



Published in final edited form as:

*Partner Abuse*. 2014 October 1; 5(4): 359–374. doi:10.1891/1946-6560.5.4.359.

## Motivations for intimate partner violence in men and women arrested for domestic violence and court referred to batterer intervention programs

JoAnna Elmquist<sup>1</sup>, John Hamel<sup>2</sup>, Ryan C. Shorey<sup>3</sup>, Lindsay Labrecque<sup>4</sup>, Andrew Ninnemann<sup>4</sup>, and Gregory L. Stuart<sup>1,4</sup>

<sup>1</sup>University of Tennessee-Knoxville

<sup>2</sup>John Hamel & Associates

<sup>3</sup>Ohio University

<sup>4</sup>Alpert Medical School of Brown University and Butler Hospital

### Abstract

Research has attempted to elucidate men and women's proximal motivations for perpetrating intimate partner violence (IPV). However, previous research has yet to clarify and resolve contention regarding whether motives for IPV are gender-neutral or gender specific. Thus, the purpose of this present study was to compare motives for physical IPV perpetration among a sample of men ( $n = 90$ ) and women ( $n = 87$ ) arrested for domestic violence and court-referred to batterer intervention programs. Results demonstrated that the most frequently endorsed motives for IPV by both men and women were self-defense, expression of negative emotions, and communication difficulties. With the exception of expression of negative emotions and retaliation, with women endorsing these motives more often than men, there were no significant differences between men and women's self-reported reasons for perpetrating physical aggression. The implications of these findings for future research and intervention programs are discussed.

### Keywords

motivations; intimate partner violence; aggression; domestic violence

---

Intimate partner violence (IPV), or acts of physical, psychological, and sexual aggression, is a significant and prevalent problem that affects individuals of all ages (Bonem, Stanley-Kime, & Corbin, 2008; Campbell, 2002). Given the alarmingly high prevalence rates and the significant consequences associated with IPV, there has been a substantial growth in research on the causes and correlates of IPV (Stuart, Moore, Hellmuth, Ramsey, & Kahler, 2006). To further understand the causes of IPV, numerous researchers have examined and attempted to elucidate two important questions: (1) what are the proximal motivations for

---

Corresponding Author: JoAnna Elmquist, University of Tennessee, Department of Psychology, 1404 Circle Dr., Austin Peay Building, 204, Knoxville, TN 37996, Phone: (214) 789-9486, Fax: (865) 974-3330, jelmquis@vols.utk.edu.

The content is solely the responsibility of the authors and does not necessarily represent the official views of the NIAAA or the National Institutes of Health.

IPV? and (2) do these motivations differ for men and women? (e.g., Langhinrichsen-Rohling, McCullars, & Misra, 2012). There is a lack of research on whether men and women differ on their motivations for IPV perpetration, particularly motivations that are proximally associated with specific violent episodes, and even less so among samples of men and women arrested for domestic violence and court referred to batterer intervention programs (BIPs).

## Men's Motivations for IPV

Early research examining men's motives for IPV demonstrated that state anger was the most commonly endorsed reason for physical aggression perpetration (e.g., Makepeace, 1986). Subsequent research has shown that perpetrators often endorsed multiple motivations for IPV (Harned, 2001; Hettrich & O'Leary, 2007; Straus, 2008), and that there is significant variation among perpetrators regarding their motives for IPV perpetration (Bell & Naugle, 2008; Stuart et al., 2006). For example, Bonem and colleagues (2008) examined the self-reported antecedents and consequences of IPV in a sample of male batterers. Results indicated that the most common motive for IPV was partner behavior (e.g., partner annoyed the assailant; partner yelled at the assailant; partner criticized the assailant). Furthermore, Hamberger and colleagues (1994) interviewed men arrested for domestic violence prior to their participation in court ordered BIPs and found that the most common reasons provided by men for perpetrating IPV were power/control (e.g., assertion of dominance, control of physical and verbal behaviors and emotional responses, punishment for unwanted behaviors), pent up anger, and desire for control. In addition in a qualitative study of 36 martially violent couples, Cascardi, Vivian, and Meyer (1991) found that men were more likely to report that they perpetrated severe IPV to control their partners.

## Women's Motivations for IPV

There is also a dearth of research that has examined women's motivations for IPV. In his landmark study on gender differences in dating violence, Makepeace (1986) found that the most frequently endorsed reasons women perpetrated IPV was for self-defense (35.6% of cases) and uncontrollable anger (24.2 % of cases). Furthermore, Olson and Lloyd (2005) interviewed women in romantic relationships about their self-reported motives for perpetrating IPV and found that the four most common reasons for perpetrating IPV were for psychological factors (e.g., problems with aggression, stress, or depression), rule violations (e.g., dissatisfaction with partners' behavior/response, not following the appropriate "rules" for intimate relationship), to gain attention and compliance (e.g., desire to gain compliance-change behavior), and restoration of face threat (e.g., use of aggression to restore face/self-image). Moreover, women in this sample reported that they frequently perpetrated IPV because aggression was the only way to get their partners' attention and/or to make their partners listen or acknowledge their presence (Olson & Lloyd, 2005). Similar results were found in a large British study (Carrado, George, Loxam, Jones & Templar, 1996), with "trying to get through" to a partner the most frequently endorsed motive for both male and female respondents. In a study examining arrested women's reasons for perpetrating physical IPV, Stuart and colleagues (2006) found that the most frequently endorsed reasons were self-defense, poor emotion regulation, provocation by a partner, and

retaliation against a partner. Aside from being one of the few known investigations of proximal motivations for IPV among women arrested for domestic violence, this study examined the most extensive list of potential motivations to date. That is, Stuart and colleagues (2006) provided 29 possible reasons for partner aggression, in contrast to other empirical studies which assessed fewer motivations, such as 7 (Makepeace, 1986) and 12 (Harned, 2001; reviewed below).

## Gender Differences in Motivations

The varied measures used to assess proximal motivations for IPV has resulted in discrepant findings regarding men and women's reasons for perpetrating IPV and the similarities and differences among them (Shorey, Metzler, & Cornelius, 2010). For example, Miller & Meloy (2006) provided evidence indicating that women typically engage in violence against their partners to either stop or escape their own victimization. Additionally, in their study on women referred to treatment agencies for abusive behavior, Babcock, Miller, & Siard (2003) found that the most frequently endorsed motive reported by female offenders for perpetrating partner violence was self-defense (Babcock et al., 2003). However, in a study examining men and women's motives for perpetrating violence in dating relationships, Harned (2001) found that men and women were equally likely to report perpetrating IPV in self-defense. Additionally, in comparison to men, women in this sample reported that they were more likely to perpetrate physical assault against a partner because of jealousy/anger (Harned, 2001). In a sample of undergraduates, Shorey and colleagues (2010) developed a contextual self-report measure of self-defensive IPV. Results indicated that men and women did not significantly differ on any motivations for physical aggression, and women were not more likely to use aggression in self-defense.

Numerous studies have shown that the primary motives provided by female perpetrators are to gain control over their partner, as retribution, as part of a reciprocally violent relationship, or out of anger, which are also motives frequently endorsed by male perpetrators (Follingstad et al., 1991; Graham-Kevan & Archer, 2005; Langhinrichsen-Rohling, 2010). Although extant research has examined and compared men and women's motivations for IPV, most of the existing research was obtained from undergraduate samples and did not contain data that enabled direct gender comparisons in the motivations for IPV (Langhinrichsen-Rohling et al., 2012). Thus, additional research that compares men and women's motivations for IPV in clinical samples (e.g., individuals arrested for domestic violence) is needed. In an effort to evaluate the available literature on men and women's motives for partner violence and ultimately clarify the similarities and/or differences among them, a number of systematic literature reviews have been conducted (Langhinrichsen-Rohling et al., 2012). Malloy, McCloskey, Grigsby, & Gardner (2003) reviewed the extant literature on motives for IPV perpetration and reported a number of gender differences. Specifically, the authors found that women typically engage in IPV out of self-defense, whereas men perpetrate IPV in order to control their partners (Malloy et al., 2003).

One framework to examine gender differences in proximal motivations for IPV perpetration has been proposed by Langhinrichsen-Rohling and colleagues (2012). In a review comparing men and women's motivations for IPV, Langhinrichsen-Rohling et al (2012)

reviewed all available papers related to men's and women's motives for partner violence. To facilitate this gender comparison, the authors created seven broad categories of motives for intimate partner aggression: (a) power/control, (b) self-defense, (c) expression of negative emotion (i.e., anger), (d) communication difficulties, (e) retaliation, (f) jealousy, and (g) other. In contrast to Malloy et al. (2003), the authors reviewed numerous studies that found that men and women endorsed similar motives for perpetrating partner violence. Despite evidence of this gender symmetry in motives, the authors concluded that there was significant heterogeneity across studies in the measures used to assess the motives for partner violence. Thus, according to the authors, there is a need for measures that not only include a more comprehensive assessment of motives, but also that include motives that are operationally defined more clearly (Langhinrichsen-Rohling et al., 2012). More important, through their review of the literature, the authors concluded that "there continues to be a need 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" (Langhinrichsen-Rohling et al., 2012; p. 457). This need is especially relevant given the heterogeneity of findings across empirical and review studies.

## Current Study

In an effort to shed more light on the motives for IPV, the purpose of the current study was to compare arrested men and women's motivations for physical IPV using the seven categories of motives for IPV identified by Langhinrichsen-Rohling and colleagues (2012). Additionally, in order to ensure a more systematic assessment of motives, we used the Reasons for Violence Scale (RVS; Stuart et al., 2006), which provides one of the most comprehensive assessments of motives for IPV. Based on previous research that has examined individual motives for partner aggression, it was hypothesized that men and women would endorse multiple and varied reasons for IPV. However given the discrepant findings across studies regarding men's and women's motives for IPV, no a priori hypotheses were made regarding the similarities and/or differences in men and women's endorsement of the seven motive categories proposed by Langhinrichsen-Rohling and colleagues (2012).

## Method

### Participants

The sample consisted of men and women, 18 years of age or older, arrested for domestic violence and court-referred to batterer intervention programs (BIPs). For the male sample, men were recruited from BIPs in California ( $n = 90$ ). Participants reported a mean age of 40.30 ( $SD = 11.7$ ), education of 13.67 years ( $SD = 2.56$ ), and annual income of \$ 49,538 ( $SD = 20,000$ ). The ethnic composition of the sample was 44.4% non-Hispanic Caucasian, 13.3% non-Hispanic Black, 7.8% Asian or Pacific Islander, 21.1% Hispanic, 11.1% "More than one race", and 2.2% "Other". At the time of the assessment, 15.6% of the sample reported that they did not have a current relationship partner; 16.7% were dating; 23.3% were married; 22.2% were living together, not married; 7.8% were separated; and 11.1% were divorced.

The sample of women was recruited from BIPs in Rhode Island ( $n = 87$ ). A detailed description of the female sample can be obtained from Stuart and colleagues (e.g., 2006) who previously reported these data.

## Measures

**Demographics Questionnaire**—A demographics questionnaire gathered information about each participant's age, ethnicity, relationship status, employment status, income, and number of violence intervention sessions attended.

**The Reasons for Violence Scale**—The Reasons for Violence Scale (RVS; Stuart et al., 2006) was used to assess reasons for perpetrating physical aggression against relationship partners. Participants were provided with 29 potential reasons and asked to identify the percentage of violent episodes in which each reason was a factor in their decision to perpetrate partner violence. The score for each item could range from 0% to 100%, which indicates the percentage of time each reason was the cause of a violent episode. Given that violence can occur for multiple reasons, participants could endorse multiple motivations for violence. We then coded each item on the RVS into the seven categories proposed by Langhinrichsen-Rohling and colleagues (2012). Table 1 presents the classification of the questionnaire items.

**The Revised Conflict Tactics Scales (CTS2)**—Intimate partner violence was assessed using the Revised Conflict Tactics Scales (CTS2; Straus, Hamby, Boney-McCoy, & Sugarman, 1996). The CTS2 is a 78-item questionnaire that assesses the frequency of negotiation, physical and psychological aggression, sexual coercion, and injury that has occurred in an intimate relationship. The measure assesses both perpetration and victimization rates for each of these acts. Total scores for each of the subscales were obtained by summing the frequency of each behavior in the year before entrance into the BIP. The score for each item can range from 0 to 25 with higher scores indicating more frequent aggression (Straus, Hamby, & Warren, 2003). The CTS2 has demonstrated good validity and reliability (Straus et al., 1996). In the sample of men, the internal consistencies for IPV perpetration were .84 for psychological aggression and .97 for physical assault. The internal consistencies for IPV victimization were .86 for psychological aggression and .94 for physical assault. In the sample of women, the internal consistencies for IPV perpetration were .79 for psychological aggression and .95 for physical assault. For IPV victimization, the internal consistencies were .83 for psychological aggression and .93 for physical assault. Internal consistency data are comparable for the women sample and are reported in Stuart et al. (2006).

## Procedure

Participants in both samples completed the assessment during their regularly scheduled BIP sessions. After informed consent was obtained, participants were provided with the study measures. Participation was voluntary, and all participants were informed that none of the information provided would be shared with the intervention facilitators or anyone in the criminal justice system. Compensation was not provided to participants. Men had attended an average of 25 intervention sessions ( $SD = 17.0$ ) at the time of the assessment and the

women had attended 8 intervention sessions ( $SD = 7.0$ ). The number of intervention sessions attended by men and women was not significantly correlated with any of the seven motive categories. Procedures were approved by all relevant Institutional Review Boards.

## Results

Raw scores were utilized in calculating means and standard deviations for the IPV variables (psychological aggression and physical assault). 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.

*T*-tests were conducted in order to compare men and women's reported IPV perpetration and victimization. Natural log transformations were performed prior to analyses in order to correct for skewed distributions. Men and women significantly differed on their reports of physical assault perpetration,  $t(158) = 5.21, p < .05$  and victimization,  $t(155) = 4.14, p < .05$  and psychological aggression perpetration,  $t(165) = 4.57, p < .05$  and victimization,  $t(162) = 4.06, p < .05$ . Women reported perpetrating significantly more acts of psychological aggression and physical assault than men, and they also reported more psychological aggression and physical assault victimization than men.

Data from the RVS are presented in Table 1. Among the sample of men, the most common reasons for perpetrating physical IPV were because "your partner provoked you or pushed you over the edge" (33.0%), self defense (29.4%), because of stress (29.4%), to show anger (27.0%), "to get away from your partner" (25.5%), and to "prove you love your partner" (24.6). According to the classification system proposed by Langhinrichsen-Rohling et al. (2012), the motivation groups most frequently endorsed by men in this sample were self-defense (29.4%), communication difficulties (21.6%), and expression of negative emotion (20.8%). Among the women, the categories of reasons most frequently endorsed were self-defense (38.7%), communication difficulties (29.2%), and expression of negative emotions (28.0%). Thus, men and women endorsed similar motivations for partner aggression perpetration. For women's endorsement of individual items on the RVS see Stuart et al., (2006).

*T*-tests were used to examine potential gender difference in the seven motivation categories for physical IPV perpetration (see Table 1). Findings indicated that men and women significantly differed in their endorsement of the motives of retaliation,  $t(167) = 2.11, p < .05$ , and expression of negative emotions,  $t(164) = 2.78, p < .05$ , with women reporting more frequent use of these reasons for perpetrating physical violence. Men and women did not significantly differ on their endorsement of the other five motive groups.

## Discussion

The purpose of the present study was to elucidate the reasons for IPV among men and women arrested for domestic violence using the seven broad categories of motives (i.e., power/control, self-defense, expression of negative emotion, communication difficulties, retaliation, jealous, and other) proposed by Langhinrichsen-Rohling et al (2012). To our knowledge, this is the first study to apply the seven motive categories to examine and compare men's and women's perpetration of physical partner aggression.

Consistent with previous research, men and women in this sample endorsed multiple motive categories at varying levels, thus highlighting the heterogeneity of violent men and women and their reasons for perpetrating IPV. It is likely that the motives for IPV perpetration differ across samples, as well as within and across relationships. In other words, within a relationship, motives for violence perpetration are likely context dependent. For instance, an individual might be motivated to perpetrate a single act of IPV because of specific situational factors that are not present during other incidents of IPV. The context of IPV has been highlighted in extant literature as being essential to the accurate conceptualization and assessment of IPV perpetration and victimization (Bell & Naugle, 2008; Downs, Rindels, & Atkinson, 2007; Kimmel, 2002). In addition, across different samples, some motives may be more likely to be endorsed. For example, self-defense as a motive for IPV perpetration may be more likely to be endorsed among women seeking help at a domestic violence shelter.

Results from this current study suggest that arrested men and women endorse similar motives for violence. Specifically, in the current study, the most frequently endorsed motive categories between both men and women were self-defense, communication difficulties, and expression of negative emotions, and there were no significant gender differences in the endorsement of these motive categories. These findings help elucidate a significant question that still remains within the field, namely do men and women have different motives for perpetrating violence? Previous reviews have reported mixed findings regarding whether women are more likely to perpetrate relationship aggression because of self-defense and men are more likely to perpetrate partner aggression because of a need to control their partners. However, findings from the current study support that men report that they are equally likely to engage in partner aggression in self-defense and women are equally likely to engage in partner aggression for reasons other than self-defense. Furthermore, the finding that self-defense is equally endorsed by men and women coupled with previous research suggesting that women may initiate more violence but men are more likely to cause injuries (Archer, 2000) indicates that self-defense may be important for both male and female victims of IPV.

Furthermore, findings indicated that while there were similarities among men and women in their endorsement of motives for partner violence, women were significantly more likely to report that they were motivated to perpetrate partner violence out of retaliation and because of problems with negative emotions (e.g., anger). This finding is consistent with previous research showing that across samples (e.g., college students, BIP participants) the inability to regulate emotions is associated with an increased likelihood of perpetrating partner violence (McNulty & Hellmuth, 2008; Shorey, Febres, Brasfield, & Stuart, 2011). However,

contrary to previous research (i.e., Langhinrichsen-Rohling et al., 2012), there were significant gender differences in men and women's endorsement of problems with negative emotions as a motivator for IPV perpetration. One possible explanation for this finding is that women in BIPs might be more likely than men to have personality traits or disorders that are associated with emotion regulation problems. For example, Simmons and colleagues (2005) examined and compared the personality profiles of men and women arrested for domestic violence. Results indicated women were more likely than men to have elevated histrionic, narcissistic, and compulsive scales and profiles indicating the presence of a personality disorder. Varelly Thornton and colleagues (2010) examined whether there were sex differences in offending behavior and found that women's IPV was predicted by Cluster B personality traits (i.e., antisocial, borderline, histrionic, and narcissistic), whereas men's IPV was predicted by Cluster A personality traits (i.e., paranoid, schizoid, and schizotypal). Moreover, Henning, Jones, and Holdford (2003) compared the psychological functioning of men and women arrested for domestic violence and found that women were more likely than men to score in the clinical range for delusional disorder, major depression, bipolar disorder, and thought disorder. Women were also more likely to have compulsive, historic, and borderline personality disorders. Taken together, these findings suggest that women in BIPs might be more likely than men in BIPs to have elevated personality traits associated with problems with emotion regulation. As a result, these women might be more likely to perpetrate IPV when they are angry or when their needs are not met, which is consistent with theories that individuals might engage in partner violence in order to regulate negative emotional states, such as anger (Bell & Naugle, 2008; Jakupcak, 2003; Shorey, Cornelius, & Bell, 2008).

A second possible explanation for the gender differences in this study is that men and women might be socialized to believe that certain motives are more acceptable to admit to than others. In the current sample, it is possible that men were socialized to believe that is unacceptable to admit that they were motivated to perpetrate IPV in order to retaliate against their partner or because of a difficulty expressing negative emotions (Langhinrichsen-Rohling, 2010). In addition, it is possible that the gender differences in this study might have been a product of underreporting. Previous research utilizing couples has consistently found that men report significantly less IPV perpetration compared to their partners' reports of IPV victimization (Hamby, 2009). In contrast, women's reports of IPV perpetration tend to be more consistent with their partners' reports of IPV victimization (Hamby, 2009). Thus, it is possible that the men in this sample not only underreported their IPV perpetration but also their motives for IPV. In the current study, arrested women reported significantly greater frequency of IPV perpetration and victimization.

A final possible explanation for the difference in motives between men and women is that women reported more violence perpetration and victimization. As a result, it is possible that they also reported more motives for IPV perpetration than men, thus leading to the gender differences.



## Implications

Although many questions regarding men and women's motives for partner violence still remain, the results of this present study may have important treatment implications. For instance, the multiple and varied reasons reported by men and women for perpetrating partner violence indicates that programs could benefit from tailoring interventions based on the unique needs of the individual. Although individualizing treatments will be more time-consuming than group interventions, the significant problems associated with group interventions (see review by Murphy & Meis, 2008) and their lack of efficacy in reducing IPV (Babcock, Green, & Robie, 2004; Feder & Wilson, 2005; Murphy & Eckhardt, 2005; Murphy & Meis, 2008) indicate the need for more effective interventions that result in more long-term behavior change. Given the lack of effectiveness of BIPs in decreasing IPV (Babcock, Green, & Robie, 2004; Feder & Wilson, 2005; Murphy & Eckhardt, 2005; Murphy & Meis, 2008), individualized interventions, or even potentially couples counseling when indicated (e.g., when violence is not severe; partners are not fearful of each other; both partners are invested in the relationship and agree to therapy; both are committed to nonviolence; safety plans are established and there are no weapons in the home; etc.), may provide alternative formats that may increase the efficacy of services provided. In many cases, individuals may be required by the criminal justice system to complete their BIP before considering couples therapy. Moreover, although some researchers have advocated for gender-specific interventions for IPV (e.g., Leisring, Dowd, & Rosenbaum, 2005), it remains an empirical question as to whether gender specific programming is more or less effective than gender-neutral programming. Given findings of gender symmetry in rates of physical IPV, in emotional abuse and control, and in risk factors, and because men and women in the current study overlapped on 5 of the 7 motivation categories, BIP programming may prove most effective when it is primarily gender neutral (Capaldi, Knoble, Shortt, & Kim, 2012; Careny & Barner, 2012; Desmarais, Reeves, Nicholls, Telford, & Fiebert, 2012).

Finally, in addition to self-defense, the most frequently endorsed motives for partner violence among both men and women were communication difficulties and expression of negative emotions. Thus, intervention programs for both men and women should incorporate interventions aimed at increasing emotion regulation and effective emotional expression. For example, Shorey and colleagues (e.g., Shorey, Zucosky, et al., 2012 and Shorey, Cornelius, & Idema, 2011) have suggested that mindfulness-based interventions, components of acceptance and commitment therapy, and/or dialectical behavioral interventions could help improve the expression and regulation of negative emotions, thus ultimately reducing the likelihood of partner violence. For instance, Fruzzetti and Levensky (2000) and Walz (2003) developed specialized dialectical behavioral therapies (DBT) to be used with partner violent individuals. According to both authors, components of DBT, such as the hierarchy of treatment targets and the focus on emotion regulation skills, are valuable and useful interventions that could more effectively reduce and eliminate partner aggression (Fruzzetti & Levensky, 2000; Waltz, 2003). Research has supported the effectiveness, acceptability, and feasibility of dialectical behavioral interventions adapted for IPV (Baer, 2005; Cavanaugh, Solomon, & Gelles, 2011; Fruzzetti, 2002). However, to our knowledge, there have been no empirical investigations that have examined the efficacy of mindfulness-based

or acceptance-based interventions in reducing and preventing IPV. Thus future research should investigate whether such interventions help to improve IPV outcomes.

### Limitations

It is important to consider the limitations of the current study when interpreting findings. One limitation is that given the sensitive nature of the assessment measures it is possible that reports of IPV and motives for partner violence may have been affected by social desirability. Future research should include measures of social desirability and more significantly, collateral information from relationship partners such as IPV perpetration, IPV victimization, and partners' motives for their own IPV. A second limitation of the study pertains to the measures that we used to assess the reasons for IPV and violence perpetration and victimization. Specifically, the RVS was based on participants' retrospective self-reports and the RVS does not assess the context in which the violent episodes occurred. Furthermore, even though the CTS2 is the most widely used measure to assess for IPV, it does not assess the context in which the violence occurred and who initiated the violent episodes. For these reasons, we recommend that future research should include both qualitative and quantitative assessments of the motives for partner violence and violence victimization and perpetration. The inclusion of more comprehensive assessments will enable a greater understanding of men and women's motives for partner violence, the heterogeneity and/or homogeneity underling the motives for partner violence, and the contexts in which the motives occur. The generalizability of the findings is also limited by our sample of primarily non-Hispanic, Caucasian participants and the nature of the population. Future research should on the motives for men and women's motives for partner violence should include a more ethnically diverse sample.

### Conclusions

In summary, the current study is one of the first known empirical investigations to use the seven motive categories proposed by Langhinrichsen-Rohling and colleagues (2012) to examine and compare men and women's motives for partner violence. Results demonstrated that men and women endorsed similar motives for partner violence for most categories. Despite this gender symmetry, women were more likely than men to be motivated by retaliation and expression of negative emotions. It will be important for continued research to examine the context in which distinct motivations for violence occur.

### Acknowledgments

This work was supported, in part, by grants F31AA020131 and K24AA019707 from the National Institute on Alcohol Abuse and Alcoholism (NIAAA) awarded to the third and last authors, respectively.

### References

- Archer J. Sex differences in aggression between heterosexual partners: A meta-analytic review. *Psychological Bulletin*. 2000; 126(5):651–680. [PubMed: 10989615]
- Babcock JC, Green CE, Robie C. Does batterers' treatment work? A meta-analytic review of domestic violence treatment. *Clinical Psychology Review*. 2004; 23(8):1023–1053. [PubMed: 14729422]

- Babcock JC, Miller SA, Siard C. Toward a typology of abusive women: Differences between partner-only and generally violent women in the use of violence. *Psychology of Women Quarterly*. 2003; 27:153–161.
- Baer, RA. *Mindfulness-based treatment approaches: Clinician's guide to evidence base and applications*. San Diego, CA: Academic Press; 2005.
- Bell KM, Naugle AE. Intimate partner violence theoretical considerations: Moving towards a contextual framework. *Clinical Psychology Review*. 2008; 28:1906–1107.
- Bell KM, Naugle AE. Intimate partner violence theoretical considerations: Moving towards a contextual framework. *Clinical Psychology Review*. 2008; 28(7):1906–1107.
- Bonem M, Stanley-Kime KL, Corbin M. A behavioral approach to understanding domestic violence: A functional assessment based on batterer- identified contingencies. *Journal of Behavior Analysis Offender and Victim Treatment and Prevention*. 2008; 1:209–221.
- Campbell JC. Health consequences of intimate partner violence. *The Lancet*. 2002; 359(9314):1331–1336.
- Capaldi D, Knoble N, Shortt J, Kim H. A systematic review of risk factors for intimate partner violence. *Partner Abuse*. 2012; 3 (2):231–280. [PubMed: 22754606]
- Carney M, Barner J. Prevalence of partner abuse: Rates of emotional abuse and control. *Partner Abuse*. 2012; 3(3):286–335.
- Carrado M, George M, Loxam F, Jones L, Templar D. Aggression in British heterosexual relationships: A descriptive analysis. *Aggressive Behavior*. 1996; 22:401–415.
- Cascardi, M.; Vivian, D.; Meyer, SL. Context and attributions for marital violence in discordant couples. Paper presented at the meeting of the Association for the Advancement of Behavior Therapy; New York, NY. 1991 Nov.
- Cavanaugh MM, Solomon PL, Gelles RJ. The dialectical psychoeducational workshop (DPEW) for males at risk for intimate partner violence: A pilot randomized controlled trial. *Journal of Experimental Criminology*. 2011; 7(3):275–291.
- Desmarais S, Reeves K, Nicholls T, Telford R, Fiebert M. Prevalence of physical violence in intimate relationships: Part 1: rates of male and female victimization. *Partner Abuse*. 2012; 3(2):140–169.
- Downs WR, Rindels B, Atkinson C. Women's use of physical and nonphysical self-defense strategies during incidents of partner violence. *Violence Against Women*. 2007; 13(1):28–45. [PubMed: 17179403]
- Feder L, Wilson DB. A meta-analytic review of court-mandated batterer intervention programs: Can courts affect abusers' behavior? *Journal of Experimental Criminology*. 2005; 1:239–262.
- Follingstad DR, Wright S, Lloyd S, Sebastian JA. Sex differences in motivations and effects in dating violence. *Family Relations*. 1991; 40:51–51.
- Fruzzetti, AE. DBT adapted for partner violent men. Paper presented at the roundtable discussion “Application of DBT for intimate partner violence” (J.H. Rathus, chair), at the annual meeting of the Association for the Advancement of Behavior Therapy; Philadelphia. 2002.
- Fruzzetti AE, Levensky ER. Dialectical behavior therapy for domestic violence: Rationale and procedures. *Cognitive and Behavioral Practice*. 2000; 7:435–447.
- Graham-Kevan N, Archer J. Investigating three explanations of women's relationship aggression. *Psychology of Women Quarterly*. 2005; 29:270–277.
- Hamberger KK, Lohr JM, Bonge D. Intendeds function of domestic violence is different for arrested male and female perpetrators. *Family Violence and Sexual Assault Bulletin*. 1994; 10(3–4):40–44.
- Hamby S. The gender debate about intimate partner violence: Solutions and Dead Ends. *Psychological Trauma: Theory, Research, Practice, and Policy*. 2009; 1(1):24–34.
- Harned M. Abused women or abused men? An examination of the context and outcomes of dating violence. *Violence and Victims*. 2001; 16:269–285. [PubMed: 11437117]
- Henning K, Jones A, Holdford R. Treatment needs of women arrested for domestic violence: A comparison with male offenders. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*. 2003; 18 (8):839–856. [PubMed: 19768888]
- Hettrich EL, O'Leary KD. Females' reasons for their physical aggression in dating relationships. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*. 2007; 22:1131–1143. [PubMed: 17704459]

- Jakupcak M. Masculine gender role stress and men's fear of emotions as predictors of self-reported aggression and violence. *Violence and Victims*. 2003; 18(5):533–541. [PubMed: 14695019]
- Kimmel MS. "Gender symmetry" in domestic violence: A substantive and methodological research review. *Violence Against Women*. 2002; 8(11):1332–1363.
- Langhinrichsen-Rohling J. Controversies involving gender and intimate partner violence in the United States. *Sex Roles*. 2010; 62:179–193.
- Langhinrichsen-Rohling J, McCullars A, Misra TA. Motivations for men and women's intimate partner violence perpetration: A comprehensive review. *Partner Abuse*. 2012; 3(4):429–468.
- Leisring P, Dowd L, Rosenbaum A. Abuse histories and symptoms of posttraumatic stress in partner-aggressive women. *Family Violence & Sexual Assault Bulletin*. 2005; 21 (1):5–12.
- Makepeace JM. Gender differences in courtship violence victimization. *Family Relations*. 1996; 35:383–388.
- Malloy KA, McCloskey KA, Grigsby N, Gardner D. Women's use of violence within intimate relationships. *Journal of Aggression, Maltreatment, and Trauma*. 2003; 6:37–59.
- McNulty JK, Hellmuth JC. Emotion regulation and intimate partner violence in newlyweds. *Journal of Family Psychology*. 2008; 22(5):794–797. [PubMed: 18855516]
- Miller SL, Meloy ML. Women's use of force: Voice of women arrested for domestic violence. *Violence Against Women*. 2006; 12(1):89–115. [PubMed: 16314663]
- Murphy, CM.; Eckhardt, CI. *Treating the abusive partner: An individualized, cognitive– behavioral approach*. New York: Guilford Press; 2005.
- Murphy CM, Meis LA. Individual treatment of intimate partner violence perpetrators. *Violence and Victims*. 2008; 23:173–186. [PubMed: 18624088]
- Olson LN, Lloyd SA. 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*. 2005; 53(7/8): 603–617.
- Shorey RC, Cornelius TL, Bell KM. Behavior therapy and dating violence: A framework for prevention programming. *Journal of Behavior Analysis of Offender and Victim Treatment and Prevention*. 2008; 1:298–311.
- Shorey RC, Cornelius TL, Idema C. Trait anger as a mediator of difficulties with emotion regulation and female-perpetrated psychological aggression. *Violence and Victims*. 2011; 26:217–282.
- Shorey RC, Febres J, Brasfield H, Stuart GL. A descriptive investigation of proximal factors to female perpetrated psychological aggression in dating relationships. *Partner Abuse*. 2011; 2(2):131–146.
- Shorey RC, Meltzer C, Cornelius TL. Motivations for self-defensive aggression in dating relationships. *Violence and Victims*. 2010; 25:662–676. [PubMed: 21061871]
- Shorey RC, Zucosky H, Brasfield H, Febres J, Cornelius TL, Sage C, Stuart GL. Dating violence prevention programming: Directions for future interventions. *Aggression and Violent Behavior*. 2012; 17(4):289–296. [PubMed: 22773916]
- Simmons CA, Lehmann P, Cobb N, Fowler CR. Personality profiles of women and men arrested for domestic violence: An analysis of similarities and differences. *Journal of Offender Rehabilitation*. 2005; 41(4):63–81.
- Straus MA. Dominance and symmetry in partner violence by male and female university students in 32 nations. *Children and Youth Services Review*. 2008; 30:252–275.
- Straus, MA.; Hamby, SL.; Warren, WL. *The Conflict Tactics Scales Handbook: Revised Conflict Tactics Scale (CTS2); CTS: Parent-Child Version (CTSPC)*. Los Angeles, CA: Western Psychological Services; 2003.
- Straus MA, Hamby SL, Boney-McCoy S, Sugarman DB. The Revised Conflict Tactics Scale (CTS2): Development and preliminary psychometric data. *Journal of Family Issues*. 1996; 17:283–316.
- Stuart GL, Moore TM, Hellmuth JC, Ramsey SE, Kahler CW. Reasons for intimate partner violence perpetration among arrested women. *Violence Against Women*. 2006; 12:609–621. [PubMed: 16777948]
- Varley Thornton AJ, Graham-Kevan N, Archer J. Adaptive and maladaptive personality traits as predictors of violent and nonviolent offending behavior in men and women. *Aggressive Behavior*. 2010; 36:177–186. [PubMed: 20213653]

Walz J. Dialectical behavior therapy in the treatment of abusive behavior. *Journal of Aggression, Maltreatment, & Trauma*. 2003; 7:75–103.

**Table 1****Reasons for Partner Violence Perpetration Among Men and Women**

<b>Reasons for Violence</b>	<b>M% (SD)<sup>a</sup></b>	
	<b>Men (n =90)</b>	<b>Women (n =87)</b>
<b>Power/Control</b>	<b>16.1 (26.3)</b>	<b>17.8 (24.0)</b>
To feel more powerful	19.8 (29.5)	
To get control over your partner (e.g., show that you're boss)	21.2 (30.3)	
To get your partner to do something or to stop your partner from doing something (e.g., going out with friends)	16.5 (27.6)	
Because you needed to make your partner agree with you	18.3 (28.7)	
To shut your partner up or to get your partner to leave you alone	20.8 (27.2)	
To make your partner afraid or scared	10.2 (23.0)	
Because you wanted to have sex and your partner didn't	6.0 (17.6)	
<b>Self-Defense</b>	<b>29.4 (33.2)</b>	<b>38.7 (36.5)</b>
To protect yourself (e.g., self defense)	29.4 (33.2)	
<b>Jealousy</b>	<b>18.0 (31.2)</b>	<b>25.1 (30.9)</b>
Because you were jealous	18.0 (31.2)	
<b>Communication Difficulties</b>	<b>21.6 (29.4)</b>	<b>29.2 (31.3)</b>
To show feelings that you couldn't explain in words	23.7 (27.8)	
To get your partner's attention	21.9 (32.3)	
Because your partner was going to walk away or leave the conflict before it was solved	19.1 (28.2)	
<b>Expression of Negative Emotions</b>	<b>20.8 (29.6)</b>	<b>28.0 (30.3)</b>
To show anger	27.0 (28.5)	
To prove that you love your partner	24.6 (36.2)	
Because you were angry at someone else and took it out on your partner	11.8 (22.4)	
Because you were afraid your partner was going to leave you	13.9 (25.5)	
Because you didn't believe your partner cared about you	17.0 (28.3)	
Because you didn't know what else to do with your feelings	22.1 (32.0)	
Because of stress	29.3 (34.3)	
<b>Retaliation</b>	<b>18.9 (29.2)</b>	<b>27.4 (32.3)</b>
To get back at your partner or to get revenge for being hit first	15.8 (28.8)	
To punish your partner for wrong behavior	13.9 (26.1)	
To get back at or to retaliate for being emotionally hurt by your partner	21.2 (31.0)	
To hurt your partner's feelings	14.9 (24.3)	
Because your partner provoked you or pushed you over the edge	33.0 (34.4)	
Because your partner cheated on you	14.4 (30.6)	
<b>Other</b>	<b>13.9 (24.7)</b>	<b>15.4 (25.0)</b>
Because it was sexually arousing	9.1 (22.7)	
Because you were under the influence of alcohol	15.8 (27.5)	
Because you were under the influence of drugs	5.1 (16.7)	
To get away from your partner	25.5 (32.0)	

*Note:* Means and standard deviations for women's individual motives for partner violence are reported in Stuart, Moore, Hellmuth, Ramsey, & Kahler (2006).

<sup>a</sup>Refers to the percentage of perpetrated violence episodes for which the reason was endorsed.