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ABSTRACT

Understanding how the role of the father influences male violence against a female intimate partner has been a missing link in research on men who batter women. Fathers can play a significant role in contributing to the sense of self in their children. Self-psychological theory postulates that a warm, understanding and empathic father can provide important psychological functions that support a cohesive self-structure and contribute to self-esteem in their children. The narcissistic personality has been a consistent profile found in studies of male batterers. A cold, rejecting, humiliating and indifferent father contributes to the formation of the narcissistic personality disorder. These men often resort to violence when they are threatened or perceive rejection.

This reflective study examined 145 men's relationships with their fathers to determine if the type of paternal engagement men had with their fathers while growing up predicted female intimate violence. A non-violent group was compared to a group of men who were arrested for domestic violence and court ordered to batterers' treatment groups. The study measured the ways fathers got involved with their children and the quality of the emotional relationship. For the purposes of this study, only those men who were physically violent were categorized as violent.

Negative paternal involvement, such as witnessing marital violence and being abused by the father; self-esteem; and the educational level of the men were statistically significant predictors of intimate violence. Shaming by the father, the moral father role,
and the positive paternal emotional relationship were not statistically significant in predicting intimate violence. However, men who had the highest positive paternal emotional relationship with their fathers had higher self-esteem than men who had poor relationships with their fathers. A positive paternal relationship was statistically correlated with self-esteem.

Logistic regression correctly classified 88% of the violent men. The most powerful independent variable predicting non-violence was a college education. In this study, negative paternal involvement and self-esteem were predictors of violence against women. Fathers who are involved with their children and who are emotionally connected with them may contribute to the child’s self-esteem.
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CHAPTER 1
INTRODUCTION

Violence against women is a serious social problem (Crowell and Burgess, 1996). Despite the creation of laws prohibiting violence against women in intimate relationships, the proliferation of shelters to protect women from male violence, and the development of batterers’ treatment programs, violence against women persists as a distinct social structure (Ptacek, 1997). In order to effectively understand this problem, and as a precursor to preventing it, it is important to understand the men who abuse their intimate partners. Men are influenced by their fathers while they are growing up and this socialization process serves to shape the son’s sense of self, influencing not only how men feel about themselves, but effecting how they interact with women. Understanding abusive men’s relationships with their fathers while growing up will provide further understanding of the factors that lead to intimate violence and possibly contribute to more effective treatment interventions.

Overview of the Study

The primary purpose of this study is to determine if the type of paternal involvement and paternal emotional responsiveness between the abuser and his father is related to intimate violence. The rationale for undertaking this study grew out of the literature on male abusers that consistently reports that the majority of abusive men as
children witnessed marital violence in childhood (Hamberger & Hastings, 1988).

Although some men only abuse their wives, others abuse their children as well. The socialization that occurs from witnessing family violence and/or being a victim of the father’s abuse most likely influences the father/child relationship and shapes the son’s use of violence as an acceptable form of problem solving. Growing up with a violent and abusive parent not only serves as a model for using aggressive tactics to resolve conflict, but most likely affects the child psychologically, creating an emotional void between the father and the son. Therefore, it seems imperative to examine the abusers’ relationship history with their fathers. The methodology of this study involves the examination of abusive men’s retrospective accounts of their relationships with their fathers while growing up. This study examines the extent and type of the father’s engagement with the son, such as time spent together, and the emotional responsiveness of the father towards the son. Additionally, it will examine whether or not the son felt understood, accepted, admired and supported by his father. Self-psychological theory postulates that children need an emotionally responsive parent to provide a deep level of understanding and admiration in order for the child to grow into a psychologically healthy adult (Kohut, 1977).

**Extent of the Problem**

Abuse of women in intimate relationships is a major social problem in the United States. In 1976 and in 1985, Straus and Gelles examined the scope of marital violence by conducting two national surveys and found that 28 percent of the married couples reported at least one physical assault at sometime during their marriage (Gelles, 1997).
Milder forms of physical abuse that most people think of as physical punishment was the most common, yet the rates of severe violence were quite high. In the 1976 survey, the severe violence rate for wife assault was 3.8% (Straus, Gelles & Steinmetz, 1980) and 3.0% for 1985 (Straus & Gelles, 1986). The Federal Bureau of Investigation (FBI) reports that 3.8 million assaults and 500,000 rapes occurred against women in 1993. Someone known to the victim committed more than 75 percent of these violent acts, and 29 percent were committed by a husband or former intimate partner (Crowell & Burgess, 1996). Wife assault is the single most common reason women enter hospital emergency rooms (Mills, 1996). In addition to medical costs, marital violence is also costly to society in terms of homelessness and welfare costs (Barnett, Miller-Perrin & Perrin, 1997).

In the United States in 1993, 4,869 women were homicide victims; of these, their husbands, ex-husbands or boyfriends killed 31 percent. Straus & Gelles (1986) estimated that a spouse or an intimate partner annually batters at least 2.5 million women in the United States. When Straus and colleagues examined their data from the first Family Violence Survey in 1975, they concluded that a marriage license could be considered a hitting license (Straus, Gelles, & Steinmetz, 1986). In examining violence from several studies, Dutton, (1988) estimated that repeated severe violence occurs in 7.2% of all marriages in the United States. Severe violence is physical assault such as slapping, kicking, punching or beating up the partner which most likely leads to injuries that result in pain, cutting or bleeding (Straus, Hamby, Boney-McCoy & Sugarman, 1996). According to Gelles (1996), “people are more likely to be killed or physically assaulted,
abused and sexually assaulted in their own homes by another family member than anywhere else and by anyone else” (p.262).

Violence against women is usually not a single event stemming from out of control behavior. On the contrary, about two-thirds of American women who are abused will experience repeated violence (Dutton & Golant, 1995). Incidence rates for severe violence in the United States range from 5.9% (Schulman, 1979) to 8.0% (Straus, Gelles & Steinmetz, 1980). Repeated severe violence occurs in about 7.2% of all marriages in the United States (Dutton and Golant, 1995).

Intimate Violence as an International Problem

Violence is a social problem that is deeply rooted in the social attitudes and the belief systems of cultures throughout the world. In the past two decades domestic violence has become a social issue that has gained international recognition, largely through the efforts of the women’s movement. It has been the driving force behind transforming wife battering into a social policy issue. Spouse abuse is a serious problem worldwide and has been referred to as a silent crime because it often is kept a family secret. Gender-based violence, including wife abuse, is a health problem for women everywhere and represents a hidden obstacle to economic and social development (Heise, Pitangy & Germain, 1994). In examining studies from around the world, Levinson (1988) found that wife beating was the most common and most frequent form of family violence. One-quarter to more than one-half of the women reported being physically abused by a partner or a former partner. An even larger percentage reported being subjected to emotional and psychological abuse.
In 1993, the first national survey of violence against women in Canada found that 3 in 10 women reported at least one incident of physical or sexual abuse by a marital partner (Rodger, 1994, as cited in Gelles, 1997). In a 1993 study in Chile, researchers found that 60% of the women involved in a relationship for two or more years had been abused by their male partner (Larrain, 1993, as cited in Gelles, 1997). In a national survey on violence in New Zealand, 35% of the men reported using physical violence and 62% reported using emotional abuse with a partner (Gelles, 1997). When family violence was studied in Korea (Kim & Cho, 1992), the incidence rate for wife assault in the past year for Koreans was 37.5%, compared with 11.6% for the United States. The severe violence rate for Koreans was 12.4% compared to 3.8 and 3.0% for the United States.

Effect of Violence on Family Members

Direct costs of domestic violence to women include physical injury, psychological symptoms and death (Crowell & Burgess, 1996). However, what we know about the consequences of violence against women has come from women seeking help and may not represent all women who are victims of intimate violence, especially older women, Native American women, rural women, lesbians or homeless women. Only a small percentage of the women who are abused report it to police. Straus and Gelles (1990) found that only 6.7% of the women assaulted by an intimate partner had reported the incident to the police. There are gaps in our knowledge about the effect of violence on women and the true cost of intimate violence remains difficult to determine.
Violence within the family has a devastating effect on family members extending to generations to come. Dutton (1995) found that a diagnosis of borderline personality disorder to be significantly associated with reports of parental abuse during childhood. Several researchers of family violence have reported that men who abuse women witness their fathers’ abuse of their mothers (Holtaling & Sugarman, 1986; Caesar, 1988 & Bennett, Tolman, Rogalski & Srinivasaraghaven, 1994). Holtaling and Sugarman (1986) in their review of empirical studies found marital violence was associated with witnessing parental violence in 88% of the studies and direct childhood experience with violence in 69% of the studies. Other researchers have examined the effects of exposure to marital violence on children and have found effects take on several dimensions including short and long term effects; emotional, cognitive and behavior effects; and internalized symptoms (Cummings, Davis & Simpson, 1994 & Harold & Conger, 1997). The findings relative to the psychological damage of witnessing marital violence tend to be within four general areas: the immediate trauma; effects on children’s development; exposure to personal injury and living under stressful conditions and the exposure to violent role models (Barnett, Miller-Perrin & Perrin, 1997). One violent act can restructure a relationship and disrupt the equilibrium within the family system (McGoldrick, 1996). As individual family members interact with other social systems within their environment, the influence of marital violence has an effect far beyond the original boundaries of the victim’s home.
Children Exposed To Intimate Violence

Many of the women who are battered may experience stress in fulfilling in their role as a nurturing mother, and may not be as emotionally available to their children; consequently the violence serves to reduce the mother's role as a protective factor. Children of battered women have been found to have higher rates of behavior problems and lower rates of social competence than children from nonviolent families (Wolfe, Jaffe, Wilson & Zak, 1986). Wolfe and colleagues found that maternal stress and family violence accounted for 19% of the variance in child behavior problems and 16% of the variance in social competence. Women who have to flee to shelters with their children also experience the additional stressor of being dislocated. In examining children in a shelter, Hughes (1988) found that shelter children who had witnessed marital violence, and also been abused, showed significantly more distress than the children who did not witness marital violence. However, a rather significant finding was that the non-abused witnesses showed significant differences from both the children who were abused and witnessed marital abuse and the non-abused group on anxiety and self-esteem measures (Hughes, 1988).

The actual number of children who are exposed to parental violence is not known, but conservative estimates indicate that approximately 3.3 to ten million children witness parental violence annually in the United States (Carlson, 1984). Several researchers have examined the effect on witnessing domestic violence on children (Hughes, 1988; Jaffe, Hurley, Wolfe, 1990 and Sternberg, Lamb, Greenbaum, Cicchetti, Dawud, Cortes, Krispin & Lorey, 1991). For many children, observing interpersonal violence is an overwhelming event that affects them emotionally and behaviorally. Jaffe and colleagues
found that one-third of the children who witnessed parental violence demonstrated significant behavioral and emotional problems including psychosomatic complaints, stuttering, anxiety, fear, sleep disturbance, excessive crying and school problems.

Hershorn and Rosenbaum (1985) found that children who witness marital violence not only experienced more conduct problems than the children from non-violent families, but children from families with marital discord also experienced higher levels of conduct disturbance. One of the concerns is that boys who witness the violence of their fathers towards their mothers are at an increased risk for perpetrating violence in their adult life. Boys who witness marital violence are three times more likely to hit their wives than those who have not, and the sons from the most violent fathers have a rate of wife beating 1,000 greater than those boys from non-violent fathers (Stark & Flitcraft, 1985).

Research has suggested that boys are more vulnerable to marital discord than girls and that boys internalize symptoms more than girls (Jaffe, Wolfe, Wilson & Zak, 1986). Fathers play a significant role in the lives of their children, possibly affecting their development in more ways than previously thought. Boys who saw their fathers more than once a month following parental divorce exhibited higher levels of self-esteem than those boys who saw their fathers less frequently (Healy, Malley & Stewart, 1990). Both younger children and boys benefited from more frequent and more regular contact with their fathers following divorce and the father-child closeness was found to be a consistently associated with high self-esteem for children without parental conflict (Healy, Malley & Stewart, 1990). A possibility exists that parental violence and stress related to conflict associated with parental divorce affects the father’s emotional
availability to the children and influences not only the way boys process the trauma but their sense of self.

**Costs To Society**

The costs to society to care for injured women and children are immeasurable. Because battering has been viewed as a private family matter for such a long time, it has been difficult to estimate the true costs to society. Some costs include: health care costs; criminal justice costs to prosecute domestic violence cases; shelter costs to protect women and children; and the loss of income for those women who work and are too injured and/or shamed to go to work with visible injuries. The consequences of violence against women spreads far beyond the direct injuries inflicted upon women. There are both social and emotional consequences. Researchers have found high rates of depression and anxiety among battered women as well as an increase risk of suicide (Schecter, 1983). Domestic disputes are the largest reason for police calls (Parnas, 1967). There are both long-term and short-term costs associated with intimate violence that have an effect far beyond the family. There is an enormous cost to society both directly and indirectly, especially in terms of how society responds to those children who grow up in violent homes. Children who witness marital violence may be some of the most ignored, overlooked, and misdiagnosed children in the child welfare system.

Wife battering is a social problem that requires strategies that attack the root causes of the problem, in addition to providing services for the women and children effected by violence within the home. It is an issue that has stirred controversy.
concerning the etiology of violence, and about which interventions and strategies are most effective in managing the problem. However, any comprehensive approach to eliminating violence against women needs to include research on programs for the perpetrators of violence.

**Conceptual Framework**

Researchers on paternal involvement in child rearing have called for greater theoretical grounding to determine the factors that promote or inhibit a son from modeling the behavior of his father (Pleck & Pleck, 1997). Much of the research on children who witness domestic violence indicates that they are at an increased risk for maladaptive behaviors, including a host of internalizing and externalizing problems (Kolbo, Blakely & Engleman, 1996). Social learning theory is a model that has been used to explain the relationship between a boy’s witnessing domestic violence and what occurs later in his development, especially whether or not he resorts to violence as a tactic to resolve conflict. Although social learning theory explains the development of aggression as a result of observing a violent role model and imitating the behavior; it does not explain the underlying processes that go on in a relationship between the violent role model and the child who observes the violence. This research study is designed to examine those underlying processes in the father-son relationship to determine if paternal involvement effects men’s levels of violence against women.

The son’s affective evaluation of his father’s involvement and the father-son bond, especially the extent to which the son feels emotionally accepted by his father, are central constructs of this research. Self-psychological theory (Kohut, 1977), offers a
comprehensive model that emphasizes the relationship between the self and its most significant others. Self-psychology is the theoretical underpinning of this research study.

According to self-psychological theory, the parents’ ability to be emotionally available and responsive during childhood are critical for psychological growth and health (Bacal, 1992). Selfobjects are psychological functions that are provided by other people that enhance the sense of self and contribute to tension regulation and psychological integration. When a parent provides “functions” in the relationship that evoke, maintain or positively affect the sense of self, they become a selfobject. As the child grows to depend upon the parent for these functions, the parent is experienced intrapsychically. Out of this selfobject relationship, a person’s sense of self emerges. The emotional availability and the responsiveness of the selfobject (and in this case the father) provides several important selfobject functions for the child’s psychological well being. These selfobject functions include attunement to the child’s affective states, validation of the subjective experience of the child, identification with the child’s perceptions, affect containment, tension regulation, emotional soothing, and recognition of the uniqueness and creative potential of the emerging child (Bacal, 1992).

Understanding and treating men who batter women have been concerns of researchers and clinicians since the problem of spouse abuse was recognized as a serious social problem in the mid 1970’s. This study examines 145 men and explores the type of relationships with their fathers to determine if there is an association between the type of paternal involvement and physical violence with a female intimate partner.
The Father as a Moderator of Male Physical Violence Towards Intimate Partners

Understanding the father's influence on the child's well being and the father's role in shaping the son's sense of self may provide much needed information for professionals who work with male batterers. Paternal involvement serves as a model for socialization, whereas parental emotional responsiveness serves to facilitate the child's sense of self. It is hypothesized that a fragile sense of self is a risk factor for violent behaviors in intimate relationships and that men who batter suffer from paternal deprivation—a lack of an emotionally responsive and supportive father.

The impact of the father can be the moderating variable among: (a) socially constructed masculinity, (b) gender role socialization, and (c) the child's developing sense of self. By providing the empathic selfobject functions of mirroring, idealizing and twinship, the father's relationship with the child becomes central to the development of the self. A cohesive self develops through an emotionally available parent who provides empathic psychological responses (Kohut, 1977). However, a father who is abusive to the child's mother and who subsequently abuses and shames the child, can contribute to narcissistic injury in the child. Narcissistic personality disorders are vulnerable to self-esteem injuries and often resort to violence when they experience psychological disintegration. Many studies have found that men who batter are highly sensitive to any signs of rejection, have narcissistic personality disorders, and require a symbiotic relationship to be complete as a person (Elbow, 1977, Hamberger & Hastings, 1988, Johnson, 1987). Preservation of the self, the search for the perfect mirror to receive recognition, approval and validation is a central need of the narcissistically injured individual.
In research on 140 court-referred and self-referred men for wife assault, Dutton, (1995) found that abusive men have disturbances of the self (such as borderline and narcissistic personality disorders), have high levels of trauma symptoms, and tend to externalize the cause of their violence. Using the "Egna Minnen Betraffande Uppfostran" (EMBU: Memories of My Upbringing) Scale (Perris, Jacobsson, Lindstrom, von Knorring & Perris, 1980), Dutton examined abusive mens’ memories of parental upbringing and found recollections of shaming to be significantly related to physical abusiveness in intimate relationships (Dutton & Golant, 1995). Early parental shaming attacks on the child have a significant effect on maintaining self-concept in adulthood (Dutton, Ginkel & Starzomski, 1995). Lacking the security that is derived from of a strong relationship with their fathers, these men are more vulnerable to emotional injury, which results in a fragile self-concept.

Shame is the result of disturbed interpersonal relationships that leaves the inner experience of the self feeling exposed, with a sense of despair and anguish-extreme utter worthlessness (Kaufinan, 1992). Shame is inner torment, a sickness of the soul (Tomkins, 1963). Shame is an internal sense of disgrace; a painful sense of self-impotence. Although shame originates interpersonally in significant relationships, such as between a father and his children, it becomes internalized and can become activated without an interpersonal event. Shame can spread throughout the self, affecting identity, self-esteem, self-concept and self-image (Kaufman, 1989).

The rejecting, critical, demeaning, disapproving or withdrawn paternal selfobject leaves the child’s self, the central core of his/her personality, severely threatened, frightened or inadequate, with an inner state of emptiness, despair and agitation. Dutton
(1995) found that paternal rejection was the strongest contributor to borderline personality disorder and concluded that cold, rejecting and abusive fathers do more than model abusive behaviors; they “contribute to the formation of a personality pattern that is associated with adult abusiveness, anger, depression, and mood cycles” (p.142).

Kaufman (1989) theorized that shame permeates the core of the self, becoming an affect of inferiority and inner torment. This lack of, or the absence of, favorable responses results in the child’s rejecting of his self. Rage becomes a reaction to the rejection of the self, and the control and dominance over others is the psychological and behavioral response to a fragmenting and depleted self (Gabel, 1993).

Rounsaville (1978) found that sudden transitions in intimacy were followed by violence in 50% of the cases examined. As the intimate partner begins to distance herself from her abuser, or to make efforts to leave the relationship, batterers with a poor sense of self are likely to experience the separation internally as a narcissistic injury. Women who leave a battered relationship are not free from the abuse, in fact, many women are stalked and abused for years following separation (Dobash & Dobash, 1979). Separation assault is a term coined by Mahoney (1991) that describes the assaults that women experience in the process of leaving. Abusive men attempt to keep women from leaving, intimidate them to return, and/or exercise threatening and terrorists acts of retaliation. In a study examining the types of events that surrounded an abusive incident, Ptacek (1988) found that 48% of the women were assaulted as they attempted to separate from their abusers. Men are socialized to be in charge, to be aggressive and dominant and, although social control and the abuse of power offer an explanatory model of abuse of female intimate partners, analysis of relationship variables may provide further
understanding of the origins of intimate violence. This loss of the relationship may activate a catastrophic violent response, as the abusers' intimate partner either physically leaves the relationship, or distances herself emotionally.

According to attachment theory, unmet attachment needs of abusive men with their fathers would produce anger (Bowlby, 1969). Bowlby emphasized that in the process of developing a relationship, the child needs repeated, consistent and adequate interactions with the caregiver in order for these interactions to produce internal representations of the self that include a model of the self as worthy. This interaction sets in motion an attachment style that serves as a model for all later interpersonal relationships.

According to object relations theory, interpersonal relations can be represented internally, as inner objects which serve as representations, models or images of the earliest relationships (Rice, 1992). Introjection is the process, through which the relationship of the father becomes a mental structure within the psyche; therefore, if there is a disturbance in the father and son relationship, there is not only a propensity for later disturbance in interpersonal relationships, but for the development of self-pathology.

Abusive men have high levels of chronic anger, externalize the cause of their violence, and have a tendency to project blame onto their partners (Dutton & Golant, 1995). In examining the role of shame and guilt in abusive men, Dutton (1994a) found that shame is related to anger arousal and that abusive men have a mixture of shame and guilt about their violent behaviors. Abusive men will attempt to minimize personal responsibility for abusive behavior in order to modulate internal states of shame and further depletion of the self. Dutton & Golant (1995) argued that the underreporting of
intimate violence and the tendency to externalize blame is influenced by social desirability and is most likely indicative of the shame and guilt associated with abusive behaviors. Other researchers have also found that shame and guilt from the family of origin are significantly related to a chronic affective style and a tendency to blame others (Tangney, Wagner, Fletcher & Gramzow, 1992 & Dutton & Starzomski, 1994). Global attacks on the self such as public scolding, random humiliation, and generic criticism are shame producing random punishment experiences that do not allow the child to differentiate the behaviors leading to punishment (Dutton, van Ginkel & Starzomski, 1995). These types of parental experiences are attacks on the child’s sense of self.

Disintegration anxiety is a form of psychological fragmentation that occurs when an individual experiences narcissistic injury. This sense of coming apart at the seams occurs when individuals experience emotional injuries such as the failures of important people in their lives to admire, understand and emotionally respond to their need for affirmation. They may fragment psychologically and resort to violence. Violence then becomes a way in which self-cohesion is restored.

Self-psychology offers an opportunity to explore the inner experience of the male batterer. By exploring the self of the batterer, the internal subjective experience, a process of personal constructionism transpires, offering an understanding of how social influences and interpersonal relations are interpreted and given meaning at the individual level. This approach to understanding the batterer builds upon other explanatory models of violence, providing an integrating structure between the social theories and the subjective inner experience of the abuser. Understanding the relationship between the batterer and his father, and how that relationship affects of the structure of the self, and
how this is then related to violence provides further knowledge to those who seek ways to reduce the use of violence in batterer’s lives.

**Rationale for the Study**

Male batterers need to be a central focus of any research exploring the causes of violence against women because 94% of the medically serious domestic assaults are male-to-female (Dutton (1994). In order to prevent violence against women, we need to understand why men batter. The National Research Council’s Panel on Research on Violence Against Women, which was established in 1995, proposed focus areas for researchers to explore as they seek to understand the causes of intimate violence. This panel concluded, that in order to significantly reduce violence against women in the United States, the focus must be on better understanding of the cause of violent behavior against women, so that more effective interventions could be developed (Crowell & Burgess, 1996).

The primary intervention with men who are violent in intimate relationships is to stop the violence. In those families, where couples decide to remain together, in addition to stopping the violence, interventions that strengthen the man’s ability to become a source of positive emotional support to his partner serve to enhance the quality of family life. The father’s influence on child development cannot be understood only in terms of the father/child interaction, but it needs to be considered within the context of the quality of the marital relationship (Belsky, 1984). Cummings and O’Reilly (1997) conceptualized a framework in which the father’s behavior in the marital relationship affects parenting, parental psychological well being, and children’s functioning, just as
these systems influence the father's well being. Parent-child relations, marital interactions and parental psychological functioning interact to influence children's adjustment. A nurturing parenting style can serve as a protective factor for children in high-risk homes (Rutter, 1987). However, battered women are likely to have diminished parenting capabilities. Maternal depression and withdrawal, which are often a symptom of being battered, may leave the mother less available to her children. Marital conflict, such as the father's physical abuse of the mother, has been associated with parenting practices and parent child attachment (Davis & Cummings, 1994). Marital aggression has been found to predict maternal reports of high parenting stress, inconsistent child rearing, low parental involvement and a lack of parental warmth (Holden & Ritchie, 1991). Levendorsky and Graham-Bermann (1998, in examining the parenting stress on children's adjustment in woman-abusing families found that parenting stress independent of the violence, contributed significantly to internalizing behaviors in children. Other studies have found that marital conflict is positively related to parental negativity and negatively related to parental warmth (Hetherington & Clingempeel, 1992). High marital conflict has been found to be associated with insecure parent-child attachment (Howes & Markman, 1989). Lamb (1997) reports that the quality of the marital relationship is correlated to the father's involvement and sensitivity to his children. Ptacek (1997) examined the testimony of women seeking restraining orders from their abusive partners and found that 24% of the abusers threatened to kill their partners, and 22% of the women indicated that the violence emerged out of conflicts over parental authority or responsibilities of the abusive partner. Parental dynamics interact to influence the child's
perception of relationships, and the way he/she is treated by the parents affect the child’s sense of self.

Women who are subjected to the power and control of men, relegated to a second-class status and beaten by the men who profess to love them cannot fully participate in society (Heise, Pitangy & Germain, 1994). Wife battering leaves physical and psychological scars on women and on the children who witness their mothers’ being beaten.

Significance of the Study

In addition to the obvious importance of working towards the elimination of violence against women by increasing knowledge about the men who abuse them, this dissertation has significance in the following areas:

1. The study contributes to the understanding of abusive behavior in intimate relationships by examining differences in men’s relationships with their fathers by comparing two groups of men: a non-violent group and a violent group. This knowledge has potential application for treatment interventions in batterer’s treatment groups. The findings from this study may also be used in a preventive way in parent education classes.

2. The study furthers empirical research on self-psychological theory by operationalizing the selfobject constructs of mirroring, idealizing and twinship. The knowledge gained will further help to understand the role of fathers in the development of self-esteem in children.

3. The study furthers knowledge building and makes a contribution to social work by examining the father as a provider of the important selfobject functions of mirroring,
idealizing and twinship. This has implications for further research on the role of attachment and bonding in the father/child relationship.

4. Self-psychological theory provides a theoretical conceptual model that explains the development of the self and how the emotional responsiveness of the selfobject contributes to self-esteem. This has application for emphasizing and expanding the role of fathers to be more emotional responsive to their children.

5. Incorporating measures of both paternal engagement and paternal emotional responsiveness contributes to knowledge by exploring, not only the quantity of father/child time spent together, but also provides knowledge of the degree of paternal emotional responsiveness as perceived by the adult child.

6. The findings from this study have implications for further research into the father’s role in child development, both as a modulator of aggression, as well as a contributor to aggression.

7. Exploring men’s relationships with their fathers will provide more knowledge of two types of paternal engagement. The first is a positively engaged and emotionally available father. The second type is characterized by a negative, abusive, critical and shaming fathering. Exploring these two types of paternal involvement in the life of a child will provide knowledge of how fathers influence adult development.

8. The study has practice implications for treatment groups for men who batter women. Educating men about the importance of positive paternal involvement in the lives of their children could become a component of a batterer’s treatment group. Providing abusive men the opportunity to sort out their own childhood experiences with their fathers may potentially help them be more emotionally available to their children.
Helping men understand (a) the devastating effect their violent behavior has on their families, and (b) ways to be positively involved with and emotionally responsive to their children, has potential to contribute to the reduction of violence in the next generation.

Underlying Assumptions

1. Fathers who are positively involved in the lives of their children enhance children's well-being.

2. Fathers who are empathic and emotionally responsive to their children have a greater chance of attaching and bonding with their children.

3. It is not only important for fathers to spend time with their children but children need to feel understood and accepted by their fathers.

4. Fathers play a significant role in shaping their children's sense of self.

5. The more nurturing and involved the father is in the lives of his children, the more likely the potential to provide selfobject functions, thus contributing to psychological well-being.

6. Men who are violent in intimate relationships experience a lack of paternal emotional responsiveness.

7. Although the social structure and the culture may support violence against women, the role of the father can serve as a moderating variable to modulate the child's aggression.

Purpose of the Research

The central purpose of this research is to compare two groups of men: one group that has resorted to violence as a conflict tactic in intimate relationships, and a second
group who are nonviolent. The study seeks to determine if the nature of paternal involvement during childhood is related to intimate violence.

Definition of Terms

1. **Male Batterer**- A husband, former husband, or a person living as a spouse, boyfriend, or former boyfriend who uses physical or psychological violence against women.

2. **Intimate Violence**- Coercive control by a male partner who is involved in an emotional and sexual relationship with a female partner that includes physical, psychological and/or sexual abuse.

3. **Physical Violence**- Includes hitting, choking, pushing, shoving, slapping, biting, burning, holding the victim against her will, throwing things at her, jerking, shaking, squeezing, kicking, pulling her hair, using a weapon against her or any bodily injuries requiring medical treatment.

4. **Levels of Violence**- The degree in which the male batterer uses various levels of violence as a conflict tactic including verbal abuse, psychological maltreatment, sexual abuse and physical violence.

5. **Psychological Abuse**- Placing an intimate partner, by the threat of force, in fear of imminent serious physical harm, verbal abuse, insults, name calling, isolating the partner, public humiliation, driving recklessly with the partner in the car, yelling, abusing pets or withholding affection or approval as a punishment.

6. **Positive Paternal Engagement**- The extent to which a father is involved in one-on-one activities with his child, the degree to which the father is accessible and available to
respond to the needs to his child, and the degree of responsibility the father has for the child’s well being.

7. **Negative Paternal Engagement** - A constellation of abusive and violent behaviors by the father. Violent behaviors include the extent to which the child witnessed physical violence within the home and whether or not the father abused the child. Abusive behaviors include the degree to which the child was emotionally maltreated, such as intentionally shouting at the child, shaming the child, saying mean things to the child to hurt his/her feelings and saying he did not like the child.

8. **Paternal Emotional Responsiveness** - The degree to which the child feels understood, cared for and made to feel special by the father. This is evidenced by the amount of affection received from the father; whether or not the son was told he was loved by the father; the amount of emotional support received from the father; and the degree to which the son felt close to the father.

9. **Narcissistic Personality Disorder** - An individual who has a grandiose sense of importance, who feels superior to others and who requires excessive admiration. Underneath this mask of protection is an individual who lacks empathy, feels inferior, and inadequate, and has great difficulty in managing self-esteem (Johnson, 1987).

10. **Self** - The self is a psychological construct that describes the psychological core of the personality. It is the person’s private inner relationship with himself. It is an experience of being whole, alive, vigorous and balanced (Stone, 1992). The development of the self occurs within self-sustaining relationships with significant others. The significant person’s availability becomes a selfobject when it is experienced as affecting the sense of self (Bacall, 1992).
11. **Selfobject Functions**—Psychological functions that are provided by other people and serve to enhance the sense of the self, and contribute to tension regulation, self-integration and self-confirmation. Selfobject functions are (a) mirroring; (b) idealizing and (c) twinship needs. Mirroring selfobject needs are the emotionally responsive recognition by significant others for who one is, including one’s unique capacities, talents, abilities and personal attractiveness. Idealizing selfobject needs are the experience of feeling linked to an admired, wise, calm and stable person. Twinship selfobject needs are the need to identify and merge with an idealized other whom the child experiences as strong and powerful (Bacall, 1995).

12. **Selfobject Relationship**—A selfobject relationship is an intrapsychic experience of a link with a significant person, such as the father who can be counted on to provide self-sustaining psychological functions.

13. **Witnessing Marital Violence**—Seeing a father hit the mother and/or being within psychological proximity of the abuse. Psychological proximity is ‘knowing’ the abuse is occurring by what one hears, possibly from another room and/or later seeing the victim with physical injuries.

14. **Self-Efficacy**—An individual’s beliefs about his/her own abilities and characteristics and the extent to which one believes oneself capable of affecting events in the surrounding world (Bandura, 1992).

15. **Self-Esteem**—The opinion of one’s self including feelings of self-worth, feeling proud of accomplishments, self-respect, feeling useful and self-satisfaction.
CHAPTER 2

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

Introduction

There is a need to conduct research on men who are perpetrators of intimate violence in order to understand which factors contribute to the abusive personality. Examining men's relationships with their fathers will help to further understand men who abuse intimate female partners. With such empirical data scholars and practitioners can better understand and predict the factors that contribute to the development of aggression in intimate relationships. Significant gaps exist in understanding the extent and the causes of violence against women. As a result, there is a great need to continue to build knowledge about intimate violence in order to improve prevention and treatment programs (Crowell & Burgess, 1996). Fathers are the missing link in research on intimate violence, and very little is known about the roles fathers and other male figures play in violent families (Sternberg, 1997).

A controversy in the study of male violence against an intimate partner exists: from whom shall we gather information about batterers (Hamberger, 1997)? There is a need to inquire into men's perceptions and beliefs about their relationships with their fathers to determine if there is a connection to intimate violence. Men who batter women have been described as blaming others for their behavior and minimizing the seriousness of their violence. The first attempts to study batterers consisted of data collected from
battered women in counseling (Elbow, 1977 & Walker, 1979). Many researchers have relied on battered women as the primary source of information about abusive men. Social service agencies, battered women’s shelters, and child welfare agencies have been the main settings for information about fathers in violent families, and seldom are violent men directly involved in these agencies. Many of these families represent a certain context characterized by low income, exposure to a more chronic type of abuse, and multiple stressors, including the threat of having one’s children taken away. Researchers have been reluctant to examine middle and upper-class families regarding intimate violence for fear their responses would be biased by a desire to present oneself in a socially acceptable way.

The role of the father is seriously understudied in domestic violence research. Researchers usually ask about the negative aspects of parenting such as discipline and aggression, yet seldom ask about more positive dimensions of the father-child relationship (Sternberg, 1997). Conducting research into the relationships abusive men had with their fathers while they were growing up, and incorporating the positive aspects of the relationship, including the level of emotional responsiveness between an abuser and his father, will provide much needed information for professionals. How those variables interact with social, demographic, and situational variables will allow for further analysis of the profile of the batterer, and help to understand the father’s role in the initial development of violence in intimate relationships.

The following literature review covers self-psychological theory, which is the theoretical framework of this study. Self-psychological theory provides a model for understanding the important influence the father’s relationship has on the child and how
this relationship may bear upon the abuser’s sense of self and their subsequent attachment style. The literature review includes the research on men who batter, methodology problems related to the study of male batterers, theoretical perspectives, and how male socialization processes influence and support the development of aggression. A review of the father’s role in child development is followed by how the culture effects the conduct of fatherhood. In conclusion, self-psychological theory, male socialization and the important role of fathers on child development will be synthesized.

The Study Of Men Who Batter Women

The study of male batterers is a relatively new area of scholarly inquiry. Prior to 1970 domestic violence is unmentioned in the research literature (Gelles & Cornell, 1990). The debate over the origins of domestic violence remains an area of controversy for social workers and researchers. More than in most areas of social work practice, practitioners’ theoretical models directly influence direct practice. The philosophical debate of objectivity versus subjectivity within research is an ever-present issue for the social scientist. Those working in direct practice, such as shelter workers, who value contextual understanding and the meaning women make of their situations, influence researchers in domestic violence. Those from the logical positivism school value quantitative research methods that use inferential statistics (Mullen, 1985). The theory a researcher holds drives and guides scientific inquiry (Nugent, 1987); and as researchers develop knowledge about intimate violence the social/psychological paradigm remains a major area of philosophical debate.
Recently, researchers have been stressing the importance of being aware of the societal factors that are more common to all men and the role they contribute to battering and not to lose sight of those as scholars research the psychological aspects of batterers (Tolman & Bennett, 1990). Yet, it is important to have a thorough understanding of the personality and behavioral characteristics of the batterer in order for treatment programs to be effective in breaking the cycle of violence (Flournoy and Wilson, 1991). These two aforementioned perspectives illustrate the continuing debate around the etiology of intimate violence as originating from either a social or psychological perspective.

Although it is widely recognized that batterers are a heterogeneous group, they are primarily still being treated in a "one-size-fits-all" approach (U.S. Department of Justice, 1998). Some common characteristics often found in men who batter are: they are not highly educated (Edleson & Syers, 1990); have low self-esteem, frequently use alcohol, have high levels of negative stress, and low socioeconomic status (Hotaling & Sugarman, 1986). Recently, researchers have been advocating interventions that are specific to a type of batterer which are based on psychological factors, risk assessment, substance abuse history (U.S. Department of Justice, 1998) and new models of brief group treatment for male domestic violence offenders (Edleson & Syers, 1990; Lee, Greene & Rheinscheld, 1998). Programs need to consider retention and efficacy, and include interventions that address cultural differences (Carter, 1991); ethnicity, gender, poverty and/or sexual orientation (Lie & Gentlewarrier, 1991; Renzetti, 1997).

Some of the early research on men who batter, which has largely been descriptive, came from interviews with battered women (Elbow, 1977 & Walker, 1979). This early research attempted to categorize martially violent men (Elbow, 1977) and to describe a
pattern of abusive behavior, which Walker (1979) termed the "cycle of violence". Early case studies of men incarcerated for wife assault concluded that they did so because they had psychiatric problems or a psychiatric disorder (Dutton, 1995). What these early studies failed to include were a number of demographic, relational, individual and situational factors that were related to intimate violence. Single explanations were not enough to advance understanding of this newly recognized social problem, yet they have greatly effected treatment groups for men who batter.

The first National Family Violence Surveys (NFVS) on marital violence conducted by Straus and Gelles in 1976 and again in 1985 used the Conflict Tactics Scale (CTS) (Straus, 1979) to specifically measure conflict between husbands and wives. A national representative sample of 2,143 family members in 1975 and 6,002 individuals in 1985 were sampled to measure the frequency of intimate violence as well as the type of abuse. In their 1985 study, the researchers found that some kind of violence had occurred in 16% of the homes surveyed in the year prior to the survey. Over one-fourth (28%) of the women in the survey indicated that they had experienced marital violence at some point in their marriages (Gelles, 1997). In 1979, in another large scale survey study of women in Kentucky, 63% of the sample (n = 1,793) were likely to experience re-victimization (Schulman, 1979). Violence is usually not a single isolated incident, in fact woman who are victimized in intimate relationships are abused, on average, three times each year (Gelles, 1997).

These large-scale survey research studies were able to measure violence in intimate relationships, something that prior to 1992 the National Crime Victimization Survey (NCVS) failed to inquire about. Controversy continues around the scope and the
magnitude of violence against women. It is believed that the real incidence of intimate violence is under-reported since many women fail to report intimate violence to the police. Three large-scale studies have found a very low likelihood that severe violence in intimate relationships is ever reported to police. A sample of 1,793 women in the state of Kentucky found that only 8.7% reported severe violence to the police (Schulman, 1979), while two nationally representative surveys found that in 1980 only 12.1% and in 1985 11.3% of the women reported serious wife assault to the police (Straus & Gelles, 1986). However, what the national surveys have been able to identify is the incidence and severity of the intimate abuse (Crowell & Burgess, 1996), which has subsequently help elevate the issue to be recognized as a major social problem.

Because clinical samples are not representative of perpetrators and large-scale surveys fail to distinguish between the subgroups of perpetrators, factors related to the etiology of intimate violence remains poorly understood. Research methodologies are needed that examine the factors associated with the initial development of violent behavior in order to examine the relational, cultural and individual issues, as well as specific factors within each domain that contribute to intimate violence.

Methodological Problems

Social influences are often transmitted within a relational context and initially individuals learn about their world and themselves through the parent child relationship. Exclusive inquiry into the nature of the relationship between an abuser and his father has remained a rather unexplored area of research. The historical era, and those social and cultural forces that define what the ‘model’ is for a father’s relationship with his children influence how men learn to be fathers. The quality of that relationship influences the
individual psychological functioning of the child that lasts for generations (Dutton & Golant, 1995). How men reacted and interacted within their families-of-origin is a missing component in domestic violence research (Kesner, 1994).

Researchers examining domestic violence come from a variety of disciplines, each with their own terms and perspectives. There has been a lack of clear definitions by researchers; hence, the words domestic violence, marital violence, battering and psychological abuse. Definitional ambiguity has hindered the understanding of what intimate violence is. Such terms as spouse abuse, marital violence, battering, and date rape have hindered the scientific investigation of intimate violence (Barnett, Miller-Perrin & Perrin, 1997). Many of these terms have not been operationalized, which contributes to weak instrumentation and problems in developing meta-analysis of the research on intimate violence. Many of the samples are small, lack control groups and use instrumentation lacking in established reliability and validity (Crowell & Burgess, 1996).

Research into understanding the nature of intimate violence has been flawed with methodological weaknesses (Crowell & Burgess, 1996). The definitions of intimate violence against women have failed to take into account the multidimensional aspect of violence against women, failed to identify the various types of violence inflicted upon women and has not taken into account the context in which the violence occurs. Legal definitions of battering vary from state to state and from research study to research study (U.S. Department of Justice, 1998).

Men who batter women are a heterogeneous group and research has indicated that there are multiple influences from the macro-level to the individual level that have been identified as risk factors for violence against women (Feldman & Ridley, 1995; &
Examining a particular variable in isolation falls short of thoroughly explaining intimate violence. Instead of using a single variable to indicate a linear relationship between the independent variable and the dependent variable, multiple regression analysis is a method of analyzing the variability of the dependent variable by two or more independent variables. Several researchers have recently examined multiple variables to determine the characteristics of the violence and characteristics of abusive husbands (Shields, McCall & Hanneke, 1988); characteristics of male spouse abusers who complete treatment and those who drop out (Hamberger & Hastings, 1989); the relationship between legally mandated male abusers to treatment and follow-through (Saunders & Parker, 1989); assessing attachment patterns as precursors of abuse in intimate relationships (Dutton, Saunders, Starzomski & Bartholomew, 1994 & Kesner, 1994) and how biological factors interact with psychosocial variables in predicting violence (McKenry, Julian & Gavazzi, 1995).

Further research on the consequences of violence against women that include the intergenerational effect of abuse is needed. The research has indicated that many men who abuse intimate partners grew up witnessing marital violence (Caeser, 1988). Researchers have found that exposure to marital violence during childhood is a more powerful indicator of future marital violence than experiencing abuse directly and witnessing paternal violence is a better predictor than witnessing maternal violence (Hotaling & Sugarman, 1986).

Building upon existing research and further understanding those processes in childhood that contribute to adult intimate violence is needed. According to Feldman and Ridley (1995), "The lack of underlying theoretical frameworks and integrative models
only exacerbates the current gap between information and knowledge” (p. 338). Most studies examining domestic violence have lacked an explicit theoretical foundation, which makes it difficult to operationally define outcome measures. Inadequate theory construction has been a consistent problem in research on intimate violence. Social work, sociology, criminal justice, psychology, and legal scholars have all examined a similar phenomena: violence within the family; but the diversity in theoretical perspectives or the lack of theory to guide scientific investigation has hindered the development of treatment interventions.

Feldman and Ridley (1995) advocate for research designs that evaluate integrative, explanatory models that benefits both research and practice. Although researchers of domestic violence commonly accept that intimate violence is multidimensional and involves the interaction of a large number of variables in the intrapersonal, interpersonal, biological and social domains, there are gaps of knowledge within each domain. As researchers test multivariate models, they must also direct greater attention to those sets of factors within any particular domain that are the most salient and offer explanatory power (Feldman & Ridley, 1995).

Theoretical Perspectives

Introduction

No one conceptual or theoretical paradigm has been able to thoroughly explain, predict or offer solutions to the problem of men battering women that satisfy those working in the field of intimate violence. One of the serious problems in the study of domestic violence is accommodating the multitude of opposing viewpoints. Interest in
domestic violence spans many professions and disciplines, each with divergent viewpoints. It is this diversity that has presented a challenge for the field. Much of the dispute centers on the etiology of domestic violence and the subsequent solutions to the problem (Barnett, Miller-Perrin & Perrin, 1997). This has resulted in a fragmented knowledge base that lacks synthesis.

Social-psychological theories seem to be the model to bridge the internal world of the batterer with the external social world in which the violence occurs. This paradigm concentrates on the intrapsychic domain of the individual as a unit of analysis, yet also includes the social and cultural context in which interpersonal relationships occur. Therefore self-psychology provides the theoretical foundation of this study. The interpersonal relationship between the father and the son occurs within a cultural context, which is then given meaning through the son’s psychological processes that result from the social relationship with the father.

Self-Psychological Theory

Kohut’s (1978) self-psychological theory of the self emerged out of his work with patients with narcissistic personality disorders and how they related to him as extensions of themselves. Kohut became increasingly concerned that traditional analytic theory and practice was wandering too far from the experiences of his patients and was not addressing the problems with which they seemed to be struggling. His understanding of the use of self in the therapeutic process placed empathy and selfobject functions at the center of clinical practice.

Kohut (1979) outlined four basic concepts of self-psychology: the self; selfobject, fragmentation of the self; and selfobject transference. The self is a depth-psychological
concept that contains the basic layers of the personality including strivings for power and success, and idealized goals, and the basic talents and skills that mediate between ambitions and ideals. The self is attached to a sense of being, both in time and space. It is both a recipient of impressions and an initiator of action. It is different from identity, whereas identity is “the point of convergence between the developed self and the sociocultural position of the individual, and changes over time; the self is continuous. (Kohut, 1979). A male with a strong, rigid masculine identity and a weak and vulnerable self may be prone to fragmentation of the self when the man’s identity is threatened in social interactions. For these men, their psychological cohesion is maintained by the intense need to remain in a particular social role such as being in a powerful, dominating or controlling position over women. On the other hand, a male with a strong well-defined sense of self, may have a diffused identity without a fragmenting self.

Selfobjects

A selfobject is the subjective aspect of a relationship that is supportive of the self (Grosch, 1994). A selfobject is not actually the person or an object but an intrapsychic experience of the selfobject functions; that dimension of our experience of something that shores up the self (Grosch, 1994). Selfobject experiences are functions provided by the parents that occur through a process of optimal responsiveness (Bacall, 1995). The selfobject relationship is the royal road to the development of the self.

Intimate partners seek responses from one another that will provide each persons with the selfobject experiences they were missing in childhood (Bacal, 1992). In other words, the partner will provide empathic optimal responsiveness to evoke, maintain or
enhance the sense of self. Bacal (1992) defines selfobject transference as a selfobject relationship. According to Bacall (1992), "An object is a selfobject when it is experienced intrapsychically as providing functions in a relationship that evoke, maintain, or positively affect the sense of self" (p. 58).

In order for the self to develop into a psychological structure that is cohesive and able to provide self-maintenance capacities, it requires selfobject functions. Bacal (1992), outlined such functions as: "attunement to affective states, validation of subjective experience (including temporary identification with the "rightness" of the child’s perceptions), affect containment, tension regulation, soothing, sustaining and organizing or restoring a weakened sense of self disrupted by selfobject failure, and recognition of the uniqueness and creative potential" (Bacal, 1992, p. 58).

If the maintenance of the self fails to receive the mirroring functions of an admiring selfobject or the merger with an idealized selfobject, there is fragmentation of the self (Grosch, 1994). "Narcissistic rage emerges out of self-fragmentation" (Grosch, 1994, p. 56). The self disintegrates during fragmentation, whereas in a more highly developed self, the failure of the self to merge with idealized selfobjects produces depletion anxiety with the associated feelings of emptiness, depression and shame (Grosch, 1994).

**Attachment Theory**

Attachment theory conceptualizes that infants develop an organized pattern of attachment behaviors that signal the adult caretaker, who is usually the mother, into a trusting and protective relationship. According to Newman and Newman (1991), "Social
attachment is a process through which people develop specific, positive emotional bonds with others” (p. 187). Bowlby (1969) postulated that the development of attachment is based on real interactive experiences with attachment figures and those actual experiences are organized by internal working models. The infant’s subjective experience in social relationships is contained in large-order memory structures and internal representatives that include attention and perception of affect, memory and behavioral responses, thus allowing the infant to form an expectation of the other (Zeanah, Mammen & Lieberman, 1993).

If the caregiver is sensitive and emotionally available, the infant develops a sense of others as dependable and supportive. This consistent and predictable caregiving contributes to the development of a sense of self as worthy of attention and affection, and a view of intimate relationships as positive. It serves to further the child’s exploration and attachment to others and sets a framework for object relations that will be carried throughout life.

Ainsworth (1979) developed an attachment classification that emerged out of her research using the Strange Situation procedure to assess the organization of attachment in infants (Zeanah, Mammen & Lieberman, 1993). This procedure involves the activation of the attachment system by separation of the attachment figure in an unfamiliar setting. Three attachment classifications emerged out of Ainsworth’s research: (a) secure, (b) insecure-avoidant, and (c) insecure-resistant. The secure infants may or may not have cried upon separation from the attachment figure, but they directly approached their caregivers upon reunion in order to re-establish contact. If they were upset, they usually calmed down and resumed their play. Infants with an insecure-avoidant attachment style
did not protest when their attachment figure left the room and they ignored them upon their return (Zeanah, Mammen & Lieberman, 1993). The insecure-resistant infants cried desperately upon separation from their attachment figures and approached them upon their return, but they resisted comforting and were not easily soothed.

Secure attachments are associated with maternal sensitivity. Infants who were classified as insecure-avoidant had mothers who were more openly rejecting of their infant’s needs. The mothers of infants classified as insecure-resistant displayed inconsistent maternal behaviors. These studies have concluded the importance of the connection between the quality of the child/maternal relationship and attachment styles.

Children who are either abused or witness domestic violence may have what Zeanah, Mammen and Lieberman (1993), refer to as an aggressive attachment disorder which is characterized by anger and frustration toward the caregiver. These children who also have symptoms of anxiety begin to use aggression instrumentally around the first year of life. Because of their aggressive nature both verbally and physically towards their attachment figure these children are difficult to comfort (Zeanah, Mammen & Lieberman, 1993).

Attachment in infancy leads to an internal representation of the principal attachment relationship. The quality of the relationship formed in infancy sets the stage for the formation of all other relationships including adult love relationships. Early attachments are critical for human development. Children who experience early loss, or who have failed to bond with a principal attachment figure, or who have experienced inconsistent care giving, experienced physical abuse, witnessed domestic violence or
simply were left emotionally unattended to, will suffer in trying to attach to others later in life.

Mahler, Pine & Bergman (1975) in their research on the psychological birth of the human infant outlined this unfolding intra-psychic process as separation and individuation that culminates with the infant attaining emotional object constancy somewhere around the age of three. Both Bowlby and Mahler identified how the infant needs a psychological home base. At around 15 months during the rapprochement phase, Mahler and colleagues noticed an important change in the child’s relationship to the mother. During the practicing period, “mother was the ‘home base’ to which the child returned often in times of need for food, need for comforting, or the need for ‘refueling’ when tired or bored” (Mahler, Pine & Bergman, 1975, p. 90).

As children become aware of their own separateness and autonomy, they begin to explore the world around them. As social interaction increases, social expansion extends to include the father. Mahler conceptualized that the father as a love object is in an entirely different category from the mother. “Although he is not fully outside the symbiotic union, neither is he ever fully part of it” (Mahler, Pine & Bergman, 1975, p. 90).

Bowlby (1969) also identified the expansion of attachment behaviors during the second year of life to include more than the one discriminated figure. Although Ainsworth (1979) hypothesized that infants seek attachment with one figure even when there are several available caretakers, a large part of that, according to Bowlby, is
determined by the availability of the attachment figures in the home in addition to the primary attachment figure.

According to Bowlby (1969), “During the second year of life a great majority of infants are directing their attachment behavior towards more that one discriminated figure, and often towards several” (p. 304). The principal attachment figure is most likely the mother; the subsidiary attachment figure is most likely a member of the household, either the father or an older sibling. Bowlby (1969) cites Schaffer and Emerson’s study of Scottish infants and reported that 29% of the infants select more than one attachment figure as soon as they begin to show discrimination. Four months following the first indications of attachment behavior, 50% of the children had more than one attachment figure and many had as many as five attachment figures. By the time the children were 18 months, only 13% of the sample had only one attachment figure (Bowlby, 1969).

Bowlby (1969), hypothesized that attachment is critical for survival and that the attachment behavioral system is comprised of behaviors that promote the proximity of the infant with the attachment figure for protection in times of danger and nurturance in times of stress. The infant’s need is for protection and nurturance from the caregiver; he or she needs the attachment figure to serve a homeostatic function between the internal tensions of the individual and the environment. Kohut hypothesized that the child needs the selfobject functions of the caregiver for psychological sustenance in order for the self to develop. The father as a subsidiary attachment figure and as a selfobject may serve to facilitate the separation-individuation process including exploration of the environment and expansion of social relationships.
Lamb (1981) in his research on the father/child relationship found that children are attached to both parents by the second year of life. Lamb found that children appear to show no preference for either parent in stress-free situations and when they are stressed they simply organize their attachment behaviors around whichever parent is available. According to Lamb (1981), “Infants clearly do become attached to both of their parents about the same time” (p. 13). Prior to age two infants prefer their mother, but according to Lamb’s research, only when they are distressed. Fathers do play a significant role as an attachment figure. Lamb (1981) found that, during the second year of life, boys start to show strong preferences for their fathers when stressed. Lamb’s research on the father/child attachment indicates that not only do children attach and bond to their fathers but boys, during the second year of life, prefer the comfort of the fathers to nurture them.

In examining the early upbringing of abusive men, Dutton (1998) found that the biggest childhood contributors to adult abusiveness were being rejected by one’s father, physical abuse by the father and being verbally abused by the father. In this seminal examination of the role of parents, Dutton (1998) found that children who witnessed marital violence also described fathers as cold, rejecting and shaming. A traumatic emotional process began to occur, characterized by shaming and emotional attacks by the father, and intermittent abuse by the father towards the mother or the son. The sons subsequently developed a fearful attachment style which lead to rage and anger, and the ultimately an abusive personality.

Fathers have an effect on how social influences are transmitted to the developing child. A father can serve as a protective barrier and can shape the child’s sense of self and modulate those social influences, which influence individual psychological
functioning, cognition and emotional development; or the father can do just the opposite. Dutton (1998) described how the absent, rejecting and punitive father contributes to the process of borderline personality organization which creates a wounded and vulnerable self that goes on the defensive to shore up a sense of self.

Shame

The affect of shame on the sense of self, self-esteem and identity has been identified as common as anxiety, but far more elusive (Kaufman, 1989, 1991, 1992). Kaufman (1989) stresses the centrality of shame to the inner self and describes shame as an affect that can be entirely an internal experience. The individual can be entirely alone and experience a sense of shame. Shame can have a binding effect on personality development and the exposure of the individual's affect of shame—the feeling of being seen—can paralyze the self (Kaufman, 1989). There is an urge to hide or disappear. This exposure of shame creates a state of loneliness, self-doubt and a feeling that one is flawed.

In the midst of shame, there is an ambivalent longing for reunion with whom ever shamed us. We feel divided and secretly yearn to feel one, whole. The experience of shame feels like a rupture either in self, in a particular relationship, or both. Shame is an affective experience that violates both interpersonal trust and internal security. Intense shame is a sickness within the self, a disease of the spirit (Kaufman, 1989, p. 19).

Dutton (1995) points out that the development of the abusive personality of the male batterer has been shaped by the abusive nature of the batterer's relationship with his
father. Dutton found that cyclic abusers, in addition to being physically and emotionally abused by their fathers, were also rejected and shamed by their fathers. The most assaultive of the male abusers had memories of cold, rejecting and abusive fathers (Dutton & Golant, 1995). These men experienced global attacks on their selfhood from their fathers causing humiliation, embarrassment and shame. Using an instrument developed in Sweden, which translates into “Memories of My Upbringing,” Dutton (1995) found that abusivé men who described their fathers as cold, rejecting and shaming were three times as violent as nonabusive men. Dutton (1995) found that the shaming experiences by the father were strongly related to adult rage, post-traumatic stress disorder and violence in intimate relationships. Dutton found the results to be so significant, that if he had to pick one parental action that generated abuse, it would be shaming by the fathers. These men were also physically abused, so they experienced attacks on the self and also were exposed to abusive modeling. However, in statistical analysis, shaming experiences were strongly related to rage and intimate violence. Dutton & Golant (1995) found that the opposite was not true; paternal physical abuse alone did not predict rage or intimate violence.

According to Dutton and Golant (1995), “In analysis after analysis, the scales measuring rejection were more important in influencing future abusiveness than were those measuring physical abuse alone. Clearly, the emotional aspects of a father’s treatment are paramount” (p. 83). According to Kohut (1978) this lack of responsiveness from the father as a selfobject produces a personality that tends to ward off an internal feeling of deadness. The needs to be affirmed, recognized, accepted and appreciated are missing from one of the most important figures in a child’s life. This results in frantic
attempts to regulate self-esteem and maintain a sense of self and identity. Violence in an intimate relationship may serve as a way to ward off this internalized sense of shame, and bring stimuli into a self lacking in vitality.

Shame has been described as a multidimensional and multi-layered experience that can be passed from generation to generation (Kaufman, 1992). Each stage of the life cycle has its own sources of shame. However, the development of the self requires empathic selfobject relationships by caring emotionally responsive adults who can mirror back the sense of greatness within the emerging personality of the child. Wolf (1988) points out that children require adversarial selfobject experiences: the need to oppose the parent and even be encouraged to do so, without the loss of supportive and emotional responsiveness. Shame destroys the sense of self; it is an attack on the whole self that has been described as soul murder (Dutton & Golant, 1995).

Shame is the affect of inferiority. No other affect is more central to the development of identity. None is closer to the experienced self, or more disturbing. Shame is felt as an inner torment. It is the most poignant experience of the self by the self, whether felt in the humiliation of cowardice, or in the sense of failure to cope successfully with a challenge. Shame is a wound made from the inside, dividing us from ourselves and others (Kaufman, 1989, p. 17).

The self internalizes shame through imagery. Visual, auditory and kinesthetic dimensions of images or scenes occur and affect is attached to them. Kaufman (1989) views affect as a central foundation for the development of the self. According to Kaufman (1989), "Interpersonal needs are experienced as critical scenes focused around recurring patterns of fundamental human interactions" (p. 59). Kaufman (1989) defines
interpersonal needs as the need for a relationship, for touching/holding, a need for identification, a need for differentiation, for affirmation and a need for power. These innate interpersonal needs are experienced as images of what is desired. These interpersonal needs might include the need to have an approving father admire the child’s drawing; the need to say “no” as a toddler and not have the father emotionally disconnect or respond punitively. Or, it may be the child’s need to be swirled around in the arms of the father who smiles and admires the child while giving him a sense that he really can fly.

As the child develops a bonding relationship with a parent, the eyes and face of the parent is central to the development of the child’s self. Extended gazes between the child and the parent allow for them to experientially enter one another (Kaufman, 1989). This would be similar to what Kohut (1979) referred to as mirroring, a reflecting of the grandiosity, admiration and acceptance to the child. This early experience of identification forms an interpersonal bridge between the child and the parent. Kaufman (1989) states, “The child needs to feel convinced that each parent truly wants his or her individual relationship” (p. 33). This relationship needs to occur separately with both the mother and the father. The child needs to feel loved and that the relationship is unique, genuine and honest. In order for the child to feel real and not just some hoped for son or daughter, he has to experience that he is a separate person in his own right (Kaufman, 1989). Parental anger can be an activator of shame (Kaufman, 1989). An angry affect breaks the bond and puts distance in the parental/child relationship; it is a selfobject failure, a rupture in the self-structure of the individual. If the anger is directed at the child over something he did or, in the most tragic sense, for who he is, a deep sense of
inadequacy begins to develop in the core of the self. The sense of self is crushed; it is defeated and the child feels deeply humiliated.

The father’s relationship with the son is a critical component in the development of the self. The shaming of the child and the failure to provide selfobject functions lead to a psychological powerlessness in adulthood. The need to exert power over others, particularly in intimate relationships, through violent tactics emerges from a lack of internal control, a feeling of powerlessness that originates within the father and son relationship.

Male Socialization

The road to male socialization and the attainment of a masculine identity is both a unique and complex process that begins at birth and is affected by social, psychological, legal, cultural and ethnic factors (Meth, 1990). Although male socialization begins within the relationship between the mother and the child, male socialization is influenced by expectations of society and the culture. Each culture prescribes certain ways for men to think, feel and behave. Although the cost of such constricted gender roles is high, most men fear anything feminine and respond to the social forces of masculinity, especially power, dominance and aggression (Meth & Pasick, 1990).

Object relations theorists have contributed significantly to understanding the intimate inner world of men in terms of their relationships to women. One perspective on object relations argues that the search for relationships is what motivates human behavior and the quality of those relationships creates the personality structure (Rice, 1992). The psychological birth of the human infant is a separate event from the physical birth and
occurs during the first three years of life as the child attaches to the mother and then ultimately begins the process of separation/individuation. In order for the child to obtain object constancy (an internal psychological representation of the mother), the mother has to be in tune to the child’s physical and psychological needs, and be emotionally responsive (Mahler, Pine & Bergman, 1976). Very soon after attaching, men are forced to detach themselves from their mothers and anything feminine. For those who have an emotionally available, loving mother, they have to distance themselves from the most intense love affair of a lifetime. Chodorow (1978) argues that since boys have to repress their early identification with their mothers, they repress their capacity for intimacy. Pittman (1992) points out that women raise their daughters to be with them always; women raise their sons to leave them. If the father is not available as a selfobject, as the boy moves away from his mother, attaining masculinity takes on an ever-increasing important role. These men leave home developmentally incomplete. They have not bonded with their fathers and strive to find their masculinity (Pittman, 1992).

Some men never recover. For those men, whose early years of life were not characterized by a loving and attentive maternal figure, the lack of trust and the weak bonding produce a man who longingly searches to fill up the void and who desperately seeks a sense of self through dominating and controlling women. Chodorow (1978) argues that men’s dependency on women remains covert and repressed. Because of the early lack of empathy and understanding, they may enter interpersonal relationships as adults with the emotional needs of an infant and an attachment style that is aggressive, anxious or one of avoidance. Men are ambivalent about this early separation and as a result are more vulnerable and have more anxiety in intimate relationships. Lacking the
ability to handle intimacy, men reduce their lives to their economic function (Pittman, 1992). Men define their masculinity by sexuality and by how much they can control and compete with other men. Some men define their masculinity by how much they can dominate women (Pittman, 1992). Because girls do not have to denounce their identification with their mothers and stay connected, they do not have to separate, but can remain relationally connected. By remaining identified with the same sex parent, they don’t experience the loss of the mother in the same way a boy does.

It is hypothesized that for men to develop a sense of self, that (in addition to the need for the mother to provide selfobject functions) boys are also dependent upon the selfobject functions provided by the father. The child’s sense of self depends upon the selfobject functions of the father, particularly for boys who are forced to separate psychologically from their mothers. The quality of the father/son relationship and the emotional availability of the father to empathetically respond to the child’s emerging self are critical for the health and vitality of the development of the self. The self emerges out of a complex relational, inter-subjective, selfobject experience (Bacall, 1995). According to Grosch (1994), “Shame and rage are explained as byproducts of selfobject failures” (p. 49). Kaufman (1989) described shame as the affect of inferiority and stated that no other affect is more disturbing or closer to the experienced self. Shame emerges out of self-depletion and that narcissistic rage emerges out of self-fragmentation (Grosch, 1994). “Violence can be understood within the framework of self-psychology as a disintegration product which provides emergency structure for the fragmenting self” (Feldman, 1988, p.281).
Empathy and Self-Structure

Empathy and vicarious introspection: (the emotional knowing of another human being), rather than intellectual understanding, came to the forefront of psychoanalytic methodology (Bacal, 1995). Empathy is a special mode of perceiving the psychological experience of another; it is identification, a quick and deep understanding (Berger, 1987). Empathic immersion in the psychological field of another human being is to remain continuously in tune to what the individual is experiencing in a moment-by-moment flow over time (Rowe & MacIsaac, 1989). Although empathy and intuition are both means to establish close contact, they attempt to deeply understand different aspects of the human experience. Empathy, as a function of the experiencing ego, relates to the world of emotions; intuition is a function of the observing ego and relates to the world of ideas (Berger, 1987).

In order for children to grow into healthy adults, they need certain empathic responses from the parents. When these responses are lacking or in the worst-case scenario, if the parent is abusive and shaming, defects begin to develop in the self. Self-pathology produces an individual who has problems with impulse control, self-esteem and modulating anxiety (Feldman, Johnson & Bell, 1990). When under stress, an individual with a weakened sense of self will experience intense anxiety. Kohut (1978) referred to this as disintegration anxiety and when an individual is experiencing fragmentation of the self, they will seek others to restore a sense of self-cohesion. The ability to self-soothe is not an internal resource available to the individual; they failed to have it provided as a child and they will frantically search for it as an adult.
The Influence of the Father

The demographic profile of American families has changed in regard to both gender roles and parental roles. The rapid shift in women entering the workforce has forced changes in the roles of women within the family and has subsequently modified men's roles within the family (Coltrane, 1996). Many scholars have been examining the changing meaning of fatherhood. There has been a growing interest in understanding men's perceptions about their father role identities; the ways and the extent resident and nonresident fathers interact with their children; fathers' involvement in child care; the effect of race and poverty on fatherhood; and paternal conduct, relationship quality and child outcomes (Marsiglio, 1995). There has been a growing interest in fatherhood and the influence of the father on children's well-being (Cohen, 1993; LaRossa, 1992; Hawkins, Christiansen, Sargent & Hill, 1995; Marsiglio, 1995; Allen & Doherty, 1996 & Mackey, 1996).

Fatherhood is in transition. The culture of fatherhood, which includes the shared norms, values, and beliefs about men's parenting, and conduct of fatherhood, what men actually do, are not in sync (LaRossa, 1992). The new nurturing father who actively participates in the daily caregiving of his children and is involved in a more intimate and expressive way has emerged as a new style of fatherhood. However, the culture of fatherhood, how we would like fathers to be, is actually changing quicker than the conduct of fatherhood, what father's actually do (LaRossa, 1992). The more involved father is what some fathers would like to be doing and what women advocate, yet this style of fatherhood is primarily a middle-class and even an upper-middle class phenomenon (Rotunda, 1985). Mackey (1996) would argue that by any standards, a
precondition for successful fathering is the sheer physical ongoing presence of the man in the life of the child. Although being accessible is a necessary function for fathers, we have yet to fully understand what being accessible emotionally may mean in the life of a child.

Lamb (1987) has defined paternal involvement into three components: engagement, accessibility, and responsibility. Engagement is the one-on-one contact a father has with his child doing such things as feeding, playing, talking, caring for a sick child and helping with homework. These caregiving behaviors foster trust, provide modeling for father involvement and facilitate a bonding between fathers and children. Accessibility, although less intense, is the kind of involvement in which the father is doing one thing, but is ready and available to respond to the child. The father may be cooking, watching television, reading, cutting the grass or household chores, but is what Mahler, Pine and Bergman (1975) referred to as a “home base” available for “emotional refueling”. The third component of paternal involvement is responsibility, which means who is accountable for the child’s welfare and care (Lamb, 1987). Responsibility involves such things as taking the child to purchase shoes, or staying home with the child when he/she is sick, taking the child to the doctor or dentist, attending parent/teacher conferences and other such tasks that support and promote the growth and development of the child.

Lamb (1987) in reviewing studies comparing contemporary fathers’ involvement with children and contemporary mothers’ involvement with children found that regardless of whether the mother was employed or not, mothers appear to carry over 90% of the responsibility for children. In two-parent families where the mother is
unemployed, fathers spend between one fifth to one quarter as much time as mothers do in engagement and about one-third as much time being accessible to their children. In two-parent families where the mother is employed, fathers spend 33% as much time as mothers do in engagement and 65% as much time being accessible (Lamb, 1987).

The trend of paternal involvement in engagement and accessible tasks, such as housework and child care combined, has increased from 20% in 1965 to 30% in 1981 (Pleck, 1997). As women have increasingly entered the workforce, men's participation in housework has increased. Pleck (1997) citing Robinson’s (1988) study found that 34% of the married men shared in housework. Although many studies indicate that men are participating in more of the housework, in examining data from the 1987 National Survey of Families and Households (NSFH), Coletrane (1996) found that women’s overall labor time is greater than men’s and that it is concentrated in repetitive indoor time consuming tasks, whereas men’s time doing household labor was concentrated in outdoor tasks. Men spent an average of 22 hours per week in nine types of household labor, compared to 38 hours per week for women (Coletrane, 1996).

As researchers examine the amount of time fathers spend with their children, they may overlook an important dimension of fatherhood: the emotional availability of the father. Kohut (1979), placed empathy at the center of self-psychological theory. According to Kohut, in order for children to grow into mature persons with a cohesive sense of self, they need certain psychological responses from their caregivers. We have most often focused our attention on the importance of the mother in providing these necessary selfobject functions of mirroring, idealizing and alterego. The formation of the self is dependent upon the caretakers within the child’s environment, his/her being able to
accept the emerging child with all of the child’s magic and wonder, as well as the child’s weaknesses and vulnerabilities. If the father rejects the child, or if the father is too critical, too harsh, too withholding or too involved with his own struggle to maintain his own vulnerable sense of self, then the child’s self will be adversely affected. The child will try to hide that which has been rejected in him and will work fervently trying to compensate for it (Johnson, 1987).

Fathers today are expected to be more expressive and active with their children; in essence more nurturing and more available. The question concerning men who batter is: what type of relationship did they have with their fathers? “One of the most important reasons for studying fathers is to examine how their level and particular type of conduct are related to children’s emotional, psychological, and financial well-being” (Marsiglio, 1996, p. 7).

Men have long been typecast in the instrumental role of the good provider (Cohen, 1993). Fatherhood has been shaped around work and being able economically to provide for the family (Pleck, 1987). The work role and the size of the paycheck have measured masculine identity and subsequently fatherhood. This theory of male identity places emphasis on men’s satisfaction with their father role in activities outside the home.

In studying new fathers, Cohen (1993) found that very few men saw their roles in the traditional term of breadwinner; in fact, they described their father role with words emphasizing nurturing parenting. The men described the nurturing activities as teaching their children values, important and necessary life skills, being emotionally supportive, physically affectionate, and playful (Cohen, 1993). The men emphasized their nurturing
role as the most important role to them; a role they also indicated was the most unlike that of their own fathers (Cohen, 1993).

Dutton found that the effects of paternal physical abuse by itself did not predict anger or even abusiveness in adults, but when Dutton examined the effects of shame on male abusiveness, he found that the shaming experience is strongly related to the development of the abusive personality and rage. According to Dutton and Golant (1995), “Shame is a generalized corrosive punishment of the self rather than a punishment of the act” (p. 84). The inability for the child to evoke an empathic response from the father positions the father as a selfobject failure, and results in a self-fragmentation in the child.

Kohut (1977) recognized that there were times when the infant needed to be soothed by the mother. At these times, the infant experiences the caregiver mirroring her inner states as an extension of the infant’s self rather than another individual (Nathanson, 1992). In this sense the caregiver acts as an external modulator of whatever affect the infant displays. A father, who is rejecting and shaming of the child, fails to serve as a selfobject necessary for self-cohesion. Such a father possibly serves as a source of merger and identification, whereas the child becomes totally at one with the what he experiences with the father. In essence, he becomes like he experienced the relationship.

The Father’s Impact on Child Development

In the professional literature, the relationship with the father has been minimized as a potential selfobject relationship and the focus has been primarily on the mother as
the central selfobject relationship. Herzog (1982) examined children’s reactions to their fathers who were absent either completely or partially because of divorce, and found that these children displayed aggressive themes and content in their fantasy, play and dreams. Herzog concluded that one of the father’s roles in children’s life during early childhood is to modulate the aggressive drive. Herzog described the affective state and longing experienced by children who were deprived of their father as “father hunger”. In his study of 72 children in play therapy, Herzog (1982) concluded that the father’s absence in the child’s mind was linked with the aggressive themes in play therapy.

Wallerstein and Kelly (1982) found in their research of children coping with divorce that children’s self-esteem is linked to continued contact with the father following the divorce. In their longitudinal study, the researchers found that at 18 months and again at 4 to 5 years afterwards, a significant connection among low self-esteem, depression and disappointment in the father’s infrequent or erratic visits. Most of the men continued to visit their children at 4 to 5 years post-divorce. Three-quarters of the men lived within an hour’s drive of their children. A quarter of the children were visited once a week or more; 40% were visited once a month or more; 10% saw their children on vacations and holidays; 20% visited their children erratically and infrequently; and 10% had no visits at all (Wallerstein & Kelly, 1982). However, for those children whose fathers were disinterested or rejecting, the unwanted children experienced intense disappointment and a diminished self-esteem. The younger children were the most vulnerable. Many became depressed and showed other symptoms such as obesity, poor learning and a pervasive sad affect. According to Wallerstein & Kelly (1982), “There
seemed no question that the absence or disruption of contact with the father will exercise a chilling effect on children’s self-esteem” (p. 464).

Lamb (1976) concluded from his research that infants are attached to both parents but, they prefer their mothers when they are distressed and that affiliative behaviors measure a preference for the fathers during the first two years of life (Lamb, 1981). Lamb observed that infants become attached to mothers and fathers at the same time. In studying the comings and goings of mother, father and a female stranger, it was found that infants expressed separation protest when either the mother or the father left, but not the female stranger.

Yablonsky (1982) in examining father/son relationships cites a study by Andry who studied the quality of parental affection and love as it relates to delinquent youth and non-delinquent youth. Delinquents felt that their fathers did not love them and did not care about them, whereas non-delinquents tended to feel loved by both parents. Delinquent boys indicated that their fathers would be embarrassed openly to show affection to their sons. The non-delinquent boys felt that their fathers cared for them and openly showed love.

Psychoanalytic theory since 1975 has examined the father’s role in child development from many perspectives. The father’s role, function and importance during the pre-Oedipal and Oedipal stages of development has been explored, and how the father influences the development of the child’s sexual orientation and gender identity has been a focus of inquiry. Psychoanalysts have also studied the father’s developmental process of fathering over time with an emphasis on the father’s own childhood; and the role of the father during latency and adolescence (Machtlinger, 1981). It is the father’s function as a
selfobject that is of central concern, specifically the father's availability to provide the selfobject needs that are required for the development of a healthy, cohesive self. It is hypothesized that if the mother fails to provide the necessary selfobject needs, then the father's availability can either serve to provide these functions for a cohesive self, or, if there is negative paternal involvement, contribute significantly to a fragile sense of self.

Probably one of Kohut's major contributions to understanding narcissism is the central importance of empathy. Kohut felt that a break in empathy between self and selfobject lead to disintegration anxiety and that this was the deepest anxiety an individual could experience. Kohut (1981), explained it as, "Disintegration anxiety means the loss of empathy, the loss of an empathic milieu, the loss of an understanding milieu, not necessarily of the correct action, but the loss of any understanding" (p. 531).

When the fragile self is exposed to stress, which leads to disintegration anxiety, the response can be certain pathological behaviors such as aggression and violence, which are mobilized to fill up the hole of empty despair. Such behaviors are attempts to stabilize the self-structure and prevent further fragmentation (Feldman, 1988). Disintegration anxiety further disrupts the fragile self and violence can be understood as an emergency measure to restore cohesion (Feldman, 1988).

Kohut (1984) thought that the children, who suffered the most from a lack of emotional responsiveness, were not necessarily those children who whose parents misunderstood them, but those children whose mothers' personalities were absent. The child feels guilty for demanding something from his mother that she simply does not have to give, because she does not have it in her to give. Johnson (1987) understood this well when he described the development of the false self. Narcissistic injury occurs when the
environment needs the child to be someone other than who he really is. Development becomes arrested when the need for reflective mirroring does not occur; it fails to support the child to grow to be who he really is. Narcissistic rage signals a breach between grandiose elements of the self and need for approving and admiring selfobjects (Sawrie, Watson, & Biderman, 1991).

A significant proportion of the resulting pathology results from the rejection of the self. Children will mirror their environment: they will reject in themselves what was rejected by others. The shamed and rejected individual will try to hide that which has been rejected and will work diligently to compensate for it. Most likely, the emotionally injured will shun or be angered by those who display what was rejected in them (Johnson, 1987).

The father’s relationship with the child can serve to provide the much needed selfobject functions. Wolf (1988) outlines six selfobject needs that include mirroring, idealizing, alterego, adversarial, merger and efficacy selfobject needs that seem central to the father’s importance as a contributor to the child’s sense of self. Mirroring needs are the child’s need to be admired, to be recognized, to feel affirmed, accepted, appreciated and to experience an awe-struck parental selfobject who is head over heels in love with the emerging child. At times the child will need to merge into the selfobject and feel at one with the parent.

Throughout his life a person will experience himself as a cohesive harmonious firm unit in time and space, connected with his past and pointing meaningfully into a creative-productive future, but only as long as, at each stage in his life, he experiences certain representatives of his human surroundings as joyfully
responding to him, as available to him as sources of idealized strength and
calmness, as being silently present but in essence like him, and, at any rate, able
to grasp his inner life more or less accurately so that their responses are attuned to
his needs and allow him to grasp their inner life when his is in need of such
sustenance (Kohut, 1984, p. 52).

The idealizing needs of children require that they experience themselves as being
a part of an admired and respected selfobject (Kaufman, 1996). According to Bacall,
(1992), “An idealizing selfobject relationship denotes the experience of feeling linked to
the admired other—the self, in effect, walks proudly in the shadow of the admired object”
(p. 59). The child needs to merge with a stable, calm and wise selfobject in order for the
self to emerge. The failure of the mother or the father to provide this function leaves the
child desperately searching for the self and the missing selfobject functions. Narcissistic
rage merges when the fragile self is misunderstood, or when the flow of empathic supply
of selfobject functions is cut off.

Alterego needs or twinship needs are the need to experience an alikeness with the
of identifying and merging with an idealized other, who through a child’s eye’s is an
example of greatness, strength, and power, that child will experience his own strength,
ideals, and a sense of competence” (p. 285). This sense of internal competency will
provide the foundations for the self to confidently get the needs of the self met through
relationships with others (Anechiarico, 1990). A fragmented self, on the other hand, will
be disappointed in the failures of empathic responsiveness and be prone to narcissistic rage.

The provision of adversarial selfobject needs requires a parent to allow, support and encourage their children to oppose them without emotionally withdrawing from them. Parents have to manage the child's need to actively oppose them, while they self repair their own narcissistic injuries over the child's rejection of them or the child's resistance to parental influence. It is the continued support and emotional availability (the self-sustaining responsiveness from the selfobject) that is necessary. Efficacy needs involve the need to experience the ability to influence the selfobject and to evoke needed selfobject experiences without feeling guilty for demanding too much for the needed sustenance for the self.

Wolf (1988) outlines six types of selfobject needs that Kaufman (1996) views as valuable concepts for therapists to incorporate into clinical practice. When the therapist is responsive to the individual's feelings and experiences, confirms them, their views of reality and their sense of self, they are in effect providing selfobject functions to strengthen the sense of self (Kaufman, 1996). Offering confrontations, correcting cognitive distortions, offering sympathy or giving advise, may be experienced by the individual as being judgmental or harsh, or at least not very understanding.

Balswick (1981) in studying male inexpressiveness and the differences between social relationships and intimate relationships found the former is based on a bond, but the latter is based upon commitment and maintained by communication. This has implications for examining the affect of the father's involvement in the lives of adult men. The level of involvement and the quality of attachment between the father and the
son, from a self-psychological perspective, would appear to have an influence on whether
the child experiences sex role strain and the ability to modulate self-esteem over
conflicting gender role norms. With the current clash between traditional and modern
man, the father’s involvement appears to be central for masculine identity and a cohesive
self.

Summary

In self-psychological theory, the father serves as the main source of male identity.
If the paternal emotional bond between a father and the child is strong, then the father’s
ability to provide selfobject functions would be a significant factor in the child’s
developing sense of self. To be understood, calmed, soothed and accepted by the father;
and to have the father reflect a sense of wonder and awe, serves to contribute to a positive
sense of self and subsequently higher self-esteem in the child.

The self is defined almost entirely by the other or by the other’s response to him.

In the absence of the other, or in the absence of the favorable response, there is
emptiness, despair, depression, or agitation, which is the narcissist’s underlying
emotional state (Johnson, 1987, p. 52).

On the other hand, the abusive and rejecting father who creates unrealistic
expectations in his child and then rejects him for not living up to his expectations, creates
narcissistic injury. No matter what he does, the father wants him to be someone different
from who he really is. The narcissistically injured individual will go to extreme lengths
to find mirroring objects or to coerce those he has into the responses desired (Johnson,
1987).
Research Questions

The following research questions were developed in order to understand more about men who batter. These research questions emerged out of: (a) direct practice conducting treatment groups for male spouse abusers; (b) a review of the literature on the male batterers, domestic violence, and the role of fathers in child development; and (c) self psychological theory.

Research Question #1
Do men who use physical violence as a means to resolve interpersonal conflict have a different type of relationship with their fathers than non-physically violent men? Do physically violent men have lower mean scores on positive paternal emotional engagement than non-physically violent men? Did the violent group have a more negative relationship with their fathers than the non-violent group? Is there a difference in terms of how accessible fathers were between the two groups? Was there more divorce in one group over the other and did these men always live with their fathers while growing up?

Research Question #2
Are men who had fathers who actively engaged in the role of the religious leader of the family less violent than men whose fathers did not take on this role or who took it on to a lesser degree?
Research Question #3

Is high self-esteem related to whether or not men have a high positive emotional relationship with their fathers? Will men who have fathers who were not as involved in a positive emotional way have lower self-esteem?

Research Question #4

Is there a relationship between the level of self-esteem and physical violence in intimate relationships?

Research Question #5

Is the level of the respondents’ education related to intimate violence?

Hypothesis

Hypotheses #1

Men who had fathers who were highly involved with them and emotionally available in a positive way will be non-violent in intimate relationships. The hypothesis is that positive paternal emotional engagement is a predictor of non-violence in an intimate relationship.

Hypotheses #2

Men who had fathers who were positively engaged with their children and who were emotionally responsive to their children will have higher self-esteem than those men who did not have fathers as highly engaged in a positive way. The hypothesis is that positive paternal emotional engagement is positively related to self-esteem for abusive and non-abusive men.
Hypotheses #3
Men with low self-esteem are more likely to be violent in intimate relationships than men with high self-esteem. The hypothesis is that self-esteem is a predictor of intimate violence.

Hypotheses #4
Men who have fathers teaching them right from wrong and who provide spiritual leadership within the home will be non-violent. The hypothesis is that the moral father role is a predictor of intimate violence.

Hypotheses #5
Children who observe their fathers abuse their mothers will most likely identify with their fathers and imitate their behaviors. Men who experienced negative paternal engagement such as witnessing marital violence will be violent in intimate relationships. The hypothesis is that witnessing marital violence is predictor of intimate violence.

Hypotheses #6
Men who experienced negative paternal involvement such as child abuse will learn that aggression is a way to solve problems and that abuse is a normal part of family life. Men who were abused as children are at a higher risk for later intimate violence than non-abused men are. The hypothesis is that child abuse is a positive predictor of intimate violence.
Hypotheses #7

Fathers who shame and humiliate their children will have an inadequate sense of self and may resort to violence when feeling threatened. The hypothesis is that shame is a predictor of intimate violence.
CHAPTER 3
THE FATHERHOOD SCALE

Introduction and Statement of Purpose

Understanding the relationship abusive men had with their fathers while growing up is a missing link in understanding violence against women. The knowledge gained by knowing more about the type of relationship men had with their fathers, and how that may be related to intimate violence, might potentially be useful to incorporate into the group treatment of men who abuse women. Witnessing marital violence and being abused as a child are research findings that have been consistently linked to male violence against a female intimate partner. Knowing more about abusive mens’ perceptions of their relationship with their fathers and how that relationship relates to mens’ self-esteem is needed in order to have a better understanding of how the role of the father may be related to violence against women.

Overview of The Fatherhood Scale

The Fatherhood Scale (FS) is a 75-item self-administered instrument that measures the type of relationship men had with their fathers while growing up, including both the extent and the quality of that relationship. The scale also measures how men
fulfill cultural expectations about how to be a father. The main research question explored in this study was to determine if the type of relationship a man had with his father while growing up is a predictor of male violence against a female intimate partner. The Fatherhood Scale is not just concerned with whether or not the father remained in the home or whether or not he was a good provider to his children; but sought to understand the depth and quality of the father/child relationship. The Fatherhood Scale measures the ways in which fathers engage with their children doing activities and various parenting tasks that enhance the child's psychological and social well being. The Fatherhood Scale also measures the extent and quality of the emotional relationship the father had with the child.

The Fatherhood Scale measures the type of relationships men had with their fathers; therefore, the constructs needed to include various levels of paternal engagement ranging along a continuum from positive to negative. An item representing positive paternal engagement is, "My father told me he liked the way I did things." Whereas, an item measuring negative paternal involvement is, "My father used to get angry and say he didn't like me."

The instrument also measures the kind of engagement fathers had with their children and the amount of time fathers spent with their children doing a particular activity. For example, the item, "I remember playing sports with my father" describes a particular kind of paternal involvement; however, some individuals may have never experienced this type of interaction with their fathers, some rarely, whereas for others, this may have always been a way they spent time with their fathers. A more important type of paternal engagement related to male violence against a female partner is
measured by the item, "My father hit my mother". In addition to measuring if an event occurred, The Fatherhood Scale also measures the extent to which the event occurred. Respondents rate the frequency of the event on a Likert type scale ranging from never to always.

In addition to measuring how fathers engage with their children, the scale measures the quality of the father/child emotional relationship. An item measuring the emotional relationship is, "My father was loving towards me."

The researcher developed the instrument based upon self-psychology, a theoretical model that accounts for the process of development of the sense of self in individuals, subsequently shaping their self-esteem. This research study also sought to explore if the type of relationship the father had with his children influenced the child’s self-esteem, since low self-esteem in the male may be associated with violence against a female intimate (Hotaling and Sugarman, 1986)

Because the culture and the historical era also define the conduct of fatherhood, The Fatherhood Scale also measures the various roles men have been expected to fulfill. The roles fathers have traditionally assumed are: (a) moral father, (b) gender role model, (c) breadwinner and (d) nurturing father. An item measuring the moral father is: "My father used to say grace at mealtime." An item measuring the gender role model is: "My dad taught me to fight back." The breadwinner role was operationalized by an item such as, "My father provided well for us financially." "My father hugged me" is an item measuring the nurturing father role.

It was important in the development of The Fatherhood Scale to operationalize the type of relationships fathers had with their children, not just whether or not they were
accessible to their children. A retrospective design was used to examine the relationship that men had with their fathers while growing up.

Retrospective accounts have been criticized for methodological weakness and research on wife assault has overused these accounts of self-reporting. Dutton and Starzomski (1994) found that men who were court-mandated to treatment tended to idealize their upbringing and minimized abusive behaviors in their parents. Yet, it is sometimes important to inquire into people's subjective perceptions. Intimate violence occurs within the privacy of intimate relationships and self-reports are critical in the study of male violence against women. People who may not report the crime to the police may be more likely to report it anonymously in a survey (YIlo, 1997). Other researchers have found self-reports to be reliable in the study of violent behaviors (Straus, 1979 & Dutton, 1995).

Self-psychological theory is interested in the subjective experience of the individual, where empathy and deep understanding are central constructs leading to healthy psychological functioning and high self-esteem. Thus, for this study, men's recollections of their relationships with their fathers are more significant than the reality of those experiences. Therefore, this research design incorporates self-psychological theory as an explanatory model for the development of the self.
Design of the Fatherhood Scale

Rationale for the Design of The Fatherhood Scale

The National Research Council’s (1996) report on understanding violence against women, suggested that researchers needed to use integrative metatheoretical approaches to conduct research on intimate violence, so that conceptual models include the historical, cultural, and social factors that effect people. Specifically, what has been lacking in research on intimate violence is how the broad social and cultural influences are moderated and/or directly transmitted within the family system. The National Research Council provided a specific directive to researchers to include in their theoretical models, "the processes whereby social influences are ‘transmitted’ to and represented within individual psychological functioning, including cognition and motivation” (Crowell & Burgess, 1996, p. 50). The historical era and those social and cultural forces that define what the ‘model’ is for a father’s relationship with his children affect how men learn to be fathers. The quality of that relationship effects individual psychological functioning that lasts a lifetime (Dutton, 1998).

Examining a particular variable in isolation falls short of thoroughly explaining intimate violence. As researchers test multivariate models, they must also direct greater attention to those sets of factors within any particular domain that are the most salient and offer explanatory power (Feldman & Ridley, 1995). Therefore, the broad category, type of relationship, needs careful scrutiny in order to identify particular behaviors displayed by the father that may be most salient and offer the most explanatory power.
Operational Considerations

Whenever the researcher is interested in examining a broad and abstract concept, such as the type of relationship that a man had with his father, it requires thoughtful consideration about the constructs one is actually attempting to operationalize. The scale measures specific acts and how often those acts occurred. The researcher considered how to conceptualize the concepts that defined how fathers engage with their children in a positive way, and how they connected emotionally. Because the study of abusive mens’ relationships with their fathers had never been undertaken in this way, and since the research study was based upon theory, the researcher developed The Fatherhood Scale to measure both the quality and quantity of the father/child relationship based upon concrete acts.

Because this is a retrospective design, it was also important to capture the feelings men had towards their fathers while growing up. While some of the items ask about specific perceptions men had towards their fathers, they were phrased in such a way that allowed for the respondents to imply their own meaning to the item. For example, “I know my father cared about me,” allows for wide interpretation. Some respondents may “know” this because they “felt” cared about, while others may “know” this because “they were told they were cared about,” and still others may “know” because of what their fathers did for them. What this takes into consideration, is the social and cultural uniqueness of each individual, and allows the respondents to make meaning out of the item and respond to it based upon their own interpretation. This and similar items measure the subjective experience the adult has of his father. Items such as, “My father
made me feel special,” and “My father understood me,” are not factual observable events; they are internalized subjective images that emerged out of the father/child relationship.

**Theoretical Foundation of The Fatherhood Scale**

The Fatherhood Scale is based upon self-psychological theory (Kohut, 1978). The self-psychological constructs operationalized include the selfobject functions of: (a) mirroring, (b) idealizing, and (c) twinship. Self-psychological theory provides an explanatory model of how fathers shape and influence the child’s self esteem, and in this case, possibly whether or not the sons will become violent in intimate relationships. A correlational research design was used in this study because it not only helps to understand how mens’ relationships with their fathers may be related to intimate violence, but the degree to which paternal involvement is related to intimate violence.

Self-psychological theory postulates that the relationship of the parent with the child provides selfobject functions that are defined as the inner subjective experience of the child’s own internal feelings about the relationship. Selfobjects are not the person, or the self of the other person, but they are the child’s experience of the relationship (Bacall, 1995). The selfobject functions measured in the scale are mirroring, idealizing selfobject needs and adversarial selfobject needs. Mirroring is the ability of the parent to be empathic and emotionally available to the child. Idealizing selfobject needs are the ability of the parent to be calm and self-soothing, so that the child will look up to and internalize the qualities of the parent. Adversarial selfobject needs are the child’s need to actively oppose and resist the parent, and not experience the parent as emotionally withdrawing.
In addition to self-psychological theory (Kohut, 1979), the theoretical model on which the scale was developed emerged out of the literature on the roles of fatherhood (Lamb, 1997). Examining the roles of fatherhood takes into account how the historical era, the culture and the social expectations that create our ideas of fatherhood shape and influence the conduct of fathers. The role expectations that guide how fathers believe they should fulfill their role are also an important variable to consider when examining paternal behavior. For example, the moral father role has been described as the dominant, stern patriarch (Griswald, 1993). Historically, this role defines a father as a man who is the head of the household and the spiritual leader of the home, residing over daily prayer and teaching the Bible (Pleck & Pleck, 1997). This role, potentially oppressive to women, may serve to teach children right from wrong, thus building a character that may be important in learning non-violent ways of resolving conflict. To the contrary, the role may teach dominance, an increased need for power and may be a contributing factor leading to intimate violence.

On more of an emotional level, the father of the abusive male may interact with his child in a detached, distant and emotionally aloof role. This role, possibly learned by his own relationship with his father, may be frustrating to the child because he is unable to attach and connect emotionally with his father. Bowlby (1969) asserted that unmet attachment needs are followed by anger. Men who have fathers who lack warmth, take on a distant role and fail to connect on an emotional level with their children, are in essence providing a model for intimacy that may lead to abusiveness in adult intimate relationships (Dutton, 1995).
The type of paternal involvement fathers have in the lives of their children has been conceptualized to mean the time fathers spend with their children in proportion to the time mothers spend with their children (Lamb, Pleck, Chamov, & Levine, 1985). Paternal involvement has been operationalized as (a) engagement, (b) availability and (c) responsibility (Pleck & Pleck, 1997). The Fatherhood Scale measures paternal involvement and the quality of the emotional bond.

Methods for Developing The Fatherhood Scale

Discussion of the Major Constructs

The Fatherhood Scale consists of three subscales that measure the type of paternal relationship men had with their fathers and six subscales that measure the roles that influence paternal conduct. Positive paternal engagement and positive paternal emotional responsiveness can be combined to form positive paternal emotional engagement. These two scales were combined to measure the overall positive relationship that includes both paternal involvement and emotional accessibility. The negative type of paternal involvement consists of items that measure shaming, child abuse, harsh treatment, and witnessing marital violence. These items can also be used independently to measure specific types of negative paternal involvement.

Because the ways in which men engage in the role of fatherhood varies, the scale also measures four historical roles that have influenced paternal behavior: moral father role, good provider role, sex-role model and the nurturing father role. Inclusion of roles in the scale broadens the usefulness of the scale by measuring one aspect of social influences that affect paternal behavior.
Positive Paternal Emotional Engagement

It is theorized that when fathers are involved with their children in a positive way, such as spending time playing with them, helping them with their homework or going on activities with them, that this type of interaction serves to enhance the emotional connection between a father and his child. If the child perceives and experiences the father as emotionally responsive and empathic, then the child will feel emotionally connected and deeply understood. If, on the other hand, the father is engaged with his child, and yet unavailable emotionally, then the child will experience the father as emotionally distant and aloof. Dutton and Golant, (1995) found that feeling a lack of warmth from one’s father was one of the biggest contributors to wife assault.

It is hypothesized that the more positively involved the father is with the child, the more likely the child will have high self-esteem. As the father takes the time to be involved with his children and if he is emotionally available and responsive to his children, then their sense of self will be solid and strong.

Shaming By The Father

Shame is an internalized sense of inferiority. Fathers shame their children when they attack the child’s core self. Shame destroys the infrastructure of the sense of self. Angry comments made by the father such as, “What’s wrong with you?” do not provide for a stable and positive resource for positive identity formation. A cold, rejecting and aloof father produces a boy who has a fragile sense of self and a weak sense of identity (Dutton & Golant, 1995). Kaufman (1989) hypothesized that the self unfolds, evolves and becomes shaped by ongoing interaction in the interpersonal environment. For
example, as the child interacts with his father, there are many visual, auditory and kinesthetic experiences that are internalized. It is through imagery that the self becomes internalized. These multiple and repeated interactions with the father become internalized images or scenes: images that are internalized with emotional meaning.

**Witnessing the Father Abuse the Mother**

Children derive meaning out of the violence they witness. They also have an emotional reaction to it. As children observe the father abuse the mother, they are not only exposed to violent role models but are exposed to a customary set of attitudes towards women, and a way of thinking about resolving conflict that shapes their own attitudes and belief systems. Observing paternal violence is one set of experiences that characterizes a negative relationship with a father (Dutton, 1998).

**Experiencing Child Abuse By The Father**

Being abused by the father is another formative indicator of a constellation of paternal behaviors that measures a negative paternal relationship. Fathers who are abusive are less likely to display understanding and warmth towards their children. As a result, the children feel their fathers’ anger, hostility and rage; which subsequently is a characteristic of their emotional connection to the father. Abusive parents have anger control problems, low frustration tolerance, depression, low self-esteem and deficits in empathy (Dore, Doris & Wright, 1995). Abusive parents also have negative perceptions of their children, and regard them as bad kids, as difficult or they view their behavior as intended to annoy them (Barnett, Miller-Perrin & Perrin, 1997). These kinds of perceptions influence a negative view of the child. This reflects back to the child an
image of being defective, not good enough, and contributes to an internalized feeling of being rejected.

The Moral Father Role

Historically, fathers have been expected to be the moral leader of the family and to set an example for responsible conduct. The moral father role is based upon the father's religious beliefs, and has been associated with doing the right thing. Men who were the moral leaders of the family taught their children based upon their religious beliefs. It was theorized that men who had fathers who fulfilled this role would also teach their children right from wrong, and possibly teach them to resolve problems with more patience and compassion; or at least to work out differences non-violently.

Measurement of the Independent Variables

Each independent variable was measured on The Fatherhood Scale using a Likert type level of measurement. Subjects were asked to think about the person they identified as their primary male caretaker while growing up. They were then asked to read each of the questions on the The Fatherhood Scale and circle the answer that most accurately reflected their perception of the relationship they had with their father, or the person they identified as their father. An example of a statement measuring the relationship with the father is “My father told me that he loved me.” Subjects rate their responses on a 1-5 scale ranging from never (1), rarely (2), sometimes (3), often (4) or always (5). Negative items of the scale were reversed scored. As a result, higher scores indicate a positive paternal relationship. An example of a statement indicative of a negative relationship is “When I was a child, my father shouted at me if I did something wrong.”
Analysis of The Fatherhood Scale

Three types of analysis were conducted to test for reliability and validity of the instrument: factor analysis, expert review, and pilot testing of the instrument on 165 subjects. Additionally, analysis of The Fatherhood Scale consisted of making sure that the instrument was easy to use and that the questions were clear and specific. Cultural and class biases were examined in order to make the items more inclusive to a broader segment of the population. Careful attention went into ensuring that the data collected from the instrument were actually measuring the constructs underlying the development of the scale.

Factor Analysis

Factor analysis was used to determine which questions of The Fatherhood Scale were highly intercorrelated representing the same latent constructs. Factor analysis is a multivariate statistical analysis utilized to define the underlying structure of data and to analyze the structure of the interrelationships among a large set of variables (Hair, Anderson, Tatham & Black, 1995). Being a newly developed scale, it was important to determine if constructs from the fatherhood literature and self-psychology were being measured as they were operationalized in The Fatherhood Scale.

Following a factor analysis and the identification of sets of factors, a reliability analysis was employed. Cronbach alpha was a statistic used to measure internal reliability of the items on The Fatherhood Scale. This analysis was utilized to measure which items were highly correlated and measuring the same thing. A factor analysis was conducted to determine if the items measuring certain constructs, such as paternal emotional responsiveness, were loading together.
In addition to identifying the underlying constructs represented by the variables, factor analysis is also used to condense the number of original variables with minimum loss of information into a smaller set of factors. It allows the researcher to reduce the number of questions; thus making it more likely subjects will fill it out, without losing the instruments ability to measure the constructs of interest.

**Expert Review**

Experts in the field of family studies and social work, in order to determine if the instrument was measuring the construct of paternal involvement, as theorized by Pleck (1997) examined The Fatherhood Scale. Four national scholars, Drs. Denise Bronson, Gilbert Greene, Patrick McKenry, and Bette Speziale reviewed the instrument and their comments were integrated into the design of the instrument. In order to determine if the instrument operationalized the constructs of self-psychology, the instrument was reviewed by one of the world's leading experts on self-psychology, Dr. Walter Stone. One suggestion from the expert on self-psychology was that some of the questions be phrased to tap more into the unconscious, possibly reducing socially desirable responses. As a whole, the experts have concurred that the instrument has face validity.

**Reliability**

Reliability is the degree to which an instrument is measuring what it is supposed to measure (Gay, 1996). The instrument was carefully designed in order to ensure clarity and that each question was operationalizing a construct from the theory upon which it was based. In order to check for internal consistency, a reliability analysis calculated the Cronbach’s alpha coefficients for the subscales on The Fatherhood Scale,
yielded alpha levels ranging from .84 to .96 (See Table 1). Cronbach alpha for the entire scale was .98.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>Cronbach’s Alpha</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Negative Paternal Engagement</td>
<td>.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive Emotional Responsiveness</td>
<td>.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive Paternal Engagement</td>
<td>.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Moral Father Role</td>
<td>.84</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1: Reliability Analysis of The Fatherhood Scale
N = 166
(Pilot Data)

Pilot Testing of the Instrument

The instrument was field tested on 166 social work professionals and graduate students in social work in the state of Ohio. The graduate students for the pilot study were recruited from first and second year graduate classes in social work. Social workers were recruited from a large private child welfare agency and from training seminars consisting of county children’s services employees. The sample consisted of college educated males who were in the social work profession or attending graduate school to obtain a Masters Degree in Social Work. The sample was predominately Caucasian.

Data from the Pilot Study

The Fatherhood Scale was tested on 166 males. The results of the demographic data are presented in Table 15. The mean age of the subjects in the pilot study was 31
Approximately 40% had a high school education or less, and approximately 40% had gone to college or graduate school. The majority of the subjects in the pilot study were Caucasian. Approximately 75% of the respondents always lived with their fathers while growing up and one-quarter of the respondents experienced their parents' divorce.

The scores on The Fatherhood Scale range from 75 to 375. Scores under 150 indicate that the father never or rarely engaged in any of the activities. Scores over 275 indicate that fathers often or always engaged in the activities. The mean score for the pilot study was 213 (S.D. = 42.15). The range was 185. Nine percent of the pilot study had fathers who were never or rarely engaged with them, compared to 3% who had fathers that were often or always engaged with them.

The scale has several subscales that attempt to measure the constructs of self-psychology. An initial factor analysis identified five major dimensions to The Fatherhood Scale: negative paternal engagement, positive paternal engagement, paternal emotional responsiveness, the moral father role and the nurturing father role. The nurturing father role was combined with the paternal emotional responsiveness dimension because they are multiple indicators of the same concept. Because the positive paternal engagement subscale was highly correlated with positive emotional responsiveness, for the purposes of this research study, they were combined. In order to examine the specific type of negative paternal engagement on the child's well-being, the subscale was further divided into shaming, witnessing marital violence and experiencing child abuse, which subsequently became independent variables in the study. Following the test pilot of the instrument, the researcher made revisions, eliminating some questions that had low
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intercorrelations with other items and adding additional questions to capture the constructs of the historical roles of fathers.

The factors of negative paternal engagement, positive paternal emotional responsiveness, positive paternal engagement, and the moral father role all had high alpha coefficients. All coefficients suggest that the items are highly correlated and are measuring the same thing. Refer to Table 1.

In summary, the process of reliability testing of the instrument consisted of an exhaustive review of the literature, careful design of the instrument, a pilot study (N = 166), reliability analysis of the data, and, following pretesting of the instrument, refinement of the instrument. Some items were deleted and other items were added to ensure the instrument was measuring what was relevant for this study.

Factor Analysis of The Fatherhood Scale in the Research Study

An exploratory factor analysis was employed in order to study the internal structure of The Fatherhood Scale and determine the underlying relations among the variables. The observed variables are the items within the instrument, which are presumed to reflect the factor or the construct the researcher is attempting to operationalize (Pedhazur & Schmelkin, 1991). A factor is a linear combination of the original variables that represent an underlying construct (Fraenkel & Wallen, 1996). Factor loadings are the correlations among the variables and the factor. The higher the factor loading the more meaningful and the greater the effect of the factor on the item (Pedhazur & Schmelkin, 1991). The scale allows for multiple strengths in fathering to be identified, yet is broad enough in scope to identify negative aspects of fathering.
To determine the suitability of the data for a factor analysis, the Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin Measure of Sampling Adequacy test was used indicating that a significant proportion of the variance in the variables was caused by underlying factors. High values near 1.0 indicate the data is useful for a factor analysis. Bartlett's Test of Sphericity tests whether the variables in the correlational matrix are unrelated. It provides a statistical probability that some of the variables have significant correlations (Fraenkel & Wallen, 1996). The test was significant at .000, indicating significant relationships among the variables. The results are displayed in Table 2.

| Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin Measure of Sampling Adequacy | .912 |
| Bartlett's Test of Sphericity | Approximate Chi-Square | 10358.050 |
| | Df | 2775 |
| | Significance | .000 |

Table 2: Suitability Test for Factor Analysis

The factor extraction method employed was a principal components analysis which was utilized in order to determine the components which accounted for the largest proportion of the variance. Thirteen components were extracted which accounted for 74% of the total variance, while 60% of the variance was explained by five components. The largest amount of variance totaling 42% was explained by one component. The initial extraction usually does not give interpretable results and most researchers will employ a rotation. The purpose of the rotation is to redistribute the variance and have a more meaningful factor pattern (Hair, Anderson, Tatham & Black, 1995). Following a
varimax rotation, the total percentage (74%) of the accounted variance does not change, but the percentage accounted for each factor does change (SPSS, 1999). Following a varimax rotation, 23% of the variance was explained by the first component, which consisted of items pertaining to positive paternal emotional engagement. The second component, accounting for 15% of the variance were items pertaining to the accessible father who was a good provider. Refer to Table 3. Five components accounted for 54% of the total variance. The factor matrix was used to examine the factor loadings for each factor. The factor loadings are the correlations between the item and the unrotated factor (SPSS, 1999). The researcher was able to examine these factor loadings and interpret which factors loaded strongly together and determine if they were representing the constructs operationalized within The Fatherhood Scale. The results are presented in Table 3.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Percent of Variance</th>
<th>Interpretation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>Positive Paternal Emotional Engagement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>Accessible, Caring, Fair, Responsible Good Provider</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>Positively Engaged Father, Involved With Child’s School</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>Psychological and Abusive Father</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>Harsh, Angry, Physically Punitive Father</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>The Moral Father Role</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>Witnessed Marital Violence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>Father Helped Around The House</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>Gender Role Model</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>Expressive Father</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>Father Shamed</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3: Factor Analysis: Rotated Component Matrix
Total Variance Explained = 69% (Components 12 and 13 were non-significant in the varimax rotation.)
Reliability Analysis of The Fatherhood Scale

Reliability refers to the consistency of the instrument. The researcher is also concerned with internal reliability of the instrument: the consistency from one set of items within the instrument to another set of items and how well those sets of items are measuring the same construct (Fraenkel & Wallen, 1996). Since the researcher was incorporating two separate theoretical domains: a) self-psychology, (b) historical roles of fathers, and items measuring the type of paternal involvement, it was important to determine if the items representing the constructs were correlated.

There are several methods for assessing the internal reliability of an instrument that require only a single administration (Fraenkel & Wallen, 1996). Cronbach’s Alpha was used to determine the reliability of the various subscales of The Fatherhood Scale. The alpha scores represent an estimate of the inter-item correlations between the subscales and are presented in Table 4.

The Cronbach Alpha for the entire Fatherhood Scale was .9762, suggesting the items on the scale are highly correlated. The self-psychology construct, which is primarily operationalized within the paternal emotional responsiveness subscale, produced a Cronbach Alpha of .9611. The new nurturing father role (nurturing, emotionally accessible and actively involved) is synonymous with the theoretical concepts of the self-psychological scale. They both characterize a highly involved father who is emotionally bonded with his child and takes an active interest in his child’s physical and emotional well-being. They were condensed with one another, since they are essentially measuring the same set of concepts.
The roles fathers have historically assumed are the subscales within The Fatherhood Scale. For example, an item representing the gender role model is “My father encourage me to be masculine.” “My dad talked to me about God” is an item that measures the moral father role and “My Dad was always employed while I was growing up” is an item representing the good provider role. This subscale produced Cronbach Alphas on the gender role model of .7231; .8637 on the moral father role model and .9010 on the good provider role model. These alpha levels suggest that the instrument items have a strong inter-item relationship, and that the items for the total scale, with an alpha level of .9762 are highly correlated.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subscale</th>
<th>Cronbach's Alpha</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Positive Paternal Emotional Responsiveness</td>
<td>.9611</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive Paternal Engagement</td>
<td>.9204</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative Paternal Engagement</td>
<td>.8515</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Moral Father Role</td>
<td>.8637</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Good Provider Role</td>
<td>.9010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Gender Role Model</td>
<td>.7231</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paternal Accessibility</td>
<td>.8882</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paternal Responsibility</td>
<td>.7888</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Fatherhood Scale</td>
<td>.9762</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4: The Fatherhood Scale Reliability Measures
Paternal involvement consists of four subscales: positive paternal engagement, negative paternal engagement, paternal accessibility and paternal responsibility. Positive paternal engagement produced a Cronbach Alpha of .9204, negative paternal engagement produced an alpha coefficient of .8515, paternal accessibility .8882 and paternal responsibility .7888. The range of alpha scores on the paternal involvement subscales suggests they have a strong inter-item correlation as well as a strong internal item correlation.

Validity Analysis of The Fatherhood Scale

While efforts were made to ensure reliability, it is an equally important fact that reliability is not a sufficient condition for validity. A measure cannot be valid, if it is not reliable, but reliability is not necessarily a guarantee that the instrument has validity (Pedhazur & Schemlkin, 1991). In order to draw correct conclusions from the data, careful analysis went into reviewing the literature and ensuring that the items were actually appropriate and meaningful to the theory in which the scale is embedded. Because it was important to gather information about the type of paternal involvement and then to make some inferences about the measures, content validity was scrutinized to ensure that the items selected were an adequate sample of each construct it is supposed to represent. Another aspect of content validity had to do with the format of the instrument and making sure each item had its own scale directly underneath each and every item, and that scale items were evenly spaced, making it easier for respondents. The format was checked to make sure that the directions were simple and clear, and that the language was understandable.
In analyzing the data collected in this research study, and in order to make valid inferences about how the role of paternal involvement is related to female intimate violence, the researcher closely scrutinized the data. Three items within the negative paternal involvement scale emerged as specific paternal behaviors leading to violence in a female intimate relationship: (a) shame, (b) child abuse and (c) witnessing marital violence. These paternal behaviors are closely related to the processes that are transmitted to the child, that are then internalized within individual psychological functioning, including cognition and motivation that Crowell & Burgess, (1996) addressed as needing to be focused upon by researchers. Therefore, in constructing a model to predict the probability of group membership into a violent or a non-violent group, the construct negative engagement needed further scrutiny. In order to eliminate this vagueness, shaming by the father, witnessing marital violence and experiencing child abuse were identified as formative indicators, or producers of the construct negative paternal engagement (Pedhazur & Schemlkin, 1991), and were therefore worthy to be a variable in their own right. These three variables also have strong theoretical support to be entered into the model as separate discrete predictor variables (Dutton, 1998). When a father abuses his child and羞hes him or her, the child experiences it as an attack on his or her core sense of self (Dutton, 1998). Internalized shame was found to be associated with rage and anger in intimate relationships.

While most researchers on paternal involvement agree that involvement encompasses only one of several modes of paternal influence on children, the focus of this research is on the type and quality of that involvement. This research study attempted to distinguish positive paternal involvement from negative paternal
involvement as it relates to male intimate violence against a female partner. Paternal accessibility and paternal responsibility are paternal characteristics that were highly correlated to positive paternal emotional responsiveness. These separate subscales were combined into one scale, since they are related. In other words, if fathers are engaged in a positive emotional way with their children, the data indicated that they are also accessible and responsible fathers. The results are presented in Table 5. Paternal accessibility has primarily been operationalized as the amount of time fathers are available to their child as compared to the mothers availability (Pleck, 1996). The focus of availability in this study was more interested in the emotional availability of the father to the child as perceived by the adult subjects.

In summary, careful consideration was put into conceptualizing the constructs being measured in this study in relation to previous operational definitions from previous studies. Researchers should propose alternative explanations of the constructs being measured, including the definition of the construct, item content, method of measurement and specifically whether or not the construct is consistent with the theoretical model within which it is embedded (Pedhazur & Schmelkin, 1991).
Table 5: The Fatherhood Scale Subscale Correlations

*Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Positive Paternal Engagement</th>
<th>Responsible Paternal Engagement</th>
<th>Paternal Accessibility</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Positive Paternal Engagement</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responsible Paternal Engagement</td>
<td>.855*</td>
<td>1.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paternal Accessibility</td>
<td>.923*</td>
<td>.789*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Scales

As a result of the pilot testing the final version of The Fatherhood Scale was developed. The original scale consisted of 75 items and the final version also consisted of 75 items. The items are grouped into 9 subscales: positive paternal engagement, positive paternal emotional responsiveness, negative paternal engagement, the moral father role, the gender role model, the good provider role, the responsible father role, paternal accessibility and the androgynous father. The items are scored using a Likert type scale where respondents rate the frequency of each type of paternal involvement by selecting a category that best represents the occurrence of event. The categories are never scored as one, rarely (2), sometimes (3), often (4) and always (5). Negative items were inversely scored. Scores were interpreted with the higher the score indicating a more positive emotional paternal relationship, whereas the lower the score, the more negative the paternal relationship.
In the research study, the analysis of data on each item of The Fatherhood Scale indicated that subjects' responses were well distributed across all the categories. For example, on the item, "I wanted to be like my Dad when I was a child", the responses were: 18% “never”; 15% “rarely”; 23% “sometimes”; 23% “often”, and 21% “always”. On some items, the responses varied, indicating a characteristic of a group of mens’ relationships with their fathers. On the item, “My father comforted me when I was feeling bad”, the responses were: 8% “always”; 11% “often”; 28% “sometimes”; 34% “seldom”, and 20% “never”. This indicates that for over 50% of the respondents, their fathers “seldom” offered comfort when they were feeling bad. One item asking whether or not the father was employed resulted in 73% of the respondents indicating that there fathers were “always” employed. Future revision of the scale could eliminate this question. The items inquiring about witnessing abuse resulted in high response sets in the never category. Observing the father beat the mother resulted in 77% of the respondents reporting “never”, whereas seeing the father hit the mother resulted in a 64% “never” response. Although the responses were not equally distributed, they were not expected to be and represent a particular type of paternal engagement that was of concern to this study.

The items representing each subscale are presented in Tables 6 through 14. For the purposes of the study, the scale “positive paternal engagement” and “positive paternal emotional responsiveness” were combined to represent “positive paternal emotional engagement”.

Positive paternal engagement measures the amount of time fathers spend with their children doing positive activities that support the child’s well-being. The subscale
measures engagement by activities that fathers do with their child, some of which are one-on-one time spent together.

Positive paternal emotional responsiveness measures the perception of the emotional availability of the father and the degree to which the respondent feels attached and emotionally close to his father. It measures the subjective experience of the respondents’ relationship with their fathers.

Negative paternal engagement measures several aspects of involvement that would potentially be damaging to the child. The scale measures shaming, child abuse, witnessing the father abuse the mother, and harsh punishment. These types of paternal involvement are likely to create a vulnerable sense of self in the child, who may be more likely to resort to violence when under stress. This type of involvement lacks empathy, warmth and understanding, all relational qualities that serve as a mirroring selfobject.

The moral father role measures the degree to which the respondent perceives the father as teaching right from wrong and instilling values based upon the fathers’ religious beliefs. The scale measures the religious modeling of the father and the father’s direct and active involvement in religious socialization.

The gender role model measures the ways in which the father influenced traditional and stereotypical masculine sex role behavior. Assertiveness, aggression, worldliness and masculinity are items representative of the gender role model.

The good provider subscale measures the respondents’ perception of the kind of breadwinner the father was for the family. This scale also implies a sense of paternal responsibility for the financial security, and/or providing material items for the child.
The responsible father subscale measures the caring, involved father who takes some degree of responsibility for child care tasks and the degree to which the father shares in parental responsibilities normally assumed by the mother.

The accessible father role measures the degree and the ways in which the father was accessible to the child. The subscale measures if the father engaged verbally with his son to solve problems and to talk over issues that would be supportive and offer guidance.

The androgynous father subscale measures whether or not the son perceived his father in a non-traditional male role. The items measure the degree to which the father was verbally expressive and if the son identified with the father.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question Number</th>
<th>Item</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>My father helped me with my homework.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>My father took me on activities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>During my teen years my father and I did things together.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>My father liked to spend time with me.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.</td>
<td>My father read to me as a child.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22.</td>
<td>My dad showed interest in my schoolwork.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26.</td>
<td>I went to the movies with my father.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34.</td>
<td>I remember playing sports with my father.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41.</td>
<td>My father and I enjoyed time together.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53.</td>
<td>My dad attended sporting events in which I played.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54.</td>
<td>My father and I had good times together.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Alpha Level = .9418  
Table 6: The Fatherhood Subscale: Positive Paternal Engagement
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question Number</th>
<th>Item</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>My father told me that he loved me.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>My father told me that I was a good boy/girl.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>My father is a caring person.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>During my childhood I felt close to my father.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>I felt close to my father as a teenager.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.</td>
<td>I know that my father cared about me.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.</td>
<td>My father told me that he loved me.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23.</td>
<td>My father hugged me.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36.</td>
<td>My father comforted me when I was feeling bad.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39.</td>
<td>My father made me feel special.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43.</td>
<td>My father was loving towards me.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48.</td>
<td>My father told me that he liked the way I did things.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50.</td>
<td>I have warm feelings toward my father.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59.</td>
<td>My father understood me.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62.</td>
<td>I told my father that I loved him.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64.</td>
<td>My father praised me.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70.</td>
<td>My father showed concern when I got hurt.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Alpha Level = .9617

Table 7: The Fatherhood Subscale: Positive Paternal Emotional Responsiveness
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question Number</th>
<th>Item</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>My father spanked me.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td>My father hit my mother.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.</td>
<td>My father was ashamed of me as a child.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.</td>
<td>My father used to say things to hurt my feelings.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25.</td>
<td>When I got in trouble, my father would punish me physically.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28.</td>
<td>I saw my father beat my mother.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44.</td>
<td>I was abused by my father.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49.</td>
<td>When I was a child, my father shouted at me if I did something wrong.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51.</td>
<td>My father neglected me.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65.</td>
<td>My father is mean.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67.</td>
<td>My father used to get angry and say he didn't like me.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71.</td>
<td>I saw my father hit one of my siblings.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Alpha Level = .8515

Table 8: The Fatherhood Subscale: Negative Paternal Engagement
## The Moral Father Role

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question Number</th>
<th>Item</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>27.</td>
<td>My father taught me right from wrong.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33.</td>
<td>My father went to church with me.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55.</td>
<td>My father instilled important values in me.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69.</td>
<td>My Dad talked to me about God</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75.</td>
<td>My father used to say grace at mealtime.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Alpha Level = .8637

Table 9: The Fatherhood Subscale: The Moral Father Role
### The Gender Role Model

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question Number</th>
<th>Item</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>My father taught me to fight back.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>My father encouraged me to say what I felt.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>My dad would talk to me about things going on in the world.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>My father talked to me about sex.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>My father encouraged me to be masculine.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>My dad taught me what it is like to be a man.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Alpha Level = .7636

Table 10: The Fatherhood Subscale: The Gender Role Model
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question Number</th>
<th>Item</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>17.</td>
<td>My father made sure I had the things I needed such as clothing and toys.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19.</td>
<td>My father provided well for us financially.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30.</td>
<td>My father was a good breadwinner for the family.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38.</td>
<td>My Dad was always employed while I was growing up.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66.</td>
<td>My father is generous.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Alpha Level = .9010

Table 11: The Fatherhood Subscale: The Good Provider Model
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question Number</th>
<th>Item</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>My father attended school conferences.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24.</td>
<td>My father is a good man.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35.</td>
<td>My father helped my mother clean house.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56.</td>
<td>My dad took me to the doctor.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57.</td>
<td>My dad tried to be a good man.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67.</td>
<td>My dad attended school activities in which I participated.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Alpha Level = .8596
Table 12: The Fatherhood Subscale: The Responsible Father
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question Number</th>
<th>Item</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>My father talked to me about my personal problems.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31.</td>
<td>My father helped me solve my problems.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40.</td>
<td>When I got angry, I used to talk things over with my dad.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63.</td>
<td>My father was around when I needed him.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Alpha Level = .8662

Table 13: The Fatherhood Subscale: The Accessible Father
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question Number</th>
<th>Item</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>29.</td>
<td>I saw my father cry.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30.</td>
<td>I could talk to my father about anything.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45.</td>
<td>My father is fair.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58.</td>
<td>My father is a kind man.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59.</td>
<td>I wanted to be like my Dad when I was a child.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>73.</td>
<td>My dad would cook meals.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>74.</td>
<td>My father would express his feelings.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Alpha Level = .8163

Table 14: The Fatherhood Scale: The Androgynous Father
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Pilot Study N = 166</th>
<th>Research Study N = 145</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Age</strong></td>
<td>M = 31 (S.D. = 11.5)</td>
<td>M = 36 (S.D. = 9.5)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Marital Status</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Married</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Divorced</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single &amp; Never Married</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Separated</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Living in a Domestic Relationship</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Educational Level of Respondents</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less Than High School</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High School Graduate</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical School</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some College</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College Graduate</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Completed Graduate School</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Race</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African American</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian American</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caucasian</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td>74%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native American</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Primary Male Caretaker Growing Up</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Father</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step-Father</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adopted Father</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 15: The Fatherhood Scale: Demographics For Both Samples (N = 311)
Note: Totals less than 100% contain missing data.

Table 15 continues on the top of the next page.
Table 15 continued.

**Always Lived With Father While Growing Up**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>72%</th>
<th></th>
<th>No</th>
<th>24%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Age At Time of Divorce**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>M = 11</th>
<th>M = 9.6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>S.D. = 7.78</td>
<td>S.D. = 7.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(n = 55)</td>
<td>(n = 52)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Income**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Income</th>
<th>35%</th>
<th>31%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0 - $30,000</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30,000 - $40,000</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40,000 - $50,000</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50,000 - $60,000</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Above $60,000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 16: The Fatherhood Scale: Demographics on Subjects’ Fathers for Both Sample

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Pilot Study N = 166</th>
<th>Research Study N = 145</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Educational Level of Respondents’ Fathers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than High School</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High School Graduate</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical School</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some College</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College Graduate</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Completed Graduate School</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experienced Parental Divorce</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>61%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Summary

The Fatherhood Scale is based upon three separate theories: (a) self-psychology, (b) historical roles of fatherhood, and (c) the literature on paternal involvement. The scale measures the type of relationship men had with their fathers while growing up. The instrument specifically measures the quality of the relationship and the frequency in which the paternal behaviors occurred. The Fatherhood Scale allows for men to interpret their own meaning to some of the items. For example, “My father liked to spend time with me” could mean that some men “felt” that their fathers liked to spend time with them, while others were told by their fathers how much they enjoyed being with them. The retrospective design of the instrument is concerned with men’s interpretive accounts of their relationship with their fathers.
The Fatherhood Scale has nine subscales, which measure various dimensions of paternal conduct. The internal consistency reliability of The Fatherhood Scale ranges from .7636 to .9617. The internal consistency reliability for the entire “Fatherhood Scale” is .9762. The testing time is approximately 15 minutes.
CHAPTER 4
METHODOLOGY

Introduction

The purpose of this study was to determine if the type of paternal relationship during childhood predicts male violence toward a female intimate. The independent variables are: positive paternal emotional engagement, shaming by the father, witnessing the father abuse the mother, experiencing child abuse by the father, and the moral father role, as measured by The Fatherhood Scale; and self-esteem, as measured by Rosenberg's Self-esteem Scale. The dependent variable is violence or non-violence in an intimate relationship, as measured by the Conflict Tactics Scale (2). A retrospective design was used to examine the relationship between intimate violence and the independent variables.

Research Design

Social science research is conducted with the purpose of predicting, describing, explaining, controlling, or exploring phenomena (Gay, 1996). This study is exploratory in the sense that it is a research topic that has not been previously explored in this way, and was conceived with the intent to gain a greater understanding of the processes that contribute to men abusing women in intimate relationships.

It is also a descriptive study, as the researcher sought to describe men and how their relationships with their fathers may or may not contribute to violence against
Research questions and hypotheses to be tested were based upon the literature which (a) suggests that aggression is learned from observing models and imitating their behavior (Bandura, 1977), (b) indicates a correlation between witnessing marital violence and later intimate violence within adult relationships (Caesar, 1988; Dutton, 1998 & Hotaling & Sugarman, 1986). The central purpose of this study was to examine the relationship between paternal involvement and intimate violence in adult relationships and determine if the type of paternal engagement is associated with male violence against a female intimate. The correlational design of this study was conducted with the purpose of determining if a set of independent variables, which have already occurred can predict whether men will be violent in intimate relationships. The categorical dependent variables are whether the respondents were ever physically violent or non-violent in intimate relationships. Logistic regression analysis is the appropriate multivariate technique when the researcher is interested in estimating the probability of an event occurring, and when the dependent variable is dichotomous, as in this case, violence or non-violence (Hair et al. 1995).

Definitions of the Independent Variables

The Fatherhood Scale measures several of the independent variables. They include: positive paternal emotional engagement, shaming by the father, witnessing the father abuse the mother, experiencing child abuse by the father, and the moral father role. The Rosenberg Self-Esteem scale measures self-esteem and the educational level is measured by the Demographic Questionnaire.
Positive Paternal Emotional Engagement

Positive paternal emotional engagement measures the type of relationship a father has with his children. It is concerned with both the amount of time fathers spend with their children and the quality of the emotional relationship the father has with his children. Positive paternal emotional engagement measures whether the father was involved with his child in a positive way and if he was emotionally available and connected in a positive way. A subscale of questions on "The Fatherhood Scale" measured the amount of time the father is involved with his child. Some examples of the questions were, "My father took me on activities"; "My father liked to spend time with me"; "My father helped me with my homework"; and "My father talked to me about my personal problems." The emotional responsiveness of the father towards his children is measuring the perception of the emotional bond and connection the child has or had with his father while growing up. A subscale of questions on The Fatherhood Scale measures the quality of the emotional bond the father has with his child. Some of the questions measuring the emotional availability of the father with his children include: "My father told me that he loved me"; "My father is a caring person"; "My father comforted me when I was feeling bad"; "I have warm feelings toward my father" and "My father understood me."

Shaming By the Father

One of the formative indicators of a negative paternal relationship occurs when the father shames the child. Dutton and Golant (1995) found in their studies on the psychological profile of the batterer that shaming by the father creates a vulnerable sense
of self and those boys who are shamed by their fathers are prone to anger and rage. They feel as if the integrity of their core self is attacked. Shaming was measured by “My father was ashamed of me as a child” and “My father used to get angry and say he didn’t like me”.

**Witnessing the Father Abuse the Mother**

Measuring if the child witnessed the father beat or hit the mother is the central description of this independent variable. This subscale of The Fatherhood Scale is interested in the most serious exposure to marital discord observed by the child and does not measure other less physically violent forms of assault or the psychological proximity the child had to the violence. “My father hit my mother” and “I saw my father beat my mother” measures witnessing marital violence.

**Experiencing Child Abuse by the Father**

This independent variable is also a formative indicator of a constellation of paternal behaviors that measures negative involvement by the father. Experiencing child abuse by the father is measuring the most serious forms of child maltreatment and asks two questions to determine if the father abused the child. “I was abused by my father” and “I saw my father hit one of my siblings” are the two items of The Fatherhood Scale that measures child abuse.

**The Moral Father Role**

The moral father role measures fathers’ spiritual leadership within the family and the degree to which the father teaches the child right from wrong based upon his religious
beliefs. The moral father role is measured by a subscale on The (FS) by questions such as "My father instilled important values in me"; "My father went to church with me"; "My father talked to me about God"; and "My father use to say grace at mealtime".

**Self-Esteem**

Self-esteem is defined as the general feelings of self-worth or self-acceptance a person has and measures the positive or negative feelings about the self. Questions measuring self-esteem include: "I feel that I have a number of good qualities"; "I certainly feel useless at times"; "I feel that I am a person of worth, at least on an equal basis with others" and "I feel that I do not have much to be proud of."

**Educational Level of the Subjects**

The educational level of the subjects is defined as the highest level of education completed for the men in the study. Educational level is obtained from the "Demographic Questionnaire" and includes six levels ranging from less that high school to completed graduate school.

**Research Methods**

The design for this study was a correlational design. "Correlational research is carried out for one of two basic purposes-either to help explain important human behaviors or to predict likely outcomes." (Frankel & Wallen, 1996, p. 310). Correlational research is sometimes called associational research because the researcher is interested in the relationships among two or more variables without any attempt to influence them (Frankel & Wallen, 1996). Correlational research is also a type of descriptive research
because it describes existing relationships. Unlike pure descriptive research, correlational research describes the degree to which two or more quantitative variables relate (Gay, 1996). The purpose of this study was to explore whether the following independent variables can predict physical violence against a female intimate partner: (a) positive paternal emotional engagement; (b) shaming by the father; (c) witnessing the father abuse the mother; (d) experiencing child abuse by the father; (e) the moral father role; (f) self-esteem and (g) educational level of the subjects.

The Setting

The study took place in Hamilton and Brown Counties in southwestern Ohio. The major sites for the study were the Cincinnati YWCA’s Amend and Clark Montessori School in the Cincinnati Public School District. The YWCA’s Amend Program has batterers’ groups operating in both Hamilton and Brown Counties. Men from both counties were sampled from both counties. Because the focus of this study was an examination of mens’ relationships with their fathers to determine whether paternal involvement during childhood was a predictor of intimate violence, the YWCA’s Amend Program, a batterer’s treatment program for abusive men, was purposively chosen.

In order to examine nonviolent men, Clark Montessori School in Cincinnati was used to sample a comparison group of men. Because Montessori Schools have a high level of paternal involvement, it was assumed that fathers who send their children to Montessori School may be more likely to have experienced positive paternal involvement growing up and may be more likely to be nonviolent. The rationale for sampling the Montessori School centered on four factors. First, it is a public school in a large urban
area. Secondly, it is a racially balanced school allowing for greater chances of drawing a racial composition that is more representative of the general population. Third, the school attracts a vast range of families with a wide range of socioeconomic backgrounds, and fourth, the Montessori School requires high parental involvement, which may be indicative of the new nurturing father role, or at least a more committed father.

The Amend Program was established by the Cincinnati YWCA in 1982 to address the issue of violence against women, by providing group counseling for men who abuse women. The groups are lead by trained therapists, many of whom have advanced degrees in social work, psychology or a related field. Both male and female therapists conduct the groups. The program serves over 2,000 men each year and the majority of those men have been arrested for domestic violence and are court ordered to treatment. One of the unique aspects of the program is that the batterers' treatment program is a component of a much larger domestic violence program, called Protection From Abuse. Other program components include the battered women's shelter, transitional living for women who leave a violent relationship, a public speaking program on violence prevention and women's issues, an intensive batterers' treatment program for incarcerated males, and an adolescent program.

Montessori is an educational philosophy developed by Maria Montessori. Cincinnati Public Schools has a long history of public Montessori education, which attracts a diverse group of parents to the school. The basic philosophy is the education of the total child, an education for life, which includes the intellectual, social, emotional and physical development of the child. Children are grouped in multi-age classrooms
because Maria Montessori noticed how children in families learn from older siblings. Teachers are always trying to move the child towards more independence and they teach by moving from concrete ideas to the abstract. Children in a Montessori classroom learn by doing and touching, where the kinesthetic and tactile aspects of leaning are accessed. Parents who send their children to Montessori want to be involved with the school and are often found in the classroom assisting the teacher. Clark Montessori is the first public Montessori High School in the United States.

The Sample

The subjects for the study were a convenience sample of 145 males. The sample consisted of (n = 95) violent and (n = 45) nonviolent men. The sample consisted of (a) male spouse abusers court ordered to batterers’ treatment and (b) men who had school age children attending public Montessori School in Cincinnati, Ohio, and (c) social workers in continuing education training.

Data Collection

Subjects were invited to be involved in a research study about their relationships with their fathers while they were growing up and how their father’s past parenting may have influenced how they feel about themselves and how they settle conflict with their wives, girlfriends, or other intimate partners today. Subjects were informed that some of the questions were personal and sensitive; and that if they chose not to participate, they could skip questions or stop at any time. A script was read to both samples explaining the research study. Each packet of information contained the following materials and is included in the Appendices.
1. Demographic Data Form
2. The Conflict Tactics Scale (II)
3. The Fatherhood Scale
4. Rosenberg’s Self-Esteem Scale

This packet of information also contained a letter of introduction, which also included both telephone numbers of the principal investigator and the co-investigator, should any subjects have any questions. Because of the potential stress related to answering personal questions about one’s father and relationship behaviors, each packet of instruments also contained a list of recommended social services agencies that provided counseling. A return postage envelope was also included for mailing back the surveys.

It was explained that their responses were anonymous and confidential. The study involved the administration of self-report pencil and paper survey instruments. The subjects were asked to complete three standardized measures and a demographic background questionnaire.

It was explained to the men in the court-ordered treatment groups that their involvement in the study (or their lack of participation in the research study) would not affect either positively or negatively their involvement in the treatment program. The researcher had face to face contact with the men in their batterers’ treatment groups. The package of instruments for the men in the court ordered treatment group were distributed during one of the sessions at the YWCA’s Amend Program. If they were interested in participating, they were given a packet of instruments to take home, ask to fill them out
and instructed to mail them to The Ohio State University. Surprisingly, the majority of the men in the groups not only agreed to complete the surveys, but many remarked that they thought it was an important study and requested to complete them while in the group. At those times, the group leader and the researcher left the room to allow the subjects to complete their surveys. This occurred in all but one group. Many of the men asked questions and several stated that they thought it was an important study, which may have accounted for their openness to completing the questionnaires. In all but one group, the group leaders appeared to have excellent rapport with the men in the groups. The subjects in the Amend Program were at various stages of their group treatment. Three of the groups had met for more than eight weeks, two groups had met for less than three weeks and one group was surveyed during their initial meeting. No subjects from this group spontaneously agreed to complete the survey. The subjects from the Montessori School were informed of the study during a monthly parent meeting, and those wishing to participate were given a packet of instruments. They took them home to complete them and mailed them to Dr. Bronson at The Ohio State University.

The principal investigator recruited the Amend subjects from one of six different groups in the batterer’s treatment program and attended the parent meeting at the Montessori School to introduce the research study. The principle investigator was available to answer questions from members of both groups.

Protection of Human Subjects

The Human Subjects Committee of The Ohio State University reviewed this study prior to the implementation of the research. Every effort was made to protect the subjects
and minimize any risks. All subjects were assured that their responses would be
anonymous. Each packet of instruments contained a cover letter, which explained the
purpose of the study and ensured protection of the subjects. The researcher also attended
each group meeting to invite the participants to be involved in the study and was
available to answer questions. The Amend subjects were told that their participation in
the study would not effect their involvement with the batterer’s treatment program or
with the court. Should anyone feel the need for counseling, due to the potential stress,
which may result from answering sensitive and personal questions about one’s father and
how an individual handles conflict, a list of social service agencies was included in each
packet. Respondents were told both verbally and in writing that they could quit at any
time. All participants were told that if they wanted a summary of the study upon its
completion, they could obtain one by calling the researcher.

Data Collection Schedule

Data were collected from the Montessori subjects on March 16, 1999. Fifty
packets of questionnaires were distributed at the parent meeting. Data were collected
from the Amend participants between March 23, 1999 and April 30, 1999 from six
different groups. A total of 300 packets of surveys were distributed with a returned
response rate just under 50%. Four questionnaires including the Demographic Data
Form, The Conflict Tactics Scale (2), The Fatherhood Scale and Rosenberg’s
Self-Esteem Scale were included in the packet and the total time to administer the
package of instruments was approximately 30 minutes.
Instrumentation

The Conflict Tactics Scale (CT) (1996) is a 78 item self-administered instrument that measures the extent and level which partners engage in physical and psychological attacks on one another. The theoretical basis for the CTS is conflict theory and the scale is widely used to obtain concrete acts of sexual coercion, psychological aggression, injuries sustained during physical attacks and the use of negotiation skills to resolve conflict. The Conflict Tactics Scale (CT) contains five subscales: (a) physical assault; (b) psychological aggression; (c) negotiation; (d) injury and (e) sexual coercion. Reliability ranges from .79 to .95 (Straus, Hamby, Boney-McCoy & Sugarman, 1996). Cronbach Alpha attained in this study was .97.

The Self-Esteem Scale (Rosenberg, 1965) measures global feelings of self-worth and self-acceptance on a 10 item self-report Likert scale. Reliability on internal consistency has attained a Cronbach Alpha of .77 and .88. Test-retest correlations of .85 have been reported after a two week interval (Rosenberg, 1965). Cronbach Alpha of .86 was attained on this study.

The Fatherhood Scale is a 75 item Likert type instrument designed to measure an individual’s perception of his relationship with his father during his growing-up years. The scale operationalizes the constructs of positive paternal emotional engagement, negative paternal engagement, the nurturing father role and the moral father role. Refer to Chapter 3 for psychometric properties.
Demographic Questionnaire is a 10-item instrument designed to gather basic demographic data on the subjects including demographic information about their fathers, such as the educational level of the subjects’ fathers, and whether or not their parents divorced. Refer to Appendix E.

Data Analysis

A variety of descriptive and inferential statistics were used for analyzing the data, including nonparametric tests and logistic regression. Demographic data were initially examined using descriptive statistics for summarizing, organizing and describing the entire data set. The categorical variables describing characteristics of the subjects, such as race, marital status, and educational level were initially examined using frequencies and percentages. Variables describing the respondents’ fathers, including their educational level and whether or not their parents divorced were also examined using frequencies and percentages. Subjects were asked to identify their adult male caretaker while growing up, and whether or not they always lived with their father while growing up. These were also examined using frequencies and percentages. Quantitative variables such as age, income and the subjects’ age at the time of the divorce, were examined using frequencies and means. Because these quantitative variables did not meet the assumption of normality, the median was also used to describe the data.

The Chi-square test was used to measure the expected frequencies with the observed frequencies on several demographic variables between the non-violent and violent groups. Contingency tables were used for both groups to compare demographic
variables of race, education, the subjects' father's level of education, subjects' male caretaker while growing up, and whether or not they always lived with their father.

The t-test was used to test the statistical significance of the results of comparing the means on variables of interest between the two groups. T-tests were used to test the statistical significance between the means on such demographic variables as education, income, and age. T-tests were also used to test the mean differences on each of the independent variables between the two groups.

Examining a particular variable in isolation falls short of thoroughly explaining intimate violence. Instead of using a single variable to indicate a linear relationship between the dependent variable and the independent variable, logistic regression is a method of predicting whether the event, violence or non-violence in an intimate relationship, will occur based upon a set of independent variables. As researchers test multivariate models, they must also direct greater attention to those sets of factors within any particular domain that are the most salient and offer explanatory power (Feldman & Ridley, 1995).

The Rationale For Use of Logistic Regression

Although there are numerous statistical techniques available to analyze and interpret research, logistic regression was chosen as the appropriate technique to answer the research questions. Logistic regression analysis would also indicate the odds of violence increasing or decreasing based upon statistically significant independent variables.
Multiple regression analysis is considered appropriate when the researcher is interested in explaining the variance in a single dependent variable through linear relationships with a set of independent variables (Hair, Anderson, Tatham & Black, 1995). When the problem under study involves a single independent variable, the statistical analysis is called simple regression. Whenever the researcher is attempting to explain the relationship between a set of independent variables and a single dependent variable, the statistical technique is called multiple regression analysis (Hair, Anderson, Tatham & Black, 1995). When the objective of the research study is to predict the magnitude of change in the dependent variable by the changes in several predictor independent variables, then multiple regression analysis would be an appropriate statistical analysis (Hair, Anderson, Tatham & Black, 1995).

When the researcher is examining a dichotomous group, such as violent or non-violent in an intimate relationship, discrete variables do not always follow a normal distribution Hair, et. al. (1995). The Kolmogorov-Smirnov test of normality produced a significance level of .000, indicating that the data differed significantly from a normal distribution. In order to avoid violating the assumptions required when using discriminant analysis, logistic regression was the statistical analysis used. The logistic regression model was developed using two models: one with six independent variables, and a second model to include the educational level of the subjects. These variables were entered into the regression analysis simultaneously.

Logistic regression was the statistical technique utilized in the study to predict the probability of whether the event, violence or non-violence in intimate relationships, occurred or did not occur, based upon the set of predictor variables. In logistic regression
the dependent variable is dichotomous and scored 0 and 1. Independent variables in logistic regression can be categorical or continuous quantitative variables. Categorical variables can be used as independent variables in logistic regression through dummy coding, such as 0 or 1 (SPSS, 1995).
CHAPTER 5

RESULTS

Introduction

The data analysis of the research study is organized into five sections. First, the demographics for the entire sample will be presented. Second, is a section determining who was violent and non-violent. Third, demographic data for both groups: violent and non-violent men and descriptive analysis of the entire sample is presented, followed by descriptive data for both groups: violent and non-violent men. Fourth, the research questions are discussed and fifth, the hypotheses will be presented, including results from the logistic regression.

Data for the analysis of this study were collected from 145 males in the state of Ohio. The purpose of the study was to determine if men’s relationship with their fathers while they were growing up influenced whether or not they were violent against a female intimate partner. The study examined the type of relationship men had with their fathers to determine if (a) the level of paternal involvement and (b) the quality of the relationship were predictors of physical violence in an intimate relationship with a female partner.
Demographic data were collected on 145 men. Demographic profiles of the subjects in the study are presented in Table 17. The age of the men in the study ranged from 19 to 61. The mean age was 35.7 (SD = 9.53).

The income level of the men in the study ranged from $0 to $225,000. The mean level of income for the sample was $54,443 (SD = $40,592). The median income was $42,000 and the mode was $60,000. Thirty-five percent of the sample was making under $34,000. Thirty-five percent were had income levels between $34,000 and $60,000. Seventeen percent reported income levels between $60,000 and $100,000. Fifteen subjects (9%) of the men in the study reported income levels between $100,000 and $225,000. Fifteen (10%) failed to report on income.

The vast majority of the subjects 80 (52%) reported being married. Nearly one-quarter of the sample, 33 (23%) were single and never married. Eleven (8%) were divorced. Ten (7%) were separated, and 9 (6%) were living with someone in a domestic relationship.

The educational level ranged from less than a high school diploma to completion of graduate school. Fourteen (10%) had less than a high school education. High school graduates comprised 38 (26%) of the sample. Ten (7%) attended Technical School. Twenty-one (15%) of the subjects had some college education. Thirty-eight (26%) of the sample were college graduates, whereas 24 (17%) completed graduate school.
The largest racial group in the study 106 (73%) was Caucasian. African Americans 28 (19%) were the second largest group. There was one (.7%) Asian American in the study; one (.7%) Hispanic; two (1.4%) Native Americans; and six subjects (4%) reported their race as “other”.

Information was obtained on the male defined by the men in the study as their primary adult male caretaker (Refer to Table 23). The vast majority 107 (74%) reported their natural father to be their primary adult male caretaker. Stepfathers were the primary adult male caretakers for 13 (9%) of the men in the study. Five (4%) of the men in the study were adopted. Eighteen (12%) of the men defined their primary adult male caretaker as other.

It was also of interest in this study to inquire if the men always lived with their father while growing up. Eighty-seven (60%) of the subjects reported they always lived with their father while growing up. Fifty-eight (40%) did not live with their father while growing up. Of the men whose parents divorced (n = 55), 79% did not live with their fathers while growing up. For those men whose parents did not divorce, 87% of the men reported they lived with their father while growing up.

Fifty-five (38%) of the men reported their parents divorced while they were growing up. The mean age of the subjects at the time of their parents’ divorce (n = 52) was 10 (SD = 7.72). Eighty-nine (61%) reported their parents did not divorce while they were growing up. For those men whose parents divorced, the median age at the time of the divorce was 9.6. The standard deviation was 7.72. The range was 31. Nine (11%)
were over the age of 18 when their parents divorced. Fifty-six percent of the African American subjects’ parents divorced and 34% of the Caucasian subject’s parents divorced. When examining the subjects’ fathers’ educational level, the group with the highest divorce rate was men who had gone to technical school (64%). The lowest divorce rate was among those men whose fathers were college graduates (10%). Of those men whose parents divorced (n = 55), 75% of them were later physically violent with a female intimate.

Educational data were also collected on the subjects’ fathers. The results of the data on the subjects’ fathers are presented in Table 20. Forty-two (29%) had less than a high school education. High school graduates made up 38 (26%) of the sample. Eleven (8%) had attended Technical School; 16 (11%) had attended some college; and 21 (15%) of the subjects’ fathers graduated from college. Fourteen (10%) completed graduate school.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Marital Status</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Married</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>55.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Divorced</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>7.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single &amp; Never Married</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>22.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Separated</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Currently Living in a Domestic Relationship</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Total):</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>98.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Educational Level of Respondents</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less Than High School</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>9.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High School Graduate</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>26.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical School</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some College</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>14.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College Graduate</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>26.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Completed Graduate School</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>16.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Total):</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Race</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African American</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>19.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian American</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caucasian</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>73.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native American</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Total):</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>99.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 17: Demographic Characteristics on the Entire Sample (N = 145)

Note: Totals less than 100% contain missing data.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Primary Adult Male Caretaker</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>While Growing Up</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Father</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>73.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step-Father</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>9.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adopted Father</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>12.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>(Total):</strong></td>
<td>143</td>
<td>98.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Always Lived With Father</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>While Growing Up</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>60.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>40.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>(Total):</strong></td>
<td>145</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 18: Paternal Availability on the Entire Sample
Note: Totals less than 100% contain missing data.

Determining Who Was Non-Violent and Violent

The Conflict Tactics Scale (2) (Straus, Hamby, McCoy & Sugarman, 1996) measures the extent to which partners engage in psychological and physical attacks on one another when dealing with conflict. The scale is based upon conflict theory, which assumes that conflict is an inevitable part of human relationships, whereas violence as a means to resolve differences is not (Straus, Hamby, McCoy & Sugarman, 1996). For the purposes of this study, the physical assault subscale (see Table 19) of this instrument was used to measure whether or not the subjects had ever engaged in any physical assultive behavior or if they had ever caused any physical injury to an intimate partner. The
Rationale in using only the physical assault scale was to categorize men into two groups: violent and non-violent. Psychological abuse and sexual coercion were not a focus of this study, nor were the underlying coercive control, fear and intimidation, which accompany so much of the physical abuse and are an intrinsic part of the cycle of violence. As a result, these subscales on the Conflict Tactics Scale (2) were not used in this study.

The results indicated that 50 subjects had never engaged in any kind of physical assaultive behavior with an intimate partner, whereas 95 subjects reported one or more incidents of physically assaultive tactics with an intimate partner. The scores ranged from one to 126. The mean score on the physical assaultive and injury scales was 14.66 (SD = 23.01), which is slightly higher 12.9 (SD = 21.6) than the findings reported by (Straus, Hamby, Boney-McCoy & Sugarman, 1996), and much higher than the mean score of 3.7 reported by (McKenry, Julian & Gavazzi, 1995). (It should be noted that in this study, physical assault and injury were combined to classify subjects into a violent group). Thirty-seven percent of the subjects reported only one incident of any type of physical assault or injury.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Non-Violent</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Violent</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 19: Dependent Variable: Violent or Non-Violent
### Educational Level of Respondents' Fathers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less Than High School</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>29.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High School Graduate</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>26.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical School</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>7.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some College</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>11.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College Graduate</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>14.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Completed Graduate School</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>9.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>(Total):</strong></td>
<td><strong>142</strong></td>
<td><strong>97.9</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Experienced Parental Divorce

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>37.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>61.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>(Total):</strong></td>
<td><strong>144</strong></td>
<td><strong>99.3</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 20: Demographic Characteristics on the Subjects' Fathers for Entire Sample

Note: Totals less than 100% contain missing data.
Demographic Data Comparing Non-Violent and Violent Group

Ordinal demographic data comparing both groups is presented in Table 21. The mean age for the non-violent group was 37.8. The mean age for the violent group was 34.5. The mean income for the non-violent group was $66,868, compared to $47,025 for the violent group. When ordinal data does not produce a normal distribution, it is also important to examine the median. Median income for the non-violent group was $56,500 and the median income level for the violent group was $37,000. There were statistically significant differences between the two groups on income ($t(2.758 = .007, p > .05)$. For those men in the non-violent group whose families divorced (28%), the mean age at the time of the divorce was 8.6. Refer to Table 24. Forty-four percent of the men in the violent group experienced parental divorce and the mean age at the time of the divorce was 10.

The racial composition of the sample consisted of 19% African American and 73% Caucasian (Chi-Square = 358.583, df = 5, p = .000). As indicated in Table 22, 10% of the non-violent group was African American; Caucasians comprised 84% of the non-violent group (Chi-Square = 93.520, df = 3, p = .000). African Americans comprised 24.2% of the violent group; Caucasians comprised 67.4% of the violent group (Chi-Square = 202.426, df = 5, p = .000). There were no Asian Americans, Hispanics or Native Americans in the non-violent sample, and only one Asian American, one Hispanic and one Native American in the violent group. Four percent in each group reported their race as “other”.
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### Table 21: Demographics Characteristics Comparing Non-Violent and Violent Group

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Non-Violent (n = 50)</th>
<th>Violent (n = 92)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Age</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>37.8</td>
<td>34.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median</td>
<td>37.5</td>
<td>35.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard Deviation</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>9.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Income</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>$66,868</td>
<td>$47,025</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median</td>
<td>$56,500</td>
<td>$37,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard Deviation</td>
<td>$42,597</td>
<td>$37,737</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Statistically significant differences

Sixty-eight percent of the subjects in the non-violent group (N = 50) were married as compared to 48% in the violent group (N = 95). Refer to Table 22. A larger percentage of men were divorced in the violent group (10%) as compared to the non-violent group (4%). Over one-quarter (27%) of the violent group were single and had never been married compared to 16% of the non-violent group. Subjects reporting that they were separated were approximately equal for both groups, 6% of the non-violent men were separated and 7% of the violent group were separated. Four percent of the non-violent group was living in a domestic relationship, whereas 7% of the violent group
were currently living in a domestic relationship. Overall 37% of the violent group were not living with partners, having been divorced, separated, or single.

Overall, the violent group had less education than the non-violent group. Refer to Table 22. Although approximately 25% of the violent group attained a college degree or higher, close to one-half of the violent respondents had a high school degree or less. Compared to the non-violent group, only 12% had a high school degree or less, whereas almost three-quarters (72%) had earned a college degree or higher. The data analysis indicated a statistically significant difference between the two groups on education (Chi-Square = 28.834, df = 5, p = .000).

There were also statistically significant differences on the subjects' fathers' educational level (Chi-Square = 36.394, df = 5, p = .000). (Refer to Table 24). Although approximately an equal percentage (30%) of subjects' fathers had less than a high school education, more of the fathers in the non-violent group had earned a graduate degree compared to the fathers of the violent subjects.

As indicated by Table 23, 64% of the men in the non-violent group (N = 50) always lived with their father while growing up and 36% did not. Fifty-eight percent of the violent group (N = 95) reported they always lived with their father while growing up, 42.1% did not. Eighty-four percent of the men in the non-violent group reported their primary adult male caretaker as their father; 4% indicated their stepfather, 6% the adopted father and 6% reported other. Sixty-eight percent of the men in the violent group
indicated their father was their primary adult male caretaker growing up, 11.6% reported their stepfather, 2.1% the adopted father and 15.8% reported other.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Non-Violent</th>
<th>Violent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Frequeny</strong></td>
<td><strong>Percent</strong></td>
<td><strong>Frequeny</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Married</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>68.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Divorced</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single &amp; Never Married</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>16.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Separated</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Currently Living in a Domestic Relationship</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>(Total):</strong></td>
<td>49</td>
<td>98.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Educational Level of Respondents**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Non-Violent</th>
<th>Violent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less Than High School</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High School Graduate</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical School</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some College</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>12.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College Graduate</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>42.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Completed Graduate School</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>30.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>(Total):</strong></td>
<td>50</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Race**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Race</th>
<th>Non-Violent</th>
<th>Violent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>African American</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian American</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caucasian</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>84.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native American</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>(Total):</strong></td>
<td>50</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 22: Demographics on the Subjects for Both Non-Violent and Violent Groups
*Statistically significant differences
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Non-Violent</th>
<th>Violent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>Percent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Primary Adult Male Caretaker</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>While Growing Up*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Father</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>84.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step-Father</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adopted Father</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Total):</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Always Lived With Father</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>While Growing Up*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>64.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>36.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Total):</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Age At The Time of Parents’ Divorce</strong></td>
<td>(n = 14)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>8.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard Deviation</td>
<td>7.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 23: Paternal Availability for Both Non-Violent and Violent Groups
*Statistically significant differences
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Non-Violent</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Violent</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>Percent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Educational Level of Respondents' Fathers</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less Than High School</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>30.0</td>
<td></td>
<td>27</td>
<td>28.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High School Graduate</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>18.0</td>
<td></td>
<td>29</td>
<td>30.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical School</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some College</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>12.0</td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College Graduate</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>18.0</td>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Completed Graduate School</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>16.0</td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Total):</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
<td>92</td>
<td>96.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Respondents Experienced Parental Divorce</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>28.0</td>
<td></td>
<td>41</td>
<td>43.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>72.0</td>
<td></td>
<td>53</td>
<td>55.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Total):</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
<td>94</td>
<td>98.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 24: Demographic Characteristics on the Subjects' Fathers Non-Violent and Violent Group
*Statistically significant differences
The Mann-Whitney test was used to test the numeric variables of age, income and the subjects’ age at the time of their parents’ divorce. The Mann-Whitney test is a nonparametric test that is equivalent to the t-test, which tests the null hypothesis that the two independent samples come from the same population. Instead of using the mean and the variance for analysis, as when the data are normally distributed, the Mann-Whitney is obtained by counting the number of times an observation from the smaller group (non-violent) precedes an observation from the larger group (violent) (SPSS, 1999). The results of the analysis are displayed in Table 25.

There were statistically significant differences ($t = (2.758) = .007, p < .005$) between the two groups on income.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>Mann-Whitney</th>
<th>Z</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age*</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>1799.00</td>
<td>-2.142</td>
<td>.032</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income*</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>1293.00</td>
<td>-3.258</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age at Time of Divorce</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>225.500</td>
<td>-.839</td>
<td>.402</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Mean Income $66,869 $47,025
Standard Deviation $42,597 $37,737

Table 25: Analyzes Numeric Demographic Variables
Note. Totals less than 100% contain missing data. $n = 52$. Age at the time of divorce was reported only if their parents divorced.

*Statistically significant differences
The Chi-Square test was used to test for statistically significant differences between observed and expected frequencies on several demographic categorical variables. The findings of the Chi-Square test are presented in Table 26. There was a statistically significant difference between the non-violent (N = 50) and violent (N = 95) groups on marital status. The majority of the non-violent men were married (68%), whereas 48% of the violent men were married. Four percent of the non-violent group was divorced, compared to 10% of the violent group. Sixteen percent of the non-violent group were single and never married, whereas 26% of the violent group was single and never married.

The violent group (N = 95) was generally less educated than the non-violent (N = 50) group (See Table 22). The largest category of educational attainment for the violent group was high school graduate (36%), whereas 52% of the non-violent group had graduated from college, or had completed graduate school. A nearly equal percentage of the subjects’ father’s had less than a high school education. Thirty percent of the subjects’ fathers in the non-violent group have less than a high school education and 28% of the subjects’ fathers in the violent group had less than a high school education. The non-violent group had a larger percentage of fathers being graduated from college or graduate school (34%), compared to the fathers of the violent group (19%).

Forty-three percent of the violent groups (N = 95) parents divorced, whereas 28% of the non-violent groups (N = 50) parents divorced. Of those men in the violent group whose parents divorced, 81% did not end up living with their fathers (Cramer's V = .696,
p = .000). Of those men whose parents divorced, 75% were violent in an intimate relationship (Cramer’s V = .156, p = .000). When the researcher wants to determine if there is an association between two variables based on chi-square, and the data are nominal data, Cramer’s V is test statistic to use (SPSS, 1999).
### Variable N X2 df Significance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>X2</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Significance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Marital Status</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>129.413</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>28.834</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subjects Fathers Education</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>36.394</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>358.583</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary Male Caretaker As A Child</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>191.741</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lived With Father As A Child</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>5.8000</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parents Divorced</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>8.028</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.005</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 26: Analysis of Demographic Data**

**Descriptive Statistics Comparing Non-Violent and Violent Group**

The descriptive statistics for the independent variables for both the non-violent (n=50) and the violent (n=95) groups including the mean, standard deviations, and T tests are reported in Table 27. An independent t-test was used to determine if the mean differences between the groups were statistically significant. There was a statistically significant difference on the independent variables: self-esteem, experiencing child abuse and witnessing the father abuse the mother. Positive paternal emotional engagement, the moral father role and shame were not statistically significant. At alpha level .05, the mean scores on self-esteem were statistically significant between the two groups. At alpha level .01, witnessing marital violence between the parents was statistically
significant. There was a statistically significant difference at alpha .001 between the non-violent and violent groups on experiencing child abuse by the father.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Independent Variable</th>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Sig. (2-tailed)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Positive Paternal</td>
<td>Non-Violent</td>
<td>94.6</td>
<td>29.96</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotional Engagement</td>
<td>Violent</td>
<td>89.9</td>
<td>29.99</td>
<td>.886</td>
<td>.377</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Moral Father Role</td>
<td>Non-Violent</td>
<td>15.22</td>
<td>5.56</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Violent</td>
<td>14.36</td>
<td>5.73</td>
<td>.857</td>
<td>.393</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Esteem</td>
<td>Non-Violent</td>
<td>32.92</td>
<td>4.50</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Violent</td>
<td>30.61</td>
<td>4.71</td>
<td>2.845</td>
<td>.005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Witnessing Parental</td>
<td>Non-Violent</td>
<td>9.44</td>
<td>1.24</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Violence</td>
<td>Violent</td>
<td>8.49</td>
<td>2.13</td>
<td>3.357</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experienced Child</td>
<td>Non-Violent</td>
<td>9.36</td>
<td>1.30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abuse By The Father</td>
<td>Violent</td>
<td>8.51</td>
<td>1.61</td>
<td>3.401</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shamed By The Father</td>
<td>Non-Violent</td>
<td>8.89</td>
<td>1.36</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Violent</td>
<td>8.55</td>
<td>1.83</td>
<td>1.568</td>
<td>.119</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 27: Analysis of Independent Variables
(Violent Group n = 50; Non-violent Group n = 95)

Research Questions

In the present study the researcher explored the relationships men had with their fathers while they were growing up to determine whether the quality of the father/son relationship (either positive or negative) was a predictor of adult intimate violence. Several questions were used to explore the relationship. If the father were positively
engaged with his son, participating in activities and emotionally available, would this
type of relationship be associated with non-violence in intimate relationships as an adult?
On the other hand, if the father was negatively engaged with his son as measured by child
abuse, abusing the child’s mother, or shaming the child, would this type of relationship
effect men’s levels of violence against a female intimate?

Research Question 1

Do men who use physical violence to resolve interpersonal conflict have a different type
of relationship with their fathers than non-physically violent men?

Non-violent men had a mean score of 39.0 (13.9) on the subscale positive paternal
engagement, (such as being told they were loved by the father, doing fun things with their
father and/or feeling close to their dad) compared to a mean score of 35.9 (13.4) for the
violent group. A t-test did not find a statistically significant difference, \( t (1.315) = .192, p > .05 \). However, the violent group reported a significantly greater occurrence of negative
paternal engagement, (such as shame, neglect, spanking, physical punishment and/or
shouting) \( (M = 47.2, \ SD = 8.80) \), compared to the non-violent group \( (M = 50.1, \ SD = 6.17) \). A t-test found that the groups differed significantly, \( t (2.073) = .040, p < .05 \).
These scores were inverted in the analysis, whereas a lower score indicates a more
negative relationship.
One way to examine the type of relationship men had with their fathers is to determine the accessibility of the fathers. Were there more divorces in one group than in the other? Did the subjects' parents' experience a divorce? Did the subjects actually live with their fathers while growing up and/or was someone else their primary male caretaker? The demographic data presented in Table 23 indicate that 68.4% of the men who use physical violence as a conflict tactic identified their father as their primary adult male caretaker while growing, compared to the men who were non-violent (84%). The violent men were more likely to live with a stepfather (11.6%) than were non-violent men (4%). Violent men were more likely to list a primary adult male caretaker as "other" (15.8%) while growing up than non-violent men (6%). Sixty-four percent of the non-violent men always lived with their father while growing up compared to 57.9% of the violent group. The violent group was much more likely to come from a divorced family (43.6%) than the non-violent group (28%).

Research Question 2

Do physically violent men have lower mean scores on positive paternal emotional engagement than non-physically violent men?

The men in the study who used physical violence as a conflict tactic had lower mean scores on positive paternal emotional engagement ($M = 89.9$, $SD = .29.9$) than men who were non-violent ($M = 94.6$, $SD = 29.9$). There were no statistically significant differences between the groups, $t (.886) = .377, p > .05$. A Pearson $r$ indicated a
significant negative correlation between positive paternal emotional responsiveness and physical violence \((r = -0.247, p = 0.01)\). The positive relationship with the father was also negatively associated to physical violence \((r = -0.279, p = 0.01)\).

**Research Question 3**

*Are men with fathers who actively pursue the role of the religious leader within the home less violent than men with fathers who do not take on this role?*

The men in the violent group had lower mean scores on the moral father role \((M = 14.3, SD = 5.73)\) compared to the men in the non-violent group \((M = 15.2, SD = 5.59)\). However, analysis did not find a statistically significant difference between the groups, \(t(857) = 0.393, p > 0.05\). Often times in data analysis, the researcher may want to examine the extreme scores of a range on a particular variable to determine if the highest scores and the lowest scores produce any significant findings. Further analyses examined the mean scores on physical violence for the top one-third of the range of scores (scores ranging from 17 to 25) on the moral father role with the lower one-third (scores ranging from 5 to 11). The physically violent scores \((M = 18.63, SD = 28.19)\) for the men with low moral father role scores \((n = 47)\) and the physically violent scores \((M = 9.66, SD = 17.34)\) for those men high moral father role scores \((n = 51)\) were not statistically significant, \(t(1.878) = 0.064, p > 0.05\).
Research Question 4

Do men with high positive paternal emotional engagement score higher on self-esteem than the group with low paternal emotional engagement?

In order to answer this research question the researcher examined the subscale positive paternal emotional engagement (M = 91.56, SD 29.95) for the entire sample and the self-esteem scores from Rosenberg’s Self-Esteem Scale. The analyses consisted of examining the scores in the top one-third of the range (scores ranging from 102 to 162) and comparing them to the scores comprising the lower one-third of the range (scores ranging from 33 to 79). These two groups representing low and high positive paternal emotional involvement were analyzed for differences in self-esteem. The analysis indicated a statistically significant difference in self-esteem scores (t (-2.134) = .035, p <.05) between the group with high positive paternal emotional engagement (n = 53) and self-esteem (M = 32.8, SD = 4.7) and the group with low positive paternal emotional engagement (n = 46) and self-esteem (M = 30.6, SD = 5.07).

Research Question 5

Is there a relationship between level of self-esteem and physical violence in intimate relationships?

In order to answer this research question the researcher examined the scores from Rosenberg’s Self-Esteem Scale and the scores on the physical violence and injury subscales from the CTS (II) Scale. Men who were violent had a lower mean score on
self-esteem of \( \text{M} = 30.6, \text{SD} = 4.71 \) compared to men in the non-violent group \( \text{M} = 32.9, \text{SD} = 4.50 \). Although a \( t \)-test found a significant difference on the mean scores between the violent and non-violent group on self-esteem (see Table 27), sometimes researchers will want to know if there is an association between the two variables and the strength of that association. A Pearson correlation found a significant negative correlation between self-esteem and physical violence \((r = -0.278, \ p = 0.01)\).

**Research Question 6**

Is there a significant difference in the educational levels between the violent and non-violent group?

The Mann-Whitney is a nonparametric test that tests whether two independent samples are from the same population. The Mann-Whitney indicated that there is a significant difference between the non-violent and violent group on education (Mann-Whitney \( U = 1168.000, \ Z = -5.137, \ p < .000 \) (2-tailed test). The mean rank for the non-violent group was 97, compared to the mean rank of 60 for the violent group. Data analysis also revealed that the educational level within the violent group (Chi-Square = 28.727, df = 5, \( p = .000 \)) and within the non-violent group (Chi-Square = 37.120, df = 5, \( p = .000 \)) was not equal across the categorical levels. A higher proportion of violent men had a high school education or less, whereas respondents in the non-violent group had a higher proportion of college educated respondents.
Research Question 7

Does a positive emotional relationship with the father, the moral father role, the subjects' self-esteem, the educational level of the subjects, and whether or not being abused by the father, shamed by the father, seeing the father abuse the mother, and being a victim of child abuse by the father predict the probability of intimate violence as an adult?

In order to answer this research question logistic regression analysis was performed. Logistic regression is the most appropriate statistical analysis to utilize when the researcher is interested in being able to predict an outcome based upon a set of predictor variables (Hair et. al, 1995). This research design is interested in predicting the probability of intimate violence based upon several variables that characterize the relationship men had with their fathers while growing up.

Based upon the literature review, theory and direct practice, several hypotheses were developed to predict the probability of violence in an intimate relationship. Two models were developed and tested.

Hypotheses for Model 1

The independent variables contained in Model 1 include positive paternal emotional engagement, model father role, self-esteem, witnessing parental violence, experiencing child abuse by the father, and being shamed by the father. The statistical hypothesis that the logistic regression coefficients for Model 1 are 0 was not rejected.
indicating that the model fits the data. The model X was calculated at 25.065 with 6 degrees of freedom. This was significant at the .0003 alpha level.

Hypotheses for Model 2

Inclusion of the educational level of the subjects is the basic difference between the two models. The independent variables contained in Model 2 include positive paternal emotional engagement, model father role, self-esteem, witnessing parental violence, experiencing child abuse by the father, being shamed by the father, and education. The results for the hypotheses regarding Model 2 were statistically significant. The statistical hypothesis that the logistic regression coefficients were 0 was not rejected indicating that the model fits the data. The model X was calculated at 47.839 with 7 degrees of freedom. This was significant at the .0000 alpha level.

Comparing Model 1 and Model 2

Model 1 was much more effective in predicting correctly the men for violent group. The model correctly predicted 84 of the 95 (88%) men in the violent group. Model 1 performed poorly in only predicting 38% of the men into the non-violent group. Only 19 predictions were correct out of 50.

Model 2 was more effective in predicting the probability of violence than in predicting non-violence. The model correctly predicted 82 of the 95 (86%) of the men in the violent group, and correctly predicted 36 of the 50 (72%) of the men in the non-violent group.
Overall Model 2 performed better than Model 1, particularly in correctly classifying non-violent men. The model correctly predicts 82 of the 95 (86%) of the men in the violent group. The model correctly predicted 36 of the 50 (72%) of the men in the non-violent group.

Hypotheses Testing for Logistic Regression

The findings for the hypotheses were analyzed using the logistic regression model. First the entire logistic regression model was tested for the “goodness of fit” for both Model 1 and Model 2. The statistical hypotheses were that the model fits that data and the model chi-square statistic tests the null hypothesis that the logistic regression coefficients for all the terms in the model, except the constant are 0. Another method for testing how well the model fits the data is to calculate R²L, which is analogous to R² in multiple regression analysis. In Model 1 R²L = .13. The measure of multiple association between the independent variables and the dependent variable was .13. In Model 2, R²L = .26, indicating that by the inclusion of education in the model, the R²L measure of multiple association between the independent variables and the dependent variable was .26. Secondly, each independent variable, which depends on the other independent variables in the model, was tested to determine if it made a statistically significant contribution to the logistic regression model. The statistical hypothesis was that the logistic regression coefficient (Bk) is zero, and the test statistic is the Wald statistic which has a chi-square distribution (Warmbrod, 1997). When the probability associated with the calculated Wald test statistic, Wald is ≤ .05, the decision rule is to reject the null
hypothesis, in other words, the logistic regression coefficient is not equal to 0. If the probability associated with the calculated Wald test statistic is > .05, the decision rule is to fail to reject the null hypothesis, which indicates that the logistic regression coefficient \( (B_k) \) equals zero.

Hypotheses One-

Positive paternal emotional engagement is a predictor of intimate violence.

The findings for the hypotheses that positive paternal emotional engagement is a positive predictor of intimate violence were not statistically significant within either model. A partial correlation between positive paternal emotional engagement and the dependent variable, holding all the other independent variables constant in Model 1 was \( (r = .0000, p = .8954) \) and in Model 2 \( (r = .0000, p = .9832) \). For a one-unit change in positive paternal emotional engagement, the odds of violence occurring are unchanged when all the other independent variables are held constant.

Hypotheses Two-

Positive paternal emotional engagement is positively related to self-esteem for abusive and non-abusive men.

The hypothesis that positive paternal emotional engagement is positively related to self-esteem for abusive and non-abusive men was statistically significant. A Pearson \( r \) \( (r = .249, p = 0.01 \text{ (2-tailed)}) \) found a statistically significant correlation between positive paternal emotional engagement and self-esteem for both groups.
Hypotheses Three-

Self-esteem is a predictor of intimate violence.

The hypothesis that self-esteem is negatively related to intimate violence was statistically significant. Holding all other independent variables constant, a partial correlation in Model 1 ($r = -.1890, p = .0032$) and in Model 2 ($r = -.1308, p = .0226$) indicates that for a one-unit increase in self-esteem, there is a one-unit decrease in the probability of violence occurring. For Model 1, Exp (B) .8755 indicates that for a one-unit increase in self-esteem, holding all the other variables constant, the odds of violence are decreased by a factor of .88 or by 12%. For Model 2, Exp (B) .8944 indicates that for a one-unit increase in self-esteem holding all the other variables constant, the odds of violence occurring are decreased by a factor of .89 or by 11%.

Hypotheses Four-

The moral father role is a predictor of intimate violence.

The hypothesis that the moral father role was negatively related to intimate violence was not statistically significant in Model 1 ($r = .000, p = .8489$) or in Model 2 ($r = .0000, p = .3731$). Holding all the other independent variables constant, for the moral father role, the odds are unchanged for a one-unit increase in the dependent variable.

Hypotheses Five-

Experiencing negative paternal engagement such as witnessing marital violence is a predictor of intimate violence.
The results for this hypothesis were statistically significant. Experiencing negative paternal engagement by witnessing marital violence is positively related to intimate violence. Witnessing marital violence in Model 1 ($r = -0.1250, p = 0.0266$) and again in Model 2 ($r = -0.1106, p = 0.0384$) indicates that for a one-unit increase in witnessing marital violence, the odds are decreased that violence will occur in adult intimate relationships. For Model 1, $\text{Exp}(B) = 0.7245$ indicates that the odds of violence for a one-unit increase in witnessing marital violence, holding all the other variables constant, are decreased by a factor of 0.72 or by 26%. For Model 2, $\text{Exp}(B) = 0.7261$ indicates that the odds of violence for a one-unit increase in witnessing marital violence holding all the other variables constant are decreased by a factor of 0.73 or by 27%.

**Hypotheses Six-**

Experiencing negative paternal engagement such as child abuse is a predictor of intimate violence.

The results for this hypothesis were statistically significant. Experiencing negative paternal engagement of child abuse is positively related to intimate violence. Holding all other independent variables constant, experiencing child abuse, both in Model 1 ($r = -0.1518, p = 0.0120$) and in Model 2 ($r = -0.1528, p = 0.0117$) indicate that for a one-unit increase in child abuse, the odds are decreased that violence will occur in an intimate relationship with a female partner. For Model 1, $\text{Exp}(B) = 0.6386$ indicates that the odds of violence for a one-unit increase in child abuse holding all the other variables constant is decreased by a factor of 0.64 or 36%. For Model 2, $\text{Exp}(B) = 0.6098$ indicates that for a one-
unit increase in child abuse, the odds of violence decreasing holding all the other
variables constant is decreased by a factor of .61 or 39%.

Hypotheses Seven-

Experiencing negative paternal engagement such as shaming by the father is a predictor
of intimate violence.

The findings for this hypothesis based on the results of the logistic regression
analysis indicated that shaming by the father was not significantly significant in Model 1
(r = .0772, p = .0777) or in Model 2 (r = .537, p = .1111). When holding all the other
independent variables constant, the odds are unchanged that shaming will produce a one-
unit increase in the dependent variable.

Results from Logistic Regression

The researcher constructed two logistic regression models: one with the subjects’
educational level and one without it. The conceptual reason to control for education was
due to the fact that education emerged out of the data analysis as such a powerful
predictor of non-violence. There were a total of six independent variables in the first
model: positive paternal emotional engagement, the moral father role, self-esteem,
witnessing parental violence, experienced child abuse by father and shamed by the father.
These combined variables were selected because they characterize either a positive or a
negative relationship with the father, and because both types of relationships are likely to
affect the subjects’ self-esteem.
In the second model, an additional independent variable was added to the model: the subjects' educational level. The researcher decided to analyze the data with and without education, because of the significant differences in education between the two groups.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Positive Paternal Emotional Engagement</td>
<td>91.6</td>
<td>29.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moral Father</td>
<td>14.6</td>
<td>5.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Esteem</td>
<td>31.4</td>
<td>4.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Witnessed</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child Abuse</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shame</td>
<td>8.7</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 28: Model 1: Mean and Standard Deviations for the Fatherhood Scale (N=145)
Table 29: Summary Data: Independent Variables Intercorrelations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>X1</th>
<th>X2</th>
<th>X3</th>
<th>X4</th>
<th>X5</th>
<th>X6</th>
<th>X7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Positive Engagement (X1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moral Father (X2)</td>
<td>-.66</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Esteem (X3)</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Witnessed (X4)</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>-.15</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child Abuse (X5)</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shame (X6)</td>
<td>-.31</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>-.22</td>
<td>-.19</td>
<td>-.41</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education (X7)</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>-.18</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Interpreting the Logistic Regression

"The logistic regression coefficient (B) can be interpreted as the change in "log odds" associated with a one-unit change in the independent variable" (Warmbrod, 1997, p. 66). Logistic regression estimates the coefficients, not by minimizing the squared deviations and obtaining the least squares, but by maximizing the likelihood the event will occur. This measures the changes in the ratio of the probability of the event occurring to the probability that it will not occur and is called the odds ratio. To better understand the estimated logistic coefficients, which are expressed in logarithms, a transformation needs to occur which transforms the coefficients back to the antilog of the value, so that the effect on the probabilities is assessed more easily to determine the probability the event will occur or not occur. (Hair, et al., 1995). Estimates of the
probability that an event will occur ranges from 0 to .1. If the probability is greater than .50, the prediction is that the event will occur. If the probability is less than .50 the prediction is that the event will not occur (Warmbrod, 1997).

Following transformation of the logit coefficients, the transformed value becomes known as Exp (B). If the logistic regression coefficient is positive, Exp (B) will be greater than 1, indicating that for a one-unit increase in the independent variable, the odds are increased that violence will occur. However, if the logistic regression coefficient is negative, Exp (B) will be less than 1, indicating that a one-unit increase in the independent variable means the odds are decreased violence will occur (Warmbrod, 1997). If the logistic regression coefficient is zero, Exp (B) has a value of 1.0 indicating that there is no change in the odds, meaning the predictor variable will produce no one-unit change in the dependent variable (Hair, et al., 1995). Exp (B) is the factor by which the odds of violence occurring increase or decrease for a one-unit increase in the predictor independent variable used within the model holding all other independent variables constant (Warmbrod, 1997).

In Model 1, the logistic regression indicated three coefficients to be significant: self-esteem, witnessing parental abuse and experiencing child abuse by the father. The other variables positive paternal emotional engagement, the moral father role and shaming by the father were not found to be significant. The logistic regression coefficient for positive paternal emotional engagement in Model 1 (refer to Table 30) is .0013 and Exp (B) is 1.00, so the odds are unchanged that this predictor variable will
cause any one-unit change in the dependent variable. Likewise, with the moral father role, the logistic regression coefficient is .0002 and \( \text{Exp} (B) \) is 1.00, therefore the odds are unchanged that this predictor variable will cause any change in the dependent variable.

In Model 2, (refer to Table 31) the analysis indicates that shame (a logistic regression coefficient of .1056 and \( \text{Exp} (B) \) of 1.1114) and the moral father role (logistic regression coefficients of .0495 and \( \text{Exp} (B) \) of 1.0508) did not contribute to the odds of a one-unit change in the dependent variable. Positive paternal emotional engagement produced a logistic regression coefficient of -.0002 and \( \text{Exp} (B) \) of .9998, however it was not statistically significant. There were four variables predicting violence: education (Bk = -.6195, \( \text{Exp} (B) \) = .5382), self-esteem (Bk = -.1116, \( \text{Exp} (B) \) = .8944), witnessing marital violence (Bk = -.7261, \( \text{Exp} (B) \) = .8944), and experiencing child abuse by the father (Bk = -.4947, \( \text{Exp} (B) \) = .6098). All four variables had negative Bk values; therefore for a one-unit increase in the independent variable the odds are decreased, that violence will occur.

The R statistic in logistic regression is used to describe the correlation between the dependent variable and each of the predictor independent variables. However, the contribution of each independent variable depends on the other predictor variables in the model (Warmbrod, 1997). A positive R value indicates that as the value of the independent variable increases, so does the likelihood violence will occur. In Model 1, shaming by the father (R= .0772) was the only predictor variable contributing to increasing the likelihood of violence. A negative R value indicates that as the value of
the independent variable increases, there is a decrease in the likelihood of violence occurring. Self-esteem \( (R = -0.1890) \), witnessing marital violence \( (R = -0.1250) \), and experiencing child abuse \( (R = -0.1518) \) all indicate as the value of each independent variable increases, there is the likelihood violence will decrease. Negative aspects of paternal involvement such as witnessing marital violence and child abuse were inversely scored, indicating that low scores meant the event occurred, and as the scores increased (move towards a higher score), the event would be less likely to occur. Within the model, both positive paternal emotional engagement \( (R = 0.000) \) and the moral father role \( (R = 0.000) \) did not contribute to predicting the probability of violence.

In Model 2, the logistic regression indicated four coefficients to be significant: self-esteem, witnessing parental child abuse, experiencing child abuse by the father and education. Positive paternal emotional engagement, the moral father role and shaming by the father were not significant. This means that for every one-unit change increase in the independent variable, the odds are decreased that violence will occur. In Model 2 both positive paternal emotional engagement \( (R = 0.000) \) and the moral father role \( (R = 0.000) \) did not contribute to predicting the probability of violence. Shaming by the father \( (R = 0.0537) \) was the only predictor variable contributing to increasing the likelihood of violence. Education \( (R = -0.2972) \), self-esteem \( (R = -0.1308) \), witnessing marital violence \( (R = -0.1106) \), and experiencing child abuse \( (R = -0.1528) \) all indicate as the value of each independent variable increases, there is the likelihood violence will decrease. Refer to Table 31.
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The statistical hypothesis is that the logistic regression coefficients for all the predictor variables in the logistic regression model, except the constant are 0 (Warmbrod, 1997). The model chi-square statistic tests for both models are significant (See Tables 30 and 31).

The proportion of the variance explained by the multiple association between the independent variables and the dependent variable in Model 1 is $R^2_L = .13$. The proportion of the variance explained by the independent variables in Model 2 is $R^2_L = .25.6$. Values vary between 0 and 1.0. Values close to 0 indicate that the model has no value in predicting the dependent variable and values of 1.0 predict with perfect accuracy.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Logistic Regression Coefficient</th>
<th>Wald Statistic</th>
<th>p</th>
<th>Exp(B)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Positive Paternal Emotional Engagement</td>
<td>.0013</td>
<td>.0173</td>
<td>.8954</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Moral Father Role</td>
<td>.0094</td>
<td>.0363</td>
<td>.8489</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Esteem</td>
<td>-.1330</td>
<td>8.6724</td>
<td>.0032</td>
<td>.8755</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Witnessing Parental Violence</td>
<td>-.3222</td>
<td>.1453</td>
<td>.0266</td>
<td>.7245</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experienced Child Abuse By The Father</td>
<td>-.4485</td>
<td>6.3060</td>
<td>.0120</td>
<td>.6386</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shamed By The Father</td>
<td>.0995</td>
<td>3.1127</td>
<td>.0777</td>
<td>1.1047</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>8.6658</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 30: Logistic Regression: Model 1, Predicting Whether Men Will Be Violent or Non-Violent (N = 145)

Factor by which the odds of being violent increase or decrease for a one-unit increase in the independent variable.

Model Chi-Square = 25.065; df = 6; p = .0003
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Logistic Regression Coefficient</th>
<th>Wald Statistic</th>
<th>p</th>
<th>Exp (B)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Positive Paternal Emotional</td>
<td>.0002</td>
<td>.0004</td>
<td>.9832</td>
<td>.9998</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotional Engagement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Moral Father Role</td>
<td>.0495</td>
<td>.7934</td>
<td>.3731</td>
<td>1.0508</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Esteem</td>
<td>-.1116</td>
<td>5.1980</td>
<td>.0226</td>
<td>.8944</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Witnessing Parental Violence</td>
<td>-.3201</td>
<td>4.2860</td>
<td>.0384</td>
<td>.7261</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experienced Child Abuse By The</td>
<td>-.4947</td>
<td>6.3610</td>
<td>.0017</td>
<td>.6098</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Father</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shamed By The Father</td>
<td>.1056</td>
<td>2.5387</td>
<td>.1111</td>
<td>1.1114</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>-.6195</td>
<td>18.4974</td>
<td>.0000</td>
<td>.5382</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>10.2452</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 31: Logistic Regression: Model 2, Predicting Whether Men Will Be Violent or Non-Violent (N = 145)

1 Factor by which the odds of being violent increase or decrease for a one-unit increase in the independent variable.

Model Chi-Square = 47.839; df = 7; p = .0000
Model One

Model one using the six-predictor variables, correctly classified 88% of the violent group (84 of 145) based on the information in those variables. However, the model only correctly classified 38% of the non-violent group, much less than what might occur by chance alone. Only 19 subjects of 145 were correctly classified as being non-violent. The model significantly forecasts violent men based on the predictor variables better than it does non-violent men. Overall, the model correctly classified 71% of the subjects as either being violent or non-violent.

The model $X$ is calculated at 25.065 with 6 degrees of freedom. This is significant at the .0003 alpha level. Therefore, the overall model significantly predicts violent status based on the specific predictor variables.

Another option for analyzing the classification table is to calculate the proportional reduction in error statistic (Warmbrod, 1997). In Model 1 there are 67% fewer errors of classification when predicting whether a man will be violent in an

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Observed</th>
<th>Predicted</th>
<th>Non-Violent</th>
<th>Violent</th>
<th>Percent Correct</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Non-Violent</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>31</td>
<td></td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Violent</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>84</td>
<td></td>
<td>88%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall % Correct</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>71%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 32: Model 1: Logistic Regression, Classification Table: Predicting Violence In An Intimate Relationship (N = 145)
intimate relationship using the logistic regression model compared to predicting that none of the men would be violent with an intimate partner. In comparison, in Model 2 there are 75% fewer errors of classification when predicting whether a man will be violent in an intimate relationship using the logistic regression model compared to predicting that none of the men will be violent with an intimate partner.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Predicted</th>
<th>Non-Violent</th>
<th>Violent</th>
<th>Percent Correct</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Observed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Violent</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>72%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Violent</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>86%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall % Correct</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>81%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 33: Model 2: Logistic Regression, Classification Table: Predicting Violence In An Intimate Relationship (N = 145)

Model Two

The educational level of the subjects was included in Model 2. The seven-predictor variables correctly classified 86% of the violent men (82 of 145) and 72% of the non-violent men (36 of 145) based on the information contained in those variables. Including education in the model increases the overall correct prediction for non-violent men by 35%; yet, the model slightly decreased the correct prediction of violent men by
7%. Overall, Model 2 correctly classified 81% of the subjects as either being violent or non-violent.

The model $X_2$ is calculated at 47.839 with 7 degrees of freedom. This is significant at the .0000 alpha level. Therefore, the overall model significantly predicts violent status based on the specific predictor variables.

**Summary of the Logistic Regression Models**

In both models, witnessing marital violence, being abused by the father and low self-esteem were statistically significant predictors of intimate violence. In both models, shaming by the father, the positive relationship with the father and the moral father role were not statistically significant predictors of intimate violence. In the second model, education was a statistically significant predictor variable. Education reduced the correct classification for predicting the probability of violence by 2%, whereas, education increased the correct classification for predicting the probability of non-violence by 34%.

**Summary of Chapter 5**

Logistic regression analysis was used on a sample of 145 cases consisting of adult men to explore the probability of the occurrence of violence or non-violence for a dichotomous dependent variable based on a linear combination of six independent variables in Model 1 and seven independent variables in Model 2. In Model 1, the independent variables were positive paternal emotional engagement, self-esteem, the moral father role, witnessing marital violence as a child, experiencing child abuse as a child and shaming by
the father. In Model 2, a seventh independent variable, the educational level of the subjects was added.

The logistic regression model was statistically significant for both models. In Model 1, the probability associated with the calculated model chi-square = 25.065, df = 6, p < .0003; so the Ho is rejected, with an overall correct prediction of 71%. In Model 2, the probability associated with the calculated model chi-square = 47.839, df = 7, p < .0000; so the researcher rejects the statistical hypothesis with an overall correct prediction of 81%.

When controlling for other variables, the contribution of each independent variable was analyzed to test for statistical significance. In Model 1, self-esteem, witnessing marital violence, and child abuse were statistically significant. In Model 2, in addition to self-esteem, witnessing marital violence, child abuse, and education (r = -.2972, p = .0000) was also statistically significant, indicating that for a one-unit increase in education (Exp (B) .5382) the odds are decreased that violence will occur by a factor of .54.

Three demographic variables found to be consistent with previous research were statistically significant between the groups: age, income, and educational level. The violent group was younger (M = 35, SD = 9.58) than the non-violent group (M = 38, SD = 9.13). A t-test indicated that the groups differed significantly, t (2.015) = 104.912, p = .046. The mean difference on income levels was (M = $9,844, SD = $7,428). A t test indicated that the groups differed significantly on income, t (2.672) = 89.183, p = .009. Income was negatively correlated to violence (r = -.241, p = .007). The violent group (n = 95) had a lower educational level than the non-violent group (n = 50) (Mann-Whitney U = 1168.000, Z = -5.137, p < .000) (2-tailed test).
CHAPTER 6

DISCUSSION

Introduction

The importance of understanding violence against women and the men who abuse them cannot be overstated. The United States is the most violent industrialized society in the world and a large proportion of this violence occurs within the family (Seigel, 1995). Violence within the family is a major social problem that has resulted in federal legislation, changes in state laws, and changes in procedures for how police, hospital emergency room personnel, human service workers, and the courts respond. Three major federal acts of legislation have elevated the issue of violence against women to recognition as a national problem. In 1994 Congress passed the Violence Against Women Act as part of the Violent Crime Control and Law Enforcement Act. President Clinton established the Office on Violence Against Women in the U.S. Department of Justice and the National Research Council established a Panel on Research on Violence Against Women in 1995. In order to synthesize the profusion of research on family violence, Congress requested the National Research Council to establish a research agenda to increase understanding and control of violence against women (Crowell &
Researchers and policy makers are in the pioneering stages of understanding the complexities of the problem.

Coalitions of professionals are working collaboratively together in counties throughout the state of Ohio to address how best to respond to the problem. Violence against women is a social problem that has crossed professional disciplines and the diversity of philosophical perspectives about the causes of violence has also resulted in an equally diverse array of solutions. Although there have been advances within the last 20 years in understanding the psychology of intimate rage, violence and abuse, and conceptualization of pathways from early development to adult violence (Dutton, 1998), what has been missing in family violence research has been the roles played by fathers (Sternberg, 1997). The purpose of this research has been an attempt to understand the men who abuse women. In exploring the etiology of intimate violence, the focus has centered on the characteristics of the fathers’ involvement in the psychological development of the sons who became abusers.

The focus in this sixth and final chapter is the integration of the findings within a meaningful theoretical context in order to deepen our understanding of men who abuse women. This research should be viewed as an initial attempt, as a pioneering exploratory study, into the lives of abusive men and the relationships they had with their fathers while growing up. The findings should provide a beginning understanding of the role of fathers in the development of aggression, raise further questions, and provide an impetus into further research.
The findings in this chapter will be discussed in separate sections and integrated with the existing literature and the theoretical models that supported the assumptions and the development of the research questions. The sections will be organized as follows: limitations of the study, summary of the findings, the demographic findings, the descriptive statistics from the independent variables, the research questions, hypotheses for the logistic regression, implications for practice, policy and future research, the limitations of the study and concluding remarks.

Limitations of the Study

The nonprobability sampling procedures limits the generalizability of the study to the sample being studied. Because the central research question inquired about men who were abusive to determine if their relationship with their fathers was associated with intimate violence with a female partner, a purposive sampling procedure was used. Therefore caution should be exercised in any attempts to generalize these findings beyond the sample studied.

Subjects, who self-select and volunteer to participate in the study may respond with answers that, are socially desirable; thus findings may be biased toward socially acceptable answers. This may be particularly true for the non-court subjects taken from the Montessori sample. Individuals with higher education may in general have a need to be viewed in a more socially desirable manner. Subjects in the Amend groups readily responded and requested to complete the surveys in the group, which may indicate a desire to be seen as cooperative. They may have thought that even though they were told
that their participation would not affect their relationship with the Amend Program, or the court; they may have thought that their involvement in the study would be looked upon favorably by the court.

Because of the sensitive nature of the questions, respondents may have denied or minimized their actual feelings and perceptions in order to avoid feelings of shame. Their ratings about their fathers may be unusually high, indicating a wish for how they wanted the relationship to be. The questions inquiring about shame were direct, possibly too direct, which may have created a bias in the subjects’ responses. Some men may have repressed memories of earlier exposure to marital violence, child abuse and shame as a way to cope and defend themselves from painful past experiences.

The abusive population, most of whom had been arrested and therefore had contact with the court, may have been resistant to authority figures and may have falsified findings to exert a negative impact on the study. They may have reported higher income levels, higher positive paternal involvement and that their fathers were always emotionally responsive to them. This may have reflected the way in which they wanted their relationships with their fathers to be versus how they really were.

The subjects who had been arrested for domestic violence represented a more physically violent type of male abuser. Therefore, this study does not represent the men who may be just as violent, yet have not been arrested for domestic violence. This study is limited in that it did not include psychological or sexual abuse, (both conflict tactics that are part of the cycle of violence) and the dynamics of mens’ abuse of power.
Being incarcerated is an event that is likely to contribute to low self-esteem, depression, and other stress related factors. These subjects do not represent the entire population of abusive men. Men who are violent and have not been arrested for violence do not have the added stress of arrest, embarrassment and shame that may accompany such a life event.

Men who reported that they engage in intimate violence may be different from those men who engage in domestic violence or from men who are not caught. Men that do not report domestic violence may be more defended, and may minimize and blame their behavior on their intimate partner. These men may also have more to lose by being arrested and therefore use private therapists instead of the domestic violent groups.

A limitation of this study is that it only examines one dimension of a complex multidimensional social problem. There are many social factors that contribute to violence against women; the father is one variable, an important one, but violence has also been found to be predicted by high levels of negative stress, alcoholism, biological factors and marital dissatisfaction (McKenry, Julian, & Gavazzi, 1996).

Summary of Findings

The findings revealed that a negative relationship men had with the father is related to female intimate violence, and that the extent to which the father is positively involved with his son, is related to higher self-esteem. Although not indicating a cause-and-effect relationship, the findings from this research study indicated that low
self-esteem and negative paternal involvement on the part of the father are predictors of men's physical violence against female intimate partners. In model one, based on the self-report measures of the men in the study, self-esteem, being abused by the father as a child, and witnessing the father abuse the mother were found to be statistically significant in predicting the probability of intimate violence.

In model two, in addition to low self-esteem, being abused as a child and witnessing marital violence, the educational level of the subjects was statistically significant in predicting female intimate violence. It is interesting to note that education was much better in predicting the probability of who would be in the non-violent group than the violent group. Men with higher educational levels were much less likely to be violent than men with lower educational levels. For every one-unit increase in education, the odds of violence decreasing (holding all the other variables constant) are decreased by 49%. The moral father role, shaming by the father and positive paternal emotional engagement by the father, were not statistically significant within either of the logistic regression models. Shaming by the father and positive paternal emotional engagement however, have theoretical interest.

The findings from this study are consistent with other studies that have found a relationship between observing parental violence and experiencing child abuse, and later intimate violence (Caeser, 1988; Hastings & Hamberger, 1988; Dutton, 1994 & Chermack & Walton, 1999). The emotional security of children is influenced by what the children witness in the marital relationship and by the parent/child attachment (Davies
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Men in this study who were abused and who witnessed marital violence were later violent within intimate relationships.

The purpose of this study was to explore the likelihood that the type of fathering men experienced while growing up was a predictor of intimate violence. Some interesting findings emerged out of the research that might suggest an indirect pathway to intimate violence. Dutton and Golant (1995) found that men who had memories of their fathers as cold, rejecting and abusive were three times more violent than non-violent men. The findings from this study were similar. Positive paternal emotional engagement was correlated to high self-esteem. Men who had fathers who were more loving and actively engaged with them had the highest scores on self-esteem; low self-esteem was a predictor of intimate violence. This indicates that although low self-esteem and the negative and abusive type of paternal involvement are predictors of intimate violence, positive paternal involvement is related to high self-esteem, and therefore positive paternal involvement may be an indirect path for non-violence. The non-violent group had higher mean scores on self-esteem and they scored higher on having a positive relationship with their fathers than the abusive group.

In this study, the level of education was a significant predictor of non-violence and may indicate that, along with a college education, there may be a host of other psychosocial variables within the lives of these men that are potentially supportive, strength-based resources. These resources, which may be a combination of both internal and external strengths, may serve to reduce violence within an intimate relationship.
Saleebey (1996) indicated that the assets of individuals are almost always embedded within an interested and involved community, and that individual creativity emerges within relationships with other people. According to Saleebey, it is through these social relationships that individuals discover their power, heighten their self-awareness and internal strengths. Possibly, men who have gone to college and graduate school experienced to some degree a sense of personal and social power that comes through dialogue and mutual collaboration, rather than the power that comes from the kind of coercive control abusive men exert within intimate relationships. An important empirical question for future research is how are people with a college education different from those without a college education? It may be that they are more goal-directed, had the economic resources to attend college, or may be of higher intelligence. There may be other factors, patterns or characteristics that are associated with a college education that have not been measured in this study and will need to be examined in future research. Males who go to college may have a higher sense of self-efficacy, better communication and problem-solving skills, more resources and less negative views of women.

An important theoretical question in this research was to explore the ways in which the father may serve as a selfobject. In other words, what were the sons' internal subjective experiences of their relationships with their fathers? The research findings provide some preliminary evidence that men who had fathers who were positively involved in their lives, and who were emotionally accessible to their children, may be
providing important psychological functions for the development of the sense of self in the child.

The emotional availability of the father is important to the child’s well being. Previous researchers have found a relationship between parental anger and behavior problems in children and adolescents, and the fathers’ internalizing anger and paternal trait anger have also been associated with the sons’ internalizing behaviors (Renk, Phares & Epps, 1999). A limitation of this study is the absence in the research design of an examination of the internalization of symptoms by the men in the study. Renk, Phares and Epps (1999) also found that fathers who score high on trait anger have a higher disposition towards anger and a higher propensity to express anger. These researchers also found that paternal depression was related to higher levels of sons’ externalizing behaviors. Another limitation of this study was that the research design did not inquire about the subjects’ fathers’ level of depression. Depressed fathers, who internalize anger and become abusive, are not as emotionally available to their children. As a result, this lack of emotional responsiveness is associated with behavior problems in sons, and as the findings in this study indicate, negative paternal involvement is associated with physical violence in relationships with female intimates. This may indicate that these children experience a void in the emotional connection with their fathers and may experience their distance as rejection.

Studies on the effects of children witnessing martial violence have been concerned with the ways in which exposure to violent role models, and the attitudes and
belief systems that accompany such behavior, effect children (Holden, Geffner & Jouriles, 1998). While researchers have been concerned about social development, how trauma effects cognition and the external behavior problems that result from witnessing marital violence, this research examines how witnessing marital violence effects the child’s sense of self.

It is important to note that it is often difficult to get an honest answer to questions pertaining to one’s relationship with one’s father. Respondents will often answer in a way that makes them appear good to the researcher. Their answers may be socially desirable, and they may have inflated their scores to make the relationship appear better than it actually was. Men with a college education may have an even stronger need to present themselves in a socially desirable way, which may explain less self-reporting of violence in intimate relationships. The research design of this study did not control for social desirability. Dutton (1998) found significantly high negative correlations between parental rejection and social desirability and high positive correlations between parental warmth and social desirability. This may explain why there was not a statistically significant difference in the scores on positive paternal emotional responsiveness between the groups and shaming by the father. Men simply may not want to report more shameful or negative aspects of the paternal relationship.

The results in the scores on positive paternal emotional responsiveness and self-esteem by no means imply a cause-and-effect relationship; rather, this study indicates that certain self-report measures on The Fatherhood Scale are associated with high scores on
the self-esteem scale. Men who had fathers that were highly engaged with them in a positive loving way had higher self-esteem than those men who had fathers who were not as highly engaged with their sons. This positive type of attachment was associated with higher self-esteem, and low self-esteem was a predictor of female intimate violence. Bowlby (1973) found that children who had a strong emotional bond with their parents were less likely to exhibit emotional distress. Perhaps the men in this study who had highly involved fathers were more secure within themselves, and had a stronger sense of self, thus less likely to resort to violence when under stress. Children who are emotionally secure with their parents, regardless of the marital conflict, show a pattern of stability and view the parents as psychologically available (Davies & Cummings, 1994).

Researchers could also study the extent, to which clinicians' examine the role of the father in their assessment of violent men along with other psychological, social, and biological factors. Clinicians who provide couples in conflict with information regarding the importance of separating the children from the conflict between the parents, and who discuss ways to separate out marital conflicts from parental responsibility may serve to bolster the parental role, even though the couple is in conflict.

Demographic Findings of the Study

Overall the violent group of men was younger, less educated, earned less annual income and more likely to be single or never married than the men in the non-violent group. Previous research by Gavazzi, Julian and McKenry (1996) also found significant differences in mean annual income between violent and non-violent groups, with the
violent group having significantly less income. In another study, McKenry, Julian and Gavazzi (1995) found that violent men are younger \((M = 34.76 \ (SD = 9.71))\) than non-violent men \((M = 36.97 \ (SD = 9.70))\). The results indicated that men who were violent were more likely to come from a divorced family. The violent subjects were less likely to have grown up with their biological father, less likely to identify their father as their primary caretaker while growing up, and more likely to have been raised by a male figure identified as “other”, than the non-violent group of men. The men in the non-violent group were more likely to have a father who was graduated from college than men in the violent group. Approximately 60% of the fathers of the men in the violent group did not attend school beyond high school. These findings are similar to other researchers who also found that non-violent men are better educated than violent men (Hastings & Hamberger, 1988).

Although by no means do these findings suggest a direct cause and effect relationship between (a) education and (b) income, and intimate violence, perhaps what they do suggest is that because the majority of the men in the non-violent group were recruited from a Montessori school and from professionals working in social work, it is much more likely that the sample represented a certain type of individual. Teachers and social workers certainly have more knowledge about human behavior and family systems. Both professions work with children and may be more embedded within an ecosystem that is relational and supportive.
Forty-three percent of the men in the violent group experienced their parents' divorce and the divorce most often occurred prior to adolescence. These findings on divorce are similar to divorce rates in the United States where almost half of all couples in their first marriages will divorce (U.S. Bureau of Census, 1992). One out of every ten children will experience two divorces of the custodial parent prior to turning 16 years old (Heatherton & Stanley-Hagen, 1997). Analysis of the data indicated that of the 55 men in the study, whose parents divorced, 75% of them were violent in an adult female intimate relationship. Of the men who experienced divorce, only 12% lived with their fathers while growing up. These findings almost mirror national trends, where the vast majority (86%) of the children live with their mothers following divorce (Seltzer, 1990).

The literature has been inconsistent on how children's well being is affected by continued involvement with their fathers following divorce. Some studies have found that a warm relationship with an authoritative nonresident father following divorce has been associated with higher self-esteem, better social and cognitive competencies, and fewer behavior problems (Heatherton, 1991). High parental conflict may cause fathers to reduce contact with their children as a way to avoid arguing with their ex-wife. Having the father move out of the home is a loss for the child and often fathers reduce contact with their children following a divorce, which results in a psychological loss for the child. Following a divorce, only 25% of the children see their fathers once a week and over 33% do not see their fathers at all, or only a few times a year (Heatherton & Stanley-Hagen, 1997).
Descriptive Findings from the Independent Variables

The non-violent group had higher scores on positive paternal emotional engagement, the moral father role, and was less likely than the violent group to witness parental violence, be abused by the father, and/or experience shaming by the father. There were statistically significant differences between the two groups on witnessing marital violence ($t (3.357) = .001, p < .005$), being abused by the father ($t (3.401) = .001, p < .005$), and self-esteem ($t (2.845) = p < .005$). These findings are similar to other studies that have found a consistent relationship between witnessing and experiencing violence and intimate violence (Hamberger & Hastings, 1991 and Chermack & Walton, 1999).

Although low self-esteem has been a characteristic of men who batter women (Hotaling and Sugarman, 1986), when that is coupled with violence within the family, and personally experiencing violence, it is quite possible that these experiences affect the abusers' relationship to the self and to others. Bowlby (1969) reported that attachment is a bond that develops with someone who is experienced as stronger and wiser. Kohut's (1979) self-psychological theory proposes that in order for the self to develop, the child has to merge with and idealize a stronger, calmer and powerful person. According to Kohut (1979), the child needs psychological sustenance from the caregiver. It is probable that, in violent and abusive families, the child is not afforded the opportunity to experience the father as a wise, calm, understanding and soothing caregiver. What is missing in this relationship is the mirroring; the reflecting to the child of a sense of self. Kohut (1979) stated that it is not enough for the child to know he is loved, the child must feel loved.
In examining the origins of rage, Dutton (1998) explored the connection between failed object relations, in which the child internalizes the parent as the “bad object” (an internal representation of the parent as unloving and unavailable). These early experiences leave the child longing for a parent who is gratifying. The absence of the love of the parent is often re-enacted in adult intimate relations through powerful sexual conquests. The early loss or absence of a powerful and loving caregiver is repeatedly played out in adult intimate relations. Bowlby (1969) proposed that early maternal rejection will intensely activate the attachment system, leaving the child in a continual search for closeness with and comfort from the mother. Mothers who are abused are not receiving from their partners the psychological sustenance needed for them emotionally to thrive, and may subsequently be less likely to be optimally responsive to their children. Therefore, the abusive father, not only sets himself apart as a caregiver for the child to attach and bond to, but also potentially impairs the internal psychological structure of the family system to provide these necessary selfobject functions. Abuse and violence, anger and rage, color childrens’ internal subjective experiences of their relationship with their fathers.

Men with low self-esteem and negative abusive relationships with their fathers may be more vulnerable and insecure in intimate relationships. Perhaps they are seeking in an intimate relationship what was lacking in their relationship with their fathers, possibly mirroring, emotional responsiveness and empathy. Abusive men will seek and love women, but only to leave them.
Interpretation and Discussion of the Research Questions

Each of the research questions and their respective subset of questions will be addressed and related to the theory in which this research study is embedded. A short review of the findings will be followed by a discussion of what all this means.

Research Question #1

Do men who use physical violence to resolve interpersonal conflict have a different type of relationship with their fathers than non-physically violent men?

The violent group of men experienced more disruption from divorce while growing up than did the non-violent group and were more likely to have lived with a stepfather or someone identified as "other" than the non-violent group. The accessibility of their fathers was different between the two groups. Only 58% of the violent group of respondents always lived with their fathers while growing up, compared to 64% of the men from the non-violent group. Divorce is no doubt a major family stressor and the loss of the father from the family is a significant loss for the children. As Ahrons (1994) indicated, "no matter how you cut it, divorce is painful" (p. 75). Following a divorce family members are uncertain about who is in and who is out of the family. Divorce brings role ambiguity to the family system and changes the way roles and tasks are performed (Ahrons, 1987). Further research is needed into how the divorce affected these men and exploration of the emotional role ambiguity would provide a deeper understanding of how these men experienced divorce and how their relationships with their fathers changed following the divorce. Anger, hostility and rage accompany divorce.
Ahrons (1994) found in her landmark longitudinal study of family relations following divorce, that 62% of the families experienced one episode of violence.

In studying what kept fathers involved with their children following divorce, Ahrons (1994) found that the kind of relationship mothers and fathers had affected the father's relationship with his children. When the relationship was unsupportive and conflicted, the fathers were less involved. In examining fathers five years following a divorce, Ahrons (1994) found that there was little change in the extent in the involvement of the fathers with their children. The kind of involvement established immediately following the divorce remained consistent five years after the divorce.

There was not much difference in the mean scores on positive paternal emotional engagement between the violent group (M = 35.9, S.D. 13.4) and the non-violent group (M 39.0, S.D. 13.9). What was important in this study was that men who had the highest scores on positive paternal emotional engagement also had the highest scores on self-esteem. This finding might explain why men who came from divorced families and who subsequently experienced reduced contact with their fathers, not only experienced a physical loss, but a psychological loss as well. Although many factors influence paternal involvement following a divorce, two perspectives are worthy of further exploration. First, understanding more about how divorced men perceive their role as fathers, and secondly, their emotional ties to the child prior to the divorce is needed. (A lack of involvement would tend to weaken the emotional bond between a father and his children). Dutton (1998) found men who are abusive have often felt rejected and shamed
by their fathers. Some men may have never had a positive emotional relationship with their fathers to begin with. What they may mourn is not the loss of the father/son bond, but the loss of what never was.

The research indicates that regardless of whether or not the subjects experienced divorce, a clear predictor of intimate violence that emerged out of this study was the presence of a negative and abusive father. The violent group experienced a different type of paternal involvement; their fathers were more abusive towards their mothers and more abusive towards them.

Research Question 2

Do physically violent men have lower mean scores on positive paternal emotional engagement than non-physically violent men?

There was not a statistically significant difference in the mean scores of positive paternal emotional engagement between the groups. There was, however, a statistically significant negative correlation between positive paternal emotional engagement and physical violence ($r = -0.247, p = 0.01$). What this may suggest is that the more fathers are involved in the lives of their children in positive and loving ways, the less likely the possibility of adult intimate violence. This does not indicate a cause and effect type of relationship but, based upon the self-reports of the men in this study, the role of the father may be a moderating variable in preventing violence against women.
Research Question 3
Are men with fathers who actively pursue the role of the religious leader within the home less violent than men with fathers who do not take on this role?

There was no statistically significant difference on the moral father role between the two groups of men. The moral father role was selected as a potential predictor of intimate violence based upon the assumption that fathers who are more religious would be non-violent role models for their children and model non-aggression solutions to conflict. Five items made up this subscale; three of those items asked specifically about the father as the religious leader of the home and two items addressed the teaching of right and wrong. It was hypothesized that men who might take the time to talk to their children about doing the right thing would be more involved with their children talking and explaining solutions to problems.

The highest potential score attained in this subscale was 25. This would mean that the fathers were always going to church, talking about God, saying grace and teaching them important values about right and wrong. The mean score was 14.6 (5.68), indicating that fathers only sometimes engaged in the moral father role. At any rate, in this study, the moral father role was not a significant predictor of female intimate violence.

Research Question 4
Do men with high positive paternal emotional engagement score higher on self-esteem than the group with low paternal emotional engagement?
Men who scored in the top one-third of the range on positive paternal emotional engagement had the highest self-esteem scores. Based upon the respondents self-reports, the highest one-third of the scores indicates that these men had fathers who were highly accessible to them both emotionally and physically. These men had fathers who were more likely to tell their children they loved them, made their children feel special, praised their children often and showed concern towards their sons. As a result the respondents were more likely to feel close to their fathers, perceived their fathers as caring, more likely to have warm feelings towards their fathers and were more likely to tell their father that they loved them.

These fathers were more involved with their children by doing things like helping with homework, taking them on activities, and showing interest in their schoolwork. As a result the men with highly-involved fathers were more likely to report having good times with their fathers, enjoyed being with their fathers, and were more likely to report that their fathers showed concern for them.

Kohut (1979) hypothesized that if the caregiver is intrapsychically experienced as providing selfobject functions that provide psychological sustenance to the child, then the child will develop a cohesive self-structure. A selfobject is the subjective aspect of a relationship that is supportive of the self (Grosch, 1994). When fathers engage in positive activities with their children that support the children's strivings for power, success, their ideals, ambitions and idealized goals, they serve a mirroring function, reflecting to the child a positive sense of self. If the father is highly involved and
emotionally responsive to the child, he serves as a psychological resource to the child; a father for the child to merge with and to idealize. The failure to merge with idealized selfobjects produces depletion anxiety which is often accompanied with low self-esteem, feelings of emptiness, depression, and shame (Grosch, 1994).

Research Question 5

Is there a relationship between level of self-esteem and physical violence in intimate relationships?

The self-report measures on self-esteem and on the physical assault subscale indicate that there is a relationship between self-esteem and physical violence. The findings in this study found a significant negative correlation ($r = -0.278, p = 0.01$) on self-reported measures of self-esteem and intimate violence. Men who were violent had lower self-esteem than non-violent respondents. Self-psychological theory postulates that mirroring, (the ability of the parent to be calm, empathic and emotionally available to the child) serves an external self-soothing function, which the child eventually internalizes. Bacall (1992) indicated that in order for the child to develop into a psychologically cohesive self with the capacity to self-regulate internal states of tension, they require selfobject functions. According to Bacal’s (1992) pathway for healthy self-development, the child needs a caregiver who is sensitive to the affective states of the child, is empathic and validates the child’s subjective experience. The father in this case would need to know when to identify with the rightness of the child’s perceptions, and not battle with him over his own view of a situation, but serve to help the child contain intense affect,
and assist in finding ways to release tension. The role of the father would be more similar to the new nurturing father role, where the father is psychologically available to the child. The father would be emotionally soothing, recognize when the child is psychologically vulnerable and make an empathic effort to restore a weakened sense of self. This kind of paternal involvement serves to provide a type of psychological sustenance that contributes to the child’s being able to self-regulate internal tension states. In essence, these children would have internalized the self-soothing abilities of the father, and be less likely to resort to physical violence.

When the self fragments, rage is often a by-product. The self disintegrates during fragmentation, especially when there is a lack of an optimally responsive selfobject. This would explain the relationship between low self-esteem and physical violence in an intimate relationship. While self-esteem is an evaluative rating of one’s self-worth, it emerges out of the core sense of self. If a narcissistically injured male (who already feels internally empty with feeling states of despair) becomes frustrated, he will become more desperate to find external sources to shore up the fragmenting self. An unresponsive intimate partner may be unaware of the intense need for mirroring and self-soothing that these men require during times of fragmentation. Another person becomes a selfobject when he/she is experienced intrapsychically and needed in the relationship to either maintain or positively affect the sense of self (Bacall, 1992).
Research Question 6

Is there a significant difference in the educational levels between the violent and non-violent group?

There was a significant difference in the educational level attained between the violent and non-violent groups. Men who have higher education may have more knowledge about the harmful effects of violence on the family, may have more to lose if arrested and may possibly have more financial resources (therefore more options to relieve stress). To a certain degree, achieving a task or reaching a goal, such as college graduation, requires good coping skills, the ability to plan, anticipate obstacles, and to have effective problem solving skills. Some men who have higher education understand the complexities of life and have egalitarian gender roles. As men are more flexible in gender roles, they may be less likely to be oppress women and assume the traditional stereotypical role of male domination of women.

There is an inverse association between economic status and the use of physical punishment and obedience (Kohn, 1977). Men who are in low paying jobs that do not require high levels of education may not feel a sense of power within their world of work and, therefore, may exert more coercive and controlling behaviors within the home. When men are not fulfilling the breadwinner role, or being limited in upward mobility due to low education, they may experience the authority of bosses and supervisors as threatening and belittling. As they grow resentful because they cannot compete, possible feelings of inadequacy emerge. A lack of emotional needs and recognition from
authority figures in the work setting may leave a man with a longing for admiration and acceptance. When this is displaced onto the intimate partner and, as self-esteem decreases, intimate violence can be a by-product.

**Interpretation and Discussion of the Hypotheses**

The hypotheses were tested using logistic regression analysis to determine if two models could predict the probability of intimate violence against a female intimate partner based upon a set of independent variables. Two models were tested. Model one included positive paternal emotional engagement, the moral father role, self-esteem, witnessing marital violence, being abused by the father and shame. In the Model two education was added.

While the first model correctly predicted 88% of the violent group, it only correctly predicted 38% of the non-violent group. Clearly, there were other factors that explained nonviolence. Therefore, a second model was explored that included the subjects’ educational level. When a second model was developed that included education, the model correctly classified 72% of the nonviolent men and 86% of the violent group.

While education was a poor predictor of violence, it was a powerful predictor of nonviolence. This is not to suggest that education alone is a predictor of non-violence, but, based upon the self-report measures in this study, the educational level of the subjects predicted nonviolence. Caution must be exercised in interpreting this finding,
due to the fact that the comparison sample consisted of social workers in continuing education classes, teachers, and fathers who had children attending a Montessori School.

In both models, negative paternal engagement (witnessing marital violence and experiencing child abuse by the father) was a significant predictor of violence against a female intimate. It is possible that men, who witnessed abuse and were also abused, not only observed their fathers' violence, and, therefore, later imitated the violent role model but it is likely that their fathers were unavailable to support their children in an emotional way. At the very least, one might speculate that the fathers of the abusive men were unable to provide the empathic understanding that would lead to a child's need for psychological merger with a stable, calm, and wise selfobject. If the father was unable to provide these necessary selfobject functions for the child's emerging self and, if the father lacked the empathy to soothe and calm the child, the child is likely to experience a narcissistic injury. Later, in adult intimate relationships when empathy is lacking or is withdrawn, rage is likely to emerge. One might conclude that violence within the family leaves the parents unavailable emotionally to be a psychological resource for their children.

Positive paternal emotional engagement was not statistically significant within either of the logistic regression models; however, positive paternal emotional engagement was negatively associated to physical violence ($r = -.247$). These findings are somewhat puzzling since positive involvement by the father is related to self-esteem and low self-esteem was a predictor on intimate violence. One explanation of these findings is that men may have idealized their fathers to some extent and may not have wanted to portray
their fathers in any negative way. Dutton (1998) found that men, who had a strong need to be viewed in a socially desirable way, also rated their relationships with their parents very high. This may have occurred with these respondents as well.

Men, whose self-reported scores on positive paternal emotional engagement were in the top one-third of the range, scored the highest on self-esteem. Based on the measures from The Fatherhood Scale and the Self-Esteem scale, men who had fathers who were highly involved with them also had high self-esteem. Because their fathers were attentive to them and did things with them, it is possible that these men felt more cared about and had a more stable relationship with their fathers. This kind of contact would support bonding and closeness in the father/son relationship. Men, who reported feeling close to their fathers and enjoyed being with their fathers, were also praised, comforted, made to feel special and felt understood by their fathers. This does not imply a cause and effect relationship but the data analysis indicated a positive association between the adult's self-esteem and a father who is highly engaged, loving, warm and understanding. These findings provide theoretical interest to further conduct research into this association.

Self-esteem was statistically significant in both logistic regression models. How men feel about themselves, based upon the findings in this study, is a predictor of intimate violence. This finding is related to the concept of psychological fragmentation that occurs when a person has a weak and fragile sense of self, lending further support to the constructs of self-psychology. Violence can be a way to restore self-cohesion, especially when intimate partners are unaware of the intense need for mirroring and
empathic responses. It is very likely, that as rage begins to build internally, the abusive male will place excessive demands for recognition upon the intimate partner, which may actually create more distance between the partners. One interpretation is that men with fragile self-esteem are sensitive to rejection and, therefore, as distance is created within the relationship, violence ensues.

The construct of shame was operationalized by only two items on The Fatherhood Scale and this limitation most likely did not provide an accurate measurement of the variable. Additionally, the items were stated in a straightforward manner, which may have initiated a defensive emotional posture and resulted in a more socially desirable response. The only two items measuring shame were "my father was ashamed of me" and "my father used to get angry and say he did not like me". Expanding the questions and making them subtler may improve the validity of the scale.

Education was a powerful predictor in the logistic regression models. However, education was a better predictor of the nonviolent group than the violent group. It is possible to surmise that men with higher educational levels have higher self-esteem, have had the success of achieving a goal and may be in a higher socioeconomic class than men who have less education. As a result these men may have more internal locus of control and feel as if they are more in charge of their lives. It is also probable that men with higher education have more resources both financially and socially. It is also possible that this finding has more to do with sample selection due to the nature of the settings in
which the samples were selected. Exploring the relationship between education and non-violence warrants further study.

Implications for Social Work Practice

Social work has a long history of focusing on the mother as the unit of analysis and on her role in the attachment and bonding process. The term maternal deprivation has been coined to explain the condition of infants who have been emotionally abandoned by their mothers. For the most part, social work has ignored the importance of the father in making a contribution to child development and has relied on other professional disciplines to address how fathers influence child well-being (Lamb, 1997). Jackson (1999) recently examined inner city single mothers attitudes and perceptions about the fathers of their children and found that, if the mother had a positive relationship and a favorable perception of the child's father, this was negatively related to mothers' abusing their children. Social work scholars need to conduct research on ways in which fathers contribute to positive family functioning. Maybe then social work practitioners will begin to consider other ways in which fathers influence family life, other than as abusing the child's mother, abusing the children, or neglecting to pay child support.

The findings from this research have implications for batterers' treatment groups. Currently the trend in batterer treatment programs is a "one-size-fits-all" approach and this single modality cannot accommodate the broad range of men who are arrested and mandated to treatment. There has been a movement to develop more multidimensional models to treat the diversity of men who batter. Researchers into the effectiveness of
counseling have found that mandatory arrest the first time police are called to the home and lengthy mandated counseling are effective in reducing male violence against their female partners (Seyes & Edleson, 1992). Many batterer treatment programs are conducted in three phases. The initial phase is a feminist approach which views battering as behavior that allow men to control and oppress women. The second phase is a cognitive/behavioral approach that helps men change their distorted thinking, and modify thoughts that lead to abusive behaviors. The third phase is usually composed of unstructured groups that use group process and allow men to deal with psychological issues that may be contributing to violence against women (Barnett, Miller-Perrin & Perrin, 1997).

The issue of fathers and how men related to their fathers can be included into the format of time-limited treatment groups with batterers, or be introduced in the more process oriented longer-term groups. As men examine their relationships with their own fathers, they can explore ways in which they can construct a more positive and satisfying role with their own children, and with the children’s mother. This more positive approach would fit with newer solution-focused approaches with batterers that seek to find exceptions to the violence problem, and use their existing strengths and competencies (Lee, Greene, & Rheinscheld, 1998). Men will gain more success in their role as a father and with their intimate partner as they expand their solution picture. As they seek exceptions to their violent behaviors and become aware of the times when the violence is not resorted to, they are more likely to feel better about themselves. A
positive and strengths based approach to group treatment of batterers can serve as a hall of mirrors, where other group members can reinforce and support the emergence of a non-violent intimate relationship.

From a prevention perspective, social workers who work in early intervention programs that support families with young children, such as Parents with Teachers, can expand their focus beyond the mother and child to include the father as an important parent for child development. Fathers who provide childcare tasks for their children and are available and accessible, provide more of an opportunity for their children to attach and bond to them, and serve to reduce the primary childcare responsibilities of the mother. (Lamb, 1997). By finding ways in which the father could support the mother emotionally would indirectly support the child. As marital quality improves, parents are likely to increase positive interactions. High marital interaction is associated with high father/child interaction. As clinicians help couples discuss roles and responsibilities as they pertain to household chores and childcare tasks, they may open the way for more egalitarian roles for both the mother and the father.

Implications for Social Work Policy

Child welfare workers are the front-line professionals who assess families experiencing domestic violence and they routinely make decisions about whether or not to take a child, who has either been exposed to family violence or been victimized by an abusive parent out of the family. Not only do caseworkers have to be highly skilled in assessing the risk for future abuse but they also need to assess for strengths and protective
factors. In the state of Ohio, the Department of Human Services requires 12 hours of training on domestic violence. It would be important for policy makers to consider mandating strengths-based assessments and training on how fathers influence child development. Social work policy that only addresses pathological aspects of human behavior may not be serving families with the best practice models.

However, it is probably in the area of child custody disputes and visitation that social policy makers need to show more concern for children who witness domestic violence. While many parents think they have protected their children from the violence, between 80% and 90% of the children indicate otherwise (Hilton, 1992). In addition to the effect of witnessing marital violence and being abused, children also exhibit more subtle signs of trauma, which may go unnoticed (Jaffe & Geffner, 1998). Therefore, professionals should explore in more depth children’s reactions, interpretations and the meaning they attribute to the violence they witness.

Although many women stay with their abusers because of their children, many also leave when their children are abused. Many children get caught in the crossfire as they try to protect their mother and actually organize their lives around trying to protect her. When women leave their abusers, the violence does not stop. In fact, it often escalates. The decision of judges to grant child custody and visitation to the father is an ongoing and unresolved debate for children who witness marital violence (Jaffe & Geffner, 1998). The debate centers on, a question: which is more traumatic-father estrangement or observing paternal abuse? In addition to these kinds of decisions, child
welfare workers are continually faced with whether or not to leave a child in the custody of the mother when she remains with the abuser. While social policy in child welfare agencies dictates an intensive assessment to determine the protective abilities of the mother, children's services workers still struggle with the alienation children experience from the father as a result of divorce, or in case of incarceration.

It is recommended that in cases where the children's services workers have access to a child's father, they conduct an assessment that includes the degree of paternal involvement, paternal competency at childcare tasks, and paternal emotional responsiveness towards the children. A fundamental issue in an assessment of domestic violence between the parents is the safety of the child. In cases where the mother is the only one abused, the children's services worker has to determine to what degree witnessing marital violence has on the children. Often as risk and protective factors are being considered, the major deciding factor is whether or not the child has been physically abused. In cases where there is no physical abuse by the father, it would be important for the safety of the children to assess the father's emotional responsiveness to the children. If the assessment indicates negative emotional engagement, then to leave the child in direct contact with the father would have to be weighed against the emotional trauma of separation and loss issues. In cases where the father is incarcerated for domestic violence, it is recommended that in addition to being referred to a batterers' treatment group, they also be referred to a parenting group for abusive fathers.
Policies that support more intensive evaluations of the abuser and the prior history of paternal involvement are warranted. Developing policies that require a lethality assessment, having supervised father/child visits during separation to determine the quality of the relationship, and conducting assessments on the protective capacities of the mother to serve as a buffer to the child should be considered by policy makers. If, in fact, it is determined that the father is both physically and psychologically abusive, then, in addition to limiting parental contact, policies need to support services that have the potential of enhancing the father's ability to be a positive role model for his child. In those cases in which the relationship is severely detrimental, a careful assessment needs to be conducted on the child to determine how the exposure to violence has affected him or her. While the debate about whether or not witnessing marital violence by a child is viewed as child abuse or not, one thing seems certain; conducting more research into how this affects children is warranted.

**Implications for Future Research**

The research design produced two models to explore men's relationships with their fathers to determine who would be physically violent with a female intimate partner. The combined models were able to correctly classify 87% of the men who have the probability of being violent with a female intimate partner. The research design was less accurate in predicting who would be non-violent (55%) in a relationship with a female intimate partner. By introducing the subjects' educational level into the second model, the logistic regression analysis correctly classified 72% of the non-violent men. Clearly,
understanding how the educational attainment of men is related to non-violent conflict resolution needs further research.

One of the strengths of the social work profession has been its commitment to examining the person within his/her social context, and the individual’s interactions within the various systems in which the individual (or the family) is embedded. Although human behavior is complex and multidimensional; the social context provides meaning, and in this case, a way of understanding how men become fathers and how they relate to a female intimate during a time of conflict. This research study examined the interactions of the father/son system. It was of interest to determine if what occurred in the father/son system during the subject’s childhood influenced behavior in another system at a much later point in time. Inasmuch as this study has focused on the person of the father and his dynamic relationship with his son, it is important to evaluate a man from a multidimensional perspective that helps social workers understand him within an environmental context. Social forces influence human behavior. As early as 1917, Mary Richmond in her book, “Social Diagnosis”, identified the social situation and the personality of the individual as the focus of the social work assessment (Hutchison, 1999). A limitation of this research is that it did not take into account the social situation, the family context, or the historical times.

Carter and McGoldrick (1989) conceptualized the family as a system moving through time producing family stress that is greatest as the family moves from one developmental stage to another. It is at these transition points that family stress is the
greatest and families are most likely to develop symptoms. This study did not examine
the father within the context of the surrounding family system; it did not take into
consideration the historical context or the life cycle stage of the family. Carter and
McGoldrick (1989) proposed viewing the family as comprising the entire emotional
system of three or four generations. Although this study examined the emotional system
of one dyad within one generation, it did not include the subjects’ fathers’ emotional
relationships with their fathers and/or mothers. Further research that examines mens’
relationships with their children, and considers the emotional context of the previous
generations is needed. This will provide further understanding on how men affect their
children and how their exposure is related to intimate violence.

Research that explores fatherhood at specific historical times is needed, especially
those historical times that are characterized by violence. For example, examining how
men father following the succession of school shootings in the United States is needed in
order to determine how these violent events effect fatherhood. In-depth qualitative
studies of fathers in these communities where school shootings occur will provide
knowledge into the ways in which these events effect fatherhood and how these fathers
talk to their children about conflict. Studying paternal behavior at times of high social
violence may add further knowledge to how these external events affect fathering at
different life-cycle stages. This would build upon the work, already undertaken by other
scholars on fatherhood, who have studied father/infant relationships (Lamb, 1997);
fathers and preschoolers (Lewis, 1997); fathers of school-aged children (Biller &
Kimptom, 1997) and fathers of adolescents (Hosley and Montemayor, 1997).
Although Lamb (1997) points out that warmth, nurturance, and closeness are associated with positive child outcomes, he also indicates that the individual characteristics of the fathers are less important than the characteristics of the relationships men establish with their children. This study examined the characteristics of the relationship, as perceived by the adult child, but it did not take into account family context, or the culture in which the family lives. Positive paternal influences are more likely when the relationship fathers have with their partners and with other children are positive (Lamb, 1997). Further research that explores the quality of family life is needed. In addition, it would be extremely useful to examine father/child relationships within various cultural groups both in the United States and around the world in order to understand how cultural, social, and economic conditions influence fatherhood.

Cummings and O'Reilly (1997) conceptualize that the father/child interactions must be considered within the broader family context. Although fathers affect family functioning and are themselves affected by family dynamics; this study was limited in that it did not consider the marital relationship. Cummings and O'Reilly (1997) proposed a framework that considers how the father’s behavior in the marital relationship affects parenting, parental psychological well-being and children’s functioning. Parent/child relations, the marital relationship, and each parent’s psychological well-being influence to what extent fathers get involved with their children. From this model, Kohut’s selfobject functioning would explain how the family system becomes a hall of mirrors, in which, each individual family member interacts, affects and influences each other. It is the quality of these relationships and the emotional availability provided by the father.
(and the mother) that shapes the core sense of self in the child. "Marital functioning does not lead directly to significant outcomes in children but affects children through a series of microsocial processes occurring interactively over a period of time..." "it is these processes that ultimately mediate relations between family experiences, on the one hand and child development outcomes of the other" (Cummings and O’Reilly, 1997, p. 52).

As fathers interact with their children and as they interact with the marital partner, these emotional and social patterns affect the child’s sense of self, how they think about conflict and attitudes towards male behavior with a female intimate partner. Therefore, future research that further examines these patterns and how children adjust to specific negative interactions is warranted.

Other research studies that would further contribute to understanding how the fathers’ role contributes to female intimate physical violence would be to conduct a national random survey of men. More research on the study of shame and how this assaultive emotional rejection of the child affects the sense of self and subsequently self-esteem would warrant further research. Dutton’s (1998) studies indicate that the fathers’ role is a major contributor to the development of the abusive personality.

Additional areas for future research would be to study how fathers rate themselves on The Fatherhood Scale and then have their children rate their fathers on The Fatherhood Scale. This would also have practice implications for use in family therapy. Therapists could use The Fatherhood Scale as another method to assess family functioning. All family members could rate the father’s involvement with his children.
Areas of positive involvement could be supported and strategies could be developed to enhance areas of weakness. Because the breadwinner role has been the dominate image of fatherhood (Marsiglio, 1995), it seems important that attention be focused on expanding public awareness of the other important aspects of fathers in the lives of children. One way to grasp the attention of mainstream America would be to conduct research on the lives of famous people and the relationships they had with their fathers. A television documentary that has fathers talking about their children and then talking about their own fathers would portray an important message on the intergenerational issues of fatherhood.

**Research in Social Work Education**

It seems that a good place to begin in the study of fatherhood would be to survey social work educators to determine the extent the social work curriculum is covering fathers as a separate topic in graduate school, or how it is infused into other broader topical areas. It would also be important to survey social work practitioners to understand their attitudes and beliefs around how fathers influence children, and the ways that this is addressed in clinical practice. This research would provide knowledge on the state of where social work as a profession is with this important subject area.

**Concluding Remarks**

Understanding the men who abuse women is necessary in order to find ways to prevent the violence. This study provided inquiry into 145 mens' relationships with their fathers to determine if the type of relationship men had with their fathers while
growing up predicts female intimate violence. Witnessing marital violence, experiencing child abuse by the father, low self-esteem and low education were predictors of intimate violence. It is hoped that the findings from this study will stimulate the interest of other researchers to continue to examine men who abuse women and that social workers will assess the degree to which the fathers with whom they work are emotionally available and responsive to their children.
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March 15, 1999

Dear Sir:

We would like to invite you to participate in a very important study being conducted at The Ohio State University on family relationships by Gary Dick under the supervision of Dr. Denise Bronson. This research is being conducted to complete a doctoral dissertation. We hope to learn more about how men work out conflict with their wives or girlfriends and how a person's view of their father's past parenting influences current family relations. What we learn from this study will help us understand the role of fathers in determining how adult men deal with conflict in personal relationships, as well as how they feel about themselves.

You are being invited to be in this study because you are involved in the Amend Program. Your responses are anonymous. There is no possible way for anyone to know whether or not you participated in this study or how you responded. Your decision as to whether to participate or not will not affect your relations with the court or the Amend Program in any way whatsoever. No one will know if you participated and there will be no negative consequences if you do participate.

A number of other men in Cincinnati are also being asked to participate in this study. As a part of this study you are being requested to take about 20 minutes to complete the enclosed questionnaires and return them in the self-addressed stamped envelop within five days of receiving this letter.

Some of the questions are of a very personal and sensitive nature. You will be asked questions about how you handle conflict with your partner, about interactions with your father and about how you feel about yourself. You can choose not to participate by simply not returning the questionnaire. If you do decide to participate, you can choose not to answer certain questions or withdraw at any time.

In case you experience any of the questions as stressful, we have included a list of additional agencies that provide counseling. If you have any questions, you may contact Dr. Bronson at (614) 292-1867 or Gary Dick (513) 271-5365.

Your returned responses will indicate your willingness to participate in the study and that you have read and understand the information in this letter. Please contact Gary Dick if you are interested in receiving a summary of the results when the research is completed. Thank you very much for your time and your willingness to participate.

Sincerely,

Denise Bronson, Ph.D.
Associate Professor

Gary Dick
Ph.D. Candidate
APPENDIX B

Statement Read To The Amend Program Subjects Regarding Participation In The Study

My name is Gary Dick and I am working on my Ph.D. at The Ohio State University. I am here to see if you would be interested in being involved in a research study. I am doing research on how your father's past parenting may influence how you settle conflict with your wives or girlfriends today. Understanding how you remember your father as a parent and your relationship with him is an important part of this study.

A number of men throughout Cincinnati are being asked to participate in this study. If you agree to participate, I will leave you with a packet of questionnaires and will ask that you take them home and fill them out. It takes about 20 minutes to complete them. Once you fill them out, please drop them in the mail. I have enclosed a stamped addressed envelope for you.

Your responses are anonymous and no one will know whether or not you participated or how you responded. Your decision as to whether to participate or not will not affect your relations with the court or the Amend Program in any way whatsoever. No one will know if you participated and there will be no negative consequences if you do participate. Your responses are anonymous, we will not be able to connect your answers to you, so don't put your name or address anywhere on the questionnaires or the envelope.

You will be asked some tough questions. Some of the questions are very personal. They deal with what you do when you disagree with your partner. Other questions deal with how you and your father got along and what you did together when you were growing up. Others deal with what you think and how you feel about yourself. If you do decide to participate, you can choose not to answer certain questions or withdraw at any time.

If you have any questions, you may contact Dr. Bronson at (614) 292-1867 or myself at 271-5365. When you mail back the questionnaires that will indicate to me your willingness to participate in this study and that you have heard, read and understand what it is all about. If you would like to know how it turns out and what we find, please call me and I will send you out a summary of the results. Thanks for your time and I hope you agree to participate in this important study.

Gary Dick
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You are being invited to be in this study because you are involved in the Amend Program. Your responses are anonymous. There is no possible way for anyone to know whether or not you participated in this study or how you responded. Your decision as to whether to participate or not will not affect your relations with the court or the Amend Program in any way whatsoever. No one will know if you participated and there will be no negative consequences if you do participate.

A number of other men in Cincinnati are also being asked to participate in this study. As a part of this study you are being requested to take about 20 minutes to complete the enclosed questionnaires and return them in the self-addressed stamped envelop within five days of receiving this letter.

Some of the questions are of a very personal and sensitive nature. You will be asked questions about how you handle conflict with your partner, about interactions with your father and about how you feel about yourself. You can choose not to participate by simply not returning the questionnaire. If you do decide to participate, you can choose not to answer certain questions or withdraw at any time.

In case you experience any of the questions as stressful, we have included a list of additional agencies that provide counseling. If you have any questions, you may contact Dr. Bronson at (614) 292-1867 or Gary Dick (513) 271-5365.

Your returned responses will indicate your willingness to participate in the study and that you have read and understand the information in this letter. Please contact Gary Dick if you are interested in receiving a summary of the results when the research is completed. Thank you very much for your time and your willingness to participate.

Sincerely,

Denise Bronson, Ph.D.
Associate Professor

Gary Dick
Ph.D. Candidate
APPENDIX D

Statement Read To The Montessori Subjects Regarding Participation In The Study

My name is Gary Dick and I am working on my Ph.D. at The Ohio State University. I am here to see if any of you men or your husbands would be interested in being involved in a research study. I am conducting research on how your father's past parenting may influence how you feel about yourself and how you settle conflict with your wives, partners or girlfriends today. Understanding how you remember your father as a parent and your relationship with him is an important part of this study, so you will be asked several questions about how you remember your father's parenting.

A number of men throughout Cincinnati are being asked to participate in this study. If you agree to participate, I will leave you with a packet of questionnaires and will ask that you take them home and fill them out. It takes about 20 minutes to complete them. Once you fill them out, please drop them in the mail. I have enclosed a stamped addressed envelope for you.

Your responses are anonymous and no one will know whether or not you participated or how you responded. We will not be able to connect your answers to you, so don't put your name or address anywhere on the questionnaires or the envelope. In order for people to feel comfortable with answering the questions, it is important for them to be completely anonymous.

You will be asked some tough questions. Some of the questions are very personal. They deal with what you do when you disagree with your partner. Other questions deal with how you and your father got along and what you did together when you were growing up. Others deal with what you think and how you feel about yourself. If you do decide to participate, you can choose not to answer certain questions by just skipping over them, or you can withdraw at any time.

If you have any questions, you may contact Dr. Bronson at (614) 292-1867 or myself at 271-5365. When you mail back the questionnaires that will indicate to me your willingness to participate in this study and that you have heard, read and understand what it is all about. If you would like to have a summary of the research, please call me and I will be happy to send you a summary of the results. Thanks for your time and I hope you agree to participate in this important study.

Gary Dick
APPENDIX E

Demographic Questionnaire

Directions: Please answer the following questions.

1. How old were you on your last birthday? ______

2. What is your marital status?
   - Married _____
   - Divorced _____
   - Single & Never Married _____
   - Separated _____
   - Currently living with someone in a domestic relationship ______

3. How much school have you completed?
   - Less than High School ______
   - High School Graduate _____
   - Technical School _____
   - Some College _____
   - College Graduate _____
   - Completed Graduate School _____

4. What is your father's education level?
   - Less than High School ______
   - High School Graduate_____ 
   - Technical School _____
   - Some College _____
   - College Graduate _____
   - Completed Graduate School _____

5. What is your total family income level from all sources? _____________

6. What race do you consider yourself?
   - Black _____ White _____ Asian _____ Asian-American _____
   - American Indian _____ Hispanic _____ Other _____________________

7. Who was your primary adult male caretaker?
   - Father _____ Step-father _____ Adopted Father _____ Other ______________

8. Did you always live with your father? Yes _____ No _____

9. Did your mother and father divorce? Yes _____ No _____

10. If so, how old were you when your parents divorced? ________
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APPENDIX F

Self-Esteem Scale

Directions: Read each of the following set of statements and circle the response that best describes how you view yourself.

1. I feel that I am a person of worth, at least on an equal basis with others.
   
   STRONGLY AGREE AGREE DISAGREE STRONGLY DISAGREE

2. I feel that I have a number of good qualities.
   
   STRONGLY AGREE AGREE DISAGREE STRONGLY DISAGREE

3. All in all, I am inclined to feel that I am a failure.
   
   STRONGLY AGREE AGREE DISAGREE STRONGLY DISAGREE

4. I am able to do things as well as most other people.
   
   STRONGLY AGREE AGREE DISAGREE STRONGLY DISAGREE

5. I feel I do not have much to be proud of.
   
   STRONGLY AGREE AGREE DISAGREE STRONGLY DISAGREE

6. I take a positive attitude toward myself.
   
   STRONGLY AGREE AGREE DISAGREE STRONGLY DISAGREE

7. On the whole, I am satisfied with myself.
   
   STRONGLY AGREE AGREE DISAGREE STRONGLY DISAGREE

8. I wish I could have more respect for myself.
   
   STRONGLY AGREE AGREE DISAGREE STRONGLY DISAGREE

9. I certainly feel useless at times.
   
   STRONGLY AGREE AGREE DISAGREE STRONGLY DISAGREE

10. At times I think I am no good at all.
    
    STRONGLY AGREE AGREE DISAGREE STRONGLY DISAGREE

   Please continue on the next page → Thank You.
Appendix G

The Fatherhood Scale

Directions: If your biological father is not the father, who raised you, identify the primary male adult caretaker in your life. Thinking about that person, answer the following questions. Read each statement and circle the answer that most accurately reflects your perceptions of the relationship with your father or the person you identify as your father.

1. My father helped me with my homework.
   Never   Rarely   Sometimes   Often   Always

2. My father talked to me about my personal problems.
   Never   Rarely   Sometimes   Often   Always

3. My father took me on activities.
   Never   Rarely   Sometimes   Often   Always

4. My father told me that he loved me.
   Never   Rarely   Sometimes   Often   Always

5. My father told me that I was a good boy/girl.
   Never   Rarely   Sometimes   Often   Always

6. My father is a caring person.
   Never   Rarely   Sometimes   Often   Always

7. My father attended school conferences.
   Never   Rarely   Sometimes   Often   Always

8. During my childhood I felt close to my father.
   Never   Rarely   Sometimes   Often   Always

9. During my teen years my father and I did things together.
   Never   Rarely   Sometimes   Often   Always

10. My father liked to spend time with me.
    Never   Rarely   Sometimes   Often   Always

11. My father spanked me.
    Never   Rarely   Sometimes   Often   Always

12. I felt close to my father as a teenager.
    Never   Rarely   Sometimes   Often   Always

13. My father hit my mother.
    Never   Rarely   Sometimes   Often   Always

14. I know that my father cared about me.
    Never   Rarely   Sometimes   Often   Always
15. My father was ashamed of me as a child.
   Never     Rarely    Sometimes    Often    Always
16. My dad taught me to fight back.
   Never     Rarely    Sometimes    Often    Always
17. My father made sure I had the things I needed such as clothing & toys.
   Never     Rarely    Sometimes    Often    Always
18. My father read to me as a child.
   Never     Rarely    Sometimes    Often    Always
19. My father provided well for us financially.
   Never     Rarely    Sometimes    Often    Always
20. My father used to say things that hurt my feelings.
   Never     Rarely    Sometimes    Often    Always
21. My father encouraged me to say what I felt.
   Never     Rarely    Sometimes    Often    Always
22. My dad showed interest in my schoolwork.
   Never     Rarely    Sometimes    Often    Always
23. My father hugged me.
   Never     Rarely    Sometimes    Often    Always
24. My father is a good man.
   Never     Rarely    Sometimes    Often    Always
25. When I got in trouble, my father would punish me physically.
   Never     Rarely    Sometimes    Often    Always
26. I went to the movies with my father.
   Never     Rarely    Sometimes    Often    Always
27. My father taught me right from wrong.
   Never     Rarely    Sometimes    Often    Always
28. I saw my father beat my mother.
   Never     Rarely    Sometimes    Often    Always
29. I saw my father cry.
   Never     Rarely    Sometimes    Often    Always
30. My father was a good breadwinner for the family.
   Never     Rarely    Sometimes    Often    Always
31. My father helped me solve my problems.
   Never     Rarely    Sometimes    Often    Always
32. I could talk to my father about anything.
   Never     Rarely    Sometimes    Often    Always
33. My father went to church with me.
   Never  Rarely  Sometimes  Often  Always
34. I remember playing sports with my father.
   Never  Rarely  Sometimes  Often  Always
35. My father helped my mother clean the house.
   Never  Rarely  Sometimes  Often  Always
36. My father comforted me when I was feeling bad.
   Never  Rarely  Sometimes  Often  Always
37. My father did not want me to cry if I got hurt.
   Never  Rarely  Sometimes  Often  Always
38. My Dad was always employed while I was growing up.
   Never  Rarely  Sometimes  Often  Always
39. My father made me feel special.
   Never  Rarely  Sometimes  Often  Always
40. When I got angry I used to talk things over with my dad.
   Never  Rarely  Sometimes  Often  Always
41. My father and I enjoyed time together.
   Never  Rarely  Sometimes  Often  Always
42. My dad would talk to me about things going on in the world.
   Never  Rarely  Sometimes  Often  Always
43. My father was loving towards me.
   Never  Rarely  Sometimes  Often  Always
44. I was abused by my father.
   Never  Rarely  Sometimes  Often  Always
45. My father is fair.
   Never  Rarely  Sometimes  Often  Always
46. My father talked to me about sex.
   Never  Rarely  Sometimes  Often  Always
47. My father encouraged me to be masculine.
   Never  Rarely  Sometimes  Often  Always
48. My father told me that he liked the way I did things.
   Never  Rarely  Sometimes  Often  Always
49. When I was a child, my father shouted at me if I did something wrong.
   Never  Rarely  Sometimes  Often  Always
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>50. I have warm feelings toward my father.</td>
<td>Never</td>
<td>Rarely</td>
<td>Sometimes</td>
<td>Often</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51. My father neglected me.</td>
<td>Never</td>
<td>Rarely</td>
<td>Sometimes</td>
<td>Often</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52. My dad taught me what it was like to be a man.</td>
<td>Never</td>
<td>Rarely</td>
<td>Sometimes</td>
<td>Often</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53. My dad attended sporting events in which I played.</td>
<td>Never</td>
<td>Rarely</td>
<td>Sometimes</td>
<td>Often</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54. My father and I had good times together</td>
<td>Never</td>
<td>Rarely</td>
<td>Sometimes</td>
<td>Often</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55. My father instilled important values in me.</td>
<td>Never</td>
<td>Rarely</td>
<td>Sometimes</td>
<td>Often</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56. My dad took me to the doctor.</td>
<td>Never</td>
<td>Rarely</td>
<td>Sometimes</td>
<td>Often</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57. My dad tried to be a good father.</td>
<td>Never</td>
<td>Rarely</td>
<td>Sometimes</td>
<td>Often</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58. My father is a kind man.</td>
<td>Never</td>
<td>Rarely</td>
<td>Sometimes</td>
<td>Often</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59. My father understood me.</td>
<td>Never</td>
<td>Rarely</td>
<td>Sometimes</td>
<td>Often</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60. I wanted to be like my Dad when I was a child.</td>
<td>Never</td>
<td>Rarely</td>
<td>Sometimes</td>
<td>Often</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61. My father is hateful.</td>
<td>Never</td>
<td>Rarely</td>
<td>Sometimes</td>
<td>Often</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62. I told my father that I loved him.</td>
<td>Never</td>
<td>Rarely</td>
<td>Sometimes</td>
<td>Often</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63. My father was around when I needed him.</td>
<td>Never</td>
<td>Rarely</td>
<td>Sometimes</td>
<td>Often</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64. My father praised me.</td>
<td>Never</td>
<td>Rarely</td>
<td>Sometimes</td>
<td>Often</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65. My father is mean.</td>
<td>Never</td>
<td>Rarely</td>
<td>Sometimes</td>
<td>Often</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66. My father is generous.</td>
<td>Never</td>
<td>Rarely</td>
<td>Sometimes</td>
<td>Often</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67. My father use to get angry and say he didn’t like me.</td>
<td>Never</td>
<td>Rarely</td>
<td>Sometimes</td>
<td>Often</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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68. My dad attended school activities in which I participated.
   Never  Rarely  Sometimes  Often  Always

69. My dad talked to me about God.
   Never  Rarely  Sometimes  Often  Always

70. My father showed concern when I got hurt.
   Never  Rarely  Sometimes  Often  Always

71. I saw my father hit one of my siblings.
   Never  Rarely  Sometimes  Often  Always

72. My father used drugs.
   Never  Rarely  Sometimes  Often  Always

73. My dad would cook meals.
   Never  Rarely  Sometimes  Often  Always

74. My father would express his feelings.
   Never  Rarely  Sometimes  Often  Always

75. My father use to say grace at mealtime.
   Never  Rarely  Sometimes  Often  Always
Appendix H
Conflict Tactics Scale 2

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

How often did this happen?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1= Once in the past year</th>
<th>2= Twice in the past year</th>
<th>3= 3-5 times in the past year</th>
<th>4= 6-10 times in the past year</th>
<th>5= 11-20 times in the past year</th>
<th>6= More than 20 times in the past year</th>
<th>7= Not in the past year, but it did happen before</th>
<th>0= This never happened</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. I showed my partner I cared even though we disagreed.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. My partner showed care for me even though we disagreed.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. I explained my side of a disagreement to my partner.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. My partner explained his or her side of a disagreement to me.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. I insulted or swore at my partner.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. My partner did this to me.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. I threw something at my partner that could hurt.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. My partner did this to me.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. I twisted my partner's arm or hair.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. My partner did this to me.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. I had a sprain, bruise or small cut because of a fight with my partner.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. My partner had a sprain, bruise or small cut because of a fight with me.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. I showed respect for my partner's feelings about an issue.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. My partner showed respect for my feelings about an issue.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. I made my partner have sex without a condom.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. My partner did this to me.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. I pushed or shoved my partner.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. My partner did this to me.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. I used force (like hitting, holding down or using a weapon) to make my partner have oral or anal sex.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. My partner did this to me.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. I used a knife or gun on my partner.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. My partner did this to me.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
23. I passed out from being hit on the head by my partner in 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 I was sure we could work out a problem.  
40. My partner was sure 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 (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 during a disagreement.  
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 did this to me.  
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 hurt the next day because of a fight with my partner.  
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 I

A List of Recommended Social Service Agencies Providing Counseling

1. YWCA's Amend Program
   (513) 241-7090 or (513) 361-2150

2. Family Service
   381-6300

3. 281-CARE

4. Beech Acres Family Center
   751-0400

5. Catholic Social Services
   241-7745

6. Central Psychiatric Clinic
   558-5823

7. Jewish Family Service
   351-3680

8. Lutheran Social Services
   326-5430

9. The Children's Home of Cincinnati
   272-2800

10. Psychiatric Emergency
    558-8577
May 15, 1998

Gary Dick
5524 Arnsby Pl.
Cincinnati, OH 45227

Dear Gary,

As professionals who have worked with batterers and victims of domestic violence for nearly 20 years, we are impressed with your proposed study: Paternal Involvement and Paternal Attachment: Does The Father’s Relationship Impact Men’s Levels of Violence Against Women? This study contains a much needed emphasis on intervention with batterers. Treatment services can be enhanced by increasing the understanding of men who batter as a conflict tactic and establishment of control and dominance in intimate relationships.

Exploration of the learned behavioral aspects of battering contributes to the process by which non-violent behaviors can be taught to replace battering behaviors. The lack of attachment and bonding of children from their fathers as well as abuse by the father in childhood are known to us through our work with batterers to have a vast impact on the development of violent tendencies toward female intimate partners. Your dissertation proposes, however, to delve much deeper into this correlation than most of the current information.

We are pleased to support your efforts and offer you our assistance. Clients of the AMEND Program can be available to participate in a study at such time that this becomes appropriate. Please feel free to contact Daniel Trujillo, Director of the AMEND Program, to clarify any further details.

Sincerely,

Charlene Ventura
Executive Director

The YWCA is a membership movement working to empower women and eliminate racism.
February 2, 1999

Mr. Gary Dick
5505 Arnsby Place
Cincinnati, Ohio 45227

Dear Mr. Dick:

I am pleased to inform you that your research application has been approved by the Research Review Committee. This approval grants you the right to approach Tom Rothwell, Principal of Clark Montessori. He will need to agree to the study before it can be implemented in that school and his decision on your request will be final.

You may feel free to show Mr. Rothwell a copy of this letter as this will notify him that your study has been approved by the Research Review Committee in advance.

You have my best wishes for a successful study and I would appreciate receiving a brief written summary of your findings at the study's conclusion.

Sincerely,

Jack L. Lewis, Ph.D.
Director
Research and Evaluation
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February 23, 1999

Gary Dick
5505 Arnsby Place
Cincinnati, Ohio 45227

Dear Gary,

Your request to sample the fathers from Clark Montessori for subjects in your research study, “The Roles of Paternal Engagement and Paternal Emotional Responsiveness In Male Violence Against Female Intimates,” has been approved. You may contact Karen Brandstetter to plan to attend the March parent meeting.

I wish you the best in completion of your dissertation.

Sincerely,

Thomas G. Rothwell
Principal