With the Compliments of Springer Publishing Company, LLC

partner abuse

New Directions in Research, Intervention, and Policy

SPRINGER PUBLISHING COMPANY

www.springerpub.com/pa

Partner Abuse, Volume 3, Number 4, 2012

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

Jennifer Langhinrichsen-Rohling, PhD
Adrianne McCullars, MS
Tiffany A. Misra, MS
University of South Alabama

The main purpose of this review article was to collect and summarize all available papers that reported empirical data related to men's and women's motivations for IPV. 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. Across the 75 samples (located in 74 articles) that were reviewed and coded for this study, 24 contained samples of only women (32%), 6 samples consisted of only men (8%), and 46 samples used both women and men (62%). Power/control and self-defense were commonly measured motivations (76% and 61%, respectively). However, using violence as an expression of negative emotion (63%), communication difficulties (48%), retaliation (60%), or because of jealousy (49%) were also commonly assessed motives. In 62% of the samples, at least one other type of motive was also measured. Only 18 of the located study samples (24%) included data that allowed for a direct gender comparison of men's and women's reported motivations. Many of these studies did not subject their data to statistical analyses. Among those that did, very few gender-specific motives for perpetration emerged. These results should be viewed with caution, however, because many methodological and measurement challenges

ONLINE TABLES: Detailed summaries of the 74 studies reviewed in this article can be found in the table available online at www.springerpub.com/pa. Click on the link to "The Partner Abuse State of Knowledge Project" and go to Topic 10 in the online document.

© 2012 Springer Publishing Company

http://dx.doi.org/10.1891/1946-6560.3.4.429

Copyright © Springer Publishing Company, LLC

exist in this field. There was also considerable heterogeneity across papers making direct gender comparisons problematic.

KEYWORDS: intimate partner violence; gender differences; motivations; power; self-defense; jealousy

One important but controversial question in the field of partner violence centers on what motivates people to perpetrate this socially undesirable and dangerous behavior in their romantic relationships. It has typically been assumed that aggression is a goal-directed behavior such that people are motivated to perpetrate violence with the expectation that their violent behavior will in some way benefit them, despite its obvious negative consequences (Buss, 1961). Benefits to the aggressor could include regaining a sense of power or control, protecting the self from ongoing physical or emotional pain (i.e., self-defense), transmitting communication about intrapersonal (i.e., anger) or interpersonal processes (i.e., relationship dissatisfaction, jealousy), or retaliating for past injustices (i.e., infidelity). Theoretically, each of these perceived benefits could then be expected to function as a primary motivation for the production of violence. Thus, reducing the perceived benefits while enhancing negative consequences to one's partner and relationship that can result from intimate partner violence (IPV) might facilitate intervention strategies for this prevalent and yet destructive behavior. Characterizing the motives that frequently emerge as perceived reasons for perpetrating violence was the primary aim of this study.

However, through the process of conceptualizing and assessing potential motivations for violence, a second important and controversial question emerged. Specifically, do the motives for perpetrating physical IPV differ for men versus women? Consequently, in this review, the literature comparing the motives for both men's and women's perpetration of physical IPV will be reviewed and analyzed.

Addressing the two central questions of what motivates partners to perpetrate IPV and whether such motivations are different for men and women has important clinical and policy implications (Saunders, 2002). Specifically, if men's violence is enacted 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. Under these conditions, the physical violence that women perpetrate in their romantic relationships may best be understood as a response to men's enactment of power to maintain their long-standing position of societal and interpersonal dominance and privilege. Taking into account women's subjugated position in our culture, their resulting victimization then becomes a necessary component of successful interventions for IPV (Hamberger & Potente, 1994).

On the other hand, if both men's and women's physical violence is motivated by anger management concerns, lack of skills to communicate successfully with intimate

Copyright © Springer Publishing Company, LLC

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 (Langhinrichsen-Rohling, 2010). Interventions that take into account these types of motivations for violence most likely need to address psychological issues and relationship-specific concerns that are unique to each perpetrator. These interventions may also not need to be so gender-specific in their construction or enactment. Several researchers and clinicians have also suggested that there is heterogeneity among motivations for perpetrating IPV among men and perhaps women, too, primarily because there are substantially different types of perpetrators (Holtzworth-Munroe & Stuart, 1994; Johnson, 1995, 2005). For example, one type of perpetrator may engage in violence because of problems with emotional regulation or the expression of anger; a different type of perpetrator may be motivated to aggress against their partner to dominate or control them or aggress in self-defense in response to a dangerous partner (Langhinrichsen-Rohling, 2010). With that said, it will be important to examine the research that has focused on whether there are different violence motivations for subgroups of perpetrators.

It is necessary to note that literature reviews related to this topic have been conducted previously. For example, in 2003, Malloy, McCloskey, Grigsby, and Gardner conducted a qualitative review of women's use of violence within their intimate relationships. These authors located the question of whether there are differences between men's and women's motivations for violence under the larger issue of whether or not there is "gender symmetry" in intimate violence perpetration. In essence, gender differences in motivations such that men use violence to control or coerce their partner, whereas women primarily use violence in self-defense would provide evidence that disputes the notion of gender symmetry in perpetration (Dobash, Dobash, Wilson, & Daly, 1992; Pence & Paymar, 1993). Conversely, more similarity in men and women's motives for perpetrating IPV would tend to support the gender symmetry position.

In the Malloy et al. (2003) review, two empirical articles that focused on motivations were highlighted. Specifically, in 1999, Dasgupta interviewed 32 women who had been court ordered to treatment as a result of their perpetration of IPV. Using transcriptions of the interviews that were conducted, motives for perpetrating IPV were coded. Dasgupta (1999) reported that several motivations for these women's perpetration emerged in her analysis. However, according to her coding of the transcribed interviews, the most common reason self-reported by these women was that they used violence to end their own abuse (i.e., in self-defense).

Malloy et al. (2003) also cited a study by Cascardi and Vivian (1995) which used a sample of married couples seeking relationship treatment. Cascardi and Vivian considered the perceived function of men's and women's perpetration of both mild and severe violence. Several functions were reported by both genders (e.g., anger/coercion, anger, provocation, personality functions, and stress). As per their results, there were no gender differences in reports of self-defense functions for mild violence (10% of husbands' perpetration was coded as serving this function vs. 5% of wives' perpetration). For severe violence perpetration, 20% of wives' indicated that it was

Copyright © Springer Publishing Company, LLC

done in self-defense versus 0% of husbands. Yet, despite the Malloy et al. review's reliance on just two studies with heterogeneous results, these authors concluded that "striking differences are found between women and men concerning the motivation for using IPV, with women often using IPV in self-defense and most men using IPV to control their intimate partners" (p. 54).

Then, in 2008, a second review of the literature was conducted. Swan, Gambone, Caldwell, Sullivan, and Snow (2008) also focused on summarizing the literature pertaining to the motivations underlying women's violence. These authors first considered gender differences in the prevalence rates of six different types of violence (e.g., physical aggression perpetration, sexual coercion, stalking, psychological aggression, coercive control, and injury production). Swan et al. concluded that although rates of physical and psychological violence are similar between men and women, men perpetrate substantially more of the other types of violence. As a result of these and other dissimilarities between men's and women's violence, these authors chose to focus on what motivates women to perpetrate IPV as different from what motives men to perpetrate IPV. They cited evidence which indicates that women report more fear of their partner's violence and that battered women's children are also likely to be abused. Although it can be argued that neither of these factors are proximal motivations, Swan et al. used these data to infer that women are more motivated than men to perpetrate violence to protect themselves and their children.

Swan et al. (2008) did acknowledge data from multiple studies indicating that both women and men perpetrate violence to regain or maintain control of their relationships, to defend themselves, and in response to retaliation from previous abuse. They also note that there are inconsistencies in the literature surrounding gender differences in most measured motivations. However, these authors still conclude that there are significant differences in the motivations between men's and women's violence. They further surmise that these differences indicate that male-derived interventions for violence may not be effective for many women (Swan et al., 2008).

Although both of these publications were some of the first to examine motivations underlying women's perpetration of IPV, there were some limitations in these reviews. First, both the Swan et al. (2008) and Malloy et al. (2003) literature reviews appear not to be comprehensive in nature. Neither review provided evidence that they conducted an exhaustive search of the motivational literature. As a result, they drew their conclusions from a limited number of studies. Second, although both reviews chose to focus on understanding women's motivations for perpetrating violence, they finished their reviews by making conclusions relating to the question of whether men and women have substantially different motives for perpetrating physically violent acts against their intimate partner. Last, it could be argued that worries about the intergenerational transmission of violence and experiences of fear as a result of victimization are important components of the experience of IPV; however, they may not qualify as motivations for perpetration. Thus, to the extent possible, this review concentrated on papers that specifically measured motivations or reasons for perpetration of IPV.

Copyright © Springer Publishing Company, LLC

Consequently, the main purpose of this review article was to collect and summarize all available papers that reported empirical data related to both men's and women's motivations for IPV. To facilitate the ability to make comparisons across papers, 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. Studies were also coded for type of sample (i.e., large populations, smaller community, university/school, clinical, and justice/legal) and the measurement devices that were used for motivations and for the perpetration of physical violence. Some of the obtained studies used vignettes to assess participants' perceptions of the perpetrator's motives; these were identified as perception/vignette studies. 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. Within studies that assessed motivations for both men's and women's perpetration of IPV, whether the men and women were a couple or were unrelated to each other was also determined.

Among the studies that measured motivations for the perpetration of both men's and women's violence, coders documented whether or not the data provided a way for the reviewers to make direct gender comparisons. When gender comparisons were available, studies were further coded as to whether the study reported the correlations between violence perpetration and some measured motivation-related risk factor (i.e., levels of control, jealousy, or anger) or whether the study specifically compared the degree to which men and women self-reported the same motivations for their violence.

Because of the expectation of heterogeneity among studies in this field (Shorey, Meltzer, & Cornelius, 2010), this review should be considered primarily descriptive in nature. Nonetheless, the following a priori hypotheses were offered:

1. It was expected that most of the existing studies would be obtained from university/school samples rather than large population, smaller community, clinical, or justice/legal samples.
2. It was expected that more studies would be located that focused on the motivations for men's violence perpetration than women's violence perpetration.
3. It was expected that few of the existing studies would have data that directly compared motivations for the perpetration of men's versus women's violence.
4. It was further expected that even fewer studies would contain data from men and women who were reporting about their mutual current romantic relationship. This would also limit direct gender-based comparisons because only studies with data from both partners in a dyadic relationship would be able to consider the couple as a unit of analysis (i.e., Winstok & Eisikovits, 2008).
5. It was expected that existing empirical studies would primarily focus on control/dominance and self-defense as motivations for men's versus women's violence, respectively (i.e., Shorey et al., 2010).

Copyright © Springer Publishing Company, LLC

6. However, when assessed, it was expected that diverse motivations for physical violence perpetration would emerge (Shorey et al., 2010). These diverse motives might include the following: because it was sexually arousing, the person was under stress, to show anger or as a consequence of emotional dysregulation, to keep from being ignored or to get a partner's attention, to get away from a partner, to obtain love, or because of reduced inhibitions caused by alcohol or drug use (i.e., Follingstad, Wright, Lloyd, & Sabastian, 1991; Leisring, 2011; Ross, 2011).
7. Considerable heterogeneity among studies was expected in terms of sample type, measures used, and who was reporting on the motivation.

METHOD

Study Inclusion and Exclusion Criteria

Studies eligible for this review were those that directly investigated motivations for the perpetration of physical IPV. For inclusion, studies were required to investigate and report results pertaining to the motivation of either men's or women's perpetration of physical violence in an intimate relationship. Studies that exclusively focused on motivations for psychological aggression, sexual coercion, stalking, or coercive control were eliminated (i.e., psychological aggression; Shorey, Cornelius, & Idema, 2011). Studies that focused exclusively on factors that motivate physical IPV victimization were also excluded (e.g., Tanha, Beck, Figueredo, & Raghavan, 2010). In addition, studies that focused on motives as associated with other related constructs were also excluded (e.g., control and marital commitment; Stets & Hammons, 2002). Included studies had to report empirical data, be written in English, use Western populations (i.e., samples within the United States, the United Kingdom, Canada, Australia, or Spain), be published during 1990 or later (or be an initial or seminal paper in the literature), and appear in a peer-reviewed journal. Consequently, excluded studies included theoretical or review articles, single case studies, studies focusing on aggression that was not defined as physical violence, studies of victimization, and material published solely in a book or a book chapter (unless the paper was widely cited as a seminal work in the field).

Data Sources and Search Strategy

Databases that were used in searching for articles included the following: Academic Search Premier, ERIC, MEDLINE, PsycINFO, CINAHL, Biomedical Reference Collection, and SocINDEX. Articles were searched using date criteria from 1990 to September 2011 and with the following terms searched in all fields: IPV, domestic violence, spouse abuse, dating violence, or partner violence; and motivation, self-defense, control, anger, communication, retaliation, jealousy. The initial search was

Copyright © Springer Publishing Company, LLC

augmented with a bibliographic review of all located studies and related review articles. Several additional articles were located in this fashion. In addition, these search strategies located a few studies on motivations for perpetrating IPV that were published prior to 1990 or were contained in a book chapter. Given that many of these additional studies were frequently cited and typically constituted landmark articles in the field (i.e., Dasgupta, 1999; Makepeace, 1986) and contained codeable data, they were retained for this review. Finally, based on the titles of papers that were located for this review, several additional searches were conducted with the following terms (reasons, justifications, antecedents, perceived function, and context) to confirm that all relevant studies were located for this review.

Study Selection

As shown in Table 1, the initial search yielded more than 7,000 articles (n = 7,631). The initial search terms used were broad by design; as a result, many obviously irrelevant articles appeared in the initial searches. However, if an article's title indicated that it could be relevant to this study, the abstract was reviewed. Next, full text articles were retrieved for the 90 studies that appeared to be eligible for inclusion in this review, or for which eligibility could not be determined from the title and abstract alone. Two independent reviewers read these 90 articles to determine relevance. These reviewers agreed that 57 of these studies were appropriate for inclusion in this review. A number of the excluded articles were topically relevant but did not include any codeable empirical data (e.g., Winstok & Eisikovits, 2008); many other located studies were theoretical or speculative in nature. Next, references cited in the 90 obtained

TABLE 1. A Description of the Initial Search Results

Initial Search	IPV	Domestic Violence	Partner Violence	Spouse Abuse	Dating Violence	Subtotals
Motivation	238	436	283	144	32	1,133
Power/control	262	584	303	193	34	1,376
Self-defense	72	241	94	45	17	469
Expression of negative emotion (e.g., anger)	271	746	345	207	75	1,644
Communication	393	1,145	448	244	97	2,327
Retaliation	31	70	38	17	3	159
Jealousy	110	160	133	82	38	523
Subtotals	1,377	3,382	1,644	932	296	Total = 7,631

Copyright © Springer Publishing Company, LLC

articles and the 57 selected studies were also considered to obtain additional studies that might qualify for inclusion; additional searches were also conducted with terms used in the identified papers. This iterative process yielded another 17 studies that contained codeable empirical data related to this topic. Thus, 74 papers are included in the final online review table that corresponds to this manuscript. One of these studies reported results on two distinct samples; thus, most tables included in this review article refer to 75 samples that were drawn from 74 empirical articles.

Data Abstraction Process

The task leaders of this article in conjunction with the editors of the *Partner Abuse State of Knowledge Project* (Hamel, Langhinrichsen-Rohling, & Hines, 2012) developed a data extraction coding system to record relevant information from eligible studies. This information is reported in the comprehensive online review table that corresponds to this article. The table was developed in an iterative fashion with extensive communication between task leaders and directors. As a result, the final online table includes the full reference of each included paper along with its sample setting (i.e., large population, small community, university/school, clinical, or justice/legal), sample characteristics (i.e., demographics, size), methodology and design (i.e., cross-sectional, self-report), and results. The measures used to quantify both motivations and IPV was recorded. Results were organized first according to sample characteristics (if the results were broken down into such groups). Within each type of sample, reported results were then categorized into the seven broad motivation groups that were identified by the authors of this article. These overall motivations were those most commonly seen in the literature and consisted of (a) power/control, (b) self-defense, (c) expression of emotion (i.e., anger), (d) communication, (e) retaliation, (g) jealousy, and (h) other. Several additional tables were then constructed to address the hypotheses advanced for this review article. These tables are included solely within this manuscript.

RESULTS

Hypothesis 1 postulated that a search of the relevant literature would locate more articles using university/school than population-based, community-based, clinical, or justice/legal samples. As shown in Table 2, 28 of the 75 samples (37%) were drawn from university/school participants. In addition, 23 of the 75 samples (31%) were obtained from justice/legal settings. Nine of the samples were categorized as coming from a clinical setting (12%), 12 of the samples were coded as community (16%), and only 3 large population studies (4%) were located for this review.

Hypothesis 2 predicted that the preponderance of studies would focus on men's motivations for perpetrating physical violence. Thus, it was expected that few studies would focus on women's motivations for physical violence perpetration. Likewise, it was anticipated that relatively few studies would be found that directly compared

Copyright © Springer Publishing Company, LLC

TABLE 2. Categorization of Samples by Setting, Gender of Participants in the Sample, and Study Methodology (n = 75 Samples From 74 Included Articles)

Study	F	M	M & F	Couples	No Gender Compare	Gender Compare	Corr	Typol	Vignette Percept
Large population studies									
Felson & Outlaw (2007)			X				X		
Felson & Messner (2000)			X		X				
Carrado, George, Loxam, Jones, & Templar (1996)			X			X			
Community samples									
Caldwell, Swan, Allen, Sullivan, & Snow (2009)	X				X				
Ross & Babcock (2009)				X				X	
Foshee, Bauman, Linder, Rice, & Wilcher (2007)			X					X	
Hamel, Desmarais, & Nicholls (2007)			X						X
Weston, Marshall & Coker (2007)	X				X				
O'Leary, Smith Slep, & O'Leary (2007)				X			X		
O'Leary & Slep (2006)				X		X			
Graham-Kevan & Archer (2005)	X				X				
Rosen, Stith, Few, Daly, & Tritt (2005)				X				X	
Babcock, Costa, Green, & Eckhardt (2004)-Study 2				X				X	
Sarantakos (2004)				X	X				
Ehrensaft, Langhinrichsen-Rohling, Heyman, O'Leary, & Lawrence (1999)				X		X			

(continued)

Copyright © Springer Publishing Company, LLC

TABLE 2. ***(continued)***

Study	F	M	M & F	Couples	No Gender Compare	Gender Compare	Corr	Typol	Vignette Percept
University/school samples									
Leisring (in press)	X				X				
Cornelius, Shorey, & Beebe (2010)			X		X				
Shorey et al. (2010)			X			X			
Walley-Jean & Swan (2009)	X				X				
Cousins & Gangestad (2007)				X			X		
Fernandez-Fuertes & Fuertes (2010)			X				X		
Hettrich & O'Leary (2007)	X				X				
Nabors, Dietz, & Jasinski (2006)			X						X
Forbes, Jobe, White, Bloesch, & Adams-Curtis (2005)			X						X
Olson & Lloyd (2005)	X				X				
Perry & Fromuth (2005)				X		X			
Archer & Graham-Kevan (2003)			X				X		
Follingstad, Bradley, Helff, & Laughin (2002)			X		X				
Harned (2001)			X			X			
Jackson, Cram, & Seymour (2000)			X			X			
Yick & Agbayani - Siewert (2000)			X						X
Milardo (1998)			X						X
DeKeseredy, Saunders, Schwartz, & Alvi (1997)	X				X				
Fiebert & Gonzalez (1997)	X				X				
Foshee (1996)			X			X			
Gagne & Lavoie (1993)			X						X
Bookwala, Frieze, Smith, & Ryan (1992)			X				X		

Copyright © Springer Publishing Company, LLC

Follingstad et al. (1991)			X			X				
Stets & Pirog-Good (1990)				X			X			
Arias & Johnson (1989)			X							X
Dutton & Browning (1988)		X			X					
Mason & Blankenship (1987)			X				X			
Makepeace (1986)			X			X				
Clinical samples			X			X				
Downs, Rindels, & Atkinson (2007)	X				X					
Kernsmith (2005)			X			X				
Babcock et al. (2004)-Study 1		X						X		
Lavoie, Robitaille, & Hebert (2000)			X							X
Cascardi & Vivian (1995)				X		X				
Prince & Arias (1994)		X			X					
Campbell, Oliver, & Bullock (1993)	X				X					
Dutton & Strachan (1987)		X								X
Saunders (1986)	X				X					
Justice or legal samples										
Ross (2011)			X			X				
Swan & Sullivan (2009)	X				X					
Flemke & Allen (2008)	X				X					
Simmons, Lehmann, & Cobb (2008)			X		X					
Smith (2008)		X			X					
Seamans, Rubin, & Stabb (2007)	X				X					
Ward & Muldoon (2007)	X				X					
Miller & Meloy (2006)	X				X					
Stuart et al. (2006)	X				X					

(continued)

Copyright © Springer Publishing Company, LLC

TABLE 2. ***(continued)***

Study	F	M	M & F	Couples	No Gender Compare	Gender Compare	Corr	Typol	Vignette Percept
Hamberger & Guse (2005)			X					X	
Henning, Jones, & Holdford (2005)			X			X			
Dobash & Dobash (2004)				X	X				
Babcock, Miller, & Siard (2003)	X				X				
Swan & Snow (2003)	X				X				
Weizmann-Henelius, Viemero, & Eronen (2003)	X				X				
Hamberger & Guse (2002)			X			X			
Dasgupta (1999)	X				X				
Barnett, Lee, & Thelen (1997)			X			X			
Hamberger (1997)	X				X				
Hamberger, Lohr, Bonge, & Tolin (1997)			X		X				
Grant (1995)	X				X				
Hamberger, Lohr, & Bonge (1994)			X			X			
Claes & Rosenthal (1990)		X			X				
Column Totals	24	6	34	12	35	18	8	6	9

Copyright © Springer Publishing Company, LLC

motivations for men's and women's violence. However, as depicted in Table 2, across the 75 samples (located in 74 articles) that were reviewed and coded for this study, 24 contained samples of only women (32%), 6 samples consisted of men only (8%), and 46 samples used both women and men (62%). Contrary to expectation, 12 of the 46 samples that used both women and men had data from women and men who were in a relationship with one another (i.e., couples, 26%).

According to Hypothesis 3, it was also expected that not many existing studies would contain data that directly compared motivations for men's versus women's violence. As shown in Table 2, 18 of the located study samples (24%) included data that allowed for a direct comparison of men's and women's reported motivations for perpetrating physical violence against their relationship partner. Another eight studies (11%) reported correlations between a motivational factor and IPV perpetration for both men and women. Thirty-five of the studies (47%) did not include data that would allow a comparison of men's versus women's motivations, although some of these papers included men and women in the sample. The remaining 15 manuscripts (20%) constituted perception/vignette ($n = 9$) or typology ($n = 6$) study samples.

Next, Hypothesis 4 predicted that among those studies with direct comparisons of men's versus women's motivations for perpetrating IPV ($n = 18$), few of these studies would contain data from men and women who were in a couple relationship with one another. This hypothesis was supported because only three of the located study samples that had self-reported motives for both the male and the female partner came from a study sample of couples (i.e., Cascardi & Vivian., 1995; Ehrensaft et al., 1999; Perry & Fromuth, 2005; 27% of the couple samples). Four of the study samples with couples contained data that included only correlations between potential motivational factors and IPV perpetration for men and women (36%), making direct comparisons of perceived motivational factors more difficult (i.e., Cousins & Gangestad, 2007; O'Leary & Slep, 2006; O'Leary et al, 2007; Stets & Pirog-Good, 1990). Three of the remaining studies using couples were focused on typology research and motivations (Babcock et al., 2004, Study 2; Rosen et al., 2005; Ross & Babcock, 2009) and the final couple study included qualitative interviews of both members of the dyad; direct comparisons of motives between genders was not possible on the basis of the presented data (Dobash & Dobash, 2004).

Across all the obtained manuscripts and regarding the motivations that were measured a priori, it was expected that existing empirical studies would primarily focus on control/dominance and self-defense as motivating factors for men's versus women's violence. As shown in Table 3, both power/control and self-defense were commonly measured motivations ($n = 57$ of 75 samples, 76% and $n = 46$ of 75 samples, 61%, respectively). However, violence motivated by the expression of negative emotion (e.g., anger; 47 of 75 samples or 63%), communication/influence efforts or difficulties (36 of 75 samples or 48%), as a means to retaliate (45 of 75 samples or 60%), and because of jealousy/cheating (37 of 75 samples or 49%) were also commonly studied. Finally, contrary to expectations of Hypothesis 5, in 47 of 75 samples (63%), at least one other type of motive was also measured.

Copyright © Springer Publishing Company, LLC

TABLE 3. Motivations Measured in Each of the 75 Coded Samples

Reference	P/C	SD	ENE	C	R	J	Other
Archer & Graham-Kevan (2003)	X						Instrumental/expressive
Arias & Johnson (1989)		X			X	X	Defense of child
Babcock et al. (2004; clinical)	X				X	X	
Babcock et al. (2004; community)	X				X	X	
Babcock et al. (2003)		X	X		X		Accepting blame for being violent; fear for other's/children
Barnett et al. (1997)	X	X	X	X	X		Unaware of intention, just teasing other
Bookwala et al. (1992)	X				X	X	Adversarial sexual beliefs
Caldwell et al. (2009)	X	X	X	X	X	X	
Campbell et al. (1993)			X			X	Pregnancy specific;
Carrado et al. (1996)	X	X		X	X		under the influence; it was in his character
Cascardi & Vivian (1995)	X	X	X		X	X	Personality, substance use, provocation, don't know
Claes & Rosenthal (1990)	X						
Cornelius et al. (2010)				X			
Cousins & Gangestad (2007)	X		X			X	
Dasgupta (1999)	X	X		X	X		Raised to be tough
DeKeseredy et al. (1997)		X			X		Initiated the attack
Dobash & Dobash (2004)		X					
Downs et al. (2007)		X					Nonphysical means of self-defense
Dutton & Browning (1988)			X				Participants rated perceived anger of videotaped men
Dutton & Strachan (1987)	X			X			
Ehrensaft et al. (1999)	X						

Copyright © Springer Publishing Company, LLC

Felson & Messner (2000)	X						
Felson & Outlaw (2007)	X					X	
Fernandez-Fuertes & Fuertes (2010)			X			X	
Fiebert & Gonzalez (1997)	X		X	X	X		Men trained not to hit, get turned on sexually, Childhood impact; men protect themselves
Flemke & Allen (2008)		X	X			X	
Follingstad et al. (2002)	X		X				
Follingstad et al. (1991)	X	X	X	X	X	X	Sexually arousing
Forbes et al. (2005)					X		
Foshee (1996)		X					
Foshee et al. (2007)	X	X	X	X	X		
Gagne & Lavoie (1993)	X	X	X		X	X	Behavior problems, alcohol/drugs, pure violence
Graham-Kevan & Archer (2005)	X	X					
Grant (1995)	X		X	X		X	Drunk or drug use
Hamberger & Guse (2005)	X	X	X	X	X		Don't know why
Hamberger & Guse (2002)		X					
Hamberger (1997)	X	X	X	X	X		Don't know why
Hamberger et al. (1994)	X	X	X	X	X		Don't know why, alcohol excuse
Hamberger, et al. (1997)	X	X	X	X	X	X	Professed ignorance, nonspecifics/alcohol
Hamel et al. (2007)	X						Coercive and expressive perceptions only
Harned (2001)	X	X	X	X	X	X	To prove love, sexually arousing
Henning et al. (2005)	X	X	X			X	Insecure in relationships, not fully committed, alcohol or drugs
Hettrich & O'Leary (2007)	X		X	X	X		Externally cued

(continued)

Copyright © Springer Publishing Company, LLC

TABLE 3. ***(continued)***

Reference	P/C	SD	ENE	C	R	J	Other
Jackson et al. (2000)	X		X		X	X	Alcohol
Kernsmith (2005)	X	X	X	X	X	X	
Lavoie et al. (2000)	X	X	X	X	X	X	Consensual sex play, alcohol and drugs, want to be victims, Boys influenced by delinquent peers
Leisring (in press)	X	X	X	X	X	X	To prove love
Makepeace (1986)	X	X	X		X		(Not specified)
Mason & Blankenship (1987)	X		X				
Milardo (1998)	X	X	X	X	X	X	
Miller & Meloy (2006)		X	X				Generally violent
Nabors et al. (2006)	X		X	X	X		Personality problem unlikely to change, women secretly want it, women leave alcohol and drugs
O'Leary & Slep (2006)				X	X	X	Because being nagged Because of child
O'Leary et al. (2007)	X		X	X		X	Family of origin childhood history Dominance/jealousy were measured together
Olson & Lloyd (2005)	X	X	X	X	X	X	Pain unresolved issues, drug or alcohol, family learned pattern, insecure with relationship, protection of partner
Perry & Fromuth (2005)	X	X	X		X	X	Playfulness
Prince & Arias (1994)	X						Self-esteem
Rosen et al. (2005)	X		X	X	X	X	

Copyright © Springer Publishing Company, LLC

Ross (2011)	X	X	X	X	X	X	Sexually arousing, influence of drugs
Ross & Babcock (2009)	X	X	X	X	X		Context predicts violence
Sarantakos (2004)	X	X	X			X	
Saunders (1986)		X			X		Initiating attack
Seamans et al. (2007)	X	X	X	X	X	X	New baby stress, postpartum depression
Shorey et al. (2010)	X	X	X	X	X	X	Sexually arousing, alcohol or drug
Simmons et al. (2008)	X	X	X	X	X	X	Drunk
Smith (2008)	X		X	X		X	Family of origin, violence
Stets & Pirog-Good (1990)	X						
Stuart et al. (2006)	X	X	X	X	X	X	Get away from partner, alcohol or drug, sexually arousing
Swan & Sullivan (2009)		X					
Swan & Snow (2003)	X	X			X		
Walley-Jean & Swan (2009)	X	X	X	X	X	X	Sexually arousing
Ward & Muldoon (2007)	X	X	X		X		Drinking or drug use
Weizmann-Henelius et al. (2003)		X		X	X	X	
Weston et al. (2007)	X	X	X	X	X		Personal problems, childhood experiences
Yick & Agbayani-Siewert (2000)	X	X	X	X		X	Drunk
TOTALS	57	46	47	36	45	37	47
Total % in 75 samples	76	61	63	48	60	49	63

Note. P/C = power/control; SD = self-defense; ENE = expression of negative emotion; C = communication; R = retaliation; J = jealousy.

Copyright © Springer Publishing Company, LLC

However, when assessed, it was also expected, in Hypothesis 6 that diverse motivations for physical violence perpetration would emerge in studies that assessed for various motives. Among the 75 study samples, either one ($n = 12$; 16%) or two ($n = 7$; 9%) of the preidentified seven-coded motivations were assessed. Another 17 studies assessed three or four of the coded motivations (23%). The remainder of studies ($n = 39$) coded five, six, or seven of the main motivations (52%).

Among the studies that reported "other" specific motivations generated by participants, several emerged with some frequency. Specifically, within the 75 study samples, 16 of the authors indicated that drug or alcohol use or abuse was cited as a motivating factor for the perpetration of IPV (22%). Eight of the studies indicated that sexual arousal was generated as a motivation for perpetrating physical violence against an intimate partner (11%). Personality or character issues, modeling effects from family of origin violence, playfulness/teasing, and unknown reasons were also generated by participants as motives for physical violence in more than one study.

As noted in Table 2, eight of the located and included studies reported correlations between a potential motivational factor and violence perpetration for men versus women. It is likely, however, that many other studies of this sort are included in papers reviewing risk factors and violence perpetration. Thus, these results should be considered cautiously.

Of these eight studies, six (75%) reported associations between power/control (or instrumental beliefs about aggression, high need for power; proprietariness, or dominance/jealousy) and IPV. Three of these studies (38%) reported a greater relationship between power/control and perpetration for men as opposed to women generally (Archer & Graham-Kevan, 2003; Mason & Blankenship, 1987) and among ex-spouses only (Felson & Outlaw, 2007). Four of the studies reported no significant gender differences in this association: macho was unrelated to perpetration for both genders (Bookwala et al., 1992), no relation between power/control and perpetration for male or female spouses in current marriages (Felson & Outlaw, 2007), jealousy/dominance was significantly associated with perpetration for both men and women (O'Leary et al., 2007), and control was related to perpetration of minor but not severe violence for both genders (Stets & Pirog-Good, 1990). However, none of these studies found a stronger association between power/control and women's physical violence than men's physical violence.

In two of the correlation studies, measures of relationship satisfaction were used as correlates of physical violence perpetration against a partner. In United States, married couples' lack of marital satisfaction was significantly associated with violence perpetration for both husbands and wives (O'Leary et al., 2007). However, in a sample from Spain, relationship dissatisfaction was significantly correlated with perpetration for women ($r = .22$) but not for men ($r = .13$).

Three of the eight (38%) correlation studies reported associations between retaliation and/or anger and violence perpetration; one of these studies also measured power/control along with retaliation. This study is reported earlier and indicates that men are more likely to perpetrate violence in retaliation/dominance than are women

Copyright © Springer Publishing Company, LLC

(Mason & Blankenship, 1987). One study failed to find a gender difference as retaliation was a significant motive for perpetration for both genders (Bookwala et al., 1992). In the study by O'Leary et al. (2007), anger was reported to be a significant correlate of expressed violence for both men and women. No gender differences in the strength of these associations were reported.

Four of the correlation studies (50%) reported findings related to the jealousy motive. In the study by O'Leary et al. (2007), dominance and jealousy were combined; this construct was significantly associated with partner aggression for men and women. Bookwala et al. (1992) used jealousy as a predictor of violence. Jealousy was significantly correlated with women's but not men's expressed violence. The remaining study in this group was conducted in Spain. They reported no gender differences in the associations between jealousy and violence perpetration as jealousy motivated IPV for both men and women (Fernandez-Fuertes & Fuertes, 2010).

Of primary importance to this review article is the data included in Tables 4, 5, 6, and 7. These tables contrast studies that provide direct comparisons of women's and men's self-reported motivations for perpetrating IPV. Some of the included studies assessed the reported construct in multiple ways; each measurement is listed as a separate row in the table resulting in nonindependence of reported data (i.e., some studies had many more measurements of the same construct than did others). Very few studies are included in each of these tables, indicating that all summaries of these analyses should be treated with extreme caution.

Nonetheless, as shown in Table 4, of the 12 papers measuring power/control motives for men and women perpetrators, three (25%) reported statistics indicating no significant gender differences (Harned, 2001; Kernsmith, 2005; Ross, 2011). One paper (8%) reported statistically significant results indicating that women were more motivated to perpetrate physical violence as a result of power/control factors than men (Follingstad et al., 1991). Three papers (25%) reported results indicating that power/control factors were more motivating for men than women (Barnett et al., 1997; Ehrensaft et al., 1999; Shorey et al., 2010), and one paper reported mixed findings for gender (8%; Makepeace, 1986). The remaining four papers (33%) did not report statistics to indicate whether or not the values they reported were significantly different between men and women.

As presented in Table 5, 13 of the 17 papers (76%) compared men's and women's perpetration of physical violence for the purpose of self-defense. Among these papers, three did not report statistics indicating whether or not the data differed significantly between men and women. Five papers (38%) reported results indicating that women were significantly more likely to report self-defense as a motive than men (Barnett et al., 1997; Foshee, 1996; Kernsmith, 2005; Makepeace, 1986; Ross, 2011). Four papers reported that no significant gender differences were obtained (Cascardi & Vivian, 1995; Follingstad et al., 1991; Hamberger & Guse, 2002; Harned, 2001) and the remaining paper reported that men endorsed self-defense as a motive for physical violence perpetration significantly more often than did women (Shorey et al., 2010).

Data from 13 studies that considered anger and/or retaliation as motives for IPV are presented in Table 6. Five of the presented studies (38%) did not report statistical

Copyright © Springer Publishing Company, LLC

TABLE 4. Gender Differences in the Expression of Power/Control as a Motivation for Perpetrating Intimate Partner Violence

Measure	Sample	Item Description	Male Mean or %	Female Mean or %	Statistic	*p* value	
Barnett et al. (1997)	Male batterers; females in a shelter for battered women	Show who is boss	1.61	1.31	6.80	$p <$ .01	M
Carrado et al. (1996)	Men and women in Britain	Make him or her do something	26.0%	26.0%			NR
Carrado et al. (1996)	Men and women in Britain	Make him or her stop doing something	43.0%	33.0%			
Cascardi & Vivian (1995)	Married couples: mild aggression	Coercion or anger	65.0%	50.0%			NR
Cascardi & Vivian (1995)	Married couples: severe aggression	Coercion/anger	57.0%	40.0%			
Ehrensaft et al. (1999)	Married ggressive couples	Control scale from interview	5.17	4.03	4.13	$p <$ .05	M
Follingstad et al. (1991)	College students	To feel more powerful	0%	3.4%			W
Follingstad et al. (1991)	College students	To get control over another	8.3%	22.0%	4.33	$p <$ .05	
Hamberger, et al. (1994)	DV perpetrators	Get him or her to shut up	.79	.83			NR
Hamberger, et al. (1994)	DV perpetrators	To control her to assert authority	.84	.94			
Hamberger, et al. (1994)	DV perpetrators	Make him or her listen	.82	.85			
Harned (2001)	Undergraduate and graduate students	To get control	1.72	1.49	1.20	*ns*	NS

Copyright © Springer Publishing Company, LLC

Harned (2001)	Undergraduate and graduate students	To feel more powerful	1.05	1.30	1.76	*ns*	
Jackson et al. (2000)	New Zealand high school students	To get own way	28.8%	15.8%			NR
Kernsmith (2005)	DV perpetrators	Factor: Exerting power	.79	.86		*ns*	NS
Makepeace (1986)	College students	To harm partner	2.40	8.30		$p <$ .05	W
Makepeace (1986)	College students	To intimidate partner	21.30	6.80		$p <$ .05	M
Makepeace (1986)	College students	To get something	3.90	2.30			
Ross (2011)	DV perpetrators	Dominate/punish	11.54	15.07	$t < 1$	*ns*	NS
Shorey et al. (2010)	College students	To feel more powerful	12.14	6.52		$d =$ .24	M
Shorey et al. (2010)	College students	Control partner	12.85	6.08		$d =$ .28	
Shorey et al. (2010)	College students	Get partner to stop/ do something	12.14	6.52		$d =$ .24	
Shorey et al. (2010)	College students	Make partner agree with you	4.28	2.39		$d =$ .19	
Shorey et al. (2010)	College students	Shut partner up	7.85	6.08		$d =$ .11	
Shorey et al. (2010)	College students	Make partner scared/afraid	4.28	1.30		$d =$ .29	

Note. M = men more motivated by power/control than women; NR = no statistics were reported; W = women more motivated by power/control than men; DV = domestic violence; NS = gender differences were nonsignificant.

Copyright © Springer Publishing Company, LLC

TABLE 5. Differences in the Expression of Self-Defense as a Motivation for Intimate Partner Violence

Study	Sample Type	Items	Male Mean or %	Female Mean or %	Statistic	*p* value	
Barnett et al. (1997)	Male batterers, females in a shelter for battered women	Protecting self	1.19	1.32	4.04	$p < .05$	W
Carrado et al. (1996)	Men and women in British heterosexual relationships	About to use physical action	21.0%	17.0%			NR
Cascardi & Vivian (1995)	Married couples: mild aggression	Self-defense	10.0%	5.0%			NS
Cascardi & Vivian (1995)	Married couples: severe aggression	Self-defense	0%	20.0%	$\chi^2 = 3.21$	$p < .07$	
Follingstad et al. (1991)	College students	To protect self	17.7%	18.6%	$\chi^2 = .09$	*ns*	NS
Foshee (1996)	Eighth and 9th grade students	Self-defense	5.4%	15.9%	$\chi^2 = 40.40$	$p < .001$	W
Hamberger, et al. (1994)	DV perpetrators	Self-defense/ defend myself	.00	.50			NR
Hamberger & Guse (2002)	DV perpetrators	Partner used violence in self-defense	48.0%	52.0%		*ns*	NS
Hamberger & Guse (2002)	Male DV perpetrators vs. sheltered battered women	Partner used violence in self-defense	49.0%	29.0%		*ns*	

Copyright © Springer Publishing Company, LLC

Harned (2001)	Undergraduate and graduate students	Self-defense	3.74	3.34	$t < 1$	*ns*	NS
Henning et al. (2005)	DV offenders	Self-defense	50.0%	65.4%			NR
Kernsmith (2005)	DV offenders	Factor: Striking back for abuse (to protect yourself)	1.11	1.50		$p < .05$	W
Makepeace (1986)	College students	Self-defense	18.1%	35.6%		$p < .05$	W
Ross (2011)	DV perpetrators	Defense	16.32	46.66	$t = 5.14$	$p < .001$	W
Shorey et al. (2010)	College students	To protect self	7.14	2.17		$d = .47$	M

Note. W = women more motivated by self-defense than men; NR = no statistics were reported; NS = gender differences were nonsignificant; DV = domestic violence; M = men more motivated by self-defense than women.

Copyright © Springer Publishing Company, LLC

TABLE 6. Gender Differences in the Expression of Anger or Retaliation as a Motivation for Perpetrating Intimate Partner Violence

Measure	Sample	Anger or Retaliation	Item	Male Mean or %	Female Mean or %	Statistic	*p* Value
Barnett et al. (1997)	Male batterers; females in a shelter for battered women	Retaliation	To teach a lesson	1.58	1.39	2.50	*ns*
Carrado et al. (1996)	Men and women in British heterosexual relationships	Retaliation	Partner said something or threatened	53.0%	52.0%		
Carrado et al. (1996)	Men and women in British heterosexual relationships	Retaliation	Partner did some physical action	27.0%	21.0%		
Cascardi & Vivian (1995)	Married couples: mild aggression	Anger	Anger only	34.0%	40.0%		
Cascardi & Vivian (1995)	Married couples: severe aggression	Anger	Anger only	29.0%	52.0%		
Cascardi & Vivian (1995)	Married couples: mild aggression	Provocation	Provocation	7.0%	5.0%		
Cascardi & Vivian (1995)	Married couples: severe aggression	Provocation	Provocation	7.0%	12.0%		
Follingstad et al. (1991)	College students	Anger	To show anger	37.5%	57.6%	5.54	$p < .05$
Follingstad et al. (1991)	College students	Retaliation	In retaliation for emotional hurt	25.0%	55.9%	13.11	$p < .0001$

Copyright © Springer Publishing Company, LLC

Follingstad et al. (1991)	College students	Retaliation	In retaliation for being hit	29.2%	13.6%	5.61	$p < .05$
Hamberger, et al. (1994)	DV perpetrators	Anger	Express anger	.92	.93		
Hamberger, et al. (1994)	DV perpetrators	Retaliation/ punishment	To get him back/ punishment	.88	.85		
Harned (2001)	Undergraduate and graduate students	Anger	Anger/jealousy	6.28	7.76	1.99	$p < .04$
Henning et al. (2005)	DV offenders	Retaliation	They started something	57.1%	65.4%		
Jackson et al. (2000)	New Zealand high school students	Anger	Anger	41.7%	21.1%		
Jackson et al. (2000)	New Zealand high school students	Retaliation	Retaliation	21.1%	16.7%		
Kernsmith (2005)	DV perpetrators	Retaliation and anger	Factor: Striking back for abuse (disciplining partner, to get back at partner for hitting, to show anger)	1.11	1.50		$p = .04$
Makepeace (1986)	College students	Retaliation	Retaliation	16.5%	18.9%		*ns*
Makepeace (1986)	College students	Anger	Uncontrollable anger	28.3%	24.2%		*ns*
O'Leary & Slep (2006)	Couples with children	Retaliation	Because of partner physical—mild	30.1%	11.0%	$z = 2.35$	$p = .02$

(continued)

Copyright © Springer Publishing Company, LLC

TABLE 6. ***(continued)***

Measure	Sample	Anger or Retaliation	Item	Male Mean or %	Female Mean or %	Statistic	*p* Value
O'Leary & Slep (2006)	Couples with children	Retaliation	Because of partner physical—severe	42.4%	21.1%		*ns*
O'Leary & Slep (2006)	Unhappy couples with children	Retaliation	Because of partner physical—mild	36.6%	10.5%		
O'Leary & Slep (2006)	Unhappy couples with children	Retaliation	Because of partner physical—severe	41.7%	41.8%		
Ross (2011)	DV perpetrators	Emotional dysregulation	To show anger, to show feelings	21.28	28.67	$t = 1.26$	*ns*
Ross (2011)	DV perpetrators	Retaliation	Because partner provoked to get back at partner	22.06	33.36	$t = 1.80$	*ns*
Shorey et al. (2010)	College students	Anger	Anger	17.85	12.82		$d = .24$
Shorey et al. (2010)	College students	Anger and retaliation	Provoked/ pushed over the edge	11.42	11.95		$d = .02$
Shorey et al. (2010)	College students	Retaliation	Get back for emotional hurt	10.00	16.73		$d = .24$
Shorey et al. (2010)	College students	Retaliation	Get back for being hit first	5.71	6.95		$d = .07$
Shorey et al. (2010)	College students	Retaliation	To hurt partner's feelings	8.57	3.91		$d = .29$

Note. DV = domestic violence.

Copyright © Springer Publishing Company, LLC

TABLE 7. Gender Differences in the Expression of Jealousy as a Motivation for Intimate Partner Violence

Study	Sample Type	Items	Male Mean or %	Female Mean or %	Statistic	*p* Value
Cascardi & Vivian (1994)	Married couples: mild aggression	Jealousy	7.0%	0%		
Cascardi & Vivian (1994)	Married couples: severe aggression	Jealousy	0%	0%		
Follingstad et al. (1991)	College students	Jealousy	41.7%	8.5%	$\chi^2 = 29.62$	$p < .001$
Harned (2001)	Graduate and undergraduate students	Jealousy/anger	6.28	7.76	$t = 1.99$	$p < .05$
Jackson et al. (2000)	New Zealand high school students	Jealousy	20.8%	15.8%		
Kernsmith (2005)	DV perpetrators	Factor: Disciplining partner (felt jealous)	.78	1.03		*ns*
Ross (2011)	DV perpetrators	Infidelity	14.16	28.83	$t = 2.04$	$p < .05$
Shorey et al. (2010)	College students	Jealousy	17.14	8.04		$d = .34$
Shorey et al. (2010)	College students	Partner cheated	2.85	5.43		$d = .19$

Note. DV = domestic violence.

Copyright © Springer Publishing Company, LLC

data regarding potential gender differences in this motivation (i.e., Barnett et al., 1997; Carrado et al., 1996; Cascardi & Vivian, 1995; Hamberger et al., 1994; Henning et al., 2005; Jackson et al., 2000). Of the remaining eight studies, three reported nonsignificant gender differences (Barnett et al., 1997; Makepeace, 1986; Ross, 2011), and two reported that women endorsed this motivation at higher levels than did men—anger/jealousy (Harned, 2001) and anger and retaliation (Kernsmith, 2005). The remaining three studies reported mixed findings as follows: two findings of women greater than men, one finding of men greater than women (Follingstad et al., 1991); women greater than men, men greater than women, and nonsignificant gender differences (Shorey et al., 2010); and one finding that men were significantly more likely to be motivated by retaliation than women, the other findings had no statistics reported (O'Leary & Slep, 2006).

Potential gender differences in self-reporting jealousy as a motivation for perpetrating IPV are presented in Table 7. Seven studies contained gender-differentiated data related to the jealousy motive. Two of these studies did not subject their data to statistical analyses (Cascardi & Vivian, 1995; Jackson et al., 2000), leaving five studies with statistical data about gender differences. One of these studies found that jealousy was more commonly cited as a motivation for men's versus women's violence (Follingstad et al., 1991). Ross (2011) indicated that women were more motivated to perpetrate violence as a result of infidelity than were men. A second study that measured jealousy and anger together also found that women reported greater amounts of this motivation than did men (Harned, 2001). However, a study of domestic violence perpetrators failed to find significant gender differences (Kernsmith, 2005). The remaining study, which relied on a university/school sample, reported that men were significantly more likely to report jealousy as a motivation for their perpetration; however, women were more likely to state that their partner cheating was a motivation for their violence; consequently, this study had mixed findings (Shorey et al., 2010).

Finally, as predicted in Hypothesis 7, considerable heterogeneity among studies was expected. As shown in the tables constructed for this manuscript and as exemplified in the online table that is associated with this article, the samples used for these studies varied considerably and the measures used to assess motivations appear to be in their infancy. Various informants were also used as determinants of the perpetrator's motivations.

DISCUSSION

This project was designed to review the existing empirical studies focused on uncovering men and women's motivations for perpetrating IPV. Although the original search yielded a reasonable pool of studies, substantially fewer ($n = 74$) studies met the specified inclusion criteria for this review. More than a third of the originally identified studies were excluded from this review because they lacked empirical or codeable data. Moreover, even among the included studies, several authors reported findings that they did not subject to statistical analysis. There continues to be a need

Copyright © Springer Publishing Company, LLC

for researchers to collect quantifiable and analyzable data that can shed light on the motives that underlie both men and women's perpetration of IPV.

Within the studies that were included in this review, it is readily apparent that various strategies were used to determine perpetration motives. In addition, many types of motive measures were employed (e.g., asking directly for reasons, using self-report measures of constructs assumed to be motivational in nature to conduct correlational analyses). Measurement development in this field has only just begun. It is particularly important that some of the main motives being measured are operationally defined more clearly because many might interpret the terms differently (e.g., self-defense, control, retaliation; Shorey et al., 2010). It is encouraging, however, that several instruments to measure motivations have been developed recently. One of the most promising is the reasons for violence (RFV) scale developed by Stuart et al. (2006). Greater use of this scale is likely to facilitate comparisons across study samples.

The existing heterogeneity in methodology, measurement, and construct development may also 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 preexisting abuse of an emotional, physical, or sexual nature (Kernsmith, 2005); 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 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 because this admission implies vulnerability.

Copyright © Springer Publishing Company, LLC

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 readily apparent that the nature and number of motives that are offered to the reporter influences the type of results that are obtained. Using open-ended questions or administering measures that offer various motives engenders a greater diversity of motivational responses than does specifying a limited number of motives. However, in 25% of the located studies, only one or two motives were measured. The remainder of the included study samples assessed three or more of the main motives postulated in the literature; although various combinations of motives were assessed across these papers. The irregularity with which all motives were included as possibilities greatly hindered direct comparisons across the literature.

It is also worth noting that some unexpected motives emerged using more open-ended or inclusive measurement strategies. For example, in a number of studies, people indicated that violence perpetration may be sexually arousing (11% of included study samples) or violence may be motivated by a desire to play with or tease one's partner. Violence perpetration is also understood as an ancillary consequence of alcohol or drug abuse (this was generated as a possible motive in 22% of included study samples). Perpetration is also seen as a consequence of enduring impacts related to childhood trauma or as a result of long-standing personality issues. Although it can be argued as to whether these factors constitute actual motives for perpetrating violence, it would seem prudent to incorporate these concepts into existing measurement devices to fully understand the function of IPV. Public perceptions of these factors as potential motivations for perpetrations may also need to be directly addressed in violence prevention and intervention programs.

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 because 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's and women's motives for perpetrating IPV must be viewed with great caution. Conducting additional population-based studies of the perceived motivations for both adolescent and adult IPV in dating, cohabitating, and married relationships would be a useful addition to the field.

Perhaps as a result of many of the earlier challenges, some researchers have chosen to avoid the problems inherent in self-reporting motives for perpetrating IPV. One of the main alternative strategies has been to use other informants such as spouses or mothers (e.g., Sarantakos, 2004). Although this strategy has intuitive appeal, the

Copyright © Springer Publishing Company, LLC

validity with which other people can accurately perceive and report on someone else's motivations is also unclear. The relationship between the reporter and the perpetrator also needs to be clearly specified and considered. The victims of IPV may have an important and yet unique understanding of the motives of their perpetrator; however, this perspective is likely to differ from that of a mother, a therapist, or the actual perpetrator. As a result, a full understanding of this literature needs to consider what motivations were measured, how they were measured, and who was inferring the reported motivation. This additional complexity makes drawing firm conclusions about this literature even more complicated.

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 most 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 is not surprising because 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 IPV 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) used a revised version of the motivations and effects questionnaire (MEQ; Follingstad et al., 1991). She reported that college womens' 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 are 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. Given the typicality with which these motives were generated for perpetrators, they should be routinely measured, better understood, and incorporated into prevention and intervention efforts.

Copyright © Springer Publishing Company, LLC

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 most 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. This number excludes studies that reported correlations between a potential motivational factor and violence perpetration for men and women although these papers are described in the "Results" section of this review ($n = 8$). The study samples that were retained for the gender comparisons vary in the degree to which each of the motives of focus in this review were assessed, thus, the *n*'s vary across each motive considered in Tables 4, 5, 6, and 7. Some of the gender comparisons seem 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's 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. Although 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, none of the obtained correlation studies reported stronger associations between power and control motives and perpetration for women as opposed to men.

Regarding 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).

Copyright © Springer Publishing Company, LLC

In a methodological advance, Shorey et al. (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 using 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.

Furthermore, although 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 10 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. However, despite findings of gender differences in some of the studies, it is important to point out that self-defense is endorsed in most samples by only a minority of respondents, male and female. For nonperpetrator samples, the rates of self-defense reported by men ranged from 0% to 21%, and for women, the range was 5%–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 experienced violence because 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

Copyright © Springer Publishing Company, LLC

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 (Langhinrichsen-Rohling, 2011), reported findings in different ways, made use of different informants, differed in whether or not they measured both men and women, and used different samples. Moreover, although this review sought to be comprehensive in nature, it is possible that some important papers in the field have been overlooked. Furthermore, this article 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. The motives for perpetrators of various types of violence may differ from those who use physical violence only. Likewise, those who perpetrate across various 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 based on the articles included in this review was not fully possible.

Nonetheless, it seems clear that both men and women perpetrate violence in response to various 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 vs. 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 to understand the motives underlying both men's 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 various 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

Copyright © Springer Publishing Company, LLC

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.

REFERENCES

References marked with an asterisk indicate studies summarized in the online-only tables available at http://dx.doi.org/10.1891/1946-6560.3.4.e10

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

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

*Babcock, J. C., 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. *Journal of Family Psychology*, *18*(3), 433–442.

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

*Barnett, O. W., Lee, C. Y., & Thelen, R. E. (1997). Gender differences in attributions of self-defense and control in interpartner aggression. *Violence Against Women*, *3*, 462–481.

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

Buss, A. H. (1961). *The psychology of aggression*. New York, NY: John Wiley & Sons.

Buunk, B. P. (1997). Personality, birth order and attachment styles as related to various types of jealousy. *Personality and Individual Differences*, *23*, 997–1006.

*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. *Aggression, Maltreatment, and Trauma*, *18*(7), 672–697.

*Campbell, J. C., Oliver, C., & Bullock, L. (1993). Why battering during pregnancy? *Clinical Issues in Perinatal and Women's Health Nursing*, *4*(3), 343–349.

*Carrado, M., George, M. J., Loxam, E., Jones, L., & Templar, D. (1996). Aggression in British heterosexual relationships: A descriptive analysis. *Aggressive Behavior*, *22*, 410–415.

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

*Claes, J. A., & Rosenthal, D. M. (1990). Men who batter women: A study in power. *Journal of Family Violence*, *5*(3), 215–224.

*Cornelius, T. L., Shorey, R. C., & Beebe, S. M. (2010). Self-reported communication variables and dating violence: Using Gottman's marital communication conceptualization. *Journal of Family Violence*, *25*, 439–448.

*Cousins, A. J., & Gangestad, S. W. (2007). Perceived threats of women infidelity, male proprietariness, and violence in college dating samples. *Violence and Victims*, *22*, 651–668.

Copyright © Springer Publishing Company, LLC

*Dasgupta, S. D. (1999). Just like men? A critical view of violence by women. In: M. F. Shepard & E. L. Pence (Eds.), *Coordinating community responses to domestic violence: Lessons from Duluth and beyond* (pp. 195–222). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

*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. *Sociological Spectrum*, *17*(2), 199–222.

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

Dobash, R. P., Dobash, R. E., Wilson, M., & Daly, M. (1992). The myth of sexual symmetry in marital violence. *Social Problems*, *39*, 71–91.

*Downs, W. R., Rindels, B., & Atkinson, C. (2007). Women's use of physical and nonphysical self-defense strategies during incidents of partner violence. *Violence Against Women*, *13*, 28–45.

*Dutton, D. G., & Browning, J. J. (1988). Power struggles and intimacy anxieties as causative factors of wife assault. In G. W. Russell (Ed.), *Violence in intimate relationships* (pp. 163–175). Costa Mesa, CA: PMA.

*Dutton, D. G., & Strachan, C. E. (1987). Motivational needs for power and spouse-specific assertiveness in assaultive and nonassultive men. *Violence and Victims*, *2*(3) 145–156.

*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? *Journal of Family Psychology*, *13*, 20–32.

*Felson, R. B., & Messner, S. F. (2000). The control motive in intimate partner violence. *School Psychology Quarterly*, *63*, 86–94.

*Felson, R. B., & Outlaw, M. C. (2007). The control motive and marital violence. *Violence and Victims*, *22*, 387–407.

*Fernandez-Fuertes, A. A., & Fuertes, A. (2010). Physical and psychological aggression in dating relationships of Spanish adolescents: Motives and consequences. *Child Abuse & Neglect*, *34*, 183–191.

*Fiebert, M. S., & Gonzalez, D. M. (1997). College women who initiate assaults on their male partners and the reasons offered for such behavior. *Psychological Reports*, *80*(2), 583–590.

Fischer, A., & Evers, C. (2011). The social costs and benefits of anger as a function of gender and relationship context. *Sex Roles*, *65*(1/2), 23–34.

*Flemke, K., & Allen, K. R. (2008). Women's experience of rage: A critical feminist analysis. *Journal of Marital and Family Therapy*, *34*, 58–74.

*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. *Violence and Victims*, *17*(1), 35–47.

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

*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. *Sex Roles*, *52*, 165–173.

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

Copyright © Springer Publishing Company, LLC

*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. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, *22*(5), 498–519.

*Gagne, M. H., & Lavoie, F. (1993). Young people's views on the causes of violence in adolescents' romantic relationships. *Canada's Mental Health*, *41*(3), 11–15.

Goldhor-Lerner, H. (1985). *The dance of anger*. New York, NY: Harper & Row.

*Graham-Kevan, N., & Archer, J. (2005). Investigating three explanations of women's relationship aggression. *Psychology of Women Quarterly*, *29*, 270–277.

*Grant, C. A. (1995). Women who kill: The impact of abuse. *Issues in Mental Health Nursing*, *16*, 315–326.

Guerrero, L. K. (1998). Attachment-style differences in the experience and expression of romantic jealousy. *Personal Relationships*, *5*, 273–291.

*Hamberger, L. K. (1997). Female offenders in domestic violence: A look at actions in their context. *Journal of Aggression, Maltreatment, & Trauma*, *1*, 117–129.

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

*Hamberger, L. K., & Guse, C. (2005). Typology of reactions to intimate partner violence among men and women arrested for partner violence. *Violence and Victims*, *20*, 303–317.

*Hamberger, L. K., Lohr, J. M., & Bonge, D. (1994). The intended function of domestic violence is different for arrested male and female perpetrators. *Family Violence and Sexual Assault Bulletin*, *10*(3/4), 40–43.

*Hamberger, L. K., Lohr, J. M., Bonge D., & Tolin, D. F. (1997). An empirical classification of motivations for domestic violence. *Violence Against Women*, *3*(4), 401–423.

Hamberger, L. K., & Potente, T. (1994). Counseling heterosexual women arrested for domestic violence: Implications for theory and practice. *Violence and Victims*, *9*, 125–137.

*Hamel, J., Desmarais, S. L., & Nicholls, T. L. (2007). Perceptions of motives in intimate partner violence: expressive versus coercive violence. *Violence and Victims*, *22*, 563–576.

Hamel, J., Langhinrichsen-Rohling, J., & Hines, D. (2012). More than a literature review: The revolutionary Partner Abuse State of Knowledge Project (PASK). *Partner Abuse, 3*, 131–139.

*Harned, M. S. (2001). Abused women or abused men? An examination of the context and outcomes of dating violence. *Violence and Victims*, *16*, 269–285.

Hazan, C., & Shaver, P. (1987). Romantic love conceptualized as an attachment process. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *52*, 511–524.

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

*Hettrich, E. L., & O'Leary, K. D. (2007). Females' reasons for their physical aggression in dating relationships. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, *22*, 1131–1143.

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

*Jackson, S. M., Cram, F., & Seymour, F. W. (2000). Violence and sexual coercion in high school students' dating relationships. *Journal of Family Violence*, *15*, 23–36.

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

Copyright © Springer Publishing Company, LLC

Johnson, M. P. (2005). Apples and oranges in child custody disputes: Intimate terrorism vs. situational couple violence. *Journal of Child Custody*, *2*, 43–52.

*Kernsmith, P. (2005). Exerting power or striking back: A gendered comparison of motivations for domestic violence perpetration. *Violence and Victims*, *20*, 173–185.

Langhinrichsen-Rohling, J. (2010). Controversies involving gender and intimate partner violence in the United States. *Sex Roles*, *62*, 179–193.

Langhinrichsen-Rohling, J. (2011, November). The context surrounding women's perpetration of intimate partner violence. In P. Leisring (Chair), *Women and intimate partner violence*. Symposium conducted at the 45th Annual Meeting of the Association for Behavioral and Cognitive Therapies, Toronto, Canada.

*Lavoie, F., Robitaille, L., & Hebert, M. (2000). Teen dating relationships and aggression: An exploratory study. *Violence Against Women*, *6*(6), 6–36.

Leisring, P. A. (2011, November). *Motivation for perpetration of physical and emotional partner violence among college women*. Paper presented at the 45th Annual Meeting of the Association for the Advancement of Behavioral and Cognitive Therapies, Toronto, Canada.

*Leisring, P. A. (in press). Physical and emotional abuse in romantic relationships: Motivation for perpetration among college women. *Partner Abuse*.

Malloy, K. A., McCloskey, K. A., Grigsby, N., & Gardner, D. (2003). Women's use of violence within intimate relationships. *Journal of Aggression*, *Maltreatment and Trauma*, *6*, 37–59.

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

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

McCullars, A. C. (2012). *Family of origin, attachment, and jealousy in adjudicated adolescent males* (Unpublished master's thesis). University of South Alabama, Mobile.

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

*Miller, S. L., & Meloy, M. L. (2006). Women's use of force: Voices of women arrested for domestic violence. *Violence Against Women*, *12*, 89–115.

*Nabors, E. L., Dietz, T. L., & Jasinski, J. L. (2006). Domestic violence beliefs and perceptions among college students. *Violence and Victims*, *21*, 779–795.

*O'Leary, K. D., Smith Slep, A. M., & O'Leary, S. G. (2007). Multivariate models of men's and women's partner aggression. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology*, *75*, 752–764.

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

*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. *Sex Roles*, *53*(7/8), 603–617.

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

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

*Prince, J. E., & Arias, I. (1994). The role of perceived control and the desirability of control among abusive and nonabusive husbands. *The American Journal of Family Therapy*, *22*(2), 126–134.

Copyright © Springer Publishing Company, LLC

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

Rosenbaum, A., & Leisring, P. A. (2001). Group intervention programs for batterers. *Journal Of Aggression, Maltreatment & Trauma*, *5*(2), 57–71.

*Ross, J. M. (2011). Personality and situational correlates of self-reported reasons for intimate partner violence among women versus men referred for batterers' intervention. *Behavioral Sciences and the Law*, *29*, 711–727.

*Ross, J. M., & Babcock, J. C. (2009). Proactive and reactive violence among intimate partner violent men diagnosed with antisocial and borderline personality disorder. *Journal of Family Violence*, *24*, 607–617.

*Sarantakos, S. (2004). Deconstructing self-defense in wife-to-husband violence. *The Journal of Men's Studies*, *12*, 277–296.

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

Saunders, D. G. (2002). Are physical assaults by wives and girlfriends a major social problem? A review of the literature. *Violence Against Women*, *8*, 1424–1448.

*Seamans, C. L., Rubin, L. J., & Stabb, S. D. (2007). Women domestic violence offenders: Lessons of violence and survival. *Journal of Trauma & Dissociation*, *8*, 47–68.

Shields, S. A. (2002). Speaking from the heart: Gender and the social meaning of emotion. New York, NY: Cambridge University Press.

Shorey R. C., Brasfield H., Febres J., & Stuart G. L. (2011). The association between impulsivity, trait anger, and the perpetration of intimate partner and general violence among women arrested for domestic violence. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, *26*, 2681–2697.

Shorey, R. C., Cornelius, T. L., & Idema, C. (2011). Trait anger as a mediator of difficulties with emotion regulation and female-perpetrated psychological aggression. *Violence and Victims*, *26*(3), 271–282.

*Shorey, R. C., Meltzer, C., & Cornelius, T. L. (2010). Motivations for self-defensive aggression in dating relationships. *Violence and Victims*, *25*, 662–676.

*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. *Violence and Victims*, *23*(5), 571–585.

*Smith, E. (2008). African American men and intimate partner violence. *Journal of African American Studies*, *12*, 156–179.

Stets, J. E., & Hammons, S. A. (2002). Gender, control, and marital commitment. *Journal of Family Issues*, *23*, 3–25.

*Stets, J. E., & Pirog-Good, M. A. (1990). Interpersonal control and courtship aggression. *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships*, *7*, 371–394.

*Stuart, G. L., Moore, T. M., Gordon, K. C., Hellmuth, J. C., Ramsey, S. E., & Kahler, C. W. (2006). Reasons for intimate partner violence perpetration among arrested women. *Violence Against Women*, *12*, 609–621.

Swan, S. C., Gambone, L. J., Caldwell, J. E., Sullivan, T. P., & Snow, D. L. (2008). A review of research on women's use of violence with male intimate partners. *Violence and Victims*, *23*, 301–314.

*Swan, S. C., & Snow, D. L. (2003). Behavioral and psychological differences among abused women who use violence in intimate relationships. *Violence Against Women*, *9*, 75–109.

*Swan S. C., & Sullivan, T. P. (2009). The resource utilization of women who use violence in intimate relationships. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, *24*(6), 940–958.

Copyright © Springer Publishing Company, LLC

Tanha, M., Beck, C. J. A., Figueredo, A., J., & Raghavan, C. (2010). Sex differences in intimate partner violence and the use of coercive control as a motivational factor for intimate partner violence. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, *25*, 1836–1854.

*Walley-Jean, J. C., & Swan, S. (2009). Motivations and justifications for partner aggression in a sample of African American college women. *Journal of Aggression, Maltreatment & Trauma*, *18*(7), 698–717.

*Ward, R., & Muldoon, J. (2007). Female tactics and strategies of intimate partner violence: A study of incident reports. *Sociological Spectrum*, *27*, 337–364.

*Weizmann-Henelius, G., Viemero, V., & Eronen, M. (2003). The violent female perpetrator and her victim. *Forensic Science International*, *133*, 197–203.

*Weston, R., Marshall, L. L., & Coker, A. L. (2007). Women's motives for violent and nonviolent behaviors in conflicts. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, *22*, 1043–1065.

Winstok, Z., & Eisikovits, Z. (2008). Motives and control in escalatory conflicts in intimate relationships. *Children and Youth Services Review*, *30*, 287–296.

*Yick, A. G., & Agbayani-Siewert, P. (2000). Dating violence among Chinese American and White students: A sociocultural context. *Dating Violence and Sexual Assault*, *8*, 101–129.

Acknowledgments. The authors wish to express appreciation to Marlinda Pruden and Candice Selwyn. Both of these individuals contributed substantially to the data collection process.

Correspondence regarding this article should be directed to Jennifer Langhinrichsen-Rohling, PhD, Life Sciences Building Room 320, University of South Alabama, Mobile, AL 36688-0002. E-mail: jlr@usouthal.edu

Copyright © Springer Publishing Company, LLC