

Battering and the Male Rejection of Influence from Women

James Coan, John M. Gottman,* Julia Babcock, and Neil Jacobson

University of Washington, Seattle, Washington

.....

The propensity of men to reject influence from women and individual differences in this tendency were examined in the present report as potentially related to two types of domestically violent men. We operationalized rejection of influence in sequential analyses of emotional behavior during a 15 min marital interaction. In our previous research, we identified two types of batterers: Type-1, whose heart rates decelerated below baseline during the marital interaction; and Type-2, whose heart rates accelerated. We found that only Type-1 husbands reject any and all influence from their wives. We postulate that Type-1 batterers reject influence as a means of maintaining power and control. *Aggr. Behav.* 23:375-388, 1997. © 1997 Wiley-Liss, Inc.

.....

Key words: Battering; aggression; marital power; influence; interaction; patterns

INTRODUCTION

In the continuing effort to better understand and treat domestic violence, a number of writers have suggested classifying batterers as a positive direction for basic research on the subject (e.g., Holtzworth-Munroe and Stuart, 1994). Typically, attempts at identifying types of physically abusive men have been based on self reports and police records. A review of these studies suggests three types: family only, dysphoric-borderline and generally violent-antisocial batterers (Holtzworth-Munroe and Stuart, 1994). There is further consensus that there are two subgroups of wife abusers: those who are violent outside of the marriage and those who are not (Dutton, 1988; Gondolf, 1988; LaTallade, Waltz, Jacobson & Gottman, 1992; Widom, 1989).

Recently, Gottman, Jacobson, Rushe, Shortt, Babcock, La Taillade and Waltz (1995) suggested a typology based on the heart rate reactivity of batterers. Gottman and his associates (1995) realized that physiological variables could be useful in the study of abusive marriages. In Gottman, et al.'s (1995) study, two sizable literatures were briefly reviewed. One indicated an association between criminality and low levels of physi-

*Correspondence to: John M. Gottman, Department of Psychology, University of Washington, Seattle, WA 98195.

ological reactivity, suggesting that low reactivity was aversive, leading to stimulation seeking through risk taking and criminality. Another linked high heart rate reactivity to Type-A personality, risk for coronary heart disease, and hostility. Gottman et al. (1995) monitored the physiology of violent couples during a two minute, eyes-closed baseline and during a 15 min marital interaction. Physically abusive men whose heart rates dropped below their baseline rates during marital interactions were classified as *Type-1* batterers. Other physically abusive men were classified as *Type-2* batterers. Compared to *Type-2* batterers, *Type-1* batterers engaged in more severe violence (Jacobson, Gottman & Shortt, 1995), were more emotionally abusive, were more violent outside of the marriage, and had more elevated scores on scales of drug abuse, antisocial behavior and sadistic aggression. Couples with *Type-1* husbands were also less likely to be separated or divorced two years later. The wives of *Type-1* batterers were more defensive and sad, and less angry during a laboratory marital interaction than the wives of *Type-2* batterers. Gottman, et al. (1994) suggested that perhaps the wives of the *Type-1* batterers did not feel as safe in expressing anger, fearing an aggressive response if they were to show any.

The systematic investigation of interaction patterns in abusive relationships has been limited. Because self-reports of behavior in violent marriages have been shown to be biased (e.g., see Dutton, 1995), observational methods have been recommended. Indeed, studies that have employed observational methods have shown that physically abusive men were more verbally aggressive towards their wives than men in nonviolent, discordant marriages (Burman, John and Margolin, 1992; Margolin, John, & Gleberman, 1988). Furthermore, violent couples were more likely to engage in negative reciprocity and for longer chains than distressed, non-violent couples or happily married couples (Cordova, Jacobson, Gottman, Rushe & Cox, 1993); and both spouses in couples with a violent husband used more provocative forms of anger, such as belligerence and contempt, than did couples in distressed, nonviolent marriages and happy marriages (Jacobson, Gottman, Waltz, Rush & Babcock, 1994). To date, only Gottman et al. (1994) have applied observational methods to the classification of battering husbands, and this classification was secondary to their primary classification mode, which was heart rate reactivity.

In this paper we draw on sequential analyses of interaction patterns in abusive relationships to examine a possible additional distinction between Gottman et al.'s (1994) *Type-1* and *Type-2* batterers: the degree to which violent husbands reject influence from their wives.

Rejecting Influence from Women

Maccoby (1990) suggested that the cross-culturally universal gender segregation effect that occurs in childhood at around age 7 may be related to the fact that boys do not accept influence from girls, while girls accept influence from both boys and girls. She suggested that eventually girls move away from boys because of their inability to influence them. It seems possible that these sex differences in accepting influence might persist into puberty and adulthood, critically affecting the fate of cross-sex relationships. We wonder whether the extent to which men continue to reject influence from women is related to whether and to what degree men will be violent toward women.

It has been postulated before that the battering of women is a natural extension of

the patriarchy that largely defines our social structure (Dobash & Dobash, 1977). Evidence for this can be found in studies demonstrating wife abuse as being nearly three times more likely to happen in relationships where the husband dominates the decision-making process than when the wife dominates, and eight times more likely than in egalitarian marriages (Murphy & Meyer, 1991; Straus, Gelles, & Steinmertz, 1980). There is also evidence showing that wives in higher status or income jobs than their husbands are more likely to be a victim of marital violence (Hotelling & Sugarman, 1986). While patriarchy does not explain why some men batter and others do not, it has prompted the suggestion that men who do batter may do so in an attempt to maintain power in their relationships (Dutton, 1988). This implies that husband aggression should occur when the violent husband perceives a decrease in his marital power. Indeed, there is some evidence to support this contention. Babcock, Waltz, Jacobson and Gottman (1993) found evidence that batterers who had less power in their relationship were more physically abusive toward their wives. Thus, the struggle for influence may be a factor in distressed and violent marriages.

In watching the marital interactions of violent men, we noticed a pattern we called the "bat-em-back" hypothesis, because these men reminded us of baseball batters at automatic pitching machines, hitting back every pitch thrown at them. The "pitches" appeared to be any low-level negative affect from their wives (e.g., complaints, sadness, anger), but their own "batting back" had an escalated "in your face" high intensity, characterized by our codes "contempt," "belligerence," or "defensiveness." It was striking to us how rarely any violent man, in interaction with his wife, ever said anything conciliatory, like "Good point, I never thought of that," or "I'm beginning to see it your way," or "Maybe you are right here and I'm wrong," or "I'm sorry." This pattern of rapid and sudden escalation of aggression was reminiscent of a pattern that G.R. Patterson (Personal Communication, 1995) described as characteristic of antisocial young men. We were also struck by the potential face-saving nature of this sudden stance of attack and defensiveness.

We again suggest that one factor in differentiating the two types of violent marriages we have identified, and perhaps in differentiating marriages that are violent from marriages that are not, is the degree to which husbands are unwilling to accept influence from their wives, as assessed by the escalation of low intensity negativity expressed by the wife to high intensity negativity by the husband. We will examine three types of sequences: (1) the "bat-em-back" sequence, which is the joint frequency of the transition from a low-level negative affect antecedent to an intense negative affect consequent by the partner; (2) negative reciprocity, which is the joint frequency of the transition from a high intensity negative affect antecedent to an intense negative affect consequent by the partner, and (3) acceptance of the partner's negativity as indexed by responding with the positive affects of interest, affection, humor, or validation. On the basis of our informal observations, we believe that these sequences will be asymmetrically related to violence, with husband consequent differentiating Type-1 from Type-2, and domestically violent from distressed, non-violent couples. Specifically, we expect to find that Type-1 batterers will "bat'em back" significantly more and accept influence significantly less than Type-2 batterers and distressed, non-violent husbands. We do not expect to find such differences between the wives of Type-1, Type-2 and distressed, non-violent husbands.

METHOD

Overview

A detailed description of the methods of this study is provided in Jacobson et al. (1994) and in Gottman et al. (1994), so this section will be abbreviated.

Experimental design

There were three groups of couples for this report. 33 couples were maritally distressed but nonviolent (DNV), and 61 couples were domestically violent (DV). All couples completed the eyes-closed baseline task, during which their autonomic physiology was monitored. During the eyes-closed baseline, subjects were asked to close their eyes and relax for 2 min. The 61 violent couples were divided by the change in the husband's heart rate from the mean of the eyes-closed baseline to the beginning third of the marital interaction. Men who reduced their heart rates were classified into the Type-1 group (number of couples = 12), while men who increased their heart rates were classified as Type-2 (number of couples, $N = 49$). One couple was dropped from the analysis due to physiological equipment problems, so the final N for the DV group was 60.

Participants

All couples were recruited through a combination of public service announcements, media advertising, and random digit telephone dialing. Subjects responded to radio, newspaper or posted ads stating "Married couples, earn up to \$200 in research study. Seeking couples experiencing conflict in their marriage." People who called were briefed on the procedures of the study over the phone. They were told that the purpose of the study was "to better understand marriage relationships. Ultimately this knowledge helps us to improve our relationship therapy programs. All participants must be able to speak and write English easily, be 18 years of age or older, be legally married and both spouses must be willing to participate." If subjects met these criteria, wives were administered our telephone version of the Locke and Wallace (1959) Short Marital Adjustment Test (SMAT) and the Conflict Tactics Scale (CTS; Straus, 1979). They were not told explicitly that we were studying domestic violence. However, many questions about the frequency of marital violence were asked. Each couple was paid \$200 for participating in the study. The Conflict Tactics Scale (CTS; Straus, 1979) was used to assess whether couples engaged in husband-to-wife violence. The CTS is the most widely utilized measure of marital violence, assessing self- and partner-aggression during the past year. The scale has shown high reliability and consistent internal factor structure (Caulfield & Riggs, 1992), and reasonable relationships with other related psychological constructs such as jealousy problems in the relationship (Riggs, 1993) and the amount of physical injury sustained (Dutton & Stazowski, 1993; Cantos, Neidig, & O'Leary, 1994). The CTS was found to be as useful as an interview in revealing the presence of physical aggression toward wives, particularly when compared to a written self report (O'Leary, Dina, & Malone, 1992). Significant interpartner agreement on reports of physical aggression have also been demonstrated using the CTS (Jouriles & O'Leary, 1985). There is widespread agreement in the field about what constitutes less and more severe aggression on the CTS (e.g., see McLaughlin, Leonard, & Senchak, 1992). In our study, to be classified as DV, within the past year the

husband, based on the wife's CTS report, had to have: 1) pushed, grabbed, shoved, slapped, hit or tried to hit his wife six or more times; 2) kicked, bit, or hit her with a fist at least twice; or 3) beat her up, threatened her with a knife or gun, or used a knife or gun on her at least once.

When couples came into the lab husbands and wives independently completed the Conflict Tactics Scale and the Dyadic Adjustment Scale (Spanier, 1976), a measure of marital satisfaction. The observed grand mean and standard deviation on the Dyadic Adjustment Scale was 92.3 (17.1) for husbands and 83.6 (21.0) for wives; these means were significantly different ($t(58)=3.12, p<.001$). The CTS scores indicate a moderate to severe level of violence in the DV group. According to DV wives, during the past year, 34% had been beaten up, 66% had been kicked, bitten, or hit, 24% of the husbands had been arrested on a domestic violence charge, and 83% of the wives had been injured by their husbands' actions with 21% injured seriously enough to seek medical attention.

Overview of procedures

Couples made two visits to the laboratory. During their first visit, couples completed a series of questionnaires, and a structured interview. The structured interview was designed to assess a variety of factors related to violence (e.g., general violence, parental violence during childhood), and also generated husband and wife descriptions of violent and nonviolent arguments. Couples returned to the laboratory again for a communication assessment, where they were videotaped while discussing conflict areas in their relationship. After filling out a problem inventory in which each spouse rated the perceived severity of each area of continuing disagreement in the marriage (e.g., in-laws, sex, money, communication), the interviewer identified the two areas rated most highly problematic by both spouses. The couple was then interviewed to help them make the problem areas more specific (for example, the area of "communication" might become disagreeing about how to behave at a party). Couples then talked for 15 min in the laboratory about these two problem areas of continuing disagreement in their marriage (e.g., money, in-laws, and sex). The interactions were videotaped and several psychophysiological measures were taken during baselines and the marital interaction.

Ethical obligations

Our debriefing procedures were developed with the help of Dr. Anne Ganley at the Seattle V.A. Hospital, an internationally renowned clinician who has been influential in developing treatment programs for domestic violence. Subjects were told that they did not have to answer any question they felt uncomfortable answering. They were given the opportunity to delete any portions of the videotape they did not want recorded. All DV women were given referrals for shelters, individual and legal counseling after each session. They were probed to see if they feared a confrontation at home, if participating in the study had put them at risk, and if they felt safe going home. If a woman felt unsafe, we devised a safety plan. All interviewers were trained on our safety protocol, which included assessing the lethality of men who batter. The campus police were informed as to the nature of our study and guaranteed their assistance within 2 min should it become necessary. We called the wives in our study two weeks following their participation and asked if any violence may have been precipitated by

involvement in our study. In no cases did the police need to intervene. Many DV women expressed interest in the referrals offered. One woman indicated that a violent argument may have been related to involvement in the study.

Measures

Coding of observational data. The Specific Affect Coding System (SPAFF) was used to code affects in the laboratory interactions (Gottman, McCoy, Coan & Collier, 1996). The SPAFF is a cultural informant coding system in which coders consider an informational gestalt consisting of verbal content, voice tone, content, facial expression, gestures, and body movement. Using Gottman laboratory AffectWheels™, a computer-assisted video coding station and a computer program that automated timing information (with a vertical interval time code signal), observers coded the onsets of each of a set of listener and speaker affects. Two coders classified the behaviors of each speaker as affectively neutral, as one of six positive affects (humor, affection, validation, interest/curiosity, joy/enthusiasm, and affection/humor blend) or as one of eleven negative affects (anger, disgust, contempt, domineering, belligerence, whining, sadness, tension, defensiveness, and listening with stonewalling). Validation is not an affect; it ranges in intensity from simple backchannels (head nods, brief vocalizations) that communicate to the listener that the speaker is tracking, to the communication of empathy, compassion, or emotional understanding. Unfortunately, we have recently discovered in our data that validation is only very rarely a communication of empathy or emotional understanding. In our data it is almost entirely assesses listener tracking. All of the data were coded by two independent observers. Cohen's kappa was consistently above 0.75, and averaged 0.89 for the entire coding. Generalizability coefficients for individual codes were over 0.80, and averaged 0.87.

SPAFF codes for sequential and non-sequential analysis

We broke down the codes of the Specific Affect Coding System (SPAFF; Gottman et al., 1996) into antecedents and consequents as follows: Antecedents include either Neutral behavior, Low Level Negativity, High Level Negativity, or an "Else" code. Low level negativity consisted of whining, anger, domineering, fear and sadness. High level negativity consisted of Contempt, Belligerence and Defensiveness. The "Else" code simply consisted of codes that were too infrequent to contribute to these analyses. These codes were Stonewalling, Surprise/Joy and Disgust. Consequents include Neutral behavior, Acceptance and Rejection. Acceptance included any of four SPAFF codes: Validation, Interest, Humor and Affection, because previous research includes these behaviors as facilitative of positive marital interaction (Gottman, 1994). Rejection included Contempt, Belligerence or Defensiveness, three codes that have been demonstrated to be either highly provocative or denying of personal responsibility in nature (Gottman, 1994). The data acquisition program sampled the A-to-D converter 256 times each second, and the most frequently occurring code for that second was summarized as the code for that second. The unit of analysis was the second; there were 900 sec in each 15 min interaction.

Analyses

There are two analyses of interest to us. The first is the comparison of DNV and both types (Type-1 and Type-2) of DV couples combined, which allows us to compare

couples along a dimension of violence, controlling for distress. The second comparison is the Type-1 versus Type-2 couples, which allows us to compare different types of violent couples. In our sequential analyses, we will be exploring four sequences, with either low intensity or high intensity negative affect as an antecedent and either the escalated form of rejection or acceptance as a consequent. We will also examine the case of wife or husband as the source of the antecedent. The analyses will be done in two ways. First, we will use log-linear analysis to examine sequences pooled across couples within each of the three groups. Second, to deal with potential problems with homogeneity of sequential structure and the large amount of power we have when we pool across couples, we will conduct analyses of variance for these sequences.

RESULTS

Log-Linear Analysis of Joint Frequencies

Using log-linear analysis, with a GAC design, with G representing the three groups (Type-1, Type-2, and DNV couples), and A representing Antecedent and C representing Consequent, we computed the joint frequencies (the frequencies of specific antecedent/consequent patterns) of the following consequences (C): accept, reject, and else with the following the antecedents (A): wife or husband low intensity negative, high intensity negative, neutral and else. The best fitting model was the [GA GCAC] model, with $G^2(42) = 3269.6$, $Q^2 = 0.87$, and $\text{delta-Q} = 0.13$. With so many observations, we have so much power that we can expect no model to fit (see Bakeman & Robinson, 1994, pp. 62), and in this case the Knoke & Burke (1980, pp. 40–41) criterion of a model whose Q^2 is approximately equal to or greater than .90 may be judged a satisfactory fit to the data.

The standardized residuals from this model for the wives' low intensity negativity showed that, for the bat-em-back hypothesis, Type-1 men were the only group significantly likely to reject their wives' low intensity negativity. Both the DNV group and the Type-2 men were inhibited in this response (DNV = -3.00, Type-1 = 20.15, Type 2 = -8.33). All differences between groups are significant, with the DNV/Type-2 comparison $z = 5.67$, and the Type-1/Type-2 comparison $z = 14.24$). The comparable standardized residuals for the reciprocation of their wives' high intensity negativity (DNV = -8.14, Type-1 = 9.04, Type-2 = 0.32) showed that this reciprocation is characteristic of Type-1 men, and of violent marriages in general. Both DNV and Type-2 men are significantly different, $z = 3.91$, and Type-1 and Type-2 men are significantly different, $z = 4.36$.

When we examined the same sequences for wives' rejection of husbands' low and high intensity negativity, a similar picture emerged. For low intensity husband negativity the residualized z -scores are -1.76, 5.18, and -3.42, for Type-2, Type-1, and DNV wives' rejection, respectively. Type-1 wives are rejecting their husbands' low intensity negativity more than Type-2 wives, $z = 3.47$, and Type-1 wives are rejecting their husbands' low intensity negativity more than DNV wives, $z = 4.30$, but Type-2 wives are not rejecting their husbands' low intensity negativity more than DNV wives, $z = .83$. For high intensity husband negativity the residualized z -scores are 1.36, 13.76, and -12.79 for Type-2, Type-1, and DNV wives' rejection, respectively. Type-1 wives are rejecting their husbands' high intensity negativity more than Type-2 wives, $z = 6.20$, Type-1 wives are rejecting their husbands' high intensity negativity more than

DNV wives, $z = 13.28$, and Type-2 wives are rejecting their husbands' high intensity negativity more than DNV wives, $z = 5.72$. Although we predicted no group differences, we found that wives of Type-1 husbands escalated low-level negativity in a fashion similar to their husbands. However, in comparing Type-1 z-scores by gender, Type-1 husbands show significantly greater escalation of low-level negativity than their wives,¹ $z_{diff} = 10.59$.

For the consequence of acceptance, only DNV men were likely to accept their wives' low intensity negative affect (DNV = 2.68, Type-1 = -.35, Type-2 = -2.33) or high intensity negativity (DNV = 8.94, Type-1 = -2.49, Type-2 = -6.68). These results also support the bat-em-back hypothesis. They also suggest that high intensity negative reciprocity is characteristic of DV and not of DNV couples, since the z-score for the reciprocation of high intensity negativity was significantly negative for the DNV couples.

When we examine the wives' consequence of acceptance of their husbands' low intensity and high intensity negativity, it is only the wives of Type-1 men were likely to accept their husbands' low intensity negative affect (DNV = 1.38, Type-1 = 5.18, Type-2 = -4.48) or high intensity negativity (DNV = -.54, Type-1 = 6.36, Type-2 = -2.79). Hence, wives will both accept and reject their husbands' low intensity negativity (see discussion).

It is usually helpful to examine ratios in looking at log-linear tables. We suggest examining not an odds ratio but the ratio of partner rejection to acceptance across the three groups of couples for each of the four antecedents of low or high intensity negative affect by either wife or husband. These ratios are presented in Table 1. Brackets on Lines 1 and 3 of the table illustrate that the bat-em-back phenomenon is a type of violent man effect. Brackets on Lines 2 and 4 illustrate that the reciprocation of high intensity negativity phenomenon is a violence effect.

It is striking how much more likely, for any group, rejection is compared to acceptance. The table also illustrates that for the antecedent of wife low intensity negativity, the Type-1 husband has the largest ratio of the three types of husbands. The Type-2 man follows, with the DNV husband lowest. For the wife antecedent of high intensity negative affect, the two types of men have similar ratios and this ratio is much higher than DNV husbands. For wife rejection of husband low intensity negativity, it is the wife of the Type-2 man who has the highest ratio, with the wife of the Type-1 man following, and the DNV wife lowest. For wife rejection of high intensity husband negative affect, once again the wife of the Type-2 man is highest, with the wife of the Type-1 man following, and the DNV wife lowest.

Analysis of Variance of Joint Frequencies

Bat-em-back hypothesis. The bat-em-back hypothesis referred specifically to husbands reacting to low-level negative wife affects with an escalated negativity. The frequency of this sequence variable resulted in a significant group F-ratio of $F(2,84) = 3.74$, $p = .028$, with means DNV = 14.96, Type-1 = 64.08, Type-2 = 27.04. Multiple comparisons of means using the LSD criterion showed that the effect was a type of violent men effect, with Type-1 > Type-2 and Type-1 greater than the DNV group. The reverse of the bat-em-back hypothesis would refer to wives reacting to low-level negative husband affects with an escalated intense negative affect. Once again, the F-

¹ $[z_{diff} = (20.15 - 5.18)/\text{SQRT}(2) = 10.59]$

TABLE I. Reject-to-Accept Ratios for Four Antecedents for the Three Groups of Couples

Antecedent	Type 1	Type 2	DNV
1. Wife low intensity negativity	[26.26]	12.93	3.56
2. Wife high intensity negativity	[23.92]	23.41]	1.76
3. Husband low intensity negative	10.29	[40.23]	4.59
4. Husband high intensity negativity	[6.82	10.56]	1.88

Brackets on Lines 1 and 3 illustrate that the phenomenon is a type of violent man effect. Brackets on Line 2 and 4 illustrate that the phenomenon is a violence effect.

ratio was significant, $F(2,84) = 3.72$, $p = .029$, with means DNV = 6.39, Type-1 = 51.92, Type-2 = 27.00. However, multiple comparisons of means using the LSD criterion showed that in this case the effect was not a type of violent men effect, since for wives Type-1 = Type-2. DV wives exceeded DNV wives, so the effect for wives was a violence effect. Women in all violent marriages reacted with intensified affect to their husbands' low level negative affect more than women do in distressed nonviolent marriages.

Escalated negative reciprocity. The husband's reciprocation of high level wife negativity also differentiated significantly between groups, $F(2,84) = 4.80$, $p = .011$, with means DNV = 14.86, Type-1 = 54.50, Type-2 = 46.79. Multiple comparisons of means using the LSD criterion showed that the effect was not a type of violent men effect, with Type-1 = Type-2. However, both Type-1 and Type-2 husbands exceeded DNV husbands, so the effect of husband reciprocation was a violence effect. The wife's reciprocation of high level wife negativity also differed significantly between groups, $F(3,96) = 8.90$, $p = .0003$, with means DNV = 14.46, Type-1 = 63.33, Type-2 = 48.09. Multiple comparisons of means using the LSD criterion showed that the effect was not a type of violent men effect, with Type-1 = Type-2. However, again, both Type-1 and Type-2 wives exceeded DNV wives, so the effect of wife reciprocation was a violence effect. It is therefore characteristic of violent marriages of both types for both partners to reciprocate high intensity negative affect.

Acceptance. The consequent of acceptance was also studied using analysis of variance. For the husband accepting his wife's low intensity negative affect, $F(2,84) = 1.18$, ns. For the consequent of the husband accepting his wife's high intensity negative affect, $F(2,84) = 3.59$, $p = .032$, with means DNV = 8.46, Type-1 = 2.42, Type-2 = 2.77. Multiple comparisons of means using the LSD criterion showed that the effect was not a type of violent men effect, with Type-1 = Type-2, but DNV significantly higher than both types of violent couples. For wife acceptance of husband low intensity negative affect, $F(2,84) = 3.58$, $p = .032$, with means DNV = 1.39, Type-1 = 6.00, and Type-2 = 1.34. Multiple comparisons of means using the LSD criterion showed that the effect was a type of violent men effect, with Type-1 > Type-2, and DNV = Type-2. Only women married to Type-1 are accepting their husbands' low intensity negative affect. For wives accepting their husbands' high intensity negative affect, $F(2,84) = 1.01$, ns.

Summary. To summarize the results of both of these analyses, it is characteristic of Type-1 men, and to a lesser extent also of their wives to "bat-em-back." This does not seem to be quite as characteristic of Type-2 marriages, and the sequence is significantly inhibited in DNV marriages. Ironically, the wives of Type-1 men are also significantly more likely to accept their husbands' low and high intensity negative affects.

TABLE II. Joint Frequency Group Means

Variable	Type 1		Type 2		DNV	
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD	Mean	SD
Bat-em-back						
1. Wives	[51.92	75.83	27.00	55.44]	6.39	12.16
2. Husbands	[64.08	122.06]	27.04	34.14	14.96	20.85
Escalated negative reciprocity						
3. Wives	[63.33	71.41	48.09	39.18]	14.46	13.15
4. Husbands	[54.50	63.78	46.78	55.27]	14.86	15.14
Acceptance of low intensity negative affect						
5. Wives	[6.00	11.94]	1.34	4.21	1.39	2.92
6. Husbands	2.58	3.29	2.51	3.32	4.18	6.75
Acceptance of high intensity negative affect						
7. Wives	9.58	22.66	4.87	9.43	7.68	8.21
8. Husbands	2.42	4.40	2.77	5.12	[8.46	14.89]

Brackets on Lines 1, 3, and 4 illustrate a violence effect.

Brackets on Lines 2 and 5 illustrates a type of violent man effect.

Lines 6 and 7 indicate no significant differences between groups.

Brackets on Line 8 illustrates a DNV effect.

In general, the reciprocation of high intensity negative affect by both spouses is characteristic of violent compared to distressed nonviolent marriages. Husbands of DNV marriages were significantly more likely to respond to their wives' high intensity negative affect with acceptance.

DISCUSSION

In the early 1970s, when observational research on marital interaction began, "negative affect reciprocity" emerged as the most consistent discriminator between happily and unhappily married couples (for a review, see Gottman, 1994). However, many disparate codes from many coding systems were thrown into the "negative" category, without much justification. For example, in some studies disagreement was considered negative while in other studies it was not. More careful analysis of only affect, however, supported the power of negative affect reciprocity to discriminate between happily and unhappily married couples. The problem was that all negative affects were lumped together in this conclusion, so that a belligerent husband whose wife responded with fear or with sadness would be considered the same as one whose wife responded with her own belligerence.

The distinction seems critical for the study of violent, compared to nonviolent marriages. In this paper we distinguish between kinds of negative affect as both antecedents and consequences. We also examine the consequence of "acceptance," that is, responding with the positive affects of interest, affection, humor, or validation.

The bat-em-back hypothesis was more characteristic of Type-1 compared to Type-2 men, and it was more characteristic of violent compared to distressed nonviolent marriages. The sequence is asymmetrical, in that the z-scores are significantly higher for husbands batting it back than for wives batting it back. The reciprocation of high level escalated negative affect was quite characteristic of violent compared to distressed nonviolent couples, and it was true for both husbands and wives. It appears that there

is a pattern of sequences, with husbands, particularly Type-1 husbands, starting up the sequence by escalating the negativity of their wives, and that, once escalated, both partners in violent couples reciprocate the high intensity negativity. Wives of Type-1 men, however, significantly follow two possible pathways, or strategies, for their next move, responding to their husbands at times with rejection and at times with acceptance. This pattern is not characteristic of their husbands, who do not accept influence. It is likely that these wives are responding with acceptance as a result of fear of their Type-1 husbands. We speculate that this combination of rejection and acceptance behaviors is evidence that wives of Type-1 men are feeling both extreme anger and terror in interactions with their husbands. They may use acceptance in an attempt to diffuse arguments with their husbands before they get too heated, for fear of their husbands' violent attacks. Another possibility to explore is that the two significant sequential pathways of the wives' response to their husbands' negativity reflect when in the interaction we look for these sequential connections. We know that at the very beginning of the interaction, Type-1 men are quite belligerent (Jacobson et al., 1994). In the beginning of the marital interaction wives may respond with acceptance as a function of being fearful, and hence compliant in their attempt to appease; but, as their husbands escalate the negativity, the wives also get caught up in the vicious cycle of "batting in back," putting aside their fear as the interaction becomes more escalated. Perhaps at home, with no outsiders present, it is this pattern that leads to physical violence.

A recent article by Nisbett (1993) suggested to us that the Type-1 pattern of "batting it back" followed by high intensity negative reciprocation may be related to an "honor code" these men may have, about not accepting influence from women. Nisbett (1993) attempted to explain the phenomenon of increased rates of violence throughout the Southern region of the United States as compared to the North. In doing so, he proposed the existence of an "honor culture," derived from the Scotch-Irish sheep herding cultures who populated much of the Southern region. As its name suggests, this culture is pre-occupied with honor, to the extent that they feel more justified in resorting to violence in response to insult than do people in the Northern region.

We wondered whether this construct might help us to explain the behavior and motivations of the Type-1 batterer. Is it possible, for example, that Type-1 batterers find the idea of accepting influence from their wives an affront to their honor, for which they feel justified in resorting to aggression and violence? Perhaps Type-1 batterers equate accepting influence from their wives with being "unmanly" or "the sort of man who can be pushed around," or some extreme approximation to both. This might explain what appears to be their deliberate, physiologically relaxed, rapid escalation of aggression in interactions with their wives. Still, if an "honor code" is indeed related to the behavior of the Type-1 batterer, we feel that the terms "honor" and "honor culture" are subtly different in the context of the Type-1 batterer than in that of Nisbett's (1993) study. For example, for the Type-1 batterer, "honor culture" might refer not only to a pathological preoccupation with saving face, but also to an equally pathological desire to control their wives through intimidation and violence, with the perception that it is their natural right to do so as its base. To the Type-1 batterer, any sign of negativity—anything that he might construe as an attempt on his wife's part to influence him—would constitute an affront to his "honor," an outrageous challenge to his position. If so, we would expect Type-1 men to be intolerant of virtually any attempt by their wives to influence them in any way. Our data support this notion.

We postulate that Type-1 batterers' rejection of influence is indicative of their refusal to tolerate any negative behavior on the part of their wives. Further, their rapid escalation during a marital discussion is, like violence, a means to control their wives. Simultaneously, their wives find themselves in a situation that is both infuriating and terrifying, alternately rejecting and, out of fear of violence, accepting their husband's negativity.

Babcock et al. (Babcock, White, O'Connor, Gottman & Jacobson, 1994) hypothesized that there are two primary motivators for battering. One is violent men's need for control, compliance, power and respect; the other is fear of abandonment. Type-1 batterers are not at all threatened by increasing independence moves by the wives; on the contrary, they may impel their wives toward greater independence (Gottman et al., 1995). We suggest that the motivator for Type-1 men, as evidenced by their rejection of influence, and the often acquiescent behavior of their wives, is to gain control, compliance and power. Perhaps what underlies this motivation is their feeling that they are justified in having this control and power over their wives by any means necessary, and as if by something like divine right. It is this sense of "honor" that renders their use of aggression and violence acceptable, necessary, and perhaps even enjoyable to them, since a noticeable compliance on the part of their wives may further reinforce this sense of "honor."

Type-2 batterers, on the other hand, reject only high negativity expressed by the wife. They may feel threatened when their wives become belligerent and contemptuous, behaviors that may indicate the wife's distancing herself and pulling away from him. Their aggressive moments may be characterized more by a lack of emotional control than by calculated, deliberate escalation. As such, we would expect that they would be more aggressive in response to their wives' high level forms of negativity than their wives' low level negative or neutral behavior. We speculate that they are motivated to violence when they are threatened by greater independence moves by their wives. They fear abandonment, so they respond with jealousy, fear and a loss of emotional control as their heart rates rise. Eventually, the Type-2 men become violent, not in an attempt to suppress their wives' anger, but in an attempt to engage their wives and keep their wives in the field of interaction (Gottman et al., 1995). Similarly, the high rates of negative reciprocity seen during nonviolent interaction may be indicative of the Type-2 batterers' attempts to keep their wives engaged.

If our speculations about Type-1 men are correct, then it suggests that a different form of intervention than anger management may be necessary for this kind of batterer. Such an intervention would explore the conditions under which accepting influence from women did not imply a loss of face. We suggest exploring the hypothesis that for Type-1 batterers, the basic need to control their wives through intimidation may lie in this arena.

REFERENCES

- Babcock, J.C., Waltz, J., Jacobson, N.S. & Gottman, J.M. (1993). Power and violence: The relationship between communication patterns, power discrepancies and domestic violence. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology*, 61(1), 40-50.
- Babcock, J.C., White, K.A.J., O'Connor, C., Gottman, J.M., & Jacobson, N.S. (1994) *Mathematical model of marital violence*. Unpublished manuscript: University of Washington.
- Bakeman, R., & Robinson, B.F. (1994) *Understanding log-linear analysis with ILOG: An interac-*

- tive approach. Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Buck, R. (1975) Nonverbal communication of affect in children. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 31, 644–653.
- Burman, B., John, R.S., & Margolin, G. (1992) Observed patterns of conflict in violent, non-violent, and nondistressed couples. *Behavioral Assessment*, 14(1), 15–37.
- Cantos, A.L., Neidig, P.H., & O'Leary, K.D. (1994) Injuries of women and men in a treatment program for domestic violence. *Journal of Family Violence*, 9(2)
- Caulfield, M.D., & Riggs, D.S. (1992) The assessment of dating aggression: Empirical evaluation of the Conflict Tactics Scale. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 7, 549–558.
- Cordova, J.V., Jacobson, N.S., Gottman, J.M., Rushe, R. & Cox, G. (1993) Negative reciprocity and communication in couples with a violent husband. *Journal of Abnormal Psychology*, 102(4), 559–564.
- Dobash, R.E. & Dobash, R.P. (1979). *Violence against wives: A case against the patriarch*. New York: Free Press.
- Dutton, D.G. & Golan, S.K. (1995). *The batterer: A psychological profile*. New York: BasicBooks.
- Dutton, D.G. (1988). *The domestic assault of women: Psychological and criminal justice perspectives*. Boston: Allyn & Bacon, Inc.
- Dutton, D.G. & Starzomski, A.J. (1993). Borderline personality in perpetrators of psychological and physical abuse. *Violence & Victims*, 8, 327–337.
- Gondolf, E.W. (1988). Who are those guys? Toward a typology of batterers. *Violence and Victims*, 3, 187–203.
- Gottman, J., McCoy, K., Coan, J., & Collier, H. (1995). The specific affect coding system (SPAFF) for observing emotional communication in marital and family interaction. In J. Gottman (Ed.), *What Predicts Divorce: The Measures*. Mahway, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Gottman, J.M. (1994) *What predicts divorce?* Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Gottman, J.M., Jacobson, N.S., Rushe, R.H., Shortt, J.W., Babcock, J.C., LaTaillade, J.J., & Waltz, J. (1995). The relationship between heart rate reactivity, emotionally aggressive behavior, and general violence in batterers. *Journal of Family Psychology*, 9(3), 227–248.
- Holtzworth-Munroe, A. & Stuart, G.L. (1994). Typologies of male batterers: Three subtypes and the differences among them. *Psychological Bulletin*, 116(3), 476–497.
- Hotaling, G.T., & Sugarman, D.B. (1986). An analysis of risk markers in husband to wife violence: The current state of knowledge. *Violence and Victims* 1(2), 101–124.
- Jacobson, N.S., Gottman, J.M., & Shortt, J.W. (1995) The distinction between Type 1 and Type 2 batterers—Further Considerations: Reply to Ormduff et al. (1995), Margolin et al. (1995), and Walker (1995). *Journal of Family Psychology*.
- Jacobson, N.S., Gottman, J.M., Waltz, J., Rushe, R. Babcock, J.C., & 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.
- Jouriles, E.N., & O'Leary, K.D. (1985). Interspousal reliability of reports of marital violence. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology*, 53, 419–421.
- Knoke, D., & Burke, P.J. (1980). *Log-linear models*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- La Taillade, J.J., Waltz, J., Jacobson, N.S., & Gottman, J.M. (1992, November). *Marital versus other interpersonal violence: An examination of differences and correlates*. Poster session presented at the meeting of the Association for the Advancement of Behavior Therapy, Boston, MA.
- Locke, H.J. & Wallace, K.M. (1959). Short marital-adjustment and prediction tests: Their reliability and validity. *Marriage and Family Living*, 21, 251–255.
- Maccoby, E.E. (1990). Gender and relationships: A developmental account. *American Psychologist*, 45, 513–520.
- Margolin, G., John, R.S., & Gleberman, L. (1988). Affective responses to conflictual discussions in violent and nonviolent couples. *Behavioral Assessment*, 11, 1108–118.
- McLaughlin, I.G., Leonard, K.E., & Senchak, M. (1992). Prevalence and distribution of premarital aggression among couples applying for a marriage license. *Journal of Family Violence*, 7, 309–319.
- Murphy, C.M. & Meyer, S.L. (1991). Gender, power and violence in marriage. *The Behavior Therapist*, 14(4), 95–100.
- Nisbett, (1993). Violence and U.S. regional culture. *American Psychologist*, 48(4), 441–449.
- O'Leary, K.D., Vivian, D., & Malone, J. (1992). Assessment of physical aggression against women in marriage: The need for multimodal assessment. *Behavioral Assessment*, 14(1), 5–14.
- Riggs, D.S. (1993). Relationship problems and dating aggression: A potential treatment target. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 8, 18–35.
- Spanier, G.B. (1976). Measuring dyadic adjustment: New scales for assessing the quality of marriage

- and similar dyads. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, 38, 15-28.
- Straus, M.A. (1979). Measuring intrafamily conflict and violence: The Conflict Tactics Scale. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, 41, 75-88.
- Straus, M.A., Gelles, R.J., & Steinmetz, S.J. (1980). *Behind closed doors: Violence in the American family*. Garden City, NY: Anchor Books.
- Wisdom, C.S. (1989) Does violence beget violence? A critical examination of the literature. *Psychological Bulletin*, 106, 3-28.

Copyright of *Aggressive Behavior* is the property of John Wiley & Sons Inc. and its content may not be copied or emailed to multiple sites or posted to a listserv without the copyright holder's express written permission. However, users may print, download, or email articles for individual use.