

#10 Motivations for Men and Women's Intimate Partner Violence Perpetration: A Comprehensive Review

Jennifer Langhinrichsen-Rohling, Adrienne McCullars, & Tiffany Misra

Full article available in *Partner Abuse*, Volume 3, Issue 4, 2012.

(Article available for free at: <http://www.ingentaconnect.com/content/springer/pa>)

The current review addresses two central questions: 1) What motivates partners to perpetrate IPV and 2) Whether such motivations differ between men and women? Delineating whether there are gender differences in motivations for perpetrating IPV has important clinical and policy implications. Specifically, if men's violence is enacted in order to subjugate women and keep them in a position of vulnerability and disempowerment, then the treatment of men's violence will best be understood in the context of societal inequities for women. Correspondingly, if women's violence is primarily enacted out of self-defense in response to their male partner's violence, they should not be considered "husband batterers". Furthermore, they are unlikely to benefit from being mandated to abuser/batterer treatment programs that were designed specifically for men. On the other hand, if both men's and women's violence is motivated by anger management concerns, lack of skills to communicate successfully with intimate partners, or because of jealousy perhaps resulting from an inability to securely attach to one's partner, different types of IPV interventions are likely to be necessary and these interventions may not need to be so gender-specific. Instead, less gender-specific interventions that take into account these latter types of motivations for violence may need to address perpetrator-specific psychological issues as well as relationship-specific concerns.

We collected and summarized all available papers that report empirical data related to men's and women's motivations for IPV ($n = 73$ empirical studies; $n = 1$ book chapter; 75 total samples). Included studies were published in 1990 or later, appeared in peer-reviewed journals, and contained empirical data. To facilitate direct gender comparisons, the motives reported in each obtained study were coded by the current authors into seven broad categories: (a) Power/Control, (b) Self-defense, (c) Expression of Negative Emotion (i.e., anger), (d) Communication Difficulties, (e) Retaliation, (f) Jealousy, and (g) Other. These studies were also coded by the nature of the sample they assessed as follows: large population samples (Table 1),

smaller community samples (Table 2), university/schools (Table 3), clinical samples (Table 4), and justice/legal related samples (Table 5). To facilitate a further understanding of gender differences or similarities in motivations for IPV perpetration, existing empirical studies were also coded for whether they measured motivations for men's physical violence, motivations for women's physical violence, or both. When gender comparisons were available, studies were further coded as to whether the study reported the correlations between violence perpetration and some measured motivational risk factor. Additionally, when gender comparisons were available, studies were then coded as to whether the study specifically compared the degree to which men and women self-reported the same motivations for their violence.

The existing heterogeneity in methodology, measurement, and construct development may reflect the inherent challenge of determining a person's motivation for committing violence. Motivations are internal experiences that may be difficult for even the perpetrator to discern. For example, when something like anger is self-reported as a motive for IPV, what might underlie that anger (hurt, jealousy, discomfort from lack of control, inability to communicate one's needs)? This specific difficulty is reflected in the studies included in this review as various researchers collapsed anger with retaliation (Kernsmith, 2005), jealousy (Harned, 2001), or other emotional dysregulation problems. It is also possible to argue that anger is not a motive for violence; it is an emotional state that is the context in which violence often occurs. Differentiating motives, reasons, functions, justifications, and contexts is a challenge that faces researchers in this area.

Still other studies included in this review had difficulty distinguishing between violence committed in self-defense and violence committed as retaliation for pre-existing abuse of an emotional, physical, or sexual nature (Kernsmith, 2005). However, some authors have worked hard to correct this concern (Shorey et al., 2010); these authors created a motivations for self-defensive aggression scale. Moreover, very few of the currently published studies separated proximal from distal motives and fewer, if any, relied on multifactorial theories that integrate motives across time or understood changes in motives for perpetrating violence as a function of individual or relationship development. Finally, even when a perpetrator is able to accurately introspect about and subsequently identify their relevant motives; social desirability concerns may preclude admission of these motives on a self-report measure or via a face to face interview.

Unfortunately, social desirability measures are not routinely included as part of the assessment strategy used in this field.

Individually, particular motives may be more acceptable to report than others; however, the acceptability of reporting specific motives may also vary by gender. For example, it might be particularly difficult for highly masculine males to admit to perpetrating violence in self-defense, as this admission implies vulnerability. Conversely, it may be more culturally sanctioned for women to admit to perpetrating violence as a result of jealousy related to their partner's infidelity than to admit to committing violence as a power and control strategy. A better understanding of gender socialization processes related to admission of motive would be helpful.

It is also possible that some motives may be more acceptable to report in particular settings. For example, individuals facing criminal charges may be more likely to invoke self-defense as a perpetration motive than individuals gathered in a university study, regardless of their gender or their experiences with IPV. This is important to consider as 36% ($n = 27$) of the study samples in this review were drawn from university/school settings and 34% ($n = 25$) were drawn from legal, criminal justice settings. Only 3% of the papers ($n = 2$) included in this review obtained data from a large population based sample. Overall, as a consequence of experiencing pressures that may differ as a function of individual differences, gender roles, and/or setting, the conclusions drawn about men and women's motives for perpetrating IPV must be viewed with great caution.

However, in spite of the challenges embedded within this field, several important findings can be gleaned from this review. First, there does seem to be consensus about the main motivations to consider as findings from the majority of the studies fit into the motive coding scheme developed by the current authors. Sixty-one percent of the samples included in this review assessed for motives of self-defense; 76% assessed for power/control motives. This not surprising as these two motives are the cornerstone of the main gender-sensitive theories regarding the perpetration of IPV by women versus men; they are also consistent with the Duluth model of intervention for domestic violence (Pence & Paymar, 1993). Other common motives assessed across these studies were anger/expression of negative emotion (63%) and using violence to retaliate (60%). Common measurement of these motives is consistent with the other set of widely used interventions for perpetrators of IPV (e.g., anger control interventions; Rosenbaum & Leisring, 2001). It is worth noting that 47% of the studies measured

communication difficulties as a motive for perpetrating IPV; similarly, 49% measured jealousy as a motivational precursor. These motives best fit with models that demonstrate that relationship dissatisfaction is an important risk factor for IPV and it is a risk factor that may be especially helpful when explaining the antecedents to what has become known as common couple violence (Langhinrichsen-Rohling, 2010).

Second, studies that considered the most frequent motivations for perpetration reported by men and women often generated similar motives. For example, Kernsmith (2005) reported that the most common reason that both men and women chose to use intimate partner violence was to get back at a partner for emotionally hurting them. Kernsmith also indicated that self-defense, anger, and stopping a partner from doing something were common motives for both men and women. Leisring (2011) reported that college women's most common motives for perpetration of minor physical violence were in retaliation for emotional hurt, anger, and because of stress or jealousy. Similarly, Shorey et al. (2010) concluded that, for both men and women, the most common motives for perpetrating violence to retaliate for emotional hurt, to express anger, to express feelings that they could not put into words or communicate, and to get their partner's attention.

Finally, one of the main purposes of this review was to address the question of whether or not there are gender differences in motivations for perpetrating IPV. This seemed possible given that 46 of the 75 study samples (61%) contained data from both men and women. Contrary to expectation, relatively few papers contained data from only one gender ($n = 24$, women only; $n = 6$, men only). It was unexpected that majority of the single gender papers focused on explaining women's perpetration of violence. Very few papers included only men's reports, perhaps suggesting that men's self-reports of their motivations were considered more suspect. Alternatively, some researchers in this area may have thought that men's motives for perpetrating violence were self-evident and thus not as worthy of extensive study.

Across this review, there were 18 study samples that provided a direct comparison of men and women's motives for perpetrating IPV. Some of the gender comparisons seemed more direct than others. For example, when the men and women are recruited in the same way from the same location, they are likely to be similar. In contrast, comparing male domestic violence (DV) perpetrators to women residing in a battered women's shelter is likely to be problematic (e.g., Barnett et al., 1997). Likewise, it may be that women who are mandated to DV perpetrator

programs differ in some substantial ways as compared to men who are mandated to DV perpetrator programs. Therefore, it is important to note who the men and the women are in the studies that compare men and women's motivations for perpetration.

In spite of all of these limitations, it is worth noting that the hypothesis that men would report perpetrating violence as a means of power and control more frequently than women was only partially supported. While three of six correlational studies that included data related to this motive did report obtaining significant associations between power/control motivations for men but not women; the other three indicated that the findings for men and women did not differ. However, consistent with gender-specific theory, none of the obtained correlation studies reported stronger associations between power and control motives and perpetration for women as opposed to men.

With regard to the direct comparison studies, four of the 12 papers considering gender differences in the power/control motive did not subject their findings to statistical analyses. Of the remaining studies, three reported that there were no significant gender differences in being motivated by power/control to perpetrate violence. One paper found that women were more motivated to perpetrate violence as a result of power/control than were men. The remaining three papers found, as expected on the basis of gender-specific theory, that men endorsed more power/control motives for their violence than did women (Barnett et al., 1997; Ehrensaft et al., 1999; Shorey et al, 2010). The final direct comparison study had mixed findings (Makepeace, 1986).

In a methodological advance, Shorey and colleagues (2010) reported effect sizes for their obtained gender differences. Worth noting is that all the effect sizes for gender differences in men endorsing power/control motives more than women would be classified as small in size. This suggests that these gender differences are weak. However, the Shorey et al. (2010) study was also conducted with a college student sample. Thus, stronger effects might be obtained with a different type of sample but utilizing the same measurement strategy. Thus, only two papers report any evidence that this motive is stronger for women than men; however, there are few, if any, indications that there is a strong effect such that power and control is much more of a motive for men's as opposed to women's violence.

Warranting further consideration, while most relationship behaviors, including violence, can be understood as a way to influence, manipulate, and/or control one another, some

perpetrators are likely to use this strategy exclusively and without remorse. Regardless of their gender, these perpetrators are likely to need different intervention strategies than those whose violence is more related to the emotional ups and downs that can be typical in less secure or unstable relationships (Johnson, 2005; Langhinrichsen-Rohling, 2010).

The notion that the self-defense motive is more common for women than men also received some empirical support. Of the ten papers containing gender-specific statistical analyses, five indicated that women were significantly more likely to report self-defense as a motive for perpetration than men. However, four papers did not find statistically significant gender differences. Only one paper reported that men were more likely to report this motive than women (Shorey et al., 2010). The degree to which this finding holds for women in all samples and settings, is consistent over time, and is relevant for women of different ages and ethnicities warrants additional consideration. Still, despite findings of gender differences in half of these studies, it is important to point out that self-defense as a motive for violence is endorsed in most samples by only a minority of respondents, male and female. For non-perpetrator samples, the rates of self-defense reported by men ranged from 0% to 21%, and for women the range was 5% to 35%. The highest rates of reported self-defense motives (50% for men, 65.4% for women) came from samples of perpetrators, who may have reasons to overestimate this motive. In addition, further work needs to be done to distinguish between self-defense and retaliation for previously experience violence as these motives were difficult to separate in many of the papers included in this review.

None of the included papers in this review solely reported that anger/retaliation was significantly more of a motive for men than women's violence; instead, two papers indicated that anger was more likely to be a motive for women's violence as compared to men. This is important because within the United States' culture, it may be more acceptable for men to experience and express anger than women because of socialization processes or adherence to traditional gender roles (Fischer & Evers, 2011; Shields, 2002). Women who perpetrate violence may particularly need more productive ways to manage anger within their personal relationships (Goldhor-Lerner, 1985). However, making conclusions about gender differences related to the anger motive is particularly uncertain because many authors measured this motive in conjunction with something else (i.e., jealousy, retaliation) and a substantial subset of papers in this area did

not subject their findings to statistical analyses (5 of 13 studies). A better and clearer understanding of how this motive influences the perpetration of IPV is warranted.

Finally, contrary to expectation, jealousy/partner cheating seems to be a motive to perpetrate violence for both men and women. This motive has been linked with an insecure attachment style in romantic relationships (Buunk, 1997; Guerrero, 1998; Hazan & Shaver, 1987; McCullars, 2012). Thus, it might be that less secure and stable relationships are more susceptible to IPV because they are unsure of the commitment and fidelity of their partner. However, given the extremely small number of papers that are summarized here, these findings should be considered preliminary.

Taken as a whole, however, the findings gleaned from this review suggest that this area of the IPV field is in its infancy. Researchers have employed different measurement tools, focused on different motives, reported findings in different ways, made use of different informants, differed in whether or not they measured both men and women, and utilized different samples. Moreover, this paper has exclusively focused on understanding the motives precipitating physical violence. Other motives are likely to be more relevant for the perpetration of psychological or sexual violence. Likewise, those who perpetrate across a variety of relationships or on multiple occasions are likely to use violence differently than individuals who have perpetrated a limited amount of violence in the context of one problematic relationship. As a consequence, making meaningful conclusions on the basis of the articles included in this review was not fully possible.

Nonetheless, it seems clear that both men and women perpetrate violence in response to a variety of motives. Violence can occur as a consequence of not knowing how to appropriately manage anger, jealousy, and communication difficulties (Langhinrichsen-Rohling, 2010). The context in which the emotion occurs may also further motivate or inhibit violence (e.g., learning about a partner's infidelity after having a few drinks versus having a partner wear revealing clothes to a work function where one is trying to impress one's boss). A better understanding of what motivates individuals to stop using violence over time or to refrain from violence in a context in which violence has often been deemed culturally acceptable would also be valuable.

In summary, much work remains in order to understand the motives underlying both men and women's perpetration of IPV. The types of motives that are measured need to be theoretically based and consistent across samples to facilitate comparisons. Allowing

perpetrators to endorse a variety of motives, as experienced across a range of contexts is likely to lead to a deeper, proximal/distal and multifactorial understanding of what underlies IPV. Integrating qualitative and quantitative methodologies is necessary. It may also be that there are individual, interpersonal, environmental, and societal motives that facilitate violence perpetration. Measuring the full array of these disparate motives in both men and women who are perpetrators will be essential. Developing a clearer picture of what motivates violence, for whom, and under what conditions will better inform violence prevention and intervention efforts. It may also facilitate theory development in the field of IPV.

About the Authors

Jennifer Langhinrichsen-Rohling, Ph.D. is a Professor in the Department of Psychology at the University of South Alabama. She currently serves as the Co-Director of USA's Coastal Resource and Resiliency Center. Dr. Langhinrichsen-Rohling earned her undergraduate degree in Psychology from Brown University and her M.S. and Ph.D. in Clinical Psychology from the University of Oregon. Dr. Langhinrichsen-Rohling completed her clinical internship at the Palo Alto V.A. and the Stanford Medical Center. She also served as an NIH post-doctoral fellow at The State University of New York Stony Brook where she conducted research, treated distressed and violent couples, volunteered at a local women's shelter, and participated on a NIMH grant to compare the effectiveness of gender-specific versus conjoint treatment for intimate partner violence. Dr. Langhinrichsen-Rohling is an author on over 80 peer reviewed publications and has received many awards both for her research and for her teaching and mentorship of students. Her IPV research has been supported by OJJDP for many years; however, her current research on couple and family resiliency is funded by SAMSHA and NIEHS.

Contact: jl@usouthal.edu

Adrienne McCullars, M.S. received a Bachelor of Science in Psychology from the University of Alabama at Birmingham in 2008. After college, Ms. McCullars was employed as a Psychologist Assistant for the UAB Department of Neurology Division of Neuropsychology. In this position, Ms. McCullars was promoted to Program Coordinator of an NIH funded study titled, Medical Decision-Making Capacity in Traumatic Brain Injury (RECLAIMED). Ms. McCullars obtained her Master of Science degree in Applied Psychology from the University of South Alabama in May 2012. During her graduate training, Ms. McCullars served as a research assistant under the mentorship of Dr. Langhinrichsen-Rohling. Ms. McCullar's research interests include adjudicated juvenile youth, intimate partner violence, and suicide related behaviors (suicide ideation, suicide attempt, and non-suicidal self-harm). Ms. McCullars is currently a doctoral student in the Combined-Integrated Clinical Counseling Program at the University of South Alabama.

Tiffany Misra, M.S. is a 5th year doctoral student in the Combined-Integrated Clinical Counseling Program at the University of South Alabama. She is currently on internship and is expected to graduate in 2013. Ms. Misra earned her undergraduate degree from the University of Georgia and her M.S. in Applied Psychology from the University of South Alabama. Before pursuing graduate training, Ms. Misra worked in the public health field, predominantly with non-profit mental health organizations. While Ms. Misra has worked on a variety of research projects, her specific research interests are in the areas of intimate partner violence, nonsuicidal self-injurious behaviors, and issues concerning social justice. Ms. Misra has been conducting research with Dr. Langhinrichsen-Rohling for five years. Ms. Misra's Master's Thesis investigated the perceptions of dating violence by comparing attributions of responsibility within the context of victim-committed sexual versus emotional infidelity. For her dissertation, she is investigating the Interpersonal-Psychological Theory of Suicidal Behavior among self-injurers, specifically concentrating on the characteristics of self-injury that may increase an individual's acquired capability for suicide.

PASK#10 Online Tables – Table 1. Large population samples

Study (Full Reference)	N	Sample Characteristics	Method/Design	Measures/Results
Large Population Samples				
<p>Felson, R. B., & Outlaw, M. C. (2007). The control motive and marital violence. <i>Violence and Victims</i>, 22(4), 387-407. doi: 10.1891/088667007781553964</p>	<p><i>n</i> = 15,161</p>	<p>Marital Status: Currently married: (<i>n</i> = 10,145) Previously married: (<i>n</i> = 5,016) Race: Currently married: Black = 5.6% Previously married: Black = 10.1% Income: Currently married: poverty = 11.2% employed = 70% Previously married: poverty = 24.5% employed = 62.8%</p>	<p>Based on the National Sample: USA National Violence Against Women Survey (1994-1996)</p>	<p>Measures: Violence was measured based on whether the respondent reported that his or her partner had engaged in one of 17 possible violent acts. Partner jealousy was measured dichotomously. Participants indicated if their current or former spouse was “jealous or possessive.” Partner control was a scale based on the total number of control behaviors (0-5) that respondents attributed to their spouse (or former spouse).</p> <p>Results: Overall, wives were more jealous and controlling than husbands. However, among ex-spouses, ex-husbands were more jealous than ex-wives were. In current marriages, control and jealousy predicted violence equally for men and women. In previously married partners, control and jealousy were more related to violence for men than for women.</p> <p>Currently married (<i>n</i> = 10,145); Reported results are based on logistic regressions predicting violence perpetration by partner by motive.</p> <p>People reported on spouse’s control, jealousy, and violence perpetration:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Power/Control = .98, <i>p</i> < .05 • Self-defense N/R • Expression of Negative Emotion N/R • Communication N/R • Retaliation N/R • Jealousy = 1.92, <i>p</i> < .05

PASK#10 Online Tables – Table 1. Large population samples

Study (Full Reference)	N	Sample Characteristics	Method/Design	Measures/Results
		<p>Age: Current marriage: <i>M</i> = 45.2 yrs</p> <p>Previously married: <i>M</i> = 49.8 yrs</p> <p>Geography: N/R</p>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Other N/R <p>Previously married (<i>n</i> = 5,016); Reported results are based on logistic regressions predicting violence perpetration by partner by motive.</p> <p>People reported on ex-partner’s control, jealousy, and violence perpetration:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Power/Control = .67, <i>p</i> < .05 • Self-defense N/R • Expression of Negative Emotion N/R • Communication N/R • Retaliation N/R • Jealousy = 1.14, <i>p</i> < .05 • Other N/R
<p>Carrado, M., George, M. J., Loxam, E., Jones, L., & Templar, D. (1996). Aggression in British heterosexual relationships: A descriptive analysis. <i>Aggressive Behavior</i>, 22, 410-415. doi: 10.1002/(SICI)1098-2337(1996)22:6<401::AID-AB1>3.0.CO;2-K</p>	<p><i>n</i> = 1,978</p>	<p>Marital status:</p> <p><u>Across ALL relationships</u> (<i>n</i> = 1,978): Heterosexual = 94%</p> <p>Married/cohabiting: Men = 15% Women = 9%</p> <p>Single/dating: Men = 22% Women = 21%</p>	<p>National Survey; Self-report; Cross-sectional; United Kingdom; Participants were recruited while filling out a regular commercial bimonthly survey ("Omnibus Survey", Market Opinion and Research International [MORI]) to determine consumer and social attitudes. The survey was administered as a face-to-face interview.</p>	<p>Measures: Violence was measured via a section from the Conflict Tactics Scale (CTS). Motives were assessed by an author-created two reason and context questions that included a list of alternative explanations for the violence.</p> <p>Results:</p> <p>Women sustained victimization (<i>n</i> = 130) Women reported on partner’s motives for perpetrating violence toward them:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Power/control = 80% • Self-defense = 10% • Expression of Negative Emotion N/R • Communication = 32% • Retaliation = 44% • Jealousy N/R

PASK#10 Online Tables – Table 1. Large population samples

Study (Full Reference)	N	Sample Characteristics	Method/Design	Measures/Results
		<p><u>Across CURRENT relationships</u> (<i>n</i> = 1,481):</p> <p>Married/cohabitating: Men = 11% Women = 4%</p> <p>Single/dating: Men = 11% Women = 6%</p> <p>Race: N/R</p> <p>Income: N/R</p> <p>Ages: 15-34, 35-54, 55+</p> <p>Geography: Great Britain (North, Midlands, South)</p>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Other: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ He was “under the influence” of, for example, alcohol at the time = 45% ○ It is or was in his character, that’s the way he is or was = 44% ○ Other, undefined = 11% <p>Men sustained victimization (<i>n</i> = 155) Men reported on partner’s motives for perpetrating violence toward them:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Power/control = 80% • Self-defense = 7% • Expression of Negative Emotion N/R • Communication = 43% • Retaliation = 52% • Jealousy N/R • Other: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ She was “under the influence” of, for example, alcohol at the time = 31% ○ It is or was in her character, that’s the way she is or was = 31% ○ Other, undefined = 6% <p>Women perpetrating violence on partner (<i>n</i> = 106) Women reported on their own motives for perpetrating violence on partner:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Power/control = 59% • Self-defense = 17% • Expression of Negative Emotion N/R • Communication = 53% • Retaliation = 73%

PASK#10 Online Tables – Table 1. Large population samples

Study (Full Reference)	N	Sample Characteristics	Method/Design	Measures/Results
				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Jealousy N/R • Other: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ I was “under the influence” of, for example, alcohol at the time = 13% ○ It is in my character, that’s the way I am = 16% ○ Other, undefined = 12% <p>Men perpetrating violence on partner (n = 85) Men reported on their own motives for perpetrating violence on partner:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Power/control = 69% • Self-defense = 21% • Expression of Negative Emotion N/R • Communication = 64% • Retaliation = 80% • Jealousy N/R • Other: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ I was “under the influence” of, for example, alcohol at the time = 35% ○ It is in my character, that’s the way I am = 27% ○ Other, undefined = 7%

PASK#10 Online Tables – Table 2. Smaller Community Samples

Study (Full Reference)	N	Sample Characteristics	Method/Design	Measures/Results
Smaller Community Samples				
<p>Caldwell, J. E., Swan, S. C., Allen, C. T., Sullivan, T. P., & Snow, D. L. (2009). Why I hit him: Women’s reasons for intimate partner violence. <i>Aggression, Maltreatment, and Trauma, 18</i>(7), 672-697. doi: 10.1080/10926770903231783</p>	<p><i>n</i> = 412; Women Only</p>	<p>Marital Status: Unmarried and cohabitating = 43% Married = 24% Dating = 26% Ended their relationship = 7%</p> <p>Race: African Am. = 150 White = 112 Latina = 150</p> <p>Income:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Income less than \$10,000 = 43% • Between \$10,000-\$20,000 = 28% • Between \$20,000-\$30,000 = 17% • Less than \$30,000 = 	<p>Cross-sectional; Self-report; Participants were recruited from a Northeastern city by placing English and Spanish-language brochures and posters in various locations, including medical clinics, stores, churches, libraries, restaurants, and laundromats throughout the city in order to obtain a community sample of women who used IPV.</p>	<p>Measures used: Intimate partner violence (IPV) was measured with the Conflict Tactics Scale (CTS-2), the short Psychological Maltreatment of Women Inventory (Tolman, 1999), and the Sexual Experiences Survey (Koss, Gidycz, & Wisniewski, 1987). Motivations were measured with the Motives and Reasons for IPV Scale (Swan & Sullivan, 2002).</p> <p>Results: Women perpetrators (<i>n</i> = 412) Women reported on their own motives for violence:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Power/control = 89% <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Tough Guise = 84% • Self-defense = 83% • Expression of Negative Emotion = 95% • Communication <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ To get him to take you seriously= 63% • Retaliation <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ He said something to hurt you = 77% ○ To harm him = 43% • Jealousy = 67% • Other: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ To get “turned on” sexually = 5%

PASK#10 Online Tables – Table 2. Smaller Community Samples

Study (Full Reference)	N	Sample Characteristics	Method/Design	Measures/Results
		12% Ages: <i>M</i> = 36.6 yrs Range = 18-65 yrs Geography: Northeastern city community		
Foshee, V. A., Bauman, K. E., Linder, F., Rice, J., & Wilcher, R. (2007). Typologies of adolescent dating violence: Identifying typologies of adolescent dating violence perpetration. <i>Journal of Interpersonal Violence</i> , 22(5), 498-519. doi: 10.1177/0886260506298829	<i>n</i> = 116 adolescents Boys = 53 of 98 completed interview Girls = 63 of 100 completed interview	Marital Status: N/R Race: White = 65.5% Black = 17.2% Self-identified as other races and ethnicities including Hispanic, Asian, American Indian, and/or mixed race = 17.3% Income: N/R Age: 17 or 18 yrs old	Cross-sectional; Self-report; surveys; interviews; community sample; Study participants were randomly selected from respondents in the Safe Dates study who had been randomly assigned to the control group. The Safe Dates study was designed to evaluate the effectiveness of an adolescent dating violence prevention program within 14 public schools.	Measures: Participants chosen on the basis of their responses to the Safe Dates Dating Violence Perpetration Acts Scale. Acts perpetrated in self-defense were not counted. Follow-up interview focused on the “first” and “worst” use of violence towards an intimate partner. Adolescents were also asked their motives for using violence (goals, intended outcomes). Results: Adolescent girls (<i>n</i> = 30) described 52 violent acts, all against boys. 55.8% (<i>n</i> = 29) of the acts were reported as occurring in response to violence initiated by a boyfriend. <i>n</i> = 18 girls described acts perpetrated “in play only” <i>n</i> = 11 girls denied any perpetration on interview <i>n</i> = 3 girls reported the perpetration as “accidental” <i>n</i> = 1 girl reported the perpetration as “accidental and playful” Girls reported on own motives for violence:

PASK#10 Online Tables – Table 2. Smaller Community Samples

Study (Full Reference)	N	Sample Characteristics	Method/Design	Measures/Results
		<p>Geography: A primarily rural county in North Carolina</p>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Power/Control N/R <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Ethic enforcement = 19.2% • Self-defense = 66.6% • Expression of Negative Emotion/Anger = 25% • Communication = N/R • Retaliation <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Fed-up/Wanted him to hurt = 30% ○ In response to his control and abuse = 38.5% • Jealousy = N/R • Other: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ First time aggressive response ($n = 9$ acts; 17.3%) <p>Adolescent boys ($n = 22$) described 28 violent acts, all against girls</p> <p>78.6% ($n = 22$) of the acts were reported as occurring in response to violence initiated by a girlfriend.</p> <p>$n = 20$ boys described acts perpetrated “in play only” $n = 9$ boys denied any perpetration on interview $n = 1$ boy reported the perpetration as “accidental” $n = 1$ boy reported the perpetration as “accidental and playful”</p> <p>Boys reported on their own motives for violence:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Power/Control = 13.6% • Self-defense = 73.3% <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Escalation prevention = 64.3% • Expression of Negative Emotion N/R

PASK#10 Online Tables – Table 2. Smaller Community Samples

Study (Full Reference)	N	Sample Characteristics	Method/Design	Measures/Results
				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Communication = 9% • Retaliation = 9% <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◦ Response to a long history of abuse by girl = 9% • Jealousy = N/R • Other = N/R
<p>Hamel, J., Desmarais, S. L., & Nicholls, T. L. (2007). Perceptions of motives in intimate partner violence: expressive versus coercive violence. <i>Violence and Victims</i>, 22, 563-576. doi: http://dx.doi.org/10.1891/088667007782312113</p>	<p>N = 401; men = 128 women = 273</p>	<p>Marital Status: N/R</p> <p>Race: White = 67%</p> <p>Age: <u><18 yrs old</u> n = 2; <1% <u>18-30 yrs old</u> n = 205; 52% <u>31-45 yrs old</u> n = 72; 18% <u>46 – 65 yrs old</u> n = 105; 27% <u>>65 yrs old</u> n = 11; 3%</p> <p>Income: N/R</p> <p>Geography: N/R</p>	<p>Cross-sectional; Community sample; Data was obtained from mental health professionals who either worked or had a strong interest in the field of family violence (20%; n = 82), domestic violence shelter workers and/or victim advocates (31%; n = 125), and university students (42%; n = 167).</p>	<p>Measures: Two versions of a questionnaire containing three IPA vignettes were created in order to compare the degree to which expressive and coercive motives are attributed to IPV perpetrated by men and women in a variety of contexts. Respondents indicated what they thought the perpetrator’s motive might be on a 5-point Likert scale (1 = exclusively expressive; 5 = exclusively coercive). No specific motivations were measured.</p> <p>Results:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Power/Control = N/R • Self-defense = N/R • Expression of Negative Emotion = N/R • Communication = N/R • Retaliation = N/R • Jealousy = N/R • Other = N/R
<p>Weston, R., Marshall, L. L., & Coker, A. L. (2007). Women’s motives for violent</p>	<p>n = 580; women only</p>	<p>Marital Status: At initial recruitment, all women had to</p>	<p>Cross-sectional; Community sample; Data were obtained from Wave 6 of Project</p>	<p>Measures: Conflict Tactics Scale (CTS2) was used to measure violence; motives were assessed with the Motivations for Violence scale (Swan & Gill, 1998).</p>

PASK#10 Online Tables – Table 2. Smaller Community Samples

Study (Full Reference)	N	Sample Characteristics	Method/Design	Measures/Results
<p>and nonviolent behaviors in conflicts. <i>Journal of Interpersonal Violence</i>, 22, 1043-1065. doi: 10.1177/0886260507303191</p>		<p>have been in a heterosexual relationship for at least one year.</p> <p>By Wave 6: In a relationship with a man = 73.9% In a relationship with two or more men = 4.4% Not in a relationship = 21.4%</p> <p>Race: African Am. = 39.5% White = 29.9% Mexican Am. = 30.6%</p> <p>Age: M = 40.3 yrs</p> <p>Income: All women had an income less than twice the poverty level when larger study</p>	<p>HOW: Health Outcomes of Women.</p>	<p>Results:</p> <p>Women’s self-reported motives for perpetrating non-severe physical violence (n = 188):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Power/Control <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ To stop partner’s negative behaviors = 2.31 • Self-defense = 3.20 • Expression of Negative Emotion = 3.77 • Communication <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ To increase intimacy = 2.86 • Retaliation = 2.11 • Jealousy N/R • Other <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Woman’s own personal problems = 2.90 ○ Partner’s personal problems = 2.22 ○ Childhood experiences = 2.01 <p>Women’s self-reported motives for perpetrating severe violence (n = 74):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Power/Control <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ To stop partner’s negative behaviors = 3.56 • Self-defense = 4.56 • Expression of Negative Emotion = 4.37 • Communication <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ To increase intimacy = 3.46 • Retaliation = 3.10 • Jealousy N/R • Other <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Woman’s own personal problems = 2.90 ○ Partner’s personal problems = 3.33

PASK#10 Online Tables – Table 2. Smaller Community Samples

Study (Full Reference)	N	Sample Characteristics	Method/Design	Measures/Results
		<p>began.</p> <p>Geography: All women were recruited from Dallas, Texas.</p>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Childhood experiences = 2.49
<p>O’Leary, S. G. & Smith Slep, A. M. (2006). Precipitants of partner aggression. <i>Journal of Family Psychology, 20</i>(2), 344-347.</p>	<p>n = 453 couples; Men = N/R Women = N/R</p>	<p>Marital Status: Couples were married or cohabitating for at least one year.</p> <p>Race: See Slep & O’Leary (2005)</p> <p>Income: See Slep & O’Leary (2005)</p> <p>Ages: See Slep & O’Leary (2005)</p> <p>Geography: See Slep & O’Leary (2005)</p>	<p>Cross-sectional; Community sample; Self-report; Participants were contacted using a random-digit-dialing procedure to contact families living within a one hour radius of the university. All spoke and read English and had at least one child between the ages of 3 and 7.</p>	<p>Measures: Conflict Tactics Scale-II (CTS2) was used to assess the frequency of perpetration of and victimization by partner aggressive conflict resolution behaviors in the past 12-months; Motives were measured with the Precipitants for Partner Aggression (PCPT) which consists of sets of questions that pertain to each of the 19 psychological and physical aggression items on the CTS2.</p> <p>Results:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Power/Control <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ To get partner to do something (“chores”) ○ To get partner to stop doing something (“spending money”) ● Self-defense <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ In response to partner’s physical aggression ● Expression of Negative Emotion = N/R ● Communication <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ In response to partner’s verbal aggression ○ In response to nagging (Men > Women) ○ In response to being ignored (Women > Men) ● Retaliation

PASK#10 Online Tables – Table 2. Smaller Community Samples

Study (Full Reference)	N	Sample Characteristics	Method/Design	Measures/Results
				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ In response to partner’s physical aggression ● Jealousy = N/R ● Other = N/R
<p>Graham-Kevan, N. & Archer, J. (2005). Investigating three explanations of women’s relationship aggression. <i>Psychology of Women Quarterly</i>, 29, 270-277. doi: 10.1111/j.1471-6402.2005.00221.x</p>	<p><i>n</i> = 358; women only</p>	<p>Marital Status: All participants had to have at least one heterosexual relationship that lasted 1 month or more.</p> <p><i>M</i> relationship duration = 21 months</p> <p>Age: Women <i>M</i> = 24 yrs Men <i>M</i> = 27 yrs</p> <p>Income or SES: Upper middle class = 12% Middle class = 42% Lower middle class = 31% Lower class = 14%</p>	<p>Cross-sectional, survey, E-mail recruitment strategy was employed. 1,026 women responded with usable data. Of these, 358 women reported using at least one act of physical violence in the past year. These women retained for the current study were staff or students at the University of Central Lancashire.</p>	<p>Measures: A modified version of the Conflicts Tactics Scale (Straus, 1979) was used to assess violence. Fear was assessed via a single item (Morse, 1995); control was measured with a revised version of the Controlling Behaviors Scale (CBS, Graham-Kevan & Archer, 2003).</p> <p>Results: Motives for women’s violence</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Power/Control <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Control and Minor Aggression <i>r</i> = .50** ○ Control and Severe Aggression <i>r</i> = .52** ● Self-defense <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Fear and Minor Aggression <i>r</i> = .13** ○ Fear and Severe Aggression <i>r</i> = .05 non-significant ● Expression of Negative Emotion N/R ● Communication N/R ● Retaliation N/R ● Jealousy N/R ● Other N/R <p>While reciprocity accounts for a significant amount of variance, fear and control both make significant and independent contributions to predictions of women perpetrating both minor and severe aggression.</p>
<p>Rosen, K. H., Stith,</p>	<p><i>n</i> = 15</p>	<p>Marital status:</p>	<p>Cross-sectional; self-</p>	<p>Measures: Interviews and responses to the Revised</p>

PASK#10 Online Tables – Table 2. Smaller Community Samples

Study (Full Reference)	N	Sample Characteristics	Method/Design	Measures/Results
<p>S. M., Few, A. L., Daly, K. L., & Tritt, D. R. (2005). A qualitative investigation of Johnson’s typology. <i>Violence and Victims</i>, 20, 319-334. doi: 10.1891/088667005780997910</p>	<p>bidirectionally violent couples</p>	<p>Married couples = 9 In committed/non-married relationships = 6</p> <p>Race: African Am. = 40% White = 33% Latino = 13% Asian Am. = 10%</p> <p>Income: Income of \$39,000 or less = 67%</p> <p>Ages: Women <i>M</i> = 33 yrs Men <i>M</i> = 36 yrs</p> <p>Geography: Northern and Central Virginia</p>	<p>report; survey; interview; Couples were recruited via flyers posted in communities in Northern and Central Virginia, and through contacts with churches or domestic violence treatment professionals.</p>	<p>Conflict Tactics Scale (CTS2).</p> <p>Results: Couples categorized into one of the following four groups:</p> <p>common couple violence (<i>n</i> = 11 couples) qualitative analysis revealed the presence of the following motives:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Power/control or seeking to influence partner = yes • Self-defense N/R • Expression of Negative Emotion = yes • Communication = yes • Retaliation = yes • Jealousy N/R • Other N/R <p>mutual violent control (<i>n</i> = 1) qualitative analysis revealed the presence of the following motives:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Power/control or Intimidation = yes • Self-defense N/R • Expression of Negative Emotion = yes • Communication N/R • Retaliation = yes • Jealousy = yes • Other N/R <p>(Pseudo) intimate terrorism (<i>n</i> = 1) qualitative analysis revealed the presence of the</p>

PASK#10 Online Tables – Table 2. Smaller Community Samples

Study (Full Reference)	N	Sample Characteristics	Method/Design	Measures/Results
				<p>following motives:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Power/control = yes • Self-defense N/R • Expression of Negative Emotion = yes • Communication N/R • Retaliation for being laughed at = yes • Jealousy N/R • Other N/R <p>Violent resistance (n = 2) qualitative analysis revealed the presence of the following motives:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Power/control or seeking to influence partner = yes • Self-defense N/R • Expression of Negative Emotion = yes • Communication N/R • Retaliation or Reactive when no other options = yes • Jealousy = yes • Other N/R

PASK#10 Online Tables – Table 2. Smaller Community Samples

Study (Full Reference)	N	Sample Characteristics	Method/Design	Measures/Results
<p>Babcock, J. C., Costa, D. M., Green, C. E., & Eckhardt, C. I. (2004). What situations induce intimate partner violence? A reliability and validity study of the proximal antecedents to violent episodes (PAVE) scale. <i>Journal of Family Psychology</i>, 18(3), 433-442. doi: 10.1037/08933200.18.3.433</p>	<p>Study 2: n = 110 couples Men = 110 Women = 110</p>	<p>Study 2: Marital Status: N/R</p> <p>Race: African Am. = 40% Caucasian = 33% Hispanic = 19% Other = 8%</p> <p>Income: Median gross family income = \$45,000/ year</p> <p>Ages: Men M = 32 yrs Women M = N/R</p> <p>Geography: Houston, Texas</p>	<p>Study 2: Cross-sectional; community sample, Self-report; participants responded to local newspaper ads and flyers recruiting couples who had been living together for at least 6 months, who were at least 18 years of age, and who were able to speak and write English proficiently.</p>	<p>Study 2: Measures: PAVE scale</p> <p>Results: Participants described the proximal antecedents to violence Confirmatory factor analysis revealed the following factors (alpha's are reported).</p> <p>Un-gendered analysis of motives</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Power/Control = 0.93 • Self-defense N/R • Expression of Negative Emotion N/R • Communication N/R • Retaliation or Violence following verbal abuse = 0.90 • Jealousy = 0.73 • Other N/R
<p>Sarantakos, S. (2004). Deconstructing self-defense in wife-to-husband violence. <i>The Journal of Men's Studies</i>, 12, 277-296. doi: 10.3149/jms.1203.27</p>	<p>n = 68 total Men = 42% Women = 58%</p>	<p>Marital Status: All men had been divorced at least once.</p> <p>At the time of the survey: Men = 77% remarried Women</p>	<p>Community; Cross-sectional; Australian; interviews; Members of violent families recruited as part of a larger study from prior research and through referrals from current subjects.</p>	<p>Measures: Interviews of why wife assaulted the husband. Specifically, they were determining the degree to which the wives' violence could constitute self-defense.</p> <p>Husbands (n = N/R) Men reported on their wives' motives for violence:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Power/Control = yes • Self-defense = 0%

PASK#10 Online Tables – Table 2. Smaller Community Samples

Study (Full Reference)	N	Sample Characteristics	Method/Design	Measures/Results
7		<p>= 28% remarried</p> <p>Remarried (more than once): Men = 0% Women = 32%</p> <p>Cohabiting: Men = 7% Women = 13%</p> <p>Living alone: Men = 16% Women = 26%</p> <p>Race: Australian</p> <p>Income: Low to middle class</p> <p>Age: Women <i>M</i> = 39 years Men <i>M</i> = 43 years</p> <p>Children: Range = 16 – 32 years</p> <p>Girls = 58%</p>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Expression of Negative Emotion = yes • Communication N/R • Retaliation N/R • Jealousy = yes • Other N/R <p>Wives (<i>n</i> = N/R) Women reported on their own motives for violence:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Power/Control N/R • Self-defense = 47% (after seeing data only 13% still asserted this) • Expression of Negative Emotion N/R • Communication N/R • Retaliation N/R • Jealousy N/R • Other N/R <p>Children (<i>n</i> = N/R) Children are reporting on their mother’s use of violence against their father:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Power/Control N/R • Self-defense = 5% • Expression of Negative Emotion N/R • Communication N/R • Retaliation N/R • Jealousy N/R • Other N/R <p>Mother-in law (<i>n</i> = N/R) Mother in law is reporting on her daughter-in-law’s</p>

PASK#10 Online Tables – Table 2. Smaller Community Samples

Study (Full Reference)	N	Sample Characteristics	Method/Design	Measures/Results
		Boys = 42% Geography: Rural and urban areas of New South Wales and Victoria (Australia)		use of violence against her son: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Power/Control N/R • Self-defense = 12% • Expression of Negative Emotion N/R • Communication N/R • Retaliation N/R • Jealousy N/R • Other N/R
Ehrensaft, M. K., Langhinrichsen-Rohling, J., Heyman, R. E., O’Leary, K. D., & Lawrence, E. (1999). Feeling controlled in marriage: A phenomenon specific to physically aggressive couples? <i>Journal of Family Psychology, 13(1)</i> , 20-32. doi: 10.1037/0893-3200.13.1.20	n = 57 couples Men = 57 Women = 57 Maritally happy, non-aggressive couples = 21 Maritally discordant, non-aggressive couples	Marital Status: Couples had been married between 1 and 7 years (M = 4.5 yrs.) Race: Caucasian = 84.5% Hispanic = 6.0% African Am. = 2.4% Asian = 2.4% Other = 4.8% Income: Maritally happy, non-aggressive couples M = \$48,053 Maritally discordant, non-	Cross-sectional; Community sample; Couples were recruited via advertisements in local newspapers to a marital therapy clinic. Couples were selected on the basis of their reported marital satisfaction and whether or not there was Husband-to-Wife physical violence in the marriage.	Measures: The Conflict Tactics Scale (CTS) was used to assess for violence. Control was assessed via a control interview developed by Ehrensaft (1994). Each spouse participated in the control interview and completed the Reasons for Violence Scale. Responses were coded from videotapes of the interview. Both husbands and wives from the Distressed/Aggressive group reported on their perceptions of whether or not their spouse was aggressive in order to control them or get them to stop doing something: Results (Interview turned quantitative): <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Power/Control – yes (overall, men more than women) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Wives were more likely than husbands to report that their spouse was aggressive to get them to stop doing something (F(1, 19) = 4.75, p < .05) ○ Wives were also more likely than husbands to answer affirmatively when

PASK#10 Online Tables – Table 2. Smaller Community Samples

Study (Full Reference)	N	Sample Characteristics	Method/Design	Measures/Results
	<p>= 16</p> <p>Maritally discordant, aggressive couples = 20</p>	<p>aggressive couples $M = \\$51,767$</p> <p>Maritally discordant, aggressive couples $M = \\$39,088$</p> <p>Age: Maritally happy, non-aggressive couples $M = 31$ yrs</p> <p>Maritally discordant, non-aggressive couples $M = 34.6$ yrs</p> <p>Maritally discordant, aggressive couples $M = 31.9$ yrs</p> <p>Geography: University of New York at Stony Brook</p>		<p>asked directly whether they thought that their spouse was aggressive in order to control them ($F(1,19) = 4.13, p < .05$)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Self-defense – no • Expression of Negative Emotion - no • Communication - no • Retaliation - no • Jealousy - no • Other - no

PASK#10 Online Tables – Table 3. University and school samples

University and School Samples				
<p>Leisring, P. A. (in press). Physical and emotional abuse in romantic relationships: Motivation for perpetration among college women. <i>Partner Abuse</i>.</p>	<p><i>n</i> = 409; undergraduates; women only</p>	<p>Marital Status: Participants had to have been involved in a romantic relationship at some point in their lives to be eligible to participate.</p> <p><i>M</i> length of romantic relationship = 19.4 mo.</p> <p>Race: Caucasian = 89% Hispanic = 5% Asian = 2% African Am. = 2% Mixed race = 2%</p> <p>Income: N/R</p> <p>Ages: <i>M</i> age = 18.8 yrs.</p> <p>Geography: N/R</p>	<p>Cross-sectional; Self-report; All participants were heterosexual college women recruited for a study on “relationship conflict”. Participants were recruited from introductory psychology classes and had to be at least 18 years of age to participate.</p>	<p>Measures: The Revised Conflict Tactics Scale was used to measure intimate partner violence. The physical aggression and injury subscales were used. The modified version of the Motivation Effects Questionnaire was used to assess motivation for physical aggression and emotional abuse.</p> <p>Results: Percentages of women perpetrators of physical abuse endorsing various motives:</p> <p>Minor Aggression (<i>N</i> = 104)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Power/control <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ To feel more powerful = 10.6 ○ To get control over the other person = 11.5 ○ To punish person for wrong behavior = 14.4 ○ To win an argument = 12.5 ○ To get my way = 4.8 • Self-defense <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ To protect self from immediate physical harm = 4.8 • Expression of Negative Emotion <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ To show anger = 69.2 ○ Anger displaced onto partner = 7.7 ○ Because of stress = 29.8 • Communication <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Due to inability to express self verbally = 20.2

PASK#10 Online Tables – Table 3. University and school samples

Study (Full Reference)	N	Sample Characteristics	Method/Design	Measures/Results
				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ To get partner's attention = 23.1 ● Retaliation <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ In retaliation for being hit first = 7.7 ○ In retaliation for emotional hurt = 31.7 ● Jealousy <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Because of jealousy = 23.1 ● Other <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ To prove love = 13.5 <p>Severe Aggression (N = 21)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Power/control <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ To feel more powerful = 19.0 ○ To get control over the other person = 9.5 ○ To punish person for wrong behavior = 14.3 ○ To win an argument = 9.5 ○ To get my way = 0.0 ● Self-defense <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ To protect self from immediate physical harm = 4.8 ● Expression of Negative Emotion <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ To show anger = 61.9 ○ Anger displaced onto partner = 14.3 ○ Because of stress = 19.0 ● Communication <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Due to inability to express self verbally = 38.1 ○ To get partner's attention = 19.0 ● Retaliation <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ In retaliation for being hit first = 9.5 ○ In retaliation for emotional hurt = 42.9

PASK#10 Online Tables – Table 3. University and school samples

Study (Full Reference)	N	Sample Characteristics	Method/Design	Measures/Results
				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Jealousy <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Because of jealousy = 19.0 • Other <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ To prove love = 14.3
<p>Cornelius, T. L., Shorey, R. C., & Beebe, S. M. (2010). Self-reported communication variables and dating violence: Using Gottman’s marital communication conceptualization. <i>Journal of Family Violence, 25</i>, 439-448.</p>	<p><i>n</i> = 173 undergraduates Men = 20% Women = 80%</p>	<p>Marital Status: Had a current previous, non-cohabitating heterosexual romantic relationship = 100%</p> <p>Exclusively dating their partner = 73%</p> <p><i>M</i> relationship duration = 14.82 months</p> <p>Race: Non-Hispanic White = 86%</p> <p>Income: N/R</p> <p>Ages: <i>M</i> = 18.38 yrs old Range = 15 to 19 yrs</p>	<p>Cross-sectional; Self-report; All participants were recruited through an introductory psychology research pool.</p>	<p>Measures: Violence was measured with the Revised Conflict Tactics Scale (CTS2; Straus et al., 1996). Relationship satisfaction was measured with Dyadic Adjustment Scale (DAS, Spanier, 1976). Communication skills were measured with six short scales by Gottman (1999).</p> <p>Results:</p> <p>Correlations between construct and intimate partner violence perpetration:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Power/control N/R • Self-defense N/R • Expression of Negative Emotion N/R • Communication = yes <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Repair attempts = -.19* ○ Accepting influence = -.21** ○ Harsh start up = .22** ○ Gridlock = .16* ○ Flooding = .24** ○ Four horsemen = .21** ○ Relationship satisfaction = -.14 ns • Retaliation N/R • Jealousy N/R • Other N/R <p>Correlations between construct and intimate partner violence victimization:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Power/control N/R

PASK#10 Online Tables – Table 3. University and school samples

Study (Full Reference)	N	Sample Characteristics	Method/Design	Measures/Results
		<p>Geography: A university in the Midwestern part of the United States</p>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Self-defense N/R • Expression of Negative Emotion N/R • Communication = yes <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Repair attempts = $-.30^{**}$ ○ Accepting influence = $-.29^{**}$ ○ Harsh start up = $.36^{**}$ ○ Gridlock = $.26^{**}$ ○ Flooding = $.33^{**}$ ○ Four horsemen = $.31^{**}$ ○ Relationship satisfaction = $-.22^{**}$ • Retaliation N/R • Jealousy N/R • Other N/R
<p>Fernandez-Fuertes, A. A., & Fuertes, A. (2010). Physical and psychological aggression in dating relationships of Spanish adolescents: Motives and consequences. <i>Child Abuse & Neglect</i>, 34, 183-191. doi: 10.1016/j.chiabu.2010.01.002</p>	<p>$n = 567$ students from a high school in Spain</p> <p>Men = 236 Women = 331</p>	<p>Marital Status: In a serious heterosexual romantic relationship = 40.2%</p> <p>In a serious relationship (greater than 1 month duration) within the past 12 months = 58.8%</p> <p>Race: All participants lived in Spain</p>	<p>Cross-sectional, Self-report; Participants completed the surveys during class. They participated voluntarily.</p>	<p>Measures used: Intimate partner violence (IPV) was measured with a brief version of the Conflict in Adolescent Dating Relationships Inventory (CADRI, Wolfe et al., 2001). The measure was administered in Spanish. Three motives that cause arguments were assessed: dissatisfaction with partner, relationship decline, and jealousy.</p> <p>Girls' associations between motives for arguments and perpetration of physical aggression:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Power/control N/R • Self-defense N/R • Expression of Negative Emotion <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Dissatisfaction with partner $r = .22^{**}$ • Communication <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Relationship decline $r = .08$ • Retaliation N/R • Jealousy

PASK#10 Online Tables – Table 3. University and school samples

Study (Full Reference)	N	Sample Characteristics	Method/Design	Measures/Results
		<p>Income: N/R</p> <p>Ages: <i>M</i> = 16.6 years Range = 15 – 19 years</p> <p>Geography: All were students enrolled in one of five public high schools in Salamanca, Spain.</p>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Jealousy $r = .26^{**}$ ● Other N/R <p>Boys’ associations between motives for arguments and perpetration of physical aggression:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Power/control N/R ● Self-defense N/R ● Expression of Negative Emotion <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Dissatisfaction with partner $r = .13$ ● Communication <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Relationship decline $r = .18^*$ ● Retaliation N/R ● Jealousy <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Jealousy $r = .27^{**}$ <p>Jealousy and perpetration of verbal-emotional aggression were retained as significant predictors of the perpetration of physical aggression in the final model for both genders.</p>
<p>Shorey, R. C., Meltzer, C., & Cornelius, T. L. (2010). Motivations for self-defensive aggression in dating relationships. <i>Violence and Victims</i>, 25, 662-676. doi: 10.1891/0886-6708.25.5.662</p>	<p><i>n</i> = 193 undergraduates</p> <p>Men = 33.3%</p> <p>Women = 77.7%</p>	<p>Marital Status: In a current dating relationship = 62.2%</p> <p>Currently living with their dating partner = 2.6%</p> <p>Race: White = 91.2%</p>	<p>Cross-sectional; Self-report; college sample; Participants were recruited from Introductory Psychology classes.</p>	<p>Measures: Revised Conflict Tactics Scale (CTS2), Reasons for Violence Scale (RVS; Stuart et al., 2006), Motivations for Self-Defense Scale (MSDS).</p> <p>Results: Men reported on own motives for violence: (<i>n</i> = 14; reported perpetrating at least one act of violence) (Means reported, motive means ranged from 0 to 100)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Power/Control <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Feel more powerful = 12.14 ○ Control partner = 12.85

PASK#10 Online Tables – Table 3. University and school samples

Study (Full Reference)	N	Sample Characteristics	Method/Design	Measures/Results
		<p>African Am. = 3.6% Asian = 2.6% Hispanic = 1.6% Other = 1%</p> <p>Income: N/R</p> <p>Age: <i>M</i> = 18.7 years</p> <p>Geography: Midwestern university</p>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Get partner to do something = 6.42 ○ Make partner agree with you = 4.28 ○ Make partner scared/afraid = 4.28 ○ Stop partner, who was going to walk away/leave conflict = 12.85 ○ Partner shut up/get them to leave you alone = 7.85 • Self-defense <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ To protect self = 7.14 ○ Prevent abuse of another person = 11.25 ○ Prevent the destruction of property = 11.07 ○ Get away from partner = 8.57 • Expression of Negative Emotion = 15.00 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Anger = 17.85 ○ Angry at someone else = 7.14 ○ Didn't know what else to do with feelings = 9.28 ○ Provoked/pushed over the edge = 11.42 ○ Stress = 15.00 ○ Afraid partner would leave you = 7.85 ○ Partner did not care about you = 10.71 • Communication <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ To show feelings that couldn't be put in words = 15.00 ○ Get partner's attention = 19.28 ○ Prove love to partner = 12.14 ○ Wanted to have sex = 3.57 • Retaliation <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ To get back/revenge for being physically hurt = 5.71 ○ To get back/retaliate for being

PASK#10 Online Tables – Table 3. University and school samples

Study (Full Reference)	N	Sample Characteristics	Method/Design	Measures/Results
				<p>emotionally hurt = 10.00</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Punish partner for wrong behavior = 5.71 ○ To hurt partner’s feelings = 8.57 ● Jealousy <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Jealousy = 17.14 ○ Partner cheated on you = 2.85 ● Other <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Sexually arousing = 15.71 ○ Under the influence of alcohol = 2.85 ○ Under the influence of drugs = 2.14 <p>Women reported on own motives for violence: (<i>n</i> = 46; reported perpetrating at least one act of physical violence)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Power/Control <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Feel more powerful = 6.52 ○ Control partner = 6.08 ○ Get partner to do something = 4.78 ○ Make partner agree with you = 2.39 ○ Make partner scared/afraid = 1.30 ○ Stop partner who was going to walk away/leave conflict = 8.69 ○ Get partner shut up/get them to leave you alone = 6.08 ● Self-defense <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ To protect self = 2.17 ○ Prevent abuse of another person = 11.25 ○ Prevent the destruction of property = 11.07 ○ Get away from partner = 4.13 ● Expression of Negative Emotion = 15

PASK#10 Online Tables – Table 3. University and school samples

Study (Full Reference)	N	Sample Characteristics	Method/Design	Measures/Results
				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Anger = 12.82 ○ Angry at someone else = 6.52 ○ Did not know what else to do with feelings = 11.52 ○ Provoked/pushed over the edge = 11.95 ○ Stress = 12.39 ○ Afraid partner would leave you = 2.82 ○ Partner did not care about you = 4.34 ● Communication <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Get partner’s attention = 16.08 ○ To show feelings that cannot be explained in words = 15.00 ○ Prove love to partner = 11.52 ○ Wanted to have sex = 0.43 ● Retaliation <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ To get back/retaliate for being emotionally hurt = 16.73 ○ To get back/revenge for being hit first = 6.95 ○ Hurt partner’s feelings = 3.19 ○ Punish partner for wrong behavior = 4.13 ● Jealousy <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Jealousy = 8.04 ○ Partner cheated on you = 5.43 ● Other <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Sexually arousing = 19.56 ○ Under the influence of alcohol = 6.30 ○ Under the influence of drugs = 1.52 <p>Men and women also gave reasons why they perpetrated violence in self-defense. Twelve potential reasons were offered.</p>

PASK#10 Online Tables – Table 3. University and school samples

Study (Full Reference)	N	Sample Characteristics	Method/Design	Measures/Results
<p>Walley-Jean, J. C., & Swan, S. (2009). Motivations and justifications for partner aggression in a sample of African American college women. <i>Journal of Aggression, Maltreatment & Trauma</i>, 18(7), 698-717. doi:10.1080/10926770903231759</p>	<p>$n = 82$; Black undergraduate women only</p>	<p>Marital Status: Heterosexual = 96.3% Single = 96.4%</p> <p>Race: African Am. = 100%</p> <p>Income: Earned less than \$10,000 per year = 69%</p> <p>Age: Range = 18 - 32 years</p> <p>Geography: Southeastern United States</p>	<p>Cross-sectional; Self-report; college sample; The majority of the sample (74%) was recruited from a small, historically Black women’s college, while the remainder of the participants (26%) were recruited from two large, coeducational universities in southeastern United States.</p>	<p>Measures: Violence was measured with the Conflict Tactics Scale-II (CTS2). Partner’s motives for using physical aggression against the women were assessed with the Motivations and Effects Questionnaire (MEQ; 13-items, Follingstad et al., 1991). The Justification for Physical Aggression Scale (JUST, Follingstad et al., 1988) was also administered.</p> <p>Results: Although 47 African American female participants reported using both psychological and physical aggression against an intimate partner, only 89% ($n = 42$) completed the MEQ to indicate their motives for use of physical aggression against their partners. These results are reported:</p> <p>Women reported on their own motives for violence ($n = 42$):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Power/Control <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ More power = 2.4% ○ To get control over other person = 2.4% • Self-defense <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ To protect self = 9.5% • Expression of Negative Emotion <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Show anger = 26.2% ○ Anger displaced onto partner = 7.1% • Communication <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Inability to express self verbally = 14.3% ○ To get attention = 11.9% ○ To prove love = 0% • Retaliation

PASK#10 Online Tables – Table 3. University and school samples

Study (Full Reference)	N	Sample Characteristics	Method/Design	Measures/Results
				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ In retaliation for emotional hurt = 11.9% ○ In retaliation for being hit first = 4.8% ○ Punishment for wrong behavior = 2.4% ● Jealousy <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Because of jealousy = 2.4% ● Other <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Because it was sexually arousing = 4.8% <p>Women reported on their partner’s motivations for violence (n = 34):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Power/Control <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ More power = 5.9% ○ To get control over other person = 8.8% ● Self-defense <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ To protect self = 2.9% ● Expression of Negative Emotion <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Show anger = 8.8% ○ Anger displaced onto partner = 5.9% ● Communication <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Inability to express self verbally = 18.0% ○ To get attention = 2.9% ○ To prove love = 2.9% ● Retaliation <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ In retaliation for emotional hurt = 12% ○ In retaliation for being hit first = 15.0% ○ Punishment for wrong behavior = 2.9% ● Jealousy <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Because of jealousy = 5.9% ● Other <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Because it was sexually arousing = 8.8%

PASK#10 Online Tables – Table 3. University and school samples

Study (Full Reference)	N	Sample Characteristics	Method/Design	Measures/Results
<p>Cousins, A. J., & Gangestad, S. W. (2007). Perceived threats of women infidelity, male proprietariness, and violence in college dating samples. <i>Violence and Victims</i>, 22, 651-668.</p>	<p><i>n</i> = 116 dating couples</p>	<p>Marital Status: Relationship had to have been longer than one month and both partners had to be willing to participate.</p> <p><i>M</i> length of relationship = 22.3 months</p> <p>Race: White = 48% Hispanic = 41% Asian = 6% African Am., Native Am., or Other = 8%</p>	<p>Cross-sectional; Self-report, Heterosexual dating couples were recruited from introductory Psychology classes at the University of New Mexico</p>	<p>The majority of participants (72%) identified only one justifiable reason for using violence – which was, if you were hit first.</p> <p>Measures: Dating violence was assessed with the Abusive Observation Checklist (ABOC; Dutton, 1992). Jealousy was measured by a modification of Ellis’ Partner-Specific Investment Inventory. Participants also rated the degree to which they perceived their partner was interested in others. Self and partner reported flirting was also assessed.</p> <p>Results: Associations with women’s perpetration of violence:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Power/Control <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◦ Self-reported proprietariness $r = .26^{**}$ • Self-defense = yes (in model $R^2 = .19$) • Expression of Negative Emotion <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◦ Dependency $r = .14$ non-significant • Communication N/R • Retaliation N/R • Jealousy <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◦ Partner’s self-report of flirting $r = -.09$ • Other N/R <p>Associations with males’ reports of violence:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Power/Control <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◦ Self-reported proprietariness $r = .23^{**}$ • Self-defense = Analyses not conducted • Expression of Negative Emotion <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◦ Dependency $r = .20^*$ • Communication N/R

PASK#10 Online Tables – Table 3. University and school samples

Study (Full Reference)	N	Sample Characteristics	Method/Design	Measures/Results
				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Retaliation N/R • Jealousy <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Partner’s self-report of flirting $r = -.20^*$ • Other N/R
<p>Hettrich, E. L., & O’Leary, K. D. (2007). Females’ reasons for their physical aggression in dating relationships. <i>Journal of Interpersonal Violence</i>, 22, 1131-1143. doi: 10.1177/0886260507303729</p>	<p>$n = 127$ of the original sample of 493 women; Women only</p>	<p>Marital Status: In a dating relationship = 100%</p> <p>M relationship duration = 16.4 months</p> <p>Race: Caucasian = 38.6% Asian Am. = 23.6% Hispanic = 18.1% African Am. =</p>	<p>Cross-sectional; Self-report; University sample; Participants were women recruited from an introductory Psychology class at Stony Brook University; All eligible participants self-reported engaging in physical aggression and were willing to come to the lab for the study.</p>	<p>Measures: Violence was measured with a modified version of the Conflict Tactics Scale. Motivations were assessed with the Reasons for Aggression Scale (by authors).</p> <p>Results: Women reported on motives for their own violence: (Open-ended responses; coded by 4 raters; 11 most common reasons are given from #1 to #11)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Power/Control <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Prevent boyfriend from leaving = #11 • Self-defense N/R • Expression of Negative Emotion <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Anger = #1 ○ Frustration = #3

PASK#10 Online Tables – Table 3. University and school samples

Study (Full Reference)	N	Sample Characteristics	Method/Design	Measures/Results
		<p>7.9% Caribbean Am. = 6.3% Filipino = 1.6% Native Am. = 0.8% Other = 2.4%</p> <p>Age: Participants' age during their current or most recent relationship was: Women <i>M</i> = 18.97 yrs Men <i>M</i> = 20.20 yrs</p> <p>Income: N/R</p> <p>Geography: Stony Brook University; Stony Brook, NY</p>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Emotions that hurt = #4 ● Communication <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Verbal argument that escalated = #2 ○ Poor communication = #6 ○ To show seriousness = #7 ● Retaliation <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Retaliation for verbal act = #5 ○ External act by the boyfriend = #8 ○ He lied = #9 ● Jealousy N/R ● Other <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Externally cued = #10 <p>Women reported motives for their own violence: (Close-ended responses; <i>n</i> = 127; self-reported perpetrating aggression in a romantic relationship; reasons given as the “main cause” of their aggression against a partner)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Power/Control N/R ● Self-defense N/R ● Expression of Negative Emotion <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Anger (<i>n</i> = 30) = 24% ○ Temper (<i>n</i> = 5) = 4% ○ Embarrassed (<i>n</i> = 5) = 4% ● Communication <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Poor communication (<i>n</i> = 6) = 5% ● Retaliation <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ He lied (<i>n</i> = 13) = 10% ● Jealousy (<i>n</i> = 5) = 5% ● Other N/R

PASK#10 Online Tables – Table 3. University and school samples

Study (Full Reference)	N	Sample Characteristics	Method/Design	Measures/Results
				<p>Women reported NON-reasons for their own violence: (Close-ended responses; $n = 127$; reasons reported as “not a cause” of their aggression)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Power/Control <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Prevent partner from committing an illegal act ($n = 91$) = 72% • Self-defense ($n = 79$) = 62% • Expression of Negative Emotion N/R • Communication N/R • Retaliation N/R • Jealousy N/R • Other <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Partner forced sex ($n = 95$) = 75% ○ Drugs/alcohol ($n = 86$) = 68%
<p>Nabors, E. L., Dietz, T. L., & Jasinski, J. L. (2006). Domestic violence beliefs and perceptions among college students. <i>Violence and Victims, 21</i>, 779-795. Retrieved from EBSCOhost.</p>	<p>$n = 1,938$</p> <p>Men = 41%</p> <p>Women = 59%</p>	<p>Marital Status:</p> <p>Participants currently in a relationship = 45%</p> <p>Participants who have previously been in a relationship = 40%</p> <p>Participants who have never been</p>	<p>Cross-sectional; Self-report; questionnaires; college sample; Participants are from the Relationship Characteristics Study conducted in 2001</p>	<p>This study replicated and extended the previous work of Worden and Carlson (2001, 2005), the developers of the attitudes and beliefs items as well as the causes of domestic violence questionnaire.</p> <p>Measures: One measure used to determine whether the respondent endorses certain causes of domestic violence (10 items; Worden & Carlson, 2005). Second measure was used to determine whether respondents believed about particular behaviors that constitute domestic violence (5 items; Worden & Carlson, 2005).</p> <p>Results: No separate reports for men versus women.</p>

PASK#10 Online Tables – Table 3. University and school samples

Study (Full Reference)	N	Sample Characteristics	Method/Design	Measures/Results
		<p>in a relationship = 15%</p> <p>Participants who have parents married to each other = 67%</p> <p>Race: White = 71% Black = 10% Hispanic = 11%</p> <p>Income: Median family income for the sample = between \$60,000 and \$69,999 per year</p> <p>Age: N/R</p> <p>Freshmen = 66% Sophomores = 14% Juniors = 11%</p> <p>Geography: N/R</p>		<p>Participants indicated beliefs about what causes domestic violence in general, not reporting on own experiences:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Power/Control <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Society teaches boys to be physically aggressive = 69% ○ Some violence is caused by the way women treat men = 62% • Self-defense N/R • Expression of Negative Emotion <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Normal reaction to day-to-day stress/frustration = 9% • Communication <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Husbands who shout, yell, and curse at their wives are likely to become physically violent eventually = 73% • Retaliation <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Women start physical fights = 80% • Jealousy N/R • Other <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Most men who act abusively toward family members have psychological or personality problems = 85% ○ People who are violent to friends and family members are unlikely to change = 71% ○ Some women who are abused secretly want to be treated that way = 26% ○ Most women could find a way to get out of an abusive relationship if they really wanted to = 77%

PASK#10 Online Tables – Table 3. University and school samples

Study (Full Reference)	N	Sample Characteristics	Method/Design	Measures/Results
<p>Forbes, G. B., Jobe, R. L., White, K. B., Bloesch, E., & Adams-Curtis, L. E. (2005). Perceptions of dating violence following a sexual or nonsexual betrayal of trust: Effects of gender, sexism, acceptance of rape myths, and vengeance motivation. <i>Sex Roles</i>, 52(3/4), 165-173. doi: 10.1007/s11199-005-1292-6</p>	<p>$n = 428$ total Men = 208 Women = 220</p>	<p>Marital Status: All but one participant was single.</p> <p>Race: European Am. = 83%</p> <p>Income: N/R</p> <p>Age: M Men = 18.8 yrs M Women = 18.6 yrs</p> <p>Geography: Small Midwestern University</p>	<p>Cross-sectional; college sample; Self-report; The participants were students in a required Freshman composition course at a small Midwestern university.</p>	<p>○ Much domestic violence is caused by alcohol and drugs = 85%</p> <p>Measures: After reading either a sexual betrayal or non-sexual betrayal vignette, the participants then answered a series of 10 questions about an incident described in a brief vignette. Some of the questions addressed the degree to which participants thought the perpetrator had a right to hit based on the betrayal they had experienced.</p> <p>Results: Percent and alpha value reported for the factor.</p> <p>Women ($n = 220$) Women’s perceptions of men and women’s violence under conditions of sexual versus emotional betrayal:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Power/Control N/R • Self-defense N/R • Expression of Negative Emotion N/R • Communication N/R • Retaliation <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Right to hit 22.4% variance accounted for, alpha = .83 • Jealousy N/R • Other N/R <p>Men ($n = 208$) Men’s perceptions of men and women’s violence under conditions of sexual versus emotional betrayal:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Power/Control N/R • Self-defense N/R

PASK#10 Online Tables – Table 3. University and school samples

Study (Full Reference)	N	Sample Characteristics	Method/Design	Measures/Results
				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Expression of Negative Emotion N/R • Communication N/R • Retaliation <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Right to hit 22.5% variance accounted for, alpha = .83 • Jealousy N/R • Other N/R <p>Sexual Betrayal was perceived as a more acceptable motive for women’s than men’s violence.</p>
<p>Perry, A. R. & Fromuth, M. E. (2005). Courtship violence using couple data: characteristics and perceptions. <i>Journal of Interpersonal Violence</i>, 20, 1078-1095. doi: 10.1177/0886260505278106</p>	<p><i>n</i> = 50; Unmarried, heterosexual couples at least one of whom was a student</p>	<p>Marital Status: Unmarried = 100%</p> <p>Currently in a relationship that had lasted longer than 1 month and were not cohabitating = 100%</p> <p>Race: White = 78% African Am. = 18% Other = 4%</p> <p>Income: N/R</p>	<p>Cross-sectional; Self-report questionnaires, University sample; Participants were recruited from a public Southeastern University.</p>	<p>Measures: Violence was measured with the Conflict Tactics Scale 2 (CTS2). Motivations and emotional effects associated with courtship violence were assessed by items based on the Motivations and Effects Questionnaire (MEQ, Follingstad et al., 1991).</p> <p>Results: Considered gender differences in self-reported intent of aggression. Women reported significantly more aggression that was intended to be playful.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Power/Control = yes • Self-defense = yes • Expression of Negative Emotion <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Anger = yes • Communication N/R • Retaliation = yes • Jealousy = yes • Other <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Playfulness (women reported this intent significantly more than men)

PASK#10 Online Tables – Table 3. University and school samples

Study (Full Reference)	N	Sample Characteristics	Method/Design	Measures/Results
		<p>Age: Women $M = 19$ yrs Men $M = 20$ yrs</p> <p>Geography: A public Southeastern University</p>		
<p>Archer, J., & Graham-Kevan, N. (2003). Do beliefs about aggression predict physical aggression to partners? <i>Aggressive Behavior</i>, 29, 41-54. doi: 10.1002/ab.10029</p>	<p>$n = 115$; Men = 57 Women = 58</p>	<p>Marital Status: N/R</p> <p>Race: N/R</p> <p>Income: N/R</p> <p>Age: Range = 16-65 yrs $M = 33$ yrs</p> <p>Geography: Northwest of England</p>	<p>Cross-sectional; Self-report questionnaires; college, justice/legal, and community sample; Participants consisted of students (from the University of Central Lancashire, Furness Higher Education College, and Charlotte Mason Teachers Training College; $n = 40$; 11 men and 29 women), women from a domestic violence shelter (Women’s Aid domestic violence refuges, $n = 29$), and male prisoners (HMP Haverigg and HMP Frankland prisons, $n =$</p>	<p>Measures: Violence was measured with the Conflict Tactics Scale (CTS); participants reported on self and other or men and women; Revised EXPAGG (Campbell et al., 1992; Beliefs about perpetration of physical aggression); Controlling Behaviors Scale (CBS)(Controlling behavior)</p> <p>Results: Results that were reported were not codeable according to the motivations guidelines used throughout this table. However, correlations between instrumental and expressive motives and perpetrating violence are reported below.</p> <p>Overall Sample ($n = 114$):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Instrumental reasons, $r = .32^*$ ○ Expressive (non-significant), $r = .02$ <p>However, expressive reasons correlate with beating up one’s partner across the whole sample, $r = .23$</p> <p>Students ($n = 37$):</p>

PASK#10 Online Tables – Table 3. University and school samples

Study (Full Reference)	N	Sample Characteristics	Method/Design	Measures/Results
			<p>46) all of whom had committed at least one act of physical aggression toward a partner.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Instrumental, $r = .54^*$ ○ Expressive, $r = -.08$ <p>Women from domestic violence shelter ($n = 29$):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Instrumental (non-significant), $r = .11$ ○ Expressive (non-significant), $r = -.13$ <p>Male prisoners ($n = 46$):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Instrumental (non-significant), $r = .31$ ○ Expressive (non-significant), $r = .25$ <p>Men ($n = 61$):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Instrumental reasons, $r = .40^*$ ○ Expressive (non-significant), $r = .18$ <p>Women ($n = 57$):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Instrumental (non-significant), $r = .23$ ○ Expressive (non-significant), $r = -.23$

PASK#10 Online Tables – Table 3. University and school samples

Study (Full Reference)	N	Sample Characteristics	Method/Design	Measures/Results
<p>Follingstad, D. R., Bradley, R. G., Helff, C. M., & Laughlin, J. E. (2002). A model for predicting dating violence: anxious attachment, angry temperament, and need for relationship control. <i>Violence and Victims</i>, 17(1), 35-47. doi: 10.1891/vivi.17.1.35.33639</p>	<p>n=422 college freshmen; Men = 223; Women = 199</p>	<p>Marital Status: N/R Race: Caucasian = 53% African Am. = 47% Age: N/R Income: N/R Geography: Large Southeastern University</p>	<p>Cross-sectional; college sample; Self-report; Participants were college freshmen (those who reported a history of violence in dating relationships and those who did not) both groups were recruited for an intervention study through flyers mailed to them.</p>	<p>Measures: Violence was assessed with a modified version of the Conflict Tactics Scale (CTS, Straus, 1979). Controlling behavior was measured using the Need for Control Scale (NCS, Follingstad, Rutledge, McNeill-Hawkins, & Polek, 1988). Angry temperament was measured by the State Trait Anger Expression Scale (STAXI, Spielberger et al., 1983).</p> <p>These data were not analyzed by gender.</p> <p>Results:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Power/Control = .57* in SEM model • Self-defense N/R • Expression of Negative Emotion <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Anger = yes • Communication N/R • Retaliation N/R • Jealousy N/R • Other N/R
<p>Harned, M. S. (2001). Abused women or abused men? An examination of the context and outcomes of dating violence. <i>Violence and Victims</i>, 16(3), 269-285. Retrieved from EBSCOhost.</p>	<p>n = 874; Men = 44% (n = 385) Women = 56% (n = 489)</p>	<p>Marital Status: To be included, all students had to report engaging in some type of dating behavior while enrolled at the university. Race: African Am. = 6%</p>	<p>Cross-sectional; University sample; Self-report; Only respondents who reported having engaged in any type of dating behavior while enrolled at the university were included in the analysis. Dating was defined as having engaged in any type of dating behavior ranging</p>	<p>Measures: 12-item Revised Conflict Tactics Scales – Physical Assault sub-scale (CTS2) was used to assess participants’ physical victimization and aggression within dating relationship; 5-item version of the CTS2-Injury sub-scale assessed injuries resulting from physical violence experienced from a dating partner; 12-item version of the Motivations and Effects Questionnaire (MEQ; Follingstad et al., 1991) assessed motives for using physical violence.</p> <p>Results: Of the 92 women and 42 men who reported perpetrating physical violence, 90% of the women and</p>

PASK#10 Online Tables – Table 3. University and school samples

Study (Full Reference)	N	Sample Characteristics	Method/Design	Measures/Results
		<p>Asian Am. = 9% Caucasian = 76% East Asian = 3% Hispanic = 3% Other = 3%</p> <p>Income: N/R</p> <p>Ages: Freshman = 26% Sophomore = 17% Junior = 18% Senior = 19% Graduate/Professional = 20% Range = 17 to 52 yrs</p> <p>Geography: N/R</p>	<p>from one-time dates to long-term relationships and included both same and opposite sex dating partners. All data were collected via an electronic survey that was located on the Internet.</p>	<p>93% of the men completed the MEQ. Factor Analysis of the MEQ formed two factors Anger/Jealousy and Self-Defense/Retaliation. Six other items were analyzed individually.</p> <p>Women’s reports of the motives for perpetration:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Power/Control <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ To feel more powerful = 15% ○ To get control over the other person = 27% • Self-defense <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Self-defense/retaliation = 42% • Expression of Negative Emotion <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Anger/Jealousy = 88% • Communication <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Inability to express self verbally = 50% ○ To get attention = 23% • Retaliation <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Self-defense/retaliation = 42% • Jealousy <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Anger/Jealousy = 88% • Other <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ To prove love = 4% ○ Because it was sexually arousing = 7% <p>Men’s reports of the motives for perpetration:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Power/Control <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ To feel more powerful = 5% ○ To get control over the other person = 44%

PASK#10 Online Tables – Table 3. University and school samples

Study (Full Reference)	N	Sample Characteristics	Method/Design	Measures/Results
				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Self-defense <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Self-defense/retaliation = 56% • Expression of Negative Emotion <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Anger/Jealousy = 64% • Communication <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Inability to express self verbally = 41% ○ To get attention = 31% • Retaliation <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Self-defense/retaliation = 56% • Jealousy <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Anger/Jealousy = 64% • Other <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ To prove love = 15% ○ Because it was sexually arousing = 18% <p>The only significant gender difference in motives was that women were more likely than men to report anger/jealousy as a motivation for their violence perpetration.</p>
<p>Jackson, S. M., Cram, F., & Seymour, F. W. (2000). Violence and sexual coercion in high school students' dating relationships. <i>Journal of Family Violence, 15</i>, 23-36. doi: 10.1023/A:1007545302987</p>	<p><i>n</i> = 373; Men = 173 Women = 200</p>	<p>Marital Status: Had been in a dating relationship: Men = 135 Women = 169</p> <p>Race: New Zealand Pakeha = 54.7% Asian = 17.5%</p>	<p>Cross-sectional; Self-report questionnaire; Participants were senior high school students in focus group discussions of violence in dating relationships.</p>	<p>Measures: Three separate questions investigated the extent of physical violence in students' dating relationships. The most commonly reported perceived reasons for the violence are listed below.</p> <p>Results (perceived reasons for violence):</p> <p>Women (<i>n</i> = 35) Women reported on partner's motives for violence:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Power/Control <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Getting own way = 15.8%

PASK#10 Online Tables – Table 3. University and school samples

Study (Full Reference)	N	Sample Characteristics	Method/Design	Measures/Results
		<p>Maori or Maori/Pakeha = 8.4%</p> <p>Pacific Island or Pacific Island/Palangi = 9.4%</p> <p>Age: <i>M</i> = 16.7 yrs Range = 16-20 yrs</p> <p>Income: From lower middle to high SES range = 79%</p> <p>Geography: Five high schools in the Auckland metropolitan area, New Zealand</p>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Show who was boss = 18.4% ● Self-defense N/R ● Expression of Negative Emotion <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Anger = 21.1% ● Communication N/R ● Retaliation = 21.1% ● Jealousy = 15.8% ● Other <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Alcohol = 21.2% <p>Men (<i>n</i> = 23) Men reported on partner’s motives for violence:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Power/Control <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Getting own way = 20.8% ● Self-defense N/R ● Expression of Negative Emotion <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Anger = 41.7% ● Communication N/R ● Retaliation = 16.7% ● Jealousy = 20.8% ● Other <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Alcohol = 29.2%
<p>Yick, A. G., & Agbayani-Siewert, P. (2000). Dating violence among Chinese American and White students: A sociocultural</p>	<p><i>n</i> = 427 people</p> <p>Women = 59.5% of Chinese</p>	<p>Marital Status: Age first started dating: Chinese Am. <i>M</i> = 16.39 yrs White <i>M</i> = 15.51 yrs</p>	<p>Cross-sectional; Self-report surveys; University sample; Undergraduate students were recruited from Asian American studies, social welfare, and other</p>	<p>Measures: Conflict Tactics Scale (CTS) was used to measure violence. Contextual Justification of Dating Violence Scale is comprised of nine closed-ended questions that assess the extent to which respondents agree or disagree whether certain situations justify the use of dating violence. It is part of the Perceptions of and Attitudes Toward Dating Violence Questionnaire</p>

PASK#10 Online Tables – Table 3. University and school samples

Study (Full Reference)	N	Sample Characteristics	Method/Design	Measures/Results
<p>context. <i>Dating Violence and Sexual Assault</i>, 8 (1/2), 101-129. Retrieved from EBSCOhost.</p>	<p>American sample Women = 68.1% of White American sample</p>	<p>Race: Chinese Am. = 289 White = 138</p> <p>Income: N/R</p> <p>Age: Chinese Am. <i>M</i> = 20.1 White <i>M</i> = 21.98</p> <p>Geography: University of California, Los Angeles, CA</p>	<p>social sciences classes during one complete academic year.</p>	<p>that was originally developed to measure attitudes towards domestic violence in the Chinese American community (Yick & Agbayani-Siewert, 1997).</p> <p>Results: Chinese American (<i>n</i> = 289; <i>M</i>'s reported)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Power/Control <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ She disobeyed = 1.55 ○ She's unwilling to have sex = 1.55 • Self-defense <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ He acted in self-defense = 3.64 • Expression of Negative Emotion <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ He's in a bad mood = 1.51 • Communication <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ She is screaming hysterically = 2.10 ○ She is nagging = 1.67 • Retaliation N/R • Jealousy <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ She is caught having an affair = 2.56 ○ She's flirting = 1.93 • Other <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ She is drunk = 1.91 <p>White (<i>n</i> = 138; <i>M</i>'s reported)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Power/Control <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ She disobeyed = 1.20 ○ She is unwilling to have sex = 1.19 • Self-defense <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ He acted in self-defense = 3.75 • Expression of Negative Emotion

PASK#10 Online Tables – Table 3. University and school samples

Study (Full Reference)	N	Sample Characteristics	Method/Design	Measures/Results
				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ He is in a bad mood = 1.20 ● Communication <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ She is screaming hysterically = 1.43 ○ She is nagging = 1.25 ● Retaliation N/R ● Jealousy <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ She is caught having an affair = 1.61 ○ She is flirting = 1.34 ● Other <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ She is drunk = 1.34
<p>Milardo, R. M. (1998). Gender asymmetry in common couple violence. <i>Personal Relationships</i>, 5, 423-438. doi: 10.1111/j.1475-6811.1998.tb00180.x</p>	<p>Study One n = 160 undergraduates Men = 88 Women = 72</p> <p>Study Two n = 97 undergraduates Men = 38 Women = 59</p>	<p>Study One Marital Status: Not currently dating = 28% Casually dating = 25% Seriously dating = 34% Engaged = 7% Married = 6%</p> <p>Race: N/R</p> <p>Income: N/R</p> <p>Age: N/R</p> <p>Geography: Maine</p>	<p>This paper reports the results from two separate studies.</p> <p>Study One: Cross-sectional; Self-report questionnaire; University sample; Participants were undergraduate students recruited from the University of Maine in a two-stage procedure. First, a complete listing of undergraduate classes that met at least once each week and included 10 or more students was obtained. From the initial list of classes, 25</p>	<p>Measures: In Study One, students’ motivations were explored by asking respondents to indicate the expected likelihood of hitting a partner or being hit by a partner in one of ten given situations and their perceived reasons for the violence.</p> <p>Results: STUDY ONE 53% of men and 89% of women indicated that they would be likely to hit their partner in at least one of the ten depicted situations. Conversely, 70% of men expected to be hit in at least one of the situations while only 50% of women reported a moderate probability of being hit in at least one of the situations.</p> <p>Men (n = 88; situations in which they expected to hit a partner)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Power/Control <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Partner refused to have sex with you = 8.1%

PASK#10 Online Tables – Table 3. University and school samples

Study (Full Reference)	N	Sample Characteristics	Method/Design	Measures/Results
		<p>Study Two Marital Status: Not currently dating = 13% Casually dating = 10% Seriously dating = 50% Engaged = 11% Married = 14%</p>	<p>classes were selected with the probability of selection proportional to the size of the class. The classes of the first 20 instructors who gave consent were selected to participate in the study; however, it was not possible to sample students from two of the chosen classes, and they were dropped from the study, resulting in 18 classes. An interviewer then visited each class and randomly selected 10 students to participate.</p> <p>Study Two Same methodology as used in Study One was employed for Study Two. However, the overall response rate was lower (54%).</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Self-defense <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Fear = 7% • Expression of Negative Emotion <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Anger = 57% ○ Confused = 22% ○ Hate = 9.5% • Communication <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ To show or indicate love = 5.4% ○ When wouldn't listen = 14.0% ○ When partner wouldn't stop yelling = 22.1% • Retaliation <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Partner hit first = 39.5% ○ Partner was mean = 11.6% ○ Partner made fun of you = 14.0% ○ Told friends you were sexually pathetic = 16.3% • Jealousy <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Partner flirted at party = 8.1% ○ Partner left party with someone else = 16.3% ○ Partner had sex with someone = 29.1% • Other N/R <p>Women (<i>n</i> = 72; situations in which they expected to hit a partner)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Power/Control <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Partner refused to have sex with you = 4.2% • Self-defense <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Fear = 22%

PASK#10 Online Tables – Table 3. University and school samples

Study (Full Reference)	N	Sample Characteristics	Method/Design	Measures/Results
				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Expression of Negative Emotion <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Anger = 51% ○ Confused = 23% • Communication <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ To show or indicate love = 3.1% ○ When wouldn't listen = 27.8% ○ Partner wouldn't stop yelling at you = 40.3% • Retaliation <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Hate = 1.5% ○ When partner hit first = 72.2% ○ Partner was mean = 26.4% ○ Partner made fun of you = 29.2% ○ Told friends you were sexually pathetic = 41.7% • Jealousy <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Partner flirted at a party = 16.7% ○ Partner left party with someone else = 44.4% ○ Partner had sex with someone = 52.8% • Other N/R <p>STUDY TWO These questions were asked about the same ten scenarios, but students were asked if this situation would lead to them beating up a partner or being beaten up by a partner. Overall, 59% of the women and 32% of the men indicated they would beat up their partner in at least one of the ten situations.</p> <p>Men (<i>n</i> = 38)</p>

PASK#10 Online Tables – Table 3. University and school samples

Study (Full Reference)	N	Sample Characteristics	Method/Design	Measures/Results
				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Power/Control <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Partner refused to have sex with you = 0% • Self-defense N/R • Expression of Negative Emotion N/R • Communication <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ When partner wouldn't listen = 2.6% ○ When partner wouldn't stop yelling = 5.3% • Retaliation <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Partner beat you up first = 28.9% ○ Partner was mean = 5.3% ○ Partner made fun of you = 5.3% ○ Told friends you were sexually pathetic = 5.3% • Jealousy <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Partner flirted at party = 5.5% ○ Partner left party with someone else = 5.3% ○ Partner had sex with someone = 7.9% • Other N/R <p>Women (n = 59)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Power/Control <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Partner refused to have sex with you = 5.3% • Self-defense N/R • Expression of Negative Emotion N/R • Communication <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ When wouldn't listen = 16.9%

PASK#10 Online Tables – Table 3. University and school samples

Study (Full Reference)	N	Sample Characteristics	Method/Design	Measures/Results
				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Partner wouldn't stop yelling at you = 16.9% ● Retaliation <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ When partner beat you up first = 50.8% ○ Partner was mean = 13.6% ○ Partner made fun of you = 16.9% ○ Told friends you were sexually pathetic = 16.9% ● Jealousy <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Partner flirted at a party = 16.9% ○ Partner left party with someone else = 27.1% ○ Partner had sex with someone = 33.9% ● Other N/R
<p>DeKeseredy, W. S., Saunders, D. G., Schwartz, M. D., & Alvi, S. (1997). The meanings and motives for women's use of violence in Canadian college dating relationships: Results from a national survey. <i>Sociological Spectrum, 17</i>(2), 199-222. Retrieved from EBSCFHost.</p>	<p><i>n</i> = 1,835; Women students only</p>	<p>Marital Status: Never married = 78%</p> <p>Race: N/R</p> <p>Income: N/R</p> <p>Age: <i>M</i> = 20 years</p> <p>Geography: Canada</p>	<p>Cross-sectional; Canadian national sample survey of community college and university students; Self-report; questionnaires; All questions in the survey referred only to events that took place in heterosexual dating (nonmarital) relationships.</p>	<p>Measures: Participants use of violence was measured with an expanded version of the Conflict Tactics Scale (CTS). Women were asked questions about the percentage of times they estimated using minor and severe violent actions on their dating partner according to several motives that were derived by those used by Saunders (1986).</p> <p>Results: Minor-violence group (<i>n</i> = 663-678)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Power/Control N/R ● Self-defense = 37.7% (at least some of the time) ● Expression of Negative Emotion N/R ● Communication N/R ● Retaliation = 46.4% (at least some of the time) ● Jealousy N/R

PASK#10 Online Tables – Table 3. University and school samples

Study (Full Reference)	N	Sample Characteristics	Method/Design	Measures/Results
				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Other <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Initiated the attack = 36.7% (at least some of the time) <p>Severe violence group (n = 359-367)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Power/Control N/R • Self-defense 43.5% (at least some of the time) • Expression of Negative Emotion N/R • Communication N/R • Retaliation 51.1% (at least some of the time) • Jealousy N/R • Other <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Initiated the attack 43.2% (at least some of the time)
<p>Fiebert, M. S., & Gonzalez, D. M. (1997). College women who initiate assaults on their male partners and the reasons offered for such behavior. <i>Psychological Reports, 80</i>(2), 583-590. Retrieved from EBSCOhost.</p>	<p>n = 978; Women only</p>	<p>Marital Status: Single (n = 690) = 71% Married (n = 222) = 23% Divorced/separated (n = 54) = 6% Widowed (n = 6) No response (n = 6) = 1%</p> <p>Race:</p>	<p>Cross-sectional; Self-report; survey; college sample; All participants were enrolled in undergraduate general education courses at community colleges and state universities in the Long Beach and Fullerton areas of southern California during the academic year of 1995.</p>	<p>Measures: Participants were asked to complete a two-page survey, the “Domestic Behavior and Analysis Form”, which contained the question: “Have you ever, during a conflict with your male partner (boyfriend or spouse), in the past five years, initiated such physical behaviors as pushing, slapping, hitting, or kicking?” If the subject responded “never”, they did not complete the remaining items. If the subject chose a response from 1-5 times, 6-10 times or higher, they proceeded with the rest of the survey.</p> <p>Subjects able to complete the remainder of the survey were presented with five immediate reasons for initiating aggression and were asked to check applicable answers.</p>

PASK#10 Online Tables – Table 3. University and school samples

Study (Full Reference)	N	Sample Characteristics	Method/Design	Measures/Results
		<p>White ($n = 486$) = 50%</p> <p>Latina ($n = 205$) = 21%</p> <p>Asian/Pacific ($n = 160$) = 16%</p> <p>African Am. ($n = 75$) = 8%</p> <p>Native Am. ($n = 17$) = 2%</p> <p>Mixed ethnicity or were nonresponsive to this item ($n = 35$) = 4%</p> <p>Income: N/R</p> <p>Age: Women between the ages of 20 and 30 yrs ($n = 757$) = 77%</p> <p>Women between the ages of 31 and 40 yrs ($n = 102$)</p>		<p>Then, subjects were asked to reflect on their behavior and to respond to ten additional deeper reasons, which may have motivated their behavior.</p> <p>Self-defensive violence was excluded and subjects were encouraged to provide additional reasons of their own choice.</p> <p>Results:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Power/Control <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ I believe women are in charge in a domestic situation and have a right to strike their partners if they break the 'rules' = 6% ○ I have seen and admired women in the movies and on TV who strike their partners = 3% ○ I learned when growing up that I could be physically aggressive toward my brother and he would not fight back = 10% ○ I feel personally empowered when I behave aggressively against my partner = 12% • Self-defense N/R • Expression of Negative Emotion <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ I believe it is important and healthy to physically express anger particularly in a personal relationship = 6% ○ I believe if women are truly equal to men than women should be able to express anger physically at men = 13%

PASK#10 Online Tables – Table 3. University and school samples

Study (Full Reference)	N	Sample Characteristics	Method/Design	Measures/Results
		<p>= 10%</p> <p>Women between the ages of 41 and 50 yrs ($n = 57$) = 6%</p> <p>Women above the age of 51 yrs ($n = 39$) = 4%</p> <p>Women who did not state their ages ($n = 23$) = 2%</p> <p>Geography: Southern California (1994-1995)</p>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Communication = 77% <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Wished to gain my partner’s attention = 44% ○ My partner was not listening to me = 43% • Retaliation <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ My partner was being verbally abusive to me = 38% ○ My partner wasn’t sensitive to my needs = 46% • Jealousy N/R • Other ($n = 153$ responses) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ I have found that most men have been trained not- to hit a woman and therefore I am not fearful of retaliation from my partner = 19% ○ I sometimes find when I express my anger physically I become turned on sexually = 8% ○ My mother would at times be physically aggressive toward my father or step-father = 8% ○ I believe that men can readily protect themselves so I don't worry when I become physically aggressive = 24%
<p>Foshee, V. A. (1996). Gender differences in adolescent dating abuse prevalence, types and injuries. <i>Health Education</i></p>	<p>$n = 1,405$ students</p> <p>Boys = 50.1%</p>	<p>Marital Status: Adolescents reporting they had been on a date (only these youth were retained for</p>	<p>Cross-sectional; Self-report questionnaires; Participants were eighth and ninth graders recruited from 14 schools in rural North</p>	<p>Measures: Asked if they ever used violence on someone they were on a date with in self-defense?</p> <p>Results: Girls ($n = 699$)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Power/Control N/R

PASK#10 Online Tables – Table 3. University and school samples

Study (Full Reference)	N	Sample Characteristics	Method/Design	Measures/Results
<p><i>Research</i>, 11(3), 275-286. doi:10.1093/her/11.3.275-a</p>	<p>Girls = 49.9%</p>	<p>data analysis) = 72%</p> <p>Race: White Boys = 78.9% White Girls = 78.1%</p> <p>Age: Boys <i>M</i> = 14.0 yrs Girls <i>M</i> = 13.9 yrs</p> <p>Income: N/R</p> <p>Geography: rural North Carolina</p>	<p>Carolina who indicated that they had been on a date.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Self-defense = 15.9% • Expression of Negative Emotion N/R • Communication N/R • Retaliation N/R • Jealousy N/R • Other N/R <p>Boys (<i>n</i> = 702)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Power/Control N/R • Self-defense = 5.4% • Expression of Negative Emotion N/R • Communication N/R • Retaliation N/R • Jealousy N/R • Other N/R
<p>Gagne, M.-H & Lavoie, F. (1993). Young people's views on the causes of violence in adolescents' romantic relationships. <i>Canada's Mental Health</i>, 41(3), 11-15. Retrieved from</p>	<p><i>n</i> = 151; Boys = 92 Girls = 59</p>	<p>Marital Status: N/R</p> <p>Race: N/R</p> <p>Income: N/R</p> <p>Age: <i>M</i> = 15.5 yrs Range = 14-17</p>	<p>Cross-sectional; Self-report; Pre-tested twice before interview; The research reported here is part of a larger study (Gagne, 1993).</p>	<p>Measures: Violence measured with 24-items taken or inspired by the Conflict Tactics Scale (CTS). Two interview questions were used to assess motivations for physical and psychological violence. Participants had to select a maximum of 3 out of 12 options for causes of violence (jealousy, anger, behavioral problems, alcohol/drugs, dominance, loss of control, vengeance, provoked by partner, intimidation, to obtain something, pure violence, self-defense).</p>

PASK#10 Online Tables – Table 3. University and school samples

Study (Full Reference)	N	Sample Characteristics	Method/Design	Measures/Results
EBSCOhost.		<p>yrs</p> <p>Geography: Quebec, Canada</p>		<p>Results:</p> <p>Girls (<i>n</i> = 59) Girls are reporting on the perceived causes of boys' dating violence perpetration:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Power/Control <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Domination = 33.9% ○ Intimidation = 25.4 ○ To obtain something = 11.9% • Self-defense = 0% • Expression of Negative Emotion <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Anger = 33.9% ○ Loss of Control = 23.7% • Communication N/R • Retaliation <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Vengeance = 18.6% ○ Provoked by Partner = 8.5% • Jealousy = 76.3% • Other <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Behavioral Problems = 40.7% ○ Alcohol/Drugs = 28.8% ○ Pure Violence = 3.4% <p>Girls (<i>n</i> = 59) Girls are reporting on the perceived causes of girls' dating violence perpetration:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Power/Control <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Domination = 11.9% ○ Intimidation = 10.2% ○ To Obtain Something = 8.5%

PASK#10 Online Tables – Table 3. University and school samples

Study (Full Reference)	N	Sample Characteristics	Method/Design	Measures/Results
				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Self-defense = 21.7% • Expression of Negative Emotion <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Anger = 42.4% ○ Loss of control = 23.7% • Communication N/R • Retaliation <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Vengeance = 28.8% ○ Provoked by Partner = 30.5% • Jealousy = 78.0% • Other <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Behavioral Problems = 25.4% ○ Alcohol/Drugs = 20.3% ○ Pure Violence = 1.7% <p>Boys (<i>n</i> = 92) Boys are reporting on the perceived causes of boys' dating violence perpetration:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Power/Control <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Domination = 23.9% ○ Intimidation = 8.7% ○ To obtain something = 16.3% • Self-defense = 2.2% • Expression of Negative Emotion <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Anger = 33.7% ○ Loss of control = 23.9% • Communication N/R • Retaliation <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Vengeance = 21.7% ○ Provoked by Partner = 28.3% • Jealousy = 64.1%

PASK#10 Online Tables – Table 3. University and school samples

Study (Full Reference)	N	Sample Characteristics	Method/Design	Measures/Results
				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Other <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Behavioral Problems = 26.1% ○ Alcohol/Drugs = 30.4% ○ Pure Violence = 8.7% <p>Boys (<i>n</i> = 92) Boys are reporting on the perceived causes of girls' dating violence perpetration:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Power/Control <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Domination = 8.7% ○ Intimidation = 13.0% ○ To obtain something = 14.1% • Self-defense = 25% • Expression of Negative Emotion <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Anger = 33.7% ○ Loss of control = 14.1% • Communication N/R • Retaliation <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Vengeance = 29.3% ○ Provoked by Partner = 39.1% • Jealousy = 67.4% • Other <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Behavioral Problems = 17.4% ○ Alcohol/Drugs = 17.4% ○ Pure Violence = 3.3% <p>Overall Results: Girls think that boys' violence is LESS likely to be provoked by their partner and MORE likely to be an intimidation strategy than is girls' violence. Boys think that boys' violence is MORE likely to be provoked by their partner and is LESS likely to be an intimidation</p>

PASK#10 Online Tables – Table 3. University and school samples

Study (Full Reference)	N	Sample Characteristics	Method/Design	Measures/Results
<p>Bookwala, J., Frieze, I. H., Smith, C., & Ryan, K. (1992). Predictors of dating violence: A multivariate analysis. <i>Violence and Victims</i>, 7, 297-311. Retrieved from EBSCOhost.</p>	<p>$n = 305$; Men = 78 Women = 227</p>	<p>Marital Status: Never married = 98% Dating = 67.3% Modal length of relationship (40%) “more than one year”</p> <p>Race: White = 87.9% Black = 9.8% Asian = 0.7% Unspecified = 1.6%</p> <p>Age: Between 18-22 years old = 97%</p> <p>Income: N/R</p> <p>Geography: Western Pennsylvania</p>	<p>Cross-sectional; Self-report; University sample; Western Pennsylvania</p>	<p>strategy than is girls’ violence.</p> <p>Measures: Jealousy was measured with 3 items from Hatfield and Rapson’s Passionate Love Scale (1987) and three items developed by Grote (1992) to measure love styles. In addition, measured macho beliefs and received violence. These predictors were correlated with expressed violence, which was measured with items derived from Straus’ Conflict Tactics Scale (CTS; 1979).</p> <p>Results: Men ($n = 78$; correlations reported with expressed violence)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Power/Control (MACHO) $r = .02$ • Self-defense N/R • Expression of Negative Emotion N/R • Communication N/R • Retaliation $r = .56^*$ • Jealousy $r = .10$ • Other <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Adversarial Sexual Beliefs $r = .26^*$ <p>Women ($n = 227$; correlations reported with expressed violence)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Power/Control (MACHO) $r = .06$ • Self-defense N/R • Expression of Negative Emotion N/R • Communication N/R • Retaliation $r = .72^*$

PASK#10 Online Tables – Table 3. University and school samples

Study (Full Reference)	N	Sample Characteristics	Method/Design	Measures/Results
				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Jealousy $r = .18^*$ • Other <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Adversarial Sexual Beliefs $r = .18^*$
<p>Follingstad, D. R., Wright, S., Lloyd, S., & Sebastian, J. A. (1991). Sex differences in motivations and effects in dating violence. <i>Family Relations, 40</i>, 51-57. Retrieved from EBSCOhost.</p>	<p>$n = 495$; Men = 207 Women = 288</p>	<p>Marital Status: N/R</p> <p>Race: Caucasian = 69% Black = 27% Hispanic = 4%</p> <p>Income: Most had families with an income over \$25,000</p> <p>Had a family income within the \$10,000 to \$25,000 range = 14%</p> <p>Had a family income under \$10,000 = 2%</p> <p>Age: Men $M = 20.6$ Women $M = 20.2$</p>	<p>Cross-sectional; Self-report; Survey; College sample; Subjects were recruited from classes, mostly Introductory Psychology, at the University of South Carolina.</p>	<p>Measures: Justification Scale (JUST, Follingstad et al., 1988). Scale contains 25 reasons why someone might use violence against a boyfriend/girlfriend. Subjects who reported being victimized by a dating partner indicated whether or not each of thirteen motivations was present when their partner used violence. Conversely, subjects who reported perpetrating physical force on a dating partner also reported any of the 13 possible motivations which they remembered experiencing. Violence was measured with a modified version of the Conflict Tactics Scale (CTS).</p> <p>Results: Men Perpetrators ($n = 24$) Men reported on their own motives for dating violence:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Power/Control <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ To feel more powerful = 0% ○ To get control over other person = 8.3% • Self-defense = 17.7% • Expression of Negative Emotion <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ To show anger = 37.5% ○ Anger displaced onto partner = 12.5% • Communication <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Inability to express self verbally = 20.8% ○ To get attention = 4.2%

PASK#10 Online Tables – Table 3. University and school samples

Study (Full Reference)	N	Sample Characteristics	Method/Design	Measures/Results
		<p>Geography: University of South Carolina</p>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ To prove love = 12.5% ● Retaliation <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ In retaliation for being hit first = 29.2% ○ In retaliation for emotional hurt = 25.0% ○ To punish person for wrong behavior = 12.5% ● Jealousy = 41.7% ● Other <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Because it was sexually arousing = 0% <p>Women Perpetrators (n = 59) Women reported on their own motives for dating violence:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Power/Control <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ To feel more powerful = 3.4% ○ To get control over other person = 22% ● Self-defense = 18.6% ● Expression of Negative Emotion <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ To show anger = 57.6% ○ Anger displaced onto partner = 3.4% ● Communication <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Inability to express self verbally = 27.1% ○ To get attention = 8.5% ○ To prove love = 1.7% ● Retaliation <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ In retaliation for being hit first = 13.6% ○ In retaliation for emotional hurt = 55.9% ○ To punish person for wrong behavior = 12.5% ● Jealousy = 8.5%

PASK#10 Online Tables – Table 3. University and school samples

Study (Full Reference)	N	Sample Characteristics	Method/Design	Measures/Results
				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Other <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Because it was sexually arousing = 0% <p>Men were more likely than women to report perpetrating in retaliation for being hit first and because of jealousy. Women were more likely than men to report perpetrating to show anger, to get control over the other person, and in retaliation for emotional hurt.</p> <p>Men Victims (<i>n</i> = 33) Men reported why they thought their female partners had perpetrated violence against them:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Power/Control <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ To feel more powerful = 20.4% ○ To get control over other person = 26.5% • Self-defense = 4.1% • Expression of Negative Emotion <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ To show anger = 59.2% ○ Anger displaced onto partner = 18.4% • Communication <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Inability to express self verbally = 32.7% ○ To get attention = 22.4% ○ To prove love = 10.2% • Retaliation <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ In retaliation for being hit first = 0% ○ In retaliation for emotional hurt = 63.3% ○ To punish person for wrong behavior = 28.6% • Jealousy = 30.6% • Other <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Because it was sexually arousing = 0%

PASK#10 Online Tables – Table 3. University and school samples

Study (Full Reference)	N	Sample Characteristics	Method/Design	Measures/Results
				<p>Women Victims (<i>n</i> = 82) Women reported why they thought their male partners had perpetrated violence against them:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Power/Control <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ To feel more powerful = 31.5% ○ To get control over other person = 55.6% • Self-defense = 4.8% • Expression of Negative Emotion <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ To show anger = 40.3% ○ Anger displaced onto partner = 10.5% • Communication <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Inability to express self verbally = 28.2% ○ To get attention = 17.7% ○ To prove love = 8.9% • Retaliation <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ In retaliation for being hit first = 21.7% ○ In retaliation for emotional hurt = 40.3% ○ To punish person for wrong behavior = 26.6% • Jealousy = 41.9% • Other <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Because it was sexually arousing = 2.4% <p>Male victims were more likely than female victims to report that their partner perpetrated violence against them in show anger and in retaliation for emotional hurt. Female victims were more likely than male victims to report that their partner perpetrated violence against them to get control over them, and in retaliation for being hit first.</p>

PASK#10 Online Tables – Table 3. University and school samples

Study (Full Reference)	N	Sample Characteristics	Method/Design	Measures/Results
<p>Stets, J. E., & Pirog-Good, M. A. (1990). Interpersonal control and courtship aggression. <i>Journal of Social and Personal Relationships</i>, 7, 371-394. doi: 10.1177/0265407590073005</p>	<p>$n = 583$; Heterosexual college students</p>	<p>Marital Status: All participants were involved in heterosexual dating relationships.</p> <p>Race: White = 100%</p> <p>Income: N/R</p> <p>Age: Upper division college students</p> <p>Geography: Midwestern University</p>	<p>Cross-sectional, Self-report; multiple choice questionnaire; college sample; A random sample of upper level classes from a listing of courses at a large Midwestern university.</p>	<p>Measures: Violence was measured with the Conflict Tactics Scale (CTS), Interpersonal Control Scale (Stets', 1988), and the Rosenberg Self Esteem Scale (Rosenberg, 1979)</p> <p>Results:</p> <p>Men ($n = 335$; correlations with perpetrating minor and severe aggression are reported):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Power/Control <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Attempt to control = .19 Minor, non-significant for severe ○ Successful control = .22 Minor, non-significant for severe • Self-defense N/R • Expression of Negative Emotion N/R • Communication N/R • Retaliation N/R • Jealousy N/R • Other N/R <p>Women ($n = 448$; correlations with perpetrating minor and severe aggression are reported)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Power/Control N/R <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Attempt to control = .21 Minor, non-significant for Severe ○ Successful control = .16 Minor, non-significant for Severe • Self-defense N/R • Expression of Negative Emotion N/R • Communication N/R • Retaliation N/R

PASK#10 Online Tables – Table 3. University and school samples

Study (Full Reference)	N	Sample Characteristics	Method/Design	Measures/Results
<p>Arias, I., & Johnson, P. (1989). Evaluations of physical aggression among intimate dyads. <i>Journal of Interpersonal Violence</i>, 4, 298-307. doi:10.1177/088626089004003004</p>	<p><i>n</i> = 202; Men = 103 Women = 99</p>	<p>Marital Status: Men: Currently exclusively dating someone = 44%</p> <p><i>M</i> of current relationship = 1 year</p> <p>Women: Currently exclusively dating someone = 57%</p> <p><i>M</i> of current relationship = 1 year</p> <p>Race: N/R</p> <p>Income: N/R</p> <p>Age: Men: Approximately 20 yrs old</p> <p>Women:</p>	<p>Cross-sectional; Self-report; University sample</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Jealousy N/R • Other N/R <p>Measures: Subjects were presented with 17 situations during which an individual might slap his/her partner. In the vignettes, the perpetrators' gender was manipulated. Subjects indicated whether violence (which consisted of slapping the partner or severe aggression) was legitimate. Four contexts were presented (slapping in self-defense, slapping to protect one's child, slapping because partner had been sexually unfaithful, slapping partner because they hit first/retaliation).</p> <p>Results: Male violence toward women as perceived by women (<i>n</i> = 99):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Power/Control N/R • Self-defense = 70% • Expression of Negative Emotion N/R • Communication N/R • Retaliation <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Reciprocation of violence = 28% • Jealousy = 20% • Other <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Defense of child = 83% <p>Male violence toward women as perceived by men (<i>n</i> = 103):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Power/Control N/R • Self-defense = 53%

PASK#10 Online Tables – Table 3. University and school samples

Study (Full Reference)	N	Sample Characteristics	Method/Design	Measures/Results
		<p>Approximately 19 yrs old</p> <p>Geography: N/R</p>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Expression of Negative Emotion N/R • Communication N/R • Retaliation <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Reciprocation of violence = 40% • Jealousy <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Sexual infidelity by victim = 44% • Other <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Defense of a child = 78% <p>Female violence toward men as perceived by women (n = 99):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Power/Control N/R • Self-defense = 84% • Expression of Negative Emotion N/R • Communication N/R • Retaliation <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Reciprocation of violence = 36% • Jealousy <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Sexual infidelity by victim = 24% • Other <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Defense of a child = 89% <p>Female violence toward men as perceived by men (n = 103):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Power/Control N/R • Self-defense = 79% • Expression of Negative Emotion N/R • Communication N/R • Retaliation <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Reciprocation of violence = 52%

PASK#10 Online Tables – Table 3. University and school samples

Study (Full Reference)	N	Sample Characteristics	Method/Design	Measures/Results
				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Jealousy <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Sexual infidelity by victim = 42% • Other <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Defense of a child = 85%

PASK#10 Online Tables – Table 3. University and school samples

Study (Full Reference)	N	Sample Characteristics	Method/Design	Measures/Results
<p>Dutton, D. G., & Strachan, C. E. (1987). Motivational needs for power and spouse-specific assertiveness in assaultive and nonassaultive men. <i>Violence and Victims</i>, 2(3) 145-156. Retrieved from EBSCOhost.</p>	<p>$n = 75$; Men only; Divided into three groups (satisfactorily married, martially conflicted, and wife assaulters)</p>	<p>Marital Status: Married = 100%</p> <p>Race: N/R</p> <p>Income: N/R</p> <p>Age: $M = 32.8$ years</p> <p>Geography: N/R</p>	<p>Cross-sectional; Community sample; Participants consisted of 25 wife assaulters, 25 maritally conflicted non-assaultive males, and 25 demographically matched male controls who reported that they were satisfactorily married.</p>	<p>The present research used a TAT scoring system to assess power motivation in assaultive and non-assaultive males.</p> <p>Measures: Thematic Apperception Test (TAT); Spouse Specific Assertiveness (SSA) Scale; Conflict Tactics Scale (CTS)</p> <p>Results: Correlations between variables across the whole sample are presented. Expressed violence is related to a higher need to control and a reduced ability to verbally communicate with one's spouse.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Power/Control $r = .69$ • Self-defense N/R • Expression of Negative Emotion N/R • Communication $r = -.72$ • Retaliation N/R • Jealousy N/R • Other N/R

PASK#10 Online Tables – Table 3. University and school samples

Study (Full Reference)	N	Sample Characteristics	Method/Design	Measures/Results
<p>Mason, A., & Blankenship, V. (1987). Power and affiliation motivation, stress, and abuse in intimate relationships. <i>Journal of Personality and Social Psychology</i>, 52(1), 203-210. doi: 10.1037/0022-3514.52.1.203</p>	<p>$n = 155$ undergraduates; Men = 48 Women = 107</p>	<p>Marital Status: College undergraduates who were either, married, cohabiting, engaged, or involved in a dating relationship served as subjects for this experiment.</p> <p>Race: N/R</p> <p>Income: N/R</p> <p>Age: Men: $M = 23.8$ yrs Range = 17 – 44 yrs</p> <p>Women: $M = 20.2$ yrs Range = 18 – 39 yrs</p> <p>Geography: Oakland</p>	<p>Cross sectional; Self-report; college sample; Participants were asked to create imaginative stories from the TAT; Subjects were enrolled in introductory psychology and research and design classes at Oakland University during the winter of 1983 and the winter of 1984 and were required to participate as research subjects in psychological studies.</p>	<p>Measures: Violence was measured with the Modified Conflict Tactics Scale, Thematic Apperception Test (TAT); Life Experiences Survey (LES)</p> <p>Results:</p> <p>Men ($n = 48$)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Power/Control (higher n Power = more abuse) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ High need for power ($n = 24$) $M = 2.58$ acts ○ Low need for power ($n = 24$) $M = 0.92$ acts • Self-defense N/R • Expression of Negative Emotion N/R • Communication N/R • Retaliation N/R • Jealousy N/R • Other N/R <p>Women ($n = 107$)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Power/Control <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ no relationship found with perpetrated abuse • Self-defense N/R • Expression of Negative Emotion <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ High stress ($n = 57$) $M = 3.00$ (in conjunction with a high need for affiliation and low activity inhibition were most abusive) ○ Low stress ($n = 50$) $M = 1.24$ ○ Also a main effect for high stress for

PASK#10 Online Tables – Table 3. University and school samples

Study (Full Reference)	N	Sample Characteristics	Method/Design	Measures/Results
		University		<p>women but not for men</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Communication N/R • Retaliation N/R • Jealousy N/R • Other N/R
<p>Makepeace, J. M. (1986). Gender differences in courtship violence victimization. <i>Family Relations</i>, 35(3), 383-388. doi: 10.2307/584365</p>	<p><i>n</i> = 391 students</p> <p>Men = 45.3%</p> <p>Women = 54.7%</p>	<p>Marital Status: N/R</p> <p>Race: White = 93%</p> <p>Income: N/R</p> <p>Age: <i>M</i> = 21.5 years</p> <p>Geography: 7 colleges located in Kansas, Oregon, North Dakota, Utah, Illinois, and Minnesota</p>	<p>Cross-sectional; Self-report; University sample; Students came from sociology, psychology, and general education classes from 7 different colleges; The 391 participant sample was selected from 2,338 of worst incident data of courtship violence experiences.</p>	<p>Measures: Questionnaire explored background and dating experience, personal attitudes, courtship violence (amount and type), and first and worst incident details (scales similar to Conflict Tactics Scale). This study focuses on the worst incident data of 391 cases with courtship violence experiences.</p> <p>Results:</p> <p>Men (<i>n</i> = 127)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Power/Control <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ To get something = 3.9% ○ Intimidate = 21.3% • Self-defense = 18.1% • Expression of Negative Emotion <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Uncontrollable anger = 28.3% • Communication N/R • Retaliation = 16.5% <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ To harm = 2.4% • Jealousy N/R • Other = 10.3% <p>Women (<i>n</i> = 264)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Power/Control <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ To get something = 2.3% ○ Intimidate = 6.8%

PASK#10 Online Tables – Table 3. University and school samples

Study (Full Reference)	N	Sample Characteristics	Method/Design	Measures/Results
				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Self-defense = 35.6% • Expression of Negative Emotion <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Uncontrollable anger = 24.2% • Communication N/R • Retaliation = 18.9% <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ To harm = 8.3% • Jealousy N/R • Other = 13.7%

PASK#10 Online Tables – Table 4. Clinical samples

Study (Full Reference)	N	Sample Characteristics	Method/Design	Measures/Results
Clinical Samples				
<p>Ross, J. M., & Babcock, J. C. (2009). Proactive and reactive violence among intimate partner violent men diagnosed with antisocial and borderline personality disorder. <i>Journal of Family Violence</i>, 24(8), 607-617. doi: 10.1007/s10896-009-9259-y</p>	<p><i>n</i> = 124 couples</p>	<p>Marital Status: N/R</p> <p>Race: African Am. = 57% Caucasian = 24% Hispanic = 15% Other = 4%</p> <p>Income: <i>M</i> family income = \$27,392 /year</p> <p>Age: Men <i>M</i> = 32 yrs Women <i>M</i> = 30 yrs</p> <p>Geography: N/R</p>	<p>Cross-sectional; Self-report questionnaires; independent interviews; clinical sample; Participants were recruited upon responding to ads in free, local newspapers and flyers soliciting “couples experiencing conflict.”</p>	<p>Measures: Violence was measured with the Revised Conflict Tactics Scale (CTS2), SCID-II used to assess Antisocial Personality disorder and Borderline personality disorder. Separately, women were asked to describe the most recent and the worst violence incidents of male to female violence (150 incidents were described by 80 women).</p> <p>Results: (<i>n</i> = 150 incidents of men’s violence as predicted by wife’s behavior immediately before violence; z-scores reported)</p> <p>Anti-Social Personality Disorder (<i>n</i> = 18)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Power/Control <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Wife’s dominance/belligerence <i>z</i> = 2.58 • Self-defense <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ When wife commits offensive violence predicts violence <i>z</i> = 3.41 • Expression of Negative Emotion <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Wife distress (non-significant) ○ When wife withdrawals (non-significant) • Communication <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ When wife has verbal defense (non-significant) ○ When wife complains (non-significant) • Retaliation <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ When wife threat (non-significant) • Jealousy N/R • Other <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ When wife acts prosocial (non-

PASK#10 Online Tables – Table 4. Clinical samples

Study (Full Reference)	N	Sample Characteristics	Method/Design	Measures/Results
				<p>significant)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Context predicts violence $z = -2.02$ <p>Borderline Personality Disorder Group ($n = 23$)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Power/Control <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Wife’s dominance/belligerence (non-significant) • Self-defense <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ When wife commits offensive violence (non-significant) • Expression of Negative Emotion <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Wife distress $z = 4.36$ ○ When wife withdrawals (non-significant) • Communication <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ When wife has verbal defense (non-significant) ○ When wife complains (non-significant) • Retaliation <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ When wife makes threat (non-significant) • Jealousy N/R • Other <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ When wife acts prosocial (non-significant) ○ Context predicts violence (non-significant) <p>No Disorder group ($n = 83$)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Power/Control <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Wife’s dominance/belligerence (non-significant) • Self-defense

PASK#10 Online Tables – Table 4. Clinical samples

Study (Full Reference)	N	Sample Characteristics	Method/Design	Measures/Results
				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ When wife commits offensive violence predicts violence $z = 6.28$ ● Expression of Negative Emotion <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Wife distress $z = -2.57$ ○ When wife withdrawals $z = 3.22$ ● Communication <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ When wife has verbal defense (non-significant) ○ When wife complains $z = 2.35$ ● Retaliation <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ When wife makes threat $z = 2.15$ ● Jealousy N/R ● Other <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ When wife acts prosocial (non-significant) ○ Context predicts husband violence $z = -2.94$ <p>BPD/co-morbid men appear to use violence more reactively, while ASPD men tend to use violence both proactively and reactively.</p>
<p>Downs, W. R., Rindels, B., & Atkinson, C. (2007). Women's use of physical and nonphysical self-defense strategies during incidents of partner violence.</p>	<p>$n = 447$; Women only</p>	<p>Marital Status: Married at least once previously = 77.4% Married = 12.1% Cohabiting = 6.2% Separated = 20.6%</p>	<p>Cross-sectional; Self-report; Interview; Clinical; Participants were recruited from 7 domestic violence programs ($n = 222$) and 5 substance use disorder programs in a Midwestern state ($n =$</p>	<p>Measures: Women were asked about the specific violent incident that most upset her or was most harmful to her as well as a typical incident. A total of 456 incidents were described. Women said they could protect themselves in 203 incidents. These formed the basis for the current qualitative analyses which coded if the woman did initiate the violence, what was her motivation for doing so.</p>

PASK#10 Online Tables – Table 4. Clinical samples

Study (Full Reference)	N	Sample Characteristics	Method/Design	Measures/Results
<p><i>Violence Against Women, 13, 28-45.</i> doi: 10.1177/1077801206294807</p>		<p>Divorced = 25.6% Single = 33.9%</p> <p>Race: Caucasian = 77.6% African Am. = 16.8% Other = 5.5%</p> <p>Income: Most of the women were not fully employed = 82.5%</p> <p>Not graduated from high school = 22%</p> <p>Age: Median = 33.54yrs</p> <p>Geography: A Midwestern state</p>	<p>225).</p>	<p>Substance Use Disorder program (<i>n</i> = 91 incidents of intimate partner violence (IPV) in which the women protected herself in some way):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Power/Control N/R • Physical Self-defense = 49.5% • Expression of Negative Emotion N/R • Communication N/R • Retaliation N/R • Other <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Non-physical means of self-defense = 26.4% <p>Domestic Violence program (<i>n</i> = 112 incidents of intimate partner violence (IPV)):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Power/Control N/R • Physical Self-defense = 39.3% • Express of Negative Emotion N/R • Communication N/R • Retaliation N/R • Other <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Non-physical means of self-defense = 57.1%
<p>Kernsmith, P. (2005). Exerting power or striking back: A gendered comparison</p>	<p><i>n</i> = 125 domestic violence</p>	<p>Marital Status: N/R Heterosexual = 90%</p>	<p>Cross sectional; Self-report; Survey; Clinical sample; Participants were recruited from a</p>	<p>Measures: Modified 19-item Perceived Behavioral Control Scale (Tolman, Edelson, & Fendrich, 1996), 6 items measuring the emotional context and 16 items measuring reasons for using violence were administered</p>

PASK#10 Online Tables – Table 4. Clinical samples

Study (Full Reference)	N	Sample Characteristics	Method/Design	Measures/Results
<p>of motivations for domestic violence perpetration. <i>Violence and Victims</i>, 20, 173-185. doi: 10.1891/vivi.2005.20.2.173</p>	<p>perpetrators Men = 53% Women = 47%</p>	<p>Race: Chicano/Latino = 46.6% Caucasian = 33% African Am./Black = 9.7% Biracial = 5.8% Asian Am./Pacific Islander = 3.9% Native American = 1%</p> <p>Income: Median income = \$37,000</p> <p>Had high school diploma or less = 42%</p> <p>Age: <i>M</i> = 34 yrs</p> <p>Geography: Los Angeles County, CA</p>	<p>batterers' treatment program in Los Angeles County, CA (89% of these participants were court-referred).</p>	<p>(Follingstad, Wright, & Lloyd, 1991).</p> <p>Results:</p> <p>Men (<i>n</i> = 60)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Power/Control (<i>M</i> = .79) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Stop partner from doing something = 15% ○ Partner challenged my authority = % N/R • Self-defense = 17% • Expression of Negative Emotion <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Anger = 10% ○ When under stress = 28% • Communication <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ When partner is nagging them = 40% ○ When partner starts an argument = 32% • Retaliation (<i>M</i> = 1.11) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Getting back at for emotional pain = 22% • Jealousy (<i>M</i> = .78) • Other N/R <p>Women (<i>n</i> = 54)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Power/Control (<i>M</i> = .85) (no difference from men) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Stop partner from doing something = 21% ○ When didn't get respect I deserved = 48% • Self-defense = 29% • Expression of Negative Emotion <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Anger = 29% • Communication

PASK#10 Online Tables – Table 4. Clinical samples

Study (Full Reference)	N	Sample Characteristics	Method/Design	Measures/Results
				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ When partner isn't listening = 30% ● Retaliation ($M = 1.50$) (higher for women) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Getting back at for emotional pain = 42% ○ When partner is trying to control them = 37% ● Jealousy ($M = 1.03$) (no difference from men) ● Other <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Women more likely than men to say they use violence when they perceive a threat to their personal liberty = % N/R ○ Women also more likely to use violence in response to previous abuse than were men = % N/R
<p>Babcock, J. C., Costa, D. M., Green, C. E., & Eckhardt, C. I. (2004). What situations induce intimate partner violence? A reliability and validity study of the proximal antecedents to violent episodes (PAVE) scale. <i>Journal of Family Psychology</i>, 18(3), 433-442. doi: 10.1037/0893-3200.18.3.433</p>	<p>Study 1: $n = 162$; Men only</p>	<p>Study 1: Marital Status: Remained involved in a romantic relationship with their partner = 57%</p> <p>Race: African Am. = 12% Hispanic = 17% Caucasian = 47% Other = 6%</p> <p>Income: N/R</p>	<p>Study 1: Cross-sectional; Clinical sample (Participants were court ordered); Self-report; Men were recruited from two intervention facilities for perpetrators of intimate partner violence. Sixty-nine men were participants in a batterer intervention program located in a suburb of Dallas, TX; Ninety-three men were recruited from a program located in Houston, TX.</p>	<p>Study 1: Measures: Proximal antecedents to violent episode (PAVE) scale. For thirty items, respondent answered how likely they were to be violent in response to the presented antecedent.</p> <p>Results: Total scores on the PAVE were correlated with self-report violence on the Conflict Tactics Scale (CTS), $r = .24$.</p> <p>Three factors emerged from the men's responses to the PAVE. These factors accounted for 69% of the variance in the total scale.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Power/Control , $\alpha = .95$ ● Self-defense N/R ● Expression of Negative Emotion N/R ● Communication N/R

PASK#10 Online Tables – Table 4. Clinical samples

Study (Full Reference)	N	Sample Characteristics	Method/Design	Measures/Results															
		<p>Age: M = 35.25 yrs</p> <p>Geography: Dallas, TX and Houston, TX</p>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Retaliation <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◦ Following verbal abuse, alpha = .95 • Jealousy = .74 (alpha) • Other N/R <p>In a second step, the men were divided into four groups: Generally Violent Borderline Antisocial Family Only</p> <table border="0" style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <tr> <td style="border-bottom: 1px solid black; padding: 2px;"><u>To Control</u></td> <td style="padding: 2px;">YES</td> <td style="padding: 2px;">Somewhat</td> <td style="padding: 2px;">Low</td> <td style="padding: 2px;">Low</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="border-bottom: 1px solid black; padding: 2px;"><u>Jealousy</u></td> <td style="padding: 2px;">Somewhat</td> <td style="padding: 2px;">YES</td> <td style="padding: 2px;">Low</td> <td style="padding: 2px;">Low</td> </tr> <tr> <td style="border-bottom: 1px solid black; padding: 2px;"><u>Retaliation</u></td> <td style="padding: 2px;">YES</td> <td style="padding: 2px;">Somewhat</td> <td style="padding: 2px;">Low</td> <td style="padding: 2px;">Low</td> </tr> </table>	<u>To Control</u>	YES	Somewhat	Low	Low	<u>Jealousy</u>	Somewhat	YES	Low	Low	<u>Retaliation</u>	YES	Somewhat	Low	Low
<u>To Control</u>	YES	Somewhat	Low	Low															
<u>Jealousy</u>	Somewhat	YES	Low	Low															
<u>Retaliation</u>	YES	Somewhat	Low	Low															
<p>Lavoie, F., Robitaille, L., & Hebert, M. (2000). Teen dating relationships and aggression: An exploratory study. <i>Violence Against Women, 6</i>(6) 6-36. doi: 10.1177/10778010022181688</p>	<p>n = 24 teens;</p> <p>Boys (n = 8)</p> <p>Girls (n = 16)</p>	<p>Marital Status: N/R</p> <p>Race: N/R</p> <p>Income: N/R</p> <p>Age: Range = 14 to 19 yrs</p> <p>Geography: Upper and lower middle class neighborhood of Quebec City, Canada</p>	<p>Cross-sectional; Qualitative exploratory study; Five focus and discussion groups; Interview; Participants came from a teen center (n = 18) and then a residential center for pregnant teen girls (6 girls living in the pregnant teen facility) in Canada.</p>	<p>Measures: Interviews and group discussions were centered on three questions that were transcribed and coded. The three focus topics were love, adolescent heterosexual couple relationships, and violence in this context.</p> <p>Results (Qualitative only):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Power/Control – yes (mostly for boys) • Self-defense – yes (both sexes) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◦ Perceived as a positive response by girls • Expression of Negative Emotion - yes <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◦ Frustration • Communication - yes <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◦ Emotional abuse perceived as violent ◦ Girl talks too much ◦ End result of being too passive ◦ Violence occurs in because of victim’s strong need for affiliation • Retaliation - yes 															

PASK#10 Online Tables – Table 4. Clinical samples

Study (Full Reference)	N	Sample Characteristics	Method/Design	Measures/Results
				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ In response to provocation ● Jealousy - yes (all agreed it was the main cause) ● Other <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Consensual aggressive sex was also discussed ○ Alcohol and drugs were also thought to be factors ○ Some girls are seen as wanting to be victims ○ Boys influenced by violent or delinquent peers and group norms
<p>Cascardi, M. & Vivian, D. (1995). Context for specific episodes of marital violence: Gender and severity of violence differences. <i>Journal of Family Violence</i>, 10(3), 265-293. doi: 10.1007/BF02110993</p>	<p><i>n</i> = 62 couples; Men = 31 Women = 31</p>	<p>Marital Status: Couples had been (men and women) married about 7 years</p> <p>Race: N/R</p> <p>Income: N/R</p> <p>Age: Men <i>M</i> = 34.18 years Women <i>M</i> = 31.12 years</p> <p>Geography: University of New York at Stony Brook</p>	<p>Cross-sectional; Self-report; Clinical sample; Interview</p>	<p>Measures: Semi-structured marital interview. Specific questions from SMI-aggression and SMI-victimization coded: current stressors, setting events, outcome, and perceived function.</p> <p>Results: Mild Aggression Husbands (<i>n</i> = 29) Husband's reports of why they use mild marital violence:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Power/Control <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Anger/coercion = 65% ● Self-defense = 10% ● Expression of Negative Emotion <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Anger only = 34% ○ Stress = 0% ● Communication N/R ● Retaliation <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Provocation = 7% ● Jealousy = 7%

PASK#10 Online Tables – Table 4. Clinical samples

Study (Full Reference)	N	Sample Characteristics	Method/Design	Measures/Results
				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Other <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Personality = 0% ○ Substance Use = 17% ○ Don't know = 0% <p>Mild Victimization Husbands (<i>n</i> = 13) Husband's reports of why wives perpetrate mild marital violence:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Power/Control <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Anger/coercion = 33% • Self-defense = 8% • Expression of Negative Emotion <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Anger only = 42% ○ Stress = 0% • Communication N/R • Retaliation <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Provocation = 8% • Jealousy = 0% • Other <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Personality = 8% ○ Substance Use = 0% ○ Don't know = 17% <p>Mild Aggression Wives (<i>n</i> = 20) Wives' reports of why they perpetrate mild violence:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Power/Control <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Anger/coercion = 50% • Self-defense = 5% • Expression of Negative Emotion <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Anger only = 40% ○ Stress = 10%

PASK#10 Online Tables – Table 4. Clinical samples

Study (Full Reference)	N	Sample Characteristics	Method/Design	Measures/Results
				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Communication N/R • Retaliation <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Provocation = 5% • Jealousy = 0% • Other <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Personality = 5% ○ Substance Use = 0% ○ Don't know = 5% <p>Mild Victimization Wives (n = 18) Wives reports of why husband's perpetrate mild marital violence:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Power/Control <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Anger/coercion =39% • Self-defense = 5% • Expression of Negative Emotion <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Anger only = 28% ○ Stress = 0% • Communication N/R • Retaliation <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Provocation = 0% • Jealousy = 11% • Other <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Personality = 0% ○ Substance Use = 28% ○ Don't know = 11% <p>Severe Aggression Husbands (n = 14) Husband's reports of why they perpetrate severe marital violence:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Power/Control

PASK#10 Online Tables – Table 4. Clinical samples

Study (Full Reference)	N	Sample Characteristics	Method/Design	Measures/Results
				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Anger/coercion = 57% ● Self-defense = 0% ● Expression of Negative Emotion <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Anger only = 29% ○ Stress = 7% ● Communication N/R ● Retaliation <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Provocation = 7% ● Jealousy = 0% ● Other <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Personality = 7% ○ Substance Use = 0% ○ Don't know = 0% <p>Severe Victimization Husbands (<i>n</i> = 32) Husband's reports of why wives perpetrate severe marital violence:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Power/Control <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Anger/coercion = 27% ● Self-defense = 3% ● Expression of Negative Emotion <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Anger only = 50% ○ Stress = 0% ● Communication N/R ● Retaliation <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Provocation = 8% ● Jealousy = 0% ● Other <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Personality = 10% ○ Substance Use = 3% ○ Don't know = 3%

PASK#10 Online Tables – Table 4. Clinical samples

Study (Full Reference)	N	Sample Characteristics	Method/Design	Measures/Results
				<p>Severe Aggression Wives (n = 25) Wives' reports of why they perpetrate severe marital violence:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Power/Control <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Anger/coercion = 40% • Self-defense = 20% • Expression of Negative Emotion <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Anger only = 52% ○ Stress = 4% • Communication N/R • Retaliation <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Provocation = 12% • Jealousy = 0% • Other <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Personality = 4% ○ Substance Use = 8% ○ Don't know = 0% <p>Severe Victimization Wives (n = 23) Wives reports of why husband's perpetrate severe marital violence:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Power/Control <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Anger/coercion = 30% • Self-defense = 5% • Expression of Negative Emotion <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Anger only = 35% ○ Stress = 4% • Communication N/R • Retaliation <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Provocation = 9%

PASK#10 Online Tables – Table 4. Clinical samples

Study (Full Reference)	N	Sample Characteristics	Method/Design	Measures/Results
				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Jealousy = 9% • Other <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Personality = 9% ○ Substance Use = 22% ○ Don't know = 17%
<p>Prince, J. E. & Arias, I. (1994). The role of perceived control and the desirability of control among abusive and nonabusive husbands. <i>The American Journal of Family Therapy</i>, 22(2), 126-134. doi:10.1080/01926189408251306</p>	<p><i>n</i> = 72 Men only; 47 non-abusive 25 abusive</p>	<p>Marital Status: Men had been married for a minimum of two years. Nonabusive men <i>M</i> = 8.7 yrs Abusive men <i>M</i> = 4.9 yrs</p> <p>Race: Nonabusive men White = 90% African Am. = 2% Hispanic = 4% Asian = 4% Other = 0% Abusive men White = 88% African Am. = 4% Hispanic = 4% Asian = 0% Other = 4%</p> <p>Income:</p>	<p>Cross-sectional; Community and clinical sample; Self-report; The sample was recruited via announcements placed in the community for participation in a marital study for men married a minimum of two years. Some of the abusive participants (<i>n</i> = 6) were recruited from a court-mandated therapy program.</p>	<p>Measures: Violence measure by the Conflict Tactics Scale (CTS); Preference motivation to control the events in one's life was measured by the Desirability of Control Scale and perceived control over life events was measured by the Spheres of Control Scale.</p> <p>Results:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Power/Control <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Desired Control = yes ○ Perceived Control = yes • Self-defense N/R • Expression of Negative Emotion N/R • Communication N/R • Retaliation N/R • Jealousy N/R • Other <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Self-Esteem = yes <p>Two patterns showed increased risk for violence: 1) Low self-esteem, low desirability of control, and low personal control (43.5% of men in this category were abusive) 2) High self-esteem, high desirability of control, and low personal control (38.9% of men in this category were abusive)</p>

PASK#10 Online Tables – Table 4. Clinical samples

Study (Full Reference)	N	Sample Characteristics	Method/Design	Measures/Results
		<p>Nonabusive men \$20, 077 per year</p> <p>Abusive men \$ 14, 542 per year</p> <p>Age: Nonabusive men <i>M</i> = 32.98 yrs</p> <p>Abusive men <i>M</i> = 27.28 yrs</p> <p>Geography: N/R</p>		
<p>Campbell, J. C., Oliver, C., & Bullock, L. (1993). Why battering during pregnancy? <i>Clinical Issues in Perinatal and Women's Health Nursing</i>, 4(3), 343-349. Retrieved from EBSCOhost.</p>	<p><i>n</i> = 97; Women only</p>	<p>Marital Status: N/R</p> <p>Race: African Am. = 47% White = 49% Native Am. or Puerto Rican = 4%</p> <p>Income: Women battered during pregnancy: total family income = \$18,688</p> <p>Women not battered during</p>	<p>Cross-sectional; Community and clinical sample; Self-report; Survey; The sample for this study was taken from a larger sample of battered women recruited by newspaper advertisement and bulletin board postings from two demographically distinct cities for a study of women's responses to battering.</p>	<p>Measures: Violence measured by a modification of the Conflict Tactics Scale (CTS); Women who said they had been beaten during pregnancy were asked why they thought the violence had happened. Answers were recorded verbatim.</p> <p>Results: Women reported on their partner's motives for violence while they were pregnant (<i>n</i> = 27):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Power/Control N/R • Self-defense N/R • Expression of Negative Emotion <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Anger = 14.8% (directed toward the infant) ○ Anger against the women or "business as usual" = 46% • Communication N/R • Retaliation N/R

PASK#10 Online Tables – Table 4. Clinical samples

Study (Full Reference)	N	Sample Characteristics	Method/Design	Measures/Results
		<p>pregnancy: total family income = \$18,824</p> <p>Age: Women battered during pregnancy: <i>M</i> = 34 yrs</p> <p>Women not battered during pregnancy: <i>M</i> = 30 yrs</p> <p>Geography: See Campbell (1989)</p>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Jealousy of unborn child =18.5% • Other: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Pregnancy specific (but not directed against the infant) =14.8%
<p>Dutton, D. G., & Browning, J. J. (1988). Power struggles and intimacy anxieties as causative factors of wife assault. In G. W. Russell, G. W. Russell (Eds.), <i>Violence in intimate relationships</i> (pp. 163-175). Costa Mesa, CA US: PMA Publishing Corp.</p>	<p><i>n</i> = 54; Men only</p>	<p>Marital Status: N/R</p> <p>Race: N/R</p> <p>Income: N/R</p> <p>Age: N/R</p> <p>Geography: N/R Researchers report that all three groups of men were</p>	<p>Cross-sectional; Self-report; Physically Aggressive group (<i>n</i> = 18) were convicted of wife assault and were attending a treatment group for spousal violence; Verbally Aggressive group (<i>n</i> = 18) were men attending counseling groups for marital conflict; Nonaggressive group (<i>n</i> = 18) were solicited</p>	<p>Measures: Used three videotapes that depicted a heterosexual couple involved in conflict that depicted either an abandonment (woman attempted to move away from the man) situation, engulfment situation (woman attempted to move closer to the man), or intimately neutral situation (no attempted movement). Participants rated their level of perceived anger had they been the male in the videotape.</p> <p>Results: Aggressive group (<i>n</i> = 18; <i>M</i> reported)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Power/Control N/R • Self-defense N/R • Expression of Negative Emotion N/R

PASK#10 Online Tables – Table 4. Clinical samples

Study (Full Reference)	N	Sample Characteristics	Method/Design	Measures/Results
Retrieved from EBSCOhost.		demographically similar.	through ads in local newspapers.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Communication N/R • Retaliation N/R • Jealousy N/R • Other N/R <p>Verbal Aggressive group ($n = 18$; M reported)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Power/Control N/R • Self-defense N/R • Expression of Negative Emotion N/R • Communication N/R • Retaliation N/R • Jealousy N/R • Other N/R <p>Nonaggressive group ($n = 18$; M reported)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Power/Control N/R • Self-defense N/R • Expression of Negative Emotion N/R • Communication N/R • Retaliation N/R • Jealousy N/R • Other N/R
Saunders, D. G. (1986). When battered women use violence: Husband abuse or self-defense? <i>Violence and Victims, 1</i> , 47-60. Retrieved from EBSCOhost.	$n = 52$; Battered women only	<p>Marital Status: Married = 23%</p> <p>Separated/divorced = 56%</p> <p>Single = 19%</p> <p>Race: N/R</p>	Clinical sample; Cross sectional; Self-report questionnaires; The subjects were part of a larger study on the police response to battered women (Saunders & Size, 1980); Participants	<p>Measure: Women completed a modification of the Conflicts Tactics Scale. 75% reported perpetrating mild violence and 60% reported some type of severe violence. The author created 6-item measure of motivations (three items for minor violence, and the same three items for severe violence).</p> <p>Results: Minor IPV ($n = 30$)</p>

PASK#10 Online Tables – Table 4. Clinical samples

Study (Full Reference)	N	Sample Characteristics	Method/Design	Measures/Results
		<p>Income: N/R</p> <p>Age: N/R</p> <p>Geography: The Midwest</p>	<p>recruited from battered women seeking help from five shelters ($n = 45$) and a counseling agency ($n = 7$).</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Power/Control N/R • Self-defense = 79% (31% of those reporting violence always reported this motivation) • Expression of Negative Emotion N/R • Communication N/R • Retaliation = 65% (23% of those reporting violence always reported this motivation) • Jealousy N/R • Other <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Initiating attack = 27% (3% of those reporting violence always reported this motivation) <p>Severe IPV ($n = 22$)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Power/Control N/R • Self-defense = 71% (39% of those reporting severe violence said this was always their motivation) • Expression of Negative Emotion N/R • Communication N/R • Retaliation = 60% (32% of those reporting severe violence said this was always their motivation) • Jealousy N/R • Other <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Initiating attack = 12% (none of those reporting severe violence said that this was always their motive)

PASK#10 Online Tables – Table 5. Justice or legal samples

Study (Full Reference)	N	Sample Characteristics	Method/Design	Measures/Results
Justice or Legal Sample				
<p>Ross, J. M. (2011). Personality and situational correlates of self-reported reasons for intimate partner violence among women versus men referred for batterers' intervention. <i>Behavioral Sciences and the Law</i>, 29, 711-727. doi: 10.1002/bsl.1004</p>	<p><i>n</i> = 86; referred to batterers' intervention as IPV offenders</p> <p>Men <i>n</i> = 56 Women <i>n</i> = 30</p>	<p>Marital Status: N/R</p> <p>Race: African Am. = 34% Caucasian = 49% Latino = 5% Asian = 2% Other = 10%</p> <p>Income: Earning < \$20,000 per year = 74% Earning b/w \$20,000 and \$40,000 per year = 15% Earning > \$40,000 per year = 11%</p> <p>Age: Avg. = 30 years SD = 10.46</p>	<p>Cross-sectional; Self-report; Individual interview about relationship conflict; Justice/legal sample; Participants were recruited from an agency providing court-ordered batterer intervention services to women and men identified as IPV offenders by the court. The participants were referred to the agency for their perpetration of IPV in the context of a heterosexual, romantic relationship.</p>	<p>Measures: Reasons for Violence (RFV) Scale was administered to measure the proportion of violent incidents motivated by one or more of 29 potential reasons for violence. The Revised Conflict Tactics Scale (CTS2) was used to measure participants' reports of their and their partners' physical aggression. The Controlling Behaviors Scale (CBS) was used so participants could report on their own and their partners' use of intimate partner control.</p> <p>Results:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Power/Control – yes (dominate/punish) • Self-defense – yes (more for wives than husbands) • Expression of Negative Emotion - yes • Communication - yes (influence) • Retaliation - yes • Jealousy - yes • Other - yes

PASK#10 Online Tables – Table 5. Justice or legal samples

Study (Full Reference)	N	Sample Characteristics	Method/Design	Measures/Results
<p>Swan S. C., & Sullivan, T. P. (2009). The resource utilization of women who use violence in intimate relationships. <i>Journal of Interpersonal Violence</i>, 24(6), 940-958. doi: 10.1177/0886260508319365</p>	<p><i>n</i> = 108; Women only</p>	<p>Geography: N/R</p> <p>Marital Status: N/R</p> <p>Race: African Am. = 71% White = 14% Latina = 10% Other = 5%</p> <p>Income: Earning < \$10,000 per year = 68% Earning between \$10,000 and \$19,999 = 19% Earning \$20,000 or more = 13%</p> <p>Age: Between 25–40 = 62% Below age 25 = 18% Over 40 = 17%</p> <p>Geography: N/R</p>	<p>Cross-sectional; Self-report; Justice/legal and community sample; Women were recruited from four locations in a moderate sized New England city: a court-mandated domestic violence program, a large inner-city health clinic for low-income residents (73% of sample), a division of family court that provides services for people with domestic violence, divorce, and child custody cases, and a local domestic violence shelter. All participants had to have reported using physical violence against a male partner within the past six months.</p>	<p>Measures: Violence was measured with the Revised Conflict Tactics Scale (CTS2; Straus et al., 1996); The Motives Scale (Swan & Gill, 1998) was used and two items were used to measure self-defense (e.g. How often do you use violence to defend yourself against your partner? How often do you use violence to get him to stop hitting you or hurting you?).</p> <p>Results: (<i>M</i> statistic given)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Power/Control N/R • Self-defense = 2.10 (Range 1 to 4) • Expression of Negative Emotion N/R • Communication N/R • Retaliation N/R • Jealousy N/R • Other N/R

PASK#10 Online Tables – Table 5. Justice or legal samples

Study (Full Reference)	N	Sample Characteristics	Method/Design	Measures/Results
<p>Flemke, K. & Allen, K. R. (2008). Women's experience of rage: A critical feminist analysis. <i>Journal of Marital and Family Therapy</i>, 34, 58-74. doi: 10.1111/j.1752-0606.2008.00053.x</p>	<p><i>n</i> = 37; Women only</p>	<p>Marital Status: N/R Heterosexual = 22 Bisexual = 11 Lesbian = 1 Unidentified = 3</p> <p>Race: African Am. = 16 White = 15 Hispanic = 6</p> <p>Income: N/R</p> <p>Age: Range = 19-47 yrs</p> <p>Geography: N/R</p>	<p>Cross-sectional; Self-report; Interview; Recruited participants were incarcerated women with addictions. Only those who met the criterion of experiencing rage towards an intimate partner were invited to participate in in-depth interviews.</p>	<p>Measures: Interviews that were transcribed and then validated with participants several weeks later. All the interviews focused on the women's experiences with "rage".</p> <p>Results: Women (<i>n</i> = 37) Women reported on own reasons for perpetrating violence:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Power/Control N/R • Self-defense = approximately 66% • Expression of Negative Emotion <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◦ Greater than 50% of the initiated violence was from rage • Communication N/R • Retaliation N/R • Jealousy <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ◦ Combination of jealousy, betrayal and abandonment = 54% • Other N/R
<p>Simmons, C. A., Lehmann, P., & Cobb, N. (2008). A comparison of women versus men charged with intimate partner violence: General risk factors, attitudes regarding using violence, and readiness to change.</p>	<p><i>n</i> = 156; perpetrators of domestic violence in a diversion program; Men =</p>	<p>Marital Status: N/R</p> <p>Race: White = 50% African Am. = 25% Hispanic = 20% Asian = 2.5% Other = 2.5%</p>	<p>Cross-sectional; Justice/legal sample; Self-report; Clinical interview; Participants were women court-ordered clients of a domestic violence diversion program who were seen between 1999 and 2003. Must be the individual's first</p>	<p>Article measures how justified women feel in using violence and how acceptable women see violence usage.</p> <p>Measures: Abusive Attitudes Toward Marriage, "A wife slaps or hits her husband if..." (Margolin & Foo, 1992)</p> <p>Results: Women (<i>n</i> = 78) (Top reported responses, % indicating situation somewhat or completely justifies the use of violence)</p>

PASK#10 Online Tables – Table 5. Justice or legal samples

Study (Full Reference)	N	Sample Characteristics	Method/Design	Measures/Results
<p><i>Violence And Victims</i>, 23(5), 571-585. Retrieved from EBSCOhost.</p>	<p>78 Women = 78</p>	<p>Income: <i>M</i> income between \$20,000 and \$29,999/year</p> <p>Age: <i>M</i> = 30.44 yrs</p> <p>Geography: North Texas</p>	<p>domestic violence arrest and willing to both admit guilt and participate in the 1-year treatment program. A comparison sample of men was selected from the court-ordered clients of the same program.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Power/Control <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ He is drunk, belligerent and acting crazy [<i>M</i> = .68; somewhat justified = 24.7%, justified = 2.6%]. ○ He threatens to move out in the middle of an argument [<i>M</i> = .17; somewhat justified = 11.7%, justified = 0%]. ○ He refuses to have sex with her [<i>M</i> = .19; somewhat justified = 11.7%, justified = 0%]. • Self-defense <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ He comes at her with a knife [<i>M</i> = 3.01, somewhat justified = 24.7%, justified = 41.5%] ○ He threatens verbally to get his gun [<i>M</i> = .95; somewhat justified = 26.0%, justified = 7.8%]. • Expression of Negative Emotion <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ She is upset about losing her job [<i>M</i> = .16; somewhat justified = 7.8%, justified = 0%]. ○ She is angry because he got a speeding ticket [<i>M</i> = .10; somewhat justified = 6.5%, justified = 0%]. • Communication <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ He screams hysterically [<i>M</i> = .26; somewhat justified = 16.9%, justified = 0%]. • Retaliation <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ He terrorizes and abuses her pet [<i>M</i> = 1.08; somewhat justified = 31.1%,

PASK#10 Online Tables – Table 5. Justice or legal samples

Study (Full Reference)	N	Sample Characteristics	Method/Design	Measures/Results
				<p>justified = 6.5%].</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ In an argument, he hits her first [$M = 2.18$; somewhat justified = 29.9%, justified = 28.6%] ○ He physically abuses their child [$M = 3.09$; somewhat justified = 22.1%, justified = 44.1%] ○ He calls her “stupid” over and over again [$M = .45$; somewhat justified = 20.8%, justified = 0%]. ○ He calls her mother nasty names [$M = .43$; somewhat justified = 19.5%, justified = 1.3%]. ○ He accuses her of being an incompetent and insensitive human being [$M = .32$; somewhat justified = 16.9%, justified = 0%]. ○ He makes her look like a fool in front of family and friends [$M = .39$; somewhat justified = 18.2%, justified = 0%]. ○ He insults her best friend [$M = .14$; somewhat justified = 9.1%, justified = 0%]. ○ He tells her he should have divorced her long ago [$M = .21$; somewhat justified = 13.0%, justified = 0%]. ○ He uncontrollably smashes her belongings [$M = .66$; somewhat justified = 27.3%, justified = 2.6%]. ○ He refuses to let her enroll in college courses [$M = .17$; somewhat justified =

PASK#10 Online Tables – Table 5. Justice or legal samples

Study (Full Reference)	N	Sample Characteristics	Method/Design	Measures/Results
				<p>11.7%, justified = 0%].</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ He refuses to let her go out for an evening with her friends [$M = .12$; somewhat justified = 7.8%, justified = 0%]. ● Jealousy <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ She catches him in bed with another woman [$M = 1.90$; somewhat justified = 27.3 justified = 22.1%]; ○ She learns that he is having an affair [$M = 1.44$; somewhat justified = 32.5%, justified = 13.0%] ○ She overhears him talking on the phone with an ex-girlfriend [$M = .23$; somewhat justified = 16.9%, justified = 0%]. ○ He flirts with another woman at a party [$M = 0.48$; somewhat justified = 20.8%, justified = 1.3%]. ● Other <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ She is drunk and out of control [$M = .66$; somewhat justified = 16.9%, justified = 6.5%].
<p>Smith, E. (2008). African American men and intimate partner violence. <i>Journal of African American Studies</i>, 12, 156-179.</p>	<p>n = 25; Men only</p>	<p>Marital Status: N/R</p> <p>Race: African Am. = 100%</p> <p>Income:</p>	<p>Cross-sectional; Interviews; Justice/legal sample; Participants were all African American men who battered their significant others. Interview subjects were identified</p>	<p>Measures: Face-to-face interviews that focused on individual (exposure to violence), cultural (constructions of masculinity), and structural causes (unemployment and incarceration) of intimate partner violence for African American men.</p> <p>Results:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Power/Control = yes

PASK#10 Online Tables – Table 5. Justice or legal samples

Study (Full Reference)	N	Sample Characteristics	Method/Design	Measures/Results
		<p>Unemployed = 40%</p> <p>Working Poor = 36%</p> <p>Middle Class = 16%</p> <p>Ages: N/R</p> <p>Geography: North Carolina (the South) and Minnesota (the Midwest)</p>	<p>by community partners employed in agencies that intervene in domestic violence disputes. Half of the men interviewed were involved in a court-ordered batterer intervention program and the other half were clients of the county child protective services unit as a direct result of the police being called to their homes during a battering episode in which their children were present.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ To assert masculinity/breadwinner role ○ To change wife's behavior ● Self-defense N/R ● Expression of Negative Emotion = yes <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ In response to feelings of insecurity ● Communication <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ In response to nagging ● Retaliation N/R ● Jealousy = yes ● Other = yes <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Family of origin violence = yes
<p>O'Leary, K. D., Smith Slep, A. M., & O'Leary, S. G. (2007). Multivariate models of men's and women's partner aggression. <i>Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology</i>, 75(5), 752-764. doi:10.1037/0022-006X.75.5.752</p>	<p>n = 453 couples; Men = 453 Women = 453</p>	<p>Marital Status: Married = 94.5%</p> <p>Race: Minority: Men = 20.8% Women = 18.1%</p> <p>Income: Family income M = \$81,498</p> <p>Employed full</p>	<p>Cross-sectional; Community sample; Self-report; Participants were recruited from 1999 to 2002 through a random digit dialing procedure modeled after those used in the 1985 National Family Violence Survey (Louis Harris & Associates, 1986).</p>	<p>Measures: Violence was measured with the Conflict Tactics Scale-II (CTS2); A scale based on Kasian and Painter's (1992) factor analysis of the Psychological Maltreatment of Women Scale; A six-item scale developed by Blood and Wolfe (1960) to assess perceived power imbalance in the marital relationship. Also measured experienced anger, childhood history of aggression, expressed anger, depressive symptoms, impulsivity, perceived social support, perceived stress, negative life events, alcohol misuse and abuse, unrealistic partner expectations, marital adjustment, flooding, dominance/jealousy, power imbalance, and attributions of partner responsibility.</p>

PASK#10 Online Tables – Table 5. Justice or legal samples

Study (Full Reference)	N	Sample Characteristics	Method/Design	Measures/Results
		<p>time: Men = 93% Women = 30%</p> <p>Age: Men <i>M</i> = 37.0 yrs Women <i>M</i> = 35.1 yrs</p> <p>Geography: N/R</p>		<p>Results: Men - It is important to note that the following variables were tested for inclusion in the model but were not retained: alcohol misuse/abuse, childhood history of aggression, experienced anger, physiological reactivity, family income, family size, income disparity, husband's age, attitudes approving of partner aggression, and unrealistic relationship expectations. The final model accounted for 47% of the variance in husbands' partner aggression in the past year in the full data set.</p> <p>Model for men's perpetration of intimate partner violence (IPV):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Power/Control <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Partner Responsibility Attributions = .17 ○ Power Imbalance = indirect path • Self-defense N/R • Expression of Negative Emotion <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Anger Expression = .11 ○ Depressive symptoms = indirect path ○ Flooding = indirect path • Communication <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Marital Adjustment = -.18 • Retaliation N/R • Jealousy/Dominance = .43 • Other <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Exposure to aggression in Family of Origin = .11 <p>Women - It is important to note that the following</p>

PASK#10 Online Tables – Table 5. Justice or legal samples

Study (Full Reference)	N	Sample Characteristics	Method/Design	Measures/Results
				<p>variables were tested for inclusion in the model but were not retained: alcohol misuse/abuse, education, impulsivity, attitudes approving of partner aggression, unrealistic partner expectations, experienced anger, husbands' occupational prestige, family size, income disparity, family income, marital status, and anger expression. The final model accounted for 50% of the variance in wives' partner aggression in the past year in the full data set.</p> <p>Model for women's perpetration of IPV:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Power/Control <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Partner Responsibility Attributions = .23 ○ Power Imbalance = indirect path • Self-defense N/R • Expression of Negative Emotion <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Anger Expression = no path ○ Depressive symptoms = indirect path ○ Flooding = indirect path • Communication <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Marital Adjustment = -.19 • Retaliation N/R • Jealousy/Dominance = .43 • Other <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Childhood history of aggression = .12 <p>Overall findings: Dominance/jealousy had strong direct paths in the models for both men and women. Similarly, power imbalance was retained in both men's and women's models. Anger expression uniquely predicted men's</p>

PASK#10 Online Tables – Table 5. Justice or legal samples

Study (Full Reference)	N	Sample Characteristics	Method/Design	Measures/Results
<p>Seamans, C. L., Rubin, L. J., & Stabb, S. D. (2007). Women domestic violence offenders: Lessons of violence and survival. <i>Journal of Trauma & Dissociation</i>, 8, 47-68. doi:10.1300/J229v08n02_04</p>	<p>n = 13; women only</p>	<p>Marital Status: All women were married or co-habiting with their partners.</p> <p>Race: Interracial marriages = 21%</p> <p>Income: Women unemployed = 4 out of 13</p> <p>Age: M = 28 yrs</p> <p>Geography: Major metropolitan area</p>	<p>Cross sectional; Interview; Participants were women perpetrators of domestic violence who had sought counseling at urban battering intervention programs. Women were offered the opportunity to anonymously participate in a structured interview that was tape-recorded and subsequently transcribed and content analyzed for themes.</p>	<p>partner aggression.</p> <p>Measures: Interviews</p> <p>Results:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Power/Control = 15% <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Resisting partner’s desire for control = 62% • Self-defense = 62% (collapsed with fighting back) • Expression of Negative Emotion <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Loss of control = 54% • Communication <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Frustrated by need to be heard = 69% • Retaliation <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ For emotional abuse = 62% • Jealousy (partner’s) = 54% • Other: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Stress related to having a new baby or having untreated post-partum depression = 38%
<p>Ward, R., & Muldoon, J. (2007). Female tactics and strategies of intimate partner violence: A study of incident reports. <i>Sociological Spectrum</i>, 27, 337-364. doi: 10.1080/0273217070</p>	<p>n = 43; Women only</p>	<p>Marital Status: Single = 15 Married = 13 Separated = 6 Cohabiting = 5 Divorced = 4</p> <p>Race: African Am. = 29 White = 14</p>	<p>Cross-sectional; Interview; Self-report; Women were court referred to a batterer intervention program for domestic violence treatment.</p>	<p>Measures: Structured clinical interview. Coded incident reports according to: (1) the tactic of physical violence, (2) the strategy of resistance, and (3) the strategy of retaliation.</p> <p>Results: (n = 35 incident reports were about women’s use of intimate partner violence)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Power/Control = 35% <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Enforcement = 63%

PASK#10 Online Tables – Table 5. Justice or legal samples

Study (Full Reference)	N	Sample Characteristics	Method/Design	Measures/Results
1290985		<p>Income: Annual income, ranged \$0 - \$25,200, with the majority earning less than \$10,000.</p> <p>Age: M age = 31.4 yrs Range = 19 to 51</p> <p>Geography: South Carolina</p>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Self-defense = 33% • Expression of Negative Emotion = 46% • Communication N/R • Retaliation = 33% • Jealousy N/R • Other <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Drinking or drug use = 44%
<p>Miller, S. L., & Meloy, M. L. (2006). Women's use of force: Voices of women arrested for domestic violence. <i>Violence Against Women, 12</i>, 89-115. doi: 10.1177/1077801205277356</p>	<p><i>n</i> = 95; women only</p>	<p>Marital Status: N/R</p> <p>Race: White = 58 African Am. = 29 Latina = 2 Unreported = 6</p> <p>Income: N/R</p> <p>Age: N/R</p> <p>Geography: Small state with only 3 counties</p>	<p>Cross-sectional; Group sessions/interviews; Participants were women involved with an offenders' treatment program. All but one participant was mandated to complete domestic violence treatment as part of parole agreement.</p>	<p>Measures: Observation of offenders' treatment groups. Group session were recorded and then transcribed. Themes were coded as present if mentioned by at least three respondents.</p> <p>Results:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Power/Control N/R • Self-defense = 65% • Expression of Negative Emotion <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Frustration response = 30% • Communication N/R • Retaliation N/R • Jealousy N/R • Other <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Generally violent = 5% (did not seem to use their violence to control others)
<p>Stuart, G. L., Moore,</p>	<p><i>n</i> = 87;</p>	<p>Marital Status:</p>	<p>Cross-sectional; Self-</p>	<p>Measures: Violence was measured by the Revised</p>

PASK#10 Online Tables – Table 5. Justice or legal samples

Study (Full Reference)	N	Sample Characteristics	Method/Design	Measures/Results
<p>T. M., Gordon, K. C., Hellmuth, J. C., Ramsey, S. E., & Kahler, C. W. (2006). Reasons for intimate partner violence perpetration among arrested women. <i>Violence Against Women, 12</i>, 609-621. doi: 10.1177/1077801206290173</p>	<p>Women only</p>	<p>Reported living with their partner = 83%</p> <p>Race: Caucasian = 76% African Am. = 8% Hispanic = 9% Native Am. = 5% Asian or Pacific Islander = 1% Other = 1%</p> <p>Income: <i>M</i> = \$18, 430</p> <p>Age: <i>M</i> = 31.2 years</p> <p>Geography: Rhode Island</p>	<p>report; Program intervention sessions; These participants represent a sub sample of 103 women who participated in a larger study that examined women court-referred to domestic violence intervention programs. These women were recruited from court-ordered batterers' treatment program because they were arrested for domestic violence in Rhode Island.</p>	<p>Conflict Tactics Scale (CTS2); Motivations were measured by an author created 29-item Reasons for Violence Scale.</p> <p>Results:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Power/Control <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ To feel more powerful = 26.1% ○ To get control over your partner = 21.7% ○ To get your partner to do something or stop doing something = 22.4% ○ To shut your partner up or to get your partner to leave you alone = 23.2% ○ To make your partner scared or afraid = 11.0% ○ Because you wanted to have sex and your partner didn't = 3.0% • Self-defense <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Self-defense = 38.7% • Expression of Negative Emotion <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Anger = 39.4% ○ Because of stress = 36.5% ○ Because you didn't know what to do with your feelings = 35.2% ○ Because you were angry at someone else but took it out on your partner = 14.8% ○ Because you were afraid your partner was going to leave you = 18.2% ○ Because you didn't believe your partner cared about you = 25.1% • Communication <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ To show feelings that you couldn't explain in words = 38.0%

PASK#10 Online Tables – Table 5. Justice or legal samples

Study (Full Reference)	N	Sample Characteristics	Method/Design	Measures/Results
				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Because your partner was going to walk away or leave a conflict before it was solved = 25.2% ○ To make your partner agree with you = 16.9% ○ To get your partner’s attention = 24.5% ○ To prove you love your partner = 27.1% ● Retaliation <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ To get back at your partner or to get revenge for being hit first = 20.2% ○ To punish your partner = 24.7% ○ To get back at or to retaliate for being emotionally hurt by your partner = 35.3% ○ because your partner provoked you or pushed you over the edge = 38.9% ○ To hurt your partner’s feelings = 20.4% ● Jealousy <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ because you were jealous = 25.1% ○ because your partner cheated on you = 24.6% ● Other <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ To get away from your partner = 25.8% ○ Because you were under the influence of alcohol = 17.8% ○ Because you were under the influence of drugs = 8.4% ○ Because it was sexually arousing = 9.7%
<p>Hamberger, L. K. & Guse, C. (2005). Typology of reactions to intimate partner violence among men</p>	<p><i>n</i> = 125; Men = 87 Women = 38</p>	<p>Marital Status: N/R Heterosexual Race:</p>	<p>Cross-sectional; Interview; Self-report; Women and men court-ordered for domestic violence</p>	<p>Measures: Interviews in which they were asked about the primary reason for their violence. Violence measured with a modification of the Conflict Tactics Scale (CTS).</p>

PASK#10 Online Tables – Table 5. Justice or legal samples

Study (Full Reference)	N	Sample Characteristics	Method/Design	Measures/Results
<p>and women arrested for partner violence. <i>Violence and Victims</i>, 20, 303- 317. doi: 10.1891/088667005780997956</p>		<p>Men: African Am. = 12% Hispanic = 8% White = 80%</p> <p>Women: African Am. = 31% Hispanic = 3% White = 64% Other = 3%</p> <p>Income: N/R</p> <p>Age: Men <i>M</i> = 34.8 yrs Women <i>M</i> = 33.5 yrs</p> <p>Geography: Wisconsin</p>	<p>treatment programs.</p>	<p>Results: Three clusters of participants: Cluster 1 (<i>n</i> = 49; 94% men) characterized by high frequency of using force back, threatening violence, laughing, and being amused.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Power/Control = 67% • Self-defense/Retaliation = 10% • Expression of Negative Emotion = 6% • Communication = 4% • Retaliation N/R (coded with self-defense) • Jealousy N/R • Other “don’t know” = 12% <p>Cluster 2 (<i>n</i> = 52; 48% men) was comprised of a cluster characterized by attempts to escape, acquiesce, and feeling fearful and angry.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Power/Control = 29% • Self-defense/retaliation = 37% • Expression of Negative Emotion = 13% • Communication = 2% • Retaliation N/R (coded with self-defense) • Jealousy N/R • Other “don’t know” = 19% <p>Cluster 3 (<i>n</i> = 24; 67% men) was comprised of a cluster characterized by use of force back, threaten violence, and are angry and insulted.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Power/Control = 50% • Self-defense/Retaliation = 13% • Expression of Negative Emotion = 13% • Communication = 4%

PASK#10 Online Tables – Table 5. Justice or legal samples

Study (Full Reference)	N	Sample Characteristics	Method/Design	Measures/Results
				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Retaliation N/R (coded with self-defense) • Jealousy N/R • Other “don’t know” = 21%
<p>Henning, K., Jones, A. R., & Holdford, R. (2005). “I didn’t do it, but if I did I had a good reason”: Minimization, denial, and attributions of blame among male and female domestic violence offenders. <i>Journal of Family Violence, 20</i>, 131-139. doi: 10.1007/s10896-005-3647-8</p>	<p><i>n</i> = 1,426; Men = 1,267 Women = 159</p>	<p>Marital Status: Dating: Men = 62.1% Women = 63.5%</p> <p>Race: Men: African Am. = 84.2% Caucasian = 15.1% Other = 0.7%</p> <p>Women: African Am. = 85.5% Caucasian = 14.5% Other = 0%</p> <p>Income: N/R</p> <p>Age: <i>M</i> Men = 32.8 yrs <i>M</i> Women = 32.3 yrs</p> <p>Geography:</p>	<p>Cross-sectional; Self-report; Interview; Participants were men and women convicted of a domestic assault against an opposite sex intimate partner.</p>	<p>Measures: Author created a 16-item measure of why violence occurred.</p> <p>Results: Men (<i>n</i> = 1,426) SELF BLAME</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Power/Control <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ I was not willing to make compromises = 21.2% • Self-defense = 50% • Expression of Negative Emotion <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Difficulty controlling anger = 27.6% ○ Emotionally unstable at times = 16.3% • Communication N/R • Retaliation N/R • Jealousy = 21.2% <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ I was unfaithful = 16.5% • Other <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Insecure in intimate relationships = 16.6% ○ I was not fully committed to partner = 21.7% ○ I have a problem with alcohol or drugs = 11.3% <p>VICTIM BLAME</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Power/Control <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Victim not willing to compromise = 45.4%

PASK#10 Online Tables – Table 5. Justice or legal samples

Study (Full Reference)	N	Sample Characteristics	Method/Design	Measures/Results
		Shelby County, TN		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Self-defense N/R • Expression of Negative Emotion <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Has difficulty controlling anger = 56.2% ○ Is emotionally unstable at times = 47.4% • Communication N/R • Retaliation N/R • Jealousy = 56.3% <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Victim was unfaithful = 31.5% • Other <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Victim is insecure in relationships = 40.7% ○ Victim was not fully committed = 37.5% ○ Victim problem with alcohol/drugs = 20.1% <p>Women (n = 159) SELF BLAME</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Power/Control <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ I was not willing to compromise = 22.6% • Self-defense = 65.4% • Expression of Negative Emotion <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Difficulty controlling anger = 30.8% ○ Emotionally unstable at times = 20.3% • Communication N/R • Retaliation N/R • Jealousy = 25.2% <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ I was unfaithful = 7.5% • Other <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Insecure in intimate relationships = 19.5% ○ I was not fully committed to partner =

PASK#10 Online Tables – Table 5. Justice or legal samples

Study (Full Reference)	N	Sample Characteristics	Method/Design	Measures/Results
				<p>16.4%</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ I have alcohol or drug problem = 7.5% <p>VICTIM BLAME</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Power/Control <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Victim not willing to compromise = 55.7% ● Self-defense N/R ● Expression of Negative Emotion <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Has difficulty controlling anger = 58.9% ○ Is emotionally unstable at times = 44.6% ● Communication N/R ● Retaliation N/R ● Jealousy = 60.8% <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Victim was unfaithful = 46.2% ● Other <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Victim is insecure in relationships = 54.4% ○ Victim was not fully committed = 50% ○ Victim problem with alcohol/drugs = 44.9%
<p>Olson, L. N, & Lloyd, S. A. (2005). “It depends on what you mean by starting”: An exploration of how women define initiation of aggression and their motives for behaving aggressively. <i>Sex</i></p>	<p><i>n</i> = 25; Women only</p>	<p>Marital Status: In marital relationships = 14 Co-habiting = 2 Dating = 8 Recently divorced = 1</p> <p>Race: European Am. = 23</p>	<p>Cross-sectional; Interview; Self-report; Potential participants were recruited by networking with individuals she knew and making announcements in college classrooms. Women participants had used aggression during</p>	<p>Measures: Participants were asked “Why did you (and/or your partner) use aggression in this conflict?”</p> <p>Results: Women (motivations for their own violence) (<i>n</i> = 25)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Power/Control <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Relational control negotiation = 6% ○ Rule violations = 36% ● Self-defense = 1% ● Expression of Negative Emotion (includes jealousy and the need to be in control) = 46%

PASK#10 Online Tables – Table 5. Justice or legal samples

Study (Full Reference)	N	Sample Characteristics	Method/Design	Measures/Results
<p><i>Roles</i>, 53(7/8), 603-617. doi: 10.1007/s11199-005-7145-5</p>		<p>African Am. = 1 Native Am. = 1</p> <p>Income: N/R</p> <p>Age: Median age of the women was in the range of 26–35 yrs</p> <p>Geography: N/R</p>	<p>conflicts with romantic partners.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Communication = 7% <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Gain attention/compliance = 33% • Retaliation <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Restoration of face threat = 23% • Jealousy (reported above) • Other <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Pain for unresolved issues = 1% ○ Drug or alcohol-induced state = 9% ○ Family learned pattern = 3% ○ Comfort/secure with relationship = 4% ○ Protection of partner = 1% <p>Women (perception of men’s motivations) (<i>n</i> = 25)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Power/Control <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Relational control negotiation = 1% ○ Rule violations = 3% • Self-defense = 0% • Expression of Negative Emotion (includes jealousy and need to be in control) = 52% • Communication = 9% <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Gain attention/compliance = 17% • Retaliation <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Restoration of face threat = 4% • Jealousy (reported above) • Other <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Pain for unresolved issues = 0% ○ Drug or alcohol-induced state = 19% ○ Family learned pattern = 7% ○ Comfort/secure with relationship = 0% ○ Protection of partner = 7%

PASK#10 Online Tables – Table 5. Justice or legal samples

Study (Full Reference)	N	Sample Characteristics	Method/Design	Measures/Results
<p>Dobash, R. P., & Dobash, R. E. (2004). Women's violence to men in intimate relationships. <i>British Journal of Criminology</i>, 44, 324-349. doi: 10.1093/bjc/azh026</p>	<p><i>n</i> = 95 couples; Men = 43 Women = 52</p>	<p>Marital Status: N/R Race: N/R Income: N/R Age: N/R Geography: N/R</p>	<p>Cross-sectional; In-depth interviews; Couples were recruited from court cases involving male perpetrated partner violence (IPV), the men form a criminal justice sample of male perpetrators.</p>	<p>Measures: Interviews; Both spouses were asked about the number of events of perpetration by each partner as well as the type of acts that were perpetrated. Men and women were asked whether women's use of violence was "always" in self-defense.</p> <p>Results: Men (<i>n</i> = 57) Men reported whether her violence was always in self-defense:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Power/Control N/R • Self-defense = 54% • Expression of Negative Emotion N/R • Communication N/R • Retaliation N/R • Jealousy N/R • Other N/R <p>Women (<i>n</i> = 51) Women reported whether own violence was always in self-defense:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Power/Control N/R • Self-defense = 75% • Expression of Negative Emotion N/R • Communication N/R • Retaliation N/R • Jealousy N/R • Other N/R
<p>Babcock, J. C., Miller, S. A., & Siard, C. (2003).</p>	<p><i>n</i> = 52; Women only</p>	<p>Marital Status: Still involved in a romantic</p>	<p>Cross-sectional; Interview; Self-report; Clinical</p>	<p>Measures: Interviewed women were asked to list their reasons for using violence via an open-ended question. Responses were coded into Hamberger et al.'s (1997)</p>

PASK#10 Online Tables – Table 5. Justice or legal samples

Study (Full Reference)	N	Sample Characteristics	Method/Design	Measures/Results
<p>Toward a typology of abusive women: Differences between partner-only and generally violent women in the use of violence. <i>Psychology of Women Quarterly</i>, 27(2), 153-161. doi: 10.1111/1471-6402.00095</p>		<p>relationship with their partner = 70%</p> <p>Race: African Am. = 17% Hispanic = 24% Caucasian = 54% Other = 4%</p> <p>Income: M income = \$16,590 (\$0-\$59,200) per year</p> <p>Women unemployed = 31%</p> <p>Age: M = 31.54 yrs</p> <p>Geography: Houston, TX</p>	<p>sample; Participants were 44 women arrested for violence towards intimate partner and 8 towards non-intimate and were recruited from an agency specializing in intervening with domestically violent women.</p>	<p>nine factors. Two additional factors were added. General violence was coded via interview. Intimate partner violence and self-defense were assessed with a modified version of the Conflict Tactics Scale-II (CTS-2). Women also completed a survey called Reasons for Using Violence Scale (Siard, 2003) which was comprised of 11 possible reasons for using violence.</p> <p>Results: Coded responses to open-ended questions regardless of group status ($n = 52$):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Power/Control = N/R • Self-defense = 28.3% • Expression of Negative Emotion <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Anger/Frustration = 20% • Communication N/R • Retaliation N/R • Jealousy N/R • Other <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Accepting blame for being violent; I need to learn a different way = yes ○ Fear for other's/children = yes <p>Group differences on self-report survey. Women were separated into two groups: Partner Only Violent Women ($n = 26$) and Generally Violent Women ($n = 26$). Generally Violent Women were more likely than Partner Only Violent Women to self-report the following motives for their violence:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Power/Control = yes <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ To push his buttons

PASK#10 Online Tables – Table 5. Justice or legal samples

Study (Full Reference)	N	Sample Characteristics	Method/Design	Measures/Results
				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Self-defense = no group differences • Expression of Negative Emotion = yes <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Because I lost control ○ Because I was frustrated • Communication N/R • Retaliation = yes <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Because he was asking for it • Jealousy N/R • Other N/R
<p>Swan, S. C., & Snow, D. L. (2003). Behavioral and psychological differences among abused women who use violence in intimate relationships. <i>Violence Against Women</i>, 9(1), 75-109. doi: 10.1177/1077801202238431</p>	<p><i>n</i> = 95; Women only</p>	<p>Marital Status: N/R</p> <p>Race: African Am. = 71% White = 14% Latina = 12% Other = 3%</p> <p>Income: Earning less than \$10,000 per year = 69% Earning between \$10,000 and \$19,999 = 18% Earning \$20,000 or more = 13%</p>	<p>Cross-sectional; Self-report; Interview; Moderate-sized New England city. Some participants were women who had been arrested for a domestic violence offense and were court mandated to attend a family violence program. Participants were also recruited from three other places. All had to have perpetrated intimate partner violence (IPV) against a male partner at least once in the last six months. This is the same sample as was reported in Swan and Snow (2002).</p>	<p>Measures: Conflict Tactics Scale-II (CTS2) was used to measure violence and Motivations for Violence scale (Swan & Gill, 1998) was used to measure motives.</p> <p>Results:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Power/Control = 38% • Self-defense = 75% • Expression of Negative Emotion N/R • Communication N/R • Retaliation = 45% • Jealousy N/R • Other N/R <p>Authors also described differences in motivations for violence among four subtypes of women perpetrators (victims, mixed-male coercive, mixed-female coercive and abused aggressors). Self-defense was a more commonly reported motive for women in the victim group as compared to motives of control or retaliation. In contrast, all three motives were equally endorsed but at low levels by women categorized into the mixed-female coercive group while all three motives were</p>

PASK#10 Online Tables – Table 5. Justice or legal samples

Study (Full Reference)	N	Sample Characteristics	Method/Design	Measures/Results
		<p>Age: Between 25- 40 yrs = 63% Younger than 25 = 17% Older than 40 = 20% Range = 25-40 yrs</p> <p>Geography: Moderate sized New England city</p>		<p>equally endorsed but at significantly higher levels for the abused aggressor group.</p>
<p>Weizmann-Henelius, G., Viemero, V., & Eronen, M. (2003). The violent female perpetrator and her victim. <i>Forensic Science International</i>, 133, 197-203. doi: 10.1016/S0379-0738(03)00068-9</p>	<p>n = 61; women only</p>	<p>Marital Status: N/R</p> <p>Race: N/R</p> <p>Income: N/R</p> <p>Age: N/R</p> <p>Geography: All women were residing in Finland</p>	<p>Participants consisted of 56% (n = 49) of the women incarcerated over a one-year period for a violent offense and 55% (n = 12) of women who were forensic psychiatric patients over the same period.</p>	<p>Measures: Semi-structured interviews and record reviews were conducted to assess the type of violent act and the motives leading to the violent act. Fourteen women were identified as perpetrators of intimate partner violence (IPV).</p> <p>Results:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Power/Control N/R • Self-defense <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Self-defense in a violent situation = 12.5% • Expression of Negative Emotion N/R • Communication <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Quarreling while drinking = 20.8% ○ Long term conflicts = 7.1% • Retaliation <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Retaliation for long term abuse = 16.7% • Jealousy

PASK#10 Online Tables – Table 5. Justice or legal samples

Study (Full Reference)	N	Sample Characteristics	Method/Design	Measures/Results
<p>Hamberger, L. K. & Guse, C. E. (2002). Men's and women's use of intimate partner violence in clinical samples. <i>Violence Against Women</i>, 8, 1301-1331. doi: 10.1177/107780102762478028</p>	<p><i>n</i> = 119 heterosexual men involved in a court-ordered domestic violence abatement program ; <i>n</i> = 24 heterosexual women involved in a court-ordered domestic violence abatement program ;</p>	<p>Marital Status: N/R</p> <p>Race:</p> <p>Court Ordered Men Black = 11% Hispanic = 8% White = 80% Other = 0%</p> <p>Court Ordered Women Black = 30% Hispanic = 4% White = 65% Other = 0%</p> <p>Shelter Women Black = 69% Hispanic = 2% White = 22% Other = 7%</p> <p>Income:</p> <p>Court Ordered Men Full time job = 86% Part time job = 3%</p> <p>Court Ordered</p>	<p>Cross-sectional; Clinical sample; Interview; Self-report; Participants were recruited from a court-ordered domestic violence abatement program for men and women and a shelter program for abused women.</p>	<p>○ Approximately 7.1%</p> <p>● Other N/R</p> <p>Measures: Partner violence history was obtained through a structured clinical interview. Partner violence was assessed using a modified version of the Conflict Tactics Scale (CTS).</p> <p>Results:</p> <p>Court ordered men reported about partner's violence:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Power/Control N/R ● Self-defense = 48% ● Expression of Negative Emotion N/R ● Communication N/R ● Retaliation N/R ● Jealousy N/R ● Other N/R <p>Court order women reported about partner's violence:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Power/Control N/R ● Self-defense = 52% ● Expression of Negative Emotion N/R ● Communication N/R ● Retaliation N/R ● Jealousy N/R ● Other N/R <p>Sheltered women reported about partner's violence:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Power/Control N/R ● Self-defense = 29% ● Expression of Negative Emotion N/R ● Communication N/R

PASK#10 Online Tables – Table 5. Justice or legal samples

Study (Full Reference)	N	Sample Characteristics	Method/Design	Measures/Results
	<p><i>n</i> = 50 heterosexual women seeking services from a shelter program for abused women</p>	<p>Women Full time job = 48% Part time job = 22% Shelter Women Full time job = 11% Part time job = 13%</p> <p>Age: Court Ordered Men <i>M</i> = 34.8 years Court Ordered Women <i>M</i> = 34.2 years Shelter Women <i>M</i> = 33.4 years</p> <p>Geography: Metropolitan area</p>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Retaliation N/R • Jealousy N/R • Other N/R

PASK#10 Online Tables – Table 5. Justice or legal samples

Study (Full Reference)	N	Sample Characteristics	Method/Design	Measures/Results
<p>Felson, R. B., & Messner, S. F. (2000). The control motive in intimate partner violence. <i>School Psychology Quarterly</i>, 63, 86-94. Retrieved from EBSCOhost.</p>	<p><i>n</i> = 2, 597; Incident s of which 19.5% involved male-on-female intimate partner violence .</p>	<p>Marital Status: N/R</p> <p>Race: N/R</p> <p>Income: N/R</p> <p>Age: 12 yrs and older</p> <p>Geography: United States</p>	<p>Cross-sectional incident data from the redesigned National Crime Victimization Survey (NCVS). Just fewer than 20% of incidents involved a male assaulting his female partner.</p>	<p>Measures: Coded whether a threat was issued by the perpetrator prior to the violence.</p> <p>Results:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Power/Control <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Preceded by a threat = 54.6% • Self-defense N/R • Expression of Negative Emotion N/R • Communication N/R • Retaliation N/R • Jealousy N/R • Other N/R
<p>Dasgupta, S. D. (1999). Just like men? A critical view of violence by women. <i>Coordinating community response to domestic violence: Lessons from Duluth and beyond</i> (pp. 195-222). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage</p>	<p><i>n</i> = 32; women only</p>	<p>Marital Status: N/R</p> <p>Race: Euro-American = 56% Native Am = 19% African Am = 19% Latino = 3% Asian Am = 3%</p> <p>Income: N/R</p> <p>Age: Range = 19 - 50 yrs</p>	<p>Cross-sectional; Interview; Self-report; Participants had been self-referred, arrested, or mandated to treatment for abusers.</p>	<p>Measures: In-depth interviews were conducted with all the women. These findings represent qualitative data.</p> <p>Results:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Power/Control <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ To get some control over situation = yes ○ To respect me = yes • Self-defense = yes • Expression of Negative Emotion N/R • Communication <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Get him to pay attention to me = yes ○ Get him to take responsibility = yes • Retaliation = yes <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Pay for his behavior = yes ○ He threatened my family = yes • Jealousy N/R • Other

PASK#10 Online Tables – Table 5. Justice or legal samples

Study (Full Reference)	N	Sample Characteristics	Method/Design	Measures/Results
<p>Barnett, O. W., Lee, C. Y., & Thelen, R. E. (1997). Gender differences in attributions of self-defense and control in interpartner aggression. <i>Violence Against Women, 3</i>, 462-481. doi: 10.1177/1077801297003005002</p>	<p>$n = 64$; Men = 34 Women = 30</p>	<p>Geography: United States</p> <p>Marital Status: All married or cohabitating</p> <p>Race: Caucasian = 100%</p> <p>Income: N/R</p> <p>Age: N/R</p> <p>Geography: N/R Groups were reported to be demographically similar.</p>	<p>Cross-sectional; Clinical, Self-report; The women participants were recruited from battered women’s shelters and out-reach groups. The male participants were recruited from court-mandated batterers program because they have been arrested for spousal abuse.</p>	<p>○ Raised to be tough</p> <p>Measures: Participants completed 28-item Relationship Abuse Questionnaire (Barnett, 1989) which has an expansion of items (28 forms of abuse) contained on the original Conflict Tactics Scale (CTS). This scale includes nine possible motives for physical abuse that are assessed after each form of abuse item.</p> <p>Results: Women ($n = 30$; M's reported) Women reported their own motives for violence:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Power/Control <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Show who’s boss = 1.30 ○ Teach other a lesson = 1.39 • Self-defense = 1.32 • Expression of Negative Emotion <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Let out violent feelings = 1.64 • Communication <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Get other’s attention = 1.55 • Retaliation <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ To upset my partner emotionally = 1.41 • Jealousy N/R • Other <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Unaware of intention = 1.12 ○ Just teasing other = 1.18 <p>Men ($n = 34$; M's reported) Men reported on their own motives for violence:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Power/Control <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Show who’s boss = 1.61

PASK#10 Online Tables – Table 5. Justice or legal samples

Study (Full Reference)	N	Sample Characteristics	Method/Design	Measures/Results
				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Teach other a lesson = 1.58 ● Self-defense = 1.19 ● Expression of Negative Emotion <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Let out violent feelings = 1.78 ● Communication <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Get other’s attention = 1.55 ● Retaliation <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ To upset my partner emotionally = 1.57 ● Jealousy N/R ● Other <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Unaware of intention = 1.34 ○ Just teasing other = 1.26 <p>Men were more likely to report using violence to show who is boss; women were more likely to report using violence to protect self. Men were also more likely to be unaware of their motivation for using violence.</p>
<p>Hamberger, L. K. (1997). Female offenders in domestic violence: A look at actions in their context. <i>Journal of Aggression, Maltreatment, and Trauma, 1</i>, 117-129. Retrieved from EBSCOhost.</p>	<p><i>n</i> = 52; Women only</p>	<p>Marital Status: Married = 37.2% Separated = 15.7% Divorced = 19.6% Never Married = 27.4%</p> <p>Race: Caucasian = 84% African Am. = 14% Hispanic = 2%</p>	<p>Cross-sectional; Interview based; Justice/legal sample. All women in this sample had been arrested for domestic violence.</p>	<p>Measures: Fifty-two women domestic violence offenders reported on their primary motivations for perpetrating violence. Some women gave more than one reason so the total number of responses to code was 54. One question was used to assess motivation. It was, “When you think about the times that you have used some type of physical violence against your partner, what was the primary reason for your use of violence?”</p> <p>Results:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Power/Control = 14.8% <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Domination/Be one up ○ To get something to stop ● Self-defense = 44.4%

PASK#10 Online Tables – Table 5. Justice or legal samples

Study (Full Reference)	N	Sample Characteristics	Method/Design	Measures/Results
		Other = 5% Age: M = 29.5 yrs Range = 19-51yrs Income: Employed = 56.8%		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Expression of Negative Emotion = 18.5% • Communication = 9.3% • Retaliation <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ For assault or psychological abuse = 11.1% • Jealousy = N/R • Other <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Don't know why = 1.9%
Hamberger, L. K., Lohr, J. M., Bonge D., & Tolin, D. F. (1997). An empirical classification of motivations for domestic violence. <i>Violence against Women</i> , 3(4), 401-423. doi: 10.1177/1077801297003004005	n = 281; Men = 215 Women = 66	Marital Status: Men: Married = 30.6% Separated = 22.5% Divorced = 12.4% Never Married = 34.5% Women: Married = 37.2% Separated = 15.7% Divorced = 19.6% Never Married = 27.4% Race: Men: White = 68.1%	Cross-sectional; Self-report; Interview; All participants were court referred because they had been arrested for assaulting an intimate partner.	Measures: Motivations were assessed by using the question: “What is the function, purpose, or payoff of your violence?” Card sort male/women sorted reasons for male/female perpetration. Male perpetration sorted by women (n = 66; factor loadings reported): <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Power/Control = .86 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Coercive power = .86 ○ Physical control = .93 • Self-defense = .89 • Expression of Negative Emotion = .84-.87 • Communication = .91 • Retaliation = .86 • Jealousy <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Punish her for sleeping around = .92 • Other <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Professed ignorance = .90 ○ Non-specifics/alcohol = .67 Female perpetration sorted by women (n = 66; factor loadings reported):

PASK#10 Online Tables – Table 5. Justice or legal samples

Study (Full Reference)	N	Sample Characteristics	Method/Design	Measures/Results
		<p>African Am. = 21.4% Hispanic = 9.5%</p> <p>Women: White = 84.3% African Am. = 13.7% Hispanic = 1.9%</p> <p>Income: N/R</p> <p>Age: <i>M</i> Men = 31.5 yrs <i>M</i> Women = 29.5 yrs</p> <p>Geography: Wisconsin</p>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Power/Control = .90 • Self-defense = .79 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Escape from aggression = .95 • Expression of Negative Emotion = .94 • Communication <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Efforts to communicate = .88 ○ To get his attention = .91 • Retaliation = .95 • Jealousy N/R • Other <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Unspecified/No reason = .69 <p>Male perpetration sorted by males (<i>n</i> = 215):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Power/Control <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Domination = .84 ○ Control Her Verbal Behavior = .92 ○ Control Her Physical Behavior = .85 ○ Control Her Emotionally = .87 • Self-defense = N/R • Expression of Negative Emotion = .94 • Communication = .92 • Retaliation N/R • Jealousy <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Punishment for sleeping around = .91 ○ Punishment for unwanted behavior = .91 • Other = .67-.76 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Professed ignorance = .90 ○ Alcohol related = .90 <p>Female perpetration sorted by males (<i>n</i> = 215):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Power/Control

PASK#10 Online Tables – Table 5. Justice or legal samples

Study (Full Reference)	N	Sample Characteristics	Method/Design	Measures/Results
				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Control verbal behavior = .89 ○ Coercive Power = .92 ● Self-defense = .52 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Escape from aggression = .86 ● Expression of Negative Emotion = .96 ● Communication <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ To get his attention = .87 ● Retaliation = .81 ● Jealousy N/R ● Other <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Unspecified = .82
<p>Grant, C. A. (1995). Women who kill: the impact of abuse. <i>Issues in Mental Health Nursing, 16</i>, 315-326. Received from EBSCOhost.</p>	<p><i>n</i> = 13; women only</p>	<p>Marital Status: Married = 6 Single = 5 Divorced = 2</p> <p>Race: Caucasian = 5 African Am. = 7 Asian = 1</p> <p>Income: N/R</p> <p>Age: Range = 26-65 years</p> <p>Geography: N/R</p>	<p>Cross-sectional; Justice/legal sample; Interview; Participants were all battered women who had been convicted of serious crimes, most for the manslaughter of their intimate partner.</p>	<p>Measures: Interviews</p> <p>Results: Women reported reasons for why their partner beat them for the first time:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Power/Control <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Putting her in her place (5 of 13) ● Self-defense N/R ● Expression of Negative Emotion <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Angry = yes (4 of 13) ● Communication <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Arguments about money, no job (5 of 13) ● Retaliation N/R ● Jealousy = yes (4 of 13) ● Other <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Drunk or Drug Use Problems = yes (5 of 13)
<p>Hamberger, L. K., Lohr, J. M., &</p>	<p><i>n</i> = 294; Men =</p>	<p>Marital Status: Women:</p>	<p>Cross-sectional; Self-report; Interview;</p>	<p>Measures: Violence was assessed with an oral administration of a modified form of the Conflict</p>

PASK#10 Online Tables – Table 5. Justice or legal samples

Study (Full Reference)	N	Sample Characteristics	Method/Design	Measures/Results
<p>Bonge, D. (1994). The intended function of domestic violence is different for arrested male and female perpetrators. <i>Family Violence and Sexual Assault Bulletin</i>, 10(3/4), 40-43. Received from EBSCOhost.</p>	<p>219 Women = 75</p>	<p>Married = 37.2% Separated = 15.7% Divorced = 19.6% Never married = 27.4%</p> <p>Men: Married = 30.6% Separated = 22.5% Divorced = 12.4% Never married = 34.5%</p> <p>Race: Women: White = 84.3% African Am. = 13.7% Hispanic = 1.9%</p> <p>Men: White = 68.1% African Am. = 21.4% Hispanic = 9.5%</p> <p>Income: N/R Women:</p>	<p>Justice/legal sample; Participants were court mandated for evaluation prior to participation in the men’s and women’s domestic counseling programs.</p>	<p>Tactics Scale (CTS, Straus, 1979). One question was used to assess the intended motivation or function of the violence: “What is the function, purpose, or payoff of your violence?”</p> <p>Results: Factor analysis of female perpetrator responses ($n = 75$) (the numbers reported are Eigen values):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Power/Control <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Negative Instrumental Control = .84 ○ Coercive Power = .94 • Self-defense = .51 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Escape = .84 • Expression of Negative Emotion = .93 • Communication <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Demanding Attention = .85 • Retaliation <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Retribution = .92 ○ Retaliation for Emotional Abuse = .85 • Jealousy N/R • Other N/R <p>Factor analysis of male perpetrator responses ($n = 219$) (the numbers reported are Eigen values):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Power/Control <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Domination = .84 ○ To control her verbally = .79 ○ To control her physically = .88 ○ To get her to change = .68 ○ To keep her from calling mom/police = .72

PASK#10 Online Tables – Table 5. Justice or legal samples

Study (Full Reference)	N	Sample Characteristics	Method/Design	Measures/Results
		Employed = 56.8% Men: Employed = 80% Age: Women: <i>M</i> = 29.5 Men: <i>M</i> = 31.5 Geography: N/R		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Self-defense N/R • Expression of Negative Emotion = .92 • Communication <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Demanding attention = .82 ○ To keep argument going = .80 • Retaliation = .88 • Jealousy N/R • Other <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Don't know why = .97 ○ Alcohol excuse = .83
Claes, J. A., & Rosenthal, D. M. (1990). Men who batter women: A study in power. <i>Journal of Family Violence</i> , 5(3), 215-224. doi: 10.1007/BF00980817	n = 21; Men only	Marital Status: Men who were cohabitating or married at the time of the assault = 100% <i>M</i> length of relationship = 51.7 months Race: White = 99% Black = 1% Income: Amounts not reported;	Cross-sectional; Interview; Self-report measures; Review of police reports of assaults; Justice/legal sample; All participants had been ordered into assessment by the court following an arrest by the police for domestic assault.	Measures: Measure of Interpersonal Power (Garrison and Pate, 1977) Results: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Power/Control <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Male's perception of partner's power did not significantly influence the degree and severity of abuse as reported from police reports of assault ($F(3, 17) = 1.865, p > .05$) ○ Power for reward significantly influenced the degree and severity of abuse when measured by the police report ($F(1, 19) = 5.295, p < .03$) ○ Leadership power (non-significant) ○ Coercion (non-significant) • Self-defense N/R • Expression of Negative Emotion N/R

PASK#10 Online Tables – Table 5. Justice or legal samples

Study (Full Reference)	N	Sample Characteristics	Method/Design	Measures/Results
		<p>however, they were predominantly working class individuals engaged in labor, construction, and maintenance occupations.</p> <p>Age: <i>M</i> = 32 years Range = 21-54 years</p> <p>Geography: N/R</p>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Communication N/R • Retaliation N/R • Jealousy N/R • Other N/R