2013

Causes and consequences of conflict : exploring the influence of honor-based norms and values on the experience of intimate partner violence in the United States

Michelle Elaine Pence
Louisiana State University and Agricultural and Mechanical College

CAUSES AND CONSEQUENCES OF CONFLICT: EXPLORING THE INFLUENCE OF HONOR-BASED NORMS AND VALUES ON THE EXPERIENCE OF INTIMATE PARTNER VIOLENCE IN THE UNITED STATES

A Dissertation

Submitted to the Graduate Faculty of the
Louisiana State University and
Agricultural and Mechanical College
in partial fulfillment of the
requirements for the degree of
Doctor of Philosophy

in

The Department of Communication Studies

by
Michelle E. Pence
B.A., University of Missouri- Kansas City, 2005
M.A., University of Missouri- St. Louis, 2007
August 2013

I don't know where Fathers go when they die. I have an idea that after a rest-wherever it is- he won't be happy unless there's work to do. He won't just sit on a cloud and wait for the woman he loved and the children she bore. He'll be busy there, too, repairing the streets, oiling the gates, improving things. Smoothing the way.
~ Anon.

I dedicate the completion of my doctorate to my grandfather, Tom Smith, who died on October 9, 2011, just a year and a half short of seeing me complete my education. My grandfather, who remains the hardest working person I've ever met, was a stoic man who took pride in his family, his city (Kansas City, Missouri), and his service to this country during World War II. He was also proud of me and my education, and was indeed one of my biggest fans. He deserves my thanks as well as this dedication, because in the midst of my traversing through "the dark side," I knew the "light" through his example of what a good man is and does. I miss him constantly and hope he will always be proud of me.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

There is absolutely no way I could have made it to this point, completing my dissertation, without support. To all the people that have been in my corner, I owe my deepest thanks. First and foremost, to my committee, James Honeycutt, Graham Bodie, and James Garand. You have no idea what it means to me that you never gave up on me; never quit. Your hard work and dedication were shining examples for me along this journey, and I will be eternally grateful.

There are members of my family which deserve special mention. To my sister, Melinda. In the hardest times, you were the person who made my escapes possible. Without your support, I would not have been able to have the good experiences and create the positive memories that kept me afloat throughout these last several years. Truly, if anyone is responsible for my sanity and grace, it is you. Thank you is simply not enough. To my parents, Gary and Kathleen Pence. Thank you for supporting me after I took the fellowship; I could not have stayed in my home without your help. That stability was probably the only way I was able to finish this project in a year. And to my mom- my "friends" thank you also! Dissertation writing has been a busy time for them, also! To my cousins, Patrick, Lisa, Courtney, and Chris- your humor, compassion, enthusiasm, and support put a smile on my face. Thank you for the memories.

There have been a handful of friends who have been there for all of it, my youth, my struggles, and now my achievement. To my best friend and savior, Mark Boyer. You saw potential in me at fourteen years old, and you never lost faith in me, even when I lost faith in myself. I will never understand why I get to be the luckiest girl in the entire world, to have you as a devoted best friend. If I go forward from here and live my life with half the humor, grace, and integrity that you have, I will be truly accomplished. To my dearest, oldest friends- Jaime Kunce and Sarah Rastogi. Thank you for being loyal. I truly love you both—thank you for

always standing behind my decisions. Get ready, it's my turn to repay visits! And finally, to Rocky Sluder- thank you for calling me every single Saturday night. I should have answered more often, but know what it meant to me to just see your call and know I have a loyal friend.

There are several people I met during my time in Baton Rouge who became my soundboards, the sources of my sanity. First, to Donna and Lisa- you both know I would have been lost without you! Second, to Danielle McGeough, Ryan McGeough, Michael Sanders, Rya Butterfield, and Marina Cohen. I spent four years under an incredible amount of stress and hundreds of miles from friends or family. You became my surrogate family, loyal and kind and forgiving. Thank you for supporting me throughout this last stage of my education. And to Megan Cunningham: Thank you for showing me what true strength looks like, and keeping me inspired on this journey.

There are a few people who I've come across while on this amazing journey who deserve my many thanks. To Jon Distel- you are my most interesting man in the world! Thank you for always believing in me, for making me feel smart enough to do this but interesting enough to stand out from the others that do. To Kami Silk- thank you always reassuring me, for helping me maintain some level of sanity! To James "Pepper" Rutland: No one knows everything that I went through in these last six months- except you. For better or worse, it was you who got the unfiltered, uncensored, unapologetic, most real and raw side of me. Thank you for that freedom, and for taking an eccentric, tattooed, and emotional girl and making her feel like she was the one worth a million bucks. Your strength, character, and generosity continue to humble me. Finally, to N.N., M.B., and J.R.: "We are the choices that we have made and our lives remain forever changed by those who would move us closer to a greater truth." Thank you for the truth, past, present, and future.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

ABSTRACT

The three studies in this dissertation were posed with the common goal of revealing possible explanations for variations in the causes and consequences of interpersonal violence across regional cultures of the United States. Study 1 posed and tested two hypotheses related to the distribution of male-perpetrated intimate partner homicide across regions of the United States. The South and West, two regions characterized in full (the South) or in part (the West) by honor cultures, emerged as the regions with the highest rates of argument- and conflict-related, male-on-female intimate partner homicides in single victim/single offender incidents.

Explanations provided at the individual level for cross-regional variation in the experience of severe intimate partner violence were explored in Studies 2 and 3, which had two goals. One, to determine whether the common pattern of mutual IPV in violent couples holds within the male-dominated, characteristically more violent honor cultures of the United States. Second, to determine if certain honor-based norms and values, which have been previously linked to male violence in honor cultures (Vandello, Cohen, and Ransom, 2008), can also help explain the higher rates of IPV perpetrated by women in honor cultures.

Two hypotheses related to differences between honor and nonhonor cultures in severity of violence attributed to certain reasons or circumstances failed to receive support in Study 3, as well as the more general hypothesis predicting males in honor cultures will perpetrate more severe forms of IPV than males from nonhonor cultures. Results testing the final hypothesis revealed that an interaction effect between self-reported honor culture identification and subjective honor/nonhonor designation is a significant predictor of the severity of IPV victimization experienced by females. Additional findings from this analysis revealed that as severity of perpetrated tactics increased, the severity of tactics experienced as a victim also

increased significantly; this finding is consistent with previous research on the mutual nature of IPV in violent couples.

A number of future directions for interpersonal and intercultural research are suggested.

CHAPTER ONE
INTRODUCTION

How can I be substantial if I fail to cast a shadow?
I must have a dark side also if I am to be whole; and in as much as I become conscious of my shadow, I also remember that I am a human being like any other.
~Carl Jung

In the United States, more than three women and one man are killed every day at the hands of their partners (Domestic violence statistics, 2012). Approximately 1 in 4 women and 1 in 7 men reported some lifetime intimate partner violence victimization, and more than 2 million injuries related to intimate partner violence (IPV) are reported annually in the United States (Brieding, Black, & Ryan, 2008). Estimates of the cost of violence in the United States reach 3.3% of the gross domestic product (World Health Organization; Waters et al., 2004). For intimate partner violence specifically, the estimates of cost vary within the billions, with one estimate at $5.8 billion (Brieding et al., 2008) and another at $67 billion (Schafer, Caetano, & Clark, 1998). While reports on rates of intimate partner violence perpetration and victimization within the United States vary widely and are dependent on the definition of IPV used by those analyzing the data (i.e., what acts are considered as violent) and methods of data collection, there is no doubt that IPV is a major public health concern (Breiding et al., 2008).

A large corpus of research has focused on predicting the occurrence of intimate partner violence by defining broad characteristics of a population with higher rates of interpersonal violence and determining certain "risk factors" for IPV, such as rates of unemployment (Campbell et al., 2003a; Jewkes, 2002) and access to certain resources, such as education (Breiding et al., 2008; Campbell et al., 2003a). However, these background or risk factors are commonly addressed in the literature in a way that subsumes their presence without actually assessing individual's perceptions of such factors (Flynn & Graham, 2010).

For example, Breiding, Black, and Ryan (2008) conducted one of the few large-scale studies which examined IPV prevalence in the United States. Their analysis included eighteen states, and used data from the 2005 Behavioral Risk Factor Surveillance System (BRFSS) survey. Breiding et al. (2008) noted that a strength of their study was in providing state-specific lifetime IPV prevalence estimates; however, the authors failed to differentiate by state their analyses of more proximal population variables (e.g., race, age, and education). Essentially, Breiding et al. (2008) found that state-specific IPV prevalence estimates covered a wide range, from 19.5% to 35% for women and 11% to 23.1% for men (p. 114), and variation in IPV prevalence rates by racial/ethnic group, income, age, and education (for both men and women) (p. 117), but the authors failed to provide results for how the proximal variables vary by state in relation to each state's rate of IPV. By aggregating the data for proximal variables, Breiding et al. (2008) essentially stated that IPV prevalence is a state-specific phenomenon (i.e., significant differences across states), but treated their additional data (i.e., race, income, and age) as coming from one sample.

This error- subsuming heterogeneity and ascribing certain characteristics as "risk factors" (e.g., race) in the absence of individual-level data- is not unique to the analysis conducted by Breiding et al. (2008). In fact, the presence of this error in much of the literature on intimate partner violence in the United States served as the catalyst for the research conducted in this dissertation, and provided the initial question: What is the explanation for differing rates and severity of intimate partner violence across the United States, and can the differences be explained by examining more proximal indicators from individual-level data? This dissertation aims to contribute to the answer to that question.

The goal of this project is to apply a regional culture perspective to the examination of variations in the causes and consequences of intimate partner violence across states and regions of the U.S. This goal follows the main principle of conflict theory, which states that conflict is an inevitable part of all human, social interaction, whereas violence to deal with such conflict is not (Straus et al., 1996). Indeed, lower rates of violence in certain regions of the United States may not necessarily be reflective of fewer conflicts; rather, the tactics to manage conflict may vary as a function of the different cultures and populations across regions of the U.S. As Newton, Connelly, and Landsvery (2001) stated, conflict can be considered a "quest for personal interests occurring at all levels of social functioning." As such, this dissertation examines intimate partner conflict at various levels, including national and individual.

Specifically, this dissertation examines reasons given for the occurrence of IPV (both perpetration and victimization) and consequences of IPV (i.e., level of injury) as stated by a sample of men and women drawn locally and nationally. By examining individual-level data from both men and women in a non-clinical and non-incarcerated sample, this dissertation is modeled in agreement with a conclusion drawn by Dutton (2006): That the "true tragedy" in the literature on intimate partner violence is in simplifying the complexity of human intimate relationships by reducing them to universal scripts, thus ignoring painful personal histories, current frustrations, and ascribing no meaningful inner life to intimate partnerships.

The following sections present a brief overview of the terms used within this dissertation, and provide information on the aspects of intimate partner violence (IPV) which will be addressed in the studies constituting this dissertation. Specifically, the two dominant perspectives taken by researchers studying IPV are reviewed in the following sections, including

variations between these perspectives regarding the causes and consequences of intimate partner violence. Following this review, a series of studies is proposed.

Variations in Previous Research on Intimate Partner Violence

Definitions of IPV. Part of the considerable variation in reports of intimate partner violence is due to the numerous and often vastly different definitions used by those collecting, analyzing, and/or presenting data. The definition of intimate partner violence used by researchers determines in a given study what acts are considered as IPV (e.g., psychological abuse, physical abuse, and/or sexual abuse), and who is considered an intimate partner (e.g., dating partners as well as married partners; previous relationships as well as current ones; hetero- and homo- sexual relationships). This has allowed for considerable variation in the statistics on IPV perpetration and victimization.

The definition of intimate partner violence used in this dissertation is intentionally broad, allowing potential participants to not be excluded from analyses for certain predetermined reasons. Intimate partner violence is defined herein as behaviors in intimate relationships that cause physical, sexual, or psychological harm, including physical aggression, sexual coercion, psychological abuse, and controlling behaviors (WHO, Violence against women, 2011). Intimate partner includes a current or former intimate partner, defined as a spouse, ex-spouse, common law spouse, current or former boyfriend or girlfriend, dating partner, or date (Saltzman, Fanslow, McMahon, & Shelley, 2002). This dissertation uses the terms psychological abuse, psychological aggression, emotional abuse, and communicative aggression interchangeably, as the variation in their definitions is not significant across the body of literature on intimate partner violence.[1] However, while the various terms for nonphysical acts of aggression share

[1] Spitzberg (2011) proposes the use of the term "communicative aggression" to denote nonphysical acts of aggression, defined as "any recurring set of messages not involving physical contact that function to impair a

commonality, the inclusion or exclusion of such acts in the various definitions of intimate partner violence is one of the most noticeable dissimilarities (see O'Leary, 2001).

Theoretical Perspectives. Discrepancies in the literature on intimate partner violence exist beyond terminology, extending to the perspectives of researchers conducting studies of IPV. The viewpoint from which a researcher approaches the study of intimate partner violence results in vastly different conclusions regarding the causes of and consequences from IPV. Two very different positions dominate the IPV literature: 1) the gender stance or gender paradigmatic explanation for intimate violence, and 2) the mutual violence stance. Those coming from the gender perspective generally define intimate partner violence as a function of patriarchal social structures, with men using violence against women to maintain these structures and for the purposes of power and control (DeKeseredy, 2011). The argument from the mutual violence perspective is that men and women perpetrate IPV at equal or near-equal rates, and for many of the same reasons.

Extensive research has shown that situations of IPV are often marked by a woman who uses violent tactics just as often, if not more, than her male partner, and that violence between partners is most often mutual and interactive (Dutton, 2012; Spitzberg, 2011). Dutton and Corvo (2006) note recent evidence from the "best designed studies" indicates that intimate partner violence is committed by both sexes equally (p. 458). Spitzberg (2011) offers that the single best predictor of whether or not a person has experienced intimate partner violence in a given relationship is a history of using violence in that relationship themselves (p. 338). Stets and

---

person's enduring preferred self-image" (Dailey, Lee, Spitzberg, 2007, p. 303). Dailey, Lee, and Spitzberg (2007) acknowledge that abusive communicative processes are often referred to as psychological abuse. As an alternative to the term "communicative aggression," psychological aggression/abuse will be used interchangeably in this dissertation to denote nonphysical acts of aggression, since the term psychological abuse/aggression is more used in a decidedly interdisciplinary area of research. Psychological aggression is herein defined as "acts of recurring criticism and/or verbal aggression toward a partner, and/or acts of isolation and domination of a partner" that cause one partner to be fearful of the other, and/or cause a partner to have low self-esteem (O'Leary, 2001).

Straus (1992) found bilateral violence as the most common form of intimate partner violence, and the stereotype of male perpetrator/female victim (i.e., female does not perpetrate, only the male) is the least common. Further, they concluded that not only do women engage in a comparable amount of violence, they are *at least* as likely to instigate violence.

Causes of IPV. Jacobson, Gottman, Waltz, Rushe, Babcock, and Holtzworth-Munroe (1994) note that while there is similarity in the frequency of violent acts perpetrated by males and females, examining perpetration rates exclusively masks the functions of violence. Scholars studying under the gender paradigm argue that analyzing function is a crucial way to examine bidirectional violence, and generally argue that the function of male violence is to control women (Pence, Paymar, Ritmeester, & Shepard, 1993). For example, Stark (2010) argues that scholars working from the mutual violence perspective confound female use of violence with male use violence, which Stark argues is to reinforce gender inequalities, dominate, and terrorize (see also Johnson, 2005). To many scholars studying under the gender paradigm, the function of female violence is retaliation or self-defense, or used for expressive purposes (Haddock, 2000).

Many states have policies which are informed by the gender paradigm. For example, prohibited practices in Georgia include any therapeutic intervention that involves linking causes of violence to personal history, the interaction dynamics of the partners, poor verbal skills, or drug and alcohol addiction. Instead, the primary goal of the type of intervention, known as the "Duluth Model," is to get male clients to acknowledge 'male privilege' and how they have used power and control to dominate their partners (Pence et al., 1993; Dutton & Corvo, 2006).

However, it is argued by the majority of scholars working from the mutual violence stance that women's use of violence is not, in fact, purely self-defense. Rather, researchers argue that abusiveness in females develops early and exhibits a life course trajectory, the same as males

(Moffitt, Caspi, Rutter, & Silva, 2001; Dutton, 2012), and aggressive females and males attract each other through a process called assortative mating (Capaldi, Kim, & Shortt, 2004). Instead, recurring intimate partner violence has been shown to be sustained through interactive factors (Margolin, John, & Gleberman, 1989). Levenson and Gottman (1983) found that in conflicted couples where both partners verbally express negativity, a "parallel patterning of physiological responses" is produced, providing the foundation for the subjective state of feeling trapped in a relationship with a destructive, self-sustaining interaction pattern.

Consequences of IPV. Another contested point in the literature is consequences of intimate partner violence. Some scholars document the increased level of harm experienced by women in violent relationships (Cascardi, Langhinrichsen, & Vivian, 1992; Jacobson & Gottman, 1998; O'Leary & Maiuro, 2001; Sillito, 2012), while others argue that the level of injury sustained by men and women is more symmetrical (Dutton & Corvo, 2006; Spitzberg, 2011) or just slightly greater (Dutton, 2012). Sillito (2012) found that women were more likely than men to report poor health if exposed to intimate partner violence (based on longitudinal data from the National Survey of Family and Households). Other research has shown that, when compared to males, female victims experience greater or higher levels of depression (O'Leary & Maiuro, 2001), post-traumatic stress disorder (Lang, Kennedy, & Stein, 2002), sleep difficulties (Lowe, Humphreys, & Williams, 2007), eating disorders (Violence against women, 2011), emotional distress (Jacobson et al., 1994; O'Leary & Maiuro, 2001), and suicide attempts (Astbury, 1996), compared to male victims.

Unifying Perspectives with a Cultural Approach

One method of addressing how or why there are variations in the cause and consequence of intimate partner violence, which takes into account aspects of both the gender paradigm and

the mutual violence stance, is to address such variation as a function of cultural differences in the populations of study. Spitzberg (2011) offered that differences in aspects of intimate partner violence across populations may be due to the fact that IPV is a "culturally ambivalent social construction," in that cultures vary considerably in their conception of IPV and what counts as violence. Similarly, Dutton (2006) argues that variation in the definitions of intimate partner violence are related to what a particular society agrees are unacceptable acts which require intervention from third parties. This way of explaining abuse is described as a normative approach, defined by Dailey, Lee, and Spitzberg (1994) as a way to label abuse based on societal or group standards. In a normative approach, actions are labeled as abusive only when the group views it as abusive (Dailey, Lee, & Spitzberg, 1994, p. 302). Normative approaches allow for various populations of study to individually define what is considered intimate partner violence, which political approaches follow predetermined assumptions about the nature of intimate partner violence (e.g., females commit acts of intimate partner violence only in self-defense).

One specific theory which can be considered a more normative approach is termed the "Culture of Honor." This theory argues that variations in rates of interpersonal violence across populations are largely a function of the presence or absence of an honor-based culture. In honor-based cultures, individual social status, economic well-being, and life itself are linked to a male's reputations for strength and toughness (Nisbett & Cohen, 1996). "Honor," therefore, refers to not only a sense of character (e.g., virtuous), but a sense of status, power, and reputation (Vandello & Cohen, 2003). Such normative expectations placed on males to appear socially powerful are so central to the value system of the society that violence is often viewed as a necessity to gain or restore honor. In this sense, violence can be caused by perceived threats to a male's most valued possessions; within honor cultures, reputation is considered a particularly

prized possession (Nisbett & Cohen, 1996). While honor-based cultures can be found globally, the "Culture of Honor" theory referenced herein was proposed as a way to examine cross-regional differences within the United States, and has produced numerous studies testing such differences.

While the literature related to violence in honor cultures is fairly extensive, studies with a specific focus on intimate partner violence are scarce. In one of the few studies on intimate partner violence in honor cultures, Vandello, Cohen, Grandon, and Franiuk (2009a) discussed how complimentary expectations for female loyalty and male defense of honor work in tandem to create a higher occurrence of intimate partner violence and increased severity of such violence in heterosexual couples. In honor cultures, a man's ability to exert control over his partner is an important component of masculine identity; as such, betrayals by a female partner represent the "ultimate act of shame" (Vandello et al., 2009a). This is not to say that members of honor cultures directly approve of violence against women. Rather, indirect scripts work by excusing or downplaying male violence perceived to be perpetrated in the defense of honor, or as a means of preserving the integrity of the man and his family (Vandello et al., 2009a).

Application of the Theoretical Model. Previous research articulating and testing theories related to the "Culture of Honor" has provided a guide for how to consider the role of factors related to regional culture in specific types of violence, such as argument-related displays of aggression (e.g., Bosson, Vandello, Burnaford, Weaver, & Arzu Wasti, 2009), intrapersonal violence (e.g., suicide; Osterman & Brown, 2011), and school violence (Brown, Osterman, & Barnes, 2009).

Cohen (1998) tested the idea of a culture of honor being the driving force behind the comparatively high homicide rates in the South, which is the primary honor-based region in the

United States. As Cohen (1998) theorized, if homicides are committed in the defense of honor, then argument- and conflict- related homicide, as opposed to felony-related homicide, should be the most common type in the South because argument- and conflict- related homicides best reflect violence in response to personal threats. To test this, Cohen (1998) conducted an analysis on data gathered by Fox and Pierce (1987) from the FBI Supplementary Homicide Report (SHR), which codes homicides in such a way that Cohen could classify them as either argument- or conflict- related (e.g., lovers' triangles) or felony-related (e.g., homicides occurring in the context of some other felony, like armed robbery). Results of this analysis supported his suggestion. Specially, Cohen (1998) found that white male offender homicide rates were indeed higher in the South, but only for argument- and conflict- related homicides; further, there were significantly more argument-related homicides proportionate to felony-related homicides in the South.

More recently, Osterman and Brown (2011) conducted a three-part study using the Culture of Honor theory to link the comparatively high suicide rates in the South to honor-based norms and values. As they suggested, strict gender-role standards and extreme sensitivity to reputational threats could lead people within honor cultures to consider suicide as an option when one's reputation is sufficiently threatened, or when other personal failures occur (Osterman & Brown, 2011). In the first of their three-part study, Osterman and Brown (2011) sought to establish that an enhanced risk of suicide exists in honor cultures. To test whether a state's culture of honor status is "uniquely related to its suicide rate," even when controlling for other statewide variables, Osterman and Brown (2011) obtained suicide rates for each state and statewide covariates (e.g., poverty rate, unemployment rate, mean state temperature). Results

supported the hypothesis that an enhanced risk of suicide does indeed exist in honor-based cultures.

After making this determination, Osterman and Brown (2011) presented two studies extending their findings. In their second study, Osterman and Brown (2011) examined whether statewide levels of major depression (one indicator of psychological distress) are higher in honor cultures and utilization of mental health resources is lower. In the third part of their study, Osterman and Brown (2011) conceptually replicated their statewide findings with individual-level data by "examining whether personal endorsement of honor-related beliefs and values predicts depression" (p. 1613). Findings from both of these studies further supported their theoretical rationale of an enhanced risk for suicide in states characterized by the presence of an honor culture.

Goals of the Current Project

Similar to the Osterman and Brown (2011) study, there are three studies contained in this dissertation which share the goal of articulating and providing empirical support to a theoretical rationale linking certain causes and severe consequences of intimate partner violence in heterosexual couples with honor-based norms and values. These studies attempt to address some of the variance in IPV across the United States.

Study 1 provides preliminary empirical evidence demonstrating that differences across regions of the United States in the rates of intimate partner homicide (the most severe consequence or outcome of IPV) reach levels of statistical significance. Garcia, Soria, and Hurwitz (2007) argued that intimate partner homicide rates is the *most* objective source of intimate partner violence data because these rates do not depend on self-reports and homicide does not have variable definitions (see also Cohen, Llorente, & Eisendorfer, 1998; Straus &

Smith, 1990). Additionally, acts of intimate partner violence are recognized as risk factors for later intimate partner homicide (Bailey et al., 1997; Campbell et al., 2003a/b; Campbell, Glass, Sharps, Laughon, & Bloom, 2007). Since intimate partner homicide is reflective of escalated intimate partner violence, the cross-state and cross-regional differences in rates of intimate partner homicide reported in Study 1 should theoretically mirror the variation in rates of severe, nonfatal intimate partner violence.

Study 2 presents the development of a self-report measure assessing causes and consequences of intimate partner violence. In Study 3, data gathered from a large-scale study utilizing the new measure are used to test a series of hypotheses. The goal of Study 3 is testing and providing preliminary support to the argument that honor-based norms and values create a unique set of circumstances which result in an increased rate of intimate partner violence, and greater severity of IPV.

To provide the rationale for the studies in this dissertation, Chapter 2 presents a thorough review of the literature on honor-based cultures within the United States. Following this review, a theoretical model is articulated which links honor-based norms and values to intimate partner violence, and extends the application of such norms and values to the aggressive behaviors of females in honor-based cultures. Currently, there are no studies which examine causes and consequences related to female's use of aggression against an intimate partner within honor-based cultures of the United States, despite evidence from the broader literature on IPV revealing that mutual violence is far more common than exclusively male-perpetrated violence in heterosexual intimate partnerships.

While many dissertations in the past contained separate methodology chapters, this dissertation will use contemporary APA format in which Chapters 3, 4, and 5 combine

methodology and results, similar to standard journal articles. Chapter 3 presents an analysis of statewide data on rates of intimate partner homicide, arguably the most severe consequence of intimate partner violence. Chapter 4 presents the development of a measure to assess specific acts of intimate partner violence perpetration and victimization, and the attributions given for these experiences. Chapter 5 presents the results of a study in which data collected from administering the new measure are used to test the hypotheses posed in this dissertation. Chapter 6 contains a summary of all results and conclusions related to the findings.

CHAPTER TWO
REVIEW OF LITERATURE

This chapter introduces culture and personality, a field appropriate for the study of regional variation in personality and communication behavior that is neutral toward political perspectives. The chapter includes an explanation of one theory of violence and aggression, the Culture of Honor, which has been proposed and successfully studied under the lens of culture and personality. A model to explain cross-regional differences in intimate partner violence, utilizing the Culture of Honor framework, is also presented in this chapter.

Culture and Personality

The human personality is both a continually producing factor
and a continually produced result of social evolution.
~W. I. Thomas

Early in the twentieth century, the field of culture and personality generated some extremely valuable work, such as Margaret Mead's studies on gender and how gender roles and relations differed across cultures and were not entirely determined by biology. However, most of the work in culture and personality had come to an end by the 1960's. Nisbett and Cohen (1996) outlined why they believed the culture and personality field died out for the most part, noting that after the 1960's there was an era in academic inquiry which favored psychological and cultural universals; during this era, it became inappropriate to imply that "human groups were different in any important sense" (p. xvi). However, there is much recent work utilizing extremely broad and diverse methodologies which demonstrates that the field of culture and personality is indeed relevant to current studies approaching various social problems.

Broadly, culture and personality refers to the study of connections between individuals (their behavioral patterns and mental functioning) and environments (e.g., social, cultural, economic, political) (LeVine, 2007). Culture, as it is used in this definition and herein, is

defined as organized rules concerning the ways individuals in a population communicate with one another, think about themselves and their environments, and behave toward one another and objects in their environment (p. 4). These rules are not universally obeyed, but are recognized by all and operate to "limit the range of variation in patterns of communication, belief, values, and social behavior in that population" (LeVine, 2007). Grammar rules are one example of constraints placed on acceptable communication patterns; other examples include rules to define patterns of appropriateness in small group and social interactions.

A complete review of the field of culture and personality is beyond the scope of this dissertation (see Kitayama & Cohen, 2007; Matsumoto & Juang, 2004; Wyer, Chiu, & Hong, 2009, for a complete review). However, there have been studies in the field of culture and personality which deserve mention because of their relevance to interpersonal scholars. Harris (2006) proposed the existence of evolved cognitive-motivational systems for socialization, relationships, and the achievement and maintenance of status. Deci and Ryan (2000) argued that evolved psychological needs such as autonomy, competence, and relatedness have fitness benefits for humans, regardless of culture. Schmidt and 121 Members of the International Sexuality Description Project (2004) found that mate poaching is a cultural universal, but that overall rates and gender differences in mate poaching vary across geographical regions depending on resources available and the ratio of women to men in those regions. Mate poaching is a concept in evolutionary psychology and, as a behavior, is widely studied by scholars examining romantic relationships. Mate poaching is defined by Schmidt and Buss (2001) as specific strategies or behaviors that are used to gain the attention of someone already in a committed, romantic relationship.

There is one social problem which is the focus of the current research and has been previously verified as a phenomenon that displays regional variation: violence. National-level data confirm that levels of violence vary across the United States, with some metropolitan areas, states, and regions of the United States being significantly more dangerous for their inhabitants than others; these data are presented in the following section. For a complete list of regions, divisions, and states as categorized by region and division, per the United States Census Bureau, see Table 2.1. The following sections also present one theory to explain this variation, the Culture of Honor, and present a model to test how interpersonal factors specific to cultures of honor influence the severity of intimate partner violence.

Table 2.1. List of United States Census-Designated Regions and Divisions.

Region One- Northeast
Division One- New England
Maine New Hampshire Vermont Massachusetts Rhode Island Connecticut
Division Two- Mid-Atlantic
New York Pennsylvania New Jersey
Region Two- Midwest
Division Three- East North Central
Wisconsin Michigan Illinois Indiana Ohio
Division Four- West North Central
Missouri North Dakota South Dakota Nebraska Kansas Minnesota Iowa
Region Three- South
Division Five- South Atlantic
Delaware Maryland Virginia West Virginia North Carolina South Carolina Georgia Florida
Division Six- East South Central
Kentucky Tennessee Mississippi Alabama
Division Seven- West South Central
Oklahoma Texas Arkansas Louisiana
Region Four- West
Division Eight- Mountain
Idaho Montana Wyoming Nevada Utah Colorado Arizona New Mexico
Division Nine- Pacific
Alaska Washington Oregon California Hawaii

Violence in the United States

There are numerous national-level data which demonstrate regional variation in violence. One of the more comprehensive data sets, the United States Peace Index, is issued annually by the Institute for Economics & Peace and ranks states on their level of peace, which is defined as "absence of violence" (Stanglin, 2012). Five criteria are used in the ranking: number of homicides per 100,000; number of violent crimes; incarceration rate; number of police employees; and availability of small arms (*United States Peace Index*, 2012).

According to the 2012 United States Peace Index, the Northeast is the most peaceful region, and the South is the least peaceful region. Maine is the most peaceful state (for the 11th year in a row), and Louisiana is the least peaceful state (for the 20th year in a row). Of note, the gap between Louisiana and the 49th ranked Tennessee is greater than any other gap between two states (*United States Peace Index*, 2012). The five least peaceful states are Louisiana, Tennessee, Nevada, Florida, and Arizona. The Northeast, which makes up 18% of the total U.S. population, is the most peaceful. The South makes up 37% of the U.S. population, making it the most populous. It is also the least peaceful, with 43.3% of the total homicides and 41.2% of the total violence crime (*United States Peace Index*, 2012). Only two southern states are in the top half of the most peaceful states: West Virginia (15th) and Kentucky (21st). Seven of the ten least peaceful states are in the South; twelve of the sixteen southern states are ranked 35th or worse. A complete list of states, their ranking, and overall score on the United States Peace Index (USPI) is presented in Table 2.2. Table 2.3 presents a list of the ten most peaceful metropolitan areas and the ten least peaceful metropolitan areas and their respective scores on the United States Peace Index (USPI).

With such noticeable variation in the rates of violence across regions of the United States, it is not surprising that there is a body of academic research devoted to explaining this variation. The following section details one theory for cross-regional differences in rates of violence, termed the "Culture of Honor."

Table 2.2. List of states from most peaceful (1) to least peaceful (50), U.S.P.I.

	State*	Overall Score**		State	Overall Score
1	Maine	1.31	26	Colorado	2.53
2	Vermont	1.55	27	Kansas	2.57
3	New Hampshire	1.55	28	New Jersey	2.63
4	Minnesota	1.61	29	Michigan	2.69
5	Utah	1.72	30	North Carolina	2.71
6	North Dakota	1.74	31	New York	2.72
7	Washington	1.78	32	California	2.74
8	Hawaii	1.78	33	Alaska	2.75
9	Rhode Island	1.79	34	New Mexico	2.85
10	Iowa	1.87	35	Illinois	2.89
11	Nebraska	1.93	36	Georgia	3.04
12	Massachusetts	2.00	37	Oklahoma	3.11
13	Oregon	2.07	38	Maryland	3.14
14	Connecticut	2.19	39	Delaware	3.15
15	West Virginia	2.20	40	Alabama	3.17
16	Idaho	2.23	41	Mississippi	3.17
17	Wyoming	2.26	42	South Carolina	3.18
18	Montana	2.27	43	Arkansas	3.20
19	Wisconsin	2.30	44	Texas	3.20
20	South Dakota	2.32	45	Missouri	3.21
21	Kentucky	2.32	46	Arizona	3.22
22	Ohio	2.33	47	Florida	3.36
23	Indianapolis	2.35	48	Nevada	3.37
24	Pennsylvania	2.37	49	Tennessee	3.41
25	Virginia	2.48	50	Louisiana	4.05

*Where the states are tied, scores were calculated to three decimal places.
**Overall Score reflects an average of five weighted and adjusted categories (homicides; violent crime; incarceration; police employees; small arms).

Table 2.3. List of 10 most and 10 least peaceful metropolitan areas, U.S.P.I.

Ten Most Peaceful Metropolitan Areas			
Rank		State	Score*
1	Cambridge-Newton-Framingham	Massachusetts	1.41
2	Edison-New Brunswick	New Jersey	1.41
3	Seattle-Bellevue-Everett	Washington	1.48
4	Minneapolis-St. Paul-Bloomington	Minnesota	1.51
5	Peabody	Massachusetts	1.54
6	Providence-New Bedford-Fall River	Rhode Island/Massachusetts	1.57
7	Lake County-Kenosha County	Illinois/Wisconsin	1.57
8	Nassau-Suffolk	New York	1.58
9	Salt Lake City	Utah	1.61
10	Portland-Vancouver-Hillsboro	Oregon/Washington	1.61
Ten Least Peaceful Metropolitan Areas			
Rank		State	Score*
52	Chicago-Naperville-Joliet	Illinois	2.70
53	Charlotte-Gastonia-Rock Hill	North Carolina/South Carolina	2.75
54	Los Angeles-Long Beach-Glendale	California	2.75
55	Jacksonville	Florida	2.75
56	Las Vegas-Paradise	Nevada	2.79
57	Houston-Sugar Land-Baytown	Texas	2.82
58	Baltimore-Towson	Maryland	2.93
59	Miami-Miami Beach-Kendall	Florida	2.97
60	New Orleans-Metairie-Kenner	Louisiana	3.70
61	Detroit-Livonia-Dearborn	Michigan	3.87

*Score reflects an overall average from four weighted and adjusted categories (homicides; violent crime; incarceration; police employees)

Southern Violence and the Culture of Honor

> The southerner who can avoid both arguments and adultery
> is as safe as any other American, and probably safer.
> ~John Reed

Cultures that place a high premium on personal honor foster certain forms of interpersonal violence, such as argument-related aggression (Cohen, 1998), aggression related to jealousy over a partner (Vandello & Cohen, 2008), and even *intra*personal violence, such as suicide (Osterman & Brown, 2011). The following sections articulate a theoretical rationale linking the most severe intimate partner violence with honor-based norms and values, and introduce a series of studies which provide preliminary evidence that such relationships do exist.

The Culture of Honor: Definition and Background. The "most compelling" (Cohen, 1998) explanation for the development of cultures of honor is based on migratory patterns of early American settlers. The South was settled by herdsman from the fringes of Britain, while the North was settled by farmers from England, Holland, and Germany (Nisbett & Cohen, 1996). Herdsman tended to show displays of great aggression and violence because of their vulnerabilities to losing their animals, which were their primary resource. To deter a loss of resources, men in cultures of honor had to be willing to commit mayhem and risk wounds to himself or even death. Combined with a low-population frontier and thus less law enforcement than the North[2], a climate was created where a man had to be on guard against any act or threat that gave the impression that he lacks strength. This included not being able to let others- particularly other men, who were and still are the strongest enforcers of gender roles in honor cultures- disrespect or insult him (Nisbett & Cohen, 1996, p. xv). "Honor," therefore, refers to not only a sense of character (i.e., virtuous), but a sense of status, power, and reputation (Vandello & Cohen, 2003). Honor in this sense has social significance and is the theme around which interpersonal lives in honor cultures are organized. The primary argument herein is that the southern region of the United States still is a culture of honor, particularly in that the men of the South are more prone than men from other regions to feel that appearing strong is a necessity, as well as protecting what he sees as his own, and be unwilling to tolerate an insult.

Precarious Manhood. Masculine honor is never assured, but must be earned on a public stage (Gilmore, 1990). From an early age, manhood, or the achievement of such, is something that is defined by achievements and not biology. Manhood can be lost through failing to meet

[2] For the purposes of the review contained in Chapter 2 and for brevity, the "North" refers to the rest of the United States that is not designated by the Census Bureau as the "South" (see Nisbett & Cohen, 1996, for example of similar usage). For a complete list of how regions and divisions of the U.S. are divided according to the U.S. Census Bureau, see Table 1.

social standards or committing certain social transgressions, while womanhood is seen as a primarily biological state and only physical changes can result in the loss of womanhood (e.g., going through menopause; mastectomies). Weaver, Vandello, Bosson, and Burnaford (2010) found that study participants tended to define manhood by actions and womanhood by enduring traits; their results suggest that action, particularly aggressive action, is integral to manhood and the defense of manhood. Bosson, Vandello, Burnaford, Weaver, and Wasti (2009) established that public displays of aggressive readiness reduced anxiety-related cognitions in men from honor cultures who were faced with a gender threat, suggesting that aggressive displays may actually function to "downregulate negative affect when manhood has been threatened" (p. 623).

Honor Threats and Violence. Since men have historically occupied status-seeking and resource acquisition roles, manhood has now become associated with qualities such as "competitiveness, defensiveness, and constant struggling to 'prove' worth and status" (Bosson & Vandello, 2011, p. 82). Toughness and perceived willingness to use violence are key components of masculinity in cultures of honor (Nisbett & Cohen, 1996).

However, this is not to say that violence in all forms is accepted in honor cultures. Men in cultures of honor do not approve of violence in the abstract (Nisbett & Cohen, 1996), but do see violence used for certain reasons as legitimate- even violence against women, for the "right" reasons. For example, the South is more accepting of violence for self-protection. Laws in honor cultures indicate increased tolerance of violence used for spousal abuse, corporal punishment, and capital punishment (Cohen, 1996). Within the extant literature, reasons that lead to condoned violence or violence seen as legitimate are termed "honor threats," and the violence used as a response to such threats is termed "honor violence." For example, stealing

resources from a man is an honor threat, and violence by men used to regain the unjustly stolen resources or punish the thief is honor violence.

Cohen (1998) predicted that social organization (strong, cohesive, tightly-structured families and communities) will influence people's behavior. He found that social organization curbed felony-related homicides related to nonhonor threats; however, when it came to homicides related to honor violence, social organization had the opposite effect. In the South and West, both community and family stability were associated with increased argument- and brawl- related homicides. Cohen (1998) concluded that violence condoned by the culture of honor is reinforced by tight social organization in the South and the West, while more stable, cohesive social organization is associated with relatively *less* violence in the North. Again, this pattern only held true for violence seen as legitimate by the cultures of the region, not all types of violence.

Field experiments by Cohen and Nisbett (1997) showed that southern and western companies were more likely than their northern counterparts to respond in understanding and cooperative ways to applicants who had killed someone in response to an honor threat. Further, they found that newspapers in southern and western cultures, when presented with the same facts as newspapers in the North, created stories that were sympathetic to a male perpetrator of a stabbing in response to a family insult, and justified the man's actions more than northern papers did. Lab studies by Cohen and colleagues (1996) found that males from cultures of honor exhibit more physiological stress (higher cortisol levels) and readiness for aggression (higher testosterone levels), as well as display more actual aggression, than males in other regions as a response to a confederate bumping into them and calling them an "asshole."

Bosson and Vandello (2011) presented college students with a mock police report in which either a man or a woman punched a same-sex stranger who taunted him or her publically and questioned his or her manhood/womanhood in front of a romantic partner. Men explained men's behavior in terms of the situation, as opposed to the way men and women explained a female aggressor's behavior. For females, participants attributed the use of aggression to internal states, such as "that is just the type of person she is" (p. 84). Bosson and Vandello (2011) concluded that male's use of violence is not always attributable to some fundamental flaw or characteristic; rather, male's use of violence is seen as largely based on context and situations (see also Weaver, Vandello, Bosson, & Burnaford, 2010). Bosson and Vandello (2011) further state that aggression is a manhood restoring tactic, used strategically when it is more likely to "pay off" successfully.

Intimate Partner Violence in Cultures of Honor

Because men in cultures of honor feel they must defend against every threat, the nature of their interpersonal relationships may become as tenuous as they perceive their manhood to be. Indeed, there are very specific standards placed on women within relationships in honor cultures. Views of women in cultures of honor are more traditional, celebrating feminine sacrifice, loyalty, and sexual purity (Vandello, Cohen, Grandon, & Franiuk, 2009a). Honor norms for females stress modesty, shame, and the avoidance of behaviors which might threaten the good name of the family, such as adultery or sexual immodesty (Vandello & Cohen, 2003). These norms are illustrated in an expression from Arab cultures (which are honor based): That a man's honor "lies between the legs of a woman" (Beyer, 1999).

Southern colloquialisms, such as "steel magnolias," emphasize that the ideal balance for a woman is between "inner strength and outward femininity" (Vandello, Cohen, Grandon, &

Franiuk, 2009a, p. 98). Wood (2001) noted that in romantic relationships, an emphasis on moral refinement and superiority implies that females should be accepting or tolerant of males' less-refined aggressive behaviors. Also valued in romantic relationships is a female's ability to "nurse, tame, and civilize" unrefined and aggressive men, even when the aggression is directed at them. Rosen (1996) notes the connection between the belief in women's altruistic powers and the psychological chains that keep altruistic women in abusive relationships (reviewed in Vandello et al., 2009a, p. 83). Rosen termed this the "Beauty and the Beast fantasy," and cited interviews in which abused women thought they could tame the man who was bullying them. Vandello et al. (2009a) believe that these stereotypes of women are eroding in most of Western culture, but that the themes still hold power as relational scripts in cultures of honor.

Vandello et al. (2009a) note that it is a mistake to assume, based on the increased aggression displayed by males in honor cultures and the clearly defined roles for females, that there are norms and attitudes in place in cultures of honor that *directly* support domestic violence. As stated, men in cultures of honor do not approve of violence in the abstract (Nisbett & Cohen, 1996). Under most circumstances, people see violence against women as worse than violence against men, in part because of norms of chivalry, which dictate that women should be protected from harm (Felson, 2002). Generally, groups develop norms prohibiting violence by physically stronger entities, such as men, on weaker entities, such as women (Thibaut & Kelley, 1959; Kelley & Thibaut, 1978). It would seem logical to assume that in more traditional honor cultures, the sentiment that "weaker" women should be protected would be more pronounced. However, domestic violence rates are relatively high in the southern United States (Vandello & Cohen, 2003; Vandello et al., 2009a).

While scholars studying honor cultures note that individual pathology can indeed be a contributing factor to domestic violence occurrence (Vandello et al., 2009a), it may also be that in some cultures, violence against women is indirectly sanctioned or condoned because of certain cultural ideas. In honor cultures, the unique gender roles and scripts regarding expectations in romantic relationships may contribute above and beyond individual pathology. Although not directly approving the use of violence against women, indirect scripts for violence may work by approving of women who express loyalty in the face of abuse and excusing or downplaying male violence perceived to be perpetrated in the defense of honor (Vandello et al., 2009a). The violence itself may be seen as undesirable, but necessary, and a "good woman" will remain loyal in the face of conflict (Vandello et al., 2009a, p. 98).

The complimentary expectations for female loyalty and male defense of honor work in tandem to create a higher occurrence of intimate partner violence, and increased severity of such violence. In honor cultures, a man's ability to exert control over his female partner is an important component of masculine identity, and betrayals by a woman represent the "ultimate act of shame" (Vandello et al., 2009a). A man who allows his partner to stray may be seen as less of a man; someone who is weak and vulnerable and able to be taken advantage of in other situations as well (Vandello & Cohen, 2003). Within this framework, male violence against women is seen as necessary to preserve the integrity of a man and his family. Further, *not* responding with violence to female's transgressions may be a source of shame.

Some research exists which supports this notion. Vandello and Cohen (2003) conducted a two-part study which demonstrated how gender expectations may be especially salient in traditional cultures which place emphasis on male honor, female loyalty, and sexual modesty. In their first study, Vandello and colleagues found that members of honor cultures were more likely

than those in nonhonor cultures to view a "cuckolded" man as less honorable and manly. They were also more likely to be accepting of a man's violence against his wife in response to her infidelity and to justify this type of violence.

In the second part of their study, Vandello and Cohen (2003) focused on specific communications between study participants and confederates, and were thus able to pick up on nuances that general attitudinal measures cannot. Participants witnessed an argument staged by confederates in a waiting room where the male was physically aggressive toward a female and intolerant of her desire to visit another man, then storms away. Data gathered included content of conversations between the female confederate and participants as well as personality ratings of the female confederate by the participants. By analyzing actual communication, instead of only scores on items or measures, Vandello and Cohen (2003) were able to assess with more clarity the differences arising from implicit norms and cultural scripts. Findings revealed that Southern Anglos (i.e., people from the southern region of the United States) were more likely than Northern Anglos to approve of a woman who was contrite (i.e., simply expressed to participants that the fight was with her fiancé, and that he really cares about her and that's how he shows it) and loyal after a physically aggressive conflict, as opposed to one who was assertive, expressed intolerance, and displayed independence (i.e., expressing to participants that the male was her fiancé, that she was tired of him getting jealous and how mad his behaviors made her, etc.). Not only were these evaluations endorsed in private, but public. Members of honor cultures were more likely than nonhonor cultures to voice tolerance for abuse to the victim herself. Members of honor cultures explicitly stated to the abused female confederate that she should remain in the relationship.

Participants in both studies conducted by Vandello and Cohen (2003) made judgments about the character and personality of violent men and their female partners, as well. Participants from honor cultures rated a woman who remained loyal in the face of violence as stronger and more agentic than a woman who threated to leave an abusive relationship, and felt that she possessed warmth and "goodness" (p. 1007). Vandello and Cohen (2003) further revealed that members of honor cultures judge a male's character on the basis of his female partner's behavior; in their study, participants from honor cultures rated a husband who was cheated on as less masculine and less honorable than one whose wife was loyal. Later studies by Vandello and colleagues (2009a) mirror these results. They found that participants from nonhonor cultures stated that a wife's affair had no relevance to her husband's good character, while participants from honor cultures thought such an affair reflected on the husband's trustworthiness and general good character as well as the wife's.

Puente and Cohen (2003) found that participants judged a man who hit or raped his wife after a jealousy-related argument as someone who loved his wife *more* than a man who hit or raped his wife after a non-honor threat; further, these participants judged a man who hit or raped his wife after a jealousy-related argument as someone who loved his wife just as much as a man who did not commit any violence at all after a jealousy-related argument. These findings reveal the line of reasoning held by some in American cultures that jealousy is a sign of love (Spitzberg, 2011). Vandello et al. (2009a) also found that members of honor cultures were more positive about a violent husband and his actions when those actions were in response to jealousy-inducing behaviors by his wife, but showed no difference from members of non-honor cultures about approval of violence for reasons unrelated to honor (e.g., a wife spending too much money on make-up). These participants also felt more warmly toward a man who was violent for honor

reasons (as opposed to nonhonor reasons or nonviolent men), believe he showed characteristics of a good partner, and believe that he showed more compassionate love for his wife.

Summary. Culture and personality, a field which analyzes the relations between individuals (their behavioral patterns and mental functioning) and their environments (social, cultural, economic, political) (LeVine, 2007), is an appropriate framework for addressing the unique nature of relationships in honor cultures and the patterns of interaction with regard to cultural scripts. In honor cultures, relationship scripts are reflective of stable, socially evolved mechanisms for behavior that can be traced back to the initial settlement of America (cf., Honeycutt & Bryan, 2011). Core features of human behavior, such as personal freedom and self-regulation (Bandura, 1986), are expressed in the literature on honor cultures. Men who punish violently may be adhering to an accepted cultural script, and have the free agency to commit these acts.

Women who stay with aggressive men are also viewed as agentic. While seen as passive, they are not powerless (Vandello & Cohen, 2003). Women carry a great deal of influence in determining the reputation of the family; they can stain the family honor through betrayals, or increase the status and power of a family by marrying up in the social chain. Women in cultures of honor are not being forced, held captive, or coerced to stay in relationships (Vandello et al., 2009a). Rather, women have the choice of how to behave in a relationship, including during and after conflict, and have the capacity to make these choices (see also Bandura, 1986). Female agency and strength are derived in part from interpersonal interaction. In honor cultures particularly, women's agency and strength can be defined by their ability to control the emotional tenor of a relationship and to withstand and overcome relationship difficulties

(Vandello & Cohen, 2003). The nature of honor-based relationships is indeed complex and deserving of further attention.

Overview of Studies

Study 1

There are three studies contained in this dissertation. Study 1 provides preliminary evidence that rates of conflict- or argument- related intimate partner homicides significantly differ across regions of the U.S. and in accordance with the presence of an honor based culture. Study 1 aims to partially replicate the findings from Nisbett and Cohen (1996) and Cohen (1998), and introduce a similar pattern of violence, but specific to heterosexual intimate partners. Both former studies demonstrated that argument- and conflict- related homicides (as opposed to felony-related homicides) are the only types which occur at significantly higher rates in the South. This study operates under the assumption that intimate partner homicides will be significantly higher in the honor-based U.S. South, because IPH are largely tied to arguments or conflict with current or former intimate partners.

Empirical evidence exists which supports this assumption. In 2010, the VPC report "When Men Murder Women" revealed that 1,800 females were murdered by males in single victim/single offender incidents. For homicides in which the relationship between the offender and victim could be established, 94% of women were killed by a male they knew. In 88% of all incidents where the circumstance could be determined, homicides were not related to the commission of any other felony (e.g., armed robbery, rape). Further, the report found that 60% of non-felony related incidents involved arguments between current or former romantic partners (*When Men Murder Women,* 2012). Garcia, Soria, and Hurwitz (2007) reported that in 1992, the number of female homicide victims killed by their partners represented about 70% of intimate

partner homicide victims. Horon and Cheng (2001) found that, in their sample, pregnant women were more likely to die of homicide than any other cause; in fact, homicide is the leading cause of death for pregnant women. The United States Department of Justice (2000) and Bureau of Justice (2004) report that females are five to eight times more likely than males to be killed by an intimate; further, women in the U.S. are murdered by intimate partners (current or former) nine times more often than by strangers.

Study 1 utilizes a method similar to Cohen (1998). In his study, Cohen examined the FBI Supplementary Homicide Report to determine that significant differences exist between honor and nonhonor cultures in the rates of argument-related homicide. Study 1 examines data based on the same report, but provided by a third party: the Violence Policy Center (VPC). Since 1998, the Violence Policy Center has annually analyzed data submitted to the FBI for its Supplementary Homicide Report and released a report titled "When Men Murder Women." The focus of this report is male-on-female homicides in single victim/single offender incidents. Two hypotheses are posed for testing in Study 1:

H1: The southern region of the United States (Delaware, Maryland, Virginia, West Virginia, North Carolina, South Carolina, Georgia, Florida, Kentucky, Tennessee, Mississippi, Alabama, Oklahoma, Texas, Arkansas, Louisiana) has a significantly higher rate of male-on-female homicides in single victim, single offender incidents than other regions of the United States.

H2: The West, comprised of Idaho, Montana, Wyoming, Nevada, Utah, Colorado, Arizona, New Mexico, Alaska, Washington, Oregon, California, and Hawaii, has the second highest rate of male-on-female homicides in single victim, single offender incidents in the United States (after the South).

Studies 2 and 3

Studies 2 and 3 conceptually replicate the findings from Study 1 with individual-level data by examining the attributions that members of honor cultures and nonhonor cultures give for their experiences with intimate partner violence, and the related severity of such violence. Osterman and Brown (2011) followed a similar procedure when they tested the hypothesis that suicide rates are significantly higher for states with an honor-based culture; first, by analyzing state-level data, then, by conceptually replicating those findings with individual-level data which predicted depression from personal endorsement of honor-related beliefs and values (p. 1613).

Perlman and Carcedo (2011) argue that there should be several working assumptions when examining the complexities of relationships. These assumptions include: 1) People approach interactions with multiple and mixed motives; 2) Interpersonal communication involves different outcomes that can simultaneously be pleasurable and painful, constructive and destructive, and functional or dysfunctional; 3) Assessments of the consequences- i.e., determining if they are prosocial or antisocial- are a function of differences in individuals, context, and culture; 4) Outcomes of communication are embedded in a hierarchical social system and can be judged differently at different levels (e.g., individuals, dyads, families, social groups, culture). In other words, the determination of whether a relationship or aggression within a relationship is functional or dysfunctional, prosocial or antisocial, is best made by those directly involved.

Attributional theories are a useful guide in understanding and assessing individual-level data. Attributional theories examine the ways in which people explain the events that happen to them and how these perceptions are determined by their perspective of the event (Fiske & Taylor, 2008). Weiner (1992) developed a motivational theory of attributions which serves as an

insightful guide for understanding intimate partner violence. This theory explains how people differ on responsibility, and whether a person attributes responsibility to one's self, others, or contextual factors (Flynn & Graham, 2010). Manusov and Spitzberg (2008) argue that attributions are fundamentally a process of interpreting and understanding (both others and ourselves); thus, any communicative event or behavior can be viewed as an effect with some associated cause, and the cause that a person attributes will likely influence the meaning of their actions and response.

Scholars have articulated the importance of understanding the unique attributions individuals give for their experiences with intimate partner violence. Flynn and Graham (2010) argue that knowledge of perceived explanations may help differentiate intimate partners who engage in minor, situational aggression from those who engage in aggression that causes more severe emotional or physical harm, and can help determine whether intimate partner violence involves more or less severe aggression on different occasions, and for different reasons, within the same couple over time (Flynn & Graham, 2010). Capezza and Arriaga (2008) remarked that when people *perceive* their partner's aggression as acceptable, a societal condition is created that breeds further aggression. However, few studies have examined the perceptions of those directly involved in situations of intimate partner violence as a way to understand the causes for such violence occurring, despite individuals' perceptions being central to their own experiences and the manner in which they behave in the face of violence from others (Flynn & Graham, 2010). Of these relatively few studies, an even smaller proportion assessed individual attributions or perceptions in samples taken from the U.S. population.

The relation between perceptions and acts of aggression by members of honor cultures has only been limitedly explored. Vandello, Ransom, Hettinger, and Askew (2009b) argued that

male norms about aggression may be in part perpetuated by beliefs that aggression is expected or socially desirable. Their study produced results to support this argument, finding that high self-esteem was correlated with perceived similarity between one's own uses of aggression compared to peers, indicating that self-perceptions about aggression norms have consequences for self-perception as well. Vandello, Cohen, and Ransom (2008) contended that the reason why norms for male honor-related aggression have persisted in the South for over 100 years is because southerners are more likely than northerners to perceive peer endorsement for aggression norms (p. 162).

Osterman and Brown (2011) also argued that an understanding of perceived attributions is important when examining honor cultures. As they stated, an important question to ask in honor cultures is whether the threats to intimate relationships are unique compared to other cultures, or if threats are common experiences but are perceived differently or more intensely in cultures of honor due to social expectations related to status and reputation. This "perceptual factor" might lead to a greater risk of severe intimate partner violence. In other words, the causes of intimate partner violence in honor cultures may not differ from the causes of intimate partner violence in nonhonor cultures, only that certain areas of conflict or certain transgressions are interpreted as more severe or consequential within honor cultures and result in more severe acts of intimate partner violence.

For example, Daly and Wilson's (1988) large-scale review of spousal homicide across a variety of cultures drew them to conclude that the leading motive in the majority of cases was a male's suspicion of infidelity or desertion. In honor cultures, where violence is seen as a means for restoring damaged reputation, a female partner's indiscretions may result in more severe violence due to the social consequences brought onto the male by the female's indiscretions.

Indeed, within honor cultures, a man who allows his partner to stray may be seen as less of a man; someone who is weak and vulnerable and able to be taken advantage of in other situations as well (Vandello & Cohen, 2003). Within this framework, male violence against women can be viewed as necessary to preserve the integrity of a man and his family (p. 998). Further, *not* responding with violence to female's transgressions may be a source of shame.

The third and fourth hypotheses posed and tested in this dissertation regard variation in causes and resultant consequences of male-perpetrated intimate partner violence against females:

H3: Men from honor cultures will report using more severe intimate partner violence than men from nonhonor cultures.

H4: Men from honor cultures will report more severe acts of aggression when motivated by jealousy and infidelity than men from nonhonor cultures who are motivated by the same reasons.

Mutual Violence. Lastly, two hypotheses are drawn from observing one of the most noticeable deficits in the literature on intimate partner violence within United States honor cultures, which is that researchers have failed to examine the use of aggression by both men *and* women. While scholars studying violence within cultures of honor note that "understanding norms for both male and female behavior is important for understanding how high rates of violence may arise" (Vandello et al., 2009a), they have failed to address female's aggressive behavior toward intimate partners.

For example, in their seminal work on violence in U.S. cultures of honor, Nisbett and Cohen (1996) only presented data on white male participants because, as they argued, "men are responsible for the vast majority of violent acts" and "the culture of honor is interwoven with cultural concepts of masculinity" (p. 26). Vandello and Cohen (2003) conducted a study on implicit cultural scripts which perpetuate domestic violence, but while acknowledging that

female-on-male violence occurs, they chose to focus on male violence against women because such violence is "much more likely to occur than female-on-male violence and because much of the female-on-male violence is likely to be a response to male aggression" (p. 997). This assessment is in direct conflict with the research detailed in Chapter 1; specifically, that the most common form of intimate partner violence is mutual (i.e., both male and female partners perpetrate abuse within a relationship; Dutton, 2012; Stets and Straus, 1992), and IPV is committed by both sexes for many of the same reasons (Jacobson et al., 1994; Stark 2010).

Not only is there evidence supporting the argument that mutual violence is the most common type of violence between intimates, but research also shows that mutual violence results in the most severe acts of violence because mutual violence escalates rapidly, and often to a very severe level (Honeycutt & Bryan, 2011). Game Theory can provide a useful guide for examining the escalation of conflict, since the theory outlines how individuals use strategies to retaliate or appease another during arguments and conflict (Honeycutt, Sheldon, & Pence, 2010). One strategy in game theory is "tit-for-tat" (Axelrod & Hamilton, 1981; Rapoport, 1966). Based on an English saying that translates to "equivalent retaliation," "tit-for-tat" strategies involve initial cooperation, then responding-in-kind to an opponent's previous action.

Felson (1981) discusses how individuals are strongly motivated to maintain a favorable image in social situations; thus, when confronted in the form of an insult that portrays the receiver in a negative light, the person being affronted retaliates in order to save face, and to also prevent future attacks. Honeycutt, Sheldon, and Pence (2010) found that study participants, when presented with a conflict situation between a husband and wife, predicted that the wife would actually be more aggressive than her husband and the husband would use more conciliatory tactics than his female partner. In a more comprehensive review, Honeycutt and

Bryan (2011) state that the highest levels of abuse emerge when both partners are initiators (p. 367).

The commonality and severity of mutual violence perpetration is not the only evidence supporting a critique of previous research ignoring female's use of intimate partner violence within honor cultures. There are also compelling statistics on higher rates of *female*-perpetrated interpersonal violence within honor cultures. Nisbett and Cohen (1996) found that white southern women are much more likely to kill than their northern counterparts, particularly when the circumstances involve provocation, such as a lovers' triangle, brawl, or argument. In fact, white southern women account for 48% of all white-female perpetrated homicides; broken down, they account for 55% percent of all lovers' triangle, 72% of all alcohol and brawl-related, and 52% of all argument-related homicides perpetrated by white females in the U.S. (Nisbett & Cohen, 1996, p. 87). Nisbett and Cohen (1996) suggested that these rates could be a combination of two factors: 1) simple reactions to more violent southern men, and/or 2) lower thresholds for what southern women will tolerate from men before becoming violent.

The following two hypotheses are posed regarding the use of intimate partner violence by women in cultures of honor:

H5: Acts of intimate partner violence reported by women from honor cultures are more severe when attributed to perceived provocation (e.g., as a response to a partner saying something disrespectful or insulting) than acts reported by women from nonhonor cultures, attributed to similar reasons.

H6: Women in honor cultures who report using more severe conflict tactics also report being the victim of more severe conflict tactics, compared to the level of severity experienced by mutually-aggressive women in nonhonor cultures.

For H6, also recall previous research by Vandello and Cohen (2003) which found that women who are more verbally contrite to physically abusive male partners are seen more favorably than women who openly express their intolerance for their male partner's behaviors.

Study 2. Study 2 presents the development of a new measure for assessing perceptions of attributions for intimate partner violence, and the severity of specific tactics associated with these attributions. Measures of attributions for IPV created in previous studies are limited, as were the studies utilizing those measures. Detailed more extensively in Chapter 4 (which presents Study 2), the phrasing of items on previously created measures limited the range of responses possible from a sample. The measure developed in Study 2 presents items as self- or partner- attributions, as opposed to victim or perpetrator attributions. This method should help limit social desirability effects related to forcing a participant to identify as a "perpetrator" or "victim." Further, looking at both self and partner attributions in the same measure recognizes that individuals may simultaneously occupy the roles of victim and perpetrator, and that different explanations may be given depending on whether a participant is addressing their own or a partner's violence (Flynn & Graham, 2011).

Study 3. In Study 3, the measure created in the second study is administered to a sample of men and women from various regional cultures of the United States. These data are then used to assess H3, H4, H5, and H6. The sampling method used in Study 3 is superior to methods used in many previous studies on intimate partner violence which were biased to the respective researchers' viewpoint on the functions of IPV. For example, many studies informed by the gender paradigm have only allowed women to identify as victims and men to identify as perpetrators (for a review, see Dutton, 2012; Straus, 1999). By allowing both men and women to identify as victim, perpetrator, or victim-as-perpetrator (i.e., occupy both roles simultaneously in

one relationship; mutual violence), the results of Study 3 should be more generalizable. Study 3 is presented in Chapter 5. Table 2.4 presents all hypotheses tested in this dissertation.

Table 2.4. Hypotheses.

Chapter 3	
Hypothesis 1 (H1)	The southern region of the United States (Delaware, Maryland, Virginia, West Virginia, North Carolina, South Carolina, Georgia, Florida, Kentucky, Tennessee, Mississippi, Alabama, Oklahoma, Texas, Arkansas, Louisiana) has a significantly higher rate of male-on-female homicides in single victim, single offender incidents than other regions of the United States.
Hypothesis 2 (H2)	The West, comprised of Idaho, Montana, Wyoming, Nevada, Utah, Colorado, Arizona, New Mexico, Alaska, Washington, Oregon, California, and Hawaii, has the second highest rate of male-on-female homicides in single victim, single offender incidents in the United States (after the South).
Chapter 4	Presents the creation and validation of a new measure.
Chapter 5	Presents the results of a large-scale study using the newly created measure.
Hypothesis 3 (H3)	Men from honor cultures will report using more severe intimate partner violence than men from nonhonor cultures.
Hypothesis 4 (H4)	Men from honor cultures will report more severe acts of aggression when motivated by jealousy and infidelity than men from nonhonor cultures who are motivated by the same reasons.
Hypothesis 5 (H5)	Acts of intimate partner violence reported by women from honor cultures are more severe when attributed to perceived provocation (e.g., as a response to a partner saying something disrespectful or insulting) than acts reported by women from nonhonor cultures, attributed to similar reasons.
Hypothesis 6 (H6)	Women in honor cultures who report using more severe conflict tactics will also report being the victim of more severe conflict tactics, compared to the level of severity experienced by mutually-aggressive women in nonhonor cultures.

Summary and Implications

Understanding the perceptions of acts of intimate partner violence or how victims interpret them is crucial in understanding how intimate partner violence functions in various regional cultures. Revealing the triggers or reasons behind the use of severe conflict tactics by participants in cultures of honor, particularly, could also have implications for understanding how or why intimate partner violence escalates to homicide within these cultures more frequently than nonhonor cultures.

Flynn and Graham (2010) note that an understanding of attributions or perceptions has direct consequences for prevention and treatment programs. Couples with problematic, recurring conflict would benefit from the ability to reinterpret perceptions in ways which will avoid aggression and violence in the future. Analysis of perceptions could also identify perpetrators who are "unwilling to change problematic attributions for their aggression" or identifying couples involved in systematic, abusive relationships that would not be amenable to couple's counseling (Flynn & Graham, 2010). Honeycutt and Bryan (2011) also argue that there is potential for rehabilitation of some relationships which have experienced abuse; specifically, they argue for communication interventionists making an attempt at creating communication skills for more effective arguing (p. 366).

CHAPTER THREE
STUDY 1

Study 1 explores whether the differences in rates of one type of intimate partner homicide (IPH) across states and regions of the United States are statistically significant, and if these rates vary in a way that can be explained by the presence of an honor-based culture. Nisbett and Cohen (1996) noted that if a culture of honor is the driving force behind the high homicide rates in the South, then argument- and conflict- related homicide, as opposed to felony-related homicide (e.g., homicide committed during the course of a home invasion), would be the most common type in the South. Their analysis of the Supplementary Homicide Report (SHR), which codes homicides in such a way that Nisbett and Cohen could classify them as either argument- or conflict- related (e.g., lovers' triangles) or felony-related (e.g., homicides occurring in the context of some other felony), supported their argument. Indeed, Nisbett and Cohen (1996) found that only argument- and conflict- related homicides were significantly higher in the South; not felony-related homicides (see also Cohen, 1998).

Study 1 examines data also based on the FBI Supplementary Homicide Report (SHR), but provided by a third party: the Violence Policy Center (VPC). Since 1998, the Violence Policy Center has annually analyzed data submitted to the FBI for its SHR and released a report titled "When Men Murder Women." The focus of this report is male-on-female homicides in single victim/single offender incidents. The most recently released report is based on data from the 2010 SHR. This VPC report revealed that in 2010, 1,800 females were murdered by males in single victim/single offender incidents. For homicides in which the relationship between the offender and victim could be established, 94% of women were killed by a male they knew. In 88% of all incidents where the circumstance could be determined, homicides were not related to the commission of any other felony (e.g., armed robbery, rape). Further, the report found that

60% of non-felony related incidents involved arguments between current or former romantic partners (*When Men Murder Women,* 2012).

Study 1 aims to replicate and extend to intimate partner violence the findings from Nisbett and Cohen (1996) and Cohen (1998) which demonstrate that argument- and conflict-related homicides (and not felony-related homicides) occur at significantly higher rates in the South. Given the statistics reviewed above (i.e., the majority of intimate partner homicides were not committed in commission of another felony; 60% of non-felony related incidents involved arguments; *When Men Murder Women*, 2012), this study operates under the hypothesis that intimate partner homicides will be significantly higher in honor-based cultures. Intimate partner homicides share similarities with the types of homicides Nisbett and Cohen (1996) and Cohen (1998) found to occur at significantly higher rates in the South; specifically, the relation of IPH to arguments and conflict and not the commission of other felonies.

Further, more in-depth analyses of the data from "When Men Murder Women" is warranted, because the report only provides the rates of male-on-female homicide in single victim/single offender incidents for each state, and ranks the states from highest to lowest based on these rates. The report does not provide an analysis of the differences between the states, including whether these differences reach levels of statistical significance. To determine statistical significance, the following hypotheses are posed and tested in Study 1:

H1: The southern region of the United States (Delaware, Maryland, Virginia, West Virginia, North Carolina, South Carolina, Georgia, Florida, Kentucky, Tennessee, Mississippi, Alabama, Oklahoma, Texas, Arkansas, Louisiana) has a significantly higher rate of male-on-female homicides in single victim, single offender incidents than other regions of the United States.

H2: The West, comprised of Idaho, Montana, Wyoming, Nevada, Utah, Colorado, Arizona, New Mexico, Alaska, Washington, Oregon, California, and Hawaii, has the second highest rate of male-on-female homicides in single victim, single offender incidents in the United States (after the South).

Recall from chapter two the review of research by Nisbett and Cohen (1996) detailing how the West is similar to the South. For example, the frontier West was settled by the same herdsman who initially settled the South, and as such, Nisbett and Cohen (1996) argued that the West should share to some degree the ideologies of the South. Field experiments by Cohen and colleagues (1996) revealed that companies in the South and West indeed shared similar viewpoints regarding honor-related violence. Cohen (1998) found similarities between the West and South in social organization. Data from the United States Peace Index (2012) show that the western United States is "less peaceful" than the Midwest or Northwest, and that the West is second only to the southern region of the United States.

Method

For Study 1, statewide rates of male-on-female homicides in single victim/single offender incidents were obtained for twelve years, 1998 through 2009, to evaluate H1 and H2. These data were gathered from the Violence Policy Center's report, "When Men Murder Women," based on homicide rates for the same years (but released yearly from 2000 to 2010). The data are based on 49 states, since Florida does not report statistics related to male-on-female/single victim, single offender homicides to the Federal Bureau of Investigation for the Supplementary Homicide Report, and are thus not reflected in the VPC reports. Data for Study 1 reflect 49 states, and contain five hundred eighty-four observations (n = 584). There were missing data

points for Alabama for 1999; Kansas for 1998 and 1999; and Wisconsin for 1998. Despite these missing data points, the data was determined to be "strongly balanced" (Allison, 2009).

For culture of honor status, states were categorized using Nisbett and Cohen's (1996) and Cohen's (1998) designation, which categorizes western states as U.S. Census Region 4 and southern states as U.S. Census Region 3. States within these regions are considered honor-based, while states within Regions 1 and 2 are grouped together as non-honor based states. Hawaii and Alaska were designated as part of the West, according to the U.S. Census designation. Previous culture of honor work has questioned the presence of an honor-based culture in these two states; thus, many prior studies exclude Alaska and Hawaii from western states. The inclusion of data for Hawaii and Alaska in the analyses conducted for Study 1 did not significantly alter the results, so these states were included in the following analyses.

Results

Mean homicide rates for male-on-female/single victim, single offender incidents from 1998 to 2009 were higher in the South (M = 20.63; SD = 4.30) and West (M = 16.40; SD = 6.52) than in the group of states not considered as honor-based (M = 11.59; SD = 3.50) (Cohen, 1998; Nisbett & Cohen, 1996). Of the two non-honor based regions, the Northeast emerged as having a slightly higher mean (M = 11.62; SD = 3.22) than the Midwest (M = 11.57; SD = 3.85). Mean homicide rates for each state are reported in Table 3.1.

To examine the extent to which the associations between honor based states and higher rates of male-on-female homicide reported in Table 3.1 could be explained by non-observed confounding factors, the data were analyzed using fixed-effects regression models (Fergusson & Horwood, 2000). The first model estimated included each year of available data, with 1998 set as the baseline comparison year, and 48 of the 49 states, with Massachusetts selected as the

baseline comparison because it represents the state with the lowest overall mean rate of male-on-female homicides for 1998 – 2009 (M = .58; SD = .14). Results of the fixed-effects regression analysis for states generally supported the findings from Table 3.1. Controlling for each year of available data for each state (n = 584), a significant association emerged between the highest murder rates and states with an honor-based culture. These results, presented in full in Table 3.2, provide preliminary evidence that the association between higher rates of male-on-female homicide in single victim, single offender incidents and the presence of an honor-based culture may not be explained by non-observable factors.

Table 3.1. Mean rates of male-on-female, single victim/single offender homicides 1998-2009.

	State	*M*		State	*M*
1	Nevada	2.60	25	Maine	1.21
2	South Carolina	2.30	26	Vermont	1.18
3	Louisiana	2.30	27	Delaware	1.18
4	Alaska	2.18	28	Kansas	1.17
5	Alabama	2.10	29	Hawaii	1.17
6	Tennessee	1.98	30	Wisconsin	1.07
7	New Mexico	1.88	31	New York	1.06
8	Arkansas	1.86	32	New Jersey	1.04
9	Oklahoma	1.82	33	Ohio	1.04
10	Arizona	1.81	34	Washington	1.02
11	North Carolina	1.80	35	Kentucky	1.02
12	Georgia	1.80	36	Utah	1.01
13	Texas	1.73	37	Idaho	.96
14	Missouri	1.65	38	Oregon	.94
15	Mississippi	1.63	39	Connecticut	.92
16	Virginia	1.57	40	South Dakota	.88
17	Maryland	1.45	41	Rhode Island	.80
18	West Virginia	1.44	42	Minnesota	.79
19	Colorado	1.42	43	Montana	.77
20	Wyoming	1.37	44	Iowa	.75
21	Pennsylvania	1.33	45	North Dakota	.66
22	Indiana	1.33	46	Nebraska	.64
23	Michigan	1.29	47	Illinois	.60
24	California	1.25	48	New Hampshire	.59
			49	Massachusetts	.58

Note: Florida does not submit data for the FBI Supplementary Homicide Report.

Table 3.2. Results of fixed effects regression analysis, states.

State	*b*	*t*	μ	State	*b*	*t*	μ
Nevada	2.02	12.65***	2.773	Maine	.632	3.95***	1.385
Louisiana *(tie)*	1.72	10.75***	2.473	Vermont	.6	3.75***	1.353
S. Carolina *(tie)*	1.72	10.75***	2.473	Delaware	.596	3.73***	1.349
Alaska	1.60	10.02***	2.353	Hawaii	.594	3.72***	1.347
Alabama	1.52	9.32***	2.273	Kansas	.616	3.67***	1.369
Tennessee	1.41	8.77***	2.163	Wisconsin	.502	3.07**	1.255
New Mexico	1.30	8.14***	2.053	New York	.479	3.00**	1.232
Arkansas	1.28	7.98***	2.033	New Jersey	.462	2.89**	1.215
Oklahoma	1.24	7.77***	1.993	Ohio	.456	2.85**	1.209
Arizona	1.23	7.71***	1.983	Washington	.439	2.75**	1.192
North Carolina	1.22	7.66***	1.973	Kentucky	.438	2.74**	1.191
Georgia	1.22	7.62***	1.973	Utah	.435	2.72**	1.188
Texas	1.15	7.19***	1.903	Idaho	.383	2.40*	1.136
Missouri	1.07	6.70***	1.823	Oregon	.36	2.25*	1.113
Mississippi	1.05	6.58***	1.803	Connecticut	.343	2.15*	1.096
Virginia	.993	6.21***	1.746	South Dakota	.298	1.86	1.051
Maryland	.869	5.44***	1.622	Rhode Island	.222	1.39	0.975
West Virginia	.856	5.35***	1.609	Minnesota	.208	1.30	0.961
Colorado	.836	5.23***	1.589	Montana	.188	1.18	0.941
Wyoming	.794	4.97***	1.547	Iowa	.168	1.05	0.921
Pennsylvania	.754	4.72***	1.507	North Dakota	.076	0.47	0.829
Indiana	.747	4.67***	1.5	Nebraska	.064	0.40	0.817
Michigan	.713	4.46***	1.466	Illinois	.023	0.15	0.776
California	.669	4.19***	1.422	New Hamp.	.011	0.07	0.764
Constant	.753	6.00***					
N	584						
R^2	0.653						
Adjusted R^2	0.614						

Note: Indicates significance at the following levels: *p < .05 **p < .01 ***p < .000

To test H1 and H2, an additional fixed-effects regression model was estimated with group variables for region in place of individual state variables. Region 2, the Midwest, was used as the baseline comparison group since the Midwest represents the region with the lowest mean rate of male-on-female homicide in single victim, single offender incidents. Results indicated that the southern and western regions of the United States have significantly higher rates of male-on-female homicide than the Midwest. The Northeast, a non-honor based culture, did not differ

significantly from the Midwest, the only other non-honor based culture in the United States. Table 3.3 presents the results of the fixed-effects regression analysis for regions.

One follow-up test to further clarify the relation between the South and the West was conducted. A second fixed-effects regression model was estimated with Region 3, the South, as the baseline comparison group. Results of this analysis revealed that the South and the West differ significantly from one another (b = -.314, t = -5.29, p < .000), providing further support for H1 and H2.

Table 3.3. Results of fixed effects regression analysis, regions.

Region	*b*	*t*	μ
South	.742	12.13***	1.898
West	.427	6.77***	1.583
Northeast	-.019	-0.27	1.137
Constant	1.156	12.95***	
N	584		
R^2	.2761		
Adjusted R^2	.2582		

*** Indicates significance at the p < .000 level.

Brief Discussion

Study 1 represents a pilot study conducted with the goal of providing preliminary evidence demonstrating significant differences between honor and nonhonor cultures within the United States for rates of male-on-female homicide in single victim, single offender incidents. The rationale for this study was informed by previous research demonstrating that rates of argument- and conflict- related homicides are significantly higher in honor cultures (Cohen, 1998; Nisbett & Cohen, 1996), and additional research revealing that this type of intimate partner homicide is largely driven from arguments and conflicts with a current or previous intimate partner (*When Men Murder Women*, 2012). The hypotheses proposed in Study 1 have the potential to inform researchers studying intercultural and interpersonal communication;

specifically, those interested in examining regional culture influences on the maintenance of escalating conflict, arguments, and aggression between heterosexual intimate partners.

Hypothesis 1 (H1) predicted that the southern region of the United States has a significantly higher rate of male-on female homicides in single victim, single offender incidents than other regions of the U.S. Indeed, fixed-effects regression analyses revealed that the southern region of the United States (Delaware, Maryland, Virginia, West Virginia, North Carolina, South Carolina, Georgia, Florida, Kentucky, Tennessee, Mississippi, Alabama, Oklahoma, Texas, Arkansas, and Louisiana) has a significantly higher rate of this type of intimate partner homicide than any other region of the United States.

Hypothesis 2 (H2) predicted that the West (Idaho, Montana, Wyoming, Nevada, Utah, Colorado, Arizona, New Mexico, Alaska, Washington, Oregon, California, and Hawaii) has the second highest rate of male-on-female homicides in single victim/single offender incidents, after the South. Fixed-effects regression analyses conducted in Study 1 provide preliminary support for H2. Analyses revealed that the South and the West differ significantly from the two non-honor based regional cultures of the United States, the Northwest and Midwest. Further analyses revealed that the West follows the South, as predicted in H2, and that these two regions differ significantly from one another. A complete discussion of the results and limitations of Study 1 is presented in Chapter 6.

CHAPTER FOUR
STUDY 2

Few studies have examined the perceptions of those involved in intimate partner violence in an effort to understand the causes or explanations for such violence occurring. However, individuals' perceptions are central to their own experiences, and the manner in which they behave in the face of violence from others (Flynn & Graham, 2010). Flynn and Graham (2010) argued that the lack of systematic research on perceptions of IPV is due to the absence of a clear conceptual model and lack of one broad, inclusive measure of perceived reasons for intimate partner violence. Study 2 presents the creation of a new instrument for measuring perceived reasons or attributions for intimate partner violence. The proposed measure improves upon previously created measures by including two parts; one part which assesses severity in acts of intimate partner violence, and a second which assesses attributions for the occurrence of IPV. The following sections present a review of the analyses conducted by Flynn and Graham (2010) on the entirety of studies addressing perceived reasons for intimate partner violence.

Prior Methods and Measures

Flynn and Graham (2010) conducted a comprehensive review of sixteen studies which examined perceptions of intimate partner violence or attributions for experiences with IPV, given by perpetrators and/or victims. The sixteen studies represented all of the studies that Flynn and Graham found which assess attributions, after a thorough review of the extant literature and a comprehensive keyword search of three databases. Articles downloaded from these databases were then further examined for references to other studies on attributions for intimate partner violence.

The first analysis conducted by Flynn and Graham (2010) examined all attributions related to the personal background and personality/character of individuals and/or their partners,

given across any or all of the sixteen studies. For attributions related to the background of the victim or perpetrator, the rate of endorsement was generally low across all studies (i.e., a nonsignificant or nearly nonsignificant amount of participants cited background as the reason for intimate partner violence occurring). For explanations regarding character or personality, the findings were widely varied. One study found that zero participants provided explanations for violence associated with character/personality, while another found that 61% of participants attributed violence in their relationship to reasons related to personality or character (Flynn & Graham, 2010). No significant gender differences were found across studies between individuals who gave character/personality as an attribution, but Flynn and Graham (2010) did find that participants were more likely to use explanations related to character in reference to their partner's violence more than their own.

In the second analysis conducted by Flynn and Graham (2010), attributions for intimate partner violence related to current life circumstances were examined. Findings revealed that stress is an important contextual contributor to violence, although likely not a specific reason for violence (Flynn & Graham, 2010). However, as noted by Flynn and Graham, only a few of the sixteen studies examined perceived stress as an explanation for violence, and those studies had small, extremely selective samples; thus, drawing conclusions for the role of stress is difficult. Another problem that arose in their analysis of life circumstances was the difficulty in classifying certain contextual factors, such as depression or drug addiction, as character/personality issues, or as current life circumstances that contribute to intimate partner violence.

Factors from both the first analysis (background of individual or personality/character) and second analysis (current life circumstances) were addressed in relatively few of the sixteen studies analyzed by Flynn and Graham (2010). Further, some aspects of background,

personality, character, or current life circumstances are interchangeable with "risk factors" for IPV, but "risk factors" are commonly addressed in the literature in a way that subsumes their presence without actually assessing individual perceptions of such factors.

The influence that some of these factors have on intimate partner violence, such as attitudes toward intimate partner violence or social norms and expectations, may only be made clear when articulated by those directly involved. Understanding these influences at the individual-level is relevant to the treatment and prevention of IPV. For example, some acts of intimate partner violence may be committed in light of social norms and expectations for violent behavior, and are not actually reflections of the perpetrator's personally held beliefs (Cohen, 2001). In these cases, the causes of IPV may be malleable and addressable in personal counseling or other interventions directed toward perpetrators, since altering individual perceptions of specific conflict situations is a more realistic goal than altering stable aspects of an individual's personality (Flynn & Graham, 2010). Perpetrators of intimate partner violence who are made aware of how their perceptions play a role in their aggressive behavior, and are willing to change, could learn to reinterpret their perceptions in ways that help avoid or reduce violence in the future (Flynn & Graham, 2011).

Flynn and Graham's (2010) third analysis involved assessing attributions relating to immediate precursors or precipitators to acts of intimate partner violence. This analysis contained the most numerous and diverse set of items. Results revealed that perceived provocation by a partner was commonly reported as a reason for self-defense and retaliatory aggression. Significant differences for self- and partner- attributions were found for self-defense, with both men and women reporting self-defense more often as an explanation for their own use of aggression, compared to a partner's use of aggression. Other commonly endorsed reasons for

aggression assessed by the third analysis included threats to the relationship, especially infidelity and "lack of commitment;" anger (*not* displaced anger); using violence to express feelings that could not be explained in words; and certain forms of controlling a partner and influencing his/her behavior. Regarding control, Flynn and Graham (2010) found that explanations relating to coercion and control were cited more frequently than explanations related to feeling more powerful, intimidation, or punishment.

Flynn and Graham (2010) note that the knowledge of victims' and perpetrators' perceived reasons for IPV is scattered throughout several different bodies of research, across studies which used very different samples, methods, and were guided by very different research questions. The lack of a clear, consistent conceptual model has likely hampered efforts at treatment and prevention of IPV. Certain constructs can be ambiguous when given as attributions, such as anger or jealousy, because they can be reflective of stable traits in a person, a transient emotional state, or a response to a perceived relationship threat (Flynn & Graham, 2010). Violence attributed to situational reactions versus personality characteristics are not only conceptually different, but are likely to require different treatment approaches or intervention efforts.

One of the primary reasons for the lack of clarity about the roles of complex constructs like anger and jealousy is the lack of a systematic or validated instrument designed specifically for comprehensive investigations into attribution of IPV given by victims and perpetrators (Flynn & Graham, 2010).[3] Variations in how attributions are specified can have an "important impact on rates of endorsement by study participants and interpretation of results by researchers" (Flynn & Graham, 2010). For example, while more than one of the measures used previously contain

[3] Since using different scales means that the studies did not present the same reasons or perceived motives for intimate partner violence to their participants, a meta-analysis (the standardized way of examining multiple studies concomitantly) is impossible.

an item related to anger as an attribution for intimate partner violence, the items are phrased or presented differently between measures. This nonspecific nature of measures hampers meaningful interpretations of data (Flynn & Graham, 2010). It is unclear if anger, for example, is indicative of a trait-like predisposition to anger, or a transient emotional state or response to certain incidents.

While currently no comprehensive and widely-used measure of attributions for IPV exists, there are four measures which "partially" tap into perceived reasons for intimate partner violence (Flynn & Graham, 2010, p. 242). The Proximal Antecedents to Violent Episodes (PAVE) scale was developed by Babcock, Costa, Green, and Eckhardt (2004) to address instrumental or expressive types of intimate violence. The PAVE categorizes batterers by three types of motives: violence to control, violence out of jealousy, and violence following verbal abuse. The PAVE was not designed to "measure systematically perceived explanations for aggression;" thus, existing work using the PAVE "does not provide a comprehensive picture of perceived causal factors among victims and perpetrators of IPV" (Flynn & Graham, 2010, p. 242). One other serious limitation of the PAVE is that the measure only assesses a participant's self-reported *likelihood* of violence in certain hypothetical situations, not actual situations where a participant was violent (Babcock et al., 2004). The Proximal Antecedents to Violent Episodes (PAVE) is presented in Appendix B for reference purposes.

The Relationship Abuse Questionnaire (RAQ), developed by Barnett, Lee, and Thelen (1997), assesses specific tactics used by intimate partners during conflict as well as outcomes related to these tactics and possible attributions for their use. In total, 28 forms of abuse are presented on the RAQ, nine possible attributions, and four possible outcomes of abuse (Flynn & Graham, 2010). Limitations faced by the RAQ could not be assessed for the purposed of Study 2

(this dissertation) because a copy of the RAQ could not be obtained. The scholar who created the RAQ did not respond to requests for copies of the measure, and the questionnaire was not presented in its entirety in any published study. A study by Barnett, Lee, and Thelen (1997) represents the most recent study utilizing the RAQ, and within the study only unpublished conference papers were cited for the creation and attempted validation of the measure (Barnett, Keyson, & Thelen, 1992; Barnett & Willet, 1987; Barnett & Wilshire, 1987). The only limitation of the RAQ acknowledged by Barnett et al. (1997) is the lack of previous discriminant validity checks comparing data collected from the RAQ with a sample of nonassaultive male respondents.

The Reasons for Violence Scale (RVS) was developed by Stuart, Moore, Coop, Gordon, Hellmuth, Ramsey, and Kahler (2006) to assess the reasons for physical violence against a partner and the frequency of such acts. The RVS lists 29 possible reasons for violence and asks participants to provide the percentage of time they were physically aggressive toward a partner for each reason presented (Flynn & Graham, 2010). The primary limitation of the RVS is the means by which the items are scaled. Each of the 29 reasons are listed in a self-report measure, and participants are instructed to "identify the percentage of violent episodes in which each reason was a factor in their decision to perpetrate partner violence" (Stuart et al., 2006). Multiple reasons could be endorsed for any act of IPV, and each item on the questionnaire could vary from 0% to 100% based on the participant's report (Stuart et al, 2006).

Stuart and colleagues did not acknowledge their scaling method as a limitation of the RVS, but accounting for percentages of time in an entire year that an individual was motivated by each reason is overly complex. Previously, scholars have noted the difficulties in determining how closely a retrospective report matches the actual moment (Caldwell, Swan, Allen, Sullivan,

& Snow, 2009). Given the highly distressing nature of IPV incidents, participants likely have difficulty remembering all the motives for acts of IPV committed over the entirety of a long time frame (Caldwell et al., 2009). Asking participants to account for percentages of time a motive was present for all acts of IPV committed over the course of such an extended time frame likely introduces a great deal more error than would, for example, a method involving collection of count data for a smaller referent period. Flynn and Graham (2010) made a similar argument, stating that a focus on specific incidents provides concrete referent periods, opposed to "less reliable" mental averaging approaches (such as the percentage method used for the RVS). The RVS is presented in Appendix C.

The Motivations and Effects Questionnaire (MEQ), presented in Appendix D, was developed by Follingstad, Wright, Lloyd, and Sebastian (1991) to study dating violence. On the MEQ, victims and perpetrators of dating violence are asked whether "thirteen possible motivations…were present in the person who used force against them or were part of their own motivations for using force" (Flynn & Graham, 2010, p. 242). One of the primary limitations of the MEQ which was discovered and discussed by the authors of the original scale creation piece was the wording of the directions. Specifically, participants in Follingstad et al. (1991) were first asked to indicate whether they had ever been a "victim of physical force in a dating relationship" (p. 53). After analyzing the results of their study, Follingstad and colleagues (1991) discovered that the terms "victim" and "perpetrator" may have been interpreted by participants in different ways, especially males. Follingstad et al. (1991) described one male participant who reported that he was not a "victim" of physical force, but went on to list a "variety of violent acts directed at him by a dating partner" (p. 55). Recently, researchers have addressed this type of artifact in data on intimate partner violence perpetration. Dutton (2012) argued that neutral language

should be presented to participants in studies of IPV, due to the fact that social desirability bias likely influences a person's willingness to identify as a "victim" or a "perpetrator."

The limitations discussed here provide the basis of the rationale for creating a new measure to assess attributions for intimate partner violence. Flynn and Graham (2010) also provided several additional arguments in support of the creation of a new measure. Their primary argument for the creation of a new measure was based in the importance of a common conceptual framework that a new, comprehensive measure would provide. Flynn and Graham (2010) argued that a common framework is especially necessary for future examinations that compare different perpetrator and/or victim groups, since perceptions of why acts of intimate partner violence occurs could vary as a function of the population under study. Interrelationships between populations cannot be determined if data are gathered using different measures presenting different attributions (Flynn & Graham, 2010).

Flynn and Graham (2010) also argued that the current measures for assessing attributions for IPV are limited by not only the types of explanations they present to respondents, but by a lack of variety in proximal and distal reasons. In order to accurately identify the reasons perceived to be the most frequent contributors to IPV, a comprehensive but standard measure is needed. Research utilizing a standard measure would, as Flynn and Graham (2010) argued, "produce more systematic knowledge of differences by gender, self versus partner attributions, and severity of violence" (p. 245).

Finally, Flynn and Graham (2010) argued that the most effective measure of attributions for intimate partner violence would include an assessment of specific experiences. As they noted, all the existing measures except for the PAVE address general tendencies, rather than explanations related to specific previous incidents. Addressing the severity of a respondent's

experiences with intimate partner violence in conjunction with perceptions of why specific incidents occurred "provides a basis for identifying perceived reasons which differentiate between different types or severity of aggression" between different couples from different populations. Considering the higher rates of IPV characterizing certain regional cultures within the United States, as detailed in Chapter 2, a measure combining assessments of severity and perceptions is particular important for research on IPV occurrence in the United States.

Creation of a New Measure

The following sections present the development of a new measure to assess individual attributions for experiences with intimate partner violence and the specific acts constituting these experiences. The new measure presents participants with two lists of possible reasons for the occurrence of intimate partner violence. The lists contain the same set of items. For the first, participants are asked to think about the most severe act of violence or aggression they perpetrated against a current or former intimate partner and indicate their reasons for committing such an act. For the second list, participants are asked to think about the most severe act of violence or aggression experienced as a victim (i.e., perpetrated *against* them), and select the reasons for why they believe their partner. Acts of aggression are assessed in the proposed measure by inclusion of the revised Conflict Tactics Scale (CTS2; Straus, Hamby, Boney-McCoy, & Sugarman, 1996). The complete measure is presented in Appendix E. The following sections present the items included on the attributions section of the proposed measure, as well as the rationales for their inclusion, followed by a description of the tactics and demographics portions of the proposed measure.

Proposed Measure: Attributions

The 24 items included on the attributions portion of the proposed measure were drawn from the four measures reviewed in the previous sections and a review of the literature on severe intimate partner violence and IPV within cultures of honor. The quantitative review conducted by Flynn and Graham (2010) helped serve as a guide for which items to include from the extant literature.

According to Flynn and Graham (2010), some of the more commonly cited reasons for intimate partner violence, across the body of literature, relate to feeling provoked (Flynn & Graham, 2010). Items across previous studies reflecting provocation have in common the idea that something one's partner did prompted an aggressive response. Rates of endorsement for reasons related to provocation may be useful in distinguishing violence committed within honor cultures, compared to violence in nonhonor cultures.

Violence as a response to provocation is more condoned in cultures of honor than nonhonor cultures. Recall field experiments by Cohen and Nisbett (1997) which showed that southern and western companies were more likely than their northern counterparts to respond in understanding and cooperative ways to applicants who had killed someone in response to an honor threat. Further, they found that newspapers in southern and western cultures, when presented with the same facts as newspapers in the North, created stories which were sympathetic to a perpetrator of a stabbing in response to a family insults, and justified the man's actions more than northern papers did. Lab studies by Cohen and colleagues (1996) found that males from cultures of honor display more actual aggression than males from other regions of the U.S. in response to a confederate bumping into them and calling them an "asshole."

Previous research also shows that women from cultures of honor are more violent than their northern counterparts in response to provocation. Nisbett and Cohen (1996) found that white southern women are much more likely to kill than her northern counterparts, particularly when the circumstances involve a lovers' triangle, brawl, or argument. In fact, white southern women account for 48% of all white-female perpetrated homicides; broken down, they account for 55% percent of all lovers' triangle, 72% of all alcohol and brawl-related, and 52% of all argument-related homicides perpetrated by white females in the U.S. (Nisbett & Cohen, 1996, p. 87). Nisbett and Cohen (1996) suggested that these rates could be a combination of two factors: 1) simple reactions to more violent southern men, and/or 2) lower thresholds for what southern women will tolerate from men before becoming violent.

Violence attributed to jealousy and infidelity concerns can also be considered acts committed in the face of provocation. Daly and Wilson (1988) argue that relationship violence occurs across all cultures and social groups, and much of this violence derives from infidelity concerns. Additional research on jealousy and infidelity within cultures of honor demonstrates how fidelity is a unique and more consequential social concern. First, female infidelity damages a man's reputation in honor cultures; second, a man's damaged reputation can be restored through the use of violence (Vandello & Cohen, 2003). Infidelity or cheating partners is not argued to be a uniquely occurring phenomenon; rather, in honor cultures, infidelity is associated with more severe forms of punishment (i.e., males using more severe tactics against an unfaithful female partner) because of social or cultural norms which indirectly sanction violence against women, particularly women who pose an honor threat (see Puente & Cohen, 2003; Vandello et al. 2009).

While previous measures did attempt to capture reasons related to jealousy and/or infidelity, the proposed measure addresses the nuances of these concepts. Jealousy can be either (or both) a stable attribute of a person's character (i.e., "He/she is the jealous type"), or an emotional state brought on by a specific event, such as infidelity (Flynn and Graham, 2010). Given the severity of violence historically associated with jealousy- and infidelity- related concerns, the current measure includes both cognitive and behavioral nuances of this complex concept. The eleven items included to assess attributions related to provoked intimate partner violence are presented in Table 4.1.

Table 4.1. Items to assess provoked IPV.

Items: Provoked Violence
Because I/my partner was 'getting back' at me/my partner for hitting me first
Because I/my partner was 'getting back' at my partner for something my partner/I said or did
Because I/my partner was unfaithful
Because I/my partner did something to make my partner/me jealous
Because I/my partner was angry with my partner/me for something I/my partner did
Because I slept separately/my partner slept separately
Because I/my partner was telling people things about my partner/me that I/my partner shouldn't have
Because I/my partner said something disrespectful to my partner/me
Because I said things which hurt my partner's feelings/My partner said things which hurt my feelings
Because I/my partner was pushed over the edge
Because I was angry with my partner for something he/she said/Partner angry for something I said

Flynn and Graham (2010) found that explanations relating to coercion and control were cited more frequently than explanations related to feeling more powerful, intimidation, and/or punishment. Within honor cultures, family stability is endorsed over individuality, and threats to a man or his family justify the use of violence, even against a woman in the event she has brought shame to the family (e.g., was unfaithful) (Vandello & Cohen, 2008). The six items included on the proposed measure to assess a person's use of violence to control his or her partner, or the relationship, are presented in Table 4.2.

Table 4.2. Items to assess IPV for control.

Items: Violence to Control
Because I was trying to stop my partner from leaving/Partner trying to stop me from leaving
Because it is my role to punish (expected of me)/Partner's role to punish (I expected it)
Because I/my partner was trying to walk away before the problem was solved
Because my partner refused to have sex with me/I refused to have sex with my partner
Because my partner refused to do as I told/I refused to do as I was told
Because I/my partner wanted to preserve the integrity of our family/relationship

Attributions related to background or personality/character, as well as life circumstances of a perpetrator or victim (all considered proximal reasons), were addressed in relatively few of the sixteen studies analyzed by Flynn and Graham (2010). Carrado, George, Loxam, Jones, and Templar (1996) found that 44% of female and 31% of male participants from a general population sample cited character attributions (i.e., "it's in his/her character; it's the way he/she is"). Fewer women (16% of participants) explained her own aggression as being due to her character than men (27% of participants) (Carrado et al., 1996). Another study by Henning, Jones, and Holdford (2005) found that 31% of arrested men and women in their sample attributed their intimate partner violence to some aspect of their own personality, and 61% attributed it to some aspect of their partner's personality. Flynn and Graham's (2010) analysis supported the findings from Henning et al. (2005). Their analysis revealed that, across the studies which included items related to personality/character, participants were more likely to use explanations related to character in reference to their partner's violence than their own.

However, Flynn and Graham (2010) remarked that certain "background" or "risk factors" are often interchangeable with personality or character attributions, but are commonly addressed in the literature in a way that subsumes their presence without actually assessing an individual's perceptions of such factors. For example, Flynn and Graham (2010) did not find any quantitative studies of perceived attributions for IPV which assessed attitudes and beliefs about

sex roles, such as the importance of a man being the breadwinner in a relationship, or beliefs about a real man being dominant and in control of a heterosexual relationship. Items are included on the proposed measure to fill this deficit in the literature, especially since rates of endorsement for these items could also potentially distinguish violence that occurs in honor cultures from that which occurs in nonhonor cultures. Seven items related to personality/character are included on the proposed measure, and are presented in Table 4.3.

Table 4.3. Items to assess IPV related to character/personality of perpetrator and/or victim.

Items: Character/Personality as Cause for IPV
Because it's just the way I am/my partner is
Because it's just the way I am/my partner is
Because I am/my partner is a 'real man' or 'real woman'
Because backing down from an argument is not an option for me/my partner
Because I/my partner was stressed about something else
Because I/my partner needed to prove that I/he/she loved the other
Because I don't/my partner doesn't see a problem with using aggressive tactics during an argument

Additional considerations. A limitation of many prior studies examining reasons for intimate partner violence is that participants were often questioned weeks or months after violent incidents occurred (Caldwell et al., 2009), which is a method common across the literature on intimate partner violence and necessary due to ethical and logistic considerations (i.e., intimate partner violence cannot be experimentally induced in a laboratory). Since errors in self-report accuracy are likely to vary in relation to the length of the referent time period (i.e., more errors as more time/more events need to be accounted for), the attributions section of the proposed measure directs participants to recall one specific, particularly severe episode of intimate partner violence. By directing participants to recall the *most* violent episodes of victimization and perpetration, the current measure also accounts for complications between emotional distress and memory. Participants may have difficulty remembering, let alone identifying the reasons for, all acts of intimate partner violence that occurred over a distressing period of time (Caldwell et al.,

2009). Participants may, however, have less difficulty remembering one particularly painful incident that "stands out" due to the severity of that episode.

The second consideration taken when developing the proposed measure was in wording the items and directions in a manner neutral to sex and victim/perpetrator status. Flynn and Graham (2010) noted that there were significant differences in self- and partner- attributions for the use of intimate partner violence. Knowledge of self- versus partner- attributions is important for understanding intimate partner violence, as interventions would be different for those who engage in sustained abuse, acknowledge such abuse, and attribute their violence to situational triggers, all while identifying their own role in violent relationships (Flynn & Graham, 2010). By presenting self-partner attributions, as opposed to victim-perpetrator, and allowing participants to self-identify, the measure developed in this study recognizes that individuals may simultaneously occupy the roles of victim and perpetrator, and that different explanations may be given depending on whether a participant is addressing his or her own, or a partner's, violence (Flynn & Graham, 2010).

Lastly, studies utilizing the four previously created measures drew samples from various and vastly different populations, some of which were so decidedly specific that results from those studies have limited external validity or generalizability. Such populations included couples in marital counseling (Cascardi & Vivian, 1995), men and women who have been arrested for domestic violence (Henning, Jones, & Holdford, 2005); or only men or only women. Consideration was taken in the development of the new measure to word the items and directions in a gender-neutral way (i.e., both men and women can identify as victims and/or perpetrators).

Proposed Measure: Demographics

The first part of the proposed measure presents participants with a series of demographic questions, including sex, age, marital status, race/ethnicity, highest level of education completed, and currently yearly income. A question asking participants if they identify as being part of a culture of honor (e.g., 'A "Culture of Honor" can be defined as a culture in which men are willing to stand up for themselves using physical aggression, particularly when they have been insulted or disrespected. In such cultures, more "traditional" gender roles are the norm (e.g., males are the "breadwinners", females are the caretakers). Additionally, participants are asked to identify the state in which they spent most of their life (defined as at least 75% of their life); if they have not spent the majority of their life in one state, they are asked to list the state which they identify with the most as being "home."

Proposed Measure: Conflict Tactics

Following the demographic questions, Part 1 of the proposed measure provides participants with the revised Conflict Tactics Scale (CTS2), which assesses the types of tactics the participant has used against a partner, and the tactics a partner has used against him or her (Straus et al., 1996). One important reason the CTS2 was utilized in the current studies is that the theoretical basis of the scale is in conflict theory, which assumes that conflict is an inevitable part of relating interpersonally, whereas violence as a tactic to deal with conflict is not (Straus, 1979; Straus et al., 1996). The revised Conflict Tactics Scales (CTS2) was chosen to assess conflict tactics because it also remains neutral in its wording regarding the sex or gender of the victim or perpetration, and assesses both the use of and victimization by various types of conflict tactics (Straus et al., 1996). The CTS2 method is an improvement over many national surveys which focused on the criminal victimization of women only, such as the National Violence

Against Women Survey. Further, empirical research has demonstrated that the Conflict Tactics Scale is 16 times more sensitive than government crime victim surveys (Dutton, 2007; Straus, 1999). The CTS2 has been specified for use by members of dating, cohabitating, and/or marital relationships (Straus et al., 1996, p. 292); this is especially important since participants in the current studies were not selected or excluded based on their relationship status.

Method

Participants

To test the proposed measure, undergraduate students enrolled in communication courses at a large university completed it during the fall of 2012. Students were only allowed to participate once in the study. All participants received credit in their communication studies courses through a research participation system, allowing all data collected to remain completely anonymous. Students completed the survey online from a location of their choice to alleviate potential social desirability effects.

Demographics. A total of 175 students completed the questionnaire. Students ranged in age from 18 - 61 (M = 21; SD = 4.85) and were predominantly Caucasian (78.74%). Just under fifteen percent (14.94%) of participants identified as Black/African American. There were 75 male and 100 female participants. The vast majority of the sample (93.71%) reported being currently single (n = 164), 4.57% reported being currently married (n = 8), and three participants listed "Other" as their currently marital status, giving "Engaged" (n = 1) and "In a Serious Relationship" (n = 2). One hundred forty-eight participants (85.06%) reported "High School Diploma/GED" as their highest level of education; 11 reported "Bachelor's Degree" and 7 reported "Associate's Degree." Approximately half (50.86%) of participants stated that their

current yearly income was less than $15,000 a year (*n* = 89); 5.14% reported $15,000-$24,000 (*n* = 9); 2.86% reported $25,000-$35,000 (*n* = 5); and 38.29% reported being unemployed (*n* = 67). Four participants (*n* = 4) listed incomes between $36,000-$100,000 and only one respondent (*n* = 1) listed an income over $100,000 per year.

Participants reported currently residing in eleven different states. One hundred fifty-nine participants reported Louisiana as the state in which they currently reside (*n* = 159); other states represented include Alabama (*n* = 2), California (*n* = 2), Florida (*n* = 2), Illinois (*n* = 1), Indiana (*n* = 1), Missouri (*n* = 3), New York (*n* = 1), North Carolina (*n* = 2), Pennsylvania (*n* = 1), and Tennessee (*n* = 1). The majority of participants (*n* = 74) reported that they adhere to a "Culture of Honor," answering "Absolutely" or "Yes, for the most part." Just over thirty-one percent (31.43%) of participants (*n* = 55) stated that they somewhat adhered to a "Culture of Honor," or were uncertain, and 17.71% answered "No, for the most part" (*n* = 31), and 8.57% answered "No, not at all" (*M* = 2.81; SD = 1.12).

Instrument

Conflict Tactics. After the demographic questions, the CTS2 was presented, which assesses the various intimate partner violence tactics participants both used and experienced during a specific referent period. For the current study, participants were asked to think about the last relationship they were in where they experienced a lot of conflict or couldn't seem to get along with their partner. Participants indicated yes or no to being currently in a relationship with the partner they were imagining, if they were/are married to this person, if they did/do live with this partner, and if the partner is male or female. Lastly, participants indicated if they or their partner had the higher income, and how long they were or have been in the relationship.

Straus et al. (1996) indicated that altering the instructions by asking participants about a specific time period and/or a specific event or situation (e.g., a specific relationship) is acceptable. Thus, the version of the CTS2 used in this pilot study differed from the original version in that participants were not provided with seven response categories. "Not in the past year, but it did happen before" was removed because participants were directed to think about one previous relationship and the conflict during that one relationship.

The CTS2 contains 78 total items (Straus et al., 1996): 39 items designed to assess the respondent's use of each of the tactics listed, referred to as the perpetration items or "Self-as-Perpetrator" items; and 39 items designed to assess the respondent's victimization from the same list of tactics (i.e., "Self-as-Victim") (Yun, 2012). In the scale creation piece, the authors (Straus et al., 1996) proposed that the CTS2 loads on five scales: Negotiation, which includes items to asses actions taken to settle a disagreement, such as "Showed respect for my partner's feeling about an issue" and "Explained my side of a disagreement to my partner"; Psychological Aggression, which assesses nonverbal aggressive acts (e.g., "Insulted or swore at my partner" and "Destroyed something belonging to my partner"); Physical Assault, which assesses acts that fit the definition of physical violence (e.g. "Pushed or shoved my partner" and "Beat up my partner"); Sexual Coercion, which includes items to asses behaviors intended to compel a partner to engage in unwanted sexual activity (e.g., "Used threats to make my partner have sex"); and Injury, which includes items to assess "partner-inflicted physical injury" (e.g., "Had a broken bone from a fight with my partner") (Straus et al., 1996). Each of the scales consists of two subscales; for all scales except Negotiation, the subscales are divided as minor and severe. The negotiation scale is divided by emotional and cognitive tactics used during conflicts.

Attributions. Following the CTS2, participants were presented with the attributions section of the proposed measure. Participants were asked to cite their reasons or motivations for using their most aggressive tactic against a current or former partner, and then asked to cite the possible motivations behind the use of the most aggressive tactic a previous partner (the same partner used for the referent period when answering the CTS2) enacted against the participant. This section of the proposed measure contains 24 possible attributions for the occurrence of intimate partner violence or aggression.

Results

Confirmatory factor analyses were conducted using Structural Equation Modeling (SEM) with Stata 12.0. Using SEM to conduct factor analytic procedures is a practice that has been more widely adopted in recent years (Crowley & Fan, 1997). The structural equation approach is a formal way of combining aspects of factor analysis and aspects of regression into the same model, and supports estimation and testing of a variety of alternative specifications, "such as error correlations, and relationships involving other observed or latent variables" (Hamilton, 2013, p. 348).

Conflict Tactics

The reliability and validity of the CTS2 have been stable across studies sampling cultures with varying levels of male dominance (Straus & Mickey, 2012). Additional psychometric analyses of the CTS2 have demonstrated that the scale can be used in populations from various cultures with similar results, and that considerations may only need to be taken if the groups being compared speak different languages (Connelly, Newton, & Aarons, 2005). In the current study, confirmatory factor analytic procedures (maximum likelihood estimation) were used to assess the fit of the CTS2 model. Confirmatory factor analyses were based on direct scores

(0 = Never; 1 = Once; 2 = Twice; 3 = 3-5 Times; 4 = 6-10 Times; 5 = 11-20 Times; 6 = More than 20 Times) (see Newton, Connelly, & Landsverk, 2001; Calvete, Corral, & Estevez, 2007). Two models are estimated: Model 1 examines whether the CTS2 is composed of ten correlated first order factors; and Model 2 assesses whether the CTS2 is composed of five correlated first order factors (Calvete et al., 2007). In the original scale development report, Straus et al. (1996) proposed that the CTS2 consists of five scales consisting of two subscales each. Distinguishing between the subscales, such as minor and severe physical assaults, recognizes that the etiology and treatment of minor assaults may be very different from severe assaults (Straus et al., 1996). Given the distinctions between the subscales for each of the five factors, some scholars argue that the CTS2 is comprised of ten factors (Calvete, Corral, & Estevez, 2007; Yun, 2011). Most prior studies investigating the factor structure of the CTS2, however, have tested a five-factor model due to its simplicity (Yun, 2011).

With $n = 175$ and $\alpha = .05$, the current study was sufficiently powered to assess small ($r = .10$), medium ($r = .30$), and large ($r = .50$) effects in structural equation models for both a five-factor and ten-factor model of the CTS2.

Model 1: Ten Factors. The first model in this study tested the structure of the CTS2 as ten correlated first-order factors, consisting of the ten subscales on the CTS2 (Negotiation Emotion [NE], Negotiation Cognition [NC], Psychological Aggression Minor [PM], Psychological Aggression Severe [PS], Physical Assault Minor [PhyM], Physical Assault Severe [PhyS], Sexual Coercion Minor [SCM], Sexual Coercion Severe [SCS], Injury Minor [IM], Injury Severe [IS]) (see also Calvete et al., 2007). The ten factors associated with the "Self-as-Perpetrator" items were analyzed separately from the ten factors associated with the "Self-as-Victim" items.

Using structural equation modeling to conduct confirmatory factor analyses, neither of the two models reached convergence. The ten factor model failed to reach convergence for neither the perpetration items, χ^2 (685) = 19148.10, $p < .000$, TLI = 0.09, CFI = 0.16, RMSEA = .42 (90% CI: .000, ---) or the victimization items χ^2 (686) = 4758.50, $p < .000$, TLI = 0.44, CFI = 0.48, RMSEA = .19 (90% CI: .000, ---).

Model 2: Five Factors. Model 2 tested whether the CTS2 structure is represented by five correlated first-order factors (Negotiation, Psychological Aggression, Physical Assault, Sexual Coercion, and Injury). The five factors associated with each set of items (victimization and perpetration) were analyzed separately. Using structural equation modeling to conduct confirmatory factor analyses, the five factor model failed to reach convergence for neither the perpetration items, χ^2 (698) = 19864.82, $p < .000$, TLI = 0.07, CFI = 0.13, RMSEA = .42 (90% CI: .000, ---) or the victimization items, χ^2 (692) = 5672.83, $p < .000$, TLI = 0.32, CFI = 0.36, RMSEA = .21 (90% CI: .000, ---).

Exploratory Factor Analyses. Given the lackluster results of the confirmatory factor analyses, exploratory factor analyses (maximum likelihood and varimax rotation) were conducted to see what these data indicated about the structure of the CTS2 (Bodie, Worthington, & Fitch-Hauser, 2011). First, a Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin measure of sampling adequacy was obtained to determine whether these data were appropriate for factor analyses. The measure was .814, which is considered a "meritorious" amount of common variance by the standards set by Kaiser (1974). Two separate exploratory factor analyses were conducted, one with the perpetration items and a second for victimization items.

The first unconstrained exploratory factor analysis on the perpetration items produced Heywood cases. To solve for this, a minimum Eigen value for common factors was set at 1.0

(Hamilton, 2013, p. 327). The constrained analysis resulted in the extraction of six factors which explain a cumulative 85% of the item variance. Results of the rotated, extracted exploratory factor analysis are presented in Table 4.4. For the initial examination of factor loadings, this study draws very conservative criteria from the literature in communication studies. Specifically, for an item to be considered an indicator of a factor, it needed to have a primary factor loading of at least .60, and no secondary loading greater than .40 (McCroskey & Young, 1979).

For the perpetration items, the two negotiation subscales (emotion and cognitive) were relatively robust, given that all items for each subscale met the .60/.40 criteria and did not cross-load on two or more factors. However, for the eight other subscales, factor matrices demonstrated complex cross-loading patterns (Yun, 2012). For example, none of the four items on the Psychological Aggression Minor subscale met the stringent loading criteria; however, even if relaxed (Brown, 2006), the four items cross-load on Factors 3 and 5 (.37 - .54). Numerous items across the eight remaining subscales had a primary factor loading greater than .60, but also had loadings greater than .40 on other factors.

Table 4.4. Factor loadings, CTS2, Self-as-Perpetrator.

	Factor					
Item	1	2	3	4	5	6
Negotiation- Emotional (NE)						
Showed partner I cared though we disagreed	-0.02	0.04	0.75	-0.13	0.05	0.03
Showed respect for partner feeling about issue	-0.06	-0.06	0.75	0.01	0.03	0.03
Said I was sure we could work out a problem	0.01	-0.10	0.81	-0.06	0.10	-0.07
Negotiation- Cognitive (NC)						
Explained my side of disagreement to partner	0.02	-0.02	0.78	0.00	0.02	-0.01
Suggested a compromise to a disagreement	-0.11	0.15	0.73	0.12	0.06	0.06
Agreed to try a solution partner suggested	-0.13	0.05	0.75	-0.05	0.04	0.05
Psychological Aggression- Minor (PM)						
Insulted or swore at my partner	0.15	-0.10	0.50	0.14	0.44	0.11
Shouted or yelled at my partner	0.01	-0.14	0.54	0.03	0.49	0.09
Stomped out room/house/yard	0.06	-0.05	0.41	0.19	0.37	0.18

(Table 4.4 continued)

	Factor					
Item	1	2	3	4	5	6
Psychological Aggression- Minor (PM) (cont.)						
Said something to spite my partner	-0.03	-0.04	0.38	0.09	0.46	0.26
Psychological Aggression- Severe (PS)						
Called my partner fat or ugly	0.51	0.11	0.04	0.16	0.35	0.27
Destroyed something belonging to my partner	0.54	0.18	-0.03	0.46	0.27	0.30
Accused my partner of being a lousy lover	0.10	0.15	0.06	0.28	0.21	0.56
Threatened to hit/throw something at partner	-0.04	-0.09	0.05	0.17	0.67	0.36
Physical Assault- Minor (PhyM)						
Threw something at my partner that could hurt	0.56	0.06	0.03	0.16	0.31	0.08
Twisted my partner's arm or hair	0.60	0.27	-0.04	0.51	0.19	0.14
Pushed or shoved my partner	0.33	0.10	0.19	-0.01	0.68	-0.05
Grabbed my partner	0.19	0.15	0.14	-0.04	0.64	-0.06
Slapped my partner	0.08	0.29	0.06	0.33	0.51	0.23
Physical Assault- Severe (PhyS)						
Used a gun or knife on my partner	0.93	0.30	-0.04	0.14	0.02	0.02
Punched/hit partner with something that hurt	0.75	0.16	0.04	0.21	0.31	-0.03
Choked or attempted to strangle my partner**	0.79	0.47	-0.02	0.31	0.02	0.05
Slammed my partner against a wall	0.10	0.33	0.03	0.09	0.62	-0.20
Beat up my partner	0.36	0.82	0.02	0.11	0.11	0.01
Burned or scalded my partner on purpose	0.45	0.63	-0.04	0.58	0.01	0.09
Kicked my partner	0.05	0.23	-0.02	0.23	0.41	0.47
Sexual Coercion- Minor (SCM)						
Made my partner have sex without a condom	0.28	-0.01	-0.04	-0.08	0.05	0.42
Insisted on sex when my partner did not want to (but did not use physical force)	0.26	0.16	0.16	0.14	-0.07	0.50
Insisted partner have oral or anal sex (no force)	0.06	0.10	0.12	0.04	-0.04	0.49
Sexual Coercion- Severe (SCS)						
Used force (hitting, holding down, or using a weapon) to make partner have oral/anal sex	0.92	0.32	-0.03	0.11	0.02	0.02
Used force (hitting, holding down, or using a weapon) to make my partner have sex	0.40	0.89	0.00	0.13	0.06	0.01
Used threats to make partner have oral/anal sex	0.45	0.66	-0.04	0.55	0.02	0.08
Used threats to make my partner have sex	0.43	0.81	-0.02	0.29	0.04	0.10
Injury- Minor (IM)						
Partner had a sprain/bruise/small cut from me	0.43	0.08	0.02	0.77	0.20	-0.03
Partner felt physical pain/hurt next day	0.23	0.24	0.02	0.78	0.05	0.08
Injury- Severe (IS)						
Partner passed out from hit on head by me	0.92	.011	-0.05	0.32	-0.01	0.06
Partner went to a doctor because fight with me	0.55	0.44	0.02	0.59	-0.01	-0.01
Partner needed doctor because of me (didn't)	0.77	0.53	-0.03	0.00	0.08	-0.01
Partner had broken bone from a fight with me	0.41	0.42	-0.06	0.72	-0.01	0.11

Exploratory factor analysis on the victimization item set produced results similar to the perpetration item set. An unconstrained EFA on the victimization items also produced Heywood cases; again, to correct this, a minimum Eigen value for common factors was set at 1.0 (Hamilton, 2013). The constrained analysis resulted in the extraction of seven factors explaining a cumulative 86% of the item variance. Results of this exploratory factor analysis are presented in Table 4.5.

Consistent with the findings from the perpetration items, the two negotiation subscales (emotion and cognitive) for victimization were relatively robust, given that all items for each subscale met the .60/.40 criteria and did not cross-load on two or more factors. The factor matrices demonstrated cross-loadings on a significant number of victimization items across the eight other subscales, although a fewer number of total items than the perpetration set demonstrated complex cross-loadings. One noticeable deviation from the results for perpetration items is the unidimensional loadings (i.e., all items loaded on one factor) for the Sexual Coercion- Minor subscale. Only one of the three items met the stringent .60/.40 criteria, but when relaxed to more standard criteria (.40 loading "salient"; see Brown, 2006), all three items loaded on a single factor (.44, .71, .54).

Brief Discussion

The purpose of Study 2 was to develop a measure for assessing specific behaviors associated with the most severe acts of intimate partner violence experienced and perpetrated by an individual, and attributions for experiences with IPV. A second purpose of Study 2 was to assess the psychometric properties of the Revised Conflict Tactics Scale, which, as stated, has shown wide variability in structure and reliability across various populations (see Yun, 2011, for a review).

Table 4.5. Factor loadings, CTS2, Self-as-Victim.

	Factor						
Item	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Negotiation- Emotional (NE)							
Partner showed me care when disagree	-0.03	-0.03	0.02	0.79	-0.04	-0.01	-0.02
Partner showed respect for my feelings	-0.12	-0.13	-0.04	0.74	0.01	0.10	-0.07
Partner said sure we work out problem	0.02	-0.16	0.22	0.75	-0.05	0.01	-0.02
Negotiation- Cognition (NC)							
Partner explained side of disagreement	-0.04	0.01	0.09	0.80	-0.06	0.02	-0.03
Partner suggested compromise	-0.13	0.13	0.17	0.71	0.03	0.05	0.01
Partner agreed try solution I suggested	-0.13	0.06	0.04	0.75	0.03	0.05	0.04
Psychological Aggression- Minor (PA)							
My partner insulted or swore at me	0.16	-0.04	0.62	0.30	-0.06	0.15	0.06
My partner shouted or yelled at me	0.10	-0.12	0.71	0.26	-0.01	0.16	0.03
Psychological Aggression- Minor (PA) (cont.)							
Partner stomped out room/house/yard	0.01	0.14	0.63	0.21	-0.02	0.27	0.01
My partner said something to spite me	-0.13	0.06	0.57	0.17	-0.05	0.27	0.06
Psychological Aggression- Severe (PS)							
My partner called me fat or ugly	0.53	0.10	0.32	-0.06	0.13	-0.12	0.09
Partner destroyed my belonging	0.91	0.21	0.19	-0.07	0.04	0.01	0.02
Partner accused me of lousy lover	0.31	0.30	0.36	-0.12	-0.14	0.32	-0.05
Partner threatened hit/throw at me	0.14	0.01	0.57	-0.08	0.08	0.23	-0.30
Physical Assault- Minor (PhyM)							
Partner threw something at me (hurt)	0.61	0.27	0.37	-0.11	0.02	-0.01	0.06
My partner twisted my arm or hair	0.71	0.42	0.28	-0.06	0.03	-0.01	-0.01
My partner pushed or shoved me	0.35	0.06	0.70	-0.02	0.16	-0.22	0.10
My partner grabbed me	0.09	0.08	0.57	0.21	0.17	-0.09	0.01
My partner slapped me	0.46	0.30	0.37	0.00	0.09	0.10	-0.23
Physical Assault- Severe (PhyS)							
Partner used a knife or a gun on me	0.81	0.46	-0.06	0.01	-0.01	0.06	0.18
Partner punched/hit with item (hurt)	0.91	0.21	0.19	-0.07	0.04	0.01	0.02
Partner choked/attempt strangle me**	0.84	0.25	0.03	-0.05	0.36	0.02	-0.17
My partner slammed me against a wall	0.32	0.10	0.60	-0.01	0.19	-0.17	-0.02
My partner beat me up	0.17	0.53	0.16	-0.03	0.64	-0.08	0.30
Partner burned/scalded me on purpose	0.42	0.89	0.01	-0.02	0.14	0.05	-0.03
My partner kicked me	0.31	0.23	0.09	-0.03	0.69	0.10	-0.19
Sexual Coercion- Minor (SCM)							
Partner made me have sex- no condom	0.12	-0.02	0.11	-0.01	0.08	0.44	0.11
Partner insisted on sex (no force)	0.10	0.13	0.17	0.15	0.14	0.71	0.00
Partner insisted oral/anal sex(no force)	0.06	0.16	-0.01	0.19	0.23	0.54	-0.01
Sexual Coercion- Severe (SCS)							
Partner used force for oral/anal sex	0.69	0.31	0.01	-0.03	0.35	-0.01	0.50
Partner used force make me have sex	0.43	0.84	-0.03	-0.04	-0.01	0.14	-0.19
Partner threats to get oral/anal sex	0.33	0.88	0.10	-0.02	0.21	0.00	0.13
Partner used threats to get sex	0.26	0.44	0.02	-0.05	0.72	0.19	0.07
Injury- Minor (IM)							
Had sprain/bruise/small cut from me	0.76	0.24	0.09	-0.06	0.20	0.10	-0.02
Partner felt physical pain/hurt next day	0.29	0.33	0.06	-0.09	0.38	0.36	-0.20

(Table 4.5 continued)

	Factor						
Item	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Injury- Severe (IS)							
Partner passed out from hit on head	0.83	0.45	-0.07	-0.01	-0.04	0.10	0.17
Partner went to a doctor because of me	0.66	0.61	-0.05	-0.01	0.38	0.06	-0.02
Partner needed doctor (didn't go)	0.29	0.05	0.07	-0.09	-0.03	0.03	0.68
Partner had broken bone from me	0.37	0.88	0.04	0.01	0.16	-0.02	0.10

Conflict Tactics. This study represented the first attempt at validating a ten-factor model of the revised Conflict Tactics Scale (Straus et al., 1996) in a nonclinical sample of both men and women. Two previous studies examined a ten factor model, but were limited. Calvete et al. (2007) only analyzed data for the items related to victimization (i.e., "Self-as-Victim"), and the sample used was comprised of exclusively Spanish-speaking women. Yun (2011) examined a ten factor model of the CTS2, but again, the sample used was exclusively female. Overall, very few studies have explored the psychometric properties of the revised Conflict Tactics Scale, and the results have been widely varied.

Psychometric examinations in the current study failed to yield adequate factor solutions. A five factor and ten factor model for both perpetration and victimization items did not reach convergence, demonstrating an extremely poor fit to these data. One of the most common methods of improving model fit is deleting individual items, or in the case of the CTS2, deleting entire scales or subscales (Connelly et al., 2005; Newton et al., 2001). However, despite the psychometric issues found in Study 2, no items, scales, or subscales will be deleted from the CTS2 portion of the newly created measure prior to conducting the large-scale study reported in Study 3.

Deleting an item from the CTS2 does not have the same implications as deleting items from some other measures (e.g., measures containing multiple items assessing a trait). The CTS2 measures behaviors, and each item on the CTS2 represents a different act. Some acts are

entirely represented by one item; therefore, deleting an item from the CTS2 completely removes the ability to assess the occurrence of the behavior represented by that item, and even infrequently endorsed items may be central to the purposes of some studies.

For example, in Study 2, the item "attempted to choke or strangle" was indicated as a previous perpetration tactic by only six participants, and only seven participants reported that they had been a victim of this tactic. Yet, assessing the frequency of occurrence for choking or strangling is critical to determining risk factors or potential indicators of later intimate partner homicide. Campbell et al. (2007), in a comprehensive review of studies on intimate partner homicide in the United States, noted that one of the more important risk factors for both intimate partner homicide and intimate partner homicide-suicide is prior incidence of nonfatal strangulation. Glass et al. (2008) found that, in their sample, prior nonfatal strangulation was associated with greater than six-fold odds of becoming an attempted homicide, and greater than seven-fold odds of becoming a completed homicide. These studies indicate that screening for nonfatal strangulation when assessing abused women, and assessing specific histories of individuals with a record of IPV perpetration, could be key in preventing later homicides (Campbell et al., 2007).

To test this argument, two Fisher's exact tests were performed on data from Study 2 to determine if there are statistically significant relations between being a previous victim of nonfatal strangulation and adherence to honor norms and values, and previous perpetration of nonfatal strangulation and adherence to these values. The item on the CTS2, "attempted to choke or strangle," was scored for prevalence (0/1 based on endorsement of the item; Straus et al., 1996). This score was tested with the demographic question describing what an honor culture is and asking if the participant adhered to the norms and values of such a culture. The

first Fisher's test revealed that the relation between self-reported perpetration of nonfatal strangulation and adherence to honor norms and values is significant (p = .040; V = .245). For the relation between self-reported victimization of nonfatal strangulation and adherence to honor values, the results of a Fisher's exact test approached significance (p = .070; V = .221). While these cursory results are not conclusive, they cannot be dismissed when arguing for the inclusion of all items on the CTS2, despite any psychometric difficulties.

Measures of attributions for IPV created in previous studies are limited, as are the previous studies utilizing those measures. Of the relatively few studies which addressed attributions for experiences of intimate partner violence, only a handful were conducted on populations within the United States. A good deal of these studies utilized a limited sample, including: 1) only couples in marital counseling (Cascardi & Vivian, 1995); 2) women only (Fiebert & Gonzalez, 1997; Hamberger, 1997; Hettrich & O'Leary, 2001); 3) only dating couples (Follingstad et al., 1991; Harned, 2001; Makepeace, 1986); 4) only individuals with previous arrests and convictions for domestic violence (Henning et al., 2005; Stuart et al., 2006); and 5) only alcoholic men and their female partners (Murphy et al., 2005). Another limitation of previous measures of attributions for IPV is their limited focus. A complete investigation of intimate partner violence requires assessing the specific tactics related to IPV in conjunction with measures of "explanatory, context, or consequence variables" (Straus et al., 1996). Stets and Henderson (1991) conducted one of the only studies which assessed the possible causes of recent, specific acts of IPV. However, their sample consisted of both men and women, but Stets and Henderson (1991) only provided results for incidents reported by the entirety of the sample instead of separating the data by gender.

Study 3 proceeds by administering the new measure to a large sample of both men and women. Based on a qualitative review of open-ended responses from participants in Study 1, two items were added to the attributions section: "Because my partner insulted me/I insulted my partner" and "Because I didn't believe that my partner/My partner didn't believe that I cared." The demographics and conflict tactics section of the instrument remain the same for Study 3. By assessing individual-level data on attributions for the experience of IPV, along with the CTS2, the measure created in Study 2 has the potential to provide critical contextual information for episodes of intimate partner violence. Specifically, the investigations contained in this dissertation provide cultural-contextual information on whether the influence of honor-based norms and values can account for some of the cross-regional variance in intimate partner violence in the United States.

CHAPTER FIVE
STUDY 3

The purpose of Study 3 is to conceptually replicate the findings of Study 1 with individual-level data. Specifically, this study examines cross-regional differences in acts of intimate partner violence and aggression and attempts to link the related degree of severity to honor-based cultures within the U.S. In addition, attributions given for the perpetration of IPV are examined, with the specific goal of assessing variations in the severity of acts perpetrated for specific reasons. Essentially, the broad goal of this study is to assess whether cross-regional differences in the causes and consequences of IPV vary in relation to regional culture.

Chapter 2 presented an examination of the extant literature and the rationale for four hypotheses, labeled H3-H6. In brief, these hypotheses test whether the presence of honor-based norms and values at the societal and individual level create a unique set of circumstances which lead to increased rates and levels of severity related to intimate partner violence. To review:

H3: Men from honor cultures will report using more severe intimate partner violence than men from nonhonor cultures.

H4: Men from honor cultures will report more severe acts of aggression when motivated by jealousy and infidelity than men from nonhonor cultures who are motivated by the same reasons.

H5: Acts of intimate partner violence reported by women from honor cultures are more severe when attributed to perceived provocation (e.g., as a response to a partner saying something disrespectful or insulting) than acts reported by women from nonhonor cultures, attributed to similar reasons.

H6: Women in honor cultures who report using more severe conflict tactics also report being the victim of more severe conflict tactics, compared to the level of severity experienced by mutually-aggressive women in nonhonor cultures.

In Study 3, the measure created and initially validated in Study 2 is given to a larger sample of men and women from various regional cultures of the U.S. These data are then used to assess H3, H4, H5, and H6. A brief discussion of these results concludes Chapter 5.

Method

Participants

To test the measure created and initially validated in Study 2, adults over the age of 18 were recruited in two ways. One, students from a large, southern university completed the measure during the Spring of 2013. Students were only allowed to participate once in this study. All student participants completed the study online via a research participation system, allowing the data collected to remain completely anonymous while enabling students to receive credit in their communication studies courses. Second, a Survey Monkey link to the same version of the measure was sent out over an e-mail list serve for the National Communication Association. Responses were collected from this link in early Spring, 2013. All national-level data collected were also completely anonymous. The procedures used in this study were approved by the LSU Institutional Review Board for human subjects.

In total, four hundred eighty-three participants (n = 483) completed the survey instrument. Prior to analyses, data for eighty-four participants (n = 84) were removed from the sample. Seventy-eight (n = 78) were removed because the participants began the survey, but failed to complete more than 80% of the entire assessment. Four (n = 4) were removed because the participants reported that they had never lived in the United States. Two (n = 2) were removed because the participants reported that they had never been in an intimate relationship. These eliminations resulted in a final sample size of three hundred ninety-nine (n = 399), with eighty-six males (n = 86) and three hundred and thirteen females (n = 313). Participants ranged

in age from 17-80 (M = 30.19; SD = 14.02), and were predominantly Caucasian (n = 342). Other races/ethnicities were also reported: Black/African American (n = 18); Asian (n = 13); Latino or Hispanic (n = 10); Pacific Islander (n = 1); Native American (n = 1); and Multi-Racial (n = 14). Two participants (n = 2) did not indicate their race/ethnicity.

Three hundred and ninety-seven (n = 397) participants answered the six-point, Likert item regarding adherence to a "Culture of Honor" (M = 3.92; SD = 1.49). Sixteen participants (n = 16; three males, thirteen females) responded that they "absolutely" adhered to a culture of honor; fifty-seven participants (n = 57; fifteen males, forty-two females) responded that they adhered to a culture of honor "for the most part"; one-hundred twenty participants (n = 120; thirty-three males, eighty-seven females) stated that they adhered to a culture of honor "somewhat"; twenty-three participants (n = 23, seven males, sixteen females) stated that they were "uncertain" whether they adhered to a culture of honor; one-hundred ten participants (n = 110, eighteen males, ninety-two females) stated that they "for the most part" did not adhere to a culture of honor; and seventy-one participants (n = 71, ten males, 61 females) states that they absolutely did not adhere to a culture of honor.

Additionally, participants self-identified the state where the majority of their life (more than 75%) had been spent; if no such state existed, participants were invited to input the state they identified as "home." Participants represented all but fourteen states (Connecticut, Hawaii, Idaho, Indiana, Maine, Minnesota, North Dakota, South Carolina, South Dakota, Tennessee, Utah, Vermont, and West Virginia). Previous studies have divided participants as honor or nonhonor based on region affiliation. For these data, using the "conventional" classification technique (i.e., honor participants are those from states in the Census-designated South; Vandello & Cohen, 2003), there were one hundred seventy-one participants classified into the "nonhonor"

group (*n* = 171; thirty-one males, one hundred forty females), and two hundred twenty classified into the "honor" group (*n* = 220; fifty-three males, one hundred sixty-seven females). Table 5.1 presents additional demographic information collected, including information regarding the relationship participants reported on.

Instrument

Conflict Tactics Scale. After the demographic questions, the revised Conflict Tactics Scale (CTS2; Straus et al. 1996) was presented. The CTS2 was utilized to assess the tactics participants perpetrated and experienced as a victim during conflict with a specific intimate partner. For the current study, participants were asked to think about the last relationship they were in which was characterized by a great deal of conflict; where it seemed like the participant could not get along with their partner. Participants indicated yes or no to being currently in a relationship with the partner they were imagining, if they were/are married to this person, if they did/do live with this partner, and if the partner is male or female. Lastly, participants indicated if they or their partner had the higher income, and how long they were or have been in the relationship. Straus et al. (1996) indicated that altering the instructions to ask participants about a specific event or situation (e.g., a specific relationship), as opposed to specific time frame (e.g., "the last year"), is acceptable (p. 304).

Table 5.1. Characteristics of participants in Study 3.

Characteristic		*n* = 399
Sex		
	Male (*n* = 86)	21.55%
	Female (*n* = 313)	78.45%
Current Marital Status		
	Single	60.76%
	Engaged	2.53%
	Married	29.37%
	Separated	0.76%
	Divorced	5.82%
	Widowed	0.76%
Race		
	White/Caucasian	85.71%
	Black/African	4.51%
	Asian	3.26%
	Latino or Hispanic	2.51%
	Pacific Islander	0.25%
	Native American	0.25%
	Multi-Racial	3.51%
Education		
	Some high school	0.75%
	High school diploma/GED	49.25%
	Career/Technical school	3.02%
	Associate's Degree	7.79%
	Bachelor's Degree	13.82%
	Master's Degree	13.07%
	Ph.D./M.D./Juris Doctorate	12.31%
Relationship Described		
Sex of Partner		
	Male	76.94%
	Female	23.06%
Married		
	No	72.22%
	Yes	27.78%
Cohabiting		
	No	56.14%
	Yes	43.86%
Highest Earner		
	Self	33.67%
	Partner	32.66%
	Don't Know	19.60%
	Self Unemployed	7.54%
	Partner Unemployed	6.53%

The revised Conflict Tactics Scale contains 78 total items (Straus et al., 1996): 39 items designed to assess the respondent's use of each of the tactics listed, referred to as the perpetration items or "Self-as-Perpetrator" items; and 39 items designed to assess the respondent's victimization from the same list of tactics (i.e., "Self-as-Victim") (Yun, 2012). In the scale creation piece, the authors (Straus et al., 1996) proposed that the CTS2 loads on five scales: Negotiation, which includes items to asses actions taken to settle a disagreement, such as "Showed respect for my partner's feeling about an issue" and "Explained my side of a disagreement to my partner"; Psychological Aggression, which assesses nonverbal aggressive acts (e.g., "Insulted or swore at my partner" and "Destroyed something belonging to my partner"); Physical Assault, which assesses acts that fit the definition of physical violence (e.g. "Pushed or shoved my partner" and "Beat up my partner"); Sexual Coercion, which includes items to asses behaviors intended to compel a partner to engage in unwanted sexual activity (e.g., "Used threats to make my partner have sex"); and Injury, which includes items to assess "partner-inflicted physical injury" (e.g., "Had a broken bone from a fight with my partner") (Straus et al., 1996). Each of the scales consists of two subscales; for all scales except Negotiation, the subscales are divided as minor and severe. The negotiation scale is divided into subscales by emotional and cognitive tactics used during discussion.

All items on the CTS2 were included for the analyses conducted in Study 3, despite the psychometric problems of the scale. An explication of this rationale is contained in the brief discussion section of Chapter 4 (see p. 74 – 77). Acknowledging, however, that it is standard practice to report the results of confirmatory factor analyses, such examinations were performed for these data, and are presented in Appendix F.

Attributions. A Cochran's Q coefficient was calculated to evaluate the significance of differences between the proportions of the single response categories (Cochran, 1950; Jann, 2004) on the attributions section of the measure. Part 1 of the attributions section contains 26 items and prompts participants to select those reasons for their own use of aggression against a current or former partner. Analyses revealed the differences in the proportions of the various responses for Part 1 were significant, χ^2 (24) = 1211.63, $p < .000$. Part 2 of the attributions section contains the same items as Part 1, but instructs participants to select the motivation or motivations they perceive were present in the partner who was most aggressive toward them (i.e., inflicted the most severe tactic the participant had experienced); thus, the items are worded slightly different from Part 1 to ensure clarity. Analysis revealed the differences in the proportions of the various responses for Part 2 were significant, χ^2 (25) = 974.26, $p < .000$.

Results

Demographic Data

Members of honor cultures and nonhonor cultures, using the conventional classification scheme described previously, did not differ significantly in terms of race, yearly income, and the dependent variables of interest for H3-H6 (degree of severity for acts of intimate partner violence perpetrated, and severity of acts experienced as a victim). Participants from nonhonor cultures tended to be older (M = 36.48) than participants from honor cultures (M = 27.01, z = 6.23, p < .000; r = .31, sufficient to detect large [.70] effects), and also tended to be more educated than participants from honor cultures (z = 7.62, $p < .000$; r = .38, sufficient to detect large [.80] effects). The relationships reported on by participants from nonhonor cultures were significantly longer (M = 9.2, years/months) than those reported on by participants from honor cultures (M = 4.9, years/months; z = 8.30, $p < .000$; r = .42, sufficient to detect large [.80] effects). Results of

chi-square tests indicated that the percentage of participants who were married to the intimate partner of report significantly differed by honor culture status ($x^2(1) = 22.28$, $p < .000$; $\varphi = .24$ for small effects), and that percentages in the category of who the highest earner in the pair was differed significantly between honor and nonhonor cultures ($x^2(4) = 14.20$, $p = .007$, $V = .19$ for small effects). These variables, however, are not correlated with the dependent variables of interest (degree of severity for tactics perpetrated, and degree of severity for tactics experienced as a victim). Lastly, participants from honor and nonhonor cultures did not significantly vary on levels of the dependent variables of interest.

Models Tested

For each hypothesis, H3-H6, several models were tested. Previous studies on honor cultures within the United States have used different coding schemes for classifying participants as members of honor cultures or nonhonor cultures; most of these classification systems are "somewhat arbitrary" (Vandello & Cohen, 1999). Due to this arbitrary nature, and the fact that no previous study to date has assessed multiple models within the same sample as a test of the subjective classification system chosen, five separate tests of H3-H6 were conducted with five different honor culture classification techniques, and results from these five analyses were compared for differences in significant predictors of the common dependent variable. The five models were formed after a thorough review of the literature, and are reflective of the techniques used in the majority of previous studies. The five models are presented in Table 5.2, as well as example studies which utilized the listed model/classification scheme.

Hypothesis 3

Hypothesis 3 predicted that men from honor cultures will report using more severe intimate partner violence than men from nonhonor cultures. The independent variable was

obtained through a scoring method of the revised Conflict Tactics Scale recommended by Straus, which allows researchers to determine degree of severity for tactics reported (Straus, 2004). Participants were coded into three mutually exclusive groups: individuals who did not report using minor or severe tactics (i.e., not endorsing any item on the eight subscales that measure minor and severe conflict tactics, Psychological Aggression, Physical Assault, Sexual Coercion, and Injury), individuals who reported only the use of tactics on the minor subscales, and individuals who reported the use of both minor and severe tactics.

Table 5.2. Five models of honor/nonhonor culture classification techniques.

	Explanation	Source Example	Hypotheses
Model 1	Honor states are those classified in the Southern region of the U.S., per the Census Bureau	Nisbett & Cohen, 1996	H3, H4, H5, H6
Sample	Honor *n* = 220 (53 males, 167 females)	Nonhonor *n* = 171 (31 males, 140 females)	
Model 2	Honor states are those classified in the Southern and Western region of the U.S., per the Census Bureau. (Alaska and Hawaii excluded)	Cohen, 1998 Osterman & Brown, 2011	H3, H4, H5, H6
Sample	Honor *n* = 255 (61 males, 194 females)	Nonhonor *n* = 136 (23 males, 113 females)	
Model 3	States in the Southern and Western regions, per the U.S. Census Bureau, with Alaska and Hawaii included.	Based on the results of Study 1 (this dissertation)	H3, H4, H5, H6
Sample	Honor *n* = 257 (62 males, 195 females)	Nonhonor *n* = 134 (22 males, 112 females)	
Model 4	High "Degree of Southernness" used as determinant of honor culture: Virginia, West Virginia, North Carolina, South Carolina, Georgia, Florida, Kentucky, Tennessee, Mississippi, Alabama, Oklahoma, Texas, Arkansas, Louisiana	Zelinsky, 1973 Gastil, 1975	H3, H4, H5, H6
Sample	Honor *n* = 222 (52 males, 195 females)	Nonhonor *n* = 169 (32 males, 137 females)	
Model 5	Honor states are the 16 states in Southern U.S. (per Census Bureau), as well as Missouri and Illinois.	Vandello & Cohen, 2003 Vandello, Cohen, & Ransom, 2008 Cohen et al., 1999	H3, H4, H5, H6
Sample	Honor *n* = 261 (62 males, 199 females)	Nonhonor *n* = 130 (22 males, 108 females)	

Note: None of the hypotheses were supported across the models. For H6, the results were significant at the .001 alpha level in the opposite direction of the hypothesis.

A Levene's test for equality of variance (Levene, 1960) was performed for each of the five models. These tests indicated the variance between males from honor cultures and males from nonhonor cultures was equal for all five models (W = .129, .251, .361, .210, .361, respectively). Due to the low number of total male participants in this study (n = 86) and the ordinal nature of the dependent variable, Mann-Whitney tests were used to determine differences in degree of severity for self-reported intimate partner violence tactics used by males from honor versus nonhonor cultures. Results indicated no significant difference in degree of severity in tactics used by men from honor and nonhonor cultures; however, the sample size was insufficient to accurately detect main effects (power to detect small effects is reported): Model 1, z = .565, p = .572, r = .062; Model 2, z = .311, p = .756, r = .034; Model 3, z = .434, p = .664, r = .047; Model 4, z = .184, p = .854, r = .020; and Model 5, z = .434, p = .664, r = .047.

Hypothesis 4

Hypothesis 4 predicted that men from honor cultures will report more severe acts of aggression when motivated by jealousy and infidelity than men from nonhonor cultures who are motivated by the same reasons. (All attributions on the scale and rates of endorsement for Study 3 are presented in Table 5.3.) A dichotomous variable was created that consisted of men from honor cultures who attributed their acts of intimate partner violence to jealousy or infidelity-related concerns, and men from nonhonor cultures who endorsed the same attributions for their previous acts of IPV. Models 2, 4, and 5 classified males in the same way that Model 1 did; thus, only results for Models 1 and 3 are presented. .

Levene's tests indicated that the variance across groups classified by Model 1 was equal (W = .760). As such, a Mann-Whitney test was performed to evaluate the difference between males classified as honor- or nonhonor- based. Results revealed no significant difference

between honor and nonhonor males in severity of tactics related to jealousy and/or infidelity concerns (z = .300; p = .765; r = .078 for small effects), but similar to hypothesis three, the sample size was insufficient to accurately assess any main effects. A second Levene's test indicated unequal variance across groups for Model 3 (W = .008). To account for this, a Kruskal-Wallis test was performed as an alternative to the Mann-Whitney test (Castellan, 1988). Results revealed no significant difference in severity of tactics between honor and nonhonor males who attributed their aggression to jealousy or infidelity concerns (χ^2 (1, n = 15) = 1.085, p = .221, r = .34 for large effects).

Table 5.3. Attributions and rates of endorsement.

	Self (*n*)		Partner (*n*)	
Reason	No	Yes	No	Yes
Stop self/partner from leaving.	320	79	291	108
Trying to walk away before the problem was solved.	278	121	296	103
Refused to have sex.	396	3	382	17
Refused to do as told.	372	27	343	56
Wanted to preserve integrity of family/relationship.	309	90	342	57
Role to punish; it was expected.	393	6	391	8
"Getting back" for being hit first.	383	16	394	5
"Getting back" for something self/partner said/did.	364	35	357	42
Unfaithful.	351	48	383	16
Made other jealous.	355	44	331	68
Angry for actions.	233	166	247	152
Slept separately.	389	10	388	11
Telling others something self/partner should not have.	376	23	383	16
Said something disrespectful.	319	80	337	62
Said things to hurt partner's feelings.	257	142	306	93
Pushed over the edge.	311	88	330	69
Angry for something self/partner said.	271	128	283	116
Way self/other is (personality)	383	16	339	60
"Real man" or "real woman."	398	1	392	7
Backing down during an argument is not an option.	379	20	367	32
Stressed about something else.	295	104	319	80
Acting in self-defense.	354	45	387	12
Needed to prove love.	357	24	381	18
Do not see a problem using aggressive tactics.	395	4	373	26
Didn't believe self/partner cared.	358	41	353	46
Insulted.	342	57	358	41

Hypothesis 5

Hypothesis 5 states that acts of intimate partner violence reported by women from honor cultures will be more severe when attributed to perceived provocation (e.g., as a response to a partner saying something disrespectful or insulting) than acts reported by women from nonhonor cultures attributed to the same reason(s). A dichotomous variable was created which consisted of women from honor cultures who attributed their use of intimate partner violence to a reason (i.e., item) listed in the "Perceived Provocation" category of the attributions portion of the measure, and women from nonhonor cultures who cited the same item(s). Model 2 classified females the same way as Model 3; thus, of the two, only Model 2 is presented, in addition to Models 1, 4, and 5.

Levene's tests for equality of variance indicated that the variance for the two groups (honor and nonhonor females who cited attributions related to perceived provocation) was equal (W = .270 - .411). As such, Mann-Whitney tests were performed to assess differences between honor and nonhonor females in severity of perpetrated tactics; however, the sample distribution resulted in cell sizes (e.g., Honor culture status X Endorsement of items representing perceived provocation) with too few participants to be sufficiently powered, and thus accurately detect significant relationships. Results from all four models tested revealed no significant difference between females in honor and nonhonor cultures for severity of tactics used in response to feeling provoked, but again, due to sample limitations these results are inconclusive (power to detect small effects is reported): Model 1, z = -1.73, p = .084, r = .12; Model 2, z = -1.67, p = .095, r = .11; Model 4, z = -1.78, p = .076, r = .12; Model 5, z = -1.06, p = .288, r = .07.

Hypothesis 6

Hypothesis 6 predicted that women in honor cultures who report using more severe conflict tactics will also report as being the victim of more severe conflict tactics (i.e., the level of severity will be greater for female victim-as-perpetrators in honor cultures, compared to nonhonor cultures). To assess this hypothesis, ordered logistic regression models were estimated for females. The degree of severity for the female participant's own acts of perpetration against her partner was used as a predictor of victimization severity. A dichotomous variable (one for each of the five models) coding women as members of an honor or nonhonor culture was included as a covariate, and five analyses were conducted. Table 5.4 reports the ordered logistic regression results for the five models of honor/nonhonor culture classification, with individuals grouped in the category of "Zero Acts" as the baseline comparison (i.e., the severity items were scored to classify individuals into three mutually-exclusive groups: no acts, minor acts, or minor *and* severe acts; see Straus, 2004). Table 5.5 presents the fit indices for the logistic regression model.

Table 5.4. Results for Models 1-5, Hypothesis 6.

	Minor Tactics Only		Minor and Severe Tactics		Honor Classification	
	b	*z*	*b*	*z*	*b*	*z*
Model 1	2.67	5.24***	4.97	8.74***	- 0.44	- 1.76*
cut1	.22					
cut2	3.84					
Model 2	2.71	5.28***	4.97	8.73***	- 0.25	- 1.34
cut1	.26					
cut2	3.87					
Model 3	2.70	5.27***	4.94	8.72***	- 0.29	- 1.14
cut1	.29					
cut2	3.89					
Model 4	2.69	5.25***	4.97	8.75***	- 0.44	- 1.75*
cut1	.22					
cut2	3.84					
Model 5	2.67	5.23***	4.90	8.70***	- 0.14	.60
cut1	.36					
cut2	3.95					

Indicates significance at the following levels: *p < .05; **p < .01; ***p < .000

Table 5.5. Fit indices.

	Model 1	Model 2	Model 3	Model 4	Model 5
Nagelkerke R^2*	.378	.375	.373	.378	.371
LRx^2	117.98	116.65	116.14	117.91	115.11
Prob (x^2)	< .000	< .000	< .000	< .000	< .000
Pseudo-R^2	.206	.204	.203	.206	.201

Note: Nagelkerke's R^2 is given as the goodness of fit index for effect size (see Yatani, 2013).

Unlike H3 – H5, results of analyses for H6 for the five classification models varied in that they did not all produce the same significant results. Model 1 and Model 4 emerged as techniques which placed participants into statistically dissimilar groups. Analysis of Model 1 revealed that women classified from honor cultures experience less severe acts of IPV compared to women from nonhonor cultures, when severity of the participant's own tactics is controlled for. The results from analysis of Model 4 were significant and in the same direction of Model 1: designation in an honor versus nonhonor culture significantly predicted the level of severity for tactics the participant experienced as a victim, controlling for the severity of tactics perpetrated by the participant. The direction of these coefficients does not support H6; in fact, they are in the opposite direction. Females classified in honor cultures by Models 1 and 4 tended to experience less severe tactics at the hands of an intimate partner than females classified into nonhonor cultures.

While these findings do not directly support H6, the findings provide support for the general rationale behind H6. A large body of research has produced empirical evidence which demonstrates that the most common type of intimate partner violence in relationships is mutual violence, as opposed to one partner exclusively occupying the role as perpetrator and the other partner exclusively occupying the role of victim (Dutton, 2012; Spitzberg, 2011). Further, research has also shown how mutual violence can escalate to very severe levels because of desires for retaliation and equal retribution (Honeycutt, Sheldon, & Pence, 2010). Results from

all ordered logistic regression analysis performed revealed that as severity of tactics used by a female increased, the severity of tactics she experienced as a victim also significantly increased.

Additional Analyses

The methods of classifying participants as honor/nonhonor for testing of H3 – H6 were derived from the body of quantitative studies on cultures of honor in the United States. The vast majority of studies made comparisons within a sample based upon a designation chosen by the researcher(s), such as "Northerners" (i.e., nonhonor based) and "Southerners" (i.e., honor based) depending on the state in which the participants lived (e.g., Vandello, Cohen, & Ransom, 2008), or spent a portion of their life (e.g., one-third; Cohen, Vandello, Puente, & Rantilla, 1999); or, classification was sometimes based on the race of the participant (e.g., Vandello, Cohen, Grandon, & Franiuk, 2009). Decidedly fewer studies have determined culture of honor status by assessing participant's self-reported identification with an honor culture and honor norms or values.

Many researchers studying honor-based cultures within the United States do, however, recognize that "people are not automata following the dictates of their culture" (Cohen & Leung, 2011). While human behavior is patterned, people can chose to follow the norms and adhere to the values of their culture, or they can chose not to. The patterns emerge, some argue, from "cultural templates" which structure certain behaviors with other behaviors or with certain situations. Differences in public norms and behavior may be "more extreme" than differences in individualized, internal beliefs (Vandello, Cohen, and Ransom, 2008). Honor, then, carries particular social significance, and represents a "theme" around which interpersonal life is organized (Vandello & Cohen, 2003).

The results presented in the previous sections assessed the similarity between honor classification models as a means of demonstrating how different subjective classification techniques can produce varying results. To further test this, a second series of ordered logistic regression analyses were estimated and tested. This set of analyses included a variable representing each participant's self-identification with an honor culture, allowing for a far less subjective comparison of honor versus nonhonor groups.

Hypothesis 6 stated that women in honor cultures who perpetrate severe acts of intimate partner violence will, in turn, be the victim of more severe acts of intimate partner violence (i.e., the severity will be greater for mutually violent females in honor cultures than mutually violence females in nonhonor cultures). The demographics section of the measure created in Study 2 and used in Study 3 contains an item to assess if the participant identifies as being part of a culture of honor (i.e., '"Culture of Honor" can be defined as a culture in which men are willing to stand up for themselves using physical aggression, particularly when they have been insulted or disrespected. In such cultures, more "traditional" gender roles are the norm [e.g., males are the "breadwinners", females are the caretakers]'). Participants selected from options on a six-point Likert scale: "Yes, absolutely"; "Yes, for the most part"; "Somewhat"; "Uncertain"; "No, for the most part"; and "No, not at all." Additionally, participants were asked to identify the state in which they spent most of their life (defined as at least 75% of their life); if they have not spent the majority of their life in one state, they are asked to list the state which they identify as being "home."

First, an ordered logistic regression analysis was estimated which included the self-report honor adherence item, and excluded any of the five state classification grouping variables, in order to assess if the self-report item alone predicted severity of tactics by a partner, controlling

for the tactics used by the participant. Results revealed no significant effect of self-reported adherence to an honor culture on severity of victimization (b = -0.052; z = -0.64; p = .262).

Second, ordered logistic regression models were estimated to test the significance of an interaction effect between each state classification model and self-reported identification with an honor culture (State Classification X Adherence). The interaction effect was introduced into the model as a predictor of the dependent variable (severity of victimization). The significant main effects related to state classification models 1 and 4, found in the first series of analyses, disappeared in the second set of analyses containing the interaction effect. In fact, when the results of the ordered logistic regression analyses are decomposed, the subjective state classification variable is only significant for one of the five models: Model 3, which was the classification technique derived from the results of Study 1. Model 3 grouped all of the states in the South and West together, and all other states together in another group .

For Models 1-4, the interaction effect emerged as a significant predictor of degree of severity for tactics that female participants reported being victimized by, controlling for severity of the participant's own perpetration tactics. For Model 5, neither the interaction effect nor the state classification variable emerged as a significant predictor of severity in a partner's tactics. Table 5.6 presents the results of the logistic regression analyses containing the interaction effect; Table 5.7 presents the fit indices for the model.

Another significant relationship that was consistent across all models was between severity of perpetration tactics used by a female toward her intimate partner, and the severity of acts she experienced from that intimate partner (i.e., victimization) (p < .000). For females, moving from using no acts of violence/aggression against an intimate partner, to using only minor tactics against an intimate partner, decreases a female's odds of being a victim of only

minor tactics by 31%, while the odds of being a victim of severe tactics increases by 50%. Additionally, moving from using no acts of IPV to using severe acts of IPV decreases a female's chances of being the victim of only minor acts of IPV by 59%, and increases the odds of becoming a victim of severe acts of IPV by 84%. These values are consistent across all models. Table 5.8 presents the results from the marginal effects analysis.

Table 5.6. Results from ordered logistic regression models with interaction effect.

		Minor Only		Minor/Severe		Self-Adhere		St. Class.		Adhere x St.	
Model		*b*	*z*	*b*	*z*	*b*	*z*	*b*	*z*	*b*	*z*
1		2.64	5.12***	4.92	8.63***	.19	1.40	.46	.80	-.31	-1.77*
	cut1	.62									
	cut2	4.26									
2		2.65	5.14***	4.90	8.59***	.23	1.55	.66	1.17	-.36	-1.98*
	cut1	.75									
	cut2	4.38									
3		2.64	5.12***	4.89	8.58***	.26	1.71*	.85	1.49	- .41	-2.22*
	cut1	.83									
	cut2	4.47									
4		2.64	5.12***	4.93	8.65***	.19	1.34	.40	.70	- .30	-1.65*
	cut1	.62									
	cut2	4.25									
5		2.66	5.17***	4.87	8.60***	.16	.97	.62	1.08	- .27	-1.40
	cut1	.70									
	cut2	4.30									

*Indicates significance at p <.05 **Indicates significance at p <.01 ***Indicates significance at p <.000

Table 5.7. Fit indices.

	Model 1	Model 2	Model 3	Model 4	Model 5
Nagelkerke R^2*	.383	.382	.383	.382	.373
LRx^2	119.11	118.63	119.22	118.66	115.30
Prob (x^2)	< .000	< .000	< .000	< .000	< .000
Pseudo-R^2	.209	.208	.210	.209	.203

Note: Nagelkerke's R^2 is given as the goodness of fit index for effect size (see Yatani, 2013).

Brief Discussion

The primary purpose of Study 3 was to test four hypotheses related to regional variations in the causes and consequence of intimate partner violence, with particular attention paid to differences in the severity of tactics used by men and women in honor versus nonhonor cultures

(H3 and H6), the degree of severity in tactics attributed to jealousy and infidelity related concerns (H4), and the degree of severity in tactics attributed to perceived provocation (H5). None of the hypotheses were supported. In fact, the results for H6 were in the opposite direction predicted.

Hypothesis 3, which suggests that men in honor cultures will report using more severe acts of intimate partner violence than men from nonhonor cultures, was not supported in the analyses. Analyses also failed to reveal significant differences between men from honor cultures and men from nonhonor cultures in severity of tactics motivated by jealousy and infidelity; therefore H4 was also not supported. However, the lack of significant differences between honor and nonhonor males provide support to the argument that intimate partner violence sparked by jealousy and infidelity is a near-universal (Daly & Wilson, 1988). The initial findings presented here suggest that violence related to these concerns may be symmetrical across regional cultures; however, the small number of men in the current sample is an acknowledged limitation. Tests using male participants were insufficiently powered to accurately detect main effects, making results from testing H3 and H4 far from conclusive. Further research with a larger male sample is needed.

Hypotheses 5 and 6 focused on the use of intimate partner violence by women in an effort to contribute to the literature on cultures of honor, which has largely failed to examine female's use of violence, despite extensive evidence that mutual violence between male and female partners is the most common (see meta-analysis by Archer, 2002), and that the highest rates of white female-perpetrated intimate partner homicides are for states characterized by the presence of an honor culture (Nisbett & Cohen, 1996). H5 predicted that there would be a significant difference between women from honor and nonhonor cultures in the severity of intimate partner

violence attributed to perceived provocation. Items on the measure assessing attributions for IPV related to perceived provocation include "I was pushed over the edge" and "I was 'getting back at' my partner for hitting me first." Analyses failed to provide support for H5. No significant differences between women from honor and nonhonor cultures emerged in the severity of tactics perpetrated for reasons related to perceived provocation.

Table 5.8. Marginal effects.

		Marginal Effects		
		0	1	2
Model 1	Minor Tactics	-.19	-.31	.50
	Minor and Severe	-.25	-.59	.84
	Self: Adherence	-.46	-.16	.21
	State Classification	-.02	-.07	.10
	Adherence X State	.14	.20	-.34
	Pr (y | x)	.05	.63	.31
Model 2	Minor Tactics	-.19	-.31	.50
	Minor and Severe	-.25	-.59	.84
	Self: Adherence	-.06	-.20	.25
	State Classification	-.04	-.10	.14
	Adherence X State	.17	.23	-.40
	Pr (y | x)	.06	.63	.31
Model 3	Minor Tactics	-.19	-.32	.50
	Minor and Severe	-.25	-.59	.84
	Self: Adherence	-.06	-.22	.28
	State Classification	-.05	-.12	.17
	Adherence X State	.20	.24	-.43
	Pr (y | x)	.05	.63	.31
Model 4	Minor Tactics	-.19	-.31	.50
	Minor and Severe	-.25	-.59	.84
	Self: Adherence	-.05	-.16	.20
	State Classification	-.02	-.06	.09
	Adherence X State	.13	.19	-.33
	Pr (y | x)	.06	.63	.31
Model 5	Minor Tactics	-.19	-.31	.50
	Minor and Severe	-.25	-.59	.84
	Self: Adherence	-.04	-.13	.17
	State Classification	-.04	-.09	.13
	Adherence X State	.11	.20	-.31
	Pr (y | x)	.06	.63	.31

A secondary goal of Study 3 was to test whether results would vary depending on the classification technique utilized (i.e., who is determined as a member of an honor culture). A thorough review of the literature revealed inconsistencies across studies in the ways samples were divided; although the differences between techniques appear trivial, assessing with certainty whether honor/nonhonor classification techniques affect the result of analyses has the potential to inform future research. To date, no prior studies have tested whether different classification techniques result in differing results within a singular sample. In Study 3, five models utilizing five different means of classification were tested for all hypotheses. While the specific values varied, the classification models did not produce different significant or nonsignificant results for H3-H5; in other words, for all models tested across H3, H4, and H5, results indicated no significant difference between the honor and nonhonor culture subsamples of interest (men, men motivated by jealousy and infidelity, and women motivated by perceived provocation).

For H6, there were differences across models in significant findings. H6 stated that mutually aggressive tactics by women in honor cultures will be more severe than mutually aggressive tactics by women in nonhonor cultures. Initial analyses failed to provide support for H6. Only two models revealed statistically significant differences between honor and nonhonor females (Models 1 and 4), and the direction of the coefficients suggested that females in honor cultures experience *less* severe acts of intimate partner violence than females in nonhonor cultures in the face of their own perpetration of severe IPV. This is directly opposite of the direction predicted in H6.

The varying significant results for H6 between subjective honor/nonhonor classification models led to a second set of analyses in order to better clarify the relationship between honor

cultures and mutual acts of intimate partner violence. First, a test conducted on female participants revealed no significant relationship between self-reported adherence to an honor culture and severity of a partner's IPV, controlling for severity of self-perpetrated IPV (i.e., mutual violence). Second, five ordered logistic regression models were estimated which included an interaction effect between self-reported identification with an honor culture, and subjective classification as an honor- or nonhonor- based female. This interaction represents an argument made by Cohen and Leung (2011), who state that people are "always in a cultural context, even if they are not always *of* it" (p. 17); in other words, people are influenced by both societal standards and internal beliefs or motivations.

In the second series of analyses, the interaction effect emerged as significant for all models. This suggests that the relation between self-reported adherence to a culture of honor and severity of intimate partner violence experienced is different for females living in pre-determined honor or nonhonor based states. Across analyses, the main effect of self-reported adherence to a culture of honor was positive, indicating that the experience as a victim of intimate partner violence tends to be greater for people with a stronger sense of identification with honor norms and values. However, the significant interaction effect was negative, suggesting that the upward slope between adherence to a culture of honor and severity of victimization is less steep for women living in states previously designated as honor cultures. These results partially support H6. Indeed, identification with the norms and values of an honor culture is related to a more severe experience with intimate partner violence; however, this relationship is not significantly stronger for females in states designated as a culture of honor, compared to females in nonhonor states. A complete discussion of the results from Study 3 is presented in Chapter 6.

CHAPTER SIX
SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

The three studies contained in this dissertation were posed with the shared goal of contributing to the growing body of research attempting to explain the variations in the causes and consequences of interpersonal violence across regional cultures of the United States. Chapter 6 presents the comprehensive findings from Studies 1, 2, and 3. A discussion of each study's limitations, as well as directions for future research, conclude this chapter.

Study 1 posed and tested two hypotheses related to the distribution of the most severe consequence of intimate partner violence—homicide—across regions of the United States. Results provided evidence in support of H1 and H2. The South and West emerged as the two regions with the highest rates of argument- and conflict- related intimate partner homicides, respectively. This is consistent with previous research indicating the presence of honor-based cultures in the South and, to a lesser extent, the West (Nisbett & Cohen, 1996).

Possible explanations for cross-regional variation in the experience of intimate partner violence were explored in Studies 2 and 3. There were two primary goals for Studies 2 and 3. One, to determine whether mutual IPV (i.e., both men and women perpetrating violence at near-equal rates) occurs within the male-dominated, characteristically more violent honor cultures of the United States. Second, if certain honor-based norms and values which have been previously linked to higher rates of IPV perpetrated by men in honor cultures (Vandello, Cohen, and Ransom, 2008; Vandello et al. 2009b) also explain the higher rates of IPV perpetrated by women in honor cultures. Four additional hypotheses were tested with null results to determine if severity in perpetration of IPV varied between men from regions previously designated as honor cultures and men from nonhonor cultures and link severe acts of intimate partner violence to the

social and personal considerations felt by men in honor cultures, namely, the necessity to respond to personal threats with violence (Bosson & Vandello, 2011).

Hypotheses 5 and 6 were posed to address women in cultures of honor; specifically, whether women in honor cultures commit more severe violence related to potential honor threats (H5), and whether women in honor cultures commit more severe IPV in mutually-violent relationships (H6).

A review of the literature made clear that, in order to accurately assess H3-H6, a more generalizable measure assessing the causes and consequences of IPV, as given by those directly involved in violent relationships, was needed. Study 2 presented the development and initial validation of such a measure. Several important considerations were taken when creating the new measure. The primary consideration was ensuring neutrality in the wording of items. Specifically, care was taken to word the items in a way neutral to sex and status of the participant, allowing both males and females to identify as victims, perpetrator, or victims-as-perpetrators. Results of confirmatory and exploratory factor analyses from the initial validation attempt demonstrated psychometric issues with the revised Conflict Tactics Scale, which was included in the new measure as the means of assessing the severity of specific tactics related to IPV perpetration and victimization. However, the variation across cultures in the frequency and severity of IPV dictated the necessity of retaining all items on the revised CTS, despite the psychometric difficulties, since each item represents a different act and deleting an item removes the ability to assess the occurrence of that act in a sample. The second part of the measure, which assesses causes of IPV by asking participants to cite their own and their partner's motivations (as the participant perceived them) for the use of severely aggressive and/or violent tactics in a previous or current relationship, was determined to be psychometrically sound.

Chapter 5 presented the results of the third and final study contained in this dissertation. In Study 3, the measure created and validated in Study 2 was administered to a nonclinical sample of both men and women from various regional cultures of the U.S. These data were used to assess H3 – H6 (which, along with H1 and H2, are presented in Table 6.1, along with the overall determination drawn from their associated analyses).

Table 6.1. Hypotheses and results.

Study1	Hypotheses	*Supported?*
H1	The southern region of the United States (Delaware, Maryland, Virginia, West Virginia, North Carolina, South Carolina, Georgia, Florida, Kentucky, Tennessee, Mississippi, Alabama, Oklahoma, Texas, Arkansas, Louisiana) has a significantly higher rate of male-on-female homicides in single victim, single offender incidents than other regions of the United States.	SUPPORTED
H2	The West, comprised of Idaho, Montana, Wyoming, Nevada, Utah, Colorado, Arizona, New Mexico, Alaska, Washington, Oregon, California, and Hawaii, has the second highest rate of male-on-female homicides in single victim, single offender incidents in the United States (after the South).	SUPPORTED
Study 3		
H3	Men from honor cultures will report using more severe intimate partner violence than men from nonhonor cultures.	NOT SUPPORTED
H4	Men from honor cultures will report more severe acts of aggression when motivated by jealousy and infidelity than men from nonhonor cultures who are motivated by the same reasons.	NOT SUPPORTED
H5	Acts of intimate partner violence reported by women from honor cultures are more severe when attributed to perceived provocation (e.g., as a response to a partner saying something disrespectful or insulting) than acts reported by women from nonhonor cultures, attributed to similar reasons.	NOT SUPPORTED
H6	Women in honor cultures who report using more severe conflict tactics will also report being the victim of more severe conflict tactics, compared to the level of severity experienced by mutually-aggressive women in nonhonor cultures.	PARTIALLY SUPPORTED

The two claims related to differences between honor and nonhonor cultures in severity of violence attributed to certain reasons or circumstances failed to receive support in Study 3. A primary focus of this dissertation was testing the argument that reasons for the use of violence do

not differ greatly between honor- and nonhonor-based cultures; rather, the response to similar threats is more severe or intense by members of honor-based cultures, due to the pressure felt by members to adhere to rigid personal and social norms (Osterman & Brown, 2011). The use of violence and aggression by females against intimate partners has been largely ignored in honor culture research (e.g., Vandello & Cohen, 2003; 2008), despite strong evidence from the general IPV literature indicating that the overwhelming majority of violent relationships are characterized by mutual violence, perpetrated at equal or near-equal rates by both male and female partners (Margolin, John, & Gleberman, 1989).

Analyses revealed no significant differences between men from honor and nonhonor cultures in frequency of use of severe tactics (H3), or in severity of violence perpetrated in response to jealousy or infidelity-related concerns (H4). There were also no significant differences between women from honor and nonhonor cultures in the severity of violence attributed to perceived provocation (H5). Findings from H3, H4, and H5 are inconsistent with previous studies demonstrating that rates of violence, including rates of the most severe forms of violence (e.g., homicide), are higher in honor-based cultures than nonhonor-based cultures for both men (Bosson et al., 2009; Vandello, Cohen, & Ransom, 2008) and women (Nisbett & Cohen, 1996).

Hypothesis 3 predicted that men from honor cultures would generally report having perpetrated more severe tactics against an intimate partner than men from nonhonor cultures; while hypothesis 4 predicted that men from honor cultures would use more severe acts of aggression in response to jealousy and infidelity, specifically, than men from honor cultures motivated by the same reasons. The direction of these hypotheses reflects a large body of prior research on male violence, and more specifically, male violence within honor cultures.

Obviously, the null results from the analyses of H3 and H4 cannot be interpreted as conclusive, due to the extremely small sample. The total sample in Study 3 included only eighty-six males (n = 86), eighty-four (n = 84) which were used in the analysis of H3 (due to missing data on the Conflict Tactics Scale for two males). For the analyses conducted to test H4, the sample was considerably smaller: only fifteen (n = 15) males attributed their acts of intimate partner violence to jealousy- or infidelity- related concerns.

Hypothesis 5 predicted that women in honor cultures would commit more severe acts of aggression against an intimate partner than women in nonhonor cultures, when the acts were committed in the face of perceived provocation. While Nisbett and Cohen (1996) provided compelling statistic which reveal that white women in honor cultures commit significantly more acts of argument-related homicides (e.g., 48% of all white-perpetrated homicides, including 55% percent of all lovers' triangle, 72% of all alcohol and brawl-related, and 52% of all argument-related homicides), more recent studies on manhood versus womanhood in U.S. cultures of honor may help explain the results from tests of H5 which showed no significant difference in the severity of IPV perpetrated in response to perceived provocation.

"Precarious manhood" is a term describing how manhood is generally regarded as tenuous, while womanhood is a more enduring state that is not easily threatened (Bosson et al., 2009; Bosson & Vandello, 2011; Weaver et al., 2010). Tenuous, as used here, refers to the idea that manhood is an achieved status that must be earned, and is easily lost via social transgressions or failures (Weaver et al., 2010). Womanhood, on the other hand, is often seen primarily as a biological state which can only be taken away by physical changes, such as menopause (Bosson & Vandello, 2011). Recent empirical evidence exists to support these assumptions. Weaver et al. (2010) found that male Southerners were more likely than female

Southerners to explain male's physical aggression as a response to situational concerns, but men and women did not differ in the explanations given for the use of physical aggression by a female. Weaver and colleagues argued that these findings provide demonstrate that manhood is characterized by active and aggressive behaviors, which supports the notion that manhood is socially-validated and requires maintenance, unlike womanhood.

Bosson and Vandello (2011) found that men and women explained female's aggression as being driven by internal states, but explained other men's aggressive behavior in terms of the "situational factors which caused it" (p. 84). Women tended to view men's aggression similarly to women's (i.e., internally caused). As Bosson and Vandello (2011) theorized, the increased sensitivity to situational concerns displayed by men in their study could be reflective of a "cultural script that links gender threats to aggressive displays," and that these cultural scripts function more strongly in men than women (p. 84). Further, this tendency is contrary to "robust tendency" of people in the United States to "explain other people's behaviors as being caused by the person, not the situation" (Bosson & Vandello, 2011, p. 83). The tendency to explain other's behavior as being caused by that person, as opposed to a situation, is known as the fundamental attribution error (Ross, 1977).

Hypothesis 4 suggested that women in honor cultures would use more severe forms of violence in response to decidedly situational factors: acts of perceived provocation (e.g., "My partner said things to hurt my feelings"; "My partner slept separately from me"; "My partner insulted me"). In light of the research testing the concept of precarious manhood, the results from tests of H4 in Study 3 are not entirely surprising. The research detailed in the preceding paragraphs provides empirical support to the idea that women likely do not respond to immediate acts of provocation the same way as males, since physical aggression is not required to achieve

and maintain womanhood (Weaver et al., 2010). Bosson and Vandello (2011) cite two viable explanations for this: 1) evolutionary theories, which describe the socially-defined nature of manhood as an adaptation reflecting early male competition for resources and fertile females, and 2) social-role theories, which attribute the precariousness of manhood to "long-established divisions of labor" (i.e., men have historically occupied roles involving "status seeking and resource acquisition" (p. 82). Study 3 provides further evidence that men's cultural scripts (but not women's) include the use of physical aggression for establishing and maintaining gender status (Vandello, Bosson, Cohen, Burnaford, & Weaver, 2008).

Perhaps the most compelling explanation for lack of support from Study 3 for H3 – H5 lies in a discussion of behavior related to prescriptive and descriptive norms found in Cohen (2001). He states, "social norms arise both when people are deeply committed to a norm and when people merely think that others are deeply committed and act accordingly," and provides evidence from previous studies demonstrating that even if an individual within an honor culture doesn't endorse aggression for themselves, he or she still "project[s] it onto the 'generalized other'," even if the "other" does not, in reality, endorse the use of aggression either (p. 462). Cohen (2001) argues that the result of these inaccurate projections is people acting contrary to their private beliefs in favor of acting in accordance with norms (whether inaccurately believed to hold sway or not). For researchers, these inaccurate predictions could help explain why examinations of public behavior regarding violence (e.g., national-level data analysis from this project's Study 1) produce significant differences between honor and nonhonor cultures in the U.S., but studies of private attitudes (e.g., the individual-level analyses in Study 3) produce much smaller effects (Cohen, 2001).

Revealing the Need for Consistency across Research Methodologies

Study 3 makes a methodological contribution to the literature dedicated to testing differences between honor and nonhonor cultures in the United States. Study 3 represents an initial attempt at assessing whether the different and "largely subjective" (Vandello & Cohen, 1999) methods of honor/nonhonor classification provide varying results. No prior studies have tested the possible varying effects of differing classification schemes within one sample, as Study 3 did, and inconsistencies were indeed revealed across models testing H6. (For H3, H4, and H5, there were no substantive differences in results using the various models of subjective honor/nonhonor classification models.)

Analyses of H6 failed to provide evidence in direct support of the hypothesis, which predicted that women from honor cultures would perpetrate more severe tactics, and as a result, become the victim of more severe tactics than female victim-as-perpetrators in nonhonor cultures. Only two of the classification models tested revealed a statistically significant relationship between honor culture status and severity of tactics experienced as a victim for females in the sample; further, the findings were in the opposite direction than was hypothesized. Women in nonhonor cultures tended to experience *less* severe tactics at the hands of an intimate partner than women classified into nonhonor cultures.

Conducting a second series of contrasting analyses using a self-report of adherence to honor norms and values proved to be an insightful way to add clarity to the relationship between honor cultures and mutual acts of intimate partner violence. In the second series of analyses, an interaction effect between self-reported honor culture identification and each of the five models of subjective honor designation was included in separate ordered logistic regression models, as opposed to including only one classification method. Results revealed that the interaction effect

emerged as significant in all tested models. This suggests that the relation between self-reported adherence to a culture of honor and severity of intimate partner violence experienced is different for females living in pre-designated honor or nonhonor based states. Across analyses, the main effect of self-reported adherence to an honor culture was positive, indicating that the experience as a victim of intimate partner violence tends to be greater for people with a stronger sense of identification with honor norms and values. These results partially support H6. Indeed, identification with the norms and values of an honor culture is related to a more severe experience with intimate partner violence; however, this relationship is not stronger for females *in* states characterized by a culture of honor.

Insights into Mutual Intimate Partner Violence

While failing to provide complete support for H6, results from the analyses did support the general rationale behind the hypothesis. Citing numerous previous studies (e.g., Archer, 2002; Honeycutt & Bryan, 2011), as well as theories including Rappaport's (1960) Game Theory (particularly the concept of "tit-for-tat" retaliation strategies), H6 generally suggested a positive relationship between severity of intimate partner violence perpetration and severity of IPV victimization. Results from testing H6 indicated that, while there were no significant differences between honor and nonhonor women in levels of severity in IPV perpetrated and victimized by, the general relationship between perpetration and victimization was significant. Results from the second series of analyses also demonstrated that as severity of perpetrated tactics increased, the severity of tactics experienced also increased, a finding consistent with the body of literature on mutual violence (outlined in Chapter 1).

These findings are also consistent with previous research in the field of interpersonal communication, as reviewed in Chapter 2 (p. 34). Honeycutt, Sheldon, and Pence (2010) argued

that conflict and mutual violence can escalate to severe levels because of basic human desires for retaliation and equal retribution, and illustrated how Game Theory is a "useful guide" to examine mutual acts of violence and aggression between intimate partners. The significant, positive relationship between severity of IPV experienced from an intimate partner, and escalating severity in acts perpetrated against an intimate partner, is reflective of one strategy described in the Game Theory literature known as "tit-for-tat," where people reciprocate the last action of another (Axelrod & Hamilton, 1981; Cohen, 2001; Rapoport, 1966).

Cohen (2001) noted that Game Theory, and particularly the notion of "tit-for-tat," has been insightful in interpreting his own research on violence, conflict behavior, and social norms within cultures of honor. Specifically, Cohen (2001) discussed his previous arguments that the threat of violence in honor cultures has produced "prosocial norms for politeness," in part related to the continuing predisposition to be defensive in the face of threats, a tendency which can be traced back to the initial settling of the large frontier, low population South (Cohen & Vandello, 1998; Nisbett & Cohen, 1996). Cohen and Nisbett (1994) suggested that the absence of caused power and hierarchy to be determined through "social mechanisms underlying the culture of honor" (p. 552). Without an effective system of law enforcement, Cohen (2001) suggests that people become responsible for their own self-defense and generally "find it wise to avoid trouble" (p. 456). Despite social norms for politeness, however, many honor cultures are characterized by a constant, underlying threat of physical violence which also dictates norms for toughness due to the socially-determined nature of man's gender status. Cohen (2001) notes that one of the better explanations for this paradox is in the work of Axelrod (1984), which suggests the particular durability of tit-for-tat strategies in social systems where people are responsible for their own self-defense.

Limitations and Suggestions for Future Research

Study 1. The data from Study 1, which examined statewide rates of male-on-female homicides in single victim/single offender incidents, were limited in several ways. First, the type of analyses conducted, as well as the aggregate nature of the data, cannot support causal conclusions. Second, individual conclusions cannot be drawn from aggregate variables, such as state- and national- level data, since doing so would represent an ecological fallacy (Robinson, 1950). Therefore, while the results suggest that future research is warranted (i.e., initial evidence for significant differences was revealed), the results are far from conclusive.

In a future study, researchers should conduct a more in-depth examination of intimate partner homicides at the national-level. Examining intimate partner homicide rates for both male and female perpetrators would add to the generalizability of the results. A more inclusive sample should be considered for future research, potentially one involving a supplementary data set which reports statistics on intimate partner homicides between current or former boyfriends/girlfriends. The FBI Supplementary Homicide Report does not contain any data regarding these types of relationships (Garcia, Soria, & Horwitz, 2007), despite evidence warranting its inclusion (e.g., dating violence rates increasing in the U.S., Hettrich & O'Leary, 2007). Finally, a superior method for future studies is to control for other statewide variables which have been linked to homicide, such rates of unemployment (Campbell et al., 2007). Osterman and Brown (2011) provided an excellent guide for this type of analysis. The primary question driving their study was whether cultures of honor create unique circumstances which explain higher suicide rates in the states characterized by the presence of an honor culture. Osterman and Brown (2011) first determined possible contributing factors to suicide (e.g.,

statewide access to medical care), gathered data reflecting those factors, and included those data as covariates in regression analyses.

Results from an in-depth analyses such as the one conducted by Osterman and Brown (2011), if conducted on intimate partner violence and/or homicide rates, have the potential to inform practitioners and policy makers to the potential impacts of regional culture on interpersonal, aggressive behavior. Ideally, policy makers or groups developing intimate partner violence prevention programs will take into account cultural influences of the region in which the efforts are to be targeted. Findings from Study 1 offer initial support to the argument against heterogeneous, one-size-fits-all prevention and intervention efforts for interpersonal violence (particularly homicide); but, as stated, more thorough studies need to be conducted for practitioners and policy makers to be adequately informed.

Study 2. The most noticeable limitation to Study 2, which presented the creation of the measure used in Study 3, was that psychometric examinations of the revised Conflict Tactics Scale failed to yield adequate factor solutions. A five factor and ten factor model for both perpetration and victimization items did not reach convergence, demonstrating an extremely poor fit to the data collected for the validation portion of Study 2. The lack of "good fit" for the revised CTS was not altogether surprising, however. Overall, very few studies have explored the psychometric properties of the revised Conflict Tactics Scale, and the results have been extremely varied. Calvete, Corral, and Estevez (2007) offered one explanation for the general lack of published psychometric analyses conducted on the revised Conflict Tactics Scale, stating that distributions for several items on the CTS2 are "characterized by high skewness and kurtosis" (p. 1074), and how it is common to observe the absence of positive answers for some of the items in certain samples (e.g., Corral & Calvete, 2006, for "burned or scalded by a

partner" in Spanish-speaking youth). Calvete et al. (2007) argued that these characteristics make it difficult to "obtain adequate factor solutions, which in turn could discourage researchers from publishing their results" (p. 1075). Future research should work toward refining the revised Conflict Tactics Scale, with the goal of creating a more stable assessment that results in a well-fitting model for a variety of data.

Study 3. The primary limitation faced in this project is the disproportionate number of female versus male respondents in the sample used to test H3 and H4. With only fifteen eligible males for the analysis of H3, and only eighty-four males for the analyses of H4, the samples utilized were considerably underpowered, preventing the accurate assessment of main effects. Researchers conducting future studies may want to consider using more targeted sampling methods; not only as a way to draw in larger numbers of men (as well as women), but to more precisely assess attributions for intimate partner violence. Drawing samples from individuals who have self-identified as victims, for example, will increase the likelihood of there being a sufficiently powered sample size within a given study to perform analyses comparing attributions given by victims compared to non-abused controls. Large, nationally-representative, community samples of men and women gathered using targeted techniques, such as ensuring a certain sample size (i.e., sufficiently powered) of males and females from each of the regional cultures of the United States, would also be more ideal for researchers conducting future studies comparing honor- and nonhonor- based cultures within the United States.

Given the small, underpowered sample, nonsignificant findings, relatively consistent results across models, and time constraints imposed for the current studies, the determination was made to not run secondary analyses for H3, H4, and H5 utilizing self-identification with a culture of honor in place of the subjective honor/nonhonor classification schemes that have

become the "convention" in cross-cultural research (Vandello & Cohen, 2003). Future research with a larger, nationally-representative sample of males should examine the differential effects of subjective versus objective honor classification techniques. Numerous studies support this assertion by arguing for the importance of understanding individual differences and/or within-culture variability, and not simply between-culture variability (Bosson et al., 2009; Cohen & Leung, 2011; Vandello & Cohen, 2003; 2008).

Several culture of honor scholars have suggested examining the inner-city as a specific within-culture population, since the violence within inner-cities is often committed for honor-based reasons, such as maintaining "respect" (Cohen, 2001; Nisbett & Cohen, 1996). Other research outside the culture of honor has described the inner-city in a way that speaks directly to researchers interested on U.S.-based honor cultures. Anderson (1994) argued that many inner-city populations do not adhere to cultural norms for violence, but are forced to play by a code of honor laid down for "the streets." Another parallel between inner-cities and the culture of honor is that the "rules of the street" may not be privately held by most in inner-cities, but failure to publically adopt these rules can lead to violence because of a cohorts shame over failure to "adhere to the code" (Kahan, 1998). Indeed, research applying the culture of honor to inner-cities will likely be complex, but given the evidence showing similarities, complete studies on inner-cities as honor cultures could make a significant and novel contribution to the U.S. culture of honor literature.

Conclusions

In conclusion, results from studies conducted within this dissertation provide evidence for the applicability of concepts from the broader intimate partner violence literature to cultures of honor. Considerable evidence has accumulated which suggests that the most common situation

in violent couples is one where both the male and female partners commit an equal or near-equal number of violent or aggressive acts (see meta-analysis by Archer, 2002), for many of the same reasons (Dutton, 2012; Spitzberg, 2011). In the sample of women used in Study 3, the strongest predictor of IPV victimization severity was the severity of that woman's own perpetrated acts of intimate partner violence. The lack of support for H5 and H6 may also imply the broader applicability of concepts from the IPV literature, since no significant differences emerged between women from honor and nonhonor cultures.

Interpersonal communication scholars, especially those focused on explaining the escalation of conflict by mutually aggressive partners, or interpersonal scholars interested in studying the principles of Game Theory (especially tit-for-tat), should further explore this largely unstudied population: mutually violent intimate partners in honor cultures. As stated, numerous scholars have overwhelmingly ignored women's use of violence in such cultures, undoubtedly leaving a multitude of areas that still need to be explored.

REFERENCES

Allison, P. D. (2009). *Fixed effects regression models*. Los Angeles, CA: Sage.

Archer, J. (2002). Sex differences in physically aggressive acts between heterosexual partners: A meta-analytic review. *Aggression and Violent Behavior, 7,* 313-351. doi: 10.1037//0033-2909.126.5.651.

Association for Psychological Science (2011, May 3). Think it's easy to be macho? Psychologists show how 'precarious' manhood is. *ScienceDaily*. Retrieved January 18, 2013, from http://www.sciencedaily.com /releases/2011/05/110502132905.htm.

Astbury, J. (1996). *Crazy for you: The making of women's madness*. Melbourne: Oxford University Press.

Axelrod, R. M. (1984). *The evolution of cooperation*. New York: Basic Books.

Axelrod, R., & Hamilton, W. (1981). The evolution of cooperation. *Science*, *211*(4489), 1390-1396. doi: 10.1126/science.7466396.

Babcock, J. C., Costa, D. M., Green, C. E., & Eckhardt, C. I. (2004). What situations induce intimate partner violence? A reliability and validity study of the Proximal Antecedents to Violent Episodes (PAVE) scale. *Journal of Family Psychology*, *18*(3), 433-442. doi: 10.1037/0893-3200.18.3.433.

Babcock, J. C., Waltz, J., Jacobson, N. S., & Gottman, J. M. (1993). Power and violence: The relation between communication patterns, power discrepancies, and domestic violence. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology*, *61*(1), 40-50. doi: 10.1037//0022-006X.61.1.40.

Bailey, J. E., Kellermann, A. L., Somes, G. W., Banton, J. G., Rivara, F. P., & Rushforth, N. P. (1997). Risk factors for violent death of women in the home. *Archives of Internal Medicine, 157*(7), 777-782. doi:10.1001/archinte.1997.00440280101009.

Bandura, A. (1986). *Social foundations of thought and action: A social cognitive theory*. Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall.

Barnes, C. D., Brown, R. P., & Osterman, L. L. (in press). Don't tread on me: Masculine honor ideology and in the U.S. and militant responses to terrorism. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*. doi: 10.1177/0146167212443383.

Barnett, O. W., & Fagan, R. W. (1993). Alcohol use in male spouse abusers and their female partners. *Journal of Family Violence, 8*(1), 1-25. doi: 10.1007/BF00986990.

Barnett, O. W., Keyson, M., & Thelen, R. E. (1992, August). *Women's violence as a response to male abuse.* Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Psychological Association, Washington, DC.

Barnett, O. W., Lee, C. Y., & Thelen, R. E. (1997). Gender differences in attributions of self-defense and control in interpartner aggression. *Violence Against Women, 3*(5), 462-481. doi: 10.1177/1077801297003005002.

Barnett, O. W., & Willet, S. L. (1987, April). *Relational consequences of wife beating for violent husbands.* Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Western Psychological Association, Long Beach, CA.

Barnett, O. W., & Wilshire, T. W. (1987, July). *Forms and frequencies of wife abuse.* Paper presented at the Third National Family Violence Research Conference, Durham, NH.

Beyer, L. (1999, January 18). The price of honor. *Time*, 55.

Bodie, G. D., Worthington, D., & Fitch-Hauser, M. (2011). A comparison of four measurement models for the Watson-Barker Listening Test (WBLT)- Form C. *Communication Research Reports, 28*(1), 32-42. doi: 10.1080/08824096.2011.540547.

Bosson, J. K., & Vandello, J. A. (2011). Precarious manhood and its links to action and aggression. *Current Directions in Psychological Science, 20*(2), 82-86. doi: 10.1177/0963721411402669.

Bosson, J. K., Vandello, J. A., Burnaford, R. M., Weaver, J. R., & Arzu Wasti, S. (2009). Precarious manhood and displays of physical aggression. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 35*(5), 623-634. doi: 10.1177/0146167208331161.

Breiding, M., Black, M., & Ryan, G. (2008). Prevalence and risk factors of intimate partner violence in eighteen U.S. states/territories. *American Journal of Preventive Medicine, 34*(2), 112-118. doi: 10.1016/j.amepre.2007.10.001.

Brown, R. P., Osterman, L. L., & Barnes, C. D. (2009). School violence and the culture of honor. *Psychological Science*, 1400-1405. doi: 10.1111/j.1467-9280.2009.02456.x.

Brown, T. A. (2006). *Confirmatory factor analysis for applied research*. New York: Guilford Press.

Buss, D. M. (1994). *The evolution of desire: Strategies of human mating*. New York: BasicBooks.

Caldwell, J., Swan, S., Allen, C., Sullivan, T., & Snow, D. (2009). Why I hit him: Women's reasons for intimate partner violence. *Journal of Aggression, Maltreatment & Trauma, 18*(7), 672-697. doi: 10.1080/10926770903231783.

Calvete, E., Corral, S., & Estevez, A. (2007). Factor structure and validity of the revised conflict tactics scales for Spanish women. *Violence Against Women, 13*(10), 1072-1087. doi: 10.1177/1077801207305933.

Campbell, J. C., Glass, N., Sharps, P. W., Laughon, K., & Bloom, T. (2007). Intimate partner homicide: Review and implications of research and policy. *Trauma, Violence, & Abuse, 8*(3), 246-269. doi: 10.1177/1524838007303505.

Campbell, J. C., Webster, D., Koziol-McLain, J., Block, C., Campbell, D., Curry, M. A., ... Laughon, K. (2003). Risk factors for femicide in abusive relationships: Results from a multisite case control study. *American Journal of Public Health, 93*(7), 1089-1097. doi: 10.2105/AJPH.93.7.1089.

Campbell, J. C., Webster, D., Koziol-McLain, J., Block, C. R., Campbell, D., & Curry, M. A. (2003). Assessing risk factors for intimate partner homicide. *National Institute of Justice Journal, 250*, 14-19.

Campbell, J. C., Webster, D. W., & Glass, N. (2008). The Danger Assessment: Validation of a lethality risk assessment instrument for intimate partner femicide. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 24*(4), 653-674. doi: 10.1177/0886260508317180.

Cano, A., & Vivian, D. (2003). Are life stressors associated with marital violence? *Journal of Family Psychology, 17*(3), 302-314. doi: 10.1037/0893-3200.17.3.302.

Capaldi, D. M., Kim, H. K., & Shortt, J. W. (2004). Women's involvement in aggression in young adult romantic relationships. In M. Putallaz & K. L. Bierman (Eds.), *Aggression, antisocial behavior, and violence among girls* (pp. 223-241). New York: Guilford.

Capezza, N. M., & Arriaga, X. B. (2008). You can degrade but you can't hit: Differences in perceptions of psychological versus physical aggression. *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships, 25*(2), 225-245. doi: 10.1177/0265407507087957.

Carrado, M., George, M., Loxam, E., Jones, L., & Templar, D. (1996). Aggression in British heterosexual relationships: A descriptive analysis. *Aggressive Behavior, 22*(6), 401-415. doi: 10.1002/(SICI)1098-2337(1996)22:63.0.CO;2-K.

Cascardi, M., & Vivian, D. (1995). Context for specific episodes of marital violence: Gender and severity of violence differences. *Journal of Family Violence, 10*(3), 265-293. doi: 10.1007/BF02110993.

Cascardi, M., Langhinrichsen, J., & Vivian, D. (1992). Marital aggression: Impact, injury, and health correlates of husbands and wives. *Archives of Internal Medicine, 152*, 1178-1184. doi: 10.1001/archinte.1992.00400180048007.

Castellan, N. J. (1988). *Nonparametric statistics for the behavioral sciences.* New York: Mcgraw -hill Book.

Cheng, C., Wang, F., & Golden, D. L. (2011). Unpacking cultural differences in interpersonal flexibility: Role of culture-related personality and situational factors. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology, 42*(3), 425-444. doi: 10.1177/0022022110362755.

Clark, L. A., & Watson, D. (1995). Constructing validity: Basic issues in objective scale development. *Psychological Assessment, 7*(3), 309-319. doi: 10.1037//1040-3590.7.3.309.

Cochran, W. G. (1950). The comparison of percentages in matched samples. *Biometrika, 37*(3/4), 256. doi: 10.2307/2332378.

Cohen, D. (1996). Law, social policy, and violence: The impact of regional cultures. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 70*(5), 961-978. doi: 10.1037//0022-3514.70.5.961.

Cohen, D. (1998). Culture, social organization, and patterns of violence. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 75*(2), 408-419. doi: 10.1037//0022-3514.75.2.408.

Cohen, D. (2001). Cultural variation: Considerations and implications. *Psychological Bulletin, 127*(4), 451-471. doi: 10.1037//0033-2909.127.4.451.

Cohen, D., & Leung, A. K. (2011). A CuPS perspective on violence and character. In P. R. Shaver & M. Mikulincer (Eds.), *Human aggression and violence: Causes, manifestations, and consequences*. Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.

Cohen, D., & Nisbett, R. E. (1994). Self-protection and the culture of honor: Explaining southern violence. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 20*(5), 551-567. doi: 10.1177/0146167294205012.

Cohen, D., & Nisbett, R. E. (1997). Field experiments examining the culture of honor: The role of institutions in perpetuating norms about violence. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 23*(11), 1188-1199. doi: 10.1177/01461672972311006.

Cohen, D., Llorente, M., & Eisdorfer, C. (1998). Homicide-suicide in older persons. *American Journal of Psychiatry, 155*(3), 390-396.

Cohen, D., Nisbett, R. E., Bowdle, B. F., & Schwarz, N. (1996). Insult, aggression, and the southern culture of honor: An "experimental ethnography" *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 70*(5), 945-960. doi: 10.1037//0022-3514.70.5.945.

Cohen, T. R., Wolf, S. T., Panter, A. T., & Insko, C. A. (2011). Introducing the GASP scale: A new measure of guilt and shame proneness. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 100*(5), 947-966. doi: 10.1037/a0022641.

Coker, A. L., Smith, P. H., Bethee, L., King, M. R., & McKeown, R. E. (2000). Physical health consequences of physical and psychological intimate partner abuse. *Archives of Family Medicine, 9,* 451-457.

Coleman, D. H., & Straus, M. A. (1986). Marital power, conflict, and violence in a nationally representative sample of American couples. *Violence and Victims, 1,* 141-157.

Connelly, C. D., Newton, R. R., & Aarons, G. A. (2005). A psychometric examination of English and Spanish versions of the revised Conflict Tactics Scales. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 20*(12), 1560-1579. doi: 10.1177/0886260505280341.

Corral, S., & Calvete, E. (2006). Evaluacion de la violencia en las relaciones de pareja mediante las Escalas de Tacticas para Conflictos: Estructura factorial y diferencias de genero en jovenes [Assessment of violence in intimate relationships by means of the CTS2: Factor structure and gender differences in youngsters]. *Psicologia Conductal, 2,* 215-234.

Crowley, S. L., & Fan, X. (1997). Structural equation modeling: Basic concepts and applications in personality assessment research. *Journal of Personality Assessment, 68*(3), 508-531. doi: 10.1207/s15327752jpa6803_4.

Cupach, W. R., & Spitzberg, B. H. (2011). *The dark side of close relationships II*. New York: Routledge.

Dailey, R., Lee, C., & Spitzberg, B. H. (1994). Communicative aggression: Toward a more interactional view of psychological abuse. In B. H. Spitzberg & W. R. Cupach (Eds.), *The dark side of interpersonal communication* (pp. 297-326). Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.

Daly, M., & Wilson, M. (1988). *Homicide*. New York: A. de Gruyter.

Deci, E. L., & Ryan, R. M. (2000). The "what" and "why" of goal pursuits: Human needs and the self-determination of behavior. *Psychological Inquiry, 11*(4), 227-268. doi: 10.1207/S15327965PLI1104_01.

DeKeseredy, W. S. (2011). Feminist contributions to understanding woman abuse: Myths, controversies, and realities. *Aggression and Violent Behavior, 16,* 297-302. doi: 10.1016/j.avb.2011.04.002.

Dobash, R. E., & Dobash, R. (1979). *Violence against wives: A case against the patriarchy*. New York: Free Press.

Dobash, R. E., & Dobash, R. P. (1984). The nature and antecedents of violent events. *British Journal of Criminology, 24,* 269-288. doi: cgi/content/short/24/3/269.

Domestic violence statistics. (2012). *Domestic Violence Resource Center*. Retrieved May 5, 2012, from http://www.dvrc-or.org/domestic/violence/resources/C61/.

Dutton, D. G. (2006). *Rethinking domestic violence*. Vancouver: UBC Press.

Dutton, D. G. (2007). *The abusive personality: Violence and control in intimate relationships*. New York: Guilford Press.

Dutton, D. G. (2012). The case against the role of gender in intimate partner violence. *Aggression and Violent Behavior, 17*, 99-104. doi: 10.1016/j.avb.2011.09.002.

Dutton, D. G., & Corvo, K. (2006). Transforming a flawed policy: A call to revive psychology and science in domestic violence research and practice. *Aggression and Violent Behavior, 11*(5), 457-483. doi: 10.1016/j.avb.2006.01.007.

Dutton, D.G., Corvo, K., & Hamel, J. (2009). The gender paradigm in domestic violence research and practice part II: The information website of the American Bar Association. *Aggression and Violent Behavior, 14*(1), 30-38. doi: 10.1016/j.avb.2008.08.002.

Dutton, D. G., & Golant, S. K. (1995). *The batterer: A psychological profile*. New York: Basic Books.

Dutton, M. A., Kaltman, S., Goodman, L. A., Weinfurt, K., & Vankos, N. (2005). Patterns of intimate partner violence: Correlates and outcomes. *Violence and Victims, 20*(5), 483-497. doi: 10.1891/088667005780927520.

Ellison, C. (1991). An eye for an eye? A note of the southern subculture of violence thesis. *Social Forces, 69*, 1223-1239.

Felson, R. B. (1981). An interactionist approach to aggression. In J. T. Tedeschi (Author), *Impression management theory and social psychological research*. New York: Academic Press.

Felson, R. B. (2002). *Violence and gender reexamined*. Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.

Fergusson, D. M., & Horwood, L. J. (2000). Alcohol abuse and crime: A fixed-effects regression analysis. *Addiction, 95*(10), 1525-1536. doi: 10.1046/j.1360-0443.2000.951015257.x.

Fiebert, M. S., & Gonzalez, D. M. (1997). College women who initiate assaults on their male partners and the reasons offered for such behavior. *Psychological Reports, 80*(2), 583-590. doi: 10.2466/pr0.1997.80.2.583.

Fiske, S. T., & Taylor, S. E. (2008). *Social cognition: From brains to culture*. Boston: McGraw-Hill Higher Education.

Flynn, A., & Graham, K. (2010). "Why did it happen?" A review and conceptual framework for research on perpetrators' and victims' explanations for intimate partner violence. *Aggression and Violent Behavior, 15*(3), 239-251. doi: 10.1016/j.avb.2010.01.002.

Follingstad, D. R., Helff, C. M., Binford, R. V., Runge, M. M., & White, J. D. (2004). Lay persons' versus psychologists' judgments of psychologically aggressive actions by a husband and wife. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, *19*(8), 916-942. doi: 10.1177/0886260504266229.

Follingstad, D. R., Rutledge, L. L., Berg, B. J., Hause, E. S., & Polek, D. S. (1990). The role of emotional abuse in physically abusive relationships. *Journal of Family Violence*, *5*(2), 107-120. doi: 10.1007/BF00978514.

Follingstad, D. R., Wright, S., Lloyd, S., & Sebastian, J. A. (1991). Sex differences in motivations and effects of dating violence. *Family Relations*, *40*, 51-57.

Garcia, L., Soria, C., & Hurwitz, E. L. (2007). Homicides and intimate partner violence: A literature review. *Trauma, Violence, & Abuse*, *8*(4), 370-383. doi: 10.1177/1524838007307294.

Gilgun, J. (n.d.). When men murder women: When will we have enough? *Scribd*. Retrieved from http://www.scribd.com/doc/20638336/When-Men-Murder-Women-When-Will-We-Have-Enough.

Gilmore, D. D. (1990). *Manhood in the making: Cultural conceptions of masculinity*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.

Glass, N., Laughon, K., Campbell, J., Block, C., Hanson, G., Sharps, P., & Taliaferro, E. (2008). Non-fatal strangulation is an important risk factor for homicide of women. *Journal of Emergency Medicine*, *35*(3), 329-335. doi: 10.1016/j.jemermed.2007.02.065.

Hamberger, L. K. (1997). Female offenders in domestic violence: A look at actions in their context. *Journal of Aggression, Maltreatment & Trauma*, *1*, 117-129. doi: 10.1300/J146v01n01_07.

Hamilton, L. C. (2013). *Statistics with Stata: Updated for version 12*. Boston, MA: Brooks/Cole.

Harned, M. S. (2001). Abused women or abused men? An examination of the context and outcomes of dating violence. *Violence and Victims*, *16*, 269-285.

Harris, J. R. (2006). *No two alike: Human nature and human individuality*. New York: W.W. Norton.

Harris, L. M., Gergen, K. J., & Lannamann, J. W. (1986). Aggression rituals. *Communication Monographs*, *53*(3), 252-265. doi: 10.1080/03637758609376140.

Hayes, T. C., & Lee, M. R. (2005). The southern culture of honor and violent attitudes. *Sociological Spectrum*, *25*(5), 593-617. doi: 10.1080/02732170500174877.

Henning, K., Jones, A. R., & Holdford, R. (2005). "I didn't do it, but if I did I had a good reason": Minimization, denial, and attributions of blame among male and female domestic violence offenders. *Journal of Family Violence, 20*(3), 131-139. doi: 10.1007/s10896-005-3647-8.

Hettrich, E. L., & O'Leary, K. D. (2007). Females' reasons for their physical aggression in dating relationships. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 22*(9), 1131-1143. doi: 10.1177/0886260507303729.

Honeycutt, J. M., & Bryan, S. P. (2011). *Scripts and communication for relationships*. New York: Peter Lang.

Honeycutt, J. M., Sheldon, P., & Pence, M. E. (2010, June). *Fight versus flight: A game theory perspective on conflict escalation and abuse*. Paper presented at International Communication Association, Singapore.

Horon, I., & Cheng, D. (2001). Enhanced surveillance for pregnancy-associated mortality: Maryland, 1993-1998. *Journal of the American Medical Association, 285*(11), 1455-1459. doi:10.1001/jama.285.11.1455.

Jacobson, N. S., & Gottman, J. M. (1998). *When men batter women: New insights into ending abusive relationships*. New York: Simon & Schuster.

Jacobson, N. S., Gottman, J. M., Waltz, J., Rushe, R., Babcock, J., & Holtzworth-Munroe, A. (1994). Affect, verbal content, and psychophysiology in the arguments of couples with a violent husband. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 62*(5), 982-988. doi: 10.1037//0022-006X.62.5.982.

Jann, B. (2004). Tabulation of multiple responses. *The Stata Journal, 5*(1), 92-122.

Jewkes, R. (2002). Intimate partner violence: Causes and prevention. *Lancet, 359*, 1423-1429. doi:10.1016/S0140-6736(02)08357-5.

Johnson, M. P. (1995). Patriarchal terrorism and common couple violence: Two forms of violence against women. *Journal of Marriage and the Family, 57*, 283-294. doi: 10.2307/353683.

Johnson, M. P. (2005). The differential effects of intimate terrorism and situational couple violence: Findings from the National Violence Against Women Survey. *Journal of Family Issues, 26*(3), 322-349. doi: 10.1177/0192513X04270345.

Jung, C. G., Dell, W. S., & Baynes, C. F. (1933). *Modern man in search of a soul*. New York: Harcourt, Brace, & World.

Kaiser, H. F. (1974). An index of factorial simplicity. *Psychometrika, 39*(1), 31-36. doi: 10.1007/BF02291575.

Kellermann, A., & Heron, S. (1999). Firearms and family violence. *Emergency Medicine Clinics of North America*, *17*(3), 699-716. doi: 10.1016/S0733-8627(05)70092-4.

Kelley, H. H., & Thibaut, J. W. (1978). *Interpersonal relations: A theory of interdependence*. New York: Wiley.

Lang, A. J., Kennedy, C. M., & Stein, M. B. (2002). Anxiety sensitivity and PTSD among female victims of intimate partner violence. *Depression and Anxiety*, *16*(2), 77-83. doi: 10.1002/da.10062.

Langley, M. (2009, September 23). When men murder women-state-by-state analysis. - *Crime in America.Net*. Retrieved from http://crimeinamerica.net/2009/09/23/when-men-murder-women-state-by-state-analysis/.

Lee, R. K., Thompson, V. L., & Mechanic, M. B. (2002). Intimate partner violence and women of color: A call for innovations. *American Journal of Public Health*, *92*(4), 530-534. doi: 10.2105/AJPH.92.4.530.

Levene, H. (1960). Robust tests for equality of variances. In I. Olkin (Ed.), *Contributions to probability and statistics: Essays in honor of Harold Hotelling* (pp. 278-292). Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.

Levenson, R. W., & Gottman, J. M. (1983). Marital interaction: Physiological linkage and affective exchange. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *45*(3), 587-597. doi: 10.1037//0022-3514.45.3.587.

LeVine, R. A. (2007). *Culture, behavior, and personality: An introduction to the comparative study of psychosocial adaptation*. New Brunswick, NJ: Aldine Transaction.

Lowe, P., Humphreys, C., & Williams, S. J. (2007). Night terrors: Women's experiences of (not) sleeping where there is domestic violence. *Violence Against Women*, *13*(6), 549-561. doi: 10.1177/1077801207301556.

Lucente, S. W., Fals-Stewart, W., Richards, H. J., & Goscha, J. (2001). Factor structure and reliability of the Revised Conflict Tactics Scales for incarcerated female substance abusers. *Journal of Family Violence, 16*, 437-450. doi: 10.1023/A:1012281027999.

Maiuro, R. D. (2001). Sticks and stones may break my bones, but names will also hurt me: Psychological abuse in domestically violent relationships [Preface]. In K. D. O'Leary & R. D. Maiuro (Eds.), *Psychological abuse in violent domestic relations*. New York: Spring Publishing Company.

Makepeace, J. M. (1986). Gender differences in courtship violence victimization. *Family Relations*, *35*, 383-388.

Manusov, V., & Spitzberg, B. (2008). Attribution theory. In L. A. Baxter & D. O. Braithwaite (Eds.), *Engaging theories in interpersonal communication: Multiple perspectives* (pp. 37-49). Los Angeles: Sage Publications.

Margolin, G., John, R. S., & Gleberman, L. (1989). Affective responses to conflictual discussions in violent and nonviolent couples. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 56*(1), 24-33. doi: 10.1037//0022-006X.56.1.24.

Matsumoto, D., & Juang, L. (2004). *Culture and psychology*. New York: Thomson.

McCrae, R. R. (2000). Trait psychology and the revival of personality and culture studies. *American Behavioral Scientist, 44*(1), 10-31. doi: 10.1177/00027640021956062.

McCrae, R. R., & Costa, P. T. (1996). Toward a new generation of personality theories: Theoretical contexts for the five-factor model (J. S. Wiggins, Ed.). In *The five-factor model of personality: Theoretical perspectives* (pp. 51-87). New York: Guilford Press.

McCroskey, J. C., & Young, T. J. (1979). The use and abuse of factor analysis in communication research. *Human Communication Research, 5*(4), 375-382. doi: 10.1111/j.1468-2958.1979.tb00651.x.

McFarlane, J. M., Campbell, J. C., Wilt, S., Sachs, C. J., Ulrich, Y., & Xu, X. (1999). Stalking and intimate partner femicide. *Homicide Studies, 3*(4), 300-316. doi: 10.1177/1088767999003004003.

Moffitt, T. E., Caspi, A., Rutter, M., & Silva, P. A. (2001). *Sex differences in antisocial behavior*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Murphy, C. M., Winters, J., O'Farrell, T. J., Fals-Stewart, W., & Murphy, M. (2005). Alcohol consumption and intimate partner violence by alcoholic men: Comparing violent and nonviolent conflicts. *Psychology of Addictive Behaviors*, *19*(1), 35-42. doi: 10.1037/0893-164X.19.1.35.

National coalition against domestic violence. (n.d.). *National Coalition Against Domestic Violence*. Retrieved from http://www.ncadv.org/.

Newton, R. R., Connelly, C. D., & Landsverk, J. A. (2001). An examination of measurement characteristics and factorial validity of the Revised Conflict Tactics Scale. *Educational and Psychological Measurement, 61*(2), 317-335. doi: 10.1177/0013164401612011.

Nisbett, R. E., & Cohen, D. (1996). *Culture of honor: The psychology of violence in the South*. Boulder, CO: Westview Press.

Novaco, R. W. (1976). The functions and regulation of the arousal of anger. *American Journal of Psychiatry, 133*, 1124-1129.

O'Leary, K. D. (1988). Physical aggression between spouses: A social learning perspective. In V. B. Van Hasselt, R. L. Morrison, A. S. Bellack, & M. Hersen (Eds.), *Handbook of family violence* (pp. 31-56). New York, NY: Plenum.

O'Leary, K. D. (2001). Psychological abuse: A variable deserving critical attention in domestic violence. In K. D. O'Leary & R. D. Maiuro (Eds.), *Psychological abuse in violent domestic relations* (pp. 3-28). New York: Spring Publishing Company.

O'Leary, K. D., & Maiuro, R. D. (2001). *Psychological abuse in violent domestic relations*. New York: Spring Publishing.

O'Leary, K. D., Malone, J., & Tyree, A. (1994). Physical aggression in early marriage: Prerelationship and relationship effects. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 62*(3), 594-602. doi: 10.1037//0022-006X.62.3.594.

Osterman, L. L., & Brown, R. P. (2011). Culture of honor and violence against the self. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 37*(12), 1611-1623. doi: 10.1177/0146167211418529.

Pence, E., Paymar, M., Ritmeester, T., & Shepard, M. (1993). *Education groups for men who batter: The Duluth model*. New York: Springer Publishing Company.

Perlman, D., & Carcedo, R. J. (2011). Overview of the dark side of relationships research. In W. R. Cupach & B. H. Spitzberg (Eds.), *The dark side of close relationships II* (pp. 1-37). New York: Routledge.

Pettigrew, T. F. (1979). The ultimate attribution error: Extending Allport's cognitive analysis of prejudice. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, *5*(4), 461-476. doi: 10.1177/014616727900500407.

Proudfoot, S. (2009, July 23). 'Honor killings' of females on rise in Canada: Expert. *The Star Phoenix*.

Puente, S., & Cohen, D. (2003). Jealousy and the meaning (or nonmeaning) of violence. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 29*, 449-460. doi: 10.1177/0146167202250912.

Rapoport, A. (1966). *Two-person game theory: The essential ideas*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.

Reed, J. S. (1981). Below the Smith and Wesson line: Reflections on southern violence. In M. Black & J. S. Reed (Eds.), *Perspectives on the American South: An annual review of Society, politics and culture*. New York: Gordon and Breach Science.

Reise, S. P., Widaman, K. F., & Pugh, R. H. (1993). Confirmatory factor analysis and item response theory: Two approaches for exploring measurement invariance. *Psychological Bulletin*, *114*(3), 552-566. doi: 10.1037//0033-2909.114.3.552.

Rentfrow, P. J. (2010). Statewide differences in personality: Toward a psychological geography of the United States. *American Psychologist*, *65*(6), 548-558. doi: 10.1037/a0018194.

Robinson, W. (1950). Ecological correlations and the behavior of individuals. *American Sociological Review*, *15*, 351-357. doi: 10.1093/ije/dyn357.

Rogers, L. E., & Farace, R. V. (1975). Analysis of relational communication in dyads: New measurement procedures. *Human Communication Research*, *1*(3), 222-239. doi: 10.1111/j.1468-2958.1975.tb00270.x.

Rosen, K. H. (1996). The ties that bind women to violent premarital relationships: Processes of seduction and entrapment. In D. D. Cahn & S. A. Lloyd (Eds.), *Family violence from a communication perspective* (pp. 151-176). London: Sage.

Ross, L. (1977). The intuitive psychologist and his shortcomings: Distortions in the attribution process. In L. Berkowitz (Ed.), *Advances in experimental social psychology* (Vol. 10, pp. 173-220). New York: Academic Press.

Saltzman, L. E., Fanslow, J. L., McMahon, P. M., & Shelley, G. A. (2002). *Intimate partner violence surveillance: Uniform definitions and recommended data elements* (Rep. No. Version 1.0). Retrieved http://www.cdc.gov/ncipc/pub-res/ipv_surveillance/Intimate%20Partner%20Violence.pdf

Schmitt, D. P., & Buss, D. M. (2001). Human mate poaching: Tactics and temptations for infiltrating existing mateships. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *80*(6), 894-917. doi: 10.1037//0022-3514.80.6.894.

Schmitt, D. P., & 121 Members of the International Sexual Description Project. (2004). Patterns and universals of mate poaching across 53 nations: The effects of sex, culture, and personality on romantically attracting another person's partner. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *86*(4), 560-584. doi: 10.1037/0022-3514.86.4.560.

Shackelford, T. K. (2001). Cohabitation, marriage, and murder: Woman-killing by male romantic partners. *Aggressive Behavior*, *27*(4), 284-291. doi: 10.1002/ab.1011.

Shackelford, T. K., & Mouzos, J. (2005). Partner killing by men in cohabiting and marital relationships: A comparative, cross-national analysis of data from Australia and the United States. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, *20*(10), 1310-1324. doi: 10.1177/0886260505278606.

Sillito, C. L. (2012). Physical health effects of intimate partner abuse. *Journal of Family Issues*. doi: 10.1177/0192513X12448742.

Spitzberg, B. H. (2011). Intimate partner violence and aggression: Seeing the light in a dark place. In W. R. Cupach & B. H. Spitzberg (Eds.), *The dark side of close relationships II* (pp. 327-380). New York: Routledge.

Spitzberg, B. H., & Cupach, W. R. (Eds.). (2007). *The dark side of interpersonal communication* (2nd ed.). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associations.

Stafford, L. (2008). Social exchange theories: Calculating the rewards and costs of interpersonal relationships. In L. A. Baxter & D. O. Braithwaite (Eds.), *Engaging theories in interpersonal communication: Multiple perspectives* (pp. 377-389). Los Angeles: Sage Publications.

Stanglin, D. (2012, April 24). Survey: Maine ranked 'most peaceful' state; Louisiana last. *USA TODAY*. Retrieved from http://content.usatoday.com/communities/ondeadline/post/2012/04/survey-maine-ranked-most-peaceful-state-louisiana-last/1.

Stark, E. (2010). Do violent acts equal abuse? Resolving the gender parity/asymmetry dilemma. *Sex Roles, 62*(3-4), 201-211. doi: 10.1007/s11199-009-9717-2.

Stets, J., & Hammond, S. A. (2002). Gender, control and marital committment. *Journal of Family Issues, 23*, 3-25. doi: 10.1177/0192513X02023001001.

Stets, J., & Straus, M. A. (1992). *The marriage license as a hitting license: Physcial violence in American families*. New Brunswick, New Jersey: Transaction.

Stets, J. E., & Henderson, D. A. (1991). Contextual factors surrounding conflict resolution while dating: Results from a national study. *Family Relations, 4*, 29-36.

Stets, J. E., & Pirog-Good, M. A. (1989). Patterns of physical and sexual abuse for men and women in dating relationships: A descriptive analysis. *Journal of Family Violence, 4*(1), 63-76. doi: 10.1007/BF00985657.

Straus, M. A. (1979). Measuring intrafamily conflict and violence: The Conflict Tactics (CT) scales. *Journal of Marriage and Family, 41*(1), 75-88. doi: 10.2307/351733.

Straus, M. A. (1999). The controversy over domestic violence by women: A methodological, theoretical and sociology of science analysis. In X. Arriga & S. Oskamp (Eds.), *Violence in intimate relationships* (pp. 17-44). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Straus, M. A. (2004, July 23). *Scoring the CTS2 and CTSPC* (Rep.). Retrieved http://gauss.unh.edu/~mas2/CTS28a3.pdf.

Straus, M. A., & Mickey, E. L. (2012). Reliability, validity, and prevalence of partner violence measured by the conflict tactics scales in male-dominant nations. *Aggression and Violent Behavior, 17,* 463-474. doi: 10.1016/j.avb.2012.06.004.

Straus, M.A, & Smith, C. (1990). Violence in Hispanic families in the United States: Incidence rates and structural interpretations. In M. A. Straus, R. J. Gelles, & C. Smith (Eds.), *Physical violence in American families: Risk factors and adaptations to violence in 8,145 families* (pp. 341-367). New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction.

Straus, M. A., Gelles, R. J., & Smith, C. (1995). *Physical violence in American families: Risk factors and adaptations to violence in 8,145 families*. New Brunswick [N.J.], U.S.A.: Transaction.

Straus, M. A., Gelles, R. J., & Steinmetz, S. K. (2009). *Behind closed doors: Violence in the American family*. Londres: Transaction.

Straus, M. A., Hamby, S. L., Boney-McCoy, S., & Sugarman, D. B. (1996). The Revised Conflict Tactics Scales (CTS2): Development and Preliminary Psychometric Data. *Journal of Family Issues, 17*(3), 283-316. doi: 10.1177/019251396017003001.

Stuart, G. L., Moore, T. M., Coop Gordon, K., Hellmuth, J. C., Ramsey, S. E., & Kahler, C. W. (2006). Reasons for intimate partner violence perpetration among arrested women. *Violence Against Women, 12*(7), 609-621. doi: 10.1177/1077801206290173.

Thibaut, J. W., & Kelley, H. H. (1959). *The social psychology of groups*. New York: Wiley.

United States Peace Index. (2012, April 24). Retrieved http://www.visionofhumanity.org/unitedstatespeaceindex/2012/.

Vandello, J. A., & Cohen, D. (1999). Patterns of individualism and collectivism across the United States. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *77*(2), 279-292. doi: 10.1037//0022-3514.77.2.279.

Vandello, J. A., & Cohen, D. (2003). Male honor and female fidelity: Implicit cultural scripts that perpetuate domestic violence. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 84*(5), 997-1010. doi: 10.1037/0022-3514.84.5.997.

Vandello, J. A., & Cohen, D. (2008). Culture, gender, and men's intimate partner violence. *Social and Personality Psychology Compass, 2*(2), 652-667. doi: 10.1111/j.1751-9004.2008.00080.x.

Vandello, J. A., Bosson, J. K., Cohen, D., Burnaford, R. M., & Weaver, J. R. (2008). Precarious manhood. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *95*(6), 1325-1339. doi: 10.1037/a0012453.

Vandello, J. A., Cohen, D., & Ransom, S. (2008). U.S. southern and northern differences in perceptions of norms about aggression: Mechanisms for the perpetuation of a culture of honor. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, *39*(2), 162-177. doi: 10.1177/0022022107313862.

Vandello, J. A., Cohen, D., Grandon, R., & Franiuk, R. (2009a). Stand by your man: Indirect prescriptions for honorable violence and feminine loyalty in Canada, Chile, and the United States. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, *40*(1), 81-104. doi: 10.1177/0022022108326194.

Vandello, J. A., Ransom, S., Hettinger, V. E., & Askew, K. (2009b). Men's misperceptions about the acceptability and attactiveness of aggression. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology, 45,* 1209-1219. doi: 10.1016/j.jesp.2009.08.006.

Violence against women: Intimate partner and sexual violence against women. (2011). *WHO*. Retrieved from http://www.who.int/mediacentre/factsheets/fs239/en/.

VPC - The Violence Policy Center - About the VPC. (n.d.). *VPC*. Retrieved from http://www.vpc.org/wmmw.htm.

Waters, H., Hyder, A., Rajkotia, Y., Basu, S., Rehwinkel, J. A., & Butchart, A. (2004). *The economic dimensions of interpersonal violence*. Geneva: Department of Injuries and Violence Prevention, World Health Organization.

Weaver, J. R., Vandello, J. A., Bosson, J. K., & Burnaford, R. M. (2010). The proof is in the punch: Gender differences in perceptions of action and aggression as components of manhood. *Sex Roles*, *62*(3-4), 241-251. doi: 10.1007/s11199-009-9713-6.

Weiner, B. (1992). *Human motivation: Metaphors, theories, and research*. Newbury Park, California: Sage.

West, R. L., & Turner, L. H. (2007). *Introducing communication theory: Analysis and application*. Boston: McGraw-Hill.

What statistical analysis should I use? Statistical analyses using Stata. (2013). *UCLA Institute for Digital Research and Education*. Retrieved from http://www.ats.ucla.edu/stat/stata/whatstat/whatstat.htm.

When Men Murder Women: An Analysis of 2009 Homicide Data (Rep.). (2011, September). Retrieved http://www.vpc.org/studies/wmmw2011.pdf.

Wilson, M., & Daly, M. (1993). Spousal homicide risk and estrangement. *Violence and Victims*, *8*(1), 3-15.

Wood, J. T. (2001). The normalization of violence in heterosexual romantic relationships: Women's narratives of love and violence. *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships, 18*(2), 239-261. doi: 10.1177/0265407501182005.

Wyer, R. S., Chiu, C., & Hong, Y. (2009). *Understanding culture: Theory, research, and application*. New York: Psychology Press.

Yatani, K. (2013). Statistics for HCI Research: Logistic Regression. *Statistics for HCI Research: Logistic Regression*. Retrieved from http://yatani.jp/HCIstats/LogisticRegression.

Yun, S. H. (2011). Factor structure and reliability of the Revised Conflict Tactics Scales' (CTS2) 10-factor model in a community-based female sample. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 26*(4), 719-744. doi: 10.1177/0886260510365857.

Zelinsky, W. (1973). *The cultural geography of the United States.* Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall.

APPENDIX A
CONFLICT TACTICS SCALE

Conflict Tactics Scale-Revised: CTS2: 78-Items

Please circle how many times you did each of the following things in the past year, and how many times your partner did them in the past year. If you or your partner did not do one of these things in the past year, but it happened before, circle "7."

How often did this happen?
"0" = No, this has never happened
"1" = Once in the past year
"2" = Twice in the past year
"3" = 3 - 5 times in the past year
"4" = 6 - 10 times in the past year
"5" = 11 - 20 times in the past year
"6" = More than 20 times in the past year
"7" = Not in the past year, but it did happen before

1. I showed my partner I cared even though we disagreed.
2. My partner showed care for me even though we disagreed.

3. I explained my side of a disagreement to my partner.
4. My partner explained his or her side of a disagreement to me.

5. I insulted or swore at my partner.
6. My partner did this to me.

7. I threw something at my partner that could hurt.
8. My partner did this to me.

9. I twisted my partner's arm or hair.
10. My partner did this to me.

11. I had a sprain, bruise, or small cut because of a fight with my partner.
12. My partner had a sprain, bruise, or small cut because of a fight with me.

13. I showed respect for my partner's feelings about an issue.
14. My partner showed respect for my feelings about an issue.

15. I made my partner have sex without a condom.
16. My partner did this to me.

17. I pushed or shoved my partner.
18. My partner pushed or shoved me.

19. I used force (like hitting, holding down, using a weapon) to make my partner have oral or anal sex.
20. My partner did this to me.

21. I used a knife or a gun on my partner.

22. My partner did this to me.

23. I passed out from being hit on the head by my partner during a fight.
24. My partner passed out from being hit on the head in a fight with me.

25. I called my partner fat or ugly.
26. My partner called me fat or ugly.

27. I punched or hit my partner with something that could hurt.
28. My partner did this to me.

29. I destroyed something belonging to my partner.
30. My partner did this to me.

31. I went to a doctor because of a fight with my partner.
32. My partner went to a doctor because of a fight with me.

33. I choked my partner.
34. My partner did this to me.

35. I shouted or yelled at my partner.
36. My partner did this to me.

37. I slammed my partner against a wall.
38. My partner did this to me.

39. I said that I was sure we could work out a problem.
40. My partner was sure that we could work it out.

41. I needed to see a doctor because of a fight with my partner, but I didn't.
42. My partner needed to see a doctor because of a fight with me, but didn't.

43. I beat up my partner.
44. My partner did this to me.

45. I grabbed my partner.
46. My partner did this to me.

47. I used force (like hitting, holding down, or using a weapon) to make my partner have sex.
48. My partner did this to me.

49. I stomped out of the room or house or yard because of a disagreement with my partner.
50. My partner did this to me.

51. I insisted on sex when my partner did not want to (but did not use physical force).
52. My partner did this to me.

53. I slapped my partner.
54. My partner did this to me.

55. I had a broken bone from a fight with my partner.
56. My partner had a broken bone from a fight with me.

57. I used threats to make my partner have oral or anal sex.
58. My partner did this to me.

59. I suggested a compromise to a disagreement.

60. My partner suggested a compromise.

61. I burned or scalded my partner on purpose.
62. My partner did this to me.

63. I insisted my partner have oral or anal sex (but did not use physical force).
64. My partner did this to me.

65. I accused my partner of being a lousy lover.
66. My partner accused me of this.

67. I did something to spite my partner.
68. My partner did this to me.

69. I threatened to hit or throw something at my partner.
70. My partner did this to me.

71. I felt physical pain that still hurt the next day because of fight we had.
72. My partner still felt physical pain the next day because of a fight we had.

73. I kicked my partner.
74. My partner did this to me.

75. I used threats to make my partner have sex.
76. My partner did this to me.

77. I agreed to try a solution to a disagreement my partner suggested.
78. My partner agreed to try a solution I suggested.

APPENDIX B
PROXIMAL ANTECEDENTS TO VIOLENCE EPISODES (PAVE)

Proximal Antecedents of Violent Episodes: PAVE: Final 20-Item Scale

INSTRUCTIONS: Sometimes there are situations when people are more likely to become PHYSICALLY aggressive than other times. Sometimes people feel that violence is justified, given the situation. Please indicate how likely it is that you would be physically aggressive in each of the following types of situations, if they were to arise.

Items rated on a scale ranging from 1 (not at all likely) to 6 (extremely likely).

1. My partner does something to offend or "disrespect" me.

2. My partner threatens to leave me.

3. My partner just won't stop talking or nagging.

4. I walk in and catch my partner having sex with someone.

5. My partner says "I wish I never married you."

6. My partner spends a lot of time with close friends of the opposite sex.

7. I find out that my partner has been flirting with someone.

8. My partner comes home late.

9. My partner spends money without consulting me.

10. When my partner and I argue about sex.

11. My partner threatens to divorce me.

12. My partner ridicules or makes fun of me.

13. My partner tells me not to do something that I want to do.

14. My partner tries to control me.

15. My partner interrupts me when I'm talking.

16. My partner does not include me in important decisions.

17. My partner ignores me.

18. My partner is physically aggressive towards me first.

19. My partner tries to leave during an argument.

20. My partner blames me for something I didn't do.

APPENDIX C
THE REASONS FOR VIOLENCE SCALE (RVS)

The Reasons for Violence Scale: RVS: Final 29-Item Scale

INSTRUCTIONS: Sometimes conflict between you and your partner may lead to physical contact or physical aggression, and there are many reasons why partners sometimes get physical with each other. Please keep in mind that you could become physical or aggressive with your partner just one time for many reasons. Please check the box that best describes the percentage of time (or how often) you were physical or aggressive toward your partner for each of the reasons listed.

1. Self-defense/to protect self

2. To get away from your partner

3. To get back at your partner or to get revenge for being hit first

4. To show anger

5. To show feelings that you couldn't explain in words

6. Because of stress

7. Because you didn't know what to do with your feelings

8. To prove you love your partner

9. Because you were jealous

10. Because you were angry at someone else but took it out on your partner

11. Because your partner provoked you or pushed you over the edge

12. Because your partner cheated on you

13. Because your partner was going to walk away or leave a conflict before it was solved

14. To feel more powerful

15. To get control over your partner

16. To shut your partner up or to get your partner to leave you alone

17. To get your partner to do something or stop doing something

18. To hurt your partner's feelings

19. To get back at or to retaliate for being emotionally hurt by your partner

20. To make your partner agree with you

21. To make your partner scared or afraid

22. Because you were afraid your partner was going to leave you

23. To punish your partner

24. Because you didn't believe that your partner cared about you

25. To get your partner's attention

26. Because you were under the influence of alcohol

27. Because you were under the influence of drugs

28. Because it was sexually arousing

29. Because you wanted to have sex and your partner didn't

Note: "Each reason was listed in a self-report measure, with participants identifying the percentage of violent episodes in which each reason was a factor in their decision to perpetrate partner violence. Multiple reasons could be endorsed for any act of violence. Each item on the questionnaire could vary from 0% to 100%" (Stuart et al, 2006).

APPENDIX D
MOTIVATIONS AND EFFECTS QUESTIONNAIRE (MEQ)

Two Parts

Have you ever been a victim of physical force in a dating relationship? Y / N

If yes, proceed to the next two sections.

PART ONE (13 Items)
INSTRUCTIONS: In the first column, please check off each motivation (presented in center column) that you perceived was present for the *person who used force against you*. In the right column, please select which of the motivations that you choose that you believe was the ***strongest*** motivation for your aggressive dating partner.

Motivation Present? *(May choose more than one.)*	MOTIVATIONS	Strongest Motivation? *(Choose only one.)*
	To Show Anger	
	Due to an Inability to Express Self Verbally	
	To Feel More Powerful	
	To Get Control Over Other Person	
	In Retaliation for Being Hit First	
	To Protect Self (i.e., self-defense)	
	In Retaliation for Emotional Hurt	
	Anger Displaced Onto Partner	
	To Punish the Other for Wrong Behavior	
	To Prove Love	
	Because it was Sexually Arousing	
	To Get Attention	
	Because of Jealousy	

PART TWO (17 items)

INSTRUCTIONS: Below is a list of seventeen possible effects which the physical force used by your dating partner could have had on you. In the first column, check all the effects (listed in center column) which you felt occurred to you as a result of the physical incident(s). In the right column, please choose which of the effects you selected that you felt was the most *major* effect.

Effect Experienced? *(May choose more than one.)*	EFFECTS	Major Effect? *(Choose only one.)*
	Fear; Anxiety	
	Anger	
	Emotional Hurt	
	You Thought it was Funny	
	Wanted to Retaliate; Get Revenge	
	You Ignored It	
	Sadness; Depression	
	Sexually Aroused	
	You Felt Guilt	
	Felt Afraid of Not Being Loved	
	Wanted to Get Away	
	Helplessness	
	Shame; Humiliation	
	Felt Like You Had to Do Whatever the Assaulter Wanted	
	Felt the Perpetrator/Assaulter Had the Right to Do It	
	You Felt Loved	
	You Experienced No Effect At All	

APPENDIX E
PROPOSED MEASURE

Sex? M / F Age? _____
In what state do you currently reside?_____

In what state have you resided in for the majority of your life? The majority of your life means more than 75% of your life.

(NOTE: If you have moved around considerably and haven't spent the majority of your life in one state, check here:_____ Then, if possible, fill in the state that you feel you most identify with as being "home.")

STATE:_____

How many years did you spend in this state? (Please answer in terms of years and months.)

____ Years _____ Months

What is your marital status?
1: Single
2: Engaged
3: Married
4: Separated
5: Divorced
6: Widowed

What is your race/ethnicity?
1: White/Caucasian
2: Black/African
3: Asian
4: Latino or Hispanic
5: Pacific Islander
6: Middle Eastern
7: Native American
8: Multi-Racial
9: Other

What is the highest level of education that you've completed?
1: Some high school
2: High school diploma/GED
3: Career/Technical School
4: Associate Degree
5: Bachelor's Degree
6: Master's Degree
7: PHD/Doctorate/Juris Doctorate

What is your current yearly income?
1: Less than $15,000
2: $15,000-$24,000
3: $25,000-$35,000
4: $36,000-$50,000
5: $51,000-$75,000
6: $76,000-$100,000
7: Over $100,000
8: I am currently unemployed.

A "Culture of Honor" can be defined as a culture in which men are willing to stand up for themselves using physical aggression, particularly when they have been insulted or disrespected. In such cultures, more "traditional" gender roles are the norm (e.g., males are the "breadwinners", females are the caretakers). Do you feel as if you adhere to a "Culture of Honor"?

1. Yes, absolutely; 2: Yes, for the most part; 3: Somewhat or uncertain 4: No for the most part, 5 No, not at all

DIRECTIONS: No matter how well a couple gets along, there are times when they disagree, get annoyed with the other person, want different things from each other, or just have spats or fights because they are in a bad mood, are tired, or for some other reason. Couples also have many different ways of trying to settle their differences. This is a list of things that might happen when you have differences.

Think about the last relationship you were in where it seemed like you argued quite a bit or experienced a lot of conflict. This could also be the relationship you are currently in. To the right of each listed tactic, please indicate how many times you have used each tactic in this relationship, or how many times your partner has used each tactic.

First: Are you currently in a relationship with this person? Y/N
Were you/are you married to this person? Y/N
Was your partner a male or female? M/F
Do you/did you live together? Y/N
Who made more money (had a higher income), you or your partner? _____
How long were you in/have been in this relationship? _____

TACTIC	Never	Once	Twice	3-5 Times	6-10 Times	11-20 Times	More than 20 Times
I showed my partner I cared even though we disagreed.							
My partner showed care for me even though we disagreed.							
I explained my side of a disagreement to my partner.							
My partner explained his or her side of a disagreement to me.							
I insulted or swore at my partner.							
My partner did this to me.							
I blamed my partner for our problems.*							
My partner blamed me for our problems.*							
I criticized my partner, and he/she defended himself/herself.*							
My partner criticized me, and I defended myself.*							
I criticize my partner, and he/she withdrew.*							
My partner criticizes me, and I withdrew.*							
I avoided talking about the problem.*							
My partner avoided talking about the problem.*							
I threw something at my partner that could hurt.							
My partner threw something at me that could hurt.							
I twisted my partner's arm or hair.							
My partner twisted my arm or hair.							

I had a sprain, bruise, or small cut because of a fight with my partner.
My partner had a sprain, bruise, or small cut because of a fight with me.
I showed respect for my partner's feelings about an issue.
My partner showed respect for my feelings about an issue.
I made my partner have sex without a condom.
My partner made me have sex without a condom.
I pushed or shoved my partner.
My partner pushed or shoved me.
I used force (like hitting, holding down, using a weapon) to make my partner have oral or anal sex.
My partner did this to me (above).
I used a knife or a gun on my partner.
My partner used a knife or gun on me.
I passed out from being hit on the head by my partner during a fight.
My partner passed out from being hit on the head in a fight with me.
I called my partner fat or ugly.
My partner called me fat or ugly.
I punched or hit my partner with something that could hurt.
My partner did this to me (above).
I destroyed something belonging to my partner.
My partner destroyed something belonging to me.
I went to a doctor because of a fight with my partner.
My partner went to a doctor because of a fight with me.
I choked or attempted to strangle my partner.**
My partner choked or attempted to strangle me.
I shouted or yelled at my partner.
My partner shouted or yelled at me.
I slammed my partner against a wall.
My partner slammed me against a wall.
I said that I was sure we could work out a problem.

My partner told me that he/she was sure we could work out a problem.
I suggested that we come up with a solution to our problem together.*
My partner suggested that we come up with a solution together.*
I needed to see a doctor because of a fight with my partner, but I didn't.
My partner needed to see a doctor because of a fight with me, but didn't.
I beat up my partner.
My partner beat me up.
I grabbed my partner.
My partner grabbed me.
I used force (like hitting, holding down, or using a weapon) to make my partner have sex.
My partner did this to me.
I stomped out of the room or house or yard because of a disagreement with my partner.
My partner did this to me.
I insisted on sex when my partner did not want to (but did not use physical force).
My partner did this to me.
I slapped my partner.
My partner did this to me.
I had a broken bone from a fight with my partner.
My partner had a broken bone from a fight with me.
I used threats to make my partner have oral or anal sex.
My partner did this to me.
I suggested a compromise to a disagreement.
My partner suggested a compromise to a disagreement.
I burned or scalded my partner on purpose.
My partner burned or scalded me on purpose.
I insisted my partner have oral or anal sex (but did not use physical force)
My partner did this to me.

I accused my partner of being a lousy lover.
My partner accused me of being a lousy lover.
I said something to spite my partner.
My partner said something to spite me.
I threatened to hit or throw something at my partner.
My partner threatened to hit or throw something at me.
I felt physical pain that still hurt the next day because of a fight we had.
My partner felt physical pain that still hurt the next day because of a fight we had.
I kicked my partner.
My partner kicked me.
I used threats to make my partner have sex.
My partner used threats to make me have sex.
I agreed to try a solution to a disagreement my partner suggested.
My partner agreed to try a solution to a disagreement that I suggested.

*Reflects an item not present on the original CTS2.

**Item changed from original CTS2 to include "attempt to strangle."

Part 2.

DIRECTIONS: There are numerous reasons for why a couple experiences conflict. Some of these reasons for conflicts or arguments are listed below. Think of the WORST fight or fights you had with the same partner you thought about for Part 1. Think about the time you were MOST aggressive toward this partner, and think about the time your partner was MOST aggressive toward you.

For Question 1/Part 1, check the box or boxes next to the reason(s) why YOU used the most aggressive tactic. You may select more than one, since reasons and motivations are often complex. For Question 2/Part 2, check the box or boxes next to the reason(s) why YOUR PARTNER used his/her most aggressive tactic; in other words, why you believe they used their most aggressive tactic. Again, you may select more than one.

Question 1/Part 1. Please check the box next to the reason(s) YOU used your most aggressive tactic against your partner. You can choose more than one.

Present?	Reason
1.1	Because I was trying to stop my partner from leaving.
1.2	Because my partner was trying to walk away before the problem was solved.
1.3	Because my partner refused to have sex with me.
1.4	Because my partner refused to do as I told.
1.5	Because I wanted to preserve the integrity of our family/relationship.
1.6	Because it was my role to punish my partner- it was expected of me.
1.7	Because I was "getting back" at my partner for hitting me first.
1.8	Because I was "getting back" at my partner for something he/she said or did.
1.9	Because my partner was unfaithful.
1.10	Because my partner did something to make me jealous.
1.11	Because I was angry with my partner for something he/she did.
1.12	Because my partner slept separately from me.
1.13	Because my partner was telling people things about me which he/she shouldn't have.
1.14	Because my partner said something disrespectful to me.
1.15	Because my partner said things which hurt my feelings.
1.16	Because I was pushed over the edge.
1.17	Because I was angry with my partner for something he/she said.
1.18	Because it's just the way I am.
1.19	Because I am a "real man" or "real man."
1.20	Because backing down during an argument is not an option for me.
1.21	Because I was stressed about something else.
1.22	I was acting in self-defense.
1.23	Because I needed to prove to my partner that I loved him/her.
1.24	Because I don't see a problem with using aggressive tactics during an argument.
1.25	Because I didn't believe that my partner cared for me.
1.26	Because my partner insulted me.
1.27	Other (please list):

Question 2/Part 2. Please check the box next to the reason(s) YOUR PARTNER used his/her most aggressive tactic toward you. You can choose more than one.

Present?	Reason
2.1	Because he/she was trying to stop me from leaving.
2.2	Because I was trying to walk away before the problem was solved.
2.3	Because I refused to have sex with him/her.
2.4	Because I refused to do as I was told.
2.5	Because he/she wanted to preserve the integrity of our family/relationship.
2.6	Because it was his/her role to punish me- I expected it.
2.7	Because he/she was "getting back" at me for hitting him/her first.
2.8	Because he/she was "getting back" at me for something I said or did.
2.9	Because I was unfaithful.
2.10	Because I did something to make him/her jealous.
2.11	Because he/she was angry with me for something I did.
2.12	Because I slept separately from him/her.
2.13	Because I was telling people things about him/her which I shouldn't have.
2.14	Because I said something disrespectful to him/her.
2.15	Because I said things which hurt his/her feelings.
2.16	Because he/she was pushed over the edge.
2.17	Because he/she was angry with me for something I said.
2.18	Because it's just the way he/she is.
2.19	Because he/she is a "real man" or "real woman."
2.20	Because backing down during an argument is not an option for him/her.
2.21	Because he/she was stressed about something else.
2.22	He/She was acting in self-defense.
2.23	Because my partner needed to prove that he/she loved me.
2.24	Because he/she doesn't see a problem with using aggressive tactics during an
2.25	Because my partner didn't believe that I cared.
2.26	Because I insulted my partner.
2.27	Other (please list):

Please answer the following general questions:

1) If you cheated on a romantic partner, how comfortable would you feel in telling your close friends or health care providers (e.g., therapist, family doctor) about the infidelity?

1: Very Comfortable; 2: Comfortable; 3: Somewhat Comfortable; 4: Neutral (i.e., "I would not feel one way or another"); 5: Somewhat Uncomfortable; 6: Uncomfortable; 7: Very Uncomfortable

2) If your romantic partner cheated on you, how comfortable would you feel in telling your close friends or health care providers (e.g., therapist, family doctor) about the infidelity?

1: Very Comfortable; 2: Comfortable; 3: Somewhat Comfortable; 4: Neutral (i.e., "I would not feel one way or another"); 5: Somewhat Uncomfortable; 6: Uncomfortable; 7: Very Uncomfortable

3) If you fought with a romantic partner about money issues (e.g., how much money to spend on vacation or you spending too much money on clothes), how comfortable would you feel in telling your close friends or health care providers (e.g., therapist, family doctor) about the incident?

1: Very Comfortable; 2: Comfortable; 3: Somewhat Comfortable; 4: Neutral (i.e., "I would not feel one way or another"); 5: Somewhat Uncomfortable; 6: Uncomfortable; 7: Very Uncomfortable

4) If your partner punished you physically for cheating, how likely would you be to end the relationship?

1: Very Likely; 2: Likely; 3: Somewhat Likely; 4: Undecided; 5: Somewhat Unlikely; 6: Unlikely; 7:Very Unlikely

5) If you did want to leave your partner because you cheated, how comfortable would you feel seeking outside help to leave?

1: Very Likely; 2: Likely; 3: Somewhat Likely; 4: Undecided; 5: Somewhat Unlikely; 6: Unlikely; 7:Very Unlikely

6) You rip a chapter out of a book in the library and take it with you. Your professor discovers what you did and tells the Dean of Students. What is the likelihood that this would make you would feel like a bad person?

1: Very Unlikely; 2: Unlikely; 3: Slightly Unlikely; 4: About 50% Likely; 5: Slightly Likely; 6: Likely; 7: Very Likely

7) After making a big mistake on an important project at work in which people were depending on you, your boss criticizes you in front of your coworkers. What is the likelihood that you would feign sickness and leave work?

1: Very Unlikely; 2: Unlikely; 3: Slightly Unlikely; 4: About 50% Likely; 5: Slightly Likely; 6: Likely; 7: Very Likely

8) You give a bad presentation at work. Afterwards your boss tells your coworkers it was your fault that your company lost a big contract. What is the likelihood that you would feel incompetent?

1: Very Unlikely; 2: Unlikely; 3: Slightly Unlikely; 4: About 50% Likely; 5: Slightly Likely; 6: Likely; 7: Very Likely

9) A friend tells you that you brag a lot. What is the likelihood that you would stop spending time with that friend?

1: Very Unlikely; 2: Unlikely; 3: Slightly Unlikely; 4: About 50% Likely; 5: Slightly Likely; 6: Likely; 7: Very Likely

10) Your home is very messy and an unexpected guest knocks on your door, and invites themself in. What is the likelihood that you would let the guest stay?

1: Very Unlikely; 2: Unlikely; 3: Slightly Unlikely; 4: About 50% Likely; 5: Slightly Likely; 6: Likely; 7: Very Likely

11) You successfully exaggerate your damages in a lawsuit. Months later, your lies are discovered and you are charged with perjury (lying to a jury). What is the likelihood that you would think you are a despicable human being?

1: Very Unlikely; 2: Unlikely; 3: Slightly Unlikely; 4: About 50% Likely; 5: Slightly Likely; 6: Likely; 7: Very Likely

12) You take office supplies home for personal use and are caught by your boss. What is the likelihood that this would cause you to quit your job?

1: Very Unlikely; 2: Unlikely; 3: Slightly Unlikely; 4: About 50% Likely; 5: Slightly Likely; 6: Likely; 7: Very Likely

13) You make a mistake at work and find out that someone else was blamed for the error, but you didn't say anything or admit it. What is the likelihood that you would feel like a coward?

1: Very Unlikely; 2: Unlikely; 3: Slightly Unlikely; 4: About 50% Likely; 5: Slightly Likely; 6: Likely; 7: Very Likely

APPENDIX F
RESULTS OF CONFIRMATORY FACTOR ANALYSES, STUDY 3

Model	x^2	df	p	RMSEA	LO90	HI90	AIC	CFI	α
Self-as-Perpetrator									
5-Factor	--*	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	/
10-Factor	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	/
Negotiation	104.59	8	<.000	.178	.149	.209	7729.33	.908	.862
Psychological Aggression	68.33	19	<.000	.082	.061	.103	9493.14	.942	.780
Physical Assault	1033.76	53	<.000	.219	.207	--	6169.57	.663	.870
Sexual Coercion	79.72	13	<.000	.115	.092	.140	2083.48	.973	.620
Injury	220.54	8	<.000	.259	.230	.289	3338.19	.868	.835
Self-as-Victim									
5-Factor	6607.93	692	<.000	.175	.000	-	28124.23	.599	/
10-Factor	5701.99	657	<.000	.149	.000	-	27288.30	.658	/
Negotiation	100.78	8	<.000	.175	.146	.207	.8115.32	.909	.866
Psychological Aggression	39.17	19	<.000	.052	.029	.076	9981.36	.983	.837
Physical Assault	930.00	53	<.000	.208	.196	.219	7479.07	.773	.926
Sexual Coercion	234.00	13	<.000	.210	.187	.234	5585.68	.888	.811
Injury	259.60	8	<.000	.281	.253	.311	780.00	.880	.877

* Indicates failure of model to reach convergence.

APPENDIX G
IRB APPROVAL

Application for Exemption from Institutional Oversight

Institutional Review Board
Dr. Robert Mathews, Chair
131 David Boyd Hall
Baton Rouge, LA 70803
P: 225.578.8692
F: 225.578.5983
irb@lsu.edu
lsu.edu/irb

Unless qualified as meeting the specific criteria for exemption from Institutional Review Board (IRB) oversight, ALL LSU research/ projects using living humans as subjects, or samples, or data obtained from humans, directly or indirectly, with or without their consent, must be approved or exempted in advance by the LSU IRB. This Form helps the PI determine if a project may be exempted, and is used to request an exemption.

– Applicant,Please fill out the application in its entirety and include the completed application as well as parts A-F, listed below, when submitting to the IRB. Once the application is completed, please submit two copies of the completed application to the IRB Office or to a member of the Human Subjects Screening Committee. Members of this committee can be found at http://research.lsu.edu/CompliancePoliciesProcedures/InstitutionalReviewBoard%28IRB%29/item24737.html

– A Complete Application Includes All of the Following:
(A) Two copies of this completed form and two copies of parts B thru F.
(B) A brief project description (adequate to evaluate risks to subjects and to explain your responses to Parts 1&2)
(C) Copies of all instruments to be used.
*If this proposal is part of a grant proposal, include a copy of the proposal and all recruitment material.
(D) The consent form that you will use in the study (see part 3 for more information.)
(E) Certificate of Completion of Human Subjects Protection Training for all personnel involved in the project, including students who are involved with testing or handling data, unless already on file with the IRB. Training link: (http://phrp.nihtraining.com/users/login.php)
(F) IRB Security of Data Agreement: (http://research.lsu.edu/files/item26774.pdf)

1) Principal Investigator: Michelle E. Pence **Rank:** Doctoral Candidate

Dept: Communication Studies **Ph:** 816-668-8250 **E-mail:** mpence2@tigers.lsu.edu

2) Co Investigator(s): please include department, rank, phone and e-mail for each
*If student, please identify and name supervising professor in this space

Dr. James Honeycutt
Professor
Communication Studies
225-578-4172/sphone@lsu.edu

IRB# E8084 LSU Proposal #
✓ Complete Application
✓ Human Subjects Training

3) Project Title: Honor Cultures- Part 2

Study Exempted By:
Dr. Robert C. Mathews, Chairman
Institutional Review Board
Louisiana State University
203 B-1 David Boyd Hall
225-578-8692 | www.lsu.edu/irb
Exemption Expires: 12/13/2015

4) Proposal? (yes or no) NO **If Yes, LSU Proposal Number**

Also, if YES, either ◯ **This application completely matches the scope of work in the grant**
OR ◯ **More IRB Applications will be filed later**

5) Subject pool (e.g. Psychology students) Communication Studies students; subscribers to National Communicat* National Communication Association listserve

*Circle any **"vulnerable populations" to be used:** (children <18; the mentally impaired, pregnant women, the ages, other). Projects with incarcerated persons cannot be exempted.

6) PI Signature [signature] **Date** 11/26/12 (no per signatures)

** **I certify my responses are accurate and complete.** If the project scope or design is later changes, I will resubmit for review. I will obtain written approval from the Authorized Representative of all non-LSU institutions in which the study is conducted. I also understand that it is my responsibility to maintain copies of all consent forms at LSU for three years after completion of the study. If I leave LSU before that time the consent forms should be preserved in the Departmental Office.

Screening Committee Action: Exempted ✓ Not Exempted ____ Category/Paragraph ____

Signed Consent Waived?: Yes / No

Reviewer James Honeycutt POM **Signature** [signature] **Date** 12/14/2012

This survey will ask questions regarding your conflict style in relationships.

All of your answers are anonymous, and the data collected will remain anonymous. Your participation is voluntary; you can stop participating at any time. You must be 18 years of age or older to complete this survey.

This survey should take you approximately 30 minutes to complete. If you have any questions about this survey, please contact Michelle E. Pence (mpence2@lsu.edu).

If I have questions about subjects' rights or other concerns, I can contact Robert C. Mathews, Chairman, Institutional Review Board, (225) 578-8692, irb@lsu.edu, www.lsu.edu/irb.

Study Exempted By:
Dr. Robert C. Mathews, Chairman
Institutional Review Board
Louisiana State University
203 B-1 David Boyd Hall
225-578-8692 | www.lsu.edu/irb
Exemption Expires: 12/13/2015

THE VITA

Michelle Elaine Pence was born in Kansas City, Missouri, and raised in the suburb of Blue Springs, Missouri, where she graduated from high school in 2002. Michelle graduated with a Bachelor of Arts in Communication Studies from the University of Missouri- Kansas City in May of 2005. In December of 2007, she graduated with a Master of Arts degree in Communication from the University of Missouri- St. Louis, where she actively participated on several research teams. Due to this newfound love of statistics and research, Michelle went on to Louisiana State University for a Doctorate in Communication Studies. While at Louisiana State University, Michelle participated on several research teams, published numerous journal articles, presented at several national and international conferences, and guest-edited a special issue of the International Journal of Listening. She will graduate in August 2013 with a Doctorate of Philosophy in Communication, and in June of 2013, Michelle begins her new position as Assistant Professor of Communication in the Department of Visual and Performing Arts at the University of Texas of the Permian Basin.