

Cumulative Control

*An Analysis of Cumulative Abuse and Control Tactics in the Gendering of Intimate
Partner Violence Victimization and Perpetration*

A Thesis

Presented to

The Faculty of the

Department of Sociology

The Colorado College

in Partial Fulfillment

of the Requirements for the Degree

Bachelor of Arts

Elizabeth Michaels

2013

On my honor
I have neither given nor received
unauthorized aid on this thesis.

Elizabeth Michaels

2013

This study utilizes shelter intake survey data from TESSA, a domestic violence resource agency in Colorado Springs, Colorado, to analyze the relationships between victim demographics and experiences with various forms of Intimate Partner Violence (IPV). This study also addresses Michael Johnson's Intimate Terrorism and Situational Couple Violence typologies and analyses the relationship between gender and control among IPV victims and perpetrators. Finally, this thesis considers the question of cumulative abuse as an indicator of abuse severity. Findings suggest that when the role of controlling behavior is considered, both gender-symmetrical and gender-asymmetrical forms of abuse can be identified in one sample. Specifically, highly controlling behaviors are more often perpetrated by males against female victims, but more event-specific and less controlling behaviors are perpetrated and experienced by males and females at roughly the same rates. Finally, findings suggest that cumulative abuse may be a proxy for control in predicting abuse severity.

Table of Contents

LITERATURE REVIEW	1
<i>Demographics Characteristic of IPV Victimization</i>	2
<i>Family Violence Perspective</i>	4
<i>Feminist Perspectives</i>	5
<i>Michael Johnson's Typology: Intimate Terrorism and Situational Couple Violence</i>	6
<i>Intimate Partner Violence as Overlapping and Multidimensional</i>	8
<i>Cumulative Abuse</i>	10
<i>Research Objectives</i>	12
METHODOLOGY	13
FINDINGS	18
<i>Descriptive Statistics</i>	18
<i>Abuse Experiences and Different Social/Demographic Backgrounds</i>	21
<i>Gender in Victimization and Perpetration</i>	22
<i>Cumulative Abuse</i>	25
CONCLUSION	27
REFERENCES	32
Appendix A: Variables in Study	37
Table of Tables	
Table 1. Percentages (Frequencies) of Victim and Perpetrator Demographics	18
Table 2. Percentages (Frequencies) of Victim and Perpetrator Social Characteristics	19
Table 3. Percentages (Frequencies) of Victim Abuse Experiences and Chi-Square Values (Cramer's V) Comparing by Gender	20
Table 4. Chi-Square Values (Cramer's V) Comparing Abuse Experiences by Perpetrator Gender	23
Table 5. Two-Group T-Tests Comparing the Mean (SE) Sum of Abuse Types between Victims and Perpetrators of Different Client Type, Gender, Race, TANF Status, and Control Level	26

As a fellow at TESSA, I worked with women from diverse backgrounds, both demographically and in terms of experiences with abuse. I met women living in the Safehouse who had been previously homeless and were living on food stamps. I also met women who were wealthy and drove luxury cars. I met single women, mothers of five, gay women, straight women, and women who didn't speak a word of English. The survivors I met at TESSA suffered numerous forms of violence in their abusive relationships. I met women who had experienced differing degrees of physical and sexual abuse, others who had experienced extreme isolation and imprisonment, and some who were forced to file child abuse reports with the Department of Human Services. One thing I found to be constant among all of the women with whom I worked at TESSA, however, was the extremely high level of ongoing coercion and control that they suffered in their relationships. These experiences working at TESSA have largely inspired my desire to study the relationship between victim and perpetrator demographics and violent and controlling behaviors among IPV survivors.

LITERATURE REVIEW

Intimate partner violence (IPV) has been defined and measured in a number of ways that have varied across time, place, and culture (Alhabib, Nur, and Jones 2009; Breiding, Black, and Ryan 2008b; Dobash and Dobash 2004; Hodges and Cabanilla 2011; Tjaden and Thoennes 2000). This analysis, however, will use the following criteria to define this complex and ubiquitous issue: IPV involves the threat, attempt, or completion of physical, sexual, psychological, property, or stalking abuse performed by a current or former spouse, boyfriend, girlfriend, date, cohabiting intimate partner, or

parents of the same child(ren) (Basile et al. 2004; CDC 2003; Saltzman et al. 2002; U.S. Department of Justice 2009).

Intimate partner violence is undoubtedly a major human rights and public health concern, resulting in an estimated 1,200 deaths and 2 million injuries per year among women and nearly 600,000 injuries per year among men (CDC 2003; Tjaden and Thoennes 2000). One in four women and one in seven men have experienced some form of IPV victimization in his or her lifetime (Breiding et al. 2008b). IPV has been shown to have severe physical (Coker et al. 2000a), psychological (Breiding et al. 2008a; Coker et al. 2002; Devries et al. 2011), and behavioral (Breiding et al. 2008a) consequences. Further, the economic impact of intimate partner violence is profound. It is reported that intimate partner violence, rape, and stalking costs the United States approximately \$7.8 billion per year in legal, medical, and mental health services for victims (CDC 2003:2).

Demographic Characteristics of IPV Victimization

IPV impacts individuals of any gender (Straus 2005), sexual orientation (Lundy and Leventhal 1999), age (Aulette 2007; Barter 2009; O’Keeffe and Brockopp 1986), race (Bograd 1999; Kanuha 1996, as cited in Bograd 1999; Sokoloff and Dunpont 2004; Thavolia and Cabanilla 2011; Yllö 2005), and socioeconomic status (Aulette 2007; Lyon 2000; Pearson, Thoennes, and Griswold 1999). While IPV does affect individuals of all walks of life, it is insufficient to characterize it as uniform across all demographic and social groups. Some argue instead that IPV is defined, understood, manifested, and experienced differently by victims of diverse social and cultural backgrounds (Bograd 1999; Kanuha 1996, as cited in Bograd 1999; Sokoloff and Dunpont 2004; Thavolia and Cabanilla 2011; Yllö 2005). These scholars have called for an intersectional approach to

understanding IPV that acknowledges the unique positions of, and gives voice to, victims from marginalized and often underrepresented backgrounds. An understanding of the way IPV manifests differently for diverse populations can help policymakers design more effective programs to prevent IPV and provide services to victims in culturally sensitive and relevant ways.

Many have analyzed the relationship between demographic, social, and behavioral factors and IPV victimization and perpetration. Studies have found that females who are black and Native American (Catalano et al. 2009:2), unmarried and heterosexual (Leventhal and Lundy 1999; Sokoloff and Dupont 2005; Stets and Straus 1989), have military (Marshall, Panuzio, and Taft 2005; Bradley 2007; Shupe, Stacey, and Hazlewood 1987; Williams 1994) or substance dependent (Flanzer 1981) partners, or who are between the ages of 20 and 24 (Greenfield et al. 1998, as cited in Aulette 2011) are at the greatest risk of IPV victimization. Further, economically marginalized women and women receiving welfare are more likely to experience IPV than their more affluent counterparts, and the consequences of IPV are frequently greater and more complex for these populations (Aulette 2007:284; Lyon 2000; Pearson et al. 1999; Tjaden and Thoennes 2000). Specifically, poorer women may have inadequate access to the healthcare necessary to seek treatment for violence related injuries, they may lack the education and occupational experience needed to be financially independent of their abusers, and may have smaller social networks from which to find support and emotional healing (summarized in Aulette 2007).

Family Violence Perspective

Throughout the literature there has existed a rift between two fundamentally different perspectives with regard to the study and understanding intimate partner violence: the family violence and the feminist perspectives. Murray A. Straus is perhaps the leading scholar of the family violence perspective (Straus 2005; 2008; Straus, Gelles, and Steinmetz 1980; Straus, Smith, and Gelles 1990). Straus and other family violence scholars attribute violence in the home to differences in gender and age within the family, extreme levels of privacy maintained within the household, the reluctance to dissolve marriages, and acceptance of violence in society at large (Straus 2008; Straus and Smith 1990). Straus argues that “multiple causes are required to explain violence between partners, only one of which is male dominance in families and society” (Straus 2008:203). Straus posits a macro-level understanding of the roots of violence in society, and has advocated for research methodologies that mirror this understanding.

Straus (2005; 2008) argues that because violence permeates all levels of society, the study of family violence must consider all of society as well. To achieve this, Straus and his colleagues have administered large-scale, nation-wide surveys to the general population in the hopes of measuring instances of violence in American families (Johnson 1995). Due to survey design, interview length, and sample size, these studies generally focus on individual instances of violent acts, or “act-based” data (Dobash and Dobash 2004). In these studies, Straus and other family violence theorists (Gelles [with Straus] 1990; Smith [with Straus] 1990; Gelles and Steinmetz [with Straus] 1980) have shown violence within the family to be relatively gender-symmetrical (Straus 2004; 2005). Straus (2004:203) explains: “women physically assault male partners at about the

same rate, and with about the same intensity as men assault female partners.” He echoes this assertion in a later work: “violence against partners by women is prevalent and is one of the many causes of violence against women, just as violence by men is prevalent and is one of the many causes of violence by women” (Straus 2005:73). This stance has been highly controversial, and has been fiercely criticized by feminists, who assert a fundamentally different understanding of IPV.

Feminist Perspectives

Many feminist studies have contested the family violence perspective (Dobash and Dobash 1979; 2004; Dobash et al. 1992; Kurz 1998; Yllö 2005). These scholars do not view violence in the family as the result of individual pathology, or as the gender-neutral manifestation of violence in society and the media, as the family violence scholars have asserted. Rather, they view IPV as the reflection of a greater structure in society that is characterized by gender inequality, and that condones hegemonic masculinity, male aggression, and the subordination of women (summarized in Aulette 2007). For feminist scholars, IPV is rarely the product of random outbursts of anger or frustration. Rather, these scholars view men’s control over and subordination of women as the primary driving force in abusive relationships. For this reason, these theorists see family violence as fundamentally gender-asymmetrical, with the overwhelming majority of cases involving men perpetrating on “their” female victims.

The feminist understanding of IPV as ongoing, controlling, and multidimensional is informed by these scholars’ research methodologies. Specifically, these researchers more often utilize data from groups of victims among shelter, court, and hospital populations. While these methods are unable to access patterns in the wider population

like Straus' (Straus and Gelles 1986) surveys, they result in a more holistic depiction of the abuse experienced by victims. Feminist scholars argue that Straus' "act-based" approach to understanding IPV "makes it nearly impossible to consider the context, wider consequences and intentions associated with violent acts or the meanings and consequences of such acts for victims and perpetrators" (Dobash and Dobash 2004:330). Feminist scholars advocate instead for a methodology that will allow for the complex and nuanced patterns of violence to be illuminated.

Michael Johnson's Typology: Intimate Terrorism and Situational Couple Violence

While these differences may appear to be profound, Michael Johnson (1995) has attempted to reconcile these two opposing positions through the formation of a typology to describe intimate partner violence based on the context in which it occurs. Johnson proposes that the feminist scholars are describing what he terms "Intimate Terrorism" (IT), while the family violence theorists are studying "Situational Couple Violence" (SCV). Note that while in some articles, Johnson (1995) refers to these typologies as "Patriarchal Terrorism" and "Common Couple Violence," others (Anderson 2008) refer to the IT and SCV terminology. Johnson (1995) argues that rather than either perspective being "right," or understanding the nature of violence "better," they are simply considering two fundamentally different forms of family violence based on their use of fundamentally different research methods.

Specifically, the phone interview survey data from large samples of the public employed by family violence scholars tend to yield more event-specific, gender-symmetrical results. In contrast, the data from smaller samples of specific populations of women who have experienced ongoing abuse utilized by the feminists tend to show IPV

to be gender-asymmetrical, complex, and highly controlling in nature. In essence, the sampling methods of these two groups of scholars “have given them access to different, and largely non-overlapping populations of victims, experiencing different forms of violence” (Johnson 1995:288-9).

The role of control in violence is a fundamental component of Johnson’s typology. For Johnson, Intimate Terrorism, which aligns with the feminist perspective, is characterized primarily by male perpetrators’ use of control tactics to subordinate and dominate female victims (Johnson 1995:284). Like the feminist scholars, Johnson attributes this form of violence largely to patriarchal social norms that emphasize hegemonic masculinity and the subordination of women. He sees IT as being characterized by ongoing coercive control, isolation, subordination, and humiliation of victims, which can manifest in physical and sexual violence, but also in psychological and emotional abuse (Johnson 1995), and often involves the use of multiple tactics (Dobash and Dobash 1979).

Situational Couple Violence, in contrast, can be characterized by the occasional and often stress-induced outbursts of rage that are committed by either men or women without any desire for ongoing coercion or control. SCV is the result of things getting “out of hand” (Johnson 1995:287), and the violence occurs when one or both partners use dramatic measures in a situation of stress or desperation. This differs from IT because the desire for control is an attempt to control the particular *situation* rather than the other *person*. In these cases, this goal of control is short-lived, situationally dependent, and rarely escalates over long periods of time.

Intimate Partner Violence as Overlapping and Multidimensional

Definitions of the various forms of IPV and what constitutes IPV have been debated. This analysis will consider physical (Saltzman et al 2002:11-12), sexual (U.S. Department of Justice 2009:7), emotional/psychological (Coker et al. 2000; Saltzman et al. 2002), and pet and property violence. Additionally, many abusive relationships involve multiple forms of IPV (CDC 2012; Dobash and Dobash 2004; Krebs et al. 2011; Russel 1986). Some scholars have studied these various forms of abuse in isolation. For example, Basile et al. (2004) examined the risk of posttraumatic stress disorder (PTSD) associated with each of four forms of IPV while controlling for other forms. This allowed the authors to see the unique effect of each form of IPV with regard to PTSD predictability. They found that all types of violence were positively associated with PTSD symptoms and that when controlling for other forms of violence, physical, psychological, and stalking violence were still associated with these symptoms.

Others have argued that viewing IPV types independently of one another is insufficient and oversimplified, for IPV generally involves multiple forms of abuse functioning simultaneously and often operating together to oppress and control the victim. These scholars (Anderson 2008; Coker et al. 2000; Krebs et al. 2011; Mahoney and Williams 1998; Pence and Paymar 1993; Scott-Storey 2011) have studied the intersections and interplay between various forms of abuse and how they impact victims. For example, some have considered the role of sexual abuse and rape in physically violent relationships (Coker et al 2000; Mahoney and Williams 1998; Pence and Paymar 1993; Scott-Storey 2011), and have shown that many women who are victims of physical violence are also victims of intimate partner rape. Further, It has been suggested that

experiencing a combination of physical *and* sexual violence in an abusive relationship is associated with experiencing more *severe* violence overall and that sexual abuse may be a sign of escalation (Coker et al. 2000). Others have looked at the role of psychological abuse in IPV relationships, and have found that psychological and emotional abuse often occur in conjunction with or as a precursor to more severe physical violence (CDC 2012; Coker et al. 2000; Krebs et al. 2011; Norris and Palarea 2011; Tjaden and Thoennes 2000). A primary mechanism of both sexual (Pence and Paymar 1993) and psychological (Coker et al. 2000) abuse in physically abusive relationships, however, is control, and the abuser's use of multiple forms of abuse to maintain this control over the victim.

The role of control in IPV has been well documented and studied, and some (Bledsoe and Sar 2011) have worked to operationalize and test measures of controlling behaviors. In their initial testing of the Intimate Partner Violence Control Scale (IPVCS), which measures beliefs in the need to control one's partner through surveillance, threats, everyday routines, decision making, and autonomous behaviors, Bledsoe and Sar (2011) found control as measured by this scale to be positively correlated with self-reported IPV and aggression, beliefs supportive of interpersonal violence, an adversarial attitude toward women and an acceptance of rape myths. This finding supports "feminist theory's attribution of control as a central motive for violence by men against their relationship partners" (p. 181).

These findings support the notion that IPV cannot be understood as a series of unrelated events, but rather as an ongoing and multidimensional phenomenon that frequently involves many forms of terrorism, that often escalates and evolves over time, and is characterized by high levels of coercion and control. An intersectional

understanding of the dynamics of IPV should be classified as feminist, as it understands IPV as fundamentally the result of men attempting to exert power and control over women. When we consider violence to be gendered, ongoing, and controlling, rather than as the result of violent outbursts caused by stress or disagreement, the complex interplay between multiple forms of subordination and abuse becomes increasingly relevant. Specifically, when we view IPV in this holistic vein, it becomes necessary to analyze role that multiple forms of abuse play in maintaining power and control in abusive relationships. The association between control, cumulative abuse, and abuse severity, however, has been debated.

Cumulative Abuse

The operationalization of abuse severity has been the focus of discussion and the quantitative study of cumulative abuse has proven to be complex and often problematic (Anderson 2008; Basile et al. 2004; Krebs et al. 2011; Scott Storey 2011). Basile et al. (2004) found evidence for a “dose response phenomenon, in which the more types of violence a woman experiences, the more increase PTSD symptoms” (p.419). This finding supports the notion that abuse is cumulative, and considering the volume of abuse types can be helpful in understanding the consequences that a woman experiences. Though they support cumulative abuse as contributing to abuse severity, Basile et al. also suggest a more holistic study of cumulative abuse, advocating “the importance of examining co-occurring types of violence in future research, as the examination of individual types of violence in isolation of the others could conceal the increased effect of the combined forms of violence” (p.419). Scott-Storey (2011) argues that with regard to predictability of negative outcomes, considering cumulative abuse and the breadth of violence by

simply counting the sheer numbers of abuse types is insufficient for understanding the complex and heterogeneous nature of victim experiences.

Anderson (2008) has contributed to the study of cumulative abuse by advocating the need to understand the role of control in these relationships. Anderson set out to determine whether negative outcomes of partner violence were more reliably predicted by higher levels of cumulative abuse (more kinds of abuse and greater frequency), or by higher levels of control in the relationship. Her goal was to use Johnson's typologies of violence to see which would have more power in predicting the negative outcomes of IPV: a distinction between violence that occurs in combination with high control (IT) and violence that does not occur in conjunction with high control (SCV), or "a simple measurement strategy of counting the number of types of violent acts that respondents experienced" (p. 1166). Anderson (2008) found the simple measure of cumulative abuse—or the breadth of violent acts experienced by victims—to be as good a predictor of most negative outcomes as the IT/SCV typologies. This finding challenges the notion that IPV is "worse" in the context of control, and supports theories that counting sheer numbers of abuse types is sufficient for understanding IPV and its consequences.

The relationship between cumulative abuse, controlling behaviors, and negative health outcomes has been debated. What is clear, however, is that one must not disregard the role of control in abusive relationships when striving to understand the complex dynamics of IPV. We have also discussed that IPV tends to escalate over time, and various forms of abuse are often employed at various times or simultaneously within one abusive relationship, functioning to maintain the abuser's power and control over the victim. Based on this literature review, a major objective of this research will be to

describe, analyze, and contribute to the knowledge regarding cumulative abuse, control, and gender in the study of IPV.

Research Objectives

This thesis will serve as an exploratory attempt to investigate some of the aforementioned patterns and discussions of intimate partner violence using data from TESSA, a domestic violence resource agency in Colorado Springs. Some studies have looked at the demographic predictors of IPV. Others have looked at physical and psychological outcomes of experiencing different forms and combinations of IPV. With these considerations in mind, the first research objective in this project is to describe the experiences with abuse of victims of various demographic and social backgrounds. This study will also consider cumulative abuse and whether or not it might be a sufficient indicator of abuse severity. Finally, this research will address questions studied by family violence theorists, feminist scholars, and Michael Johnson by exploring the gendered nature of IPV and the role of control in abusive relationships. Most importantly, however, this thesis can be characterized as community-based research in that research topics have been inspired by personal experiences, data come from a local and specific agency, and findings will be presented to this agency in the hopes of informing practice. Because of the use of shelter-level data, this thesis will assume a theoretical framework that aligns more strongly with feminist scholars than with family violence theorists.

Ultimately, the objective of this study is to illuminate the complex and nuanced interplay between multiple and combined forms of IPV as they affect women of diverse backgrounds while also considering gender and control in abusive relationships in the context of Michael Johnson's typologies. Simply put, this research serves three primary

agendas: first, to describe the demographics and unique experiences of TESSA clients; second, to further understand the characteristics and consequences cumulative abuse, and address the question as to whether or not cumulative abuse is a sufficient indicator of abuse severity; third and finally, to analyze the gendering of IPV perpetration and victimization and consider the role of control tactics in this gendering.

METHODOLOGY

Based on the local, organization-specific nature of the data, this thesis will assume an action-oriented research approach (Small and Uttal 2005). “Action-oriented research is a methodological approach for doing collaborative research with practitioners and community partners that can inform practice, programs, community development, and policy while contributing to the scientific knowledge base” (Small and Uttal 2005:936). Action-oriented research rejects the epistemological, positivist paradigm that defines the majority of social research, and questions the notion that social research can be objective and value free. Action-oriented research instead acknowledges the researcher’s agenda and makes it a primary driving force in the research process. My research agenda is shaped by my personal experience working at TESSA, my hope to better understand the demographic characteristics and unique experiences of these clients, and ultimately my desire to give this knowledge back to the organization in a way that will help inform practice.

Data for this research were provided by TESSA of Colorado Springs. TESSA is the only domestic violence and sexual assault resource agency in El Paso and Teller Counties, providing confidential victim advocacy, a 24-hour crisis line, court support, hospital on-call advocacy, counseling, children’s’ programs, and safe housing to

survivors of IPV and their children. TESSA has three primary goals: to “provide immediate safety for women, children, and other victims escaping abuse, (to) empower survivors through programs and support such as advocacy and counseling, and (to) create a safer future through education and outreach to schools, businesses, and other organizations” (TESSA).

This analysis examined data from two groups of adult TESSA clients from the year 2011: Safehouse residents and Outreach clients. Data for this research came from the intake survey (see author for details) that is completed by an advocate for every TESSA client, regardless of which services he or she receives. The survey includes self-reported demographic, lifestyle, and behavioral information about both victims and perpetrators. Based on the review of the literature, as well as the nature of the research questions, a list of relevant variables was compiled, and then further collapsed into a series of dichotomous variables intended to simplify analysis. A complete list of variables in the study can be found in Appendix A. There were, however, a few noteworthy transformations that warrant explanation.

Dichotomous variables were created for each racial category, and clients received a “1” for each race with which they identified. This resulted in frequencies for race that amounted to more than the total population because many clients identified as multiple races. The only exception was for white: clients were *only* coded as white if they listed white as their only race, with no other races. If they reported white in conjunction with other races, they would be coded as those races, but not as white. Clients who identified as black *and* other races, in contrast, were coded for all races listed, including black. While analyses were performed on each racial category, few significant differences were

found, and thus the majority of analyses reported focus on the white versus non-white category. The three transgendered individuals in the sample were treated as missing for gender due to the small number and limited analysis possible. Clients were asked for their household income and whether or not they receive TANF (Temporary Assistance for Needy Families), but the response rate for the latter was far greater. For this reason, the dichotomous variable to indicate TANF status was used as the primary measure of client poverty throughout analysis. Note that roughly ten percent of cases were dropped due to incomplete or contradictory responses.

The behavioral checklist includes the victim's report of a "yes" or "no" response to the list of behaviors perpetrated by the abuser. While the original behavioral checklist included indicators of duration of abuse, the data are entered into Alice as simple dichotomous "yes" or "no" responses. Clients were coded as "1" for each form of abuse that they experienced, and these behaviors were further transformed into a series of indices to describe combined forms of abuse (Appendix A). A "hands-on abuse" variable was created in which those who experienced physical abuse, strangulation, sexual abuse, and/or were restrained from leaving received a "1." Pets and weapons were treated as missing in this variable due to the ambiguity of whether or not these behaviors constitute hands-on abuse. Note that "restrained from leaving" was treated as a form of "hands-on" abuse because of the limitations and often danger that it places on a victim's physical state. Conversely, a "hands-off" variable was created to describe those who experienced verbal/psychological/emotional abuse, threats, the use of children to control, property damage, confinement, and/or isolation, without *any* physical abuse. In other words, this variable describes those who experienced *no* hands-on violence. Weapons and pet abuse

were also coded as missing for the “hands-off” variable. A “sex + physical” abuse variable was created to describe those who experienced sexual abuse/rape in conjunction with any form of physical abuse (physical, strangulation, and/or restrain).

A series of indices were also created to describe varying levels and combinations of controlling behaviors: restraint from leaving, isolation, and confinement. First, the “any control” variable describes those who experienced *any* of the controlling behaviors. Similarly, the “all control” variable describes those who experienced *all* of the controlling behaviors. The “control + physical” variable describes those who experienced *any* controlling behavior in conjunction with *any* form of physical abuse. Finally, an “all control + physical” variable describes those who experience *all* forms of control in conjunction with *any* form of physical abuse. These three behaviors (restraint from leaving, isolation, and confinement) were treated as primary indicators of control due to the coercive and manipulative nature of these acts. These behaviors cannot be construed as angry outbursts or losses of temper in a stressful situation, but rather serve the primary goal of subordinating, limiting, and undermining one’s partner in a way that compromises his or her autonomy, sense of self, and individual liberties. Lastly, a “cumulative abuse” variable was created that simply indicates the total number of abuse types experienced by each victim.

The following analysis was performed using Stata 12. Note that the number of observations (n) fluctuates throughout the analysis because of missing data based on varying response rates to different survey questions and uneven group sizes between the Outreach and Safehouse populations. Analysis included a series of descriptive statistics, chi-square tests, two-group t-tests, and logistic regressions, not all of which are shown in

the results. Chi-square analyses were performed to analyze correlations between victim and perpetrator gender and experiences with abuse. In these tests, Pearson's chi-square values, Cramer's V values, and statistical significance were reported. Two-group t-tests were performed to compare mean numbers of the sum of abuse types (cumulative abuse) experienced by victims of different client types, demographics, and levels of control experienced. Due to the uneven distribution of the dependent variable as well as largely uneven group sizes, Mann-Whitney non-parametric alternative tests were also performed, the values of which were reported in place of t-values.

FINDINGS

Descriptive Statistics

Descriptive statistics refer to the entire sample in the study (N=1797), and portray victim and perpetrator demographics (Table 1) and social characteristics (Table 2).

Table 1. Percentages (Frequencies) of Victim and Perpetrator Demographics

Victim Demographics	% (n)	N
Gender		
Male	5.7 (101)	1788
Female	94.4 (1687)	1788
Race		
white	63.6 (1021)	1605
black	13.0 (208)	1605
Hispanic	17.6(282)	1605
Asian/Pacific Islander	2.1 (33)	1605
Native American	3.0 (48)	1605
Multi-racial	2.6 (41)	1605
Age	Mean (SD)	Range
Age	34.18 (10.749)	18-72
Total = 1797		
Perpetrator Demographics	% (n)	N
Gender		
Male	91.19 (828)	908
Female	8.81 (80)	908
Race		
white	70.56 (556)	788
black	16.24 (128)	788
Hispanic	0.38 (3)	788
Asian/Pacific Islander	2.15 (17)	788
Native American	0.89 (7)	788
Multi-racial	9.9 (77)	788
Age	Mean (SD)	Range
Age	36.10 (10.756)	17-72
Total = 909		

Note: The percentages of each race equal more than one hundred percent because individuals who identified as more than one race were coded as belonging to each racial group with which they identified.

The majority of clients identified as female, and the mean age was roughly 34 years. The majority of clients were white, followed by Hispanic and black with very small numbers of other racial groups. Most perpetrators in this sample were employed

white males, and the mean perpetrator age was about 36. About 25 percent of perpetrators were in the military.

Table2. Percentages (Frequencies) of Victim and Perpetrator Social Characteristics

Victim characteristics	% (n)	N	
Married	42.00 (633)	1507	
Divorced	10.09 (152)	1507	
Separated	16.39 (247)	1507	
Single	31.52 (475)	1507	
Has children	85.17 (1137)	1335	
Employed	47.36 (547)	1155	
Receives TANF	64.77 (1164)	1797	
Military (past or present)	6.11 (99)	1621	
Legally living in the US	97.99 (779)	795	
US citizen	95.09 (756)	795	
Disabled (any)	19.41 (242)	1247	
Mentally disabled	8.85 (110)	1243	
Physically disabled	13.03 (162)	1243	
Addict (past or present)	12.40 (76)	613	
Current addict	7.99 (49)	613	
Recovering addict	4.40 (27)	613	
Continuous variables	Mean (SD)	Range	N
Household income	\$19927.62 (36533.95)	\$0-\$713,000	1183
Personal income	\$11983.71 (18989.57)	\$0-\$200,000	583
Number of dependents	1.750 (1.232)	0-8	1335
Total = 1797			
Perpetrator characteristics	% (n)	N	
Employed	63.69 (314)	493	
Military (past or present)	25.23 (408)	1617	
Total =908			

Most subjects were married, followed by single. The least common relationship status was divorced. Most clients had children, received TANF, and were legal citizens of the United States. About half of the subjects were employed. Few subjects were current or recovering addicts, worked in the military, or were disabled. The mean household income was roughly \$20,000, and the personal income (without the offender) was about half of that.

Table 3: Percentages (Frequencies) of Victim Abuse Experiences and Chi-Square Values (Cramer's V) Comparing by Gender

Type of violence by combined percent (n) experienced	Combined clients % (n)	Male victims % (n)	Female victims % (n)	Chi ² Value (Cramer's V value)
Violent behaviors				
Verbal/psychological/emotional	77.7 (1386)	68.3 (69)	77.7 (1301)	4.73* (0.052)
Physical violence	77.0 (1374)	75.3 (76)	77.7 (1302)	0.34 (0.014)
Isolation	43.9 (784)	24.8 (25)	45.3 (758)	16.24*** (0.096)
Restraint from leaving	42.5 (758)	14.9 (15)	44.2 (741)	33.65*** (0.138)
Destruction of property	41.6 (743)	44.6 (45)	41.6 (697)	0.34 (-0.014)
Threats ^a	27.3 (487)	16.8 (17)	27.9 (468)	5.92* (0.058)
Confinement	34.3 (612)	18.8 (19)	35.3 (592)	11.54*** (0.081)
Uses children to control	32.0 (571)	38.6 (39)	31.8 (532)	2.051 (-0.034)
Strangulation	17.4 (310)	4.0 (4)	18.2 (305)	13.46*** (0.087)
Weapons threatened or used	17.3 (309)	16.8 (17)	17.4 (292)	0.02 (0.004)
Rape/sexual abuse	15.9 (283)	5.9 (6)	16.5 (277)	7.99** (0.067)
Other violence	9.4 (167)	11.9 (12)	9.2 (154)	0.81 (-0.021)
Abuse of pets	5.8 (103)	3.0 (3)	6.0 (100)	1.57 (0.030)
Total	1785	101	1675	
Combined violence indices				
Any control	59.2 (1056)	34.7 (35)	60.8 (1019)	27.07*** (0.123)
Any control + physical	54.6 (974)	31.7 (32)	56.1 (940)	22.96*** (0.114)
All control	21.1 (376)	6.9 (7)	22.0 (369)	13.01*** (0.086)
All control + physical	19.0 (339)	5.9 (6)	19.9 (333)	11.99** (0.082)
Hands-on violence	18.3 (1478)	74.2 (72)	85.1 (1411)	8.38** (0.069)
Hands-off abuse	15.1 (265)	25.0 (24)	14.3 (236)	8.14** (-0.068)
Sexual + physical	14.3 (256)	4.0 (4)	15.0 (252)	9.49** (0.073)
Verbal only	5.3 (95)	6.9 (7)	5.0 (83)	0.77 (-0.021)
Total	1754	97	1657	

Note: * $p \leq 0.05$, ** $p \leq 0.01$, *** $p \leq 0.001$. ^a = threats to harm/kill victim/children. A value of 1 = female.

Based on self-reports, Table 3 presents percentages and frequencies of victims who experienced various forms of abuse, as well as combined abuse indices. The most common forms of abuse in this sample were physical violence and verbal/emotional/psychological abuse. Other commonly experienced abuse forms included confinement, restraint from leaving, the use of children to control, threats to harm/kill victim/children, isolation, and destruction of property. Few clients reported experiencing strangulation, abuse of pets, rape/sexual abuse, and the use of weapons. The most common combined abuse indices were the various combined control tactics and all “hands-on” violence. The least common abuse index was “verbal only.” Most clients

experienced some form of controlling behavior, and over half experienced this controlling behavior in conjunction with some other form of physical abuse.

Cross tabulations and chi-square tests were performed to analyze differences between Outreach and Safehouse clients in terms of demographics, social characteristics, and experiences with abuse, and to predict Safehouse residency based on these characteristics. Not surprisingly, findings indicated that the Safehouse provides shelter to those in the greatest need of immediate safety and support: the economically and socially marginalized who may lack other means of assistance, as well as those who have experienced more severe controlling behaviors and hands-on violence.

Abuse Experiences and Different Social/Demographic Backgrounds

A number of cross tabulations and chi-square tests were performed to analyze how IPV manifests for victims—and is perpetrated by abusers—of various demographic and social backgrounds. Few significant differences were found, even among demographics such as race, which have been shown to predict IPV victimization (Catalano 2009). Unemployed victims (84.6%) experienced statistically significantly more physical abuse than employed victims (79.8%). Unemployed victims also experienced statistically significantly more sexual abuse (20%) and controlling behaviors (26.1%) than employed victims (14.8% and 20.3%, respectively). An analysis of disability status and abuse experience found that victims who were mentally or physically disabled experienced more physical abuse, sexual abuse, verbal abuse, and controlling tactics than those who were not disabled, and mentally disabled victims experienced statistically significantly higher rates of sexual abuse and controlling behaviors than those who were not. These findings suggest that some perpetrators may target the mentally

disabled through various control tactics. Lastly, there is a statistically significant correlation between a perpetrator's military status and the rates at which he or she commits different forms of IPV. Specifically, more military (past and present) perpetrators committed verbal/emotional/psychological abuse, abuse through controlling behaviors, and threatened or used weapons, than their civilian counterparts.

Gender in Victimization and Perpetration

Table 3 displays results from chi-square tests analyzing correlations between victim gender and abuse experiences. There are significant correlations between a victim's gender and experiencing the following types of abuse: physical abuse, strangulation, confinement, sexual abuse and rape, restraint from leaving, threats, and isolation. In all of these forms of abuse, greater percentages of females were affected than men. The most significant gender differences include strangulation, confinement, restraint from leaving, and isolation. No significant differences exist between male and female victims' experiences with pet abuse, the use of children to control, verbal/psychological/emotional abuse, the threats or use of weapons, property destruction, nor other violence. With regard to combined abuse indices, more female victims experienced various combinations of controlling behaviors, as well as combined hands-on abuse. Females also experienced more sexual abuse in conjunction with physical violence than males. Conversely, more male victims experienced hands-off violence than females. No gender differences exist with regard to weapon use or verbal abuse.

Table 4. Chi-Square Values (Cramer's V) Comparing Abuse Experiences by Perpetrator Gender

Type of violence by combined percent (n) experienced	Male Perpetrators	Female Perpetrators	Chi ² Value (Cramer's V value)
Violent behaviors			
Verbal/psychological/emotional	83.2 (688)	77.5 (62)	1.65 (0.043)
Physical	74.9 (619)	65.0 (52)	3.68* (0.064)
Isolation	50.9 (421)	23.8 (19)	21.54*** (0.154)
Restrain	46.9 (388)	20.0 (16)	21.39*** (0.154)
Destruction of property	49.3 (408)	50.0 (40)	0.01 (-0.004)
Threats ^a	31.7 (262)	23.8 (19)	2.16 (0.049)
Confinement	34.3 (284)	8.8 (7)	21.93*** (0.156)
Uses children to control	37.2 (308)	36.3 (29)	0.03 (0.006)
Strangulation	22.1 (183)	7.5 (6)	9.46** (0.102)
Weapons threatened or used	21.3 (176)	18.8 (15)	0.28 (0.018)
Rape/sexual abuse	18.6 (154)	7.5 (6)	6.21* (0.083)
Other violence	8.5 (70)	11.3 (9)	0.71 (-0.028)
Pet abuse	8.1 (67)	3.8 (3)	1.94 (0.046)
Total	827	80	
Combined violence indices			
Any control	64.9 (537)	36.25 (29)	25.58*** (0.168)
Any control + physical	58.9 (487)	35.00 (28)	16.96*** (0.137)
All control	22.9 (189)	1.25 (1)	20.56*** (0.151)
All control + physical	20.9 (173)	0 (0)	20.68*** (0.151)
Hands-on	84.1 (683)	72.23 (56)	6.50* (0.086)
Hands-off	16.8 (138)	26.32 (20)	4.33* (-0.071)
Sexual + physical	16.6 (137)	5.00 (4)	7.43** (0.091)
Verbal only	5.2 (43)	8.75 (7)	1.77 (-0.044)
Total	805	77	

Note: * $p \leq 0.05$, ** $p \leq 0.01$, *** $p \leq 0.001$. ^a = threats to harm/kill victim/children. A value of 1 = male.

Table 4 shows correlations between perpetrator gender and abuse experienced by victims. While in most cases the perpetrator's gender is not the same as the victim, the analysis accompanying Table 4 serves as a rejection of heteronormative assumptions by considering perpetrator gender and abuse experiences independently of victim gender. Considering the perpetrator's gender as opposed to the gender of the victim, however, illuminates similar patterns as in the previous analysis, with female victim experiences aligning closely with male perpetrator behaviors, and vice versa. More male perpetrators committed physical abuse, strangulation, confinement, sexual abuse, restraint, isolation, combined physical and hands-on abuse, and combined control tactics than their female

counterparts. The only notable difference is that the correlation between gender of the perpetrator (Table 4) and threats to harm/ kill victim/children is not significant, as it was for victim gender (Table 3). A greater percentage of female perpetrators committed hands-off violence without physical abuse than males. There are no significant gender differences in the perpetration of pet abuse, the use of children to control, verbal/psychological/emotional abuse, the threats or use of weapons, property destruction, nor other violence.

When a series of logistic regressions (tables not included) were performed to predict combined forms of abuse (control + physical violence and hands-off abuse) based on various victim and perpetrator characteristics, results further supported these findings. Specifically, when controlling for other characteristics, the regressions showed that victim and perpetrator genders predicted controlling behaviors, with males roughly 150 percent more likely (OR = 2.46, SE = 0.68) to perpetrate and females 170 percent more likely (OR = 2.70, SE = 0.64) to experience controlling behaviors in conjunction with physical abuse. Conversely, female victims were less than half as likely (OR = 0.53, SE = 0.14) than males to experience hands-off abuse, male perpetrators were less than half as likely (OR = 0.51, SE = 0.162) than females to commit hands-off abuse.

These findings should be considered in the context of the aforementioned debate regarding the gendered nature of IPV. Rather than IPV being gender-symmetrical (Straus 1995) or entirely gender-asymmetrical (Dobash and Dobash 1979), this portion of analysis supports Johnson's (1995) work and shows that different forms and combinations of abuse are gendered differently. Specifically, physical and hands-on violence, as well as highly controlling behaviors in isolation and in conjunction with

physical abuse are experienced more by female victims and are perpetrated more by males. Hands-off violence, conversely, is more frequently perpetrated by females against males. Property abuse, weapon use, and the use of children to control are not correlated with gender—males and females both perpetrate and experience these abuse forms in comparable proportions. Findings indicate that the most controlling behaviors are gender-asymmetrical—predominantly males perpetrating on female victims—and the less controlling behaviors are gender-symmetrical with males and females experiencing and perpetrating at roughly the same rate. Further, many of the gender-symmetrical behaviors seem to be less physically violent (verbal and hands-off tactics), and more indirect (property abuse and using children to control) than directly aggressive. Finally, while “physical abuse” and strangulation are both associated with gender—perpetrated by men against women—the latter is more strongly correlated. Following the pattern of males perpetrating and females experiencing more controlling behaviors, one may make the case that in terms of physical abuse, strangulation is more controlling in nature than other forms of “physical abuse.” While the term “physical abuse” is vague, and likely encompasses a wide variety of violence behavior, the most common of these behaviors are likely physical blows—punches, slaps and kicks. In contrast to hitting or punching, which may occur as the result of an angry outburst, strangulation serves as an attempt to limit the victim’s oxygen—their very basic human reflex—and in doing so, maintaining an extreme level of power and control over that individual.

Cumulative Abuse

The discussion of cumulative abuse addresses whether or not simply counting the number of abuse forms experienced by victims is a good indicator of abuse severity.

Anderson (2008) found little difference in PTSD predictability between counting abuse forms and using Johnson's IT and SCV classification to identify more controlling behaviors. While this analysis lacks follow-up data that could reveal outcomes and consequences of different forms of abuse, it is possible to analyze the role of cumulative abuse by comparing the mean sums of abuse types experienced by victims in different groups.

Table 5. Two-Group T-Tests Comparing the Mean (SE) Sum of Abuse Types between Victims and Perpetrators of Different Client Type, Gender, Race, and TANF Status, and Control Level.

Grouping Category (n)	Mean sum of abuse (SE)	Standard Deviation	Mann-Whitney Value
Client type			
Outreach (1556)	4.43 (0.07)	2.76	
Safehouse (229)	4.77 (0.15)	2.24	-2.70**
Gender			
Male victims (101)	3.46 (0.21)	2.11	
Female victims (1675)	4.55 (0.07)	2.72	-3.81***
Male Perpetrators (827)	4.88 (0.09)	2.67	
Female Perpetrators (80)	3.54 (0.23)	2.04	-4.31***
Race and SES			
Non-white victims (584)	4.63 (0.11)	2.69	
White victims (1015)	4.63 (0.08)	2.64	-0.10
Non-TANF recipients (628)	4.88 (0.11)	2.70	
TANF recipients (1157)	4.27 (0.08)	2.68	4.70***
Control			
All control = 0 (1409)	3.60 (0.57)	2.15	
All control =1 (367)	7.77 (0.10)	1.91	-25.12***
Physical + control = 0 (811)	2.31 (0.05)	1.36	
Physical + control = 1 (974)	6.28 (0.07)	2.16	-32.36***

Note: * $p \leq 0.05$, ** $p \leq 0.01$, *** $p \leq 0.001$, two-tailed test. The t-value is negative for both the victim and perpetrator genders. This is due to the coding of a "1" as "female" for victim gender, and also a "1" as "male" for perpetrator gender.

There are significant differences in mean sums of abuse forms experienced by clients of different types, genders, and control levels, but not between clients of different races. This analysis was performed to consider blacks versus non-blacks, as well as Hispanics versus non-Hispanics, but no significant differences were found, and thus, only

white versus non-white is reported. Safehouse clients experienced significantly more cumulative forms of abuse than Outreach clients and female victims experienced significantly more than males. Conversely, male perpetrators committed significantly more cumulative forms of abuse than female perpetrators. Those receiving TANF experienced significantly fewer abuse forms than those not receiving aid. Finally, victims who were classified as more severely controlled in that they experienced all of the controlling behaviors or that they experienced any control combined with any physical abuse also experienced more cumulative forms of abuse.

Findings suggest that, like control, cumulative abuse may be indicative of abuse severity. Safehouse residents—who as previously discussed, are those more in need of support due to economic and social disadvantages, as well as more severe and controlling abuse forms—experienced higher numbers of cumulative abuse. Other marginalized groups such as females, economically deprived, and more highly controlled victims who have been shown to experience more abuse severity also experienced greater levels of cumulative abuse. Findings support Anderson's (2008) theory that there is little use in differentiating between cumulative abuse and control as indicators of abuse severity. Both cumulative abuse and controlling behaviors are indicative of abuse severity, and cumulative abuse may be used as a proxy for controlling behavior when such indices are unavailable for analysis.

CONCLUSION

This thesis set out to utilize an action-oriented research perspective and provide information to TESSA through an analysis of different forms and combinations of abuse as they impact clients of different demographic and social backgrounds. In doing this,

however, two important findings were illuminated. First, findings contribute to the discussion of gender in IPV victimization and perpetration by supporting Johnson's (1995) thesis that there exist two distinct forms of IPV—IT and SCV—while also elaborating on this theory by showing how these two distinct forms of violence can be identified using shelter data. Second, this analysis has shown how cumulative abuse may be a good proxy for controlling behavior in predicting abuse severity.

Specifically, these data support earlier evidence that, when females perpetrate IPV, it is often more hands-off, event-specific and less ongoing than when males perpetrate. Secondly, males tend to utilize more forms of abuse than females, and they also tend to utilize more controlling forms of abuse. Viewed in combination, these findings imply that cumulative abuse and control often function together and that this combination is most frequently perpetrated by males and experienced by females. Findings demonstrate that cumulative abuse and control function in similar ways to subordinate and oppress victims, and thus cumulative abuse may be considered as a form of control or a proxy for control when necessary.

As detailed in the literature review, there has existed a great deal of disagreement with regard to the gender symmetry or asymmetry of IPV victimization and perpetration. To summarize, through the use of large-scale phone-survey data of the general public, family violence scholars such as Straus (2005) have shown IPV to be relatively event-specific and gender-symmetrical. Conversely, through the use of smaller agency-specific samples composed entirely of victims, feminist scholars (Dobash and Dobash 1979; 2004; Dobash, et al. 1992; Kurz 1998; Yllö 2005) have argued that IPV is inherently gender-asymmetrical, and perpetrated by males on females as a reflection and

reproduction of gender roles, patriarchy, and hegemonic masculinity in society. Feminist scholars reject the event-specific approach to understanding IPV and focus instead on patterns of abuse with an emphasis on the ongoing and controlling nature of behaviors. Michael Johnson (1995) asserts that neither theory is adequate. Instead, based on their different sampling techniques and populations reached, these two groups of scholars have accessed and described two distinct forms of IPV: Intimate Terrorism (IT) and Situational Couple Violence (SCV).

While Johnson (1995) argues that the disagreement between these two groups of social scientists has resulted largely from different sampling methodologies, this thesis shows that both gender-symmetrical and gender-asymmetrical forms of violence can be identified in the same sample. Specifically, this study has found non-controlling and some hands-off tactics to be largely gender-symmetrical and more in line with Johnson's SCV typology, while also illuminating patterns of highly controlling and physically dangerous tactics that are highly gender-asymmetrical and more similar to IT.

This analysis also considers the question of cumulative abuse. Like Anderson (2008), this thesis finds that cumulative abuse can be an adequate indicator of abuse severity. Unlike Anderson however, this analysis lacks follow-up data on victims' experiences with PTSD and other negative outcomes, and so the bulk of the discussion on cumulative abuse relates to comparing cumulative abuse experiences between victims of different groups. Knowing the experiences of these different groups, however, makes it possible to propose ideas regarding the relationship between cumulative abuse and abuse severity, specifically that there is a strong relationship between the two. Findings show that more marginalized and endangered groups (Safehouse clients, female victims, and

victims of control tactics) also experience greater amounts of cumulative abuse, and that male perpetrators use more forms of cumulative abuse than female perpetrators. In this way, the analysis of cumulative abuse in this thesis supports and elaborates upon the discussion of the gendering of IPV.

Findings indicate that male perpetrators not only utilize more controlling behaviors, but also more abuse tactics overall. These highly controlling, ongoing, and cumulative behaviors resemble Michael Johnson's (1995) IT specification. In contrast, female perpetrators use more hands-off abuse tactics, and fewer overall numbers of abuse forms. Further, behaviors such as weapon use, threats, and property abuse are gender-symmetrical, and resemble the more event-specific, less-controlling violence that characterizes SCV. Findings in this thesis contribute to Johnson's theory by positing that while an understanding of these two abuse typologies often results from different sampling methodologies, they can also be identified in one small, agency-specific sample comprised entirely of victims' self-reports about their own and their perpetrators' characteristics, as well as personal experiences with abuse.

This study was limited in a number of ways by the available survey data. Had the data included indicators of the duration of abuse experienced, as the initial survey does, a more complex analysis of ongoing, controlling, and cumulative abuse would have been possible. Further, the sample included large portions of missing data—specifically perpetrator information—which would have allowed for further analysis of perpetrator characteristics and behaviors. The ambiguity of some of the abuse behaviors, such as “verbal/emotional/psychological,” made classification and categorization difficult. Consequently, much of the grouping of variables resulted from educated guesses

regarding about what each behavior description was intended to convey. Further, the data for this study were entered into Alice by a range of TESSA employees and volunteers. Each advocate's understanding of the behavioral checklist is likely shaped by his or her training, experiences, and personal belief system. This potential lapse in coding consensus may have yielded inconsistencies in the data. Lastly, these data came from victim self-reports. As with any self-reported data, one must be wary of the subjectivity of the information provided, as victim reports can be influenced by incomplete memories, personal perceptions of events, and desires to persecute, or conversely, to defend the abuser. Future research should attempt to identify gender-symmetrical and asymmetrical violent behaviors among TESSA clients through qualitative methodologies, thus allowing the researcher to understand the different behaviors and patterns of ongoing abuse and in a more intimate and complex way than this thesis allowed. Future research should also consider repeating this study using shelter data from other organizations like TESSA around the country or world to analyze the existence of similar patterns in areas with different geographic, cultural, political, and sociodemographic characteristics.

REFERENCES

- Aulette, Judy R. 2007. "Battering and Marital Rape." Pp. 280-307 in *Changing American Families: 2nd edition*. Allyn & Bacon, Inc.
- Anderson, Kristin L. (2008). "Is Partner Violence Worse in the Context of Control?" *Journal of Marriage and Family* 70(5): 1157-1168.
- Barter, Christine. 2009. "In the Name of Love: Partner Abuse and Violence in Teenage Relationships." *British Journal of Social Work* 39:211-233.
- Basile, Kathleen C., Ileana Airas, Sujeta Desai, and Martie P. Thompson. 2004. "The Differential Association of Intimate Partner Physical, Sexual, Psychological, and Stalking Violence and Posttraumatic Stress Symptoms in a Nationally Representative Sample of Women." *Journal of Traumatic Stress* 17(5):413-421.
- Bograd, Michele. 1999. "Strengthening Domestic Violence Theories: Intersections of Race, Class, Sexual Orientation, and Gender." *Journal of Marital and Family Therapy*, 25(3): 275-289.
- Bradley, Christopher. 2007. "Veteran Status and Marital Aggression: Does Military Service Make a Difference?" *Journal of Family and Violence* 22:197-209.
- Bledsoe, Linda K. and Bibhuti K. Sar. 2011. "Intimate Partner Violence Control Scale: Development and Initial Testing." *Journal of Family Violence*, 26:171-184
- Breiding, Matthew J., Michele C. Black, and George W. Ryan. 2008a. "Prevalence and Risk Factors of Intimate Partner Violence in Eighteen U.S. States/Territories, 2005." *American Journal of Preventive Medicine* 34:112-118.
- Breiding, Matthew J., Michele C. Black, and George W. Ryan. 2008b. "Chronic Disease and Health Risk Behaviors Associated with Intimate Partner Violence – 18 U.S. States/Territories, 2005." *Annals of Epidemiology* 18:538-544.
- Catalano, Shannan, Erica Smith, Howard Snyder, and Michael Rand. 2009. *Female Victims of Violence*. Bureau of Justice Statistics Selected Findings. U.S. Department of Justice. Washington, DC.
- Centers for Disease Control [CDC]. 2003. *National Center for Injury Prevention and Control. Costs of Intimate Partner Violence Against Women in the United States*. Atlanta: Centers for Disease Control and prevention (CDC).
- Centers for Disease Control [CDC]. 2012. Understanding Intimate Partner Violence Fact Sheet. *National Center for Injury Prevention and Control, Division of violence prevention*. Atlanta: Centers for Disease Control and prevention (CDC).
- Cherlin, Andrew J., Linda M. Burton, Tera R. Hurt, and Diane M. Purvin. 2004. "The Influence of Physical and Sexual Abuse on Marriage and Cohabitation." *American Sociological Review* 69:768-789.

- Coker, Ann L., Paige H. Smith, Lesa Bethea, Melissa R. King, and Robert E. McKeown. 2000a. "Physical Health Consequence of Physical and Psychological Intimate Partner Violence." *Arch Fam Med* 2000 9:451-57.
- Coker, Ann L., Paige H. Smith, Melissa R. King, and Robert E. McKeown. 2000b. "Frequency and Correlates of Intimate Partner Violence by Type: Physical, Sexual, and Psychological Battering." *American Journal of Public Health* 90(4):553-559.
- Devries, Karen, Charlotte Watts, Mieko Yoshihama, Ligia Kiss, Lilia B. Schraiber, Negussie Deyessa, Lori Heise, Julia Durand, Jessie Mbwambo, Henrica Jansen, Yemane Berhane, Mary Ellsberg, Claudia Garcia-Moreno, and WHO Multi-Country Study Team. 2011. "Violence Against Women is Strongly Associated with Suicide Attempts: Evidence from the WHO Multi-Country Study on Women's Health and Domestic Violence Against Women." *Social Science and Medicine* 73:79-86.
- Dobash, Russel P. and R. Emerson Dobash. 1979. *Violence Against Wives: A Case Against Patriarchy*. New York: Free Press. (summary).
- Dobash, Russel P. and R. Emerson Dobash. 2004. "Women's Violence to Men in Intimate Relationships: Working on a Puzzle." *British Journal of Criminology*, 44(3):324-349.
- Dobash, Russel P., Emerson R. Dobash, Margo Wilson, and Martin Daly. 1992. "The Myth of Sexual Symmetry in Marital Violence." *Social Problems* 39(1):71-91.
- Feld, S.L., and Murray A. Straus .1990. "Escalation and Desistance from Wife Assault in Marriage." Pp. 489-505 in M.A. Straus and R.J Gelles (Eds.), *Physical Violence in American Families*. New Brunswick, JH: Transaction Publishers.
- Flanzer, Jerry P. 1981. "The Vicious Circle of Alcoholism and Family Violence." *Alcoholism*, 1(3):30-32.
- Gelles, Richard J. and Mary M. Cavanaugh. 2005. "Association is not Causation: Alcohol and Other Drugs do not Cause Violence. Pp. 174-189 in Gelles, Richard J. Mary M. Cavanaugh, and Donileen R. Loseke (Eds.), *Current Controversies in Domestic Violence*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Hodges, Thavolia A. and Anne S. Cabanilla. 2011. "Factors that Impact Help-Seeking Among Battered Black Women: Application of Critical and Survivor Theories." *Journal of Cultural Diversity* 18(4):120-125.
- Johnson, Michael. 1995. "Patriarchal Terrorism and Common Couple Violence: Two Forms of Violence Against Women." *Journal of Marriage and Family* 57(2):283-294.
- Kanuha, Valli K. 1996. "Domestic Violence, Racism, and the Battered Women's Movement in the United States." Pp. 34-50 In Jeffrey L. Edelson and Zvi C.

- Eisikovits (Eds.), *Future Interventions with Battered Women and Their Families*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Krebs, Christopher, Matthew J. Breiding, Angela Browne, and Tara Warner. 2011. "The Association Between Different Types of Intimate Partner Violence Experienced by Women." *Journal of Family Violence* (26):487-500.
- Kurz, Demie. 1998. "Old Problems and New Directions in the Study of Violence Against Women. Pp. 197-208 in Raquel K. Bergen (ed.), *Issues in Intimate Partner Violence*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Lundy, Sandra E. and Beth Leventhal. 1999. *Same-Sex Domestic Violence: Strategies for Change*. Thousand Oaks: Sage.
- Lyon, Eleanor. 2000. "Welfare, Poverty, and Abused Women: New Research and its Implications." *Building Comprehensive Solutions to Domestic Violence*, 10:1-15.
- Mahoney, Patricia and Linda Williams. 1998. "Sexual Assault in Marriage: Prevalence, Consequences, and Treatment of Wife Rape." Pp. 113-163 in Jasinski, Jana L. Linda W. Meyer, and David Finkelhor (Eds.), *Partner Violence: A Comprehensive Review of 20 Years of Research*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Marshall, Amy D., Jillian Panuzio, and Casey T. Taft. 2005. "Intimate Partner Violence Among Military Veterans and Active Duty Servicemen." *Clinical Psychology Review* 25:862-876.
- National Center for Injury Prevention and Control. 2003. *Costs of intimate partner violence against women in the United States*. Atlanta (GA): Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC).
- Pearson, Jessica, Thoennes, Nancy, and Esther Ann Griswold. 1999. "Child Support and Domestic Violence." *Public Welfare* (Winter):26-32.
- Pence, Ellen and Michael Paymar. 1993. "Theme Six: Sexual Respect." Pp. 132-145 In "Education Groups for Men Who Batter." New York: Springer Publishing Company, Inc.
- Russel, Diana. 1986. *The secret trauma: Incest in the Lives of Girls and Women*. New York: Basic Books.
- Saltzman, Linda E., Janet L. Fanslow, Pamela M. McMahon, and Gene A. Shelley. 2002 "Intimate Partner Violence Surveillance: Uniform Definitions and Recommended Data Elements, version 1.0." Atlanta (GA): National Center for Injury Prevention and Control: Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC).
- Scott-Storey, Kelly. 2011. "Cumulative Abuse: Do Things Add Up? An Evaluation of the Conceptualization, Operationalization, and Methodological Approaches in the Study of the Phenomenon of Cumulative Abuse." *Trauma Violence Abuse* 12(3):135-150.

- Shupe, Anson D., William A. Stacey, and Lonnie R. Hazlewood. 1987. *Violent Men, Violent Couples: The Dynamics of Domestic Violence*. NY: Lexington Books.
- Small, Stephen A. "Action-Oriented Research: Models and Methods." 1995. *Journal of Marriage and Family* 57(4):941-955.
- Small, Stephen A. and Lynet Uttal. 2005. "Action-Oriented Research: Strategies for Engaged Scholarship." *Journal of Marriage and Family* 67:936-948.
- Sokoloff, Natalie J. and Ida Dupont. 2005. "Domestic Violence at the Intersections of Race, Class, and Gender: Challenges and Contributions to Understanding Violence Against Marginalized Women in Diverse Communities." *Violence Against Women* 11(38):38-64.
- Stets, Jan E. and Murray A. Straus. 1989. "Marriage License as a Hitting License: A Comparison of Assaults in Dating, Cohabiting, and Married Couples." *Journal of Family Violence* 4(2):161-180. (Abstract).
- Straus, Murray A., and Richard J. Gelles. 1986. "Societal Change and the Change in Family Violence From 1975-1985 as Revealed by Two National Surveys." Pp. 113-131 in Murray A. Straus and Richard J. Gelles (Eds.), *Physical Violence in American Families*. New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction Publishers.
- Straus, Murray A., Richard J. Gelles, and Suzanne K. Steinmetz. (1980). *Behind Closed Doors: Violence in the American family*. Garden City, NY: Doubleday/Anchor Press.
- Straus, Murray A. 2005. "Women's Violence Toward Men is a Serious Social Problem." pp. 174-189 In Gelles, Richard J., Mary M. Cavanaugh, and Donileen R. Loseke (Eds.), *Current Controversies in Domestic Violence*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Straus, Murray A. 2008. "Bucking the Tide in Family Violence Research." *Trauma, Violence, and Abuse* 9(4):191-213.
- Straus, Murray A., and Christine Smith. 1990. "Family Patterns and Primary Prevention of Family Violence." Pp. 507-526 in Murray A. Straus and Richard J. Gelles (Eds.), *Physical Violence in American Families*. New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction Publishers.
- Tjaden Patricia, and Nancy Thoennes. "Extent, Nature, and Consequences of Intimate Partner Violence: Findings From the National Violence Against Women Survey." Washington (DC): Department of Justice; 2000.
- TESSA. 2012. "TESSA Fact Sheet and Overview."
- Williams, Christine. 1994. "Militarized Masculinity." *Qualitative Sociology* 17(4):415-422.
- Yllö, Kersti A. 2005. "Through a Feminist Lens: Gender, Diversity and Violence: Extending the Feminist Framework." Pp. 19-33 in Gelles, Richard J., Mary M.

Cavanaugh, and Donileen R. Loseke (Eds.), *Current Controversies in Domestic Violence*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Appendix A. Variables in Study

Variable Name	Description	Variable Type	Coding Scheme	Range
VICTIM VARIABLES				
<i>Victim Demographics</i>				
type	Safehouse or outreach client	dichotomous	0 = outreach, 1 = Safehouse	0 – 1
female	Victim female (transF and transM = missing)	dichotomous	0= no, 1= yes	0 – 1
age	victim age at time of intake	continuous	---	18 - 72
white	Victim white?	dichotomous	0= no, 1= yes	0 – 1
black	Victim black?	dichotomous	0= no, 1= yes	0 – 1
Hispanic	Victim Hispanic?	dichotomous	0= no, 1= yes	0 – 1
Asian/PI	Victim Asian/Pacific Islander?	dichotomous	0= no, 1= yes	0 – 1
Indian	Victim Native American?	dichotomous	0= no, 1= yes	0 – 1
Multi	Victim Multi-Racial/other?	dichotomous	0= no, 1= yes	0 – 1
<i>Victim Lifestyle and Behaviors</i>				
Deps	Number of dependents	continuous	---	0-8
Deps SH	Number of dependents living in Safehouse	continuous	---	0-4
Has kids	Victim has children (1 or more)	dichotomous	0= no, 1= yes	0 – 1
Victim work	Victim work status	dichotomous	0= unemployed, 1= employed	0-1
TANF	Victim receiving TANF?	dichotomous	0= no, 1= yes	0 – 1
HHI	Household income	continuous		0-713,000
Personal income	Personal income (w/o offender)	continuous		0-200,000
Citizen	Victim is a U.S. citizen (excludes Greencard and visa holders)	dichotomous	0= no, 1= yes	0 – 1
legal	victim legally living in US?	dichotomous	0= no, 1= yes	0 – 1
Victim military	Victim in military?	dichotomous	0= no, 1= yes	0 – 1
Mental disability	Mental or learning (developmental=missing)	dichotomous	0= no, 1= yes	0-1
Physical disability	Physical (developmental=missing)	dichotomous	0= no, 1= yes	0-1
Disabled	Victim has a disability (any kind)	dichotomous	0= no, 1= yes	0-1
Ever addicted	Has the victim ever been an addict?	dichotomous	0= no, 1= yes	0-1
Currently addicted	Is the victim currently an addict?	dichotomous	0= no, 1= yes	0-1
Recovered addict	Recovered addict (vs. non-addicts and current addicts)	dichotomous	0= no, 1= yes	0-1
Married	Married	dichotomous	0= no, 1= yes	0-1
Divorced	Victim is divorced	dichotomous	0= no, 1= yes	0-1
Separated	Victim is divorced	dichotomous	0= no, 1= yes	0-1
Single	Victim is single	dichotomous	0= no, 1= yes	0-1
PERPERATOR VARIABLES				
Perp male	Perpetrator is male (trans M = missing)	dichotomous	0= no, 1= yes	0-1
Perp age	Perpetrator age	continuous	---	17-72
Perp white	Perp white?	dichotomous	0= no, 1= yes	0-1
Perp black	Perp black?	dichotomous	0= no, 1= yes	0-1
Perp Hispanic	Perp Hispanic?	dichotomous	0= no, 1= yes	0-1
Perp Asian/PI	Perp Asian/Pacific Islander?	dichotomous	0= no, 1= yes	0-1
Perp Native American	Perp Native American?	dichotomous	0= no, 1= yes	0-1
Perp Multi	Victim Multi-Racial/other?	dichotomous	0= no, 1= yes	0-1
Perp work	Perpetrator work status	dichotomous	0= unemployed 1= employed	0-1
Perp military	Perpetrator in military?	dichotomous	0= no, 1= yes	0 – 1
VIOLENT BEHAVIORS				
<i>Type of violence</i>				

Physical	physical violence	dichotomous	0= no, 1= yes	0 – 1
Strangle	strangulation	dichotomous	0= no, 1= yes	0 – 1
Pets	abuse of pets	dichotomous	0= no, 1= yes	0 – 1
Confine	confinement	dichotomous	0= no, 1= yes	0 – 1
Sex	rape/sexual abuse	dichotomous	0= no, 1= yes	0 – 1
Restrain	restrained from leaving	dichotomous	0= no, 1= yes	0 – 1
Kids control	uses kids to control	dichotomous	0= no, 1= yes	0 – 1
Threats	threats to harm or kill victim or children	dichotomous	0= no, 1= yes	0 – 1
Psych	verbal/emotional/psychological	dichotomous	0= no, 1= yes	0 – 1
Weapons	weapons threatened or used	dichotomous	0= no, 1= yes	0 – 1
Iso	isolation	dichotomous	0= no, 1= yes	0 – 1
Prop	destruction of property	dichotomous	0= no, 1= yes	0 – 1
Other violence	other	dichotomous	0= no, 1= yes	0 – 1
Manipulated Behavior Variables				
Any control	Any “high control” indicator present (iso, confine, restrain)	dichotomous	0= no, 1= yes	0 – 1
All control	All “high control” indicators present	dichotomous	0= no, 1= yes	0 – 1
Any control + physical	Any control indicator present AND any physical behavior (sex, strangle, physical, restrain)	dichotomous	0= no, 1= yes	0-1
All control + physical	All “high control” indicators present and any physical violence present (physical, strangulation, restrain, and/or sexual abuse) weapons and pets=.	dichotomous	0= no, 1= yes	0-1
Hands-on	Any hands-on violence (physical, strangulation, restrain, and/or sexual abuse) weapons and pets=.	dichotomous	0= no, 1= yes	0-1
Hands-off	Any hands-off violence (includes: psych, confine, iso, threats, kids control, prop, stalk)... <i>without any hands-on.</i> Any hands-on violence = “0” pets and weapons = missing.	dichotomous	0= no, 1= yes	0-1
Verbal only	<i>Only</i> verbal abuse (verbal/psychological/emotional and/or threats) <i>without any hands-on violence</i> pets and weapons = missing.	dichotomous	0= no, 1= yes	0-1
Sexual + physical	respondent experienced <i>any</i> physical (strangulation or physical, restraint) AND sexual abuse pets and weapons = missing.	dichotomous	0= no, 1= yes	0 – 1
Cumulative abuse	Sum of all abuse types experienced by victim	Continuous	---	1-13