

Violence Research with Intimate Male Partners

Anam Bano^{1*} Tabassum Jahan²

¹ Research Scholars, Department of Sociology, Sai Meer Degree College, Uttar Pradesh

² Supervisor, Department of Sociology, Sai Meer Degree College, Uttar Pradesh

Abstract – Women represent a major share of those imprisoned each year in the United States for domestic violence (Miller, 2005). A Tennessee study, for example, has shown that 16% of the prisoners of violence are women (Feder & Henning, 2005), while 35% in Concord, New Hampshire Women are women (Miller, 2005). Many of them are short-term offers such as a programme of batterer response or anger control (Miller, 2005). A substantial number of women recognised as physical abusers against their partners are also provided by the army. In one research by 2,991 airmen in the Air Force who had physically abused a wife, 23% of the convicts are women (Brewster, Milner, Mollerstrom, Saha, & Harris, 2002). An further examination in the Central Registry of the Army data from 1989 to 1997 shows that women were 33% of those who committed domestic violence (McCarroll et al., 1999).

This section analyses important findings from research on the use by women of violence against intimate males in support of those involved in the provision of aid to women and their families involved in domestic violence. This study discusses how the prevalence of women's committees is contrasted with the presence of male committees; how intimate relationship abuse prevails among military members; the difference in gender in the physical and psychological consequences of domestic abuse among women sometimes varies from violence in males; Violence at home. Violence at home

Keywords – Women's Violence; Women's Aggression; Partner Abuse; Domestic Violence

-----X-----

1. PREVALENCE OF WOMEN'S PERPETRATION OF DIFFERENT TYPES OF ABUSIVE BEHAVIORS

How prevalent in the United States is violence against women in intimate relationships and what is the incidence of violence against men? The answer to this question vary depending on the kind of aggression under examination. The following portions discuss the parallels and variances in sex in physical attack on women and men and intimate relationship violence injury, sexual coercion, stalking, mental assault and control.

1.1 Physical Aggression

Studies have repeatedly shown that as many women as men engage in this behaviour when physical hostility is investigated (for a review see Archer, 2000). For example, the Straus & Gels 1990 Nationwide Family Violence Survey showed that 12.4% of women who had experienced husband violence reported themselves, compared to 11.6% of husband violence, in a nationwide sample of 6,002 men and women, in the year before the survey. 4.8% of the women reported serious violence to their husbands, whereas 3.4% reported serious violence to spouses (Straus & Gelles, 1990). College studies

also shown that women and men are equally physically aggressive or more aggressive than women (Cercone, Beach & Arias 2005). (Friedrich, 2004).

1.2 Sexual Coercion

Sexual coercion has been described as "any circumstance in which one person, with or without agreement of another person, utilises verbal or physical measures to achieve sexual activity by consent (including the use of drugs or alcohol)" (Adams-Curtis, p. 91) [2003.]. Most studies have been carried out in the university of Katz, Carino, & Hilton, 2002; Ménard, Hall, Phung, Ghebrial & Martin, 2003; O'Sullivan, Byers & Finkelman, 1998; Straus, Hamby, Boney-McCoy, & Sugarman, 1996, Struckman-Johnson, & and Anderson, 2003 with a few exceptions. The report is published in French, French, German, German-language, French-language and German, in English, French and English (Feder & Henning, 2005; West & Rose, 2000). Every study found that a greater percentage of men are engaged in coercive sexual conduct against partners than women, irrespective of the population investigated (Archer, 2000; Feder & Henning, 2005; Katz, Carino, et al., 2002; Ménard, et al., 2003; O'Sullivan et al., 1998; Straus et al.,

1996; Struckman- Johnson et al., 2003; West & Rose, 2000).

1.3 Stalking

In a poll of over 8,000 men and 8,000 women in the United States, the National Poll on Abuse Against Women analysed the experiences of partner violence and hostage-taking by participants. In the survey, Stalking was described as "a behaviour that comprises a recurrent visual or physical approach, in consensual communication or an oral, written, or implied risk, or combined with a reasonable person." Stalking Stalking (Tjaden & Thoennes, 1998, p. 2). Controlling or eavesdropping on someone outside the house or company, making uninvited appeals or vandalising their property may involve (Tjaden & Thoennes, 2000). 14.2% of women and 4.3% of men experienced stalking in their lives in the National Violence against Women Survey (Davis, Coker, & Sanderson, 2002). Of them, 41% had personal relationships with women and 28% with males. In addition, women indicated that they had 13 times greater dread of the stalker than males (Davis et al. 2002), whereas the majority of women and men reported stalked by males (Tjaden & Thoennes, 2000).

The National Violence Against Women survey examined stalking, not stalking, experiences. The women's experience in stalking victims from their intimate relationships and women's stalking activities towards their relationship was evaluated in a research with 412 female partners who engaged in physically aggressive behaviours towards the male partner (Swan, Snow, Sullivan, Gambone, & Fields, 2005). All information was acquired from the women's own accounts and the actions of their spouses. Women have been the victims of stalking more frequently than they have conducted stalker behaviour, according to the national statistics on violence against women.

1.4 Psychological Aggression

Psychological assault was described as "a message orally or not, aimed at causing or perceived psychological suffering to others," and as an activity, degrading, undermining or damaging the self-worth of a party" (Straus and Sweet, 1992, p. 347). (Tolman, 1989). Women in the National Family Violence Survey used thus much psychological attack as males (Straus & Sweet, 1992). In the poll, 74% of men and 75% of women acknowledged doing at least one psychologically hostile conduct during the last year towards their spouses (Straus & Sweet, 1992). In college samples, men and women have also found the similar levels of psychological attack. Cercone et al. (2005) no significant differences in mild (86% vs 89%) and more severe types of psychological abuse (30% vs 27% respectively) among college men and women were detected. (2005)

1.5 Coercive Control

Controlling coercive is defined as "a pattern of coercion characterised by threats, intimidation, isolation and emotional abuse, as well as a pattern of controlling sexuality and social life, including . Relationships with family and friends; material resources (e.g. money, food, or transportation); and various types of psychological aggression; The coercive control focuses on separating the victim from his social network and micromanaging everyday activity by using credible threats with negative effects for failures to comply (Dutton, Goodman, & Schmidt, 2006; Stark, 2006). Physical and sexual violence are methods employed by batterers to control victims via coercion. Coercive control mimics traditional gender norms in an extreme way, which specify the domination of men and women. Stark (2006) also contends that coercive control, above physical violence, is the contributor of many of her victims, including depressions, anxiety and post-traumatic stress disorders, to catastrophic psychological impacts of domestic violence. One research demonstrated that coercion is linked to post-traumatic stress disorder even after physical, sexual, and psychological assault control (Dutton et al., 2006)

1.6 Injury

In survey data, women and men report equivalent physical antagonism although women are far more likely to experience household abuse under situations (Archer, 2000; Feder & Henning, 2005; Hamberger, 2005; Temple, Weston, & Marshall, 2005; Whitaker, Haileyesus, Swahn, & Saltzman, 2007). In the National Survey of Families and Houses, 73 percent had acknowledged hurting an intimate partner as women (Zlotnick, Kohn, Peterson, & Pearlstein, 1998). In contrast to 39 percent of men who were seeking emergency care for men and women, Phelan et al (2005) have shown that all women suffered an injury from their spouses. Given that men are often larger and stronger than their wives, men tend to damage spouses more often through relatively minor aggression, such as knocking and shaking (Frieze, 2005). A study showed that for women with partner violence, men, women with relationship violence and males with violence, medications would be needed, as is the average cost per person of partner-violence injuries (Hamberger, 2005; Tjaden & Thoennes, 2000). Arias, Corso, 2005.

1.7 Prevalence Rates From Studies of Military Personnel

Intimate partner violence studies with military people imply that there may be a somewhat greater frequency of partner abuse than in civil communities. Heyman and Neidigen (1999) have extensively examined and rectified demographic differences in population using a sample of 33,762 members of the active-duty army and 6,002

participants in the National Family Violence Survey. They found no difference in men behaviour of moderate sample violence—10.8% reported moderate marital abuse in the Army compared with 9.9% of the male group. They reported moderate marital abuse. However, the military group revealed much greater levels of serious violence, with 2.5% of the military male sample reporting severe marital violence compared to 0.7% of the civilian male sample. Regarding women's abuse, moderate and severe marital violence in the military sample was much higher—13.1 per cent of Army women reported moderate violence against 10 per cent of civilians, 4.4 percent of Army women reported serious violence against 2 per cent of civilians.

32 percent of males and 47 percent of women reported having used some type of physical attack against an inner partner in a major survey of Navy recruits (1,307 men and 1,477 women) last year (White, Merrill, & Koss, 2001). The Navy recruiting rates are anticipated to be high in part owing to the sample's youthful age; the average age of the recruits has been 20. The prevalence levels of the Navy are similar to the prevalence of university and other young specimens. For instance, the worldwide dating violence research of Straus (2004) showed that the proportion of university students reporting a physical assault on a partner varied from 12% to 42% for men, and 17% to 48% for women. In a cohort study in New Zealand of 941 21 years of age, 37 per cent of women and 22 per cent of males experienced physical violence toward an intimate partner (Magdol et al., 1997).

2. DIFFERENT ABOUT WOMEN'S VIOLENCE

2.1 Their male partners usually commit violence against women in the context of violence against them

Studies have proven consistently that most domestic violence against women also involves violence towards their husbands. Among two women research on ethnic diversity and the poor economic neighbourliness, there was a considerable rate of victimisation in women who used violence. In the study conducted by Temple et al (2005) on Black, 86 percent of women who have been abused have also been victims in Mexico and white women. Swan et al. (2005) accounted for 92%. Similar findings have been reported for university women (Cercone et al., 2005; Orcutt, Garcia, & Pickett, 2005). 64 per cent of women claimed their spouse used violence in their National Family Violence Survey (Straus & Gelles, 1990). Many studies concerning convicts of women in domestic violence have also revealed that more than 90% of women describe male maltreatment by their male spouses (Hamberger & Guse, 2002; Stuart et al., 2006; Swan & Snow, 2001).

Many women, particularly those engaged with domestic violence in the criminal justice system, are

thus not the only perpetrators of violence. The victimisation of your male partners is an important contextual factor to understand your motivation for violence. Some women who are tried for a domestic violence are really mistreated women who have struggled against (Kernsmith, 2005; Miller, 2005). They may be at the same danger as abused women who seek refuge for major harm or death. Providers of services that deal with domestically abusive women may need to construct safety plans comparable to those developed for abused women.

2.2 The Types of Violence Women Commit Differ From Men's Violence

Two study studies have shown women's committee different sorts of violence and their experiences of male aggression (Swan & Snow, 2002; Swan et al., 2005). Both research involved women who used violence against an intimate male partner. The study results were consistent: Women and partners have used the similar degree of psychological assault. Women used moderate violence more than their wives and more serious physical violence. However, the chances of women being strong in their coercive control were nearly 1.5 times higher. Similarly, women were 2.5 times more obliged to be sexually obliged than their spouses. There were 1.5 times more women who suffered damage than their partners. Similar outcomes have been found in a study conducted by 87 women involved in Stuart et al. (2006) on short-term domestic violence intervention. Swan et al. (2005) also found that women were harassed by their partners far more than themselves.

2.3 Domestic Violence May Affect Men and Women Differently

The connection between two wives is a reciprocal violence as portrayed in literature on violence against intimate partners (e.g., Straus & Gelles, 1990). This definition does not include how violent a spouse is than the other or how aggressive a spouse is in self defence, or if a spouse is more able to use violence than the next spouse (e.g. sexual violence).

The study outlined above reveals that in many scenarios that may be deemed to be mutually violent such as sexual coercion and coercive control, women are more and more severely harmed than men by severe and coercive types of partner violence. It is thus not surprising that interviolence has a harmer impact on the physical and psychological wellbeing of women than men (Frieze, 2005; Hamberger, 2005). Using the National Comorbidity Survey information from Williams and Frieze (2005) it was discovered that women who had relationship aggression reported much more suffering and less matrimonial satisfaction than men with relationship violence. Likewise, college women had less satisfaction because of partner violence, while males didn't

suffer less than pleasure (Katz, Kuffel, & Coblenz, 2002). When examining the prediction of breaches in a nationwide sample, the relationship's discontent and disintegration were predicted by male violence and not female violence (DeMaris, 2000).

3. WOMEN'S MOTIVATIONS FOR VIOLENCE

In addition to the discovery of differences in the sorts of abusive behaviours of men and women as well as disparities in partner violence outcomes between men and women, studies also show that women are frequently very different from males in violent behaviour.

3.1 Self-Defense

Violence against women (Babcock, Miller & Siard, 2003), and other research have demonstrated that women claim more often self-defense than men as a cause of violence (e.g., Barnett, Lee, & Thelen, 1997; Hamberger, 2005; Makepeace, 1986; but for an exception see Kernsmith, 2005). With 75% of interviewees admitting they used violence to defend themselves, the most prevalent cause of self-defense was in examining the motives for violence by women (Swan&Snow, 2003). In the Stuart et al. (2006) sample of women who had been imprisoned for intimate partnership abuse, the self-defense reason was 39%.

3.2 Fear

Women will be more afraid of domestic abuse (Cercone et al., 2005; Foa, Cascardi, Zoellner, & Feeny, 2000; Hamberger, 2005; Jacobson et al., 1994; Kernsmith, 2005; Langhinrichsen-Rohling, Neidig, & Thorn, 1995; Morse, 1995; Phelan et al., 2005). In study performed on domestic violence orders by men and women, women indicated higher concern about violence against their spouses than men (Hamberger & Guse, 2002; Kernsmith, 2005).

3.3 Defense of Children

30% to 60% of children whose moms are attacked were judged to be victims of maltreatment (National Research Council, 1993; see also Edleson, 1999). The risk of sexual abuse for children living with an abusive mother was 12-14 times higher than children whose moms were not mistreated (McCloskey, Figuero, & Koss, 1995). The impacts of family-based violence upon children, both in terms of real child physical abuse and child maltreatment, alter women's behaviour (Dasgupta, 2002; Foa et al., 2000). Some women are aggressive in protecting their children and themselves towards their relationships (Browne, 1987; Morash, Bui, & Santiago, 2000).

3.4 Control

A lot of studies have revealed that males are more likely than women to recur or control the relationship (Barnett et al., 1997; Cazenave & Zahn, 1992; Ehrensaft, Langhinrichsen-Rohling, Heyman, O'Leary, & Lawrence, 1999; Jacobson, 1994; Makepeace, 1986; Renzetti, 1999) than women are of violence. Hamberger and Guse (2002) findings indicating that males are more likely to start and control violent encounters, while women are more likely to use violence but are not in control of violent encounters with partners, men and women courted to a domestic violence threat programme (HVVT). This doesn't imply, however, that women's violence lacks control reasons. Swan and Snow (2003) discovered that 38 percent of women said they threatened to at least occasionally use violence to get their spouse to do what they wanted them to do. 53 percent said threats were at least occasionally successful. Similarly, Stuart and others (2006) have shown that the proportion of time they spent using violence "to control your spouse" was around 22 percent, "to convince your spouse to do anything or stop doing something," was 22 percent, and "to make you agree with your spouse" was 17 percent, respectively (p. 615).

3.5 Retribution

Several research indicate that the punishment of actual or perceived misconduct is prevalent cause of female violence. In Swan and Snow (2003), forty-five% of women reported having used violence to obtain something they had done with their spouses. Women detained on behalf of intimate spouse violence in Stuart et al(2006) .s sample said that 35 percent of the time they used violence in reprisals for their partners' emotional harm, while 20 percent reproaches for first hitting. The reasons for the wishes of men and women to pay may vary, with women utilising violence more often in revenge for emotionally harmed (Follingstad, Wright, Lloyd, & Sebastian, 1991; Hamberger et al., 1997). For example, 42% of women (compared with 22% of males) said they used violence to get back at a spouse and emotionally harm them. For example (Kernsmith, 2005). In this research women were also more likely than men to declare their spouse had to be physically assaulted and punished for prior violence.

4. CHARACTERISTICS OF WOMEN WHO USE VIOLENCE

This section discusses risk factors and mental health and drug addiction issues common to women who use violence.

4.1 Childhood Trauma

Evidence from various research shows that trauma and abuse in women who use violence are highly high. In Swan et al(2005) .'s intimate partner abuse sample, 60% suffered mental abuse and negligence, 58% were sexually assaulted, 52% were physically assaulted and 41% were physically neglected (see also Swan & Snow, 2003). In studies of women in court-appointed treatment of domestic violence, high rates of childhood abuse were also discovered (Dowd, Leisring, & Rosenbaum, 2005; Hamberger & Potente, 1994; Kernsmith, 2006; Leisring, Dowd, & Rosenbaum, 2003).

Different study has shown that childhood trauma is a risk factor for violence and abuse by women (Mihalic & Elliott, 1997; Straus, 1990; Sullivan, Meese, Swan, Mazure, & Snow, 2005; White & Humphrey, 1994). The influence of childhood abuse on adult women's interactions was investigated in a longitudinal study of 136 women treated for sexual abuse as children in the hospital (Siegel, 2000). The research indicated that childhood experiences of sexual abuse both predicted the use of violence by women against intimate relationships and the use of violence by partners. Women violence toward their spouse has also been forecast in experiences of being struck and abused by a parent.

4.2 Psychological Functioning

The traumatic experience in general and the victimisation of domestic violence in particular were connected with four psychological conditions: depression, anxiety, substantive abuse and posttraumatic stress (Axelrod, Myers, Durvasula, Wyatt, & Chang, 1999; Foa et al., 2000). In women with intimate relationship abuse, all these symptoms are highly common. Swan and others (2005) for instance, have discovered that 69 percent satisfied criteria for screened depression in the case of women who had used violence against male partners. Criteria for post traumatic stress disorder have been satisfied by almost one in three. Almost one in five had difficulties with alcohol or drugs and 24 per cent used psychiatric drugs. Likewise, Dowd et al. (2005) observed a significant frequency of depression (67%), bipolar disorder (18%), anxiety (9%) and drug use disorders in their studies of females who participated in an intimate partner violence anger management programme; (67 percent). Furthermore, 30 percent reported suicide, 20 percent hospitalised and 25 percent detoxified for mental reasons.

5. IMPLICATIONS FOR SERVICE PROVIDERS

The literature study and the data submitted here provide essential information to those who serve and respond to women who act violently to personal relationships. Violent women are also to a significant degree victims of their male spouses' violence.

Furthermore, women suffer greater injuries and more serious injuries than males during domestic violence. Security problems for women who are domestic violence are thus of fundamental importance.

Women in certain situations could conduct as much or more physical violence than their partners, while other sorts of abuse, such as sexual abuse and coercive control, could be committed by their partners. We urge that aid providers not just examine physical violence but other sorts of abuse perpetrated by the woman and committed against her by her husband. For example, such an evaluation might show that the physical aggression of a woman responds to the efforts of her boyfriend to control her coercively. In this situation, behavioural modification treatments in both spouses will be essential to halt the abuse.

As shown below, interventions based on the concept of male violence against women may not work for many women because of the significant discrepancies in the way men and women behave themselves (Feder & Henning, 2005; Hamberger, 2005; Kernsmith, 2005). Gender-specific therapies which will change the behaviour of aggressive women more probable.

6. CONCLUSION

The importance of the current research is to clarify that IPV offenders and their victims constitute a wide range of precipitating and exacerbating categories. In our opinion it may be possible to advance not only our definitions and understandings of IPV, but also the development and empirical assessment of approaches to intervention and prevention, if we recognise the possibilities of different types of IPV with different etiologies and consequences, as well as differentially appropriate treatment approaches. We indicate that more study on the investigation and empirical validation of IPV types, especially in Johnson's typologies (in varied environments and people), promises to enhance efforts to eventually prevent IPV.

REFERENCES

1. Adams-Curtis LE, Forbes GB (2004). College women's experiences of sexual coercion: A review of cultural, perpetrator, victim, and situational variables. *Trauma, Violence, and Abuse*; 5: pp. 91–122. [PubMed] [Google Scholar]
2. Anderson KL (2002). Perpetrator or victim? Relationships between intimate partner violence and well-being. *Journal of Marriage and Family*; 64: pp. 851–863. [Google Scholar]
3. Archer J. (2000). Sex differences in aggression between heterosexual partners:

- A meta-analytic review. *Psychological Bulletin*; 126: pp. 651–680. [PubMed] [Google Scholar]
4. Arias L, Corso P. (2005). Average cost per person victimized by an intimate partner of the opposite gender: A comparison of men and women. *Violence and Victims*; 20: pp. 379–391. [PubMed] [Google Scholar]
 5. Axelrod J, Myers HF, Durvasula RS, Wyatt GE, Chang M (1999). The impact of relationship violence, HIV, and ethnicity on adjustment in women. *Cultural Diversity and Ethnic Minority Psychology*; 5: pp. 263–275. [Google Scholar]
 6. Babcock JC, Miller SA, Siard C (2003). Toward a typology of abusive women: Differences between partner-only and generally violent women in the use of violence. *Psychology of Women Quarterly*; 27: pp. 153–161. [Google Scholar]
 7. Hamberger LK, Guse CE (2002). Men's and women's use of intimate partner violence in clinical samples. *Violence Against Women*; 8: pp. 1301–1331. [Google Scholar]
 8. Hamberger LK, Lohr JM, Bonge D, Tolin DF (1997). An empirical classification of motivations for domestic violence. *Violence Against Women*; 3: pp. 401–423. [PubMed] [Google Scholar]
 9. Hamberger LK, Potente T. (1994). Counseling heterosexual women arrested for domestic violence: Implications for theory and practice. *Violence and Victims*; 9: pp. 125–137. [PubMed] [Google Scholar]
 10. Heyman RE, Neidig PH (1999). A comparison of spousal aggression prevalence rates in the U.S. Army and civilian representative samples. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology*; 62(2): pp. 239–242. [PubMed] [Google Scholar]
 11. Jacobson NS (1994). Contextualism is dead: Long live contextualism. *Family Process*; 33: pp. 97–100. [Google Scholar]
 12. Jacobson NS, Gottman JM, 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: pp. 982–988. [PubMed] [Google Scholar]
 13. Johnson MP (1995). Patriarchal terrorism and common couple violence: Two forms of violence against women. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*; 57: pp. 283–294. [Google Scholar]
 14. McCloskey LA, Figuerdo AJ, Koss MP (1995). The effects of systemic family violence on children's mental health. *Child Development*; 66: pp. 1239–1261. [PubMed] [Google Scholar]
 15. Ménard KS, Hall GC, Phung AH, Ghebrial ME, Martin L (2003). Gender differences in sexual harassment and coercion in college students: Developmental, individual, and situational determinants. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*; 18(10): pp. 1222–1239. [PubMed] [Google Scholar]
 16. Mihalic SW, Elliot D (1997). A social learning theory model of marital violence. *Journal of Family Violence*; 12: pp. 21–47. [Google Scholar]
 17. Miller SL (2005). *Victims as offenders: The paradox of women's violence in relationships*. New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press; [Google Scholar]
 18. Morash M, Bui HN, Santiago AM (2000). Cultural-specific gender ideology and wife abuse in Mexican-descent families. *International Review of Victimology*; 7: pp. 67–91. [Google Scholar]
 19. Morse BJ (1995). Beyond the conflict tactics scale: Assessing gender differences in partner violence. *Violence and Victims*; 10: pp. 251–272. [PubMed] [Google Scholar]
 20. National Research Council (1993). *Understanding child abuse and neglect*. Washington, DC: National Academy Press.

Corresponding Author

Anam Bano*

Research Scholars, Department of Sociology, Sai Meer Degree College, Uttar Pradesh