

# **My Back Pages: reflections on thirty years of Domestic Violence Research**

**Donald G. Dutton  
Department of Psychology  
University of British Columbia**

**Ah, but I was so much older then. I'm younger than  
that now. – Bob Dylan**

I was honored to be asked to write what amounts to a research biography by the Journal of Interpersonal Violence (JIV Career Researcher). I review this work below- it touches on criminal justice policy to “domestic violence”, profiles of abuse perpetrators, reactions in victims and argues, in the final analysis, that our conceptualization of intimate partner violence (IPV) in gender terms is erroneous and misleading. My work on domestic violence (later called intimate partner violence or IPV) began with my frustration with solely “basic research” in social psychology (in which I was initially trained) coupled with an opportunity (in 1974) to advise my provincial government on psychological perspectives to improve police training. I started by riding on police patrol and asking the police what part of their job they felt least equipped to handle. The answer was “domestic disturbances”. I developed a police training manual and was then asked to assist with the police intervention training. It led to a six year commitment to developing police training in the 1970’s. An upshot of this work was the discovery that training police how to more effectively handle “domestics” would not have any desirable

outcomes if the rest of the criminal justice system was not on the same page. Police, at that time, viewed domestics as social work not as part of their job and having a serious violence potential.(D.G. Dutton & Levens, 1977) Consequently, the police response to 911 calls for domestic disturbance was, to say the least, underwhelming(Levens & Dutton, 1977). I reviewed all published studies on police response both in Canada and the US and determined that only about 15% of men who assaulted their wives were arrested and only about 2.5% punished by the criminal justice system (D.G. Dutton, 1987) although evidence for assault existed in far more cases (Worden & Pollitz, 1984) (Smith & Klein, 1984) (punishment being defined then as jail or a fine). At that time, the *Zeitgeist* was moving toward more aggressive- pro-arrest policies coupled with an effective outcome for judges to clear a case. It is hard to remember now but prior to the push for increased arrest, researchers had argued that draconian police intervention may inadvertently make matters worse or produced unintended negative consequences (Bard, 1971) . Instead of arrest, they envisioned police focusing on conflict resolution. What goes around comes around. This argument has been revisited recently(D.G. Dutton, 2006b; Garner & Maxwell, 2000; Mills, 1999) by some (including myself) who have seen the policy shift from non-arrest to mandatory arrest as going too far in the opposite direction. Clearly varied responses from co-ordinated criminal justice and mental health teams are required but are rarely in place.

At that time (1979) there was no court-mandated treatment available and I had just completed a summer internship in group therapy. I set out with Dale Trimble, and the then Chief family court judge in Vancouver, Douglas Campbell, to establish a court-mandated treatment program for men convicted of wife assault. We developed the system, which was essentially cognitive-behavioral treatment (CBT) through trial and error and made plenty of errors. CBT systems are now well established- the best , in my opinion, being Chris Murphy's (Murphy & Eckhardt, 2005)

excellent, *Treating the Abusive Partner*. Of all intervention systems that have been evaluated, CBT has the best record in terms on diminishing recidivism (Babcock, Green, & Robie, 2004; Feder & Wilson, 2005). Nevertheless, theoretically flawed and ineffective “psycho-educational interventions” are mandated in many states despite their dismal record (D.G. Dutton & Corvo, 2006; D.G. Dutton & Corvo, 2007) and treatment of the psychological foundations of IPV are forbidden by law (see Dutton, *Rethinking Domestic Violence*, Chapter 12). We have traveled far since 1974 and gone around in a circle.

### Facets of male abusiveness

Trained as a research psychologist, I was curious about the factors that contributed to abusiveness in the court-mandated sample we were treating. At that time, as a function of the gender-paradigm then in existence (and about which I have subsequently written (D.G. Dutton, 2006b; D.G. Dutton & Corvo, 2006)) we considered abusiveness to be exclusively a male problem. Not only the Zeitgeist, but the entire criminal justice response, including out treatment group was set up to arrest, convict and treat a group comprised exclusively of heterosexual males and was based on the assumption that their violence was unilateral. Initially, we worked from a treatment model derived from social learning theory (SLT) (Bandura, 1979) that viewed forms of aggression as learned, typically through witnessing inter-parental aggression. Subsequently, I came to view the social learning model valuable as far as it went, but limited in the sense that it could not explain “private reactions”- those that were not capable of being witnessed ( for example, cognitions and affective reactions) that were nevertheless, a part of the infrastructure of abusiveness (D.G. Dutton, 1999a). Nor could it explain proactive abusiveness. SLT also could not explain the totality of a response to witnessing an

aggressive act, for the example, an assault against ones' mother (as opposed to ones' sister). Although the same violence may be witnessed in both cases, they are not the same. The assault on ones' mother is better explained by acknowledging the symbolic aspect of such an observation: that it was experienced as an attack on one's security base(D.G. Dutton, 2000) and hence, capable of generating trauma, not just the mimicry of behavior. One test of SLT was the transmission rate (i.e. the rate of abused children who went on to be abusers). The results of assessments on transmission rates were highly variable but there was an indication that in prospective studies, most children who had witnessed abuse did not become abusers themselves (Kaufman & Zigler, 1993). One explanation for the high false positive rate was that witnessing abuse may produce abuse only if other conditions co-occur in the family of origin. I became interested in the early developmental origins of abusiveness which I shall describe below.

At this historical point though, my work was still focusing of what I would call "facets" of abusiveness, rather than a coherent theory of an abusive personality.

At that time a stereotype of batterers existed. Batterers were described in the literature as using repeat, severe and unilateral violence against an innocent female victim because they believed it was "male privilege and this belief was supported by cultural norms" (see, for example, anything by Dobash and Dobash(R.E. Dobash & Dobash, 1978; R.E. Dobash & Dobash, 1979; R. P. Dobash & Dobash, 2004). This stereotype was applied to all men in treatment- that is, all were considered to be "batterers", even though studies show that few of them used severe, repeat violence against their wives, 66% had wives who were also violent and 40% had wives who hit them first.(D.G. Dutton & Corvo, 2007) In a representative sample, Stets and Straus(J. Stets, . & Straus, 1992) found that, of all respondents who reported any kind of IPV, only 6% reported this stereotypical "battering" pattern compared to 11% who reported a female using severe violence against a non-violent

male and 14% reporting mutual use of severe violence. Also, the normative argument for wife assault never had empirical support it was just a gender-political claim. Simon et al (Simon et al., 2001) performed a large sample survey that found only 2% of men agreed with the statement “its’ ok to hit your wife to keep her in line”. It is daunting that this simplistic stereotype has persisted-attribute to the powers of groupthink and belief perseverance, coupled with ideology enshrined by criminal justice system practice - see Dutton & Corvo, *inter alia*.(D.G. Dutton & Corvo, 2006; D.G. Dutton & Nicholls, 2005). However, at that time, the research focus was exclusively on male perpetrators of IPV.

So, for example, I studied “neutralization “ processes in men in treatment for spouse assault (D.G. Dutton, 1986). The neutralization of self-punishment involves the cognitive processes used to diminish the appraisal of “reprehensible conduct” (defined as non- normative conduct that the perpetrator appraises as shameful. In order to minimize shame or self-punishment, the perpetrator alters his perceptions of the actions by viewing them as less serious, diminishing the negative consequences for the victim or by blaming the victim for the action. In our study one third of the men attributed their violence to provocations from the victim. Our treatment philosophy was that men were completely responsible for their own actions regardless of cause; that they had choices not to fight back. From a research perspective however, the Gondolf data from his multi-site study(E. W. Gondolf, 2000), indicated that these men may not have been misleading us about their partners’ use of violence (see also Dutton and Corvo 2007). In the Gondolf set of studies 40% of the wives of men in treatment said that they (the wives) started violent exchanges.

Dutton and Hemphill (D.G. Dutton & Hemphill, 1992) also found patterns of minimizing of violence in court-mandated perpetrators, that men in treatment showed significant negative correlations between scores on a measure of socially desirable responding and

reports of their own verbal or physical aggression. In retrospect, this pattern of denial was depicted as representative of batterers ( see Jaffe et al, for example(Jaffe, Lemon, & Poisson, 2003)) but is more broadly a symptom of a perpetrator of any counter-normative behavior. It showed that most “batterers” had a conscience, as Bandura originally described neutralization of self-punishment , it was device driven by an attempt to fit one’s own counter-normative acts into a normative framework by making them less reprehensible.

Dutton &Strachan (1987)(D.G. Dutton & Strachan, 1987) assessed power needs in an sample of court-mandated assaultive men and found that, as a group and compared to martially conflicted but non-violent controls, the men had higher needs for power but lower spouse-specific assertiveness skills. They presented as men with high power needs and no requisite skills to express them. “It’s all about power and control” was a virtual mantra in those days in explaining wife assault and this study seemed to confirm that power needs were high in this group. However, as I have pointed out in subsequent publications (D. G. Dutton, 1994b; D.G. Dutton, 2006b), power over another person is only one form of a power need. Attachment to a perceived powerful other is another behavior associated with power needs, hence, women with high power needs may attempt to mate with a powerful male, called assortative mating (Capaldi, 2004) and thought to be a sociobiological strategy(Buss, 1994).

At this time, I also became interested in the presence of personality disorders (PD) in abusive men. Largely due to the influence of Stephen Hart, we began to routinely test men in court-mandated treatment groups for PD using the Millon Clinical Multi-axial Inventory. We found three clusters to be most prevalent, what I would term an Antisocial- Sadistic Cluster, a Borderline Cluster and a Avoidant/Passive-Aggressive cluster. (Hart, Dutton, &

Newlove, 1993) Other researchers largely confirmed the presence of these three peaks(Hamberger, Lohr, Bonge, & Tolin, 1996; Holtzworth-Munroe & Stuart, 1994; Saunders, 1992). Later studies tried to claim that abusive men were not, in the main, personality disordered(E.W. Gondolf, 1999) but these studies overlooked the out-of-range social desirability scores being provided by their samples (D.G. Dutton, 2003; D.G. Dutton & Bodnarchuk, 2005). Also overlooked were the differential selection procedures due to mandatory arrest; relatively non-violent men, men who were in bilaterally violent relationships and who were less disturbed were now becoming part of the mix for treatment group subjects. Studies repeatedly show that bilateral violence is the most common form of IPV(J. Stets, . & Straus, 1992; Whitaker, Haileyesus, Swahn, & Saltzman, 2007) but men are disproportionately the ones who are arrested (Brown, 2004; Buzawa, Austin, Bannon, & Jackson, 1992). Later work (Tweed & Dutton, 1998) involved comparisons of borderline and antisocial abusers. Borderline men have frequently been misdiagnosed as antisocial when their impulsivity leads to criminal activity in terms of wife or substance abuse. The DSM-1V reminds us that crimes by Antisocial personalities are typically for “profit, power or some other material gratification” (p 710) while those of Borderlines are “geared toward gaining the concern of caretakers”. In the analysis Roger Tweed and I did(Tweed & Dutton, 1998), “impulsive” abusers, compared to “instrumental” abusers were more likely to have a fearful attachment style and to experience high levels of trauma symptoms. They also had higher levels of anger than instrumentals and were more likely to exhibit Borderline Personality organization (BPO).

One final facet of male abusiveness should be mentioned here, lack of emotional intelligence. Using a multifaceted measure of emotional intelligence (Bar-On, 1997) we found that men convicted of wife assault scored significantly lower than the

general population of males on all components of (EQ-I: emotional intelligence), including emotional self-awareness, stress management, self-regard, empathy, reality testing, stress tolerance and impulse control. Although the EQ-I was not designed to assess personality disorder, many of the components listed above are consistent with borderline traits and are listed as descriptors of borderline personality organization (Westen & Shedler, 1999). This research however, examined EQ-I as a “stand-alone” facet or component of abusiveness not in relation to a systemic personality pattern.

### Intimate Conflict Analogue Studies

I became interested in the reactivity of abusive men to intimacy issues without knowing, at that time, that such reactivity was part of a borderline pattern or may have an attachment base. I started a series of studies to assess this emotional reactivity in response to conflict scenarios presented in either a visual or auditory mode. Dutton & Browning (1988) (D.G. Dutton & Browning, 1988) showed video clips of couples conflicted over one of three issues to groups of assaultive men and to appropriate controls. One of the issues involved “abandonment” from the male perspective- the woman was telling her husband she was going to spend a weekend with women friends in another city and was joining “a woman’s consciousness raising group” and the man became jealous and angry. Men who used IPV but no other forms of violence reacted with the greatest self-reports of anger and anxiety to this tape, compared to all control groups (including generally violent men and non-violent men). Also, this “abandonment” produced greater anger and anxiety than other issues (engulfment- the woman wanting more attention or neutral-whether to spend a holiday camping or in another city). This research was implemented just before Hazan and Shaver published their landmark study (Hazan & Shaver, 1987) that connected work

on infant attachment with adult attachment styles. Eventually these streams of research drawing on early origins of separation rage, symptomatic jealousy and IPV would coalesce into profiles of abandonment homicide perpetrators (D.G. Dutton, 1999b) (D.G. Dutton & Kerry, 1999) . The Dutton and Browning study initiated a series of lab analogue studies of emotional reactions to intimate conflict.

In these studies, an emotional “baseline” measurement was taken and then subjects observed (videotape) or listened (audiotape) to an intense two person family conflict, after which they were again assessed for emotional reactions to and perceptions of the conflict (who’s fault it was, whose side they took, *et cetera*). Many of these conflicts involve parent-adolescent themes but some were couple focused, raising issues such as jealousy and potential abandonment of one partner by the other (Strachan & Dutton, 1992).

Strachan and Dutton (1992) had college students listen to jealousy related couple conflicts. The participants’ affective responses were measured both prior to and following exposure to the conflict tapes. Males and females showed significant post exposure elevations in both anxiety and anger, with anger tending to be higher than any other affective reaction. Pre-post differences were examined for male-initiated and female-initiated conflicts. Women tended to report significantly more affect, with women’s post-anger scores increasing by 114%, which differs greatly from the 56% increase reported by the males

The Strachan & Dutton (1992) study focused on jealousy, power, anger and anxiety. Dutton, Webb and Ryan (1994)(D.G. Dutton, Webb, & Ryan, 1994) conducted a study that examined anger, sub-anger (a category of emotional descriptions comprised of frustration, annoyance and irritation), and anxiety reactions to conflict. Undergraduates listened to conflict tapes of a variety of

parent-teenager conflicts. Participants experienced low-anger and moderate anxiety in anticipation of the conflict exposure. As with the previous study, women's post-anger scores were disproportionately increased in comparison to the males: 163% and 70%, respectively. Women also tended to show larger increases in the subanger composite than men. However, when men's increases in anger-anxiety were interpreted as a ratio of their overall increase in affect, these ratios were found to be greater than those calculated for the women. Anger scores in general were significantly greater than scores for any other measure of affect. Women use emotional self-report scales differently than men, reporting from the entire range of the scale. Men tend to use a restricted range, especially for emotions that are not consistent with their sex-role conditioning (such as fear). We cannot determine from the research design used whether men do not feel the fear or do not report it. This would require comparison of reactions on an experimental task disrupted by anxiety to self-reports of fear/anxiety.

In both the Strachan and Dutton (1992) and the Dutton, Webb and Ryan (1994) study, anger reactions differed from anxiety reactions, with anger showing radical pre-post elevations, while anxiety seems to be heightened only moderately. Jack, Dutton, Webb and Ryan (1995)(Jack, Dutton, Webb, & Ryan, 1995) focused the "predictors" of anger upon exposure to simulated family conflict to a more individual level, that of exposure to specific parenting behaviors. The Jack et al. (1995) study used analog conflict with a non-clinical, undergraduate sample of 120 to ascertain whether Strachan and Dutton's and Dutton et al.'s findings could be explained by the experience of abusive conflict resolution strategies in the family of origin. During the prescreening portion of the experiment, participants were asked to answer a set of demographic questions as well as to fill out the Conflict Tactics Scale (Straus, 1992). Respondents rated both their own and a parents' use of these strategies. Two weeks later, subjects were

again contacted at which time they completed the emotion measure both prior to and in response to the conflict tape exposure.

Heightened reactive anger levels prior to conflict exposure were associated with the experience of withdrawal or verbal abuse by parents during childhood and adolescence. Similarly, exposure to family of origin conflict characterized by withdrawal, verbal abuse and physical abuse, generated elevations in subanger (annoyance, frustration and irritation) and total affect. Thus, it would appear that experience with family of origin conflict tactics might be related to elevated affective responding to anticipated conflict. We suggested that greater anger and subanger in anticipation of and in response to conflict may be detrimental to an individual's conflict solving ability. This conclusion was supported by the observation that physically abusive couples, prior to short-term problem-solving activities, presented with increased negative emotional state and arousal in comparison to non-abusive controls (Margolin, John, & Gleberman, 1989).

As described below, Dutton (D. G. Dutton, Starzomski, A. & Landolt, M., 1994) developed a scale to assess propensity for intimate abusiveness. This scale, called the Propensity for Abusiveness Scale (PAS) had good psychometric properties and was predictive of male abusiveness across a variety of samples. Thomas et al (Thomas & Dutton, 2004) used the PAS to predict emotional reactions of college students to exposure to conflict. Participants listened to taped conflict and filled out a battery of questionnaires. The PAS scores correlated strongly and significantly with two anticipatory emotions that are counterproductive to conflict resolution: anger and anxiety. Pre-post conflict-exposure increases were observed for all affect measures, with the high PAS group (those individuals scoring in the fourth quartile) tending to be angrier and more anxious than the low PAS group. Results suggested that PAS may be a reasonable

predictor of affective reactions to conflict. Other studies also found it predictive of emotional and physical abuse (D.G. Dutton, Landolt, Starzomski, & Bodnarchuk, 2001) (Buttell & Carney, 2006; R. J. Clift, Thomas, L. & Dutton, D.G., 2005).

## Traumatic Bonding

At the same time as we studied facets of male abusiveness, we attempted as well, to answer questions about what Rounsaville in a perceptive early study, had called “the tenacity of both partners to the relationship in the face of the severe abuse sustained” (Rounsaville, 1978) (p.20). Drawing from the experimental literature on attachment, Susan Painter and I, developed a theory that we called ‘traumatic bonding’ (D.G. Dutton & Painter, 1981), essentially that the intermittency of abuse and power differential in unilateral abusive relationships would produce strong attachment in battered women like anyone else exposed to this type of reinforcement schedule (intermittent) under these conditions. We went on to test the theory (D.G. Dutton & Painter, 1993a, 1993b), assessing intermittency and severity of abusiveness as predictor variables and self esteem, attachment to the abuser and trauma symptoms as the outcome variables. The predictor variables all accounted for substantial variance in the outcome variables. Relationship dynamics not a “masochistic personality” was what kept battered women attached. A later study (Coolidge & Anderson, 2002) did find though, that women who returned to abusive relationships with multiple partners, were likely to have a personality disorder and these were most likely self-defeating, depressive, dependent, avoidant or borderline. Perhaps not coincidentally, these same personality disorders also represent a peak profile for male spousal homicide perpetrators (D.G. Dutton & Kerry, 1999). There may be, in other words, a bilateral personality disorder basis for Rounsaville’s bidirectional tenacity.

Walker (L. Walker, 1984) had discussed a “battered woman syndrome (BWS)” she thought occurred upon repeated exposure to severe battering and which consisted of lower self-esteem, trauma –like anxiety and idealization to the abuser (a form of symbolic attachment). Follingstad (Follingstad, 2003) assessed Walker’s ‘Battered Woman Syndrome’ (relevance to TB) and concluded the Dutton and Painter studies were the only empirical studies of BWS. Follingstad concluded that it had not been established that the syndrome always followed exposure to battering or even always took the same form. Symptoms varied and hence, it was questionable whether professionals could reliably diagnose BWS and hence, the “syndrome” was dubious as defense in court.

### Integrated Models of Abusiveness

While it may be useful to know which facets of personality batterers may possess or to know something about their attributional mind sets, there was no coherent portrait of an abusive personality as recently as 1998. I had published a series of papers prior to that date that empirically demonstrated the existence of new features of abusiveness (D. G. Dutton, 1994a; D.G. Dutton, 1995b; D.G. Dutton, Starzomski, Saunders, & Bartholomew, 1994; D.G. Dutton, van Ginkel, & Landolt, 1996; D.G. Dutton, van Ginkel, & Starzomski, 1995). These features generated a challenge to the social learning perspective on the development of abusiveness. Many could not be learned through observation. They were internal processes (anxiety, blaming orientation, unstable sense of self) of self-generated tension states with internal origins. I discovered most of them in an attempt to explain the “cycle of violence” described in Lenore Walker’s (L. E. Walker, 1979) classic. This cycle of violence depicted a man, starting from a baseline “normal state” and becoming increasingly tense and abusive to the point of exploding, regardless of what his partner

did to appease him. The tension building phase was supplanted by a battering phase where the abuse became physical and extreme. Typically this phase was where the police might be called. After separation, and the prior explosion of energy and subsequent reflection, a contrition phase occurred where the man became temporarily apologetic, promised to make amends to attend therapy etc and drew all resources (including people) to the task of re-establishing the relationship. In searching for a psychological explanation for these perpetrator characteristics, I was led eventually to Gunderson's treatise on borderline personality disorder (Gunderson, 1984). Only there, was the three- phase variations of emotion and behavior that characterized the cycle of abuse sufficiently explained as phasic responses to anxiety. The anxiety was attachment-based, although Gunderson did not draw upon attachment theory. He explained the tension building as stemming from a "dysphoric stalemate" where intimacy needs were unmet and the requisite motivation, insight and skills to assert those needs were absent. In *The Abusive Personality* (2003, 2007), I mapped the phases of borderline functioning onto the cycle of abuse and found a good conceptual match. I also began a set of empirical studies designed to assess borderline traits and "associated features" of abusiveness in a court and self-referred treatment population of abusive males.

This work was published in a series of papers, starting with Dutton and Starzomski (1993)(D.G. Dutton & Starzomski, 1993) examination of borderline traits in a court-mandated population of abusive males. Using a self-report measure for borderline traits (borderline personality organization or BPO) developed by Oldham(Oldham et al., 1985) and an anger self-report measure ( multidimensional anger inventory or MAI) (Siegel, 1986) we assessed anger and borderline traits in a male perpetrator population and correlated the self reports with their wives reports of abusiveness using both the CTS and the Psychological maltreatment of Women Inventory (Tolman, 1989). We found that

a total of four subscales from the BPO and MAI accounted for 50% of the variance in partners reports of domination and 35% of emotional abuse. This was, at the time, a very parsimonious set of predictor variables, indicating a powerful effect of borderline traits and anger as having a role in abusiveness. Clinical and diagnostic checklists for borderline personality typically refer to “inappropriate intense anger” (DSM-IV-TR- p. 710) so it was mysterious why an anger subscale was not part of Oldham’s original measure. That having been said, the borderline-anger combination was strong predictor of abusiveness in this population. Sub-groups exist obviously (Holtzworth-Munroe & Stuart, 1994) and borderline traits can be thought of as central in an “emotionally volatile” group (Saunders, 1992) and as peripheral but still existent in other groups. Also, while there has been research contrasting “instrumental and impulsive” abusers (Tweed & Dutton, 1998), there is also evidence for comorbidity or overlap of categories.(Zanarini, Frankenburg, & al., 1998) Recent research has supported the view of treating borderline traits on a continuum(Rothschild & al., 2003; Westen & Shedler, 1999) and of borderline PD as being a form of “trauma spectrum” disorders(Lieb, Zanarini, Schmahl, Linehan, & Bohus, 2004). Some of the features of borderline pathology such as emotional reactivity and rejection sensitivity now appear to have a genetic basis(Skodol et al., 2002) although early experience factors play a part in its’ development as well(Zanarini & Frankenburg, 2007).

## Attachment

One of the main correlates of borderline functioning is attachment anxiety. The DSM-1V describes “frantic efforts to avoid real or imagined abandonment” (p.710). However, at the time of our early research no one had connected borderline features or attachment insecurity to each other or to abusiveness. Thanks to my associations with Susan Painter and Kim Bartholomew, I became aware of the importance of attachment as a human motive and of attachment dysfunction as a potential contributor to IPV.

Using the same research format (male perpetrators in court mandated groups as a source of the psychological data and their female partners are reports of abusiveness), we assessed attachment style, thought to be a set of traits that contains schemata of expectancies about and manifests behavior in intimate relationships (D.G. Dutton, Starzomski et al., 1994). We found that “fearful attachment”, an attachment style with high anxiety – based anger as a central feature, to be correlated significantly with wives’ reports of abusiveness and with the perpetrators self-reports of jealousy, anger and trauma symptoms. Men who were abusive in intimate relationships had both borderline features and attachment-insecurity. A schema or pattern of psychological features of abusiveness was beginning to emerge. Subsequent research with larger samples has largely confirmed these early findings (Edwards, Scott, Yarvis, Paizis, & Panizzon, 2003; Henderson, Bartholomew, & Dutton, 1997; Mauricio, Tein, & Lopez, 2007) of a pattern of connections amongst borderline traits, attachment insecurity, impulsivity and abusiveness. This same pattern has been found in abusive females as well (R. J. Clift, 2007). Henning and his colleagues have found that females convicted of IPV and court-mandated for treatment have four times the rate of borderline disorders (assessed by the MCMI-111) than male abusers. (Henning, Jones, & Holford, 2003)

## Shame

Another aspect of abusiveness stemmed from exposure to the work of June Tangney (Tangney, 1991; Tangney, Wagner, Fletcher, & Gramzow, 1992). She had described a “shame-prone” personality as tending to externalize blame for any negative outcomes as an attempt to ward off re-experiencing shame. Shaming in the clinical literature (Lewis, 1971) was defined as any assaults on the global sense of self. This included global criticism “you’ll never amount to anything”, criticism in front of others (typically siblings) and random punishment. The latter generates a

sense of being punished for one's self one is rather than what one has done. We had assessed recollections of childhood upbringing in our abuser population and simply revised the scale (the memories of My Upbringing Scale(Perris, Jacobsson, Lindstrom, von Knorring, & Perris, 1980)) to use eleven items assessing shaming experiences (D.G. Dutton et al., 1995). It is important to note that these are subjective perceptions of being shamed and are not easily subjected to confirmation. These recollections were, however, significantly correlated with anger and partners reports of abusiveness. More importantly, they combined through some form of toxic combination, with exposure to physical abuse in the family of origin, to predict use of abuse in the adult relationship. We argued that the debate about whether exposure to parental violence was correlated with use of IPV could be clarified by assessing the “double whammy” of exposure to both physical violence and shaming. This combination better predicted use of IPV, as assessed through partial correlations.

## Trauma

Abusive adults often grow up in homes where physical abuse is displayed (Straus, Gelles, & Steinmetz, 1980) but this display is often part of a general dysfunctionality that includes psychological abuse (including shaming) and substance abuse. Children who grow up in such families are repeatedly exposed to traumatic stressors; their security base is often under attack and the base itself (conceived of as consistent and supportive protection from stressors) is unavailable. For these reasons, attachment insecurity, as we described above, is lacking. The composite effect of this exposure to intra-familial stressors and lack of a secure base, is traumatic and shows up in trauma measures administered to abusers(D.G. Dutton, 1995b, 1999b). While gender based analyses

have focused on trauma in battered women shelters, they have largely missed the reality of trauma in IPV perpetrators, although our own work, based on comparing PTSD profiles of abusive men with Vietnam vets diagnosed with war-induced PTSD, showed the trauma profile in adult abusers with no adult exposure to trauma sources.

### A Trauma Model of Abusiveness

Prospective studies of children traumatized by physical abuse (Dodge, Pettit, Bates, & Valente, 1995) showed that these children have long-lasting “cognitive deficits” from this exposure. These deficits involve an inability to think of conflicts as situationally determined or to think of negotiation strategies to resolve the conflict. Abusers have this same cognitive deficit. College age men who report the use of IPV show this cognitive deficit as a by-product of their attachment style (Starzomski, 1995). IPV, to the extent it is generated by one member of a couple, can be viewed as an outcome of that person’s entire personality. Their cognitions tend to externalize blame and the view negative experiences as “caused” by their partner. Their affective state is prone to repeatedly generate “dysphoric affect” that is then blamed on the partner (Gunderson, 1984), the dysphoria (which is probably best treated as an attachment disorder) and the blaming combine to generate frustration and anger at the partner. The anger builds to a threshold of physical abusiveness and is then expressed, often destructively. The borderline center of this “abusive personality” generates repetition and affective states that swamp the phenomenology of the abuser and doom superficial interventions to failure. For these reasons, *inter alia*, “psycho-educational interventions” have repeatedly shown high recidivism rates, in the range of 40% (Babcock et al., 2004; Feder & Wilson, 2005).

Detailed summaries of research on the abusive personality have culminated in a book (D. G. Dutton, 1998) (D.G. Dutton, 2006a) and a scale (D.G. Dutton, 1995a) that assesses its component parts and has good predictive accuracy for IPV. Collection of normative data for the scale is ongoing.

## The Gender Paradigm and Female Abusiveness

Psychoeducational interventions, currently in use as a court-mandated outcome of arrest for spouse assault, are misdirected, focusing on “male privilege” and “acceptance of violence”. Studies show that , as of 1992, only 9.4% of American marriages were “male dominant” (Coleman & Straus, 1992) and that only 2% of North American men accepted physical violence as a means of controlling their female partner(Simon et al., 2001). There is no “norm of acceptance” for IPV as Dobash and others have claimed(R.E. Dobash & Dobash, 1979; R. P. Dobash & Dobash, 2004; E.W. Gondolf & Heckert, 2003). IPV occurs across all forms of intimate relationship, including gay and lesbian relationships (Landolt & Dutton, 1997; Lie & Gentlewarrier, 1991), underscoring the intimate aspect of IPV and its origins in attachment disruption. Furthermore, surveys that equate for level of violence by gender show that bi-directional IPV, matched for level of severity is the most common form of IPV (J. Stets & M.A., 1989). Abusive personalities either generate abusiveness in their partners or find similar others (Capaldi, 2004; Ehrensaft et al., 2003; Serbin et al., 2004). Studies of males who are court mandated for wife assault find that most have violent partners and that 40% of these women start the violence(D.G. Dutton & Corvo, 2007). Studies of female abusers find personality disorder again to be prevalent, find the same personality disorders as with male abusers, and find “assortative mating” occurs where syndromes of co-morbidity (IPV, substance abuse, presence of PD) are shared with the male partner (Capaldi, 2004; Serbin et al., 2004; Whitaker et al., 2007). Laboratory studies of couple interaction show

increasing power struggles and destructive communication (Burman, Margolin, & John, 1993; Cordova, Jacobson, Gottman, Rushe, & Cox, 1993; Gottman et al., 1995; O'Leary et al., 1989) , exacerbated by alcohol use(Leonard & Roberts, 1998). A recent large sample study found that 50% of IPV was bilateral and of the unilateral cases, 70% were female violent. Injuries to women were more likely to occur in bilateral cases. (Whitaker et al., 2007) Unfortunately, even where such bilateral aggression is observed, it is often reported in the popular press as “male violence”( see Dutton and Corvo (D.G. Dutton & Corvo, 2006; D.G. Dutton & Corvo, 2007)).

Our interventions for IPV are too rigid, too late, too superficial (treating symptoms) and too narrowly defined. We need more and better work at prevention of IPV- empathy training and conflict resolution in school children of both genders. We need a variety of treatment options, including justice circles(Mills, 2003), couples treatment(Stith, Rosen, & McCollum, 2003) and CBT for men and women(Murphy & Eckhardt, 2005). We need CBT that has a broader focus, including the associated features of abusiveness such as attachment disorder, self-disturbances and trauma reactions(D.G. Dutton, 2008). Most importantly, we need to stop thinking of the problem in superficial and overly broad “gender analysis” terms (D.G. Dutton, 2006b; D.G. Dutton & Corvo, 2006; D.G. Dutton & Nicholls, 2005) and then to proceed with the recognition and treatment of the psychology of IPV in its’ deeper individual and interpersonal forms. In short, we need to put the psychology back into our understanding of IPV not dismiss it either by fiat or conceptual ignorance. If we fail to do so, there will be little change in IPV incidence despite our best intentions.

## References

- Babcock, J. C., Green, C. E., & Robie, C. (2004). Does batterers' treatment work?: A meta-analytic review of domestic violence treatment outcome research. *Clinical Psychology Review, 23*, 1023-1053.
- Bandura, A. (1979). The social learning perspective: Mechanisms of Aggression. In H. Toch (Ed.), *The Psychology of Crime and Criminal Justice*. New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston.
- Bar-On, D. (1997). *Bar On Emotional Quotient Inventory: Users' Manual*. Toronto: Multi-Health Systems.
- Bard, M. (1971). Iatrogenic violence. *Police Chief, 38*(January), 16-17.
- Brown, G. A. (2004). Gender as a factor in the response of the law-enforcement system to violence against partners. *Sexuality and Culture, 8*(3-4), 3- 139.
- Burman, B., Margolin, G., & John, R. S. (1993). America's Angriest Home Videos: Behavioral Contingencies Observed in Home Reenactments of Marital Conflict. *Journal of Consulting And Clinical Psychology, 61*(1), 28-39.
- Buss, D. (1994). *The evolution of desire: Strategies of human mating*. New York: Basic Books.
- Buttall, F. P., & Carney, M. M. (2006). A large sample evaluation of a court-mandated batterer intervention program: Investigating differential program effect for African American and Caucasian men. *Research on Social Work Practice, 16*(2), 121 -1341.
- Buzawa, E. S., Austin, T. L., Bannon, J., & Jackson, J. (1992). Role of victim preference in determining police response to victims of domestic violence. In E. S. Buzawa & C. G. Buzawa (Eds.), *Domestic violence: The changing criminal justice response* (pp. 255 - 270). Westport, Conn: Auburn House.
- Capaldi, D. M., Kim, H.K., and Shortt, J.W. (2004). Women's involvement in aggression in young adult romantic relationships. In M. a. B. Putallaz, K.L. (Ed.), *Aggression, antisocial behavior, and violence among girls*. (pp. 223 -241.). New York: Guilford.
- Clift, R. J. (2007). *Borderline traits and attachment insecurity in abusive undergraduate females*. UBC, Vancouver.
- Clift, R. J., Thomas, L. & Dutton, D.G. (2005). Two-year reliability of the Propensity for Abusiveness Scale. *Journal of Family Violence, 20*(4), 231 - 234.
- Coleman, D. H., & Straus, M. A. (1992). Marital power, conflict and violence in a nationally representative sample of American couples. In M. A. Straus & R. J. Gelles (Eds.), *Physical violence in American families* (pp. 287-300). New Brunswick: Transaction.
- Coolidge, F. L., & Anderson, L. W. (2002). Personality Profiles of Women in Multiple Abusive Relationships., *Journal of Family Violence* (Vol. 17, pp. 117-131): Kluwer Academic Publishing.
- Cordova, J. V., Jacobson, N. S., Gottman, J. M., Rushe, R., & Cox, G. (1993). Negative reciprocity and communication in couples with a violent husband. *Journal of Abnormal Psychology, 102*(4), 559-564.

- Dobash, R. E., & Dobash, R. P. (1978). Wives: The appropriate victims of marital assault. *Victimology: An International Journal*, 2, 426-442.
- Dobash, R. E., & Dobash, R. P. (1979). *Violence against wives: A case against the patriarchy*. New York: Free Press.
- Dobash, R. P., & Dobash, R. E. (2004). Women's violence to men in intimate relationships. *British Journal of Criminology*, 44, 324 - 349.
- Dodge, K. A., Pettit, G. S., Bates, J. E., & Valente, E. (1995). Social Information-Processing Patterns Partially Mediate the Effect of Early Physical Abuse on Later Conduct Problems. *Journal of Abnormal Psychology*, 104(4), 632-643.
- Dutton, D. G. (1986). Wife assaulters' explanations for assault: The neutralization of self punishment. *Canadian Journal of Behavioural Science*, 18(4), 382-390.
- Dutton, D. G. (1987). The criminal justice response to wife assault. *Law and Human Behavior*, 11(3), 189-206.
- Dutton, D. G. (1994a). The origin and structure of the abusive personality. *Journal of Personality Disorder*, 8(3), 181-191.
- Dutton, D. G. (1994b). Patriarchy and wife assault: The ecological fallacy. *Violence and Victims*, 9(2), 125-140.
- Dutton, D. G. (1995a). A scale for measuring propensity for abusiveness. *Journal of Family Violence*, 10(2), 203-221.
- Dutton, D. G. (1995b). Trauma symptoms and PTSD-like profiles in perpetrators of intimate abuse. *Journal of Traumatic Stress*, 8(2), 299-316.
- Dutton, D. G. (1998). *The Abusive Personality*. New York: Guilford.
- Dutton, D. G. (1999a). Limitations of social learning models in explaining intimate aggression. In X. B. Arriaga & S. Oskamp (Eds.), *Violence in intimate relationships*. Thousand Oaks, Ca.: Sage.
- Dutton, D. G. (1999b). The traumatic origins of intimate rage. *Aggression and Violent Behavior*, 4(4), 431-448.
- Dutton, D. G. (2000). Witnessing parental violence as a traumatic experience shaping the abusive personality. *Journal of Aggression, Maltreatment and Trauma*, 3(1), 59-67.
- Dutton, D. G. (2003). MCMI results for batterers: A response to Gondolf. *Journal of Family Violence*, 18(4), 253-255.
- Dutton, D. G. (2006a). *The abusive personality (Second Edition)*. New York: Guilford press.
- Dutton, D. G. (2006b). *Rethinking domestic violence*. Vancouver: UBC Press.
- Dutton, D. G. (2008). Blended behavior therapy for intimate violence. In A. Baldry (Ed.), *Intimate partner violence: Prevention and intervention*. New York: Nova Press.
- Dutton, D. G., & Bodnarchuk, M. (2005). Personality disorders and spouse assault. In R. J. Gelles & D. R. Loseke (Eds.), *Current controversies on family violence (3rd edition)*. Newbury Park: Sage.
- Dutton, D. G., & Browning, J. J. (1988). Concern for power, fear of intimacy, and aversive stimuli for wife assault. In G. J. Hotaling, D. Finkelhor, J. T. Kirkpatrick & M. A. Straus (Eds.), *Family abuse and its consequences: New directions in research* (pp. 163-175). Newbury Park, C.A.: Sage.
- Dutton, D. G., & Corvo, K. (2006). Transforming a flawed policy: A call to revive psychology and science in domestic violence research and practice. *Aggression and Violent Behavior*, 11(5), 457 -483.

- Dutton, D. G., & Corvo, K. C. (2007). The Duluth model: A data-impervious paradigm and a flawed strategy. *Aggression and Violent Behavior, 12*, 658 -667.
- Dutton, D. G., & Hemphill, K. J. (1992). Patterns of socially desirable responding among perpetrators and victims of wife assault. *Violence and Victims, 7*(1), 29-40.
- Dutton, D. G., & Kerry, G. (1999). Modus Operandi and personality disorder in incarcerated killers. *International Journal of Law and Psychiatry, 22*(3-4), 287-300.
- Dutton, D. G., Landolt, M. A., Starzomski, A., & Bodnarchuk, M. (2001). Validation of the PAS in diverse male populations. *Journal of Family Violence, 16*(1), 59-73.
- Dutton, D. G., & Levens, B. (1977). Domestic crisis intervention: attitude survey of trained and untrained police officers. *Canadian Police College Journal, 1*(2), 75 -90.
- Dutton, D. G., & Nicholls, T. L. (2005). The gender paradigm in domestic violence research and theory: Part 1- The conflict of theory and data. *Aggression and Violent Behavior, 10*(6), 680 - 714.
- Dutton, D. G., & Painter, S. L. (1981). Traumatic bonding: The development of emotional bonds in relationships of intermittent abuse. *Victimology: An International Journal, 6*(1-4), 139-155.
- Dutton, D. G., & Painter, S. L. (1993a). The Battered Woman Syndrome: Effects of severity and intermittency of abuse. *American Journal of Orthopsychiatry, 63*(4), 614-622.
- Dutton, D. G., & Painter, S. L. (1993b). Emotional attachments in abusive relationship: A test of traumatic bonding theory. *Violence and Victims, 8*(2), 105-120.
- Dutton, D. G., & Starzomski, A. (1993). Borderline personality in perpetrators of psychological and physical abuse. *Violence and Victims, 8*(4), 327-337.
- Dutton, D. G., Starzomski, A., Saunders, K., & Bartholomew, K. (1994). Intimacy-anger and insecure attachment as precursors of abuse in intimate relationships. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology, 24*(15), 1367-1386.
- Dutton, D. G., Starzomski, A. & Landolt, M. (1994). *Validation of a scale for measuring propensity for abusiveness*. Ottawa: Solicitor-General of Canada.
- Dutton, D. G., & Strachan, C. E. (1987). Motivational needs for power and dominance as differentiating variables of assaultive and non-assaultive male populations. *Violence and Victims, 2*(3), 145-156.
- Dutton, D. G., van Ginkel, C., & Landolt, M. A. (1996). Jealousy, intrusiveness and intimate abusiveness. *Journal of Family Violence, 11*(4), 411-423.
- Dutton, D. G., van Ginkel, C., & Starzomski, A. (1995). The role of shame and guilt in the intergenerational transmission of abusiveness. *Violence and Victims, 10*, 121-131.
- Dutton, D. G., Webb, A. N., & Ryan, L. (1994). Gender differences in anger/anxiety reactions to witnessing dyadic family conflict. *Canadian Journal of Behavioural Science, 26*(3), 353-364.
- Edwards, D. W., Scott, C. L., Yarvis, R. M., Paizis, C. L., & Panizzon, M. S. (2003). Impulsiveness, impulsive aggression, personality disorder and spousal violence. *Violence and Victims, 18*(1), 3-14.
- Ehrensaft, M. K., Cohen, P., Brown, J., Smailes, E., Chen, H., & Johnson, J. G. (2003). Intergenerational Transmission of Partner Violence: A 20-Year Prospective Study. *Journal of Consulting And Clinical Psychology, 71*(4), 741-753.

- Feder, L., & Wilson, D. B. (2005). A meta-analytic review of court mandated batterer intervention programs: Can courts affect abusers' behavior? *Journal of Experimental Criminology*, 1, 239 - 262.
- Follingstad, D. R. (2003). Battered woman syndrome in the courts. In A. M. Goldstein (Ed.), *Handbook of Psychology: Forensic Psychology* (Vol. 11). New York: John Wiley and Sons.
- Garner, J. H., & Maxwell, C. D. (2000). What are the lessons of the police arrest studies? *Journal of Aggression, Maltreatment and Trauma*, 4, 83-114.
- Gondolf, E. W. (1999). MCMI-III results for batterer program participants in four cities: Less "pathological" than expected. *Journal of Family Violence*, 14, 1-17.
- Gondolf, E. W. (2000). A 30-month follow up of court-referred batterers in four cities. *International Journal of Offender Therapy and Comparative Criminology*, 44(1), 111-128.
- Gondolf, E. W., & Heckert, D. A. (2003). Determinants of women's perceptions of risk in battering relationships. *Violence and Victims*, 18(4), 371-386.
- Gottman, J. M., Jacobson, N. S., Rushe, R., Shortt, J. W., Babcock, J., La Taillade, J. J., et al. (1995). The relationship between heart rate reactivity, emotionally aggressive behavior and general violence in batterers. *Journal of Family Psychology*, 9(3), 227-248.
- Gunderson, J. G. (1984). *Borderline personality disorder*. Washington, DC: American Psychiatric Press, Inc.
- Hamberger, L. K., Lohr, J. M., Bonge, D., & Tolin, D. F. (1996). A large empirical typology of male spouse abusers and its relationship to dimensions of abuse. *Violence and Victims*, 11, 277-292.
- Hart, S. D., Dutton, D. G., & Newlove, T. (1993). The prevalence of personality disorder among wife assaulters. *Journal of Personality Disorder*, 7(4), 329-341.
- Hazan, C., & Shaver, P. (1987). Conceptualizing romantic love as an attachment process. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 52, 511-524.
- Henderson, A. J. Z., Bartholomew, K., & Dutton, D. G. (1997). He loves me, He loves me not: Attachment and separation resolution of abused women. *Journal of Family Violence*, 12(2), 169-192.
- Henning, K., Jones, A., & Holford, R. (2003). Treatment needs of women arrested for domestic violence: a comparison with male offenders. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 18(8), 839-856.
- Holtzworth-Munroe, A., & Stuart, G. L. (1994). Typologies of Male Batterers: Three Subtypes and the Differences Among Them. *Psychological Bulletin*, 116(3), 476-497.
- Jack, L. A., Dutton, D. G., Webb, A. N., & Ryan, L. (1995). Effects of early abuse on adult affective reactions to exposure to dyadic conflict. *Canadian Journal of Behavioural Science*, 27(4), 484-500.
- Jaffe, P., Lemon, N., & Poisson, S. E. (2003). *Child custody & domestic violence: A call for safety and accountability*. Thousand Oaks: Sage.
- Kaufman, J., & Zigler, E. (1993). The transmission rate of abuse is overstated. In R. J. Gelles & D. R. Losecke (Eds.), *Current controversies on family violence*. Newbury Park, CA.: Sage.
- Landolt, M. A., & Dutton, D. G. (1997). Power and personality: An analysis of gay male intimate abuse. *Sex Roles*, 37, 335-358.

Leonard, K. E., & Roberts, L. J. (1998). The effects of alcohol on the marital interactions of aggressive and nonaggressive husbands and their wives. *Journal of Abnormal Psychology, 107*(4), 602-615.

Levens, B., & Dutton, D. G. (1977). The social service role of police: domestic crisis intervention, citizen's requests for service and the Vancouver police response. *Canadian Police College Journal, 1*(1), 29 -50.

Lewis, H. B. (1971). *Shame and guilt in neurosis*. New York: International Universities Press.

Lie, G.-y., & Gentlewarrier, S. (1991). Intimate violence in lesbian relationships: Discussion of survey findings and practice implications. *Journal of Social Service Research, 15*(1), 41-59.

Lieb, K., Zanarini, M. K., Schmahl, C., Linehan, M., & Bohus, M. (2004). Borderline personality disorder. *The Lancet, 364*(July 23), 453 -461.

Margolin, G., John, R. S., & Gleberman, L. (1989). Affective responses to conflictual discussions in violent and non-violent couples. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 56*(1), 24-33.

Mauricio, A. M., Tein, J. Y., & Lopez, F. G. (2007). Borderline and antisocial personality scores as mediators between attachment and intimate partner violence. *Violence and Victims, 22*(2), 139 -157.

Mills, L. G. (1999). Killing her softly: Intimate abuse and the violence of state intervention. *Harvard Law Review, 113*(2), 551-613.

Mills, L. G. (2003). *Insult to Injury: rethinking our response to intimate abuse*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Murphy, C. M., & Eckhardt, C. I. (2005). *Treating the abusive partner*. New York: Guilford.

O'Leary, K. D., Barling, J., Arias, I., Rosenbaum, A., Malone, J., & Tyree, A. (1989). Prevalence and stability of physical aggression between spouses: A longitudinal analysis. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 57*, 263-268.

Oldham, J., Clarkin, J., Appelbaum, A., Carr, A., Kernberg, P., Lotterman, A., et al. (1985). A self-report instrument for Borderline Personality Organization. In T. H. McGlashan (Ed.), *The Borderline: Current empirical research* (pp. 1-18). Washington, DC: American Psychiatric Press.

Perris, C., Jacobsson, L., Lindstrom, H., von Knorring, L., & Perris, H. (1980). Development of a new inventory for assessing memories of parental rearing behaviour. *Acta Psychiatrica Scandinavica, 61*, 265-274.

Rothschild, L., & al., e. (2003). A taxonomic study of personality disorder. *Journal of Abnormal Psychology, 112*(4), 657 -666.

Rounsaville, B. (1978). Theories in marital violence: Evidence from a study of battered women. *Victimology: An International Journal, 3*(1-2), 11-31.

Saunders, D. G. (1992). A typology of men who batter: Three types derived from cluster analysis. *American Journal of Orthopsychiatry, 62*(2), 264-275.

Serbin, L., Stack, D., De Genna, N., Grunzeweig, N., Temcheff, C. E., Schwartzmann, A. E., et al. (2004). When aggressive girls become mothers. In M. a. B. Putallaz, K.L. (Ed.), *Aggression, antisocial behavior and violence among girls* (pp. 262 -285). New York: The Guilford Press.

- Siegel, J. M. (1986). The multidimensional anger inventory. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 5(1), 191-200.
- Simon, T. R., Anderson, M., Thompson, M. P., Crosby, A. E., Shelley, G., & Sacks, J. J. (2001). Attitudinal acceptance of intimate partner violence among U.S. adults. *Violence and Victims*, 16(2), 115-126.
- Skodol, A., Siever, L. J., Livesley, W. J., Gunderson, J. G., Pfohl, B., & Widiger, T. A. (2002). The borderline diagnosis 11: biology, genetics and clinical course. *Biological Psychiatry*, 51, 936-950.
- Smith, D. A., & Klein, J. R. (1984). Police control of interpersonal disputes. *Social Problems*, 31(4), 468-481.
- Starzomski, A. (1995). *Attachment pattern and attributional style in abusive college men*. Unpublished Master, University of British Columbia, Vancouver, British Columbia.
- Stets, J., & Straus, M. A. (1992). The marriage license as a hitting license. . In M. S. a. R. Gelles (Ed.), *Physical violence in American Families* (pp. 227 -244). New Brunswick, N.J.: Transaction Publishers.
- Stets, J., & M.A., S. (1989). The marriage license as a hitting license: A comparison of dating, cohabiting and married couples. *Journal of Family Violence*, 4.
- Stith, S. M., Rosen, K. H., & McCollum, E. E. (2003). Effectiveness of couples treatment for spouse abuse. *Journal of Marital and Family Therapy*, 29, 407-426.
- Strachan, C. E., & Dutton, D. G. (1992). The role of power and jealousy in anger responses to sexual jealousy. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 22(22), 1721-1740.
- Straus, M. A. (1992). Measuring intrafamily conflict and violence: The Conflict Tactics Scale. In M. A. Straus & R. J. Gelles (Eds.), *Physical violence in American families*. New Brunswick, N. J.: Transaction Publishers.
- Straus, M. A., Gelles, R. J., & Steinmetz, S. (1980). *Behind closed doors: Violence in the American family*. Garden City, N.Y.: Anchor Press/Doubleday.
- Tangney, J. P. (1991). Moral affect: The good, the bad, and the ugly. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 61(4), 598-607.
- Tangney, J. P., Wagner, P., Fletcher, C., & Gramzow, R. (1992). Shamed into anger? The relation of shame and guilt to anger and self-reported aggression. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 62(4), 669-675.
- Thomas, L., & Dutton, D. G. (2004). The Propensity for Abusiveness Scale (PAS) as a predictor of affective priming to anticipated intimate conflict. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 34(10), 2166 - 2178.
- Tolman, R. M. (1989). The development of a measure of psychological maltreatment of women by their male partners. *Violence and Victims*, 4(3), 159-177.
- Tweed, R., & Dutton, D. G. (1998). A comparison of instrumental and impulsive subgroups of batterers. *Violence and Victims*, 13(3), 217-230.
- Walker, L. (1984). *The battered woman syndrome*. New York: Springer.
- Walker, L. E. (1979). *The battered woman*. New York: Harper and Row.
- Westen, D., & Shedler, J. (1999). Revising and assessing Axis II, Part 1: Developing a clinically and empirically valid assessment instrument. *American Journal of Psychiatry*, 156(2), 258-285.
- Whitaker, D. J., Haileyesus, T., Swahn, M., & Saltzman, L. (2007). Differences in frequency of violence and reported injury between relationships with reciprocal and non-reciprocal intimate partner violence. *American Journal of Public Health*, 97(5), 941-947.

Worden, R. E., & Pollitz, A. (1984). Police arrests in domestic disturbances: A further look. *Law and Society Review*, *18*(1), 105-119.

Zanarini, M. C., & Frankenburg, F. R. (2007). The essential nature of borderline psychopathology. *J. Personality Disorders*, *21*(5), 518 - 535.

Zanarini, M. C., Frankenburg, F. R., & al., e. (1998). Axis 1 comorbidity of borderline personality disorder. *American Journal of Psychiatry*, *155*, 571-578.