, although examining any possible differences between the instruments by conducting categorical comparisons.

The Conflict Tactics Scales are the seminal instrument for the measurement of violence in the home. Although a number of other instruments exist, most are derivatives of the Conflict Tactics Scales or are designed for a specific purpose. The Domestic Conflict Index (Margolin, Burman, John, & O'Brien, 1990) is a twenty-five item instrument, of which fifteen items are directly derived from the Conflict Tactics Scales, with almost all items having an equivalent in the Conflict Tactics Scales or in the Conflict Tactics Scales 2. The scales in the instrument split the acts of abuse into minor physical abuse, severe physical abuse and emotional abuse. Although containing some additional items not included in either the Conflict Tactics Scales or Conflict Tactics Scales 2, and different wording for a number of items, this instrument represents no real difference from the Conflict Tactics Scales instruments. With its extensive list of items, particularly for emotional abuse, improvements on the clarity of items and use of interval level data, the Domestic Conflict Index could well be called Conflict Tactics Scales 1.5, as the instrument has addressed some of the criticisms levelled at the original Conflict Tactics Scales while neglecting some of the criticisms the Conflict Tactics Scales 2 has addressed. As shown in *Table 3*, all but one of the physical abuse items included in the Domestic Conflict Index are in the Conflict Tactics Scales 2, however only two items from the emotional abuse scale have a Conflict Tactics Scales 2 equivalent.

Table 3. Items From the Domestic Conflict Index (Margolin et al., 1990) and How They Correspond to Items From the Conflict Tactics Scales 1 & 2.

Item
Physical Abuse
Minor Physical Abuse
Pushed, Grabbed or Shoved Spouse [a]
Slapped Spouse [a]
Threw an Object at Spouse [a]
Severe Physical Abuse
Kicked, Bit or Hit Spouse with Fist [a]
Hit or Tried to Hit Spouse with Object [a]
Threatened Spouse with Knife or Gun [a]
Beat up Spouse (Multiple Blows) [a]
Used Knife or Gun [a]
Physically Twisted Spouse's Arm [b]
Shook Spouse [c]
Threw or Tried to Throw Spouse Bodily [b]
Choked or Strangled Spouse [b]
Physically Forced Sex on Spouse [b]
Burned Spouse [b]
Emotional Abuse
Frightened a Spouse [b]
Damaged a Household Item or Some Part of Home Out of Anger toward Spouse [b]
Deliberately Disposed of or Hid an Important Item Belonging to Spouse [c]
Tried to Prevent Spouse from Seeing/Talking to Family or Friends [c]
Restricted Spouse's Use of Car or Telephone [c]
Tried to Turn Family, Friends, or Children against Spouse [c]
Told Spouse She Could Not Go to School or Other Self-Improvement Activity [c]
Locked Spouse Out of House [c]
Purposely Hurt Spouse's Pet [c]
Purposely Damaged or Destroyed Spouse's Clothes, Car or other Personal Possessions [c]
Prevented Spouse from Getting Medical Care She Needed [c]

[a] Items adapted directly from the Conflict Tactics Scales (Straus, 1979).
[b] Violent acts which are included in the Conflict Tactics Scales 2 (Straus et al, 1996), although in different wording.
[c] Violent acts which have no equivalent in the Conflict Tactics Scales or Conflict Tactics Scales 2.

The Domestic Conflict Index includes eleven items for emotional abuse, some of which are extremely specific, including items suggesting men's control over their wives' lives[8]. The Domestic Conflict Index would seem to be a more sensitive instrument than the Conflict Tactics Scales 2, with a greater variety of emotional abuse items for participants to endorse and very few minor physical violence items available to be endorsed, not including the item "physically twisted my partner's arm" which was classed as severe physical violence in the Domestic Conflict Index and as minor physical violence in the Conflict Tactics Scales 2. The Domestic Conflict Index has

[8] Tried to prevent spouse from seeing/talking to family or friends, restricted spouses use of car or telephone, told spouse she could not go to school or other self improvement activity, prevented spouse from getting medical care she needed.

included two items with the qualifier "tried to…" in the severe violence category; categorising an attempt at a violent act as equivalent to a violent act may be problematic, as it could skew the data towards higher levels of violence. The inclusion of emotional abuse items, which relates more to attempts to control the partner rather than psychological abuse which may occur during a conflict, reflects a divergence in the instruments.

Despite the more extensive emotional abuse scale the Domestic Conflict Index has, the Conflict Tactics Scales 2 is a more comprehensive measure, factoring in injury and sexual abuse as well as cognitive and emotional negotiation skills and is thusly much more widely used than the Domestic Conflict Index. However, due to the overlap in items and presumably high correlation[9] between the two instruments it seems valid to include the data of studies that used the Domestic Conflict Index in a synthesis based on Conflict Tactics Scales and Conflict Tactics Scales 2 results. Particularly in the context of the current study, where the discrepancy in reporting is the chief concern, there are no obvious differences in these instruments that will likely differently affect men and women reporting the same violence. However, it is still important to compare the results obtained with the Domestic Conflict Index with results from other instruments to determine if the effect sizes from these studies are significantly different and may have confounded the synthesis result.

This study will compare the discrepancy in reporting, comparing the Conflict Tactics Scales, Conflict Tactics Scales 2, Domestic Conflict Index, and straight frequency reports. It is anticipated that while these measures are similar enough to compare on standardised differences, some differences will be found which can be attributed to the differential effects the instruments will have on men and women and victims and perpetrators. While some studies may have variations on the main instruments, these variants represent only very small changes in the instrument and so will be categorised as using the main form of the instrument used.

Social Desirability Indexes

While the focus of this study is on the discrepancy of violence reporting, specifically in terms of male underreporting, the problem being addressed is that of reporting bias. Besides looking at the discrepancies in reporting, another approach to examining reporting bias is the use of social desirability indexes. Instruments such as

the Marlowe-Crowne Scale (Crowne & Marlowe, 1960) and the Balanced Inventory of Desirable Responding (Paulhaus, 1984) are used to examine the participant's likelihood of responding in a way that they feel is likely to improve others' impressions of them. Researchers can then examine the relationship between the instruments being used and the social desirability variable, assessing the potential strength of the reporting bias in a particular instrument (Stober, 2001). Although a social desirability scale is often used in the design of instruments, it is also useful at a participant level to examine a particular participant's extent of potential reporting bias or even a subset of a participant's likelihood of desirable responding (Holtzworth-Munroe, Meehan, Herron, Rehman, & Stuart, 2000). To this end, Saunders (1991) outlined the use of the shortened Marlowe-Crowne Scale (Strahan & Gerbasi, 1972); adjusting the scores of participants responding on the Conflict Tactics Scales (Straus, 1979). This is done by regressing the Conflict Tactics Scales scores on the Marlowe-Crowne Scale; adjusting the Conflict Tactics Scales scores according to the participant's likelihood of desirable responding (Saunders, 1991). This method is particularly advisable in violence reporting when only one participant is being used for data collection (Saunders, 1992; Tweed & Dutton, 1998) but has also been used to complement couple data (Holtzworth-Munroe, Meehan, Herron, Rehman, & Stuart, 2000).

Although a proven and efficient method in examining reporting bias in reference to job interview questionnaires and psychological testing (Crowne & Marlowe, 1960), the Marlowe-Crowne scale's use as a measure of reporting bias in terms of real events is less valid, as real events are not analogous to the kind of thoughts and feelings usually examined with instruments such as the Marlowe-Crowne (1960). Using desirability indexes also requires additional time on the part of participants and additional resources for researchers to process the data. The effectiveness of such indexes are questionable when included in the measures to be completed by an intimately violent sample, as these questions are so obviously different from questions measuring violence that such questions could be answered flippantly, or participants may guess at their purpose. Essentially the problem with desirability indexes being used in this capacity is that the instrument was designed and is commonly used to refer to less tangible variables, such as personality and attachment. It is a big step from this application to then use figures obtained from the instrument to then alter the scores obtained by another. Also, adjustment levels are typically different between husbands and wives which will

[9] No such study has been done to date.

artificially exacerbate a discrepancy between husband and wife report of violence. Fortunately, most studies of husband and wife reporting have not incorporated social desirability in their violence measure and mostly use social desirability as a separate variable to relate back to offender profiles (Holtzworth-Munroe et al., 2000). Studies with data corrected for desirable responding would potentially have to be excluded from a quantitative synthesis of violence reporting, or data prior to correction would have to be obtained. The proper evaluation of the extent of responding bias in the report of violence requires a purpose designed instrument with proven validity and reliability in domestic violence samples.

Another approach to adjusting scores from single participant studies is to calculate the discrepancy for an equivalent population. Heyman and Schlee (1997) examined the discrepancy of reporting between partners in a clinical sample (*N*= 256) and a community sample (*N*= 521) and based on the discrepancies in reporting from these samples suggested that single partner reports of violence by husbands concerning husband violence in a clinical sample should be multiplied by 1.33, or 2.4 when specifically focusing on severe acts, in order to correct for socially desirable reporting. In a community sample the correction factor is 1.4 for all violence, or 1.7 for severe violence. This method is obviously less sophisticated than the use of desirable responding scales as a mean discrepancy figure is applied to all participants regardless of their level of violence, not taking into account that participants reporting severe acts of violence are most likely to underreport (Heyman & Schlee, 1997). The inclusion of studies that have adjusted figures is problematic, in that violence levels are being included in the synthesis that has not been reported by the participants.

Separate from the issue of adjusted scores is studies who have incorporated severity weights or similar measures into their scores. One such example is Holtzworth-Munroe, Meehan, Herron, Rehman and Stuart (2000) who factored in the likelihood of a violent act's injury into the score. This is unlikely to have a tangible effect on the discrepancy besides exacerbating whatever existing discrepancy, particularly in cases where a victim has indicated a severe violent act occurred which a perpetrator denied in the instrument.

Time Period of Violence Reporting

When a study involving the Conflict Tactics Scales is being undertaken, it typically refers to the past six months, year or the duration of the relationship. The

introduction of differing reference periods is potentially a difficult issue in a synthesis. Although the focus is on husband/wife discrepancies and time would seem to be a somewhat innocuous factor, there are some factors which may facilitate a difference in reporting of violence over different periods of time. Data collected with a reference period outside that of the current relationship will have to be excluded as this will provide discrepancies related not to any reporting effect but due to the fact that that data from one partner will not necessarily refer to the other. Primarily, studies using the Conflict Tactics Scales will have a reference period of either a year or for the course of the relationship. Time could factor into a discrepancy by exacerbating the recall differences between perpetrator and victim. Presumably, the experience of intimate violence is very different between offender and victim; offender and victim may recall violent episodes differently as a factor of fear, stress and anxiety, the effects of which may diminish over time. Research referring to long periods of time may also be inadvertently using an unrepresentative sample, being that couples that stay together for long periods of time regardless of the occurrence of violence may have a dynamic which could affect discrepancy reporting. In conducting a synthesis of violence reporting it would seem prudent to separate studies with different reference periods, however in the interest of maintaining as large a sample of discrepancies as possible and the likelihood that time will not produce a differing effect in terms of the discrepancy between men and women, studies with different reference periods will be included in the analysis.

Statistical Level

Most studies using the Conflict Tactics Scales have used the standard form of the instrument; a seven point scale for each item which is summed to a total level of violence; an interval measure of violence. However some studies have used the instrument as nominal measure of violence; participants are presented the instrument and if they indicate that they have committed any acts of violence then they are classed as violent, while if they had not, they are classed as non-violent. Nominal measurement mostly occurs in large community samples where only some of the sample is likely to be intimately violent. In terms of discrepancies, these two statistical levels represent two very different measures. A discrepancy in an interval measure is representative of the disagreement about a number of violent acts occurring, whereas the nominal measure represents the disagreement on the occurrence of any violence in the relationship. As in Archer (1999), these variables will both be included in the main meta-analysis but a

categorical comparison will examine the potential differences between measuring violence with an interval or nominal statistical level.

Severity of Violence Level

Some studies restricted their measurement to only severe or only minor acts of violence in the relationship. Some data exists suggesting that the discrepancy is greater for more severe acts of violence (Heyman & Schlee, 1997), so minor only, severe only and mixed measures of violence will be compared.

Comparison of Sample Characteristics

The sample used in studies is of as great significance as the nuances of the instrument used to measure the violence. Attentiveness to the sample used in violence studies may help to isolate effects specific to a particular sample as well as ensuring a valid result for the synthesis as a whole. Of relevance to this synthesis is same sex couples, the ethnicity of the sample, the origin of the sample and the extent of the relationship.

Same Sex Intimate Relationships

The issue of violence in same sex relationships is typically treated as a very separate issue from heterosexual relationships. The difficulty is not in making comparisons between male-male, female-female and male-female relationships but rather in likening then to each other. In each there are very different dynamics and specific issues in play which defy generalisation. For this reason, studies commonly set parameters around researching heterosexual or homosexual intimate violence. Although eliminating the gender variable could reveal some interesting factors in terms of the discrepancy in reporting between perpetrator and victim, researchers are typically hesitant to consider perpetrator and victims of different sexualities as analogous, potentially because of how gender is defined. The experience of homosexuality from a sociological perspective is deemed to be vastly different to that of a heterosexual (Island & Letellier, 1991). Because of these issues and other unexplored variables, the scope of this study cannot extend to homosexual couples. The effects of gender and the dynamics of a heterosexual relationship are inevitably part of the effects being observed as a part of intimate violence and to include studies that do not share these conditions is to compromise the validity of the synthesis.

The Ethnicity of the Sample

The ethnicity of the sample is an issue in terms of the potential effects of a traditional or honour based culture, and the effects different cultures are likely to have on the discrepancy between husband and wife reporting of violence. While the ethnicity of the sample could possibly yield differing effect sizes due to cultural differences, their inclusion in a synthesis seems valid as the husband and wife are exposed to the same conditions. In addition, most intimate violence studies carried out in Africa and Asia are carried out at universities (Straus, 2004a) and are likely to be quite a 'westernised' sample as a result. While including these studies in the synthesis, a comparison will be appropriate to examine possible differential effects the ethnicity of the sample may have.

Origin of Sample

Especially in terms of the extent of women's violence, the issue of origin of sample is pertinent. Studies examining women's violence have made vastly different findings based on if the sample was from the community (Straus & Ramirez, 2002), from a clinic or treatment facility (Taft, Murphy, Elliott, & Morrel, 2001). Samples from clinical and community samples have long been seen as referencing very different populations (Holtzworth-Munroe, Meehan, Herron, Rehman, & Stuart, 2000) and separately, samples from women's shelters commonly over represent the victims of severe violence (Dutton & Nicholls, 2005). As samples from women's shelters commonly do not reference the husband in the recording of violence, particularly as the women are usually trying to leave the relationship, no samples from women's shelters are likely to be included in the synthesis. As to the issue of community and clinical samples, of which clinical samples are usually more violent (Archer, 2000), the samples will be included together. Although clinical samples are more violent and violent samples tend to underreport at greater rates (Heyman & Schlee, 1997) which will have an effect on the discrepancy, the focus is on the discrepancy as a whole over the greatest amount of studies possible, and dividing clinical and community studies represents a great divergence in the synthesis. The difference between these two conditions, which will likely be the most significant comparison, will be examined on the level of discrepancy between partners.

Nature of the Relationship

The nature of the relationship is another important variable as dating and married samples may not be analogous in terms of discrepancies in violence reporting.

The dynamics of a dating relationship are undoubtedly different, with common sense suggesting that married partners will be less likely to report violence in the context of their relationship. How this will effect the discrepancy is debateable, although both genders are under the same condition, the relationship may have different meanings for each. Limited research suggests that violence in dating relationships is more common than violence in marriage (Sugarman & Hotaling, 1989), but it is unclear how the different dynamics of these relationships would effect the discrepancy in reporting. Dating and married samples will be included together on the main analysis but will be examined as to how the length and nature of the relationship affects violence reporting discrepancies.

Chapter Summary

As previously discussed, the focus of a meta-analysis is on the effect of interest and the inclusion of studies that provide a comprehensive perspective of the area of interest. In this case, the analysis will include studies that have both heterosexual intimate partners' report on violence perpetrated by either the male or female, where the study presents data referring to the violence perpetrated by a particular partner rather than violence occurring in the relationship in general. The violence reporting will refer only to that particular partner, so studies that involve victimisation or perpetration of violence over the course of a lifetime or since a particular age will be excluded. The different types of instruments used, the time period referred to in the instrument, the statistical level used and the severity of violence level measured will all be examined in terms of intimate partner reporting discrepancies as well as the origin of the sample, the relationship of the couples in the sample and the ethnicity of the participants.

CHAPTER 7
METHOD, RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Data Collection

The sample of studies to be used in the Meta-analysis was obtained by a variety of methods to ensure the breadth of the research in the area was included in the synthesis. Firstly, studies involving couples used in the Archer (1999) meta-analysis were obtained, some of which were unpublished theses, of which some of these could not be obtained. For articles which were not available through the Edith Cowan University or Curtin University library systems, a request was sent through the document delivery service to obtain a copy of the articles. Where the article was not available through this service, the researcher was contacted via the latest available contact details available at their university of origin, latest publication, or from the web search engine, google. Copies of eight studies were not obtained, so for these, the mean effect sizes calculated by Archer (1999) were used, and where possible, the classifications used by Archer (1999) were used. Where the study could be obtained, the calculated effect size for male and female violence, sample size and categories the studies fit into were entered into an SPSS spreadsheet.

Secondly, a bibliography of studies using the Conflict Tactics Scales (Straus, 2006b) and the Conflict Tactics Scales 2 (Straus, 2006a) was obtained. In Straus, Hamby, Boney-McCoy and Sugarman (1996) the researchers indicated that the Conflict Tactics Scales 2 were available for use without charge as long as researchers were willing to report reliability figures back to the researchers and potentially provide data from a factor analysis. Straus (2006a) has made this information public, including a list of published studies which have used the Conflict Tactics Scales and some basic reliability data.. A similar summary exists for the original Conflict Tactics Scales (Straus, 2006b) but is identified as being much less comprehensive as many of the studies identified in the bibliography were recorded retrospectively. Although these summaries are quite comprehensive, they are inevitably limited to research which the author has been informed of, meaning that studies published in books and dissertations are neglected in the summary. Generally, studies which conclude with a null-hypothesis are likely to not have been published and so would be unlikely to appear in a summary; the ‘file drawer effect’ commonly referred to in meta-analytic studies (Rosenthal, 1979).

While generally it is likely that studies with a null-hypothesis are less commonly published, most of the studies of interest involve the discrepancy of reporting either in the main hypothesis or as a secondary issue to discuss; in which case the finding of a strong relationship between spouses' reports or the finding of a weak relationship are equally poignant. Further measures were required to obtain and include studies that had been published since the last update of the summary, involve the original Conflict Tactics Scales and were published after 1996, and involve a similar measure such as the Domestic Conflict Index (Margolin, Burman, John, & O'Brien, 1990).

From the bibliographies provided by Straus (Straus, 2006a; , 2006b) a pool of articles to be checked were sorted. For the original Conflict Tactics Scales this included ninety-one studies of dating couples, three-hundred and ninety-eight studies of married couples, for the Conflict Tactics Scales 2 this involved three-hundred and forty-two studies. Initial filtering involved rejecting review studies and studies where the Conflict Tactics Scales had been used in a context other than heterosexual partner violence. Studies were then excluded if they had not measured both partners' report of intimate violence or if both partners were reporting on violence in the relationship rather than each other's violence. Studies presenting means in their results section were added to the data that had been entered into the SPSS spreadsheet; the effect size was calculated to two decimal places.

In order to address the potential limitations of the summary provided by Straus (March, 2001; February, 2006), a literature search using Meta-Quest[10] was conducted using the keywords *intimate, domestic, marital or dating* and *violence, aggression, abuse* which was searched for articles compatible with the synthesis. To follow up, a search with the keywords *Conflict Tactics Scales* and *couples* was also conducted. A manual search of related journals was also conducted including *Violence and Victims, Journal of Interpersonal Violence, Journal of Family Violence and Violence against Women*. This provided a comprehensive shortlist of studies to potentially be included in the meta-analysis.

From all the studies included in Straus's bibliography (Straus, 2006a, 2006b) found via journal search engines and from manual journal searches, eighty-nine studies were found that recorded both self-report and partner data on a measure of violence. Very few of these studies presented means from the male and female reports of violence

in their results section. Using the email address listed in the most recent article published or from the most recent academic listing available, forty-six researchers were contacted asking for assistance in obtaining means for this meta-analysis. The responses are presented in table 4.

Table 4. Responses from Researchers for Means from Previous Research Studies

Researchers Contacted: N= 46
No Response (Including Referrals to Other Researchers Who Did Not Reply): N= 29
Couple Data not Collected: N= 4
Data no Longer Available: N= 8
Irretrievable from Dated Program: N= 6
Irretrievable from Funding Source/ Relevant Authority: N= 2
Data Supplied: N= 5
Data Useable: N= 4
Data Not Useable: N= 1

A significant issue seemed to be that data from more than about five years previous had been recorded using obsolete software and could not be retrieved, or that data sets had been discarded over time. Researchers should be aware of the potential use of their data and strive to update and maintain data sets or to keep physical copies. Because of this, much of the data obtained from contact with researchers was from between 2002 and 2006. Also, many researchers were not contactable from the email addresses listed in their most recent research article or from their academic listing. The best efforts had been made to contact all researchers who may have retained eligible data.

The next step was to utilise tables including the perpetration of all acts of violence by men and women and their partner reports. It was anticipated that for studies which provided a table displaying the acts of violence perpetrated a mean figure of acts of violence could be obtained. However, this was not possible as tables that displayed the total acts of violence did not indicate what proportion of participants indicated no violence, making it impossible to generate means and standard deviations for the full samples.

[10] Edith Cowan University's standard search engine for articles which may appear in any number of separate publisher's databases including unpublished theses.

Some research articles involved a number of different samples[11] and had split measures for severe and minor acts of violence. The analysis included the sample separately as each group represent a distinct sample, similar to what was done in Archer (1999). However, in the interests of examining reporting discrepancies, samples where severe and minor acts of violence were reported separately, both measures were included in the analysis and a new measurement variable was created to examine the effect the reporting of minor, severe and mixed acts of violence had on the reporting discrepancy between partners. Although in the main analysis of discrepancy figures, this is potentially a limitation as a particular sample's report of violence is included more than once. The fact that the same sample is reporting on essentially a different measure, plus the benefits of being able to examine the effects of severity of violence on the reporting discrepancy outweigh the consequences of including a sample on multiple occasions.

Categorisation

The data was converted into effect sizes (*g*) using SPSS. A normal analysis was performed with no weighting and the main effect analysis was repeated, the second time being weighted by sample size. The following information was coded from each study prior to the final analysis: (a) sample origin, (b) reference period, (c) participant relationship, (d) statistical level used, (e) Conflict Tactics Scales version and (f) if severe, minor or mixed levels of violence were measured. As previously mentioned, if a study had two samples under different conditions then these were included and coded separately. The categories were devised over the data collection phase in order to compare studies which had particular differences in their samples and in their measurement. Some of these categories were collapsed or cancelled due to the lack of an adequate sample for that condition.

The sample origin variable is fairly simple and standard distinction between the types of populations being studied. Clinical samples generally represent more severely and frequently violent offenders (Babcock, Costa, Green, & Eckhardt, 2004; Hamberger, Lohr, Bonge, & Tolin, 1996; Holtzworth-Munroe, Meehan, Herron, Rehman, & Stuart, 2000), while community samples involve participants from student, military or the general community who have responded to advertisements asking for participants in a study of marital interactions or conflict. A factor not previously identified in Archer (1999) is the fact that while some community studies involve

[11] E.g. Low level violence offenders and severe level violence offenders.

participants which have indicated certain levels of violence as a prerequisite to being included in the study, other community studies rely on the sample that have indicated interest in being included in a study of marital conflict having significant levels of abusive behaviour to study. This is distinct from Archer's (1999) approach which broke the sample origin down specifically (i.e. university, prison, general community samples). For the purposes of this study, community violent and community mixed have been treated as separate categories.

The reference period refers to the length of time over which the instrument asks participants to indicate the incidence of violence in their relationship. As previously discussed, any measurement of violence outside the intimate relationship was not used so the reference period generally was either the course of the relationship, six months or twelve months. These three categories were used in the analysis.

Three different categories were used for the relationship between the intimate partners, dating, married or mixed. These categories adequately represent the diversity of relationships between intimate partners in the studies used.

Originally, a category was made for ethnicity of sample in order to examine the effects of different cultures on the discrepancy in reporting. However, within the samples used, only one study was not involving participants from the United States, United Kingdom, Europe, Australia, New Zealand and Canada. Such a comparison would not be possible with only one sample from a non-westernised country so this category was scrapped.

The form of the instrument used was one of the main categories of interest, particularly in terms of the distinction between the Conflict Tactics Scales 1 and 2. Separate categories were created for Conflict Tactics Scales 1 (Physical Only), Conflict Tactics Scales 2 (Physical Only) and when no specific instrument used. Where studies had made significant changes to the Conflict Tactics Scales, it was anticipated that new categories would have to be made to accommodate them or they would have to be excluded. However the studies that included variations on the Conflict Tactics Scales made only limited changes, excluding one or two items or adding a few items. As the changes were small and would seem to have a limited impact on the discrepancy between partners, these studies were included in the appropriate category. It is also worth noting that no studies used the entire Conflict Tactics Scales in a summed form, so for all studies only the violence scale was used in order to obtain discrepancies. A

small number of studies used figures indicating the frequency of violent acts generally with no definition besides what the participant thought constituted a violent act. These studies were categorised as using frequency as the instrument. No studies were obtained which recorded both partner's report of violence using the Domestic Conflict Index (Margolin, Burman, John, & O'Brien, 1990).

Some studies used only a nominal measure of violence, participants indicated either yes or no if an act of violence had occurred. This represents a very different measure from the interval level Conflict Tactics Scales, and is likely to yield high levels of agreement as the issue is only if any violence has occurred in the relationship in the time period. Separate categories were created for interval and nominal measures of violence. A separate category was also used for studies that had separate measure of minor and severe forms of violence.

Results

Descriptives

Thirty-four samples (N=3522) were found which had data available to facilitate a comparison of male and female partners' violence levels as recorded on the Conflict Tactics Scales. As recorded in Table 5, all but one study used physical violence data as measured by the Conflict Tactics Scales; one study asked participants to indicate for themselves if an act of violence had occurred in the relationship (Okun, 1986). No studies with useable data had used the Domestic Conflict Index (Margolin, Burman, John, & O'Brien, 1990) or any other instrument that was not based on the Conflict Tactics Scales. Three sources of data had used a measure which referred to violence outside the context of the present relationship, one of which had been included in Archer (1999) (Marshall, 1987, May-June). Surprisingly, this figure had a moderate negative effect size (-*.35* for men's violence: -*.48* for women's violence) suggesting that men had perpetrated more violence in the current and past relationship than women had received in the current and past relationship and also that women had perpetrated more violence in the current and past relationship than men had received in the current and past relationship. This figure represented the largest negative effect size in Archer (1999). Two other sources of data in the current meta-analysis referred to violence outside the current relationship (Morrel, Elliott, Murphy, & Taft, 2003) and contrary to Marshall (1987, May-June) a strong positive effect size was found (.75 & .62). However the measures used in these studies differ in that Marshall (1987, May-June) did not set a

specific reference period for violence, while Morrell, Elliott, Murphy and Taft (2003) restricted the reference period to the last six months.

Few studies measured minor and severe acts of violence independently; two studies measured only severe acts of violence (Rollins & Oheneba-Sakyi, 1990; Stith, Rosen, McCollum, & Thomsen, 2004), one measured minor acts of violence separately (Stith, Rosen, McCollum, & Thomsen, 2004), and another sample was restricted to only participants who had not committed an act of severe violence (Waltz, Babcock, Jacobson, & Gottman, 2000). Seven samples used the Conflict Tactics Scales 2 physical violence scale (Morrel, Elliott, Murphy, & Taft, 2003; Perry & Fromuth, 2005; Stith, Rosen, McCollum, & Thomsen, 2004), one sample was measured with no instrument, requiring the participant to indicate violence using their own definition (Okun, 1986). All other studies used the Conflict Tactics Scales 1 physical violence scale and closely linked variations on this scale. Only one study used a so called 'variety' measure of violence (Moffitt et al., 1997), which was classed as a separate level measure as it involved a nominal measure of the items on the Conflict Tactics Scales 1 physical violence scale, which was different from studies who used a nominal measure of violence generally. The nominal and interval categories were both well populated. The reference period categories were well populated besides Marshall (1987, May-June) who used a lifetime reference period for violence.

In terms of participant variables, the categories were well populated, making for a more relevant comparison. However, only three studies concerning a predominantly dating population were found.

Analysis

Table 6 summarises the findings from the main analysis of the effect size concerning the discrepancy between partner's reports of violence. All figures indicate that partners reported more violence than the self-report. The figures seem to indicate that this is especially so in terms of men's violence, with a weaker effect size for women's violence. A significant difference was found in discrepancy of reporting between men and women's violence for weighted data $t(6616) = -9.88$, p two-tailed= .000 but this was not significant for unweighted data $t(56) = 1.90$, p two-tailed= .063.

Table 6. Meta-Analysis of the Discrepancy between Partner's Report of Men and Women's Violence.

	Mean g	*CI*	*k*	p^a	p^b
Men's Violence	.20	.09/.32	34	.200	.263
Men's Violence Adjusted[1]	.18	.07/.29	33	.200	.635
Men's Violence Weighted[2]	.26	.25/.26	34 (3522)	.000	.000
Men's Violence Weighted and Adjusted[3]	.24	.24/.25	21 (3427)	.000	.000
Women's Violence	.04	-.09/.17	24	.200	.822
Women's Violence Weighted[4]	.33	.31/.34	24 (3096)	.000	.000
Women's Violence Weighted and Adjusted[5]	.36	.34/.37	23 (2966)	.000	.000

Note: A positive result indicates that the partner reported more violence than the self-report. Mean *g*= Mean Effect Size, CI= Confidence Interval, k= Number of Studies Included, p^a= Kolmogorov-Smirnov Normality Significance (Lower Bound of the True Significance), p^b= Shapiro-Wilk Normality Significance. [1] Despite the Kolomogorov-Smirnov and Shapiro-Wilk normality statistics indicating normality, outliers were removed (Browning & Dutton, 1986). [2] Studies were weighted by the sample size [N=3398]). [3] Outliers were removed but normality could not be reached (Browning & Dutton, 1986; Lawrence, Heyman, & O'Leary, 1995; Marshall, 1987, May-June). [4] Studies were weighted by sample size [N=3046]). [5] Outliers were removed but normality could not be achieved (Greening, 1995).

Both the discrepancies in men and women's violence (Unadjusted and unweighted) were homogeneous (See table 6); however some outliers existed in the men's violence samples. One study was removed which resulted in a slightly lower mean effect size as the men's violence sample was slightly skewed towards greater effect sizes. Studies were reanalysed with weighting as to sample size. In an interesting result, weighted samples produced a similar mean effect size to Archer's (1999) weighted sample, although Archer (1999) weighted his studies by the reciprocal of the variance. Outliers from the weighted samples were removed but normality could not be reached for either men or women's violence when effect sizes were weighted by sample size.

The analysis was conducted using Hedge's *g*, a statistic which corrects for biases in small sample sizes. This statistic was used as for the articles that could not be obtained, effect sizes were presented as *g* statistics in Archer (1999). Due to some data not being available, it was not possible to perform the analysis using the reciprocal of the variance, the weighting technique used in Archer (1999); similarly a forest plot would have been limited to only the studies collected currently due to limited access to data and the fact that Archer (1999) did not present a forest plot in his meta-analysis. Attempts were made to obtain this data without success. Other weighting systems were examined, however due to the fact that in all studies a similar instrument was used and no variation in the conditions suggested that one study was better than another, no other weighting system seemed feasible.

Categorical Analyses

The means from the studies reviewed as a part of the main meta-analysis were compared along the lines of variables which theoretically could affect the discrepancy between men and women reporting each other's violence. The categorical analysis will be performed using unweighted samples as the main analysis and some early categorical analysis suggest that the data was highly skewed and neither normality nor homogeneity of variance could be established with the removal of any number of outliers. Some studies had very small sample sizes and their findings should be interpreted carefully.

When unweighted; clinical, community violent and community mixed were all normalised samples in the men's violence groups (See table 7). This supports the use of the Community Mixed sample as a distinct group and the inclusion of the original outlier studies from the main analysis into the categorical analysis.

Table 7. Meta-Analysis of Men and Women's Discrepancy in Reporting Violence in Clinical, Community Violent and Community Mixed Samples Unweighted Analysis.

	Mean *g*	*CI*	*k*	*p* [a]	*p* [b]
Men Clinical	.43	.22/.64	13	.200	.901
Men Community Violent	.08	-.26/.42	6	.200	.673
Men Community Mixed	.05	-.05/.15	15	.200	.979
Women Clinical[1]	.27	.07/.47	6	.200	.515
Women Community Violent	-.09	-.54/.36	4	n/a[2]	.420
Women Community Mixed	.03	-.13/.19	13	.200	.488

Note: A positive result indicates that the partner reported more violence than the self-report. Mean *g*= Mean Effect Size, CI= Confidence Interval, k= Number of Studies Included, p[a]= Kolmogorov-Smirnov Normality Significance (Lower Bound of the True Significance), p[b]= Shapiro-Wilk Normality Significance. [1] Greening (1995) was removed which normalised the sample. [2] Not available due to small sample size.

A one-way ANOVA with a planned comparison between the men's violence clinical sample and the community violent and community mixed violence sample was conducted. The variance between samples was found to be non-homogeneous ($p >$ .041), thus caution is advised with the finding that the sample type influences effect size $F(2, 31) = 7.12$, p .003. The planned comparison found that the clinical sample was significantly different from both community violent and community mixed violence samples $t(18.12) = 4.18$, p .001. Post-hoc tests with Tukey's HSD found that the clinical sample (M= .43, SD= .35) was significantly different from the community violent sample (M= .08, SD= .33) and the community mixed sample (M= .05, SD= .18). The community violent and community mixed samples were not significantly different from each other. For women's violence, the sample was homogeneous ($p < .50$) but no significant main effect was found for the type of sample on the discrepancy between men and women's reports $F(2, 20) = 2.83$, p .083. Although a significant difference was found between the clinical group and the other groups in a planned comparison $t(20) =$ 1.95, p .066, no significant differences were found in post-hoc comparisons of each of the samples.

The predominate type of relationship for men's violence in the sample was not found to effect the discrepancy $F(2, 31) = .989$, p .384 and none of the post-hoc comparisons revealed any significant differences between the married/cohabitating (M= .18, SD= .35, k= 24), dating (M= .11, SD= .16, k= 4) and mixed (M= .37, SD= .29, k= 6) samples. However the samples may have been too small to observe accurate discrepancy level for the dating and mixed samples. For women's violence the type of relationship was not found to effect the discrepancy $F(2, 21) = 0.21$, p. 813. Post-hoc comparisons could not be performed as the mixed sample included only one study, so t-tests were carried out to compare the married/cohabitating (M= 0.05, SD= .34) and dating (M= -.04, SD= .21) samples. Both samples were found to not violate the assumption of normality and no significant differences were found $t(21) = .48$, p .640.

The reference period was not found to produce any significant difference on the reporting discrepancy of men's violence $F(2, 30) = 1.64$, p .210. Post-hoc comparisons found no significant differences between the report of violence in the previous six months (M= .22, SD= .34, k= 7), the previous twelve months (M= .16, SD= .28, k= 20) and the course of the relationship (M= .42, SD= .37, k= 6), although the small amount of studies referencing the previous six months and the course of the relationship may have diminished the effects these conditions may have had on effect size. For women's violence, the reference period was found to have no effect on the reporting discrepancy $F(2, 20) = 1.17$, p .331. No differences were significant in the post hoc comparisons between studies with a six month (M= .02, SD= .29, k= 3), twelve month (M= .12, SD= .33, k=16) or course of the relationship reference period (M= -.12, SD= .08, k=4), however there was a small number of studies for the six month and course of the relationship reference period. For both men's and women's violence, the single study that referenced incidence of violence over the lifetime was not included (Marshall, 1987, May-June).

The version of the instrument used was not found to significantly effect the level of discrepancy reporting $F(1, 31) = 1.03$, p. .317. An independent samples t-test was used to compare the means from the studies using the Conflict Tactics Scales 1 (M= .17, SD= .34, k= 26) and the Conflict Tactics Scales 2 (M= .31, SD= .30, k= 7) and it was found that the two instruments were not significantly different $t(31) = -1.02$, p .317. For women's violence the version of the instrument used was not found to effect the discrepancy levels $F(1, 22) = .79$, p .385. An independent samples t-test found that no significant difference existed in the discrepancy between reporting on the Conflict

Tactics Scales 1 (M= 0.02, SD= .32, k= 21) and the Conflict Tactics Scales 2 (M= .19, SD= .25, k= 3) $t(22) = -.89$, p .385, however the number of studies using the Conflict Tactics Scales 2 were very small. The one study that did not use a particular instrument to define acts of violence was not included in this analysis (Okun, 1986).

For men's violence, the statistical level of the instrument was found to not have a significant effect on the discrepancy in reporting $F(2, 31) = 3.08$, p .060. An independent samples t-test found that nominal (M= -0.55, SD= .25, k= 7) and interval (M= .27, SD= .32, k= 26) measures of violence were significantly different $t(31) = -2.48$, p .019. In terms of women's violence, no main effect was found for the statistical level of the instrument $F(2, 21) = 0.27$, p .765 and an independent samples t-test found no significant differences between nominal (M= .09, SD= .36, k= 7) and the interval (M= .01, SD= .31, k= 16) measures of violence $t(21) = .59$, p .560. The one study that used a variety measure of violence (Moffitt et al., 1997) was excluded from this analysis.

For men's violence, the analysis of the violence level of measures was limited as the minor and severe categories had only two studies each. Nonetheless, a one-way ANOVA was performed, which found that the violence level was not significantly related to the discrepancy $F(2, 31) = 0.47$, p .628. Post hoc testing found that no significant differences existed between the severe only (M= .36, SD= .03, k= 2), minor only (M= .04, SD= .28, k= 2) and mixed (M= .20, SD= .34, k= 30). For women's violence, no main effect was found for level of violence used in the instrument $F(2, 21) = 3.09$, p .066. An independent samples t-test was administered as the minor only condition for women's violence had only one study (Stith, Rosen, McCollum, & Thomsen, 2004). It was found that severe only (M= .46, SD= .23, k= 2) was significantly different from the mixed (M= -.02, SD= .29, k= 21) level sample $t(21) = 2.21$, p .038, although the sample size of the severe only condition was very small.

Discussion

The current findings generally suggest that both sexes underreport the incidence of violence in their relationships, and that men's violence is related to greater discrepancy rates, although this did not reach significance ($p \leq .072$). Attempts to factor in sample size from the studies were unsuccessful in producing a normal distribution for both men and women's violence. When weighted by sample size, the discrepancy concerning men's violence was quite similar, however weighting women's violence

produced a much larger discrepancy (See Table 6). Although differing in some respects, mainly in terms of the use of individual men and women's discrepancies as well as couples, and weighting the effect sizes of studies based on the reciprocal of the variance, the main findings were quite similar to that of Archer (1999); that men and women both underreport their violence and that limited support exists for men underreporting their own violence more than women.

The categorical findings are limited in some cases by a small sample size which may have resulted in particular trends not being observed. The main categorical findings of interest are that among men's violence; clinical samples yield a significantly greater discrepancy rate than community violent and community mixed samples and interval data had a significantly larger discrepancy than nominal data. For women's violence it was found that clinical samples yield a larger discrepancy rate than the other conditions and those studies reporting severe levels of violence had a larger discrepancy rate than those reporting on a mixed measure in terms of level of violence. While significance was not reached, it was also found that the reporting of men's violence had the greatest discrepancy when the relationship between partners was not restricted to dating or married partners (mixed), the reference period was over the course of the relationship and the instrument measured only severe acts of violence. For women's violence, the greatest non-significant discrepancies occurred when participants were married/cohabitating couples, the reference period referred to the previous twelve months, the Conflict Tactics Scales 2 was used to measure violent acts and nominal measures of violence were used.

Where differences exist, greater disagreement between partners is shown to vary, however more explanations exist for variations in discrepancy levels. For both men and women's violence, clinical samples were found to have the largest discrepancy level. This could be attributed to some particular characteristic of the men and women who are from a clinical sample, bearing in mind that a clinical sample meant that the man was involved in a treatment program. Alternately, the larger amount of items likely to be endorsed by partners in a clinical sample increases the possibility of one partner endorsing an act that the other did not report. However, this discrepancy would not necessarily go in the direction of the partner report, which suggests that the difference observed between the clinical sample and the other samples is robust. Similarly, the finding among the male violence sample that the Conflict Tactics Scales 2 is related to greater discrepancies could be related to the larger variety of violent acts for partners to

indicate have occurred, but it seems unlikely that this could have caused such a strong effect in the positive direction. Unfortunately, the sample size for this category was particularly small (k= 6), so this finding should be taken cautiously. For men's violence, studies which used an interval measure of violence had significantly greater discrepancies than those which used nominal data, which would seem logical as more opportunity for discrepancies exist when couples are reporting individual acts of violence. It is problematic though that this was not found in the female violence sample, which may suggest a more specific interaction between gender and reporting which is outside the scope of this study.

While not reaching significance, most of the categories differed as expected in terms of men's violence. Discrepancies were the greatest in studies that used the reference period of the course of the relationship, which seems logical as it is the longest reference period, meaning partners would have to agree on acts of violence that may have occurred years ago. Severe violence was found to have the highest level of discrepancy, consistent with Heckert and Gondolf (2000). However, discrepancies differed in some unpredictable ways in terms of women's violence. It was found that the twelve month reference period and studies using nominal data yielded the greatest level of discrepancy. These findings seem counterintuitive, but may reflect gender effects which have not previously been observed. These findings for women's violence were consistent with Archer (1999). Archer (1999) also found that the discrepancy was larger for women's violence in community samples and that self-report was greater than partner report in university and college samples, suggesting that this offered some support for the hypothesis that men underreport their victimisation. Some support was found for this idea, in that among samples of couples from the community which had significant levels of violence in the relationship, women reported perpetrating more violence than men reported receiving.

Limitations

The current study was limited in terms of sample size, weighting procedures, missing data, sampling issues, multiple inclusions, the differences between self-report and dual partner reports, and over reporting. As previously mentioned, in some categories the number of studies included was very small, in particular the finding of statistical significance of studies using only severe measures of violence for women's violence, the Conflict Tactics Scales 2 for men's violence and community violent samples for women's violence. Some of the other findings which did not reach

statistical significance may also have been affected by small sample size, so cautious interpretation of these findings is encouraged.

The current study used no weighting procedure for the categorical analysis, meaning all studies had equal weighting, including ones which may not have measured the discrepancy as reliably. Weighting by sample size was attempted, but a normalised sample could not be reached, even with the removal of all outliers. While not an outlier, the Rollins and Oheneba-Skyi (1990) study featured a very large sample size (n= 1471) and a moderate mean effect size for men's violence (d= .38) and a large effect size for women's violence (d= .62) which may have skewed the data beyond a salvageable normal distribution. While this procedure failed, the weighting system used in Archer (1999) could not be used as not all data needed for this procedure was accessible. Interestingly, both male and female mean results of the current study weighted by sample size was within .01 of the male and female results from Archer (1999) using the variance weighting.

For a small number of cases, original articles used in Archer (1999) could not be obtained and integrated into the current categories. For these studies, Archer's (1999) interpretation was relied upon and integrated into the current study. This represents a limitation as some specific distinction may have caused a study to be included in a different category or to require a category of their own which did not occur as the study could not be obtained.

A number of issues come up when considering the sample of the studies obtained. Firstly, while attempts were made to access as many studies as possible which had eligible data, this search was biased towards journals and other peer reviewed publications. While the journal *International Dissertations Online*, a collection of unpublished theses, was included in the search, no eligible studies were found. This biases the sample towards studies with a significant finding (Rosenthal, 1979), however attempts were made to curtail this, but there was simply no unpublished studies available which fit the criteria. Secondly, as Archer (1999) had searched for studies within the range 1979-1999, much of the focus was on studies 2000-2006, although attempts were made to obtain a number of studies pre-1999 which were not included in Archer's (1999) analysis. As previously mentioned, most studies did not include comparison means and standard deviations in the results sections, therefore most data collection occurred through relevant researchers sending their means and standard

deviations. Most studies which researchers supplied means for were studies which occurred within the last 2-3 years; older data tended to be unavailable, lost or irretrievable on outdated statistical programs. The sample was inevitably biased towards very recent studies. Thirdly, a very large set of studies were screened and reviewed in order to find the greatest number of studies as possible (Straus, 2001, 2006c). This process involved initially identifying studies which were likely to have self and partner reports of violence, and as the number of studies being reviewed was sizeable (831 studies were in the secondary review stage) it seems plausible that some studies which met the prerequisites and could have been included in the study were overlooked. This is particularly likely for studies which the title did not suggest that couple data would be collected. Although additional searching procedures were used which may have turned up some of these eligible studies, it remains quite likely that some studies were not included which could have been.

For this study, the file drawer effect (Rosenthal, 1979) would seem to be much less of a problem than for other meta-analysis. Having access to the bibliographies of the Conflict Tactics Scales (Straus, 2001, 2006b) meant that every study that had ever used the instrument, regardless of if it had been published was checked for eligibility. A small number of studies may have been eligible but not accessible, but considering the large amount of studies sourced and the very small amount that was able to be included, it seems unlikely that eligible studies were missed because they were not published in a prominent journal. Another reason the file drawer effect is less of an issue with this study is that even a null finding would be of interest for researchers in the area as it would suggest a lower discrepancy between partner's reporting than other studies.

For a small amount of studies (Morrel, Elliott, Murphy, & Taft, 2003; Stith, Rosen, McCollum, & Thomsen, 2004) participants were included twice although under different conditions. In Stith, Rosen, McCollum and Thomsen (2004) minor and severe violence was measured separately and two separate figures were obtained for participants. In Morrel, Elliott, Murphy and Taft (2003) pre and post treatment measurements of violence were used as separate samples. This is a limitation as it gives undue weight to the results for the participants of these studies.

An effect not considered in this study which has implications for the interpretation of the results is the differential effects of researcher bias for single and dual partner reporting. Although it has not been researched, and it would be very

difficult to do so, it is possible that the rates of underreporting may be greater for self reporting, than for dual partner reporting as the single partner is aware that no other record is going to dispute their report. If so, then the current findings are not analogous to self report measures of violence and reflect only the discrepancy for each gender when both partners are involved. However, this would likely suggest that self-report is likely to yield an even greater underreport that dual partner reporting.

As previously discussed, the current research is restricted to discussing discrepancies rather than identifying self-report. It is problematic that research suggests that some victims of violence underreport their experience of violence (Heckert & Gondolf, 2000) and that the potential exists for victims to over report for whatever reason. All that can be said to mitigate these factors are that the current research is interested in report discrepancies between partners and that it cannot be assumed that the discrepancy is totally based on underreporting by the perpetrator.

Chapter Summary

To summarise this chapter: Studies measuring men and women's violence with both partners in the relationship were obtained and effect sizes were calculated. Studies were categorised as to their sample origin, relationship between the partners of the sample, reference period for the instrument, instrument type, statistical level used and severity of violence measured. Studies often did not present adequate information in their results section to be included and most researchers did not have access to their data when it was older than two years or so. Both gender's violence was found to have discrepant reports, in that the perpetrator reported less violence, although the effect was much small for women's violence in the unweighted analysis. For both men and women, clinical samples were found to have significantly higher discrepancies compared to community violent and community mixed samples. The meta-analysis was quite limited, especially in terms of the weighting of samples sizes.

CHAPTER 8
DUAL AND SINGLE PARTNER REPORT OF VIOLENCE IN TYPOLOGICAL STUDIES

The previous chapter examined the extent of discrepancies in the report of men and women's violence. The current chapter will put these discrepancies into context by examining and comparing typological studies which have used either dual partner reporting of violence, and if so, whether an average or high score was used, and studies which have used only single partner report. The focus is on the discrepancy in the report of men's violence as the typological studies in this chapter all concern the male's violence only and limited research exists into the different characteristics of women's violence (Babcock, Miller, & Siard, 2003). It is anticipated that some differences will be observed between studies which have used dual and single partner reporting in terms of the levels of violence observed as a whole and within the individual types and the results obtained.

As found in the previous chapter, discrepancies concerning men's violence are prevalent, men typically underreport the violence they perpetrate compared to their female partner's reports of victimisation (g= .20 in unweighted samples, g= .26 when weighted by sample size), particularly in clinical samples (g= .43). The issue is then how this discrepancy has affected research efforts in this area. One area of research which seems particularly vulnerable to variations in violence reporting is typological studies, which classify intimately violent men along the lines of differences in psychological, generality of violence and severity/frequency of violence characteristics. These studies typically involve low levels of violence (Delsol, Margolin, & John, 2003; Holtzworth-Munroe, Meehan, Herron, Rehman, & Stuart, 2000; Waltz, Babcock, Jacobson, & Gottman, 2000) so the effects of dual reporting compared to individual reporting could produce much lower rates of violence, which could effect the distribution of participants into categories, particularly when taking into account that more violent offenders may underreport their violence at even greater rates (Heyman & Schlee, 1997). However, the use of dual partner reporting is not a golden measure, research has found that victims also underreport violence (Heckert & Gondolf, 2000) which potentially is a confound to the finding of levels of the discrepancy; the levels may be in-fact even greater if victim underreporting is prevalent. Regardless, the current

body of typological research has paid limited attention to the potential effects which the discrepancy could have on the typology, focusing more on the problems with the distinction between the men on psychological characteristics. In the context of the differential report of violence, the problem with the reliable distinction between the types may be explained.

Single and Dual Partner Reporting in Typological Studies

Table 8 details the particulars of the main studies in the area. As discussed in chapter 4, while the studies have some disparate findings, generally three distinct types can be observed. One profile of very violent men with antisocial characteristics and high levels of general violence (Generally Violent Antisocial), one type with medium to high levels of violence in the family, borderline characteristics and low levels of general violence (Borderline-Dysphoric), a type with low levels of violence, very low generality of violence and no significant psychopathology (Family-Only), and a type similar to the Family Only type except with significant antisocial characteristics and some general violence (Low Level Antisocial), which can appear distinct in a community sample or in place of a Family Only type in a clinical sample. However, some studies have had inconsistent findings, particularly in regards to the Borderline-Dysphoric and Generally Violent Antisocial types, some studies have not found them to be distinct on antisocial and borderline characteristics (Delsol, Margolin, & John, 2003; Saunders, 1992; Waltz, Babcock, Jacobson, & Gottman, 2000). While the original Gottman et al. (1995) article would suggest that the type 1 and type 2 men fit neatly into the Holtzworth-Munroe, Meehan, Herron, Rehman and Stuart (2000) typology, a number of findings since them have disputed this (Babcock, Green, Webb, & Graham, 2004; Meehan, Holtzworth-Munroe, & Herron, 2001). The current focus is on how the violence report source may affect the findings of these typological studies.

Table 8. Violence Report Source and Key Findings from Typological Studies.

Study	Violence Report Source	Findings
Babcock, Green, Webb, Graham (2004)	Husband and Wife Report (Highest Report Overall)	Examined heart-rate reactivity, did not find the same characteristic differences as Gottman, et al. (1995).
Delsol, Margolin, & John (2003)	Husband and Wife Report (Highest per Item)	Three types, two non-pathological no separate types for borderline and antisocial types.
Gottman, et al., (1995)	Wife Report	Found 2 types related to heart rate reactivity. The under active type had high rates of antisocial behavioural characteristics.
Graham-Kevan, Archer (2003)	Self Report	Used different samples to demonstrate a dyadic typology. Participants reported their and their partner's violence.
Hamberger, Lohr, Bonge, & Tolin (1996)	Husband and Wife Report (Highest Report Overall)	Three types, BD the most violent.
Holtzworth-Munroe, Meehan Herron, Rehman, & Stuart (2000)	Husband and Wife Report (Highest Report Overall)	Found four types of maritally violent men.
Meehan, Holtzworth-Munroe Herron (2001)	Husband and Wife Report (Highest Report Overall)	Examined heart-rate reactivity, found two types which did not differ as in Gottman, et al. (1995) on violence, antisocial and general violence variables.
Saunders (1992)	Husband Report (Corrected for Responding and severity)	Three groups were found, FO, a generally violent type and a emotionally volatile type.
Tweed & Dutton (1998)	Husband Report (Corrected for Responding)	Examined impulsive and instrumental batterers and found distinct pathological differences between the two types.
Waltz, Babcock, Jacobson, & Gottman (2000)	Wife Report	Found three types, GVA and BD types not distinct on personality characteristics.

The first group of studies to compare are the direct tests of the Holtzworth-Munroe and Stuart (1994) typology. Holtzworth-Munroe, Meehan, Herron, Rehman and Stuart (2000) tested the typology among a community sample, measuring violence using the highest total report between a husband and a wife. Delsol, Margolin and John (2003) also tested the typology in a community sample and used the highest total report between a husband and wife per item. Saunders (1992) examined similar distinctions to the Holtzworth-Munroe and Stuart (1994) types in a clinical sample, and used a self-

report measure augmented by correcting for desirable responding, and added extra weighting for extreme acts of violence. Tweed and Dutton (1998) examined the distinction between the impulsive and instrumental batterer which can be likened to the Borderline-Dysphoric and Generally Violent Antisocial types in a clinical sample, using self-report which was corrected for desirable responding. Waltz, Babcock, Jacobson and Gottman (2000) tested the typology in a community sample and used only wife report.

Holtzworth-Munroe, Meehan, Herron, Rehman and Stuart (2000) represent the archetype of typology studies; all the predicted differences between the types from the theory (Holtzworth-Munroe & Stuart, 1994) were found and a fairly comprehensive measure of violence was used. The use of the highest total report between a husband and wife, as used in the Holtzworth-Munroe, Meehan, Herron, Rehman and Stuart (2000) study, somewhat negates the discrepancy effect. Although an unpredicted fourth type was found, the Low Level Antisocial type was fit into the framework of the typology and has been found in other studies (Babcock, Costa, Green, & Eckhardt, 2004). Delsol, Margolin and John (2003) used a very comprehensive measure of violence utilising both partners; the highest report for each item was used which negates the discrepancy effect totally by assuming that any time an act of violence is reported by either partner, it occurred. Unfortunately, these two studies used vastly different methods in measuring violence and in sorting participants into types so no meaningful comparison can take place. However, it can be said that Delsol, Margolin and John (2003) used the more comprehensive measure of violence. Delsol, Margolin and John (2003) found no distinction between borderline and antisocial characteristics in the types, finding a Family Only type with low level violence, a medium violence type and a generally violent/psychologically distressed type with both significant antisocial and borderline characteristics. It is possible that the more comprehensive measure of violence has resulted in a larger report of violence, which has exposed a previously unobserved group with no significant pathology or generalised violence but significantly more violence than the Family Only type, and obscured the distinction between the Borderline-Dysphoric and Generally Violent Antisocial types.

Saunders (1992) used only a self-report measure of violence, although it was altered using socially desirable responding and factored in severe acts of violence. These measures fail to adequately compensate for the discrepancy effect, particularly considering the study took place in a clinical sample which was found to have a particularly large discrepancy in the current study (d= .43). The adjustments made by

Saunders (1992) represent very small changes in violent samples. This lower bound measure of violence in the relationship may have contributed to the finding that the emotionally volatile group was not significantly more violent than the Family Only type, while the generally violent type was significantly more violent than both. A specific underreporting effect may exist within the types, however data was not available to facilitate an examination of this[12]. If so, the relatively low levels of violence observed in this emotionally volatile type may be attributed to the use of a self report measure of violence.

Tweed and Dutton (1998) used a self-report measure of violence and adjusted for social desirability in a similar fashion to Saunders (1992). This lower bound measure of violence in the relationship successfully found a significant difference between the Generally Violent Antisocial and Borderline-Dysphoric types on all the variables identified by Holtzworth-Munroe, Meehan, Herron, Rehman and Stuart (2000). As the analysis was restricted to examining impulsive and instrumental batterers, it may be that the reporting discrepancies were not nearly as relevant to the distinction as the antisocial and borderline personality characteristics.

Waltz, Babcock, Jacobson and Gottman (2000) used wife report of the husband's violence and found types which were similar to the profiles described by Holtzworth-Munroe and Stuart (1994) in theory. However, it was found that the Borderline-Dysphoric and Generally Violent Antisocial types were not distinguishable by psychopathology. The researchers suggest that this was because of the similarities in the definitions of antisocial and borderline personality characteristics, which seems likely as the instrument used to measure these constructs has significant overlap for these characteristics (Waltz, Babcock, Jacobson, & Gottman, 2000). Wife report is no substitute for dual partner reporting, considering victims may underreport some incidents of violence (Heckert & Gondolf, 2000); self report may identify acts of violence not indicated by the partner, however it seems likely that in most cases, studies that used the greatest total level of violence between husbands and wives would use partner report as the final result. If so, this would argue the case for the use for the sole use of partner report.

Gottman et al. (1995) used solely wife report of violence in their test of the heart rate reactivity typology. The finding was consistent with Holtzworth-Munroe and Stuart

[12] The discrepancy data presented in Waltz, Babcock, Jacobson and Gottman (2000) was not presented in

(1994); that one type exhibited antisocial characteristics and other related variables and that another had borderline/dependant characteristics. Gottman et al. (1995) also found that each of these types had a distinct pattern of heart rate reactivity. This finding has been disputed by other studies which have used dual partner reporting of violence (Babcock, Green, Webb, & Graham, 2004; Meehan, Holtzworth-Munroe, & Herron, 2001) and found that although violent men can be differentiated in terms of heart-rate reactivity, they did not have the characteristics described by Gottman et al. (1995). As previously discussed, wife reporting of violence could potentially be a good measure as it seems likely that when researchers are using the highest total report, the women's report will usually be the highest. It does not seem likely that the inconsistencies to do with the finding of antisocial and borderline characteristics of type 1 and type 2 men can be explained with the discrepancy effect.

A typology that does not fit into the main body of work as easily as the previous studies is that of Johnson's (Johnson, 1995; Johnson & Ferraro, 2000) typology of the dyad. The theory suggests that some couples experience low-level, infrequent, reciprocal violence (Common Couple Violence), while others experience violence used as a part of control tactics in a relationship (Intimate terrorism). This was tested in a quantitative study with participants from women's shelters and prison (Graham-Kevan & Archer, 2003). Participants indicated the incidence of violence for themselves and for their partner, which means reporting discrepancies are in full effect for both men and women's violence. However, as the study was more concerned with the occurrence of violence in the dyad, the kinds of discrepancies which are likely to occur are not likely to affect the classifications made in this study.

Chapter Summary

The current chapter reviewed the effect that reporting discrepancies could potentially have on typological studies, with many studies using different reports in the measurement of violence in the relationship. Discrepancies in the report of violence may have a hand in the problems of reliably differentiating between the BD and GVA types in a community sample. Although no consistent finding was made linking differences in reporting with disparate findings, in a number of cases the measurement of the level of violence may be involved in the finding of different descriptive types and types having differing characteristics. The last chapter will sum up the findings from the

---

terms of the types.

current research, examine the implications of the current findings, suggest areas of future research and make recommendations for changes to current policy.

CHAPTER 9
SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION

The current study involved a meta-analysis of male and female reporting of violence, extending upon the work of Archer (1999) to produce the most comprehensive analysis possible. The widest possible search criterion was used to obtain articles to include in the meta-analysis. However, most articles involved only one partner's report of violence, did not present means in the articles, or the researchers involved did not supply the required data to add the article to the analysis. The articles obtained were classified along categories which theoretically could have different rates of discrepancies. Overall, it was found that men (d= .20 Unweighted, d= .26 Weighted) and women (d= .04 Unweighted, d= .33 Weighted) both underreport their violence, although the mean effect size for women's violence was small in the unweighted analysis. It was also found that in terms of men's violence, underreporting was greater among clinical samples, among mixed samples of dating and married partners, when the instrument measured violence over the course of the relationship, when the Conflict Tactics Scales 2 was used, when violence was measured with an interval measure, and when the level of violence being reported upon was severe, although only the clinical sample, the use of the Conflict Tactics Scales 2 and the severe level of violence yielded significance. For women's violence, the clinical sample compared to the rest of the sample, married/cohabitating relationships, instruments measuring violence in the previous twelve months, the use of the Conflict Tactics Scales 2, nominal measurements of violence and studies which measured only severe violence all had the greatest discrepancy ratings, although only the use of a clinical sample and the measurement of only severe violence reached statistical significance. Many of the findings between the categories were limited due to small sample size. What this means is that when using empirical instruments researchers must be aware of the discrepancy between partners, particularly when male violence is being measured and the study involves clinical samples.

This study reviewed the typology literature and found strong consistent profiles that exist among different typology studies, despite a number of studies finding a lack of consistency in some of the findings. Researchers in this area suggest that these types identified in different studies are similar, yet lack qualification in exactly how they

differ and in what ways they are similar. In an attempt to explain some of the inconsistencies, typological studies were reviewed, comparing the report of violence used. Although no consistent finding was made linking differences in reporting with disparate findings, in a number of cases the measurement of the level of violence may be involved in the finding of different descriptive types, and of types having differing characteristics.

Implications and Applications

The findings from the current study as well as the findings from a review of the literature have implications for the way intimate violence policy is implemented. Firstly, policy needs to be informed by empirical research as well as advocacy, and represent the diversity in explanations of intimate violence. To a degree, advocacy has overtaken social science in informing government policy, particularly prominent is the belief that men's violence is never accidental or impulsive, that it is not caused by any mental defect, illness or addictions and represents men's societal level campaign to dominate women (Corvo & Johnson, 2003). This extraordinarily skewed point of view lacks the support of empirical research, especially considering intimate violence has been found to not be related to structural patriarchy (Archer, 2006; Yllo & Straus, 1990), and significant patterns have been found in terms of psychopathology, generality of violence, severity of violence and other theoretically linked variables (Babcock, Costa, Green, & Eckhardt, 2004; Chase, O'Leary, & Heyman, 2001; Delsol, Margolin, & John, 2003; Gondolf, 1988; Hamberger, Lohr, Bonge, & Tolin, 1996; Holtzworth-Munroe, Meehan, Herron, Rehman, & Stuart, 2000; Langhinrichsen-Rohling, Huss, & Ramsey, 2000; Saunders, 1992; Tweed & Dutton, 1998; Waltz, Babcock, Jacobson, & Gottman, 2000). The current approach promotes the use of wide spread arrest, the provision of shelters and resources for women and in some cases, feminist treatment programs (R. P. Dobash & Dobash, 2004). While these options are important in providing abused women with options, this theoretical orientation takes a very homogeneous view of intimate violence.

The second suggestion is that the diversity of intimate violence be taken account of in intimate violence policy. Current policy assumes that all batterers are like the men described by severely beaten women at shelters and clinical samples, when much violence occurs in reciprocal patterns (Graham-Kevan & Archer, 2003; Rosen, Stith, Few, Daly, & Tritt, 2005; Straus & Ramirez, 2002), women perpetrate some violence independently (Babcock, Miller, & Siard, 2003; Edleson & Brygger, 1986; Fiebert &

Gonzalez, 1997; Hirschel & Buzawa, 2002; Larance, 2006; Medina-Ariza & Barberet, 2003; Straus & Gelles, 1986; Straus, Gelles, & Steinmetz, 1980; Straus & Ramirez, 2002), even in female-female same-sex relationships (Levy & Lobel, 1998; Lie, Schilit, Bush, Montague, & Reyes, 1991). Men's violence has been found to occur infrequently and at low levels in community samples, although also at severe and frequent levels similar to that described by feminist works (Delsol, Margolin, & John, 2003; Holtzworth-Munroe, Meehan, Herron, Rehman, & Stuart, 2000; Langhinrichsen-Rohling, Huss, & Ramsey, 2000; Saunders, 1992; Waltz, Babcock, Jacobson, & Gottman, 2000). What is missing from policy is the acknowledgement of diversity among intimately violent samples. With this idea integrated into the current framework, the kinds of campaigns initiated in Western Australia (Donovan, Paterson, & Francas, 1999) could be even more effective by targeting the types of offenders that exist in the community, and the types of interventions offered could be improved by reflecting the diverse needs of intimately violent men.

Thirdly, the development of treatment programs need to be improved, particularly in terms of providing for the diverse needs of intimately violent men. Research has shown that patient matched interventions provide better efficacy (Dutton, Bodnarchuk, Kropp, Hart, & Ogloff, 1997; Langhinrichsen-Rohling, Huss, & Ramsey, 2000; Saunders, 1996), and that men in relationships where women are violent as well have particularly low chances of not inflicting another act of violence (Feld & Straus, 1989; Gelles & Straus, 1988; S. G. O'Leary & Slep, 2006; Schumacher & Leonard, 2005; Woodin & O'Leary, 2006). Treatment programs also need to address the needs of men in terms of psychological problems; particular types have been shown to be high in personality disorders (Chase, O'Leary, & Heyman, 2001; Delsol, Margolin, & John, 2003; Gondolf, 1988; Gottman et al., 1995; Hamberger, Lohr, Bonge, & Tolin, 1996; Holtzworth-Munroe, Meehan, Herron, Rehman, & Stuart, 2000; Langhinrichsen-Rohling, Huss, & Ramsey, 2000; Tweed & Dutton, 1998; Waltz, Babcock, Jacobson, & Gottman, 2000). Programs to help reduce the non-self defence violence of women may also be effective in reducing violence in the dyad; however more research is required to examine this.

Fourthly, studies using quantitative measures of violence need to be aware of the effects of underreporting and account for the occurrence in the measurement of violence. Ideally, the types of tactics used by the typological studies are ideal (Babcock, Green, Webb, & Graham, 2004; Delsol, Margolin, & John, 2003; Hamberger, Lohr,

Bonge, & Tolin, 1996; Holtzworth-Munroe, Meehan, Herron, Rehman, & Stuart, 2000; Meehan, Holtzworth-Munroe, & Herron, 2001). No gold measure exists, so it is important for researchers to exercise caution in the interpretation of findings including only self-report measures of violence. Efforts have been made to improve the measurement of violence, however many studies are not making use of them. Very few studies from the meta-analysis used the updated Conflict Tactics Scales (Straus, Hamby, Boney-McCoy, & Sugarman, 1996) and even fewer used the full scale of either the updated or original Conflict Tactics Scales.

Finally, researchers need to retain access to their data in order to allow for meta-analytic studies. In the current study, where the data was older than two years, most researchers indicated that they no longer had access to their results, either due to incompatible software or hardware, or having to provide all copies of their results to their funding body. It is a considerable impediment to the unification of a body of research to have large amounts of data missing which otherwise could have been included in an analysis. Researchers could ensure the future use of their data and interest in their work by updating their data occasionally to current formats and to retain even descriptive data from their funding bodies.

Some of the findings of this study and literature review can be implemented directly in the Western Australian context. Campbell (1986) identified the over use of arrest in American policy and designed an instrument which identifies dangerous and persistent perpetrators and victims with the greatest need for legal intervention. The Danger Assessment Scale (Campbell, 1986) could potentially be used in a Western Australian context in order to help identify offenders which need to be prosecuted and sentenced aggressively, and victims which have the greatest need for protection and advocacy, with alternative interventions being better suited to less at risk offenders and victims. Efficient prosecution of perpetrators and protection of victims in the most serious cases makes the best use of the court's limited resources and represents the best outcome for public safety, and the Danger Assessment Scale represents a tool to assist the criminal justice system distribute its resources efficiently (Goodman, Dutton, & Bennett, 2000). Courts such the Joondalup Family Violence Court may already use informal procedures similar to the evaluative process of the Danger Assessment Scale which refer some offenders to services, victims to advocacy, but aggressively prosecute particularly at risk offenders.

In terms of treatment, Western Australia needs a variety of treatment programs which provide patient matched needs, acknowledges the significant psychopathology of intimate violence perpetrators and includes the partner in the intervention when the partner's violence may be a factor in the patient's offending. Factoring in women's violence is an especially important issue as putting violent men with poor social and problem solving skills (Babcock, Costa, Green, & Eckhardt, 2004; Chase, O'Leary, & Heyman, 2001; Delsol, Margolin, & John, 2003; Holtzworth-Munroe, Meehan, Herron, Rehman, & Stuart, 2000; Saunders, 1992; Tweed & Dutton, 1998; Waltz, Babcock, Jacobson, & Gottman, 2000) into a situation where they are confronted with aggression is likely to result in aggression, regardless of whatever gender sensitivity and empathy training they have received. Communication between these programs is also important in order to improve efficacy and provide data on how to address specific needs of different types of patients. Programs need to be monitored with an extensive recidivism measure involving self and partner reports using uniformed instruments such as the Conflict Tactics Scales (Straus, Hamby, Boney-McCoy, & Sugarman, 1996), arrest records and psycho-metric data.

While programs like 'Freedom from Fear' help to change community ideas about intimate violence by presenting the effects of it on the family, another approach could involve making younger people aware of intimate violence, helping them to be able to identify abusive relationships and where to go for help. By presenting the problem of violence in an intimate relationship to teenagers in a similar format to sexual education, it could have an effect on stopping the intergenerational transmission of violence and help to develop community values strongly disapproving of violence between intimate partners.

Future Research

Research in the area of domestic violence is in need of more transparent reporting and more comparable statistics in order to demonstrate the reliability of particular effects. Although a synthesis has been performed (Cavanaugh & Gelles, 2005) and the types yielded by studies are commonly compared, these different types found in research have yet to be sufficiently empirically linked. With a valid, reliable typology, empirical researchers have a better chance of influencing government policy by demonstrating the heterogeneity of intimate violence in a neat succinct package. While this is important, the next step in the development of intimate violence would seem to be dimensional approaches which consider some of the variables identified in

typological research as a whole instead of separate related variables. Holtzworth-Munroe and Meehan (2004) formed a composite measure of antisociality including violence outside the home, substance use and criminal behaviour and a measure of borderline personality measures including jealousy, preoccupied attachment, fear of abandonment and borderline personality organisation. These measures take the focus off clinical diagnostic tools such as the Millon Clinical Multi-axial Inventory-III (Millon, 1994) and back onto more tangible variables which are closely related to the perpetration of intimate violence.

In terms of the measurement of violence, more research is needed to evaluate the quality of the measures used, specifically how the tactics devised by Straus, Hamby, Boney-McCoy and Sugarman (1996) compare to the original measure and if the criticisms of the Conflict Tactics Scales have indeed been addressed adequately in the Conflict Tactics Scales 2. If a case is to be made to use empirical measures in the criminal justice system, their efficacy must be well established. To this end, the Conflict Tactics Scales needs to be compared to the definitions of intimate violence used in the criminal justice system.

Some studies found large discrepancies in the report of women's violence (Browning & Dutton, 1986; Rollins & Oheneba-Sakyi, 1990). Although the main finding from this study suggested that the discrepancy was very limited, weighted analysis found a considerable effect size. Research needs to be conducted to examine the conditions and characteristics of women's underreporting of their own violence.

Applied research is needed to assess the demand for support services for men and perpetrator programs for women and how effective these initiatives overall would be for the reduction of intimate violence. Despite the large rates of violence perpetrated by women as found in empirical examinations of intimate violence, very few men report this violence or access any services. While many men may not live in fear of women's violence, services should exist for those who need refuge, as long as a viable need is demonstrated. Programs for women who perpetrate intimate violence not in self defence is a necessary addition to state resources, considering the prevalence of women's violence reported in community samples and the research tying the prevention of men's violence to women's violence. Women's violence within the relationship could potentially be a large factor by which total violence in intimate relationships could be reduced.

References

Acts Amendment (Family and Domestic Violence) Act 2004 (WA).

Apsler, R., Cummins, M. R., & Carl, S. (2003). Perceptions of the police by female victims of domestic partner violence. *Violence against Women, 9*(11), 1318-1335.

Archer, J. (1999). Assessment of the reliability of the conflict tactics scales: A meta-analytic review. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 14*(12), 1263-1289.

Archer, J. (2000). Sex differences in aggression between heterosexual partners: A meta-analytic review. *Psychological Bulletin, 126*(5), 651-680.

Archer, J. (2006). Cross-cultural differences in physical aggression between partners: A social-role analysis. *Personality and Social Psychology Review, 10*(2), 133-153.

Archer, J., & Ray, N. (1989). Dating violence in the United Kingdom: A preliminary study. *Aggressive Behavior, 15*(5), 337-343.

Babcock, J. C., Costa, D. M., Green, C. E., & Eckhardt, C. (2004). What situations induce intimate partner violence? A reliability and validity study of the proximal antecedents to violent episodes scale. *Journal of Family Psychology, 18*(3), 433-442.

Babcock, J. C., Green, C. E., Webb, S. A., & Graham, K. H. (2004). A second failure to replicate the gottman et al. (1995) typology of men who abuse intimate partners... and possible reasons why. *Journal of Family Psychology, 18*(2), 396-400.

Babcock, J. C., Green, C. E., Webb, S. A., & Yerington, T. P. (2005). Psychophysiological profiles of batterers: Autonomic emotional reactivity as it predicts the antisocial spectrum of behavior among intimate partner abusers. *Journal of Abnormal Psychology, 114*(3), 444-455.

Babcock, J. C., Miller, S. A., & Siard, C. (2003). Toward a typology of abusive women: Differences between partner-only and generally violent women in the use of violence. *Psychology of Women Quarterly, 27*(2), 153-161.

Babcock, J. C., Walt, 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*(1), 40-50.

Bagshaw, D., & Chung, D. (2000). *Women, men and domestic violence*. Canberra: Partnerships Against Domestic Violence.

Bail Act 1982 (WA).

Bailar, J. C. (1997). The promise and problems of meta-analysis. *New England Journal of Medicine, 337*(8), 559-561.

Bandura, A. (1973). *A social learning analysis*. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice Hall.

Bard, M. (1970). Family intervention police teams as a community mental health resource. *Journal of Criminal Law, Criminology and police Science, 60*(2), 247-250.

Barnett, O. W. (2001). Why battered women do not leave, part 2. *Trauma, Violence, & Abuse, 2*(1), 3-35.

Berkowitz, L. (1962). *Aggression: A social-psychological analysis*. New York: McGraw Hill.

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*(5), 666-674.

Boffey, P. M. (1983, April 5th). Domestic violence: Study favours arrest. *New York Times,* p. 124.

Browning, J., & Dutton, D. G. (1986). Assessment of wife assault with the conflict tactics scale: Using couple data to quantify the differential reporting effect. *Journal of Marriage and the Family, 48*(2), 375-379.

Bui, H. N. (2001). Domestic violence victims' behavior in favor of prosecution: Effects of gender relations. *Women & Criminal Justice, 12*(4), 51-76.

Cadsky, O., & Crawford, M. (1988). Establishing batterer typologies in a clinical sample of men who assault their female partners. *Canadian Journal of Community Mental Health, 7*(2), 119-127.

Caesar, P. L. (1986, August). *The male batterer: Characteristics of a heterogeneous population.* . Paper presented at the Symposium conducted at the 94th Annual Convention of the American psychological Association, Washington D.C.

Campbell, J. C. (1986). Assessment of risk of homicide for battered women. *Advances in Nursing Science, 8*(4), 36-51.

Cantos, A. L., Neidig, P. H., & O'Leary, K. D. (1994). Injuries to women and men in a treatment program for domestic violence. *Journal of Family Violence, 9*(2), 113-124.

Cavanaugh, M. M., & Gelles, R. J. (2005). The utility of male domestic violence offender typologies: new directions for research, policy and practice. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 20*(2), 155-166.

Chase, K. A., O'Leary, K. D., & Heyman, R. E. (2001). Categorizing partner-violent men within the reactive-proactive typology model. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 69*(3), 567-572.

Coleman, D. H., & Straus, M. A. (1986). Marital power, conflict, and violence in a nationally representative sample of American couples. *Violence and Victims, 1*(2), 141-157.

Corcoran, J., Stephenson, M., Perryman, D., & Allen, S. (2001). Perceptions and utilization of a police-social work crisis intervention approach to domestic violence. *Families in Society, 82*(4), 393-398.

Corvo, K., & Johnson, P. J. (2003). Vilification of the "batterer": How blame shapes domestic violence policy and interventions. *Aggression and Violent Behavior, 8*(3), 259-281.

Counts, D. A., Brown, J. K., & Campbell, J. C. (1992). *Sanctions and sanctuary: Cultural perspectives on the beating of wives*. Boulder: Westview.

Court Services Division, Department of Justice, & Crime Prevention and Community Support Division of the Western Australian Police Service. (2002). *Joondalup family violence court: Final Report*. Perth: Department of Justice.

Cox, E., & Leonard, H. (1991). *Costs of domestic violence*. Sydney: New South Wales Women's Coordination Unit.

Crimes (Domestic Violence) Amendment Act 1983 (NSW).

Crimes (Family Violence) Act 1987 (Vic).

Criminal Code Act Compilation Act 1913 (WA).

Crowne, D. P., & Marlowe, D. (1960). A new scale of social desirability independant of psychopathology. *Journal of Consulting Psychology, 24*(4), 349-354.

DeKeseredy, W. S., & Schwartz, M. D. (1998). *Woman abuse on campus: Results from the Canadian national survey*. California: Sage.

Delsol, C., Margolin, G., & John, R. S. (2003). A typology of maritally violent men and correlates of violence in a community sample. *Journal of Marriage and the Family, 65*(3), 635-651.

Dobash, R. E., & Dobash, R. P. (1992). *Women, violence and social change*. London: Routledge.

Dobash, R. P., & Dobash, R. E. (1983). *Do we need new methods for studying wife abuse? The context specific approach*. California: Sage.

Dobash, R. P., & Dobash, R. E. (2004). Women's violence to men in intimate relationships. *The British Journal of Criminology, 44*(3), 324-349.

Domestic Violence Prevention Unit. (1999). *Best practice model for the provision of programs for perpetrators of domestic violence in Western Australia*. Perth: Department of Community Development.

Domestic Violence Prevention Unit. (2006). The men's project: Exploring responces to men who are victims and perpetrators of family and domestic violence [Electronic Version] from http://www.community.wa.gov.au/NR/rdonlyres/281BE8DE-A378-43B0-B70E-667C6280CE28/0/MensProjectReport.pdf.

Donovan, R. J., Paterson, D., & Francas, M. (1999). Targeting male perpetrators of intimate partner violence: Western Australia's "Freedom from Fear" campaign. *Social Marketing Quarterly, 5*(3), 128-144.

Dugan, L. (2003). Domestic violence legislation: Exploring its impact on the likelihood of doemstic violence, police involvement, and arrest. *Criminology & Public Policy, 2*(2), 283-311.

Dutton, D. G. (1994). Patriarchy and wife assault: The ecological fallacy. *Violence and Victims, 9*(2), 125-140.

Dutton, D. G., Bodnarchuk, M. K., Kropp, R., Hart, S. D., & Ogloff, J. P. (1997). Client personality disorders affecting wife assault post treatment recidivism. *Violence and Victims, 12*(1), 29-36.

Dutton, D. G., & Nicholls, T. L. (2005). The gender paradigm in domestic violence research and theory: Part 1-The conflict of theory and data. *Aggression and Violent Behavior, 10*(6), 680-714.

Edleson, J. L., & Brygger, M. P. (1986). Gender differences in reporting of battering incidents. *Family Relations, 35*(3), 377-382.

Ehrensaft, M. K., Cohen, P., Brown, J., Smailes, E., Chen, H., & Johnson, J. G. (2003). Intergenerational transmission of partner violence: A 20 year prospective study. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 71*(4), 741-753.

Fagan, J. A. (1989). Cessation of family violence. In L. Ohlin & M. Tonry (Eds.), *Family Violence* (Vol. 11). Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Fagan, J. A., Stewart, D. K., & Hansen, K. V. (1983). Violent men or violent husbands? Background factors and situational correlates. In D. Finklehor, R. J. Gelles, G.

T. Hotaling & M. A. Straus (Eds.), *The dark side of families: Current family violence research* (Vol. 49-68). Beverly Hills: Sage.

Faludi, S. (1991). *Backlash: The undeclared war against American women*. New York: Crown Publishers.

Family and Domestic Violence Unit. (2006a). Progress report of the Western Australian family and domestic violence action plan 2004-2005. from http://www.community.wa.gov.au/NR/rdonlyres/FAA28D2E-F44F-4CD1-8F18-4C787E18E8EA/0/ProgressreportFINAL.pdf

Family and Domestic Violence Unit. (2006b). Western Australian family and domestic violence action plan 2005-2006. from http://www.community.wa.gov.au/NR/rdonlyres/7F67524B-EA23-4A7C-AAB9-22EF9ACF66CF/0/ActionPlan20052006FINAL.pdf

Family and Domestic Violence Unit. (2006c). Western Australian family and domestic violence state strategic plan from http://www.community.wa.gov.au/NR/rdonlyres/209390A2-76A2-4303-9AB6-61E7DAABE3AF/0/DCDRPTFamilyandDomesticViolenceStateStrategicPlan2004.pdf

Faulk, M. (1974, July). Men who assault their wives. *Medicine, Science, and the Law*, 180-183.

Federal Bureau of Investigation. (1997). *Uniform crime reports*. Washington DC: United States Government Printing Press.

Feld, S. L., & Straus, M. A. (1989). Escalation and desistance of wife assault in marriage. *Criminology, 27*(1), 141-161.

Ferreol, M., Dohet, A., Cauchie, H., & Hoffman, L. (2005). A top down approach for the development of a stream typology based on abiotic variables. *Hydrobiologia, 551*(1), 193-209.

Fiebert, M. S. (2004). References examining assaults by women on their spouses or male partners: An annotated bibliography. *Sexuality and Culture, 8*(3), 140-176.

Fiebert, M. S., & Gonzalez, D. M. (1997). College women who initiate assaults: The reasons offered for such behavior. *Psychological Reports, 80*(2), 583-590.

Flood, M. (1999, Summer). Claims about husband battering. *Domestic Violence and Incest Resource Centre Newsletter,* pp. 3-8.

Follingstad, D. R., Bradley, R. G., Heliff, C. M., & Laughlin, J. E. (2002). A model for predicting dating violence: Anxious attachment, angry temperment and need for relationship control. *Violence and Victims, 17*(91), 35-47.

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

Gelles, R. J. (1993). Family violence. In R. L. Hampton, T. P. Gullotta, G. R. Adams, E. H. Potter III & R. P. Weissberg (Eds.), *Family violence: Prevention and treatment* (Vol. 1, pp. 1-24). Newbury Park: Sage.

Gelles, R. J., & Straus, M. A. (1988). *Intimate violence*. New York: Simon & Schuster.

George, M. J. (1999). A victimization survey of female-perpetrated assaults in the United Kingdom. *Aggressive Behavior, 25*(1), 67-79.

Giles-Sims, J. (1983). *Wife battering: A systems theory approach*. New York: Guilford Press.

Gondolf, E. W. (1985). *Changing men who batter: An integrated approach to stopping wife abuse*. Florida: Learning Publications.

Gondolf, E. W. (1988). Who are those guys? Toward a behavioral typology of batterers. *Violence and Victims, 3*(3), 187-203.

Gondolf, E. W. (1997). Batterer programs: What we know and need to know. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 12*(1), 83-99.

Goodman, L. A., Dutton, M. A., & Bennett, L. (2000). Predicting repeat abuse among arrested batterers: Use of the danger assessment scale in the criminal justice system. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 15*(1), 63-74.

Gosselin, D. K. (2000). *Heavy hands: An introduction to the crimes of domestic violence*. New Jersey: Prentice Hall.

Gottman, J. M., Jacobson, N. S., Rushe, R. H., Short, J. W., Babcock, J. C., & La Taillade, J. J. (1995). The relationship between heart rate reactivity, emotionally aggressive behavior, and general violence in batterers. *Journal of Family Psychology, 9*(3), 227-248.

Graham-Kevan, N., & Archer, J. (2003). Intimate terrorism and common couple violence: A test of Johnson's predictions in four British samples. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 18*(11), 1247-1270.

Greening, D. E. (1995). Affects and cognitions of convicted batterers and their intimate partners (Doctoral dissertation, Wayne State University). *Dissertation Abstracts International, 57*, 114A.

Griffin, R. W., & Lopez, Y. P. (2005). Bad behavior in organisations: A review and typology for future research. *Journal of Management, 31*(6), 988-998.

Grych, J. H., Seid, M., & Fincham, F. D. (1992). Assessing marital conflict from the child's perspective: The children's perception of interparental conflict scale. *Child Development, 63*(3), 558-572.

Hamberger, L. K., & Guse, C. E. (2002). Men's and women's use of intimate partner violence in clinical samples. *Violence against Women, 8*(11), 1301-1331.

Hamberger, L. K., Lohr, J. M., Bonge, D., & Tolin, D. F. (1996). A large sample empirical typology of male spouse abusers and its relationship to dimensions of abuse. *Violence and Victims, 11*(4), 277-292.

Hamby, S. L., Sugarman, D. B., & Boney-McCoy, S. (2006). Does questionnaire format impact reported partner violence rates?: An experimental study. *Violence and Victims, 21*(4), 507-518.

Heckert, D. A., & Gondolf, E. W. (2000). Predictors of underreporting of male violence by batterer program participants and their partners. *Journal of Family Violence, 15*(4), 423-443.

Hershorn, M., & Rosenbaum, A. (1991). Over vs. undercontrolled hostility: Application of the construct to the classification of maritally violent men. *Violence and Victims, 6*(2), 151-158.

Heyman, R. E., & Schlee, K. A. (1997). Toward a better estimate of the prevalence of partner abuse: Adjusting rates based on the sensitvity of the conflict tactics scale. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 11*(3), 332-338.

Hirschel, D., & Buzawa, E. (2002). Understanding the context of dual arrest with directions for further research *Violence against Women, 8*(12), 1449-1473.

Holbert, R. L. (2005). A typology for the study of entertainment television and politics. *The American Behavioural Scientist, 49*(3), 436-454.

Holtzworth-Munroe, A., & Meehan, J. C. (2004). Typologies of men who are maritally violent: Scientific and clinical implications. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 19*(12), 1369-1389.

Holtzworth-Munroe, A., Meehan, J. C., Herron, K., Rehman, U., & Stuart, G. (2000). Testing the Holtzworth-Munroe and Stuart (1994) batterer typology. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 68*(6), 1000-1019.

Holtzworth-Munroe, A., & Stuart, G. (1994). Typologies of male batterers: Three subtypes and the differences among them. *Psychological Bulletin, 116*(3), 476-497.

Hornung, C. A., McCullough, B. C., & Sugimoto, T. (1981). Status relationships in marriage: Risk factors in spouse abuse. *Journal of Marriage and the Family, 433*(5), 675-692.

Hotaling, G. T., & Straus, M. A. (1989). Interfamily violence and, crime and violence outside the family. In L. Ohlin & M. Tonry (Eds.), *Family violence* (Vol. 11, pp. 315-376). Chicago: University of Chicago.

Humphries, D. (2002). No easy answers: public policy, criminal justice, and domestic violence. *Criminology & Public policy, 2*(1), 91-96.

Island, D., & Letellier, P. (1991). *Men who beat the men who love them*. New York: Haworth Press.

Johnson, M. P. (1995). Patriarchal terrorism and common couple violence: two forms of violence against women. *Journal of Marriage and the Family, 57*(2), 283-294.

Johnson, M. P., & Ferraro, K. J. (2000). Research on domestic violence in the 1990s: Making distinctions. *Journal of Marriage and the Family, 62*(4), 948-963.

Johnson, M. P., & Leone, J. M. (2005). The differential effects of intimate terrorism and situational couple violence: Findings from the national violence against women survey. *Journal of Family Issues, 26*(3), 322-349.

Jouriles, E. N., & O'Leary, K. D. (1985). Interspousal reliability of report of marital violence. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 53*(3), 419-421.

Jung, C. G. (1923). *Psychological types*. New York: Harcourt.

Jung, C. G. (1987). *C. G. Jung speaking: Interviews and encounters*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Kalmuss, D. (1984). The intergenerational transmission of marital aggression. *Journal of Marriage and the Family, 46*(1), 11-19.

Kaplan, H. B. (1972). Toward a general theory of psychosocial deviance: The case of aggressive behavior. *Social Science and Medicine, 6*(4), 593-617.

Kwong, M. J., Bartholomew, K., Henderson, A. J., & Trike, S. J. (2003). The intergenerational transmission of relationship violence. *Journal of Family Psychology, 17*(3), 288-301.

Landolt, M. A., & Dutton, D. G. (1997). Power and personality: An analysis of gay male intimate abuse. *Sex Roles, 37*(5), 335-359.

Langhinrichsen-Rohling, J., Huss, M., & Ramsey, S. (2000). The clinical utility of batterer typologies. *Journal of Family Violence, 15*(1), 37-53.

Larance, L. Y. (2006). Serving women who use force in their intimate heterosexual relationships: An extended view. *Violence against Women, 12*(7), 622-640.

Lawrence, E., Heyman, R. E., & O'Leary, K. D. (1995). Correspondence between telephone and written assessments of physical violence in marriage. *Behavior Therapy, 26*(4), 671-680.

Levy, B., & Lobel, K. (1998). Lesbian teens in abusive relationships. In B. Levy (Ed.), *Dating violence: Young women in danger* (pp. 91-113). Seattle: Seal Press.

Lie, G., Schilit, R., Bush, J., Montague, M., & Reyes, L. (1991). Lesbians in currently aggressive relationships: How frequently do they report aggressive past relationships. *Violence and Victims, 6*(2), 121-135.

Lockley, P. (1999). *Counselling women in violent relationships*. London: Free Association.

Lundgren, E., Heimer, G., Westerstrand, J., & Kalliokoski, A. M. (2002). *Captured queen: Men's violence against women in "equal" Sweden-A prevalence study*. Stockholm: Offentliga Publikationer.

Margolin, G., Burman, B., John, R. S., & O'Brien, M. (1990). *Domestic Conflict Index*. Unpublished instrument, Los Angeles: University of Southern California.

Marshall, L. L. (1987, May-June). Partnership abuse: Comparison of two studies using college students. *Paper Presented at the Iowa Conference on Personal Relationships, North Texas State University*.

Mason, A., & Blankenship, V. (1987). Power and affiliation motivation, stress, and abuse in intimate relationships. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 52*(1), 203-210.

Maxwell, C. D., Garner, J. H., & Fagan, J. A. (2002). The preventive effects of arrest on intimate partner violence: Research, policy and theory. *Criminology & Public Policy, 2*(1), 51-80.

McCauley, J., Kern, D. E., Kolodner, K., Dill, L., Schroeder, A. F., DeChant, H. K., et al. (1995). The "battering syndrome": Prevalence and clinical characteristics of domestic violence. *Primary Care Internal Medicine Practices, 123*(10), 737-746.

McFerran, L. (2007). Taking back the castle: How Australia is making the home safer for women and children [Electronic Version]. *Australian Domestic & Family Violence Clearinghouse Issues Paper*, 14. Retrieved 28th November 2007 from http://www.austdvclearinghouse.unsw.edu.au/PDF%20files/Issues%20Paper_14.pdf.

Medina-Ariza, J., & Barberet, R. (2003). Intimate partner violence in Spain. Findings from a national survey. *Violence against Women, 9*(3), 302-322.

Medina, K. L., Schafer, J., Shear, P. K., & Armstrong, T. G. (2004). Memory ability is associated with disagreemtn about the most recent conflict in polysubstance abusing couples. *Journal of Family Violence, 19*(6), 387-398.

Meehan, J. C., Holtzworth-Munroe, A., & Herron, K. (2001). Maritally violent men's heart rate reactivity to marital interactions: A failure to replicate the Gottman et al. (1995) typology. *Journal of Family Psychology, 15*(3), 392-408.

Miller, J. (2003). An arresting experiment: Domestic violence victim experiences and perceptions. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 18*(7), 695-716.

Millon, T. (1983). *Millon clinical multiaxial inventory*. Minneapolis: Interpretive Scoring Systems.

Millon, T. (1987). *Manual for the Millon clinical multiaxial inventory-II*. Minneapolis: National Computer Systems.

Millon, T. (1994). *Millon clinical multiaxial inventory-III*. Minneapolis: National Computer Systems.

Mirrlees-Black, C., & Byron, C. (1999). *Domestic violence: Findings from the BCS self-completion questionnaire*. London: Home Office.

Moffitt, T. E., Caspi, A., Krueger, R. F., Magdol, L., Margolin, G., Silva, P. A., et al. (1997). Do partners agree about abuse in their relationship? A psychometric evaluation in interpartner agreement. *Psychological Assessment, 9*(1), 47-56.

Morrel, T. M., Elliott, J. D., Murphy, C. M., & Taft, C. T. (2003). Cognitive behavioral and supportive group treatments for partner-violent men. *Behavior Therapy, 34*(1), 77-95.

Morris, A., & Reilly, J. (2003). *New Zealand national survey of crime victims 2001*. Wellington: Ministry of Justice.

Mott-McDonald Associates. (1979). *The report from the conference on intervention programs for men who batter*. Washington D.C.: U.S. Department of Justice.

Myers, I. B. (1976). *Introduction to type*. California: Consulting Psychologists Press.

Myers, I. B., & McCaulley, M. H. (1985). *Manual: A guide to the development and use of the Myers-Briggs type indicator*. California: Consulting Psychologists Press.

Neidig, P. H., Collins, B. S., & Friedman, D. H. (1986). Attitudinal characteristics of males who have engaged in spouse abuse. *Journal of Family Violence, 1*(3), 223-233.

Newby, J. H., Robert, D. S. W., Ursano, R. J., McCarroll, J. E., Martin, L. T., Norwood, A. E., et al. (2003). Spousal aggression by U.S. army female soldiers towards employed and unemployed civilian husbands. *73, 3*(288-293).

O'Farrell, T. J., Murphy, C. M., Stephan, S. H., Fals-Stewart, W., & Murphy, M. (2004). Partner violence before and after couples based alcoholism treatment for male alcoholic patients: The role of treatment involvement and abstinence. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 72*(2), 202-217.

O'Leary, K. D., & Arias, I. (1988). Assessing agreement of reports of spouse abuse. In G. T. Hotaling, D. Finklehor, J. T. Kirkpatrick & M. A. Straus (Eds.), *Family abuse and its consequences* (pp. 218-227). California: Sage.

O'Leary, S. G., & Slep, A. M. S. (2006). Precipitants of partner aggression. *Journal of Family Psychology, 20*(2), 344-347.

Office for the Status of Women. (2001). Working together against violence: The first three years of partnerships against domestic violence [Electronic Version]. Retrieved 28th November 2007 from http://www.ofw.facs.gov.au/downloads/pdfs/d_v/work_together_dv_three_yrs_padv.pdf.

Office for Women. (2007a). What is domestic violence: Examples of domestic violence. Retrieved 2007, 28th November, from http://ofw.facsia.gov.au/womens_safety_agenda/domestic_violence_help/examples.html

Office for Women. (2007b). Women's safety agenda: Elimination of violence. Retrieved 28th November, 2007, from http://ofw.facsia.gov.au/womens_safety_agenda/index.htm

Office of the Status of Women. (2001). A historical response to domestic violence issues. Retrieved 28th November, 2007, from http://www.osw.sa.gov.au/files/Brochure%20-%20Historical%20DV%20Timeline%202001.pdf

Okun, L. (1986). *Woman abuse: Facts replacing myths*. New York: State University of New York Press.

Park, J. S., Nakamura, T., & Price, D. M. (2005). Estimation of the age of a pre-industrial iron site in Korea. *Archaeometry, 47*(4), 861-869.

Partnerships against Domestic Violence. (2001). Partnerships against Domestic Violence: Summary findings from phase 1. Retrieved 2007, 28th November, from http://ofw.facs.gov.au/downloads/pdfs/d_v/policy_makers_young_%20people.pdf

Paulhaus, D. L. (1984). Two-component models of socially desirable responding. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 46*(3), 598-609.

Perkins, K. D., & Klaus, P. (1996). *National crime victimization survey: Criminal victimization*. Washington DC: U.S. Department of Justice.

Perry, A. R., & Fromuth, M. E. (2005). Courtship violence using couple data: Characteristics and perceptions. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 20*(9), 1078-1095.

Phillips, R. (2006). Undoing an activist response: Feminism and the Australian government's domestic violence policy. *Critical Social Policy, 26*(1), 192-219.

Restraining Orders Act 1997 (WA)

Rinfret-Raynor, M., Riou, A., Cantin, S., Drouin, C., & Dube, M. (2004). A survey on violence against female partners in Quebec, Canada. *Violence against Women, 10*(7), 709-728.

Rollins, B. C., & Oheneba-Sakyi, Y. (1990). Physical violence in Utah households. *Journal of Family Violence, 5*(4), 301-309.

Rosen, K. H., Stith, S. M., Few, A. L., Daly, K. L., & Tritt, D. R. (2005). A qualitative investigation of Johnson's typology. *Violence and Victims, 20*(3), 319-334.

Rosenthal, R. (1979). The file drawer problem and tolerance for null results. *Psychological Bulletin, 86*(3), 638-641.

Ryckman, R. M. (2000). *Theories of personality*. Connecticut: Wadsworth.

Sagrestano, L., Heavey, C., & Christensen, A. (1999). Perceived power and physical violence in marital conflict. *The Journal of Social Issues, 55*(1), 65-80.

Saunders, D. G. (1991). Procedures for adjusting self-reports of violence for social desirability bias. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 6*(3), 336-344.

Saunders, D. G. (1992). A typology of men who batter: Three types derived from cluster analysis. *American Journal of Orthopsychiatry, 62*(2), 264-275.

Saunders, D. G. (1996). Feminist-cognitive-behavioral and process psychodynamic treatments for men who batter: Interactions of abuser traits and treatment models. *Violence and Victims, 11*(4), 393-414.

Schafer, J., Caetano, R., & Clark, C. L. (2002). Agreement about violence in U.S. couples. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 17*(4), 457-470.

Schumacher, J. A., & Leonard, K. E. (2005). Husbands' and wives' marital adjsutment, verbal aggression, and physical aggression as longitudinal predictors of physical aggression in early marriage. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 73*(1), 28-37.

Sherman, L. W., & Berk, R. A. (1984). The specific deterrent effects of arrest for domestic assault. *American Sociological Review, 49*(2), 261-272.

Sherman, L. W., Schmidt, J. D., & Rogan, D. P. (1992). *Policing domestic violence: Experiments and dilemmas*. New York: Free Press.

Shields, N. M., McCall, G. J., & Hanneke, C. R. (1988). Patterns of family and nonfamily violence: Violent husbands and violent men. *Violence and Victims, 3*(2), 83-97.

Simpson, L. E., & Christensen, A. (2005). Spousal agreement regarding relationship aggression on the Conflict Tactics Scale-2. *Psychological Assessment, 17*(4), 423-432.

Stark, E., & Flitcraft, A. (1983). What factoirs shape professional and social responces?: Social knowledge, social policy, and the abuse of women: The case against patriarchal benevolence. In D. Finklehor, R. J. Gelles, G. T. Hotaling & M. A. Straus (Eds.), *The dark side of families: Current family violence research.*

Stark, R., & McEnvoy, J. (1970). Middle class violence. *Psychology today, 4*(6), 107-112.

Stephen, F. (2005, April). Are men and women equally violent? Understanding claim making. *Australian Domestic and Family Violence Clearinghouse, 21*(1), 9-10.

Stets, J., & Straus, M. A. (1992). Gender differences in reporting marital violence. In J. Stets & M. Straus (Eds.), *Physical violence in American Families* (pp. 227-244). New Jersey: Transaction Publishers.

Stith, S. M., Rosen, K. H., McCollum, E. E., & Thomsen, C. J. (2004). Treating intimate partner violence within intact couple relationships: Outcomes of multi-couple versus individual couple therapy. *Journal of Marital and Family Therapy, 30*(3), 305-318.

Stober, E. (2001). The social desirability scale- 17 (SDS- 17). *European Journal of Psychological Assessment, 17*(3), 222-232.

Strahan, R., & Gerbasi, K. (1972). Short, homogenous version of the Marlowe-Crowne Social Desirability Scale. *Journal of Clinical Psychology, 28*, 191-193.

Straus, M. A. (1979). Measuring intrafamily conflict and violence: The conflict tactics scales. *Journal of Marriage and the Family, 36*(1), 13-29.

Straus, M. A. (1990). The conflict tactics scales and its critics: An evaluation and new data on validity and reliability. In M. A. Straus & R. J. Gelles (Eds.), *Physical violence in American families: Risk factors and adaptions to violence in 8,145 families*. New Brunswick: Transaction Publishers.

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*. Thousand Oaks: Sage.

Straus, M. A. (2001). *Conflict Tactics Scales bibliography 1972-1996*. Retrieved September 17 2006, from http://pubpages.unh.edu/~mas2/CTS11R.bib.pdf.

Straus, M. A. (2004a). Prevalence of violence against dating partners by male and female university students worldwide. *Violence against Women, 10*(7), 790-811.

Straus, M. A. (2004b). *Scoring the CTS2 and CTSPC*. Retrieved December 12, 2006, from http://pubpages.unh.edu/~mas2/CTS28a3.pdf.

Straus, M. A. (2006a). Bibliography and tabular summary of publications on the revised Conflict Tactics Scales (CTS2 and CTSPC). from http://pubpages.unh.edu/~mas2/CTS39J.htm

Straus, M. A. (2006b). *Bibliography of the Conflict Tactics Scales and the Parent Child Conflict Tactics Scales*. Retrieved September 17, 2006, from http://pubpages.unh.edu/~mas2/CTS48%20CTS2%20%20and%20CTSPC%20BLIOGRAPHY%202.pdf.

Straus, M. A. (2006c). The conflict tactics scales. from http://scholar.google.com/url?sa=U&q=http://pubpages.unh.edu/~mas2/CTS44G.pdf

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*(3), 465-479.

Straus, M. A., Gelles, R. J., & Steinmetz, S. K. (1980). *Behind closed doors: Violence in the American family*. New York: Anchor/Doubleday.

Straus, M. A., Hamby, S. L., Boney-McCoy, S., & Sugarman, D. B. (1996). The revised conflict tactics scales: Development and preliminary psychometric data. *Journal of Family Issues, 17*(3), 283-316.

Straus, M. A., & Ramirez, I. L. (2002). Gender symmetry in prevalence, severity, and chronicity of physical aggression against dating partners by university students in Mexica and USA. [Electronic Version] from http://pubpages.unh.edu/~mas2/ID12F.pdf.

Sugarman, D. B., & Hotaling, G. T. (1989). Dating violence: Prevalence, context, and risk markers. In M. A. Pirog-Good & J. Stets (Eds.), *Violence in dating relationships: Emerging social issues* (pp. 3-32). New York: Praeger.

Sulaiman, S., & Mitchell, F. (2005). Utilising a typology of management accounting change: An empirical analysis. *Management Accounting Research, 16*(4), 422-437.

Swan, S. C., & Snow, D. L. (2002). A typology of women's use of violence in intimate relationships. *Violence against Women, 8*(3), 286-319.

Sweeney, S., & Key, L. J. (1982, June). Psychological issues in counseling batterers. *Theology, News, and Notes*, 12-16.

Taft, C. T., Murphy, C. M., Elliott, J. D., & Morrel, T. M. (2001). Attendance-enhancing procedures in group counseling for doemstic abusers. *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 48*(1), 51-60.

Tweed, R. G., & Dutton, D. G. (1998). A comparison of impulsive and instrumental subgroups of batterers. *Violence and Victims, 13*(3), 217-230.

Walternaurer, E. M., Ortega, C. A., & McNutt, L. (2003). Issues in estimating the prevalence of intimate partner violence. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 18*(9), 959-974.

Waltz, J., Babcock, J. C., Jacobson, N. S., & Gottman, J. M. (2000). Testing a typology of batterers. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 68*(4), 658-669.

Weis, J. G. (1989). Family violence research methodology and design. *Crime and Justice, 11*(1), 117-162.

Women's Safety After Separation. (2006). Western Australia Protection Orders. from http://www.ncsmc.org.au/wsas/legal_system/avo_wa.htm

Women's Safety Australia. (1996).). Canberra: Australian Bureau of Statistics.

Woodin, E. M., & O'Leary, K. D. (2006). Partner aggression severity as a risk marker for male and female violence recidivism. *Journal of Marital and Family Therapy, 32*(3), 283-296.

Yllo, K., & Straus, M. A. (1990). Patriarchy and violence against wives: The impact of structural and normative factors. In M. A. Straus & R. J. Gelles (Eds.), *Physical violence in American Homes*. New Jersey: Transaction Publishers.