Amer. J. Orthopsychiat. 62(2), April 1992

FAMILY VIOLENCE

A TYPOLOGY OF MEN WHO BATTER: Three Types Derived From Cluster Analysis

Daniel G. Saunders, Ph.D.

Important theoretical and treatment implications may be revealed when men who batter their intimate partners are categorized according to type. Data on 165 batterers were cluster analyzed, and three types identified: family-only aggressors, generalized aggressors, and emotionally volatile aggressors. The clustering variables explained 90% of the variance in category assignment. Implications for treatment are discussed.

Considerable progress has been made in describing the characteristics of men who batter their intimate partners *(Hotaling & Sugarman, 1986)*. Most theoretical and empirical work, however, attempts to generalize about all men who batter and pays little attention to the possibility that there are distinct types of abusers. If typologies are uncovered, some puzzling or controversial findings from previous research may be explained. Typologies might also help refine strategies for intervention. Some clinicians report that certain types of abusers may respond better to particular treatment methods *(Brisson, 1983)*, but treatment programs typically use the same methods with all men who batter.

PREVIOUS STUDIES

Early speculations about types of abusers were not greeted enthusiastically. For example, participants at a 1979 colloquium on intervention programs *(Mott-McDonald Associates, 1979)* were presented with two different typologies, but concluded that the most important task for practitioners was simply to describe the violent behavior and work to stop it. One of the two typologies was constructed by Elbow *(1977)*, who described four types: the "controller," who uses his mate as an object so that he can feel in control; the "defender," who mixes hate and love, and is dependent on the mate's acceptance and forgiveness; the "approval seeker," who is looking for reinforcement of his self-image; and the "incorporator," who sees his partner as part of himself. Elbow presented possible parental messages that might lead to these types, but did not empirically validate the typology.

The other typology, also based on clinical impressions, divided abusers into "hitters" and "batterers" *(Mott-McDonald, 1979)*. According to this typology, the hitter tends to take greater responsibility for the abuse and warns the victim of the

Based on a presentation at the 1987 National Conference for Family Violence Researchers, University of New Hampshire, Durham. Work was supported in part by Centers for Disease Control Grant CCR502584 and National Institute of Mental Health Grant MH00542-01. *Author is at the School of Social Work, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, and at the Program to Prevent Woman Abuse, Family Service, Madison, Wis.*

buildup of anger. The batterer, on the other hand, is more frequently and severely violent, uses threats to terrorize, and refuses to take responsibility for the abuse. This typology is similar to that of Sweeney and Key *(1982)*, who distinguished between the infrequent batterer, who is rigidly inhibited, and the frequent batterer, who tends to respond with anger and aggression whenever frustrated.

Steinmetz *(1978)* theorized that there are two types of couples. In one, there is mutual "provocation" and mutual abuse; in the other, the woman is severely abused but does not provoke the abuse. Steinmetz noted that the mutual-combat couple seems to abuse alcohol before their fights. Her typology was derived, in part, from her controversial reports on the "battered husband syndrome" *(Pleck, Pleck, Grossman, & Bart, 1978; Steinmetz, 1977–78)*.

Some empirical support exists for a typology that contains features of the hitter-batterer dichotomy. Studies have compared men who are violent only at home with those who are violent both inside and outside the home, or are generally aggressive. These generally aggressive men seem to use more severe violence *(Fagan, Stewart, & Hansen, 1983; Shields, McCall, & Hanneke, 1988)* and are more likely to abuse alcohol *(Brisson, 1983; Shields et al., 1988)*. Hofeller *(1980)* found that generally aggressive men had several traits of dominance, whereas the family-only type had signs of dependence (e.g., suicide attempts if divorce was imminent). The dependent type was more affectionate and showed more remorse after the abuse.

The dominant, or generally aggressive, type of men are less likely to seek help *(Brisson, 1983)* and are more traditional in their views of women *(Rosenbaum & O'Leary, 1981)*. Shields et al. *(1988)* found generally aggressive men to have proviolence attitudes, criminal life-styles, and more extramarital affairs. There is also evidence that these men were more likely to have been abused as children *(Caesar, 1986; Fagan et al., 1983; Hofeller, 1980)*, although one study indicated that family-only abusers were more likely to have been abused as children *(Shields et al., 1988)*.

Caesar *(1986)* found support for the dominant type in her descriptive study of abusers. The dominant man, whom she labeled the "tyrant," showed psychopathic and paranoid traits on the Minnesota Multiphasic Personality Inventory, used fear to control his partner, showed little remorse, and wanted his wife to care for and nurture him. A second type, the "exposed rescuer," had intervened in his parents' fights as a child. He was chronically resentful, but had trouble expressing it; abused alcohol; wanted a wife who was dependent on him; and felt remorse for his violence. A third type—the "non-exposed altruist"—inhibited his anger, tried to please his partner, and had strong ambivalence about dependence. These results are largely heuristic because the sample was small.

Gondolf *(1987)* cluster-analyzed the reports of 550 shelter residents on their partners' history of violence and background, including generalized violence. He found three clusters. The one he labeled "typical batterers" had the lowest levels of verbal, physical, and sexual abuse; these men apologized after the abuse and were the least likely to have alcohol problems or an arrest record, being thus similar to the dependent, family-only abuser. The group Gondolf labeled "sociopathic" (7% of the sample) inflicted the most severe injuries, had the highest arrest rate, and were the most likely to be violent outside the home; they were also the most likely to abuse their partners sexually, abuse their children physically, and abuse alcohol. The group labeled "antisocial batterers" were also extremely abusive; they were the most likely to use weapons and were the second most likely to cause injuries.

Hamberger and Hastings *(1986)* studied the personality profiles of a treatment sample of men who batter using the Millon Clinical Multiaxial Inventory *(Millon, 1983)*.

Three major categories were derived from factor analysis: schizoidal/borderline, narcissistic/antisocial, and dependent/compulsive. However, most of the men showed a mixed pattern of some combination of the three factors. The largest of the "pure" categories was the dependent-compulsive group. This comprised only 16% of the total sample, thus illustrating the heterogeneity of men who batter. Self-reported anger arousal was consistently the highest (between two samples) for the groups who reported that they were asocial, avoidant, aggressive, and negativistic. Subjects with the highest narcissistic and aggressive tendencies had only moderately high anger scores, which suggests a philosophy of "I don't get mad, I get even." The study did not correlate personality traits with anger toward the spouse or the severity of marital violence.

Snyder and Fruchtman *(1981)* conducted a cluster analysis of a wide variety of factors reported by battered women residing at a shelter. Although they did not investigate the distinction between family-only and generalized abuse, they detected five patterns of wife abuse. The abuser's behavior was a stronger factor in distinguishing among the groups than was the background of the victim. Women who viewed alcohol as the cause of the violence (23%–36% of the women in four groups) were more likely to report frequent violence and severe injuries, a finding substantiated by Eberle *(1982)*. Marital rape was also the most common in the two groups reporting the most severe injuries. In contrast to Gondolf's *(1987)* study, child abuse by the man was highest in the group with the lowest frequency and severity of woman abuse.

In summary, previous studies have indicated the existence of more than one type of batterer. A picture emerges of two major types—dominant and dependent—with the dominant man having antisocial traits and exhibiting the most severe violence. This dichotomy is tentative, however, because dominance and dependence were not usually measured directly. Also, the picture is undoubtedly more complex, since some studies found more than two types of abusers.

The present study was conducted to replicate and extend the findings of previous studies and to use many variables from different studies in a single study. It used a larger number of variables than most and focused to a greater extent on psychological variables. It was hypothesized that men who are violent only at home would be less severely violent and show signs of depression and jealousy, and that generally violent men would have been most severely victimized in childhood, would be more severely violent in adulthood, would abuse alcohol more often, and would have the strongest signs of male dominance. This dichotomy follows Megargee's *(1973)* theoretical and empirical distinction between "overcontrolled" and "undercontrolled" offenders, the latter being generally aggressive.

METHOD

Sample

The respondents were 182 men who were being assessed for admission to a treatment program for men who batter. Their average age was 30.6 years ($SD = 7.2$), and their average income was $12,331 ($SD = 9598$). The majority had not been educated beyond high school (59.5%) and were white (75.8%); African-Americans formed the next largest racial group (18.1%). Because of missing data, the sample size for the major data analysis was 165.

About 70% of the men were referred on a mandatory basis from the courts or a deferred prosecution program. Most others were referred from community agencies; few were self-referred. Some men (24%) did not actually enter treatment because they did not follow through after completing the assessment phase.

Measures

Generalized violence. Information on whether they were violent outside their current intimate relationship was gathered from the men during a lengthy clinical intake in-

terview. Intake counselors used a seven-page questionnaire to guide their data gathering. For this variable, the men were asked if they had ever assaulted a stranger. Because this item correlated significantly with items indicating a history of assaulting parents and siblings, the three items were added to form a single index. Most men (60.5%) reported at least one episode of violence outside the marriage (19.1% reported two episodes and 5.9% reported three).

Childhood victimization. The structured interview also asked about violence experienced from parents and siblings. The violence was coded as severe if it involved the use of fists or objects. Violence from parents and siblings was then added to form a single index with a possible range of from zero to six.

Severity of violence. Physical aggression was measured during the intake interview with the widely used Conflict Tactics Scale (CTS) *(Straus, 1979).* Several items were added to make the scale more comprehensive; for example, "driving recklessly to frighten" the partner and "physically forcing sex" on her. Responses indicating whether the abuse had ever happened were used. The items were weighted according to their severity. Of the 14 items of physical aggression, four had been classified as life threatening in a previous factor-analytic study. These four items were multiplied by two.

Psychological abuse. The items from the CTS measuring psychological abuse were used, as well as the following: "interrupted her eating or sleeping," "said she could not leave or see certain people," "non-violent threats to withhold money, take away the children, have an affair," etc., and "threats to leave the relationship." These items were added to form a single scale.

Traditional views of women's roles. The 15-item version of the Attitudes Toward Women Scale was used to measure this variable. Evidence of its reliability and validity is reported in Spence and Helmreich *(1978).* The scale measures the extent of agreement with statements about the rights and roles of women along a traditional–liberal continuum.

Democratic decision making. The Blood and Wolfe *(1960)* Decision Power Index was used to measure the extent to which the husband or wife has the final say in five areas of marital decision making. In this index, the greatest weight is given if the couple shares decision making and the least if either one is dominant. A modified version of the scale, used in the first national study of family violence *(Straus, Gelles, & Steinmetz, 1980),* was used here.

Level of conflict. The extent of conflict in the relationship was measured with the Marital Conflict Index, which was also used in the first national study of family violence *(Straus et al., 1980).* Five areas of the relationship (managing money, affection and sexual relations, household chores, social activities, and children) were rated on the frequency of agreement during the past year, from "always" to "never."

Anger toward partner. A 30-item modified version of the Novaco Anger Index *(Novaco, 1975)* was used to measure the level of anger arousal the men reported in response to a series of hypothetical situations. In this index, respondents rate how angry each situation would make them, from "very little anger" to "very much anger." The original 80-item scale had only one item pertaining specifically to marital situations. In 20 of the items, the word *person* was changed to *partner.* In ten of the items, the word *friend* or *co-worker* was used. The internal reliability coefficient (alpha) of the modified scale was .89, compared with .96 in Novaco's study using the 80-item scale.

Jealousy. Romantic jealousy was measured with a scale developed by White *(1977).* Tests of its construct validity showed that it correlated as predicted with dependence. White's study also showed that it had high internal reliability and was not correlated with social desirability response bias.

Depression. Depression was measured with the widely used Beck Depression In-

ventory. The inventory's 21 items cover a wide range of symptoms, including somatic complaints, guilt, pessimism, and indecisiveness. The internal reliability coefficient of the scale was reported by its authors as .86 (split-half corrected) *(Beck, Ward, Mendelson, Mock, & Erbaugh, 1961)*.

Alcohol use. Respondents were asked during the structured intake interview to estimate the percentage of time that alcohol use was associated with violence against their partners. The counselor recorded the degree of association reported, from zero to 100%. In a subsample of respondents who had been administered the Michigan Alcohol Screening Test (MAST) (ten-item version), the item on alcohol use correlated significantly with the MAST ($r = .39$). There is evidence from another study *(Eberle, 1982)* that the use of alcohol during battering incidents is strongly associated with general alcohol use.

Impression management. A ten-item, Likert-type version of the Marlowe-Crowne Social Desirability Scale was used as a measure of impression management, or the men's tendency to "fake good" *(Greenwald & Satow, 1970)*.

Background. Two background variables were obtained from the structured interview: arrest history and whether the men had received counseling before. In another study of men who batter, these reports were shown to be uncorrelated with social desirability bias *(Saunders, 1991)*.

Analysis

The distributions of the variables were first inspected to determine if there were enough with multimodal distributions to warrant cluster analysis *(Fleiss, Lawlor, Platman, & Fieve, 1971)*. The stability of the typology was tested with both correlational and distance measures in the cluster analysis. Clustering with Euclidean distance, which utilized a complete linkage procedure, was relied on most heavily because it contains information about relative profile elevation, shape, and scatter *(Everitt, 1979)*. The correlational matrix was used as input for a hierarchical group-averages method *(McKennell, 1977)*.

The derivation of clusters was followed by statistical comparisons for the variables used in clustering, as well as a series of additional "external" variables. Significant differences are expected to be found on the clustering variables merely because the clustering creates groups that maximize differences on the variables. Differences found on "external" variables, however, enhance the validity of the clustering *(Aldenderfer & Blashfield, 1984)*. Differences between groups were tested with Duncan's Multiple Range Test.

Because this study relied on self-report measures that can easily be faked in a socially desirable manner, the analysis was repeated with scores adjusted for social desirability response bias. The adjustment procedures yield results identical to the analysis of covariance and are described elsewhere *(Saunders, 1991)*. The Marlowe-Crowne measure of impression management and response bias correlated most strongly with reports of psychological abuse ($r = -.50$), depression ($r = -.45$), jealousy ($r = -.42$), and severe violence ($r = -.38$).

To uncover the overall association between the clusters and the variables used, a discriminant function analysis was conducted. The percentage of variance accounted for in predicting group membership and the percentage of correct group classification were computed.

RESULTS

Several patterns were seen in the variables' distributions. Some variables were skewed, particularly depression and generalized violence and, to a lesser extent, severity of violence and jealousy. The measure of husband dominance had a strong central tendency. The measure of alcohol use had three distinct modes, the largest two being men who reported either no drinking while violent or a 100% association be-

tween drinking and violence. Conflict in the relationship followed a fairly normal distribution. Anger toward the partner showed a generally even distribution, but there was evidence for three groups based on levels of anger. The outline of the histogram for the Attitudes Toward Women Scale appeared to approximate a normal distribution, but two groups could be discerned, one above and one below the median. On the basis of the distributions, there was enough evidence of highly skewed and multimodal distributions to warrant a cluster analysis.

Six variables were entered into the cluster analysis: depression, anger, generalized violence, severity of violence, attitudes toward women, and alcohol use. The same basic clusters were derived whether correlational or distance measures were used. Only the results of the distance measure (squared Euclidean distance, complete linkage method) will be reported.

A plot of the agglomeration coefficients (analogous to a scree test) showed that three clusters explained the data most adequately. The correlational cluster analysis also showed three distinct clusters (as revealed in the dendrogram).

TABLE 1 presents the means of the clustering variables for each of the three clusters, or types, of men, together with the means adjusted for social desirability response bias. The significant findings of the analysis of variance are to be expected, merely because the clustering variables were used, since cluster analysis aims to maximize group differences on these variables. Of greater interest are the patterns of differences between pairs of groups found with Duncan's Multiple Range Test. For unadjusted scores, three of the six variables (anger, depression, and generalized violence) showed pairwise differences among all three types of men, and the remaining three variables (severity of violence, attitudes toward women, and alcohol use) showed significant differences between two of the three groups. When the scores were adjusted, there was no longer a significant difference between men in the first group (Type 1) and those in the second (Type 2) on anger and depression. After adjustment, men in the third group (Type 3) scored as significantly more liberal on the Attitudes Toward Women Scale.

Group comparisons of the ten external variables are presented in TABLES 2 and 3. Six of the ten variables showed significant differences for unadjusted scores among the groups and two more showed near-significant differences. Significant differences

Table 1

MEAN GROUP DIFFERENCES ON CLUSTERING VARIABLES[1]

VARIABLE	TYPE 1 ($N=86$)	TYPE 2 ($N=48$)	TYPE 3 ($N=31$)	F
Generalized violence	$.27_a$	1.90_b	1.00_c	72.4*
Adjusted for bias	$.30_a$	1.75_b	$.89_c$	79.9*
Severity of violence	10.56_a	19.68_b	12.50_a	8.6*
Adjusted for bias	10.39_a	21.18_b	11.67_a	18.3*
Anger at partner	2.24_a	2.57_b	3.41_c	16.9*
Adjusted for bias	2.36_a	2.51_a	3.21_b	15.5*
Depression	5.76_a	9.13_b	24.17_c	28.2*
Adjusted for bias	7.10_a	8.15_a	23.33_b	43.9*
Liberal views of sex roles	28.04_a	25.32_b	26.83_b	2.4
Adjusted for bias	27.32_a	24.51_b	31.73_c	12.8*
Alcohol use	44.56_a	77.35_b	25.42_a	11.7*
Adjusted for bias	33.75_a	76.53_b	42.11_a	21.0*

Note: Groups with different subscripts are significantly different from each other using Duncan's Multiple Range Test.
[1] The second row of values for each variable has been adjusted for social desirability response bias using the Marlowe-Crowne Scale.
* $p<.001$.

Table 2

MEAN GROUP DIFFERENCES ON INTERVAL-LEVEL EXTERNAL VARIABLES[1]

VARIABLE	TYPE 1 ($N=86$)	TYPE 2 ($N=48$)	TYPE 3 ($N=31$)	F
Jealousy	16.76_a	18.08_a	23.00_b	2.1
Adjusted for bias	16.70_a	18.91_a	20.87_a	2.3
Marital satisfaction	10.65_a	6.22_b	1.18_c	7.9**
Adjusted for bias	9.56_a	5.27_b	6.06_{ab}	4.4*
Psychological abuse	5.23_a	7.35_b	8.50_c	19.0**
Adjusted for bias	5.31_a	7.02_b	6.87_b	12.5**
Husband's dominance	12.06_a	11.11_a	11.42_a	1.5
Adjusted for bias	11.68_a	11.21_a	10.97_a	1.4
Marital conflict	2.41_a	2.75_b	3.19_b	5.1*
Adjusted for bias	2.39_a	2.69_b	2.88_b	4.9*
Impression management	13.27_a	10.87_a	3.42_b	8.5**
Adjusted for bias	11.95_a	10.60_a	9.00_a	1.6

Note: Groups with different subscripts are significantly different from each other using Duncan's Multiple Range Test.
[1] The second row of values for each variable has been adjusted for social desirability response bias using the Marlowe-Crowne Scale.
* $p<.01$; ** $p<.001$.

were found for marital satisfaction, psychological abuse, marital conflict, impression management, childhood abuse, and arrests for drunk driving. The adjustment for response bias naturally eliminated the differences found on the Marlowe-Crowne measure. Three of the other five differences remained significant.

The three clusters are highly interpretable. Type 1 men can be characterized as "family-only" aggressors. They reported low levels of anger, depression, and jealousy and had the highest scores on the measure of social desirability bias (Marlowe-Crowne), suggesting a suppression of feelings. After adjustment for social desirability bias, they did not differ from Type 2 men on anger and depression or from either Type 2 or Type 3 men on jealousy. They are the least likely to have been severely abused as children and to be violent outside the home. They reported the most satisfaction in the relationship, the least marital conflict, and being the least psychologically abusive. These reports were maintained even with adjustment for response bias. Their violence was associated with alcohol about half of the time, and some of them had been arrested for drunk driving.

Type 2 men can best be labeled "generally violent" aggressors because they were the most likely of the three types to be violent outside the home. The majority had been severely abused as children, yet they reported relatively low or moderate levels of depression and anger. Their violence was usually associated with alcohol use, and they reported the most frequent use of severe violence. Their attitudes about sex roles were more rigid than those of the Type 1 men, and their reports of marital satisfaction and conflict were moderate compared with the other types. Their reports of alcohol use and severe violence were reflected in their relatively high rates of arrest for drunk driving and violence.

Type 3 men reported the highest levels of anger, depression, and jealousy, and can be characterized as "emotionally volatile" aggressors. They reported being severely violent significantly less often than did the Type 2, the generalized aggressors, but reported being the most psychologically abusive, and the least satisfied in their relationships. After adjustment for response bias, however, they did not differ from the Type 2 on psychological abuse or satisfaction with their relationships. They reported infrequent alcohol use associated with their violence, and showed moderately frequent use after adjustment for response bias. That about half these men had previously re-

Table 3

PERCENTAGE GROUP DIFFERENCES ON DICHOTOMOUS EXTERNAL VARIABLES[1]

VARIABLE	TYPE 1 ($N=86$)	TYPE 2 ($N=48$)	TYPE 3 ($N=31$)	χ^2
Prior counseling	$30\%_a$	$37\%_a$	$50\%_a$	1.5
Adjusted for bias	$36\%_a$	$44\%_{ab}$	$59\%_b$	5.5
Severe abuse as child	$24\%_a$	$57\%_b$	$33\%_a$	6.9*
Adjusted for bias	$34\%_a$	$51\%_a$	$40\%_a$	3.4
Arrest for drunk driving	$15\%_a$	$39\%_b$	$0\%_a$	10.4**
Adjusted for bias	$13\%_a$	$21\%_a$	$7\%_a$	3.7
Arrest for violence	$65\%_a$	$74\%_a$	$42\%_a$	4.0
Adjusted for bias	$45\%_a$	$70\%_b$	$30\%_a$	15.8***

Note: Groups with different subscripts are significantly different from each other using Duncan's Multiple Range Test.
[1] The second row of values for each variable has been adjusted for social desirability response bias using the Marlowe-Crowne Scale.
* $p<.05$; ** $p<.01$; *** $p<.001$.

ceived counseling is consistent with their relatively low scores on the Marlowe-Crowne scale, indicating low defensiveness and the likelihood that they would continue treatment.

Although the cluster with the severest violence was not the highest in anger and other emotions, it is worth noting that a post hoc analysis showed significant correlations between reports of the severity of violence and anger ($r=.31$), depression ($r=.28$), and jealousy ($r=.29$).

A post hoc analysis of the contributions of some of the demographic variables to group membership found that age, education, and income were weak predictors of such membership. Younger, better-educated men tended to belong to Type 3, the emotionally volatile. There were not enough racial minorities in the sample to assess racial differences.

Because remorse and suicidal behavior were important dimensions in Hofeller's *(1980)* typology, specific components of depression were also tested in the model. Items measuring guilt and suicidal thoughts on the Beck Depression Inventory and an intake question about suicide attempts showed a pattern of correlations and group membership similar to the general measure of depression, meaning that they were most prevalent in Type 3 men. Further delineation of the personality characteristics of Type 3 men was also of interest. A subsequent intake sample of 225 men was administered the Millon Clinical Multiaxial Inventory *(Millon, 1983)*. Although the Dependent scale was somewhat associated with depression ($r=.14$), as Hofeller predicted, depression, anger, and jealousy were much more strongly associated with the Avoidant ($r.=.49$–$.70$), Passive-Aggressive ($r=.50$–$.69$), and Borderline ($r=.40$–$.59$) scales. The Antisocial scale was not strongly related to anger and jealousy ($r=.21$ and $r=.18$) and was not related to depression. These findings on anger are consistent with those of Hamberger and Hastings *(1986)*.

To assess the overall strength of association between the men's characteristics and their assignment to one of the three types, two discriminant function analyses were conducted. In the first, the six clustering variables were entered, all in a single step. The Wilk's lambda was significant, as expected (lambda $=.175$, $\chi^2=147.1$, $df=12$, $p<.0001$); 84.8% of the variance in the linear combination of the clustering variables was accounted for by assignment to the three types. The standardized discriminant function coefficients are presented in TABLE 4. Because these coefficients are analogous to regression beta weights and because of intercorrelations of the variables, these coefficients should not be interpreted as absolute. Suppression effects will disguise their independent contributions to the variance.

In the second discriminant analysis, the

Table 4

STANDARDIZED DISCRIMINANT FUNCTION COEFFICIENTS OF CLUSTERING VARIABLES

	COEFFICIENTS	
CLUSTERING VARIABLES	FUNCTION 1	FUNCTION 2
Depression	−0.065	0.758
Anger toward partner	0.279	0.508
Alcohol use when violent	0.414	−0.314
Generalized violence	1.086	−0.117
Severity of violence	−0.151	−0.467
Attitudes toward women	−0.349	0.077

clustering and external variables with significant or near-significant differences were entered. Again the Wilk's lambda was significant (lambda = .096, $\chi^2 = 104.1$, $df = 24$, $p < .0001$). The amount of variance accounted for by assignment to the three types was 90.4%. The correct rate of classification to each of the three groups using both sets of variables as predictors was 93.3%, compared with 89.1% using only the six clustering variables.

DISCUSSION

An inspection of the distributions of each variable, particularly the measures of alcohol use, traditional views of women, and anger at the partner, indicated that abusers may be classified into distinct types.

Researchers have been surprised to find that abusers and nonabusers do not differ on the Attitudes Toward Women Scale *(Neidig, Collins, & Friedman, 1986)*. The distribution of the scale in this sample may provide an explanation. There were two groups, about a standard deviation apart. One group had relatively liberal attitudes, within the range of the attitudes of college men and women, while the other group had fairly conservative attitudes. It should be noted that a variable score that is similar to a college norm should not be ruled out as a risk factor because a substantial proportion of college men are likely to be abusive in dating relationships *(Makepeace, 1981)*.

The results of the cluster analysis revealed partial support for the theoretical distinction between dominant and dependent types of abusers. Men with the most rigid attitudes about women's roles were most likely to be generally violent (Type 2) and the most severely violent. Reports of husband-dominant decision making, however, did not characterize any particular group. Thus, a traditional pattern of beliefs, rather than traditional behavior, was the distinguishing factor. Many abusers say that they aspire to be macho, but fall short of it *(Gondolf, 1987)*.

As in other studies *(Fagan et al., 1983)*, the generally violent (Type 2) men were more likely to have been severely abused as children, and such abuse appears to be related to low self-esteem in men who batter *(Johnston, 1987)*. Abuse as a child may also be responsible for the apparent paucity of affective expression in this group. That is, although there may be some conscious suppression of negative emotions (as seen in the Marlowe-Crowne scores), it is also likely that these men became detached from their feelings when they were victimized as children. Affective numbing, or alexithymia, is a common response to posttraumatic stress *(Krystal, Giller, & Cicchetti, 1986; van der Kolk, 1987)*. Dutton *(1988b)* discussed the role that childhood trauma may play in the adulthood problems of men who batter. One of his studies is consistent with the present findings that Type 2 men were less likely to respond with anger to videotaped scenarios of conflicts over intimacy *(Dutton, 1988a)*. Furthermore, this group's frequent use of alcohol may be a sign that they are attempting to dull the pain of traumatic childhood memories.

The group closest to Hofeller's *(1980)* dependent type seems to be Type 3, the emotionally volatile. Men in this group were most likely to report a fear of losing their partners (jealousy) and to be depressed, suicidal, and angry. They reported being very psychologically abusive and very unhappy with their intimate relationships; they also reported rigid sex-role attitudes that might explain their

strong jealousy. Members of this group reported less severe physical abuse as children and less generalized violence than did Type 2 men; however, they may have suffered from sexual or psychological abuse, neither of which was explored in this study. These men are probably the most likely to remain in treatment because many of them have previously been in treatment and they are the most open about their problems.

The group reporting the least violence outside the family was Type 1, the family-only aggressors. Rather than being emotionally volatile, however, these men appeared to be suppressing their feelings. They reported the lowest rate of abuse in childhood, the most marital satisfaction, and relatively liberal attitudes about sex roles. They occasionally abused alcohol, which for some resulted in arrest for drunk driving. Members of this group may be generally nonassertive and thus avoid conflict. They probably suppress their anger until alcohol or a stressor triggers its release. The conflicts and stress they experience may arise at work and lead to anger that is displaced onto their families.

An alternative explanation of these findings is that two or three of these types represent different phases of the batterer's behavior. Neidig, Friedman, and Collins *(1984)* suggested that most batterers begin with expressive forms of violence (for example, exploding in a flash of jealousy). Over time, they learn that negative consequences do not follow abuse, and the abuse becomes more instrumental, with conscious attempts to coerce. Supporting this interpretation, the battered women in Walker's *(1984)* study reported that after the first abusive incident, over two-thirds of the men showed loving contrition, but after the most recent incident, only about 40% did. Arguing against this interpretation for the Type 2 men (generally violent aggressors) is the consistent finding from this and other studies that the men had experienced severe abuse during childhood.

IMPLICATIONS FOR TREATMENT AND RESEARCH

Whether the descriptions reported here are enduring types or represent phases in the men's behavior, more refined intervention strategies appear to be called for after immediate steps have been taken to stop both the abuse and the justifications for it. The generally violent (Type 2) man may need help in uncovering and healing his psychic wounds from childhood, stopping his abuse of alcohol, and improving his impulse control through cognitive restructuring. Once he learns to recognize feelings, assertiveness training can teach him to express them. Finally, he can be helped to see that his rigid notions about sex roles are harmful to himself and those around him. He probably needs much more than the three to six months of treatment now provided in most programs.

The emotionally volatile (Type 3) man may need help in expressing feelings in nonaggressive ways, perhaps first learning to accept his "weaker" feelings of jealousy and depression without automatically channeling them into anger. He could probably benefit greatly from systematic desensitization and cognitive restructuring. He also needs to become aware of the harm caused by his rigid sex-role beliefs and psychological abuse.

The family-only aggressor (Type 1), who suppresses his emotions, may gain most from interventions that emphasize the communication aspects of assertiveness training. However, he probably first needs to be given "permission" to express anger and other emotions and to understand his assertive rights. These men may be the best candidates for couples counseling if their reports of the low severity of violence are independently validated by their partners, if they remain nonviolent, and if both partners are highly motivated to work on the relationship.

Consideration also needs to be given to the role of criminal justice and other interventions outside treatment. Men who batter are influenced by their fear of social disap-

proval and sanctions from the criminal justice system *(Carmody & Williams, 1987)*. However, these interventions may work better with one type of abuser than they do with another. For example, Steinfeld *(1986)* predicted that the perceptions of the emotionally volatile (Type 3) man will be too clouded for him to consider such negative consequences of his behavior as the possibility of arrest.

Despite the ability of the variables in this study to distinguish among three types of abusers, further research is needed to learn whether these findings can be replicated. Cross-validation with other samples will be an important step in determining whether these findings are a stable phenomenon. The consistency of the findings with those of other studies is encouraging, however. Although adjustments were made for the tendency to fake responses in a socially desirable manner, the study is limited by its reliance on offenders' reports. Introduction of victim reports could improve validity. Studies have shown that the men minimize their reports of violence *(Edleson & Brygger, 1986)*, and there are large differences between the men's and women's perceptions of the men's sex-role beliefs *(Walker, 1984)*.

Once a typology gains more validity, treatment comparison studies can include analyses that try to answer the question, "What type of treatment works best with what type of abuser?" Almost all intervention programs thus far have been aimed at all types; perhaps as a result, they have been eclectic in their approach. They often combine, with varying degrees of emphasis, sex-role resocialization, assertiveness training, cognitive restructuring, relaxation training, and some insight into the childhood victimization of the men *(Eddy & Myers, 1984)*. If differential treatment effects are found, then more efficient interventions are likely to evolve. It is hoped that this study will encourage researchers to attempt such investigations of differential treatment effects and will encourage clinicians to see that there is no single profile of men who batter.

REFERENCES

Aldenderfer, M.K., & Blashfield, R.K. (1984). *Cluster analysis*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications.

Beck, A.T., Ward, C.H., Mendelson, M., Mock, J., & Erbaugh, J. (1961). An inventory for measuring depression. *Archives of General Psychiatry, 4*, 53–63.

Blood, R.O., & Wolfe, D.M. (1960). *Husbands and wives*. Glencoe, IL: Free Press.

Brisson, N. (1983). Battering husbands: A survey of abusive men. *Victimology, 6*, 338–344.

Caesar, P.L. (1986, August). Men who batter: A heterogeneous group. In L.K. Hamberger (Chair), *The male batterer: Characteristics of a heterogeneous population*. Symposium conducted at the meeting of the American Psychological Association, Washington, DC.

Carmody, D.C., & Williams, K.R. (1987). Wife assault and perceptions of sanctions. *Violence and Victims, 2*, 25–38.

Dutton, D.G. (1988a). *The domestic assault of women: Psychological and criminal justice perspectives*. Boston: Allyn & Bacon.

Dutton, D.G. (1988b). Profiling of wife assaulters: Preliminary evidence for a trimodal analysis. *Violence and Victims, 3*, 5–30.

Eberle, P.A. (1982). Alcohol abusers and non-users: A discriminant analysis of differences between two subgroups of batterers. *Journal of Health and Social Behavior, 23*, 260–271.

Eddy, M.J., & Myers, T. (1984). *Helping men who batter: A profile of programs in the U.S.* Austin, TX: Texas Dept. of Human Resources.

Edleson, J.L., & Brygger, M.P. (1986). Gender differences in self-reporting of battering incidences. *Family Relations, 35*, 377–382.

Elbow, M. (1977). Theoretical considerations of violent marriages. *Social Casework, 58*, 515–526.

Everitt, B.S. (1979). Unresolved problems in cluster analysis. *Biometrics, 35*, 169–181.

Fagan, J.A., Stewart, D.K., & Hansen, K.V. (1983). Violent men or violent husbands? Background factors and situational correlates. In D. Finkelhor, R.J. Gelles, G.T. Hotaling, & M.A. Straus (Eds.), *The dark side of families: Current family violence research*. Beverly Hills: Sage Publications.

Fleiss, J.L., Lawlor, W., Platman, S.R., & Fieve, R.R. (1971). On the use of inverted factor analysis for generating typologies. *Journal of Abnormal Psychology, 77*(2), 127–132.

Gondolf, E.W. (1987). Who are those guys? Toward a behavioral typology of batterers. *Violence and Victims, 3*, 187–201.

Greenwald, H.J., & Satow, Y. (1970). A short social desirability scale. *Psychological Reports, 27*, 131–135.

Hamberger, L.K., & Hastings, J.E. (1986). Personality correlates of men who abuse their partners: A

cross-validation study. *Journal of Family Violence, 1*, 323–341.

Hofeller, K.H. (1980). Social, psychological and situational factors in wife abuse. *Dissertation Abstracts International, 41*(1-B), 408.

Hotaling, G.T., & Sugarman, D.B. (1986). An analysis of risk markers in husband to wife violence: The current state of knowledge. *Violence and Victims, 1*, 101–24.

Johnston, M.E. (1987, July). *Correlates of early violence experience among men who are abusive toward female mates*. Paper presented at the National Conference for Family Violence Researchers, University of New Hampshire, Durham.

Krystal, J.H., Giller, E.L., & Cicchetti, D.V. (1986). Assessment of alexithymia in posttraumatic stress disorder and somatic illness: Introduction of a reliable measure. *Psychosomatic Medicine, 48* (1-2), 84–94.

Makepeace, J. (1981). Courtship violence among college students. *Family Relations, 30*, 97–102.

McKennell, A.C. (1977). Attitude scale construction. In C.A. O'Muircheartaigh & C. Payne (Eds.), *The analysis of survey data: Vol. 1, Exploring data structures*. New York: John Wiley.

Megargee, E. (1973). Recent research on overcontrolled and undercontrolled personality patterns among violent offenders. *Sociological Symposium, 9*, 37–50.

Millon, T. (1983). *Millon Clinical Multiaxial Inventory*. Minneapolis: National Computer Systems.

Mott-McDonald Associates. (1979). *The report from the conference on intervention programs for men who batter*. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Justice.

Neidig, P.H., Collins, B.S., & Friedman, D.H. (1986). Attitudinal characteristics of males who have engaged in spouse abuse. *Journal of Family Violence, 1*, 223–233.

Neidig, P.H., Friedman, M.S., & Collins, B.S. (1984). *The violence continuum: A conceptual model of spouse abuse with clinical applications*. (Available from Behavioral Science Associates, P.O. Box 1485, Beaufort, SC 29901)

Novaco, R.W. (1975). *Anger control: The development and evaluation of an experimental treatment*. Lexington, MA: Lexington Books.

Pleck, E., Pleck, J.H., Grossman, M., & Bart, P. (1978). The battered data syndrome. *Victimology, 2*, 680–683.

Rosenbaum, A., & O'Leary, K.D. (1981). Marital violence: Characteristics of abusive couples. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 49*, 63–71.

Saunders, D.G. (1991). Procedures for adjusting self-reports of violence for social desirability bias. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 6*, 336–344.

Shields, N.M., McCall, G.J., & Hanneke, C.R. (1988). Patterns of family and nonfamily violence: Violent husbands and violent men. *Violence and Victims, 3*, 83–98.

Snyder, D.K., & Fruchtman, L.A. (1981). Differential patterns of wife abuse: A data-based typology. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 49*, 878–885.

Spence, J.T., & Helmreich, R.L. (1978). *Masculinity and femininity: Their psychological dimensions, correlates, and antecedents*. Austin: University of Texas.

Steinfeld, G.J. (1986). Spouse abuse: Clinical implications of research on the control of aggression. *Journal of Family Violence, 1*, 197–208.

Steinmetz, S.K. (1977–78). The battered husband syndrome. *Victimology, 2*, 499–509.

Steinmetz, S.K. (1978). Wifebeating: A critique and reformulation of existing theory. *Bulletin of the American Academy of Psychiatry and the Law, 6*, 322–334.

Straus, M.A. (1979). Measuring intrafamily conflict and violence: The conflict tactics (CT) scales. *Journal of Marriage and the Family, 41*, 75–88.

Straus, M.A., Gelles, R.J., & Steinmetz, S.K. (1980). *Behind closed doors: Violence in the American family*. New York: Doubleday/Anchor.

Sweeney, S., & Key, L.J. (1982, June). Psychological issues in counseling batterers. *Theology, News, and Notes*, pp. 12–16.

van der Kolk, B. (1987). *Psychological trauma*. Washington, DC: American Psychiatric Press.

Walker, L.E. (1984). *The battered woman syndrome*. New York: Springer.

White, G.L. (1977). The social psychology of romantic jealousy. *Dissertation Abstracts International, 37*(10), 5449-B.

For reprints: Dr. Daniel Saunders, School of Social Work, University of Michigan, 1065 Frieze Bldg., Ann Arbor, MI 48109-1285