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The primary purpose of this research was to investigate any catalysts to changes in self-concept that may have occurred among thirteen men who had been labeled as batterers by the courts and who were about to graduate from the Project to End Abuse through Counseling and Education (PEACE), a court-mandated batterers’ intervention program, in Nashville, Tennessee. It is deemed necessary for a batterer to first recognize himself as such before he is able to stop battering. The second purpose of this research was to document the men’s attitudes about PEACE and how it affected them. Within the framework of symbolic interactionism the change process and the redefining of the men’s self-identity due to internal and external pressures were examined. The men’s catalysts were instrumental in changing their self-concept from entitled controller to batterer because of events that occurred during the labeling process. A model of events depicts experiences that most of the men endured during their labeling process, which includes being arrested for assault against their partners, going to jail, attending the court hearing, and being sentenced to at least 26 weeks of PEACE.

Each event that occurred in the model of events was a primary or secondary catalyst to at least one of the men. A primary catalyst is designated as one recognized by the respondent multiple times during the interview; a secondary catalyst is one recognized only once. Most of the men mentioned more than one event, which indicates that a series of
events or a process caused the redefinition of their self-concept. The most common primary catalysts were violent battering incidents and the PEACE program. The most common secondary catalysts were the violent incidents, arrest, jail, court, returning home and to work.
CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Since the 1970s there has been an enormous expansion of interest in and study of violence toward women, including battering. Some recent statistics on the nature and extent of battering show the importance of fully understanding it in order to aid in treatment and prevention. The Domestic Violence: Prosecution, Policy, and Procedure Manual for Kentucky (Office of the Attorney General 1997) states that domestic violence is one of the most common of all crimes. Most family violence is committed against women: 95 percent of all spouse assaults are committed by men, 21 percent of all women who use the hospital emergency surgical services are battered, and six million American women are beaten each year by their husbands or boyfriends. Battering is the single major cause of injury to women--more frequent than automobile accidents, muggings, and rapes combined. In 1996 Kentucky's spouse-abuse centers provided emergency shelter to 2,726 battered women and their children. Emergency shelter was also provided to 16 men, and the centers received 38,188 crisis calls during the same period (Office of the Attorney General 1997).

The primary focus of battering research and programs has been directed toward victims. One reason that this attention has focused on victims rather than on their perpetrators is that victims are thought to have the more pressing needs for services and programs. Providing safety, advocacy, appropriate criminal justice, and social service
intervention are critical needs, and the awareness of them was virtually nonexistent until
the 1970s (Dobash and Dobash 1988; Pagelow 1984; Schecter 1982). Intervention with
batterers developed as part of the larger women’s movement addressing the rights and
needs of battered women.

In 1977 eight profeminist men in the Boston area came together to form a men’s
group called Emerge (Adams and McCormick 1982). They began to provide
interventional services to batterers. Their creation of such services responded to the
frustration of shelter workers, who noted that women were being beaten when they
returned home from the shelter, and to the observation that some men were moving from
one violent relationship to another. Emerge became one of the first organizations to offer
group treatment for men who batter. A growth of interventional services for batterers
rapidly followed the founding of Emerge (Eisikovits and Edleson 1989; Feazell, Mayers,
and Deschner 1984; Pirog-Good and Stets-Kealy 1985).

The primary focus of this research is on how socially labeled batterers who are about
to graduate from a court-mandated batterers’ intervention program have redefined
themselves from entitled controller to batterer, if they have at all. In particular, I explored
the catalyst that forced the men to view themselves as batterers. The second focus of the
research is the men’s evaluation of the program. Due to the nature of the interview
questions, the second focus is inevitable. The men are asked their feelings about the
program and how it has benefited them; therefore, their evaluation is recorded.

There are a few studies describing the rationalizations and justifications used by
batterers (Pence and Paymar 1986; Ptacek 1988) and by other deviant offenders such as
juvenile delinquents (Sykes and Matza 1957); however, the point or points in the battering
career when batterers reject prior rationalizations and begin to view themselves as true abusers has not been previously studied. Kathleen Ferraro and John Johnson (1983) investigated the victimization process of battered women and described six catalysts identified by these women as critical to their redefinition of self from devoted and long-suffering mate to victim. Such redefinition was viewed by these women as essential to their escape from the battering relationship. The discovery of similar catalysts of self-redefinition for labeled batterers from entitled controller to batterer would aid in the understanding of the dynamics of battering and its desistance, and it would improve interventional treatment.

In choosing to study men who have been confronted with the label of “batterer,” (i.e., have been arrested and convicted of domestic violence and are about to graduate from a court-mandated treatment program) this research ensures that the men have all been through a similar labeling process and exposed to the same educational program. This labeling process generally consists of a man having physically battered his partner, the police having arrested him, his having been sent to jail, and his having endured a court hearing in which the judge determined that he be placed on probation and in a batterers’ intervention program (Pence 1989). The men in this study are about ready to graduate from the Project to End Abuse through Counseling and Education (PEACE) program. It should be noted that this study includes only batterers who have been physically violent to their partners and have been caught. Battering includes nonviolent as well as violent forms, but only the violent manifestations are illegal and, therefore, brought to the attention of the criminal justice system. The batterers included in this study have been violent to their wives or girlfriends and forced to attend PEACE because of their violence.
PEACE was founded in May 1986. It is a private, nonprofit organization created to represent the second phase in Nashville, Tennessee's response to the problem of domestic violence. The first phase was the establishment of shelters for battered women and their children. PEACE provides weekly counseling and education groups to between 200 and 225 court-ordered batterers. The curriculum used in the program is an adaptation of the Domestic Abuse Intervention Program (DAIP), which originated and is headquartered in Duluth, Minnesota. PEACE has tailored this program to be used by the courts as a sentencing alternative for individuals who are charged with domestic-related misdemeanor offenses or by individuals who decide on their own that they need help to stop their abusive behavior.

DAIP serves nationwide as a model intervention program based on feminist theory (Pence and Paymar 1986). DAIP is a cognitive-behavioral intervention model that is designed to reduce cultural supports of battering by holding batterers accountable for their behavior. The program’s initiators emphasized cooperation with community law enforcement agencies, the criminal justice system, and human service agencies in order to make the batterer accountable to society as well as to the victim. The program coordinates the intervention capabilities of these three types of agencies to provide a comprehensive community response that locates the problem within society, not just within the individual (Pence and Shepard 1988; Yllo 1993). The program has an educational curriculum for groups of batterers that focuses on power and control (Pence and Paymar 1986).

PEACE and the DAIP define abuse as the use of coercive control over another person when that abuse is socially reinforced through sexist attitudes (Pence and Paymar...
In implementing DAIP the organizers attempted to apply a feminist theory of battering. One feminist researcher defines battering as "an obsessive campaign of coercion and intimidation designed to dominate and control a woman by a man, that occurs in the personal context of intimacy and thrives in the sociopolitical climate of patriarchy" (Goetting forthcoming). In other words, men use their male privilege derived from a patriarchal social structure to dominate and control women. This feminist perspective of battering emphasizes that when using this definition there can be no battered men. Women can abuse men, physically and emotionally; however, they cannot be battered because that would require a society that favors women over men (Goetting forthcoming).

The above definition of battering contends that batterers strive for dominance and control over their partners. It is this quest for power and control over their partners that fuels battering in both its emotional and physical manifestations. The batterer wants and needs control over his partner because of his aspiration to have an "exploitive intimate relationship that holds her hostage and in servitude to his personal needs and desires" (Goetting forthcoming). Therefore, the batterer is not just dominant and controlling of his partner, he also wants her to be a "personal slave" to him. Some batterers will employ whatever intimidation strategies necessary to control "their" women; if yelling, threatening, smashing things, and abusing pets fail, some will resort to physical injury.

It is important to emphasize that there can be battering in the absence of physical attacks. Anne Ganley (1989) states:

There is the "hands on" [emphasis mine] battering where the offender has physical contact with the victim's body: physical or sexual assault. The physical may include shoving, pushing, scratching, biting, backhanding, slapping, choking, burning, use of weapons, beating and so on...Sexual battering, like physical battering, covers a range of behaviors: pressured sex, coerced sex, sex accompanied by physical violence.
Sexual battering, like physical battering, may result in physical injury or emotional damage or both. In "hands off" [emphasis mine] battering, the perpetrator has no contact with the victim's body; the assaults are carried out through psychological battering and the destruction of property/pets. Psychological battering includes activities typically associated with brainwashing: threats of violence (against the victim, others, and himself), repeated attacks against self-esteem, coercing the victim to do degrading things, and excessive controlling of victim's activities. In the destruction of property/pets, even though something else is damaged, the attack is still meant for the victim. It is her clothes that are torn, her pet cat that is strangled, gifts that he has given her that are burned, or even his favorite object that he damages and then says, "Look what you made me do." (p. 201).

Within the framework of symbolic interactionism this research represents an attempt to investigate the catalysts identified by clients at PEACE, who are about to graduate, as having forced them to view themselves as batterers. In addition, the men give their evaluations of the program and how it has benefited them. Through qualitative analysis of in-depth interviews with thirteen labeled batterers, I identify the change process in self-identity from entitled controller to batterer. In the following chapter I investigate whether this approach has been taken before in other research.
CHAPTER II
LITERATURE REVIEW

The primary purpose of this research is to examine the catalysts to the change process that may have occurred among labeled batterers who are about to graduate from the Project to End Abuse through Counseling and Education (PEACE) program. Secondarily, there are implications that the information obtained from the research will be of interest to the PEACE program. The main focus of this research is to investigate how and why men who have been labeled as batterers by society and by the courts redefine their behavior and attitudes toward women to become accountable batterers. The men in this study have been court-mandated to attend at least 26-weeks of PEACE following an arrest, jail, court, and probation with PEACE as a stipulation. Therefore, the men have in common this legal labeling process and also have been exposed to the same profeminist, cognitive-behavioral education and counseling treatment.

This research differs from the body of research on why men batter, the dynamics of battering, and batterers' program evaluations. This particular study relates to the investigation of desistance (i.e., a conscious decision to stop being violent) in wife abuse (Fagan 1989; Feld and Straus 1989) and to the Kathleen Ferraro and John Johnson (1983) study, which identified the catalysts for battered women as they come to redefine the violence occurring to them and to view themselves as victims instead of devoted and long-suffering wives. In accordance with the Ferraro and Johnson study I investigate the
catalysts for batterers--at what point or points they redefine their violence to view themselves as abusers rather than entitled controllers. While initial attempts to develop an understanding of battering and batterers came from in-depth interviews with victims of wife abuse (Dobash and Dobash 1988; Ferraro and Johnson 1983; Pagelow 1984; and Schecter 1982), recent work has captured the dynamics of battering from the perspective of the batterer. Even though caution is in order when studying batterers directly, because of their potential to deny or minimize the abuse, studying the men directly as well as the battered women ensures a more complete understanding of battering.

Ann Goetting’s (forthcoming) definition of battering is consistent with that employed by the profeminist program PEACE. To summarize--battering is the controlling of a woman in an intimate relationship, which can flourish in a patriarchal society. This type of controlling behavior and dominance may be called wife beating, domestic violence, woman abuse, spouse abuse, marital assault, conjugal violence, family violence, or battering. These different labels reflect either intentional or unintentional efforts to emphasize or de-emphasize gender issues, the intimate nature of the battering, or the assignments of responsibility for the controlling behaviors (Ganley 1989). In this study only the terms battering and wife abuse will be used in order to ensure that the victim (usually the woman) is not implicitly or explicitly blamed for her own victimization. Other “gender neutral” terms, such as spouse abuse or family violence, tend to collapse the distinctions between husband-to-wife violence, wife-to-husband violence, incest, child abuse, and elder abuse (Bograd 1988a, p. 11). Feminists argue that such terms ignore the context of the battering and its nature and consequences, and they can lead to misunderstandings about who is responsible and how to deal with the situation (Schecter 1982).
It is important to reiterate that there are two types of battering: "hands on and hands off" (Ganley 1989, p. 201). There can be battering without any physical injury or violence; however, there can not be any physical, hands-on battering in the absence of psychological, hands-off battering. Throughout this thesis when the words violent battering or violence are used, one can assume that nonviolent as well as violent battering has occurred. The batterer will usually use only the minimal amount of effort that it takes to keep his partner "in line" and under his control. Therefore, hands on battering is not the preferred method of coercion due to the risks of being arrested or to the potential of the woman leaving the relationship. However, if the batterer feels his control slipping, due to the woman's actions or his own paranoia, he has the option to increase the battering to include more intense intimidation tactics or physical attacks.

**Battering: Dynamics and Perspectives**

A basic familiarity with the dynamics of and perspectives on battering is a prerequisite to understanding the significance and value of this research. Four areas within the study of battering are addressed in the remainder of this chapter. They include dynamics of battering, typologies of batterers, rationalizations of battering, and methods of stopping battering. The chapter concludes with a section about the importance of this research.

**Dynamics of Battering**

To understand the dynamics of battering, one must consider at least three focal areas: how battering works, battering tactics, and when battering escalates. To know how battering works, one must understand the cycle of battering, the bonding that can occur in the battering relationship, and the reason women stay in battering relationships. About
two decades ago Lenore Walker (1979) recognized that battering can occur in a continuous cycle of three distinct stages: tension-building, explosion, and loving remorsefulness. She referred to it as the cycle of violence, but the model can be applied to battering that does not include physical violence (Goetting forthcoming). It is the remorseful, loving, and kind behavior of the batterer during the third phase that provides reinforcement for the cycle, allowing the battered woman to be convinced that her batterer is willing to stop and capable of stopping the abuse. The cycle then begins all over again, with the battering sometimes escalating in frequency and severity.

During the tension-building stage the man becomes irritable for no apparent reason. He reacts with escalating verbal and sometimes physical attacks. He may be jealous, sometimes drawing ludicrous conclusions about nonexistent sexual affairs. He does not merely react to events but creates a different view of the world, in which emotional bumps become earthquakes. And then, suddenly, after the catastrophic explosion he is remorseful, sweet, and loving. Many abused women refer to their batterers' behavior and apparent dual personality in terms of “Dr. Jekyl and Mr. Hyde” (Symonds 1978), Dr. Jekyl being the man with whom she fell in love and Mr. Hyde the “monster” he becomes when he forcefully tries to gain control over her. In this respect Susan Painter and Donald Dutton (1985) and Dutton and Painter (1981) conclude that the repetition of the buildup, the trauma during the explosion, and the reconciliation that follows serve to traumatically bond the battered woman to her batterer and decrease the likelihood that the woman will leave the relationship.

This traumatic bonding, which refers to the “strong emotional ties that develop between two people when one person intermittently harasses, beats, threatens, abuses, or
intimidates the other” (Painter and Dutton 1985, p. 364), has been compared to the “Stockholm Syndrome” (Dutton and Painter 1981; Finkelhor and Yllo 1985; Graham, Rawlings, and Rimini 1988; Hilberman 1980; Painter and Dutton 1985; Symonds 1979). The Stockholm Syndrome is an emotional bond that develops between captor and hostage. The two features that battered-batterer, hostage-captor, and abused child-perpetrator all have in common are the power imbalance and the persistent nature of the abuse (Graham et al. 1988; Painter and Dutton 1985).

Women in battering relationships often continue to live with their abusers for many years because of this special kind of bond and other continuing circumstances. Such circumstances include: the children’s financial and educational needs; the woman’s erroneous belief, encouraged by the man, that she can not survive without him; her own feelings of guilt and low self-esteem for not making the relationship work; the unhappiness that she feels is due to her own endless faults; and the belief that attempting to leave him would result in serious reprisal. Over the past decade feminist scholars have been critical of analyses that focus on the reasons women remain in battering relationships (Loseke and Cahill 1984, Tift 1993). The question “Why do battered women stay?” is misinformed and misdirected, and it blames the victim for her own victimization. Most battered women leave, especially if the relationship becomes violent; however, they are more likely to be seriously hurt in the process of leaving or after they leave than while living with the abuser (Tift 1993). More fundamentally the question of why women stay implies that the battered women’s behavior, rather than the behavior of the batterer, is problematic. The more appropriate questions are “Why do men batter?” and “Why do they stay when women tell them to go?” (Bograd 1988a; Kelly 1988; Tift 1993).
When battered women stay, it is often due to the third stage of the cycle of battering, which was explained earlier. The loving, “honeymoon” stage or the Dr. Jekyll personality, which appears periodically, may incite hope and promise for change and the return of the man with whom the woman originally fell in love. That promise of change becomes the pitfall that seduces her to stay as long as she sees hope for change in his behavior. However, if the man realizes that he need not bother with the loving stage of the cycle of battering because he deems the woman to be too entrenched in the relationship to get out even without it, he may eventually stop that stage. The batterer will use only the minimal amount of effort necessary to maintain his control—to ensure no future rebellion from his partner. Therefore, the explosion stage of the battering cycle can bypass the loving stage altogether.

The second focal area within the dynamics of battering to be discussed here is battering tactics. Men who batter use a system of abusive tactics to control their partners. Some of those tactics have been depicted in the “power and control wheel,” which was developed by DAIP and based on interviews and discussions with over 200 battered women (See Figure 1). It portrays nine of the battered women’s abusers’ most controlling and abusive tactics (Pence and Paymar 1986, 1993). In the center of the wheel is power and control, the main purpose for battering. Each spoke (using intimidation; using emotional abuse; using isolation; minimizing, denying, and blaming; using the children; using male privilege; using economic abuse; and using coercion and threats) represents a nonviolent battering tactic used to exert control or gain power. The rim or outer section of the wheel, which surrounds and holds the spokes together, is physical and sexual violence. Violence or the threat of violence can hold the system together and give the
Figure 1. The Power and Control Wheel

- **Using Coercion and Threats**: Making and/or carrying out threats to do something to hurt her, threatening to leave her, to commit suicide, to report her to welfare, making her drop charges, making her do illegal things.

- **Using Economic Abuse**: Preventing her from getting or keeping a job, making her ask for money, giving her an allowance, taking her money, not letting her know about or have access to family income.

- **Using Male Privilege**: Treating her like a servant, making all the big decisions, acting like the "master of the castle," being the one to define men's and women's roles.

- **Using Children**: Making her feel guilty about the children, using the children to relay messages, using visitation to harass her, threatening to take the children away.

- **Using Intimidation**: Making her afraid by using looks, actions, gestures, smashing things, destroying her property, abusing pets, displaying weapons.

- **Using Emotional Abuse**: Putting her down, making her feel bad about herself, calling her names, making her think she's crazy, playing mind games, humiliating her, making her feel guilty.

- **Using Isolation**: Controlling what she does, who she sees, and talks to, what she reads, where she goes, limiting her outside involvement, using jealousy to justify actions.

- **Minimizing, Denying, and Blaming**: Making light of the abuse and not taking her concerns about it seriously, saying the abuse didn't happen, shifting responsibility for abusive behavior, saying she caused it.
nonviolent tactics more strength (Pence and Paymar 1986). In other words, the spokes can be used before or in place of violence, with just the threat of violence to maintain control. However, violence can also be used first, and the spokes can be used to maintain control by the threat of continued violence. In the PEACE program the wheel is used as a visual aid with violent batterers to show tactics that they may have used in their own battering.

The third focal area, within the dynamics of battering, to be discussed here is the escalation of abuse within the battering relationship. The batterer will escalate his abuse when he senses that he is losing control. Escalation is the intensification of any or all of the battering tactics. When the batterer feels he is losing control over the woman, he must decide whether he will allow his control to slip away or escalate his battering in order to “keep her in her place” (Goetting forthcoming). For example, the woman may say she wants to go back to school or see certain friends of whom he disapproves. At that point the batterer must decide whether to escalate the battering or accept the loss of control. The batterer will use only enough force to guarantee that the woman will remain under his control and not leave him. However, this feeling of losing control does not have to be based on some external reality. Even though the woman may be doing everything “right,” the batterer may still feel he is losing control due to imagined transgressions. For example, he may have found out at work that the wife of one of his friends is having an affair. Even though the man is sure his wife is not having an affair, the thought of him losing control over her elicits fear, and, therefore, he comes home and escalates the battering. If and when he chooses to escalate the battering, he may select from among several forms of abuse, as displayed on the wheel, to assure his authority. He may
intensify them and even resort to violence at will (Ganley 1989; Goetting forthcoming; Pence and Paymar 1986, 1993).

According to the feminist perspective battering is viewed as a means by which men maintain dominance over women in a patriarchal society. The use of abusive behavior by individual men to maintain control over their partners is linked to the broader social environment, which promotes a culture of dominance and aggression (Schechter 1982). In the context of power and control as fundamental issues, an educational process is provided through profeminist batterers’ programs that challenges the abusive man’s attempts to control his partner through the use of intimate abuse in its various forms. Peer group education, such as the PEACE program and the Domestic Abuse Intervention Project (DAIP) model, is the preferred format because it is believed to best reinforce the message that wife abuse is learned behavior that has its roots in patriarchal social norms rather than in the individual (Adams and McCormick 1982, Pence and Paymar 1986, 1993). The goal of DAIP is to protect battered women by bringing an end to battering and to “challenge men to see their abuse as a choice; not an uncontrolled reaction to their past, their anger, or their lack of skills, but a choice” (Pence and Shephard 1988, p. 296).

Typology of Batterers

Several typologies of batterers have been constructed from research in order to help us understand how to create successful prevention and intervention strategies for batterers. According to a review conducted by Vernon Lee and Stephen Weinstein (1997) research directed at describing the batterer has evolved from three theoretical models or approaches designed to promote an understanding of battering. Broadly defined, these are personality-behavioral models, social learning approaches, and psychodynamic
explanations. The personality-behavioral depictions of battering are based on the specific controlling characteristics or personality of the batterer. The social learning approaches are primarily focused on whether the batterer experienced or witnessed abuse as a child and, therefore, is more likely to engage in partner abuse. The psychodynamic explanations of battering are presented in the framework of Freudian theory. They contend that abusive behavior results from being abused as a child and suppressing the resulting rage. The batterer tries to find ways to express that suppressed rage in appropriate ways but fails to do so. On account of this failure the batterer feels powerless and engineers ways to direct the rage at his partner.

There is no one theory or model that fully explains the causes of battering or the characteristics of all batterers; therefore, in order to understand battering, one must view these three models as complementary rather than mutually exclusive. Most of what is known about the characteristics of batterers is derived from the personality-behavioral model. Within that model the four most prominent typologies are constructed by Margaret Elbow (1977) and Martin Symonds (1978), James Hastings and Kevin Hamberger (1988), Daniel Saunders (1992), and Edward Gondolf (1988). This section focuses on these four typologies. The first three typologies include reference to both violent and nonviolent battering while Gondolf’s typology (1988) is specific to violent battering.

The first typology studies investigating the personality styles of batterers were conducted by Elbow (1977) and Symonds (1978). According to Elbow’s general description, the batterer is highly rigid and unaccepting of the partner’s need for autonomy, has problems with intimacy, and projects internal conflicts onto the partner.
Elbow then describes four types of batterers—categories that show overlap with Symonds' three categories. The four categories include: the "controller," who uses his partner as an object so that he can feel in control; the "defender," who mixes hate and love and is dependent on the partner'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 identifies possible childhood teachings that might lead to these types but does not empirically confirm the typology.

The second typology study conducted by Hastings and Hamberger (1988), developed an empirical typology based on personality data. Three major categories emerged: schizoid/borderline, narcissistic/antisocial, and dependent/compulsive. The first profile (schizoid/borderline) describes a person who is withdrawn, moody, and hypersensitive to interpersonal disagreements. He is calm one minute and extremely angry the next; he is characterized by high levels of anxiety, depression, and alcohol problems. The second profile (narcissistic/antisocial) describes a self-centered person who uses others to meet his needs. He insists that his perceptions, values, and rules be accepted by others, or he responds with threats. The third profile (dependent/compulsive) describes a rigid person who behaves in a passive way. He lacks self-esteem and has a strong sense of need for a significant other. Research efforts by Saunders (1992), who conducted the third typology study, resulted in three categories of batterers. They are: (1) those who used aggression solely within the family, (2) those who generalized their aggression and were likely to be violent outside the home as well, and (3) the emotionally volatile aggressors who were psychologically abusive and extremely jealous of their partners.

The fourth typology study, which was conducted by Gondolf (1988), developed a
typology of violent batterers based on 550 reports of their sheltered partners and the batterers' history of violence, including generalized violence. Gondolf labeled the three resulting clusters as sociopath, antisocial, and typical. The "sociopath" cluster included seven percent of the men. They were the most severely violent and most likely to have been previously arrested. The "antisocial" cluster consisted of 41 percent of the men. These men were also extremely abusive but less likely to have been arrested. The "typical" batterers included 52 percent of the men; they had committed less severe abuse and were more likely to be apologetic following battering incidents, consistent with Walker's (1979) honeymoon stage description. They were also unlikely to have been arrested.

The Rationalization of Battering

With an understanding of the various typologies of batterers it is important to be familiar with their rationalizations. Batterers taking responsibility for their abuse can not do that until they admit they are doing something wrong. Some batterers recognize the inappropriateness of only the violent part of battering and as a result refrain from that but still use the sometimes subtle mental abuse that can be just as harmful. Batterers rarely define their battering tactics as deviant behavior; however, when questioned they attempt to rationalize their behaviors through minimization ("I didn't hurt her that bad"); denial of intention ("I didn't mean to hurt her"); confusion ("I don't know what happened"); outright denial; intoxication; loss of control; and projection of blame onto the woman (Adams and McCormack 1982; Dobash and Dobash 1977-1978; and Straus 1980). The batterer tries to rationalize his behavior in order to justify and make sense of his actions. However, batterers' accounts tend to be inconsistent and contradictory. Battered women
and abusive men do not share similar perceptions or understandings of battering. Michele Bograd (1988b) found that battered women and abusive men employ different explanations to account for personal experiences with battering. More than half of the abusive husbands studied named the woman as the primary reason for the battering incident, most often (58%) for her failure to meet the man’s expectation of “the good wife” (Bograd 1988b, pp. 67-68). Few of the battered women studied (13%) stated that they deserved or provoked the abuse.

This section describes research on the rationalization of battering. To date two such studies have been conducted on that topic, both limiting their scope to violent battering. They include the work of Ellen Pence and Michael Paymar (1986), and James Ptacek (1988). I will consider first Pence’s and Paymar’s work conducted for the Domestic Abuse Intervention Project (DAIP) on batterers’ justifications. They identified 15 of the most common justifications expressed by batterers. In developing these justifications or rationalization statements Pence and Paymar met with five battered women and four men who had completed the educational program and stayed nonviolent for a year or longer. DAIP is designed to challenge a lifelong pattern of thinking, of rationalizing, and of acting that leads to battering. The DAIP and PEACE programs are set up to deal with violent battering; therefore, these statements by batterers represent a violent batterer’s mind-set. However, recall that there can not be violent battering without the inclusion of nonviolent battering tactics. Following are the erroneous beliefs or justifications thought to be the most important to discuss in the DAIP program.

Belief 1—Anger causes violence.

Variations: Violence is a response to anger.
I lost control and hit her.
Violence is often unintentional loss of control.
Belief 2—Women are manipulative.
Variations: Women lie, cheat, and steal to provoke men.
Women say no when they mean yes.

Belief 3—Women think of men as paychecks.
Belief 4—I give her the paycheck so she has economic power.
Variations: If a man works outside the home and the woman works in the home, everything is equal.

Belief 5—If I don’t control her, she’ll control me.
Variations: If a man is hurt, it’s okay or natural for him to hurt back.
If you don’t strike back, you’ll be henpecked all your life.

Belief 6—Smashing things isn’t abusive, it’s venting.
Belief 7—Sometimes there’s no alternative to violence.
Variations: If a man’s partner does something wrong, he has the right to punish her to make her stop doing it.

Belief 8—Women’s libbers hate men.
Variations: The shelter wants marriages to break up.

Belief 9—Women are just as violent as men.
Belief 10—Women want to be dominated by men.
Variations: If women didn’t like it, they wouldn’t stay.
Some women are masochistic.
Women ask for it.

Belief 11—Somebody has to be in charge.
Belief 12—Jealousy is natural in men.
Variations: Jealousy is a sign of love.

Belief 13—Violence is often a breakdown in communication.
Variations: Men hit women because they are not as articulate as women.
Men hit women to get them to stop nagging.
Men batter women because they are insecure.

Belief 14—A man has the right to choose his partner’s friends.
Variations: Women are too easily influenced so men should watch out for their partner’s [sic] interests.
A man is only protecting his interest when he limits who his partner can spend time with.

Belief 15—A man can’t change if the woman won’t.
Variations: Nothing can change if the woman doesn’t also change.
It takes two to tango.
The woman is half the problem.
(Pence and Paymar 1986, pp.8-16)

The more important and more recent work on rationalizations given by batterers is from Ptacek’s (1988) study. Ptacek found that the most common way batterers attempt to excuse their violent behavior is by an appeal to loss of control. These denials of responsibility include losing control due to alcohol or drugs, having a build-up of frustration, and stating they were provoked by the woman, or victim blaming. While
excuses represent denial of responsibility, justifications are denials of wrongdoing on the part of the batterer. Ptacek identifies two categories of justifications: denial of injury and failure by the woman to fulfill obligations of a good wife. Men may attempt to neutralize the unacceptability of their behavior by denying or minimizing the woman’s injuries. An example is seen in the statement “women bruise easily” (Ptacek 1988, p. 147). This statement demonstrates the contradictory nature of a batterer’s account in that he admits to bruising his partner but at the same time blames it on her. The second justification category is the woman’s failure to be a good wife. This justification is the point of entrance for a sense of the male privilege and entitlement that society provides men comes in. Some examples of this justification are “I’m the man of the house,” and “I should just smack you for the lousy wife you’ve been” (Ptacek 1988, p. 148).

Ptacek’s (1988) work was based on the earlier work of Gresham Sykes and David Matza (1957) and Marvin Scott and Stanford Lyman (1968). Sykes and Matza’s (1957) research on the rationalizations of deviant offenders, in particular juvenile delinquents, revealed a typology of “techniques of neutralization,” which allow offenders to view their actions as normal, acceptable, or at least justifiable. Scott and Lyman (1968) also use these techniques of neutralization in their explanation of justifications. They include (1) the denial of responsibility, (2) the denial of injury—no one was seriously hurt, (3) the denial of victim—the victim deserved it, (4) the condemnation of the condemners—could have done worse things, and (5) the appeal to loyalties—did the act for the greater good. Ferraro and Johnson (1983) apply these techniques to victims of battering. They found that women usually used at least one of these techniques to make sense of their situations and rationalize a reason to stay in the relationship due to the “brainwashing” of the
Ptacek's (1988) work also relied on Scott and Lyman's (1968) work on explanations of accounts, which include excuses and justifications. When a person whose behavior is regarded as socially unacceptable is questioned about such behavior, the person's response may be called an account. Accounts are attempts at face-saving or avoiding judgment. Scott and Lyman distinguish two types of accounts that serve to neutralize socially disapproved behavior: excuses and justifications. Excuses are accounts in which one may admit that the act is wrong but deny full responsibility. Justifications are accounts in which one may assume responsibility but deny or minimize the wrongness of his or her action. In making excuses and justifications, the deviant individual adopts "socially approved vocabularies" that are normalized within the culture (Scott and Lyman 1968, p. 46).

How Batterers Stop

Few studies have examined how, why, and under what conditions batterers stop their victimization. However, there has been a great deal of research on the desistance process with respect to chemical addictions to alcohol, nicotine, and other mind-altering drugs. Other research focuses on cessation of delinquency and food addiction. Jeffrey Fagan (1989) examined this desistance research and applied it to battering, equating the addiction of substances to the "addiction" of power and control over a woman in an intimate relationship. In order to familiarize the reader with the cessation process, especially as it applies to battering, the following research is addressed: the stages of change in smoking cessation and how they apply to the desistance of battering, Fagan's (1989) three stages of the stopping process, David Adams' (1988) description of the desistance of battering as it
parallels Elisabeth Kubler-Ross' (1975) five stages of grief, research on batterers' motivations to stop, and Edward Gondolf and James Hanneken's (1987) study of how "reformed" violent batterers stopped. It is this last study that most closely resembles the research that was conducted for this study. It should be noted that the literature about how battering stops is limited, in scope, to violent battering.

Using data on smoking, Wayne Velicer, Stanley Hughes, Joseph Fava, James Prochaska, and Carlo DiClemente (1995) investigated the different stages of change toward smoking cessation. This process of behavioral change are as follows:

precontemplation, contemplation, preparation, action, and maintenance. Precontemplation is a stage in which smokers are thinking about quitting smoking, but not within the next six months. A six-month time frame was used because it was assumed that this stage is about as far into the future that most people plan a specific behavior change.

Contemplation is the period of time in which smokers are seriously thinking about quitting smoking in the next six months. Preparation has been defined as involving both an attempt to quit smoking in the past year and the intention to quit in the next month. Action is a period ranging from zero to six months after smokers have made the overt decision to quit smoking. Maintenance is defined as the stage beginning six months after action started and continuing until smoking is terminated as a problem. Donald Dutton and Susan Golant (1995) apply Velicer et al.'s six stages to batterers. They state:

In the first, or precontemplation stage, the batterer hasn't quite accepted that he has a problem, although others may be bringing it to his attention. Certainly, the arrest and conviction for wife assault should be a red flag, but the man may not be convinced yet that it's his problem...The contemplation stage involves acknowledging that there is a problem. Preparation encompasses seeking help; action means taking the cure. Maintenance requires one to stay "sober" or violence-free (1995, p. 173).
From research on alcohol, nicotine, drugs, and delinquency cessation, Fagan (1989) identified three stages that characterize the desistance process for batterers (Biernacki 1986; Clarke and Cornish 1985; Stall and Biernacki 1986; Waldorf 1983). The stages include: (1) the catalysts for change, (2) discontinuance of behavior, and (3) maintenance. The first stage relates to a voluntary decision to quit or a forced decision such as an arrest or social sanctions. Lee Bowker (1983) discovered that the fear of sanction or loss enables a large percentage of the batterers to stop. From the victims’ perspective, public disclosure and sociolegal sanctions contribute most often to desistance. The second stage is to stop the violence. This stage involves learning new coping skills, having an open line of communication, and exchanging social networks to ones that support the desistance. The third stage is the maintenance of desistance, which may include substitution of old social networks and stabilization of new norms developed for the purpose of desistance.

Adams’ (1988) research describes the cessation process of battering as it parallels the five stages of grief identified by Kubler-Ross (1975). The five stages of grief are denial, anger, bargaining, depression, and acceptance. In the beginning stages, the batterer moves among denial (he is not responsible for his violence), anger (for being caught or having attention called to him due to his behavior), and bargaining (trying to save some control). Depression, the fourth stage among batterers, results from men not having the tools to act and think in a nonviolent, non sexist way. Some men will seek out support groups to help maintain their new actions. Acceptance that they can not control the ways their wives act or feel is the final stage of change for batterers. It is at this point that men become more self-motivated to examine sexist expectations and confront their own controlling behaviors.
What motivates batterers to stop battering? Some believe that increased awareness of the adverse consequences of abuse on battered women and the family is fundamental to desistance (Dutton 1987). Other research has concluded that batterers are motivated to end violence in order to avoid divorce or loss of the relationship (Bowker 1983; Fagan 1989). Still others have concluded that the avoidance of potential consequences flowing from second arrest for domestic assault is critical to violence cessation (Sherman and Berk 1984). Eve Buzawa and Carl Buzawa (1993) stated that long-term counseling and other rehabilitation measures ultimately prove more effective than arrest in deterring future violence. Others state that preliminary data suggest that court-mandated treatment following arrest and prosecution for domestic assaults may substantially contribute to the reduction in severe violence by batterers (Dutton 1986). Those completing court-mandated treatment are less likely to recidivate than those terminating before completion (Edleson and Grusznski 1988). Barbara Hart (1988) suggested that batterers engage in a cost/benefit analysis when considering whether to terminate or continue battering; when the costs begin to substantially outweigh the benefits and when life is more disrupted than facilitated by violence, batterers may choose to moderate their use of violence.

In Gondolf and Hanneken’s (1987) study, 12 “reformed” violent batterers were interviewed about their perceptions on the nature of their abuse and how they stopped it. It was found that the abuse was a reaction to their failed “macho complex” (p. 177). The batterers described the process of change in terms of personal growth, which involved “accepting responsibility for their actions, becoming aware of their feelings and developing empathy toward others, and redefining their sense of masculinity and resisting the pressure
to conform” (Gondolf and Hanneken 1987, p. 187). The “reformed” batterers had attended a men’s counseling program for 24 weeks and were nonviolent for at least 10 months, according to their partners. Descriptive analysis of the interviews suggested that these men had difficulty living up to the macho, traditional sex-role stereotype that was often present in their fathers. As a result they viewed themselves as inadequate, developed low self-esteem, and ironically attempted to alleviate these feelings through the control and physical abuse of their wives, possibly as a way of minimizing any perceived threat by their partners. The process of change was described as long-term and involved not treating their wives like “objects” (p. 187). The men also credited the counseling program for being a reinforcement for their self-determination to change. Gondolf and Hanneken found that 10 out of the 12 men identified a “galavanzing” experience or a catalytic situation in which they were on the verge of violence, acted nonviolently, and had the restraint acknowledged (p. 187). This experience seemed to confirm and encourage that change was happening and that continuing the work was meaningful.

Importance of this Research

I have reviewed the dynamics of battering, typologies of batterers, rationalizations of battering, and how batterers stop. The latter element, that is, how batterers stop their abusive behavior toward women, is the focus of the present research. Previous research on desistance of battering does not directly investigate the catalysts (i.e., the change process) that batterers who have been labeled by the court and society would implicate as being the cause of their desistance. That research does, however, outline models for desistance of battering and other forms of undesirable behavior that can be condensed into Fagan’s (1989) three-stage model involving (1) catalysts for change, (2) discontinuation
of behavior, and (3) maintenance of that discontinuation. Of all the research reviewed here, Gondolf and Hanneken’s (1987) study is the most similar to the present study; however, it too does not examine the specific point or points in batterers’ “process of personal growth” that caused them to redefine their self-identity from an entitled controller to batterer (p. 187).

Ferraro and Johnson (1983) identified six catalysts that served to redefine battering for women. These were points when the battered women rejected earlier rationalizations—ways of coping with an abusive situation—and began to view themselves as victims of the abuse instead of devoted and long-suffering mates. The six catalysts include (1) a change in the level of battering—it may start to include violence or the violence already exhibited may increase, (2) a change in resources—may be able to escape, (3) a change in the relationship—no more honeymoon stage, (4) despair—loss of hope that he will change, (5) a change in the visibility of the battering—it may become publicly displayed, and (6) external definitions of the relationship—laws may change. Ferraro and Johnson’s research is an appropriate springboard for the investigation of batterers’ rejecting their rationalizations for their own abuse and redefining their behavior and their self-identity. The value of the present study lies in my potential to fortify the current body of knowledge on battering. Identifying the change process in self-concept from entitled controller to batterer would yield a clearer understanding of battering and improve prevention and intervention treatment for batterers. In the following chapter I investigate theories about how people change their self-identity.
CHAPTER III
THEORETICAL PERSPECTIVE

This area of study provides an opportunity to analyze the applicability of symbolic interactionism to the change process involved with batterers redefining their self-identity from entitled controller to batterer. To investigate the point or points batterers accepted, if they did at all, their stigmatized label would aid in improving prevention and intervention treatment for batterers. Within the framework of symbolic interactionism the change process and the redefining of one’s self-identity due to societal pressures is examined. The remainder of this chapter opens with a review of the major tenets of symbolic interactionism and of some writings that are helpful in understanding the definition of self and self-concept and the identity-change process. The chapter closes with a discussion of the relevance of this theory to the present study.

**Symbolic Interactionism**

In symbolic interactionism an individual’s identity and self-concept, cognitive processes, values, and attitudes are seen as existing only in the context of society—acting, reacting, and changing in social interaction with others (Ritzer 1992). The concept of symbolic interaction identifies the interaction between people that takes place through symbols such as signs, gestures, and language. Society is seen as being composed of individuals actively participating in symbolic social interactions. The label, “symbolic interactionism,” was introduced by Herbert Blumer (1969) whose views were greatly
influenced by George Herbert Mead (1934). In a now classic essay by Blumer he states:

The term “symbolic interaction” refers, of course, to the peculiar and distinctive character of interaction as it takes place between human beings. The peculiarity consists in the fact that human beings interpret or “define” each other’s actions instead of merely reacting to each other’s actions. Their “response” is not made directly to the actions of one another but instead is based on the meaning which they attach to such actions. Thus, human interaction is mediated by the use of symbols, by interpretation, or by ascertaining the meaning of one another’s actions (1969, pp. 78-79).

From the early writings of Charles Horton Cooley ([1902] 1964) and Mead (1934) to such later theorists as Blumer (1969), Erving Goffman (1963), and Morris Rosenberg (1979), symbolic interactionism has emphasized the exchange of meanings communicated in face-to-face interaction through language, verbal utterances, and gestures and the interplay of this interaction with an individual’s self-identity. Nancy Herman and Larry Reynolds (1994) offer a summary of the basic principles of this theory:

1. Humans live in a symbolic world of learned meanings.
2. Symbols arise in the social process and are shared;
3. Symbols have motivational significance; meanings and symbols allow individuals to carry out distinctively human action and interaction;
4. The mind is a functional, volitional, teleological entity serving the interests of the individual. Humans unlike lower animals, are endowed with the capacity for thought; capacity for thought is shaped by social interaction;
5. The self is a social construct; just as individuals are born mindless, so too are they born selfless; our selves arise in social interaction with others;
6. Society is a linguistic or symbolic construct arising out of the social process; it consists of individuals interacting;
7. Sympathic introspection is a mandatory mode of inquiry (p. 1).

According to the symbolic interactionist view, people do not respond to the world directly; rather they place a social meaning on it and respond to that meaning.

Individuals live in a symbolic as well as physical world, and their social life involves a constant process of interpreting the meanings of their own acts and those of others
Therefore, people are born without a "concrete" self; life is a series of symbolic interactions that serve the development of the self. For the purposes of this study, Herman and Reynolds' (1994) fifth principle, which suggests that individuals take on the attitudes toward themselves from others around them, is examined at length.

To investigate the change process and redefinition of a batterer's self-identity that may occur after rationalizations for their behavior are no longer accepted is the intent of this study. People define themselves by the way others see them; therefore, if society defines a man who aggressively controls his wife as a batterer, then, according to symbolic interactionism, the man, through his interaction with others, will come to define himself as a batterer. Because this research is concerned with change in self-identity, this review will be limited to probing into the developments of the self and the self-concept, the reactions to stigma by stigmatized persons, and the identity-change process.

One major concept in symbolic interactionism is the "looking-glass self" (Cooley [1902] 1964), in which one's own self-concepts are reflections of others' conceptions of them. People are or become what they think others think they are. If significant others interact with someone as if he or she were a certain type of person with certain characteristics, then a sort of self-fulfilling prophecy (Merton 1957) may be set in motion so that the person comes to take on those same characteristics. What others think is communicated in part by applying labels to them; thus, their self-concepts and actions can be shaped by such societal labeling.

By the looking-glass self Cooley meant that people have the ability to see themselves as they see other social objects. The idea of a looking-glass self can be broken down into three components: "(1) the imagination of our appearance to the other
person; (2) the imagination of his or her judgment of that appearance, and (3) some sort of self-feeling, such as pride or mortification” (Cooley [1902] 1964, p. 184). As a result of this type of self-perception, people may alter their attitudes to be consistent with the way they think others see them. Cooley suggests that the self develops, arises, and learns about not only its surroundings from others but from itself as well. A self learns about itself and learns to react to itself by observing its own reflection in the behaviors and imagined perceptions of others. Being able to mentally put oneself in another’s place is what Mead (1934) refers to as “taking the role of the other.”

Taking the role of the other involves both seeing from another’s point of view and understanding how the other is likely to react to one’s own behavior. In a more advanced stage of development of the self, Mead says, one is able to assume the roles of many other individuals at once. Mead uses the example of a baseball player involved in a game. “What he does is controlled by his being everyone else on that team, at least in so far at those attitudes affect his own particular response” (p. 154).

There is a further stage of development, however, in which the individual is able to assume the role of what Mead (1934) calls the generalized other.

The organized community or social group which gives to the individual his unity of self may be called “the generalized other.” The attitude of the generalized other is the attitude of the whole community (p. 154).

If the given human individual is to develop a self in the fullest sense, it is not sufficient for him merely to take the attitudes of other human individuals toward himself and toward one another within the human social process, and to bring that social process as a whole into his individual experience merely in these terms: he must also, in the same way that he takes the attitudes of other individuals toward himself and toward one another, take their attitudes toward the various phases or aspects of the common social activity or set of social undertakings in which, as members of an organized society or social group, they are all engaged; and he must then, by generalizing these individual attitudes of that organized society or social group itself, as a whole, act toward different social projects which at any given time
it is carrying out, or toward the various larger phases of the general social process which constitutes its life and of which these projects are specific manifestations (p. 154-55).

Thus, an individual's surroundings help form the self, but the self also helps shape the surroundings. Mead differentiated between these two parts of the self, assigning the name "me" to the part of the self that is shaped by one's environment. The "I" is the part of the self that acts toward one's environment. As Mead says, "The attitudes of the others constitute the organized 'me,' and then one reacts toward that as an 'I'" (p. 175).

Other important concepts that were associated with symbolic interactionism are Rosenberg's (1979) ideas on self-concept formation. Rosenberg's main interest was in the self-concept rather than the self. The self-concept is the self as an object. Rosenberg defines the self-concept as "the individual's fundamental frame of reference, the foundation on which almost all his actions are predicated" (1979, p. 59). Rosenberg states that self-esteem and self-consistency, which help enhance and maintain the self-concept, are two primary motives guiding human behavior. "The first is the self-esteem motive--the wish to think well of oneself. The second is the self-consistency motive--the wish to protect the self-concept against change or to maintain one's self-picture" (Rosenberg 1979, p. 53). In other words, people strive to maintain consistent and positive views of themselves to others and to themselves; therefore, when this perception is put into question it creates a "cognitive dissonance," i.e., an unpleasant state of arousal that occurs when people behave inconsistently with their attitudes or the "picture" they are to present to others. Dissonance can motivate people to change their attitudes and/or behaviors (Lippa 1994, p. 268). When inconsistency occurs in the men of this study, due to societal labeling, some type of action is used to maintain equilibrium within the self.
For the purposes of this study, the action that is investigated is the attitude change about the self-concept.

Rosenberg also identified four dimensions of the formation of the self-concept. They include reflected appraisals, social comparisons, self-attribution, and psychological centrality. Reflected appraisals occur when “people are deeply influenced by the attitudes of others toward the self and when, in the course of time, they come to view themselves as they are viewed by others” (1979, p. 63). Therefore, people’s concern with how others perceive them is critical in shaping their own self-concept. Social comparisons result when people compare themselves to others and then rate how they measured up. However, the result of the rating depends on the group to which one compares himself or herself. This type of social comparison is similar to Tamotsu Shibutani’s (1978) “reference group” perspective, which states that a person identifies with a group, aspires to be accepted into it, and takes on its norms and values.

Self-attribution involves “understanding the bases on which people draw conclusions about their own motives or underlying characteristics and how they go about verifying their tentative conclusions” (Rosenberg 1979, p. 71). In other words, when a child does well in school, he or she is more likely to have a self-concept that is consistent with the idea that he or she is smart. Psychological centrality states that the formation of the self-concept is based on a highly complex organization of hierarchical components, one of which is the self-concept of change. “Whether it is difficult or easy to change a self-concept component thus depends in large part on how critical it is to the individual’s system of self-values” (Rosenberg 1979, p. 76). Therefore, the perceived importance of the component on the concept of self will determine if change is possible.
One of the more famous symbolic interactionists is Erving Goffman. In his book *Stigma: Notes on the Management of Spoiled Identity* (1963), he offers an unusual look into the situation of persons who are unable to conform to the codes that society has established as "normal." He analyzes stigmatized people's feelings about themselves and their relationship to "normals," people without a stigma, and describes the different strategies these stigmatized people use to deal with the exclusion of them by society. A stigma is a social attribute which is discrediting for an individual or group. Stigmas can be known or unknown to the public. There are stigmas of the body (blemishes and deformities), of character (homosexuality), and of social collectivities (race or tribe). For those whose stigma is "secret"—as with homosexuals, alcoholics, or batterers—the question is how they respond to society and themselves about the stigma once it is known to the public.

For the purpose of this study the focus is on examining how these stigmatized persons responded or dealt with the reaction of society. Goffman (1963) found that in some cases the people made an attempt to correct the stigma directly or indirectly. "Directly" means correction by treatment or some type of public "repair," and "indirectly" means correction by self-improvement or some type of personal "repair." (pp.9-10). Both attempts would be seen as acceptable gestures by "normals" to correct a stigma. Some stigmatized persons use their stigmas as excuses for not having success in their lives. Some accept their stigmas and attempt to learn from their mistakes and help others with similar stigmas. However, others decide to "re-assess" normals and their perceptions of the supposed stigmas and not to accept the negative label of their stigmas (Goffman 1963, p. 11).
Goffman (1963) also discussed what he termed as a “spoiled identity,” a person who has a negative self-concept in addition to having society discriminating against him or her. This identity seems to be the case in some batterers as well as in obese individuals. Douglas Degher and Gerald Hughes’ (1997) study of the identity-change process in obesity investigated how people come to make personal sense out of preexisting societal labels and their accompanying identities. Degher and Hughes (1997) stated that their concern is “the change process that takes place as individuals come to see definitions of self in light of specific transmitted information” (p. 240). The identity-change process must be viewed as occurring on the public (external) level and the private (internal) level due to the concept of “career,” which was used by Degher and Hughes. As Goffman has stated, “One value of the concept of career is its two-sidedness. One side is linked to internal matters held dearly and closely, such as image of self and felt identity; the other side concerns official position, jural relations, and style of life and its part of a publicly acceptable institutional complex” (1961, p. 127). Degher and Hughes (1997) described the two levels.

On the public level, social status exists as part of the public domain; social status is socially defined and promoted. The social environment not only contains definitions and attendant stereotypes for each status, it also contains information, in the form of status cues, about the applicability of that status for the individual.

On the internal level, two distinct cognitive processes must take place for the identity change process to occur: first, the individual must come to recognize that the current status is inappropriate; the second, the individual must locate a new, more appropriate status. Thus, in response to the external status cues, the individual comes to recognize internally that the initial status is inappropriate; then he or she uses the cues to locate a new, more appropriate status. The identity change occurs in response to, and is mediated through, the status cues that exist in the social environment (p. 240).

Status cues compose the external component of the identity change process. A status cue is some feature of the social environment that contains information about a
particular status (p. 240). Degher and Hughes’ cues of interest are about "fatness"; the
cues for the present study are about battering. Other components of the identity change
process include the internal or cognitive level: recognizing and placing (See Figure 2).
These internal components occur in response to the status cues in society. Status cues
interact with the internal components in two ways: actively and passively. Active cues
are transmitted through interactions whereas passive cues must be sought out by the
individual. "Recognizing" refers to the internal identity change in which a person
becomes aware that a certain status is inappropriate and wrong. However, Degher and
Hughes (1997) pointed out that this acceptance does not always occur, but that failure
was not considered in their study. Due to the awareness that the status is wrong, one
must then search for a new and appropriate status. This process is called "placing,"
whereby someone starts to identify an appropriate status to internalize. The final stage of
the identity change is actually internalizing the new status sought out in the placing.

Figure 2. The Identity Change Process

Relevance to Present Study

Symbolic interactionism’s views of the self, the self-concept, and the stigmatized
person, along with the model of the identity-change process, are all critical to the
question of the point or points at which labeled batterers accept or internalize their labels.
Symbolic interactionism views society as being made up of actively engaging social
individuals. Because of this interaction people form a concept of themselves that is dependent on meanings they assign to others’ perceptions as well as to their own perceptions. However, to change one’s self-concept is not easy and is dependent on how crucial the person’s system of self-values is to him or her. Due to society’s negative view of battering, people may want to be consistent in their self-concepts and their behaviors. This negative labeling may elicit a change in some batterers; however, if their self-concept deeply influences their values, change may not occur even after public labeling. In addition, Mead (1934) states that an individual’s surroundings help form the self, but the self also helps shape the surroundings. Therefore, once the batterer is able to take the role of the other (i.e., his partner and victim) and/or the generalized other (i.e., society and his new nonviolent social group) and view his behavior and attitudes as wrong, he is more likely to redefine himself from entitled controller to batterer.

When someone is stigmatized, how he or she responds is also important. Goffman (1963) found that stigmatized persons can directly or indirectly receive treatment, use stigma as an excuse that cannot be avoided, learn from their mistakes, or redefine others so the stigma is not viewed as negatively. Batterers can respond in these particular ways as explained by Goffman (1963) when publicly labeled, which would affect how they internalize their label. The identity-change process study pinpoints the efforts of this study--to identify the change process that takes place if a batterer chooses to accept his label and redefine himself as a batterer. Therefore, the batterer must first come to recognize that the current status is not acceptable due to society’s definition of battering, and then he must locate a new status that is more appropriate. I would now like to discuss the procedure for obtaining data for this research.
CHAPTER IV
RESEARCH METHODS

The primary purpose of this research is to examine the catalysts or the change process that may have occurred among labeled batterers who are about to graduate from the Project to End Abuse through Counseling and Education (PEACE) program. The second purpose and inherent in this research are implications that this information will have for the future of the PEACE program. Due to the ready availability of the data and in the spirit of reciprocity, I want to give back to the organization that so generously allowed me to utilize them for research purposes. The information obtained may be of interest and/or benefit to PEACE.

Identifying the process of change in self-concept from entitled controller to batterer would allow for a clearer understanding of battering and improve prevention and intervention treatment for batterers. In investigating the redefining of one’s self-concept, qualitative methodology should be used. According to Jennifer Mason (1996):

Qualitative research aims to produce rounded understandings on the basis of rich, contextual, and detailed data. There is more emphasis on “holistic” forms of analysis and explanation in this sense, than on charting surface patterns, trends, and correlations (p. 4).

Qualitative research uses primarily in-depth interviewing and participant-observation to acquire rich detail. The main reason for choosing qualitative methods is the rich, informative quality of data that is usually impossible to obtain in quantitative research (Mason 1996). In order to obtain such detailed data one must typically keep the
respondent number small and rely on the precarious nature of self-reports. The emphasis of quantitative methods is on prediction of stable relationships in the world as they pertain to the phenomenon under investigation. The problem is that the world is not always predictable, especially when it comes to studying social interactions and the changing of one’s self-concept. Herbert Blumer (1969) stated that people act toward things and other people based on the particular meanings they attach to them. In other words, people are not merely responding to certain external events in predictable ways but are guided internally by the meanings they attach to events. Quantitative methods typically fail to get at these internal social meanings.

Due to the fact that I examine past events and feelings and compare them to the present situation, a retrospective research design is in order. Retrospective or follow-back studies are designs that use information about past events (Wicks-Nelson and Israel 1991, p. 80). The purpose of such studies is to explore any relation that may evolve between the past and present. One obvious weakness of this method concerns the occasional inconsistency of a person’s memory. In addition, the way one views the past can be colored by the circumstances of the moment. However, Georges Gusdorf (1980) states that this removal from the actual event can have a positive result.

In the immediate moment, the agitation of things ordinarily surrounds me too much for me to be able to see it in its entirety. Memory gives me a certain remove and allows me to take into consideration all the ins and outs of the matter, its context in time and space. As an aerial view sometimes reveals to an archaeologist the direction of a road or a fortification or a map of a city invisible to someone on the ground, so the reconstruction in spirit of my destiny bares the major lines that I have failed to notice, the demands of the deepest values I hold that, without my being clearly aware of it, have determined my most decisive choices (p. 38).

A retrospective design is necessary here because it would be impossible to identify graduates of the PEACE program before the arrest that would place them in that program.
The alternative to using a retrospective research design is a type of longitudinal research called prospective research. Prospective studies are designs that identify subjects and then follow them over time (Wicks-Nelson and Israel 1991, p. 80). This design enables the researcher to “see” development or change as it occurs. However, it would be virtually impossible to study batterers’ change process as it occurs, even though doing so would ensure a more accurate account of their feelings. In addition, using prospective methods is more time consuming and expensive. Though the design of this research is primarily retrospective in nature, some prospective data are included. PEACE keeps a written progress report in the form of extended check-ins (explained in detail later) about the men’s attitudes toward the PEACE program and about the battering behaviors to which they admit. The extended check-in forms are administered the first, eighth, sixteenth, and last (twenty-sixth) days of group. These forms provide an excellent way of chronicling changes in the men. PEACE keeps these forms in the men’s file for reference on their progress in the program. The data derived from these forms for this study could be considered prospective or concurrent in nature.

Throughout this thesis, battering is defined as “an obsessive campaign of coercion and intimidation designed to dominate and control a woman by a man, that occurs in the personal context of intimacy and thrives in the sociopolitical climate of patriarchy” (Goetting forthcoming). A theme that has been stressed throughout this thesis is the dichotomy of battering. There can be battering with or without a violent component. However, one can assume that nonphysical battering always accompanies physical battering. The batterer will usually use only the minimal amount of effort to keep his partner under control. Therefore, the physical battering can be a last resort for the
batterer to regain control. Only the physical battering is illegal and warrants arrest; the nonphysical can be practiced without identification by or repercussions from authorities. Due to the impracticality of studying all forms of battering, only the violent manifestations are investigated here. The batterers in this study have been violent to their wives or girlfriends and forced to attend PEACE because of their violence. A description of the PEACE program follows.

PEACE

PEACE, as explained in the introduction of this thesis, is modeled after the Domestic Abuse Intervention Program (DAIP) initiated by Ellen Pence and Michael Paymar in Duluth, Minnesota in 1986. PEACE is used by the courts as a sentencing alternative for individuals who are charged with domestic-related misdemeanor offenses. However, not all of the individuals who attend PEACE are court-mandated; some are volunteers sent by their partners or therapists. According to Heather Rakoczy (1997), the program coordinator at PEACE, 90 percent of the clients at PEACE are court-mandated while only 10 percent are volunteers. In addition, PEACE has three different court-mandated groups—those that extend for 16 weeks, 26 weeks, and 52 weeks. Two counselors, one male and one female, facilitate each group. The groups cannot exceed 15 men. They last two hours each and the men may attend only one group per week. Payment is determined by a sliding income scale. There are specific rights and responsibilities associated with group participation; they are introduced at orientation and intake meetings, which occur before the man is assigned to a group (See Appendixes A, B, and C). These two meetings, orientation and intake, which are used to acquire more background information, count as one group meeting each; therefore, there are only 24
actual group meetings.

The first hour of each group meeting is devoted to taking money, assessing homework or control logs—which are assigned in each group and represent reflection on past behavior—and assessing extended check-ins—if they are administered that particular week. These extended check-ins are read aloud by the client, and his fellow group members along with the facilitators are then expected to comment on how he did (See Appendixes D and E). The facilitators and other group members look for accountability in the man’s responses and for any minimization or denial of his actions. The confrontation between the man and his fellow group members regarding his failure to accept responsibility for his actions can be an important redefining catalyst. This type of confrontational technique called “mutual criticism” has been used in various self-help/supportive contexts including the 19th century Oneida community (Kephart 1966) and the Synanon community (Yablonsky 1965). In addition, when a man confronts another member, with the help of the group facilitators, this confrontation can have an important effect on that man. Donald Cressey (1955) forecasted the need for this confrontative type of treatment technique. He described “…a group in which Criminal A joins with some noncriminals to change Criminal B is probably most effective in changing Criminal A” (p. 119). This change may be a result of Criminal A having to honestly internalize what he is teaching to Criminal B so that Criminal B will believe Criminal A in his attempt to change.

The second hour is dedicated to the educational curriculum. The curriculum is based on cognitive restructuring of the men’s sexist attitudes and beliefs. Cognitive restructuring is as follows:
psychological approach to counseling and education whereby people are held accountable in an effort to examine and to change their belief and subsequent behavior. Cognitive restructuring deconstructs harmful belief systems and reconstructs healthy belief systems; ideally, destructive behavior is relinquished and replaced with more constructive behavior (Rakoczy 1998, p. 35).

Through cognitive restructuring, the men are challenged to examine learned attitudes and values and to question their beliefs. Once they have determined that former attitudes, values, and beliefs about male superiority are destructive, they may be receptive to learning new beliefs and behaviors. The power and control wheel (See Figure 1) and the equality wheel (See Figure 3) are used as a visual aid for the men to see how their controlling tactics contribute to their violent behaviors. The equality wheel depicts alternative attitudes and behaviors to the power and control wheel.

In an effort to do cognitive restructuring, the PEACE curriculum is geared toward naming violent and controlling beliefs and behaviors and changing those beliefs and behaviors to non-controlling alternatives. Thus, the curriculum follows a simple pattern for each of the eight themes, namely: _name_ the controlling and non-controlling behavior, _claim_ personal use of the violent and controlling behavior, and _change_ behavior to the non-controlling alternative. The eight themes include: violence vs. nonviolence; intimidation vs. non-threatening behavior; emotional abuse vs. respect; isolation vs. trust and support; minimization, denial, and blame vs. honesty and accountability; sexual violence and disrespect vs. sexual nonviolence and respect; economic abuse, male privilege, and using children vs. partnership; and coercion and threats vs. negotiation and fairness. This examination includes discussions, videotapes, and worksheets. The group facilitators assume five roles:

(1) to keep the group focused on the issues of violence, abuse, control, and change; (2) to facilitate reflective and critical thinking; (3) to maintain an
Figure 3. The Equality Wheel

1. **NEGOTIATION AND FAIRNESS**
   - Seeking mutually satisfying resolutions to conflict
   - Accepting change
   - Being willing to compromise.

2. **ECONOMIC PARTNERSHIP**
   - Making money decisions together
   - Making sure both partners benefit from financial arrangements.

3. **NON-THREATENING BEHAVIOR**
   - Talking and acting so that she feels safe and comfortable
   - Expressing herself and doing things.

4. **RESPECT**
   - Listening to her non-judgmentally
   - Being emotionally affirming and understanding
   - Valuing opinions.

5. **SHARED RESPONSIBILITY**
   - Mutually agreeing on a fair distribution of work
   - Making family decisions together.

6. **TRUST AND SUPPORT**
   - Supporting her goals in life
   - Respecting her right to her own feelings, friends, activities, and opinions.

7. **RESPONSIBLE PARENTING**
   - Sharing parental responsibilities
   - Being a positive non-violent role model for the children.

8. **HONESTY AND ACCOUNTABILITY**
   - Accepting responsibility for self
   - Acknowledging past use of violence
   - Admitting being wrong
   - Communicating openly and truthfully.
atmosphere that is compassionate and challenging and not colluding; (4) to provide new information and teach non-controlling relationship skills; and (5) to facilitate a healthy group process (Pence and Paymar 1986, p. 17).

The present study is similar to Kathleen Ferraro and John Johnson's (1983) research that investigated the victimization process of battered women and described six catalysts identified by these women as critical to their redefinition of self from devoted and long-suffering mate to victim. These women who escaped the battering relationship viewed such redefinition as essential. In a similar way, this study endeavors to discover catalysts of self-redefinition for labeled batterers from entitled controller to batterer.

Sample and Data Collection

The study population for this research consists of 13 batterers who were about to graduate from the PEACE program. The men had attended at least 25 group meetings of PEACE. It would have been ideal to interview these men right after their last group meeting, but the realization that the men would be more likely to refuse to participate because the interview would be on their own time discouraged that approach. It was more plausible to use the group time the week before their last group to interview them; in that manner they did not have to schedule personal time. Using this time slot would allow the men to obtain group-meeting credit for the time they spent answering questions for this study. Heather Rakoczy (1997) suggested that the men would be more apt to agree to be interviewed if they were not required to do so on their personal time.

In choosing to study the men who have been court-mandated to PEACE, I ensure that they all have been through a similar labeling process and have been exposed to the same educational program. This labeling process generally consists of a man having physically battered his partner, the police having arrested him, his having been sent to
jail, and his having endured a court hearing in which the judge determined that he be placed on probation and in the PEACE program.

I randomly chose 13 batterers who were court-mandated to PEACE and who had completed at least 25 groups during the time frame allotted for this study. In-depth interviews were conducted with each man and were recorded on audio-tape. Participants were guaranteed confidentiality, and their names are altered in this paper. They were required to sign a consent form stating that their participation was voluntary, that the interview had no repercussions on their group standing, and that they were informed that they could refuse to cooperate at any time. The interview questions focused on 11 specific points or events in the men's experiences. A description of the model created for this study follows.

**Model of Events**

The model of events depicts experiences most of the men in this study have endured. The first three events include violent incidents that occurred in the distant past and the arresting incident that brought them to PEACE. The events consist of the first time violent in any intimate relationship, first time violent in the PEACE relationship, and the PEACE arresting incident. These may be the same incident or they may be three separate incidents. The fourth event in the model is the police being summoned to the scene where the violence occurred. The fifth, sixth, and seventh events pertain to the arresting process and consist of the arrest, going to jail, and the court hearing. The next three events (eighth, ninth, and tenth) are returning to their home, work, and community after being arrested for domestic violence. These events were applicable for the men only if the people in the place to which they returned knew them before the arrest and
knew about the arrest; therefore, the other people’s reactions and how their reactions affected the men’s self-concepts can be examined. Returning home was applicable if the men returned to their immediate family--partner and children or parents’ home. Returning to work was applicable if the men returned to the same work they had had before the arrest and if people at work knew about the arrest. Returning to the community was applicable if the men were a part of some organization, church, or school in which people knew about the arrest. The eleventh event examined in the model is the PEACE experience.

All men in this study have physically battered their partners, been arrested and sent to jail, attended a court hearing for the offense, and are about to graduate from the PEACE program. The other events may or may not be applicable for a particular man, but all the men have been formally labeled as batterers by the court system. For each event questions were asked pertaining to the respondent’s self-concept at the time (entitled controller or batterer) and now looking back, who was present, whether anyone treated him as a batterer, and whether he thought of himself as a batterer. These questions were designed to uncover the catalysts that may have caused these men to redefine themselves from entitled controllers to batterers. Items 12h and 14 of the questionnaire were used to draw out the men’s attitudes about PEACE--their evaluation of the program and how it benefited them. The basic interview guide is located in Appendix F. The consent form appears in Appendix G. A figure depicting the 11 experience points is located in Appendix H.

**Respondents’ Demographics**

Respondents ranged in age from 20 to 49 with a mean age of 33.7 and a median age
of 34. Only one man had attended graduate school, three of the men had at least one year of college completed, seven had graduated from high school, one had his G.E.D., and two had not finished high school. Regarding annual income, four of the men were in the $0 to $7,500 range, five in the $7,501 to $12,500 range, three in the $12,501 to $17,500 range, none in either the $17,501 to $22,500 or $22,501 to $27,500 range, and only one fell in the $27,501 or more range. Ten (77%) of the men were European-American and three (23%) were African-American, which is proportional to PEACE’s overall ethnic make-up--73% European-American, 24% African-American, 2% Hispanic, and 1% other, according to Susan Canon, PEACE’s Executive Director (1998). See Appendix H for complete demographic information. The remainder of this thesis is devoted to the findings and conclusions of this study.
CHAPTER V
FINDINGS

During the interviews the 13 men were asked to define their self-perceptions at each of the 11 events in the model. The apparent candor and openness from most of the men was appreciated and informative. The interviews took about two hours each and took place during their regular group time. Although two of the men had to cancel their original interview dates, they insisted on rescheduling even though that meant they would have already graduated and had no real obligation to come to PEACE anymore.

This chapter has three sections: definitions and self-perceptions, results from the model of events, and respondents' evaluations of PEACE. The definitions and self-perceptions section describes the men's own definitions of battering and how they see themselves according to those definitions. That section is followed by the primary findings of the study, which are derived from the model of events. The chapter closes with a description of how the men evaluated the PEACE program and its effects on them.

Definitions and Self-Perceptions

The men's self-perceptions are at the very heart of this study. In order to understand the men's perceptions about being batterers or not, we must know what the words, battering and batterer, mean to them. Throughout this thesis battering has been defined as "an obsessive campaign of coercion and intimidation designed to dominate and control a woman by a man, that occurs in the personal context of intimacy and thrives in the
sociopolitical climate of patriarchy (Goetting forthcoming), which is consistent with present literature and PEACE’s definition. However, in order for me to understand the ideology of the men as they explained their actions and self-perceptions, I needed to know their own definitions.

At the very beginning of the interview, respondents were asked to define battering and batterer in their own words. For most of the men some type of physical violence was a prerequisite for the definition of battering.

Battering is being physically violent with another person. (Jerry)

Any physical abuse that is inflicted on your partner. (Joe)

Battering is using any kind of abuse toward another individual to get what you want. (Barry)

I would say hitting someone against their will. (Lee)

Is when you [are] abusing someone, beating on a female--mainly female. (Red)

I guess where a man or a woman lose control of their self and beats on someone else (Don)

Some of the men included emotional or mental battering, but the majority considered only physical violence as battering.

I would say just hitting, slapping, or doing anything physically abusive to your partner. There doesn't necessarily have to be any physical violence. I guess it could also be mental. (Leroy)

Battering can be physical, and I think it can also be emotional--words, calling names. (Bob)

It ranges from aggravating someone or consistently bugging someone to physical beating. (Mike)

Only three men (Joe, Red, and Leroy) made the specification that physical battering can occur to only female partners; the rest of the men stated that battering could be done to
any individual.

When I asked for their definition of a batterer, physical violence along with regularity was a necessary component for five of the men.

A person that abuses someone you know kinda on a regular basis, I suppose sets a pattern for themselves. (Lee)

Somebody who continues to beat on someone. (Don)

Someone who goes around beating people up. (Jerry)

A batterer is an aggressive person, a bully going around finding victims to insult, to harm, to hurt feelings or emotions, to lose one's temper--a vindictive person is a batterer sorta speaking that type of things. (Mike)

A batterer is someone who does it regularly. (Rocky)

All of the men denied being "that" type (regularly violent) of batterer. They admitted to being a batterer when the definition was limited to singular or infrequent physical violence; but when it included regular use of violence, all rejected the label. This narrow definition may have been used in an attempt to minimize their actions by stating that they may have been violent but at least they were not repeatedly violent.

Inconsistencies and contradictions became apparent early in the interviewing process. This discrepancy is consistent with previous research in which men who batter have been interviewed (Ptacek 1988); the men would vascillate back and forth between accepting and not accepting responsibility for their actions. The men in this study showed the same kind of fluctuation. Although the men I interviewed were inconsistent and contradictory in their perceptions of themselves and their definitions of battering, all thirteen claimed responsibility for their violent actions and admitted that they could have acted nonviolently toward their partners. One clear example of the contradictions occurred when I asked
Jerry how he perceived himself.

I define a batterer as someone who has been physically violent to another person. Do I consider myself as one? Well as bad as I have to say it—yes I was convicted of it, but I don't go around just beating up people. No, I've never really thought of myself as a batterer. So I guess if you hit your partner and you label that as a batterer, well, yes, I'm a batterer. When I was convicted, I still didn't think of myself as a batterer, you know, and I still don't today. But, the thing about when you asked me did I think I was--well now I sit here and think I was convicted of it; therefore, I must be a batterer, but so if I think of it that way--yes I am. But, if I think of it as me being in the relationship with a woman and me beating her up--no I'm not a batterer....I don't have fights with my partners and beat them up--there has been one or two incidents in all my relationships...and at those times I was struck first, and it was more reaction than it was. I hate to say this but I didn't hurt her that bad--and here we go minimizing and denying from class you know--I don't know what to say!

An example of inconsistency was displayed when I asked Mike about his perceptions of his violence and whether he considered himself a batterer.

Battering ranges from aggravating someone or consistently bugging someone to physical beating. A batterer is a person who is persistent, obnoxious, possible self-seeking, an inability to have regards for others. At times I consider myself one because at times....I will be persistent to try to make the situation justified--or to get my so-called rights back or whatever. Basically I'm not a batterer, I mean in a physical sense. Sometimes I have a very short tongue, and I voice my opinions and my beliefs...I don't go out looking for people to batter, I'm not a trouble maker...but as far as to try to be consistently domineering over people and controlling of other people by threats--physical force--no. So, if that explains it...a batterer is a person who is out of control--I mean who wants to control. He thinks everything is somebody else's fault. Like I've said before, I know I have battered. I'm not a person who goes around looking for someone to batter. Am I a batterer? No it's not one of my qualities or one of my character defects. No, I have a tendency to defend myself--at one time maybe yes I was a very abusive person....A batterer to me is an aggressive person or bully, the word batterer means a vindictive person--which I am not. A batterer, physically, yes I realize that I had been physically...but I didn't want to be. An intentional batterer--no; a non-intentional batterer--yes.

These two men seemed to switch back and forth from seeing themselves as batterers to seeing their actions as justified, even though they later admitted they could have handled the situation nonviolently. At the first of the interview four other men were like Mike and Jerry, in that they admitted to being or having been batterers and then later, during the
interview, changed their definition of the word, denying being or having been batterers.

An additional six men initially admitted to being or having been batterers and remained firm in that statement. Other definitions of a batterer used by the men included such descriptions as lacking self-discipline; being “persistent, obnoxious, possibly self-seeking, no regards for others;” taking advantage of other people in a physical way; and using physical violence to achieve goals. Bob was one who used to think regularity was needed to be a batterer, but he now no longer thinks that.

Yes, some might think a batterer. You know, when I used to hear that term, I would think well that’s someone who beats their spouse, usually a man who beats his wife...I used to think of that as a REAL bad term, which it is anyway, but I used to think well that’s someone who beats up on someone ALL the time but that’s not necessarily what I think it is now. I mean, if you raise your hand to hurt anyone or I think you can batter someone without actually touching them--emotional abuse goes pretty far.

When I asked the question "Do you consider yourself a batterer?" at the very beginning of the interview, all but one added qualifiers either directly after the question or later in the interview. Lee was the only one who stated a definite no.

Ah, no because well in my particular case I feel I was provoked into the anger that it was almost to a point of no return. I realize now that I shouldn't have done what I did. I should have just left, but it wasn't something that I got my jollies out of, you know. It wasn't something that I wanted to do or enjoyed doing. I felt bad about it before, during, and after so I wouldn't consider myself a batterer.

However, Lee did go on to admit that he had felt like a batterer or at least "a bad guy" after the first violent incident in any intimate relationship and after the arresting incident that brought him to PEACE. Other men explained that they perceived themselves as batterers at one time or in the past, as in the following:

I was, so obviously the potential is in there....I have used physical violence.  
(Lobo)
I was, I don't now, but I was. I did...you know how they talk about alcohol—once you're an alcoholic, you always are an alcoholic. But, I guess I'll always be a batterer because I've DONE it, but I don't think it will ever get to that point again...I don't think of myself as a batterer now. I think of myself as I was a batterer and still have the potential to be but am not going to be—I've made a different choice! (Bob)

At one time I did because I was very abusive. (Red)

Yes, at times....I don't go out looking for people to batter....I'm not the kind of guy who walks in and asks my wife why aren't the fries a little bit more crispy—I'm going to whoop your ass over it....At one time maybe yes I was a very abusive person....I was an unintentional batterer—in that sense I was a batterer. A batterer physically yes I realize that I had been physically. (Mike)

Joe and Leroy stated that they consider themselves batterers now because they have been violent to their partners. Joe sums it up for both by saying:

I think a batterer is someone who had any violent incident with his partner, that goes into unwanted touching, unwanted kissing, you know, any kind of violence....Yes, I would have to I consider myself a batterer based on the answer I have given you. You know I don't like that title, but you know it's a fact that's what I am right now. You know it kinda sounds, "batterer," you know it [the word] sounds bad—but that's what I am.

Results from the Model of Events

After the definitions of battering and batterer were explored, the interview turned to inquiring about actual violent incidents, how the men perceived themselves afterwards, and then to how they perceived themselves at the other 10 points in the model (See Appendix G). The first three events were examined because of the possibility that the men may have viewed themselves as batterers before they were formally labeled as such.

Violent Incidents in Intimate Relationships

There were three different categories of violent incidents in intimate relationships examined for each man: the first time violent in any intimate relationship, first time violent in the relationship that brought him to PEACE, and the arresting incident that resulted in PEACE. For four of the men (Barry, Joe, Homer, and Rocky), these three categories
were the same incident, which means that the arresting incident that resulted in PEACE was the first time ever violent with a partner. For Bob, Lobo, Leroy, and O.J., the first time violent in any relationship and the first time violent in the relationship that brought them to PEACE was the same incident, while the arresting incident was with the same partner but a different incident. Red and Mike's arresting incident that brought them to PEACE was the first time they had been violent in that relationship; however, they had been violent before with another partner but had not been sentenced to PEACE. The remaining three men (Lee, Don, and Jerry) had three different violent incidents; the first time violent in any relationship was with a different partner than the one that they were with when sentenced to PEACE; in addition, they had been previously violent with the PEACE partner. It is interesting to note that alcohol was involved in only four of the arresting incidents that resulted in PEACE (Red, Leroy, Don, and Rocky). Red stated that even though he had been drinking before the incident, "you CAN'T BLAME the alcohol for your actions, you know!" That perspective on alcohol and domestic violence is stressed in PEACE classes.

When I asked whether the violent incident or incidents caused the men to think of themselves as batterers at the time of the incident, all but Joe stated yes in some form or another. However, when I asked about their first time violent either with the PEACE partner or with another partner, they stated they were not sure at the time of the incident what the word batterer meant but that they knew something was wrong.

No, because I didn't really know what it was about--what battering was. I mean you constantly heard just that a man and his woman was into it again, you know, an old remedy. (Don)

I thought well you know when it first started happening. I thought well this is normal. Everyone has arguments; everyone has fights but I misunderstood--everyone
doesn't do that. And I thought well it was something we had to live with....I thought that violence would get my point across. I thought that that would make my partner listen to me more, but she listened to me less. I lost love, lost respect, and tore our relationship up or did damaging things to it. (Bob)

I figured everybody slapped their wife--I mean that is how STUPID I was. (Leroy)

I guess in certain terms I did. I didn't even know what to define myself, you know. I just knew at that point that I wasn't happy because I couldn't live with the situation--an idea like that (batterer) was just lost. I didn't know what I was or what I needed to do. (Mike)

No maybe because of denial. Like I said I just felt like I was a desperate man, you know, like the old saying--desperate times calls for desperate measures. (Joe)

For two of the men the only recognition of their inappropriate behavior was the fear that they were following their "father's footsteps." When I asked Leroy, "Why did he feel it was okay to be violent in his first relationship?" he responded "I'm not really sure. That's a good question--I guess I thought it was the thing to do at the time cause that's the way I had seen my father do and I assumed that was how you did it." As regards that same incident, he added:

Yes, it caused me to think of myself as a batterer because I had seen my father do it, and I thought of him as a batterer or a least a bad guy, and I knew I was going down the same road....Every time that I slapped my wife, I just knew that I didn't want to turn out like my father. He is a great man, don't misunderstand, but he was a batterer also....So I knew I was turning out just like him, and I didn't want to.

Moreover, O.J. declared that he thought of himself as a batterer because of his father's abusive behavior.

Yea, well no, well yea, I did think of myself as a batterer because I knew what I did was wrong. Not at the time, but I knew it was wrong because I grew up watching my dad hit my mom and hit us and stuff. I grew up in an environment like that and saw stuff like that, and I knew it wasn't right, but for some reason or another I went to it.

In addition to their fear of turning out like their fathers, other events caused those men to
view themselves as batterers before any formal authority declared them as such. The events included were as follows: the men's partners showing fear toward them after the incident, the family of either side or neighbors and friends finding out about the incident, the severity of the violence during the incident, and the realization this type of violence could happen to a loved one—a mother or a daughter.

It changed her perspective when she looked at me, you know. It took her awhile to get over it. She was scared for the longest time that I was going to hit her again. (O.J)

My boys, like I said, were pretty leery. You know, [they were] kinda afraid, and my wife, she was afraid of me for a while, too. (Leroy)

The final incident caused her family to lose respect for me. That is still a consequence. They still have trouble forgiving me, and I don't go over there anymore because they don't want me over there...My father probably thought negatively of me. (Bob)

I have a lot of respect for my father. It bothered me because I've worn a mask, you know with my father for a long time. There were lots of things that came out--the open marriage came out, so with all those things my family were extremely disappointed....It would just be remembering times I was violent; it would be the violence. (Lobo Negro)

I backhanded her. I hit her in the nose and she started bleeding and stuff. That just scared me to death....My dad just loved her, and he couldn't believe that I did that. I felt really small....I was embarrassed to tell anyone. I mean just hitting her, it was the wrong thing to do. (Lee)

I buste her nose. I felt real bad,...running through the house getting towels and ice 'cause she was really bleeding....For a certain length of time if they see that you raise your voice or something, then they would look and say, 'Well, I gotta go.' I felt like, you know, they must think I'm going to do something, like right now! Because of the neighbors I could probably be outside wrestling with my daughter (16 years old), and I guarantee the police would be there....My partner was real jittery and nervous around me....I was ashamed to face her mother and my mother. (Red)

Her (my partner) kids were pretty upset with me....It was their momma, and I told them that I would never do that again, but they didn't act the same around me....But then I realize that my mom put up with a lot when my father was alive, and she puts up with her boyfriend....I wouldn't want him hurting my mom so I understand what
those kids felt—I don't want my mom treated like that so I won't treat my wife like that. I know I was doing wrong; and I know that if I keep living that life, I would never make it nowhere, and I know I would NEVER have nobody in my life. It only takes one time, and word spreads around that he is an abuser and a batterer. I know I have to make a change in my life. (Homer)

Now I think, 'What if I had a daughter,' you know, and somebody put their hands on her in some kind of way. I can just sit there and picture what I would do to that guy if that ever happen, you know, so I feel guilty most of the times....I still feel guilty, you know, [and] I still say, ‘What if I had a daughter!’ (Joe)

**Police Being Summoned**

The next event in the model is the police being summoned to the arresting incident that resulted in PEACE. This event was not as influential for most as the actual arrest; however, it was significant for some. Four of the men turned themselves in to the police, and a couple ran from the police for a few days before being brought in or turning themselves in to the police. Two of the men (Lobo and Leroy) stated that their children called the police. Both stated that at that time they couldn't believe it and were upset but now say it was the best thing the children could have done. Leroy stated, "I was very surprised and shocked that they did call the police, but as I think back it was the smartest thing to do." During the incident he had also slapped his two sons who were trying to protect their mother. Lobo's daughter called after hearing her mom and him arguing in their bedroom. "She is 14....She didn't know [what was going on]--the doors were locked, but she could hear us. I believe she could hear something not the words....So she was concerned for her mom. I think she did the right thing,...still do, and I told her that."

Only two of the men (Leroy and Rocky) stated that this event caused them to perceive themselves as batterers. Leroy claimed he felt like a batterer due to the police being summoned by his children. Rocky stated he turned himself in to the police;
therefore, the police were not summoned. Most of the men’s partners summoned the police, except in five incidents in which the man’s child or bystanders called the police. Six of the partners wanted to drop the charges against the men, but that is not allowed in Tennessee. This restriction is part of a community effort by the state and local governments to ensure that protection for domestic abuse victims is being enforced. The men in my study made reference to the fact that their partners wanted to drop charges but were not able to so the men appeared to refocus their anger from their partner to the court system in general. The men seemed to take the law and its attitude toward domestic-violence offenders very seriously and planned on never making the same mistake again, which is the whole point of such law. This attitude was very apparent throughout the interview, especially while focusing on the incidents that involved authority figures—arrest, jail, court hearing, and PEACE.

The Arrest

The arrest made three of the men (Barry, Leroy, and Bob) feel like batterers because of the actual arrest procedure. Leroy stated that the police came to his house and handcuffed him in front of his sons. "That was a pretty bad feeling." Barry and Lobo had never been arrested before so this event was more significant to them than to most. Even though Lobo stated that he thought of himself as a batterer before the actual arrest incident, he added that the arrest reinforced this knowledge. Barry stated that the entire process--involving the arrest, going to jail, and attending the court hearing--had a big impact on him.

The rest of the men had been arrested before for either domestic violence or other crimes. Four of the men (Red, Mike, Homer, and Don) had been arrested previously for
domestic violence. They either had received jail time or probation or the charges were dropped. These events occurred many years before PEACE was set up, and some happened in other states where there is no state law to indict the perpetrator. Red was the only one who had served any significant jail time on a previous domestic violence charge. He had served 18 months for aggravated assault, which means he had used a weapon in the incident. Nine of the men had been arrested previously for other types of crimes, which included driving under the influence of alcohol, public intoxication, fighting, assaulting a police officer, and driving without a license. Most of these charges were followed with a few days in jail and fines; three charges were dismissed (Rocky, Joe, and Lee).

When I asked how these men felt about the police involved with their arrest, all but three (Red, Don, and Mike) stated that the police were just doing their jobs and that they were generally "humane" and "respectful" toward them. Barry stated that the police acted nonchalantly about the whole process.

The whole place was full of police. The arresting officer was just getting off work. He was more apologetic than anything...he said, "I just have one more arrest and I'm going home." He was fair; he had a job to do.

Joe also described the police as acting like "it was just another day at the office." In Red's case he was upset because he thought the police used unnecessary force to take him even though he did not make them search for him when he knew they had been summoned by his partner: "Well they didn't have to tell me to get down on the ground and all that because, you know, I stayed there and waited for them because she was bleeding pretty bad, and I was determined that I was not going to leave." The police may have been extra precautionary because of his previous prison record and his prior use of weapons. Mike and
Don were upset because the police did not seem to listen to their version of events and they had to pay a large amount of money for bail. The financial loss due to bail and court fees is the first consequence the majority of the men discuss when asked about outcomes of their violence. Joe stated that the police did not treat him badly; it was just the procedure of being arrested. "Yea they did the fingerprinting and the booking thing with pictures, making you feel like a murderer, check for tattoos and all that." O.J. was arrested at his home while the whole family was at dinner. He stated that he felt "embarrassed, I felt like I was an inch tall. I thought the whole world was against me."

When he was brought to the station he stated that the police did not have to treat him as a batterer; he already felt like one: "Well no, they didn't have to. They just asked me if I had any bruises, scares, tattoos, and the way they looked at you like you are an asshole. I asked the cop can I use the phone real quick, and they just look at you like you are a piece of shit you know." He may have projected what he was feeling about himself onto what he perceived the police to be thinking about him. Having either family members or neighbors seeing the police cars at their house made a big impact on many of the men.

The arresting procedure involves the actual arrest and the men being brought to the police station and being put in a holding cell with other accused criminals until processing. Processing includes fingerprinting and having their pictures taken. Either they are released from jail with bail or bond, which ensures their return for a court hearing, or they are given an orange jumpsuit and taken to the main jail to spend the night. The next event to be discussed is the jail experience. Jail time was experienced by all the men; however, some stayed in longer than others did.

Jail

The men were jailed immediately after being arrested and released usually within
hours on bond pending sentencing. The minimum amount of presentencing jail-time was 30 minutes for Leroy and the maximum amount of time was two days in Jerry's case. Jerry and Lee both had to do more time later as part of their sentence or as a result of probation violation. Jerry had to do 106 days before starting PEACE, and Lee had to do 10 days. Six of the men felt that the jail experience caused them to see themselves as batterers mainly because they were actually in jail for their actions. Leroy felt like a batterer because of the bail money he had to produce. "Reality finally set in. I just paid $700 to get out, and that was really hitting home." Bob stated, "I think I learned from it. It definitely was a negative effect, it would get your attention. I think it's going to help me from taking those actions again as one part of it because I don't want to go to jail again. It was a learning process I guess you'd say." Jail caused Homer to see himself as a batterer because "I know if I don't change my life I won't have anyone in it....I got two choices in life: I could keep going down this road and do my life in jail, or I could change my life so I decided to change my life."

All the men stated that jail was not a good experience. Barry even went so far as to describe it as being similar to Vietnam:

It reminded me of going to Vietnam, survival and concentration camps. [It was like] being incarcerated in a small room without any clothes on, about 105 degrees. The room being made of metal, like a chicken shack....You have to be on your knees, and you have to go to the bathroom in a can, and you're with a bunch of other guys....It was almost like that.

Most did not think it was that bad, but they described rough conditions:

Sitting in jail with no phone, people sleeping up underneath the bed, bums from the side of the road--I felt like SHIT. I felt bad. (O.J.)

It was hot and crowded. It was hard to sit down, and it stunk. And then there were a lot of street people with all different body odors. (Don)

It was just nasty and dirty. (Red)

I'll tell you what, the longer you are there, it gets better, the way you are treated. The first time you get put in it's terrible because they don't give you a pillow or blanket, [and] you have nowhere to lay down. It's like you are on a cement slab; I mean, its
cold. It's like living in a dungeon or something. It's terrible! That's why you want to get out; I think that's why it's like that because they help you call somebody and get out. But once you are in there and you get sentenced for a certain amount of time...you get sent...where it is clean and modern and you are treated somewhat like a human. (Lee)

When asked how they were treated in jail by the police, guards, or other inmates, most said they were either ignored or treated poorly.

You know, you eat when they tell you to eat [and] shower when you can. They give you orange jumpsuit, and if it's too big you wear it anyway. (Red)

I was treated like an ape. They just keep us locked down, it was pretty bad, roaches all over the floor. (O.J.)

I was treated poorly, but looking from the standpoint that they deal with criminals everyday [it wasn't too bad]. But, I still don't agree with some of the things they did....But, when someone turns himself in, I would think they could show them a little respect. At least you didn't have to chase them down....I didn't like jail; I don't like getting in closed elevators. (Rocky)

Bob and Lobo stated that the police or guards seemed to pretty much ignore them, but the other inmates did not. "Other prisoners would try to intimidate me, and I ignored them and just didn't let them (Lobo)." Bob remembered how other inmates treated him when they found out what he was in for.

I remember talking to other inmates and, you know, lots of guys in jail will say, 'What did you do,' and things like that and I was kinda afraid to say what I did. But, I eventually did and, of course, I got some harsh looks, you know, and some guys looked like they wanted to beat me up and stuff....I guess some people, even though, you know, a crime is a crime they look harder at certain types of crimes than others...They may have been in there for possession of 10 pounds of cocaine, but, you know, mine in their eyes was worse. (Bob)

Joe was the only one whom jail did not seem to bother. He stated that he was treated "you know not good and not bad, just like another number" and that his stay was so short; he knew he was getting out soon.

Their partners bailed out five of the men; the others called friends or family members to bail them out of jail. The court hearing is the next event in the model; it occurred at
least two weeks after release from jail. Some of the men waited three months for the hearing. During that time some of the men remained with their partners at home, some stayed with their parents, and some had their own places or stayed in hotel rooms.

**Court Hearing**

The court hearing was a significant event for seven of the men, who stated it caused them to think of themselves as batterers. These men explained that the actual hearing caused their change in self-perception.

Being there, and it got me thinking about the times I have slapped my wife in the past. (Leroy)

Yes, because I was being sentenced for it and I wouldn't have been there if I hadn't done something....It got my attention. I think it actually helped me in the long run, I was scared, I was uncertain. I think it was eventually beneficial. (Bob)

Yes, because I plead guilty. (Rocky)

I felt like one in court, looking around at all the other people there for the same thing. Getting accused and being put on probation--I felt like a batterer. (Lee)

When I asked about the men's feelings and reactions toward their lawyers and the judges associated with their cases, most thought they were "doing their job" and that the judge was fair. Leroy and Red stated that they were appreciative of the judge for giving them PEACE:

I really do appreciate the judge giving me the chance to come to PEACE instead of putting me in jail. I don't like him, don't misunderstand me, but I do appreciate the chance he gave me. (Leroy)

I feel real grateful for the PEACE program....Well it's not that I'm scared to go to jail, but this right here [PEACE] has helped me more than just lying over there locked up in jail. You know, it's taught me how to deal with problems and relationships. (Red)

Rocky explained that he was very pleased with the judge. "Based on what he was told I think he was very fair." In this particular court the men seemed to have a greater chance
at getting a female district attorney or a female judge; therefore, a few of the men talked about how they just gave up “fighting the system” because they felt they could not be judged fairly. However, the results were consistent no matter who was the judge. Joe even commented that he had a female district attorney and female judge, and he thought "they would really take it to the limit or whatever, but she didn't." Don, on the other hand, exclaimed, "I don't know, you got a woman judge, you got a woman DA, women--it was all women so I was like I'm going to plead guilty, and let's get it over with. I mean I was guilty of doing that (the violence) anyway." Jerry seemed to agree by explaining that the female district attorney "had it in for him" and the female judge did not want to hear what he had to say. Everyone stated that the court experience was "nerve shattering," an "emotional roller-coaster," and overall pretty scary for them. The next event covered in the interview was returning home after being arrested and sentenced in court.

Returning Home

Only men who returned home to their partners or to other family members were questioned in this category. Nine men met these requirements--six returned to their partners and immediate families, two returned to their parents' houses, and one started seeing a new partner who knew about the arrest. The other four men had their own places, or the partner had moved out before they were released from jail. Returning home was a significant event for five of the men (Bob, Red, Homer, Rocky, and Leroy). Bob moved in with his parents after the incident occurred but later returned to his wife and two sons. Rocky, Red, Homer, and Leroy returned to their partners directly after being released from jail. All five men stated that their partners and children acted differently around them, changed in some way.
My oldest daughter just kinda stared at me, you know. Lisa was nervous and real jumpy like. (Red)

My boys, like I said, were pretty leery. You know [they were] kinda afraid, and my wife, she was afraid for awhile. I know we didn't sleep in the same bed for, I guess a month....Yea, attitudes toward me changed. It was kinda like “watch out,” walking on eggshells. It wasn't a comfortable feeling at all. (Leroy)

Well, the kids were afraid, and she was afraid too. She didn't talk to me too much because she was scared I was going to just snap on her, you know. (Homer)

With my partner and kids--it changed in a way that she lost some respect for me; lost some love for me....She was scared of me. (Bob)

Julie would threaten to call the police to get her way. That made me think of myself as a batterer because she could do it and get away with it. That's what the lawyer told me, that if I looked at her wrong she could call the police and I could go to jail and be in serious trouble. (Rocky)

Tension and fear from partners and disappointment from other family members were common reactions according to the other men; however, it was not as significant for them as it was for the five above. Bob stated that returning home caused him to view himself as a batterer because of the tension between him and his partner and the reality of having to move in with his parents after the incident. Red stated that it was the tension and the fact that his neighbors would look at him and know what he did. Leroy and Homer were affected mostly by their partners' and their children's reactions. The next event examined was returning to work and the interactions there. This category was applicable only to men who were employed at the same place before and after the incident and whose arrest was known by someone at work.

Returning to Work

Nine men met the requirements of this category. The other four either were unemployed at the time of the incident, or no one at work knew that they had been
arrested for domestic violence. Homer was fired due to the incident occurring on work premises although he stated that his coworkers and boss were supportive of him. Out of the nine men whose work situations were applicable, only three (Bob, Barry, and Red) stated that returning to work caused them to think of themselves as batterers. This self-perception resulted from how they felt when coworkers and supervisors found out and how the work situation changed.

I was embarrassed. I was so embarrassed that I didn't think it was necessary to tell ALL the stuff....Some of them [coworkers] sympathized with me. Some of them were very supportive, and then others just didn't say anything. So, if they don't say anything, I'm thinking, you know, well they have an opinion [and] they don't want to voice so I take that kinda negative. Yes, it made me think of myself as a batterer when I had to tell people about it. (Bob)

I was doing construction then. It was just before the band's touring season, and my boss treated me very terrible. He didn't respect me much after that because the police had called him and told him I was picked up for domestic violence. I had to take off work for court....His wife would give everyone their paychecks, and she would hardly ever talk to me. She used to talk to me a lot; but when I would go to get paid, she would just hand me the check....They didn't know the situation. They just knew I was arrested. The guys in the band were more cold to me than normal. I think they had lost respect for me. Work changed by [it] not feeling very comfortable and [me] not being treated the same as I was before it happened. There was definitely a change. (Barry)

When I returned to work, I was told that, because you know my partner is a white female, they said, “Well hey, here come O.J. back to work!”’ I was told that, and I'd say, “Well, you know, y'all taking it as a joke, but it's not funny!” That was when my boss man he called me into the office and kinda ragged me out....They [coworkers] said you ought to be ashamed of yourself. You need to quit all that bullshit. Some of the women told me that you're a woman beater. You're a woman beater....That made me feel real bad especially, you know, when you think about that you have daughters....Returning to work made me think of myself as a batterer because I knew I has to face them at work and [face] what I had done. (Red)

The other men who qualified for the event but did not change their self-perception stated that even though their coworkers and supervisors knew they had been arrested, nothing changed at work. The men commented on how others did not really seem to care what
had happened to them just as long as it did not disrupt their work. When I asked Mike how he felt about his coworkers' nonchalant attitudes he stated,

I couldn't relate to them on a healing level or a growth-type of level. In other words, the "good ole boys" they seen it for something you got in trouble about. It wasn't something that could be done about....It was just the idea that she deserved it....It was hard for me to say, "Well I screwed up," which would cause them to say that they were screwing up too, which they are not going to say....One time they asked me about PEACE, and I said that it helps you try to deal with your anger and they said, "Well, I KNOW how to deal with it--with fists."

Returning to the Community

The return to the community caused only Barry to view himself as a batterer. He described the event as a reinforcement of what he had already accepted about himself. For the purpose of this study the community could consist of church, school, neighborhood, or any organizations with which the men were involved. It was stipulated that the members of the designated community had to have knowledge of the arrest. Two of the men (Rocky and Mike) used their Alcoholics Anonymous meetings to represent their community, Barry used his church and Sunday school, and Joe used his neighborhood. The other nine men did not meet the requirements, either because they did not belong to a church or an organization or the other members in the community did not know they had been arrested.

Barry explained that his Sunday School knew he had been arrested and were supportive of him and of his efforts to change. He stated, "I felt pretty good that people in my church could receive me with open arms like that." However, he did admit to "feeling uncomfortable and ashamed for being caught for something like that and being charged and arrested." He explained that he had attended another church after the incident because he "couldn't go back to that part of my community" due to stalking
charges made against him. Joe used the neighborhood in which he grew up to represent his community. Even though the people knew he had been arrested, they were supportive of his actions.

I guess most of them [friends in the neighborhood] had gone through the same situation so, you know, your friends are the last ones who are going to tell you you were wrong. They were all behind me 100 percent, you know, laughing....It was sad, but it was funny to most of them....They would say stuff like, “I hate when they [women] do that,” and, “You should have kicked her behind.” That made me seem like I was justified, and it helped me deal with the guilt that I was putting on myself.

Rocky and Mike explained how they felt when people at AA found out about the arrest.

They had all been there and done that so they listened....They were supportive of me, and I would ask for their opinions on how to deal with a certain situation....A lot of the women who attended AA would say, “Honey you didn't do that bad.” Not trying to say what I did was o.k., but I'm like that's at the point where I said, “Well, hell, I didn't beat the living you know what out of her.” (Rocky)

Yes, I was shy about saying things because I didn't want the women to, for their lack of understanding and even the men for their lack of understanding about the situation, feel they needed to judge....The people in AA, a lot of them could relate. Some of them, who were in the same situation, seemed confused. (Mike)

The nearly void category of returning to the community demonstrates that the men were not socially involved in their communities. This absence of involvement in any type of organization, except for possibly work, could have had a negative effect on the men’s self-perceptions. That may be one reason PEACE had such an overwhelmingly positive effect on the men. They were finally a part of some social organization that was accepting of them as people, along with challenging their sexist ideas at the same time. The men felt able to discuss topics that normally would not be brought up in other social settings, even with close friends and family members. However, most of the men did not feel this way about PEACE until at least five weeks into the program. The court-mandated factor and the financial stress involved slowed their acceptance of the program.
Eleven out of the thirteen men in the study stated that the PEACE program caused them to view themselves as batterers. The only two men who did not (Lee and Jerry) stated they still learned various "tools" so they would not be controlling and abusive in future relationships. The eleven men who did find that PEACE helped them view themselves and their actions as abusive stated four reasons: the program curriculum, the other members, the co-facilitators or staff persons, and the group structure. PEACE's program curriculum includes educational information that challenges sexist ideas and provides anger management techniques, and the power and control wheel, which defines battering. Joe and Bob explained that you have to want to change for the program to truly work; this desire to change may not occur immediately but for most of the men in this study it did occur at some point during the program.

It's all in a person's attitude whether they want to use what the program teaches or refuse it, and I decided to use it....I think some guys do a little better, even if they don't want to learn from it. But, you have to conform yourself and your attitudes and actions, but that attitude had to come first because if you don't conform that attitude, your actions won't help out either. (Bob)

You kinda get out of PEACE what you put into it....Some of the guys look at it as this is what I have to do to get out under the law so "I'll fake it and I'll get out," but, you know, it [my violence] scared me, and I honestly wanted to get help. (Joe)

All eleven stated they learned something constructive either pertaining to anger management techniques such as time-outs and red flags or pertaining to a clearer understanding of battering.

I've learned too that the most important thing is to deal with my anger...I know how to deal with it instead of just acting out. I know how to take time-outs now. I know how to communicate with my partner....It helps you recognize red-flag situations; in other words, it helps you recognize things that do tick you off, and then when those things occur then you say, "Hey, that's one of my red flags." Then it helps you with
your physical cues—things that you've done maybe before you do get into a fight—
your heart races and your palms sweat. It helps me realize that o.k. I'm having
physical cues. I really need to take a time-out and, you know, you just kinda de-
escalate, and that's two of the most important things PEACE has taught me. I
already knew those things, but PEACE just helps you bring it to the surface, and you
actually apply what you already know. (Joe)

I wanted to get some insight to what I was doing or to what was going on with
me....[It] helped me stay calmer and helped to recognize the red flag
situations....PEACE educated me and helped me get rid of my ignorance and
denial....I am better about voicing my opinions and what I am feeling because of
PEACE--putting them up front instead of letting them come out sideways. (Mike)

Thought provoking....I think I've learned a lot about my behaviors, old and new. I
think I have definitely benefited. I recognized my shortcomings, recognized the
wrong behaviors, and started learning how to correct them. It's given me a lot of
tools to start using and helping me to control myself and control my actions and even
my temper....Once it shows you, hey, this is wrong, then if you DO want to do good
and DO want to change, then you can change; but you have to WANT to. (Bob)

I understand now anything physical it's not where it is at....I assumed that there was a
difference between slapping and punching, but there is not....I realize anything, it
don't have to be physical, you know, it can be emotional. There is so many forms of
abuse that I didn't know. I just had no idea. (Leroy)

Now I see it a little differently. Now if you did it [be violent] you did it. It doesn't
matter how bad or how minor her injury was, you did it! (Rocky)

The power and control wheel (see Figure 1) was also an important educational tool
that enabled the men to see the different abusive tactics that can be used in relationships.

Most of the men stated that they had used a tactic from every spoke, but using male
privilege seemed to stand out more than any other spoke. Other spokes such as emotional
abuse, intimidation, and using coercion and threats are typically not thought of as abusive.

As Barry explained, "it all cut deep in my life the way I thought a male should be." Joe
stated that he had "honestly used all those spokes in my relationship, and it was kinda
strange seeing it down on paper." Red found that learning the wheel was a very important
part of PEACE. "When I first started, it was like on the power and control wheel I'd look
at it. I never realized all that, all of each little things that I have done and still sometimes do." When the men started to realize that battering included more than just the physical aspect that is more commonly known, they were surprised at how many of these controlling tactics they had used.

The second way PEACE caused a change in self-perception was the association with other men in the group, which seemed to have a profound effect on most of the men in the study. Sharing similar stories and receiving advice from others was very constructive for the men. Most found it comforting that they were not alone with this problem; however, they were all somewhat leery and defensive when they first entered the group. The group, which is explained in detail in the methods section of this paper, consists of around 15 to 17 men at different stages in the program. It is an open program, which means that there could be men in the group who are about to graduate and there could be men who had just started the program. This design is used so that men who have just started can learn from those who have been there awhile. PEACE encourages veterans to share their knowledge and help enforce accountability among the men. Leroy stated that it helped him to know that "we are all there for the same reasons. No one is better than anyone in there. We are all the same." Bob paralleled PEACE to joining the Army. "One thing about them it's like joining the Army. You are all in the same boat. You are all at the same level right now so you can't put one down more than the other." He also stated that listening to other men is "an eye opener because you get to compare,...your case to others' cases,...that makes you look around and think about things!" Barry, Rocky, and Joe talked about how beneficial it was to hear other men talk about their problems.

I think it was a very good experience to actually see men after a long period of time get comfortable with each other and actually have emotional feelings....Talk from
their heart that they have acted violently and wrong....To hear a man say that, you don't hear that very often when hanging around other men. You don't really get into that kinda of feelings because they are more macho. (Barry)

First few times in group it was uneasy, but after the truth came out, some of the other guys who had been there for a while and accepted what they had done were able to stand there, and I started listening and started thinking....That goes back to been there and done that. It was a lot easier to talk to the guys about my situation. For them to say that's what I did, it may have worked for you and it may not work for me, but to have that thought in mind helps.(Rocky)

It is actually better than being locked up at first because you get to go through it with other guys in the same boat. You get to talk about things and get them off your chest....You like become a family....It's not one of our guy strong points, being open and communicating with a room full of guys there; but then you find yourself doing it and you like are talking about some very personal stuff with guys who at first you don't even know. But, then when you come it's like a family....It's just comforting to be able to talk about things with people who understand and not there to judge you....I could tell those guys things that I wouldn't even tell some of my best friends on the street or tell my mother. (Joe)

Most of the men stated that their facilitators did a good job and were very helpful, even when they would confront the men about their ideas. The third source of change in self-concept inspired by PEACE relates to PEACE’s facilitators or staff people. Barry stated that his female facilitator made a particular impact on him when she challenged him in the group to change his views about his actions.

The other group members confronted me by saying that I said, “I only touched her face.” [The word] “only” and I remember the female co-fac saying, “Show me what kind of touch it was. Now that could be thought of as an unwanted touch, you know, the look in your eye at the time, etc.” I think that was about the fifth week when she did that, and I realized that I DID touch her and it WAS an unwanted touch, and she had every right, and I had NO right....I knew it was her job; and probably if the female co-fac wouldn't have brought it up, I wouldn't have caught it that fast. I wouldn't have caught what I was learning.

Leroy stated that a story told by a PEACE staff person during the assessment meeting, which is held before the client starts group, really caused him to think about himself as a batterer. The story is a common theme PEACE tries to enforce in group. It deals
with how past behaviors affect present behaviors:

Well, I'll tell you, there was a little story when I first came. The very first day, before group, a staff person said, “The first time you walked in this room and I smack you on the hand with a paddle, when you go away you'll be watching me.” The next time you come in, and I just have the paddle, but I don't hit you, you are still going to be leery of that paddle. Then the third time you come in...” You know, I don't know, it just made a lot of sense, and I was like maybe that is how my wife feels....It made all the sense in the world, and I feel like I will always remember that, you know, that little story because it hit awfully close to home and it made me stop and think. That is probably how my wife and boys felt so this stuff works. I told my wife that too, and she agrees.

PEACE’s group structure was the last component of PEACE mentioned by the men that caused them to see themselves as batterers. The group structure involves the court-mandated aspect, the time frame, the honesty, and accountability that is rewarded and encouraged and the extended check-ins (see Appendix E), which are part of the requirements of the program. Joe, Don, and Bob explained that because they were court-ordered to this program, they "might as well get something out of it." This acceptance did not come immediately but occurred after a few weeks in group. Joe stated it was the eighth week for him. Don felt such antagonism toward the program that he missed the maximum amount of classes he was allowed to miss. He missed so many that he violated his probation and was almost sent to jail.

The time frame of the group meetings seemed to change a few of the men's perceptions. It was sooner for some than others depending on the amount of hostility and denial the men felt when they started group. Rocky stated it was near his fourth meeting that he "caught on to what was really going on. I started changing my thought patterns. I was responsible; I could have done something differently. That's a big help." He said this realization occurred because he started listening to the other men. Barry said it was about
five weeks into the program that he began to realize the "kind of partner I COULD be if I stop doing those little things [like] mind game and making someone feel guilty....I just started to spend a lot of time looking at the wheel and I knew I had done a lot of those things." He added that it was during his eighth week that he started to think of himself as an abuser.

That's when I really started to get hungry for information....I think that was when the co-facs brought in the newspaper clippings about a man killing his wife being let out of prison, and I realized the real sincerity and what exactly they were trying to do for us regardless for what you were in for. PEACE really has a good objective that needs to be addressed.

Don also stated that around the eighth week was a significant time for him because he finally felt comfortable enough to open up and share with the group. Homer said it was in his tenth or eleventh week that he started seeing things and understanding more about life....Some older guy in group got to talking about how you can really let things get to you,...and I started to realize that all it takes sometimes is to open your mouth and tell someone instead of trying to take it all on you."

Mike stated that it was not until his twenty-sixth week--he was court-ordered to go to 52 weeks--that the program made sense to him.

It wasn't until six months until some of it really started sinking in. Well, that was when I started looking at things like rushing to make a decision and things like that and realizing that they were also abusive behaviors....I started seeing that I had used a lot of those things.

Red, Rocky, and Barry found that the requirement to be accountable and honest in group, along with the willingness of everyone to be open about his feelings and not be in fear of judgment was a very significant aspect of the group structure. Red said, "It was real nice to get our problem out in the open, and it looks like from the time that I leave here on Saturdays....I have a beautiful week." Rocky compared group to an AA meeting,
"It's kinda like AA sometimes. After you go and get in there, it took a relief or a burden off of you—kinda a refresher to open your mind.... You don't talk about this sorta thing just anywhere." Barry stated that PEACE class reminds him of Bible School,

I don't mind going to PEACE class. It reminded me a lot of when I was younger and Bible School—never really wanting to go but then after you went and came home, you felt so much better--almost like you were able to take that week previously and bring it up in a two-hour session. A lot can come out of you in two hours, and when I leave I feel more relieved and refreshed. I feel clean again, and I'm learning a little more, and you move each time in your classes you're studying and try to apply it in living in general, and it's not hard to.

The extended check-ins that the men give every eighth week of their program was significant for the majority of the men. The check-ins are used by PEACE to have a written account of any progress the men may have from the time they enter the program to the time they graduate. It is the responsibility of the other group members as well as the facilitators to hold the men accountable during their check-ins. Some of the men take this responsibility very seriously. I was able to get a copy of the actual check-ins for most of the men in this study. There appeared to be more detail about the incidents in the men’s check-ins given in group than what they told me during the interview. While examining the check-ins, it was obvious that the men became more accountable on each progressing check-in. By the time the majority of the men graduated and did their last check-in, they had checked almost everything on the violent and controlling behavior list.

The protocol for check-ins is that the man reads his check-in aloud to the group and then anyone can comment or confront him about what he said. Homer called it the "hot seat"; thus, most of the men when they did their first check-in were very defensive and felt threatened stating that the other men were not there at the time of the incident and, therefore, could not tell them what they should have done.

I felt like nobody was really there, and so they didn't know what really actually happened. (Homer)
I was like, "Man, what do you know? Was you there?" (Don)

Joe and O.J. stated that they felt that same way; however, they realized that these comments were just opinions and that everybody is entitled to his or her opinion and that we should respect all opinions. Bob and Rocky stated that they enjoyed confronting other men during their check-ins because they felt a sense of justice for what they had to endure during their check-ins.

It felt good, felt like alright I'm going to get somebody back, or at least they deserve their fair share. If I had to come out, with it they are going to have to come out with it. (Bob)

They dread doing their extended check-in because they say I'm a little too aggressive on them....But I've had all four of the guys I grilled comment on that when they did their next check-in, they have been totally turned around...."Well, man you were hard on me, but you know I shut up and listened." And I said, "I know. I've been down that road. That's how I got to where I could tell you....Get off the 'she did it' because she didn't you did." I'll stay on somebody till I get them to see, but in a way it will help me see that I was the same mode of thinking and can get back into that same mode of thinking very easily. (Rocky)

Mike and Bob felt that they became more accountable for their battering, and their check-ins likewise reflected this the longer they were in the program.

Each check-in...I would find more and more things, you know, that I had done on the checklist on the back of the check-in....I've come to a point where I might not have admitted that on the last check-in, but I sure did admit it on this one, you know. I got a little more accountable each time, I think. (Bob)

It was painful when others confronted me, but I knew that it was necessary to see truths about myself....I loved it when someone did confront me. They didn’t realize how much they were helping me. The check-ins were a good experience because it helps me get it out of me. It helps--sometimes it’s not easy, but it’s healthy....I just know the check-ins gradually got better; the situation just gradually got clear with what was going on. (Mike)

The two men, Lee and Jerry, who did not find PEACE to be a significant event that caused them to view themselves as batterers did, however, find it to be beneficial for their
relationships. Lee stated he learned more from the other men than from the curriculum, and he added that PEACE helped him to take this type of problem (domestic violence) more seriously. However, Jerry seemed to get more out of the curriculum: identifying his red flags, learning how to take time-outs, and being exposed to the different definitions of abuse. Jerry was very angry at first about being sent to PEACE, but he said he started to accept it and “figured it might do me some good….I now realize there is no excuse for violence….PEACE tries to make you come clean and try to make you responsible for your own actions and not blame others.” He speculated it was “probably around his sixteenth week….I started listening to other people tell their stories and I started listening to the co-facs,…realizing that just because they [other men] hit their wives in an argument, that doesn't make it right.” The next section describes the men’s attitudes toward PEACE.

Respondents’ Evaluation of PEACE

The majority of respondents stated that at first they hated PEACE, they felt they did not belong there, and they thought it was a useless program motivated by profit. However, they seemed to change their perceptions of the program after they had been in it for awhile. Rocky stated that he did not feel that he had been forced to attend PEACE.

I don’t think I was forced. I was given a choice--jail or PEACE. I committed a crime and was given a choice to learn something about preventing that [from] happening again, or I could go sit down there [in jail] for awhile. Well, I took the lesser of the choice, of course….No, I wouldn’t call it forced.

Joe and Bob explained how they felt when they first started PEACE.

At first, I thought it was the dumbest thing I had ever heard of, and “Why me?” But as I attended the classes,...I really am glad....It was actually better than being locked up....I thought it was just a money-making scheme by the city to help fund different things for the city. I thought it was just a crock basically. Now, I think it’s a brilliant idea because it gives you a good perspective on your partner and the way you should treat your partner and women in general. It’s better than locking someone up and
throwing away the key because if you lock someone up, you are not going to get anything accomplished. They will be talking [about] how terrible their partner is and why it is their partner’s fault that they are in there [jail]. But, PEACE allows you to talk things out. [Talk] the whole situation with other guys that have gone through it....After you get over the denial part and you get over being angry,...I mean it’s inspiring. (Joe)

At first I didn’t like it. Then I thought, “Well, it’s just something that they do. They don’t care about rehabilitating anyone or not; they just want the money.” It’s just something to show or to point to when society says what’s being done to these people, you know. And I thought, “Well, that’s all it is.” Then when I started and really got involved in PEACE, I was like, “Well, you know, maybe they do care; or even if they don’t care, the program is here and I can either make something positive of it or not.” I thought it was just a court-ordered way to collect cash....Now, I think it is a court-ordered way to collect cash that is beneficial. I don’t mean that in a negative way--it’s a very good program. I’m glad I was forced to go through it. (Bob)

Leroy stated that at first he did not feel that he belonged in PEACE, but then the curriculum started “hitting home, you know. So, this is where I need to be, and it beats the hell out of jail!” Don, also, thought he did not belong and claimed he hated the program; now he likes it. “I’m getting help, and I feel that I’m helping somebody else, you know. Like I said, when I was arrested,...I spoke out and about nobody listened to me. But, now when I speak, everybody is looking at me; and I KNOW they are listening.” In addition, Barry thought the program was designed for somebody else. “In the beginning, I felt like I was being punished for something I...didn’t do. I didn’t know why this was all happening to me.” Now, he exclaimed that “the judge, by doing this, gives you the opportunity to learn this stuff [PEACE curriculum] while he keeps an eye on you. Truly, it’s [PEACE information] not out there anywhere else!”

At the conclusion of the interview I asked every man to rate how much he had changed due to his experiences. The scale ranged from 1, no change, to 4, completely changed. Then, I asked for the men’s definition of change. All the men attributed the
change to PEACE and the experience of being labeled as batterers. Lobo rated himself a 3 ½, while five other men (O.J., Joe, Bob, Rocky, and Barry) rated themselves a 4. The remaining men rated themselves a 3, which represents some change. When I asked for clarity about their definition of change, I received a wide variety of answers. Most dealing with a new outlook on relationships and how they control their anger. Red commented on his new alternatives to violence, “red flags and time-outs.” Leroy declared that he now considers all forms of violence the same— one violent act is not any less violent than another—and that abuse is not just physical. Homer, Don, Rocky, and Barry stated they are more respectful of other people, especially their partners, and they tend to think, now, before they act.

The next chapter analyzes the findings of this research. First, the meaning behind the inconsistencies and contradictions expressed by the respondents when asked about battering and batterers is explored. That exploration is followed by an analysis of the findings from the model of events.
CHAPTER VI

ANALYSIS

As reported in the previous section, the men were very inconsistent and contradictory about their definitions of battering and their self-perceptions as batterers. Perhaps human nature is at least partially to blame for the men not being settled on a self-identity. Self-identity may depend on mood, time of day, and present circumstances. A clue to another explanation is found in Robin Warshaw’s now classic book, *I Never Called It Rape* (1988), which reports a study of rape conducted by Mary Koss, Christine Gidycz, and Nadine Wisniewski (1987) on a national sample of U.S. college students. Koss et. al (1987) found that men who would not admit to rape would admit to forcing sex. The term “batter,” which is used throughout the interviews for this study, can be paralleled to the term “rape” used in the Koss et. al study. Both terms are laden with blame and carry negative stereotypes. This manipulation of language to deny culpability was apparent in the current study. It seemed that when I would use the term “batterer” to describe the men, they became very defensive. The men would be inconsistent in their definition of battering and batterer perhaps to make their own actions seem justified or at least less violent. For instance, Rocky declared at the beginning of the interview that he was a batterer, and his definition at that time was “to hurt someone by the use of violence.” Later in the interview Rocky stated that he was not a batterer in that he did not use violence regularly. His definition of battering had changed later to be “to hurt
someone by the use of regular violence," which he denied doing. It is clear that Rocky was resisting calling himself a batterer.

Another significant discovery to come out of this study was that the changes in self-identity from entitled controller to batterer for the majority of the men were caused by several points or events, suggesting there is a catalytic process instead of a catalyst. I was hoping to uncover one particular event that was a catalyst to the men viewing themselves as batterers. However, no single such point or event was found. Instead there appeared to be several points or events that seemed to make an impact on the men's self-identity. The finding of multiple points affirms previous research, which identified an identity-change process. The work of Degher and Hughes (1997) identified the change process as it relates to obesity. Ferraro and Johnson's (1983) study identified the change process as it relates to battered women.

Even though I expected to have a few men say that more than one event caused them to view themselves as batterers, I did not expect for the majority to say almost every one of the events had an impact on their self-perception. Eight of the men saw at least four and as many as eight events causing them to view themselves as batterers. I determined that, by definition, a catalyst would be the point when the event or events in question caused the men to view themselves as batterers. Considering the sample as a whole, the most common catalysts were the violent incidents and the PEACE program. Also, there appeared to be distinct differences among catalysts, showing some to be more significant than others to the men. Some catalysts were mentioned only once during the interview, when that particular event was covered. Others were mentioned a second time at the end of the interview when I asked, "Which event made the biggest impact on your current
feelings about yourself?” In order to make a distinction of importance between the two apparent catalysts, I created the labels primary and secondary. The primary catalyst is the more significant event and was mentioned at least twice during the interview. The secondary catalyst is a significant event that was mentioned only once during the interview. The most common secondary catalysts were the violent incidents, arrest, jail, court, returning home and to work. A distribution of the primary and secondary catalysts for the men is located in Table 1.

There was one man (Jerry) who did not have a primary catalyst and one (Joe) who did not have a secondary catalyst. Joe’s primary catalyst was PEACE, which shows that it was not until he attended PEACE that he began to view himself as a batterer. Jerry’s absence of a primary catalyst reveals that none of the events made a big enough impact on his self-perception to warrant mentioning more than once. However, Jerry did proclaim a secondary catalyst, which occurred after the first time he was violent in the PEACE relationship.

PEACE was an overwhelmingly decisive event for all the men. Even though the program was forced on them, they seemed to find great comfort in attending PEACE. Through the education and constructive advice of PEACE, many of the men started to understand battering fully and how to avoid it in their relationships. Many of the men suggested that the tools PEACE teaches, from anger management techniques to disbanding sexist ideas, aid them in their intimate relationships as well as in other relationships. Some of the men commented in the violent incident section of the interview that it was PEACE that seemed to help them define what battering was and how to stop it. Although some of the men appeared to sense without any formal
Table 1. Distribution of Primary and Secondary Catalyst

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EVENT</th>
<th>Bob</th>
<th>Lobo</th>
<th>Barry</th>
<th>Red</th>
<th>Lee</th>
<th>Mike</th>
<th>Leroy</th>
<th>Joe</th>
<th>Homer</th>
<th>O.J.</th>
<th>Don</th>
<th>Rocky</th>
<th>Jerry</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>First time violent in any relationship</td>
<td>X₁</td>
<td>X₁</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X₁</td>
<td>X₁</td>
<td>X₁</td>
<td>X₁</td>
<td>X₁</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X₁</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First time violent in PEACE relationship</td>
<td>X₁</td>
<td>X₁</td>
<td>X₁</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X₁</td>
<td>X₁</td>
<td>X₁</td>
<td>X₁</td>
<td>X₁</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X₁</td>
<td>X₁</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PEACE arresting incident</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X₁</td>
<td>X₁</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X₁</td>
<td>X₁</td>
<td>X₁</td>
<td>X₁</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X₁</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Police Summoned</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X₁</td>
<td>X₁</td>
<td></td>
<td>X₁</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X₁</td>
<td></td>
<td>X₁</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arrest</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X₂</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jail</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Court</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Home</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PEACE</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

X - represents primary catalyst  
x - represents secondary catalyst  
Subscript indicates same incident
influence that they were doing something wrong in their relationships, they did not realize it was battering until PEACE. This realization of a problem but not knowing what to call it or what to do about it is reminiscent of “the problem that has no name” described by Betty Freidan in *The Feminine Mystique* (1962). Friedan characterizes a problem that was not put into words and could not be put into words due to language limitations of the time. Friedan’s inability to explain her problem is similar to the inability of the men in this study—knowing something is wrong about their controlling behaviors, feeling bad about it, but not knowing what to call it, how to deal with it, or how to change. Most of the men never could have defined battering and, therefore, dealt with it without the aid of PEACE.

Like I said it was really after I got to PEACE when I figured yea I've battered--I've really done that. (Don)

I consider myself a batterer now because of 25 weeks of PEACE....I know now because of PEACE that I am a batterer and have been and basically for most of our marriage. (Leroy)

I have stopped doing most of the things that I was doing because of it coming to light through the PEACE program that these things are wrong. And, a lot of them I didn't realize I was doing, and it pointed out and told me it was wrong so I'm using the things I learned at PEACE to stop those things....I didn’t know about these tools to change it. (Bob)

PEACE helped to clarify and really gave me something to think about. (Lobo)

The PEACE class, like I said, when I got in there, I started to realize the things that I had done that was considered abuse, and I realized after talking about it and going through it that yes the things that I had done was abuse. And, I think that made the biggest impact on me by opening my eyes and me recognizing things that I was doing and didn't even think twice about them. (Jerry)

Again it was all based on ignorance. You have to get out of denial of things....As ignorance was crashed and denial was crashed or whatever, I started finding out through PEACE that yes these behaviors are considered battering. (Mike)

It became clear that once the actions of these men and their ideology were put into words
and challenged and they were given "tools" to correct them, the men were able to be clearer about their self-perceptions and to change their controlling behaviors. This redefinition appears to involve two levels: (1) knowing something is wrong and (2) having it clarified by PEACE. The results of this study support mandatory arrest and treatment policies. Even if the men may know they have a problem, they need to have the experience of formal labeling and education to fully understand that their actions are not acceptable and to learn alternatives to violence.

Inquiries during the interview pertaining to who was present during an event, what they said, and how that made the men feel are significant because of the effect other people's reactions may have had on how the men perceive themselves. For instance, if a man does not respect what police or judges say about domestic violence, then the arrest and court hearing event will not influence any change in the man's self-perception. Therefore, examining comments from people whom the men respect and with whom they identify is critical in order to understand changes that may have occurred. Symbolic interactionism contends that people define themselves by the way others see them; therefore, if the people with whom the men interact perceive those men's violence as negative, then the men may start to view their own actions as battering and likewise themselves as batterers. Most of the men in this study did redefine themselves as a result of being publicly labeled as batterers and having people they respected consider them as batterers. Most of the men declared that their redefinition occurred because of PEACE's education, a particular event or events in the model, and/or a few significant people who supported their nonviolent change.

It becomes clear then that what changed the men's self-concept was a process of
events. The most common catalyst, primary or secondary, was being violent (92%), being arrested (54%), going to jail (38%), attending the court hearing (54%), returning home (38%), and attending the PEACE program (85%). Almost all of the men were affected by their own violence; therefore, hitting their partner did not leave them the same people. Even though the men may not have had adequate language to describe their actions or feelings, they knew something was wrong. Other lesser or secondary events were constant reminders to the men of their new label, such as being arrested and jailed and attending court. These events were formal testaments of society’s inability to accept battering. When the men returned home they were informally labeled and judged by their families. Being formally labeled as a batterer was a momentous experience; another was being educated about battering. PEACE helped the men pull it all together—the definition of their original self and the redefinition of their “new” labeled self. The PEACE program was able to bring a sense of resolution to the men by educating them about battering and giving them tools or alternatives to using violence in their relationships. The summary and conclusions are discussed in the next chapter. That is followed by retrospective recommendations, suggestions for future research, and the applicability of the findings.
The primary purpose of this research was to investigate any catalysts to changes in self-concept that may have occurred among thirteen men who had been labeled as batterers by the courts and who were about to graduate from the Project to End Abuse through Counseling and Education (PEACE), a court-mandated batterers’ intervention program, in Nashville, Tennessee. It is deemed necessary for a batterer to first recognize himself as such before he is able to stop battering. The second purpose of this research was to document the men’s attitudes about PEACE and how it affected them. Within the framework of symbolic interactionism the change process and the redefining of the men’s self-identity due to internal and external pressures were examined. The men’s catalysts were instrumental in changing their self-concept from entitled controller to batterer because of events that occurred during the labeling process. A model of events depicts experiences that most of the men endured during their labeling process, which includes: being arrested for assault against their partners, going to jail, attending the court hearing, and being sentenced to at least 26 weeks of PEACE.

Each event that occurred in the model of events was a primary or secondary catalyst to at least one of the men. A primary catalyst is designated as one recognized by the respondent multiple times during the interview; a secondary catalyst is one recognized only once. Most of the men mentioned more than one event, which indicates that a series
of events or a process caused the redefinition of their self-concept. The most common primary catalysts were violent battering incidents and the PEACE program. Twelve out of the thirteen men reported that their own violence caused them to view themselves as batterers. Eleven out of the thirteen men stated that the PEACE program caused them to view themselves as batterers. The most common secondary catalysts were the violent incident, arrest, jail, court, returning home and to work. All of these events, both primary and secondary, except for violent incidents, were influential in part because of the publicity of the crime. When other people such as neighbors, relatives, and friends found out that the police and courts had labeled the man a batterer, the man’s self-concept changed. He may not have had adequate language to understand his behavior until he was educated by PEACE, but he did know something was wrong. This group of men showed support for mandatory treatment because a high proportion of them believed they were positively affected by the PEACE program.

This study adds to the plethora of domestic violence research by providing a unique understanding of the batterer’s self-concept. The identity change process that occurred for most of the men from entitled controller to batterer happened once the man was able to take the role of the other (i.e., his partner and victim) and/or the generalized other (i.e., society and his new nonviolent social group) (Mead 1934). Therefore, once the men understood that their behavior toward and attitudes about women were wrong, they were more likely to redefine themselves from entitled controller to batterer. PEACE was a key component to this redefinition of the men in this study. PEACE educated and challenged the men and supported their use of nonviolent alternatives in their personal relationships.

Understanding that batterers change their self-concepts because of formal sanctions, such as arrest and PEACE, can help legislators create laws and help judges interpret laws
more appropriately in domestic violence cases. Realizing that there are informal sanctions inherent in assault, such as stereotypes imposed on the men by their neighbors and coworkers, can direct domestic violence counselors in their clinical strategy. Armed with insights gleaned from this study, they will be aware that the men may have already experienced catalysts and that, therefore, the counselors should focus on those events in their counseling and education. The participants in this research may not have been able to change their self-concept so readily without community cooperation in fighting domestic violence. Society's intolerance of battering was reinforced every time the men were confronted in the model of events. This collaboration was responsible for causing the men to accept themselves as batterers and, in turn, set them on their way to recovery.

This study was designed to be exploratory and descriptive in nature and to focus on a small number of respondents in order to devote great attention to detail. The sample is not intended to be representative. Instead, it is designed to provide suggestive information and groundwork for future investigation. In hindsight, there are some things that I would do differently if I had it to do over. First and foremost, I created or allowed ambiguity to set in by not having a clear and standard definition of battering in the interview. In order to understand the men's perceptions about whether they were batterers, I felt it was important to know what those words meant to each man. However, by doing that I inadvertently allowed serious inconsistency and contradiction in an individual man's definitions and self-perceptions. Thus, if I were to do a repeat of this study, I would use a standard definition of battering such as the one cited at the beginning of this thesis. Second, I would interview the men after completion of their PEACE classes rather than while they were still finishing the program. In an ideal situation, the men would have completed PEACE before interviewing so that they could draw their answers from the
entire curriculum. However, it was more practical that the interviews occur the next to
last group meeting before graduation because of the incentive for cooperation from the
men. Last, I would move the interview to another setting. The men may have been
inclined to speak positively of PEACE because the interview was conducted at the
PEACE site and with a PEACE facilitator. Some of the men did have negative comments
about PEACE, and I certainly did not discourage them; but still, the interview setting may
have biased their responses.

I found it difficult to separate my conflicting roles as interviewer and PEACE
facilitator during the interview. Many times during the interview the men’s responses
seemed to warrant challenge from a facilitator, which I am trained to do. However, I felt
the interview was not the appropriate setting for some of these issues to be confronted. I
felt it was more appropriate as the interviewer to make the respondents feel comfortable
enough to open up and tell me about their attitudes and behavior. In Ptacek’s (1988)
study, he referred to the same conflicting roles during his interviews with batterers.
Likewise, he tried not to confront the men during the interviews because he wanted an
open and comfortable atmosphere. Another factor that may have affected the men during
the interview was that I was a woman. However, the fact that they are exposed to female
facilitators and PEACE staff persons on a constant basis should have lessened any
discomfort for the men.

Suggestions for future research include using a greater number of respondents and/or
conducting a longitudinal study. Longitudinal research would allow for the researcher to
follow the men after graduation and investigate their changes in self-concept as well as
identify any new catalysts that may occur after PEACE. Another suggestion is to
interview only men who have been court-ordered to 52-weeks of PEACE. This longer time frame may allow for a clearer description and understanding from the men about their change process.

Inherent in this research was finding out the men’s attitudes about PEACE and how they believed the program affected them. PEACE was described as an overwhelmingly positive influence in these men’s lives. As noted in the findings section, the men said that PEACE helped them view themselves as batterers in four ways: the program curriculum, the other members, the facilitators or staff persons, and the group structure. Even the two men who said PEACE did not cause them to view themselves as batterers expressed benefits from the program. In addition, the men credited the change in their self-identity to PEACE and the experience of being labeled as batterers. The men in this study revealed that PEACE was very beneficial to them. PEACE facilitators and staff persons, as well as legislators and judges, should be aware of the positive consequence that PEACE was able to achieve with these men.

In conclusion, investigating perpetrators of domestic violence can be helpful to victims, advocates of victims, and the perpetrators themselves. Uncovering the perpetrator’s catalysts or change process from entitled controller to batterer allows batterers’ programs, laws, and courts to be more effective in their fight against domestic violence.
APPENDIX A

RIGHTS AND RESPONSIBILITIES

PEACE, Inc. offers a counseling and education program to men who are abusive in their intimate relationships. Below are the requirements of your participation:

1.) I agree not to be violent with any person during my participation in the PEACE program. I understand that any new incidents of violence will be evaluated on a case by case basis.

2.) I agree to participate in a tutorial group and/or substance abuse treatment if these are ordered by the court or determined necessary by PEACE.

3.) I understand that I am allowed four (4) absences. There is no such thing as an excused or unexcused absence. I agree to contact the PEACE office if I can not attend a session.

4.) I understand that if I miss more than four sessions, I must make an appointment with the PEACE staff within five (5) days of my 5th miss. If I fail to schedule a 5th miss meeting, I understand that a recommendation may be made that my probation be revoked or that my case be re-opened.

5.) I understand that I may attend only one (1) group per week.

6.) I understand that I am expected to be on time. The door to each group room will be locked at the time the group is scheduled to begin. If I arrive past the designated time, I will not be allowed to stay and will be counted absent.

7.) I am expected to complete all assigned exercises and homework. I understand that I will not be granted credit for class attendance unless I have a completed homework. I understand that anything reported on the homework or in group will be considered to be the truth.

8.) I understand that participation in group includes the reporting of any continued abusive behavior, police involvement, re-arrests, court dates and new warrants.

9.) I understand that I am expected to refer to my partner by her name or as “my partner.”

10.) I am expected not to discuss other group members outside of group.

11.) I agree to pay my weekly fee. I understand that my balance may not exceed two time my weekly fee. I understand that I can make special financial arrangements by calling the office. I understand that I should never miss group because I do not have my weekly fee. PEACE will not notify the court of my completion until I have paid my balance in full.

12.) I understand that PEACE will contact my partner/ex-partner, to explain to her about the PEACE program and obtain relevant information about my abuse.

13.) I agree not to hinder my partner’s or ex-partner’s participation in Victim Support Services or PEACE’s Orientation for Women. I understand that if I do, I may be terminated from the program.

14.) I understand that PEACE is required by law to contact my partner/ex-partner if I should make statements threatening violence toward her. If PEACE is unable to reach my partner, they are obligated to contact the necessary authorities.

15.) I understand that PEACE will keep my partner/ex-partner and the court system informed of my compliance or non-compliance with PEACE.
16.) I understand that what I say or do in group will be kept confidential, except for the following:
   1. reports of continued use of violence
   2. threats of violence to myself or others
   3. indications of child abuse

17.) I will remove any and all firearms from my person or car while participating in this program.

18.) I will be free of alcohol and drugs on the day of each group. I understand that I will be turned away from group for using alcohol and drugs the day of my group and this will count as an absence.

19.) I understand that the use of all tobacco products is prohibited in the building.

20.) I understand that I am not allowed to touch others in group. This includes demonstrating, even in slow motion, an assault that you may have made or seen.

21.) I understand that all electronic devices, such as pagers and cellular phones must be turned to silent or off.

22.) I am expected not to use profanities, sexist, racist, anti-gay or anti-lesbian language in the group.

23.) I understand that I should not wear clothing that reflects pornographic images or demeaning slogans, nor exhibit tattoos that are pornographic or obscene.

I understand that my failure to comply with any of the requirements of PEACE may result in one or more of the following:
   1. dismissal from a group meeting;
   2. dismissal from the program;
   3. a recommendation that my probation or suspended time be revoked or that my case be re-opened.

I understand that I will be asked to sign a contract at my intake assessment stating that I have had the above rights and responsibilities explained to me.
APPENDIX B

RIGHTS

1. You have the right to be treated in a respectful and professional manner.

2. You have the right to be supported in your sincere efforts to end violence and other abusive behaviors in all your relationships.

3. You have the right to have your control logs returned promptly, with suggestions for ending abusive behaviors.

4. You have the right to receive assistance for any special problem that may make it difficult for you to complete the PEACE program. In particular, you have the right to participate in the Tutorial Group if for any reason you find it difficult to complete written assignments. Additionally, PEACE will make appropriate referrals to substance abuse treatment or to individual counseling should you wish to supplement your work in group with such programs.

5. You have the right to schedule a half-hour interview with a PEACE staff person at any time to discuss any concerns or difficulties you are having in the program.

6. You have the right to enter the Phase III group after completing twenty-six weeks (Phase I and II) of the program and meeting criteria for entry into that group.
APPENDIX C

AGREEMENT FOR PARTICIPATION—PHASE I AND II

NAME __________________________ PHONE ___________________

ADDRESS __________________________ ZIP ___________________

PEACE (Project to End Abuse through Counseling and Education) offers a counseling and education program to men who are abusive in their relationships. Below are the requirements of your participation:

1. I agree not to be violent with any person during my participation in the PEACE program. I understand that any new incidents of violence will be evaluated on a case by case basis.

2. I understand that PEACE’s program involves 1 assessment, 1 orientation, and 24 two hour groups. I agree to attend all of the required sessions. I agree to participate in PEACE’s Tutorial Group and/or substance abuse treatment if these have been ordered by the court or if my probation officer or PEACE determines that they are necessary.

3. I agree to notify the PEACE office if I cannot attend a session. I understand that more than four absences may result in a recommendation that my probation be revoked or that my case be reopened.

4. I agree to pay my weekly fee of $____. I understand that special financial arrangements can be made by calling the office.

5. I agree that PEACE may talk to my partner, ________, to explain to her about the program and obtain relevant information about my abuse. I understand that PEACE or any member of the intervention team will contact my partner if I should make statements threatening violence to her.

6. I agree not to hinder my partner’s or ex-partner’s participation in the YWCA Support Group or PEACE’s orientation for women. I understand that if I do, I can be terminated from the program.

7. I understand that PEACE will keep my victim, my probation officer, and the district attorney, judge, The Department of Human Services (DHS) and Victim Witness advocate involved in my case informed of my compliance with PEACE. This includes sharing information about my continued use of violence, threats of violence to any person, attendance record, re-arrests, revocation, court dates, and general progress. I understand that PEACE will keep everything else that I say or do in group confidential.

8. I understand that my failure to comply with this contract will result in a recommendation that my probation or suspended time be revoked or that my case be re-opened.

On ______ I discussed and agreed to the conditions of participation with PEACE.

PEACE reserves the right to change this contract with due notice.

______________________________    ______________________________
Signature                          Witness

Revised 2/96
APPENDIX D

CONTROL LOG
Men's Education Groups

Name____________________
Date____________________

1. ACTIONS: Briefly describe the situation and the actions you used to control your partner (statements, gestures, tone of voice, physical contact, facial expressions).

2. INTENTS AND BELIEFS: What did you want to happen in this situation?

3. FEELINGS: What feelings were you having?

4. MINIMIZATION, DENIAL, AND BLAME: In what ways did you minimize or deny your actions or blame her?

5. EFFECTS: What was the impact of your action?
On you____________________
On her____________________
On others__________________

6. PAST VIOLENCE: How did your past use of violence affect this situation?

7. NON-CONTROLLING BEHAVIORS: What could you have done differently?
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APPENDIX E

EXTENDED CHECK-IN
(Used the 1st week, the 8th week, the 16th week and the 26th week)

Date presented to group: ____________________.

1. Name.

2. Victim's name.
   Names of any children living in home.

3. Goal of program (What do I hope to learn from PEACE).

4. What I did in any and all incidents of abuse toward a woman (not what she did or what lead up to my actions).

5. Effects: How she and others (children) were affected physically and emotionally by my violence.

6. Consequences of My abuse (jail, counseling, feelings of self worth, etc).

7. Violent and Controlling Behaviors Checklist (see attached).
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VIOLENT AND CONTROLLING BEHAVIORS CHECKLIST

Instructions: Please check each type of abuse (and circle each specific behavior) that you have used.

____ Slap, punch, grab, kick, choke, push, restrain, pull hair, bite
____ Rape (use of force, threats to get sex)
____ Use of weapons, throwing things, keeping weapons around which scare her
____ Abuse of furniture, things in the home, pets, destroying her things
____ Intimidation (standing in the doorway over her, out-shouting, driving recklessly)
____ Uninvited touching
____ Threats (verbal or nonverbal, direct or indirect)
____ Harassment (uninvited visits or calls, following her around, checking up on her, embarrassing her in public, not leaving when asked)
____ Isolation (preventing or making it hard for her to see/talk to friends, relative, others)
____ Yelling, swearing, being lewd, raising your voice, using angry expressions or gestures
____ Criticism (name calling, swearing, mocking, put-downs, ridicule, accusations, blaming, use of trivializing words or gestures)
____ Pressure tactics (pushing her to make a decision, using guilt/accusations, sulking, threatening to withhold financial support, manipulating children, abusing feelings)
____ Economic coercion (withholding money, the car, or other resources; sabotaging her attempts to work)
____ Claiming “the truth,” being the authority, defining her behavior, using “logic”
____ Lying, withholding information, infidelity (having sex with others)
____ Using pornography (e.g., magazines, movies, strip shows, home videos, etc.)
____ Withholding help with childcare/housework; not doing your share of following through on your agreements
____ Emotional withholding (not expressing feelings, not giving support, validation, attention, compliments, respect her feelings, rights and opinions)
____ Not taking care of yourself (not asking for help or support from friends, abusing drugs or alcohol, being a “people-pleaser”)
____ Other forms of manipulation (please list)

(Adapted from EMERGE, Boston, Massachusetts)
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APPENDIX F
INTERVIEW GUIDE

Pseudonym Name ________
Race ________
Birth Date ________
Age ________

NOTE: These questions are based on a time line of events. There are ten different stages that may have occurred with questions for each stage. A visual depiction of these series of events appears in Appendix G. Questions 1 and 2 are inquiries about the respondents' definitions and question 14 is a self-rating question about any change that may have occurred.

1. Define what battering is in your own words.
2. Define what a batterer is in your own words? Do you consider yourself a batterer? Why?
3. First time violent in any intimate relationship:
   a. What happened?
   b. What were you feeling?
   c. Why did you feel it was okay to be violent?
   d. What happened as a result of the violence?
   e. Who was present at the time? Did anyone find out about the incident?
   f. Did they say or do anything? If yes, what did they say? How did that make you feel? Why?
   g. What do you think they thought of you and the situation? Why?
   h. How do you think you were affected, if at all?
   i. Did anyone treat you negatively as a batterer? If yes, who? How did they treat you?
   j. Did this incident cause you to think of yourself as a batterer? If so, how and why?
4. First time violent in relationship that brought you to PEACE, if not the same as #3:
   a. Same questions a-j.
b. What was different about #3 and this?

5. Police being summoned in #4 incident:
   a. What happened?
   b. Who called them?
   c. Who was present?
   d. What did you think they thought of you and/or the situation? Why?
   e. How did you feel about yourself and/or the situation? Why?
   f. How do you think you were affected, if at all?
   g. Did anyone treat you negatively as a batterer? If yes, who? How did they treat you?
   h. Did this incident cause you to think of yourself as a batterer? If so, how and why?

6. The arrest:
   a. What happened? Where? Was this the first time arrested either for domestic violence or any crime?
   b. How many police came? How did you feel about the police that arrested you? Why?
   c. Who was present?
   d. How did you feel about yourself and/or the situation? Why?
   e. What did the police say to you? What did anyone else say to you?
   f. How do you think you were affected, if at all?
   g. Did anyone treat you negatively as a batterer? If yes, who? How did they treat you?
   h. Did this incident cause you to think of yourself as a batterer? If so, how and why?

7. Going to jail:
   a. What happened? Where were you taken? For how long?
   b. What was the procedure?
   c. Did you call anyone from there? If so, who and why?
   d. How were you treated? What was it like in jail?
   e. Who knew you were in jail?
f. What do you think they thought of that? Why?
g. What did you think about yourself and/or the situation? Why?
h. How do you think you were affected, if at all?
i. Did anyone treat you negatively as a batterer? If yes, who? How did they treat you?
j. Did this incident cause you to think of yourself as a batterer? If so, how and why?

8. The court hearing:
   a. What happened? Where? How did you feel about the judge and/or lawyers who were associated with your case? Why?
b. Who was present?
c. What do you think they thought about it? Why?
d. Did they say or do anything? If yes, what did they say? How did that make you feel?
e. What were you feeling?
f. What was it like for you?
g. What was the outcome?
h. How do you think you were affected, if at all?
i. Did anyone treat you negatively as a batterer? If yes, who? How did they treat you?
j. Did this incident cause you to think of yourself as a batterer? If so, how and why?

9. Returning home (kids, partner, parents, friends, etc.):
   a. Where did you go after you were released from jail?
b. How did your family react to you and to what you had done? What do you think they thought? Why?
c. How do you feel about yourself, about your family, and about the situation? Why?
d. Did you feel you were wrongly accused? Why?
e. How do you think you were affected, if at all?
f. Did anything change? If so, what? What did you think about this change?
g. Did anyone treat you negatively as a batterer? If yes, who? How did they treat you?

h. Did this incident cause you to think of yourself as a batterer? If so, how and why?

10. Returning to work:
   a. What type of work do you do?
   b. What happened when you returned?
   c. Who knew you had been arrested for domestic violence? How did they react to you? How did you feel about your fellow coworkers? Why?
   d. What did you think they thought about you and your situation? What did you think? Why?
   e. Did anyone say or do anything? If yes, what did they say? How did that make you feel?
   f. Did anything at work change? If so, what? What did you think about it?
   g. How were you affected, if at all?
   h. Did anyone treat you negatively as a batterer? If yes, who? How did they treat you?
   i. Did this incident cause you to think of yourself as a batterer? If so, how and why?

11. Returning to the community (church, school, etc.):
   a. Who knew? How did they react? How did you feel about them? Why?
   b. Which area would have influenced or did influence you the most if and when they found out?
   c. What were you feeling at the time?
   d. What do you think others thought about you and the situation? Why? Did they say or do anything? If yes, what did they say? How did that make you feel?
   e. How were you affected, if at all?
   f. Did anyone treat you negatively as a batterer? If yes, who? How did they treat you?
   g. Did this incident cause you to think of yourself as a batterer? If so, how and
12. Attending PEACE:

a. Who knew you were attending groups? What did they say about it? How did that make you feel?

b. What did you think they thought about you or the situation? Why?

c. How did you feel about being forced to attend PEACE groups? Why?

d. What was it like to be in a room full of men who were labeled as batterers by the courts?

e. What was the group like? How did it make you feel when others confronted you and criticized you? What did they say?

f. How did you feel when you confronted others, if you ever did? Why?

g. What did you think about the two facilitators? Why? What did you think of the other group members? Why?

h. What did you think about PEACE when first started? And now? How did you act when first started and now?

i. How were you affected, if at all?

j. What did you think of the 8 themes covered in the group? Was there any particular theme that really made you think about yourself and you situation? Why?

k. What was your first extended check-in like? How did you feel telling other people your business? What was it like being confronted by others about what happened, if confronted)? Why? *Ask these same questions for each extended check-in (1, 8, 16, and try to get 26) and then compare to the actual form from their file.

l. Did anyone treat you negatively as a batterer?

m. Did this incident cause you to think of yourself as a batterer? If so, how and why?

13. Was there any point or incident that was not included that caused you to think of yourself as a batterer? Explain.

14. As you look back over these experiences, how do you think of yourself—any differently than the first time you were violent in a relationship? What point or
points made the most impact on your current feelings about yourself as a batterer?

Rate yourself on how much you have changed:
1--no change
2--little change
3--some change
4--completely changed

Explain what you mean by change.
APPENDIX G

INFORMED CONSENT FORM

A Study of the Change Process in Labeled Batterers

The purpose of this research project is to examine the change process in men who have been labeled by society as batterers. This project is being conducted in an effort to complete a Master of Arts Degree in Sociology at Western Kentucky University.

You will be asked a series of questions concerning the research topic, and your responses will be recorded onto audiocassette. Although some of the questions may be personal, answering will not in any way affect your progress at PEACE as the researcher, Dee Powell, guarantees confidentiality. Only the researcher will know your identity, and your real name will be replaced with a pseudonym at the completion of the data collection process.

Participation is completely voluntary, and you may refuse to answer any particular question or discontinue participation at any time. By participating, you give the researcher the right to use any information, except your name and residence, in completion of her master’s thesis or for other publication purposes. This usage of your information will include direct quotes from the interview and paraphrasing of your words.

You may experience some emotionally painful or difficult memories about past events or behaviors. However, you should be accustomed to sharing this type of information due to your participation in PEACE group meetings. Some benefits for you in participating may be the knowledge that information obtained in this study will be used to strengthen PEACE and other batterers’ intervention programs. In addition, participation
may allow for you to do a self-evaluation of your progress at PEACE and throughout your life.

This study has been satisfactorily explained to me. I understand what my participation will involve, and I agree to participate according to the provisions stated. I may also request further information by contacting Dee Powell at (502) 782-2847.

RESPONDENT'S NAME

RESPONDENT'S SIGNATURE

DATE

RESEARCHER'S SIGNATURE

DATE
APPENDIX H
MODEL OF EVENTS

First time violent in any relationship

PEACE arresting incident

The arrest

The court hearing

Returning to work

Returning to the community

First time violent in PEACE relationship

Police being summoned

Going to jail

Returning home

Attending PEACE
## APPENDIX I

RESPONDENTS' DEMOGRAPHIC INFORMATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Names</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Race</th>
<th>Annual-Net Income</th>
<th>Grade Level Completed</th>
<th>Occupation</th>
<th>Arrest History</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bob</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>$0 - $7500</td>
<td>Soph. in College</td>
<td>computer operator</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lobo</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>$27,500 - plus</td>
<td>Graduate School</td>
<td>lab manager</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barry</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>$12,501 - $17,500</td>
<td>Soph. in College</td>
<td>construction / country band</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Red</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>$7,501 - $12,500</td>
<td>11th</td>
<td>produce place</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lee</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>$0 - $7,500</td>
<td>12th</td>
<td>restaurant cook</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mike</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>$7,501 - $12,500</td>
<td>GED</td>
<td>construction / taxi driver</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leroy</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>$7,501 - $12,500</td>
<td>12th</td>
<td>construction</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joe</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>$12,501 - $17,500</td>
<td>Jr. in College</td>
<td>professional football player</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Homer</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>$0 - $7500</td>
<td>9th</td>
<td>maintenance</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O.J.</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>$7,501 - $12,500</td>
<td>12th</td>
<td>auto mechanic</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>$7,501 - $12,500</td>
<td>12th</td>
<td>factory</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rocky</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>$7,501 - $12,500</td>
<td>12th</td>
<td>factory</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jerry</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>W</td>
<td>$0 - $7500</td>
<td>12th</td>
<td>paint contractor</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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