



# *Understanding the Use of Violence Among Men Who Sustain Intimate Terrorism*

Denise A. Hines, Ph.D., Clark University &  
Emily M. Douglas, Ph.D., Bridgewater State College

Paper presented at the International Family Violence and Child Victimization  
Research Conference, July 12, 2010, Portsmouth, NH

Sponsored by: National Institute of Mental Health Grant # 1R21MH074590

# Introduction

- Members of violent relationships cannot always be dichotomized as “innocent victims” vs “blameworthy perpetrators”
- Researchers who have examined samples of IPV victims have typically not:
  - Investigated the behaviors that victims may engage in that could perpetuate the IPV or be abusive
  - Examined reasons, other than motives, for why victims of IPV may also use violent behaviors.

# Use of Intimate Partner Violence Among Victims in Clinical Samples

- Our sample sustained intimate terrorism (IT) from their female partners.
- 55% used some type of physical IPV in the previous year & 19.5% used severe physical IPV.
  - Very similar to findings on battered women in shelters.
  - The use of physical IPV by victims of IT is typically attributed to a pattern of violent resistance.

# Use of Intimate Partner Violence Among Victims in Clinical Samples

- It is important to understand why some of these men are engaging in violent resistance in their relationships, while others are not.
  - Dysfunctional
  - Escalation of IPV
  - Physical and psychological injuries

# Methods: Sample

- **Criteria:**
  - Heterosexual men
  - Ages 18-59
  - In a relationship lasting at least one month in the previous year
  - Physically assaulted by female partner within previous year
  - Sought outside assistance/support
  - Lived in U.S.
- **N = 302**

# Methods: Survey

- Demographics
- Conflict Tactics Scales
- Violent Socialization & Sexual Abuse History Scales from the Personal & Relationships Profile
- PTSD Checklist
- Alcohol/Substance Abuse Survey from the National Women's Study

# Results: Demographics of Male Participants

	No Physical IPV ( <i>n</i> = 135)	Minor Physical IPV Only ( <i>n</i> = 108)	Severe Physical IPV ( <i>n</i> = 59)	$\chi^2$ or <i>F</i>
<b>Age</b>	<b>43.15 (7.92)<sub>a</sub></b>	<b>39.69 (9.34)<sub>a</sub></b>	<b>36.03 (8.56)<sub>a</sub></b>	<b>15.67***</b>
White	87.4%	84.3%	89.8%	1.12
Black	6.7%	6.5%	3.4%	0.87
Hispanic	2.2%	8.3%	5.1%	4.75
Asian	4.4%	5.6%	1.7%	1.39
Native American	0.7%	2.8%	3.4%	2.02
Education	4.55 (1.51)	4.37 (1.65)	4.14 (1.48)	1.60
Income (in thousands)	49.66 (26.29)	51.36 (25.75)	50.52 (24.58)	0.30
Disabled	15.6%	13.1%	10.2%	1.06

# Results: Demographics of Female Partners

	No Physical IPV ( <i>n</i> = 135)	Minor Physical IPV Only ( <i>n</i> = 108)	Severe Physical IPV ( <i>n</i> = 59)	$\chi^2$ or <i>F</i>
<b>Age</b>	<b>40.59 (7.56)<sub>a,b</sub></b>	<b>36.32 (8.50)<sub>a</sub></b>	<b>34.76 (9.37)<sub>b</sub></b>	<b>13.14***</b>
White	76.3%	70.4%	76.3%	1.27
Black	8.1%	6.5%	6.8%	0.27
Hispanic	5.9%	9.3%	8.5%	1.02
Asian	8.1%	13.9%	3.4%	5.37
Native American	3.7%	0.0%	5.1%	4.88
Education	3.67 (1.85)	4.06 (1.88)	3.71 (2.03)	2.03
Income (in thousands)	30.56 (24.86)	31.36 (24.97)	26.89 (21.93)	0.71
Disabled	10.2%	6.5%	10.2%	1.11



# Results: Relationship Demographics

	No Physical IPV ( <i>n</i> = 135)	Minor Physical IPV Only ( <i>n</i> = 108)	Severe Physical IPV ( <i>n</i> = 59)	$\chi^2$ or <i>F</i>
Relationship Length	103.92 (84.29)	96.34 (83.44)	86.66 (74.01)	0.41
Currently in the Relationship	55.6%	58.9%	54.2%	0.42
Children Involved	77.3%	75.5%	66.1%	2.77

# Results: Childhood History of Abuse

	No Physical IPV ( <i>n</i> = 135)	Minor Physical IPV Only ( <i>n</i> = 108)	Severe Physical IPV ( <i>n</i> = 59)	$\chi^2$ or <i>F</i>
Experienced Physical Abuse	42.2%	51.9%	48.3%	2.29
Witnessed Interparental Violence	19.3%	21.3%	27.1%	1.51
Sexually Abused by a Family Member	14.1%	10.2%	15.3%	1.16
Sexually Abused by a Non- Family Member	20.7%	11.1%	20.3%	4.40

# Results: Mental Illness

	No Physical IPV ( <i>n</i> = 135)	Minor Physical IPV Only ( <i>n</i> = 108)	Severe Physical IPV ( <i>n</i> = 59)	$\chi^2$ or <i>F</i>
PTSD Total Score	45.79 (13.49)	46.94 (15.08)	47.61 (14.37)	0.40
Scored Above Clinical Cut- Off for PTSD	54.8%	58.3%	64.4%	1.56
Ever Diagnosed with Mental Illness	22.7%	21.3%	30.5%	1.92

# Results: Alcohol/Substance Abuse

	No Physical IPV ( <i>n</i> = 135)	Minor Physical IPV Only ( <i>n</i> = 108)	Severe Physical IPV ( <i>n</i> = 59)	$\chi^2$ or <i>F</i>
<b>Frequency of Alcohol Intoxication</b>	<b>0.68 (1.21)<sub>a,b</sub></b>	<b>1.28 (1.75)<sub>a</sub></b>	<b>1.24 (1.37)<sub>b</sub></b>	<b>8.36***</b>
<b>Abused Alcohol</b>	<b>11.1<sub>a,b</sub></b>	<b>24.1<sub>a</sub></b>	<b>22.0<sub>b</sub></b>	<b>7.73*</b>
<b>Frequency of Substance Use</b>	<b>0.26 (0.72)<sub>a</sub></b>	<b>0.42 (0.91)<sub>b</sub></b>	<b>0.78 (1.11)<sub>a,b</sub></b>	<b>6.25**</b>
<b>Abused Substances</b>	<b>6.7<sub>a</sub></b>	<b>11.1<sub>b</sub></b>	<b>23.7<sub>a,b</sub></b>	<b>11.70**</b>

# Results: Female Partner's Use of IPV

	No Physical IPV ( <i>n</i> = 135)	Minor Physical IPV Only ( <i>n</i> = 108)	Severe Physical IPV ( <i>n</i> = 59)	$\chi^2$ or <i>F</i>
Controlling Behaviors – Prevalence	94.1	91.7	94.9	0.84
Controlling Behaviors – Frequency	40.42 (36.03)	36.78 (37.21)	43.88 (36.90)	0.73
Severe Psychological IPV – Prevalence	95.6	95.4	98.3	1.00
<b>Severe Psychological IPV – Frequency</b>	<b>26.59 (26.78)<sub>a</sub></b>	<b>24.08 (23.34)<sub>b</sub></b>	<b>37.11 (28.41)<sub>a,b</sub></b>	<b>4.57*</b>
<b>Physical IPV – Frequency</b>	<b>38.51 (52.39)<sub>a</sub></b>	<b>46.69 (50.02)</b>	<b>65.56 (58.00)<sub>a</sub></b>	<b>4.72**</b>
<b>Male Sustained Severe Injury</b>	<b>28.9<sub>a</sub></b>	<b>32.4<sub>b</sub></b>	<b>54.2<sub>a,b</sub></b>	<b>12.12**</b>
<b>Insisting on Sex – Prevalence</b>	<b>42.2</b>	<b>31.5<sub>a</sub></b>	<b>55.9<sub>a</sub></b>	<b>9.56**</b>

# Results: Male Participant's Use of IPV

	No Physical IPV ( <i>n</i> = 135)	Minor Physical IPV Only ( <i>n</i> = 108)	Severe Physical IPV ( <i>n</i> = 59)	$\chi^2$ or <i>F</i>
<b>Severe Psychological IPV – Prevalence</b>	<b>20.0<sub>a,b</sub></b>	<b>50.9<sub>a</sub></b>	<b>66.1<sub>b</sub></b>	<b>44.60***</b>
<b>Severe Psychological IPV – Frequency</b>	<b>0.91 (4.67)<sub>a,b</sub></b>	<b>2.69 (5.73)<sub>a</sub></b>	<b>4.76 (8.50)<sub>b</sub></b>	<b>22.15***</b>
<b>Insisting on Sex – Prevalence</b>	<b>4.5<sub>a,b</sub></b>	<b>16.7<sub>a</sub></b>	<b>28.8<sub>b</sub></b>	<b>21.95***</b>
<b>Controlling Behaviors – Prevalence</b>	<b>34.8<sub>a</sub></b>	<b>46.3<sub>b</sub></b>	<b>69.5<sub>a,b</sub></b>	<b>19.92***</b>
<b>Controlling Behaviors – Frequency</b>	<b>2.21 (5.61)<sub>a</sub></b>	<b>3.00 (6.02)<sub>b</sub></b>	<b>6.31 (10.31)<sub>a,b</sub></b>	<b>8.75***</b>
<b>Physical IPV – Frequency</b>	<b>--</b>	<b>3.51 (7.61)</b>	<b>15.29 (19.50)</b>	<b>4.46***</b>
<b>Female Sustained Severe Injury</b>	<b>2.2<sub>a</sub></b>	<b>4.6<sub>b</sub></b>	<b>23.7<sub>a,b</sub></b>	<b>29.87***</b>

## Conclusion: Differences Between Male Victims who Use Physical IPV and Male Victims Who Don't

- Male victims who use IPV:
  - Are younger
  - Engage in other maladaptive behaviors as well
  - Abuse alcohol
  - Are no more likely to have been abused as a child or suffer from a mental illness

## Conclusion: Differences between male victims who use minor physical IPV only and severe physical IPV

- **Male victims who use severe physical IPV:**
  - Use more physical IPV and controlling behaviors
  - Are injured more often
  - Have partners who are injured more often
  - Abuse illegal substances



# Implications

- Results are consistent with studies that have examined the use of IPV among samples of battered women; thus, the findings do not appear to be related to gender.
- Findings help us to better understand the complexities within many relationships that are violent and can help providers shape screening questions and services to individuals seeking help.
- Findings challenge our understanding and classifications of “victims” and “perpetrators” as uni-dimensional figures.
- The findings speak to the importance of examining more broadly incidents of victimization and perpetration of IPV.

# Contact Information

Denise A. Hines, Ph.D.

Clark University Department of Psychology

508-793-7458

[dhines@clarku.edu](mailto:dhines@clarku.edu)

<http://www.clarku.edu/faculty/dhines>

# Publications from Dataset

- Hines, D.A., & Douglas, E.M. (2009). Women's use of intimate partner violence against men: Prevalence, implications, and consequences. *Journal of Aggression, Maltreatment, and Trauma, 18*, 572-586.
- Hines, D. A., & Douglas, E. M. (in press). Intimate terrorism by women towards men: Does it exist? *Journal of Aggression, Conflict, and Peace Research*.
- Hines, D. A., & Douglas, E. M. (in press). A Closer Look at Men Who Sustain Intimate Terrorism from their Female Partners. *Partner Abuse*.
- Hines, D. A., & Douglas, E. M. "Symptoms of post-traumatic stress disorder in men who sustain intimate partner violence: A study of helpseeking and community samples." Manuscript provisionally accepted to *Psychology of Men and Masculinity*.
- Douglas, E. M., & Hines, D. A. "The Helpseeking Experiences of Men Who Sustain Intimate Partner Violence: An Overlooked Population and Implications for Practice." Manuscript submitted to the *Journal of Family Violence*.
- Hines, D. A., & Douglas, E. M. "Symptoms of alcohol and substance abuse in men who sustain intimate partner violence" Manuscript submitted to *Psychology of Violence*.
- Hines, D. A., & Douglas, E. M. "Understanding the use of violence among male victims of intimate terrorism." Manuscript submitted to *Partner Abuse*.