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ABSTRACT

To explore the dynamics of partner and stranger violence, 66 college student men who had been in a relationship with a partner during the past year were placed into one of four groups based on their conflict resolution tactics in the past year (Straus, 1980, Conflict Tactics Scale): nonviolent (n=17), partner violent (n=15), stranger violent (n=17), or panviolent (violent with partners and strangers; n=17). Violent men minimally "kicked, bit, or hit with a fist" another person. The men responded to 10 cards of the Thematic Apperception Test, scored for castration anxiety (Schwartz, 1955), and object relations (Westen, Barends, Leigh, Mendel, & Silbert, 1990; included to replicate an earlier study) and completed the MMPI-2 (for levels of alcohol-related problems, number of elevations on the clinical scales, and anxiety content scale). Alcohol-related problems assessed by the MMPI-2, MAC-R and the proportion of elevations on the clinical scales on the MMPI-2 were included based on previous literature and to help differentiate between the meaning of castration anxiety and general anxiety or psychopathology. Differences associated with the dimensions of partner or stranger violence were assessed with MANOVA tests, with ANOVA tests, chi square and subsequent follow-up tests as warranted.

Partner violent men had significantly higher levels of castration anxiety than others. Castration anxiety has to do with concerns about bodily damage, particularly aroused in an intimate relationship theoretically due to anxiety of bodily differences between men and women. Stranger violent men, including the panviolent men, reported significantly more alcohol-related problems (MMPI-2, MAC-R) than nonviolent and partner-only violent men. Object relation scores
(four dimensions of mental representations of people and relationships between people) differed as a function of partner violence, with partner violent men reporting more benevolent views of relationships than nonviolent and stranger violent men. Indications of psychopathology and general anxiety (MMPI-2, proportion of elevations on the clinical scales and anxiety content scale) did not differ between groups.
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CHAPTER I
INTRODUCTION

Physical violence in the United States is relatively common, affecting many people by its occurrence and diminishing the quality of people's lives because of fear of its occurrence (United States Department of Justice Statistics, 1987). In 1991, approximately 6.4 million violent crimes such as rape, robbery, and aggravated assaults were committed in the United States (United States Department of Justice Statistics, 1992). While most people worry about being victims of violent crime perpetrated by strangers "lurking in the dark" (United States Department of Justice Statistics, 1987), the source of danger for many is within the family. In the United States approximately 18% of all murders are committed by a relative (U.S. Department of Justice, 1987). In the same light, the U.S. Surgeon General has reported that every 15 seconds a woman is beaten, most often by her husband or male partner (as cited in Geffner & Rosenbaum, 1990). While most men do not hit other people (Kandel-Englander, 1992), national surveys indicate there are high percentages of male violence toward strangers, acquaintances, romantic partners, and other family members (Straus, 1980; Straus & Gelles, 1986).

Violence perpetrated by men against their partners and against strangers is emphasized here. While other types of violence also merit study, my interest lies with understanding men who hit a potential sexual partner and men who hit other kinds of people. By studying the differences between nonviolent, partner violent, stranger violent, and generally violent men, I hope to gain insight into the psychodynamics of violence. With increased understanding of the dynamics of
violence, better prevention and treatment programs can be developed for perpetrators.

**Violence**

Lifetime prevalence rates for marital violence are estimated at 30% (Straus, 1980), and each year over three million married couples in the United States are involved in one or more serious violent acts including punching, biting, kicking, hitting with an object, beating up, or other assaults with a knife or gun (Straus & Gelles, 1988). Approximately three to four percent of partner assaults each year are likely to result in serious injury (Dutton, 1988). Lifetime arrest rates of men for crimes such as aggravated assault, rape, and murder also are alarmingly high, involving approximately 14% of white men and 50% of black men (Blumstein & Cohen, 1987). Crimes committed by relatives more often involve physical attacks compared to crimes committed by strangers. However, of those injured, victims of stranger violence more often are seriously injured (United States Department of Justice, 1987).

Most perpetrators of violence hit either partners or strangers. But some men, called panviolent, hit both their partners and strangers, and one-third to one-half of spouse abusers have also been arrested for nonfamily violence (Brisson, 1981; Dutton, 1988; Fagan, Stewart, & Hansen, 1983). In a representative national community sample, of the 15% of men self-reporting violence toward partners and/or strangers during the previous year, Kandel-England (1992) found that between 10% and 15% were panviolent. In a sample consisting of married or co-habitating men (referred from a variety of social service agencies), Sheilds, McCall, and Hanneke (1988) found approximately half of the men who were assaultive outside of the family were also violent toward their partner. In a sample
of single, college men who had been in a relationship with a partner within the
previous year, Dromgoole and Cogan (1995) found 11.9% self reported panviolent
behaviors over the past year.

Violence to Partners

Many past researchers have assumed that partner violence begins after
marriage (c.f. Gelles, 1972). However, fifteen percent of battered women reported
that violence in their relationship began during the courtship period (Rosenbaum &
O'Leary, 1981). Because dating provides a context for young adults'
conceptualization of intimate, male/female relationships (c.f. White & Koss,
1991), expectations and patterns of marital violence are developed during

Makepeace's 1981 study was the first serious investigation of courtship or
dating violence. Makepeace (1981) found that one in five college students
surveyed had experienced courtship violence, and 70% of college students
reported knowing someone who experienced courtship violence. A recent study of
302 single college men, who had been in a relationship with a partner within the
twelve months prior to the study, found that 16.5% of the men reported
perpetrating severe courtship violence (ranging from hitting with a fist to using a
gun or knife) during the past year (Dromgoole & Cogan, 1995). Estimates of
lifetime prevalence rates of dating violence range from 9% (Roscoe & Callahan,
1985) to 65% (Laner, 1983). Differences in estimates have to do with different
definitions of dating violence with those including more severe forms of violence
yielding lower prevalence rates and those including threats in addition to acts of
violence yielding higher rates (Sugarman & Hotaling, 1989). Here, courtship
violence will be defined as physical behavior, between unmarried individuals who
are romantically involved, that risks physically hurting another person regardless
of the actual consequences (Carlson, 1987). Variations in estimates of dating
violence also relate to the age of respondents and the region of study. College
students report higher levels of violence than high school students, and those in the
south and western regions of the United States report higher incidences of violence
than those in the east and midwestern states (Sugarman & Hotaling, 1989).
Studies comparing courtship and marital violence have found similarities in the
prevalence and types of violence (c.f. Flynn, 1987; Sugarman & Hotaling, 1989).
Because of the similarities of dating and marital relationships (i.e., shared time
together, intimacy, emotional vulnerability, and investment), many investigators
have argued for a theory of relationship violence as opposed to viewing courtship
and spouse violence as separate phenomena (Roscoe & Benaske, 1985; Laner &
Thompson, 1982). People in dating relationships are often subject to the same
types of "interactional stressors and sociocultural influences" as married people
(Laner & Thompson, 1982). Thus, violence in an "adult love relationship" may
have similar dynamics whether the partners are married or not.

In intimate relationships, men have traditionally been identified as the
perpetrators of violence and women have been identified as victims (Lundberg,
1990). Some have suggested that partner violence is a predominately male
characteristic that is motivated by a belief that men have the “right” to own and
control women (Johnson, 1995). This kind of thinking is questionable when
considering the partner violent man’s response to his violence. Partner violent
men tend to deny, minimize, and externalize blame for their violence (Sonkin,
1988). This suggests that the partner violent man is aware his behavior is wrong
or unacceptable (Dutton & Browning, 1988).
Interestingly, being a victimizer is strongly correlated with being a victim (Sack, Keller, & Howard, 1982), and women are as likely as men (Straus, 1980; Straus & Gelles, 1986) or even more likely than men (Magdol et al., 1997) to hit a partner. Instead of viewing women as victims and men as perpetrators, some suggest that in abusive couple relationships "there are always two victims; the sadist and the masochist are one and the same" (Levinson, 1994, p.113). Nevertheless in comparison to male violence, acts of violence committed by women are less injurious (Straus, 1980; Makepeace, 1981; Dutton & Starzomski, 1995), and women's violence is more often viewed as "ineffective or non-threatening" by husbands (Pagelow, 1984). In contrast, men's violence is more likely to lead to physical injury and emotional harm (Makepeace, 1986; Cantos, Neidig, & O'Leary, 1994), and more women than men report feelings of victimization as a result of partner violence (Makepeace, 1981; Bernard & Bernard, 1983). Some argue that women engage in violence for self-defense (Straus, 1980; Saunders, 1986), but this is contra-indicated by reports that women initiate violence as often as men do (Straus & Gelles, 1988). Regardless of the reciprocity of violence, society tends to view male violence as "less acceptable, more injurious (both physically and emotionally), and more criminal" than violence perpetrated by women (Bethke & DeJoy, 1993, p.47).

Violence between partners does not inevitably lead to the end of the relationship. Fifty percent of victims terminate a relationship after a violent incident (Makepeace, 1981; Roscoe & Benaske, 1985). Some explain the relatively low termination rate as a result of the couple's attitude toward violence. Some individuals who perpetrate and sustain violence do not consider the incidents as violent (Pirog-Good & Stets, 1989; Sonkin & Durphy, 1982). They may tend to idealize the dating relationship to the extent that the violence is disregarded.
Partner violent men are frequently described as using denial and minimization defensively (c.f. Dutton & Browning, 1988), and these defenses can serve to perpetuate violence (Walker, 1979). Some also interpret violence in a positive light. For example, Arias and Johnson (1989) report that one-third of their college sample viewed violence between intimate partners as an indication of love. For those relationships that are not terminated, episodes of violence are likely to reoccur and escalate in intensity (Laner, 1983; Roscoe & Benaske, 1985). Also, interestingly, adults in abusive relationships who do eventually divorce and remarry tend to repeat similar negative "behavioral patterns [i.e., physical violence] from previous marriage into remarriage" (Kalmuss & Seltzer, 1986, p. 118).

Past research has identified characteristics of men who hit their romantic partners. After reviewing 52 case-controlled studies, Hotaling and Sugarman (1986) have reported several consistent risk markers associated with partner violence. To be defined a consistent risk marker, the marker had to be measured in at least three separate studies with a significant association to partner violence in a predicted direction for at least 70% of the cases. Of thirty-eight variables, the following characteristics of partner violent men were identified as consistent risk markers: violence toward children, sexual abuse toward wives, and witnessing past parental abuse. As well, men who have been identified as partner violent have been found to have more alcohol-related problems, less assertiveness, lower income, and lower occupational status (Hotaling & Sugarman, 1986).

Despite some important similarities in the profiles of men who are physically abusive to their partners, men who hit are a heterogeneous group (Stith, Jester, & Bird, 1992; Hastings & Hamberger, 1991; Gondolf, 1988). Researchers suggest there may be several types of partner violent men. Some have divided
partner violent men into groups defined by frequency and severity of violent behavior, for example "hitters" (less frequent and less severe abuse) and "batterers" (more frequent and more severe) (Mott-McDonald, 1979). Partner violent men also have been categorized according to psychopathology or personality disorders (c.f. Holtzworth-Munroe & Stuart, 1994). For example, partner violent men have been classified into different character types based on descriptions of borderline, narcissistic/antisocial, and dependent/compulsive personality features (c.f. Hastings & Hamberger, 1988). Other typologies of partner violent men are based on the generality of violence, with some men violent only toward their wife and possibly their children, and others violent toward their family and also in relationships outside of the family (c.f. Holtzworth-Munroe & Stuart, 1994). Other differences appear when comparing partner violent men in treatment with partner violent men in the community. Hamberger and Hastings (1991) studied MCMI profiles, family of origin violence, and alcohol usage reporting that batterers in the community did not significantly differ from nonviolent men on the measures, but partner violent men in treatment did differ from the nonviolent men.

Violence Outside the Family

One in fourteen households in the United States during the year 1990 reported being victim to "crimes of high concern"; defined as violent crimes committed by strangers (U. S. Department of Justice Statistics, 1992). The National Crime Survey (United States Department of Justice Statistics, 1987) reports that 46% of cases of rape, robbery, and assault during 1982-1984 were crimes committed by total strangers, and an additional 11% were committed by persons the victims knew only by sight. Violent crime outside of the family,
 unlike violence within the family, is disproportionately perpetrated by men (Bartol & Bartol, 1986; Fagan & Wexler, 1987). And interestingly, most violent crimes committed by strangers (70%) are committed against men (United States Department of Justice, National Crime Survey, 1987).

Men who are violent outside of the family, or stranger violent, have rarely been studied in the college population despite the fact most criminal arrestees are young. Statistics indicate that arrests for robbery, burglary, and aggravated assault peak around age 20 and are drastically reduced for ages 30 and above (Blumstein & Cohen, 1987). One recent study (Dromgoole & Cogan, 1995), found a high incidence of involvement with severe stranger violence in a college population. Of thirty-nine percent of college men self-reporting commission of severe violence (ranging from kicked, bit, or hit with a fist to using a gun or knife), 88% admitted assaulting strangers in a conflict during the past year. In 2% of these stranger-violent interactions, the student reported threatening to use a gun or knife, and in an additional 2% the student reported having used a gun or knife.

Adolescent and adult men who are convicted of stranger violent acts have been characterized as young (Blumstein & Cohen, 1987) and nonwhite (Petersilia, Greenwood, & Lavin, 1978), being "weakly bonded" to school (Fagan, Piper, & Moore, 1986) with limited interpersonal skills (Cocozza & Hartstone, 1978). Sinclair and Chapman (1973) surveyed 1,009 prisoners concluding that prisoners present with different degrees of two problems. Younger prisoners tended to dislike authority and displayed impulsive aggression, and older prisoners tended to be socially isolated with difficulty forming interpersonal relationships (Sinclair & Chapman, 1973). Finally, like partner violent men, stranger violent men more often report childhood experiences involving physical violence (Groth & Birnbaum, 1979). However, while early childhood exposure to violence has
"demonstrable long-term consequences for delinquency, adult criminality, and
violent criminal behavior," the connection between antisocial violent behavior and
childhood victimization is not "inevitable" (Widom, 1989, p. 244).

Group Differences

Significant differences seem to exist between partner violent, stranger
violent, and panviolent men. Sheilds, McCall, and Hanneke (1988) described
family-only perpetrators (or partner violent) as more law abiding, having higher
occupational status, and as being less likely to have substance-abuse problems in
comparison to panviolent men and men violent exclusively outside the family.
Fagan, Stewart, and Hansen (1983) compared partner-only, stranger-only, and
panviolent men, and report that men who are violent both in and out of the home
are most likely to have prior court arrests. The panviolent men also use more
severe violent tactics, have the most drug and alcohol problems, and seem to be
less stable and less committed in relationships (Sheilds, McCall, & Hanneke,
1988).

Psychodynamics of Violence

With the abundance of male batterer typologies (c.f. Elbow, 1977; Hastings
& Hamberger, 1988; Gondolf, 1988; Holtzworth-Munroe & Stuart, 1994), it seems
clear that researchers have begun to recognize the importance of studying subtypes
of violent men, as opposed to nonviolent versus violent men. As previously
discussed, past research has focused on the personalities, criminal behaviors, and
the severity and generality of violence among the subtypes of batterers
(Holtzworth-Munroe & Stuart, 1994). Few, however, have investigated or noted
the importance of understanding the psychodynamics of these men. It seems likely
that some intrapsychic characteristic may differentiate violent and nonviolent men. These two groups of men are likely to differ in three areas; how they experience or mentally represent people, castration anxiety, and use of alcohol.

**Object Relations.** Object relations refers to a person's mental representations of him/herself, of other people, and also of the relationships between people. Object relation theorists assume that individual people experience relationships differently, both cognitively and affectively. People's interpersonal relationships differ depending on their ability to see others as unique and separate, the "affective coloring" of their world, their level of emotional investment in others, and their understanding of why other people think and act as they do (Westen, Barends, Leigh, Mendel, & Silbert, 1990). Higher levels of object relations have to do with more complex, more positive affective tone, more emotional investment in others, and more complex attributions about social causality (Westen, Barends et al., 1990). These underlying ideas about a person's self and world schema are important in understanding a person's interpersonal history.

Lundberg (1990) speaks to the importance of understanding the underlying dynamics of people in abusive relationships particularly for treatment planning. The current "male-perpetrator/female-victim" treatment models may fail to meet the needs of people in partner violent relationships. Kernberg (1989) states that the dominant assumption that treatment for couples in abusive relationships should focus on issues such as communication, "only touches the surface" of the conflicts without an understanding of the individuals' unconscious struggles. By neglecting intrapsychic dynamics, Lundberg (1990) also notes traditional programs are prevented from recognizing the individualistic nature of men's and women's
relationships. As result, some men and women in abusive relationships are likely to feel misunderstood and drop out of treatment (Lundberg, 1990).

Some has been written about the dynamics associated with partner violence. Several have suggested that internal deficiencies in object relations are likely to contribute in the expression of violence in interpersonal relationships (Lundberg, 1990; Young & Gersen, 1991). Comparing couples in abusive relationships beginning psychotherapy with a comparison sample of student couples in non-abusive relationships, Cogan and Porcerelli (1996) found more primitive levels of self and object representations in men and women in abusive relationships. They have reported more need-gratifying relations, less logical attributions, lower levels of differentiation of self and others, and more malevolent affect for individuals in abusive relationships. It seems likely, then, that men who are violent (towards partners or strangers) have impaired object relations as compared with nonviolent men.

In measuring object relations of both partner violent and stranger violent men, I predicted that violence is associated with impaired object relations, that is, nonviolent men will have the highest levels of object relations, selectively violent men will have intermediate levels, and the panviolent men will have the most impaired object relations. What is more puzzling, however, is what differentiates men who hit only their partners and men who hit only strangers. Differences in object relations cannot readily account for selective violence toward strangers or partners. Something else must be involved for a man to hit his partner. Since courtship and marriage involve intimate partnerships, some dynamic having to do with physical intimacy may be involved. Physical intimacy may be expected to activate ideas or schemas having to do with differences between men and women, and thus activate any important unconscious conflict about sex differences.
Castration Anxiety. In the psychoanalytic theory of psychosexual development, a child consolidates internalization of authority figures and parental values during the oedipal period (c.f. Tyson & Tyson, 1990). This is a time when a boy, heavily invested in or interested in his genitals, feels an attraction to the mother and a wish to displace (destroy) the father, his rival (c.f. Tyson & Tyson, 1990). The boy's fear of retaliation or castration by the father leads to resolution of the oedipal complex (Freud, 1927). The male child represses sexual feelings for the mother and identifies with the father, wanting to be like him. This resolution or internalization of the father's authority and morals allows the child to experience guilt and relates to the consolidation of the superego, a solid orientation to society's rules and reality (Salonen, 1987).

In adulthood when faced with male/female genital differences, the man reacts according to the degree he has internalized, through identification with the father, a solution to instinctual danger or castration anxiety. "The more fragile this identification matrix is, the greater the tendency of the castration shock to take on meanings of annihilation and early separation" (Salonen, 1987, p. 31). Developmentally, castration anxiety promotes separation from the mother. If in attempting to work through the oedipal period the child does not find a realistic solution, ties with reality (i.e., society's rules) may be diminished. Thus, denying the impossibility of oedipal wishes results in problems with superego or moral development, psychosis, and perversions (Salonen, 1987; Chasseguet-Smirgel, 1974).

Castration anxiety is a fundamental concept in psychoanalytic thought and may have relevance in understanding the psychodynamics of partner violent men. Kernberg (1995) has suggested "the predominant pathology interfering with a stable, fully gratifying relationship with a member of the opposite gender is
represented... by the incapacity to resolve oedipal conflicts with a full gender identity with the parental figure of the same gender" (p.55). Castration anxiety is a concept used by some clinicians to help understand something about people's fears and concerns about being powerless. It is also a concept that has been studied experimentally (c.f. Schwartz, 1955; 1956; Shill, 1981; Melamed & Berman, 1981; Clary & Tesser, 1984).

As noted, castration conflicts have a "developmental history...originating during the period of childhood sexuality" (Rangell, 1991, p. 3). Specifically, castration anxiety refers to the unconscious fears of something damaging the male's most "sensitive, prized organ" (i.e., penis; Fenichel, 1945). Castration anxiety is most likely to be manifested, not directly in its original (unconscious) form, but as more widespread reactions that involve concerns with injuries, losses, or invasion of any part of the body or possessions symbolically representing the body (Rangell, 1991). Concerns about power, potency, and physical endowment may be interpreted as indication of castration anxiety (Kirmayer, 1992). In addition, castration anxiety can manifest through individual concerns about sexual inadequacy and other feelings of personal inadequacy (Schwartz, 1955).

Castration anxiety may help differentiate between partner violent and stranger violent men. Partner violent men, by definition, are nonviolent toward strangers, while they are selectively violent toward partners with whom they share affectionate relations. Because intimate, male/female relationships involve recognition of genital differences, castration conflicts for partner violent men may be especially salient. I predicted that, because a man anxious about body integrity is likely to become more anxious in an adult-love relationship, partner violent men will have higher levels of castration anxiety (anxiety over bodily harm) than other men. To help clarify if castration anxiety is a helpful construct in differentiating
partner and stranger violent men, this study also investigated group differences on a general measure of anxiety and an indicator of psychopathology.

Alcohol. Finally, many have noted a relationship of alcohol use and partner violence (c.f. Hotaling & Sugarman, 1986; Rosenbaum & O'Leary, 1981; Kantor & Straus, 1987). Tolman and Bennett (1990) reviewed thirteen studies of partner violence and concluded half of all batterers presenting for treatment will have an alcohol problem. Others have reported partner-only violent men are not likely to have problems with substance abuse (Sheilds, McCall, & Hanneke, 1988). Past literature reports that panviolent men are the most likely to report seeking help, often due to court involvement, for alcohol-related problems, and stranger violent men are also likely to seek help for alcohol-related problems, again frequently directed by courts (Sheilds, McCall, & Hanneke, 1988). Typologies (c.f. Gondolf, 1988) present generally violent or panviolent men as most likely to have substance abuse problems. Guided by this past research, I predicted that stranger violence would have a stronger association with alcohol related problems compared to partner violence.
CHAPTER II
METHODS

Subjects

Subjects were recruited from a large group of general psychology students who participated in a mass-survey project. Student participation in the mass survey is voluntary and is one of several available alternatives for earning class credit.

Instruments

Conflict Tactics Scale (CTS). The CTS (Straus, 1979) is an 18-item, self-report questionnaire. It measures the frequencies of various behaviors used to resolve conflicts within the past year. The CTS's items are grouped into three subscales beginning with less violent conflict resolution strategies. The first subscale, reasoning, lists three items referring to discussing conflict situations. The second subscale, verbal aggression, includes six items involving verbal or nonverbal acts "symbolically" aimed at hurting another person during a conflict. The third, the violence subscale, is comprised of eight items describing physical acts of aggression. Of the eight items, the last five represent acts of severe violence ranging from "kicked, bit, or hit with a fist" to "used a gun or knife." The severe violence subscale described by Straus (1980) is an "index confined to acts with a high likelihood of causing an injury which needs medical treatment" (p. 684). It has been used in the past as an indicator of severe physical violence (Straus, 1980; Straus & Gelles, 1986) and has been validated by Kalmus and Straus (1982). Subjects are asked to indicate on a seven point scale (0 = never, 6 = 20 or more times) how often he engaged in each behavior. Two forms of the CTS
were used: the standard form (conflict tactics with a partner) and a form adapted to measure conflict tactics with strangers. The CTS is reported to be internally consistent (Straus, 1979) with high test-retest reliability reported at .83 for male-to-female violence (Straus, 1980). Validity has been assessed by comparing reports of husbands and wives and reports of children and parents (c.f. Straus, 1979; Jouriles & O'Leary, 1985).

**Thematic Apperception Test (TAT).** Ten cards from the TAT (Murray, 1943) were used: 1, 2, 3BM, 4, 8BM, 13MF, 14, 15, 18BM, and 20. Cards 2, 3BM, 4, 8BM, 13MF, 14, 18BM, and 20 were preselected according to Schwartz's (1955/1991) guidelines to maximize the variable castration anxiety. Cards 1, 2, 3BM, 4, 13MF, and 15 were selected according to Westen's guidelines (c.f. Westen, Ludolph, Block, et al., 1990; Westen, Ludolph, Lerner, et al., 1990). Cards were also selected with the future purpose of scoring the data for defense mechanisms.

**Object Relations and Social Cognition Scale (SCORS).** The SCORS (Westen, Barends et al., 1990) assesses four dimensions of object relations: Complexity of Representations of People, Affect-tone of Relationship Paradigms, Capacity for Emotional Investment in Relationships and Moral Standards, and Understanding of Social Causality. Complexity of Representations of People assesses how clearly one separates self from others; realizing self and others are multidimensional, with complex motives and subjective experiences (Westen, Barends et al., 1990). The Affect-tone of Relationship Paradigms assesses the overall "affective coloring" of the person's world, from malevolent to benevolent. The Capacity for Emotional Investment scale measures the degree to which others are treated as "ends rather than means." The fourth scale, Understanding Social Causality, measures how one understands the actions, thoughts, and feelings of
other people. Each of these dimensions (excluding Affect-tone of Relationship Paradigms) are conceptualized by developmental levels. For example, a level one response would be considered relatively primitive and level five would be considered more mature. Interrater reliability reports range from .80 to .95 (Westen, 1991). Using eight to ten TAT cards, Westen, Barends, et al. (1990; scoring manual) report internal consistency (Cronbach’s alpha) approximating .80. Validity of the SCORS has been established through findings of developmental changes across childhood, adolescence and adulthood (Westen, Klepser, Rutrins, Silverman, Lifton, & Boekamp, 1991) and through differences related to psychopathology (c.f Westen, Lohr, Silk, Gold, & Kreber, 1990; Porcerelli, Hill, & Dauphin, 1995). The measure uses TAT data for scoring and assessment of the different object relations dimensions. TAT data is particularly useful in assessing object relations and social cognition due to the social, interpersonal nature of the test (Westen, 1991).

**Schwartz's Castration Anxiety Scale (SCAS).** The SCAS (Schwartz, 1955) is a one dimensional scale using TAT responses to measure castration anxiety. The ten categories used to assess castration anxiety include: Genital injury or loss, Damage to or Loss of Other Parts of the Body, Damage to or Loss of Extensions of the Body Image, Sexual Inadequacy, Personal Inadequacy, General Repetitive Attempts at Mastery, Intrapsychic Threat, Extrapsychic Threat, Loss of Cathected Objects, and also formal characteristics of stories are scored. Schwartz's measure is derived from psychoanalytic theory, and has been experimentally validated differentiating castration anxiety from anxiety associated with loss of love and controls (Schwartz, 1955, 1956, 1991). Schwartz (1991) reports good interrater reliability at .80.
Minnesota Multiphasic Personality Inventory (MMPI-2). The MMPI-2 is a 567 item true/false personality inventory. The MMPI-2 is made up of ten clinical scales measuring psychopathology (hypochondriasis, depression, conversion hysteria, psychopathic deviate, masculinity-femininity, paranoia, psychasthenia, schizophrenia, hypomania, and social introversion). The inventory includes three validity scales measuring test taking attitude. The MMPI-2 also includes 15 supplementary scales designed to help interpret validity and the clinical scales, and 15 content scales assess symptomatology and negative treatment indicators (Greene, 1991). This study investigated three features of the MMPI-2: the supplementary scale MAC-R (to investigate alcohol-related problems), the content scale Anxiety (included to verify the specific nature of castration anxiety and to replicate Schwartz, 1955), and also to assess overall psychopathology the proportion of the number of elevations (T = 65 or more) on the clinical scales were calculated (to assess the possibility that castration anxiety reflects overall psychopathology). One scale, masculine-feminine, was excluded, because this scale does not indicate psychopathology (c.f. Greene, 1991)

Procedures

As part of a mass survey of students enrolled in an introductory psychology course, all participants completed a short demographic questionnaire, and two forms of the CTS (in counterbalanced order). Based on responses to the last five items (the severe violence subscale; items ranging from "kicked, bit, or hit with fist" to "used a gun or knife") on both forms of the CTS, the students were identified as violent or not to partners and violent or not to strangers (partner violent, stranger violent, and panviolent); or they were placed into the nonviolent
After subjects had been categorized according to the CTS, 15-17 single, white men between 17 and 31 years of age who had been in a partner relationship within the past year, were randomly selected from each group (the partner violence group was selected from a smaller pool of students as there are significantly less partner violence compared to stranger violence in a college population; c.f. Dromgoole & Cogan, 1995). The average age of the men was 19 years. Most were freshmen college students (68%), although there were some sophomores (24%), juniors (3%), and seniors (3%). See appendix B for levels of partner and stranger violence.

The men were first administered the MMPI-2. They then were administered the following TAT cards individually, according to standard manual procedure (with one exception, subjects were prompted one time only for missing elements of the stories): cards 1, 2, 3BM, 4, 8BM, 13MF, 14, 15, 18BM, and 20 (Murray, 1943). Following MMPI-2 and TAT administration, subjects were debriefed and dismissed.

After training in scoring technique (Westen, Barends, et al., 1990; Schwartz, 1991; scoring manuals), transcribed TAT protocols were coded for both measures. The SCORS was coded by four trained graduate students and the author of this study. I also administered the TAT. The SCAS was coded by two psychologists. All coders were blind to subjects' group membership. Joint coding was conducted on half of the protocols and coding was evenly split between the two coders for the remaining half. Due to inaudible tape recordings, six protocols could not be transcribed or scored. One additional TAT could not be scored due to incomplete stories, and two TAT profiles were not scored for castration anxiety.
because of coding error. Interrater reliability for the SCORS was: Complexity of Representations, $r = .70$, Emotional Investment, $r = .80$, Affect tone, $r = .88$ and Social Causality, $r = .76$. Interrater reliability for the SCAS was, $r = .90$.

The MMPI-2 data was computer scored, and six profiles were invalid based on $L > 65$, $F > 100$, or $K > 65$ (Greene, 1991). An additional four MMPI-2 profiles could not be scored due to incomplete data.

The SCORS data were analyzed with a two by two factorial multivariate analysis of variance (MANOVA) with partner violence and stranger violence as the factors. Follow-up analysis of variance tests (ANOVA) were run where appropriate. A two by two analysis of variance tests was also run using the total SCAS score as the dependent variable and partner violence and stranger violence as the factors. A second two by two factorial analysis of variance was run using partner and stranger violence again as the factors and the MAC-R scores from the MMPI-2 as the dependent variable. Also a two by two factorial analysis of variance was run with partner and stranger violence as the factors and the Anxiety content scale from the MMPI-2 as the dependent variable. A Chi-Square analysis was run with nonviolent, partner violent, stranger violent, and panviolent as groups and one or more elevations (at or above $T = 65$) on the clinical scales of the MMPI-2 as the dependent variable.
Differences Between Groups

Castration Anxiety. Analysis of variance tests showed that total scores of the SCAS differed as a function of the interaction of partner violence and stranger violence, \( F(1, 55) = 3.98, p = .05 \). Tests after F indicated that the partner-only violent group had significantly higher castration anxiety scores than the nonviolent, stranger-only violent, and the panviolent groups (see Table 1). Partner violence and stranger violence did not demonstrate reliable differences, \( F(1, 55) = 2.15, p < .14 \) and \( F(1, 55) = 1.89, p < .17 \), respectively.

MAC-R. An analysis of variance of scores on the MAC-R showed differences between groups as a function of stranger violence, \( F(3, 52) = 12.10, p < .001 \) (see Table 2). Partner violence and the partner by stranger violence interaction did not demonstrate reliable differences, \( F(3, 52) = .05, p = .82 \) and \( F(3, 52) = .93, p < .34 \), respectively.

Anxiety. An analysis of variance of scores on the Anxiety content scale of the MMPI-2 showed no reliable differences between groups. Stranger violence, \( F(3, 52) = .19, p = .66 \); partner violence, \( F(3, 52) = .92, p < .34 \); and the partner by stranger violence interaction, \( F(3, 52) = 1.42, p < .24 \) were all insignificant.

MMPI-2 Clinical Scale Elevations. A chi square analysis showed no differences between groups in the proportion of people with one or more elevations at or above \( T = 65 \) on the MMPI-2 clinical scales, chi-square (df3) = 1.72, \( p < .63 \).

Object Relations. Object relations scores differed as a function of partner violence, Wilks's lambda = .8971, \( F(4, 50) = 2.4324, p < .05 \). Follow-up analyses
of variance showed that affect tone differed as a function of partner violence, $F(1,56) = 5.73$, $p < .0202$, and tests after $F$ showed that partner violent men had more positive scores on affect tone than did men who were not partner violent. Partner only-violent men had significantly higher (i.e., more positive) scores than the nonviolent and stranger violent groups but did not significantly differ from the panviolent group (see Table 3). The ANOVA for complexity of representations showed no reliable differences for partner violence $F(1, 56) = 3.46$, $p < .0686$. The ANOVA's for emotional investment, $F(1, 56) = 2.77$, $p < .1017$, and social causality, $F(1, 56) = .92$, $p < .3409$, also demonstrated nonsignificance for the variable partner violence. Neither stranger violence nor the partner by stranger interaction were significant, Wilks's lambda = .9492, $F(4, 50) = .6696$, $p < .6161$ and Wilks's lambda = .8823, $F(4, 50) = 1.6681$, $p < .1721$, respectively.

Discriminating Between Groups

A linear discriminant function analysis was carried out using three variables as predictors of membership in four groups. Groups were nonviolence, partner violence, stranger violence, and panviolence. Predictors were castration anxiety scores, MAC-R scores, and scores on the affect dimension of the SCORS. Of the original 66 cases, 13 were dropped due to missing data, leaving 12 nonviolent, 14 partner violent, 16 stranger violent, and 12 panviolent. Of the nonviolent men 45% were classified correctly. Of the panviolent men 50%, of the partner violent men 58%, and of the stranger violent men 31% were classified correctly.
Table 1

Average total scores of castration anxiety

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nonviolent</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>16.92a</td>
<td>6.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partner V.</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>22.93b</td>
<td>5.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stranger V.</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>18.01a</td>
<td>7.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Panviolent</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>17.08a</td>
<td>5.20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Differences between groups: p = .05.
Table 2

Average MAC-R scores from MMPI-2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nonviolent</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>51.1a</td>
<td>12.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partner V.</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>48.9a</td>
<td>11.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stranger V.</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>58.5b</td>
<td>9.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Panviolent</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>62.0b</td>
<td>10.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Differences between groups: p < .001.
Table 3

Average scores on the Social Cognition and Object Relations Scale

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Affect</th>
<th>Investment</th>
<th>Social Causality</th>
<th>Complexity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>S.D.</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>S.D.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nonviolent</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>2.52a</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td>2.10</td>
<td>.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partner V.</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>2.76b</td>
<td>.29</td>
<td>2.30</td>
<td>.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stranger V.</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>2.55a</td>
<td>.37</td>
<td>2.08</td>
<td>.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Panviolent</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>2.70a</td>
<td>.30</td>
<td>2.24</td>
<td>.23</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Differences between groups: p < .02.
Castration Anxiety

In this study castration anxiety differentiated partner violent men from nonviolent, stranger violent, and panviolent men. Partner-only violent men reported more fears about castration anxiety than nonviolent, stranger violent, or panviolent men. This suggests that partner violent men have more concerns than other men about power, potency, and perhaps more concerns about what it means to be a man. Men having higher levels of castration anxiety may become anxious when in an intimate relationship, because at some level they are anxious about the physical differences between men and women. Shill (1981) reports that an awareness of sexual differences is one of the most "potent" exacerbating sources of castration anxiety. Thus, ideas about physical intimacy for some men may evoke unconscious or unresolved issues from early childhood, for example, issues having to do with fear of injury or losses. Partner violent men may experience intimate relationships with increasing fears of injury or loss. A man in an intimate relationship with a woman and who has worries about being damaged or powerless may react with anxiety and then with fear and anger. Worries about being powerless or being hurt stirred up by intimacy are likely to be directed at the intimate partner because her characteristics have been the proximal stimulus for the increased anxiety. This could help to explain why partner-only violent men hit their potential sexual partner and not other kinds of people.

Links between castration anxiety and partner violence here have been based on psychoanalytic theory and clinical observations. There are of course alternate ways of interpreting the data. However, interestingly, an indicator of
psychopathology and a general level of anxiety could not differentiate between groups, whereas, the variable castration anxiety could differentiate partner-only violent men from the other groups. This suggests that Schwartz's (1955) measure of castration anxiety is assessing something different than psychopathology (as measured by the proportion of elevated clinical scales on the MMPI-2) or general anxiety, and gives support to the construct castration anxiety. Schwartz (1955) also found that castration anxiety was not related to general anxiety.

Alcohol

Panviolent men, followed by stranger-only violent men, had the highest scores on the MAC-R. The panviolent and stranger violent men's scores were reliably higher than nonviolent and partner-only violent men's MAC-R scores. The panviolent and stranger violent men's average MAC-R scores were not quite in the clinically significant range, but do indicate that these men have greater tendencies toward substance abuse. Men with high scores on the MAC-R "are usually described as being antisocial with a tendency to act out" (Green 1991, p.192). The MAC-R is known to tap into characteristics of substance abusers such as impulsivity and risk taking (as cited in Greene, 1991). These results are similar to past research (c.f. Sheilds, McCall, & Hanneke, 1988) suggesting that panviolent men and stranger violent men are more likely to get drunk and get into fights or act out, while partner only violent men are less likely to have alcohol-related problems. It may be that the fifty percent of partner violent men in treatment with substance abuse problems, discussed by Tolman and Bennett (1991) for example, are panviolent men. Or it may be that partner violent men in treatment are different from a nonclinical sample of partner violent men.
Object Relations

The results of this study suggest that, unexpectedly, partner violent student men have more positive affect tone than nonviolent and stranger violent men. That is, partner violent men had higher levels of object relations, specifically affect tone, than the nonviolent men and the stranger violent men. Men who hit their partners viewed relationships more positively than the men who do not hit their partners. This finding is unexpected for several reasons. First not only does it seem intuitively incorrect, but also this finding is different from previous research (Cogan & Porcerelli, 1996). Cogan and Porcerelli (1996) studied abusive couples entering treatment and a comparison sample of nonabusive student couples and found object relations of the men and women in physically abusive relationships to be more primitive and malevolent than the object relations of the nonviolent couples. Cogan and Porcerelli (1996) were able to differentiate the nonviolent from the violent couples on all four dimensions of the SCORS. Here, opposite results for affect and partner violence were found. I was, further, not able to differentiate partner, stranger, panviolent, and nonviolent men on the other three dimensions (investment, social causality, or complexity) of the SCORS. These results may differ for several reasons. First, Cogan and Porcerelli (1996) were studying abusive couples beginning psychotherapy and comparing them to nonabusive students not in psychotherapy. It seems likely that there will be differences in the object relations of clinical versus nonclinical samples. People entering psychotherapy may either be different from others or may respond differently because of the dynamics involved in entering psychotherapy.

Interestingly, Hamberger and Hastings (1991) report "the types of conclusions drawn about batterer characteristics may be partially determined by the recruitment source" (p.145). Hamberger and Hastings (1991) investigation of
personality characteristics (using the MCMI) and family of origin differences with domestically violent men "officially identified" (i.e., referred for treatment and divided according to alcoholic or nonalcoholic traits) and maritally violent men identified through community sampling (not in treatment) found that community identified batterers did not differ from the nonviolent men on measures of personality or reported family of origin violence. However, the violent men in treatment did differ from the nonviolent control group on both measures of personality and family of origin violence. Hamberger and Hastings (1991) concluded, "the community-identified batterers appear quite dissimilar to the two agency-identified batterer groups, and very similar to the nonviolent controls" (p.143). Some researchers have concluded that batterers as a group are not different from nonviolent men as a group (c.f Pagelow, 1988 as cited in Hamberger & Hastings, 1991). This may help explain why Cogan and Porcerelli’s clinical sample had more primitive, malevolent objects relations compared to a nonclinical control sample; and why our nonclinical samples of nonviolent, partner violent, stranger violent, and panviolent men were not differentiated by object relations scores on three of the dimensions. This does not, however, explain why partner violent men scored higher or had more positive affective representations in our sample.

Partner violent men have been described as moody, emotionally labile (Hastings & Hamberger, 1988), intense, and impulsive (c.f. Dutton, 1995). Intensity of feeling may be what is being picked up by Westen's measure in combination with partner violent men's tendencies for denial. Partner violent men have frequently been described as using denial and minimization defensively (c.f. Sonkin, 1988; Dutton & Browning, 1988; Walker, 1979). This may be particularly true for partner violent men not participating in therapy, such as in this nonclinical
sample. Walker's cycle of violence (1979) demonstrates how the cycle of violence is perpetuated through defenses such as denial and projection.

Summary

Object relations and castration anxiety have to do with intrapsychic processes. This study attempted to explore the ways that intrapsychic dynamics affect interpersonal relations. The findings on castration anxiety suggest that men who are only violent to an intimate partner experience themselves and the world differently than other men. That is, they have more fears or concerns about being harmed or inadequate. Object relations also suggest something about the inner experiences of the men in this study. Unexpectedly, the results suggest that object relations are not largely different for partner and stranger violence, except in regard to affect tone. These findings may help clinicians guide their work with perpetrators of violence. Understanding intrapsychic dynamics allows for more accurate interpretations and a better understanding of the dynamics between the clinician and patient. The findings here may suggest that partner violent men tend to be more defensive and more fearful about being hurt than other violent men.

Alcohol use also seems to have implications for understanding a person's internal world. For example, a person may be using substances like alcohol to help cope with difficult or painful feelings. Here the results suggest there is a connection between stranger violence and tendencies toward substance abuse, and this is useful information for clinicians. It also may be helpful for clinicians to ask partner violent men about violence with strangers, as this may alert them to potential tendencies toward substance abuse.
Limitations and Future Research

These findings about castration anxiety and object relations and partner violence are new, and it will be important to have future attempts to replicate these results perhaps using different kinds of projective data such as clinical interviews or Rorschach responses. This study investigated a small nonclinical sample, and the small sample size is one important limitation in the study. It would be interesting to attempt replication of the castration anxiety results with a larger, clinical sample as this has never been done, and basic differences in clinical and nonclinical samples of violent men have been noted. Interestingly, findings related to alcohol and stranger violent men (including panviolent men) seem to hold even with a nonclinical sample. It seems there is more to learn about partner and stranger violent men who have not been clinically identified. And it is important for researchers to not only look at differences in the subtypes of violent men, but also to look at differences between the men in treatment and other violent men in the community.

What continues to be puzzling here is what differentiates stranger violent from panviolent men besides hitting or not hitting a partner. In this study stranger violent and panviolent men were not reliably differentiated on any of the measures. This replicates Shields, McCall, and Hanneke's (1988) finding that stranger-only violent men are "indistinguishable" from generally violent (or panviolent) men. This will be an important area to explore in future research. Efforts at understanding the psychodynamics of these violent men are useful, because intrapsychic processes are closely intertwined with interpersonal relations, and understanding these psychodynamics allows clinicians to develop better treatment models for men involved in violent relations.
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APPENDIX A
EXTENDED LITERATURE REVIEW

Partner Violent Men

For the past twenty years many have attempted to understand what makes someone hit their intimate partner. Clinical descriptions of men who hit their partners have been developed by many. Conflicts leading to physical violence are often regarding minor or unspoken issues. Besides the acts of violence, wives often describe these men as "good" husbands, and the typical batterer is likely to be a married man in his twenties or early thirties and is likely to have watched his father hit his mother (Shupe, Stacey, & Hazelwood, 1987).

Some describe the batterer as a Dr. Jeckle/ Mr. Hyde (Bernard & Bernard, 1984) of sorts. They describe the male batterer as moody, emotionally labile (Hastings & Hamburger, 1988), intense, and impulsive (c.f. Dutton, 1995). Violent men have been characterized as poor communicators, unassertive, and jealous (c.f. Elbow, 1977; Gondolph, 1988). Some have problems with alcohol (c.f. Makepeace, 1981).

Some have explained men's violence as a product of traditional male sex role socialization or patriarchal values (c.f. Sugarman & Frankel, 1996; Johnson, 1995; Smith, 1990). Some have described perpetrators of partner violence as motivated by a basic belief or “right to control their women” (Johnson, 1995, p.284). However, this is questionable when looking at perpetrators' responses to violence (Dutton & Browning, 1988). They are described as externalizing blame for their violence (c.f. Shupe et al., 1987; Elbow, 1977) and denying or minimizing their violence (c.f. Sonkin, 1988; Shupe et al., 1987). This suggests that the
violent man is aware his behavior is not socially acceptable (Dutton & Browning, 1988).

Understanding who hits their partner has interested many because of the damaging effects on families. The following paragraphs look at the current empirical literature that characterizes these partner violent men.

Demographics

**Age.** Although "wife beating" occurs in every age group (Straus, 1976), partner violence, as well as, violence in general (Blumstein & Cohen, 1987) is most prevalent with younger males. Shupe et al. (1987) studied male perpetrators of partner violence by compiling data over a four-year period from three Texas counseling programs. In all three treatment programs the men had been physically violent with acts ranging from throwing objects, kicking, choking, and battering pregnant women. The ages of 714 male batterers ranged from 18 to 73 years. Despite the range of ages, most of the partner violent men were young (averaging 29 years). In Kandel-Englader's (1992) national community survey of 2,291 men, ages of batterers also ranged from 18 to 79 years with the mean age of 35.5 years. Others have agreed the typical male batterer is often in his thirties or younger (Fagan, Stewart, & Hansen, 1983). "Youthfulness" may be one important factor in physical violence, because it is a time of high stress (i.e., less job security, more adjustments with marriage and children) (Shupe et al., 1987).

However, many researchers like Straus (1976) point out that partner violence is not committed just by the young. Some suggest older men may be less likely to present for counseling or have wives who present to shelters (where data is often gathered), because of traditional attitudes and resistance to change (Shupe et al., 1987). These kinds of suggestions may help explain why meta-analyses
yield mixed findings associating age and partner violence. For example, Hotaling and Sugarman (1986) identified risk markers of husband-to-wife violence by comparing the findings of 52 studies in which there was a violent and a control group. They identified "markers" by four categories: consistent risk, inconsistent risk, consistent nonrisk, and risk with inconclusive data. A risk marker was defined as "an attribute or characteristic that is associated with an increased probability to... the use of husband to wife violence" (p.102). Violence was defined as "the use of physical force or restraint carried out with the intention of causing physical pain or injury to another person...excluding marital rape" (p.103). Comparing the results of nine studies in which age was a variable, age was found to be an inconsistent risk marker of partner violence.

**Education.** While batterers are found at all educational levels, many researchers conclude that the typical batterer is often not educated beyond high school. Fagan et al. (1983) report 74% of their sample of 270 victims of domestic violence report their violent partners were not educated beyond high school. In eight out of ten studies, Hotaling and Sugarman (1986) found a negative relationship between educational level and the use of violence toward a partner. They note, however, that the two most representative studies included did not support this finding. For example, no relationship was found between education and partner violence in Hornung, McCullough, and Sugimoto's (1981) study. Straus et al.'s national survey (1980) suggested a curvilinear relationship with high school educated men reporting higher rates of partner violence than men with more or less education.

There are likely to be educational differences among partner violent men as a group. Shupe et al. (1987) compared partner violent men in counseling with other partner violent men. Eight out of ten men in counseling for battering had a
high school education or above, compared to six out of ten partner violent men not in counseling. They also compared court-ordered partner violent men in treatment with partner violent men in treatment voluntarily. Court-ordered men (43.8%) were less likely to have completed a high school education (Shupe et al., 1987).

**Occupational Status and Income.** Occupational status and income have also been investigated. Unemployment rates have been reported to be double among partner violent men in comparison to national rates of unemployment (Shupe et al., 1987). Fagan et al. (1983) also found 30% of their sample of batterers was unemployed when interviewed for their study. In Hotaling and Sugarman's (1986) review of the domestic violence literature, both lower occupational status and lower income were identified as consistent risk markers for partner violence. Three of out four studies looked at by Hotaling and Sugarman (1986) showed a negative relationship between income and partner violence. Four studies of occupational status (Gelles, 1972; Peterson, 1980; Steinmetz, 1977; Straus et al., 1980) also report a negative relationship between occupational status and partner violence.

**Race.** Investigations of race and partner violence have produced mixed conclusions. Some have concluded the typical male battered is "as likely to be white as nonwhite" (White & Koss, 1991; Fagan et al., 1983, p.51). Racial differences have appeared when severity of violence is investigated. For example, Rouse (1988) compared black, white, and Hispanic students' use of violence in dating relationships. Eight hundred eighty-five student respondents (64 black, 34 Hispanic, 130 randomly selected white) attending a Southwestern urban university were given a 25-item questionnaire asking about violence. Moderate physical abuse (including pushing, punching, or hitting with an object) was reported most frequently by the black students and least frequently by Hispanic students.
McLaughlin, Leonard, and Senchak (1992) found similar results investigating premarital aggression among 625 newlywed couples. Controlling for SES and using eight items from the Conflict Tactic Scale (Straus, 1979), they found black husbands (29%) were more likely to report moderate premarital aggression (defined as slapping) compared to white husbands (12%). No significant differences between white (19%) and black (23%) husbands' reports of mild aggression (defined as pushing, grabbing, or shoving) were found. Cazenave and Straus (1990) explain differences of violence between whites and blacks could be due to factors such as discrimination and other stressors.

**Stress.** The relationship between stress and partner violence provides mixed results (c.f. Hotaling & Sugarman, 1986). This is due in part to related research on key variables, such as number of children in the family, also providing inconsistent data (Hotaling & Sugarman, 1986). General stressors are not likely to be a direct cause of battering, however the empirical literature is mixed (review by Tolman and Bennett, 1990). Rather than causing violence, stress may instead be one component affecting the likelihood of violent interactions (Shupe et al., 1987).

Stress may increase the likelihood of partner violence (Straus, 1980). Many researchers have considered this topic of study with mixed results. Most have looked at negative stress in relation to partner violence. Barling and Rosenbaum (1986) report that abusive husbands report the most stress with work and a greater impact of stress when compared to husbands that are nonviolent, distressed, or maritally satisfied. MacEwen and Barling (1988) found opposite results in their study of working couples. They report work stress and life stress are not predictive of abuse.
Makepeace (1983) studied the impact of positive in addition to negative stressors on the frequency of dating violence. His sample of 244 college students completed the Conflict Tactics Scale (Straus, 1979) and the Student Life Events Schedule. "Undesirable" stress correlated with increased partner violence, and "desirable" stress correlated with decreased partner violence (Straus, 1979). Marshall and Rose (1990) also investigated the impact of positive stress on premarital violence. They had 579 undergraduate students (205 male) complete the Life Experience Survey (Sarason, Johnson, & Seigel, 1978), thirteen items of the Student Life Events Schedule (Makepeace, 1983), and the Conflict Tactics Scale (Straus, 1979). Only positive stress contributed to the expression of aggression with men (Marshall & Rose, 1990). Marshall and Rose (1990) propose that differences in their results and Makepeace's (1983) results could have to do with who rates the valence of the stressor. In Makepeace's (1983) study, he assigned the valences, where Marshall and Rose had the student respondents rate the valences of stressors.

Substance Abuse. Alcoholism has been strongly associated with marital discord and partner violence (Rosenbaum & O'Leary, 1981). Tolman and Bennett (1990) reviewed 13 studies and concluded that approximately half of batterers coming for treatment will also have an alcohol abuse problem. Kantor and Straus (1987) studied a national sample of 5,159 families, and reported that "excessive drinking is associated with higher wife abuse rates, but alcohol use is not an immediate antecedent of violence in the majority of families" (p.213). Chronic alcohol abuse, not acute intoxication is predictive of partner violence (Tolman & Bennett, 1990). Hotaling and Sugarman (1986) also concluded alcohol usage is positively (in eight of nine studies reviewed) correlated with partner violence.
Alcohol usage has been defined a consistent risk marker for partner violence (Hotaling & Sugarman, 1986).

Hamberger and Hastings (1991) compared alcoholic batterers, nonalcoholic batterers, and control groups. The alcoholic batterers had the highest MCMI elevations when matched for age and education compared to nonalcoholic batterers and a control group (Hamberger & Hastings, 1991). Others report that alcoholic batterers are more likely to have antisocial or sociopathic personality when compared with other batterers (Tolman & Bennett, 1990).

Few have investigated other drug usage and partner violence. One study by Fagan, Stewart, and Hansen (1983) interviewed 270 domestic violence victims and reported drugs (other than alcohol) are a problem for approximately one-fourth of batterers.

**Self esteem and Jealousy.** Goldstein and Rosenbaum (1985) investigated self esteem and partner violence. They looked at three groups of men: 20 abusive husbands (who had minimally slapped their wife), 18 nonviolent husbands, and 20 satisfactorily married husbands. The men in the abusive husbands' group scored significantly lower on measures of self esteem than men in the other two groups (with variance due to social desirability and marital discord factored out). Abusive husbands also tended to perceive their wife's behavior as threatening to their self esteem (Goldstein & Rosenbaum, 1985). Goldstein and Rosenbaum (1985) report the directionality of their results are unclear. Low self esteem could be a factor in abusing one's wife or abusing one's wife could damage self esteem (Goldstein & Rosenbaum, 1985). Hotaling and Sugarman's (1986) review reported self esteem to be an inconsistent risk marker in husband-to-wife violence. In 60% of the five studies they reviewed, there was a negative relationship between partner violence and self esteem.
Shupe et al. (1987) suggest a combination of emotional dependence on others and feelings of personal insecurity are two important characteristics of partner violent men. Partner violent men in their sample depend on others but do not trust them, nor do they feel they have control in relationships. Two-thirds of their sample of partner violent men endorsed the questionnaire item, "People would take advantage of you if you let them." One out of four report "feeling bothered by easily hurt feelings." One-fourth report feeling "trapped," and an addition one-fourth report "others are to blame for most of your problems."

Frequently partner violent men are described as jealous. Eight out of ten female partners of male batterers in a treatment program, described their partners as "overly suspicious" (Shupe et al., 1987), and 80% further report their husbands try to "control" what they do. The men are also described by their female partners as isolated, and 80% of the men in this sample were not involved in civic organizations or other similar activities (Shupe et al., 1987).

Dutton and Browning (1988) address what they call intimacy anxieties, which includes jealousy. Jealousy may be a key "mediating factor" in violence (Dutton & Browning, 1988). Sexual jealousy may be indicative of "chronic abandonment anxiety" (i.e., jealousy indicates a fear of losing a relationship), and abusive men react strongly to abandonment compared to other nonviolent men (Dutton & Browning, 1988). Dutton and Browning (1988) suggest that abandonment anxiety is evident in what Walker (1979) describes as the "battering cycle." Following an "acute battering phase" the abusive male often experiences guilt, remorse, and fear that the partner will leave. They will promise their partner they will never harm her again. They attempt to convince her to stay or return to them. They may obsess over her, or watch her every move. This phase demonstrates the strong dependency needs of the batterer. Dutton and Browning
(1988) conducted a study using abandonment scenarios on videotapes. Their subjects consisted of three groups, each of eighteen men. One group, physically aggressive, consisted of men referred to a therapy group for physically assaulting a spouse. Group two, verbally abusive, consisted of men who were in treatment for marital conflict, but were not physically abusive. The third group of men were recruited from a newspaper advertisement. All three groups viewed videotapes that showed varying degrees of intimacy between a heterosexual couple (i.e., abandonment- woman moves away from the man, engulfment- woman moves closer to the man, and neutral- no movement). The partner violent men reported significantly more anger in response to abandonment scenes than men in the other two groups. In addition the partner violent men reported significantly greater anger in response to the abandonment scenes than other conflicted scenes without abandonment as a threat.

Communication Skills/ Assertiveness. In Shupe et al.'s (1987) four-year investigation of partner violent men across three treatment programs, they concluded that partner violent men did not communicate their needs or frustrations appropriately. One in four of the partner violent men in the Austin diversion program endorsed the item, "Feeling others do not understand you;" however, no data from a nonviolent treatment group are included for comparison (Shupe et al., 1987). The female partners of these men also describe them as poor communicators. They report the men did not make clear what they expected from others; they could not except their wife being angered, and they showed little interest in others' (i.e., the wives') viewpoints (Shupe et al., 1987).

Rosenbaum and O'Leary (1981) investigated partner violent men's ability to communicate assertively. They used two measures of assertion; one specific to communicating with wives and one was more general. Partner violent men were
significantly less assertive with their wives than nonviolent husbands (Rosenbaum & O'Leary, 1981).

Social Learning/ Witnessing and Experiencing Physical Abuse. Social learning theory suggests that violence is a learned behavior, and there have been many studies investigating the relationship of violence learned through direct experience in one's family of origin and violence learned through witnessing role models' (parents) being violent (c.f. Sack, Keller, & Howard, 1982). Several have reported a strong connection between being a "victim and a victimizer" (c.f. Sack et al., 1986; Deal & Wampler, 1986). Many such as Gelles (1972) have noted that even techniques of violence in the family are passed through generations.

Worth, Matthews, and Coleman (1990) investigated family background and courtship violence. One hundred nine university students similar in age, marital status and living arrangements were placed into a nonabusive group or an abusive (defined as throwing an object at a partner to kicking or hitting a partner) group. Fifty-four percent of the abusive group recalled parental violence at least once during childhood compared to only thirty-one percent of the nonabusive group (Worth et al., 1990). Laner and Thompson (1982) also looked at the relationship between experiencing violence in the family of origin and later experiencing courtship violence. Of 371 single university student respondents, those who experienced childhood violence were more likely to experience courtship violence (60% of the women and 67% of the men; Laner & Thompson, 1982). Fagan et al. (1983) conducted 270 interviews with domestic violence victims from family violence programs. The victims' reports indicated 57% of the batterers' childhood homes included some form of domestic violence (either victims of child abuse or witness to spouse abuse). Caesar (1988) studied 26 wife abusers in therapy and 18 nonviolent married men in therapy. Wife abusers were more likely to have been
abused in their family of origin, more likely to have witnessed their fathers hit their mothers, and more likely to have been disciplined by corporal punishment compared to the nonviolent men (Caesar, 1988). Kalmuss (1984) used the National Survey data (Straus et al., 1980) and concluded both observation of domestic violence and being victimized in the family of origin are predictive of use of aggression as an adult. She reported that, in comparison with being a victim of violence in childhood, there is a stronger relationship between witnessing spousal violence and use of aggression in adulthood.

Witnessing parental violence as a child or adolescent has been strongly associated with violence toward wives in adulthood (c.f. Hotaling & Sugarman, 1986). Witnessing parental violence in childhood was reported to be a consistent risk marker of husband-to-wife violence in Hotaling and Sugarman's 1986 review of sixteen studies. However, being abused as a child was found to be related but an inconsistent predictor in male batterers after reviewing thirteen studies (Hotaling & Sugarman, 1986).

Domestic violence has been thought of as a vicious cycle. Many have concluded that men who abuse their wives are also likely to abuse their children (c.f. Straus et al., 1980). Violence toward children was reported as a consistent risk marker of partner violence by Hotaling and Sugarman (1986).

The impact of spousal abuse in childhood has been investigated. Children who witness spousal abuse begin to show signs early of poor communication, ineffective problem solving, and low self esteem (Mayhall & Norgard, 1983). These characteristics have all been associated with partner violent men. Children who witness domestic violence develop more behavioral problems in comparison to children whose parents are not violent (Rosenbaum & O'Leary, 1981). Suh and Mazur Abel (1990) studied 258 children (via interviews with the children's
motors) in a battered women's shelter hypothesizing these children are at increased risk of being abused and of behavioral problems. Sixty-seven percent of the children had been "hurt" by their parents (Suh & Mazur Abel, 1990). Ninety percent had been spanked. Of the 90% who were spanked, half reported being "hit often." The children, who were exposed to and recipients of domestic violence, were at greater risk of behavioral problems (45% fought with siblings, 47% fought with others, and 33% fought with parents; Suh & Mazur Abel, 1990).

Psychopathology, Affects, and Personality

Psychopathology. Many clinicians have associated partner violence with psychopathology. For example, Bland and Orn (1986) report a strong association between partner violence and psychopathology. They conducted standardized clinical interviews (Diagnostic Interview Schedule, DSM III) with 1200 randomly selected Canadians from a large urban city. Fifty-four percent of the violent individuals (70% of the violent men) in their sample had one or more psychiatric diagnoses compared to 15% of the nonviolent individuals in the sample. Also of the men in the sample with psychiatric diagnoses, 52% were involved in violent behavior. Violence behavior was defined as hitting or throwing things at a partner.

Depression. Depression has often been related to violence. One-third of Bland and Orn's (1986) sample with recurrent depression (defined by DSM III) reported involvement with violence. Lifetime prevalence rates of suicide for this population was 1.8 percent. Of those who attempted suicide, over half were involved in one of three forms of violence (hitting spouse, child, or fights with strangers). If alcoholism is combined with depression, antisocial disorder or both, 80% to 93% were also involved in violence (Bland & Orn, 1986). Ganley and
Harris (1978; as cited in Maiuro, Cahn, Vitaliano, Wagner, & Zegree, 1988) also report high incidence of depression and suicide in the batterer population.

Rosenbaum and Bennett (1986) suggest that dysphoric mood in combination with "personal injury" (such as fear of infidelity) leads to violent behavior. Feelings of hopelessness and depression are common among partner violent men (Tolman & Bennett, 1990). From clinical experience, Tolman and Bennett (1990) suggest that when partner violent men feel "threatened" they increase attempts to control their partners leading them into Walker's (1979) cycle of violence.

In a study of 129 men presenting for treatment, partner violent men reported significantly higher incidence of depression compared to generally assaultive, mixed assaultive, and nonviolent men (Maiuro et al., 1988). Hamburger and Hastings (1991) studied MCMI protocol of batterers in treatment, batterers in the general community, and nonviolent men. They found no significant differences in the depression scale of the MCMI between nonviolent men and batterers in the community. However, there were significant differences between batterers in treatment and nonviolent men. Some have suggested that it is the consequences of battering, not battering itself that lead to depression and dysphoric affect (Tolman & Bennett, 1990).

**Anger.** Some suggest that anger is the most important precursor of partner violence (Gondolph, 1985). Partner violent men report and are often described as angry or having a "temper." Maiuro et al. (1988) report that the partner violent men in their study evidenced higher levels of anger and hostility than nonviolent men. Shupe et al. (1987) had partner violent men in the Austin Diversion Program fill out a Psychological Self Inventory. Approximately half of the men reported being "irritable or easily annoyed." Approximately half of the men also reported
feeling "tense" or having "urges to break or smash things." Seventy percent reported "temper outbursts they could not control" or having "frequent arguments."

Ryan (1995) conducted two studies with 385 college men. In both studies she found men who are aggressive with a dating partner (defined by the last eight items on the Conflict Tactics Scale) are more likely to report "mood swings" or a "quick temper" when compared to nonviolent dating men.

**Typologies.** Many have described batterers as a heterogeneous group and typologies have developed typologies to better understand these men. Elbow (1977) was one of the first to develop a typology of partner violent men. She identified four types of partner violent men from clinical observations. The approval seeker experiences depression and needs approval from his wife. He feels bad about himself and uses violence to increase his self-esteem. The defender is dependent on his wife and overprotective of her. He is afraid of being "harmed" and attempts to decrease his anxiety by controlling his wife so that she is completely dependent on him. The incorporator views his wife as an extension of himself. He needs his wife to help define himself. He tends to be manipulative and is likely to use alcohol or other drugs. The controller sees his wife as an object. He views his wife, as well as people in general, as a "means to an end." He attempts to control and isolate his wife and uses violence to exert control.

Caesar (1986) used clinical interviews and MMPI scores of 26 batterers to classify them. The nonexposed altruist is unassertive. He tries to please his wife and not express anger. He is dependent on his wife and is conflicted about this dependency. The exposed rescuer has histrionic features. He has difficulty expressing feelings of resentment. He wants his wife to be dependent on him. The tyrant has psychopathic and paranoid features. He is hostile, tries to control
his wife through fear and psychological abuse, and shows little remorse for his violence.

In a study investigating relationship functioning, sixty-nine college men reported on measures of relationship negotiation styles and coping strategies (Stith, Jester, & Bird, 1992). Four clusters of physically violent men were derived based on the following variables: severity of violence, degree of emotional and verbal abuse, self-esteem, mastery, and length of relationship). The four clusters were labeled: secure lovers, stable minimizers, hostile pursuers, and hostile, disengaged types. The first group, secure lovers, reported the most satisfactory relationships with the least conflict and rare use of physical violence. They had highest levels of self esteem and mastery indicating less psychological problems. Stable minimizers also reported infrequent physical violence, but only moderate levels of relationship functioning (defined as love and conflict). These couples had the longest relationships. Hostile pursuers reported more moderate use of physical violence, a high level of concern with maintenance of the relationship, and the highest levels of conflict in the relationship. The fourth group, hostile-disengaged, reported most frequent and most severe physical violence having the most problematic relationships.

Hastings and Hamberger (1988; Hamberger & Hastings, 1991) have also created a typology of batterers. They divided male batterers attending a treatment program into three character structures based on MCMI protocols. Factor analysis of the men's protocols identified three character groups: schizoid/borderline, narcissistic/antisocial, and dependent/compulsive. The schizoid/borderline group is described as anxious, depressed, moody, asocial, often withdrawn, and hypersensitive to perceived "interpersonal slights." They may be volatile and overreact. The narcissistic/antisocial group is described as self-centered.
individuals who use others to meet their needs. The narcissistic/antisocial character type is self centered and feels entitled to be treated well. They are most likely to respond with aggression and threats if their values, perceptions, and needs are not met by others. This group tended to use drugs and alcohol. The third group, dependent/compulsive, are described as tense, rigid and passive individuals. This type of batterer lacks self-esteem and has strong dependency needs. These men may become hostile if their "needs" are not met.

Gondolf (1988) identified types of batterers based on the reports of 525 women entering Texas shelters. Gondolf used six variables for cluster analysis (amount of physical violence, verbal abuse, degree of remorse after abuse, substance abuse, generality of violence, and previous arrests). Three types of batterers were identified: sociopathic, antisocial, and typical. The sociopathic group, consisting of 5% to 8% of his sample, is most severely violent, and these perpetrators are likely to have been arrested for a variety of offences (such as, drug/alcohol offenses). They are most likely to have substance abuse problems. These men are likely to abuse their children and physically and sexually abuse their wives. Their assaults are more likely to involve weapons. The antisocial group, 30% to 42 %, is also extremely abusive to their wife and possibly children. They are also likely to be involved in extramarital violence. But they are not as likely to have been arrested as the sociopathic batterers. The typical group, 52%, are less extensively and severely violent. They are least likely to engage in child abuse or sexual abuse of a wife. They are most likely to be apologetic and have victims return to them.

Holtzworth-Munroe and Stuart (1994) proposed a typology of partner violent men based on a review of the literature. They report three descriptive dimensions have been consistently used to differentiate batterers (severity of
violence, generality of violence, and psychopathology). Based on these variables, they divide batterers into three groups: family only batterers, dysphoric/borderline, and generally violent/antisocial. They describe the family only batterers to engage in less severe violence within the family. They are least likely to sexually or psychologically abuse their wife. They are not likely to engage in violence outside the family or have arrests. They are not likely to evidence psychopathology. If they have characteristics of a personality disorder, it is most likely to be related to dependent personality disorder. Holtzworth-Munroe and Stuart (1994) believe this type of batterer could comprise fifty percent of all batterers, especially considering batterers in the community versus those in treatment only. The second type of batterer, dysphoric/borderline, could make up to 25% of partner violent men. They are described as sexually and psychologically abusive to a wife. They are moderately to severely physically abusive to a wife. Their violence is primarily targeted at the family, but may include some extramarital violence and/or arrests. They are described as the most psychologically distressed with dysphoric affect. They may have drug and alcohol related problems. They may exhibit symptoms of borderline or schizotypal personality disorders. The third group of partner violent men, generally violent/antisocial, are sexually, psychologically, and physically abusive. Their abuse is moderate to severe. They are likely to engage in violence outside the family and have criminal records. They are likely to have drug and alcohol problems. They are likely to exhibit antisocial personality characteristics. Holtzworth-Munroe and Stuart (1994) estimate this group to comprise 25% of batterers.

**Personality Disorders.** Many have associated partner violence with personality disorders. For example, Hamburger and Hastings (1991) studied
personality characteristics of partner violent men. Their study looked at 38 partner violent men with alcohol problems referred for treatment, 61 partner violent men without alcohol problems referred for treatment, 28 partner violent men from a community sample, and a group of nonviolent controls. They predicted batterers would have higher MCMI elevations on the subscales Asocial, Avoidant, Negativistic, and Borderline. Alcoholic batterers had the highest elevations and nonalcoholic batterers had "moderate" elevations. The partner violent men from the community sample (i.e., not in treatment) did not significantly differ from the nonviolent controls. They concluded, "not all batterers look alike." They report in their sample alcoholic batterers reported the most severe psychopathology and were most different from controls. They described the alcoholic batterers as alienated, unpredictable, and volatile. The nonalcoholic batterers were described as less vindictive. They were described as struggling with impulses in light of moral constrictions. The community batterers were not significantly different from nonviolent controls. Hamburger and Hastings (1991) suggested that the community batterers had socioeconomic advantages the other groups of batterers did not, and that differences clearly exist between "identified" batterers and those not yet identified.

Dutton (1995) has described partner violent men as having a borderline personality organization, a less severe form of borderline personality disorder. Dutton describes a group of partner violent men who "repeatedly" attack their intimate partners. Dutton (1995) describes these men as affected by "mood swings" or violence precipitated by internal instead of external events. He sees these men as "enraged" by their intimate attachments. This group of batterers Dutton estimates is 40% of partner violent men.
Other Violent Men

Domestic and nondomestic male violence has been studied since the 1970's. Two literatures on interpersonal violence have developed separately (c.f. Shields, McCall, & Hanneke, 1988; Fagan & Wexler, 1987). The family violence literature has investigated domestic violence or partner violent men. Criminology has investigated nondomestic violence or "street violence" which includes panviolent and stranger violent men. Interestingly, these two literatures have rarely been integrated. Criminology often relies on arrest rates or interviews with randomly selected households for study. In the past criminology or law enforcement has had difficulty prosecuting domestic assaults. This seems in part due to victims, as well as others, viewing domestic assaults in noncriminal terms (Dutton, 1988). Despite this, Shields et al. (1988) note that the two literatures historically have minimized any similarities between domestic violence and other kinds of interpersonal violence. Thus the "overlap" of domestic and nondomestic violence is more recently being investigated.

Panviolent Men

Some men, called panviolent, hit their intimate partners and others. Some have called them "generally violent" or violent in and outside of the family. These men comprise a small percentage, 10%, of men self-reporting violence in a national community survey (Kandel-Englander, 1992). In a sample of single college men, 11.9% self reported panviolent behaviors (Dromgoole & Cogan, 1995). In Kandel-Englander's survey 51.5% of the panviolent sample were non-White, and 71% were blue collar workers.

Fagan et al. (1983) suggest that there is a relationship between the severity of violence inside the home or toward a partner and involvement with
"extramarital" violence. Both the frequency of partner violence and the severity are predictive of general violence (Fagan et al., 1983). Men who use the most frequent and severe violent tactics with partners are often violent in other relationships (Fagan et al., 1983). In a study of 270 victims of domestic violence, violence toward a pregnant woman was predictive of panviolent behavior (Fagan et al., 1983). Men who physically abuse a pregnant partner are almost four times more likely to be panviolent as opposed to being violent only with a partner (Fagan et al., 1983).

Panviolent men are typically described as younger and involved in shorter relationships compared to other violent men (Fagan et al., 1983). These men have been described as having more criminal behaviors (Fagan et al., 1983), having more alcohol and drug problems, and using the most severe violence (Sheilds et al., 1988) when compared to other violent men.

Shields et al. (1988) interviewed 85 married or cohabitating men who were referred to the study by a variety of social service agencies. All of the participants in the study had been physically violent with an adult during their marriage or time living with a partner. The men were categorized into one of three groups: family only, nonfamily only, or generally violent. The family only group included violence toward any family member, not just partners. The generally violent men had the greatest number of "targets" compared to the other two groups. And considering family violence, the generally violent men were violent with a significantly greater number of family members than the family only group. The generally violent men used approximately the same level of violence toward family and nonfamily members. For example, severity of violence was similar with a wife or a stranger.
Generally violent men are likely to become involved in an "illegal, deviant lifestyle" compared to other violent men (Shields et al., 1988). Generally violent men report using illegal drugs most frequently (41% of the time) compared to nonfamily only and family only violent men (Shields et al., 1988). The generally violent men report feeling justified for their use of violence, in contrast to the family only men (Sheilds et al., 1988). They also report feeling the most positive about their use of violence when compared to nonfamily only and family only violent men (Sheilds et al., 1988). In this sample generally violent men were more likely to have been arrested and involved with crime for profit. They were most likely to gamble with large sums of money (Sheilds et al., 1988). Generally violent men reported less commitment in their romantic relationships and the least stability in relationships (measured by the number of marriages or live in relationships) compared to other violent men (Sheilds et al., 1988).

As with partner-only violence, panviolence is associated with experiencing physical abuse as a child. Fagan et al. (1983) report that in their sample 67% of panviolent men reportedly had a history of physical abuse in childhood, compared to 46% of partner-only violent men. In contrast, Sheilds et al. (1988) found "family only" violent men were most likely to have physically abusive fathers compared to "nonfamily only" and generally violent men. Sheilds et al. (1988) suggest sampling differences may contribute to this inconsistency. Fagan et al.'s (1983) data is from wives' reports and Sheilds et al.'s (1988) data is via the men's self reports.

Typologies of panviolent men have been described previously. They include Elbow's (1977) controllers, Stith et al.'s (1992) hostile disengaged type, Hastings and Hamberger's (1988) narcissistic/antisocial type, Gondolf's (1988)
sociopathic/antisocial, and Holtzworth and Munroe's (1994) generally violent/antisocial type.

**Stranger Violent Men**

One type of man, violent only outside the family, is called stranger violent. One in fourteen households in the United States in 1990 reported being victim to violent crimes committed by strangers (U.S. Department of Justice, 1992). In a national community survey (Kandel-England, 1992) 33% of men self-reporting violence were violent only to strangers. In a recent study of violence in the college population, 22.5% of single men in a relationship (during the past year) reported severe stranger violence occurring within the past year (Dromgoole, & Cogan, 1995). In over one-third of stranger violent acts recorded by the U.S. Department of Justice (1987) a weapon is involved. One-fourth of stranger violent crimes result in injury (U.S. Department of Justice, 1987).

Violent crime committed against strangers is almost always perpetrated by men (c.f. Fagan & Wexler, 1987) toward other men (U.S. Department of Justice, 1987). Adolescent and adult men who commit stranger violent acts have been described as nonwhite (Petersilia, Greenwood, & Lavin, 1978), being "weakly bonded" to school (Fagan, Piper, & Moore, 1986), and with limited interpersonal skills (Cocozza & Hartsone, 1978). The typical stranger violent man is young between 20 and 25 years (U.S. Department of Justice, 1996).

As noted, acts of stranger violence are most common among younger men. Limentani (1985) reports that half of those indited for offenses in England are between 10 and 21 years. Interestingly, this rate of arrest is more than double the proportion of this age group in the general population (as cited in Limentani, 1985). He reports that one in five boys in England will be convicted for a variety
of criminal offenses including violence. He reports most "criminal careers" end in the late twenties. Limentani (1985) suggests that, "the problem derives from the delicate nature of the developmental phases of prepuberty, puberty, and adolescence" (p.384).

Past studies on the male "career criminal" report that age of onset of juvenile criminal behaviors and the extent and history of crime are the strongest predictors of adult criminality (Blumstein, Farrington, & Moitra, 1985). Farrington (1989) conducted a longitudinal study of adolescent aggression and adult violence. His study investigated the lives of 411 males (ages 8 to 32 years) and concluded the best predictors of aggression and violence are: economic deprivation, family criminality, poor child rearing, school failure, hyperactivity/impulsivity, and antisocial childhood behavior. Generally, he concluded predictors of aggression and violence are similar to the predictors of antisocial behavior.

Fagan and Wexler (1987) further emphasize that "regarding both stranger and family violence, exposure to violence as a child is an important precursor of adult violence" (p.9). Straus (1979) found that college students exposed to violence among parents were three times more likely, than students not exposed to childhood violence, to hit a stranger. In a study of 1,575 child victims of abuse and neglect, the United States Department of Justice statistics (1996) show children with a history of abuse are significantly more likely to be arrested for violent crime than children without a history of abuse. This study also reported a difference in arrests by race. They suggest that "abuse and neglect appeared to magnify preexisting disparities between the races. Black individuals who had been abused or neglected as children were being arrested at a much higher rate
than white individuals with the same background" (U.S. Department of Justice, 1996, p.2).

Various clinical descriptions and explanations of stranger violent men have been developed. Sinclair and Chapman (1973) developed a typology of criminals based on a survey of 1,009 prisoners. Seven types of prisoners were identified. The occasional delinquent is under 30 years, has less than three convictions, may commit crimes under the influence of alcohol, and generally does not live off of crime but may take part in crime if opportunity presents. The late delinquent is under 30 years and has less than three convictions, but began his criminal career after 25 years. They often have employable skills. The professional delinquent is less than 30 years and has more than three convictions. They live off of criminal activities preferring crime to employment. The plan their criminal activities and are not likely to engage in crime under the influence of alcohol. The aggressive delinquent is under 30 years with more than three convictions. These offenders are not likely to plan crime, but instead are impulsive with violent temperaments. They are likely to come from families where alcohol consumption, instability, and violence are acceptable. Offenders with skilled employment status are over 30 years and often are imprisoned for alcohol related offenses or debt. The socially integrated unskilled offender is over 30 years and likely to have a family. Crime often is an attempt to solve financial problems. They are least likely to offend again. The final type, the social inadequate, is over 30 years employed in unskilled labor and unlikely to have ties to family or work. Sinclair and Chapman (1973) concluded from their typology that prisoners present with different degrees of two problems. Younger prisoners tended to dislike authority and displayed impulsive aggression. Older prisoners tended to be socially isolated with difficulty forming interpersonal relationships.
Mahnquist (1971) investigated proneness to homicide in juveniles. He studied twenty adolescents charged with some form of murder (murder of a stranger). He identified several factors occurring just prior to murder. The juveniles experienced behavioral changes defined as shifts in mood or cognition. They showed a sense of "deep pessimism" and reduced ability to function in relationships with others. A call for help often occurred (to a family often in denial about an adolescent's problems or to police). Drugs usage was common and increased prior to violent acts. Object loss, feelings of rejection, or threats to one's manhood precipitated the violence. Finally, Mahnquist (1971) reports increased somatization (i.e., headaches, physical aches, sometimes delusions that an organ was diseased) and an emotional crescendo (pacing, restlessness, agitation) preceded murder. Mahnquist (1971) describes these adolescents as extremely self-depreciatory, feeling hopeless and helpless. He suggests murder often follows a blow or insult leaving the attacker feeling unrepairable. He describes a "breaking point" (i.e., violence) that follows loss or an accumulation of disappointment. His clinical work leads him to believe, "the homicide can serve the illusory function of saving one's self ... by displacing onto someone else the focus for aggressive discharge. It may be a last desperate effort to survive" (p.465).

Sohn (1995) described an unprovoked assault as an incident when a stranger assaults an innocent person that he has never met, often in a public, crowded place. Her clinical descriptions of stranger violent men are based on ten case studies of men in a medium security forensic hospital. She suggests, while apparently random, in these kinds of assaults the victim and the attacker can be "tied together" in the attacker's mind.

Sohn's patients presented with psychotic thinking. Some were diagnosed as schizophrenic. She describes the patients' attacks on strangers as their attempts to
"cure themselves." These are people who often live in a fantasy world. She suggests that these patients cannot tolerate feeling of intense dysphoria. However, they inevitably would experience dysphoric feelings and experience them as "depressive intrusions" into their fantasy world. The patients would then project the feelings onto someone else by the act of physical violence. The victim would become the "split off" part of the attacker's self. The strangers these patients attacked were often viewed as "totally free of any sign of misery" (p.567) and experienced as "careless" to the patient's state of mind or pain. Physical attacks were often preceded by some sort of loss (i.e., suicide of friend, losing shelter). Sohn describes the attacker as showing no remorse for these attacks. She summarizes her experiences with stranger violent patients by writing, "in response to loss, they all found what they believed to be, and later denied, a non-depressed, 'non-caring' person who became a 'suitable victim.' Prior to their assault, each of them felt that an unprovoked attacked had taken place within himself, and following their responses to such an inner assault, even felt themselves to be honorably restored" (p.574).

Sheilds et al. (1988) investigated stranger violent men or "nonfamily only" violent men in comparison to "family only" and generally violent men. In many respects they found nonfamily-only violent men to be indistinguishable from generally violent men. Both groups held violent attitudes and involved themselves in a deviant often unlawful lifestyle. Nonfamily-only violent men (3.35) followed generally violent men (5.33) in the greatest number of targets with family only averaging 2.62. Nonfamily-only violent men reported using illegal drugs 33% of the time compared to generally violent men (41%) and family-only violent men (13%). Like generally violent men, nonfamily-only violent men believed their use of violence was justified and they held positive attitudes about violence. The
generally violent men and nonfamily only-violent men were equally likely to be arrested, and the family-only violent men were unlikely to be arrested. Both the generally violent and nonfamily-only men were approximately equally likely to support themselves by illegal means. Like generally violent men, nonfamily-only were more likely than family-only to be involved in gambling. Compared to family-only men, the nonfamily-only violent men were similar to the generally violent men, less committed and stable in relationships.

**Psychodynamics of Violence**

There are many approaches to studying violent perpetrators. Here my interest lies in understanding the psychodynamics of violent men. Intrapsychic processes and interpersonal relations are closely related, and thus understanding psychodynamics can help clinicians develop better treatment models.

**Object Relations**

Object relations have to do with an "individual's thoughts and feelings about people," oneself, and relationships between people (Westen, 1991). People with impaired object relations have been described as having unstable interpersonal relationships (for example, issues with trust, separation, inaccurate attributions, or malevolent expectations). Perpetrators of violence too, have been described as unstable and explosive in interpersonal relations. Understanding more about the object relations of violent men may aide in prevention and development of better treatment programs.

Ideas about people (objects) and relationships (object relations) develop as an infant progresses through different phases of attachment and individuation. This early development is mediated by relations with caregivers (c.f. Greenberg &
Mitchell, 1983). Kernberg's (1976) developmental model of object relations, for example, consists of three components: an object image (for example, mother), an image of the self, and an affective tone or emotional valence surrounding object interactions (for example, between self and mother). Kernberg emphasizes the importance of the child's development and internalization of self representation and object representations. The internalization of self and object representations, together with an affect linking the two, becomes the foundation for later object representations (enduring views of self and others) and psychic structure.

According to Kernberg (1976), object relations develops through four stages. In the first and second stages, the child does not differentiate self from others and images of self are merged with images of others in the child's mental representations. During stage three the child differentiates self from others, but has two, opposing sets of object representations. One set is good, and one is bad. The child's representations are separated into images of a "good, compliant self-image who is in a positive, loving relation to a warm, giving, good mother-image, and a bad self-image in a hateful tie to a depriving or rejecting, bad mother-image" (Gillman, 1980, p. 348). In the fourth stage of Kernberg's (1976) developmental model, these representations of good and bad are integrated, and a whole, more realistic self and object (both with good and bad features) can be mentally represented.

There are important developmental differences in one's attainment of the four levels of object relations. For example, different defense mechanisms seem to develop at the different stages (A. Freud, 1936/1988; Kernberg, 1975). In stage three, splitting is the main defensive structure and serves to reduce the anxiety that bad representations will overcome the good. This is also the common defense mechanism among borderline character structures. The adult who at times
experiences him/herself as all good or all bad may reduce anxiety by projecting problematic representations of the self onto others. For example, to keep good and bad separate, the positive representations at times may be projected onto a partner and the bad introjected onto the self, or vice versa. Kernberg (1980) refers to this process as projective identification.

In love relationships, Kernberg (1995) describes an "unconscious collusion" of the couple, whereby conflicted, internalized object relations are reenacted. Kernberg (1989) suggests that romantic partners "tend to induce in the other the characteristics of the past oedipal and/or preoedipal object (early relationship with the parents) with whom they experienced conflicts" (p.50). There is a "reprojection" of the parental representation onto the romantic partner (Kernberg, 1995). "Ultimately, the fate of the 'marital object' seems remarkably dependent upon the child's relation with the 'maternal object'; that is, with the child's developmental capacity for clearly distinguishing and then integrating 'good' and 'bad' mother images" (Calogeras, 1985). These kind of dynamics between partners become more prominent as emotional intimacy develops in adult relationships (Kernberg, 1989). Thus for people in abusive relationships, early childhood experiences may be models from which partners reenact conflicts. Both partners in an abusive relationship may be repeating the same conflicts or types of conflicts that they experienced in their childhood history (Levinson, 1994).

Castration Anxiety

Castration anxiety is a concept that may be helpful in understanding a particular kind of violent man, a man who hits his intimate partner. Involvement in a potentially sexual relationship with a woman may exacerbate castration anxiety because of an awareness of genital differences. A man who hits his
partner, specifically, may have serious concerns about what it means to be a man and fears about being harmed. Castration clinically has remained an important construct for many (c.f. Rangell, 1991; Salonen, 1987; Schwartz, 1991), and many clinicians continue to think about difficulties patients present with as preoedipal or oedipal in nature. Rangell (1991) agrees with Freud that castration anxiety is "one of the two major anxieties in human life" the other being separation anxiety (p.4). He suggests that castration anxiety has "lasting applicability," but has been "obscured" due to "changing fashions" (for example, Rangell notes that clinicians focus more on separation anxiety and therapeutic emphases today are more preoedipal) and psychoanalytic clinicians' lack of empirical work (Rangell, 1991, p.5).

Some empirical studies of Freud's theory castration have been carried out since 1954. Schwartz (1955) developed a measure of castration anxiety based on TAT protocols and was able to experimentally differentiate between subjects exposed to castration anxiety-evoking stimuli, subjects exposed to stimuli evoking anxiety over loss of love, and a control group. Also using this measure and in accordance with Freud's theory, Schwartz (1956) reported men evidence more castration anxiety than women. Schwartz (1956) also differentiated overt homosexual men's protocols from comparable heterosexual men's protocols, with the homosexual men, as predicted, higher in castration anxiety. The experimental manipulations did not change general anxiety. Using Schwartz's scoring method, Shill (1981) compared 28 father-absent males with 103 father-present males and found significantly higher levels of castration anxiety in the father-present men, thus suggesting the importance of the father in boys' mastery of castration anxiety. Some psychoanalytic thinkers have suggested that oedipal dynamics are "central in the psychologically significance in the game of chess" (Melamed & Berman, 1981,
Some suggest the motive in chess is patricide (Jones, 1931), with the king representing both the boy's phallus and the father "cut down" to the boy's size (Fine, 1956) and the queen symbolic of the woman/mother figure (Fine, 1956). In a study of 26 adolescent boys who played chess and 26 non-chess playing boys of the same age, Melamed and Berman (1981) hypothesized the chess players would express greater frequencies of oedipal motives. Using a composite index measuring: jealousy regarding the father's relationship with the mother, castration anxiety, and aggression in the father-son relationship, their hypothesis was confirmed. The boys who regularly played chess scored significantly higher than the control group in expression of jealousy toward the father and castration anxiety.

Other studies have investigated castration anxiety and its relation with fear of death. Theoretically, men high in castration anxiety experience fear of bodily injury and ultimately displace this fear of bodily harm into a fear of death (c.f. Clary & Tesser, 1984). Some have suggested that sexual arousal makes these fears more notable for men with high castration anxiety and manifests as increased fear of death (Sarnoff & Corwin, 1959). Clary and Tesser (1984) predicted a correlation between castration anxiety and fear of death after exposure to sexually-provocative stimuli finding only a weak and nonsignificant relationship (r = .16). In another study of dream content, Hall and Van de Castle (1964) hypothesized that men's dreams involve more expression of castration anxiety, and women's dreams involve more expression of castration wishes and penis envy. "Men dream of what might happen, whereas, women dream of what they think has happened" (Hall & Van de Castle, 1964, p.26). Derived from Freud's theory, criteria for castration anxiety in dreams included: "actual or threatened loss or injury to the dreamer's body, actual or threatened damage or loss of an object or animal
belonging to the dreamer, the dreamer's inability to use his penis or other objects with phallic qualities, and when a man dreams he is a woman or changes into a woman or wears a woman's clothes" (Hall & Van de Castle, 1964, p.22). Their hypothesis was clearly confirmed with men having more dreams than women of castration anxiety and women having more dreams of castration wishes and penis envy.
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## APPENDIX B: LEVELS OF VIOLENCE

Table 4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Conflict Tactic Scale item</th>
<th>Partner Only</th>
<th>Violent Men</th>
<th>Panviolent</th>
<th>Men</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>14. Kicked, bit, or hit with a fist</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Hit or tried to hit with something</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Beat up the other one</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>66%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Threatened with a gun or knife</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Used a gun or knife</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 5

Levels of Stranger Violence

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Conflict Tactic Scale items:</th>
<th>Stranger Only</th>
<th>Panviolent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>14. Kicked, bit, or hit with a fist</td>
<td>94%</td>
<td>80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Hit or tried to hit with something</td>
<td>82%</td>
<td>73%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Beat up the other one</td>
<td>76%</td>
<td>66%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Threatened with a gun or knife</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Used a gun or knife</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### APPENDIX C: CORRELATION ANALYSIS

Table 6

Correlations Between Measures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>CAST</th>
<th>INV</th>
<th>AFF</th>
<th>COM</th>
<th>SOC</th>
<th>MAC-R</th>
<th>ANX</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CAST</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>-0.2893</td>
<td>0.2826</td>
<td>0.0967</td>
<td>0.0284</td>
<td>0.1923</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INV</td>
<td>-0.0793</td>
<td>0.5649</td>
<td>0.0322</td>
<td>0.0366</td>
<td>0.4825</td>
<td>0.8416</td>
<td>0.1721</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AFF</td>
<td>-0.2893</td>
<td>0.3464</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>0.1393</td>
<td>0.3033</td>
<td>-0.0996</td>
<td>-0.0140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COM</td>
<td>0.2826</td>
<td>0.3868</td>
<td>0.1393</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>0.6182</td>
<td>-0.1104</td>
<td>0.0284</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOC</td>
<td>0.0967</td>
<td>0.6014</td>
<td>0.3033</td>
<td>0.6182</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>-0.1818</td>
<td>-0.0909</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAC-R</td>
<td>0.0284</td>
<td>-0.0559</td>
<td>-0.0996</td>
<td>-0.1104</td>
<td>-0.1818</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>0.1429</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ANX</td>
<td>0.1923</td>
<td>-0.1221</td>
<td>-0.0140</td>
<td>0.0284</td>
<td>-0.0909</td>
<td>0.1429</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

82