PASK 2025-2026 Review

Topic #8: A Review of Motives For Perpetrating Physical Intimate Partner Violence

Jennifer Langhinrichsen-Rohling & Penny Leisring

Full article available in *Partner Abuse*, Volume 17, Issue 1, 2026

The reasons why, or motivations for engaging in intimate partner violence perpetration are essential to understand if we are to understand, intervene with, and/or prevent this destructive and potentially life-threatening behavior. Current batterer interventions typically incorporate relatively few motivations (power/control; self-defense; anger; communication deficits). Furthermore, some well-disseminated interventions are predicated on the idea that motivations for IPV perpetration are gender specific such that men use IPV as a power and control tactic in their relationships while women engage in IPV in self-defense. For example, this premise underlies the Duluth treatment model which has been codified into law in many states. However, existing intervention strategies for IPV perpetrators have repeatedly been shown to be less efficacious than ideal. Thus, a full understanding of both men and women's motivations for IPV perpetration remains essential.

To address this need, in 2012 Langhinrichsen-Rohling and colleagues comprehensively collected existing empirical research to summarize the State of Knowledge related to the reasons men and women perpetrate physical violence against their intimate partners. Multiple conclusions were drawn in the 2012 summary of intimate partner violence (IPV) perpetration motivations. First, as anticipated, the majority of existing studies focused on power/control and self-defense as motivations for IPV. Second, relatively few studies used established motivation measures to assess participants' reasons for physical IPV perpetration. Third, although the Duluth model rests on the assertion that men and women have different motivations for perpetrating IPV, very few of the studies included in the 2012 review used statistics to test for gender differences in motivation endorsement. Fourth, among the studies that did test for gender differences in IPV perpetration motivations, relatively few gender-specific motivations emerged.

In the current study, the 2012 methodology to identify relevant studies was reenacted. Doing this, 33 articles, published between 2011 and 2023, were located for review; 18 articles were determined to be eligible for coding. Two primary questions were addressed: 1) Do the conclusions reached by Langhinrichsen-Rohling et al. (2012) hold when incorporating recently published literature? 2) What literature gaps remain and require continued or increased attention?

The 18 collected papers for the current review include a variety of research methods (interviews, surveys, file reviews) and samples (all women, all men, men and women who have no relation with each other, men and women in the same relationship; college students, forensic samples, population level studies). These studies are sorted by sample type in the on-line tables: large population samples (Table 1); community samples (Table 2); university/student samples (Table 3); clinical samples (Table 4); and justice/legal samples (Table 5).

While this level of diversity provides information about the stability and generalizability of any obtained results, it is concerning that less than half of the new studies used an established measure of motivation (only 7 out of 18). None assessed social desirability. Eight studies focused exclusively on understanding women's motivations for IPV and few studies explicitly tested for gender-of-perpetrator differences in motivations. Collecting and testing comparable samples is important if we are working to prevent both men and women's IPV and determining the degree to which interventions should be gender-specific or tailored.

Which articles assessed for which motivation and to what effect is the information presented in the published manuscript that corresponds to this summary. Of note, the majority of included studies assessed self-defense (88.9% of articles), power/control (66.7%), and/or retaliation/revenge (61%) as a motivation for IPV. Assessing Anger/Negative Emotions as a motivation for IPV was also common (66.7% of included studies), followed by jealousy (50%), communication problems (44.4% of articles), and substance abuse (27.8%). Other motives were also assessed (61% of articles). Most articles (77%) assessed for or reported on at least two motivations for perpetrating IPV. However, four articles (22%) only assessed self-defense as a motive and two of these three articles focused solely on female perpetrators (Powers & Bleeker, 2023; Wolbers & Ackerman, 2020).

A number of important conclusions can be drawn from this work. First, if participants are given the option to endorse more than one motive for their behavior, they typically do so. This suggests that the motivations for IPV perpetration are complex. Second, rates of endorsement also vary by the item used to assess the motivation. For example, a number of different items have been used to assess the power and control motive. Moreover, statistically significant gender-of-perpetrator differences in endorsing this motive only occurred in the largest samples which contained male and female college students. Importantly, findings went in both directions with women endorsing perpetrating IPV significantly more than men to "make them do what I wanted" and men endorsing perpetrating IPV significantly more than women "to show them who is boss."

Third, consistent with the first review in 2012, almost all located studies in the current paper assessed self-defense as a motive. Again, statistically significant gender-of-perpetrator differences in endorsing this motive were only obtained in the largest sample and it was composed of college students. Contrary to theory, in this particular study, men self-reported using IPV in self-defense more than women.

Unfortunately, few of the included studies in this review conceptually distinguished among self-defense, retaliation, control/punishment, and anger. Conceptual and measurement clarity remains a necessary next step for the field. However, as shown in the corresponding publication, there was some support for the greater endorsement of anger, emotional dysregulation, jealousy, communication difficulties, and retaliation for emotional hurt, as motivations for women's rather than men's IPV perpetration. Men may receive more socialization about handling their anger non-violently than women.

In this review we coded for a motivation that was not assessed in 2012; the use of violence to obtain attention or love, or to prove love or give attention. This was a surprisingly common motive endorsed by individuals in both college IPV perpetrator and offender samples; it was also endorsed by men and women.

Several other motives emerged as important to consider: same day substance use, because of sexual arousal, and due to other factors including a desire to escape, as part of playing or joking around, or because of motivations that were unknown to the perpetrator. No clear gender differences emerged in the endorsement of these motives and/or contextual factors.

Overall, many questions about motivations need additional research attention. Conceptual clarity around what constitutes a motivation and how particular motivations (e.g., self-defense versus retaliation; response to unfilled sexual arousal versus coercive control) differ from one another is required. Routine use of established measures assessing an array of motivations would be helpful for the field. There is also a lack of studies on motivations for IPV in non-heterosexual relationships. Furthermore, it is unclear the degree to which the motivations for perpetrating psychological abuse, physical IPV, sexual IPV, and stalking differ or whether there is a motivation to lash out and the form of IPV is less important than the reason. In short, understanding contextual risk factors as well as dynamic and temporal changes in a myriad of motivations for all types of intimate partner violence perpetrated by heterosexual and sexual minority men and women warrants continued attention.

About the Authors

Jennifer Langhinrichsen-Rohling is a Professor of Psychological Science at University of North Carolina Charlotte She holds a Sc.B degree in Psychology from Brown University and she received her Ph.D. in clinical psychology from the University of Oregon. She completed her pre-doctoral internship at the Palo Alto V.A. and Stanford Medical Center; her postdoctoral fellowship in marital violence took place at the State University of New York at Stony Brook. Her research focuses on intimate partner and family violence (e.g., stalking, sexual assault, physical abuse, and the intergenerational transmission of relationship behaviors) and young adult engagement in risky, unhealthy, suicidal, and/or life-diminishing behaviors. Dr. Langhinrichsen-Rohling has over 250 peer-reviewed publications in well-regarded journals and edited books; she is also a licensed psychologist with a small private practice. Most recently, Dr. L-R has been working with data emerging from the National Sexual Assault Kit Initiative. To advance the field, she has co-authored a book, "Sexual Assault Kits and Reforming the Response to Rape", which curates the pivotal findings emerging across the United States from this initiative.

Penny A. Leisring is a Professor of Psychology at Quinnipiac University in Hamden, CT. She holds B.A. degrees in psychology and child development from Connecticut College and she received her Ph.D. in clinical psychology from the State University of New York at Stony Brook. She completed her predoctoral internship at UMass Medical School/Worcester State Hospital
and a postdoctoral fellowship at the Marital Violence Research and Treatment program at UMass Medical School. She is a licensed psychologist and conducts research examining male- and female-perpetrated intimate partner violence. Her work has been published in various journals and she is on the editorial boards for the Journal of Aggression, Maltreatment, and Trauma and for Partner Abuse. She teaches a variety of undergraduate courses including psychopathology, child psychopathology, and the psychology of women and gender.

2025-2026 Review: A Review of Motives for Perpetrating Physical Intimate Partner Violence

NOTE: References organized according to the most recent year published. Those published the same year are arranged alphabetically by author(s) name.

Table 1. Large Population Samples					
Study (Full Reference) & Link to Article	***N***	**Sample Characteristics**	**Method/Design**	**Measures**	**Results**
1. Powers, R. A., & Bleeker, K. (2023). Self-defense and police reporting of intimate partner violent victimization: a comparison of White, Black, and Hispanic women victims. *Journal of interpersonal Violence*, *38*(3-4), 4189-4214. https://doi.org/10.1177/08862605221114304	*N=5,782* ***women*** *who were victims of physical or sexual IPV*	**RACE** White = 72.5% Black = 16.2% Hispanic = 3% **EDUCATE** Some college education = 46.2% **EMPLOY:** Employed = 59.1% **GEO:** Live in urban setting = 81.0%	Data came from the National Crime Victimization Survey (NCVS), a nationally representative sample of U.S. households.	**Measures: Violence AND Motivation:** To assess physical self-defense victims of physical or sexual IPV were asked, "Did you do anything with the idea of protecting yourself or your property while the incident was going on" Responses counted as physical self-defense if they included any of the following: attacked the offender with a gun, fired a gun; attacked the offender with a weapon that was not a gun; attacked the offender without a weapon (hit, kicked, etc.); defended	**Self-Defense**: 28% of the female victims endorsed using physical violence in self-defense. However, the definition of self-defense was broad. Black female victims were more likely to report using physical violence in self-defense than White female victims (34.4 vs 26.9%) or Hispanic victims (34.4% vs. 29.1%)

				self (struggled, blocked blows); threatened the offender with a gun; threatened the offender with another weapon; threatened to injure the offender, with no weapon.	

Table 2. Smaller Community Samples					
Study (Full Reference) & Link to Article	**N**	**Sample Characteristics**	**Method/Design**	**Measures**	**Results**
2. Neal, A. M., & Edwards, K. (2019). Examining situations involving intimate partner aggression: A dyadic study of agreement on behaviors, attributions, and emotional effects. *Psychology of Violence, 9, 288-297.* http://dx.doi.org/	*N = 199 couple in a romantic relationship*	Couples were recruited from the university and the community; however, the majority of couples retained for this paper were students. 114 of these couples agreed on the same incident of conflict and were retained in the study; however, only	Each member of the couple reported on their attributions for specific incidents of psychological, physical, and sexual IPA	**Measures:** **Violence:** Participants recalled the last 10 specific incidents of IPA (physical, sexual, psychological, controlling or conflictual) – followed up with Sexual Experiences Survey (Koss et al., 2007) and Safe Dates Psychological and Physical Scales (Foshee et al., 1998) **Motivation:** The Motivations and	Only 21 participants (12.7%) indicated that physical IPA occurred. Similarly only 15 (9.0%) participants indicated that sexual IPA occurred. The majority of IPA was psychological in nature. *Perpetrators could be either men or women.* **General Motivations for IPA, as endorsed by Perpetrators (%): (note percentages were received by personal communication with Angela Neal)** **Power/Control** ● Get control over partner = 22.81 ● Hurt partner's feelings = 24.56 ● Partner was going to walk away or leave a conflict before it was solved = 17.56 ● Make partner agree with them = 33.93

10.1037/vio0000092		52 couples agreed on the type of violence and were retained for attributions.. **AGE:** M = 19.71 yrs (SD = 1.51) **LENGTH:** M = 16.27 months **RACE:** Caucasian = 90.4% **INCOME:** 71.2% Family income > $50,000		Effects Questionnaire (MEQ; Follingstad et al., 1991) And the Reasons for Violence Scale (Stuart et al., 2006) Both perpetrator attributions for the event and victim attributions for the event were obtained; the findings in this table were obtained directly from the authors upon request.	● Feel more powerful = 14.04 ● Get partner to do or stop doing something = 49.12 ● Make partner scared/afraid = 0 ● Shut partner up or to get partner to leave them alone = 12.28 **Self-Defense** ● To protect self (i.e., self-defense) = 7.02 ● Get away from partner = 8.93 **Jealousy** ● Jealousy = 38.6 **Expression of Negative Emotion** ● Show anger = 66.67 ● Didn't know what to do with feeling = 30.36 ● Displaced anger = 28.07 ● Because of stress = 50.87 **Retaliation/Revenge** ● Punish partner for wrongdoing = 35.72 ● Cheated on = 14.03 ● Retaliation for emotional hurt = 57.9 ● Retaliation for being hit first = 5.26 ● Provoked or pushed over the edge = 36.85 **Communication Diff.** ● Inability to express self verbally = 33.93 **Substance Use** ● Under influence of drugs or alcohol = 28.07 **Seeking Love** ● Get attention = 15.79

					● Didn't believe partner cared = 22.81 ● Afraid partner was going to leave them = 14.02 ● Prove love = 16.07 **Other:** ● Sexually arousing = 3.57 ● Wanted to have sex and partner didn't = 1.75 **Perpetrator endorsed motivations for the Specific IPA incident chosen to focus on = (%):** **Substance Use** ● Under the influence of alcohol = 5.36% ● Lost control because intoxicated = 7.14% ● Under the influence of drugs = 3.64% **Home Environment** ● Main place of residence is an area where people don't look out for each other = 3.57% ● Main place of residence is an area where everyone fights and argues like this = 7.14% ● Main place of residence is an area where people tend not to get punished for committing crimes = 3.57% ● Main place of residence is an area where people struggle to have enough money to live = 3.64% **Learning History (often from Family of**

					Origin) ● Was how they saw parents act toward each other and/or toward them = 5.36% ● Didn't have any good models growing up to show them how to handle arguments differently = 5.45% ● Grew up in a family that was distant, with lower parental involvement = 5.45% ● Grew up either free from discipline, or the discipline received did not stop them from "acting out" = 2 3.70% ● Believe men should make decisions in relationships and women should take care of men = 5.36% ● Think aggression and hostility are not a big deal = 3.64% ● Around people (friends and/or family) that think it is okay to be aggressive in relationships = 2 3.64% ● Around people (friends and/or family) that think aggression in a relationship helps to maintain roles men and women are supposed to play = 3.64% **Long Standing Personal Problems** ● Suffer from mental health issues e.g., depression = 7.02% ● Personality = 10.53% **Power/Control**

					• Wanted to keep partner from breaking up with/leaving them = 7.14% • Makes them feel powerful = 8.77% • Like to have control over partner = 10.53% **Emotional Dysregulation** • Often worry partner doesn't really love them = 1.85% • Anger issues (for example, get angry easily) = 8.77% • Not happy with relationship = 5.36% • Have been under a lot of stress = 17.54% • Had strong feelings, like jealousy or resentment, at the time = 29.82% **Self-Defense** • Acted in self-defense = 10.53% • Needed to protect self from physical harm/ injury = 0% **Communication** • Have a hard time understanding partner = 5.36% **Retaliation** • Punish partner = 8.93% • Retaliated after being hit, slapped, pushed, etc. first = 3.51% **Other** • Sexually arousing = 1.75% • Wanted to have sex and partner didn't = 0% • Wanted to become sexually turned on = 0%

3. Babcock, J. C., Snead, A. L., Bennett, V. E., & Armenti, N. A. (2019). Distinguishing subtypes of mutual violence in the context of self-defense: Classifying types of partner violent couples using a modified Conflict Tactics Scale. *Journal of Family Violence*, *34*, 687-696. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10896-018-0012-2	*N= 180 couple*	Heterosexual couples married or living together for at least 6 months.	Self-report measures were administered separately to each spouse.	**Violence and Motivation:** CTS-2SD (asked self-defense questions after every IPV question): How many of those times was it in defending yourself against your partner's violence? And participants also answered about their partner's self-defense: How many of those times was it to defend against your violence?	**Self-Defense** ● Men self-reported that their violence was self-defense 27% of the time. ● Women self-reported that their violence was self-defense 22% of the time. Partner reports also indicated that men were more likely to engage in violence in self-defense than women (34% for men according to their female partners vs. 27% for women according to their male partners).
4. Guay, S., Sader, J., Boisvert, J. M., & Beaudry, M. (2016). Typology of perceived causes of intimate partner violence perpetration in young adults. *Violence and Gender*, *3*(4),	*N= 392 participants (202 women and 190 men)*	Young Canadian couples ages 18-30 recruited from newspapers, and universities/colleges. **MARITAL STATUS:** N/R but in a heterosexual	In person survey and structured interview with partners in separate rooms.	**Motivation:** *Perceptions of Aggression were obtained via a* structured interview based on Follingstad's MEQ. Participants indicated what "led" to their violence as reported on CTS2 and had an answer sheet with	**Results:** **Power/Control** ● Women (to dominate) = 61.2% ● Men (to dominate) = 38.8% ● Women (to intimidate) = 51.9% ● Men (to intimidate) = 48.1% **Self-defense** Women = 44.4% Men = 55.6% **Expression of Negative Emotion** Women (anger) = 56.4%

189-195. DOI: 10.1089/vio.2016.0004		relationship for less than 5 years. 53% cohabitated and 8% had children. **AGE:** **Women** *M*=22.3 years (*SD*=2.7) **Men** *M*=23.5 years (*SD*=3.17) **INCOME:** N/R **GEOGRAPHY**: Canada		possible responses. Participants reported motives for physical and psychological IPV. These are the results for the physical IPV only	Men (anger) = 43.6% **Communication** = N/R **Retaliation** Women (revenge) = 41.1% Men (revenge) = 58.9% **Jealousy** Women = 52.6% Men = 47.4% **Other** ● Under the Influence of Alcohol or Drugs Women = 44.9% Men = 55.1% ● Because I lost control Women = 34.9% Men = 65.1% ● Because partner provoked me Women = 43.8% Men = 56.3% ● To obtain something Women = 53.8% Men = 46.2% More women than men reported anger was a motive. More men than women reported loss of control and revenge as motives. Top 3 reported motives overall were anger,

					b/c provoked by a partner, and jealousy. Top 3 for women were: To dominate, b/c of anger, and to obtain something. Top 3 for men were: lost control, revenge, and b/c my partner provoked me.
5. Orengo-Aguayo, R. E., & Lawrence, E. (2014). Missing the trees for the forest: Understanding aggression among physically victimized women. *Partner Abuse*, 5(3), 297–322. https://doi.org/10.1891/1946-6560.5.3.297	*N=40 women*	Women living with male partners for at least 3 months and who had at least one major argument in the past 4 months were recruited through newspapers and flyers. **AGE:** *M* = 35 years (SD 10.95) **EDUCATION:** 68% had at least some college education, 30% had a high school diploma or less. **RACE:** 68.6% = White 22.9% were	Participants completed a survey and were interviewed regarding a specific episode of IPV.	**Measures** **Violence:** - CTS2 Scale (only physical assault scale was used) **Motivation:** -MMEA (Murphy & Hoover, 1999) -The Context of Intimate Partner Violence Interview (CIPVI; Lawrence et al., 2008)	**Results** ● **Expression of Negative Emotion** (45%): angry, "worked up," or frustrated ● **Retaliation**/to get back at (30%) ● **Self-defense** (25%): based on interview responses indicating that they were defending or protecting themselves

		African American **RELIGION:** 72% identified as Christian **MARITAL STATUS:** The women had lived with their partners an average of 50 months (SD 73.8 months), and 20% were married.			

Table 3. University/Schools					
Study (Full Reference) & Link to Article	**N**	**Sample Characteristics**	**Method/Design**	**Measures**	**Results**
6. Elmquist, J., Wolford-Clevenger, C., Zapor, H., Febres, J., Shorey, R. C.,	*N = 482 college student taking undergraduate*	**EDUCATE** 76.6% were freshmen; 13.7% sophomores; 6.6% juniors;	Online survey	**Violence** CTS2 Scale to measure Dating Violence **Motivations:** Reasons for Violence Scale. (RVS; Stuart,	**Results** **Men's Categories:** The most frequently endorsed motive categories for men were: **Self-defense** (22.4%; *n* = 17)

Hamel, J., & Stuart, G. L. (2016). A gender comparison of motivations for physical dating violence among college students. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, *31*(1), 186-203. https://doi.org/10.1177/0886260514555130	*psych. Courses* Male (n = 163) Female (n = 319)	2.9% seniors; and less than 1% were post-baccalaureate. **RACE:** 81.4% (n=390) White; 8.4% (n = 40) Black/ African American; 3.5% (n = 17) Asian American; 3.1% (n = 15) More than one race; 1.9% (n = 9) Indian/ Native American; 1.3% (n = 6) Hispanic/ Latino; Other = less than 1% (n = 2) **SEXUAL ORIENTATION:** 95.8% (n=		Moore, Hellmuth, et al., 2006).	**Communication difficulties** (16.1%; *n* = 17) **Expression of negative emotions** (12.1%; *n* = 17). **Also measured power/control; jealousy, retaliation, sexual arousal, substance use, other** **Men's Items:** The most commonly endorsed individual motive items for perpetrating DV among men were because ● "it was sexually arousing" (27.1%; *n* = 17), ● "to prove that you love your partner" (25.9%; *n* = 17) ● "self-defense" (22.4%; *n* = 17), ● "to show feelings that you couldn't explain in words" (22.4%; *n* = 17). **Women's Categories** The motive categories most frequently reported by women were: **communication difficulties** (16.0%; *n* = 51) **self-defense** (14.5%; *n* = 51), **jealousy** (14.31%; *n* = 51). **Also measured power/control; emotional dysregulation; retaliation, sexual arousal, substance use, other** **Women's Items:** The most commonly endorsed motive items for perpetrating DV among women were: ● because "it was sexually arousing"(22.35%; *n* = 51) ● "to show anger" (21.57%; *n* = 51)

		461) heterosexual 2.5% (n = 12) homosexual; 1.5% (n = 7) bisexual; and other – less than 1% (n = 1) **RELATIONSHIP STATUS:** Mean dating length: 14.82 mnths (SD = 14.45 months).			● "to get your partner's attention" (19.4%; *n* = 51). There were no significant gender differences on any of the motive categories (power/control, self-defense, jealousy, communication difficulties, expression of negative emotions, retaliation; see Table 2).
7. Kelley, E. L., Edwards, K. M., Dardis, C. M., & Gidycz, C. A. (2015). Motives for physical dating violence among college students: A gendered analysis. *Psychology of Violence*, *5*(1), 56-65. https://doi.org/10	*N = 221 college studentwith a history physical dating violence* **Sex**: 89 men 132 women	**AGE:** 18-26, (*M*= 19.00, *SD*= 1.19). **RACE:** White (86.9%), Black (5.4%), Other/Multiracial (4.5%), Asian/ Pacific Islander (2.3%), Latino/ Hispanic (0.9%).	All participants were recruited from general psychology courses in a university setting and were given course credit for their participation in a self-report survey.	**Violence** CTS2 scale to measure dating violence **Motivation** The Motives and Reasons for IPV scale (MRIPV; Caldwell et al., 2009) was used to determine perceived motives for why physical DV was used.	**Results:** The authors found three factors for motives: 1. **emotional expression/ dysregulate** 2. **control/tough guise** 3. **self-defense** Women scored higher on the emotional expression/dysregulation motive factor than men. No significant differences were found between men and women on the tough guise or self-defense factor.

.1037/a0036171		**INCOME** Greater than or equal to $51,000 (62.1%), Less than $51,000 (18.3%), unknown (19.6%). Violence: All 221 participants had a history of domestic violence perpetration.			
8. Leisring, P. A. (2013). Physical and emotional abuse in romantic relationship: Motivation for perpetration among college women. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 28*(7), 1437–1454. https://doi.org/10.1177/08862605	*N = 348 heterosexual college women (106 had perpetrated minor or severe physical aggression)*	**RELATIONSHIP:** *M* = 19.4 months **RACE** Caucasian = 89% Hispanic = 5% Asian = 2% African Am. = 2% Mixed race = 2% **INCOME** N/R	Cross-sectional; Self-report; All participants were heterosexual college women recruited for a study on "relationship conflict". Participants were recruited from introductory psychology classes and had to be at least 18 years of age and have been in a	**Violence:** The Revised Conflict Tactics Scale (CTS2) was used to measure intimate partner violence. The physical aggression and injury subscales were used. **Motivation:** The modified version of the Motivation Effects Questionnaire was used to assess motivation for physical aggression and emotional abuse.	**Results:** **Percentages of women perpetrators of physical abuse endorsing various motives:** **Women reporting any physical aggression perpetration (N=106)** **Power/control** ● To feel more powerful = 12.3% ● To get control over the other person =12.3% ● To punish person for wrong behavior = 14.2% ● To win an argument = 12.3% ● To get my way = 4.7% **Self-defense** ● To protect self from immediate

12468236		**AGE** *M*=18.8 yrs.	relationship to participate.		physical harm = 5.7% **Expression of Negative Emotion** ● To show anger = 68.9% ● Anger displaced onto partner = 9.4% ● Because of stress = 29.2% **Communication** ● Due to inability to express self verbally = 21.7% ● To get partner's attention = 24.5% **Retaliation** ● In retaliation for being hit first = 8.5% ● In retaliation for emotional hurt = 34.9% **Jealousy** ● Because of jealousy = 23.6% **Other** ● To prove love = 13.2%
9. Neal, A. M., Dixon, K. J., Edwards, K. M., & Gidycz, C. A. (2015). Why did she do it? College women's motives for intimate partner violence perpetration. *Partner Abuse, 6*	*n = 484 college women who had at least one act of IPV perp. In their current relation. (from a total sample of 1,028 women)*	**AGE** M = 18.77 years (SD = 1.00) **RELATIONSHIP STATUS** 99.4% of women (*n* = 471) reported being in a heterosexual relationship (10 did not indicate	Female participants were recruited from the psychology department participant pool at a medium-size Midwestern University. To avoid sampling bias, no mention of abuse or violence was included in the study description	**Violence** The CTS2 Scale was used to assess perpetration **Motivation** A modified version (11 items) of the Motivation and Effects Questionnaire (MEQ; Follingstad et al., 1991) was used to assess IPV motives. This was answered in reference to the most severe act of	**Results** Summary- Among the current sample of 484 women perpetrators of IPV (47.1% of the original 1,028 sample of women), the following were reported by participants as their most severe act of perpetration: 374 (77.3%) reported engaging in psychological IPV, 92 (19.0%) in physical IPV, and 18 (3.7%) in sexual IPV. More than half of the participants (60.5%) also reported some type of IPV victimization in their current relationship; 39.5% reported no IPV victimization. Motives were reported separately for psychological, physical, and sexual violence

(4), 425–441. https://doi.org/10.1891/1946-6560.6.4.425.		the gender of their partner). **RACE** White (89.9%; *n* = 435), 4.5% were Black, 2.3% were two or more races, 1.7% were Asian or Pacific Islander, 1.2% were Latino/a or Hispanic, and 0.4% identified as other. **INCOME** 73.4% = annual family income above $50,000, 50.4% above $75,000, 31.4% above $100,000, 11.5% above $150,000.	that was posted as a part of the message in the online recruitment system. Participants completed the survey in a group setting consisting 10–15 women	perpetration they had endorsed on the CTS2.	perpetration As shown in Table 1, **Motives for physical violence:** **Power/Control** ● Power and Control=15.2% *(n=14)* **Self-Defense** ● Self defense = 2.2% (*n*=2) **Jealousy** ● Jealousy=13.0% *(n=12)* **Communication** ● Inability to express themselves verbally = 42.4% *(n=39)* **Expression of Negative Emotions** ● Loss of Control= 38.0% *(n=35)* ● Anger =84.8% *(n=78)* **Retaliation** ● Desire to punish partner= 15.2% *(n=14)* ● Retaliation for being hit first or for emotional hurt =67.4% *(n=62)* **Seeking Love** ● Prove Love= 3.3% *(n=3)* ● Desire to get attention= 8.7% *(n=8)* **Substance Abuse** **Other** ● Sexual Arousal= 5.4% *(n=5)* Overall, some of the motives were reported at different frequencies across the three types of IPV perpetration with self-reported motives for sexual IPV varying most from psychological and physical IPV (i.e., prove love and sexual arousal most common for

					sexual but not psychological and physical IPV), although some motives were more (e.g., inability to express themselves verbally) or less (e.g., gain power and control) common for physical IPV compared to psychological IPV. Although there There were also similarities in motives across types of IPV (e.g., anger and retaliation for being hit first or for emotional hurt were endorsed at similar levels for both physical and psychological IPV).
10. Wolbers, H., & Ackerman, J. (2020). The degree of specialization among female partner violence offenders and the role of self-defense in its explanation. *Victims & Offenders*, 1–21. https://doi.org/10.1080/15564886.2019.1671280	*N=189 college women who had at least one act of IPV perp. Against a current or past partner*	University students who attended one of three universities in either Australia or the United States. **RACE** Non-white 31.9% Australian 54.6% **AGE** *M* = 24.8 years (SD = 7.46)	The data used in the current study was collected using a computer-administered online survey.	**Violence** Participants were asked to self-report engagement in any of 17 different offenses (7 of these were physical IPV items adapted from the CTS) **Motivations:** Participants were asked if the IPV behavior was perpetrated in self-defense (yes/no) Participants who rated all their acts of IPV as occurring in self-defense received 100%	**Results** **Self-Defense** 9.7% (*n* = 18 women) reported that all of their acts of IPV were perpetrated in self-defense. An additional 27 (so *n* = 45 total or 24.3% of the sample) reported that at least one of their IPV acts was perpetrated in self-defense.

11. Whitaker, M. P. (2014). Motivational attributions about intimate partner violence among male and female perpetrators. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, *29*(3), 517-535. https://doi.org/10.1177/0886260513505211	*N = 5,035 U.S. undergraduates* **Sex**: Females (*n* = 3,699) and Males (*n* = 1,336) Respondents also had the option to choose both and 21 selected both sexes.	**AGE:** *M* = 20, range 18-25. **RACE:** Most Likely White based off of undergraduate student population but no race was collected on the survey **LOCATION:** Southeastern US **ACADEMIC LEVEL:** 25% Freshman, 17% Sophomore, 28% Junior, and 29% Senior	Cross-sectional survey sent through campus email with 3 weekly reminders and a chance to win a $50 gift card. 38% response rate.	**Violence:** IPV perpetration was measured using subscales of the Revised Conflict Tactics Scale (CTS2). **Motivations:** Participants who indicated IPV perpetration were asked, "looking back, why do you think you did most of these things?'. They were then given 11 attribution items with yes/no response options.	**Results:** Over 15% of male respondents reported perpetrating physical IPV and 29% reported psychological IPV in the past year. Females were more likely than males to report perpetrating physical IPV and psychological IPV. Males 2 ½ times as likely to report severe forms of perpetrating involving assault with a deadly weapon and 57% more likely to report choking or burning a partner. Most IPV involved psychological IPV. 72.7% of males perpetrated only psychological IPV and 27.3% included physical IPV 59.4% of females perpetrated only psychological IPV and 40.6% perpetrated physical IPV too. **Attribution % for Physical Intimate Partner Violence Tactics for Males vs Females** **Power/Control** **MEN vs. WOMEN** ● Control 87.4 v 93.9 ● To make my partner listen 67.0 vs 72.6 ● To make my partner do what I wanted 29.7 vs. 32.8 ● To show who is boss 21.2 vs. 10.5 **Retaliation/Revenge** ● To punish my partner 24.2 vs. 28.8 ● Retaliation 54.4 vs. 41.4 ● To get back at my partner for verbal

					abuse 38.7 vs. 31.9 ● To get back at my partner for physical abuse 13.7 vs. 6.2 **Self-Defense** ● To escape my partner 24.7 vs. 17.9 ● It was self-defense 23.6 vs. 10.9 **Emotional Dysreg** ● I lost my temper 69.2 vs. 80.9 **Substance Use** ● I was drunk or high 23.9 vs. 24.8 **Other** ● I don't know 34.3 vs. 32.5

Table 4. Clinical Samples

Study (Full Reference) & Link to Article	***N***	**Sample Characteristics**	**Method/Design**	**Measures**	**Results**
12. Kahn, E. R., Finlayson, T. L., Rasmussen, L., Raj, A., Silverman, J. G., Rusch, M., & Reed, E. (2022). Reported perpetration of intimate partner violence among adolescent girls: Motivations and IPV victimization.	*N = 159 Adol. girls*	**MARITAL STATUS:** N/R, 83% living with parents; 87.7% currently enrolled in school. **FACE:** 77.3% Hispanic **INCOME:**	Cross-sectional; self-report; surveys; clinical sample; Participants were recruited via community health clinic staff and research team in the clinic waiting room.	**Violence:** IPV perpetration was measured with two author-created questions where participants responded with a "yes" or "no". Participants reported whether they had perpetrated physical or sexual violence with boys or men they were dating in their lifetime.	**Results:** 24 female participants reported perpetration of physical or sexual violence in an intimate partner relationship. **Motivations for girls:** **Power/Control** ● I was trying to make my partner feel humiliated 4.2% ● I was trying to make my partner afraid of me (8.3%) ● I was trying to hurt them 12.5% ● I wanted to feel in control of them 8.3%.

Adolescents, *2*(4), 479-492. **https://doi.org/10.3390/adolescents2040038**		N/R **AGE:** *M* = 17.1, had to be between 15 and 19 **Geography:** Recruited in San Diego, California. 76.5% born in the US All: English speaking, sexually active with a male partner in the past six months		**Motivation:** Motivation for IPV perpetration was measured using an author created question asking why the adolescent girl physically hit, pushed, slapped, choked or otherwise physically hurt the boy/man they were dating. Survey responses included a list of reasons and participants were able to mark all responses that applied.	**Retaliation/Revenge** ● I wanted to do these things to them because they did them to me before 12.5% **Self-Defense** ● Defending myself because they were trying to hurt me 45.8% **Emotional Dysreg** ● I was mad at them for saying something I didn't like or calling me a name 29.2% ● I was mad at them for their behavior: having sex with someone else 12.5% ● I was mad at them for being out late with friends 12.5% ● I was mad at them for getting drunk and/or high 20.8% **Other** ● I was joking around 37.5%
13. Epstein-Ngo, Q. M., Walton, M. A., Chermack, S. T., Blow, F. C., Zimmerman, M. A., & Cunningham, R. M. (2014). Event-level analysis of antecedents for youth violence:	*N=575 patients coming to an urban ED. All screened positive for past six months drug use*	**AGE:** *M*=20.0 yrs (SD = 2.40) **RACE:** 59.7% African American **INCOME:** 72.7% receive public assistance	Data for this study came from the Flint Youth Injury Study, a prospective study of substance use and violence among youth treated in an urban emergency	**Violence:** Aggression Module (TLFB-AM) assessed daily acts of physical aggression in the past 90 days - items were adapted from the CTS2 physical assault scale. **Motivation:** Motivations for the	**Results:** 75.1% of the sample reported dating violence (55% of the males and 63.3% of the females) The three most common reasons for DV were: **angry or bad mood** (43.2% of conflicts) **jealousy** 28.8% **personal belongings** (e.g. cell phones; 28.1%)

Comparison of dating violence with non-dating violence. *Addictive Behaviors*, 39(1), 350–353. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.addbeh.2013.10.015	41.2% female		department. The design included oversampling patients (14–24 years) presenting to the ED for violent injury (i.e., assault-related) and reporting past 6-month substance use. A proportionally age- and gender-sampled comparison group was recruited, consisting of those treated in the ED for other medical complaints and past 6-month substance use. Participants completed "timeline follow-back aggression" modules assessments at baseline and 6- and 12-months after the ED	assault were assessed with the question, "What was the reason for the fight? 17 response options were provided.	**Gender differences for DV motivations** Females were most likely to report: **angry/bad mood** 44.3% Males were most likely to report: **Jealousy** 51.7% A comparison of DV conflicts vs. non DV conflicts indicated DV conflicts were significantly more likely to be attributed to personal belongings, angry/bad mood, jealousy, being drunk/high on drugs, and arguing about sex.

			visit.		
14. Nelson-Aguiar, R. J., Weiss, N. H., Swan, S. C. & Sullivan, T. P. (2022). Alcohol misuse and women's use of aggression in intimate relationships: The mediating role of motivations for using aggression. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 37*(5-6), 2310-2330. DOI: 10.1177/0886260520938512	*N = 412 ethnic. diverse comm. **women**, between the ages of 18 and 65, who were in IPV relationship with bi-direct violence*	**AGE** 18-65 **RACE** 36.4% African American 36.4% Latina 27.2% White **EMPLOY** 66.1 Unemployed **EDUCATE** M = 12.44 years **INCOME** 43% with a family income of less than 10,000 US per year **RELATIONSHIP STATUS** 43% unmarried and cohabitating Mean length of current relationship was 8.02 years	Self-report survey after a short telephone screening	**Violence:** Physical aggression items from the Revised CTS-2 **Motivations:** Motivations and Reasons for IPV Scale (Caldwell et al., 2019; Swan & Sullivan, 2002) This measure has five subscales: ● Expression of Negative Emotion (5 items) ● Self-Defense (5 items) ● Control (6 items) ● Jealousy (2 items) ● Tough Guise (8 items) - wanting to appear tough, intimidating, and willing to harm partner	**Results** % of the Sample Endorsing this Motive: **Expression of Negative Emotion** 95% **Self-Defense** 83% **Control** 89% **Jealousy** 67% **Tough Guise** 84% Greater IPV endorsement was correlated with all five motivations (.35 to .55) as well as alcohol misuse (.29)

		77% were mothers			

Table 5. Justice/Legal Related Samples

Study (Full Reference)	N	Sample Characteristics	Method/Design	Measures	Results
15. Boxall, H., Dowling, C., & Morgan, A. (2020). Female perpetrated domestic violence: Prevalence of self-defensive and retaliatory violence. *Trends and Issues in Crime and Criminal Justice*, (584), 1-17.	*N* = 153 females in the Australia justice system	Participants were all females who perpetrated IPV that was reported to the police in Australia **RELATIONSHIP STATUS** 60% of the sample was currently in a relationship	This study was a case file review based on police reports. Specifically, the Australian Institute of Criminology (AIC) was provided with police narratives for 200 randomly selected episodes of domestic violence reported to the NSW Police Force in 2016 where a woman was identified as the person of interest (POI), and the male victim was her current or former	Self-defensive and retaliatory violence was defined as episodes involving one or both of the following conditions: • the female perpetrated domestic violence was immediately preceded by abusive or threatening actions from the male partner (physical intimidation, abusive language, threatening gestures or movements towards the female POI etc); and/or the female POI was previously involved in a domestic violence incident where they were identified as the victim and their male partner as the POI.	**Results** **Tipping Point for Violence:** **Self-Defense/ Retaliation** ● Violence or abuse by male victim 20% **Jealousy** ● Accusations or revelations of infidelity 15% **Communication Difficulties** ● Male victim ignored female perpetrator 13% ● Male victim attempted to leave 23% ● Disagreement over access to children 9% **Control/Power** ● Attempts to end relationship 3% ● Calling/threatening to call police 3% **Other** ● Any Other 41% ● Any tipping point mentioned 79% Critically, in one in five episodes (20%), the woman appeared to have become violent in

			partner (hereafter referred to as her partner). 47 narratives were excluded due to insufficient information, concerns about the veracity of the report, the presence of bi-directional violence, or the lack of physical violence in the narrative.		direct response to her partner's aggression or verbal and emotional abuse (e.g., insults and name-calling, or language or actions intended to coerce, control, intimidate, denigrate, humiliate or shame).
16. Guerrero-Molina, M., Moreno-Manso, J. M., Eloísa Guerrero-Barona, & Beatriz Cruz-Márquez(2020). Attributing responsibility, sexist attitudes, perceived social support, and self-esteem in aggressors convicted for	*N* = 129 men convicted for gender-based violence and were in prison in Spain	27.9% convicted for physical and psychological abuse **AGE:** *M* = 39.98 years (SD = 10.86 years)	Surveys were administered individually. Participants received prison benefits as compensation for their time.	**Violence:** DV was coded from the conviction **Motivation:** Motivations were assessed with the Attribution of Responsibility and Minimization of Harm Scale which has four subscales one of which is self-defense. The Self-Defense (SD) subscale evaluates the degree to which the aggressor believes that he behaved in the way	**Results** **Self-defense**: As for the self-defense factor, 23.3% of the male aggressors have high scores (*n* = 30) indicating they believe this was a motivation. 17.1% have moderate scores on the self-defense scale; 59.7 % of the perpetrators did not endorse moderate or high levels of self-defense as a motive. 74.4% of the men scored low on the scale that blamed themselves for the gender-based violence.

gender-based violence. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 35(21-22), 4468–4491. https://doi.org/10.1177/0886260517715025				he did in response to an attack by his partner. Cronbach's alpha for this subscale previously at α = .79. The internal consistency found in this study was α = .71.	
17. Elmquist, J., Hamel, J., Shorey, R., Labrecque, L., Ninnemann, A., & Stuart, G. (2014). Motivations for intimate partner violence in men and women arrested for domestic violence and court referred to batterer intervention programs. *Partner Abuse, 5*(4), 359–374.	*N=177 male and female perp. arrested for DV and court-referred to DV treatment 90 men 87 women*	**AGE:** *M* = 40.30 years (SD = 11.7) **EDUCATION** Mean education of 13.67 years (SD = 2.56) **INCOME:** Mean annual income of $ 49,538 (SD = 20,000). **RACE:** 44.4% non-Hispanic Caucasian, 13.3% non-Hispanic Black, 7.8%	Participants completed the survey during a regular session of their BIP meeting. Men had attended, on average 25 sessions when completing the measures; Women, on average had completed 8 sessions.	**IPV** was measured using the CTS2 scale **Motivations**: Reasons for Violence Scale (Stuart et al 2006) was used to assess reasons for perpetrating physical aggression against relationship partners	**Results** In the year prior to entering the BIPs, the men reported perpetrating a mean of 30.3 acts of psychological aggression (SD = 36.5) and 10.8 (36.8) acts of physical assault. In the year prior to their entrance to the BIPs, the men reported that they were the victims of 36.5 (SD = 40.9) acts of psychological aggression and 10.07 (SD = 26.1) acts of physical assault. Women reported perpetrating approximately 20 more acts of psychological aggression and 14 more acts of physical violence than men. In the year prior to entrance to the BIPs, women reported that they were the victims of approximately 24 more acts of physical violence and 23 acts of psychological violence than men. **Reasons for Partner Violence Perp**

https://doi.org/10.1891/1946-6560.5.4.359		Asian or Pacific Islander, 21.1% Hispanic, 11.1% "More than one race", and 2.2% "Other". **RELATIONSHIP STATUS** At the time of the assessment 15.6% were not in a relationship; 16.7% were dating; 23.3% were married; 22.2% were living together, not married; 7.8% were separated; and 11.1% were divorced.			**Men and Women** **MEN vs WOMEN** **Power/Control** 16.1 vs 17.8 Men ONLY: ● To feel more powerful 19.8% ● To get control over your partner (e.g., show that you're boss) 21.2% ● To get your partner to do something or to stop your partner from doing something (e.g., going out with friends)16.5% ● Because you needed to make your partner agree with you 18.3% ● To shut your partner up or to get your partner to leave you alone 20.8% ● To make your partner afraid or scared 10.2% ● Because you wanted to have sex and your partner didn't 6.0% **MEN VS WOMEN** **Self-Defense** 29.4 vs. 38.7 **MEN VS. WOMEN** **Jealousy** 18.0 vs. 25.1 **MEN VS. WOMEN** **Communication Difficulties** 21.6 vs. 29.2

					MEN ONLY: ● To show feelings that you couldn't explain in words 23.7% ● To get your partner's attention 21.9% ● Because your partner was going to walk away or leave the conflict before it was solved 19.1% **MEN VS. WOMEN** **Expression of Negative Emotions** 20.8 vs. 28.0 MEN ONLY: ● To show anger 27.0% ● To prove that you love your partner 24.6% ● Because you were angry at someone else and took it out on your partner 11.8% ● Because you were afraid your partner was going to leave you 13.9% ● Because you didn't believe your partner cared about you 17.0% ● Because you didn't know what else to do with your feelings 22.1% ● Because of stress 29.3% **MEN VS. WOMEN** **Retaliation** 18.9 vs. 27.4 MEN ONLY ● To get back at your partner or to get revenge for being hit first 15.8% ● To punish your partner for wrong

					behavior 13.9% ● To get back at or to retaliate for being emotionally hurt by your partner 21.2% ● To hurt your partner's feelings 14.9% ● Because your partner provoked you or pushed you over the edge 33.0% ● Because your partner cheated on you 14.4 % **MEN VS WOMEN** **Other** 13.9 vs. 15.4 MEN ONLY ● Because it was sexually arousing 9.1% ● Because you were under the influence of alcohol 15.8% ● Because you were under the influence of drugs 5.1% ● To get away from your partner 25.5% Note: Means for women's individual motives for partner violence are reported in Stuart, Moore, Hellmuth, Ramsey, & Kahler (2006).
18. Stewart, L. A., Gabora, N., Allegri, N., & Slavin-Stewart, M. C. (2014). Profile of female perpetrators of intimate partner violence in an	*N = 58 women offenders with an IPV history*	Women offenders under federal supervision in CSC in September 2002 who had a current or past	The study explores the demographic, offense-related, and risk/need characteristics of women perpetrators of IPV; the context	**Measures** **IPV:** Offender info extracted from Offender Management System (OMS) Offender Intake Assessment (OIA), a comprehensive evaluation conducted	**Results (most vs at least one DV)** Primary motivation **Revenge/retaliation**; Most incidents versus at least one DV incident: 7.7% vs. 37.9% **Instrumental purposes**; 7.7% vs. 31.6% **Fear of further control/abuse by partner;** 5.1% vs 19.4% **Self-defense;** 5.1% vs. 18.2% **Defense of children**; 0.0% vs. 2.4%

offender population: Implications for treatment. *Partner Abuse*, *5*(2), 168-188. https://doi.org/10.1891/1946-6560.5.2.168		history of violence in intimate relation-ships. A random sample of 58 were selected for participation	surrounding their use of violence in intimate relationships; the level of injury of the victims of the women violence; and the motives for violence toward intimate partners.	with all in-coming offenders that includes the assessment of dynamic and static risk factors. **Motivations:** Motives for IPV were extracted from file information that included quotes from the women. Five motives were coded: **1) Revenge/ retaliation** **2) Instrumental (to achieve a goal)** **3) Fear of future abuse/further control** **4) Self Defense** **5) Defense of children.**	