

University of Montana

ScholarWorks at University of Montana

Graduate Student Theses, Dissertations, &
Professional Papers

Graduate School

2014

PSYCHOLOGICAL ABUSE AS A PREDICTOR OF TRAUMA IN WOMEN WHO HAVE EXPERIENCED INTIMATE PARTNER VIOLENCE

Marie Baca Villa
The University of Montana

Follow this and additional works at: <https://scholarworks.umt.edu/etd>

Let us know how access to this document benefits you.

Recommended Citation

Baca Villa, Marie, "PSYCHOLOGICAL ABUSE AS A PREDICTOR OF TRAUMA IN WOMEN WHO HAVE EXPERIENCED INTIMATE PARTNER VIOLENCE" (2014). *Graduate Student Theses, Dissertations, & Professional Papers*. 4346.

<https://scholarworks.umt.edu/etd/4346>

This Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by the Graduate School at ScholarWorks at University of Montana. It has been accepted for inclusion in Graduate Student Theses, Dissertations, & Professional Papers by an authorized administrator of ScholarWorks at University of Montana. For more information, please contact scholarworks@mso.umt.edu.

PSYCHOLOGICAL ABUSE AS A PREDICTOR OF TRAUMA IN WOMEN
WHO HAVE EXPERIENCED INTIMATE PARTNER VIOLENCE

By

MARIE ELIZABETH VILLA

Bachelor of Arts, California State University Channel Islands, Camarillo, CA, 2011

Thesis

presented in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the degree of

Master of Arts
in Clinical Psychology

The University of Montana
Missoula, MT

May 2014

Approved by:

Sandy Ross, Dean of The Graduate School
Graduate School

Christine Fiore, Ph.D., Chair
Department of Psychology

Jennifer Waltz, Ph.D.
Department of Psychology

Sara Hayden, Ph.D.
Department of Communications Studies

Abstract

Chairperson: Christine Fiore, Ph.D

Intimate partner violence (IPV) is a long-standing issue that has recently been investigated as a significant social and interpersonal problem. Research has suggested that psychological abuse is both more prevalent and more devastating to victims, as compared to physical violence. While there remains no true consensus as to the definition of “psychological abuse”, a current conceptualization typifies psychological abuse into four groups of acts that are meant to (a) denigrate and damage a partner’s self-esteem, (b) withhold nurturing and support, (c) both explicitly and implicitly threaten, and (d) restrict personal freedom. It is hypothesized that an analysis of existing measures of IPV will find the four proposed distinct groups of psychological abuse and one distinct group of physical violence. By controlling for physical violence, it is hypothesized that the four proposed groups of nonphysical abuse will each individually account for more variance in trauma symptoms than physical violence alone. Two hundred and fifty two volunteers from the greater Missoula community who experienced or were experiencing violence in their relationship participated in this study. All participants completed a semi-structured interview, the Conflict Tactics Scale (Straus & Gelles, 1979), the Psychological Maltreatment of Women Inventory (Tolman, 1989), and the Trauma Symptoms Checklist (TSC-33, Briere & Runtz, 1989). An exploratory factor analysis was conducted to investigate the fit of all items of the measures of emotional abuse to Maiuro’s conceptualization. Five distinct forms of abuse were found: emotional control and restriction of resources; denigration and damage to partner’s self-image or esteem; restriction of social outlets; the abusive partner’s self-centered manipulation tactic, and physical threats and violence. A hierarchical regression found that emotional control and restriction of access to resources was the only significant form of nonphysical abuse contributing to trauma. This suggests that an abuser’s efforts to isolate a victim from their children, control the household and finances, and block the victim’s access to care is a significantly traumatizing experience. Results have implications for the importance of investigating, assessing and treating forms of emotional abuse that include isolation, control, and restriction of resources for women in violent relationships.

Psychological Abuse as a Predictor of Trauma in Women who have experienced Intimate Partner Violence

Intimate partner violence (IPV) is a long-standing, relevant issue that has recently been researched as a significant social and interpersonal problem within the United States (Basile, Arias, Desai, & Thompson, 2004; Babcock, Roseman, Green, & Ross, 2008; Strauchler et al., 2004). Research conducted with a nationally representative sample found that approximately 1.5 million women are physically or sexually assaulted by an intimate partner nationally (Tjaden & Thoennes, 2000). Additionally, women who experience assault within a relationship experience an average of 3.4 assaults annually (Basile et al., 2004; Tjaden & Thoennes, 2000). Intimate partner violence has traditionally been conceptualized as blatant acts of physical or psychological abuse (Basile et al., 2004), and the majority of IPV research continues to portray abuses as limited in scope. For example, the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC) currently defines intimate partner violence as physical violence, sexual violence, threats of physical or sexual violence, and psychological/emotional violence (CDC, 2010), without delineating forms or types of each of these overly broad classifications of abuse; Especially what is termed as psychological/emotional abuse. The lack of specificity in the definitions of various forms of IPV continue to make it difficult for researchers to differentiate what constitutes each unique form of violence. Accordingly, there is still a great need to investigate psychological abuse as a multi-dimensional and dynamic form of intimate partner violence (Outlaw, 2009).

Follingstad (2007) argues that there remains, despite a recent proliferation of research in this area, no true consensus as to the definition of “psychological abuse”, and that a whole and complete paradigm for defining psychological abuse has yet to be determined. However, Follingstad, and other researchers (e.g. Jordan, Campbell, & Follingstad, 2010; Follingstad,

2009) note that Maiuro (2001) has published an approach to categorizing psychological abuse, and suggest that this schema may be the most promising in terms of a unified classification. Maiuro (2001) notes that there is an “endless number of tactics” (p. *x*) that could be seen as psychological abuse, and consequently categorizes acts of psychological abuse into four groupings, not based on the type of act alone, but grouped according to the perceived effect of an act on a victim. This includes acts that are meant to (a) denigrate and damage a partner’s self-esteem (e.g. yelling, name calling, and put downs), (b) withhold nurturing and support (e.g. punitive use of avoidance or withdrawal, sulking, and emotional abandonment), (c) both explicitly and implicitly threaten (e.g. threats to physically hurt, lying and infidelity, and engaging in reckless behavior), and (d) restrict personal freedom (e.g. isolation from friends and family, stalking, and preventing partner from going out on their own); see Appendix D for the detailed paradigm. Similarly to these definition issues, Marshall (1996) reported that since researchers have started to investigate psychological abuse as its own prevalent and important form of IPV, this type of abuse has been referred to in numerous ways: nonphysical abuse, maltreatment, psychological aggression, verbal aggression, emotional abuse, controlling behaviors, competitive behaviors, and psychological torture. The terms “emotional abuse”, “nonphysical abuse”, and “psychological abuse” tend to be the most frequently used, and this investigation will use these terms interchangeably to reflect all forms of abuse and aggression which do not involve direct physical contact between the victim and the abuser.

Walker (1984) was one of the first investigators to researcher the link between the reported psychological symptoms experienced by victims of IPV and Posttraumatic Stress Disorder (PTSD). Since then, extensive research has found that, depending on the population, sampling procedure, and method of assessment, between 33% and 84% of battered women

experience PTSD or related symptoms (Basile et al., 2004; Coker, Weston, Creson, Justice, & Blakeney, 2005). Similar research has found that violent victimization by an intimate partner is associated with host of negative health outcomes, including depression, anxiety, lowered self-esteem, and substance use (Ovara, McLeod, & Sharpe, 1996; Sackett & Saunders, 2001; Straight, Harper, & Arias, 2003). However, victim reports have suggested that nonphysical forms of IPV are both more prevalent in relationships and more devastating to victims (Marshall, 1996; Walker, 1984; Follingstad, Rutledge, Berg, Hause, & Polek, 1990; Outlaw, 2009; Street & Arias, 2001). Research has also found that women experiencing psychological and emotional abuse are more likely to report range of psychological and physical consequences, (Ali, Oatley, & Toner, 2012; Coker et al., 2002; Kelly, 2004). Accordingly, an overview of current IPV research supports the finding that psychological abuse is a stronger predictor of trauma symptoms than physical violence alone (Arias & Pape, 1999; Basile et al., 2004; Marshall, 1996; Street & Arias, 2001). However, despite these important findings, there remains a need for research linking psychological abuse to trauma. For example, in her review of current research into psychological abuse, Kelly (2004) noted that research in this area continues to be “scarce” (p. 383), and of twenty-one articles she reviewed, she reviewed none that linked psychological abuse directly with PTSD.

One of the main reasons there remains a deficit in this area of literature is because the effects of nonphysical forms of abuse are also often confounded with other forms of IPV, due to the fact that violent relationships rarely exhibit a singular form of abuse. For example, Marshall (1996) was one of the first researchers to consider threats of physical violence and acts of physical violence as separate forms of abuse. While she was unable to find markedly distinct groups of different types of IPV, by using cluster analyses, she found that threats of violence

contributed uniquely to women's negative mental health outcomes and help seeking behaviors and therefore suggested the importance of analyzing verbal forms of abuse as separate constructs of IPV. Basile et al. (2004) investigated the association between physical, sexual, stalking, and psychological abuse with trauma symptoms. Although they investigated all of these forms of abuse as co-occurring, their findings also suggest psychological abuse could be differentially associated with trauma symptoms. Arias and Pape (1999) found that, after analyzing the relevant contribution of all forms of abuse in a violent relationship to trauma symptoms, not only was psychological abuse still a significant predictor of trauma, but that physical violence was no longer a statistically significant predictor within their sample. Street and Arias (2001) went on to replicate these results in a similar study, and found once again that psychological abuse remained a significant predictor of trauma symptoms, above and beyond physical abuse alone.

Additionally, in 2005, Pico-Alfonso conducted research with a sample of 127 women investigating the link between all forms of IPV and PTSD. She found a significant link between all forms of IPV (including physical) and PTSD, but additionally found that when each type of abuse was considered separately, psychological abuse was the strongest predictor of PTSD. These findings combined suggest that although nonphysical forms of abuse most often co-occur within a context of a physically violent relationship, investigation involving statistical methods of control can find significant relationships between nonphysical intimate partner abuse and PTSD symptoms.

The above studies found that psychological abuse had significant and powerful impacts on the presence of trauma symptoms, but each had limitations that impact the strength of these findings. Street and Arias (2001), Arias and Pape (1999), and Pico-Alfonso (2005) all noted the difficulty in generalizing their results as these studies used samples from women's shelters. The

majority of all of the women in these studies reported high levels of physical violence, and Arias and Pape noted the possible the “lack of variability in physical abuse” (p. 62) could make generalizing results to victims in less physically violent situations difficult. Street and Arias also noted the possible confounding variable of trauma associated with relocation to the shelter. Other research has found that women in shelters who have experienced IPV report substantially more negative mental health symptoms than women who experience IPV in the general population (Helfrich, Fujiura, & Rutkowski-Kmitta, 2008). These studies concluded there needed to be continued research on more heterogeneous and non-shelter samples. Similar to the research reviewed above, previous research has been limited most frequently to clinical or shelter samples (Basile et al., 2004), or has been suggested to have insufficient sample sizes (Babcock et al., 2008), and research in this field is in need of data collected from larger and more variable samples. The current proposed research has the benefits of utilizing data from a community-based sample, which, as suggested by the previously discussed studies, could enhance the extrapolation of the results of this study to the more general, non-help seeking population of women who experience IPV. In addition, the proposed research has the benefit of being conducted on a larger sample size than has been routinely used in previous research (e.g. Arias & Pape, 1999; Street & Arias, 2001). This larger sample size would increase the statistical and inferential power of the results. Finally, the proposed research also includes factor analysis to enhance the construct validity of the definition of psychological abuse, and therefore addresses the need for more clearly defining the construct of psychological abuse that has been neglected in previous research.

Accordingly, the intent of this proposal would not be to further contribute to methodological issues found within this field of research, and therefore sought to begin research

with exploratory statistical techniques to investigate the fit of the current data to Maiuro's (2001) categorization. As this research was conducted on archival data, this investigation used the Conflict Tactics Scale (CTS; Straus, 1979) and Psychological Maltreatment of Women Inventory (PMWI; Tolman, 1989) as measures of the frequency and types of psychological abuse reported by women (see Appendices A and B for complete measures). In order to enhance the construct validity of psychological abuse, and due to the above noted difficulty in appropriately categorizing this form of IPV, these measures were factor analyzed to ensure that the data is investigated as per Maiuro's proposed paradigm. All items from both measures were predicted to load on to at least one, and only one, of the four proposed categories, as per the item's content: one factor will consist of items measuring acts that denigrate/damage self-esteem; One factor will consist of items measuring acts that withhold of support; One factor will consist of items that measure acts that include implicit/explicit threats; And, one factor will consist of items measure acts that restrict personal freedom. Similarly, it was hypothesized that items that measure acts of physical violence, as measured by the Conflict Tactics Scale (Straus, 1979), would then load on to a separate factor, and will therefore be controlled for in later hypothesis testing.

The proposed research contributes to the previously promising findings by using statistical techniques in order to control for the differential effects of physical violence as compared to the effects of the four proposed categories of acts of psychological abuse: (a) denigration/damage to self-esteem, (b) withholding of support, (c) implicit/explicit threats, and (d) restriction of personal freedom. By controlling for physical violence as its own construct, the relative contribution of the four other factors were examined using established measures of various constructs of psychological abuse (Straus, 1979; Tolman, 1989).

Therefore, it was hypothesized that the four proposed groups of nonphysical abuse would each individually account for more variance in trauma symptoms, as measured by the Trauma symptom checklist (TSC-33, Briere & Runtz, 1989), than physical violence alone (see Appendix C for complete measure). Specifically, it was expected that psychological abuse that aims to denigrate or damage the self-esteem of victims would account for more variance in trauma symptoms than physical violence. Also, it was expected that psychological abuse that aims to withhold emotional support from victims would account for more variance in trauma symptoms than physical violence. Additionally, it was expected that acts of psychological abuse that include implicit and explicit threats to the well-being of victims would account for more variance in trauma symptoms than physical violence. Finally, it was expected that acts of psychological abuse that aim to restrict the personal freedom of victims would account for more variance in trauma symptoms than physical violence. As per the findings of similar research, it was also hypothesized that if any the four groups of psychological abuse were found to be significant predictors of trauma symptoms, physical violence alone would no longer be a significant predictor of variance in trauma symptoms.

Methods

Participants

Three hundred ninety-two female participants were recruited between the years of 1994 and 2001 via flyers, advertisements, and subject pools at the University of Montana, and western Montana communities. Flyers and advertisements requested women who had experienced violence or “relationships distress” to participate in a study of violence in relationships. The flier advised all contact and information collected would be confidential, and advised there would be a \$10 incentive. A phone number and office location was provided and it was

requested to facilitate initial contact of the investigators by the potential participant. Later in the study, the flier was changed to the wording of “violent” to “relationship distress”, to increase participation, based on feedback received.

Participants were screened over the phone by investigators for eligibility to participate. The criteria to participate was at least four or more moderate incidents of physical violence or one incident of severe physical violence during a 12-month period of the relationship, as measured by the Conflict Tactics Scale (CTS; Straus, 1979).

Of the 392 total number of participants, 252 were used for the analyses due to incomplete data on one or all measures from the other 140 participants. Of this sample, 87.7% were Caucasian (N=222), 5.9% were American Indian (N=15), 0.4% were African-American (N=1), 0.8% were Hispanic (N=2), 0.8% were Asian (N=2), and 4.3% reported being of another ethnicity (N=11). Participants had a mean age of 30.62 years (SD=10.48, range 18-58). Of the total participants, 14% reported having less than a high school diploma (N=26), 13.5% reported having graduated high school (N=34), 62.2% reported having some college or vocational school (N=156), 6.8% had a college degree (N=17), and 7.2% reported having either some grad school, or a graduate degree (N=18). All relationships reported for the study were heterosexual and monogamous. The mean reported length of the participants’ last violent relationship was 47.4 months (SD=71.70, Range 0-360). The mean reported length of time since the participants were last in a violent relationship was 48.36 months (SD=69.97, Range 0-379).

Measures

Psychological Maltreatment of Women Inventory (PMWI; Tolman, 1989). This is a 58-item self-report inventory which measures psychological abuse of women by their partners. The measure asks for estimation of incidents for about one year in the participant’s current

abusive relationship; or for one year in the past relationship if the participant is no longer in the abusive relationship. The scale consists of two empirically derived subscales. The first is the dominance-isolation subscale, which measures "behaviors related to isolation from resources, demands for subservience, and rigid observances of traditional sex roles." The second subscale is the emotional-verbal subscale which measures behaviors related to "verbal attacks, attempts to demean the partner, and withholding emotional resources." Responses are rated by the participant on a five-point likert scale which ranges from "1=Never" to "5=Very frequently". There is also an option for "not applicable". Internal consistency for the subscales has been found to be relatively high ($\alpha=.95$ for the dominance-isolation subscale; $\alpha=.93$ for the emotional-verbal subscale).

Conflict Tactics Scale (CTS; Straus, 1979). This 19-item scale was used in data collection to assess the level of violence experienced by participants within their relationship. The conflict tactics on this scale range from "discussed the issue calmly" to "used a knife or gun." Responses consisted of ranges of total times a certain item took place within the relationship, ranging from "0=Never" to "6=more than 20 times". The measure asks for estimation of incidents for about one year in the participant's current abusive relationship; or for one year in the past relationship if the participant is no longer in the abusive relationship. The scale consists of three factor analytically-derived scales that include the categories of reasoning, verbal aggression, and physical violence. There are also two categories of measures for minor and severe physical violence. The authors of the scale report that these two features were found consistently through research utilizing this measure ($\alpha=.51$ for reasoning; $\alpha=.79$ for verbal aggression; and $\alpha=.82$ for physical aggression).

Trauma symptom checklist (TSC-33, Briere & Runtz, 1989). This is a 33-item inventory that measures the frequency of clinically-derived trauma-symptoms. Responses are measured with a four-point likert scale ranging from “0=Never” to “3=Very often”. The checklist asked for responses based on experiences from the previous two months. Within the checklist, there are measures of five trauma-symptom clusters: dissociation, anxiety, depression, postsexual abuse trauma, and sleep disturbance. Previous research on samples of sexual abuse survivors suggest that reliability of this measure is relatively high ($\alpha=.89$).

Procedure

Data collection took place at any one of four pre-determined locations, chosen by the participant, out of consideration for safety and convenience. Participants scheduled meeting times according to their availability. Participants were seen individually by trained investigators, and informed consent was obtained in all cases. Investigators first conducted semi-structured interviews to collect information regarding the participants experience in an abusive relationship. Investigators then gave brief descriptions of the measures participants would be completing, and each participant was given a packet of 10-13 questionnaires, which took approximately one hour to complete. At the end of the session, participants were debriefed by the investigators and given information on services and counseling they may access. Participants were also informed of the potential future uses of the data collected.

Results

In all measures, participants were asked to rate the frequency of types of verbal and non-verbal abuse that took place within their violent relationship. Items ranged in specificity about types of physical and verbal actions; see appendices A and B for all items. All items from both measures were predicted to load on to at least one, and only one, of the four proposed categories

(denigration/damage of self-esteem; acts withholding support; implicit/explicit physical threats; and acts that restrict personal freedom). To determine if these underlying patterns of abuse existed in this data set, the scales were factor analyzed. Suitability for the data for factor analysis assessed with the Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin measure of sampling adequacy yielded the value .902, indicating the data were appropriate for this analysis.

A principal components method was used to extract factors and orthogonal rotation of factors was performed using the VARIMAX method. Based on the analysis of the scree plot, five factors were retained. The combined factors accounted for approximately 47% of the combined variance of ratings of frequency of all types of verbal and non-verbal abuse. Loading of all items on these five factors is shown in table 2. Based on these loadings, factor 1 ($\alpha=.95$) was interpreted as representing **emotional control and restriction of resources**; factor 2 ($\alpha=.93$) was interpreted as **representing denigration and damage to partner's self-image or esteem**; as hypothesized, factor 3 ($\alpha=.91$) was interpreted as representing **physical threats and abuse**, to be used as the control for physical violence; factor 4 ($\alpha=.84$) was interpreted as representing **restriction of social outlets**; and factor 5 ($\alpha=.83$) was interpreted as representing the **abusive partner's self-centered manipulation**.

Communality values indicated that the five factors accounted well for the data of the majority of items. These factors are not exactly like those hypothesized into Maiuro's four categories. Analysis proceeded with the factors identified in this community sample data set. Although it was predicted that all items would load onto at least one factor, four items ultimately did not load onto any factor due to correlations less than .3 (e.g. "my partner threatened to have an affair with someone else;" "partner argued heatedly, but short of yelling;" "partner got

information to backup your/his/her side of things;” “partner brought in or tried to bring in someone to settle things.”).

The original hypotheses expected that the factor analysis would result in four significant groups of non-physical abuse, and one factor of physical abuse. Subsequently, a regression was to be conducted on these four factors to determine the factors’ contributions to trauma symptoms. However, the results of the factor analysis revealed four statistically significant groups of nonphysical abuse that differed from those proposed. As per the original hypotheses, these factors of non-physical abuse were hypothesized to each individually account for more variance in trauma symptoms, as measured by the Trauma symptom checklist (TSC-33, Briere & Runtz, 1989), than physical violence alone (see Appendix C for complete measure). Although not the proposed groups exactly, the four nonphysical abuse groups identified in the PCA of this data set were entered as the independent variables. A two-step hierarchical multiple regression analysis as conducted to examine the relations of the dependent variable of trauma symptoms to **emotional control and restriction of resources, denigration and damage to partner’s self-image or esteem, restriction of social outlets, and the abusive partner’s self-centered manipulation**. Prior to conducting a hierarchical multiple regression, the relevant assumptions of this statistical analysis were tested. The sample size of 252 was deemed sufficient for the five variables to be utilized in this analysis. The assumption of multicollinearity was met and tolerance and VIF scores were all within accepted limits. Informal analysis of the data using histograms and scatterplots reveal no serious threat to the assumptions of linearity, normality, or homoscedasticity. An examination of correlations revealed that no independent variables were highly correlated. The physical abuse factor was entered in step 1 to control for the variance of physical abuse in trauma symptoms. **Emotional control and restriction of resources,**

denigration and damage to partner's self-image or esteem, restriction of social outlets, and the **abusive partner's self-centered manipulation** were entered in step two. The non-verbal forms of abuse were entered in one step in this manner because it was not hypothesized that any one form of non-verbal forms of abuse would contribute more significantly than another. The regression statistics can be seen in table 3. The hierarchical multiple regression revealed that at step one, physical threats and violence contributed significantly to the regression model, $F(1,251) = 18.82, p < .05$) and accounted 7.0% of the variation in trauma symptoms. In step two, the addition of **emotional control and restriction of resources, denigration and damage to partner's self-image or esteem, restriction of social outlets**, and the **abusive partner's self-centered manipulation** to the regression model explained an additional 6.3% of the variation in trauma symptoms and this change in R^2 square was also significant, $F(4, 247) = 4.51, p < .001$. When all five independent variables were included in stage two of the regression model, the most important non-physical predictor of trauma symptoms was **emotional control and restriction of resources** which uniquely explained 3.7% of the variation in trauma. Together the five independent variables accounted for 13.3% of the variance in trauma symptoms.

Discussion

An exploratory factor analysis was conducted to investigate the fit of all items of the Conflict Tactics Scale (CTS; Straus, 1979) and Psychological Maltreatment of Women Inventory (PMWI; Tolman, 1989) to Maiuro's conceptualization. Maiuro's model included four groups of nonphysical abuse and one group of physical abuse, and it was hypothesized that the current data set would fit this model. Results differed from the proposed paradigm, as four forms of psychological abuse were found through factor analysis of the responses, as opposed to three, and only one of the categories closely matched the proposed subtypes (**Emotional control and**

restriction of resources; denigration and damage to partner's self-image or esteem; restriction of social outlets; the abusive partner's self-centered manipulation tactics) and one factor which included items denoting physical violence.

The current study supports the conceptualization of psychological abuse as an important and potent form of abuse in intimate partner violence. Nonphysical forms of abuse have only recently been investigated as their own constructs in regards to abusive relationships, and there continues to be a lack of consensus as to how to define this heterogeneous construct. When Maiuro originally organized a paradigm that coded psychological abuse as per its perceived impact, he noted that a classification schema that is "...most explanatory, predictive, or useful in terms of intervention has yet to be determined (p. x)." He also stated that "...the actual theoretical or practical utility of conceptualizing and classifying various types of psychological abuse will be determined by empirical studies (p. x)." The current research was able to extend Maiuro's suggestion by investigating the appropriateness of defining psychological abuse by its perceived impact on the victim, using a community sample of women who reported variable levels of abuse within the relationship and examined endorsement of physical and psychological abuse with reported trauma symptoms. While the results of this investigation do not specifically support Maiuro's (2001) classification schema, it does support the value of examining subtypes of psychological abuse that examines the perceived impact on the victim.

Additionally, the regression revealed some unpredicted differences between Maiuro's proposed groups and the reports of victims. Maiuro's conceptualized physical threats to be conceptually different from the actual acts, but the results of this study suggests they have a very close relationship, and predicted trauma symptoms at a similar rate, as evidenced in items endorsing physical violence and threats of physical violence loading on the same factor.

Similarly, factor five, or what is presently referred as the **abusive partner's self-centered manipulation tactics**, would have fallen into other categories, such as threats or promises, as per Maiuro's original conceptualization. This subtype contained items that described manipulation tactics that involved the abuser directly, such as "My partner threatened to hurt himself if I didn't do what he wanted me to."; and "My partner promised to change." The resulting independent factor, and its lack of significance in predicting trauma, could possibly indicate that acts that are only threatening to the abuser's well being are not as important or traumatizing as other forms of abuse. This could possibly be due to the distal nature of the threats, which, although still upsetting, would ultimately bring more harm to the abuser than the victim.

Each of the subtypes of psychological abuse was also proposed to individually account for more variance in trauma symptoms than physical violence. A hierarchical regression found that **emotional control and restriction of resources** was the only significant nonphysical form of abuse related to higher trauma symptoms in this sample of women. This finding supports previous findings (Arias & Pape, 1999; Basile et al., 2004; Marshall, 1996; Street & Arias, 2001) that psychological abuse – in some form - is as important a predictor of trauma symptoms as physical violence. Specific to the current findings, as the only significant factor in the regression beside physical violence, this form of abuse (and these acts) could be the means by which IPV facilitates trauma symptoms, even when physical violence is present.

Further exploring the subtype of **emotional control and restriction of resources** reveals that items that accounted for the greatest variance in trauma symptoms centered on preventing family and childcare, as well as access to economic resources, including finances ("My partner acted irresponsibly with our financial resources.") and material goods that make daily life possible ("My partner restricted use of the car."). This subtype also included items that limit the

victim's own accessibility to health and wellness (e.g. "My partner kept me from getting medical care that I needed."). The significance of this subtype suggests that what may be most traumatizing in an emotionally abusive relationship are the abuser's efforts to keep the victim from being able to control their own household, their own welfare, or even care for their family on a concrete level.

This subtype may also suggest that for women in violent relationships with children, their lack of control over how their families are treated within their own home can be deeply traumatic. Approximately half of the current sample of participants had children (Armstrong, 2009), which suggests that the traumatizing effects of having children manipulated are extremely significant to this population. Further, this subtype contained the majority of items wherein which the abuser attempted to turn family members, including children, against or away from the victim, suggesting what could also be very damaging is the mere threat of loss of the children, both physically and emotionally. In regards to items that reference the whole family (e.g. "My partner tried to convince my friends, family, or children that I was crazy."), it appears that the victim could face a form of isolation that is especially devastating, due to the closeness of familial relationships. While the field of IPV currently considers children to be a significant factor in stay leave decision making (Strauchler, et al., 2004), these results suggests providers need to widen their scope to understand the traumatizing effects of having children threatened, and the welfare of the home used as a weapon of abuse.

Some items in this subtype also point to the traumatizing effects of a newly identified form of IPV: economic abuse. Economic or financial abuse has been loosely defined as the "...imposed economic dependence of the abused by the abuser...(Outlaw, 2009, p. 264)." Attention to this particular form of abuse has increased in recent years, and while the measures

used in the current research weren't necessarily designed to capture this construct, items in factor 1 describe this type of abuse specifically: "My partner was stingy about giving me money."; "My partner acted irresponsibly with our financial resources."; and "My partner used our money or made important financial decisions without talking to me about it." There are also items such as "My partner refused to let me work outside the home," that seem to serve a dual purpose of isolation and keeping the victim financially dependent on the relationship.

Considering these items' importance to factor 1 (see Table 2), and the significance of restriction of resources in the prediction of trauma symptoms, further research could clarify the importance of this particular form of abuse to the field at large, and could have even wider implications for educating providers on how to properly assess a client's needs.

Considering **emotional control and restriction of resources** was the significant predictor of trauma symptoms in the regression, this form of abuse may be the most frequently reported among women seeking assistance with both an abusive relationship and trauma. By understanding the significance of this type of abuse in violent relationship, practitioners could more easily assess the client's current experience of abuse, or past abuse. For example, while the level of physical violence may have subsided in a relationship, if a practitioner assesses experiences such as restriction (e.g. "My partner restricted the use of the telephone.") and control (e.g. "My partner interfered in my relationships with other family members."), providers can more clearly see that the client remains in a dangerously abusive environment. Assessment would also be key for practitioners to formulate treatments and interventions that fit the needs of the client, increasing efficacy of trauma work. For example, clients may seek support for trauma associated with overt acts of violence, while remaining in an environment where the abusive partner maintains control over the car, financial resources, or children. While providers may be

prepared to facilitate treatment for specific traumatic events, the efficacy of these interventions could be severely hindered by the abuser remaining in control of the client's well-being. By failing to assess experiences of emotional control and restriction of resources, providers may fail to address the traumatizing effects of the client not feeling fully in control of their own, or their children's, well being.

Acts such as name-calling, blaming, restriction of the victim's efforts to seek resources and activities outside the home were not significant, despite these being common examples of psychological abuse. By examining differences between emotional control and these other factors, providers may find a few key differences that suggest how this particular form of abuse can be exceptionally harmful to victims. The overall difference between these subtypes appears to be that other forms of abuse are directed more overtly towards the woman's physical or emotional self. For example, factor 4, or **restriction of social outlets**, includes some forms of social isolation and emotional restriction, as well as attempts to dissuade the victim from seeking support outside the home (e.g. "My partner tried to keep me from doing things to help myself."; and "My partner demanded obedience to his/her whims."). However, the isolation attempts seen in this factor differ from the isolation found in the factor of **emotional control** because the items found in factor 4 are centered on mostly social outlets and means of bettering/improving the victims situation (including pursuing work, school, and friendships outside the home), whereas the isolation seen in factor 1 contains mostly disrupting emotional and intimate relationships that have already been established (e.g. children and family members). This type of isolation, as well as manipulating and controlling the woman's means by which to properly take care of herself and others appears, by comparison, to be a more personal means by which the abuser can control a victim and her family. Perhaps by targeting the woman's family, the abuser has found the most

efficient or powerful way to keep the victim in the relationship, with the most devastating mental health outcomes. In other words, threatening access to others versus her own needs gets at the potential core factors of social support and when a mother, her role of caretaking.

Other notable differences between forms of psychological abuse can be seen in factor 2, or what is referred to as **denigration and damage to partner's self-image or esteem**. This subtype contained items denoting overt attacks on self-esteem, employing yelling, screaming, cussing, blaming, and withholding of support (e.g. "My partner called me names."; "My partner treated me like an inferior."; and "My partner blamed me for causing his/her violent behavior."). This factor is the only factor that appears similar to any of Maiuro's originally proposed groups, and thus is named as per his conceptualization. Both Maiuro's proposed group of "denigrating damage to partner's self-image and or esteem" and the factor found in the current research contains acts that are most easily identified as verbally abusive, including not only the acts already described, but ridicule, profane language, and public shaming or humiliation. However, the proposed and resulting subtypes differ because Maiuro's groups included items which involved "attempts to disaffect or alienate children," which, in this research, were absorbed in to factor 1, and have already been discussed above. Interestingly, Maiuro also suggested isolation from friends and family would fall under the category of "restricting personal territory and freedom," and therefore has mentions of children and family spread across two different categories. From this, it could be hypothesized that Maiuro underestimated the importance of the manipulation of children as an abusive factor, and therefore possibly failed to recognize that child and family resources would factor together and thus be experienced similarly, and be among the most powerful psychological influences for women in violent relationships.

Finally, the current research can contribute to spreading knowledge and understanding of the multiple facets of violent relationships across fields. Arias and Pape (1999) found in their own research that psychological abuse significantly impacted the decision to leave a violent relationship. By furthering research in this area, and investigating the various types of psychological abuse and emotional abuse women may experience, the current results can contribute to the understanding that psychological abuse affects multiple facets of a woman's life. This understanding is integral to aiding women across various fields, including legal contexts where the relationship between abuse and trauma may not be well understood or formally recognized. If more professionals can understand the experience of women facing physical violence, they can better provide services and representation that can end victim-blaming attitudes and persecution of women who feel they cannot escape violent partners.

This study also has some limitations that suggest an even greater and more specific need for research in this area. A regression analysis was conducted in an attempt to differentiate effects of psychological abuse from effects of physical violence. As referenced, research in this area has suffered from the inability to separate these constructs, because psychological and physical abuse most frequently co-occurs. While this research found a differentiated relationship between **emotional control and restriction of resources** and trauma symptoms, other forms of nonphysical abuse did not appear to have significant relationships. This could be due to a variety of reasons, including the specific population. The lack of significance in other areas of psychological abuse could suggest this population does not experience, or report, these types of abuse, despite its potential importance overall. This research could also suffer from the same limitations of other studies that make it difficult to differentiate effects of these co-occurring forms of abuse.

Similar to other studies, the women in this sample were experiencing variable levels of physical violence but were screened for moderate to severe violence to enter the study. There may be a more highly nuanced relationship between types and levels of physical violence, and types and levels of psychological abuse that has not been detailed in this study, due to lack of specificity in this particular aspect of the relationship. Responses in this database were also categorized into high, medium, and low levels of violence utilizing the original Conflict Tactics Scale (Straus, 1979). However, the current research did not delineate between levels of violence in the current sample, and therefore may have missed trends in how more violent couples, as opposed to less violent couples, experience psychological abuse. This could also suggest differences in types of perpetrator. For example, an abusive partner maybe be less physical, but more controlling, and a more violent partner may be more restricting, but less emotionally controlling. Further research in this area could investigate the intersection between types of perpetration, levels of violence, and trauma symptoms.

In addition to experiencing variable levels of violence, the majority of women within current sample reported being out of the violent relationship. The average time since the last violent relationship was about 4 years, which could impact both the participant's memories of the type of violence experienced and their reporting of trauma symptoms. It is possible that the respondents are limited by their memory and therefore only report the most salient forms of abuse. Further research could investigate the impact of psychological and emotional abuse with women who are currently in a violent relationship, or have just ended the relationship. Conducting similar research could clarify the link between the experience of physical and non-physical abuse and the development of trauma symptoms. However, also significant would be the fact that despite the majority of women being out of the violent relationship, they are still

currently experiencing trauma symptoms. This overall effect is consistent with the finding that physically violent relationships can significantly impact mental health (Ovara, McLeod, & Sharpe, 1996; Sackett & Saunders, 2001; Straight, Harper, & Arias, 2003).

Overall, the current research also does lack the generalizability that much research in this area suffers from, in regards to population. This research was done with a sample that is entirely heterosexual and female. While this population is very important in regards to addressing violent relationship, the mental health field is steadily seeing growing numbers of non-heterosexual or gender variant populations accessing resources (Outlaw, 2009). This appears to be a reflection of increasing awareness and rights within previously marginalized groups, and practitioners and researchers should make ethical efforts at examining these populations distinctly.

Nonetheless, the significant results do provide insight into further understanding emotional control and restriction of access as standalone constructs that should be further addressed both in research and practice. While not completely resolving the definitional issues currently facing this field, the current research was able to utilize a community sample of women to investigate Maiuro's proposed organization, and supports a movement towards a paradigm that examines the impact of acts of emotional abuse for the victim, and assessing abusive environments with more specificity. This research also contributes further support to the finding that trauma can be linked to abusive relationships, both physical and non-physical, and more specifically suggests that elements such as manipulating children and access to resources is significant and can be very traumatic for women in violent households.

References

- Ali, A., Oatley, K., & Toner, B. B. (1999). Emotional abuse as a precipitating factor for depression in women. *Journal of Emotional Abuse, 1*(4), 1-13.
- Arias, I., & Pape, K. T. (1999). Psychological abuse: Implications for adjustment and commitment to leave violent partners. *Violence and Victims, 14*(1), 55-67.
- Basile, K. C., Arias, I., Desai, S., & Thompson, M. P. (2004). The differential association of intimate partner physical, sexual, psychological, and stalking violence and posttraumatic stress symptoms in a nationally representative sample of women. *Journal of Traumatic Stress, 17*(5), 413-421.
- Babcock, J. C., Roseman, A., Green, C. E., & Ross, J. M. (2008). Intimate partner abuse and PTSD symptomatology: Examining mediators and moderators of the abuse-trauma link. *Journal of Family Psychology, 22*(6), 809-818.
- Briere, J., & Runtz, M. (1989). The trauma symptom checklist (TSC-33): Early data on a new scale. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 4*, 151-163.
- Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. (2010, September 20). *Intimate partner violence: Definitions*. Retrieved from <http://www.cdc.gov/ViolencePrevention/intimatepartnerviolence/definitions.html>
- Coker, A. L., Weston, R., Creson, D. L., Justice, B., & Blakeney, P. (2005). PTSD symptoms among men and women survivors of intimate partner violence: The role of risk and protective factors. *Violence and Victims, 20*(6), 625-643.
- Follingstad, D. R. (2009). The impact of psychological aggression on women's mental health and behavior: The status of the field. *Trauma, Violence, & Abuse, 10*(3), 271-289.

- Follingstad, D. R. (2007). Rethinking current approaches to psychological abuse: Conceptual and methodological issues. *Aggression and Violent Behavior, 12*(4), 439-458.
- Follingstad, D. R., Rutledge, L. L., Berg, B. J., Hause, E. S., & Polek, D.S. (1990). The role of emotional abuse in physically abusive relationships. *Journal of Family Violence, 5*(2), 107-120.
- Helfrich, C. A., Fujiura, G. T., & Rutkowski-Kmitta, V. (2008). Mental health disorders and functioning of women in domestic violence shelters. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 23*(4), 437-453.
- Jordan, C. E., Campbell, R., & Follingstad, D. (2010). Violence and women's mental health: The impact of physical, sexual, and psychological aggression. *Annual Review of Clinical Psychology, 6*, 607-628.
- Kelly, V. A. (2004). Psychological abuse of women: A review of the literature. *The Family Journal, 12*(4), 383-388.
- Maiuro, R. D. (2001). Sticks and stones may break my bones, but names will also hurt me: psychological abuse in domestically violent relationships. In *Psychological Abuse in Violent Domestic Relations*, ed. KD O'Leary, RD Maiuro, pp. ix-xx. New York: Springer
- Marshall, L. (1996). Psychological abuse of women: Six distinct clusters. *Journal of Family Violence, 11*(4), 379-409.
- Outlaw, M. (2009). No one type of intimate partner abuse: Exploring physical and nonphysical abuse among intimate partners. *Journal of Family Violence, 24*(4), 263-272.
- Ovara, T. A., McLeod, P. J., & Sharpe, D. (1996). Perception of control, depressive symptomatology and self-esteem of women in transition from abusive relationships. *Journal of Family Violence, 11*, 167-186.

- Pico-Alfonso, M. (2005). Psychological intimate partner violence: The major predictor of posttraumatic stress disorder in abused women. *Neuroscience and Biobehavioral Reviews*, 29(1), 181-193.
- Sackett, L. A., & Saunders, D. G. (2001). The impact of different forms of psychological abuse on battered women. In K. D. O'Leary & R. D. Maiuro (Eds.), *Psychological abuse in violent domestic relations* (pp.197-210). New York: Springer.
- Straight, E. S., Harper, F. W., & Arias, I. (2003). The impact of partner psychological abuse on health behaviors and health status in college women. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 18, 1035-1054.
- Strauchler, O., McCloskey, K., Malloy, K., Sitaker, M., Grigsby, N., & Gillig, P. (2004). Humiliation, manipulation, and control: Evidence of centrality in domestic violence against an adult partner. *Journal of Family Violence*, 19(6), 339-354.
- Straus, M. A. (1979). Measuring intrafamily conflict and violence: The conflict tactics (CT) scales. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, 41(1), 75-88.
- Street, A. E., & Arias, I. (2001). Psychological abuse and posttraumatic stress disorder in battered women: Examining the roles of shame and guilt. *Violence and Victims*, 16(1), 65-78.
- Tjaden, P., & Thoennes, N. (2000). Prevalence and consequences of male-to-female and female-to-male intimate partner violence as measured by the national violence against women survey. *Violence Against Women*, 6(2), 142-161.
- Tolman, R.M. (1989). The development of a measure of psychological maltreatment of women by their male partners. *Violence and Victims*, 4(3), 159-177.

Tolman, R.M. (1999). The validation of the psychological maltreatment of women inventory.

Violence and Victims, 14(1), 25-35.

Walker, L.E. (1984). *The Battered Woman Syndrome*, Springer Publishing Co., New York.

Table 1

Means and Standard Deviations For Scores Of All Items Of All Measures

<u>Item</u>	<u>M</u>	<u>SD</u>
My partner put down my care of the children	1.54	1.95
My partner demanded that I stay home and take care of the children	1.27	1.88
My partner used our money or made important financial decisions without talking to me about it	2.62	2.06
My partner became upset if household work was not done when s/he thought it should be	2.42	1.96
My partner did not do a fair share of child care	1.64	2.14
My partner criticized the way I took care of the house	2.36	1.88
My partner acted irresponsibly with our financial resources	2.90	2.09
My partner threatened to take the children away from me	1.27	1.85
My partner did not do a fair share of household tasks	2.93	2.03
My partner tried to keep me from seeing or talking to my family	2.48	1.76
My partner was stingy about giving me money	2.80	1.99
My partner did not contribute enough to support our family	2.44	2.18
Did your partner point out to you your responsibilities to your family	2.62	1.63
Did your partner threaten to keep children or significant others from you	2.52	1.54
My partner refused to let me work outside the home	1.43	1.54
My partner kept me from getting medical care that I needed	1.53	1.63
My partner restricted the use of the car	2.09	1.95
My partner restricted the use of the telephone	2.21	1.78
My partner interfered in my relationships with other family members	2.79	1.67
My partner acted like I was his/her personal servant	3.13	1.73
Did your partner mention how difficult it would be for you to live on your own	2.96	1.54
My partner tried to turn our family, friends and/or children against me	2.67	1.77
My partner did not allow me to go out of the house when I wanted to go	2.44	1.65
My partner tried to convince my friends, family, or children that I was crazy	2.53	1.72
My partner threatened to have me committed to a mental institution	1.35	1.32
My partner told me I couldn't manage or take care of myself without him/her	3.00	1.67
My partner ordered me around	3.47	1.42
Did your partner provide well for you or your family	2.29	1.41
My partner withheld affection from me	3.55	1.47
My partner stomped out...or the yard during a disagreement	3.46	1.49
My partner called me names	3.99	1.29
My partner swore at me	4.26	1.08
My partner yelled and screamed at me	4.31	1.01

My partner told me my feelings were irrational or crazy	3.68	1.35
Partner insulted, yelled, or swore at each other?	5.28	1.21
My partner treated me like an inferior	4.18	1.07
Partner stomped out of the room or house (or yard)	3.85	2.01
My partner threatened to leave the relationship	2.38	1.49
My partner blamed me for his/her problems	3.92	1.30
My partner was insensitive to my feelings	4.26	.973
My partner brought up things from the past to hurt me	3.99	1.25
My partner treated me like I was stupid	3.67	1.30
Did your partner threaten to leave	2.40	1.38
My partner insulted me or shamed me in front of others	3.49	1.22
Partner did or said something to spite the other one?	4.84	1.39
My partner blamed me for causing his/her violent behavior	3.95	1.30
My partner gave me the silent...acted as if I wasn't there	3.31	1.46
My partner said something to spite me	3.95	1.05
My partner tried to make me feel like I was crazy	3.73	1.47
Did your partner blame you for the violent behavior	3.75	1.11
Partner sulked and/or refused to talk about it	4.28	1.96
My partner did not talk to me about his/her feelings	3.69	1.26
My partner threatened to have an affair with someone else	2.32	1.61
Partner argued heatedly, but short of yelling	4.01	2.04
Partner slapped the other one	2.94	2.42
Partner kicked, bit, or hit with a fist	2.92	2.40
Partner hit or tried to hit with something	2.92	2.34
Partner pushed, grabbed, or shoved the other one	4.45	1.65
Partner beat up the other one	2.22	2.40
Partner threw something at the other one	3.05	2.26
Partner threatened to hit or throw something at the other one	4.08	1.97
Partner threw or smashed or hit or kicked something	4.53	1.60
Did your partner threaten to harm you or someone physically	3.24	1.38
Did your partner threaten to harm or kill you or your children	2.21	1.41
Partner threatened with a knife or gun	1.09	1.81
Did your partner physically not allow you to leave	3.06	1.30
Did your partner threaten to harm you or someone emotionally	3.36	1.47
Partner used a knife or gun	.55	1.50
My partner did not want me so socialize with my same sex friends	3.47	1.46
My partner demanded obedience to his/her whims	3.65	1.43
My partner tried to keep me from doing things to help myself	3.09	1.64
Did your partner prohibit you from friends, relatives or other sources of support	3.56	1.40
My partner did not want me to go to school or other self-improvement activities	3.10	1.74

My partner blamed me when...when it had nothing to do with me	3.87	1.31
Partner discussed the issue calmly	2.64	1.87
My partner sulked or refused to talk about problem	3.95	1.21
My partner moods changed radically from very calm to very angry and vice versa	4.26	1.039
My partner put down my physical appearance	3.14	1.399
My partner was insensitive to my sexual needs and desires	3.34	1.61
Partner forced the other to perform sexually against his or her will	1.98	2.23
Partner got information to back up (your/his/her) side of things	2.11	2.19
Partner brought in or tried to bring in someone to settle things	1.03	1.74
My partner threatened to hurt himself/herself if I left	2.38	1.67
Did your partner threaten to harm or kill themselves	2.41	1.42
Did your partner promise to change	3.63	1.27
My partner was jealous or suspicious of my friends	4.09	1.31
My partner accused me of having an affair with another man/woman	3.46	1.59
My partner was jealous of friends who were of his/her sex	4.18	1.15
My partner threatened to hurt himself/herself if I didn't do what s/he wanted me to	1.79	1.42
My partner monitored my time and made me account for where I was	3.65	1.543
Did your partner apologize for the violent behavior	3.53	1.31
Partner cried?	2.06	1.96
Did your partner promise you gifts or privileges	2.55	1.37

Table 2

Factor Loadings and Communalities for All Items

<u>Item</u>	<u>Factor</u>					<u>h²</u>
	1	2	3	4	5	
My partner put down my care of the children	.749					.598
My partner demanded that I stay home and take care of the children	.741					.586
My partner used our money or made important financial decisions without talking to me about it.	.729					.596
My partner became upset if household work was not done when s/he thought it should be.	.725					.626
My partner did not do a fair share of child care	.719					.553
My partner criticized the way I took care of the house	.703					.560
My partner acted irresponsibly with our financial resources	.696					.552
My partner threatened to take the children away from me	.678					.530
My partner did not do a fair share of household tasks	.667					.553
My partner tried to keep me from seeing or talking to my family	.630			.359		.630
My partner was stingy about giving me money	.627					.509
My partner did not contribute enough to support our family	.614					.424
Did your partner point out to you your responsibilities to your family	.611					.434
Did your partner threaten to keep children or significant others from you	.593					.511
My partner refused to let me work outside the home	.582					.380
My partner kept me from getting medical care that I needed	.581		.302			.501
My partner restricted the use of the car	.574					.422
My partner restricted the use of the telephone	.570					.521
My partner interfered in my relationships with other family members	.544			.357		.534
My partner acted like I was his/her personal servant	.539	.300		.392		.595

Did your partner mention how difficult it would be for you to live on your own	.522		.452
My partner tried to turn our family, friends and/or children against me	.520		.442
My partner did not allow me to go out of the house when I wanted to go	.505	.332	.498
My partner tried to convince my friends, family, or children that I was crazy	.488		.394
My partner threatened to have me committed to a mental institution	.474		.299
My partner told me I couldn't manage or take care of myself without him/her	.461	.375	.473
My partner ordered me around	.428	.357	.423
Did your partner provide well for you or your family	.335		.161
My partner withheld affection from me	.573	.303	.482
My partner stomped out of the house or the yard during a disagreement	.561		.336
My partner called me names	.557		.433
My partner swore at me	.552		.426
My partner yelled and screamed at me	.549	.301	.478
My partner told me my feelings were irrational or crazy	.394	.533	.513
Partner insulted, yelled, or swore at each other	.528	.383	.479
My partner treated me like an inferior	.526	.406	.512
Partner stomped out of the room or house (or yard)	.526		.349
My partner threatened to leave the relationship	.523		.346
My partner blamed me for his/her problems	.310	.515	.338
My partner was insensitive to my feelings	.511	.385	.470
My partner brought up things from the past to hurt me	.509		.380
My partner treated me like I was stupid	.314	.504	.351
Did your partner threaten to leave	.497		.323
My partner insulted me or shamed me in front of others	.310	.490	.301
Partner did or said something to spite the other one	.483	.418	.457
My partner blamed me for causing his/her violent behavior	.479	.318	.499
My partner gave me the silent treatment or acted as if I wasn't there	.469		.319
My partner said something to spite me	.362	.462	.412

My partner tried to make me feel like I was crazy	.373	.459		.406
Did your partner blame you for the violent behavior		.447		.411
Partner sulked and/or refused to talk about it		.435		.193
My partner did not talk to me about his/her feelings		.380		.245
My partner threatened to have an affair with someone else				.181
Partner argued heatedly, but short of yelling				.073
Partner slapped the other one		.791		.667
Partner kicked, bit, or hit with a fist		.784		.643
Partner hit or tried to hit with something		.748		.613
Partner pushed, grabbed, or shoved the other one		.720		.573
Partner beat up the other one		.709		.548
Partner threw something at the other one		.679		.555
Partner threatened to hit or throw something at the other one		.669		.578
Partner threw or smashed or hit or kicked something	.308	.650	.304	.616
Did your partner threaten to harm you or someone physically		.509		.400
Did your partner threaten to harm or kill you or your children	.358	.486		.410
Partner threatened with a knife or gun		.472		.314
Did your partner physically not allow you to leave		.451	.319	.405
Did your partner threaten to harm you or someone emotionally		.374		.411
Partner used a knife or gun		.341		.162
My partner did not want me so socialize with my same sex friends			.573	.487 .653
My partner demanded obedience to his/her whims	.341		.552	.524
My partner tried to keep me from doing things to help myself	.484		.537	.711
Did your partner prohibit you from friends, relatives or other sources of support	.341		.510	.486 .664
My partner did not want me to go to school or other self-improvement activities	.444		.454	.532
My partner blamed me when...when it had nothing to do with me	.389		.435	.529
Partner discussed the issue calmly?			.412	.178
My partner sulked or refused to talk about problem	.383		.388	.308
My partner moods changed radically from very calm to very angry and vice versa	.305		.368	.330
My partner put down my physical appearance	.355		.363	.381
My partner was insensitive to my sexual needs and desires			.350	.292
Partner forced the other to perform sexually against his or her will			.317	.263
Partner got information to back up (your/his/her) side of things				.077
Partner brought in or tried to bring in someone to settle things				.097
My partner threatened to hurt himself/herself if I left				.665 .464
Did your partner threaten to harm or kill themselves				.620 .421
Did your partner promise to change				.600 .392

My partner was jealous or suspicious of my friends	.445	.552	.568
My partner accused me of having an affair with another man/woman		.533	.419
My partner was jealous of friends who were of his/her sex	.333	.520	.416
My partner threatened to hurt himself/herself if I didn't do what s/he wanted me to		.514	.319
My partner monitored my time and made me account for where I was	.432	.511	.550
Did your partner apologize for the violent behavior		.505	.339
Partner cried		.396	.220
Did your partner promise you gifts or privileges		.353	.192

Table 3

Hierarchical Regression Analysis Predicting Score On Trauma Symptom Checklist

Variable	B	SEB	Beta	t	Sig.	R2	ΔR2
Step 1 Physical Threats and Abuse	.028	.006	.264	4.338	.000	.070	.070
Step 2 Emotional control and restriction of resources	.015	.005	.286	3.269	.001	.033	.063
Denigration and damage to partner's self-image or esteem	.009	.006	.129	1.528	.128		
Restriction of social outlets	-.020	.014	-.140	-1.392	.165		
Partner's self-centered manipulation	.002	.011	.011	.151	.880		

Appendix A
Psychological Maltreatment of Women Inventory

Please indicate, by circling the appropriate number, how frequently your partner did each of the following to you. If you are currently in your relationship, please indicate how frequently s/he did each during this past year. If you have left your relationship, please indicate how frequently s/he did each during the last year of your relationship. Your choices are:

0 Does Not Apply	1 Never	2 Rarely	3 Occasionally	4 Frequently	5 Very Frequently	
1. My partner put down my physical appearance.	0	1	2	3	4	5
2. My partner insulted me or shamed me in front of others.	0	1	2	3	4	5
3. My partner treated me like I was stupid.	0	1	2	3	4	5
4. My partner was insensitive to my feelings.	0	1	2	3	4	5
5. My partner told me I couldn't manage or take care of myself without him/her.	0	1	2	3	4	5
6. My partner put down my care of the children.	0	1	2	3	4	5
7. My partner criticized the way I took care of the house.	0	1	2	3	4	5
8. My partner said something to spite me.	0	1	2	3	4	5
9. My partner brought up something from the past to hurt me.	0	1	2	3	4	5
10. My partner called me names.	0	1	2	3	4	5
11. My partner swore at me.						
12. My partner yelled and screamed at me.	0	1	2	3	4	5
13. My partner treated me like an inferior.	0	1	2	3	4	5
14. My partner sulked or refused to talk about a problem.	0	1	2	3	4	5
15. My partner stomped out of the house or the yard during a disagreement.	0	1	2	3	4	5
16. My partner gave me the silent treatment, or acted as if I wasn't there.	0	1	2	3	4	5
17. My partner withheld affection from me.						
18. My partner did not talk to me about his/her feelings.	0	1	2	3	4	5
19. My partner was insensitive to my sexual needs.						
20. My partner demanded obedience to his/her whims.	0	1	2	3	4	5
21. My partner became upset if household work was not done when s/he thought it should be.	0	1	2	3	4	5
22. My partner acted like I was his/her personal servant.	0	1	2	3	4	5
23. My partner did not do a fair share of household tasks.	0	1	2	3	4	5
24. My partner did not do a fair share of child care.	0	1	2	3	4	5

25. My partner ordered me around.	0	1	2	3	4	5
26. My partner monitored my time and made me account for where I was.	0	1	2	3	4	5
27. My partner was stingy in giving me money.	0	1	2	3	4	5
28. My partner acted irresponsibly with our financial resources.	0	1	2	3	4	5
29. My partner did not contribute enough to supporting our family.	0	1	2	3	4	5
30. My partner used our money or made important financial decisions without talking to me about it.	0	1	2	3	4	5
31. My partner kept me from getting medical care that I needed.	0	1	2	3	4	5
32. My partner was jealous or suspicious of my friends .	0	1	2	3	4	5
33. My partner was jealous of friends who were of his/her sex.	0	1	2	3	4	5
34. My partner did not want me to go to school or other self-improvement activities.	0	1	2	3	4	5
35. My partner did not want me to socialize with my same sex friends.	0	1	2	3	4	5
36. My partner accused me of having an affair with another man/woman.	0	1	2	3	4	5
37. My partner demanded that I same home and take care of the children.	0	1	2	3	4	5
38. My partner tried to keep me from seeing or talking to family.	0	1	2	3	4	5
39. My partner interfered in my relationship with other family members.	0	1	2	3	4	5
40. My partner tried to keep me from doing things to help myself.	0	1	2	3	4	5
41. My partner restricted my use of the car.	0	1	2	3	4	5
42. My partner restricted my use of the telephone.	0	1	2	3	4	5
43. My partner did not allow me to go out of the house when I wanted to go.	0	1	2	3	4	5
44. My partner refused to let me work outside the home.	0	1	2	3	4	5
45. My partner told me my feelings were irrational or crazy.	0	1	2	3	4	5
46. My partner blamed me for his/her problems.	0	1	2	3	4	5
47. My partner tried to turn our family, friends, and/or children against me.	0	1	2	3	4	5
48. My partner blamed me for causing his/her violent behavior.	0	1	2	3	4	5
49. My partner tried to make me feel like I was crazy.	0	1	2	3	4	5
50. My partner's moods changed radically, from very calm to very angry, or vice versa.	0	1	2	3	4	5

- | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 51. My partner blamed me when s/he was upset about something, even when it had nothing to do with me. | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 52. My partner tried to convince my friends, family, or children that I was crazy. | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 53. My partner threatened to hurt himself/herself if I left. | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 54. My partner threatened to hurt himself/herself if I didn't do what s/he wanted me to. | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 55. My partner threatened to have an affair with someone else. | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 56. My partner threatened to leave the relationship. | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 57. My partner threatened to take the children away from me. | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| 58. My partner threatened to have me committed to a mental institution. | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |

Appendix B
Conflict Tactics Scale

No matter how well a couple gets along, there are times when they disagree on major decisions, get annoyed about something the other person does, or just have spats or fights because they're in a bad mood or tired or for some other reasons. They also see different ways of trying to settle their differences. Please read the list below of some things that you and your spouse/partner might have done when you had a dispute.

If you are in your relationship, please circle the number of times you or your partner did the following during the past year. If you have left your relationship please circle how often you or your partner did the following during any one year of your relationship. Circle "Ever?" if it did not happen during the year but happened at any time prior to or after the year you are describing.

- | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|-------|---|---|-----|------|-------|-----|-------|--|
| a. Discussed the issue calmly. | | | | | | | | | |
| You: | Never | 1 | 2 | 3-5 | 6-10 | 11-20 | +20 | Ever? | |
| Partner: | Never | 1 | 2 | 3-5 | 6-10 | 11-20 | +20 | Ever? | |
| b. Got information to back up your/his/her side of things. | | | | | | | | | |
| You: | Never | 1 | 2 | 3-5 | 6-10 | 11-20 | +20 | Ever? | |
| Partner: | Never | 1 | 2 | 3-5 | 6-10 | 11-20 | +20 | Ever? | |
| c. Brought in or tried to bring in someone to help settle things. | | | | | | | | | |
| You: | Never | 1 | 2 | 3-5 | 6-10 | 11-20 | +20 | Ever? | |
| Partner: | Never | 1 | 2 | 3-5 | 6-10 | 11-20 | +20 | Ever? | |
| d. Argued heatedly but short of yelling. | | | | | | | | | |
| You: | Never | 1 | 2 | 3-5 | 6-10 | 11-20 | +20 | Ever? | |
| Partner: | Never | 1 | 2 | 3-5 | 6-10 | 11-20 | +20 | Ever? | |
| e. Insulted, yelled, swore at each other. | | | | | | | | | |
| You: | Never | 1 | 2 | 3-5 | 6-10 | 11-20 | +20 | Ever? | |
| Partner: | Never | 1 | 2 | 3-5 | 6-10 | 11-20 | +20 | Ever? | |
| f. Sulked and/or refused to talk about it. | | | | | | | | | |
| You: | Never | 1 | 2 | 3-5 | 6-10 | 11-20 | +20 | Ever? | |
| Partner: | Never | 1 | 2 | 3-5 | 6-10 | 11-20 | +20 | Ever? | |
| g. Stomped out of the room or house (or yard). | | | | | | | | | |
| You: | Never | 1 | 2 | 3-5 | 6-10 | 11-20 | +20 | Ever? | |
| Partner: | Never | 1 | 2 | 3-5 | 6-10 | 11-20 | +20 | Ever? | |
| h. Cried. | | | | | | | | | |
| You: | Never | 1 | 2 | 3-5 | 6-10 | 11-20 | +20 | Ever? | |
| Partner: | Never | 1 | 2 | 3-5 | 6-10 | 11-20 | +20 | Ever? | |

- i. Did or said something to spite the other one.
 You: Never 1 2 3-5 6-10 11-20 +20 Ever?
 Partner: Never 1 2 3-5 6-10 11-20 +20 Ever?
- j. Threatened to hit or throw something at the other one
 You: Never 1 2 3-5 6-10 11-20 +20 Ever?
 Partner: Never 1 2 3-5 6-10 11-20 +20 Ever?
- k. Threw or smashed or hit or kicked something.
 You: Never 1 2 3-5 6-10 11-20 +20 Ever?
 Partner: Never 1 2 3-5 6-10 11-20 +20 Ever?
- l. Threw something at the other one.
 You: Never 1 2 3-5 6-10 11-20 +20 Ever?
 Partner: Never 1 2 3-5 6-10 11-20 +20 Ever?
- m. Pushed, grabbed, or shoved the other one.
 You: Never 1 2 3-5 6-10 11-20 +20 Ever?
 Partner: Never 1 2 3-5 6-10 11-20 +20 Ever?
- n. Slapped the other one.
 You: Never 1 2 3-5 6-10 11-20 +20 Ever?
 Partner: Never 1 2 3-5 6-10 11-20 +20 Ever?
- o. Kicked, bit, or hit with a fist.
 You: Never 1 2 3-5 6-10 11-20 +20 Ever?
 Partner: Never 1 2 3-5 6-10 11-20 +20 Ever?
- p. Hit or tried to hit with something.
 You: Never 1 2 3-5 6-10 11-20 +20 Ever?
 Partner: Never 1 2 3-5 6-10 11-20 +20 Ever?
- q. Beat up the other one.
 You: Never 1 2 3-5 6-10 11-20 +20 Ever?
 Partner: Never 1 2 3-5 6-10 11-20 +20 Ever?
- r. Threatened with a knife or gun.
 You: Never 1 2 3-5 6-10 11-20 +20 Ever?
 Partner: Never 1 2 3-5 6-10 11-20 +20 Ever?
- s. Used a knife or gun.
 You: Never 1 2 3-5 6-10 11-20 +20 Ever?
 Partner: Never 1 2 3-5 6-10 11-20 +20 Ever?
- t. Forced the other one to perform sexually against his or her will.
 You: Never 1 2 3-5 6-10 11-20 +20 Ever?

Partner:	Never	1	2	3-5	6-10	11-20	+20	Ever?
----------	-------	---	---	-----	------	-------	-----	-------

Appendix C
Trauma Symptom Checklist

How often have you experienced each of the following in the last two months? Please circle the appropriate number.

	Never	Occasionally	Fairly Often	Very Often
1. Insomnia (trouble getting to sleep)	0	1	2	3
2. Restless sleep	0	1	2	3
3. Nightmares	0	1	2	3
4. Waking up early in the morning and can't get back to sleep.	0	1	2	3
5. Weight loss (without dieting)	0	1	2	3
6. Feeling isolated from others	0	1	2	3
7. Loneliness	0	1	2	3
8. Low sex drive	0	1	2	3
9. Sadness	0	1	2	3
10. "Flashbacks" (sudden, vivid, distracting memories)	0	1	2	3
11. "Spacing out" (going away in your own mind)	0	1	2	3
12. Headaches	0	1	2	3
13. Stomach problems	0	1	2	3
14. Uncontrollable crying	0	1	2	3
15. Anxiety attacks	0	1	2	3
16. Trouble controlling temper	0	1	2	3
17. Trouble getting along with others	0	1	2	3
18. Dizziness	0	1	2	3
19. Passing out	0	1	2	3
20. Desire to physically hurt yourself	0	1	2	3
21. Desire to physically hurt others	0	1	2	3
22. Sexual problems	0	1	2	3
23. Sexual overactivity	0	1	2	3
24. Fear of men	0	1	2	3
25. Fear of women	0	1	2	3
26. Unnecessary or over frequent washing	0	1	2	3
27. Feelings of inferiority	0	1	2	3
28. Feelings of guilt	0	1	2	3
29. Feeling that things are "unreal"	0	1	2	3
30. Memory problems	0	1	2	3
31. Feelings that you are not always in your body	0	1	2	3
32. Feeling tense at all times	0	1	2	3
33. Having trouble with breathing	0	1	2	3

Appendix D

Dimensions of Psychological Abuse in Domestically Violent Relationships

- I. Denigrating Damage to Partner's Self-Image or Esteem: Yelling; referring to partner in profane, derogatory and demeaning terms; name calling; put-downs regarding appearance and behavior; shaming or embarrassing in front of friends and family; attempts to disaffect or alienate children; being hypercritical; negativism; ridiculing; invalidating feelings; projecting personal responsibility through blame; focusing upon the person rather than his/her behavior.
- II. Passive-Aggressive Withholding of Emotional Support and Nurturance: Punitive use of avoidance and withdrawal; sulking; silent treatment; spiteful inactions; neglect; emotional abandonment.
- III. Threatening Behavior: Explicit and Implicit: Threats to physically hurt, disfigure, or kill; coercive threats to divorce, to take away the children; lying and infidelity; engaging in reckless driving or behavior.
- IV. Restricting Personal Territory and Freedom: Isolation from friends and family; stalking or checking on whereabouts; invading diary or telephone records; preventing partner from working or going to school or doing things on their own; dominating decision making with the relationship; controlling partner's money; exit blocking; interfering with partner's use of telephone; taking care keys or disabling the car; sex-role stereotypes, (I.e., "a woman's place is..."); controlling partner's options on the basis of gender and/or marital status, a sense of entitlement or ownership.

Adapted from "Sticks and stones may break my bones, but names will also hurt me:

psychological abuse in domestically violent relationships," by Maiuro, R. D., 2001,

Psychological Abuse in Violent Domestic Relations, ed. K. D. O'Leary, R. D. Maiuro, pp. ix–xx. New York: Springer