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Abstract

Despite a growing body of knowledge, there is still debate as to whether men who perpetrate lethal and non-lethal intimate partner violence display similar characteristics as men who are violent more generally. Calls have been made for research to examine which, if any, contexts, factors and situations are unique to male-perpetrated intimate partner homicide (IPH) compared to other types of homicide. The current research addresses this empirical question.

Theoretically, this research is guided by general strain theory (GST; Agnew, 1992). According to GST, experiences of strain increase the likelihood of an individual engaging in criminal behaviour. This link between strain and crime is mediated by negative emotions and moderated by factors such as personal characteristics, peer associations and access to social support. The current research proposes that GST extends the current theoretical landscape of male-perpetrated IPH in three ways: by focusing attention on the role of negative emotions, by explaining variations in coping mechanisms and by incorporating both distal and proximal variables associated with male-perpetrated IPH. Building on existing theoretical and empirical research, the current research provides a GST application of male-perpetrated IPH.

Most homicide research use official data sources. Research projects utilising direct interviews with homicide perpetrators remain scarce and are often, though not always, restricted to small sample sizes. The current research is unique in that it uses interview data with one of the largest samples of homicide perpetrators collected in Australia and internationally. The data for this research come from the Australian Homicide Project. The first study consists of structured interviews with 41 males convicted of murder or manslaughter of an intimate partner and 116 males convicted of murder or manslaughter of someone other than an intimate partner. This study allows
for examinations of differences between these two types of homicide perpetrators in relation to theoretically relevant variables measuring strain, negative emotions and potential moderating factors. The second study explores experiences of subjective strain, negative emotions and coping mechanism through semi-structured interviews with a sub-sample of ten males convicted of killing an intimate partner. The extensive scope of these data allows for significant contributions to be made to the homicide literature.

Collectively the research findings suggest that there is theoretical and empirical validity in using GST to explain male-perpetrated IPH. The findings also reveal important differences between IPH and non-IPH perpetrators for factors relating to individual, relationship and situational contexts, suggesting that IPH should be considered a unique category of homicide. In particular, findings highlight that male IPH perpetration is associated with experiences of partner infidelity, cognitive appraisals of injustice and relational devaluation, situational anger, feelings of hurt, jealous personality dispositions, experiences of accumulative strain and perceived lack of access to social support mechanisms.
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Chapter 1: The Research Agenda

The question of whether intimate partner homicide (hereinafter IPH) perpetrators are distinctly different to other categories of homicide perpetrators has recently received increased attention in the literature (e.g. DeJong, Pizarro, & McGarrell, 2011; Kivivuori & Lehti, 2012; Thomas, Dichter, & Matejkowski, 2011), forming part of a larger debate regarding criminal diversification versus specialisation (see for example Blumstein, 1986; Piquero, 2000). The underlying question is whether individuals ‘specialise’ in certain types of offending behaviour or whether they engage in a wide variety of offences (Blumstein, 1986). As applied to intimate partner violence, this issue is highly contentious. On the one hand, generalist approaches, or the ‘violence perspective’ as it is also known, state that men who perpetrated intimate partner violence are generally antisocial individuals and that the sources of intimate partner violence and other forms of violence are the same (Felson, 2006; Felson & Lane, 2010). On the other hand, the ‘gender perspective’ (see Felson, 2006) states that men’s violence against female partners is gendered in nature and grounded in patterns of male domination and gender inequality, and is therefore distinctly different to other forms of violence (Daly & Chesney-Lind, 1988; Dobash & Dobash, 1979). Applied to homicide, some researchers argue that IPH perpetrators represent a unique category of offenders (Miethe & Regoeczi, 2004; Taylor & Jasinski, 2011), while others argue that the characteristics of IPH perpetrators are no different to other homicide perpetrators (Felson & Lane, 2010).

Not only is the question of whether IPH perpetrators are different from non-IPH perpetrators a theoretically important issue to examine, but what is also relevant about this debate are the policy outcomes attached to it. If there are certain characteristics specific to IPH perpetration then prevention and intervention efforts should be shaped to
target those particular areas. This research empirically and theoretically examines whether, and which, individual, relationship and situational factors are associated with male-IPH perpetration. It does so through the use of a theoretical framework that allows for examinations of proximal and distal variables associated with homicide, namely general strain theory (hereinafter GST).

**Context of the Research**

Most homicides are detected and reported to the police, making it one of few offence classifications where official statistics provide relatively reliable prevalence estimates (Lewis, 1992; Mouzos, 2002). Homicides further have a high clearance rate of up to 90 per cent (Queensland Police Service, 2009; Victoria Police, 2009). In Australia, homicide data are analysed within the Australian Institute of Criminology’s (AIC) National Homicide Monitoring Program (NHMP), which has recorded the nature and extent of homicides in Australia since 1989. These data are collected from police reports, coronial reports and press clippings, and further cross-validated with additional sources (Mouzos, 2002).

While the public perception may be that homicides are committed by strangers, NHMP data show that in approximately 80 per cent of homicides the victim knew their offender (Dearden & Jones, 2008). In 2007/08 there were 80 homicides committed between intimate partners\(^1\), representing 30.8 per cent of all homicide incidents in Australia that year (Virueda & Payne, 2010). This makes it the largest victim-offender homicide category in Australia, with 30.4 per cent involving acquaintances, 20.8 per cent involving family and relatives, and 19.8 per cent involving strangers. Other studies have found that 81 per cent of domestic homicides were committed by someone the victim knew (Mouzos, 2002; Neilsen et al., 2011). In 2007/08, there were 80 intimate partner homicides, which represents 30.8 per cent of all homicide incidents. This category is the largest category of victim-offender relationship, followed by acquaintance homicides (30.4 per cent) and stranger homicides (20.8 per cent).

\[^1\] Definitions of intimate partner differ slightly between studies. The most commonly applied conceptualisation encompasses current or former romantic partners, including individuals in de jure, de facto and dating relationships, which is also the definition applied within the current research (for further discussion of this definition see Chapter 5).
cent of homicides involving family members and 11.5 per cent involving strangers (Virueda & Payne, 2010). Slightly smaller proportions of IPH are found in Canada (21.3%; Hotton Mahony, 2011), the United States (16.3%; Cooper & Smith, 2011) and England and Wales (18.7%; Smith, Coleman, Eder, & Hall, 2011). The past two decades have seen a slight decrease in the rate of IPH in Australia, from 0.5 to 0.3 per 100,000 of the population per year, although the actual frequency of incidents has remained the same (Australian Institute of Criminology, 2008). This decline appears to be part of a general international trend. In the United States, the rate of IPH decreased extensively between 1976 and 1995, from 1.6 to 0.8 per 100,000 (Puzone, Saltzman, Kresnow, Thompson, & Mercy, 2000). Similarly, the rate of IPH in Canada declined from 0.9 per 100,000 in the mid-1970s to 0.3 per 100,000 in 2010 (Hotton Mahony, 2011; Li, 2008). Although this downward trend is encouraging, it is important to examine its representativeness across demographic groups. Data show that the most rapid decline in IPH victimisation rates can be seen among males and non-whites (Puzone et al., 2000; Statistics Canada, 2005; Wells & DeLeon-Granados, 2004).

Lethal violence is largely a male phenomenon. Males are clearly overrepresented as perpetrators in the overall homicide statistics, with figures showing that approximately 80 to 90 per cent of homicide perpetrators across all victim-offender categories in Australia and internationally are male (Cooper & Smith, 2011; Hotton Mahony, 2011; Li, 2008).

---

2 Caution should be taken when comparing these figures cross-nationally. In the United States, homicide data are collected within the Federal Bureau of Investigation’s Supplementary Homicide Reports (SHR). In the SHR data, the victim-offender relationship is unknown in 46 per cent of all cases (US Department of Justice, 2009). In contrast, the data provided by NHMP, Statistics Canada and Home Office contain only a small amount of cases where the victim-offender relationship is not known. Further reason for caution is that the SHR data underreport the prevalence of boyfriend/girlfriend relationships (Langford, Isaac, & Kabat, 1998). In addition, the calculation of IPH proportions in Canada excludes unsolved homicides (Hotton Mahony, 2011; Li, 2008).

3 Data specifically examining IPH rates from more recent years were not available.
Mahony, 2011; Smith et al., 2011; Virueda & Payne, 2010; Weizmann-Henelius et al., 2012). Males are also overrepresented as perpetrators of IPH, although when women kill they are more likely to kill an intimate partner than someone else (Dearden & Jones, 2008; Wilson & Daly, 1992). Research suggests that men and women who kill a current or former intimate partner experience distinctly different situations and emotions in the months and weeks preceding the homicide incident. Men who kill their partners report experiences of losing control, suspecting infidelity, involuntary separation, jealousy and rage (Daly & Wilson, 1988; Johnson & Hotton, 2003; Polk, 1994; Wallace, 1986). In contrast, women who kill their partners report feelings of fear and depression resulting from exposure to domestic violence and social isolation (Johnson & Hotton, 2003; Mills, 1985; Stark, 2007). Given the overrepresentation of males as perpetrators of IPH, from a harm minimisation approach it is imperative that research establishes which factors are particularly relevant to males, both empirically and theoretically.

The recent establishment of domestic violence death reviews in jurisdictions across Australia (see New South Wales Government, 2009; Queensland Government, 2009) speaks for the importance of understanding the contexts, situations and perpetrator characteristics that lead to these events. Understanding these factors is crucial for establishing prevention and intervention measures. Although IPH incidents are relatively rare, these acts place a major burden on society. Monetary costs associated with homicide in general are estimated at over five million US dollars per offence (DeLisi et al., 2010). More importantly, families of homicide victims experience severe loss and emotional distress (Hardesty, Campbell, McFarlane, & Lewandowski, 2008; Peterson Armour, 2002), with more than one in five immediate family members

---

4 A more thorough examination of the factors associated with male-perpetrated IPH is provided in Chapter 2.
developing homicide-related post-traumatic stress disorder (Amick-Mcmullan, Kilpatrick, & Resnick, 1991). In IPH cases where children are involved, the loss of one parent is often coupled with the loss of the other parent to the criminal justice system. This is particularly the case for male-perpetrated IPH, as males are more likely to receive custodial sentences compared to females (Auerhahn, 2007). Research also suggests that violence is transmitted between generations, with children exposed to IPH in childhood growing up to experience intimate partner violence in their adult years (Parker, Steeves, Anderson, & Moran, 2004). Furthermore, recidivism rates among male perpetrators of lethal and non-lethal intimate partner violence are high, with research suggesting that 24 per cent of released offenders commit similar offences within two years of their release (Grann & Wedin, 2002). What these data highlight is the need for researchers, policy-makers and support services to improve understanding of the nature of these offences.

**Using GST to Explain Male-Perpetrated IPH**

Given the level of harm caused by IPH there is a demand for explanatory theoretical frameworks providing insight into why these acts are committed and, consequently, the development of preventative measures (Durrant, 2009). Current theoretical frameworks applied to male-perpetrated IPH include feminist theories, evolutionary psychology and symbolic interactionism (Daly & Wilson, 1988; Duntley & Buss, 2005; Swatt & He, 2006; Taylor & Jasinski, 2011). These theories offer important contributions to the understanding of male-perpetrated IPH by drawing attention to such factors as patriarchy, possessiveness and situational characteristics of the events. However, they do not fully explain the role of negative emotions and the ways in which certain factors moderate the effect of situational events on IPH.
perpetration. Therefore, a key aim of the current research is to extend current theorising by employing an alternative theoretical framework, namely GST.

Since its conceptualisation by Robert Agnew in 1992, GST has received much empirical attention. Fundamentally the theory states that experiencing strain, such as being exposed to aversive events, losing something valuable or being prevented from achieving one’s goals, increases the likelihood of criminal behaviour (Agnew, 1992, 2006b). The link between strain and criminal behaviour operates through negative emotions such as anger, frustration and jealousy (Agnew, 1992, 2006b).\(^5\) However, while most individuals are exposed to strain and negative emotional reactions at some point in their lives, not everyone turns to crime. According to GST, this is because certain factors condition and affect individual coping strategies (Agnew, 1992, 2006b; Agnew, Brezina, Wright, & Cullen, 2002).

Although initially empirical tests of the theory mainly examined juvenile delinquency (see for example Agnew & White, 1992; Brezina, 1996; Mazerolle & Piquero, 1998), recent applications of the theory suggest the relevance of using a GST framework to explain more serious offending, such as prison violence and misconduct (Blevins, Johnson Listwan, Cullen, & Jonson, 2010; Morris, Carriaga, Diamond, Piquero, & Piquero, 2012) and non-lethal intimate partner violence (Anderson & Lo, 2011; Arter, 2008; Katz, 2000). Although the theory has been recognised for its

\(^5\) The concept ‘negative emotions’ is used throughout this thesis to refer to emotions such as anger, irritation, jealousy and sadness (see Chapter 5 for the operationalisation of the emotion variables included in the current research). Although it is recognised that, historically, public expressions of emotions such as anger were more socially acceptable compared to modern times (Stearns & Stearns, 1986), these emotions are referred to as ‘negative’ in this thesis to be consistent with the expectations of Agnew’s (1992) theory.
applicability for explaining homicide (see Delisi, 2011), such applications are largely non-existent.⁶

GST extends theories of male-perpetrated IPH in a number of ways. First, it accounts for the role of negative emotions. IPH incidents are often referred to as ‘crimes of passion’ and the literature suggests that male-perpetrated IPH incidents are characterised by high levels of emotional and expressive features, including experiences of anger and jealousy (Adams, 2007; Polk, 1994; Thomas et al., 2011). By treating emotional reactions as important mediators between adverse experiences and criminal involvement, GST has the potential to provide a valuable contribution to the theoretical landscape of IPH. Second, GST incorporates individual differences, such as availability of resources, personality traits and belief systems, to help explain why some individuals cope better than others when experiencing adverse events and negative emotions. This allows for GST to account for both perpetration and abstention of homicidal acts. Third, GST sits at the intersection of two prominent theoretical fields in criminology: personality, or trait-based explanations (e.g. Gottfredson & Hirschi, 1990), and situational explanations (e.g. Clarke & Felson, 1993). By accounting for the importance of a wide range of variables, including situational events, emotional reactions and individual differences in beliefs, cognitions and temperament, GST provides an important integration of proximal and distal variables to explain male-perpetrated IPH.

**Focus of the Current Research**

The focus of the current research is to use GST as a theoretical model to examine empirically which factors are unique to male-perpetrated IPH compared to

---

⁶ Although see Levin and Madfis (2009) for an examination of school mass murder using GST and other theories.
other types of male-perpetrated homicide. This research has two key aims. The first aim is to build on existing theoretical and empirical research to construct a GST application of male-perpetrated IPH. This includes reviewing what is currently empirically known about the factors and situations associated with IPH incidents and interpreting this through the theoretical principles of GST. Since this research is in many ways exploratory, a GST application of non-IPH is also constructed. GST has the potential to explain both IPH and non-IPH perpetration, although different variables may be relevant to the different homicide categories. The construction of a non-IPH model allows for comparisons between groups in relation to variables that empirically have been associated with non-IPH perpetration, but not necessarily with IPH perpetration. The construction of theoretical models of male IPH perpetration and male non-IPH perpetration is a crucial step toward understanding which factors are unique to male-perpetrated IPH.

The second aim of this research is to assess empirically the validity of these theoretical models. This is done by comparing males who have perpetrated IPH to males who have perpetrated non-IPH in relation to a number of theoretically relevant factors, including strain, negative emotions and conditioning variables. In addition, the validity of the IPH model is further assessed qualitatively to allow for examinations of interpretations of events and coping strategies of men who have killed their intimate partners.

**Data Source**

Available information regarding IPH is mostly limited to secondary data sources such as police case files, court transcripts and prison records (see for example Dearden & Jones, 2008; Johnson & Hotton, 2003), although some research examines victim
experiences by utilising interviews with attempted homicide victims or proxy victims, such as friends or family members (Bailey et al., 1997; McFarlane, Campbell, & Watson, 2001). Directly conducting interviews with homicide perpetrators can be logistically challenging, requiring negotiating access to correctional institutions (Roberts & Indermaur, 2007). Therefore, research using primary sources of data in the form of interviews with homicide perpetrators remain scarce and are often restricted to small sample sizes (although see Lewis, Dobash, Dobash, & Cavanagh, 2003).

This research addresses this methodological gap by using interviews conducted with a large sample of homicide perpetrators convicted of murder or manslaughter across three states in Australia. Interviews were conducted at correctional centres and probation and parole offices with 41 males who had killed a current or former intimate partner. These data are then compared to data from interviews conducted with 116 males whose victim was someone other than an intimate partner, such as family members, friends or strangers. These interviews were structured and explored issues relating to experiences of strain, negative emotions and conditioning factors, all of which are theoretical concepts within GST. To complement and enhance the validity of these quantitative data, semi-structured interviews were conducted with a sub-sample of ten male IPH perpetrators in order to explore their experiences more in-depth. These semi-structured interviews allowed for examinations of subjective experiences of strain and emotions, as well as the role of individual coping resources and strategies.

**Plan of the Thesis**

The following chapter examines the empirical literature on male-perpetrated IPH by presenting an overview of the correlates associated with these types of homicides. The chapter is structured according to thematic groupings of factors specific to the
individual, relationship and situational contexts. The chapter further examines some of the more prominent theoretical perspectives with which IPH perpetration by males is currently understood. Three theoretical frameworks are reviewed: feminist theories, evolutionary psychology and symbolic interactionism. The ways in which GST can extend existing theories is then presented at the end of this chapter.

This is followed by Chapter 3, which provides a comprehensive review of the historical development, theoretical propositions and empirical understanding of GST. Chapter 4 then accomplishes one of the aims of this research, which is to provide a GST application of male-perpetrated IPH. This model is strongly informed not only by the GST principles presented in Chapter 3, but also by the empirical literature reviewed in Chapter 2. In addition, a GST application of male-perpetrated non-IPH is also presented in Chapter 4. The chapter concludes with the research questions that guide the empirical examinations that follow.

Chapter 5 outlines the research methodology. This research uses a mixed-methodology approach, consisting of structured interviews with 157 male homicide perpetrators and semi-structured interviews with ten male IPH perpetrators. The chapter describes the sampling strategies, research locations, data collection tools, variables and analytical strategies utilised in each of the studies.

The findings of this research are reported in Chapters 6 through 9. The first three results chapters draw on the data collected as part of the structured interviews, comparing male IPH perpetrators to male non-IPH perpetrators across three theoretical themes: strain (Chapter 6), negative emotions (Chapter 7) and conditioning factors (Chapter 8). Results from the qualitative narratives are then presented in Chapter 9, where the focus is on experiences of subjective strain, negative emotions and coping mechanisms among male IPH perpetrators.
Finally, Chapter 10 provides a comprehensive discussion of the combined research findings from all four results chapters. This chapter further addresses the implications of these findings for theory, policy, practice and future research.
Chapter 2: Understanding Male-Perpetrated IPH: Current Empirical and Theoretical Context

The first part of this chapter reviews the literature on male-perpetrated IPH. It presents the correlates typically associated with these types of homicide, including individual characteristics as well as variables relating to relationship and situational contexts. This review of the literature plays an important component in the application of GST as a theoretical framework to explain male-perpetrated IPH, which is presented in Chapter 4. The second part of this chapter reviews the three main theoretical positions that have been used to explain male-perpetrated IPH, namely feminist theories, evolutionary psychology and symbolic interactionism. The chapter concludes by examining the gaps and limitations of current theories and suggesting an alternative theoretical framework that builds on existing theorising, namely GST.

Empirical Research

As the focus of the current research is on examining factors associated with male-perpetrated IPH, the focal point of this part of the chapter is on identifying variables that are associated with these types of homicides. However, while specifically calling attention to correlates of male-perpetrated IPH, this section further explores the similarities and dissimilarities with non-IPH perpetration. In addition, male-perpetrated IPH is distinctly different to female perpetration patterns (Serran & Firestone, 2004; Walker, 1989; Weizmann-Henelius et al., 2012) and, where appropriate, this section also calls attention to gender differences in IPH perpetration. Importantly, as research suggests that lethal and non-lethal partner violence differ on key variables (Campbell, Webster, Koziol-McLain, Block, Campbell, Curry, Gary, Glass, et al., 2003; Dobash & Dobash, 2012; Dobash, Dobash, Cavanagh, & Medina-Ariza, 2007) this section first
and foremost calls attention to correlates associated with completed or attempted homicides. Most of the studies reviewed have used official data from a variety of sources, including court transcripts, forensic examination reports and police interviews, while some research have used data consisting of interviews conducted with victims of attempted homicide or proxy victims, such as family members of friends. Limited research has conducted interviews with homicide perpetrators, and these are mostly, though not always, restricted to small sample sizes (although see Lewis et al., 2003).

**Individual-level factors**

A number of individual-level variables are of importance in explaining male IPH perpetration, such as age, ethnicity, exposure to violence in childhood, criminal history and personality characteristics. This section presents research examining these and other individual-level factors and how they are associated with male IPH perpetration. However, the first task is to understand the role of gender.

**Gender**

There are distinct gender differences in homicide perpetration patterns. Males are clearly overrepresented as perpetrators in the overall homicide statistics. Australian NHMP data show that of the 298 known homicide perpetrators in 2006/07, 82 per cent were male while 18 per cent were female (Dearden & Jones, 2008). These data further show that, while in numbers more males than females killed their partners, as many as 38 per cent of female homicide perpetrators killed an intimate partner, compared to 18

---

7 The current study uses the term ‘gender’ as opposed to ‘sex’ to refer to males and females. Although gender is a social and cultural construct, it is preferred in the current study as this is the terminology used by most IPH and GST researchers (e.g. Broidy & Agnew, 1997; Dobash, Dobash, & Cavanagh, 2009).
per cent of males. Thus, while fewer females than males commit homicide, when they do, it is more often directed towards partners than non-partners. In contrast, when men kill it is more often directed toward friends, acquaintances or strangers (Dearden & Jones, 2008).

One way of illustrating the proportion of male and female IPH perpetrators is through the sex ratio of killing (SROK). The SROK is a measure of the number of female IPH perpetrators per every 100 male IPH perpetrators. Using this measure, Wilson and Daly (1992) found that in Australia and Canada 31 females per every 100 males killed their partners (SROK of 31), while in England and Wales this figure was as low as 23. Thus, males constitute a much higher proportion of IPH rates in these countries. Interestingly, United States had an SROK of 75, indicating a smaller gender gap than other countries (Wilson & Daly, 1992). Although the availability of firearms has been linked to increased risks of homicide victimisation in the home (Kellermann et al., 1993), and thus may act as an explanation for the high rate of female IPH perpetrators in the United States, research has not found conclusive support for this hypothesis (see Wilson & Daly, 1992). However, recent years have seen a decrease in the male IPH victimisation rate in the United States, more so than the rate of female IPH victimisation (Cooper & Smith, 2011). In 2011, the SROK in the United States had decreased to 26 (Federal Bureau of Investigation, 2013). Among other explanations, the decrease in male victimisation rates has been attributed to increased mandatory arrest rates and improved economic circumstances for women (Gauthier & Bankston, 2004).

8 The 2011 SROK figures were calculated by using data on victim-offender relationship from the Expanded Homicide Data Table 10: Murder circumstances by relationship. To calculate the SROK, the combined number of husband and boyfriend victims was divided by the combined number of wife and girlfriend victims.
Gender disparities are also seen in terms of victimisation rates. According to NHMP data, males are overrepresented in the overall homicide victimisation statistics, independent of victim-offender relationship (Dearden & Jones, 2008). However, females are at an increased risk of IPH victimisation compared to males, with half of female homicide victims killed by an intimate partner in comparison to ten per cent of males (Dearden & Jones, 2008). These Australian data are validated further by international reports. According to 2008 data from the Federal Bureau of Investigation’s Supplementary Homicide Reports (SHR), 45 per cent of female and five per cent of male homicide victims in the United States were killed by an intimate partner (Cooper & Smith, 2011)\(^9\). The Home Office reports similar figures for England and Wales in 2009/10, with 54 per cent of females and five per cent of males killed by an intimate partner (Smith et al., 2011). Similarly, figures provided by Statistics Canada reveal that in 2010 the IPH victimisation rate for females was more than double that of males (0.44 and 0.19 respectively) (Hotton Mahony, 2011). These data clearly highlight the existing gender differences of IPH, and direct attention to women’s elevated risk of being killed by their intimate partners in comparison to males.

**Age**

Male IPH perpetrators are generally older at the time of the incident compared to male non-IPH perpetrators (Dobash, Dobash, Cavanagh, & Lewis, 2004; Thomas et al., 2011; Weizmann-Henelius et al., 2012). Examining data from the Indiana Department of Correction, Thomas et al. (2011) found that men whose victim was an intimate

\(^9\) Caution should be taken when interpreting data examining the relationship between offender and victim within the SHR as this information is unknown in 46 per cent of all cases (US Department of Justice, 2009). Furthermore, the SHR data underreport the prevalence of boyfriend/girlfriend relationships (Langford, Isaac, & Kabat, 1998).
partner were on average 6.7 years older compared to non-IPH perpetrators (33.4 versus 26.7 years). Data from the Murder in Britain study\textsuperscript{10} reveal similar figures, with an average age of male IPH perpetrators of 34.1 compared to 26.9 among males who killed other males (Dobash et al., 2004). These age differences are also evident, although not as pronounced, in data from Finnish forensic examination reports, where the average age of male IPH perpetrators was 38.3 compared to 35.1 among the non-IPH perpetrators (Weizmann-Henelius et al., 2012).

Research on male IPH victims suggests that they generally are older than female victims are (Block & Christakos, 1995; Mouzos & Shackelford, 2004; Smith, Moracco, & Butts, 1998). In Australia, younger women, particularly below the age of 25, are at an elevated risk of IPH victimisation compared to older women, while in the United States women aged between 35 and 44 are most at risk (Shackelford & Mouzos, 2005). Research shows that younger women being more at risk is not a function of being married to younger men; in contrast, this risk remains despite the age of the male partner (Shackelford, Buss, & Peters, 2000). However, other data suggest that there are no major age differences between male IPH perpetrators and their female victims, particularly when compared to non-IPH incidents (Dobash et al., 2004).

\textit{Ethnicity}

IPH incidents are further marked by ethnic differences. In Australia, IPH incidents are twice as prevalent among Indigenous Australians as among non-Indigenous Australians (Carcach & James, 1998; Mouzos, 2001). While Indigenous Australians are also overrepresented in terms of killings between other family members, 

\textsuperscript{10}As suggested by its name, the Murder in Britain study only includes individuals who have been convicted of murder.
they are very rarely involved in stranger homicides (2.7%) compared to non-Indigenous Australians (21.2%) (Mouzos, 2001). Data also show that Aboriginal peoples in Canada are at disproportionate risk of IPH victimisation (Trainor & Mihorean, 2001). In contrast, SHR data show that in the United States a lower proportion of black perpetrators killed intimate partners (43.5%) compared to the average across all homicide categories (52.5%) (Cooper & Smith, 2011). Similar results are seen in data from the State of Indiana, where 34.2 per cent of male IPH-perpetrators were black, compared to 46.3 per cent of male non-IPH perpetrators (Thomas et al., 2011).

Examining gender, female Indigenous homicide perpetrators in Australia are equally likely to kill an intimate partner compared to female homicide perpetrators overall, however, this is not the case for males. In 2006/07 the overall proportion of male IPH perpetration was 18 per cent, while within the Indigenous population this figure was 28 per cent (Dearden & Jones, 2008). Interestingly, Canadian victimisation data show that Aboriginal males are more at risk of IPH victimisation compared to females. Between 1991 and 1999, Aboriginal females in Canada were eight times more likely to be killed by an intimate partner compared to non-Aboriginal females, while Aboriginal males were 18 times more likely to be killed by an intimate partner compared to non-Aboriginal males (Trainor & Mihorean, 2001). Similar gender findings are reported in data from the United States. Wilson and Daly (1992) note that at least part of the high SROK found in the United States can be explained by the high proportion of African-American female IPH perpetrators, where in the African-American population 131 females per every 100 males kill their partners whereas white females kill their partners at a rate of 43/100.
**Socio-economic status**

Research consistently suggests that measures of social and economic disadvantage correlate with violence between intimate partners (see Campbell, Webster, Koziol-McLain, Block, Campbell, Curry, Gary, Glass, et al., 2003; Holtzworth-Munroe, Smutzler, & Bates, 1997; Hotaling & Sugarman, 1990; Walby & Allen, 2004; Walton-Moss, Mangelon, Frye, & Campbell, 2005), although limited research has examined fatal outcomes. Comparing IPH and attempted IPH, Campbell et al. (2003) report that perpetrator unemployment was the single most important socio-demographic explanatory variable of completed IPH. Further, NHMP data show that in approximately 60 per cent of IPH incidents both the victim and offender were unemployed, irrespective of the gender of the victim (Mouzos, 1999a).

However, although a substantial proportion of IPH perpetrators are unemployed at the time of the incident, research suggests that these figures are not as high as those for non-IPH perpetrators. Case file data from the Murder in Britain study show that males who had killed an intimate partner were more than twice as likely to have been regularly employed prior to the incident compared to males who had killed other males (Dobash et al., 2004). Similarly, data from the United States suggest that while 72.9 per cent of men convicted of killing an intimate partner were employed at the time of the incident, less than half (44.6%) of male non-IPH perpetrators were employed (Thomas et al., 2011). In addition, official data from Finland suggest that certain categories of homicide perpetrators are more disadvantaged than others are. For example, the data reveal that in 72 per cent of homicides between unrelated males the perpetrator was either unemployed or on a work disability pension, compared to 57 per cent of male IPH perpetrators (Kivivuori & Lehti, 2012). Thus, while low socio-economic status may
be a correlate of IPH perpetration, it appears to be more strongly associated with non-IPH perpetration.

**Exposure to violence in childhood**

There is an extensive body of literature linking exposure to violence in childhood to intimate partner violence perpetration in adulthood (see Gover, Kaukinen, & Fox, 2008; Kalmuss, 1984; Stith et al., 2000). Research suggests that this link also exists for IPH perpetrators (Adams, 2009). Interviewing 31 male IPH perpetrators in Massachusetts, Adams (2009) found that 48 per cent had been physically abused in childhood and 55 per cent had observed their father abusing their mother. However, research examining exposure to violence in childhood across victim-offender categories have found mixed results. Data from the Finish forensic examination reports show that while 24.2 per cent of male IPH perpetrators were physically abused in childhood, as many as 44.3 per cent of men who had killed someone other than an intimate partner had been exposed to this type of violence in childhood (Weizmann-Henelius et al., 2012). Differences were also found in terms of observing parental violence, where proportionally more male non-IPH perpetrators compared to IPH perpetrators had witnessed violence in the family (40.8% and 25.0% respectively) (Weizmann-Henelius et al., 2012). However, while the Murder in Britain study shows similar findings in terms of observing father-to-mother violence, their data suggest no differences in terms of being physically or sexually abused as a child (Dobash et al., 2004). Similarly, research from the United States suggests no differences between IPH and non-IPH perpetrators in terms of exposure to violence in childhood (Thomas et al., 2011).
Criminal history

Research suggests that IPH perpetrators often have an existing criminal record (Dawson & Gartner, 1998; Dobash et al., 2004; Eke, Hilton, Harris, Rice, & Houghton, 2011; Moracco, Runyan, & Butts, 1998; Websdale, 1999). This appears to be a stronger correlate for male IPH perpetrators compared to female. Some studies note that in over 60 per cent of male-perpetrated IPH the perpetrator had a criminal history (Dawson & Gartner, 1998; Moracco et al., 1998), while research examining female IPH perpetrators has found prevalence rates of prior criminal records of 35 per cent (Johnson & Hotton, 2003).

However, although a history of criminal involvement is common among individuals who kill their intimate partners, these figures are not as high compared to non-IPH perpetrators. Data show that 21.3 per cent of male non-IPH perpetrators were on probation at the time of the incident compared to 14.3 per cent of men who had killed an intimate partner (Thomas et al., 2011). Using official data from Sweden, Belfrage and Rying (2004) found that a history of known criminal activity was not specific to IPH, but more strongly associated with non-IPH (61% compared to 72%). Research suggests that this distinction applies to both property and violent crimes (Weizmann-Henelius et al., 2012). For example, in the Finnish data a higher proportion of males who had committed homicide against another male had served time in prison, been convicted of theft/burglary or been convicted of assault/homicide compared to males who had killed an intimate partner (Kivivuori & Lehti, 2012).

Research further suggests that these differences are noticeable from a young age. Dobash et al. (2004) found that 22.7 per cent of men who had killed other men, compared to 12.1 per cent of IPH perpetrators, had five or more criminal convictions prior to the age of 16. Similarly, Thomas et al. (2011) found that 38.4 per cent of male
non-IPH perpetrators had previous juvenile offences, compared to only 19 per cent of the IPH perpetrators.

Thus, it appears as though while a criminal history is evident in many of the IPH perpetrators, these numbers are not as high as they are for men who have perpetrated non-IPH. However, examining assault convictions in more detail, Dobash et al. (2004) found that while over half of IPH perpetrators had previous assault convictions where the usual victim was a female, this was only true for one-tenth of men who had killed other men. This suggests the importance of examining more specifically against whom the previous violence was directed.11

**Alcohol and drug problems**

Research suggests an association between offender drug or alcohol problems and homicide perpetration (Kellermann et al., 1993; Sharps, Campbell, Campbell, Gary, & Webster, 2003; Shaw et al., 2006). In terms of IPH, interviews with female victims of attempted IPH and proxy victims of completed homicides reveal that, in the year leading up to the incident, as many as 49.2 per cent of perpetrators could be classified as problem drinkers and 11.3 per cent had been in drug treatment (Sharps et al., 2003).

Compared to non-IPH, much of the research suggests that the prevalence rates of alcohol and drug problems are either similar or lower for IPH perpetrators (Dobash et al., 2004; Kivivuori & Lehti, 2012; Thomas et al., 2011; Weizmann-Henelius et al., 2012). For example, data from the Murder in Britain study suggest that while 37.9 per cent of male IPH perpetrators had abused alcohol as adults, 56.6 per cent of men who had killed other men had abused alcohol (Dobash et al., 2004). These distinct

11 The association between previous non-lethal intimate partner violence perpetration and IPH will be discussed further in the section describing relationship variables.
differences were also found in terms of drug abuse, with 14.7 per cent of IPH perpetrators and 35.6 per cent of male-on-male homicide perpetrators having a history of drug abuse. Similarly, although not finding any major differences in terms of alcoholism, Kivivuori and Lehti (2012) found a higher prevalence rate of drug abuse among males who had killed other males compared to males who had killed intimate partners (37% and 14% respectively).

**Mental health problems**

Research relating to mental health problems among IPH perpetrators has provided mixed findings. For example, data from the United States show that a history of severe mental illness significantly increases the likelihood of IPH for men (Thomas et al., 2011). Similarly, in Finland a higher proportion of IPH males are considered legally insane or non-culpable for the homicide due to mental illness compared to men whose victim is another male (Kivivuori & Lehti, 2012; Weizmann-Henelius et al., 2012). However, data from the Murder in Britain study suggest no differences between male IPH perpetrators and men who had killed other men in terms of mental health problems during adulthood (Dobash et al., 2004). Examining victim-offender relationships in more detail, NHMP data suggest that mentally disordered individuals were more likely to kill family members than partners, friends or strangers (Mouzos, 1999b). Data further suggest the importance of examining different categories of mental health problems separately. For example, Weizmann et al. (2012) found that a higher proportion of male non-IPH perpetrators were diagnosed as having antisocial personality disorder compared to male IPH perpetrators (37.3% and 23.6% respectively).
**Personality characteristics**

While much research has been conducted into the personality characteristics of individuals who perpetrate non-lethal intimate partner violence (e.g. Holtzworth-Munroe, Stuart, & Hutchinson, 1997), research has rarely examined whether and how these factors are associated with IPH. The most prominent personality traits identified in the literature relate to jealousy and possessiveness (Adams, 2007; Campbell, 1992; Dobash & Dobash, 2011; Easteal, 1993; Nicolaïdis et al., 2003; Wallace, 1986; Websdale, 1999). For example, examining male-perpetrated IPH in Florida, Websdale (1999) found that 50.7 per cent of perpetrators had displayed possessiveness or jealousy toward the victim prior to the incident. The impact of these traits appears to be of particular relevance in cases of relationship separation (Easteal, 1993; Johnson & Hotton, 2003; Polk, 1994), which is discussed in further detail in the section describing relationship factors that follows.

Other personality traits include negative emotionality and impulsivity. The non-lethal violence literature suggests that men who are violent toward partners exhibit relatively similar levels of negative emotionality (also referred to as trait anger) compared to men who are violent more generally (Moffitt, Krueger, Caspi, & Fagan, 2000). However, research suggests that men who engage in intimate partner violence have lower levels of impulsivity compared to men who are violent more generally (Boyle, O’Leary, Rosenbaum, & Hassett-Walker, 2008; Holtzworth-Munroe, Meehan, Herron, Rehman, & Stuart, 2000; Moffitt et al., 2000). Examining individuals convicted of lethal and non-lethal partner violence, Grann and Wedin (2002) found that higher levels of impulsivity significantly increased recidivism rates. However, as research suggests that individuals who are high in trait anger are more likely to respond to negative events with situational anger (Mazerolle, Piquero, & Capowich, 2003), it is not
only important to examine personality traits, but also situational negative emotions and the way that these interact to increase the possible likelihood of criminal outcomes.

**Relationship factors**

When researching IPH it is important to take the context of the relationship into account. This section examines a number of relationship factors that research has found to be associated with male IPH perpetration, such as a history of non-lethal intimate partner violence and relationship separation.

**History of intimate partner violence**

One of the most central risk factors of male-perpetrated IPH is previous violence within the relationship (Browne, 1986; Campbell, Webster, Koziol-McLain, Block, Campbell, Curry, Gary, McFarlane, et al., 2003; Easteal, 1993; Sharps et al., 2001; Taylor & Jasinski, 2011; Websdale, 1999). Much of the research comparing IPH and non-IPH examines whether previous violence existed between the offender and the victim, finding that a history of violence is more prevalent among IPH compared to non-IPH perpetrators (Dobash et al., 2004; Kivivuori & Lehti, 2012). However, by definition, non-IPH incidents are not directed toward intimate partners, and therefore examinations of previous violence between the offender and the victim do not provide information regarding differences in prior use of intimate partner violence. When specifically examining a history of intimate partner violence, the Murder in Britain study showed that while 56.9 per cent of IPH males had previously been violent toward an intimate partner, 34.9 per cent of men who had killed other men had previously displayed this type of violence (Dobash et al., 2004).

Retrospective studies consistently find that intimate partner violence was prevalent in the majority of relationships where partner killings occurred (Sharps et al.,
2001; Smith et al., 1998; Statistics Canada, 2005). For example, through interviews with women who had survived a homicide attempt by a current or former partner, Nicolaidis et al. (2003) found that 67 per cent of these women reported a history of physical or sexual abuse within the relationship. Similarly, through interviews with close friends and family members of female IPH victims, Sharps et al. (2001) found that over 65 per cent of female victims had been physically abused by their partners prior to the incident. Research further suggests that the violence extends beyond the female partner. For example, comparing female IPH victims to a control group of abused women, Campbell et al. (2003) found that in 34 per cent of the IPH cases the male partners had made threats to kill the rest of the family, compared to eight per cent in the control group.

Physical and sexual abuse during pregnancy has also been associated with increased risks of IPH victimisation for women, although the research findings are mixed. Some research suggests that homicide (although not specifically between intimate partners) is one of the leading causes of death in pregnant and post-partum women (Chang, Berg, Herndon, & Saltzman, 2005; Dannenberg et al., 1995; Horon & Cheng, 2001). In a study on pregnancy and abuse, McFarlane, Campbell, Sharps and Watson (2002) found that 23 per cent of female IPH victims, 26 per cent of female attempted IPH victims and eight per cent of female non-lethal intimate partner violence victims had been abused during pregnancy. In contrast, Taylor and Nabors (2009) did not find any statistically significant differences between lethal and non-lethal intimate partner violence in terms of the pregnancy status of the female victim, even finding that pregnant women have significantly lower odds of being victims of IPH compared to non-pregnant women.

In many cases, the non-lethal violence had been subject to criminal justice system interventions. Research by McFarlane et al. (2001) found that approximately
half of women who had been killed by their partners or survived a homicide attempt had used some form of justice services within the year leading up to the incident. Queensland research further reveals that domestic violence protection orders were present in 30 per cent of male-perpetrated IPH cases (Mouzos, 2000), while data from Florida suggest that more than half of victims had prior police contact relating to domestic violence (Websdale, 1999). However, a common concern among victims of intimate partner violence is that visiting a health practitioner or seeking help through the legal system may put them in even greater danger, as they fear that the abusive partner may retaliate (Douglas & Godden, 2003; Rodriguez, Quiroga, & Bauer, 1996).

**Relationship status**

Research suggests that the risk of IPH victimisation is higher in de facto relationships than in married couples (Johnson & Hotton, 2003; Shackelford & Mouzos, 2005; Wilson, Daly, & Wright, 1993). In Australia and the United States, females in de facto relationships are up to ten times more at risk than females in married relationships (Shackelford & Mouzos, 2005). Data from Statistics Canada suggest similar figures, with around six to eight times higher victimisation rates for women in de facto relationships (Johnson & Hotton, 2003; Wilson et al., 1993). However, it appears as though males in de facto relationships are particularly at risk. In Australia, males are 16 times more likely to be killed by an intimate partner if they are in a de facto relationship compared to if they are legally married, while American males are ten times more at risk (Mouzos & Shackelford, 2004). Similar patterns are again shown in Canada, with de facto males experiencing between a 12 and 15 times higher likelihood of homicide victimisation compared to their legally married counterparts (Johnson & Hotton, 2003; Wilson et al., 1993). However, more recent data from the United States suggest that
males and females in de facto relationships are no longer at an increased risk of IPH victimisation compared to married couples (James & Daly, 2012).

**Relationship separation**

Women who have separated from their partners are at an increased risk of being victims of IPH compared to women in intact relationships (Johnson & Hotton, 2003; Thomas et al., 2011; Wallace, 1986; Wilson & Daly, 1993b). Examining official data from Canada, the United States and Australia, Wilson and Daly (1993b) found higher homicide rates among separated couples than among co-residing couples. Interviewing close friends or family members of female IPH victims, Campbell et al. (2003) found that 55 per cent of the homicides occurred while the couple was separated. Similarly, research based on interviews with female victims of attempted homicide reveals that 73 per cent of incidents occurred during a change in the relationship, such as separation (Nicolaidis et al., 2003). In addition to actual separation, research suggests that the threat of separation is also associated with an elevated risk of homicide victimisation for females (Wilson & Daly, 1993b).

In contrast, relationship separation is not associated with increased risks of IPH victimisation for males. Using data from Statistics Canada, Johnson and Hotton (2003) found that males were more at risk of being killed by a current partner than by a former partner. Similarly, Wilson and Daly (1992) note that the SROK is significantly lower in instances where the couple was separated compared to when they were co-residing. Contrary to these findings, however, data collected from coronary reports and interviews with police officers from North Carolina indicate no statistically significant differences between male and female victims with regards to relationship state (Smith et al., 1998).
Comparing across victim-offender relationship categories, Thomas et al. (2011) found that relationship separation was more common among male IPH perpetrators compared to men whose victim was a non-partner. While 17.9 per cent of men who had killed an intimate partner were separated at the time of the offence, only 2.2 per cent of the comparison group were separated. They found similar results in terms of divorce, with 20.3% of IPH perpetrators and 12.1% of non-IPH perpetrators being divorced at the time of the incident. Examining relationship separation in previous relationships, Dobash et al. (2004) found that although a sizeable proportion of males who had killed other males had experienced at least one relationship break-down in a previous relationship (60.8%), this was experienced by a significantly higher proportion of male IPH perpetrators (76.0%).

The risk of homicide victimisation for females by a former partner diminishes with the length of the separation (Hotton, 2001; Wallace, 1986). Based on data from Australia, Wallace (1986) reports that most wives are killed within the first few months after separation, with the first few weeks being particularly dangerous. Similarly, using narrative data from police records in Canada, Hotton (2001) found that 49 per cent of females killed by a former partner were killed within the first two months of separation compared to 19 per cent of victims who were killed more than a year after the separation.

**Presence of step-children**

Some studies have found that the presence of children from previous relationships increases the risk of IPH victimisation for females (Campbell, Webster, Koziol-McLain, Block, Campbell, Curry, Gary, Glass, et al., 2003; Daly, Wiseman, & Wilson, 1997). As information regarding children is not often readily available in police records, Daly et al. (1997) combined data from Statistics Canada with information from
local newspapers for a city in Canada for 1974 to 1995. In analysing these data, they found that women who had children by former partners had a 12 times greater risk of being killed by their current partners in comparison to women who only had children by their current partner. Unfortunately their sample size was small ($N=16$), as it was limited to mothers. However, other research substantiates their findings. Campbell et al. (2003) found that while 18 per cent of women in a control group of abused women had children other than their current partners’ living in the household, 39 per cent of female IPH victims had step-children living with them.

**Situational factors**

This section examines correlates of IPH perpetration specific to the situation in which the homicide occurs outside of the context of relationship variables. Included in this section are perpetrators motives, use of alcohol and drugs, and weapon use.

**Motives**

IPH incidents often occur in the context of relationship separation and other relationship conflicts. In these contexts, the use of lethal or non-lethal violence can be seen as a means of maintaining control in a relationship or reacting to extreme feelings of jealousy and anger (Adams, 2007; Campbell, 1992; Daly & Wilson, 1988; Polk, 1994). Although the dichotomisation of crimes into expressive and instrumental categories has not been without its critics (see Felson & Tedeschi, 1993), the homicide literature suggests that lethal violence between intimate partners or other family members often contain emotive and expressive features (Block & Christakos, 1995; Last & Fritzon, 2005), particularly when compared to other victim-offender categories (Decker, 1993; Miethe & Regoecki, 2004). For example, analysing nearly 200,000 narrative accounts of homicide as part of the SHR data, Miethe and Regoecki (2004)
found that while 53.2 per cent of intimate partner and family homicides could be classified as uniquely expressive, this applied to none of the stranger homicides. In contrast, 65.4 per cent of stranger homicides and none of the partner/family homicides were classified as uniquely instrumental.

Using secondary data to examine emotive aspects in more detail, Thomas et al. (2011) found that experiences of hatred or rage were more common among male IPH-perpetrators compared to non-IPH perpetrators. Research also suggests that jealousy is frequently a motivating factor in male-perpetrated IPH (Adams, 2007; Campbell, 1992; Dobash & Dobash, 2011; Easteal, 1993; Nicolaidis et al., 2003; Wallace, 1986). Research from Australia examining NHMP and court data suggests that jealousy was a contributing factor in one-fifth of male-perpetrated IPH incidents (Easteal, 1993). Similarly, interviewing friends and families of female IPH victims, Campbell et al. (2003) found that in 38.6 per cent of all incidents jealousy was the triggering factor. Research by Dobash et al. (2007) further suggests that jealousy and possessiveness were five times more likely in cases of lethal partner violence compared to non-lethal partner violence.

Research suggests that a greater proportion of non-IPH incidents are accompanied by other criminal activities compared to IPH (Moracco et al., 1998; Thomas et al., 2011). For example, Thomas et al. (2011) found that 44.1 per cent of male-perpetrated non-IPH incidents were related to another crime (e.g. robbery) compared to 2.9 per cent of IPH incidents. Examining motives in more detail, they further found that money was more often a motivating factor in non-IPH incidents compared to IPH incidents (42.2% compared to 3%). Similarly, research by Moracco et al. (1998) suggests that one-third of non-IPH incidents involving female victims were committed during the act of robbery, compared to less than three per cent of IPH
incidents involving female victims. Similar differences exist with regard to homicides committed in the course of sexual assault (Moracco et al., 1998). Research further shows that male IPH perpetrators are less likely to commit homicide as an act of self-defence compared to non-IPH perpetrators (1.1% and 15.4% respectively; Weizmann-Henelius et al., 2012). Australian data show that about half of incidents involving unrelated males were precipitated by arguments, many of which involved the use of alcohol (Mouzos, 2000). This may include what Polk (1994) refers to as ‘confrontational homicide’, characterised by honour or masculinity disputes between males.

**Alcohol and drug use at the time of the incident**

The association between substance use and non-lethal intimate partner violence has been widely documented (see Garcia, Soria, & Hurwitz, 2007; Lipsky, Caetano, Field, & Larkin, 2005; Norlander & Eckhardt, 2005). This link has also been found in connection to IPH (Dearden & Payne, 2009; Stout, 1993). Limited IPH research has examined alcohol and drug use at the time of the incident across gender, particularly as related to perpetrator use. Those studies that have examined perpetrator use have generally found no gender differences (Swatt & He, 2006; Weizmann-Henelius et al., 2012), although data from Statistics Canada (2005) show that higher proportions of female IPH perpetrators (76%) had consumed alcohol and/or drugs at the time of the incident in comparison to male IPH perpetrators (55%). In contrast, victim data suggest that substance use is more prevalent among male victims compared to female victims (Smith et al., 1998). Examining medical reports in the United States, Smith et al. (1998) found that 70 per cent of male IPH victims and 33 per cent of female IPH victims had alcohol in their blood at the time of their death.
The association between substance use and lethal or non-lethal intimate partner violence is even greater among Indigenous populations. In Australia, Indigenous IPH incidents are more often associated with alcohol use compared to non-Indigenous IPH incidents (Mouzos, 2001). Using NHMP data, Dearden and Payne (2009) found that as many as 87 per cent of IPH incidents involving Indigenous perpetrators and victims were alcohol-related. This is significantly higher compared to homicides involving non-Indigenous partners, where 30 per cent of incidents were alcohol-related (Dearden & Payne, 2009). Similar patterns are found in Canada, where data show that the risk of severe violence directed towards Indigenous women increased by 17 per cent if the partner was a heavy alcohol consumer, compared to the risk for non-Indigenous women which increased by 11 per cent (Brownridge, 2003).

In terms of differences between IPH and non-IPH, the findings are mixed. Some research suggests that the rates of alcohol intoxication are similar for IPH and non-IPH perpetrators (Moracco et al., 1998; Weizmann-Henelius et al., 2012). However, other data suggest higher rates of alcohol intoxication among non-IPH compared to IPH perpetrators (Dearden & Payne, 2009; Dobash et al., 2004). In contrast, data have also shown that a higher proportion of IPH perpetrators were under the influence of alcohol at the time of the incident compared to non-IPH perpetrators (Belfrage & Rying, 2004). In terms of drug use, the limited research conducted suggests this is more strongly related to non-IPH compared to IPH (Dobash et al., 2004; Moracco et al., 1998).

**Use of weapons**

Weapon use plays an important role in differentiating non-lethal from lethal intimate partner violence due to the higher risk of sustaining serious injuries when weapons are involved (Dobash et al., 2007). The majority of violent altercations resulting in IPH involve some form of weapon (Block & Christakos, 1995; Mercy &
Saltzman, 1989; Mouzos & Rushforth, 2003). For example, research from the United States suggests that upwards of 65 per cent of all IPH incidents involve the use of firearms (Mercy & Saltzman, 1989; Smith et al., 1998). However, in countries with stricter gun control policies firearms are used to a much lesser extent. In Canada, 29 per cent of IPH incidents involve firearms (Statistics Canada, 2005) while in Australia the prevalence is 22 per cent (Mouzos & Rushforth, 2003).

While equal proportions of male and female IPH perpetrators use firearms to kill their partners, research suggests gender differences in other methods of killing, with a higher proportion of female perpetrators using knives and a higher proportion of male perpetrators using bodily force (Mercy & Saltzman, 1989; Mouzos & Rushforth, 2003; Smith et al., 1998). For example, data from Canada show that 66 per cent of male IPH victims were killed by stabbing compared to 29 per cent of female victims (Statistics Canada, 2005). Similarly, Australian NHMP data reveal that 55 per cent of male and 33 per cent of female IPH victims were killed by stabbing (Mouzos & Rushforth, 2003). In contrast, 27 per cent of female and eight per cent of male IPH victims were beaten to death (Mouzos & Rushforth, 2003).

While data show distinct differences in weapon use across gender, research comparing IPH and non-IPH perpetrated by males reveals mixed findings. For example, data from the United States show that men who perpetrate IPH are less likely to use firearms and more likely to use knives or other sharp objects compared to male non-IPH perpetrators (Thomas et al., 2011). Similarly, research by Kellermann et al. (1993) examining the correlation between firearm accessibility and homicide risks in the United States found that the presence of one or more guns in the home incurred an eight times greater risk of homicide by a family member or an intimate partner, while this was not a risk factor for homicides committed by friends or strangers. Limited research
has examined weapon use across homicide categories outside of the United States. Data from the Murder in Britain study suggest that men who kill other men are more likely to use an instrument or a weapon compared to men who kill an intimate partner. Research from Finland suggests that while there are no differences between male IPH and non-IPH perpetration in terms of firearm use, males who kill non-partners are more likely to use sharp objects (Weizmann-Henelius et al., 2012).

**Current Theoretical Explanations of Male-Perpetrated IPH**

Thus far this chapter has provided a description of the correlates associated with male IPH perpetration. As indicated by the literature reviewed, a number of individual, relationship and situational factors need to be taken into consideration when attempting theoretical explanations of lethal violence between intimate partners, including the role of relationship separation, personality characteristics of perpetrators and a history of intimate partner violence perpetration. The focus of this section is on examining the main theoretical positions that have been used to explain these types of homicides. Numerous theories have been used to explain non-lethal intimate partner violence, including attachment and social learning theories. However, although homicide is often viewed as an extension of intimate partner violence, research suggests key differences between lethal and non-lethal acts (Campbell, Webster, Koziol-McLain, Block, Campbell, Curry, Gary, Glass, et al., 2003; Dobash et al., 2007), warranting the need to examine IPH separately to non-lethal intimate partner violence. Therefore, the focus of this section is exclusively on theories used to explain lethal intimate partner violence. Furthermore, as the current research specifically examines male-perpetration patterns, theories used to explain female-perpetrated IPH (e.g. self-help theories, see Black, 1983; Peterson, 1999) are not reviewed.
Although a range of theories have been applied to male-perpetrated IPH, this section of the chapter examines the theoretical propositions of the three more prominent theories, namely feminist theories, evolutionary psychology and symbolic interactionism. In addition, this section presents some of the empirical research examining these theories. The final part of this section includes an examination of the gaps and limitations of current IPH theorising, and explores the need for an alternative theoretical framework.

**Feminist perspectives**

Directing attention to issues of gender equality and patriarchy, the most commonly applied theories in terms of male-perpetrated violence against women are socialist and radical feminist perspectives (Brownmiller, 1975; Daly & Chesney-Lind, 1988; Dobash & Dobash, 1979; Dobash, Dobash, Wilson, & Daly, 1992; Klein, 1981; Simpson, 1989; Stark, 2007; Taylor & Jasinski, 2011). Both perspectives emphasise the importance of examining patriarchy as a cause of male violence, although they differ in their explanations of the origin of patriarchy. Radical feminist ideas centre around male violence as a form of control over women’s sexuality (Daly & Chesney-Lind, 1988; Simpson, 1989). This manifestation of patriarchy is not limited to the domestic sphere but further integrated into the social structure, enforcing male domination and control.

---

12 Whilst presented as three distinct theories it should be noted that these theories share some common ground. For example, the emergence of symbolic interactionism in the middle of the 20th Century focused attention on the importance of understanding micro-level human interaction, thus making what was previously considered personal a subject of intellectual enquiry (West, 1996). In this way, symbolic interactionism is consistent with feminist approaches, which not only function to politicise the personal, but also to apply a more nuanced interpretive understanding of how social institutions and ingrained structures of power in society can marginalise and control females. Another example of sharing common ground is feminists’ and evolutionary psychologists’ emphasis on men’s sexual proprietariness as a source of violence against women (Johnson, 2012), as described further in-text.
over women (Daly & Chesney-Lind, 1988; Klein, 1981). As a radical feminist Brownmiller (1975) argues that male sexual violence against women acts as a form of intimidation, targeting not only women directly exposed to sexual violence, but controlling all women by keeping them in constant fear of sexual victimisation. Dobash and Dobash (1979) further propose that all types of violence, not only sexual, should be viewed as a form of control and subordination of women.

Socialist feminists extend these ideas in arguing that male domination is further manifested through the workforce and that patriarchy and capitalism are both responsible for gender oppression (Daly & Chesney-Lind, 1988; Eisenstein, 1979). Male violence against women thus acts as a form of control mechanism to keep women in place both as the subordinate gender and as the subordinate class (Simpson, 1989). Despite the centrality of the concept of patriarchy in radical and socialist feminist thought, only limited research has operationalised this concept in relation to partner violence specifically (see for example Vieraitis, Britto, & Kovandzic, 2007).

Of central importance to feminist theories as applied to male-perpetrated IPH are issues of gender inequality and women’s absolute and relative status in society (Taylor & Jasinski, 2011). According to feminist perspectives, increased gender equality would result in either reduced rates of male-perpetrated IPH due to increased access to support services for abused women that serves to protect them from partner violence (the ameliorative hypothesis) or higher rates of male-perpetrated IPH as a means for men to control ‘liberated’ women (the backlash hypothesis) (see Dugan, Nagin, & Rosenfeld, 1999; Vieraitis et al., 2007; Whaley & Messner, 2002).

Research on the ameliorative and backlash hypotheses has provided mixed evidence. For example, macro-level research by Gauthier and Bankston (1997) lends support for the backlash hypothesis. Their results show that relatively high economic
advantage for women is associated with higher levels of male-perpetrated IPH, although their data further suggest that the effects of women’s increased gender equality may be contingent on contextual variables such as cultural values. Micro-level research also provides support for the backlash argument. Examining case files as part of the Murder in Britain study, Dobash and Dobash (2011) note that violence is a means for males of correcting and punishing the partner for not behaving according to expectations (also see Felson & Messner, 2000). Involuntary relationship separation is perhaps the ultimate loss of control, and as noted earlier in this chapter, research has consistently identified separation as a central risk factor of IPH victimisation in women (Johnson & Hotton, 2003; Wilson & Daly, 1993b).

Other research has found support for the ameliorative hypothesis. For example, Dugan, Nagin and Rosenfeld (2000) suggest that part of the overall decline seen in the United States can be accounted for by women’s reduced exposure to violence. Their data show that improved services for abused women, increased awareness of domestic violence in the community and altered living conditions has had the effect of reducing women’s exposure to domestic violence. Similarly, Gauthier and Bankston (2004) note that the increase in mandatory arrest rates and improved economic circumstances for women has led to a levelling out of the gender differences in homicide perpetration in the United States. However, as noted by Wells and DeLeon-Granados (2004), this exposure reduction to violence has not been consistent for all women across social class and ethnicity.

Feminist perspectives also highlight the importance of examining jealousy and sexual possessiveness, particularly in relation to the loss of control associated with relationship separation (Taylor & Jasinski, 2011). As discussed earlier in this chapter, jealousy and possessiveness are frequently found to be motivating factors in male-
perpetrated IPH (Adams, 2007; Campbell, 1992; Dobash & Dobash, 2011; Easteal, 1993; Nicolaidis et al., 2003; Polk, 1994; Wallace, 1986). Although the concepts of jealousy and possessiveness are important to feminist theories explaining male-perpetrated IPH, these are concepts that stem from the evolutionary psychology literature (for a discussion see Johnson, 2012), which is described in further detail next.

**Evolutionary psychology**

According to evolutionary psychologists, the key to understanding the presence of human characteristics in modern society can be traced back to our ancestral past (Tooby & Cosmides, 2005). Through a process of natural selection, mutations facilitating reproduction of oneself or one’s genetic relatives are retained while mutations preventing reproduction are discarded (Buss, Haselton, Shackelford, Bleske, & Wakefield, 1998; Tooby & Cosmides, 2005). It is through this evolutionary process that humans have developed situation-specific programs located within the brain that activate behavioural and physiological responses to information gathered from the environment (Tooby & Cosmides, 2005).

Applied to the study of IPH, evolutionary psychologists examine violence as a response to adaptive problems. When confronted with a perceived threat to the intimate relationship, feelings of jealousy are aroused (Campbell & Ellis, 2005; Goetz, Shackelford, Starratt, & McKibbin, 2008; Wilson & Daly, 1993a). According to evolutionary psychologists women experience *emotional* jealousy in response to the fear of losing physical and emotional resources from the male partner, while men experience *sexual* jealousy when faced with the possibility of losing a partner’s reproductive abilities through sexual competition and infidelity, something which could potentially lead to cuckolding (the rearing of a child to whom one is not the father) (Wilson & Daly, 1993a). Jealousy thus acts as the psychological link between the
perceived threat of sexual infidelity and the act of violence (Wilson & Daly, 1993a). Campbell (2005, p. 633) further argues that selection processes have resulted in “extreme sensitivity” to relationship threats where even instances without any actual threats are responded to, since the risk of losing a partner is greater than the risk of reacting to non-existent threats.

Within evolutionary psychology there are two prominent and qualitatively different theories that seek to explain male-perpetrated IPH. The homicide adaptation theory, developed by Duntley and Buss (2005, 2008), proposes that humans hold adaptations for homicidal behaviour (see also Buss & Duntley, 2003; Duntley, 2005). These adaptations have been developed through an evolutionary process whereby under certain circumstances the benefits associated with committing homicide would have exceeded the costs and been more beneficial than other available solutions. When an intimate relationship is under threat and certain environmental, psychological and personality factors are present, the adaptive response of homicide is then used to solve the ‘problem’.

In contrast to the theory presented by Duntley and Buss, Daly and Wilson (1988, 1999) argue that homicide is not an adaptation per se but instead functions as a by-product of adaptive behaviour (see also Wilson & Daly, 1993a). They note that instead of serving the best interests of the male, homicide is in fact counterproductive, as it results in the loss of the person they are attempting to retain. Instead, Daly and Wilson argue that it is non-lethal violence that acts as an adaptive response, in that non-lethal intimate partner violence assists males to keep their partners under coercive control. Homicides, they argue, are “dysfunctionally extreme manifestations of violent inclinations” (Wilson & Daly, 1993a, p. 281). Noting that marriage is essentially a reproductive union, they further argue that men view their partners as commodities and
that this male sexual proprietariness creates feelings of entitlement. The use of violence thus acts as a control mechanism to keep the partner from leaving or engaging in extramarital acts.

One of the most prominent hypotheses as identified by evolutionary psychology is that women in their reproductive years are more at risk of being victimised by their intimate partners than post-menopause women. As Daly and Wilson (1988) argue, this is due to men being more jealous, and thus more coercively controlling, of reproductive women. As identified earlier in this chapter, research on the correlation between age and IPH supports this hypothesis, in showing that younger women are more at risk of being killed by their partners than older women (Shackelford et al., 2000). However, research also suggests that women who are older than their partners are at an increased risk of homicide victimisation (Mouzos & Shackelford, 2004), a finding that does not lend support to this hypothesis.

Evolutionary psychologists further state that relationship separation and de facto marriages act as risk factors for female IPH victimisation (Daly & Wilson, 1988; Wilson & Daly, 1993a, 1993b). Relationship separation is important because it results in the loss of the partner’s reproductive capabilities. As previously discussed, research shows that women are more at risk of being killed by an intimate partner during separation than while in an intact relationship (Johnson & Hotton, 2003; Wilson & Daly, 1993b). Similarly, women in de facto relationships would be more at risk of homicide victimisation due to the lack of relationship security that comes with marriage (Daly & Wilson, 1988). Early research generally found support for this argument (Johnson & Hotton, 2003; Wilson et al., 1993). However, more recently, James and Daly (2012) found that the rate of IPH among de facto and married couples has
converged, indicating that relationship state is perhaps no longer associated with female IPH victimisation patterns.

In terms of cuckolding, the two evolutionary psychology perspectives differ somewhat in terms of the risk to the female partner. While Duntley and Buss (2005) argue that it is the resource-absorbing non-genetic kin (i.e. the step-child) that is at risk, Daly and Wilson (1988) contend that the presence of step-children in the household leads to conflict between the partners related to resource-distribution, indicating that it is the genetic parent of the child who is at risk of homicide victimisation. This latter hypothesis finds support, as research shows that the presence of step-children in a household increases the likelihood of male-perpetrated IPH (Campbell, Webster, Koziol-McLain, Block, Campbell, Curry, Gary, Glass, et al., 2003; Daly et al., 1997; Miner, Shackelford, Block, Starratt, & Weekes-Shackelford, 2012).

**Symbolic interactionism**

The third theoretical perspective commonly applied to IPH is symbolic interactionism. This perspective differs from feminist theories and evolutionary psychology in its exclusive focus on the situational aspects of crime incidents. Symbolic interactionism derives from the work of Mead (1934) and Blumer (1969), and was further developed by Goffman (1967). It takes the position that it is through interactions between people that individuals assign meaning to the world around them (Blumer, 1969). This process of interpretation is ongoing, and plays a fundamental role in explaining human behaviour (Blumer, 1969).

An interactionist approach to the understanding of IPH focuses on the homicide event and the interactions that occur between the actors partaking in that event, including third parties (Athens, 1977; Felson & Steadman, 1983; Hepburn, 1973). According to symbolic interactionist perspectives, negotiations of identity is a common
occurrence in everyday life, and when an individual’s identity is threatened this may result in violence (Felson & Steadman, 1983; Hepburn, 1973).

In his theory of homicide as a situated transaction, Luckenbill (1977) examines homicide through an interactionist perspective, arguing that it is through the unfolding of the event that the roles of victim and perpetrator become clear, a line of thinking similar to Wolfgang’s (1957) notions of victim-precipitation. A ‘situated transaction’ refers to situations of interaction between individuals limited to the timeframe during which they are in each other’s immediate physical presence. According to this theory, there are a number of stages of interaction in criminal homicide. Importantly, in the first stage the perpetrator is affronted by a verbal comment, gesture or other made by the victim, resulting in a loss of face and threatened identity.

Similarly, in their social interactionist theory of coercive action, Felson and Tedeschi (1993) argue that individuals engage in violence in order to gain compliance, redress grievances or defend their identity (see also Felson, 2002; Tedeschi & Felson, 1994). Their theory further highlights the importance of examining the decision making process involved in violent encounters, as well as the ways in which events are interpreted by the actors involved (Felson & Tedeschi, 1993). Importantly, according to Felson and Tedeschi (1993), the instigators of violence are similar irrespective of the relationship between the victim and the offender. Violence is a means of exercising coercive control and, according to this perspective, intimate partner violence stems from frequent and intense conflict rather than gender inequality, male domination and belief systems legitimising the use of partner violence (Felson, 2002). In this sense, symbolic interactionism more generally, and the social interactionist theory of coercive violence specifically, adhere to the ‘violence perspective’ as opposed to the ‘gender perspective’,
in arguing that the sources of intimate partner violence are the same to those of other forms of violence (Felson, 2006).

Due to the theory’s general focus, most research on symbolic interactionism examines violence outside the realm of intimate partner conflict. In general, this more broader research is supportive of the hypotheses that homicide events occur in stages of interaction (Felson & Steadman, 1983; Luckenbill, 1977), that the event is initiated by verbal conflict or threats (Barnes, Gordon, & Hudson, 2001; Felson & Steadman, 1983), that actions by witnesses of the event may instigate and facilitate the violence (Decker, 1995) and that the victim may play a role in his or her own death (Athens, 1977; Felson & Steadman, 1983; Polk, 1997).

Using survey data from inmates serving sentences for murder, manslaughter or physical assault, Felson and Lane (2010) found support for a violence perspective. Their results showed that males were less likely to use violence against their partners unless they were being victimised by their partners. Furthermore, their results showed similarities between individuals who had engaged in intimate partner violence and individuals who engaged in violent offences directed toward others in relation to a number of factors, including criminal history, alcohol problems and exposure to abuse in childhood. Similarly, using Finnish data Kivivuori and Lehti (2012) also found support for a violence perspective. They argue that IPH incidents involving male perpetrators share many of the characteristics of perpetrators of other forms of homicide, including a history of criminal involvement and the use of alcohol at the time of the incident.

Interviewing abused women in refuges, Dobash and Dobash (1984) have also found support for an interactionist explanation of intimate partner violence, in that the violent events were often initiated when the male perpetrator felt as though his authority
was being questioned. However, Dobash and Dobash further argue that while some features of intimate partner violence may be explained by social interactionism, a purely situational framework fails to take socio-cultural factors, such as patriarchy, into account.

**Gaps and limitations of existing theories**

It is evident that the theoretical perspectives reviewed in this chapter offer important contributions toward explaining male-perpetrated IPH. Feminist theories illustrate the importance of examining and understanding gender issues, in particular male patriarchy and control, and the ways in which society upholds and reinforces these structural conditions. Similarly, evolutionary psychologists provide a framework for understanding how issues relating to male control and jealousy influence lethal and non-lethal intimate partner violence. Finally, symbolic interactionism provides an important emphasis on the situational characteristics of the homicide event.

However, though informative, these theories of male-perpetrated IPH contain gaps and limitations. Firstly, although it has been argued that all offences have an instrumental quality to them (see Felson & Tedeschi, 1993), male-perpetrated intimate partner violence are characterised by high levels of emotional and expressive features, (Norlander & Eckhardt, 2005; Polk, 1994; Thomas et al., 2011). Existing theories do not fully explain the role of negative emotions on criminal behaviour. Although evolutionary psychologists identify the importance of jealousy, their arguments do not extend to other emotions. Furthermore, although feminist theories do incorporate some emotive features, these are more characteristic of emotive-facilitative traits, such as hypersensitivity to perceived threats, rather than emotional states. Recent years have seen calls for greater understanding of emotions in theoretical applications of criminal behaviour and criminal justice responses (e.g. LaFree, 2007; Sherman, 2003). Given the
role emotions play in IPH incidents, there is a need for theories to specifically consider and account for how emotions are associated with male-perpetrated IPH.

Secondly, while non-lethal intimate partner violence occurs frequently across the community, with international victimisation surveys estimating lifetime prevalence rates of between 10 and 70 per cent (Garcia-Moreno, Jansen, Ellsberg, Heise, & Watts, 2006; Heise & Garcia-Moreno, 2002; Tjaden & Thoennes, 2000), only a small proportion of these incidents result in homicide, indicating that IPH is a clear behavioural exception rather than the norm. However, current theoretical explanations of IPH offer limited advice regarding why for example the majority of males with control issues who experience relationship separation do not kill their partner, or why not all situations in which an individual experiences the need to redress grievances result in homicide. A theoretical explanation of male-perpetrated IPH must be able to explain why some, but not all, men kill their partners given such conditions.

Thirdly, a theoretical framework explaining IPH perpetration must be able to incorporate known correlates and explain these through as few and concise statements as possible (Akers, 2000). Many of the theories reviewed in this chapter provide explanations of specific elements of male-perpetrated IPH, such as culture or control, but fall short of explaining issues outside of their particular domain. Calls have been made for theories that are able to integrate both distal and proximal correlates in examining intimate partner violence issues (DeMaris, Benson, Fox, Hill, & Van Wyk, 2003; Serran & Firestone, 2004), and based on the research findings reviewed in the earlier section of this chapter it is clear that a theoretical perspective applied to male-perpetrated IPH must be able to explain and integrate individual-level variables, including cognitions and emotions, relationship variables and situational variables.
What does GST offer?

GST has the ability to extend the theoretical perspectives reviewed in this chapter on three counts. Firstly, GST treats emotions as important mediators between adverse experiences and criminal involvement (Agnew, 1992, 2006b). Given the centrality of emotions in IPH, GST thus has the potential to provide a valuable contribution to the theoretical landscape of male-perpetrated IPH. Secondly, GST states that although all individuals occasionally experience strain, not everyone will engage in criminal coping (Agnew, 1992, 2006b). This is because individual differences, such as availability of resources, personality traits and coping strategies, help explain why some individuals, though exposed to difficult situations, cope better than others do. This allows for GST to account for both perpetration and abstention of homicidal acts. Thirdly, GST sits at the intersection of two prominent theoretical fields in criminology: personality, or trait-based explanations (e.g. Gottfredson & Hirschi, 1990), and situational explanations (e.g. Clarke & Felson, 1993). By accounting for the importance of a wide range of variables, including situational events, emotional reactions and individual differences in beliefs, cognitions and temperament, GST provides a much needed integration of proximal and distal variables to explain male-perpetrated IPH.

Chapter Summary

This chapter has provided a contextual understanding of the individual, relationship and situational factors associated with male-perpetrated IPH as identified in the empirical literature. Some of the more pertinent factors include jealousy, relationship separation and a history of intimate partner violence perpetration. The chapter also reviewed three of the most frequently applied theories of male-perpetrated IPH: feminist theories, evolutionary psychology and symbolic interactionism. It was
noted that although these theories provide valuable insights and offer important contributions toward explaining male-perpetrated IPH, the existing theoretical landscape also contains gaps and limitations. Therefore, an alternative theoretical framework was proposed. The focus of the next chapter is on presenting the theoretical tenets of GST and reviewing the theory’s current empirical status. Taken together, the current chapter and the next form the basis for the GST application of male-perpetrated IPH that will follow in Chapter 4.
Chapter 3: Theoretical Approach: GST in Context

This chapter provides an overview of the basic tenets of GST as well as some of the research conducted examining GST propositions. The first section of this chapter outlines the theoretical background of traditional strain theory, including the work by Merton (1938), Cohen (1955) and Cloward and Ohlin (1960), and presents the main criticisms directed towards traditional strain theory. Although a number of macro-level strain theories have been formulated over the years (e.g. Messner & Rosenfeld, 2007) the focus here is on micro-level explanations. The second part of this chapter examines Agnew’s modification and extension of strain theorising in 1992 by providing an overview of the main theoretical propositions of GST. Originating from the work of Agnew (1985, 1992) GST evolved in response to criticisms of traditional strain theory. GST has attracted a great deal of interest, and the last part of this chapter describes the current empirical standing of the theory.

Traditional Strain Theory

Although traditional strain theorists share a number of common features, such as attempting to explain delinquent behaviour among lower-class males by focusing on how individuals adapt when faced with disjunctions between goals and means, they also diverge on a number of issues, particularly in relation to the types of goal blockages and

---

13 In fact, Merton’s (1938) strain theory included a macro-level component. He argued that societies that place emphasis on cultural goals and aspirations but do not provide the norms, modes and means with which to achieve these goals are characterised by anomie, or normlessness (see also Durkheim, 1897/1966). Although cultural definitions of success in these societies transcend class boundaries, unequal availability of education and economic resources means that not all sections of the class structure have the same opportunity to achieve success (Merton, 1938). This macro-level explanation to crime thus serves as an explanation as to why some societies have higher crime rates than others.
the role of subcultures (see Agnew, 1980). As the first of the traditional strain theorists, Merton (1938) set the foundation for explaining delinquency on the basis of social and cultural structures. According to Merton’s arguments, non-conformity is the outcome of the disjunction between culturally defined goals and the social definitions, regulations and controls in place to achieve these goals. He argued that a disproportionate emphasis on specific cultural aspirations that are not supported by the social-structural processes in place to attain these aspirations creates pressure upon individuals to engage in non-conformist behaviour.

As an American living in the era of The Great Depression, it is perhaps not surprising that the cultural aspiration Merton (1938) placed the most emphasis on was monetary success. According to Merton, delinquency is a consequence of people’s inability to achieve monetary goals, especially in societies that place prominent emphasis on monetary wealth. This is particularly relevant for the lower classes, who have limited access to education and economic resources, and who often experience stigmatisation. According to Merton (1938, p. 681), people experience “strain toward dissolution” when faced with this type of goal blockage. This experience of strain is sustained by a competitiveness to succeed and a notion that the end justifies the means. Individuals adapt to this strain in one of five ways, through: conformity, which refers to conventional behaviour where both the culturally defined goals and the legitimate means are accepted by the individual; innovation, where the individual adheres to the goals but selects alternative means with which to reach those goals; ritualism, where the goals are discarded but a dedication to the legitimate means remains; retreatism, where both goals and means are rejected; and rebellion, where an individual rejects the established concepts of goals and means, substituting these for alternative standards (Merton, 1938). Merton argued that individual differences in adaptations are not
reflections of personality traits but, rather, dependent upon cultural background and 
socialisation.

Although agreeing with Merton (1938) that delinquency can be explained by 
examining social and cultural structures, Cohen (1955) criticised the applicability of 
Merton’s theory of youth delinquency on the basis that delinquent behaviour is 
characterised by short-term goals and non-utilitarianism, rather than monetary 
attainment. While Merton’s version of strain theory emphasised the role of monetary 
success, Cohen instead argued that delinquent behaviour is the product of the inability 
for young working-class males to achieve middle-class status. Cohen suggested that, 
from a young age, people growing up in working-class families internalise middle-class 
values. However, working-class youth, particularly boys, are consistently denied status 
due to their relative low position within the class hierarchy, creating a problem of 
adjustment.

The solution to this problem of adjustment comes from participating in 
delinquent subcultures, which Cohen (1955) argued serves three functions. Firstly, these 
subcultures create alternative status criteria, allowing its members to compare 
themselves to the norms of the group rather than according to middle-class values. 
Secondly, these subcultures legitimise aggression directed toward the source of the 
status-frustration, namely the middle-class. Thirdly, they provide a basis for reaction 
formation, whereby the group members express hostility and contempt against 
individuals who do not belong to the subculture, as opposed to the indifference on 
which their attitudes were originally based. Cohen argued that these subcultures set their 
own norms and values, including engaging in antisocial and violent behaviour. These 
types of norms and values are more easily accessible and attainable to working-class 
boys compared to achieving middle-class status. Those individuals who internalise the
values of the subculture, and live up to them, earn status and respect in the eyes of their peers. Thus, while Merton’s emphasis was on the role of the individual and on monetary success, Cohen extended this to include examinations of the role of subcultures on delinquent behaviour, particularly relating to status-frustration.

Similar to Cohen (1955), Cloward and Ohlin (1960) observed that delinquent subcultures appear to be a lower-class phenomenon (see also Cloward, 1959). However, in contrast to Cohen, and more in line with Merton’s (1938) arguments, Cloward and Ohlin argued that lower-class boys measure success not through status, but in terms of monetary achievement. In particular, financial success is best attained through education. However, due to cultural and structural barriers within society, education is not equally accessible to all. In line with the arguments made by Merton and Cohen, Cloward and Ohlin argued that pressure from unfulfilled aspirations and blocked opportunities may, through a process of alienation, turn individuals toward alternative means with which to achieve success. Youths externalising their blame on society rather than attributing their misfortunes to their own deficiencies are more likely to experience a sense of alienation and frustration with the existing social structure. This tension can be relieved by associating with others in the same situation.

However, Cloward and Ohlin (1960) further noted that whether or not an individual turns to delinquency, and what form that delinquent behaviour takes, depends upon the availability of both legitimate and illegitimate means of achieving one’s goals, in conjunction with the social structure of the neighbourhood in which an individual resides. Cloward and Ohlin proposed three different types of subcultures: criminal, conflict and retreatist. Areas with high levels of integration between older and younger delinquents allow for criminal learning to take place, thus fostering a criminal subculture. Conflict subcultures, on the other hand, flourish in areas with low levels of
integration and high levels of instability and transition\textsuperscript{14}, while retreatist subcultures arise out of a limited availability of both legitimate and illegitimate means.

Traditional strain theory has received considerable criticism. In particular, critique was directed toward the emphasis on the relationship between social class and criminal involvement (see Elliot, Ageton, & Canter, 1979; Hirschi, 1969; Stinchcombe, 1964; Tittle, Villemez, & Smith, 1978). Referring to strain-based explanations as class theories of delinquency, Hirschi (1969) argued that because of their working-class focus these theories are unable to explain the existence of criminal behaviour among the middle-class. Similarly, Tittle et al. (1978) argued that criminological theories should move away from social class explanations of crime. Based on a meta-analysis of 35 studies, they found that the relationship between class and crime as presented in earlier studies was only a function of the type of data collection used and the decade in which the study was conducted. Their results showed that the use of official data generally indicated a stronger relationship between class and crime compared to self-report data. Furthermore, earlier studies (conducted before 1959) suggested a stronger relationship between class and crime than later studies (conducted after 1960). Tittle et al. interpreted these findings in terms of improved civil rights, leading them to conclude that the association between class and crime as seen in historical data was an effect of a biased and prejudiced justice system rather than an effect of between-group differences in behaviour across social strata.\textsuperscript{15}

\textsuperscript{14} These arguments are similar to those of Chicago School theorists who argue that areas with high transition levels and social change are characterised by social disorganisation and subsequent delinquent activity (see Shaw & McKay, 1942).

\textsuperscript{15} However, data have also been presented that contradict the research by Tittle et al (1978). For example, Braithwaite (1981) argued that there is in fact empirical support for a class-crime association. Critiquing the research conducted by Tittle et al., Braithwaite examined a total of 224 studies on social class and crime. The results show that “the number of [self-report] studies
Critique was further directed toward the lack of empirical support for the discrepancy between goals and means as a cause of strain, particularly in terms of aspirations and expectations (see Hirschi, 1969; Kornhauser, 1978; Liska, 1971). In particular, researchers criticised the use and operationalisation of the concept of aspirations. For example, Elliot and Voss (1974) argued that the aspirations of youths are less likely to be similar to the long-term financial goals observed among adults, and more strongly related to immediate aspirations within the community, school and home environments. Thus, they argued that research should focus on more immediate goals relating to the social contexts of the sample studied. Similarly, Farnworth and Leiber (1989) argued that the effect of aspirations on delinquency is greatly dependent upon how aspiration is operationalised.

In 1985, Agnew presented a modified version of strain theory. While previously the focus had been on strain as a function of the disjunction between goals and means, Agnew’s revision extended the concept of strain to include instances where an individual attempts to avoid painful or aversive situations but is blocked from doing so (Agnew, 1985). Focusing particularly on youths, Agnew argued that due to their underage status, youths do not have the legal powers to escape aversive situations, such as being bullied at school, and that this may pressure them to turn to delinquency. Agnew argued that delinquency may be either instrumental or expressive in nature. For example, youths can escape the situation by running away from home or school, or resolve the situation by fighting. Using longitudinal data from the Youth in Transition which have uncovered a significant relationship is clearly greater than would be expected on the basis of chance” (Braithwaite, 1981, p. 46). Braithwaite further argued that the lack of association between social class and crime in some of the self-report studies was a function of the operationalisation of the crime variable, as measures of crime in these studies generally included less serious offences, status offences and general “bad manners” (Braithwaite, 1981, p. 45).
survey, Agnew (1989) found support for this model in that measures such as dissatisfaction with school and parental punitiveness were associated with delinquent behaviour.

**GST**

In 1992, Agnew presented a general strain theory of crime and delinquency. Taking into account the criticisms directed toward traditional strain theory and drawing heavily on research on aggression, stress and equity (e.g. Adams, 1963; Averill, 1982; Thoits, 1983), Agnew’s work represented a major revision of strain theory. Not only did Agnew expand and alter the categories of strain, but the new theory also incorporated and explained the role of negative emotions and how factors buffer or exacerbate the effects of strain on criminal coping. This part of the chapter presents the central tenets and hypotheses of GST, providing the theoretical background for Chapter 4, where GST is applied to male IPH perpetration.

**The role of strain**

Strain refers to events or conditions that are disliked by individuals (Agnew, 1992, 2006b). The source of strain can be classified as belonging to one of three main categories. The first category, *being prevented from or unable to achieve positively valued goals*, includes situations in which an individual seeks to accomplish certain goals, such as status or money, but is unable to achieve these goals. This main category of strain consists of three sub-categories. While the focus of traditional strain theory was on the disjunction between aspirations and expectations for success, based on the lack of empirical support for this type of strain, Agnew (1992) argued that *actual* achievement rather than *expected* achievement should be the focus of research. The other two sub-categories were new to strain theorising: the disjunction between
expectations and actual achievements and the disjunction between just/fair outcomes and actual outcomes.

The second main category of strain, *removal of positively valued stimuli*, includes situations where a person loses something they value highly. Examples of this category of strain include relationship separation and theft victimisation. The third main category of strain, *presentation of negatively valued stimuli*, refers to instances where an individual experiences negative events, including physical victimisation and experiencing negative relationships with friends or family. This is the category of strain that Agnew introduced in his 1985 revision of strain theory.

In his 1992 article, Agnew noted that it is not only direct experiences of these strains that are important, but also the anticipation of strain. Agnew (2002) later expanded on these ideas, making conceptual distinctions between strains that are personally experienced and those that are anticipated or experienced vicariously. He referred to *anticipated strain* as manifested in situations where individuals believe strain is likely to be inflicted in the future or, if the strain is currently experienced, will be continuous. By *vicarious strain*, Agnew referred to those strains that are not personally experienced by the individual but instead experienced by someone within their proximity, such as a friend or family member. For example, physical victimisation of a family member may be experienced as a vicarious strain.

**Characteristics of strain**

Although in his 1992 paper Agnew had specified that *clustering of strain*, i.e. experiencing a number of strains clustered together in time, would be particularly criminogenic, in a later paper Agnew (2001) instead encouraged examinations of the effects of specific strains on crime. To assist researchers in this endeavour, Agnew proposed a number of characteristics of strain that are more likely to lead to criminal
involvement. The first characteristic is the perceived magnitude of the strain, which is influenced by a number of features, such as degree, duration, recency and centrality (Agnew, 2001). The degree of strain refers to the quantity, for example the amount of physical or emotional pain inflicted. The duration or frequency of strain refers to how long and how often the strain is experienced. The recency of strain is the amount of time that has passed between the negative event and the present time. Strains that are more recent are hypothesised to be more influential than temporally distant strains. Lastly, strains high in centrality are those that threaten the core goals, needs, values, activities or identities of the individual.

Furthermore, strains that are seen as unjust, either through voluntarily infliction by others or being in breach of a given society’s norms and values of what constitutes justice, are more likely to provoke negative emotions (discussed further in the next section), thereby increasing the likelihood that an individual will cope with strain through criminal behaviour (Agnew, 2001). Additionally, strains associated with low social control affect an individual’s coping mechanisms by reducing the perceived cost of crime (Agnew, 2001). The last characteristic of strain identified by Agnew is whether the strain is associated with pressure or incentive for criminal coping. This includes situations where criminal behaviour is reinforced and modelled (such as in a delinquent peer group) or where the options for non-criminal coping are limited.

What is particularly relevant about these characteristics of strain is that they affect the ways in which individuals perceive and evaluate events (Agnew, 2001).

---

16 In his 1992 paper Agnew referred to the concept of magnitude in terms of size or degree of strain and treated magnitude as separate to temporal aspects of strain. However, according to Agnew’s more recent theorising (Agnew, 2001, 2006b), perceptions of magnitude are influenced both by the degree and the temporal aspects of strain. The conceptualisation of magnitude as discussed in the current research aligns with Agnew’s more recent statements.
Agnew (2001) notes that although adversities in life may lead to criminal involvement, not all individuals value events equally. This is where the characteristics of strain play an important role. For example, some individuals may experience relationship separation by a romantic partner as particularly unjust due to the high level of investment they have provided to the relationship (e.g. marriage, mortgage and children). However, individuals experiencing low relationship satisfaction may perceive separation as a positive event rather than a source of strain. Thus, Agnew (2001) emphasised the importance of estimating individual assessments of situations in order to understand the degree to which these events are perceived as negative or stressful to that particular individual.

Conceptually, Agnew (2001, 2006b) distinguishes between objective strain, which are strains that most individuals in a given population would consider adverse, and subjective strain, which takes into account the individual’s subjective evaluation of events. Subjective ratings of events provide researchers with a greater understanding of which strains are perceived as more adverse than others. Furthermore, Agnew (2001, 2006b) notes that experiences of subjective strain should have a stronger association with criminal behaviour than objective strain. Research on subjective strain thus allows researchers to categorise the effect of strain on criminal behaviour based on an individual’s own evaluation of these events. Agnew (2006c) notes that one means of accessing accounts of subjective strain is to examine offender storylines, which refers to the key events and conditions leading up to an incident as identified by the offender.

Negative emotions

An integral feature of GST is the focus on negative emotions (Agnew, 1992). Experiencing one or more of the three main categories of strain increases the likelihood that a person will experience negative emotions. In turn, negative emotions create a
need for corrective action, such as escaping from the strain or obtaining revenge. While Agnew (1992, 2006b) notes that an individual may experience a range of emotions in reaction to strain (e.g. disappointment, depression and fear) the emotion most likely to lead to criminal coping is anger.

The experience of anger is associated with criminal coping as it affects feelings of perceived injustice, creates a desire for retaliation, affects problem-solving abilities and prepares individuals for action (Agnew, 1992, 2006b). Agnew (1992) notes that experiences of anger are more likely to occur when an individual blames his or her adversity on others. He argues that while external attributions of blame are associated with outer-directed criminal actions, internal attributions of blame are more associated with self-destructive forms of delinquency such as suicide. In particular, Agnew (2006b) argues that anger is more strongly associated with aggressive behaviour because it creates feelings of power and increases the level of activity of an individual, while emotions such as depression are associated with feelings of powerlessness and low activity and may therefore result in coping strategies involving drug use rather than physical aggression. Thus, Agnew (2006b) notes the importance of examining the association between different emotional states and types of coping strategies.

**Coping strategies**

While GST emphasises the importance of understanding the characteristics of different types of strain and the ways in which strain may lead to criminal behaviour, the theory also recognises that not all individuals who experience strain and negative emotions turn to crime (see Agnew, 1992, 2006b). There are numerous ways in which an individual may cope with strain in a legitimate manner (Agnew, 1992; Lazarus & Folkman, 1984; Thoits, 1988). Changing one’s perceptions about the event and the subsequent consequences is one method. This type of *cognitive coping* occurs in
instances where an individual minimises or completely ignores the importance of the event or alters the perception of the event outcome. Another cognitive coping strategy involves accepting responsibility for the event, which subsequently changes the individual’s perception of whether the strain was warranted or not. *Behavioural coping* strategies may also be used, such as seeking out the blocked goal, trying to retrieve positively valued stimuli or escaping from negative experiences. Another set of strategies, *emotional coping*, includes the use of meditation, anti-depressants or other forms of mind-altering techniques specifically aimed at reducing the negative emotions experienced.

Logically, these strategies could also be used in an *illegitimate* manner. For example, an individual may try to reunite with an ex-partner by going to relationship counselling (legal coping) or they may attempt to coerce the partner to stay through the use of violence (illegal coping). Agnew (2006b) notes that illegal coping strategies can be either instrumental, retaliatory or escapist in nature. Instrumental coping includes turning to property crime as a means of alleviating financial strain or fighting back when assaulted to reduce the level of injuries. Another means of coping with strain is through retaliation in the form of threats, violence or theft toward the individual who originally caused the strain. Finally, criminal coping may serve as a means of escaping the felt strain. As will be discussed in more detail below, criminal coping allows individuals to reduce or alleviate the negative emotions caused by the strain.

**Conditioning factors**

As discussed, while most individuals are exposed to strain at some point in their lives and may experience negative emotions as a reaction to this exposure, not everyone turns to crime. According to GST, certain factors moderate the effect of strain and negative emotions on individual coping strategies (Agnew, 1992, 2006b). These
Conditioning factors include personal characteristics, peer associations, access to social support, access to legal resources and levels of social control.\footnote{Conditioning variables are expected to moderate the effect of strain on criminal coping (Agnew, 1992, 2006b). In the broader literature these factors are often referred to as moderator variables (see Baron & Kenny, 1986). These terms are used interchangeably within this document, although the term conditioning factors is specifically used when GST processes are discussed.}

Agnew (1992, 2006b) argues that personal characteristics such as low self-efficacy, low constraint, negative emotionality and belief systems legitimising criminal activity are associated with an increased likelihood of criminal coping. Self-efficacy refers to the belief in one’s capabilities to produce desired results (see Bandura, 1997) and people exhibiting low self-efficacy would be more likely to turn to crime due to inadequate beliefs in their own abilities to cope legally with adverse events (Agnew, 2006b). Negative emotionality and low constraint increase the likelihood of criminal coping in a number of ways, as individuals with these characteristics display generally impulsive behaviour, inadequate social skills, a general lack of concern for others and a tendency to attribute their adversities to the actions of others (Agnew, 2006b; Agnew et al., 2002; Caspi, Moffitt, Silva, & Krueger, 1994).

Similarly, individuals who hold belief systems legitimising criminal activity would be more likely to turn to criminal coping when experiencing strain compared to individuals who disapprove of criminal behaviour (Agnew, 1992). These attitudes might also be affected by an individual’s involvement in delinquent peer groups where delinquent behaviour is modelled and reinforced (Agnew, 1992). On the other hand, access to conventional social support and legal resources provide individuals with the ability to better cope with stressful events through legitimate means (Agnew, 1992). Furthermore, individuals who are directly controlled by, or experience a bond with,
family and society in general would be less likely to engage in crime since they have
greater investment, and therefore more to lose by engaging in criminal activity,
compared to individuals without these forms of social control (see Agnew, 2006b;

**GST applied to gender, ethnic and age differences in crime**

Although the focus of GST is on understanding individual responses to
experiences of strain and negative emotions, the theory can also explain differences in
offending rates at the group-level. In particular, GST has been used to explain male and
female offending rates, differences across ethnic groups and offending across the life
course.

**GST and gender**

In 1997, Broidy and Agnew made an important contribution to the GST
framework by providing a theoretical explanation of gender differences in criminal
behaviour. In their paper they argue that GST has the ability to explain both male and
female criminal behaviour through its focus on the ways in which gender conditions the
processes proposed by GST (Broidy & Agnew, 1997; also see Agnew 2006b). Their
gender application addresses two fundamental questions about gender and crime,
namely why males are overrepresented as offenders and why females engage in crime.

In terms of experiences of strain, males are more likely to experience strains that
are conducive to crime, such as harsh discipline, victimisation and homelessness
(Agnew, 2006b; Broidy & Agnew, 1997). These types of strain are criminogenic in that
they are often of high magnitude and associated with low social control and perceived
injustice (Agnew, 2006b). Furthermore, males are more likely to pursue status and
masculinity goals (Agnew, 2006b). However, females are more likely to experience
certain types of strain, such as sexual abuse and gender discrimination, which can help explain why some females do engage in criminal behaviour (Broidy & Agnew, 1997).

Furthermore, while males and females are equally likely to respond to strain with anger, the experience of anger in females is more often accompanied by other emotions, including fear and anxiety (Broidy & Agnew, 1997). In contrast, male anger is more often characterised by feelings of moral outrage (Broidy & Agnew, 1997). One of the reasons for this, according to Broidy and Agnew (1997), is that males tend to externalise their blame onto others while females tend to internalise blame. Furthermore, more concerned with the preservation of interpersonal relationships with others compared to males, females are less likely to engage in criminal coping, as this might jeopardise these ties (Broidy & Agnew, 1997).

Broidy and Agnew (1997) further argue that there are gender differences in terms of the strategies used by males and females to cope with experiences of strain and negative emotions. For example, while males are more likely to engage in behavioural coping strategies by venting their frustrations externally in the form of aggression, females are more likely to engage in emotional self-destructive coping strategies, manifested through behaviour such as eating disorders and drug use. Broidy and Agnew note that these gender differences in coping strategies may stem from existing gender stereotypes and differences in socialisation.

Broidy and Agnew (1997) further argue that males and females are distinctly different in terms of conditioning factors. For example, they note that while studies show that women often have higher levels of social support, men experience less social control. Furthermore, men are more likely to associate with delinquent peers and to hold accepting attitudes toward criminal activity (Agnew, 2006b). For males, engaging in violence is further a means through which masculinity is achieved (Agnew, 2006b; see
also Messerschmidt, 1993). Thus, according to GST, gender differences in conditioning factors still result in different criminal coping levels and strategies, even in instances where males and females experience similar levels and types of strain and negative emotions.

**GST and ethnicity, culture and race**

Similar to Broidy and Agnew’s gender application, GST explains ethnic, cultural or racial differences in offending rates by emphasising differences in the types of strain experienced and availability of coping resources across groups (Agnew, 2006b; Kaufman, Rebellon, Thaxton, & Agnew, 2008). Although the focus has mainly been on explaining criminal involvement among African-Americans, recent research has extended the scope of GST to apply explanations for offending behaviour among other ethnic, cultural or racial groups, including Chinese (e.g. Bao & Haas, 2009; Cheung, Ngai, & Ngai, 2007), Hispanics (Perez, Jennings, & Gover, 2008) and American Indians (Walls, Chapple, & Johnson, 2007).

As applied to African-Americans, Agnew (2006b) notes that this population is more likely to live in socially disadvantaged communities and therefore more likely to experience strains conducive to crime, such as chronic unemployment and victimisation (see also Kaufman et al., 2008). Furthermore, African-Americans are more likely to experience discrimination across all levels of society, including within the criminal justice system (Agnew, 2006b; Kaufman et al., 2008). Experiencing these strains, particularly as they relate to issues of discrimination, is likely to be cognitively interpreted as unjust, thereby increasing the likelihood that strain will be interpreted as aversive (Agnew, 2001, 2006b; Kaufman et al., 2008). Differences may also exist in the availability of coping resources and the ability to cope with strain in legitimate ways. For example, Kaufman et al. (2008) note that African-Americans experience lower
levels of social support and, as a result of low educational attainment, may not possess the problem-solving skills to successfully and legitimately cope with strain.

**GST and age**

GST has also been used to explain two of the most pertinent age-related questions asked within life course criminology, namely why there is a peak in offending prevalence rates in adolescence (adolescent-limited offenders) and why some individuals persist with chronic offending across the life-course (life-course persistent offenders) (see Moffitt, 1993 for a discussion of these concepts). In terms of the first question, Agnew (1997, 2006b) notes that adolescents are more likely to experience strain conducive to crime compared to children and adults, particularly relating to negative peer relationships and the inability to achieve autonomy and status. Reacting to these strains, adolescents are more likely to experience negative emotions, experiences of which in turn are conducive to criminal coping (Agnew, 1997, 2006b). Furthermore, adolescents are not only exposed to conditioning factors such as associating with delinquent peers, but also experience lower levels of social control, social support and problem-solving skills, and are therefore less equipped to cope legitimately with strain compared to adults (Agnew, 1997, 2006b).

Agnew (1997, 2006b) argues that although adolescents generally have high trait anger and impulsivity, the effects of these personality traits are even more pronounced for life-course persistent offenders.\(^\text{18}\) This is because angry and impulsive individuals are more likely to provoke negative reactions from other people and to find themselves within environments where they may experience strain. They are also more likely to

\(^{18}\) Note that in the 1997 paper Agnew refers to “aggressiveness” as the key theoretical concept. An individual who is high in aggressiveness holds personality traits such as irritability, hyperactivity, insensitivity to others and impulsivity.
view the experience of strain as unjust and have limited abilities to cope with strain through legitimate channels. This would serve to explain why some individuals persist with crime throughout the course of their lives. However, Agnew (1997, 2006b) further calls attention to the impact chronic social disadvantage such as poverty has on offending behaviour. He argues that not all life-course persistent offenders are high in trait anger and impulsivity but, rather, are exposed to strains conducive to crime as a result of belonging to the urban underclass, where chronic exposure to strain, low social control and involvement in delinquent peer groups is common across the life-course. Thus, criminal involvement among life-course persistent offenders may not only be a product of personality traits, but also the environment in which individuals find themselves.

**Research on GST**

GST has generated a wealth of research despite its relative infancy. This part of the chapter focuses on GST’s empirical standing. The first generation of research to arise from Agnew’s 1992 paper focused on examining the core questions of the theory, namely whether strain leads to crime, whether negative emotions mediate the effect of strain on crime and whether certain variables condition the effects of strain on criminal coping. As research increasingly answered these primary questions, the second generation of GST research expanded the scope of their empirical investigations by measuring specific strains in preference to composite strain indices, examining subjective experiences of strain, exploring the role of anticipated and vicarious strain and examining differences between trait emotions and situational emotions. More recently, research has begun examining the generality of GST, by testing strain
processes across gender, ethnicity and more serious offences. These examinations of the
generality of GST are referred to herein as the third generation of GST research.

**First generation of GST research: Answering the core questions**

The first studies to examine GST empirically addressed the core questions
derived from the theory. The key issues were whether strain leads to criminal
involvement, whether negative emotions mediate this relationship and whether the
conditioning variables identified by GST moderate the effect of strain on criminal
coping strategies. Research representative of this first generation of GST research is
presented below.

**Research on the relationship between strain and crime**

In the first empirical test of GST, Agnew and White (1992) examined the effect
of a number of strains on delinquency and drug use among adolescents in the United
States. Cross-sectional analyses suggested that while controlling for differential
association and social control variables, strain indices of negative life events (e.g. death
of a close friend), life hassles (e.g. not being liked by classmates) and parental fighting
were associated with engagement in both delinquency and drug use. The experience of
negative relationships with adults (teachers and parents) was associated with increased
delinquency but not with drug use, and the presence of neighbourhood problems was
associated with increased drug use but not with other forms of delinquency. Agnew and
White further conducted longitudinal analyses of their data, although these did not
provide the same support for GST as the cross-sectional analyses. Addressing the lack
of support in the longitudinal analyses, Agnew and White note that while GST assumes
contemporaneous effects of strain on delinquency, the time lag of three years between
data waves in their sample was probably overly temporally distant for any effects to remain.

Replicating and extending the research by Agnew and White, Paternoster and Mazerolle (1994) conducted both cross-sectional and longitudinal analyses of data from the National Youth Survey. The follow-up period in the National Youth Survey was one year, thus providing a better measure of the hypothesised contemporaneous effects of strain on delinquency. Using similar variables, they found longitudinal effects of negative life events, school and peer hassles, neighbourhood problems and experiences of negative relations with adults on involvement in delinquency. However, school and peer hassles were not found to correlate with delinquency in the cross-sectional analyses.

Extending these initial studies, Agnew and Brezina (1997) measured the effect of negative and positive interpersonal relationships on delinquent involvement. Their results showed that poor relationships with peers correlated positively with engagement in delinquent acts among males but not among females. In contrast, examining longitudinal effects of a composite measure of stressful life events measuring parental risk factors such as family financial problems, parental affective disorder and parental separation on delinquency and drug use among adolescents in the High Risk Youth Study, Hoffmann and Su (1997) did not find any gender differences. Their results showed that stressful life events had a positive and significant correlation with both delinquency and drug use for both males and females. Although the research conducted by Agnew and Brezina, as well as Hoffmann and Su, did examine gender differences in delinquent involvement, as is discussed later in this chapter, it was not until after the publication of Broidy and Agnew’s theoretical article in 1997, in which they applied a
gender lens to GST, that gender became an important aspect of the theory rather than simply another variable.

**Research on the mediating role of negative emotions**

These first empirical studies on the effects of strain on crime provided enough support to warrant further empirical enquiries. The next step involved the examination of negative emotions, a variable that theoretically plays an important mediating role in GST. Mazerolle and Piquero (1997) were among the first to include a measure of anger. Using a vignette design to examine intentions to assault among male undergraduate students in the United States, their research showed that males high in strain (e.g. family problems, partner break-up) experienced higher levels of anger. Their results were also supportive of the mediating effects of anger on violent behaviour. Extending Mazerolle and Piquero’s research, Aseltine, Gore and Gordon (2000) included measures not only of anger but also anxiety in a sample of adolescents. Measuring family conflict, peer conflict and negative life events, they found that strain had a causal positive effect on both anger and anxiety. However, examining mediation, their results were only supportive in terms of anger mediating the effect of family conflict on aggressive behaviour, while no mediating effects were found in terms of anxiety.

Similar results are shown in research by Brezina (1996) using data from the longitudinal Youth in Transition survey. Strain was measured as an additive scale of parental punitiveness, mean teacher (e.g. teacher making negative comments, teacher losing their temper) and dissatisfaction with school. Results from the longitudinal analyses suggested that individuals experiencing higher levels of strain also experienced higher levels of anger, resentment, anxiety and depression; however, when delinquent behaviour was entered into the equation, only anger had a significant mediating effect.
What this early research on negative emotions suggested was that while anger appeared to mediate the effect of strain on delinquency, particularly violent behaviour, this was not the case for other negative emotions, including anxiety and depression. However, the measures of negative emotions used in the first generation of GST research were effectively measures of trait emotions, rather than emotional reactions to specific situations. As will be discussed later in this chapter, there is an important distinction between the two conceptualisations of emotions, and subsequent research has tended to focus more on measuring emotion states as opposed to emotion traits.

**Research on the role of conditioning factors on criminal coping**

As discussed previously in this chapter, GST identifies a number of variables hypothesised to affect the choice of coping strategies employed by individuals experiencing strain and negative emotions, including self-efficacy, negative emotionality, low constraint, social support and attitudes toward criminal behaviour (Agnew, 1992). This section reviews the literature examining the moderating effects of these variables.

Research has generally not found support for the moderating role of self-efficacy (Aseltine et al., 2000; Hoffmann & Cerbone, 1999; Hoffmann & Miller, 1998). For example, using four waves of data from the Family Health Study, Hoffmann and Cerbone (1999) found that a greater number of negative life events was associated with increased involvement in delinquency, irrespective of levels of self-efficacy, suggesting no moderation effects. Other studies have found support for the moderating effects of self-efficacy, although not in the direction anticipated by GST. Instead of decreasing the likelihood of criminal outcomes, these studies suggest that high levels of self-efficacy increase the likelihood of an individual engaging in criminal behaviour (Baron, 2004; Paternoster & Mazerolle, 1994).
Research examining the moderating effect of negative emotionality and low constraint has been surprisingly absent from the GST literature. Rather than examined as moderating variables, early research more commonly used negative emotionality and low constraint as measures of trait anger, examining whether trait anger mediates between strain and criminal involvement (see for example Baron, 2004; Mazerolle & Piquero, 1997; Piquero & Sealock, 2004). For this purpose, researchers used the sub-scales of temper (closely related to negative emotionality) and impulsivity (closely related to low constraint) from the self-control scale constructed by Grasmick, Tittle, Bursik and Arneklev (1993). However, the limited research examining personality traits as moderators has generally been supportive. For example, Agnew et al. (2002) examined data from the National Survey of Children and included personality traits as moderating variables in their analyses. Their results showed that individuals reporting high negative emotionality and low constraint were more likely to respond to strain with delinquency than individuals who displayed low negative emotionality and high constraint. Similarly, using data from a longitudinal study on high risk children in the United States, Slocum (2010) found that individuals exposed to stress in adulthood were more likely to experience depression and use drugs if they scored high on a combined measure of negative emotionality and low constraint.

Research on the moderating effects of social support has provided mixed results. Gibson, Swatt and Jolicoeur (2001) found that police officers exposed to adverse experiences at work or at home experienced lower levels of anger if they felt they had family and friends to talk to about their experiences. Other studies have not found this association between social support and negative emotions (Capowich, Mazerolle, & Piquero, 2001; Tittle, Broidy, & Gertz, 2008). When examining moderation effects, Gibson et al. (2001) found that perceived availability of social support did not appear to
moderate the effect of strain and anger on criminal activity. In contrast, more recent research by Kort-Butler (2010) on violent victimisation has found support for the GST proposition that social support moderates the effect of strain and negative emotions on criminal involvement. What this research showed was that the experience of negative emotions was associated with delinquency only for those individuals who were low in perceived availability of social support.

The reason for the inconsistent findings in terms of the moderating effect of social support may be a function of the operationalisation of the variable and the use of adolescent samples. Social support from criminal friends may increase an individual’s likelihood of criminal coping instead of acting as a buffer, in line with social learning theories (see Akers, 1998; Capowich et al., 2001). For example, Agnew and White’s (1992) research found that the effect of strain as a composite measure on delinquency and drug use was even greater for individuals who had delinquent friends. In contrast to this, other research suggests that peer support may in fact be negatively associated with crime in males (Piquero & Sealock, 2004). What this research suggests is that it is important to consider the operationalisation of social support and exposure to peer delinquency in the context of moderation effects.

Moral beliefs are also expected to moderate the effect of strain on criminal behaviour, for example, the belief that violence is unacceptable is hypothesised to have a buffering effect on violent behaviour (Agnew, 1992). Using data from the National Youth Survey, Mazerolle and Maahs (2000) found that individuals experiencing high levels of strain were more likely to engage in criminal behaviour if they held weak moral beliefs against delinquent activity. In their research on intentions to commit assault among university students, Mazerolle and Piquero (1998) further examined intentions to engage in other delinquent acts, including shoplifting and drinking and
driving. While weak moral beliefs did not moderate the effect of strain on intentions to assault or drive drunk, the results did show that individuals who held moral beliefs against stealing were less likely to report intentions to commit shoplifting. In contrast, other studies have not found support for a moderation effect of moral beliefs on criminal outcomes (Eitle & Turner, 2003; Moon, Morash, McCluskey, & Hwang, 2009; Paternoster & Mazerolle, 1994). For example, research by Eitle and Turner (2003) shows that although weak moral inhibitions were found to be predictive of criminal behaviour, the effect of strain such as recent life events and chronic stressors on criminal behaviour was not moderated by moral beliefs.

In conclusion, cumulatively the research on conditioning factors has provided mixed results. While research on factors such as low constraint and negative emotionality is generally supportive, the moderating effects of self-efficacy, social support and moral beliefs are not as clear. Calls have been made for researchers to thoroughly review which conditioning factors are the most relevant (Hay & Evans, 2006). Clearly more research is needed, especially in terms of understanding whether certain factors are of particular importance to certain types of criminal outcomes (e.g. violence, theft).

**Second generation of GST research: Extending the research on strain and negative emotions**

Having examined the core questions of GST, researchers expanded their scope of investigation and began exploring strain and negative emotions in more detail. As per Agnew’s (2001, 2002) suggestions, studies began examining the effects of specific strains rather than using composite measures, paying attention to the importance of strain characteristics, exploring the role of subjective experiences of strain and examining the effects of anticipated and vicarious strain. Furthermore, as previously
discussed, research began including measures of situational emotional reactions, enabling analyses of the relative importance of state versus trait emotions.

**Extending the research on strain**

In his earlier work, Agnew (1992) highlighted the importance of examining the effects of cumulative strain, and consequently research initially utilised composite strain measures. A more neglected issue was Agnew’s emphasis on understanding individual strains. In his 2001 article, Agnew argued that research should examine specific strains, and that only then would researchers be able to establish which strains are more conducive to crime than others are. Taking note of this advice, most current research on GST examines specific types of strain rather than using composite scales. What this research suggests is that a wide variety of strains are associated with criminal activity, including exposure to partner abuse (Eitle & Turner, 2002; Katz, 2000), sexual abuse (Baron, 2004), break-up of romantic relationships (Frohgio & Agnew, 2007), witnessing domestic violence (Eitle & Turner, 2002), work-related stress (Arter, 2008; Gibson et al., 2001), economic strain and relative depravation (Baron, 2004; Moon et al., 2009; Perez et al., 2008) and homelessness (Baron, 2004).

While research has increasingly begun to understand which individual strains are important, limited research has examined the characteristics of strain that, according to Agnew (2001), increase the likelihood of criminal coping. The aspects that have received the most attention in the literature relate to duration, recency and clustering of strain in time, adding temporal aspects to the concept of strain along the lines of developmental research on criminal involvement (see Agnew, 2011; Piquero, Farrington, & Blumstein, 2003). The limited GST research that has examined temporal issues has generally found support for examining pathways of strain toward crime. For example, using longitudinal data from the Family Health Study on strain and offending
among adolescents, Hoffmann and Cerbone (1999) used growth curve modelling for four waves of data in order to examine intra- and inter-individual change. The results showed that the increase in the number of negative life events was associated with increased delinquent involvement. Extending this research, Slocum, Simpson and Smith (2005) examined the effect of duration, recency, clustering and accumulation of strain on a sample of incarcerated women by retrospectively collecting 36 months of data using a life event calendar approach. Their results suggested that while only two of the characteristics (duration and clustering), contributed to predictions of violent offending, all four characteristics significantly contributed to non-violent offending. Their results suggest that although Agnew (2001) has highlighted the importance of examining specific strains, there may still be value in examining composite measures of strain within a temporal context.

Limited research has explored the role of perceived injustice as a characteristic of strain. For example, Mazerolle et al. (2003) found that receiving an unfair grade was associated with experiencing anger and intentions to assault within a sample of undergraduate students in the United States. Extending this research, Rebellon, Manasse, Van Gundy and Cohn (2012) included questions regarding how unfair respondents experienced a particular strain to be. Similar to the findings by Mazerolle et al., the results showed that unfairness was linked to experiences of anger, which in turn was associated with delinquent involvement.

Ultimately, the characteristics of strain affect the way individuals perceive events (Agnew, 2001). The majority of studies on strain have utilised variables measuring objective strain. However, research has found support for the importance of using subjective evaluations (see Baron, 2004; Froggio & Agnew, 2007; Tittle et al., 2008). For example, Froggio and Agnew (2007) measured subjective strain by using
negativity ratings, finding much variation in subjective evaluations of strain, including such strains as emotional distance from parents and the break-up of romantic relationships. Their research showed that high negativity ratings of romantic break-up and school failure had higher correlations with criminal activity in comparison to these same sources of strain measured objectively. Similarly, Baron (2004) found that subjective measures of financial strain, including monetary dissatisfaction and relative deprivation, were associated with criminal activity in a sample of homeless youths. These studies highlight the importance of examining not only whether certain events occur, but also how events are interpreted by individuals.

Research further began exploring the concepts of anticipated and vicarious strain. While some research prior to Agnew’s 2002 paper detailing these types of strain had included examples of vicarious strain such as illnesses or accidents affecting friends or family members, or witnessing violence within the home (see for example Hoffmann & Miller, 1998; Paternoster & Mazerolle, 1994; Piquero & Sealock, 2004), these questions generally appeared as part of negative life event indices, making it difficult to establish the effect of individual strains on criminal behaviour. In one of the most comprehensive studies to date, Agnew (2002) found that physical victimisation of family and friends (vicarious strain) and the perceived likelihood of getting shot or stabbed (anticipated strain) were significantly related to delinquency in a sample of adolescent boys. Similarly, Eitle and Turner (2002) found that past experiences of witnessing domestic violence was associated with self-reported criminal behaviour, although this was mediated by the experience of more current strain. Interestingly, the same study found that more recent exposure to domestic violence was not associated with criminal activity, indicating that effects of witnessing violence within the household may appear later in life, in line with intergenerational transmission of
violence propositions (e.g. Stith et al., 2000). Furthermore, research also shows that although both direct and vicarious victimisation have separate and individual effects of delinquent engagement, the combination of the two exacerbates the strength of this effect (Lin, Cochran, & Mieczkowski, 2011).

*Extending the research on emotions: The role of situational emotions*

While the first generation of GST research found support for the mediating effects of anger on violent behaviour, anger did not appear to mediate between strain and other forms of delinquency. Although some subsequent studies have found mediation effects, others have only found partial support (Aseltine et al., 2000; Bao, Haas, & Pi, 2004; Brezina, 1996, 1998; Broidy, 2001; Hay, 2003; Mazerolle, Burton, Cullen, Evans, & Payne, 2000; Perez et al., 2008; Piquero & Sealock, 2000, 2004; Sigfusdottir, Farkas, & Silver, 2004; Simons, Chen, Stewart, & Brody, 2003).

Scholars soon began acknowledging that the failure to find a connection between strain, anger and crime was most likely a function of the operationalisation of anger. As Agnew (2006b, p. 36) put it: “the neglect of emotional states is perhaps the largest gap in the research on GST”. While earlier studies predominantly examined anger as a static personality trait, the second generation of GST research began measuring situational emotional reactions. This different conceptualisation and operationalisation of anger provided results largely in support of the link between situational anger and crime (Capowich et al., 2001; Mazerolle et al., 2003; Moon et al., 2009; Rebellon, Piquero, Piquero, & Thaxton, 2009). For example, expanding on Mazerolle and Piquero’s (1997, 1998) vignette studies, Capowich et al. (2001) conducted cross-sectional research on a sample of university students in which they measured respondents’ situational anger in response to specific hypothetical situations.
They found that situational anger mediated the effect of strain on intentions to commit assault, but not other delinquent acts.

While more research began examining situational anger, researchers also started examining the more precise role of trait anger. For example, Mazerolle et al. (2000) found that individuals high in trait anger were more likely to experience situations leading to strain. This link has also been noted by Agnew (2006a), who points out that the exposure to chronic or repeated strain may have an effect on an individual’s personality traits, which in turn may affect predispositions to criminal involvement. Furthermore, research suggests that individuals high in trait anger are more likely to experience situational anger (Mazerolle et al., 2003). In this sense, trait anger may function as a conditioning variable positively correlated with the emergence of situational anger. This suggests that trait anger may act more as a moderator than as a mediator, in line with Agnew’s (1992) proposition that an individual’s temperament affects their disposition to engage in criminal activity.

**Third generation of GST research: Examining generality**

The first and second generations of research generally provided support for the hypotheses derived from GST. However, limited research had explored the generality of the theory across gender and ethnic groups. Furthermore, much of the research conducted was based on conventional samples or youth samples. What also needed to be better understood was whether GST could be applied to more serious offence types. Representative studies exploring these issues are presented below.

**Research on the role of gender in GST**

One of the first studies to examine gender differences in strain, negative emotions and conditioning variables examined data from the National Youth Survey.
Mean-level differences showed that while no gender differences were reported in terms of negative life events, neighbourhood problems and traditional strain, males reported higher levels of negative relations with adults. Further, while females reported higher levels of moral beliefs, males reported greater exposure to delinquent friends. Longitudinal analyses showed that while negative life events and negative relations with adults were significantly associated with later violent delinquency for males, none of the strain measures were significantly associated with violent behaviour among females.

Attempting to understand why there appears to be a lack of association between strain and criminal outcomes for females, and applying a gender-sensitive approach as per Broidy and Agnew’s 1997 article, researchers began examining alternative negative emotions that might be more theoretically relevant to females. For example, conducting research on undergraduate students, Broidy (2001) found that while both genders experienced similar amounts of strain and were equally as likely to respond to strain with anger, the females in the sample were more likely to react with negative emotions other than anger. The results further showed that females were more likely to engage in legitimate coping strategies such as ignoring the problem or talking to friends and family. Similarly, exploring the experience of guilt in relation to familial strain (including physical punishment and parental rejection), Hay (2003) found that while both genders experienced anger, females reported significantly higher levels of guilt.

Other research has focused on experiences of depression. Research by Sigfusdottir et al. (2004) found that females exposed to familial strain experienced higher levels of depression compared to males. However, their results also suggested that females experienced even higher levels of anger than males but lower levels of delinquency. Interpreting these findings, Sigfusdottir et al. suggest that the females in
the sample were less likely to engage in delinquency due to the interaction effect of anger and depression, as their results showed that depression was not correlated with delinquent behaviour. Research by De Coster and Cornell Zito (2010) provide similar results, although they argue that rather than explaining the lower engagement in criminal activities among females as a function of depression, the focus should be on how experiences of anger and depression exacerbate the risk for male criminality.

Particular focus has also been on the types of strains that females are typically exposed to, including gender discrimination and violent victimisation, as well as gendered outcomes (Eitle, 2002; Katz, 2000; Sharp, Terling-Watt, Atkins, Gilliam, & Sanders, 2001; Slocum et al., 2005). For example, using the National Longitudinal Study of Adolescent Health, Kaufman (2009) tapped into features of strain and delinquency particularly applicable to female samples by including a question regarding suicidal behaviour of friends or family as a measure of loss of positively valued stimuli and measures of ‘typical’ female delinquent behaviour such as suicidal thoughts and running away from home. As expected, the results showed that more females than males reported having a family member or friend engage in suicidal behaviour while more males reported violent victimisation. Delinquent outcomes were also gendered in nature. While females reported higher levels of suicidal thoughts and running away from home, males reported higher participation in violent delinquency. However, when examining the pathways between strain, negative emotions and delinquent behaviour, the results showed that while these pathways were gendered for violent behaviour, no gender differences were found in the pathways leading to suicidal thoughts and running away from home.

Research has further examined whether different conditioning variables play different roles in male and female criminal behaviour. In research on homeless youth,
Baron (2007) noted that although both genders reported similar levels of strain, homelessness as a measure of financial strain was more strongly correlated with female violent offending than with male violent offending. Explaining this finding, Baron suggested that females in this environment are often less restricted by social controls and more exposed to violence. Results further showed that the effect of relative deprivation and monetary dissatisfaction on violent offending was greater for females holding deviant attitudes, suggesting the importance of examining gender differences in conditioning factors. Examining social support as a conditioning factor, Robbers (2004) found that females exposed to loss of positively valued stimuli, such as separation between parents, were less likely to engage in delinquency if they experienced high levels of social support. However, this moderating effect was not significant for males. Interestingly, conducting research on youths detained at juvenile detention centres Piquero and Sealock (2004) found that resources encouraging social coping was in fact associated with increased delinquency in males, noting that social support in the form of delinquent peers would not be expected to have the same buffering effect as the form of social support that encourages non-criminal coping.

**Research on GST across ethnicity, culture and race**

Earlier studies often utilised American samples to test the hypotheses derived from GST. As researchers began exploring the generality of the theory, they extended their scope to include examinations across ethnic, cultural and racial groups (e.g. Aaltonen, Kivivuori, & Martikainen, 2011; Bao et al., 2004; Botchkovar, Tittle, & Antonaccio, 2009; Froggio & Agnew, 2007; Lin & Mieczkowski, 2011; Maxwell, 2001;
Moon et al., 2009; Perez et al., 2008; Sigfusdottir et al., 2004; Walls et al., 2007). For example, noting that African-American samples tend to be overlooked by GST research, Jang and Johnson (2003) used data from the National Survey of Black Americans to examine sources of strain particularly relevant to the experiences of African-Americans, such as exposure to racism and economic disadvantage. Furthermore, external attributions of blame for experiences of strain were hypothesised to be particularly prevalent among African-Americans due to the history of racial conflict and discrimination, while religiosity was hypothesised to have a buffering effect on experienced strain. Results suggested that strain had an effect on deviant behaviour, and that this was mediated by negative emotions. The results also suggested that inner-directed emotional responses had a greater effect on inner-directed forms of deviance (drug use) than on outer-directed deviance (fighting). This link was also found between outer-directed emotions and outer-directed deviance. Furthermore, while religiosity did not have a buffering effect on emotional reactions to strain, it did appear to ameliorate the effect of negative emotions on criminal coping.

Another example of the importance of using ethnically and culturally relevant sources of strain is found in the research by Bao and colleagues (Bao & Haas, 2009; Bao et al., 2004). Applying GST to contemporary China, in a theoretical article (Bao & Haas, 2009) they emphasised the role of social change on increased adolescent participation in criminal activities. They argued that at a macro-level, experiences of strain resulting from economic inequality, official corruption and the one-child policy in China were hypothesised to result in higher levels of micro-level exposure to strain, including pressures for academic achievement and stressful conditions at home or in

---

19 Limited research has examined GST within an Australian context (although see Fitzgerald, Mazerolle, Piquero, & Ansara, 2012).
school. Examining micro-level processes, their research (Bao et al., 2004) focused specifically on the effect of negative relationships with parents, teachers and peers on delinquency, mediated through anger, resentment, anxiety and depression in a sample of Chinese students. They found that while anger mediated the effect of negative interpersonal relationships on all forms of delinquency (including violence), resentment, anxiety and depression were only found to mediate the effect of negative relationships on less serious delinquency.

**Research examining offending populations and more serious crime**

In addition to examining criminal coping across gender and culture, researchers began exploring the applicability of GST to samples of incarcerated populations (e.g. Blevins et al., 2010; Morris et al., 2012; Piquero & Sealock, 2000; Slocum et al., 2005) and across more serious criminal behaviour, such as prison violence (Blevins et al., 2010; Morris et al., 2012), intimate partner violence perpetration (Anderson & Lo, 2011; Gibson et al., 2001), terrorism (Agnew, 2010) and school mass murder (Levin & Madfis, 2009).

In terms of prison research, Blevins et al. (2010) integrated current theories of prison violence and misconduct into one overarching framework consisting of GST. They identify the most apparent strains among inmates as loss of liberty, autonomy and the comfort that life outside of prison provides. Another source of strain is the experience of being prevented from achieving certain goals within the prison environment, such as visitation rights, early release and other privileges. This, Blevins et al. argue, may create anger and frustration among inmates. Other forms of strain present within correctional facilities include victimisation and prison overcrowding. They further argue that emotional responses to strain experienced in these circumstances, and the coping skills of the individual, are important in predicting
whether an individual will turn to deviant or conventional coping strategies. In particular, they emphasise the importance of social support. Examining this theoretical model using correctional data from male inmates in the United States, Morris et al. (2012) examined the impact of environmental strain, including inmates classified as high security and gang members in prison facilities, on inmate behaviour. They found that exposure to these types of strain was significantly related to engagement in prison misconduct such as verbal disruptions and assault.

The limited research applying a GST framework to explain intimate partner violence perpetration has generally provided support for the usefulness of such an approach (Anderson & Lo, 2011; Gibson et al., 2001). For example, examining data from the Police Stress and Domestic Violence in Police Families study, Gibson et al. (2001) found that work-related strain, operationalised as job dissatisfaction and exposure to negative work-related events, had a positive and significant effect on intimate partner violence perpetration. They further found that this relationship was mediated by both anger and depression. Interestingly, whilst availability of social support reduced the likelihood of experiencing negative emotions, it did not have a significant effect in terms of the relationship between strain and intimate partner violence perpetration.

General strain theory has also been applied to school mass murder. Using an integrated theoretical framework, Levin and Madfis (2009) argue that experiences of chronic strain such as parental rejection and bullying victimisation lead to social isolation. As a result, youths who perpetrate mass murder lack the social bonds and support systems to deal with more acute experiences of strain, such as loss of face, partner rejection or academic failure. The act of mass murder is thus a means of regaining power and achieving masculinity.
Chapter Summary

This chapter has outlined the theoretical framework of GST, which forms the foundation of the current research. The theory states that experiences of strain resulting from being prevented from achieving goals, losing something valuable or being exposed to negative stimuli generate negative emotions and create the need for corrective action. Engaging in criminal activity is one means by which the experience of strain and negative emotions can be alleviated and whether or not an individual copes with strain legitimately depends upon individual and external factors. These central hypotheses have generally found support in empirical research. Building on the theoretical principles of GST and the empirical literature on homicide, the following chapter presents a GST application of male-perpetrated IPH. This includes reviewing what is currently empirically known about the factors and situations associated with IPH incidents and interpreting this through the theoretical principles of GST. Since the current research is in many ways exploratory, a GST application of non-IPH is also constructed, allowing for comparisons between groups in relation to variables that empirically have been associated with non-IPH perpetration, but not necessarily with IPH perpetration. This is a crucial step toward understanding which factors are unique to male-perpetrated IPH. The theoretical models presented in the next chapter provide the basis for the empirical examinations that follow in Chapters 6 through 9.
Chapter 4: Theoretical Application: Using GST to Explain Male-Perpetrated IPH and Non-IPH

The previous chapter presented an overview of the concepts and principles of GST and the research that has been conducted testing its theoretical propositions. The focus of the current research is on examining whether there are certain characteristics that are unique to male-perpetrated IPH compared to non-IPH. As GST has not previously been used to explain IPH perpetration, the first step is to provide an application of the theory. Based on the theoretical framework of GST (presented in Chapter 3) and the known correlates of IPH (presented in Chapter 2), this chapter presents a GST application of male-perpetrated IPH. In order to ascertain whether certain correlates are specific to IPH, it is important to examine differences between IPH and non-IPH. Therefore, this chapter also presents a GST model of male-perpetrated non-IPH to allow for comparisons of a wide range of factors associated with different homicide categories. These two theoretical models do not represent an exhaustive list of correlates that may be important in explaining homicide. Instead, the models are based on the most central variables identified by GST and the homicide literature.

A GST Application of Male-Perpetrated IPH

Much of what is currently known about male-perpetrated IPH can be interpreted in terms of experiences of strain operating through negative emotions and moderated by conditioning factors. As discussed in the final section of Chapter 2, GST offers important contributions to the theoretical landscape of IPH. In particular, GST can help further the understanding of IPH through its emphasis on the role of expressive features of crimes, its explanation of how certain factors buffer or exacerbate the experience of
strain and negative emotions and its ability to account for both proximal and distal variables associated with male-perpetrated IPH. The sections that follow detail the sources of strain, negative emotions and conditioning factors that are theoretically and empirically relevant to a GST explanation of male-perpetrated IPH.

**Sources of strain for male IPH perpetrators**

Based on the literature, it is expected that a number of sources of strain are relevant in terms of explaining male-perpetrated IPH. Research suggests a link between abuse in childhood and non-lethal violence perpetration in adulthood (Gover et al., 2008; Kalmuss, 1984; Stith et al., 2000). Although not as strong a correlate of lethal violence as non-lethal violence (Dobash et al., 2007), research shows that a high prevalence of male perpetrators of IPH were exposed to physical, sexual or emotional abuse during childhood (Adams, 2009; Dobash et al., 2004; Thomas et al., 2011; Weizmann-Henelius et al., 2012). For example, examining official data from the United States, Thomas et al. (2011) found that, of men convicted of IPH, one-third had been physically abused in childhood. They also found that seven per cent of the sample had been sexually abused and more than one-third had been exposed to emotional abuse. Similarly, in the Murder in Britain study, one-fifth of the men who had killed an intimate partner had been physically abused and four per cent had been sexually abused (Dobash et al., 2004). Although abuse in childhood is temporally a distant strain, factors such as duration and frequency, coupled with the severity of the victimisation, are characteristics hypothesised to affect the perceived magnitude of the strain (Agnew, 2001), suggesting that exposure to violence in childhood may still play an important role in explaining behaviour in adulthood. Thus, it is expected that exposure to abuse in childhood, including physical, sexual and emotional abuse, act as strain in the form of *presentation of negatively valued stimuli* for males who perpetrate IPH.
The use of violence or threat of violence as a means of controlling the behaviour of others and generating compliance is a prominent theme in much of the theoretical literature on lethal and non-lethal male partner violence, including feminist theories (Dobash & Dobash, 1979; Johnson, 1995; Klein, 1981), evolutionary psychology (Daly & Wilson, 1988) and interactionism (Tedeschi & Felson, 1994). For example, control as a source of strain is a central hypothesis in research on the backlash effects of domestic violence resources on male-perpetrated IPH (Dugan, Rosenfeld, & Nagin, 2003). Research by Felson and Messner (2000) shows that male-perpetrated intimate partner violence is often preceded by threats, suggesting an escalation from threat to actual violence when the former is not enough to coerce compliance. Given the importance of control in lethal and non-lethal intimate partner violence research, it is expected that men’s failure to assert control or inability to achieve masculinity within relationships function as sources of strain for male perpetrators of IPH in that they are prevented from achieving a positively valued goal.

Similarly, the failure to maintain control has been identified in research on violence in reaction to perceived questioning of male authority (Dobash & Dobash, 1979; Dobash & Dobash, 2011) and relationship separation (Johnson & Hotton, 2003). This sense of not maintaining control has long been recognised as an important variable in explaining intimate partner violence perpetrated by men (Gondolf, 1985; Polk, 1994). Based on this research, it is expected that males who initially perceive themselves as being in control of their partner and subsequently subjectively lose this control experience removal of positively valued stimuli. In addition, threatened loss of control works as anticipated strain. The perceived magnitude of losing control or not being able to maintain control would be particularly intensified for men whose sense of entitlement forms a core part of their identity (affecting the centrality characteristic of strain, see
Agnew, 2001). This would be particularly relevant for men who live in societies, subcultures or families where proprietary attitudes are normative.

As mentioned, relationship separation may be the catalyst for experiences of losing control. In fact, relationship separation is one of the most prominent risk factors for female IPH victimisation (Johnson & Hotton, 2003; Thomas et al., 2011; Wallace, 1986; Wilson & Daly, 1993b), and research suggests that relationship separation substantially increases the odds of male-perpetrated IPH compared to other types of male-perpetrated homicide (Thomas et al., 2011). Recently, GST researchers have also begun exploring the impact separation has on criminal behaviour, with research showing subjective negative ratings of relationship break-downs to be related to criminal involvement in youth (Froggio & Agnew, 2007). Given the emphasis afforded this issue, particularly in IPH research, it is expected that relationship separation acts as removal of positively valued stimuli. As most homicides between intimate partners occur within the first few months after separation (Hotton, 2001; Wallace, 1986) it is expected that recency as a characteristic of strain has an important impact on subjective evaluations of strain magnitude (Agnew, 2001). Furthermore, it is expected that the threat of relationship separation (see Wilson & Daly, 1993b) acts as anticipated strain.

However, an exclusive focus on separation does not capture the reason for the relationship break-down. Evolutionary psychologists, in particular, stress the importance of examining the effects of perceived infidelity (Campbell & Ellis, 2005; Shackelford, Buss, & Weekes-Shackelford, 2003; Wilson & Daly, 1993a). Comparing the reasons for relationship separation between female IPH victims and a comparison group of abused women, Campbell et al. (2003) found an increased risk of lethal violence victimisation for women who had left their partner for someone else. This in particular appeared to mediate the relationship between controlling behaviour and IPH.
According to the Australian NHMP data, 21.2 per cent of homicides between intimate partners committed between 1989 and 1999 were preceded by arguments relating to perpetrator perceptions of partner infidelity (Mouzos, 2000).\textsuperscript{20} It is thus anticipated that actual and, perhaps more importantly, suspected infidelity (see Browne, 1987) act as strains for male IPH perpetrators as \textit{presentation of negatively valued stimuli.}

Further related to relationship separation issues are disputes regarding the care of the children, which research shows precipitate some IPH cases (Mouzos, 2000; Saunders, 1998; Wallace, 1986). For example, Australian data show that arguments relating to custody or parenting issues preceded 9.6 per cent of IPH cases between 1989 and 1999 (Mouzos, 2000). In research on child murder, Johnson (2005) specifically calls attention to the escalation of male violence and stalking after relationship separation, including threats to kill or harm the partner and/or the children. It has been suggested that harming the children may be a means of retaliating against the partner (McCloskey, 2001) or preventing the partner from leaving the relationship (Stahly, 2000). Although limited research has examined the role of child custody disputes on male-perpetrated IPH, it is expected that males who lose access to their children (including anticipated loss) through relationship separation or other means experience \textit{removal of positively valued stimuli.}

As discussed in Chapter 2, violent men who subsequently kill their partners have oftentimes been subject to prior legal interventions. Research shows the presence of previous domestic violence protection orders in approximately one-third of IPH cases involving a female victim (Mouzos, 2000; Websdale, 1999). While some IPH research finds a protective effect of arrest (Campbell, Webster, Koziol-McLain, Block,

\textsuperscript{20} This is based on \(n=52\). In 72.5\% of cases the motive/argument was not known.
Campbell, Curry, Gary, Glass, et al., 2003) other research suggests it might be countercproductive (Gauthier & Bankston, 2004). The deterrent effects of arrest on non-lethal partner violence as reported in findings from the Minneapolis Domestic Violence Experiment and Spouse Assault Replication Program have had important policy implications, although research further suggests that the effectiveness of arrest may depend upon moderating characteristics such as employment status and alcohol use (Maxwell, Garner, & Fagan, 2002; Sherman & Berk, 1984). In line with ‘backlash’ arguments, it may be that legal interventions create further stress and conflict within the relationship and thus may put women in more danger (see Dugan et al., 2003). It is therefore expected that protection orders and arrests are experienced as presentations of negatively valued stimuli, but also as removal of positively valued stimuli due to imposed restricted access to the female partner. Although GST states that strains associated with high social control should decrease the likelihood of crime (Agnew, 2006b), men who believe their violence is justified may experience being issued a protection order as unjust, a characteristic of strain hypothesised to decrease social control and increase the amount of anger experienced (Agnew, 2001). This is supported by research showing that perceptions of procedural justice play a role in decreasing intimate partner violence recidivism rates (Paternoster, Brame, Bachman, & Sherman, 1997).

**Negative emotional reactions to strain among male IPH perpetrators**

According to GST strain operates through negative emotions. The IPH literature is filled with accounts of male perpetrators experiencing anger, rage and jealousy (Dobash et al., 2007; Nicolaidis et al., 2003; Polk, 1994; Websdale, 1999). For example, coroner records of male-perpetrated IPH cases show presence of morbid jealousy, abandonment-rage and intense anger, sometimes to the extent that perpetrators report a
sense of relief after the incident (Polk, 1994). Examinations of official data show that experiences of rage increase the likelihood of male-perpetrated IPH compared to other types of male-perpetrated homicide by a factor of five (Thomas et al., 2011). The same research also suggests high levels of situational experiences of hatred among men who kill an intimate partner (49.3%). Research also shows that IPH perpetrators display higher levels of possessiveness and jealousy compared to perpetrators of non-lethal violence (Dobash et al., 2007). Similarly, female victims of attempted IPH report that their partner displayed extreme levels of jealousy prior to the incident (Nicolaidis et al., 2003). GST research highlights the importance of anger and rage as emotional reactions to strain among males, and suggests that although levels of anger are similar across gender, experiences of anger are more likely to result in violent acts among men (Mazerolle et al., 2003; Piquero & Sealock, 2004). From the literature it is thus expected that anger, rage and jealousy are key emotions that mediate the relationship between experiences of strain and male IPH perpetration. As per GST principles, the perpetration of IPH may thus be a means of dealing with the intense negative emotions experienced in reaction to strain such as losing control, going through a relationship separation, suspecting infidelity or being issued with a protection order.

Factors conditioning the effect of strain on male IPH

Of the conditioning variables identified by GST to increase the likelihood of crime, personality traits, attitudes and beliefs, associating with criminal others, learning history and access to social support may be particularly relevant in explaining male IPH perpetration. In terms of personality traits, GST research suggests that negative emotionality (also known as trait anger) and low constraint (also known as impulsivity) condition the effect of strain on criminal behaviour (Agnew et al., 2002). Although conceptualisations of negative emotionality have been virtually absent in the partner
violence literature, Moffitt et al. (2000) note that feminist and evolutionary theories discuss personality characteristics of male perpetrators of intimate partner violence in terminology similar to negative emotionality. Moffitt et al. argue that hypersensitivity to perceived threats and expected rejection are characteristics of negative emotionality that are important in explaining violence. Their findings suggest that negative emotionality is significantly correlated with both intimate partner violence perpetration and violence toward other people. However, their results further show that low constraint individuals who ‘specialise’ in intimate partner violence hold higher levels of constraint than individuals who engage in violence toward others or who engage in a combination of intimate partner violence and other violence. Similar results are found in research by Holtzworth-Munroe et al. (2000), suggesting that low constraint may be particularly relevant for individuals engaging in both partner and other forms of violence. Further data also suggest that low constraint plays an important role in explaining recidivism. Examining individuals convicted of lethal and non-lethal partner violence, Grann and Wedin (2002) found that higher levels of impulsivity significantly increased recidivism rates.

Based on the above research data, it is expected that negative emotionality and low constraint will play important roles in conditioning the effect of strain and negative emotions on criminal coping for male IPH perpetrators. However, as will be discussed later in this chapter, the limited research conducted suggests that these processes may also be relevant for male non-IPH perpetrators. As individuals with negative emotionality and low constraint are less likely to be concerned with the cost of crime and more likely to experience strains as unjust and high in magnitude (Agnew, 2001, 2006b), it is expected that these individuals are more likely to react to strain with lethal
violence. Furthermore, research shows that individuals high in trait anger are more likely to experience situational anger in response to strain (Mazerolle et al., 2003).

Further to these personality traits, research consistently suggests that jealousy is an important factor in explaining male-perpetrated IPH (Daly & Wilson, 1988; Dobash et al., 2007; Nicolaidis et al., 2003; Polk, 1994). Most commonly the IPH literature refers to jealousy in terms of a characteristic of the perpetrator as opposed to an emotional response limited to a specific unique situation such as relationship separation (Daly & Wilson, 1988; Dobash & Dobash, 2011; Websdale, 1999). This suggests that it may be relevant not only to examine jealousy as a situational emotion, but also as a dispositional characteristic of the individual, similar to the distinction made between situational and trait anger. Based on the research by Mazerolle et al. (2003) showing that trait anger acts as a moderator for anger reactions to strain, it is anticipated that individuals with jealous dispositions (trait jealousy) are more likely to react to situations with jealous emotions (situational jealousy), and therefore more likely to engage in criminal behaviour.

Another conditioning factor important for IPH explanations is the individual’s belief system. Research suggests that individuals who approve of and legitimise intimate partner violence are more likely to engage in this type of violence (Bryant & Spencer, 2003; Herzog, 2007). Straus (1980) found that individuals who approved of slapping a spouse were over five times more likely to engage in intimate partner violence when experiencing high levels of stress than individuals who disapproved of this form of violence. Similarly, research by Holtzworth-Munroe et al. (2000) shows that males reporting high levels of marital violence hold more condoning attitudes towards partner violence than males reporting lower levels or no involvement in marital violence. These belief systems may originate from the family of origin (e.g. Kalmuss,
1984), with some research suggesting a higher prevalence rate of witnessing parental violence among male IPH perpetrators compared to males who have killed someone other than an intimate partner (Weizmann-Henelius et al., 2012). These attitudes may also originate from peers, with research suggesting that associating with peers who approve of, or engage in intimate partner violence, is related to perpetration of such acts (DeKeseredy & Schwartz, 1998; Sellers, Cochran, & Branch, 2005; Smith, 1991). GST states that holding beliefs favourable to crime and associating with criminal others are factors that lower an individual’s perceived cost of crime, reduce their access to legal coping strategies and affect the way in which an individual perceives the strain, thereby increasing the likelihood of criminal coping (Agnew, 2006b). It is therefore expected that men who condone the use of intimate partner violence, have witnessed parental violence or are associating with peers who condone intimate partner violence are more likely to respond to strain such as relationship separation through lethal violence compared to other men.

Similarly, proprietary and entitlement attitudes are consistently found to be related to male lethal and non-lethal intimate partner violence (Daly & Wilson, 1988; Dobash et al., 2007; Polk, 1994; Wilson & Daly, 1993a). For example, examining case records of 104 men convicted of murder of an intimate partner as part of the Murder in Britain study, Dobash and Dobash (2011) found that these perpetrators often held notions of men as authority figures and women as subordinates. Similarly, examining the characteristics of 67 IPH incidents involving male perpetrators, Websdale (1999) found that in half of these cases the men had displayed obsessive possessiveness or morbid jealousy. These findings would suggest that men who live in societies, subcultures or families where proprietary attitudes are normative would be more likely to react negatively to instances of separation or experiences of losing or not maintaining
control. It is thus expected that men who hold proprietary and entitlement attitudes are more likely to perpetrate IPH when experiencing strain and negative emotions compared to men not holding these attitudes.

Also of importance is the prior learning history of the individual. According to GST, experiences of reinforcement of certain types of behaviour in the past may act to moderate the way in which an individual reacts to experiences of strain and negative emotions in the present (Agnew, 1992). As discussed, violence as a means of controlling partner behaviour is a prominent theme in the intimate partner violence literature (Daly & Wilson, 1988; Dobash & Dobash, 1979; Felson & Messner, 2000; Johnson, 1995; Klein, 1981) and research suggests that a history of non-lethal intimate partner violence perpetration is common among males who perpetrate IPH (Campbell, Webster, Koziol-McLain, Block, Campbell, Curry, Gary, McFarlane, et al., 2003; Easteal, 1993; Sharps et al., 2001; Websdale, 1999). As discussed by Daly and Wilson (1988, p. 208), “by and large, men resort to violence in their efforts to control women, because–to some degree–violence works”. Thus, achieving control through the use of violence may act as a reinforcement promoting the use of violence in the future. It is therefore expected that individuals who have previously used violence in an intimate partner relationship will be more likely to turn to violence, including lethal violence, in reaction to experiences of strain and negative emotions.

GST further states that individuals experiencing low conventional social support are less able to cope with strain in a legitimate way (Agnew, 1992, 2006b), although strain research has provided mixed support for this proposition (Capowich et al., 2001; Kort-Butler, 2010; Maschi, 2006; Tittle et al., 2008; Warner & Fowler, 2003). Although most homicide research examining social support have focused on female perpetrators killing their abusive partners (see Browne & Williams, 1989; Dutton, Hohnecker, Halle,
& Burghardt, 1994; Peterson, 1999), macro-level homicide research do suggest that measures of social support can help explain variations in overall homicide rates (Pratt & Godsey, 2003; Worrall, 2009). For example, Pratt and Godsey (2003) found that social support, as measured by the percentage of a nation’s gross domestic product spent on health care, worked to decrease the criminogenic effects of economic inequality on overall homicide rates. Thus, based on theoretical and empirical grounds, it is expected that access to social support serves to moderate the effect of strain and negative emotions on homicide. However, research has yet to examine whether social support is more important in explaining certain victim-offender homicide categories, including IPH, compared to others.

The effects of strain such as relationship separation on coping strategies may further be moderated by attachment styles. Research on non-lethal intimate partner violence suggests that violent men are more likely to display insecure attachment styles and greater partner dependency compared to non-violent men (Babcock, Jacobson, Gottman, & Yerinton, 2000; Holtzworth-Munroe, Stuart, et al., 1997; Murphy, Meyer, & O’Leary, 1994). Dutton (2003) argues that fear of rejection is particularly relevant in explaining intimate partner violence perpetration by males, as fearful men tend to react to separation and rejection with anger and rage, referred to by Dutton (2003, p. 133) as “anger born of fear”. Exposing males to videotapes depicting a scenario in which a woman attempts to become more independent from her partner, Dutton and Browning (1988) found that physically abusive males reacted with higher levels of anger to this scenario compared to verbally abusive and non-abusive males. Research further suggests that males displaying fearful attachment styles experience higher levels

---

21 Also referred to in the literature as avoidant or anxious-ambivalent attachment styles.
of jealousy compared to other males (Dutton, Saunders, Starzomski, & Bartholomew, 1994; Hazan & Shaver, 1987). Despite limited research examining attachment processes in lethal intimate partner violence (although see Dutton, 2002; Dutton & Kerry, 1999), and although attachment has not previously been identified by GST as a conditioning factor, the intimate partner violence literature suggests that, theoretically, this may be an important variable. It is therefore expected that while a secure attachment style will help buffer the effects of strains such as relationship separation and experiences of negative emotions on IPH perpetration by males, insecure attachment styles (e.g. fearful) will serve to exacerbate this effect.

**A GST Application of Male-Perpetrated Non-IPH**

The previous section suggests that there is conceptual validity in applying GST as a theoretical model with which to explain male IPH perpetration. This section shifts the focus from IPH to non-IPH perpetration by males. As with IPH, much of what is known about male-perpetrated non-IPH can be interpreted through GST principles. Non-IPH is a more diverse group compared to IPH. Included in this category are homicides where the perpetrators and victims were family members, friends or strangers. The purpose of this GST application of non-IPH is not to be all-inclusive in terms of a complete list of correlates that may or may not be associated with specific victim-offender categories of homicide, but rather to examine the more central variables that distinguish IPH from, or in some cases are similar to, non-IPH perpetrated by males.

---

22 For an application of GST and other theories for explaining school mass murder see Levin and Madfis (2009).
Sources of strain for male non-IPH perpetrators

It is expected that male non-IPH perpetrators experience a number of sources of strain. Similar to childhood experiences of IPH perpetrators, exposure to physical, sexual and emotional abuse in childhood is also common among males who perpetrate non-IPH (Dobash et al., 2004; Thomas et al., 2011; Weizmann-Henelius et al., 2012). While some research suggests that this is more common among non-IPH than IPH perpetrators (Weizmann-Henelius et al., 2012), other research shows no distinct differences (Dobash et al., 2004; Thomas et al., 2011). As discussed in the IPH model, the severity, duration and frequency of childhood abuse affect perceptions of magnitude (Agnew, 2001), which means that child abuse may still play an important role in violent offending despite the length of time passed since the abuse occurred. Thus, it is expected that exposure to abuse in childhood, including physical, sexual and emotional abuse, acts as presentation of negatively valued stimuli for men who perpetrate non-IPH.

One source of strain that may be particularly relevant to male perpetrators of non-IPH is financial difficulties. Research suggests that non-IPH incidents are more often characterised by financial motives compared to IPH (Moracco et al., 1998; Thomas et al., 2011). For example, research by Moracco et al. (1998) shows that a significantly larger proportion of males who commit homicide against female non-partners do so in the context of a robbery compared to male IPH perpetrators. Another indication of financial difficulties is unemployment. Data from the Murder in Britain study show that men whose victim were intimate partners were more than twice as likely to have had regular employment prior to the incident compared to males who killed other males (Dobash et al., 2004). Similar figures are observed in the United States, where Thomas et al. (2011) found that 72.9 per cent of men convicted of IPH
were employed at the time of the incident compared to 44.6 per cent of men convicted of non-IPH. Given these research findings it is expected that financial difficulties act as a source of strain for men who have committed non-IPH, either as being *prevented from achieving a positively valued goal* (financial goal) or as *removal of positively valued stimuli* (e.g. being made redundant at work).

Many homicides involving male perpetrators are characterised by spontaneous arguments over trivial matters, particularly when the victim is also male (Daly & Wilson, 1988; Polk, 1994; Wolfgang, 1957). Polk (1994) refers to these as confrontational homicides typified by honour and masculinity contests. These contests may at the onset be verbal or non-verbal in nature, frequently involving the use of alcohol and occurring in public settings (Polk, 1994). Examining motives, Weizmann et al. (2012) found that in 12.5 per cent of cases involving male non-IPH perpetrators the motive was revenge, compared to only 2.2 per cent of men who killed an intimate partner. Based on these findings, it is expected that perceiving one’s honour or masculinity status as threatened acts as *removal of positively valued stimuli* for male non-IPH perpetrators. In line with GST arguments, this is particularly relevant for males whose masculinity forms a core part of their identity, thus affecting the centrality characteristic of strain (Agnew, 2001).

It has long been acknowledged that males often play a precipitating role in their own victimisation (Wolfgang, 1957). Research by Weizmann et al. (2012) shows that self-defence is more often a motivating factor for male perpetrators of non-IPH (15.4%) compared to IPH (1.1%). As physical victimisation is often high in magnitude and seen as unjust, Agnew (2001) argues that it should be strongly related to offending behaviour, and strain research supports this prediction (Agnew, 2002; Baron, 2004; Hay & Evans, 2006). For example, Hay and Evans (2006) found that actual or threatened
physical victimisation was associated with increased violent and property offending in a sample of American youths. It is therefore expected that physical victimisation acts as a source of strain, namely *presentation of negatively valued stimuli* for male perpetrators of non-IPH.

As discussed in reference to the IPH model, being on a domestic violence protection order may act as a strain for men who commit IPH, in that their freedom and movement is restricted in terms of accessing their partner. In a similar way, custodial and community sentences may act as strain for non-IPH perpetrators. Imprisonment as loss of autonomy and liberty has previously been acknowledged in the GST literature as important in explaining prison violence and misconduct (Blevins et al., 2010; Morris et al., 2012). Research shows that at the time of the homicide incident 21.3 per cent of male non-IPH perpetrators were on probation for another crime compared to 14.3 per cent of men whose victim was an intimate partner (Thomas et al., 2011). In Australia, depending upon the conditions of the probation or parole, offenders may be required to regularly report to officers, apply for permission for national and international travel, attend drug and alcohol programs, provide regular urine and blood tests and comply with any other court ordered probation and parole conditions (Queensland Corrective Services, 2007; Simpson, 1999). In this sense, it is expected that serving a custodial or community order acts as *removal of positively valued stimuli*. Furthermore, imprisonment is associated with the *presentation of a range of negatively valued stimuli*, such as victimisation and overcrowding (Blevins et al., 2010). In terms of strain characteristics, perceived procedural injustice may serve to exacerbate an individual’s subjective experiences of these types of strain (Agnew, 2001).
Negative emotional reactions to strain among male non-IPH perpetrators

Limited research has examined situational negative emotions among male non-IPH perpetrators. Most research that examines emotive expressions are focused on more proximal victim-offender relationships, such as homicide committed between family members or intimate partners (e.g. Websdale, 2010). However, research suggests that expressive features are also present in homicides involving more distal social relations, such as between strangers (Decker, 1996). As discussed in the IPH model, emotions such as anger or rage are expected to play an important role in male-perpetrated IPH incidents. However, as research by Thomas et al. (2011) shows, although experiences of rage were predictive of male-perpetrated IPH incidents, a large proportion (one-third) of non-IPH perpetrators were also motivated by rage. Furthermore, male non-IPH perpetrators are more likely to kill in self-defence compared to IPH perpetrators (Weizmann-Henelius et al., 2012), suggesting that experiences of fear may be present in non-IPH incidents. Despite the limited research conducted, it is therefore expected that emotions such as anger, rage or fear play a role in mediating the relationship between strain and homicide perpetration among males who kill someone other than an intimate partner.

Factors conditioning the effect of strain on male non-IPH

As with males who kill an intimate partner, it is expected that personality traits such as negative emotionality (trait anger) and low constraint (impulsivity) are important in explaining non-IPH perpetration by males. Research has found both of these traits to be related to non-lethal violence (Holtzworth-Munroe et al., 2000; Moffitt et al., 2000; Piquero, MacDonald, Dobrin, Daigle, & Cullen, 2005) and homicide perpetration (Biro, Vuckovic, & Djuric, 1992). The non-lethal violence literature
suggests that men who are generally violent have higher impulsivity levels compared to men who are only violent towards their partner (Holtzworth-Munroe et al., 2000). Similarly, research by Moffitt et al. (2000) suggests that individuals engaging in violent crime against non-partners are more impulsive compared to individuals who engage in intimate partner violence. The same pattern appears for negative emotionality. However, compared to non-violent individuals, those who engage in any form of violence (whether against a partner or someone else) score lower on both negative emotionality and impulsivity. The limited homicide research conducted shows that half of homicide perpetrators have personality profiles characteristic of impulsive-aggressive outbursts and intolerance of frustration (Biro et al., 1992), although this research does not examine across victim-offender categories. It is therefore expected that both of these traits are conducive to crime in that they condition the effect of experiences of strain on situational negative emotions and homicide perpetration for both IPH and non-IPH males.

According to GST, another key conditioning factors explaining criminal behaviour is association with criminal others and, relatedly, holding beliefs favourable to crime (Agnew, 1992, 2006b). At a macro-level, research shows that violent cultural orientations correlate with higher homicide rates in the United States (Williams & Flewelling, 1988), suggesting the importance of examining cultural norms and beliefs toward the use of violence. GST further states that the prior learning history of an individual is expected to play an important role (Agnew, 1992). Homicide research suggests that non-IPH perpetrators often have a criminal history, and that this is more common than among IPH perpetrators (Belfrage & Rying, 2004; Dobash et al., 2004; Kivivuori & Lehti, 2012; Thomas et al., 2011; Weizmann-Henelius et al., 2012). For example, research shows that having served time in prison and holding previous
convictions for theft/burglary and assault/homicide is more common among men whose victim was another male compared to men who killed an intimate partner (Kivivuori & Lehti, 2012). It is therefore expected that holding beliefs favourable to the use of violence, associating with criminal others and having a history of violence act as factors conditioning the effect of strain for male non-IPH perpetrators by increasing the likelihood of homicide perpetration as a means of coping with strain such as financial difficulties and criminal victimisation.

Similarly, according to GST, individuals who are low in social control are more likely to engage in crime as they are less invested in conventional activities and hold fewer emotional bonds with conventional others, thereby having less to lose by engaging in criminal behaviour (Agnew, 2006b). Thomas et al. (2011) note that men who kill someone other than an intimate partner appear to have a lower stake in conformity compared to men who perpetrate IPH. Their data suggest that IPH perpetrators are more likely to be married, be employed and have completed a higher level of education. Similar indicators of low social control among male perpetrators of non-IPH are found in other homicide research as well (Dobash et al., 2004; Kivivuori & Lehti, 2012). It is therefore expected that male non-IPH perpetrators hold lower levels of social control compared to IPH perpetrators, which serves to exacerbate the effect of strain and negative emotions.

As discussed in the IPH model, macro-level homicide research has found social support to be relevant in explaining differences in overall homicide rates across communities (Pratt & Godsey, 2003; Worrall, 2009). GST highlights the importance of social support as moderating the effects of experiences of strain on criminal involvement (Agnew, 1992, 2006b). Individual-level research on the availability and use of support systems for individuals who commit homicide is limited, particularly as
it relates to differences across victim-offender relationship categories. It is therefore not possible to predict whether social support plays a more important role for IPH or non-IPH perpetrators. However, due to its importance in GST, as well as the limited research findings suggesting that measures of social support correlate with overall homicide rates (Pratt & Godsey, 2003; Worrall, 2009), it is recognised that social support may act as a moderator for male non-IPH perpetrators, as well as for male IPH perpetrators.

Summary of Theoretical Models

Based on theoretical and empirical research on GST and homicide, this section has outlined the ways in which GST can be applied to explain homicide perpetration by males. Two models were presented, one examining the strains, negative emotions and conditioning factors specific to male-perpetrated IPH, and the other examining male-perpetrated non-IPH. A summary of these theoretical applications is presented in Figure 1.

Cumulatively, as seen in Figure 1, the research identifies key strains important for the explanation of male IPH perpetration, including loss of control, relationship separation, child custody disputes and partner infidelity, resulting in feelings of anger, rage or jealousy. Personality factors such as levels of trait anger and attachment styles act as conditioning variables that buffer or exacerbate the effect of strain and negative emotions on male-perpetrated IPH. In comparison, it is anticipated that male non-IPH perpetrators experience strains such as financial difficulties, threatened honour and violent victimisation, resulting in experiences of negative emotions such as anger or fear. While certain conditioning factors appear relevant for both types of homicide categories, including negative emotionality and low constraint, other factors appear to
be specific to non-IPH perpetrators, such as having a criminal history and experiencing low social control.

**Figure 1.** A general strain theory application of male-perpetrated IPH and non-IPH.

As evidenced by the theoretical application presented in this chapter, GST appears to hold conceptual validity in terms of explaining IPH perpetration by males in that it is able to account for a number of strains, emotions and conditioning factors.
associated with male IPH perpetration. Although non-IPH perpetrators represent a diverse category, including family, friend, and stranger victim-offender relationships, the GST model of non-IPH perpetration also appears to hold conceptual validity. The next section presents the aims and research questions arising from the GST models.

**Aims and Research Questions**

This research has two main aims. The first aim is to establish theoretical models based on GST principles and existing homicide research that takes into account the qualitatively different situational events and emotional reactions experienced by male IPH and non-IPH perpetrators. The current chapter has worked toward the accomplishment of that aim by introducing GST applications of IPH and non-IPH perpetrated by males.

The second aim of this research is to examine the empirical validity of these theoretical models. This research specifically compares males who have committed IPH to males who have committed non-IPH. Understanding which (if any) characteristics distinguish intimate partner violence from non-partner violence has been recognised as important in establishing preventative measures and creating valid theoretical models within criminology more generally (Dobash et al., 2004; Felson, 2010; Felson & Lane, 2010; Moffitt et al., 2000; Thomas et al., 2011). Furthermore, it is not only important to understand the differences between IPH and non-IPH perpetrators, but also the ways in which IPH males interpret events and the coping strategies they utilise. It is therefore necessary to explore the IPH model more in-depth. The research questions building on the theoretical models presented in this chapter are provided below. These are the questions that guide the empirical analyses that follow in Chapters 6 through 9.
Research question 1: What is the role of strain on male IPH perpetration and how does it differ for non-IPH perpetrators?

According to GST, events and conditions that are disliked by individuals may result in criminal action (Agnew, 1992, 2006b). In particular, Agnew (2001) has highlighted the importance of examining the role of individual strains on criminal behaviour. However, research also suggests that experiences of clustering of strain in time may be particularly criminogenic (Hoffmann & Cerbone, 1999; Slocum et al., 2005). Thus, it is important to establish whether clustering of strain, as well as which individual strains, differentiate between male IPH and non-IPH perpetrators, and furthermore, whether these predict male IPH perpetration. This involves answering the following subsidiary research questions:

- Does clustering of strain differentiate between male perpetrators of IPH and non-IPH?
- Does clustering of strain predict male-perpetrated IPH?
- Which specific strains differentiate between male perpetrators of IPH and non-IPH?
- Which specific strains predict male-perpetrated IPH?

In addition, given that subjective interpretations of strain theoretically should have a stronger association with criminal behaviour than objective strains (Agnew, 2001), it is also important to explore which events male perpetrators of IPH subjectively interpret as strains. The focus here is on IPH perpetrators exclusively, since they are the focal point of the current research. The following subsidiary research question was posed to explore experiences of subjective strain among male perpetrators of IPH:

- Which subjective strains do male IPH perpetrators report experiencing?
Research question 2: What is the role of negative emotions on male IPH perpetration and how does it differ for non-IPH perpetrators?

GST states that negative emotions are experienced in reaction to strain (Agnew, 1992, 2006b). As per the theoretical models presented above, research suggests that male perpetrators of IPH experience anger, rage or jealousy, while non-IPH perpetrators experience anger, rage or fear. The second step in the research process thus involves identifying which negative emotions are experienced in reaction to strain and whether these differ between male IPH perpetrators and non-IPH perpetrators, as well as understanding which negative emotions predict IPH perpetration. Thus, the following subsidiary research questions were posed:

- Which negative emotions differentiate between male perpetrators of IPH and non-IPH?
- Which negative emotions predict male-perpetrated IPH?

In addition, GST states that experiences of negative emotions mediate the relationship between strain and criminal coping (Agnew, 1992). Research has found support for the mediating effects of negative emotions, particularly for anger on violent offending (Aseltine et al., 2000; Capowich et al., 2001; Hay & Evans, 2006). To explore the mediating effect of negative emotions, the following research question was posed:

- Do negative emotions mediate the effect of strain on male-perpetrated IPH?

Furthermore, while examining experiences of subjective strain among male IPH perpetrators is relevant, it is also important to understand whether and which negative emotions are experienced in reaction to subjective strains. Therefore, the following question was posed:
• Which negative emotions do male perpetrators of IPH report experiencing in reaction to subjective strain?

**Research question 3: What is the role of conditioning factors on male-perpetrated IPH perpetration and how does it differ for non-IPH perpetrators?**

According to GST, an individual’s coping strategies in reaction to strain depends among other things upon individual characteristics and access to social support, rendering some individuals better equipped to cope with distress (Agnew, 1992; Agnew et al., 2002). Some of the more salient characteristics identified in the literature as important in understanding men’s intimate partner violence perpetration include angry and jealous dispositions and holding condoning attitudes toward the use of violence in intimate relationships (e.g. Holtzworth-Munroe et al., 2000; Moffitt et al., 2000; Polk, 1994). The third step in the research process is to understand which conditioning factors differ for male IPH and non-IPH perpetrators, and which conditioning factors predict male IPH perpetration. Therefore, the following subsidiary research questions were posed:

• Which conditioning factors differentiate between male perpetrators of IPH and non-IPH?

• Which conditioning factors predict male-perpetrated IPH?

Furthermore, GST emphasises that conditioning factors act to either buffer or exacerbate the effect of strain and negative emotions on criminal outcomes (Agnew, 1992, 2006b). To examine whether these factors act as moderating variables the following research question was posed:

• Do conditioning factors moderate the effect of strain on male-perpetrated IPH?
Research question 4: Which coping strategies do male perpetrators of IPH report using in reaction to subjective strain?

GST states that criminal involvement is one means through which an individual may cope with experiences of strain and negative emotions (Agnew, 1992). However, there are numerous legitimate ways of coping with these experiences, such as engaging in cognitive, behavioural or emotional coping strategies (Agnew, 1992; Lazarus & Folkman, 1984; Thoits, 1988). Limited research has explored which legitimate coping strategies individuals engage in when experiencing strain and negative emotions. It may be that criminal acts are preceded by alternative attempts to cope with these experiences. To explore the use of coping strategies, the following research question was posed:

- Which coping strategies do male perpetrators of IPH report using in reaction to subjective experiences of strain?

Chapter Summary

Based on theoretical and empirical research on GST and the homicide literature, this chapter has outlined the ways in which GST can be applied to explain homicide perpetration by males. Two models were presented, one examining the strains, negative emotions and conditioning factors specific to male-perpetrated IPH, and the other examining male-perpetrated non-IPH. Building on these theoretical models, this chapter also presented the aims and research questions to be examined in the current research. The following chapter explains the methodology used to answer these research questions.
Chapter 5: Methodological Approach

As evidenced by the theoretical application presented in the previous chapter, GST appears to hold conceptual validity in terms of explaining male IPH and non-IPH perpetration. The next step is to explore these applications empirically to examine the ways in which IPH and non-IPH males differ on the key theoretical variables identified by GST. To achieve this aim, the current research utilised a self-report methodology consisting of face-to-face interviews with males convicted of murder or manslaughter.

There are two important reasons for using an offender-based self-report methodology. Firstly, previous studies of IPH have frequently used official data (see Decker, 1996; Johnson & Hotton, 2003; Jurik & Winn, 1990), which provide a static picture of homicide events and limited insight into the dynamic lives of perpetrators. Secondly, studies that have conducted interviews with victims of attempted homicide or victim proxies (see Bailey et al., 1997; McFarlane et al., 2002; Sharps et al., 2001), although providing important contextual data, are limited in their focus on victims or proxy victims as sources of information. By exploring homicide through a GST lens, the focus of investigation is on perpetrator experiences. Rarely has homicide research used interviews with perpetrators as a source of data (for exceptions see Browne, 1986; Dobash et al., 2009; Grant & Curry, 1993), despite the insights into perpetrator motives, perceptions and cognitions that stand to be gained from such research (for a discussion see Lewis et al., 2003). Furthermore, existing offender-based studies are generally limited to small sample sizes. Thus, by conducting interviews with homicide perpetrators this research provides an original and important contribution to empirical and theoretical knowledge of the causes of male IPH perpetration.

This research utilised a mixed-methods approach. The first study used a quantitative methodology to examine strain, situational emotions and conditioning
variables. For this study, structured interviews were conducted with 157 male homicide perpetrators. This quantitative study allowed for the use of statistical analyses to explore the validity of using GST to explain male-perpetrated IPH. Moreover, these analyses allowed for examinations of differences between male IPH and non-IPH perpetrators, addressing the question of whether IPH should be considered a unique category of homicide (Felson & Lane, 2010; Miethe & Regoeczi, 2004).

The second study was qualitative and data for this study were collected simultaneously to the first study. The use of a qualitative study served two purposes. Firstly, analyses of a combination of quantitative and qualitative data allow for more accurate inferences to be made (Teddlie & Tashakkori, 2003). Secondly, certain concepts within GST, such as subjective experiences of strain and the ways in which individuals react to strain, would benefit from the use of a qualitative data collection technique. For the second study, semi-structured interviews were conducted with a subsample of ten male IPH perpetrators who participated in the first study.

The present chapter outlines the methodologies for both studies and includes information regarding research design, sampling procedures, data collection, analytical strategy and variable construction. For the purpose of this research, ‘intimate partner’ is operationalised as a current or former partner with whom the respondent had been romantically involved. This includes de jure, de facto and dating relationships.

**Study 1: Exploring the Role of Strain, Negative Emotions and Conditioning Factors on Male IPH Perpetration**

**Research design**

The objective of the first study was to analyse the GST models presented in Chapter 4 empirically to allow for comparisons between male IPH and non-IPH
perpetrators in relation to key theoretical variables of interest relating to strain, negative emotions and conditioning factors. Data for this study were collected as part of the Australian Homicide Project (AHP), which was supported by an Australian Research Council Discovery grant\textsuperscript{23}. The main aim of AHP was to examine the causes of homicide in order to improve understandings of pathways to homicide and responses by criminal justice, health and social welfare agencies. The AHP project represents the first major study of homicide in Australia, and one of few studies internationally, that involves self-report data with a large sample of homicide perpetrators. Data were collected through the use of structured face-to-face interviews with individuals convicted of murder or manslaughter across three Australian jurisdictions (Queensland, New South Wales and Western Australia)\textsuperscript{24}.

**Sample and research locations**

Respondents in the study consisted of 157 men convicted of murder or manslaughter serving custodial sentences or reporting to probation or parole offices across Queensland, New South Wales and Western Australia. Interviews were conducted with these individuals between June 2010 and May 2012 by five trained interviewers (the doctoral scholar included). As seen in Table 1, 66 interviews were conducted in correctional centres in Queensland, 22 interviews were conducted in probation and parole offices in Queensland, 36 interviews were conducted in custodial centres in New South Wales, 32 interviews were conducted in custodial centres in

\textsuperscript{23} Full project title: Developmental pathways to intimate partner homicide: Understanding individual and situational dimensions. Project ID: 35756. Chief Investigator: Professor Paul Mazerolle.

\textsuperscript{24} At the time of writing, data were still being collected in a number of other jurisdictions across Australia for the overall AHP project.
Western Australia and one interview was conducted in a probation and parole office in Western Australia. Of the 157 respondents, 41 (26.11%) had killed a current or former intimate partner (classified as IPH) while 116 (73.89%) had killed someone other than an intimate partner, including family members, friends or strangers (classified as non-IPH).

Table 1. Sample Locations and Sample Size (Study 1)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>Correctional type</th>
<th>Facilities</th>
<th>N=157</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Queensland</td>
<td>Custodial</td>
<td>Borallon</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Capricornia</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Darling Downs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Maryborough</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Numinbah</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Townsville</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Townsville Farm</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Wolston</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Woodford</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Queensland</td>
<td>Probation and parole</td>
<td>Brisbane Central</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Brisbane North</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Brisbane South</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Caboolture</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Ipswich</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Logan City</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mt Gravatt</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Southport</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Toowoomba</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New South Wales</td>
<td>Custodial</td>
<td>Dawn De Loas</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Goulburn</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>John Morony</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Lithgow</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mid North Coast</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Western Australia</td>
<td>Custodial</td>
<td>Acacia</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Albany</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Bunbury</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Casuarina</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Western Australia</td>
<td>Probation and parole</td>
<td>Midland</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A limited number of facilities in each jurisdiction were excluded from participating in this research. In the majority of cases these facilities were located in
rural areas that were logistically difficult to access. Another reason for exclusion was the limited number of individuals serving murder or manslaughter sentences at the facilities. Furthermore, since conducting interviews in probation and parole offices requires constant on-hand availability of interviewers, these interviews were only conducted in Queensland and Western Australia, as the research team had access to interviewers residing in these two jurisdictions but not in New South Wales. For logistical reasons only probation and parole centres located around Brisbane (Queensland) and Perth (Western Australia) were included.

Individuals serving custodial or community sentences for murder or manslaughter as their most serious offence were invited to participate, while individuals whose most serious offence included attempted murder or driving causing death were excluded from the research. Correctional services in each jurisdiction assisted with identifying eligible perpetrators. In total, 961 eligible homicide perpetrators were located at the custodial or community corrections locations shown in Table 1. This does not include 20 homicide perpetrators located at the so-called ‘Supermax’ unit at Goulburn prison in New South Wales, who were excluded from participating in the research as per advice from Corrective Services New South Wales. Of the 961 eligible individuals, 219 were originally interviewed, resulting in a response rate of 22.79 per cent. However, this response rate is most likely conservative. Due to the logistical challenges of fieldwork, and the reliance on correctional staff for distribution of expressions of interest, the actual number of eligible perpetrators approached may have been minimised.

Although originally 219 interviews were conducted with individuals convicted of murder or manslaughter, 62 interviews were excluded from the current research, leaving a sample size of 157. The exclusion of these interviews was based on five
criteria. Firstly, as this research is focused on understanding male perpetration patterns, 32 females who were interviewed were excluded from the current sample. Secondly, although some researchers argue that the possibility of wrongful convictions in IPH cases is highly unlikely (see Dobash & Dobash, 2011), individuals arguing innocence were excluded from the analyses. In the current research, these individuals were excluded due to limited information provided by the respondents in relation to the homicide incidents. Thirdly, individuals whose cases or sentences were under appeal at the time of the interview were also excluded. In total, 17 respondents were excluded for either one of these two aforementioned reasons. Fourthly, 12 interviews that were terminated either due to time constraints or language barriers were also excluded. Lastly, although it is important to understand the dynamics of same-sex IPH offences, one same-sex IPH incident was excluded from the analyses. This individual was excluded from the current study as research suggests differences between same-sex and opposite-sex IPH (Mize & Shackelford, 2008).

**Recruitment of respondents and data collection procedures**

After approval was granted from the Griffith University Human Research Ethics Committee (HREC), applications to conduct research were submitted to the relevant departmental agencies in each of the jurisdictions. Approvals to conduct research were provided by Queensland Corrective Services in March 2010, Department of Corrective Services Western Australia in August 2010 and Corrective Services New South Wales in January 2011. The processes for recruitment of respondents and data collection differed for custodial and community corrections and these are therefore detailed separately below.
**Procedures for data collection in correctional centres**

Details of contact persons (most commonly the facility manager) in individual correctional centres were provided by corrective services in each jurisdiction. These persons were then contacted and informed about the project. Staff at each correctional centre provided eligible individuals with an introduction package a few weeks before data collection was due to commence. These introduction packages were delivered in sealed envelopes by hand or via the internal mail system depending upon the logistical operations of the individual centres. The packages contained information sheets stating the structure and aim of the research, as well as expression of interest forms (see Appendix A for the Queensland version). Eligible individuals were instructed to indicate whether or not they were interested in participating in the research project by filling out the expression of interest form, putting the form in a sealed envelope and returning the form to correctional staff. The assigned contact person at each centre then either sent the expression of interest envelopes to the research team or opened the envelopes and provided the research team with a list of individuals interested in participating in the research. A few individuals chose to send the envelopes directly to the research team at Griffith University via the external mail system. On limited occasions discretionary decisions were made by correctional staff (most commonly prison psychologists) in terms of excluding individuals who had indicated a willingness to participate in the project but who were deemed high risk or mentally unstable.

Before data collection began a one-day training workshop was held with a team of interviewers hired specifically for the research project. The workshop provided interviewers with detailed information about the data collection process, including safety procedures at correctional centres, managing participant distress and using the
data collection tools. The five trained interviewers (doctoral scholar included) conducted all of the 157 interviews in the current sample.

In general, interviewers were sent out to correctional centres in pairs. At times this was not feasible due to the availability of interviewers and interview rooms at the centres. Criminal history checks were completed for all interviewers before gaining access to the centres. Depending upon the security level of the correctional centre, the interviewers went through biometric and fingerprint scanning, metal detectors and, on limited occasions, drug substance detectors. Most of the centres provided interviewers with duress alarms, depending upon the security level of the correctional centre. Ensuring the safety of the interviewers was of the highest concern for the project team. Interviewers were advised to be conscious of their safety for the duration of their stay at the correctional facility and to follow the safety procedures provided by correctional staff at all times.

At the time of data collection, correctional staff escorted potential participants to an interview room within the correctional centre. Most commonly these rooms contained security cameras and further duress alarms. As part of their training, interviewers were instructed to be seated closest to the exit. Interviewers were further instructed to terminate the interview if they perceived that their safety was in any way jeopardised. Incidents involving research staff at correctional facilities are rare occurrences (Martin, 2000; Roberts & Indermaur, 2007), and this was also found in the current research.

In order to ensure respondent confidentiality no other person than the interviewer and the respondent was present in the room during the interview. However, the interviews conducted in Western Australia differed somewhat in terms of these procedures. In Western Australia interviewers were granted access to the visitors
sections of the centres. These interviews were conducted in larger rooms where at times other people were present. In these instances interviews were always conducted in an area of the visitors section that was physically removed from other individuals, ensuring that interviews were not overheard.

Before commencement, interviewers provided potential participants with an information sheet detailing the objectives and benefits of the research, the data collection procedures, potential risks associated with participation, issues relating to confidentiality, the voluntary nature of the research and contact details of the research investigators and the Griffith University HREC. Interviewers were instructed to read the information sheet to potential participants who displayed difficulties with reading. Some respondents asked for the information sheet to be read to them. Most commonly this was because respondents had not brought their reading glasses with them to the interview room. Respondents were encouraged to ask questions after careful reading of the information sheet. Respondents who wanted to proceed with the interview were provided with a consent form to sign (see Appendix B for the Queensland version of the information sheet and consent form). Interviewers were instructed to conduct interviews with only individuals whom they considered able to provide informed consent. Any individuals who did not wish to be interviewed were escorted back by correctional staff.

The information sheet clearly stated the risks associated with participating in the research. Most importantly, it was recognised that some questions asked might cause respondents to experience emotional distress. Respondents were advised to inform the interviewer should they experience any distress during the interview and to advise correctional staff should they experience distress after the interview had been conducted. Interviewers were further instructed to assess whether respondents were experiencing emotional distress during the interview. Given the sensitive topic, a few of
the respondents showed minor distress, most commonly because of feelings of remorse. Actions taken by interviewers included skipping sections of the interview and, on limited occasions, notifying the prison psychologist.

Incentives were provided to respondents in Queensland correctional centres. The incentive consisted of $10, which was transferred into respondents’ prison accounts after all interviews had been completed at any given correctional centre. Incentives were not provided to respondents in New South Wales and Western Australia because of the policies advising against the use of incentives in each of these jurisdictions.

The correctional centre interviews ranged in length from 40 minutes to 3 hours. On average, each interview took approximately 1.5 to 2 hours. Five (3.73%) interviews lasted less than an hour. At times the respondents’ availabilities were constrained due to work or other obligations, in which case certain sections of the interview were not completed. In other cases the respondents simply managed to complete the full interview in less than an hour. Of the 134 interviews conducted in correctional centres across the three jurisdictions, 42 (31.34%) were interrupted at some point during the interview. In the majority of cases this was due to muster, which at some centres required the respondent to leave the interview for a certain period of time. In these instances the interview was resumed after muster had been completed. In most of the minimum and medium security facilities the respondents were allowed to remain in the interview room during muster. Other reasons for interruptions included lunch breaks, toilet visits, cigarette breaks and interruptions by correctional staff.

**Procedures for data collection in probation and parole offices**

Similar to the procedures in correctional centres, contact persons for each probation and parole office were identified by correctional services in Queensland and Western Australia. These contact persons were approached and provided with
information about the project. After identifying those individuals eligible for inclusion in the project the contact persons were sent pre-paid envelopes containing information sheets and expression of interest forms (see Appendix C for the Queensland version). Upon advice from Queensland Corrective Services the information sheets and consent forms were kept non-specific, neither detailing the topic of the research nor mentioning probation or parole. This was done as a preventative measure in the event that someone other than the respondent was to open the envelope. Before the envelopes were mailed out, eligible individuals were contacted by their case managers over the phone. The aim of this phone call was to inform potential participants about the project and to indicate that a letter containing more information would be sent out. A few individuals declined participation in the project during this initial phone conversation. Envelopes were sent out to a total of 119 eligible individuals across both jurisdictions.

As per instructions in the information sheet, individuals interested in participating were informed to send their expressions of interest in the reply-paid envelope supplied. The expressions of interest were sent directly to the research team at Griffith University, who then contacted the relevant probation and parole offices for the case managers to set up interviews with respondents. Interviews were conducted at the probation and parole offices at times suitable to the respondent and the probation and parole staff. As much as possible the interviews were conducted in conjunction with the respondents’ regular reporting routines.

The procedures of gaining informed consent from respondents interviewed in probation and parole offices were similar to the procedures in place at the correctional centres. Potential participants were provided with an information sheet detailing the objectives and benefits of the research, the data collection procedures, potential risks associated with participation, issues relating to confidentiality, the voluntary nature of
the research and contact details of the research investigators and the Griffith University HREC (see Appendix D for the Queensland version). Interviewers were instructed to read the information sheet to potential participants who displayed difficulties with reading. As with the interviews conducted in correctional facilities, the information sheet clearly stated that some questions might cause emotional distress in the respondents. Respondents were advised to inform the interviewer should they experience any distress during the interview and to advise probation and parole staff should they experience distress after the interview had been conducted. Respondents who wanted to proceed with the interview after careful reading of the information sheet were provided with a consent form to sign. Interviewers were instructed to conduct interviews with only individuals whom they considered able to provide informed consent.

Similar to the protocols for correctional centres, incentives were only provided to respondents reporting to probation and parole offices located in Queensland. The incentive consisted of $20. Upon completion of the interview, respondents were asked to initial a research participation sheet stating that they had received the incentive (see Appendix E). Incentives were provided to respondents in cash. Incentives were not offered in Western Australia because of their policy advising against the use of incentives.

The probation and parole interviews ranged in length from 45 minutes to 2 hours and 25 minutes. On average, each interview took approximately 1.5 hours. One interview lasted less than an hour and, according to the interviewer, this was because the respondent understood all scales and instructions without any difficulties. Of the 23 interviews conducted, 8 (33.3%) were interrupted at some point during the interview. In
the majority of cases this was due to mobile phone calls received by respondents and cigarette breaks.

**Sample characteristics**

Descriptive data for the full sample of 157 males convicted of murder or manslaughter interviewed across correctional centres and probation and parole offices are presented in Table 2. Information is also provided for the sub-sample of males who had killed a current or former intimate partner \( (n=41) \) and males who had killed someone other than an intimate partner \( (n=116) \). The data show that the IPH perpetrators were on average 10.63 years older at the time of the incident than the non-IPH perpetrators. However, the two groups were relatively comparable in terms of their self-reported ethnic and non-English speaking backgrounds. More pronounced differences exist in terms of employment status. The data show that a higher proportion of IPH perpetrators were full-time employed (or self-employed) compared to non-IPH perpetrators. Similarly, approximately one-third of non-IPH perpetrators reported that they were unemployed at the time of the incident compared to approximately one in eight of the IPH perpetrators. Results also show that IPH perpetrators had a higher level of education compared to the non-IPH perpetrators, with one-fifth of IPH perpetrators having completed some form of tertiary education (including trade certificates, TAFE and university degrees) compared to only one-tenth of non-IPH perpetrators.

The data show distinct differences between the two groups in terms of their relationship status. A considerable higher proportion of the non-IPH perpetrators reported being single at the time of the incident. Given that the IPH perpetrators by definition had killed a current or former intimate partner, this finding is not surprising. What is interesting is that nearly 10 per cent of the IPH perpetrators referred to themselves as single although their victim was a former intimate partner. The results
further show that the IPH perpetrators were more likely to be legally married and less likely to be in de facto or dating relationships. Furthermore, at the time of the incident, one in five IPH perpetrators referred to themselves as separated or divorced, compared to only seven per cent of the non-IPH perpetrators.

Within the non-IPH group, approximately 45 per cent had killed strangers, 41 per cent had killed acquaintances and 15 per cent had killed family members. As previously discussed, the IPH victims were all female. In contrast, approximately 72 per cent of the non-IPH victims were male, while 28 per cent were female.
Table 2. Sample Characteristics (Study 1)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Full sample (N=157)</th>
<th>Non-IPH (n=116)</th>
<th>IPH (n=41)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age at time of incident</td>
<td>M=30.00 (SD=10.27)</td>
<td>M=27.22 (SD=8.28)</td>
<td>M=37.85 (SD=11.47)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnicity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Australian</td>
<td>114 (73.08)</td>
<td>85 (73.91)</td>
<td>29 (70.73)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander</td>
<td>14 (8.97)</td>
<td>11 (9.57)</td>
<td>3 (7.32)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>28 (17.95)</td>
<td>19 (16.52)</td>
<td>9 (21.95)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-English speaking background</td>
<td>11 (7.00)</td>
<td>8 (6.90)</td>
<td>3 (7.32)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment status</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full-time employment / self-employed</td>
<td>73 (46.50)</td>
<td>45 (38.79)</td>
<td>28 (68.29)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part-time / casual employment</td>
<td>20 (12.74)</td>
<td>15 (12.93)</td>
<td>5 (12.20)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pensioner</td>
<td>9 (5.73)</td>
<td>7 (6.03)</td>
<td>2 (4.88)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unemployed</td>
<td>47 (29.94)</td>
<td>41 (35.34)</td>
<td>6 (14.63)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Other  
  *This includes individuals in prison, individuals in home detention and students.* | 8 (5.06)            | 8 (6.90)        | 0 (0.00)   |
| Highest level of education             |                     |                 |            |
| No high school                         | 15 (9.55)           | 13 (11.21)      | 2 (4.88)   |
| Some high school (Year 8-11)           | 92 (58.60)          | 67 (57.76)      | 25 (60.98) |
| Completed high school                  | 31 (19.75)          | 25 (21.55)      | 6 (14.63)  |
| Trade / TAFE / University              | 19 (12.10)          | 11 (9.48)       | 4 (19.51)  |
| Relationship status                    |                     |                 |            |
| Single                                 | 49 (31.21)          | 45 (38.79)      | 4 (9.76)   |
| Married                                | 20 (12.74)          | 5 (4.31)        | 15 (36.59) |
| De facto                               | 53 (33.76)          | 44 (37.93)      | 9 (21.95)  |
| Dating                                 | 15 (9.55)           | 13 (11.21)      | 2 (4.88)   |
| Separated / divorced                   | 20 (12.74)          | 9 (7.76)        | 11 (26.83) |
| Victim-offender relationship           |                     |                 |            |
| Intimate partner                       | 41 (26.11)          | -               | 41 (100)   |
| Family                                 | 17 (10.83)          | 17 (14.66)      | -          |
| Acquaintance                           | 47 (29.94)          | 47 (40.52)      | -          |
| Stranger                               | 52 (33.12)          | 52 (44.83)      | -          |
| Victim gender                          |                     |                 |            |
| Male                                   | 83 (52.87)          | 83 (71.55)      | -          |
| Female                                 | 74 (47.13)          | 33 (28.45)      | 41 (100)   |

*Note.* Valid per cent.

Sample representativeness

Homicides have one of the highest clearance rates of all offences, with approximately 90 per cent of reported offences cleared (Queensland Police Service,
Similarly, 90 per cent of perpetrators sentenced for murder or manslaughter of an intimate partner receive custodial orders in correctional institutions (Sentencing Advisory Council, 2007). According to the National Prisoner Census published by the Australian Bureau of Statistics (ABS), in 2011 the population of inmates in prison for homicide-related offences was 2,592 males and 242 females across Australia (Australian Bureau of Statistics, 2011). In order to examine the representativeness of the AHP sample, comparisons were made with published ABS data in relation to available characteristics. However, it should be noted that there are challenges associated with directly comparing the AHP data to the ABS data. Firstly, the ABS classification includes attempted murder and driving causing death, which are offence classifications that were excluded from the present research. Secondly, the ABS data include unsentenced individuals, while the AHP data only include sentenced individuals. Thirdly, the ABS data are limited to individuals serving custodial sentences, while the AHP data also include individuals serving community-based sentences. To overcome this latter issue, comparisons were only made for the prison-based respondents in the AHP data. Fourthly, in the ABS data the estimation of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander (ATSI) status includes females, while the current AHP data only examines males.

Table 3 provides a comparison between the prison-based AHP sample and the ABS prisoner population figures in terms of perpetrator age and ATSI status. The table shows that the median age at the time of the interview (AHP data) and at the time of the National Prisoner Census (ABS data) was almost identical across the two samples. However, the AHP sample contains a smaller rate of individuals identifying themselves as having ATSI background. This difference is most likely an effect of the jurisdictions in which the AHP data were collected. For example, AHP data were not collected in the
Northern Territory, a jurisdiction where, according to NHMP data, the prevalence rate of male Indigenous homicide perpetrators was 72 per cent in 2006/07 (Dearden & Jones, 2008).

Table 3. Comparison Between Prison-Based Respondents From the Australian Homicide Project (AHP) and the Australian Bureau of Statistics (ABS) National Prisoner Census 2011 in Relation to Key Characteristics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>AHP (n=134)</th>
<th>ABS (N=2,592)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
<td>Mdn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current age</td>
<td>39.00</td>
<td>38.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander\a</td>
<td>9.77</td>
<td>17.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: ABS data include unsentenced individuals. ABS data also include attempted murder and driving causing death as most serious offence (Australian Bureau of Statistics, 2011)
\a For the ABS data this variable includes females (total N=2,834).

To provide a further indication of the representativeness of the AHP sample, comparisons were also made to the 2007/08 NHMP data. The major challenge in these comparisons is that while the AHP data include homicides committed across a number of decades, the NHMP data only provide a temporal snapshot of the homicide offences committed in any one given year (in this instance 2007/08). Furthermore, the NHMP data also contain incidents where the perpetrator committed suicide, which in 2007/08 represented four per cent of the total population of homicide perpetrators (Virueda & Payne, 2010).

Table 4 shows the comparison between the AHP data and the NHMP data. As seen in the table, the two datasets are comparable in terms of the mean age of perpetrators at the time of the homicide incident. Similar to the comparison with ABS data, however, a lower prevalence rate of ATSI status was reported in the AHP data. Again, this is most likely an effect of the jurisdictions in which the AHP data were collected. Examining the victim-offender relationship, the two datasets are comparable in terms of the prevalence rate of IPH and acquaintance homicides. However, the AHP
data contain a lower prevalence of family homicides and a higher prevalence of stranger homicides.

Table 4. *Comparison Between the Australian Homicide Project (AHP) and the National Homicide Monitoring Program (NHMP) in Relation to Key Characteristics*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>AHP (N=157)</th>
<th>NHMP (N=243)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age at time of incident</td>
<td>30.00</td>
<td>31.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander</td>
<td>8.92</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Victim-offender relationship</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intimate partner</td>
<td>26.15</td>
<td>30.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family</td>
<td>10.83</td>
<td>20.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acquaintance</td>
<td>29.94</td>
<td>30.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stranger</td>
<td>33.12</td>
<td>11.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>6.54</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* NHMP data represent homicides committed 2007/08 (Virueda & Payne, 2010).

**Data collection tool and procedures**

Data were collected by the interviewer reading questions to the respondent and recording their responses onto an interview schedule. The comparatively low educational attainment among adult prisoners (Australian Bureau of Statistics, 2003; National Centre for Vocational Education Research, 2007) necessitated the use of face-to-face interviews as opposed to questionnaires for this population group, as interviews do not require respondent writing or reading skills and enables the interviewer to provide further clarification regarding potentially difficult questions.

Two pilot studies were conducted. The interview schedules were first piloted with eight staff members within the Arts, Education and Law Faculty at Griffith University. The feedback from these interviews resulted in a few changes to the interview format and question design. The second pilot consisted of interviews with respondents convicted of murder or manslaughter serving time at two correctional facilities in Queensland. Only minor changes were made to the interview schedule.
based on the second pilot study. The pilot interviews conducted at the two correctional facilities were included in the total sample.

The interviews were structured and contained mainly closed-ended questions. The interview schedule was divided into three sections. In the first section data relating to demographic variables, childhood experiences, drug and alcohol use, attitudes, personality traits and relationship characteristics were collected. This section was structured as a traditional interview where questions were read out to respondents and recorded directly onto the interview schedule by the interviewer. A number of questions had multiple response options, including Likert scales, in which cases respondents were shown a rating card specifying the response option available for that particular question (see Appendix F for an example).

The second part of the questionnaire consisted of a life event calendar. Building on the design of normal calendars, life event calendars allow for the measurement of variables over time. This data collection technique has previously been used in research to measure variables such as relationship status (Freedman, Arland, Camburn, Alwin, & Young-DeMarco, 1988), intimate partner violence victimisation (Yoshihama, Clum, Crampton, & Gillespie, 2002), household composition (Belli, Shay, & Stafford, 2001), employment status (Belli et al., 2001; Freedman et al., 1988), depression (Kim-Cohen, Caspi, Rutter, Tomas, & Moffitt, 2006) and criminal activity (Horney & Marshall, 1991; Roberts, Mulvey, Horney, Lewis, & Arter, 2005). The life event calendar methodology has not previously been used in research on IPH. Its use is further a novelty in the field of GST research, despite Jang and Johnson (2003) specifically recommending this data collection technique for research examining GST. A notable exception is the research conducted by Slocum et al. (2005) on incarcerated women, in which they measured strain and criminal behaviour retrospectively covering 36 months.
The life event calendar methodology was used for two reasons. Firstly, it has the ability to provide detailed data relating to temporal changes in behaviour patterns, allowing for collection and analyses of data across time. This, in particular, enables analyses of changes in life situations in the time period leading up to the homicide incident. Temporal aspects are particularly important for research on male-perpetrated IPH, since these incidents often occur in periods of relationship change (Johnson & Hotton, 2003; Nicolaidis et al., 2003). The life event calendar utilised in this research covered the 12 months prior to the homicide incident as well as the days in the week leading up to the event. Many of the variables used in the current research were operationalised based on questions from the life event calendar.

Another reason for this choice of methodology was improved memory recall, which is particularly important in cases where respondents have been imprisoned for a number of years. Research suggests marked improvements through the use of life event calendar data collection tools, surpassing the extent of recall in traditional questionnaires (Belli et al., 2001). Noting that autobiographical memory is stored hierarchically, thematically and temporally, Belli (1998) argues that the life event calendar has the ability to tap into all of those domains by situating the timing of events around other events (top-down memory retrieval), establishing a timeline of what occurred (sequential memory retrieval) and comparing events across themes (parallel memory retrieval). Furthermore, research suggests that the use of significant personal and national events, including birthdays and major sporting events, facilitate respondent recall (Loftus & Marburger, 1983). These types of ‘anchor points’ were included in the present study.

In making the transition to the calendar, interviewers informed respondents that the focus of the interview was now on the year leading up to the event, with a particular
interest in when during that year certain events occurred. The respondents were then provided with a respondent calendar, on which the interviewer recorded the month of the incident (e.g. March) and the eleven preceding months (e.g. April-February). This calendar was provided to respondents as a visual cue of the time period leading up to the incident. The respondents were instructed to think about events that occurred across three life domains: housing, work and relationships. The interviewer then proceeded to ask questions relating to events considered ‘anchor points’, including the respondents’ residences during that year. Through a semi-structured format, the interviewer then asked the interview questions, first ascertaining whether a certain event occurred in that year and then examining more closely the months and days when it occurred. As part of the one-day interviewer training, interviewers were taught to use a conversational style of interviewing. Part of this included utilising information gathered in previous sections of the interview, including using phrases such as “you mentioned previously that…”. Interviewers recorded information onto the interview schedule calendar by ticking and crossing boxes. Interviewers were also instructed to verify information provided by the respondents to questions with that provided to other questions. For example, if a respondent stated that a shift in housing arrangements had occurred in a particular month, the interviewer might ask whether this coincided with their relationship breakdown in the same month, as indicated by the respondent in a previous question.

The third and last section of the interview schedule was semi-structured and allowed for short-sentence open-ended answers. In this section the interviewer asked questions relating to the situational aspects of the homicide incident. This included, but was not limited to, drug and alcohol use, timing and location of the homicide incident, situational emotions experienced, use of weapons, third party involvement and intentions, as well as post-event behaviour and emotions.
Measures

This research examines a variety of measures, all of which are conceptually derived from the existing literature on homicide and GST as presented in Chapter 4. Depending upon the availability of measures collected as part of the AHP, not all elements of the IPH and non-IPH theoretical models presented in Chapter 4 are under examination in the current research. The ways in which these variables were operationalised are described below. The dependent variable (IPH status) is described first, followed by the control variables. Next, the independent variables (measuring strain) are presented in thematic groupings: childhood strain, relationship strain, financial strain, legal strain and strain clustering. This is followed by a description of the mediating variables, namely situational negative emotions. Lastly, the conditioning variables are presented, which have been grouped THEMATICALLY: general conditioning variables, relationship conditioning variables and criminal conditioning variables.

For continuous variables, normality of distributions were assessed in a number of ways, in accordance with recommendations by Field (2005). Firstly, histograms, normal Q-Q plots and detrended Q-Q plots were visually inspected. Secondly, results from the Kolmogorov-Smirnov test were examined, with significant test statistics indicating deviations from normality. Thirdly, kurtosis and skewness scores were converted to z-scores, with values above 1.96 indicating significant kurtosis or skewness. These assessments were made both for the sample as a whole and according to sub-groups (IPH and non-IPH perpetrators separately).

Dependent variable

IPH status: The dependent variable used in this research is IPH status. Individuals who had killed current or former romantic partners were classified as IPH perpetrators. This includes de jure, de facto and dating relationships. Individuals who
had killed someone other than an intimate partner, including relatives, extended family, friends, acquaintances or strangers, were classified as non-IPH perpetrators.

**Control variables**

**Age at time of incident:** Respondents were asked how old they were at the time they committed the homicide. This is a continuous variable and as such was visually and statistically examined and considered normally distributed.\(^{25}\)

**Aboriginal or Torres Strait Islander (ATSI) background:** Respondents’ ethnic backgrounds were originally assessed through the open-ended question “Which ethnic background to you mostly identify with”. A dichotomous variable was created to indicate ATSI status. Respondents who reported “Australian Aboriginal”, “Aboriginal”, “Torres Strait Islander” or “Aboriginal/Torres Strait Islander” were coded as having ATSI background. Respondents who reported identifying with two ethnic backgrounds, one ATSI and the other non-ATSI, were also coded as having ATSI background. All other respondents were coded as non-ATSI.

**Completed high school:** Educational attainment at the time of the homicide incident was originally measured through the question “What was the highest level of education that you had completed at the time of the incident”. This was an open-ended question, and interviewers coded responses as one of seven response categories, ranging from “no formal schooling” to “university postgraduate”, as well as an “other” category. A dichotomous variable was created indicating completion of high school, operationalised as completion of year 12 or above. Included in this category were

---

\(^{25}\) The variable was slightly positively skewed. To ensure that this was not a problem in terms of normality, this variable was further square rooted (Tabachnick & Fidell, 2007) and examined in every regression model. This did not alter any of the results. As transformed variables are more difficult to interpret, models using the original variable are therefore reported throughout the results chapters.
individuals holding trade certificates, diplomas, TAFE certificates and university degrees.

**Childhood strain variables**

*Physical abuse in childhood:* Exposure to physical abuse in childhood was measured through the use of two items from a scale measuring family violence created by Stewart, Senger, Kallen and Scheurer (1987): “My parents have beaten me so badly that I was ashamed to be seen by others” and “Sometimes my parents beat me so badly I needed to see a doctor”. For these questions, as well as other questions relating to childhood experiences (see below), respondents were informed that “parent” might also refer to “caregiver”. A dichotomous variable was created. Respondents who provided a positive response to at least one of these two questions were coded as having been physically abused in childhood.

*Sexual abuse in childhood:* The question measuring exposure to sexual abuse in childhood was created by the research team. Respondents providing a positive response to the statement “I was sexually abuse by one of my parents” were coded as having been sexually abused in childhood. This is a dichotomous variable.

*Emotional neglect in childhood:* This variable was measured through the use of the following question from the family violence scale by Stewart et al. (1987): “While I was growing up my parents neglected me emotionally”. A dichotomous variable was created to indicate emotional neglect in childhood.

*Physical neglect in childhood:* This variable was measured through the use of the following question from the scale by Stewart et al. (1987) scale: “While I was growing up my parents neglected my physical needs”. A dichotomous variable was created to indicate physical neglect in childhood.
**Relationship strain variables**

**Relationship separation**: Respondents’ experiences with relationship separation and divorce were measured as part of the life event calendar through the questions “At any point during the 12 months prior to the incident, did you and your partner separate” and “At any point during the 12 months prior to the incident, did you get divorced”. These two variables were then combined into one dichotomous variable. For the purposes of this research the presence or absence of relationship separation was contingent on whether the respondent had been in a romantic relationship at some point during the 12 months prior to the homicide (assessed through the question “At any point during the 12 months prior to the incident, were you in a relationship”). Individuals who had not been in a relationship were treated as missing cases.

**Threat of relationship separation**: The threat of relationship separation was assessed in the life event calendar through the question “At any point during the 12 months prior to the incident, did your (ex-)partner threaten to leave you”. As with the relationship separation variable, the threat of separation was contingent on whether the respondent had been in a romantic relationship at some point during the 12 months prior to the homicide. Respondents who reported not having been in a relationship were treated as missing cases.

**Partner infidelity**: Perceived partner infidelity was measured in the life event calendar through the question “At any point during the 12 months prior to the incident,  

---

26 A less conservative approach to variable construction often used in GST and homicide research is to include all individuals in the analyses. However, running analyses of both the full sample and sub-groups (i.e. only individuals who had been in a relationship in the 12 months prior to the incident) showed that this somewhat biases the results to suggest greater differences between IPH and non-IPH perpetrators (resulting in lower alpha levels and increased effect sizes). The more conservative approach of comparing prevalence rates only for those individuals who had been in a relationship was therefore employed in this research.
did your (ex-)partner cheat on you”. Respondents who reported not having been in a relationship during the 12 months prior to the homicide incident were treated as missing cases.

**Suspected partner infidelity:** Suspected partner infidelity was measured in the life event calendar as “At any point during the 12 months prior to the incident, did you suspect your (ex-)partner was cheating on you”. 27 Respondents who reported not having been in a relationship during the 12 months prior to the homicide incident were treated as missing cases.

**Disputes regarding children:** The life event calendar included a question regarding disputes relating to children: “At any point during the 12 months prior to the incident, were there any disputes relating to the care of the children”. This variable was contingent on whether the respondent had children (including step-children). Individuals who reported not having children were treated as missing cases for this variable. Although the GST model of male-perpetrated IPH states that child custody disputes should function as a strain, this more generalised variable was used as a proxy for questions relating to child custody disputes.

**Domestic violence protection order:** Respondents were asked “At any point during the 12 months prior to the incident, was there a legal order (such as a DVO, ADVO or VRO28) preventing you from approaching your (ex-)partner taken out against

---

27 The variables partner infidelity and suspected partner infidelity were further combined into one single measure. However, of those who suspected infidelity only half reported being certain that their partner had cheated. Similarly, of those who had been exposed to partner infidelity, 12.50 per cent had not suspected it beforehand. In the logistic regression analyses VIF and Tolerance measures did not suggest issues in terms of multicollinearity between the two variables. Therefore, these two variables were treated as separate variables in this research.

28 DVO=Domestic Violence Order (terminology used in Queensland), ADVO=Apprehended Domestic Violence Order (terminology used in New South Wales), VRO=Violence Restraining Order (terminology used in Western Australia).
you” as part of the life event calendar. Respondents who reported never having been in a relationship (assessed through the following questions: “At any point during the 12 months prior to the incident, were you in a relationship”, “At the time of the incident, how many times had you been married legally” and “At the time of the incident, how many times had you been in a co-habiting relationship (as a couple)”) were treated as missing cases.

Financial strain variables

**Unemployment:** This variable was measured through the question: “At the time of the incident, what did you do for a living”. There were ten response categories, including “unemployed”, “student” and “retired”, as well as an open-ended “other” category. This was coded into a dichotomous variable measuring unemployment. Six respondents who reported being in prison or otherwise detained during the week preceding the incident were treated as missing cases. Individuals who reported being on the run from prison at the time of the incident were coded as unemployed.

**Partner unemployment:** In the life event calendar respondents were asked “At any point during the 12 months prior to the incident, was your partner unemployed”. Respondents who reported not having been in a relationship during the 12 months prior to the homicide incident were treated as missing cases.

**Loss of job:** In the life event calendar respondents were asked “At any point during the 12 months prior to the incident, did you lose a job”.

**Inability to pay bills:** Respondents were asked “At any point during the 12 months prior to the incident, were you unable to pay your bills”, as part of the life event calendar.
**Legal strain variables**

**Arrest:** In the life event calendar respondents were asked “At any point during the 12 months prior to the incident, were you arrested”.

**Probation or parole:** Respondents’ experiences with probation and parole were measured using two questions in the life event calendar: “At any point during the 12 months prior to the incident, were you on probation” and “At any point during the 12 months prior to the incident, were you on parole”. These two variables were then combined into one single dichotomous variable. Respondents who provided a positive response to at least one of these two questions were coded as having been on probation or parole in the 12 months prior to the homicide.

**Strain cluster variables**

**Total strain cluster:** This variable is a composite scale measuring the total number of strains experienced in the 12 months preceding the incident. This scale includes the following variables: physical abuse in childhood, sexual abuse in childhood, emotional neglect in childhood, physical neglect in childhood, relationship separation, threat of separation, partner infidelity, suspected partner infidelity, disputes regarding children, domestic violence protection order, unemployment, partner unemployment, loss of job, inability to pay bills, arrest and probation or parole. As described in the preceding sections, these variables were all dichotomous. Visual and statistical examination of the scale revealed that it was not normally distributed. Therefore, an ordinal variable was created based on the composite score, consisting of the following four categories: 0-1 strains, 2-3 strains, 4-6 strains and 7-16 strains. These categories were selected as they provided acceptable cell sizes for use in bivariate
analyses by meeting the assumptions of Pearson’s chi-square (Field, 2005).\textsuperscript{29} The same approach of creating categories in order to obtain acceptable cell sizes based on the assumptions of Pearson’s chi-square was also used for the other cluster variables (childhood, relationship and financial strain clusters), described in more detail below.

**Childhood strain cluster:** Clustering of childhood strain was measured by adding the number of childhood strains (physical abuse in childhood, sexual abuse in childhood, emotional neglect in childhood and physical neglect in childhood) experienced. Visual and statistical examination of this variable revealed that it was not normally distributed. Therefore, an ordinal variable was created based on the composite score, consisting of the following four categories: 0 strains, 1 strain, 2 strains and 3–4 strains.

**Relationship strain cluster:** This variable was measured by adding the number of relationship strains (relationship separation, threat of separation, partner infidelity, suspected partner infidelity, disputes regarding children and domestic violence protection order) experienced. Visual and statistical examination of this variable revealed that it was not normally distributed. Therefore, an ordinal variable was created based on the composite score, consisting of the following four categories: 0 strains, 1 strain, 2 strains, 3–6 strains.

**Financial strain cluster:** This variable was measured by adding the number of financial strains (unemployment, partner unemployment, loss of job and inability to pay bills) experienced. Visual and statistical examination of this variable revealed that it was

\textsuperscript{29} When grouped into smaller categories a number of cells revealed an expected count of less than 5, which means that the assumptions for Pearson’s chi-square were not met. For example, a zero category was not feasible due to the limited number of cases observed in the overall sample ($n=4, 7.84\%$). Therefore, a category was created consisting of individuals experiencing either zero or one strain ($n=12, 23.53\%$). What this demonstrates is that most respondents experienced some form of strain.
not normally distributed. Therefore, an ordinal variable was created based on the composite score, consisting of the following three categories: 0 strains, 1 strain and 2-4 strains.

**Legal strain cluster:** This variable was measured by adding the number of legal strains (arrest and probation or parole) experienced. The variable consists of the following three categories: 0 strains, 1 strain and 2 strains.

**Situational negative emotions**

As part of the third section of the interview, respondents were asked “Immediately before it [referring to the homicide incident] happened how were you feeling”. This was an open-ended question and interviewers recorded responses verbatim onto the questionnaire. As discussed by Scherer (2005), this technique of using open-ended questions when measuring emotions is preferable to using closed-ended questions as standardised lists of emotions may trigger responses otherwise not chosen. In total, 103 different words or phrases were identified. Of these, three were excluded as they represented alcohol or drug induced states rather than emotions (“drunk”, “tipsy” and “spaced out”). Furthermore, since the focus of this research is on negative emotions, nine words/phrases representing positive or neutral emotions were also excluded (“alright”, “average”, “calm”, “careless”, “fine”, “good”, “normal”, “nothing” and “OK”). The remaining 91 words/phrases were grouped into categories based on a prototype approach to classifying emotions constructed by Shaver, Schwartz, Kirson and O'Connor (1987). Through hierarchical cluster analysis, Shaver et al. identified three basic levels of negative emotions: anger, sadness and fear. Within each basic level of emotion Shaver et al. further identified a number of subordinate categories. These basic and subordinate categories of emotions can be seen in Figure 2.
Although not listed in the figure, each subordinate category is represented by a number of emotion words.  

\[ \text{Anger} \rightarrow \text{Irritation} \rightarrow \text{Exasperation} \rightarrow \text{Rage} \rightarrow \text{Disgust} \rightarrow \text{Envy} \]

\[ \text{Sadness} \rightarrow \text{Suffering} \rightarrow \text{Sadness} \rightarrow \text{Disappointment} \rightarrow \text{Shame} \rightarrow \text{Neglect} \]

\[ \text{Fear} \rightarrow \text{Horror} \rightarrow \text{Nervousness} \]

*Figure 2. Prototype of emotions (Shaver et al., 1987).*

Using the classification scheme constructed by Shaver et al. (1987), 36 of the 91 words/phrases were grouped into categories. An additional 17 words/phrases were categorised by examining the Macquarie Dictionary (Macquarie Library, n.d.) for synonyms and dictionary entries. Furthermore, 11 emotions were categorised by examining prototypical features of basic emotions as identified by Shaver et al. These prototypical features include not only subjective feelings but also information regarding antecedents and, most importantly, behavioural responses. For example, a number of respondents reported feeling as though they “lost control”. Although not a subjective feeling, Shaver et al. (1987, p. 1078) suggest that “incoherent, out-of-control, highly emotional behavior” is characteristic of the anger prototype and therefore respondents who reported losing control were categorised as experiencing anger prior to the

---

30 For example, the subordinate category of irritation is represented by the following emotion words: aggravation, irritation, agitation, annoyance, grouchiness and grumpiness (see Shaver et al., 1987, for a full list).

31 The Macquarie Dictionary is the standard reference for Australian English.
homicide incident. This left 27 words/phrases that could not be categorised. Some of these included “cold”, “lost”, “emotional” and “numb”.

Of the emotion prototypes identified by Shaver et al. (1987), all basic levels of negative emotions (anger, sadness and fear) were used in this research. However, only some of the subordinate categories were examined. Subordinate categories were excluded either due to the presence of univariate outliers (more than 90/10 split between categories) or due to large amounts of missing data (Tabachnick & Fidell, 2007). The retained subordinate emotion categories were irritation, rage, jealousy, sadness, neglect, horror and nervousness. The basic and subordinate categories included in this research, together with the open-ended responses, are presented in Table 5.\(^{33}\)

\(^{32}\) Although Shaver et al. chose to label the jealousy category envy, due to the theoretical and empirical importance of jealousy in IPH research, and for the sake of clarity, this category is herein called jealousy as opposed to envy.

\(^{33}\) It should be noted that although emotions are measured as distinct constructs in the current research, other research suggests that emotions are rarely experienced in isolation (Ellsworth & Smith, 1988; Guerrero & Andersen, 1998). Examining the mediating effects of distinct emotions in the current study is seen as a first step toward more fully understanding the role emotions play in intimate partner homicide perpetration. Subsequent research should examine the co-occurrence of emotions to advance knowledge regarding fatal outcomes.
Table 5. Coding of Emotions Based on Open-Ended Responses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Basic emotion</th>
<th>Subordinate emotion</th>
<th>Open-ended responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Anger</td>
<td></td>
<td>aggro, agitated, anger, angry, annoyed, buggered, disturbed, exasperated, enraged, frustrated, furious, hate, irate, offended, outraged, pissed, pissed off, possessed by rage, rage, resentful, wanted retribution, wronged</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Irritation</td>
<td>agitated, annoyed, buggered, disturbed, offended, wronged</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rage</td>
<td>aggro, anger, angry, enraged, furious, hate, irate, outraged, pissed, pissed off, possessed by rage, rage, resentful, wanted retribution</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jealousy</td>
<td>jealousy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sadness</td>
<td>alone, betrayed, depressed, disappointment, humiliated, hurt, insulted, isolation, let down, lonely, powerless, sad, worthless</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sadness</td>
<td>depressed, powerless, sad, worthless</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neglect</td>
<td>alone, humiliated, insulted, isolation, let down, lonely</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fear</td>
<td>afraid, anxious, concerned, distraught, fear, frightened, nervous, panic, scared, shocked, startled, tense, threatened, worried</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Horror</td>
<td>afraid, fear, frightened, panic, scared, shocked, startled, threatened</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nervousness</td>
<td>anxious, concerned, distraught, nervous, tense, worried</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**General conditioning variables**

**Trait anger:** This variable was measured through the Trait Anger sub-scale of the State-Trait Anger Expression Inventory-2 (STAXI-2; Spielberger, 1999). This is a copyrighted scale, and permission to use the STAXI-2 scale was granted by PAR Inc. The sub-scale consists of ten questions measuring angry temperament (four questions) and angry reaction (six questions). Individuals with high scores on this sub-scale are considered quick-tempered and highly sensitive to criticism by others (Spielberger, 1999). The respondents were asked to indicate the response that best described how they generally felt or reacted around the time of the homicide incident. Responses were recorded on a 4-point Likert scale: *almost never, sometimes, often* and *almost always*. The items showed high internal consistency (Cronbach’s alpha=.92). Visual and statistical examination of this variable revealed that it was not normally distributed and
it was therefore dichotomised. To create groups of low and high trait anger, the full sample was divided at the 50th percentile. Similar procedures to obtain cut-off points for dichotomous variables have previously been used in GST research.34

**Impulsivity:** Respondents’ levels of impulsivity were assessed through the 4-item Impulsivity sub-scale from the Self-Control scale constructed by Grasmick et al. (1993). The items for this scale are provided in Appendix G. Respondents were instructed to think about the way they related to other people around the time of the homicide incident. Responses were recorded on a 4-point Likert scale: *strongly disagree, disagree somewhat, agree somewhat* and *strongly agree.* Higher scores indicate higher levels of impulsivity. The items showed good internal consistency (Cronbach’s alpha=.78). Visual and statistical examination revealed that this variable was normally distributed. However, high standard errors were observed in the regression models when impulsivity and strain interactions were examined. As a result, the decision was made to dichotomise this variable. Similar to the trait anger variable, this involved dividing the full sample at the 50th percentile to create groups of low and high impulsivity.

**Social support:** This research used a measure of perceived social support developed by researchers from the Chicago Women’s Health Risk Study. The 12-item Social Support Network scale includes the following sub-scales: Acceptance and Support, Emergency Help and Access to Resources (see Block, 2000; Davies, Block, & Campbell, 2007). Respondents were asked to think back to the year of the homicide incident and indicate *agree* or *disagree* to the items. The original questions were modified from present tense to past tense. The modified version of the scale is provided

---

34 While some research has used the median (e.g. Kort-Butler, 2010), other research has used the 50th percentile (e.g. Capowich et al., 2001) as the cut-off point.
in Appendix G. Due to the large number of missing values for one of the items from the sub-scale measuring access to resources (“It was difficult for me to ask for help because people didn’t always speak my language [native language]”) this item was dropped.\textsuperscript{35} After reverse coding of relevant items, disagreeing with statements from the scale indicated perceived low social support. The items showed good internal consistency (total scale Cronbach’s alpha=.86). Visual and statistical examination of this variable revealed that it was not normally distributed. Similar to previous scales, this scale was therefore dichotomised by dividing the full sample at the 50th percentile.

\textit{Relationship conditioning variables}

\textbf{Attitudes toward partner violence:} The respondents’ attitudes toward partner violence were assessed through the 14-item Revised Attitudes toward Wife Abuse scale (RAWA; Yoshioka, DiNoia, & Ullah, 2001). This scale consists of three sub-scales: Endorsement of Male Privileges, Perceived Lack of Alternatives and Situation-Specific Approval of Violence (see Appendix G). The respondents were asked to indicate the response that best described their attitudes around the time of the homicide incident. Responses were recorded on a 6-point Likert scale ranging from \textit{strongly disagree} to \textit{strongly agree}. The Perceived Lack of Alternatives sub-scale was reverse coded. High scores on this measure indicate more condoning attitudes toward partner violence. The items showed good internal consistency (total scale Cronbach’s alpha=.83). Visual and statistical examination revealed that it was not normally distributed and therefore this variable was dichotomised by dividing the full sample at the 50\textsuperscript{th} percentile.

\textsuperscript{35} The large number of missing values was a result of the high prevalence rate of respondents indicating English as their first language ($n=146, 92.99\%$).
Peer attitudes toward partner violence: The original 14-item RAWA scale (Yoshioka et al., 2001) was modified by the research team to measure peer attitudes toward partner violence by adding the prefix “my friends thought that…”. The modified scale is provided in Appendix G. Respondents were asked to think about the close friends they had in the year prior to the homicide incident. Similar to the original RAWA, the modified scale consists of three sub-scales: Endorsement of Male Privileges, Perceived Lack of Alternatives and Situation-Specific Approval of Violence. Similar to the original scale, responses were recorded on a 6-point Likert scale ranging from strongly disagree to strongly agree. The Perceived Lack of Alternatives sub-scale was reverse coded. After reverse coding high scores on the full scale indicate having peers who hold condoning attitudes toward the use of intimate partner violence. The items showed high internal consistency (total scale Cronbach’s alpha=.95). Visual and statistical examination revealed that this variable was normally distributed. However, high standard errors were observed in the regression models when peer attitudes and strain interactions were examined. As a result, the decision was made to dichotomise this variable by dividing the full sample at the 50th percentile.

Trait jealousy: Trait jealousy was measured using a modified version of Salovey and Rodin’s (1988) scale measuring jealousy-provoking situations in the romantic domain. The original scale determines situations in which jealousy may be aroused. In order to capture the emotional response rather than the prevalence of situations in which jealousy may be provoked, this scale was modified to include questions relating to how upset respondents would feel in response to these hypothetical situations. For the purpose of this research, the relationship states referred to in the original scale were also modified. Rather than referring to the respondent’s “date” or “boyfriend/girlfriend”, the modified version refers to the “partner” (e.g. “Someone is flirting with your partner”).
The modified version of this scale is provided in Appendix G. Respondents were described a jealousy-provoking situation (e.g. “Your partner talks about an old lover”) and asked “How upset would this make you feel”. IPH respondents were instructed to provide responses based on their relationship with the person who was killed, while non-IPH respondents were instructed to relate their responses to their most recent partner. The respondents were asked to indicate the response that best described how they generally felt or reacted around the time of the homicide incident.

Responses were recorded on a 4-point Likert scale: not at all, a little, somewhat and very. The original scale consists of eight items. However, during the interviews it became apparent that there were inconsistencies in respondents’ interpretation of the item “Your partner wants to go out with other people”. While some respondents interpreted this as meeting friends of both genders, other respondents interpreted this as dating. Therefore, this item was dropped from the scale. Although this resulted in slightly lower internal consistency (Cronbach’s alpha=.82 compared to .84 for the original scale), this is made up for by the increased face validity of the scale. Visual and statistical examination revealed that this variable was normally distributed. However, high standard errors were observed in the regression models when trait jealousy and strain interactions were examined. Therefore, the decision was made to dichotomise this variable. Similar to other scales the full sample was divided at the 50th percentile in order to create a dichotomous variable indicating high or low trait jealousy.

**Relationship entitlement**: Relationship entitlement was measured through the Relational Entitlement and Proprietariness Scale (REPS), consisting of three sub-scales: Behavioural Control, Social Control and Information Control (Hannawa, Spitzberg, 2005).

---

36 The lowered Cronbach’s alpha is most likely a function of the smaller number of items of the scale. As the number of items decrease, so does Cronbach’s alpha (see Field, 2005).
Wiering, & Teranishi, 2006). The original REPS questions were modified for the purpose of this research. Whereas the original questions were phrased both as commands (e.g. “You do what I tell you to do”) and as first person statements (e.g. “Sometimes I have to remind my partner of who’s boss”), for the sake of clarity all statements were changed to the latter sentence structure (see Appendix G). This was done in order to maximise respondent comprehension. The respondents were asked to indicate how they generally experienced relationships around the time of the homicide incident. Responses were recorded on a 7-point Likert scale ranging from strongly disagree to strongly agree. The items showed high internal consistency (total scale Cronbach’s alpha=.96). Visual and statistical examination of this variable revealed that it was not normally distributed. The scale was therefore dichotomised into high and low relationship entitlement by dividing the full sample at the 50th percentile.

**Attachment:** Respondents’ attachment styles were measured using the 36-item Experiences in Close Relationships scale (Brennan, Clark, & Shaver, 1998). The scale classifies respondents into one of four attachment styles: secure, fearful, preoccupied and dismissing. As theory and research have identified fearful attachment as particularly relevant in explaining intimate partner violence perpetration (Dutton, 2003), a dichotomous variable measuring fearful versus other attachment styles was created.\(^{37}\)

**Criminal conditioning variables**

**History of partner violence perpetration:** This variable measures ever prevalence of physical or sexual violence against a current or former partner. The measure is operationalised from a number of scales and questions. Perpetration of violence in the

\(^{37}\) A variable measuring secure versus insecure (fearful, preoccupied and dismissing) was also created and examined. See Chapter 8 for further details.
current or most recent relationship was measured through the use of the Physical Assault and the Sexual Coercion ever prevalence sub-scales of the Revised Conflict Tactics Scale (CTS2; Straus, Hamby, & Warren, 2003). CTS2 is copyrighted, and permission to use the scale was granted by Western Psychological Services. Perpetration of violence against a previous partner was measured through the use of three items constructed by the research team: “How often were you physically violent (e.g. punched, hit or slapped) toward any of your previous partners”, “How often were you sexually violent to previous partners” and “How often did any of your previous partners need medical treatment as a result of your violence”. Respondents who answered hardly ever, sometimes, often or very often to any of these questions were coded as having perpetrated violence against a previous partner. A dichotomous measure was created based on the responses from CTS2 and the questions relating to violence in previous relationships. Individuals reporting perpetrating physical or sexual violence against a previous partner or a current partner were coded as having a history of partner violence perpetration.

**History of serious violent crime:** A history of serious violence perpetration was measured using five items: “Before the incident how often had you:…” “got involved in gang fights”, “attacked someone with the idea of seriously hurting them”, “used force to get money or things from another person” and “used a weapon to get money or things from another person”. Responses were recorded on a 4-point Likert scale: never, occasionally, often and very often. The items showed good internal consistency (Cronbach’s alpha=.84). Visual and statistical examination of this variable revealed that it was not normally distributed and it was therefore dichotomised. Individuals reporting engaging in at least one of these behaviours were coded as having a history of serious violent crime.
Summary of variables

A summary of the variables used in the current research is presented in Figure 3. According to GST, the effect of experiences of strain on criminal behaviour should be mediated by negative emotions. Furthermore, conditioning factors should moderate the effect of strain on criminal behaviour. The figure presents all of the independent (strain), mediating (negative emotions) and moderating (conditioning factors) variables used in this research. What is not presented in the figure is the distinction between which variables are expected to be important to male IPH perpetrators and which variables are expected to be important to male non-IPH perpetrators. This was discussed in Chapter 4, and is further presented in the introduction to each of the results chapters.
**Figure 3.** Summary of variables used in the current research.

### Analytical strategy

Data from the first study were analysed using the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS). The first step was to conduct bivariate analyses in order to explore differences between the IPH and the non-IPH men. To assess the association between categorical variables this research utilised chi-square analyses. Pearson’s chi-square was reported for 2x2 and rxc contingency tables that contained less than 25%
cells with expected frequency below 5. Where this assumption was not met, Fisher’s Exact Probability was instead reported, as per recommendation by Dancey and Reidy (2007). As the Fisher’s Exact Probability test does not generate a test statistic, only the p-values and effect sizes were reported for these variables.

For 2x2 tables odds ratios were calculated by dividing the odds of experiencing the outcome when not experiencing the independent variable by the odds of experiencing the outcome when experiencing the independent variable (Field, 2005; Tabachnick & Fidell, 2007). Odds ratios above 1 indicate an increase in odds while odds ratios below 1 indicate a decrease in odds (Tabachnick & Fidell, 2007). Cramer’s V was reported for rxc tables (Field, 2005). The interpretation of effect sizes follows the guidelines set by Cohen (1988). For statistically significant results in rxc tables Cramer’s V was further squared to obtain the percentage of the variation in the dependent variable that can be explained by the independent variable (Gravetter & Wallnau, 2007). These figures are presented in-text.

To assess the predictive abilities of the independent variables sequential logistic regressions (using IPH status as the dependent variable where IPH=1) were performed. Significant variables as identified in the bivariate analyses were utilised as independent variables in the regression analyses. A theory-driven approach was taken to the data, and variables in the bivariate analyses with alpha levels <.25 were retained in the multivariate models, as per recommendation by Hosmer and Lemeshow (2000, p. 95). Logistic regression models were first run thematically for each variable category independently (e.g. childhood, relationship, financial and legal). Variables with alpha

38 Although some researchers argue for the use of Yates’s continuity correction instead of Pearson’s chi-square for 2x2 contingency tables, this research follows Howell’s (2007) and Field’s (2005) advice against the use of this test due to problems with overcorrection.
levels < .20 in these thematic regressions were then included in a full model, again per recommendation by Hosmer and Lemeshow (2000, p. 118). While it is recognised that less conservative alpha levels result in increased risks of making Type I errors, i.e. rejecting the null hypothesis although no differences exist in the population (Tabachnick & Fidell, 2007), the exploratory and theory-testing nature of the analyses, coupled with the relatively small sample size, suggested the use of less conservative alpha levels. The only proper means of increasing the probability of statistical analyses to detect differences in the population is by way of increasing the sample size, which, given the population at hand, is a logistically challenging task. To ensure transparency, exact p-values and effect sizes are reported throughout.

Before including variables in the logistic regression models they were assessed for collinearity. Using Field’s (2005) criteria of ensuring tolerance values are greater than .10 and VIF values lower than 10, none of the variables were considered problematic in terms of collinearity. For each regression model, the standardised, studentised and deviance residuals were analysed and values within ±2.58 were considered acceptable (Field, 2005). Influence statistics were further analysed for each of the regression models. The threshold for acceptable values was set at Cook’s distance less than 1, DFBeta within ±1 and influence values lower than twice the average leverage value (Field, 2005). Outliers for Cook’s distance and studentised residuals were present in a number of regression models. Upon closer inspection of these outliers it was found that they were generally confined to five individual cases. Examining these five cases more closely revealed that they were relatively young males who had killed

39 As discussed further in Chapter 7, the variables measuring situational emotions revealed relatively high multicollinearity (although still within the criteria identified by Field, 2005). The decision was therefore made to run separate logistic regression models for each of the emotion variables.
their intimate partners. No data entry errors were found. As the regression models in Chapters 6 through 9 will show, the IPH perpetrators were generally older than the non-IPH perpetrators. Running the regression models without the age variable resulted in decreased incidences of residual outliers. It was therefore concluded that the presence of outliers was to a certain extent driven by the relatively young age of the five perpetrators. Excluding the residual outliers in each individual regression model did not alter the overall results, except for lowering the alpha levels and inflating the Exp(B) values. It was decided to include the residual outliers in all models for four reasons. Firstly, they were not the result of data entry errors. Secondly, outliers were not present for the standardised, deviance, DFBeta and influence measures. Thirdly, the overall results were not altered. Fourthly, including the residual outliers resulted in more conservative alpha levels and odds ratios.

The Nagelkerke $R^2$ was used as measure of the proportion of variation in the dependent variable explained by the regression model, where values closer to 0 indicate lower effects and values closer to 1 indicate higher effects (Field, 2005; Nagelkerke, 1991). Furthermore, odds ratio, referred to in tables as Exp(B), were used to ascertain the odds of an individual belonging to the IPH group given exposure to the independent variable (Tabachnick & Fidell, 2007). Confidence intervals (CI; 95%) of Exp(B) were also analysed. These are reported in-text only for those variables reaching statistical significance (p<.25 for bivariate and p<.20 for multivariate analyses). Indicator contrast was used for dichotomous and polytomous dependent variables with the first category used as reference category (e.g. non-ATSI, no strain experienced, etc.).

Mediation analyses were examined through a series of stepwise logistic regression models, a method of enquiry previously used in GST research (Capowich et al., 2001; Mazerolle et al., 2000; Walls et al., 2007). This involved two steps. First, the
dependent variable was regressed on the independent variables. In the second step, the hypothesised mediation variable was entered. Mediation effects were considered present if any of the significant relationships between the dependent and independent variables decreased after the mediation variable was entered into the model.

In terms of moderation, Mazerolle and Maahs (2000, p. 758) note that although moderation is often examined through the use of interaction terms in regression models, these types of analyses “can create obstacles to finding statistically significant relationships even when substantive relationships exist”. Therefore, moderation was assessed using three-way contingency tables allowing for examinations of the association between strain and IPH across the two levels of each of the conditioning variables (e.g. high versus low trait anger). Homogeneity of the odds ratios across the levels of the conditioning variables were assessed using the Breslow-Day test (Breslow & Day, 1980). Significant results indicate moderation effects.

**Study 2: Exploring the Role of Subjective Strain, Situational Negative Emotions and Coping Mechanism on Male-Perpetrated IPH**

**Research design**

The structured interviews in the first study were designed to include a variety of measures of strain, emotions and conditioning factors to be examined within a large sample size (given the population) of male homicide perpetrators. Complementing and enhancing the quantitative data, the second study employed qualitative semi-structured interviews with ten male IPH perpetrators in order to provide rich and contextual narrative data with which to examine the subjective experiences, emotions and coping mechanisms of men who kill their partners. The aim of the second study was to
understand the nuances and complexities of the events preceding homicide incidents and to capture the lived experiences of perpetrators and the meaning they attach to events and emotions. It was a means of exploring IPH perpetration from a different lens by examining offender narratives. According to GST, subjective experiences of strain should have a greater effect on criminal coping strategies than objective strain (Agnew, 2001). By allowing the respondents to tell their stories and thereby identifying events and emotions that were important to them, this second study allowed for examinations of this important aspect of the theory. Furthermore, the qualitative nature of the study allowed for unexpected themes to arise (Champion, 2006), while enhancing the validity of the inferences made from the first study by using a triangulation approach (Berg, 2007).

The second study recognised the importance of examining offender narratives and storylines (Agnew, 2006c; Presser, 2009), and the ways in which individuals interpret events (Polizzi, 2011). Agnew (2006c, p. 121) defines storylines as “temporally limited, interrelated set of events and conditions that increase the likelihood that individuals will engage in a crime”. He argues that storylines are conceptually different from background and situational factors associated with criminal events. For example, according to an offender storyline approach, factors that inhibit or exacerbate criminal involvement are not stable over time but rather in constant fluctuation dependent upon the subjective experiences of events that form part of the storyline. Agnew further argues that an exclusive focus on situational characteristics of crime limits the opportunity to examine events that form part of the offender’s storyline that perhaps occurred weeks or sometimes months before the crime incident. Expanding on Agnew’s conceptualisations of subjective strain and storylines, Polizzi (2011) proposes the use of a phenomenological approach to researching GST. He argues that exploring
the way in which individuals perceive the world and how social contexts influence these perceptions not only accounts for the many nuances and complexities present in the lives and events of offenders, but also enhances the integrity of the theoretical framework of GST.

**Sample, recruitment and data collection**

The second study consisted of qualitative semi-structured interviews with a sub-sample of ten male respondents who participated in the first study. All interviews were completed by the doctoral scholar. The research location was limited to Queensland only, due to the location of the doctoral scholar. After completion of the quantitative interview as part of the first study, all male respondents whose victim was an intimate partner were provided with an information sheet detailing the nature and scope of the second study, as well as an expression of interest form and a reply-paid envelope (see Appendix H for the Queensland probation and parole version). As detailed in the methodological section describing study 1, a number of exclusion criteria applied. Individuals were excluded from the current research if they were arguing innocence, if their cases were under appeal at the time of the interview, if the interview was not completed or if they were in a same-sex relationship with the partner who was killed. This left 16 individuals. Eleven expressions of interest were received. For logistical reasons one individual who expressed an interest in participating in the second study was not interviewed. Of the ten interviews, seven were conducted in correctional centres and three were conducted in probation and parole offices.

The procedures of the semi-structured interviews were similar to those of the structured interviews. In correctional centres, the correctional staff escorted the respondent to a secure interview room within the correctional facility. Duress alarms were provided in some of the correctional centres, depending upon the security
classification of the centre. In the probation and parole offices the interviews took place in regular reporting rooms. To ensure respondent confidentiality only the interviewer and the respondent were present in the room during the interview. The information sheet and consent form used in the second study were different to the ones used in the first study (see Appendix I). All respondents agreed to participate after reading through the information sheet. Incentives of $10 were provided to respondents in correctional centres and $20 to respondents in probation and parole. Recording devices were not allowed into correctional facilities and therefore none of the interviews conducted in correctional centres were recorded. Two of the interviews in probation and parole settings were digitally recorded, while one respondent declined having the interview recorded. The digitally recorded interviews were transcribed by the doctoral scholar. Extensive field notes were taken during and after the interviews in those instances where recording was not allowed or declined.

The sample consisted of ten males convicted of murder or manslaughter of an intimate partner. The majority of the men were Australian-born and only two men referred to themselves as having ATSI background. The sample was diverse in terms of age at the time of the incident, ranging from late teenager to over 60 years of age. At the time of the incident half of the men were (or had been) legally married to their victim, while half were (or had been) in a de facto relationship. In terms of education, the sample was diverse, ranging from no high school attainment to having completed tertiary education. All of the victims were female ranging in age from late teenager to just below 50. Two of the victims were described by respondents as being of ATSI background.

The interview guide was semi-structured, containing the general themes to be covered (strain, negative emotional responses and coping strategies), follow-up
questions and prompts (see Appendix J). Respondents were asked to describe and talk about particularly problematic or stressful events that occurred in the time period leading up to the homicide incident. While some of the events had previously been covered in the life event calendar section in the first study, the respondents were encouraged to describe in their own words what happened, what was going on emotionally, how they reacted to these events and how they attempted to cope with the strain and emotional reactions. The questions were open-ended and allowed for respondents to tell their story using their own words.

One of the challenges with conducting qualitative research is to get respondents to tell a narrative, rather than providing short answers. Since responses are a function of the questions asked, of central concern for this research was to formulate questions that encourage detailed responses. Furthermore, since respondents recruited for this research had previously taken part in a structured interview, it was particularly important to break the cycle of using structured closed-ended questions. Introductory questions about specific situations or occurrences were used since these encourage respondents to identify situations themselves (thus providing measures of subjective strain) and promote detailed responses (see Elliott, 2005; Kvale, 2007). Kvale (2007) emphasises the importance of the interviewer being familiar with the topic and having good listening skills. Without these skills, it is difficult for the interviewer to provide appropriate follow-up questions and prompts to the information provided by the respondent to the introductory questions. By the time the first qualitative interview was conducted, the doctoral scholar had completed 14 quantitative interviews as part of the first study, thereby gaining familiarity with the topic of homicide and experience in conducting interviews with homicide perpetrators in correctional settings.
Another challenge in the qualitative study was that of using a sub-sample of respondents who had participated in the first interview. In effect, the respondents were thereby interviewed twice. Having already participated in a structured interview, respondents may have had preconceived ideas about the aims of the second study. In longitudinal research this is known as the ‘testing effect’, where respondents may recall the answers provided in previous data collection efforts, thereby affecting the internal validity of the research (Champion, 2006; Farrington, 1979). In the current study, it is probable that certain questions asked in the quantitative interview may have prompted respondents to discuss these particular issues while leaving out other, perhaps more important, issues in the qualitative interview. Although testing effects cannot be eliminated completely, prior to the qualitative interview respondents were informed that the aims and data collection strategies were different from those in the quantitative interview.

The length of the interviews ranged from 25 minutes to 3 hours and 10 minutes. The communication skills of the respondents were highly variable. This may have been due to differences in educational attainment. Some interviews were more difficult to conduct than others were. For example, one of the respondents was not particularly verbal, and only provided short-sentence responses to the questions asked. Prior to the interview, staff had communicated that this particular individual was relatively abrupt in his manner. However, the majority of the respondents were very forthcoming in telling their stories and appreciative of the opportunity to talk. As one of the men expressed:

No one ever spoke to me this way before. No one ever listened before. I often get up and leave when people talk rubbish. You listen to my beliefs.
Measures

Given the theory-driven nature of this research, the interview guide for the semi-structured interviews was constructed to examine particular aspects of GST that had not been covered in the quantitative interviews. Due to the qualitative nature of this research, the measures used are presented below as broader themes. Since the interviews were enquiring about subjective experiences these measures have been conceptualised but not operationalised.

Subjective strain: The first theme in this study relates to experiences of subjective strain. Respondents were asked to describe particularly problematic or stressful experiences in the time period leading up to the incident. This allowed respondents to identify strain they experienced as stressful, providing information regarding the subjective nature of strain as opposed to objective strain (for a discussion see Agnew, 2001). The timeframe was left open for interpretation, with questions only referring to the “time period before the incident”. This was done intentionally, since an exclusive focus on events located temporally close to the behaviour under examination may limit the opportunity to examine events that form part of offenders’ storylines and are of high relevance to the respondents independent of the time the subjective strains were occurring (Agnew, 2006c). Depending upon the comprehensiveness of the answers, respondents were asked a number of prompts and follow-up questions. Respondents were also asked about the homicide incident and about why the incident occurred. Collectively these questions elicited responses relating to any subjective strain the respondent was going through in the time period before the incident.

Situational negative emotions: The second theme examined relates to situational negative emotions, that is, emotions elicited by the subjective strains identified by the respondents. In conjunction with describing stressful and problematic experiences,
respondents were asked to describe how they were feeling as the strain occurred, or afterwards. Respondents finding it difficult to explain how a particular event made them feel were asked to describe what sort of things were going on emotionally for them at that time (in general) and then asked to describe why they were feeling that particular way.

**Coping strategies:** The third theme examined the ways in which the respondents reacted to the subjective strain and negative emotions they were experiencing. This was asked in order to ascertain the types of coping strategies used by respondents in reaction to strain and/or negative emotions. Most importantly, this was not limited to criminal coping strategies. Instead, respondents were asked to describe what their reactions were and what they did. They were further asked whether this was their normal means of reacting to events of similar character and their perceptions of the availability of coping resources.

**Analytical strategy**

Coding and analysis of the narrative data was thematic and deductive, and interpreted within the context of GST. Themes were developed using a theory-driven approach (see Boyatzis, 1998; Braun & Clarke, 2006) and coded using NVivo software. Since the focus of this research was on examining the applicability of GST for explaining IPH, a deductive approach using GST as the reference point was considered appropriate. The phases of thematic analyses included becoming familiar with the data, generating initial codes, searching for themes, reviewing themes and defining and naming the themes (Braun & Clarke, 2006). This process was completed systematically and in conjunction with writing of the results. In order to enhance the validity of the coded themes the narratives were further discussed extensively with the research team during all phases of analysis. Using NVivo, the information was coded hierarchically in
tree nodes (Richards, 1999). In accordance with the theoretical concepts examined, the three main categories of nodes were subjective strain, situational negative emotions and coping strategies. A number of sub-categories within each of these nodes were generated.

Chapter Summary

This chapter has outlined the methodological approach used in this research. This research uses the theoretical framework of GST to explain male IPH perpetration. In order to examine experiences of strain and negative emotions, as well as the presence of conditioning factors and coping strategies, this research used a mixed-methods approach. Two studies were conducted, both of which utilised interviews with male homicide perpetrators. The first study was quantitative and included structured interviews with 157 male homicide perpetrators. A number of variables were included in this first study, examining strain, negative emotions and conditioning variables. To enhance validity, and to explore the role of subjective strain, emotional experiences and coping mechanisms more in-depth, a second study was also conducted. This study included qualitative semi-structured interviews with a sub-sample of ten male IPH perpetrators. Most importantly, while in the first study respondents were asked whether they experienced a certain strain or not, the second study asked respondents themselves to identify strains experienced. This allowed for measures of subjective experiences of strain. Collectively the aim of these two studies was to provide data to assess the applicability of GST for explaining male IPH perpetration in order to understand which (if any) characteristics distinguish male IPH from non-IPH perpetration.
Chapter 6: Exploring the Role of Strain for Male Perpetrators of IPH

According to GST, experiences of strain may lead an individual to engage in criminal behaviour. The focus of this chapter is on understanding which strains are unique to the experiences of male IPH perpetrators. To do so, this chapter compares the strains reported by male IPH perpetrators to those reported by male non-IPH perpetrators. The data used to explore the role of strain are taken from the quantitative study described in Chapter 5. Exploring which strains are relevant, and how they may be relevant, is the first step of many. Guided by GST, the following chapters then build on the analyses in the current chapter by exploring the mediating role of situational negative emotions (Chapter 7) and the moderating role of conditioning factors (Chapter 8).

Based on the theoretical model presented in Chapter 4, and the variables available within the Australian Homicide Project discussed in Chapter 5, the expected sources of strain for male IPH and non-IPH perpetrators are presented in Table 6. As seen in the table, while experiences of childhood strain were not expected to differentiate between the two categories of perpetrators, other strains were hypothesised to be relevant to only one of the groups. For example, it was expected that the IPH perpetrators experienced a range of relationship strains prior to the incident, including relationship separation and infidelity, while the non-IPH perpetrators were expected to have experienced financial and legal difficulties. Based on these expectations, non-directional hypothesis testing was used for the childhood variables, while directional tests were used for variables within the relationship, financial and legal strain domains.

As discussed in Chapter 5, the analyses were theory-driven. Therefore, as per recommendation by Hosmer and Lemeshow (2000), higher alpha levels were accepted
for variables from the bivariate analyses to be included in thematic logistic regression models (p<.25) and from the thematic models to the full logistic regression models (p<.20).

Table 6. *Sources of Strain Expected to be Relevant for Male IPH and Non-IPH Perpetrators*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Male IPH perpetrators</th>
<th>Male non-IPH perpetrators</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Childhood strain</td>
<td>Childhood strain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical abuse</td>
<td>Physical abuse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sexual abuse</td>
<td>Sexual abuse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotional neglect</td>
<td>Emotional neglect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical neglect</td>
<td>Physical neglect</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relationship strain</td>
<td>Financial strain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relationship separation</td>
<td>Unemployment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Threat of relationship separation</td>
<td>Partner unemployment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partner infidelity</td>
<td>Loss of job</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suspected partner infidelity</td>
<td>Inability to pay bills</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disputes regarding children</td>
<td>Legal strain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Domestic violence protection order</td>
<td>Arrest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Probation or parole</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Differences in Experiences of Strain Clustering**

Early GST research used composite measures of strain, in general because the theory highlighted the importance of examining the effects of cumulative strain (for a discussion see Agnew, 2001). Although more recent research has shifted focus to examining specific strains, analysing the effects of combinations of strain is still empirically and theoretically relevant. In particular, GST states that the clustering of a number of negative events in time may be particularly criminogenic (Agnew, 1992; see also Slocum et al., 2005). Therefore, the first subsidiary research question explored whether there were differences between the male IPH and non-IPH perpetrators in terms of their experiences of clustering of strain (i.e. the number of strains experienced).
The first analysis examined the total number of strains experienced across all strain domains (i.e. childhood, relationship, financial and legal strains). As seen in Figure 4, non-IPH perpetrators experienced a higher number of total strains compared to the men whose victim was an intimate partner, and a two-tailed chi-square test for independence revealed that these differences were statistically significant ($\chi^2(1, n=51)=4.49, p=.213$). For example, while less than five per cent of the IPH perpetrators had experienced seven or more strains, more than one-fifth of the non-IPH perpetrators had experienced this many strains. The effect size was found to be small to moderate (Cramer’s V=.297), with 8.82 per cent of the variance explained by total strain clustering.

---

Note that comparisons between IPH and non-IPH offenders were based on sub-groups. For example, relationship strains were only examined for those individuals who were in a relationship at some time during the 12 months prior to the homicide incident. Similarly, strains relating to children were only examined for those individuals who had children at the time of the incident. A less conservative approach to variable construction often used in GST and homicide research is to include all individuals in the analyses. However, running analyses of both the full sample and the sub-groups showed that this somewhat biases the results to suggest greater differences between the two categories of offenders. Therefore, the variables used in this research were based on sub-groups. For more information regarding the variables and how they were constructed see Chapter 5.
As hypothesised, IPH and non-IPH perpetrators should experience different types of strain leading up to the incident. The next logical step was therefore to examine clustering effects within specific categories of strain, starting with the more temporally distal strains, namely those experienced during childhood. Figure 5 shows differences between men who committed IPH and men who committed non-IPH in terms of the number of childhood strains experienced. Inspection of the figure suggests that experiences of three or more childhood strains were more prevalent among non-IPH perpetrators compared to IPH perpetrators. Similarly, men who had killed an intimate partner had lower prevalence rates compared to non-IPH perpetrators in terms of not experiencing any of the childhood strains. However, a two-tailed chi-square test for independence did not reveal any statistically significant differences between the groups ($\chi^2(1, n=152)=3.75, p=.290$).

**Figure 4.** Prevalence (%) of number of total strains experienced among male IPH and non-IPH perpetrators.
The next variable to be examined was relationship strain clustering. Figure 6 shows that individuals whose victim was an intimate partner were more likely to have experienced three or more relationship strains in the 12 months leading up to the homicide incident. Similarly, while nearly half of non-IPH perpetrators had not experienced any relationship strains, approximately one-quarter of the IPH perpetrators had experienced zero relationship strains. A one-tailed chi-square test for independence showed that these differences were statistically significant ($\chi^2(1, n=67)=4.84$, $p=.092$), suggesting that relationship strains may be particularly relevant in explaining male IPH perpetration. The effect size was found to be small to moderate (Cramer’s V=.269), with 7.24 per cent of the variance explained by relationship strain clustering.
Figure 6. Prevalence (%) of number of relationship strains experienced in the 12 months preceding the homicide incident among male IPH and non-IPH perpetrators.

In terms of financial difficulties, Figure 7 suggests an association between IPH status and the number of financial strains experienced, and a one-tailed chi-square test for independence showed that this was statistically significant ($\chi^2(1, n=90)=6.29$, $p=.022$). As expected, a higher proportion of males who had killed someone other than an intimate partner had experienced two or more financial strains compared to the IPH perpetrators. The magnitude of the association between financial strain and homicide category was small (Cramer’s V=.264), with 6.97 per cent of the variance in IPH status explained by the number of financial strains experienced.
Figure 7. Prevalence (%) of number of financial strains experienced in the 12 months preceding the homicide incident among male IPH and non-IPH perpetrators.

Significant differences were further identified in the number of legal strains experienced in the 12 months prior to the homicide incident (see Figure 8), with non-IPH perpetrators significantly more likely to experience a clustering of legal strains compared to IPH perpetrators (one-tailed $\chi^2(1, n=155)=11.44, p=.002$). In contrast, more than three quarters of the individuals who killed an intimate partner experienced zero legal strains. The effect size can be considered small (Cramer’s V=.272), with 7.40 per cent of the variance explained by the number of legal strains experienced.
Figure 8. Prevalence (%) of number of legal strains experienced in the 12 months preceding the homicide incident among male IPH and non-IPH perpetrators.

Predicting Male-Perpetrated IPH from Strain Clustering

The second subsidiary research question examined whether the various clusterings of strain identified in the chi-square analyses presented in the previous section predict IPH perpetration among males. This was undertaken through thematic logistic regression analyses. As advised by Hosmer and Lemeshow (2000), variables with p-values of <.25 in the bivariate analyses were analysed in the thematic regressions. Based on this criteria, the chi-square tests for independence conducted in the previous section suggest that while clustering of total, relationship, financial and legal strain distinguished between male IPH and non-IPH perpetrators, clustering of childhood strain did not. Therefore, a thematic regression analysis was not conducted of childhood strain clustering.
Table 7 shows that clustering of total strain did not significantly predict IPH perpetration among males (overall p=0.485) when controlling for age of the perpetrator at the time of the incident.\(^\text{41}\) What the regression model showed, however, was that perpetrator age was predictive of IPH categorisation, with the odds of an individual being classified as an IPH perpetrator increasing with age (OR 95% CI [1.00, 1.13]).

Table 7. Clustering of Total Strain Predictors of Male-Perpetrated IPH: Logistic Regression

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>S.E.</th>
<th>Wald</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>(p^a)</th>
<th>Exp(B)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Control variables</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age at time of incident</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>3.86</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.049</td>
<td>1.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total strain clustering</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0-1 strains experienced (referent)</td>
<td>2.45</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.485</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-3 strains experienced</td>
<td>0.77</td>
<td>0.86</td>
<td>0.81</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.368</td>
<td>2.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-6 strains experienced</td>
<td>0.62</td>
<td>0.79</td>
<td>0.61</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.437</td>
<td>1.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7-16 strains experienced</td>
<td>-0.92</td>
<td>1.28</td>
<td>0.52</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.472</td>
<td>0.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>-2.65</td>
<td>1.34</td>
<td>3.91</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.048</td>
<td>0.07</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(-2\) log likelihood 61.24  
Nagelkerke R\(^2\) .222  
\(\chi^2\) 9.29  
\(p\) .054  
Model prediction rate 64.71%  
n 51

\(^a\) Two-tailed tests.

Table 8 shows that clustering of relationship strain significantly predicted IPH perpetration among males (overall p=0.029). Significant values were also attained when comparing each of the cluster categories to the zero strains reference category. The

\(^{41}\) In this and subsequent analyses in this chapter two of the control variables (ATSI status and completion of high school) were not found to make significant contributions to the regression models. Chi-square tests for independence did not reveal any statistically significant differences between male IPH perpetrators and male non-IPH perpetrators in terms of ATSI status (\(\chi^2(1, n=156)=0.19, p=.665\)) or completion of high school (\(\chi^2(1, n=157)=0.14, p=.713\)). Therefore, these two variables were dropped from all regression models, resulting in increased statistical power (see Tabachnick & Fidell, 2007). Furthermore, in the current model the ATSI variable was associated with high standard errors.
results show that men who experienced one type of relationship strain were over six
time more likely to be categorised as an IPH perpetrator compared to men who
experienced no relationship strain (OR 95% CI [1.24, 31.10]). Similarly, experiencing
two relationship strains was also significantly predictive of IPH categorisation
compared to experiencing zero strains (OR 95% CI [0.85, 21.10]). The experience of
three or more relationship strains was also associated with a significant increase in odds
(OR 95% CI [1.45, 29.72]). The table further shows that perpetrator age at the time of
the incident was predictive of IPH categorisation, with the odds of an individual being
categorised as an IPH perpetrator increasing with age (OR 95% CI [1.03, 1.16]).

Table 8. Clustering of Relationship Strain Predictors of Male-Perpetrated IPH:
Thematic Logistic Regression

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>S.E.</th>
<th>Wald</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>p</th>
<th>Exp(B)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Control variables</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age at time of incident</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>7.61</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.006</td>
<td>1.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relationship strain clustering</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0 strains experienced (referent)</td>
<td></td>
<td>7.54</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>.029</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 strain experienced</td>
<td>1.83</td>
<td>0.82</td>
<td>4.95</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.013</td>
<td>6.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 strains experienced</td>
<td>1.44</td>
<td>0.82</td>
<td>3.10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.039</td>
<td>4.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-6 strains experienced</td>
<td>1.88</td>
<td>0.77</td>
<td>5.96</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.008</td>
<td>6.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>-4.22</td>
<td>1.31</td>
<td>10.35</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>0.02</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

-2 log likelihood | 77.72 |
Nagelkerke R2 | .259 |
χ² | 14.43 |
p | .006 |
Model prediction rate | 70.15% |

*One-tailed test for clustering of relationship strain variable. Two-tailed test for the control variable.

The next thematic logistic regression, seen in Table 9, shows that after
controlling for perpetrator age, clustering of financial strain remained associated with
IPH status in that it decreased the odds of a perpetrator being categorised as IPH
(p=.079). Compared to the reference category of zero strains, the data show that both
experiencing one financial strain and experiencing two or more financial strains statistically decreased the odds of an individual belonging to the IPH category (OR 95% CIs [0.12, 1.14] and [0.10, 1.54] respectively). Similar to the previous models, perpetrator age at the time of the incident was a statistically significant predictor of IPH categorisation (OR 95% CI [1.05, 1.16]).

Table 9. Clustering of Financial Strain Predictors of Male-Perpetrated IPH: Thematic Logistic Regression

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>S.E.</th>
<th>Wald</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>p</th>
<th>Exp(B)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Control variable</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age at time of incident</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>12.69</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>1.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial strain clustering</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0 strains experienced (referent)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3.69</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.079</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 strain experienced</td>
<td>-1.01</td>
<td>0.58</td>
<td>3.03</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.041</td>
<td>0.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-4 strains experienced</td>
<td>-0.92</td>
<td>0.69</td>
<td>1.78</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.091</td>
<td>0.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>-3.26</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>11.90</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>0.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-2 log likelihood</td>
<td>93.08</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nagelkerke R2</td>
<td>.309</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\chi^2$</td>
<td>22.83</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$p$</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Model prediction rate</td>
<td>75.56</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n</td>
<td>90</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* One-tailed test for clustering of financial strain variable. Two-tailed test for the control variable.

The last model to be examined was clustering of legal strain. Table 10 shows that, overall, this variable was statistically significant ($p$=.038). Examining each level individually, the results show that compared to the reference category of zero strains, experiencing one legal strain significantly decreased the odds of a perpetrator belonging to the IPH category (OR 95% CI [0.13, 1.00]). Similarly, experiencing two legal strains

Note that an odds ratio of < 1 does not suggest that experiences of financial strain act as protective factors for IPH. Rather, as the dependent variable is categorised as IPH (coded as 1) and non-IPH (coded as 0), an odds ratio < 1 of suggests that there is a decrease in the odds of an individual belonging to the IPH category as opposed to the non-IPH category.
also decreased these odds (95% OR CI [0.03, 1.96]). As in previous models, perpetrator age at the time of the incident was again predictive of IPH categorisation (OR 95% CI [1.05, 1.15]).

Table 10. Clustering of Legal Strain Predictors of Male-Perpetrated IPH: Thematic Logistic Regression

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>S.E.</th>
<th>Wald</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>p</th>
<th>Exp(B)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Control variables</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age at time of incident</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>18.94</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>1.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legal strain clustering</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0 strains experienced (referent)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 strain experienced</td>
<td>-1.01</td>
<td>0.52</td>
<td>3.88</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.025</td>
<td>0.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 strains experienced</td>
<td>-1.47</td>
<td>1.10</td>
<td>1.81</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.090</td>
<td>0.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>-3.76</td>
<td>0.77</td>
<td>23.65</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>0.02</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[-2 \text{ log likelihood} = 140.75\]
\[\text{Nagelkerke R}^2 = .306\]
\[\chi^2 = 36.27\]
\[p = .000\]

Model prediction rate 80.65

\[n = 155\]

*One-tailed test for clustering of legal strain variable. Two-tailed test for the control variable.

**Differences in Specific Strains Experienced**

Having identified clustering of relationship, financial and legal strain as particularly relevant in predicting IPH perpetration among males, the next step was to explore the role of specific strains. As discussed by Agnew (2001), although it is important to understand the effects of strain clustering on criminal behaviour, scales composed of several strain items tend to obscure the relevance of certain specific strains on crime. Therefore, the third subsidiary research question examined whether male homicide perpetrators who kill an intimate partner differ in terms of the types of strains experienced compared to male non-IPH perpetrators. The sources of strains were explored in thematic categories through bivariate analyses, again using alpha levels of <.25 as criteria for statistical significance (Hosmer & Lemeshow, 2000).
The first set of variables examined was childhood strain. Figure 9 shows differences in experiences of four types of childhood strains. Although clustering of childhood strain was not found to differentiate between the two groups of perpetrators in the previous section, two-tailed chi-square tests for independence of specific types of childhood strain revealed that two of the four variables were significantly associated with IPH status, suggesting that the examination of childhood strain clustering might have concealed the effects of individual strains. The data show that experiencing physical abuse in childhood was statistically more prevalent among non-IPH perpetrators compared to IPH perpetrators ($\chi^2(1, n=155)=4.07, p=.044, \phi=-.162$).

While approximately one-third of men who had killed an intimate partner had experienced physical abuse during childhood, half of men who had killed someone other than an intimate partner had experienced this type of childhood strain. Physical abuse decreased the odds of belonging to the IPH category by 54 per cent (OR=0.46, 95% CI [0.22, 0.99]). Emotional neglect was also experienced to a greater extent by non-IPH perpetrators and this difference was also statistically significant ($\chi^2(1, n=153)=2.66, p=.103, \phi=-.132$), decreasing the odds of IPH categorisation by 45 per cent (OR=0.55, 95% CI [0.27, 1.13]).Nearly two-thirds of the non-IPH men had experienced emotional neglect in childhood compared to approximately half of the IPH men. No statistically significant differences between IPH and non-IPH perpetrators were found in terms of exposure to sexual abuse ($\chi^2(1, n=156)=0.87, p=.351$) and physical neglect ($\chi^2(1, n=154)=0.29, p=.588$).
The next set of variables to be examined was relationship strain. As expected, Figure 10 shows that most of the relationship strains, except for threat of relationship separation and disputes regarding children, were experienced to a greater extent by IPH compared to non-IPH perpetrators in the 12 months leading up to the homicide incident. One-tailed chi-square tests for independence showed that these differences were statistically significant for relationship separation ($\chi^2(1, n=120)=2.20$, $p=.069$, phi=.135), partner infidelity ($\chi^2(1, n=106)=9.48$, $p=.001$, phi=.299), suspected partner infidelity ($\chi^2(1, n=116)=1.96$, $p=.081$, phi=.130)$\footnote{When combined into one single measure, infidelity and suspected infidelity was also found to be statistically associated with IPH status (one-tailed $\chi^2(1, n=113)=3.47$, $p=.032$). However, as discussed in Chapter 5, due to the lack of overlap between these two variables they were treated as separate variables.}$ and being on a domestic violence protection order ($\chi^2(1, n=139)=13.22$, $p=.000$, phi=.308). Being on a domestic violence protection order was associated with the highest odds ratio (OR=11.64, 95% CI [2.35, 57.59]),
showing that men who were on a domestic violence protection order were over eleven times more likely to be categorised as IPH perpetrators. This was followed by partner infidelity, where the data show that men who experienced partner infidelity in the 12 months leading up to the homicide incident were over four times more likely to belong to the IPH category compared to men who did not experience partner infidelity (OR=4.31, 95% CI [1.64, 11.37]). The lower odds ratios for partner separation (OR=1.79, 95% CI [0.83, 3.88]) and suspected partner infidelity (OR=1.81, 95% CI [0.78, 4.19]) suggests that these experiences may not be as important in explaining IPH perpetration as being on a domestic violence protection order and actually experiencing partner infidelity. No significant differences were observed in terms of threat of relationship separation ($\chi^2(1, n=116)=0.01, p=.460$) and disputes regarding children ($\chi^2(1, n=84)=0.15, p=.356$).

![Figure 10. Prevalence (%) of relationship strain experienced in the 12 months preceding the homicide incident among male IPH and non-IPH perpetrators.](image)

According to the theoretical model presented in Chapter 4, experiences of financial strain are expected to be more common among non-IPH compared to IPH
perpetrators, and a visual examination of Figure 11 suggests that this hypothesis was supported for all financial strain variables except being unable to pay bills. One-tailed chi-square tests for independence further showed that these differences were statistically significant. The data show that a statistically higher proportion of male non-IPH perpetrators were unemployed at the time of the incident ($\chi^2(1, n=153)=6.81$, $p=.005$, phi=-.211) or had a partner who was unemployed ($\chi^2(1, n=111)=7.72$, $p=.003$, phi=-.264) in the 12 months leading up to the homicide incident, individually decreasing the likelihood of an individual being categorised as an IPH perpetrator by 70 per cent (OR=0.30, 95% CIs [0.12, 0.77] and [0.12, 0.71] respectively). In terms of losing a job in the 12 months prior to the incident, the data also suggest that this was statistically more prevalent among non-IPH compared to IPH perpetrators ($\chi^2(1, n=118)=1.37$, $p=.121$, phi=-.108), and this was associated with an odds ratio of 0.46 (95% CI [0.12, 1.73]). No statistically significant differences were observed between the two groups in terms of inability to pay bills ($\chi^2(1, n=153)=0.07$, $p=.394$), with around one quarter of the sample, irrespective of IPH status, reporting this type of strain.
Figure 11. Prevalence (%) of financial strain experienced in the 12 months preceding the homicide incident among male IPH and non-IPH perpetrators.

As expected, the data in Figure 12 reveal that being arrested and being on probation or parole were legal strains more commonly experienced by male non-IPH perpetrators in the 12 months preceding the homicide incident compared to men whose victim was an intimate partner. One-tailed tests for independence showed that these differences were statistically significant. Almost 40 per cent of non-IPH perpetrators had been arrested in the 12 months before the incident compared to about 15 per cent of the IPH perpetrators ($\chi^2(1, n=156)=8.24$, $p=.002$, phi=-.230), with experiences of arrest decreasing the likelihood of being categorised as an IPH perpetrator by 73 per cent (OR=0.27, 95% CI [0.10, 0.69]). Similarly, while nearly one-fifth of non-IPH perpetrators had been on probation or parole in the 12 months preceding the incident, this was only the case for 5 per cent of the IPH perpetrators ($\chi^2(1, n=156)=4.06$, $p=.022$, phi=-.161). Once again, the odds ratio suggests a significant decrease in the likelihood of a perpetrator being categorised as IPH if being on probation or parole (OR=0.24, 95% CI [0.05, 1.07]).
Figure 12. Prevalence (%) of legal strain experienced in the 12 months preceding the homicide incident among male IPH and non-IPH perpetrators.

Predicting Male-Perpetrated IPH from Specific Strains

The next step in examining the role of strain on IPH perpetration by males was to examine the predictive ability of specific strains. This was done through a series of thematic logistic regressions examining childhood, relationship, financial and legal strain separately. Inclusions of variables in these models were based on the outcome of the chi-square analyses.

Table 11 shows the outcome of the thematic logistic regression analyses examining the impact of physical abuse and emotional neglect on IPH perpetration among males. Controlling for perpetrator age, none of the childhood strain variables were found to significantly predict IPH perpetration, suggesting no differences between IPH and non-IPH perpetrators in terms of exposure to childhood strain. The only

---

44 Five cases were considered outliers in terms of studentised residuals. However, excluding these cases from the analysis did not alter the overall results and therefore these cases were
variable that made a unique and significant contribution to the model was the control variable perpetrator age, where the results suggest that men who killed an intimate partner generally were older than men who killed someone other than an intimate partner (OR 95% CI [1.06, 1.16]).

Table 11. *Childhood Strain Predictors of Male-Perpetrated IPH: Thematic Logistic Regression Model*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>S.E.</th>
<th>Wald</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>p^a</th>
<th>Exp(B)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Control variables</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age at time of incident</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>22.58</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>1.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Childhood strain variables</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical abuse</td>
<td>-0.30</td>
<td>0.52</td>
<td>0.32</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.569</td>
<td>0.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotional neglect</td>
<td>-0.17</td>
<td>0.51</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.743</td>
<td>0.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>-4.07</td>
<td>0.80</td>
<td>25.86</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>0.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-2 log likelihood</td>
<td>143.86</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nagelkerke R2</td>
<td>.286</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(\chi^2)</td>
<td>33.37</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(p)</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Model prediction rate</td>
<td>81.59%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(n)</td>
<td>152</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^a\) Two-tailed tests

The next regression model examined which relationship strains predicted male IPH perpetration. As seen in Table 12, two of the variables made statistically significant contributions to the model.\(^{45}\) Controlling for other factors, individuals experiencing partner infidelity in the 12 months leading up to the homicide incident were almost five times more likely to be categorised as IPH perpetrators (OR 95% CI [1.36, 18.17]). However, the strongest predictor was being on a domestic violence protection order, which was associated with an odds ratio of 7.49 (OR 95% CI [1.16, 48.43]), indicating included in the final analysis. This was also the case for all other residual outliers in this chapter. See Chapter 5 for a more detailed discussion.

\(^{45}\) Five residual outliers (Cook’s distance and studentised residuals) included in the model.
that respondents who were on a domestic violence protection order were over seven times more likely to belong to the IPH category. Neither relationship separation nor suspecting partner infidelity was found to be predictive of IPH perpetration controlling for other variables. Similar to the childhood strain model, perpetrator age at the time of the homicide incident significantly predicted IPH categorisation (OR 95% CI [1.06, 1.18]).

Table 12. Relationship Strain Predictors of Male-Perpetrated IPH: Thematic Logistic Regression

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>S.E.</th>
<th>Wald</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>p</th>
<th>Exp(B)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Control variables</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age at time of incident</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>15.67</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>1.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relationship strain variables</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relationship separation</td>
<td>0.41</td>
<td>0.56</td>
<td>0.55</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.230</td>
<td>1.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partner infidelity</td>
<td>1.61</td>
<td>0.66</td>
<td>5.90</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.008</td>
<td>4.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suspected partner infidelity</td>
<td>0.39</td>
<td>0.66</td>
<td>0.34</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.280</td>
<td>1.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Domestic violence protection order</td>
<td>2.01</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>4.47</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.018</td>
<td>7.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>-4.89</td>
<td>1.03</td>
<td>22.65</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

-2 log likelihood: 95.61
Nagelkerke R2: .422
χ²: 37.70
p: .000
Model prediction rate: 76.70%
n: 103

* One-tailed tests for relationship strain variables. Two-tailed test for the control variable.

The next thematic logistic regression model examined financial strain. Table 13 shows that only one of the financial strain variables predicted IPH perpetration among males when controlling for perpetrator age at the time of the incident.⁴⁶ Experiencing partner unemployment decreased the likelihood of an individual being categorised as an IPH perpetrator by 72 per cent (OR 95% CI [0.09, 0.87]). In terms of perpetrator

---

⁴⁶ One studentised residual outlier included in the model.
unemployment and losing a job, none of these financial strain variables were found to be predictive of IPH. Again the analysis shows that perpetrator age at the time of the incident made a statistically significant contribution to the model (OR 95% CI [1.05, 1.16]).

Table 13. Financial Strain Predictors of Male-Perpetrated IPH: Thematic Logistic Regression

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>S.E.</th>
<th>Wald</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>( p^2 )</th>
<th>\text{Exp(B)}</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Control variables</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age at time of incident</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>12.82</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>1.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial strain variables</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unemployment</td>
<td>-0.25</td>
<td>0.98</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.400</td>
<td>0.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partner unemployment</td>
<td>-1.28</td>
<td>0.58</td>
<td>4.89</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.014</td>
<td>0.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loss of job</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.428</td>
<td>1.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>-3.35</td>
<td>0.93</td>
<td>12.86</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>0.04</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(-2\log \text{likelihood} = 91.18\)
\(\text{Nagelkerke R^2} = .332\)
\(\chi^2 = 24.73\)
\(p = .000\)

Model prediction rate 74.44%
\(n = 90\)

* One-tailed tests for financial strain variables. Two-tailed test for the control variable.

Examine legal strain, Table 14 shows that both being arrested and being on probation or parole significantly predicted IPH perpetration, decreasing the odds of an individual being categorised as IPH perpetrator by 56 per cent (95% CI [0.16, 1.20] and 65 per cent (95% CI [0.07, 1.74]) respectively.\(^{47}\) As in previous models, perpetrator age at the time of the incident was associated with increased odds of an individual being categorised as an IPH perpetrator (OR 95% CI 1.06, 1.15)).

\(^{47}\) Five studentised residual outliers included in the model.
Table 14. Legal Strain Predictors of Male-Perpetrated IPH: Thematic Logistic Regression

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>S.E.</th>
<th>Wald</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>p</th>
<th>Exp(B)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Control variables</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age at time of incident</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>19.08</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>1.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legal strain variables</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arrest</td>
<td>-0.82</td>
<td>0.51</td>
<td>2.57</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.055</td>
<td>0.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Probation or parole</td>
<td>-1.05</td>
<td>0.82</td>
<td>1.65</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.100</td>
<td>0.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>-3.08</td>
<td>0.78</td>
<td>24.02</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>0.02</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

-2 log likelihood                | 140.84 |
Nagelkerke R2                    | .306   |
\( \chi^2 \)                      | 36.17  |
p                               | .000   |
Model prediction rate             | 80.65% |
\( n \)                          | 155    |

* One-tailed tests for legal strain variables. Two-tailed test for the control variable.

Having examined each strain category separately through thematic logistic regression models, the next step was to examine the full model. Table 15 shows the full model including the predictor variables retained from the thematic logistic regression models based on the p<.20 criteria. Five predictor variables were included in the full model, representing relationship, financial and legal strain. No childhood strains were included in the full model since these were not found to predict IPH perpetration in the thematic logistic regression model. Based on the p<.20 criteria, the full regression analyses showed that all six predictor variables made unique statistically significant contributions to the model.48 The results indicate that men who experienced partner infidelity in the 12 months prior to the homicide incident were over seven times more likely to belong to the IPH category compared to men who did not experience infidelity (OR 95% CI [2.07, 27.29]). Similarly, respondents who were on a domestic violence

---

48 Five residual outliers (Cook’s distance and studentised residuals) included in the model.
protection order were over 15 times more likely to be categorised as IPH (OR 95% CI [1.21, 189.91]). The results further show that partner unemployment, arrest and being on probation or parole significantly decreased the odds of an individual being categorised as an IPH perpetrator (OR 95% CIs [0.09, 1.02], [0.06, 1.48] and [0.05, 2.80] respectively). As consistently seen in the previous models, the control variable perpetrator age at the time of the incident was statistically significant in the full model, indicating that the older the perpetrator was at the time of the homicide incident, the higher the odds of IPH categorisation (OR 95% CI [1.05, 1.19]).

Table 15. Strain Predictors of Male-Perpetrated IPH: Full Logistic Regression

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>S.E.</th>
<th>Wald</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>p</th>
<th>Exp(B)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Control variables</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age at time of incident</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>13.53</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>1.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strain variables</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partner infidelity</td>
<td>2.02</td>
<td>0.66</td>
<td>9.37</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>7.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Domestic violence protection order</td>
<td>2.72</td>
<td>1.29</td>
<td>4.44</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.018</td>
<td>15.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partner unemployment</td>
<td>-1.23</td>
<td>0.64</td>
<td>3.73</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.027</td>
<td>0.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arrest</td>
<td>-1.24</td>
<td>0.83</td>
<td>2.22</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.068</td>
<td>0.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Probation or parole</td>
<td>-0.97</td>
<td>1.02</td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.171</td>
<td>0.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>-4.14</td>
<td>1.08</td>
<td>14.65</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>0.02</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

-2 log likelihood                | 78.37|
Nagelkerke R2                    | .521 |
\( \chi^2 \)                     | 46.23|
\( p \)                          | .000 |
Model prediction rate            | 80.81%|
\( n \)                          | 99 |

*a One-tailed tests for strain variables. Two-tailed test for the control variable.

Chapter Summary

The aim of this chapter was to understand which experiences of strains are unique to male IPH perpetrators. To achieve this aim, this chapter compared the strains reported by 41 male IPH perpetrators to those reported by 116 non-IPH perpetrators. Theoretically, this chapter was guided by GST. As expected from the GST models
presented in Chapter 4, relationship strains were found to be particularly relevant in explaining male IPH perpetration, both when examined as a clustering effect and in terms of specific strains. Data showed that experiencing a higher number of relationship strains increased the likelihood of an individual belonging to the IPH category. Examining specific types of strain, relationship strains such as experiencing partner infidelity and being on a domestic violence protection order were found to be predictive of IPH categorisation. While these findings are consistent with the IPH literature (Campbell, Webster, Koziol-McLain, Block, Campbell, Curry, Gary, Glass, et al., 2003; Dugan et al., 2003; Mouzos, 2000), it is surprising that strains relating to relationship break-down, including actual and threatened separation, were not predictive of IPH when controlling for other strains, despite relationship separation being one of the most prominent correlates identified in the literature (Campbell, Webster, Koziol-McLain, Block, Campbell, Curry, Gary, Glass, et al., 2003; Johnson & Hotton, 2003; Wilson & Daly, 1993b). However, examining the data more closely it is clear that a large proportion of both the IPH perpetrators (51.28%) and the non-IPH perpetrators (37.04%) had experienced a relationship break-down in the 12 months preceding the homicide incident. Other research reveals similar results (Dobash et al., 2004). That relationship separation was not predictive of IPH perpetration specifically may thus be a function of the use of non-IPH perpetrators as the comparison group. It is possible that comparing lethal and non-lethal intimate partner violence perpetrated by males may reveal statistically significant differences, as found in other research (Campbell, Webster, Koziol-McLain, Block, Campbell, Curry, Gary, Glass, et al., 2003).

Results in this chapter further showed that, as expected, experiences of specific financial and legal strains were more strongly associated with non-IPH than IPH perpetration, both when examined as strain clusters and as specific strains. Of the
financial strains, partner unemployment appeared to play a particularly important predictive role, more so than the perpetrator experiencing job loss or unemployment. This latter finding is particularly interesting, given that the literature has found perpetrator unemployment to be much more prevalent among non-IPH compared to IPH perpetrators (Dobash et al., 2004; Thomas et al., 2011). While these measures of financial strain may all be considered objective measures of strain (see Agnew, 2001), it is noteworthy that no differences were found between IPH and non-IPH perpetrators in terms of subjective experiences of financial difficulties, measured by asking respondents about whether they experienced being unable to pay their bills. In terms of legal strains, as consistent with previous research (Dobash et al., 2004; Kivivuori & Lehti, 2012; Thomas et al., 2011; Weizmann-Henelius et al., 2012), the findings in this chapter suggested that custodial or community sentences were more prevalent among non-IPH perpetrators. The data further showed that although in the bivariate analyses exposure to physical abuse and emotional neglect in childhood was more prevalent among the non-IPH perpetrators, these differences were not significant in the multivariate analyses.

In conclusion, this chapter explored one of the core questions of GST, namely whether experiences of strain lead to criminal behaviour, which in the current research is IPH perpetration. However, exploring the relationship between strain and male-perpetrated IPH is only the first of many important questions emanating from the theory. The next step is to examine the role of negative emotions, and this is done in the following chapter.
Chapter 7: Exploring the Role of Negative Emotions for Male Perpetrators of IPH

Negative emotions play an important role in GST. This chapter examines experiences of negative emotions among male IPH perpetrators and compares these to non-IPH perpetrators. As in the previous chapter, the data used to explore these differences come from interviews with 157 males convicted of murder or manslaughter (described in Chapter 5). Due to the limited research on emotions and homicide, in particular examining across victim-offender categories, the analyses herein were considered exploratory. However, based on limited accounts in the literature, it was anticipated that the males who had killed intimate partners would report experiences of anger, rage or jealousy in reaction to strain, while the male non-IPH perpetrators would report anger, rage or fear.

According to GST, negative emotions are important in that they mediate the effect of strain on criminal outcomes (Agnew, 1992) and this chapter seeks to examine whether this applies to homicide perpetration. In order to ascertain whether a variable may be considered a mediator, a number of conditions apply (Baron & Kenny, 1986). This includes examining whether the mediator predicts the dependent variable and whether the independent variable predicts the mediator. Lastly, when controlling for these paths, previous relationships between the independent and the dependent variable should decrease in magnitude. Figure 13 illustrates the causal paths of mediation for the variables used in the current research.
Results from the thematic logistic regressions in Chapter 6 showed that the strains predictive of IPH were partner infidelity, domestic violence protection order, partner unemployment, arrest and probation/parole. These were therefore the strain variables examined in this chapter. The current chapter starts by analysing whether male IPH and non-IPH perpetrators experience different negative emotions immediately prior to the homicide incident, and whether these emotions are predictive of IPH perpetration. The chapter then examines which of the strains identified in Chapter 6 are predictive of negative emotions, before analysing whether negative emotions mediate the pathway between strain and IPH. Same as in Chapter 6, as per recommendation by Hosmer and Lemeshow (2000), higher alpha levels were accepted for variables from the bivariate analyses to be included in thematic logistic regression models (p<.25) and from the thematic models to the full logistic regression models (p<.20).

**Differences in Experiences of Negative Emotions**

The first subsidiary research question to be explored was whether male homicide perpetrators who kill an intimate partner differ in terms of their experiences of negative emotions immediately prior to committing the homicide compared to male homicide perpetrators who kill someone other than an intimate partner. This was examined
through a number of chi-square tests for independence. As previous research rarely has compared these two groups in terms of emotional reactions to strain, the tests conducted were non-directional (i.e. two-tailed). Using a prototype approach to classifying emotions constructed by Shaver et al. (1987) three basic emotions (anger, sadness and fear) and a number of subordinate emotion categories were examined (see Chapter 5 for further details).

Anger as a basic emotion is made up of three subordinate emotion categories, namely irritation, rage and jealousy. Examining these emotions, Figure 14 shows that IPH perpetrators more often reported experiencing anger and related emotions immediately prior to the homicide incident. In terms of the basic emotion, almost three-quarters of the IPH perpetrators reported experiencing anger compared to approximately half of the non-IPH perpetrators, and this was associated with an odds ratio of 2.36 (95% CI [1.07, 5.20]). A two-tailed chi-square test for independence showed that this difference was statistically significant ($\chi^2(1, n=150)=4.71, p=0.030, \text{phi}=0.177$). Anger as a basic emotion consists of a number of subordinate categories, and of these categories both rage ($\chi^2(1, n=141)=2.49, p=0.114, \text{phi}=0.133$) and jealousy (Fischer’s Exact Test (1, $n=140), p=0.020, \text{phi}=0.238$)49 were more likely to have been experienced by men who killed an intimate partner compared to the non-IPH perpetrators. Experiencing rage nearly doubled the odds of an individual being categorised as an IPH perpetrator (OR=1.82, 95% CI [0.86, 3.85]). No statistically significant differences were found in

49 As none of the non-IPH offenders reported experiencing jealousy, an odds ratio for this variable was not calculated. Furthermore, as recommended by Hosmer and Lemeshow (2000) variables that yield a zero cell in contingency tables should be excluded from regression models. Therefore, no multivariate analyses were conducted to examine jealousy as a predictor of IPH. Furthermore, this variable was excluded from examinations of whether strain predicts negative emotions. This was because jealousy was considered a univariate outlier (more than 90/10 split between categories) (Tabachnick & Fidell, 2007).
terms of experiencing irritation prior to the homicide incident ($\chi^2(1, n=140)=0.79$, $p=.374$).

**Figure 14.** Prevalence (%) of anger and subordinate emotions experienced immediately preceding the homicide incident among male IPH and non-IPH perpetrators.

Examining sadness and its subordinate emotions, Figure 15 shows that sadness (as a basic emotion) was experienced to a lesser extent in both groups compared to anger, with approximately one in four IPH perpetrators and one in eight non-IPH perpetrators experiencing sadness. Two-tailed chi-square tests for independence showed that the difference between IPH and non-IPH perpetrators was statistically significant ($\chi^2(1, n=150)=4.61$, $p=.032$, phi=.175) and the odds ratio suggested that individuals experiencing sadness were more than twice as likely to belong to the IPH category (OR=2.60, 95% CI [1.07, 6.35]). Examining the two subordinate categories, no statistically significant differences were found comparing IPH and non-IPH perpetrators’ experiences of sadness ($\chi^2(1, n=150)=0.38$, $p=.538$) and neglect ($\chi^2(1, n=150)=0.57$, $p=.450$).
Figure 15. Prevalence (%) of sadness and subordinate emotions experienced immediately preceding the homicide incident among male IPH and non-IPH perpetrators.

The basic emotion of fear is made up of two sub-categories (horror and nervousness). The results in Figure 16 show that men who had killed someone other than an intimate partner more frequently reported feeling fear prior to the homicide incident. Almost one-quarter of non-IPH perpetrators experienced fear, compared to 15 per cent of the IPH perpetrators. Two-tailed chi-square tests for independence further showed that these differences were statistically significant ($\chi^2(1, n=150)=1.56$, $p=.212$, phi=-.102) and associated with a decrease of 46 per cent in the odds of being categorised as an IPH perpetrator (OR=0.54, 95% CI [0.21, 1.43])\(^{50}\). Similar significant patterns were found in terms of the subordinate emotion of horror ($\chi^2(1, n=150)=2.58$, $p=.108$, phi=-.131), which was associated with an even greater decrease in odds.

\(^{50}\) As discussed in Chapter 6, an odds ratio of < 1 does not suggest that experiencing fear acts as a protective factor for IPH. Rather, as the dependent variable is categorised as IPH (coded as 1) and non-IPH (coded as 0), it suggests that there is a decrease in the odds of an individual being classified as belonging to the IPH category as opposed to the non-IPH category.
(OR=0.37, 95% CI [0.10, 1.30]). There was no statistically significant difference between IPH and non-IPH perpetrators in terms of experiencing nervousness immediately prior to the homicide incident ($\chi^2(1, n=149)=0.06, p=.800$).

**Figure 16.** Prevalence (%) of fear and subordinate emotions experienced immediately preceding the homicide incident among male IPH and non-IPH perpetrators.

**Predicting Male-Perpetrated IPH from Negative Emotions**

Having identified which negative emotions were associated with IPH and non-IPH in bivariate analyses, the next step was to examine whether these emotions predicted IPH using logistic regression models. Similar to the procedures in Chapter 6, variables found to be significant at the <.25 alpha level were retained in the multivariate analyses (Hosmer & Lemeshow, 2000). Based on these criteria, this section examines whether anger, rage, sadness, fear and horror predict IPH perpetration. As an examination of the relationship between these variables revealed relatively high
multicollinearity, separate regression models were fitted for each emotion variable individually. The high multicollinearity was not a surprise, given that rage and horror are subordinate categories of anger and fear respectively.

The first model examined whether anger predicts IPH perpetration among males. As seen in Table 16, anger did make a statistically significant contribution to the model. Controlling for perpetrator age at the time of the incident, individuals experiencing anger immediately prior to the homicide incident were more than twice as likely to be categorised as IPH perpetrators (OR 95% CI [0.95, 5.35]). The results also indicate that perpetrator age at the time of the homicide incident significantly predicted male-perpetrated IPH, with the odds increasing with age (OR 95% CI [1.06, 1.15]).

51 Highest values recorded were VIF=4.25 and Tolerance=0.24.
52 Five cases were considered outliers in terms of studentised residuals. However, excluding these cases from the analysis did not alter the overall results and therefore these cases were included in the final analysis. This was also the case for all other residual outliers in this chapter. See Chapter 5 for a more detailed discussion.
53 Similar to the regression models in Chapter 6, in this and subsequent analyses within this chapter two of the control variables (ATSI status and completion of high school) were not found to make significant contributions to the regression models. Therefore, these two variables were dropped from the regression models, resulting in increased statistical power (see Tabachnick & Fidell, 2007).
Similar to the previous model, Table 17 shows that rage was predictive of IPH perpetration. The data show that individuals experiencing rage were nearly twice as likely to belong to the IPH category (OR 95% CI [0.82, 4.41]). The model shows that perpetrator age at the time of the incident was once again predictive of IPH categorisation (OR 95% CI [1.06, 1.16]).

---

54 Three studentised residual outliers included in the model.
Table 17. Predicting Male-Perpetrated IPH From Rage: Logistic Regression

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>S.E.</th>
<th>Wald</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>p</th>
<th>Exp(B)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Control variable</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age at time of incident</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>21.83</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>1.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative emotion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rage</td>
<td>0.64</td>
<td>0.43</td>
<td>2.24</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.135</td>
<td>1.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>-4.44</td>
<td>0.79</td>
<td>31.28</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

-2 log likelihood               135.45
Nagelkerke R2                    0.284
\( \chi^2 \)                    30.84
p                                 .000
Model prediction rate            76.60%

\( n \)                           141

*Two-tailed tests

The next logistic regression model (seen in Table 18) found that sadness was predictive of IPH.\(^55\) This was also reflected in the odds ratio, which suggested that individuals experiencing sadness were nearly three times as likely to belong to the IPH category (OR 95% CI [1.02, 7.75]). Perpetrator age at the time of the incident was once again found to be a significant predictor of IPH perpetration (OR 95% CI [1.06, 1.16]).

\(^55\) Four studentised residual outliers included in the model.
Table 18. Predicting Male-Perpetrated IPH From Sadness: Logistic Regression

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>S.E.</th>
<th>Wald</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>p</th>
<th>Exp(B)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Control variable</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age at time of incident</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>22.46</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>1.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative emotion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sadness</td>
<td>1.04</td>
<td>0.52</td>
<td>4.03</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.045</td>
<td>2.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>-4.47</td>
<td>0.76</td>
<td>34.85</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>0.01</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

-2 log likelihood           | 141.40|
Nagelkerke R2               | .284  |
\( \chi^2 \)                | 32.57 |
\( p \)                     | .000  |
Model prediction rate        | 78.00%|
\( n \)                     | 150   |

* Two-tailed tests

Examining the basic emotion of fear and its subordinate category horror, Table 19 and Table 20 show that these variables were not predictive of IPH perpetration controlling for age.\(^{56}\) However, both tables show perpetrator age to be a significant predictor of IPH perpetration (OR 95% CIs [1.06, 1.15]).

Table 19. Predicting Male-Perpetrated IPH From Fear: Logistic Regression

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>S.E.</th>
<th>Wald</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>p</th>
<th>Exp(B)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Control variable</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age at time of incident</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>22.37</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>1.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative emotion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fear</td>
<td>-0.55</td>
<td>0.58</td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.344</td>
<td>0.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>-4.13</td>
<td>0.74</td>
<td>30.98</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>0.02</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

-2 log likelihood           | 144.40|
Nagelkerke R2               | .261  |
\( \chi^2 \)                | 29.57 |
\( p \)                     | .000  |
Model prediction rate        | 78.67%|
\( n \)                     | 150   |

* Two-tailed tests

\(^{56}\) Three cases in each of the fear and horror models were considered outliers in terms of studentised residuals. These were included in the models.
Table 20. Predicting Male-Perpetrated IPH From Horror: Logistic Regression

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>S.E.</th>
<th>Wald</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>( p )</th>
<th>Exp(B)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Control variable</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age at time of incident</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>21.88</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>1.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative emotion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Horror</td>
<td>-0.89</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>1.42</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.233</td>
<td>0.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>-4.12</td>
<td>0.74</td>
<td>30.74</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>0.02</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(-2 \log \text{ likelihood} \quad 143.73\)
\(\chi^2\) \quad 30.25
\(p\) \quad .000
Model prediction rate \quad 78.67%
\(n\) \quad 150

\(^{*}\) Two-tailed tests

Predicting Negative Emotions from Strain

The previous section identified anger, rage and sadness as important in predicting IPH perpetration. As per Baron and Kenny’s (1986) instructions the next step was to examine the relationship between strain and emotions. This was done by regressing negative emotions on the strains identified in Chapter 6, namely partner infidelity, domestic violence protection order, partner unemployment, arrest and probation/parole. Due to the relatively low sample size, particularly within the IPH category, regressions were run of the sample as a whole while including homicide category as a grouping variable. These analyses thus examine whether strain predicted negative emotions controlling for IPH status.

Table 21 shows the results of the logistic regression analyses examining the impact of strain on anger among male homicide perpetrators.\(^{57}\) Of the five strain variables, experiencing partner infidelity, partner unemployment and being on probation

\(^{57}\) One studentised residual outlier included in the model.
or parole at some point during the 12 months prior to the homicide incident made statistically significant contributions to the model. While experiencing partner infidelity was associated with decreased odds (95% CI [0.14, 1.47]), having a partner who was unemployed and being on probation or parole were associated with increased odds of experiencing anger (95% CIs [1.45, 11.62] and [0.85, 24.74] respectively). Neither being on a domestic violence protection order nor being arrested was predictive of anger. The results further show that age was not a significant predictor of experiencing anger immediately preceding the incident.

Table 21. Strain Predictors of Anger Among Male Homicide Perpetrators: Logistic Regression

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>S.E.</th>
<th>Wald</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>p²</th>
<th>Exp(B)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Control variable</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age at time of incident</td>
<td>-0.01</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.708</td>
<td>0.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strain variables</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partner infidelity</td>
<td>-0.79</td>
<td>0.60</td>
<td>1.73</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.189</td>
<td>0.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Domestic violence protection order</td>
<td>-0.78</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td>0.72</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.397</td>
<td>0.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partner unemployment</td>
<td>1.41</td>
<td>0.53</td>
<td>7.05</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.008</td>
<td>4.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arrest</td>
<td>0.46</td>
<td>0.56</td>
<td>0.67</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.414</td>
<td>1.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Probation or parole</td>
<td>1.53</td>
<td>0.86</td>
<td>3.16</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.076</td>
<td>4.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IPH</td>
<td>1.23</td>
<td>0.65</td>
<td>3.59</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.058</td>
<td>3.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>-0.23</td>
<td>0.81</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.780</td>
<td>0.80</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

-2 log likelihood                       | 109.96|
Nagelkerke R2                           | .212  |
χ²                                      | 16.12 |
p                                      | .024  |
Model prediction rate                   | 65.26%|

*Two-tailed tests

The negative emotion examined next was the subordinate emotion of rage. Table 22 shows similar patterns compared to the anger model.58 The model found partner

---

58 One studentised residual outlier included in the model.
infidelity, partner unemployment and being on probation and parole to be significant predictors of experiencing rage. Similar to the anger model, partner infidelity was associated with decreased odds of experiencing rage (95% CI [0.08, 1.01]), while having a partner who was unemployed and being on probation or parole were associated with increased likelihood of an individual experiencing rage immediately prior to the homicide (95% CIs [1.69, 14.04] and [0.67, 14.86] respectively). Neither being on a domestic violence protection order nor being arrested was associated with rage. Similar to the anger model, the data suggests that age was not significantly predictive of experiences of situational rage.

Table 22. Strain Predictors of Rage Among Male Homicide Perpetrators: Logistic Regression

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>S.E.</th>
<th>Wald</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>p</th>
<th>Exp(B)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Control variable</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age at time of incident</td>
<td>-0.02</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>0.53</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.469</td>
<td>0.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strain variables</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partner infidelity</td>
<td>-1.25</td>
<td>0.65</td>
<td>3.78</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.052</td>
<td>0.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Domestic violence protection order</td>
<td>-0.92</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td>0.98</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.322</td>
<td>0.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partner unemployment</td>
<td>1.58</td>
<td>0.54</td>
<td>8.55</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.003</td>
<td>4.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arrest</td>
<td>-0.21</td>
<td>0.58</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.722</td>
<td>0.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Probation or parole</td>
<td>1.15</td>
<td>0.79</td>
<td>2.12</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.145</td>
<td>3.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IPH</td>
<td>1.21</td>
<td>0.66</td>
<td>3.30</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.069</td>
<td>3.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>-0.12</td>
<td>0.81</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.884</td>
<td>0.89</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

-2 log likelihood                      | 105.31|
Nagelkerke R2                          | .228  |
$\chi^2$                                | 16.51 |
$p$                                     | .021  |
Model prediction rate                   | 65.91%|
$n$                                     | 88    |

* Two-tailed tests

The logistic regression model examining whether strain predicts sadness was found to be non-significant ($\chi^2(7, n=95)=9.61, p=.212$) indicating that although sadness
is predictive of IPH, strains are not associated with experiences of sadness. The model is therefore not reported here, nor is it included in any subsequent mediation analyses, as the non-significant model indicates that sadness does not adhere to the mediation criteria discussed by Baron and Kenny (1986).

**Mediating Effects of Negative Emotions**

Results in the previous sections indicate that experiencing partner infidelity, partner unemployment and being on probation or parole in the 12 months leading up to the homicide incident were predictive of anger and rage and that, in turn, anger and rage were predictive of IPH perpetration. The last step in establishing whether negative emotions mediate the effect of strain on IPH was to examine whether the effect of strain decreased in magnitude when controlling for negative emotions. This was examined through a series of stepwise logistic regression models, a method of enquiry previously used in GST research to examine mediation processes (Capowich et al., 2001; Mazerolle et al., 2000; Walls et al., 2007). The first step involved was regressing IPH on strain, while in the second step the negative emotion variable was entered. Mediation effects were deemed present if any significant relationships between strain and IPH were reduced when entering negative emotions into the model (see Baron & Kenny, 1986).

Table 23 shows the results of the mediation analyses examining anger. Model 1 shows that all three strain variables (i.e. partner infidelity, partner unemployment and probation/parole) were predictive of IPH controlling for perpetrator age at the time of the homicide incident. The strongest predictor was partner infidelity, which was

---

59 Three residuals outliers (Cook’s distance and studentised residuals) included in the model.
associated with a nine-fold increased likelihood of an individual belonging to the IPH category (OR 95% CI [2.53, 31.68]). Partner unemployment, on the other hand, was associated with a 70 per cent decrease in odds of an individual being categorised as an IPH perpetrator (OR 95% CI [0.10, 0.91]). Similarly, being on probation or parole in the 12 months prior to the homicide incident was also associated with decreased odds of belonging to the IPH category (OR 95% CI [0.07, 2.49]).

As seen in Model 2, the inclusion of anger in the model did not result in a decrease of the partner infidelity, partner unemployment and probation/parole variables. Instead, these variables were relatively stable and were still found to be statistically significant predictors of IPH perpetration. The control variable perpetrator age at the time of the incident was a significant predictor in both models (OR 95% CIs [1.05, 1.19] and [1.06, 1.19] respectively). Interestingly, Model 2 further showed that anger made a statistically significant contribution to the model independent of the strain variables, showing that individuals experiencing anger immediately prior to the homicide incident were nearly three times more likely to belong to the IPH category (OR 95% CI [0.79, 9.55]). These findings thus suggest that strain and anger may be predictive of IPH perpetration independent of each other. In other words, there was no support for the mediation hypothesis.

60 Although no cases in Model 1 were considered outliers, three cases in Model 2 were considered outliers in terms of studentised residuals. These were included in the model.
Table 23. *Mediating Effects of Anger on Strain for Male-Perpetrated IPH: Logistic Regression*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Model 1</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Model 2</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>S.E.</td>
<td>Wald</td>
<td>df</td>
<td>$p^a$</td>
<td>Exp(B)</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>S.E.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control variables</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age at time of incident</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>14.02</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>1.12</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>0.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strain variables</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partner infidelity</td>
<td>2.19</td>
<td>0.64</td>
<td>11.58</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>8.96</td>
<td>2.35</td>
<td>0.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partner unemployment</td>
<td>-1.21</td>
<td>0.57</td>
<td>4.49</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.017</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>-1.51</td>
<td>0.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On probation or parole</td>
<td>-0.86</td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.171</td>
<td>0.42</td>
<td>-1.20</td>
<td>0.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative emotion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anger</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.01</td>
<td>0.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>-4.24</td>
<td>1.05</td>
<td>16.33</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>-4.83</td>
<td>1.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-2 log likelihood</td>
<td>84.99</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>82.26</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nagelkerke R2</td>
<td>.435</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.462</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\chi^2$</td>
<td>35.79</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>38.51</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$p$</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Model prediction rate</td>
<td>80.21%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>81.25%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$n$</td>
<td>96</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>96</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* One-tailed tests for strain variables (partner infidelity, partner unemployment, on probation or parole). Two-tailed tests for other variables, including anger.
The second set of analyses, reported in Table 24, examined the mediating role of rage. The analyses revealed similar findings to the anger model, which is not surprising given that rage is a subordinate emotion of anger. Model 1 shows the effects of strain on IPH, holding perpetrator age at the time of the incident constant. As in the anger model, partner infidelity, partner unemployment and being on probation or parole significantly predicted IPH perpetration. The results show that individuals experiencing partner infidelity were nearly nine times more likely to be categorised as an IPH perpetrator (OR 95% CI [2.48, 31.49]) while partner unemployment was associated with a 66 per cent decrease in odds (OR 95% CI [0.11, 1.05]) and being on probation or parole was associated with a 55 per cent decrease (OR 95% CI [0.07, 2.76]).

Model 2 demonstrates that adding rage into the regression did not result in a reduction in the association between strain and IPH perpetration. Instead, partner infidelity was still associated with increased odds (OR 95% CI [2.87, 43.90]) while partner unemployment and probation/parole were still associated with decreased odds (OR 95% CIs [0.07, 0.84] and [0.05, 2.35] respectively) of an individual belonging to the IPH category. Once again, in both models perpetrator age at the time of the incident was found to be a statistically significant predictor of IPH (OR 95% CIs [1.05, 1.18]). Furthermore, rage was a significant predictor of IPH perpetration, associated with an almost three-fold increase in odds (OR 95% CI [0.78, 9.36]). Based on these models, it was concluded that although rage may be predictive of IPH, it does not mediate the relationship between strain and IPH.

---

61 Five cases in Model 1 and two cases in Model 2 were considered outliers in terms of Cook’s distance and studentised residuals. These were included in the model.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Model 1</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>S.E.</td>
<td>Wald</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control variables</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age at time of incident</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>12.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strain variables</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partner infidelity</td>
<td>2.18</td>
<td>0.65</td>
<td>11.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partner unemployment</td>
<td>-1.09</td>
<td>0.58</td>
<td>3.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On probation or parole</td>
<td>-0.80</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td>0.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative emotion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rage</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>-4.06</td>
<td>1.04</td>
<td>15.35</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

-2 log likelihood: 81.30
Nagelkerke R2: .424
χ²: 32.45
p: .000
Model prediction rate: 79.78%
n: 89

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Model 2</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>S.E.</td>
<td>Wald</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control variables</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age at time of incident</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>13.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strain variables</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partner infidelity</td>
<td>2.42</td>
<td>0.70</td>
<td>12.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partner unemployment</td>
<td>-1.41</td>
<td>0.63</td>
<td>4.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On probation or parole</td>
<td>-1.06</td>
<td>0.98</td>
<td>1.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative emotion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rage</td>
<td>0.99</td>
<td>0.63</td>
<td>2.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>-4.56</td>
<td>1.12</td>
<td>16.59</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

-2 log likelihood: 78.68
Nagelkerke R2: .451
χ²: 35.08
p: .000
Model prediction rate: 80.90%
n: 89

*a One-tailed tests for strain variables (partner infidelity, partner unemployment, on probation or parole). Two-tailed tests for other variables, including rage.
Chapter Summary

This chapter empirically assessed an important part of GST, namely the role of negative emotions. In particular, the chapter used Baron and Kenny’s (1986) instructions to assess whether negative emotions mediate between experiences of strain and IPH. The first part of the analyses established that male IPH and non-IPH perpetrators differed in their emotional experiences immediately preceding the homicide incident. While men who killed their intimate partners were more likely to experience anger, rage, jealousy and sadness prior to the act, men who killed someone other than an intimate partner were more likely to experience fear and horror, although when controlling for perpetrator age both fear and horror were found to be non-significant.

Assessing whether strain was predictive of negative emotions, it was found that while experiencing partner infidelity, partner unemployment and being on probation or parole were predictive of anger and rage, being on a domestic violence protection order and being arrested were not. Interestingly, experiencing partner infidelity sometime in the 12 months preceding the homicide incident was associated with decreased odds of experiencing anger or rage at the time of the incident. It may be that experiencing partner infidelity is associated with emotions other than anger. Unfortunately the low prevalence rate of jealousy in the sample prevented analyses of whether, and which, strains predict jealousy (see Tabachnick & Fidell, 2007, for a discussion of univariate outliers). Another possible reason for why experiencing partner infidelity was associated with decreased odds of anger or rage may be the temporal gap between when the strain was experienced (measured as anytime in the preceding 12 months) and the emotion was experienced (measured as immediately prior to the homicide incident).

The last set of analyses examined whether negative emotions mediate the effect of strain on IPH. What these analyses showed was that although anger and rage were
predictive of IPH, they did not appear to act as mediators, but rather as independent predictors. These types of analyses have not previously been conducted within homicide research and were therefore considered exploratory. From a theoretical perspective, these findings were not consistent with what was expected. While research on less serious criminal behaviour has been largely supportive in terms of the mediating role of negative emotions (Capowich et al., 2001; Mazerolle et al., 2003; Moon et al., 2009; Rebellon et al., 2009), the results in this chapter appear to suggest that for IPH this mediating effect is absent.
Chapter 8: Exploring the Role of Conditioning Factors for Male Perpetrators of IPH

According to GST, the effect of strain and negative emotions is expected to be either exacerbated or reduced depending upon a number of conditioning factors (Agnew, 1992). Based on the theoretical model presented in Chapter 4, and the variables available within the Australian Homicide Project discussed in Chapter 5, the factors expected to moderate the relationship between experiences of strain and homicide are presented in Table 25. These factors have been categorised as general, relationship or criminal involvement.

Table 25. Conditioning Factors Expected to be Relevant for Male IPH and Non-IPH Perpetrators

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Male IPH perpetrators</th>
<th>Male non-IPH perpetrators</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>General conditioning factors</td>
<td>General conditioning factors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High trait anger</td>
<td>High trait anger</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High impulsivity</td>
<td>High impulsivity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low social support</td>
<td>Low social support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relationship conditioning factors</td>
<td>Criminal involvement conditioning factors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trait jealousy</td>
<td>History of serious violent crime</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Condoning partner violence</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peers condoning partner violence</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High relationship entitlement</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fearful attachment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criminal involvement conditioning factors</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>History of partner violence perpetration</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As shown in Table 25, due to limited research on the differences between male IPH and non-IPH in terms of levels of trait anger, impulsivity and social support, examinations of these variables were not based on directional hypotheses testing; rather, these variables were expected to exacerbate the effect of strain for both categories of homicide perpetrators. However, based on previous research it was expected that a number of conditioning factors related to relationship issues exacerbate the effect of
strain on homicide only for those males who had killed intimate partners, such as trait jealousy, holding condoning attitudes toward the use of partner violence and fearful attachment styles. Furthermore, it was expected that a history of partner violence perpetration would act to exacerbate the effect of strain on IPH, while a history of general violent offending would exacerbate the effect of strain on non-IPH perpetration.

Baron and Kenny (1986) note that while mediators are situated causally between the predictor and the outcome (examined in Chapter 7), moderators are temporally located at the same level as the predictors. They suggest that moderation be established through the examination of interaction effects between the predictor and the possible moderator. Significant results indicate moderation, irrespective of whether the predictor and moderator remain statistically significant with the interaction effect entered into the analysis (Baron & Kenny, 1986). A model of the moderation as suggested by Baron and Kenny is presented in Figure 17.

![Figure 17. Model of moderation (adapted from Baron & Kenny, 1986).](image)

Results from Chapter 6 showed that the strains predictive of IPH were partner infidelity, domestic violence protection order, partner unemployment, arrest and probation/parole, and these were therefore the strain variables included in this chapter. This chapter begins with an examination of which of the hypothesised conditioning
factors were related to, and predictive of, IPH perpetration. These were then examined further to assess whether they moderated the effect of strain. As recommended by Hosmer and Lemeshow (2000) the theory-driven approach of this research allowed for lower alpha levels for inclusion from bivariate to multivariate analyses (p<.25) and from thematic models to full regression models (p<.20).

**Differences in Conditioning Factors**

The first subsidiary research question to be explored was whether male IPH perpetrators differed in terms of conditioning factors compared to male non-IPH perpetrators. This issue was examined thematically through a number of chi-square tests for independence. The first set of analyses examined the general conditioning factors, including high trait anger, high impulsivity and low social support.

The results seen in Figure 18 show that a lower proportion of IPH perpetrators reported high trait anger and high impulsivity compared to non-IPH perpetrators. Two-tailed chi-square tests for independence showed that these differences were statistically significant. While approximately 57 per cent of the non-IPH perpetrators reported high trait anger, less than 40 per cent of the men who had killed an intimate partner had high trait anger ($\chi^2(1, n=148)=3.84, p=.050, \phi=-.161$). Similarly, while nearly half of the non-IPH men reported high impulsivity, almost one-third of the IPH perpetrators reported high impulsivity ($\chi^2(1, n=138)=2.96, p=.085, \phi=-.146$). The odds ratios suggest that individuals high on trait anger or impulsivity were approximately half as likely to be categorised as IPH perpetrators (OR 95% CIs [0.23, 1.01] and [0.22, 1.11] respectively).  

62 No statistically significant differences were detected in terms of low

---

62 As discussed in Chapters 6 and 7, an odds ratio of < 1 does not suggest that trait anger or impulsivity act as protective factors for IPH. Rather, as the dependent variable is categorised as
social support ($\chi^2(1, n=133)=0.20, p=.655$), with approximately one in four homicide perpetrators, irrespective of IPH status, experiencing low social support in the 12 months prior to the homicide incident.

Figure 18. Prevalence (%) of general conditioning factors among male IPH and non-IPH perpetrators.

The next set of analyses, shown in Figure 19, examined conditioning factors relating to relationship cognitions, experiences and attitudes. As expected, one-tailed chi-square tests for independence showed that IPH perpetrators were more likely to be classified as condoning partner violence ($\chi^2(1, n=133)=5.25, p=.011, \phi=.199$), holding high trait jealousy ($\chi^2(1, n=133)=1.80, p=.090, \phi=.116$) and high relationship entitlement ($\chi^2(1, n=129)=0.60, p=.219, \phi=.068$). The likelihood of an individual belonging to the IPH category among those holding condoning attitudes were more than double compared to those who did not hold these attitudes (OR=2.48, 95% CI [1.13,

IPH (coded as 1) and non-IPH (coded as 0), it suggests that there is a decrease in the odds of an individual being classified as belonging to the IPH category as opposed to the non-IPH category.
5.44], while the odds for high trait jealousy (OR=1.68, 95% CI [0.78, 3.62]) and reporting high relationship entitlement (OR=1.36, 95% CI [0.63, 2.94]) were slightly lower. No statistically significant differences were found in terms of having peers who condone the use of partner violence ($\chi^2(1, n=98)=0.01, p=.464$) and having a fearful attachment style ($\chi^2(1, n=132)=0.08, p=.392$).

---

Figure 19. Prevalence (%) of relationship conditioning factors among male IPH and non-IPH perpetrators.

Figure 20 shows the prevalence of conditioning factors relating to criminal involvement. The figure shows that more than half of the IPH perpetrators had a history of non-lethal intimate partner violence perpetration against a former partner or the partner who was killed. Although a slightly higher proportion of IPH perpetrators reported a history of intimate partner violence compared to the non-IPH perpetrators, one-tailed chi-square tests for independence showed that these differences were not

---

A chi-square test for independence was also examined for insecure (which includes fearful, preoccupied and dismissing attachment styles) versus secure attachment. No statistically significant differences were found (one-tailed $\chi^2(1, n=132)= 0.07, p=.393$).
statistically significant ($\chi^2(1, n=128)=0.17, p=.343$). However, the results did show that non-IPH perpetrators were more likely to have a history of serious violent crime ($\chi^2(1, n=153)=3.84, p=.025, \phi=-.158$), and this was associated with decreased odds of an individual being categorised as an IPH perpetrator by 52 per cent (OR=0.48, 95% CI [0.23, 1.01]).

Figure 20. Prevalence (%) of criminal conditioning factors among male IPH and non-IPH perpetrators.

**Predicting Male-Perpetrated IPH from Conditioning Factors**

Those conditioning variables that statistically differentiated between male IPH and non-IPH perpetrators in the bivariate analyses ($p<.25$) were then entered into thematic logistic regressions in order to examine the second subsidiary research question, namely whether conditioning factors predict IPH perpetration. As seen in

---

64 Analyses of violence in the most recent relationship (which for the IPH perpetrators was the partner who was killed) did not reveal any differences between the two groups either, with 44.74% of IPH perpetrators and 47.13% of non-IPH perpetrators reporting a history of non-lethal intimate partner violence (one-tailed $\chi^2(1, n=125)= 0.06, p=.403$).
Table 26, the first thematic logistic regression model examined the general conditioning factors of high trait anger and high impulsivity. According to the results, only high trait anger provided a statistically significant contribution to the model.\textsuperscript{65} The odds ratio suggests that high trait anger was associated with decreased odds of an individual being categorised as an IPH perpetrator (OR 95% CI [0.19, 1.26]). Similar to the results in Chapters 6 and 7, the control variable perpetrator age at the time of the incident made a statistically significant contribution to the model, suggesting that the odds of IPH increased with perpetrator age (OR 95% CI [1.06, 1.17]).\textsuperscript{66}

Table 26. General Conditioning Factor Predictors of Male-Perpetrated IPH: Thematic Logistic Regression

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>S.E.</th>
<th>Wald</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>p$^a$</th>
<th>Exp(B)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Control variables</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age at time of incident</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>20.68</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>1.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conditioning factors</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High trait anger</td>
<td>-0.72</td>
<td>0.48</td>
<td>2.21</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.137</td>
<td>0.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High impulsivity</td>
<td>-0.16</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.744</td>
<td>0.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>-4.05</td>
<td>0.83</td>
<td>23.72</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>0.02</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\textsuperscript{65} One case was considered an outlier in terms of studentised residuals. However, excluding this case from the analyses did not alter the overall results and it was therefore included in the final analysis. This was also the case for all other residual outliers in this chapter. See Chapter 5 for a more detailed discussion.

\textsuperscript{66} Similar to the regression models analysed in Chapters 6 and 7, in this and subsequent analyses, two of the control variables (ATSI status and completion of high school) were not found to make significant contributions to the regression models. Therefore, these two variables were not included in the regression models, resulting in increased statistical power (see Tabachnick & Fidell, 2007).

\textsuperscript{a} Two-tailed test.

\textsuperscript{2} Two-tailed test.
The next thematic logistic regression model examined those relationship variables that were statistically significant in the bivariate analyses. Of these, Table 27 shows that when controlling for perpetrator age, only high trait jealousy was a significant predictor of IPH perpetration.\(^{67}\) The odds ratio suggests that men high in trait jealousy were more than twice as likely to be categorised as IPH perpetrators (OR 95% CI [0.81, 6.17]). Neither condoning partner violence nor high relationship entitlement made significant contributions to the model. The control variable perpetrator age at the time of the incident was again found to be predictive of IPH perpetration (OR 95% CI [1.07, 1.20]).

### Table 27. Relationship Conditioning Factor Predictors of Male-Perpetrated IPH: Thematic Logistic Regression

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>S.E.</th>
<th>Wald</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>(p^a)</th>
<th>Exp(B)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Control variables</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age at time of incident</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>18.04</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>1.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conditioning factors</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Condoning partner violence</td>
<td>0.27</td>
<td>0.57</td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.323</td>
<td>1.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High trait jealousy</td>
<td>0.81</td>
<td>0.52</td>
<td>2.43</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.060</td>
<td>2.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High relationship entitlement</td>
<td>0.28</td>
<td>0.58</td>
<td>0.24</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.312</td>
<td>1.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>-5.48</td>
<td>1.07</td>
<td>26.35</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

-2 log likelihood                | 103.56|
Nagelkerke R2                    | 0.354 |
\(\chi^2\)                       | 32.44 |
\(p\)                           | .000  |
Model prediction rate            | 80.87%|
\(n\)                           | 115   |

\(^a\) One-tailed test for conditioning factors. Two-tailed test for control variable.

Turning to the conditioning factor relating to previous criminal involvement, Table 28 shows that a history of serious violent crime made a statistically significant

\(^{67}\) Two studentised residual outliers included in the model.
contribution to the model. As suggested by the odds ratio, the likelihood of an individual being categorised as an IPH perpetrator decreased by 48 per cent when there was a history of serious violence perpetration (OR 95% CI [0.23, 1.20]). The model further shows that perpetrator age again made a significant contribution to the model with the odds of IPH perpetration increasing with age (OR 95% CI [1.06, 1.16]).

Table 28. Criminal Conditioning Factor Predictors of Male-Perpetrated IPH: Thematic Logistic Regression

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>S.E.</th>
<th>Wald</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>p^a</th>
<th>Exp(B)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Control variables</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age at time of incident</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>23.38</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>1.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conditioning factors</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>History of serious violent crime</td>
<td>-0.65</td>
<td>0.42</td>
<td>2.36</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.063</td>
<td>0.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>-4.06</td>
<td>0.76</td>
<td>28.57</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>0.02</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

-2 log likelihood                        | 143.72|
Nagelkerke R2                            | .291  |
\(\chi^2\)                               | 34.14 |
p                                        | .000  |
Model prediction rate                     | 79.08%|
\(n\)                                    | 153   |

^a One-tailed test for conditioning factors. Two-tailed test for control variable.

The next step was to enter the statistically significant variables from the thematic logistic regressions into a full model, the result of which is presented in Table 29. The results show that when entered into the full model, a history of serious violent offending was no longer predictive of IPH, while trait anger and trait jealousy both made significant contributions to the model. Individuals reporting high trait anger were less likely to belong to the IPH category compared to individuals reporting low trait anger (OR 95% CI [0.17, 1.18]). As expected, high trait jealousy was associated

---

^68 Four studentised residual outliers included in the model.

^69 Three studentised residual outliers included in the model.
with an increased likelihood of an individual being categorised as an IPH perpetrator (OR 95% CI [1.02, 6.96]). As consistently seen in the previous models, the control variable perpetrator age at the time of the incident was statistically significant in the full model, again indicating that the older the perpetrator, the higher the odds of IPH categorisation (OR 95% CI [1.06, 1.16]).

Table 29. Conditioning Factor Predictors of Male-Perpetrated IPH: Full Logistic Regression

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>S.E.</th>
<th>Wald</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>p</th>
<th>Exp(B)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Control variables</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age at time of incident</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>18.75</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>1.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conditioning factors</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High trait anger</td>
<td>-0.82</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>2.64</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.104</td>
<td>0.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High trait jealousy</td>
<td>0.98</td>
<td>0.49</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.023</td>
<td>2.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>History of serious violent crime</td>
<td>-0.17</td>
<td>0.48</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.365</td>
<td>0.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constant</td>
<td>-4.06</td>
<td>0.86</td>
<td>22.33</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>0.02</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

-2 log likelihood: 123.31
Nagelkerke R2: .309
\( \chi^2 \): 31.31
p: .000
Model prediction rate: 78.29%
n: 129

*Two-tailed tests for trait anger and control variable. One-tailed tests for trait jealousy and history of serious violent crime.

**Moderating Effects of Conditioning Factors**

The last subsidiary research question examined the moderating effect of conditioning factors. The regression models presented in the previous section showed that while high trait jealousy increased the odds of IPH categorisation, high trait anger decreased the odds. This section examines whether the effect of strain on IPH was stronger for individuals high in trait jealousy and trait anger. As discussed by Mazerolle and Maahs (2000, p. 758), although moderation is often examined through the use of interaction terms in regression models, these types of analyses “can create obstacles to
finding statistically significant relationships even when substantive relationships exist”. Therefore, moderation was assessed using three-way contingency tables allowing for examinations of the association between strain and IPH across the two levels of each of the conditioning variables (e.g. high versus low trait anger).\textsuperscript{70} Homogeneity of the odds ratios across the levels of the conditioning variables were assessed through the Breslow-Day test (Breslow & Day, 1980). Significant results indicate moderating effects. The p<.20 criteria is used for these multivariate analyses.

The first set of analyses examined whether trait anger moderated the effect of strain on IPH. Initial visual examinations of the odds ratios in Table 30 suggest differences in the odds of an individual being categorised as an IPH perpetrator depending upon whether they reported high or low trait anger. However, the Breslow-Day test statistic shows that these differences were only statistically significant for one of the strain variables, namely experiencing partner infidelity in the 12 months leading up to the incident ($\chi^2(1, n=102)=2.05, p=.153$). Although both low and high trait anger were associated with increased odds of belonging to the IPH category when experiencing partner infidelity, low trait anger was associated with a significantly higher odds (OR=7.86 95% CI [1.89, 32.69]) compared to high trait anger (OR=1.69 95% CI [0.34, 8.31]). This means that men reporting low trait anger were more likely to belong to the IPH group when experiencing partner infidelity compared to men reporting high trait anger, suggesting that the anger experienced by IPH males in reaction to partner infidelity is unprecedented.

\textsuperscript{70} Alternative analyses were conducted by examining interaction terms (strain x conditioning factor) in logistic regression models. However, this resulted in high standard errors for a number of the variables and the decision was therefore made to use three-way contingency tables.
Table 30. Prevalence (%) of Strain Among Male IPH and Non-IPH Perpetrators Reporting Low and High Trait Anger

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strain</th>
<th>Trait anger</th>
<th>Non-IPH</th>
<th>IPH</th>
<th>$\chi^2$</th>
<th>$p^a$</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>Phi</th>
<th>OR$^c$</th>
<th>BD$^c$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Partner infidelity</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>9.09</td>
<td>44.00</td>
<td>9.47</td>
<td>.002</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>.404</td>
<td>7.86</td>
<td>.153</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>High</td>
<td>18.18</td>
<td>27.27</td>
<td>0.42</td>
<td>.517</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>.098</td>
<td>1.69</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Domestic violence protection order</td>
<td>Low$^b$</td>
<td>2.44</td>
<td>24.00</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>.010</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>.340</td>
<td>12.63</td>
<td>.721</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>High$^b$</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>12.50</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>.143</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>.216</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partner unemployment</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>52.94</td>
<td>21.74</td>
<td>5.55</td>
<td>.018</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>-.312</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td>.592</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>High</td>
<td>55.26</td>
<td>33.33</td>
<td>1.75</td>
<td>.185</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>-.187</td>
<td>0.41</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arrest</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>28.89</td>
<td>16.00</td>
<td>1.45</td>
<td>.228</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>-.144</td>
<td>0.47</td>
<td>.342</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>High</td>
<td>44.26</td>
<td>12.50</td>
<td>5.45</td>
<td>.020</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>-.266</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Probation or parole</td>
<td>Low$^b$</td>
<td>15.22</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>.087</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>-.241</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>High</td>
<td>19.67</td>
<td>12.50</td>
<td>0.44</td>
<td>.508</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>-.075</td>
<td>0.58</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. BD = Breslow-Day test.

$^a$Two-tailed tests

$^b$Fischer’s Exact Probability Test (> 25% cells had expected frequency below 5)

$^c$Not calculated when zero cases in one category

Table 30 further shows that there were no statistically significant differences in odds ratios depending upon the level of trait anger for any of the other strain variables, including being on a domestic violence protection order ($\chi^2(1, n=132)=0.13, p=.721$), having a partner who was unemployed ($\chi^2(1, n=107)=0.29, p=.592$) and being arrested ($\chi^2(1, n=147)=0.90, p=.342$) in the 12 months prior to the homicide incident. What this means is that the odds of an individual belonging to the IPH category as opposed to the non-IPH category remained similar irrespective of whether the individual reported high or low trait anger. In other words, no moderation effects were present for these variables.

As no IPH perpetrators who reported low trait anger also reported being on probation or parole in the 12 months prior to the incident, odds ratios were not calculated. However, a basic visual comparison of the prevalence rates suggest that being on probation or parole in the 12 months leading up to the homicide incident was
associated with a decreased likelihood of a perpetrator belonging to the IPH category irrespective of whether they reported high or low trait anger. Again, this suggests that no moderation effects were present.

The next conditioning variable examined was trait jealousy. Table 31 shows that, similar to the previous analyses, the only strain that was statistically significant in terms of differences between odds ratios was partner infidelity. Once again, partner infidelity was associated with an increased likelihood of an individual belonging to the IPH category. However, the direction of the association differed compared to the analyses examining trait anger. What the data show is that while individuals who reported low trait jealousy were twice as likely to kill an intimate partner when experiencing partner infidelity (OR 95% CI [0.63, 8.07]), those reporting high trait jealousy were over 18 times more likely to kill an intimate partner when experiencing partner infidelity (OR 95% CI [1.98, 167.34]). These differences were statistically significant as measured by the Breslow-Day test ($\chi^2(1, n=98)=2.83, p=.092$). What this suggests is that trait jealousy moderated the effect of partner infidelity on IPH perpetration.
Table 31. Prevalence (%) of Strain Among Male IPH and Non-IPH Perpetrators Reporting Low and High Trait Jealousy

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strain</th>
<th>Trait jealousy</th>
<th>Non-IPH</th>
<th>IPH</th>
<th>$\chi^2$</th>
<th>$p^a$</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>Phi</th>
<th>OR$^c$</th>
<th>BD$^c$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Partner infidelity</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>21.05</td>
<td>37.50</td>
<td>1.59</td>
<td>.208</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>.171</td>
<td>2.25</td>
<td>.092</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>High</td>
<td>3.70</td>
<td>41.18</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>.003</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>.473</td>
<td>18.20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Domestic violence protection order</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>1.96</td>
<td>16.67</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>.052</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>.276</td>
<td>10.00</td>
<td>.967</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>High</td>
<td>2.78</td>
<td>21.05</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>.043</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>.302</td>
<td>9.33</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partner unemployment</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>60.98</td>
<td>40.00</td>
<td>1.96</td>
<td>.162</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>-1.87</td>
<td>0.43</td>
<td>.428</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>High</td>
<td>51.72</td>
<td>17.65</td>
<td>5.23</td>
<td>.022</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>-3.37</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arrest</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>37.29</td>
<td>16.67</td>
<td>2.68</td>
<td>.102</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>-1.86</td>
<td>0.34</td>
<td>.752</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>High</td>
<td>43.24</td>
<td>15.79</td>
<td>4.22</td>
<td>.040</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>-2.75</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Probation or parole</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>16.95</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>3.51</td>
<td>.061</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>-.213</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>High</td>
<td>16.22</td>
<td>10.23</td>
<td>0.33</td>
<td>.565</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>-.077</td>
<td>0.61</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. BD = Breslow-Day test.

$^a$ Two-tailed tests

$^b$ Fischer’s Exact Probability Test (> 25% cells had expected frequency below 5)

$^c$ Not calculated when zero cases in one category

The remaining results in Table 31 show that, for other strain variables, trait jealousy did not moderate the relationship between experiences of strain and IPH perpetration. This was true for being on a domestic violence protection order ($\chi^2(1, n=124)=0.02, p=.967$), having a partner who was unemployed ($\chi^2(1, n=102)=0.63, p=.428$) and being arrested ($\chi^2(1, n=133)=0.10, p=.752$). This means that the odds of belonging to the IPH category were statistically similar irrespective of whether that person reported high or low trait jealousy.

Once again, as no IPH perpetrators who were low in trait jealousy reported being on probation or parole in the 12 months leading up to the incident, the odds ratio for this analysis was not calculated. However, visual inspection of the prevalence rates suggests a greater decrease in the likelihood of belonging to the IPH category for individuals who were low in trait jealousy, although this could not be examined statistically.
Chapter Summary

This chapter empirically assessed the part of GST that states that certain factors moderate the effect of strain on crime (Agnew, 1992). Before testing for moderation effects, the chapter first examined which conditioning factors differentiated between male IPH and non-IPH perpetrators, showing that IPH perpetrators were more likely to condone the use of partner violence and to report high trait jealousy and relationship entitlement. Of these variables, subsequent multivariate analyses showed that only high trait jealousy statistically increased the likelihood of belonging to the IPH category when controlling for other factors. The analyses further showed high trait anger to be associated with decreased odds of an individual being categorised as an IPH perpetrator. Due to the limited extant literature comparing IPH and non-IPH perpetrators in terms of attitudes and cognitions, it is difficult to establish whether these results are consistent with previous research findings. However, the literature specifically identifies jealousy as an important factor explaining IPH (Daly & Wilson, 1988; Polk, 1994), while research on non-lethal violence suggests that trait anger is relevant to both general and intimate partner violence (Moffitt et al., 2000).

The last section of this chapter specifically examined whether the conditioning factors differentiating between IPH and non-IPH perpetrators serve as moderators, as per GST propositions. The results showed that the effect of strain on IPH, as measured by the odds of an individual belonging to the IPH category when experiencing a particular strain, remained the same for most strain variables independent of whether an individual reported high or low trait anger. The exception was partner infidelity, where individuals reporting low trait anger were more likely to belong to the IPH category compared to individuals reporting high trait anger, suggesting that the anger experienced by IPH males in reaction to partner infidelity is unexpected and sudden.
Examining trait jealousy, the results showed that individuals reporting high trait jealousy had significantly higher odds of belonging to the IPH category when experiencing partner infidelity compared to individuals reporting low trait jealousy.
Chapter 9: Exploring the Experiences of Male Perpetrators of IPH: Qualitative Accounts

While previous empirical chapters examined whether GST serves as a valid explanation for male-perpetrated IPH using a quantitative approach, this chapter explores the applicability of the theory through a qualitative lens. The data used in this chapter are drawn from semi-structured interviews with ten men who have killed their intimate partners (see Chapter 5 for further information regarding the methodology). A qualitative approach was used to examine the lived experiences of men who kill their intimate partners and to better understand the nuances and complexities of the events leading up to homicide incidents. This approach further allowed for an examination of the social contexts in which these homicides occur and how the context affects individual perceptions of events. Understanding not only what happened, but also how events were interpreted by the men, is at the core of this study. Thus, analytically, the focus was on understanding the events and situations leading up to the homicide incident from the subjective experiences of the perpetrator. By using a qualitative approach to examine IPH, this study complements and enhances the results found in previous chapters.

The themes used during data collection and developed during the data analysis were theory-driven (Boyatzis, 1998) and centred around experiences of strain, negative emotions and coping strategies. These themes, and the categories within the themes, are explored in subsequent sections allowing for examinations of similarities and differences between individual experiences. As recommended by Richards (2005), each of the ten men was provided with pseudonyms to facilitate the examination of individual cases across each of the thematic categories.
Subjective Experiences of Strain

Whether or not a particular event is considered stressful to an individual depends upon that person’s subjective evaluations of the event (Agnew, 2001). At the outset of each semi-structured interview, respondents were asked to identify any issues they considered particularly problematic or stressful in the time period before the homicide incident occurred. All of the men who were interviewed reported experiencing at least one form of strain, although some of the men reported experiencing a wide variety of strain. Given the nature of their crimes (IPH), it is perhaps not surprising that the majority of the men reported experiencing problems with their relationships. Some also reported experiencing strain relating to issues outside of the relationship, such as legal, housing and financial difficulties, although these forms of strain were often triggered by relationship events.

Partner infidelity

A salient theme relating to relationship strain emerging from the narratives was partner infidelity, which is also one of the more prominent risk factors for male-perpetrated IPH identified in the literature (Campbell, Webster, Koziol-McLain, Block, Campbell, Curry, Gary, Glass, et al., 2003; Mouzos, 2000; Wilson & Daly, 1993a). Four men reported experiences of partner infidelity. For example, Kane was informed by someone else that his partner was having an affair. When confronting his partner with this information, instead of asking for forgiveness, Kane recounted his partner shrugging her shoulders and saying “it just happened”. When talking about her lack of explanation about why the infidelity occurred, Kane appeared upset. He described that what followed after the confrontation was a disruptive period of arguments, separations
and reunions. For Kane the most difficult part was that he had entrusted his partner to remain faithful, as shown in the following quote:

Someone I’d never thought’d do that to me, you know. Because, as I said to you before, I’d never played up on her. I thought she did the right thing by me.
(Kane)

Using a GST lens, Kane’s experience of losing his partner to another man, as well as the loss of trust he experienced, can be interpreted as removal of positively valued stimuli (Agnew, 1992). What his account also reveals is that there is a perceived discrepancy in the investments made in the relationship, referred to by Leary and Springer (2001) as relational devaluation. Kane argued that he never engaged in sexual endeavours with other women, and he expected his partner to provide a similar commitment to the relationship. Theoretically, experiences of inequity within a relationship, or relational devaluation, may have the effect of increasing the likelihood that an individual experiences anger or hurt in reaction to negative events (Agnew, 2001; Leary & Springer, 2001). Ultimately, Kane sought to reunite with his ex-partner, although when she refused to take him back he shot her.

While Kane found out from someone else about his partner’s infidelity and later confronted her about it, Isaac recounted how he one night caught his partner in bed with another man. Isaac described the ensuing argument:

Isaac: “Who’s that bloke?”
Partner: “None of your business”
Isaac: “Yes, it is, we live together”
Partner: “I don’t care”
Isaac: “If you don’t shut up I’ll shoot you”. It was the first time I had seen her get cranky and abusive. I don’t like nagging women. I just turned around and shot her.
Isaac’s reference to the fact that they were living together seems to suggest that, similar to Kane, he expected a commitment from his partner, which given her infidelity she was not providing him with. These experiences can be interpreted as being prevented from achieving a positively valued goal, namely a committed relationship, although the ensuing argument and Isaac’s reference to his partner’s “nagging” further suggests that he was also experiencing the presentation of negatively valued stimuli (Agnew, 1992).

While for both Kane and Isaac the act of infidelity came unexpectedly, other respondents reported suspecting infidelity. For example, Frank described how he had been suspicious of his partner’s behaviour for weeks before finding out about her infidelity:

I had reason to believe there was another bloke. [...] I had a suspicion about 2 to 3 weeks before the incident. At the back of my mind I felt something was not right. (Frank)

According to Frank, the suspicion that his partner was cheating on him were accurate, as he later found out. However, the IPH literature suggests that delusional accusations of infidelity are common (Dobash & Dobash, 2011; Polk, 1994). Interestingly, Frank was clear to point out that it was not the act of infidelity that was the most difficult for him to deal with, but rather the fact that his partner denied it when confronted:

She didn’t tell me the truth until Saturday night. Then it all bubbled out. She said “this has been going on for about six weeks”. She finally told the truth. Why did she lie to me? [...] The lying is what hurt the most. Why didn’t she come clean in the first place? (Frank)

What followed was an escalation in verbal and physical violence between Frank and his partner, ultimately leading to her death. For Chris it was another set of
circumstances. For a number of years, Chris and his partner were physically apart. Chris came from overseas to work in Australia while his partner was still residing in their home country. During this time Chris reported receiving accounts from his family that his partner was cheating on him with other men. When asked about his reactions to these accusations he said:

[I would] show her I really love her and not stop helping her. I said “just be positive, you’ll come to Australia soon”. (Chris)

The interesting part of Chris’s account is that although he discussed his partner’s infidelity in response to the question of whether there was anything in his life in the time period before the incident that he found difficult to deal with, he did not appear particularly distressed about his partner’s infidelity. Chris’s relationship problems were, however, of a different nature, which will become apparent later in this chapter.

**Relationship separation**

Another recurring theme in the narratives was that of strain pertaining to relationship separation. Five men discussed their experiences with relationship breakdown in the interviews, which is consistent with research suggesting that separation is one of the most important risk factors for IPH perpetration by males (Dobash & Dobash, 2011; Easteal, 1993; Johnson & Hotton, 2003; Wallace, 1986; Wilson & Daly, 1993b). For some of the men the separation came unexpectedly. For Adam, his partner’s separation from him a few months prior to the incident was sudden. Adam found it particularly difficult to understand the reason she was leaving him. Recalling the situation, Adam discussed his reactions to his partner’s decision to leave. Similar to Kane’s experiences with confronting his partner about her infidelity, Adam appeared upset at the lack of explanation provided by his partner:
I couldn’t understand what was happening. She was saying she didn’t love me anymore. She was crying. She was crying as she said it. […] I asked her if it was another man and she said no. We had been together for 14 years and she just shrugged it off. I couldn’t understand it. (Adam)

As in Adam’s case, most of the separations were recent, occurring only months before the incident happened. This recency in separation is consistent with research suggesting that the first few months of separation are the most dangerous to the female partner (Hotton, 2001; Wallace, 1986). However, for Ben the strain was not an actual separation, but rather the anticipation of one. Having come across what he believed to be evidence that his partner was planning to leave him, he described an amassing pressure as the time of the anticipated separation was drawing near:

There was a timeline. I had a week of pressure. The clock was ticking. I thought “If you wanna play this game, I’m in”, “I’ll raise the ante to whatever”. […] As the days got closer […] I didn’t know what to do. It built up inside of me. (Ben)

According to GST, experiencing separation is an example of removal of positively valued stimuli (Agnew, 1992), but in Ben’s case the separation had not yet occurred. Agnew (2002) notes that anticipated strains are more likely to lead to criminal involvement in instances where the strain is perceived to have a high likelihood of occurring and where it poses an immediate threat. Both of these circumstances were present in Ben’s case, particularly the immediacy characteristic of the strain, in that Ben perceived he only had one week to resolve the issue. Furthermore, the loss of a partner can also represent a loss of self (Parrott, 1991). This was particularly true for Ben, who described his own identity as subsumed by the relationship with his partner:

I was so enmeshed in the relationship. I didn’t understand the concept of own space. (Ben)
As described in the accounts above, the separations were most commonly initiated by the partner, as is generally the case in IPH incidents involving male perpetrators (Wilson & Daly, 1993b). However, inconsistent with prior research, Eric was the person proposing the separation to his partner:

Meantime [she] started to change. She wanted something different. [She] started smoking more, drinking more, going out more. We didn’t even sleep together anymore. […] One day I made my decision. […] I said “Look, it looks like you’ve made up your mind. You want to move. I don’t. How about we get a divorce? When the house is sold we will go our separate ways. I think it would be a good thing to do. It’s the end of the road.” (Eric)

Although Eric took the initiative to separate, he reached his decision after a time period of his partner being emotionally distant, which, to him, may have been experienced as emotional separation. During the interview it became apparent that Eric was heavily invested in the relationship. For example, Eric described how he had separated from a previous partner to enter into this new relationship. He had also accepted paternal responsibilities for his partner’s children, referring to his new family as “my world”. It appears that Eric considered his partner’s emotional distance in the time period before the actual separation as unjust and undeserved, a characteristic of strain expected to increase the pressure to engage in criminal coping (Agnew, 1992, 2001):

I don’t deserve this. I didn’t get any love anymore. […] I loved her so much and gave her so much but I didn’t get anything back. […] The better person you are the less you get back. But that’s life. (Eric)

According to Eric’s statement, the perceived injustice appears to stem from his experiences of a sense of discrepancy in the level of investment in the relationship, or relational devaluation (Leary & Springer, 2001), similar to that described by Kane when he found out about his partner’s infidelity.
For some of the men it was not only the act of separation that was difficult, but also the time period following the separation. For example, still being in contact with his ex-partner, Adam sometimes frequented social gatherings where she was present. On one of these occasions, Adam sensed that he was being ostracised and that people were talking about him behind his back:

It felt like a stand-off situation. […] They were eyeing me. As if [ex-partner] had said something. Bad atmosphere. Something was going on. I couldn’t stand it. (Adam)

In Adam’s case, this experience reflects not only rejection from the ex-partner but also experiences of social exclusion from the group of individuals who were present. As discussed by Polizzi (2011) strain is more likely to be experienced as adverse in instances where it is interpreted as such within the social context in which it occurs. For Adam, the rejection by his partner and the social group was made public, and it is this social experience that often leads to adverse emotional reactions (Katz, 1988).

**Housing**

Post-separation housing issues can cause even further stress to an already difficult situation (Anthony, 1997; Gram-Hanssen & Bech-Danielsen, 2008; McManus & DiPrete, 2001), something which was discussed by two of the men. While talking about his separation, Adam expressed a sense of attachment to the matrimonial home. Adam recounted his response to his partner telling him she was leaving and selling the house:

It was unbelievable. I thought “I can’t keep the house, I wouldn’t be able to pay back the mortgage”. […] We had done all this work to the house. (Adam)
Eric also discussed post-separation housing issues as a source of strain. Similar to Adam, Eric also appeared to have become attached to the matrimonial home. After the separation his partner moved out while Eric remained in the house. However, she later contacted him to inform him she was claiming ownership of the house and that he was being evicted. In response Eric proclaimed “but it’s my house too”, indicating a sense of injustice in reaction to her demands. Whether Adam and Eric reported experiencing strain relating to the matrimonial home because there was a sense of finality to the separation (relationship loss) or because they had a strong attachment to the house as an entity (material loss) is not clear. However, in both accounts the men made reference to the extensive renovations they had completed on the house, suggesting a strong invested commitment. Whatever the underlying reason for experiencing strain in relation to housing was, using a GST lens, it is clear that what the men were describing was removal of positively valued stimuli (Agnew, 1992).

For Eric, the problematic housing situation escalated relatively quickly. While at work one day he received a message from his ex-partner informing him that all his belongings had been placed in storage. Not wanting to believe the message Eric returned to the house to discuss the matter with his ex-partner. However, when he arrived he found that the house was locked. After half an hour of attempting to enter the premises, his ex-partner called out to him:

“Go away. This is not your home anymore. I don’t want to talk to you. Everything is in the letter. You’re trespassing.” (Eric)

Eric was physically removed from the property by police. He described how the police were suggesting he come back later when things had settled. By referring to the advice given to him by the police, it is evident that Eric experienced his attempts to enter the house as justified, even according to an authoritative source such as the police.
In essence, what he reported experiencing from his ex-partner was a voluntary violation of a relevant justice rule (Agnew, 2001), namely, his sense of entitlement to reside in the matrimonial home.

The issue of housing was also discussed by Harry, although his account differed markedly from those of Adam and Eric. Harry was one of two men in the sample who identified himself as having ATSI background. Harry was leading a criminal lifestyle and, as a result, was in constant contact with the authorities. However, he aspired to change his lifestyle and desist from crime. These aspirations appeared to be tightly connected to a sense of home. It appears that Harry was experiencing being prevented from achieving positively valued goals (Agnew, 1992). Specifically these goals referred to a house of his own and a criminal-free lifestyle. When asked whether there was anything in his life that was particularly difficult or stressful for him in the time period before the incident Harry made reference to his experience of being homeless. The following quote illustrates Harry’s issues:

Not having somewhere to be. No house to be in. To be in the environment that we were in. The people, alcohol, parties, people around me. This would always lead to getting kicked out. [...] If you don’t have money you’re screwed. All I ever wanted is my own house and a car. I’ve sworn to myself that if I ever had it I would not lose it. If I could get my own house I could have somewhere to call my own. Without my own house there was no point. (Harry)

**Legal strain**

Harry’s desistance from crime was transient. He particularly noted the difficulties with desisting from crime and, as he put it, “getting a fair start” while being in the criminal environment he was in. The most salient subjective strain identified by Harry was having his children removed from him by family services due to the criminogenic environment he was in. It is clear from Harry’s account that he was
experiencing a removal of positively valued stimuli (Agnew, 1992) substantiated by the repeated use of the word ‘loss’ throughout the interview to describe his experiences:

Lost so many things in my life. [...] At the end of the day it was just a loss of everything. I had [children]. They took them away. (*Harry*)

For Harry there was a sense of injustice in the decision by family services to remove his children. According to Agnew (2001), strains are perceived as particularly unjust when they are voluntarily inflicted, as they were in Harry’s case. He expressed that one of his children was taken into child protection just as he was getting his life back together and that the experience of losing his child created a vicious cycle for him. He further explained how he experienced that family services were manipulating his partner:

Family services tried to manipulate us quite bad. They told my girlfriend I was bad. She was easily talked into. (*Harry*)

Because of these experiences Harry distrusted the authorities, a common experience among male offenders (Howerton et al., 2007). This distrust affected Harry’s ability to cope with the strain caused by the removal of his children and his criminal lifestyle.

**Financial and occupational strain**

Similar to Harry, Adam also experienced legal strain in relation to his children. As previously detailed, after having been in a relationship with his partner for 14 years, she unexpectedly wanted a separation. In the months that followed Adam described receiving numerous requests for child support from the authorities. However, when discussing these incidents it was clear that, subjectively, the nature of Adam’s strain was more financial than legal:
Got letter from Centrelink. Three zeroes. They wanted more than my wages. How did they work that out? […] What do I do now? (Adam)

This presentation of negatively valued stimuli (Agnew, 1992) was difficult for Adam to deal with. He demanded from his ex-partner that she handle the situation by requesting that the authorities cease the child-support payment requests. Aware of his bad temper, Adam was reluctant to address the issue himself, saying that “had I gone in there they would have been in strife”. However, the issue of child-support payments was not resolved. On the day of the incident Adam received yet another payment request. Adam recounted the event:

I went out to get the mail. It was the letter. […] I opened them up. God not one of those again. […] That is more money than I earn. (Adam)

It appears it was this final payment request that triggered the homicide incident. Adam described how when he opened the letter “it all came at once”. What ensued was a battle with his conscience. The voices he described hearing were the last thing Adam remembered before the incident. His next memory was standing over his ex-partner’s dead body. Adam described the battle with his conscience as:

Two sides, it was my conscience. One was bad. The other angel. One said: “Turn around and go back”. The other said: “Keep going. You’re doing the right thing. Finish what you started.” (Adam)

Evidence of financial strain was also apparent in Chris’s account. Chris had arrived in Australia from overseas to work while his partner remained in their home country waiting for immigration clearance to join him in Australia. As previously discussed, the physical distance was difficult for Chris, particularly when his partner started dating other men. Apart from the experience of partner infidelity, in the interview Chris repeatedly expressed concerns regarding the financial arrangements between him and his partner. Although, according to familial obligations, Chris was
expected to send money back home, he expressed his partner’s repeated requests for money as particularly difficult. An example of this type of presentation of negatively valued stimuli (Agnew, 1992) is presented below:

She gave me an ultimatum of sending her money. No later than three days. She said “If more than three days, you may not find me in [home country]”. I said “Be patient. I will give you money”. It exceeded one day. She had already left. The time she gave me was too little. I didn’t have money in my account. […] It was a struggle. I wanted to find ways to get money. (Chris)

For John the strain was not financial per se but, rather, related to negative experiences at work. Having only recently started a new position, John was keen to perform well and was working long hours to do so. In his eyes, John was an asset to the company and his performance exceeded expectations. One day John provided advice to the owners relating to an aspect that he believed could make the company more profitable. However, in return, John was reprimanded rather than appreciated. John described how the owners of the company called him into the office and said “we run this place, not you”. It is clear that John experienced the reprimand as unjust and undeserved because, as he expressed, he was “trying to do the right thing by the company”. Occupational stress has previously been linked to intimate partner violence perpetration (Gibson et al., 2001), suggesting stress spill-over effect across life domains (see De Coster & Kort-Butler, 2006).

**Relationship (dis)satisfaction**

Although previous research has identified separation and infidelity as the key risk factors for female victims of IPH, researchers also note that not all cases adhere to this pattern (see Polk, 1994). Two of the men, John and Doug, described reluctantly remaining with their partners. Both these men described low relationship satisfaction,
which, research suggests, correlates positively with non-lethal partner violence perpetration, particularly among clinical samples (Stith, Green, Smith, & Ward, 2008). Apart from the problems that John was experiencing at work, he was also unhappy in his relationship. Having recently experienced a difficult separation from his ex-partner, John described his relationship with his new partner as one of “convenience”. Metaphorically, he compared his new relationship to a train, suggesting that it was almost forced upon him:

She wanted it all, babies and rings and marriage and everything. […] And, in my mind it was not what I wanted. In my mind it was not who I wanted to be with. I think I just fell into it, this is happening to quick, but I couldn’t stop it, I couldn’t stop the train sort of thing, it kept going. […] I wasn’t happy, I wasn’t. I was railroaded into this relationship. (John)

During the interview John discussed his previous partner on a number of occasions. Part of the reason why John was unhappy in the new relationship was because the feelings between John and his new partner were not of the same intensity compared to the feelings between John and his ex-partner. Talking about his need to feel loved, it appears as though John was prevented from achieving positively valued goals (Agnew, 1992), namely, a relationship that was filled with the same amount of love and lust that characterised his previous relationship:

I wanted to be loved, I think. Really, really loved […] even the sex part of the relationship wasn’t that good. […] I didn’t get excited about seeing her, or anything like that. Whereas, my previous wife I did. She was a bit of a woman, you know. (John)

Although John was not able to remember much about the homicide incident, despite being one of the few men who had not been drinking, he explained that ultimately he killed his partner because she would not leave him alone when he needed space.
Doug’s issues were considerably different. Doug was the second participant in the sample to identify himself as having ATSI background. He described his relationship with his partner as problematic and one that he would rather end. His partner was constantly accusing him of infidelity, which he strongly denied. Doug described his partner’s jealousy:

When I met her she was jealous […] Everything was good otherwise, except for this business of jealousy. (Doug)

His partner’s accusations of infidelity are indicative of presentations of negatively valued stimuli (Agnew, 1992). What is even more interesting is the event that triggered the homicide incident for Doug. Although his partner’s accusations of infidelity and the fighting that would ensue had been ongoing, there was something about the argument on the day of the incident that set it apart from other arguments.

When asked to explain what was different this time, Doug said:

In my culture when someone says something bad it is a curse. It will curse you until the person takes the curse off. It is a very bad thing. Everything could go wrong. I was afraid when she talked like that it would be a bad thing. It is a very powerful thing. […] You can cop it forever. […] I was worried what she said was a curse. (Doug)

Limited research has explored the cultural significance of curses such as that described by Doug, and the effect curses might have on behaviour. Research examining Aboriginal peoples’ health views reveals beliefs that cancer is caused by curses and black magic placed on an individual by someone who wishes them harm (McGrath, Holewa, Ogilvie, Rayner, & Patton, 2006). These findings suggest the importance of taking cultural belief systems into account. Although most individuals would perhaps not consider a curse to be a form of strain, Doug’s cultural and spiritual background acted as a form of conditioning factor to construct the curse into a subjectively adverse
experience. In this sense, the curse can be classified as the presentation of a negatively valued stimulus (Agnew, 1992). Doug described how the cursing incident resulted in him hitting his partner, who died in hospital later that day.

While John and Doug described low relationship satisfaction, Harry reported being relatively content with his relationship. Although Harry and his partner separated on a number of occasions in the time period leading up to the homicide incident, he did not experience these separations as particularly distressing. The couple’s relationship was nevertheless tumultuous, and the cycle of verbal fighting, separating and reuniting was ongoing. However, Harry emphasised that, despite having frequent arguments, he was satisfied with the relationship with his partner. Rather, it was Harry’s long history of criminal involvement and contact with the criminal justice system that caused his experiences of strain. One sign of Harry’s contentedness with the relationship was that he attributed his recent criminal desistance to his partner:

Without her I was alone. She was my life. She kept me out of jail. […] I felt like she was changing me. […] My spare time was her time. I have something now, something big. I hadn’t done a house [break and enter] in a year. I felt proud.  
(Harry)

The picture emerging from Harry’s account indicates that the relationship with his partner was fundamental in changing his entrenched pattern of criminal involvement. Using social control as a guiding theoretical principle, Laub and Sampson (2003) argue that marriage (or partnership, as in Harry’s case) may act as a turning point facilitating criminal desistance through increased direct social control and relationship investment. Social control also plays an important role in GST, although the emphasis in GST is more on how experiences of strain reduce the presence of social control factors, resulting in increased likelihood of criminal engagement (Agnew, 2006a). Thus, social control is expected to buffer the effect of strain on crime. However, despite
having an emotional bond with a conventional other, Harry still engaged in criminal activity.

Despite Harry’s satisfaction with the relationship, the situational aspects of the incident were surprisingly similar to Doug’s case. Harry described how the incident occurred at a party after his partner had accused him of flirting with other women. He explained how she attacked him out of jealousy and that her lethal injury was obtained as a result of his defence against her attacks. With the exception of the cursing incident, Harry’s experiences are strikingly similar to the account given by Doug. Although Harry was generally content with the relationship and even attributed his improved lifestyle to his partner, ultimately Harry killed his partner during a relationship argument.

**Violence in the relationships**

An interesting aspect of Harry’s account is that he perceived his partner to be violent. According to the IPH literature, partner violence is most commonly perpetrated against the female victim (Browne, 1986; Campbell, Webster, Koziol-McLain, Block, Campbell, Curry, Gary, McFarlane, et al., 2003; Easteal, 1993; Sharps et al., 2001; Taylor & Jasinski, 2011; Websdale, 1999). However, the men’s accounts tell a different story. Whether these accounts are constructed justifications or objectively ‘accurate’ versions of events is difficult to establish. However, more to the point, the aim of this qualitative study was not to examine versions of events objectively but, rather, the perpetrators’ subjective experiences. According to Harry, the homicidal act was in response to his partner’s violence. Violence within the relationship as presentation of a negatively valued stimulus (Agnew, 1992) was also reported by Doug:

> When I met her she was jealous. We’d argue and she’d throw things. Then everything went calm. But as soon as there was a woman present she would get
jealous. [...] I want a woman to be better, not argument and fighting. This is not life. I want it to be like mum and dad. They never fought in front of us. *(Doug)*

In describing the relationship, Doug used his parents as a reference point of what he thought a good relationship ought to be. Similar to John’s description of how his partner failed to meet his expectations of the relationship, Doug’s expectations, as learned through observing his parents’ relationship, were not being fulfilled, suggesting that he was being prevented from achieving positively valued goals *(Agnew, 1992)*.

Similar goals were expressed by Chris:

The motive was to seek a peaceful life. I just wanted a peaceful life. *(Chris)*

For a long time, Chris’s partner had remained in their home country while Chris was working in Australia. However, as soon as immigration clearance was finalised, his partner joined him in Australia. In the time that followed, the couple argued frequently. Chris described how, since arriving in the country, his partner appeared unhappy. Her unhappiness appeared to stem from her unwillingness to be in Australia and her dissatisfaction with her relationship with Chris. Chris also expressed concern about how his partner treated their child, arguing that she was emotionally and physically neglecting their child. However, what Chris found the most difficult to deal with was his partner’s verbal and physical aggressiveness. Chris described one violent incident:

She slapped me. One day God will give me power. She was yelling. Insult. [...] Maybe one day she may hurt me really badly. If I talk she may become aggressive. *(Chris)*

Chris described a similar violent incident that, ultimately, triggered the homicide. He recounted how she was coming towards him with a knife. After taking the knife off her, he proceeded to stab her. According to Chris, this incident was in self-defence. However, while talking about the incident, Chris also said:
I blame myself. Had I not stabbed back continuously she wouldn’t have died. How can I deny? I can’t deny. (Chris)

**Accumulation of strain**

What is apparent from the men’s narratives is that strain was rarely reported as experienced in isolation. Most of the men reported experiencing a clustering of several types of strain. For some, it was this accumulation of strain that was the most difficult to cope with. For example, in his account of how his children were removed from him by family services, Harry referred to not only the specific loss of his children but also a generalised “loss of everything” that had accumulated throughout his life. According to Harry this accumulation started in childhood:

After so much years of misfortune and loss, even small things […] When I was 6 years old I went into foster care. I wasn’t wanted. My mum didn’t want me. But I kept going back [to the family home]. That was a big thing. (Harry)

Accumulation of strain is referred to in the GST literature as the build-up of residual strain (Slocum et al., 2005), and Harry’s account is indicative of this. Ben described a similar experience. Although, for Ben, the anticipated separation was the catalyst for the homicide, the pressure he reported experiencing in the week leading up to the incident was familiar to him. From a young age, Ben’s father, whom Ben described as a “scary, intimidating, angry” man, had exceptionally high expectations for Ben to succeed. When talking about the incident, Ben specifically referred to this accumulation of pressure:

All the pressure of my whole life was maybe released in that one incident. (Ben)

Limited research has explored the release of pressure that Ben reported experiencing in relation to the homicide incident. In his research, Polk (1994) found that some male IPH perpetrators experienced a sense of relief post-incident, which is similar
to Ben’s description of pressure release. Similarly, Umberson, Williams and Anderson (2002) suggest that non-lethal violence acts as a form of emotional release. They argue that individuals who repress or avoid emotions experience a build-up of emotional tension that is released through the act of violence. In the interview, John talked about a number of stressful experiences in the time period before the incident happened, including being reprimanded at work and having relationship difficulties. John referred to Lego to explain the accumulation of strain, and talked about the release of the burden associated with this build-up:

> Look, there’s a hundred reasons, I mean, it was like a Lego thing, every little thing just kept getting piled up. [...] It was just like a waterfall, it all just happened at once. [...] And like I said, the Lego blocks it got big, big, big, and I’m carrying this burden around, and then I’ve just busted lose. (John)

The references to ‘pressure release’ and ‘busting lose’ suggest that the homicide might be a cathartic experience. Although catharsis theory has mostly been discarded due to a lack of evidence that release of pressure decreases emotional tension (see Bushman, 2002), the concept of emotional discharge is still present in the coping literature (Pearlin & Schooler, 1978; Thoits, 1988). To improve understanding of the role of negative emotions, the next section examines emotional reactions to subjective strain as discussed by the ten men.

**Negative Emotions Experienced in Reaction to Strain**

Taken together, the experiences of strain as reported by the men show that considering the context of the intimate partner relationship is crucial to understanding why these types of homicides occur. However, current understanding of the link between these types of experiences and emotional reactions among homicide offenders is scarce. Negative emotions play an integral role in GST explanations of criminal
involvement and this is because experiences of negative emotions create a need for corrective action, such as obtaining revenge or turning to crime as a means of alleviating these emotions (Agnew, 1992).

In the interviews, the men were asked about their emotional reactions to the subjective strains they had discussed. While some men appeared to have no major difficulties with identifying and conceptualising their emotional states, this emotional awareness was not present in all of the men. However, although some men found it easier than others to discuss emotions, all of the men were able to identify at least one emotion they had experienced. Thematic coding revealed five categories of emotions present in the men’s accounts: anger, resentment, jealousy (or lack thereof), hurt and sadness.

Each of the categories is discussed below, although it should be noted that while the categories are presented separately, the men rarely described experiencing emotions in isolation. Similar to the subjective strains, the men discussed experiencing a mixture of emotions. This is consistent with research showing that individuals rarely experience only one type of emotion (Guerrero & Andersen, 1998), and further demonstrates the complexity of the role of emotions on criminal behaviour and, specifically, on male IPH perpetration.

**Anger**

According to GST, anger plays an important role in explaining why individuals who experience strain resort to criminal coping strategies as opposed to legitimate means of coping (Agnew, 1992, 2006b). Importantly, anger was a common theme in the interviews. Six of the men reported experiencing some form of anger, with common expressions including feeling “angry”, “mad”, “enraged” and “pissed off”. Frank’s account illustrates a combination of emotions which, as previously mentioned, was a
common occurrence among the men. Frank had come home one night to find his partner in the arms of another man. As seen in the quote below, Frank expressed both anger and desperation in reaction to the infidelity. This particular combination of emotions is common in response to separation among individuals who display insecure attachment styles (Bowlby, 1998; Mikulincer, 1998), suggesting that Frank’s emotional reactions to the infidelity may have been conditioned by insecure attachment:

That lying little bugger. Look at what I did for you. [...] I lost control. I was angry. I was desperate. (Frank)

particularly salient in Frank’s account is his feeling of injustice by him saying “look at what I did for you”. Perceived injustice is one of the key reasons why anger is expected to be more likely to lead to criminal coping than other types of emotions (Agnew, 1992). Perceived injustice was also evident in Eric’s account. After being locked out of the matrimonial home by his ex-partner and escorted from the premises by police, Eric returned to discuss the matter further with his ex-partner. However, Eric described how as he arrived at the house his ex-partner came at him with a knife. After a short struggle Eric took possession of the knife and stabbed his ex-partner. The resulting homicide was an act of vindication, a means for Eric to retaliate against the actions of his ex-partner. As discussed by Agnew (1992, 2006b), one of the key reasons anger is conducive to outer-directed criminal behaviour is because it creates a need for revenge. This is evident in Eric’s description of the homicide incident:

I was angry. I nearly killed myself too. [...] It was for vindication. For every stab I said “this is for everything I’ve done for you” and other things. (Eric)

For Isaac, who had confronted his partner about her infidelity, the feeling of anger was closely associated with a sense of disrespect:

Never had a girl done that to me before. I have to have respect for myself. Don’t want people saying she’s going with others. I know someone whose missus went
behind his back. People would say “poor guy, if only he knew”. […] I was pissed off. Pretty pissed off. I don’t like women disrespecting me. (Isaac)

Making reference to another man’s experiences with infidelity, Isaac appears to be concerned about being humiliated. The experience and meaning of humiliation for Isaac is constructed within a social context, as evidenced by his concern for other people’s perceptions of the situation. Examining the emotional components of homicide, Katz (1988) refers to humiliation as an experience of losing control over one’s own identity and fearing public degradation. Katz notes that humiliation often precedes experiences of rage and that raging violence is a means for individuals to defend their sense of self-worth. Katz refers to these types of homicides as righteous slaughter, indicating that the perpetrator is upholding a sense of their own interpretation of ‘good’. Violent acts like these may also be fuelled by feelings of shame, where the violence is a means of amending violations to one’s self-esteem (Gilligan, 2000, 2003).

For Ben, who had come across what he believed to be evidence that his partner was going to leave him, the intensity of his emotions increased every day. In some ways, he was himself responsible for this increase. His account reveals an almost obsessive-compulsive behaviour, whereby he would play games in his mind with his partner, despite being aware of how these games were exacerbating his negative emotions:

Ben: I played games with her [in my mind]. This made me feel even angrier and more numb.

Interviewer: What kind of games?

Ben: I would ask her things […] Things that I knew but she didn’t know I knew. […] I was getting angrier and angrier. […] This was going on every day. I was feeding off that.
Interestingly, Ben referred to both anger and emotional numbness, experiences that, by definition, are mutually exclusive. Emotional numbness can be a means of coping with stress through denial (Roth & Cohen, 1986), while from Ben’s account it appears as though he was acutely aware of the anticipated separation. It is possible that his numbness instead refers to a lack of affection for his partner, and this is consistent with his statement that he “stopped seeing her as a person”. During this time period Ben was completely preoccupied with fantasies of confronting his partner, possibly as a means of regaining power and control over the situation. In a sense, it appears as though imagining angry situations, in which he would confront his partner and she would deny any wrong-doing, was exacerbating his already existing anger. As discussed by Lazarus and Folkman (1984), some individuals engage in strategies that increase their emotional distress rather than decrease it, either to mobilise themselves for action or, simply, because acute distress brings with it a form of release. The intensity of Ben’s emotions was completely novel to him. In the end, Ben did confront his partner about his suspicions that she was about to leave him. When she rejected his accusations Ben reacted by fatally stabbing her. According to Ben, the homicide was an act of losing control:

Something just snapped. Like fingers. I have never experienced not being in control. (Ben)

Frank and Isaac also referred to losing control with respect to their anger. Traditionally, loss of control were often used as ‘heat of passion’ defences, although recent legal critique has, at least partially, resulted in reduced acceptability of loss of self-control as a defence in homicide court cases (see Fitz-Gibbon & Pickering, 2012). It is clear that the experience of intense anger, as seen in the accounts above, severely
affected the men’s problem-solving abilities and reduced the likelihood that they would consider the long-term consequences of their behaviour (Agnew, 1992, 2006b).

**Resentment**

Some of the men expressed resentment rather than anger. Limited research has examined the quality of resentment and how it relates to other emotions. Resentment has been classified as a subcategory of anger (Shaver et al., 1987) and hostility (Storm & Storm, 1987), and has also been associated with experiences of envy (Parrott, 1991). For John, his resentment was directed toward his partner. John felt as though the relationship had been forced on him by his partner:

This is happening too quick, but I couldn’t stop it, I couldn’t stop the train, sort of thing, it kept going. So I guess there was resentment there, right from the word go. I’m not happy. But I kept staying. (*John*)

John’s account signals both external and internal blame. Although John felt as though he was being “railroaded” into the relationship by his partner, he still accepted a certain responsibility for staying:

If I wasn’t happy, I should have not developed it [the relationship] so much. (*John*)

Another respondent who expressed feeling resentment was Harry. However, for Harry the resentment was not directed toward his partner but, rather, toward the authorities for removing his children:

I felt resentment toward them. Deep down I knew that some of it was right but I don’t understand why it was against me. (*Harry*)

Harry’s account reveals signs of perceived injustice. Although, to a certain extent, Harry internalised the blame by stating that he thought some of the legal actions against him were valid. However, at the same time, he also experienced being unjustly
punished. As seen in previous sections, Harry had a general distrust of family services, who in his experience manipulated his partner to turn against him.

**The role of jealousy**

Although jealousy has consistently been identified as a key emotion underpinning IPH perpetration by males (Daly & Wilson, 1988; Dobash et al., 2007), most of the men who were interviewed emphasised that, from their perspective, jealousy did not trigger the homicidal act. For example, while discussing his partner’s infidelity, Frank reasoned:

> I was never a jealous person. I wish I could tell you I was because then I would understand better why I did it. *(Frank)*

Similarly, Eric described that he did not have a jealous disposition, although when discussing an incident in which he suspected his partner of infidelity, Eric did express a desire to question his partner about her actions, a behaviour that would appear indicative of jealousy:

> Because I trusted her I never asked her. Because I’m not a jealous person, never have been. I wanted to say “what did you do” but I didn’t because then you lose the trust. *(Eric)*

According to Ben, his reactions were less about jealousy and more about fearing failure. Fear of failure often stems from parenting practices and high expectations (Teevan & McGhee, 1972), consistent with Ben’s account of his upbringing. An integral part of fear of failure is shame (Atkinson, 1957; McGregor & Elliot, 2005) and Ben’s reference to pride seems to suggest that shame played an important role:

> Jealousy is a small thing of it. I was worried about my pride. I had a fear of failure. Here I am moving forward in my life. Now I have to move back with my parents. I didn’t want to deal with it. […] Having to move home again made me feel like a failure. She was making me fail. I was blaming her. *(Ben)*
Ben’s account further illustrates an externalisation of blame, similar to some of the other men’s narratives. Individuals who blame their adversity on others are more likely to experience anger compared to individuals who internalise their blame (Agnew, 1992). Externalisation of blame is associated with shame-proneness, which in turn is related to anger (Tangney, Wagner, Fletcher, & Gramzow, 1992). These were all emotions displayed by Ben.

The only respondent who explicitly acknowledged feeling jealousy was Harry. As discussed in the section describing subjective strain, Harry’s experiences differed fundamentally from the other men’s experiences. The source of strain for him was not his relationship. Rather, Harry’s experiences of strain were of a financial and legal nature. Harry was leading a criminal lifestyle, and according to him, his jealousy was directed toward the victims of his break and enters:

I felt jealous of what other people have. But I wouldn’t get angry with them or that. When doing break and enter I’d cry myself to sleep. These people have a house and have worked hard. And I’d smoke it up. And I used to feel like… if I cry about it then I must have a heart somewhere. So I did know right from wrong. (Harry)

Harry’s jealousy appears indicative of envy. Jealousy and envy share certain common features, yet, are conceptually quite distinct. The source of envy is social comparison, which may serve to elucidate one’s own relative deprivation (Parrott, 1991). The absence of anger in Harry’s account, coupled with his remorse for the break and enters, suggest that he was experiencing ‘non-malicious envy’ (Parrott, 1991), which is characterised by a longing for what other individuals possess rather than a focus on removing the desired object from the individual who has access to it.
Hurt

Another common theme in the narratives was feeling “hurt”, which was reported by half of the men. Although hurt is often experienced in conjunction with other emotions, it has certain distinguishable features (Leary & Springer, 2001). According to Leary and Springer (2001), feelings of hurt stem from experiences of relational devaluation, where an individual perceives that he or she places a greater importance on the relationship compared to the other person. Frank’s case is particularly illustrative of this. As discussed previously, Frank sensed that there was an imbalance in the investment made by him and his partner in the relationship, evidenced by his statement “look at what I did for you”. According to Frank, what hurt the most was not his partner’s infidelity, but, rather, that she remained untruthful when confronted. Implicit in his account was also a loss of trust:

What hurt the most was that she lied to me the other times when I confronted her. Why didn’t she just tell me? (Frank)

Feeling betrayal is a form of hurt (Leary & Springer, 2001). As discussed by Elisha, Idisis, Timor and Addad (2010), for a number of male IPH perpetrators the homicidal act is not about sexual jealousy, but rather about betrayal and loss of the family frame. This was particularly salient in Eric’s account. While talking about the separation from his partner, Eric described the following experiences of loss:

You lose all this love, you feel betrayed. I came to the conclusion that she didn’t love me as much as I loved her. I felt bad. I loved her so much and gave her so much but I didn’t get anything back. (Eric)

Again, there is evidence of perceived injustice in Eric’s statement, similar to many of the men’s accounts of subjective strain and experiences of anger. Websdale (1999) argues that for some men the act of separation is experienced as a form of emotional treachery. By leaving, the female partner is not only removing their love and
affection, but also the perpetrator’s dreams and hopes for the future. Eric felt betrayed by his partner and ultimately these experiences, coupled with anger, led him to stab his partner several times out of revenge for the separation and for her claiming ownership of the matrimonial home.

Chris also referred to feeling hurt in response to his partner’s infidelity. While Chris was working in Australia, he received information from his family that his partner was seeing other men in their home country. In reaction to this information, Chris said:

When I heard sometimes it would hurt. But I understand. I can’t do anything. It hurts. It is normal to human beings to hurt. (Chris)

Minimising or ignoring the importance of strain is a common coping mechanism of cognitively reducing the subjective experiences of strain (Agnew, 1992). However, rather than minimising the impact of the actual strain (infidelity), Chris was minimising the impact of his emotional reactions to the strain. He did this by normalising his feelings of hurt by situating it within a context of normative human experiences.

For Adam, whose partner unexpectedly wanted a separation, the feelings of hurt were experienced in combination with other emotions. As Adam’s story unfolded he talked about how post-separation issues such as financial requests for child support made him “even madder”, referring to an experience of escalation. However, it is interesting to note that his initial reaction to the separation was not anger but, rather, feelings of hurt, disbelief and confusion:

She said she was packing out and that she was selling the house. I felt terrible. It was unbelievable. […] I was hurting pretty bad. I felt more confusion than I thought. (Adam)

For Frank, Chris and Adam, feelings of hurt were related to relationship strain such as separation and infidelity. However, for two other men the sources of emotional hurt were outside of the realm of their relationships. For example, John reported feeling
hurt when he was reprimanded at work. His experience of hurt was tightly connected to feelings of injustice. As previously discussed, John was reprimanded for providing advice to his employers regarding aspects of the company that he believed could be made more profitable. The reprimand was experienced by John as undeserved, since he was attempting to improve company revenue. For Harry, the experience of hurt was in response to the legal strain he experienced in relation to his children being removed from him by family services:

I was so used to it. I just went with the program. But deep down it hurt. (Harry)

Harry also expressed feeling hurt in relation to his childhood experiences. He described a “loss of everything”, something which had accumulated from childhood when he experienced maternal rejection. Although Harry’s account suggests that he was not externalising blame, there appears to be deep-seated feelings of perceived injustice:

It hurts. Not good at all. After a while you stop thinking about it. You get used to life on the street. You don’t blame anyone. Although you do question how come my sister gets a better life and I don’t. (Harry)

Sadness

Some of the men reported experiencing sadness, most commonly in reaction to relationship separation. For example, Eric reported feeling upset and sad in response to his partner’s emotional distance before he took the initiative to separate. Eric described how his partner’s behaviour had changed and how they no longer had an emotional and sexual relationship. It was clear from Eric’s account that his partner was emotionally distancing herself from him. As he said:

Eric: We fell apart.
Interviewer: How did this make you feel?
Eric: I was so upset. I was sad. You do so much, but you get no reward.
Again, similar to many of the other men’s accounts, Eric’s emotional reaction is characterised by perceived injustice. Theoretically, inequity is assumed to play an important role in explaining the link between strain, anger and outer-directed crime (Agnew, 2001, 2006b). However, as seen in this and previous sections, it seems as though perceived unjust or undeserved experiences are related not only to anger but also to feelings of hurt, jealousy and sadness.

Although Adam did not specifically mention the word ‘sad’, his behaviour was indicative of sadness. As previously discussed, when Adam attended a social event organised by his ex-partner he reported what he experienced to be a “stand-off situation” whereby he felt ostracised by the group of individuals who were present. Thus, the experience of rejection was exacerbated in this social context. In the interview Adam described how he became distressed and decided to remove himself from the situation, because, as he put it:

I didn’t want [my child] to see me in a mess and crying. (Adam)

Leary (1990) argues that experiences of social exclusion are likely to result in negative affective reactions such as anxiety and loneliness. Adam reported how he began crying once he had left the social event. Although he did not specifically label his behaviour with an emotion term, Adam’s tears indicate that he was experiencing sadness. This is consistent with using a prototype approach, which examines and takes into account not only the labelled feeling but also antecedents, physiological reactions and behaviour, including crying (Shaver et al., 1987).

While Adam only briefly discussed his emotional state, Ben provided a detailed account of his emotional reactions to what he perceived to be a pending separation from his partner:
I contracted. I was very emotional. It broke me. My whole world just crashed [...] My world went dark. I felt invested in the relationship. [...] I was instantly broken. My world was upside down. I felt numbness. (Ben)

The oxymoronic nature of Ben’s emotional description is intriguing. As with his experiences of anger, Ben made reference to feelings of numbness, suggesting emotional denial. Numbness may also be a symptom of feeling shame (Gilligan, 2003), which is consistent with Ben’s account of his fear of failure associated with having to move back to his parents place. However, at the same time Ben reported feeling emotional. Ben’s references to how his world crashed and went dark appear suggestive of experiences of hopelessness, despair and depression (Abramson, Metalsky, & Alloy, 1989; Bürgy, 2008; Oliffe & Phillips, 2008), experiences of which have been linked to suicidal ideation (Chioqueta & Stiles, 2005) and eventual suicide (Beck, 1986). These, and other means of coping with strain and negative emotions, are discussed further in the following section.

Coping Mechanisms

Based on the qualitative narratives, the men interviewed in this study experienced a range of strains, which were sometimes, but not always, accumulated over time and experienced across several strain domains. As seen in the previous section, these strains resulted in experiences of negative emotions, including anger, hurt and sadness. GST suggests that criminal involvement is a behavioural means of coping with experiences of strain and negative emotions (Agnew, 1992). Legitimate coping mechanisms can be either cognitive or behavioural and may target either the specific source of the strain or serve as a means of alleviating negative emotional reactions (Agnew, 1992; Thoits, 1988). As individual coping strategies were not explored in the quantitative study, this was incorporated as a theme in the semi-structured interviews.
One specific aim was to understand how these men typically coped with experiences of strain and emotions, and what coping mechanisms were available to them in the time period preceding the homicide. These factors are relevant, given that coping strategies (what the men did) depend upon the perceived availability of coping resources (what the men perceived to be available to them) (Pearlin & Schooler, 1978). The latter is often included as condition factors in GST (Agnew, 1992).

Five categories of coping strategies and coping resources were identified in the interviews: use of alcohol or drugs, suicidal ideation, physical removal of oneself, formal help-seeking and informal help-seeking. These coping strategies and resources are discussed further below.

**Use of alcohol or drugs**

When asked how they would normally react to or deal with the subjective strain and negative emotional reactions they described, three of the respondents discussed their experiences with using alcohol or drugs as a means of blocking out personal issues. Using mind-altering substances is an escapist means of coping with negative emotions arising from strain (Agnew, 1992; Thoits, 1988). Harry, whose entrenched criminal lifestyle led government authorities to issue him with a child protection order, and whose financial situation was strenuous at best, described his experiences with using alcohol and drugs as a means of escaping:

> If I was high or drunk it was sweet. I’d be high or drunk every day. Drugs and drink was the place to be. It was to get away. All my worries were gone. *(Harry)*

Kane also discussed the use of alcohol as a means of coping. When probed about the function of alcohol, Kane indicated that it helped to alleviate his negative emotions. After having confronted his partner about her infidelity, Kane and his partner went through a disruptive period of arguments, separations and reunions. During this time,
Kane expressed concern that perhaps his partner was dating other men. When asked about how he felt about that, Kane explained:

I didn’t know too much about it because I was on the grog. (*Kane*)

For Isaac, who came home to find his partner in the arms of another man, alcohol also served a purpose. Isaac explained that he felt “pissed off” at his partner when he found out about the infidelity. When asked how he would normally react to emotions such as the one he described, Isaac said:

I’d get on the piss. But pubs were closed at that time of night. […] I should have got blind and crashed out. (*Isaac*)

For Isaac, although his statement incorporates the ‘wisdom’ of hindsight, it also indicates that his regular avenue of coping was not readily available to him at the time of the incident. Whether this would have made a difference to the outcome is questionable, and, to some extent, Isaac’s statement may reflect an externalised attribution of blame. However, his interpretation of the role of alcohol in coping with negative emotions is central to the understanding of perceived available resources.

**Suicidal ideation**

Another form of escapist coping is suicide. Two of the men discussed experiencing suicidal ideation in the time period before the incident. For Harry, who had experienced an accumulation of strain from childhood, culminating in the loss of his children, his criminal lifestyle and the perceived legal strain were simply too difficult to deal with:

Don’t know how many times I thought of ending it. I put petrol on me, put myself on fire, cut wrists, was taken to mental hospital. […] You look down upon yourself. I felt hopeless. You name it, I felt it. (*Harry*)
While Harry had attempted suicide prior to the homicide incident, Ben thought constantly of suicide, although he did not act on these thoughts:

All problems would end there instantly [through suicide]. I thought “fuck this”, “all this for nothing”, “what’s the point”. (Ben)

Ben’s reference to suicide as a means of eliminating problems is clearly in line with a GST approach, where behaviour is viewed as ways of coping with strain and negative emotions. GST research has found support for the relationship between experiences of strain and risk of suicide (Stack & Wasserman, 2007) and the mediating role of negative emotions such as anger and depression on this relationship (Walls et al., 2007).

**Physical removal**

While the use of mind-altering substances and suicide can be understood as means of escaping from adverse emotional experiences, two of the men talked about physically removing themselves from the strain. Withdrawal or leaving is considered a behavioural situation-focused coping strategy (Agnew, 1992; Thoits, 1988). For John, the accumulation of strain from both the work and the home environment, referred to him as “Lego blocks”, created a massive burden. When discussing his reactions to these types of strain John initially said that he “did not have any outlets”. However, shortly thereafter he discussed how his motorbike served as a means of coping with his experiences:

*John:* And sometimes, like I’d just bust lose sometimes, just get on me bike and go for a ride, you know. I didn’t realise that at the time that that was doing me good.

*Interviewer:* That was an outlet for you?

*John:* That was an outlet for me.
John explained that, because of the long hours he was working and the obligations he had at home, he only had a “small window of opportunity […] to be alone”, suggesting that he perceived his normal coping strategy as unavailable to him when he needed it the most. As previously discussed, John felt “railroaded” into the relationship he had with his partner. When talking about how he would normally cope with relationships in which he felt unhappy, John described:

I’ve had girlfriends and partners and I’ve grown tired of them […] I’d go find someone else. (John)

The use of relationship separation as a means of creating distance from a bad relationship was also discussed by Doug. Similar to John, Doug experienced low relationship satisfaction. For Doug, his partner’s jealousy was particularly difficult to deal with. He explained how he normally would end relationships in which he was experiencing low relationship satisfaction. However, in his relationship with the partner he killed, Doug described not being able to distance himself physically from his partner due to the remoteness of the location where he lived:

When woman make wrong thing I disappear. I always do that. But [at the location] there is nowhere to disappear to. (Doug)

**Access to informal social support**

Perceived social support buffers the effect of strain on negative emotional outcomes such as depression and anxiety (Cohen & Wills, 1985). Having access to social support is technically a coping resource as opposed to a coping strategy (Pearlin & Schooler, 1978; Thoits, 1995). However, some of the men discussed accessing informal support networks as a coping strategy to gain assistance with their problems. For example, when talking about how his partner had separated from him and his
subsequent financial difficulties due to child support payments, Adam recalled a conversation with his employer regarding methods of coping with his experiences:

Just in case, I ended up changing position in my job. I used to mainly be out on my own. But I was not handling this real well. I’d rather be with someone. Boss heard what was going on. He offered me time off. […] No, that would be worse. I would just be […] by myself. […] If I was with someone then I could say “enough work for today” and he could drive me home. The friend I ended up working with had also gone through some traumas in his life and he would understand what I was going through. (Adam)

While Adam described having access to social support, Ben did not perceive support to be available. Ben, who believed that his partner was about to separate from him and who experienced suicidal ideation in reaction to this threat, expressed how his strong attachment to the relationship that he was in resulted in him distancing himself from his friends, thereby limiting his access to social support:

I had pushed my friends away so my friends were no longer there to support me. (Ben)

Ben further explained that while his friends were no longer available to provide support, he felt unable to discuss his problems and concerns even when social support was available. Unlike the other men who were interviewed, Ben was the only person who expressed experiencing homicidal ideation prior to the homicide, and the severity of these ideations constrained his ability to seek help:

How do you talk to someone? Who do you talk to? Murder has such a stigma attached to it. You think you can get locked up by talking about these things. (Ben)

Similarly to Ben, Frank believed that he did not have access to social support. Frank suspected that his partner was cheating on him and was experiencing feelings of anger and desperation in reaction to his partner’s denials. He mentioned that, although
he was available to provide support to friends with similar experiences, and had done so on previous occasions, he felt embarrassed discussing his own problems with his friends:

If I had just talked to someone about things. I never talk to people about my problems, I always keep them inside. I am there for other people when they want to talk but I can never talk about my issues. […] I didn’t think that there was anyone to talk to. I felt embarrassed as well, too embarrassed to talk to anyone about my problems. (Frank)

**Access to formal social support**

Another recurrent theme related to formal avenues for help-seeking. Two of the men reported having sought counselling prior to the homicide incident. Being aware of the availability of counselling services from accessing these within a previous relationship, John still did not seek help although, in his view, “counselling would have fixed it”. Adam, on the other hand, was acutely aware of the how poorly he was handling the separation from his partner and, therefore, decided to see a counsellor, alongside his more informal approaches discussed above. Adam appeared to put his trust in the counsellor’s reassurance that he would be able to cope with the separation:

The counsellor asked me how I cope. He asked me if I was putting up a wall, if I was blocking some things out. I said I don’t think so. I said I deal with each thing separately. There were so many things going on. The counsellor said he thought I was handling things the right way. I thought I was going to be alright. (Adam)

Going through legal and financial difficulties, Harry appeared to experience an exclusion from regular society. While seemingly taking responsibility for his criminal lifestyle, he still found it difficult to understand why he was in constant contact with the criminal justice system and, more importantly, why his children had been removed from
him. Although Harry wanted to resolve his legal problems, he expressed a lack of confidence in contacting the authorities to ask for assistance:

I’m shy, well not shy really, but, I couldn’t approach and talk to the government and stuff. I felt resentment toward them. Deep down I knew that some of it was right but I don’t understand why it was against me. […] The way of having a life is too difficult, real estate, getting an ID, you don’t think highly of yourself. You don’t think you’re gonna get a fair start. A bit of it is low self-esteem, but you’re shattered. (Harry)

Research shows that many offenders do not seek help due to a general distrust of ‘the system’ (Howerton et al., 2007). Furthermore, experiences of perceived unfair treatment by the criminal justice system may exacerbate a person’s low self-esteem, resulting in experiences of shame and anger (Karstedt, 2002). For Harry, the resentment he felt toward the authorities, combined with his low self-esteem, prevented him from making attempts to resolve his problems.

Chapter Summary

Qualitative interviews with ten men who had killed an intimate partner revealed that many of these men experienced relationship break-downs and infidelity, sometimes coupled with post-separation financial, housing and legal strain. Others described their relationships as problematic with frequently occurring arguments and fights. An unexpected finding was the reference to intimate partner violence victimisation made by some of the men. Perhaps these were violent relationships in general, with high levels of mutual violence. Some men reported an accumulation of strain, which ultimately created an extreme pressure. The strains experienced by these men were consistently perceived as unjust and undeserved. The frequency with which injustice and relational devaluation emerged in the men’s accounts across categories of subjective strain
suggests that this is a crucial component of explanations of IPH perpetrated by these men.

Through the narratives it further became clear that there was a complexity to the experiences of negative emotions expressed by the men, a complexity that is perhaps difficult for quantitative data to capture. Although some men found it difficult to discuss emotions, suggesting a lack of emotional awareness, all of the men identified at least one emotional state. Many of the emotions were experienced in combination, suggesting that emotions may work together to affect cognition and behaviour. In particular, the men reported experiences of anger, hurt and sadness. Although the literature suggests that male-perpetrated IPH cases are often associated with jealousy (Campbell, 1992; Dobash & Dobash, 2011; Nicolaidis et al., 2003; Polk, 1994; Wallace, 1986; Websdale, 1999), unexpectedly, jealousy did not frequent in the men’s accounts. This suggests that, at least as interpreted by the men, other emotions played more prominent roles.

In terms of coping resources and strategies, five general themes were developed. Some of the men referred to escapist strategies to attempt to block out the negative emotions experienced or to remove themselves physically from the source of the strain. Others discussed support, both formal and informal. Some of the men expressed reluctance to access support, due to embarrassment or a lack of confidence. Others described how they had removed themselves from the availability of support or had accessed support, without finding it helpful.

Taken together, these narratives challenge the concept of a ‘typical’ male IPH perpetrator (see Polk, 1994). The stories of these ten men were, in many ways, unique. Although general themes were salient, such as relationship separation, perceived injustice, and experiences of anger, these characteristics were certainly not present in all of the men’s narratives.
Chapter 10: Discussion of Key Findings and Implications for Theory, Policy and Practice

This research has applied GST to male-perpetrated IPH and examined the empirical validity of this theoretical model. In doing so it has answered the call from homicide researchers to examine which, if any, individual, relationship and situational factors are unique to IPH perpetration patterns compared to other types of homicide (Felson & Messner, 1998; Miethe & Regoeczi, 2004). Despite a growing body of knowledge, there is still debate as to whether men who perpetrate lethal and non-lethal partner violence display similar characteristics as men who are violent more generally (Felson & Lane, 2010; Taylor & Jasinski, 2011). Not only does the current research fill this empirical gap in knowledge, it does so by adding to the methodological and theoretical landscape of homicide research.

Conducting homicide research can be methodologically challenging given the logistical difficulties with accessing criminal justice institutions (Roberts & Indermaur, 2007). This has resulted in the use of alternative data sources, such as secondary data utilising police case files, court transcripts and prison records (see for example Dearden & Jones, 2008; Johnson & Hotton, 2003), but also primary data sources such as interviews with victims of attempted homicide or proxy victims, including friends or family members of the victim (Bailey et al., 1997; McFarlane et al., 2001). Research projects utilising direct interviews with homicide perpetrators remain scarce and are often, though not always, restricted to small sample sizes (although see Lewis et al., 2003).

Data for this research were collected through structured interviews with 157 men serving custodial or community sentences for murder or manslaughter across three states in Australia (Queensland, New South Wales and Western Australia). Of these
men, 41 had killed a current or former intimate partner (classified as IPH) while 116 had killed someone other than an intimate partner, including friends, family members or strangers (classified as non-IPH). One of the strengths of this research is that it includes a comparison group, providing a unique source with which to examine differences between male IPH and non-IPH perpetrators. In addition, qualitative semi-structured interviews were conducted with a sub-sample of ten male IPH perpetrators, to examine the lived experiences, subjective interpretation of events, emotions experienced and coping strategies used by these men. The scope of these data has allowed for significant contributions to be made to the homicide literature.

Although much of what is empirically known about male IPH perpetration can be interpreted through GST, such an application has not previously been completed. Research shows that events such as separation and infidelity act as risk factors for male IPH perpetration and that IPH incidents are characterised by emotive features (Campbell, 1992; Dobash & Dobash, 2011; Johnson & Hotton, 2003; Thomas et al., 2011; Wallace, 1986; Wilson & Daly, 1993a). According to GST, experiences of strain and subsequent negative emotional reactions increase the likelihood of criminal coping, particularly for individuals who hold certain personality traits or have limited access to legitimate coping resources (Agnew, 1992; Agnew et al., 2002). By accounting for the importance of a wide range of variables, including situational events, emotional reactions and individual differences in beliefs, cognitions and temperament, GST provides an important integration of proximal and distal variables to explain male-perpetrated IPH. GST has previously been applied to non-lethal intimate partner violence (Anderson & Lo, 2011; Arter, 2008; Katz, 2000) and the theory has further been recognised for its possible applicability to homicide (Delisi, 2011). This research has provided the next logical step by generating a GST explanation of male-perpetrated
IPH that is not only theoretically innovative but which could also be tested using the data at hand.

The purpose of this chapter is to summarise and discuss the main findings of this research and to examine the implications that this research has for theory, policy and practice. This chapter also highlights some of the strengths and challenges associated with the current research and provides suggestions for future research.

Main Findings

Collectively the research findings suggest that there is theoretical and empirical validity in using GST to explain male-perpetrated IPH. The findings also suggest that IPH should be considered a unique category of homicide. Important differences were found between IPH and non-IPH perpetrators for factors relating to individual, relationship and situational contexts. The data from the quantitative interviews and the qualitative narratives draw attention to four overarching themes centred around strain, negative emotions, conditioning factors and coping strategies and resources. These themes are presented below.

The salience of strain

Overall, while some of the expected findings as suggested from the GST application of male IPH perpetration were observed in the data, some were not. Collectively the findings from the quantitative and qualitative data suggest the importance of examining experiences of relationship strain among male IPH perpetrators. The most salient relationship strain was partner infidelity, which distinguished between IPH and non-IPH perpetrators in both bivariate and multivariate models. More than one-third of the IPH perpetrators in the quantitative study reported experiencing partner infidelity at some point during the 12 months prior to the homicide
incident. Adding further depth to these data, the men who participated in the qualitative interviews also discussed partner infidelity as a subjective strain when asked to identify and elaborate on the difficulties they were experiencing in the time period before the incident. This is consistent with the literature, which identifies partner infidelity as a correlate of IPH victimisation in women (Campbell, Webster, Koziol-McLain, Block, Campbell, Curry, Gary, Glass, et al., 2003; Wilson & Daly, 1993a). What was particularly powerful in some of the narratives was the men’s experiences of perceived relational devaluation (see Leary & Springer, 2001). To these men, the infidelity exposed their partner’s lack of commitment to the relationship, suggesting not only a sense of loss but also of being prevented from achieving a relationship built on trust and commitment.

One of the more surprising findings from the quantitative study was that experiences of relationship separation did not differentiate between IPH and non-IPH perpetrators. This is inconsistent with the literature, where separation is regarded as one of the key risk factors of IPH (Johnson & Hotton, 2003; Thomas et al., 2011; Wallace, 1986; Wilson & Daly, 1993b). However, it is important to remember that the non-significant findings are a function of the use of non-IPH perpetrators as the comparison group. What the data show is that relationship separation was experienced by a large proportion of the perpetrators across both homicide categories, which is consistent with previous research (Dobash et al., 2004). More than half of the IPH perpetrators and more than one-third of the non-IPH perpetrators had experienced a relationship breakdown in the 12 months prior to the incident. This was the highest prevalence rate of all relationship strains. Thus, while relationship separation may not distinguish between IPH and non-IPH perpetrators, it may still be an important factor that needs to be taken into account when examining IPH. This conclusion is further supported by the
qualitative narratives, where many of the men reported actual or anticipated removal of positively valued stimuli in the form of relationship separation. Similar to the men’s experiences with partner infidelity, their accounts of the separations were often characterised by experiences of relational devaluation and perceived injustice. This highlights the importance of measuring not only whether individuals experience objective strain, but also which characteristics of strain play a role in shaping individuals’ subjective experiences.

Another unexpected finding was that some of the men in the qualitative study reported experiences of low relationship satisfaction and sometimes even violent victimisation at the hands of their partners. As most of the homicide research has identified IPH as an escalation of controlling and violent behaviour perpetrated against, rather than by, the female partner (e.g. Sharps et al., 2001), these variables were neither included in the GST application of IPH nor examined empirically in the quantitative study. However, in the narratives these experiences were discussed by a number of the men. From what can be distinguished from their accounts, the violence in their relationships appears indicative of what Johnson (1995; 2006, 2008) would refer to as situational couple violence, where both parties are violent but their violence is not characteristic of the power and control factors associated with intimate terrorism.\(^{71}\) Johnson (2008) notes that these violent acts, though not rooted in attempts to control the partner, can be severe enough to result in homicide. Of course, one of the challenges in the current research is that the victims are not available to provide their perspectives regarding the events leading up to the homicide.

\(^{71}\) Johnson first labelled the categories *common couple violence* and *patriarchal terrorism* but has since abandoned this terminology for *situational couple violence*, *violent resistance*, *intimate terrorism* and *mutual violent control*, the three latter of which are variations of the initial term patriarchal terrorism.
What the results further show is that male IPH perpetrators generally experienced childhood, financial and legal strain to a much lesser extent than non-IPH perpetrators. IPH perpetrators were less likely to be exposed to physical abuse and emotional neglect in childhood, be unemployed, have a partner who was unemployed, lose a job, be arrested and be on probation or parole in the 12 months preceding the homicide incident. Although some of these differences were not statistically significant in the multivariate models, generally what these results suggest is that the IPH perpetrators were more ‘conventional’ than non-IPH perpetrators, which is in line with previous research (Dobash et al., 2004). However, research also suggests that the conventional label put on IPH perpetrators may not be completely accurate, as a sizeable proportion of IPH perpetrators are less likely to be regularly employed and have had persistent contact with the criminal justice system (Dobash et al., 2009). These characteristics were prominently displayed by one of the men in the qualitative interviews, whose criminal lifestyle and contact with the criminal justice system and family services acted as sources of strain, and where the homicide resulted from an escalated argument characteristic of situational couple violence.

A salient characteristic of strain that appeared in both the quantitative and the qualitative data was that of clustering and accumulation. Examining the total number of strains experienced within each strain domain, the bivariate and multivariate analyses suggested that IPH perpetrators experienced a significantly higher total number of relationship strains and a lower total number of financial and legal strains. However, although the IPH perpetrators were less likely to experience specific and cumulative financial and legal strain, what the qualitative interviews showed was that not only did the IPH men experience a combination of strains within the relationship domain, but also across other domains. When examined as total number of strains across all domains
(i.e. childhood, relationship, financial and legal) in the quantitative analyses, the multivariate model did not show any statistically significant differences between IPH and non-IPH. Again, the lack of significant results may be a function of the use of non-IPH perpetrators as the comparison group. While in the narratives, accumulation of strain across domains appeared as a salient theme, the IPH men were no different from the non-IPH men in the number of total strains experienced as reported in the quantitative interviews. What this suggests is that both types of homicide perpetrators experience strain across domains.

**Pinpointing negative emotions: Although no mediating effects**

GST predicts that negative emotions play an important role in explaining the ways in which an individual reacts to experiences of strain (Agnew, 1992, 2006b). In particular, certain negative emotions are hypothesised to be more conducive to criminal coping strategies than others, particularly anger. Despite this focus on emotions within the theory, limited research has examined situational emotional reactions to strain. As Agnew (2006b, p. 36) puts it “the neglect of emotional states is perhaps the largest gap in the research on GST”. What the current research shows is that the male IPH perpetrators were more likely to report experiencing anger or rage immediately prior to the incident compared to the non-IPH perpetrators, and this was found across both the bivariate and the multivariate analyses. The importance of anger was also apparent in the qualitative narratives. Although limited research has examined emotional experiences within homicide settings, particularly comparing across victim-offender categories, these findings are consistent with what was expected based on the limited literature available (Dobash et al., 2007; Polk, 1994; Thomas et al., 2011; Weizmann-Henelius et al., 2012). Furthermore, what was particularly salient in the IPH men’s narratives was the sense of injustice, disrespect and humiliation that accompanied their
feelings of anger. Research shows that these attributes of the source of the strain are commonly associated with experiences of anger (Averill, 1982; Katz, 1988; Shaver et al., 1987).

Interestingly, in the quantitative analyses experiences of partner infidelity were associated with decreased odds of an individual experiencing anger or rage. One possible reason for this might be the temporal gap in when the infidelity was experienced (measured as anytime in the 12 months prior to the incident) and when the emotion was experienced (measured as immediately prior to the incident). It may also be that these men experienced other emotions than anger and rage in reaction to their partners’ infidelity. Although in the narratives, some of the men reported feelings of anger in reaction to their partner’s infidelity, another salient emotion was feeling hurt. In addition, the men reported experiencing a range of other emotions in reaction to strain, such as resentment and sadness. Sadness was examined in both the quantitative and the qualitative data, where it was found to be particularly prevalent among IPH perpetrators, while hurt and resentment were identified by some of the men in the qualitative interviews. These emotions have rarely been examined within the IPH literature, but warrant further attention.

In terms of situational negative emotions, two unexpected findings emerged from the data. Firstly, although the literature suggests that male-perpetrated IPH cases are often associated with jealousy (Campbell, 1992; Dobash & Dobash, 2011; Nicolaidis et al., 2003; Polk, 1994; Wallace, 1986; Websdale, 1999), this was not reported by the men in either the quantitative data or the narratives. This could be due to a lack of emotional awareness (Barrett, Lane, Sechrest, & Schwartz, 2000; Danielsson & Johansson, 2005) and thereby limited comprehension of what constitutes jealousy, or perhaps an unwillingness on the part of the perpetrators to label themselves as jealous.
individuals. Certainly what was present in the men’s accounts were experiences of infidelity and betrayal, experiences which are commonly associated with feelings of jealousy (Parrott, 1991). Alternatively, these men simply did not experience situational jealousy, and research suggests that not all male IPH perpetrators do (Elisha et al., 2010). Secondly, although anger, rage and sadness were emotions more often reported by IPH than non-IPH perpetrators, in the quantitative analyses these did not mediate the effect between strain and IPH, as would have been expected by the theory (Agnew, 1992, 2006b) and prior GST research (Capowich et al., 2001; Moon et al., 2009; Rebellon et al., 2009).

What really conditions? The importance of trait anger and trait jealousy

The bivariate analyses from the quantitative interviews show that male IPH perpetrators were less likely to report high trait anger and high impulsivity. Limited homicide research has explored differences between IPH and non-IPH perpetrators in relation to these personality traits. However, the non-lethal violence literature suggests that while men who engage in intimate partner violence hold similar levels of trait anger (Moffitt et al., 2000), their impulsivity levels are lower (Boyle et al., 2008; Holtzworth-Munroe et al., 2000; Moffitt et al., 2000) compared to men who are violent more generally. The current research further shows that the IPH perpetrators were less likely to have a history of perpetrating serious violent crime compared to non-IPH males, which is consistent with the literature (Kivivuori & Lehti, 2012). Furthermore, the IPH men were more likely to condone the use of intimate partner violence, hold high trait jealousy and high levels of relationship entitlement, which is also consistent with previous homicide research (Adams, 2007; Campbell, 1992; Dobash & Dobash, 2011; Easteal, 1993; Nicolaidis et al., 2003; Wallace, 1986), although limited research has
compared across victim-offender categories. In the multivariate analyses only two conditioning factors remained significant. These results show that male IPH perpetrators exhibited lower levels of trait anger and higher levels of trait jealousy compared to male non-IPH perpetrators.

Of the strains found to predict IPH, moderating effects were found for experiences of partner infidelity. Both of the conditioning variables found to predict IPH in the multivariate models showed moderating effects. The first of these was trait anger. The results show that men reporting low trait anger were more likely to belong to the IPH group when experiencing partner infidelity compared to men reporting high trait anger. This is an interesting finding. Research shows that male IPH perpetrators often display anger or rage at the time of the killing (Polk, 1994), to a greater extent than non-IPH perpetrators (Thomas et al., 2011), and this pattern was also found within the current research. What trait anger measures is the extent to which an individual possesses a disposition towards anger. As research shows that individuals high in trait anger are more likely to experience situational anger (Mazerolle et al., 2003), it is interesting that the individuals who reported low trait anger were more likely to belong to the IPH category, the category experiencing the most situational anger. This suggests that the anger associated with IPH perpetration is unexpected and sudden, particularly when experienced in reaction to partner infidelity.

The second conditioning factor found to have a moderating effect was trait jealousy. The results show that individuals reporting high trait jealousy were significantly more likely to belong to the IPH category compared to individuals reporting low trait jealousy when experiencing partner infidelity. Although previous IPH research has not specifically tested moderation effects, it has consistently found that the combination of jealousy and estrangement is particularly relevant in terms of
explaining male-perpetrated IPH (Campbell, Webster, Koziol-McLain, Block, Campbell, Curry, Gary, Glass, et al., 2003; Daly & Wilson, 1988; Dobash & Dobash, 2011; Polk, 1994). What is interesting is that although a high proportion of men reported high levels of trait jealousy, very few of the men reported experiencing situational jealousy in relation to the incident. This may relate to how the different dimensions of jealousy are measured, and should be explored further in future research.

Unexpectedly, no differences were found comparing IPH and non-IPH perpetrators in relation to potential conditioning factors such as having peers who condone the use of violence, holding fearful (or insecure) attachment styles and having a history of intimate partner violence perpetration. These are attitudes, patterns and behaviours that, according to the literature, one would expect to see in men who perpetrate lethal and non-lethal intimate partner violence (Campbell, Webster, Koziol-McLain, Block, Campbell, Curry, Gary, McFarlane, et al., 2003; Dutton & Browning, 1988; Smith, 1991), but that was not found in the data. This is particularly surprising as it pertains to a history of intimate partner violence perpetration. However, as previously discussed, the non-significant results are a function of the group with which the IPH perpetrators are compared. The results show that over half of the perpetrators across both homicide categories had a history of perpetrating physical or sexual intimate partner violence. What this suggests is that the majority of homicide perpetrators in general have a history of perpetrating intimate partner violence, but that the IPH men were no more likely to display a history of intimate partner violence compared to non-IPH men. This finding is inconsistent with research suggesting that a history of intimate partner violence perpetration is more common among men who kill their intimate partners (Dobash et al., 2004). As argued by Dobash and Dobash (2012), there is an implicit assumption in much of the IPH research that lethal violence is preceded by non-
lethal violence, despite some research suggesting otherwise. The findings in this research are supportive of the arguments made by Dobash and Dobash, in suggesting that although a large proportion of male perpetrators of IPH do have a history of non-lethal intimate partner violence perpetration, approximately half do not report previously using violence against their intimate partners.

**Coping strategies and access to social support**

Coping strategies and access to resources were not explored in the quantitative interviews and this was therefore included in the semi-structured interviews. What emerged from the narratives was that the men engaged in a number of coping strategies, including using alcohol or drugs to block out the experiences of strain or negative emotions, engaging in suicidal ideation and physically removing themselves from the strain. In terms of alcohol and drugs as a coping mechanism, research suggests that a high proportion of male IPH perpetrators have problems with substance use, although not to the same extent as non-IPH perpetrators (Dobash et al., 2004; Kivivuori & Lehti, 2012). As discussed by Brownhill, Wilhelm, Barclay and Schmied (2005), manifestations of avoidant or numbing behaviour might be indicative of emotional distress and, if left untreated, can lead to violent behaviour. What the current data suggest is that escaping and avoiding negative issues, as well as problems with substance use, may be indicators of experiences of stress and negative emotions, and this association should be explored further in future research.

Another salient theme in the IPH accounts was that of formal and informal social support systems. Although in the quantitative interviews perceived low social support did not differentiate between IPH and non-IPH perpetrators, what emerged from the qualitative interviews was a perceived lack of access to, or unwillingness to engage with, formal and informal support systems. Barriers to men’s help-seeking behaviour
include masculine gender role socialisation, perceived non-normativeness of the problem, and a concern for how others will react to the problem and the help-seeking behaviour (Addis & Mahalik, 2003). More research is needed to understand the reasons why males who perpetrate IPH report reduced access to social support systems.

**Theoretical Implications**

Overall the research findings provide partial support for a GST explanation of male-perpetrated IPH. According to GST, criminal behaviour is a means of coping with strain and subsequent negative emotions (Agnew, 1992), and this research suggests that GST provides conceptual and empirical validity accounting for male-perpetrated IPH. Although not all of the expected strains, emotions and conditioning factors were predictive of IPH, many of them did distinguish between IPH and non-IPH perpetrators in the bivariate analyses. This provides support for the ability of the theory to distinguish between different categories of homicide perpetrators. Support was also provided for the moderating effect of certain conditioning variables. This provides a theoretical platform with which to understand why some individuals react differently to experiences of strain than others. In this sample, the individuals who reported high trait jealousy were more likely to belong to the IPH category compared to individuals who reported low trait jealousy when faced with partner infidelity. In the context of GST, this shows the importance of examining theoretically and empirically relevant conditioning variables to understand which variables moderate the relationship between strain and criminal behaviour and which variables do not.

In his 1992 article, Agnew highlighted the importance of examining the effects of cumulative strain, and early GST research therefore generally used composite strain measures (e.g. Agnew & White, 1992; Paternoster & Mazerolle, 1994). On Agnew’s
(2001) suggestion, later research began examining individual strains, in order to ascertain whether specific strains are relevant in explaining criminal behaviour. What the findings in the current research suggest is that while it is important to understand which individual strains are relevant, there is also a need to improve understanding of whether certain combinations of strain are particularly criminogenic and how strains work together to affect criminal behaviour. Although only slightly touched upon in the quantitative analyses in Chapter 6, the findings of this research show that IPH (and non-IPH) often experienced a clustering of strain within and across strain domains. Similarly, analyses of the qualitative interviews suggest that individual strains were rarely experienced in isolation. This highlights the importance of understanding how accumulation of strain affects criminal behaviour. Although recent research has begun exploring the role of strain accumulation (Botchkovar & Broidy, 2010; Slocum et al., 2005), more research is clearly needed.

The current research has taken significant steps to understanding the role of situational negative emotions on male-perpetrated IPH. Importantly, both the quantitative and the qualitative interviews used open-ended questions to measure emotions. The use of open-ended questions proved valuable, in that the respondents were allowed to identify their emotive experiences. Although anger was certainly the most commonly experienced situational emotion, the findings also suggest that other emotions may be important, such as sadness and feeling hurt. This highlights the importance of using open-ended questions to measure emotions in GST research (see Scherer, 2005).

What the research findings did not provide support for was the mediating effect of negative emotions. Theoretically, experiences of strain may cause adverse emotional reactions, and criminal behaviour is a means of coping with these negative emotions.
Analyses based on the quantitative interviews did not show a mediation effect. This is inconsistent with prior GST research, which has provided results largely in support of the mediating effect of situational anger (Capowich et al., 2001; Mazerolle et al., 2003; Moon et al., 2009; Rebellon et al., 2009). However, examining the ways in which strain and emotions were operationalised in this research may provide an answer to this unexpected finding. While the men who participated in the quantitative interviews were asked whether they had experienced a number of adverse events, they were not asked to identify the emotions associated with each specific strain. Rather, the variable negative emotions measured the emotions experienced immediately prior to the incident. This temporal gap between when the strain was experienced (sometime in the 12 months preceding the incident) and when the emotion was experienced (immediately prior to the incident) might help explain the lack of mediation. Therefore, it is important for research using GST as a theoretical framework to consider whether emotions are measured as specific reactions to strain. The theory suggests causality, and measures of emotions in future research should be operationalised to reflect this.

Implications for Policy and Practice

GST provides two general implications for policy and practice. This section will briefly discuss some of the issues arising from these recommendations, as well as the implications of the findings for lethal violence risk assessment tools. The first recommendation arising from GST is to reduce exposure to strain conducive to crime (Agnew, 1995, 2006b). The strains experienced by the IPH perpetrators who participated in this research are relatively ‘normal’, in the sense that a reasonably large proportion of individuals in the population will experience strains such as infidelity or divorce at some point during their lives (Australian Bureau of Statistics, 2007; Blow &
Although the quantitative interviews were not able to tap into the characteristics of strain, the qualitative interviews suggested that experiences of injustice and relational devaluation were salient among the male IPH perpetrators. It therefore appears that, rather than the objective experience of strain, it is the ways in which these strains are interpreted and the characteristics assigned to the strains that are of importance. Thus, rather than explicitly reducing exposure to strain, efforts should target the ways in which events are interpreted. This may be done by altering individuals’ perceptions and goals to make them less likely to view strain as unjust (Agnew, 2006b).

The second policy and practice recommendation that stems from GST is to reduce the likelihood that individuals will cope with strain and negative emotions through criminal behaviour (Agnew, 1995, 2006b). One means of doing this is to increase the level of available coping resources. The findings from this research suggest that access to formal and informal support services is important. In Australia there are a number of organisations that provide free and confidential counselling services, some directly targeted at males (e.g. MensLine, Dads in Distress, Australian Men’s Shed Association). However, whether men who are experiencing infidelity or separation are aware of these organisations, perceive them to be approachable and are encouraged to seek support is a different question. Research shows that perceived availability of support is more important than actual levels of support (Cohen & Wills, 1985; Wethington & Kessler, 1986). As previously mentioned, barriers to help-seeking for males include masculine gender role socialisation, perceived non-normativeness of the problem, and being concerned about the reactions of other people (Addis & Mahalik, 2003). It is therefore important that the larger sociocultural environment support men’s help-seeking behaviour. As discussed by Ridge (2011), the development of recent
policies such as Australia’s National Male Health Policy (see Australian Government Department of Health and Ageing, 2010) are particularly important, in that they emphasise the significance of understanding men and their specific health needs.

These issues are equally as important in terms of understanding men’s emotional distress and encouraging help-seeking behaviour. Commonly used violence prevention programs are those that target anger management (Howells et al., 2002). However, these programs are primarily targeted towards individuals who already display angry tendencies or who have committed violent crimes. Although the majority of male IPH perpetrators in this research reported experiencing situational anger in relation to the incident, they were much less likely to report high trait anger compared to the non-IPH males. Thus, many of these men may not be targeted for inclusion in anger management programs. Furthermore, the findings show that, in addition to situational anger, feelings of hurt and sadness were also common emotional experiences, and that a large proportion of the male IPH perpetrators displayed jealous dispositions. Thus, it is important to recognise that other emotions than anger or rage might play important roles. What research shows is that males possess lower levels of emotional awareness (Barrett et al., 2000) and are less emotionally articulate (Danielsson & Johansson, 2005) compared to females. Thus, it is important to recognise that males may express their emotional distress through means other than labelling and discussing them with others (Brownhill et al., 2005; Danielsson & Johansson, 2005; Umberson et al., 2002).

Further to the recommendations mentioned above, the research findings also provide valuable information for risk assessment instruments. A number of tools are currently available to assess the risk of IPH perpetration, including the Danger Assessment (Campbell, Webster, & Glass, 2009) and the Ontario Domestic Assault Risk Assessment (Eke et al., 2011; Hilton et al., 2004). The findings in this research
confirm the importance of examining trait jealousy, relationship separation and a history of non-lethal intimate partner violence, which are factors commonly included in existing risk assessment tools. Further to these factors, the findings suggest the importance of including measures of other factors, such as actual or suspected partner infidelity.

Of course, risk assessment tools are not always reliable. IPH is a rare event, and not all individuals who experience strain or who score highly on the risk assessment tools will go on to kill their intimate partners. These cases are referred to as false positives, and general crime prevention research suggests that good intentions may not always be accompanied by good results (McCord, 2003). In the case of intimate partner violence, legal interventions may put women in even more danger (Dugan et al., 2003; Gauthier & Bankston, 2004). The issue of false positives is further wrought with moral and practical implications. As discussed by one of the men who participated in the qualitative interviews:

Is the answer, OK, let’s grab all the blokes that are in the world if they’re big enough to put their hand up and say [...] right I’ve got a marriage problem. Grab them all. Throw them in jail for a couple of years, put them through intense re-programming training, and bring them out and say, right, now go back to your wife. That’s not the answer. (John)

Also of concern are the false negatives, i.e. those individuals who score low on the risk assessment tools but who still commit IPH. As was evident in the research findings, although many of the men reported commonly known risk factors, these factors were not present in all of them. As highlighted by Dobash et al. (2004), there is a need to empirically examine the diversity within the IPH category to more fully understand the characteristics of IPH perpetrators who do not adhere to the more commonly used risk assessment criteria. Research has begun exploring the diversity and
complexity within the IPH category (Adams, 2007; Dobash et al., 2009; Elisha et al., 2010), although more research is clearly needed.

**Research Strengths and Challenges**

The current study represents one of the largest studies in Australia and internationally that makes use of perpetrator accounts to examine the individual, relationship and situational contexts of homicide incidents. The quantitative and qualitative interviews conducted with homicide perpetrators provided unique sources of data, which were used to examine differences between IPH and non-IPH perpetration based on theoretical propositions by GST. The scope of these data has allowed for significant empirical and theoretical contributions to the study of male IPH perpetration. As with any research, there are challenges and considerations to be taken into account when interpreting the reported findings from this research, such as sample representativeness, selection bias, social desirability and memory recall.

One issue to be considered is whether the sample interviewed in this research is representative of the population of homicide perpetrators. A number of custodial facilities across the three states were not included in the research, either because of their rural location or because of the limited number of homicide perpetrators located at the facilities. Similarly, interviews at probation and parole offices were only conducted in two of the states. Furthermore, it is probable that correctional staff excluded certain perpetrators from receiving invitations to participate in the research due to the risk they might pose to the interviewers. For example, as per advice from Corrective Services New South Wales, 20 homicide perpetrators located at the so-called ‘Supermax’ unit at Goulburn prison in New South Wales were excluded from participating in the research. Even among those who were approached to participate there would be a certain
selection bias. As the literature shows, prisoners participate in research for a number of different reasons (Bosworth, Campbell, Demby, Ferranti, & Santos, 2005; Liebling, 1999; Roberts & Indermaur, 2007). In this research the main reasons stated for participating was for their stories to be heard and to help others. Whether this means that less altruistic individuals chose not to participate in the research is difficult to ascertain. Comparing the current sample to figures from the ABS National Prisoner Census 2011 and NHMP data from 2006/07 suggests that while the sample appears representative of the Australian homicide perpetrator population on key characteristics such as age and the proportion of IPH incidents, there is an underrepresentation of perpetrators reporting ATSI background. 

While one of the strengths of this research is that it constitutes one of the largest studies in the world that uses interviews with homicide perpetrators, ironically one of its challenges is the relatively low sample size compared to self-report studies utilising university or community samples. Small sample sizes are tainted by decreased statistical power (Tabachnick & Fidell, 2007), most likely rendering some of the analyses conducted in this research non-significant where the use of a larger sample size would have detected differences. To overcome the issue of decreased statistical power this research followed the recommendations by Hosmer and Lemeshow (2000) in employing less conservative alpha levels. However, less conservative alpha levels result in increased risks of making Type I errors, i.e. rejecting the null hypothesis although no differences exist in the population (Tabachnick & Fidell, 2007). For transparency, exact p-values and effect sizes were reported throughout. The only proper means of increasing the probability of statistical analyses to detect differences in the population is by way of

---

72 See Chapter 5 for a full discussion of sample representativeness.
increasing the sample size, which, given the population at hand, is a logistically challenging task.

Few studies have examined differences between IPH and non-IPH perpetrators. One of the strengths of the current research is that it specifically allows for examinations of the differences between IPH and non-IPH perpetrators, addressing the question of whether IPH should be considered a unique category of homicide (see Felson & Lane, 2010; Miethe & Regoeczi, 2004; Taylor & Jasinski, 2011). However, while the choice of non-IPH perpetrators as comparison group was deliberate, it is possible that comparing IPH to non-lethal intimate partner violence perpetrators, or even non-violent males, would reveal greater differences. This would require a different set of research questions to be posed, and is for future research to explore. Furthermore, the diversity of the non-IPH group must be taken into account when interpreting the findings from this research. For the non-IPH males, victims included family members, friends and strangers. This research has found that there are a number of factors that are unique to male IPH perpetration patterns. Given this finding, the non-IPH group would likely also benefit from disaggregation based on victim-offender relationships (see Miethe & Regoeczi, 2004). Although this was not the focus of the current research, future empirical examinations should explore the issue of diversity within the non-IPH group further.

As previously mentioned, the current research is one of the largest studies in the world that uses offender-based data. The use of perpetrators as a source of information provides important aspects into why these incidents occur. This is particularly important when using GST as a theoretical framework. According to GST, criminal involvement is a consequence of the perpetrator’s subjective experiences of events, meaning that the focus is on perpetrator experiences. At the same time, to a certain extent offender-based
data provide only partial accounts of incidents. Although homicide research for obvious reasons precludes analyses of victim experiences of the event, research shows the value of including information provided by proxy victims, such as family members, or victims of attempted homicide (e.g. McFarlane et al., 2001). A triangulation of data sources would result in increased levels of reliability and validity. However, although there is unquestionable merit in understanding whether the presence of strain as reported by perpetrators can be verified by external accounts, which would provide valuable information regarding the ways in which individuals interpret events, the GST focus is on perpetrator experiences.

Another challenge for this research is that, as with any research utilising self-report measures, interviews with perpetrators may be subject to social desirability. This is particularly important for research examining sensitive or socially unacceptable issues. Meta-analytical research by Sugarman and Hotaling (1997) suggests a weak to moderate correlation between social desirability and the perpetration of non-lethal intimate partner violence. This poses a significant challenge to the current research, as social desirability has the potential to affect perpetrator accounts of individual and situational factors associated with events.73 In a related vein, respondents may have been concerned about the confidentiality of their responses, particularly if they held high levels of paranoia and secrecy. To reduce these concerns, respondents were

---

73 Measures of social desirability were employed in this research. Analyses showed that respondents in this research reported slightly higher social desirability scores on the Marlow-Crowne social desirability scale compared to undergraduate students (information regarding undergraduate students were taken from Reynolds, 1982). However, analysis of interviewer assessments in terms of the perceived truthfulness of respondent accounts showed that interviewers considered 87.90% of respondents to be providing honest and reliable answers to the questions, while 4.46% of respondents did not. In 7.64% of cases the interviewers were uncertain as to whether respondents were providing honest and reliable answers.
informed of the confidentiality of their answers prior to the commencement of the interviews. In addition, only closed cases were included in the research.

Another important challenge in the current research is that of memory recall. In this research the average number of years between when the homicide was committed and when the interview was conducted was 13 years. Many of the questions in this research ask about the year leading up to the incident, a specificity that for some respondents might be difficult to recall. In addition, individuals’ memory retrievals of emotional states are not always accurate and reliable and may be affected by post-event cognitive appraisals (Levine & Safer, 2002). At the same time, the homicide incident and the subsequent incarceration represent significant life-altering events, and memory recall research suggests that memories centred around landmark events assist memory retrieval processes (Shum, 1998). Research on homicide offenders shows that the negative emotional arousal associated with homicide perpetration works to enhance the quality and vividness of the memory (Woodworth et al., 2009). Furthermore, this research included the use of a life event calendar (see Chapter 5), a methodology and data collection tool which research suggests improve memory recall (Belli, 1998).

Despite the challenges mentioned above, this research is unique in that it empirically and theoretically examined differences between male IPH and non-IPH perpetrators by using interview data with one of the largest samples of homicide perpetrators collected in Australia and internationally. Lewis et al. (2003) note that homicide researchers may be reluctant to use interview data with perpetrators because of challenges such as social desirability, memory recall and subjectivity. However, as they argue “to see these factors as stripping perpetrators’ accounts of their ‘truth’ is to misunderstand the value of their accounts” (Lewis et al., 2003, p. 57-58). As shown in the current research, offender-based data provide an important opportunity to examine
the experiences of the main actors of the event, thereby providing a clearer picture of
the situations, contexts and factors that precede homicide incidents.

**Future Research**

While making significant empirical, theoretical and methodological
contributions to the study of IPH, this research has also identified a number of aspects
that require further research. In terms of GST, more research is needed to understand
which characteristics of strain are particularly criminogenic. The findings showed that
strain was often clustered in time and experienced across domains, and future research
should extend beyond examinations of individual strain to examine the effect of strain
characteristics such as clustering, duration and accumulation (Agnew, 2001; Slocum et
al., 2005), particularly as it applies to IPH. The life event calendar allows for such
examinations to be made. Another characteristic of strain that was particularly salient in
this research was perceived injustice and relational devaluation. Limited research has
explored the role of injustice in a GST context, despite the theory stating that injustice
may serve to exacerbate an individual’s subjective experiences of strain (Agnew, 2001).
There is therefore scope for future research to explore the role of perceived injustice on
IPH, particularly within a GST context.

Further research is also needed in terms of experiences of negative emotions.
The findings from this research suggest that negative emotions are rarely experienced in
isolation and further research is required to understand the ways in which emotions
work together. What proved particularly valuable in this research was the use of open-
ended questions to measure negative emotions. As discussed by Scherer (2005), this
technique is preferable to using closed-ended questions, as standardised lists of
emotions may trigger responses otherwise not chosen. To date, limited GST research
has utilised open-ended questions to measure negative emotions. Future GST and IPH research should utilise this methodology as it may serve to extend current knowledge of negative emotions, their potential mediating effect on criminal behaviour and the various combinations of emotions experienced in reaction to strain.

Perhaps the most important task for GST researchers, however, is to understand whether GST is indeed a theory of homicide or whether it is a theory of violence. This would require theoretical re-conceptualisations of the role of precipitating factors such as weapons. GST is unique in that it sits at the intersection of two prominent theoretical fields in criminology: personality or trait-based explanations (e.g. Gottfredson & Hirschi, 1990) and situational explanations (e.g. Clarke & Felson, 1993). By accounting for the importance of a wide range of variables, including situational events, emotional reactions and individual differences in beliefs, cognitions and temperament, GST provides an important integration of proximal and distal variables to explain IPH. However, the precise role of precipitating factors is not clear within GST as it is applied to homicide. Research suggests that there are important differences between lethal and non-lethal violence (Campbell, Webster, Koziol-McLain, Block, Campbell, Curry, Gary, Glass, et al., 2003; Dobash et al., 2007). To further explore these issues, future research should continue to empirically explore differences between IPH and non-lethal intimate partner violence perpetration, while providing theoretical explanations for any differences observed. This would allow for examinations of which factors are associated not only with perpetration, but also abstention, of homicide acts.

Concluding Remarks

This research has examined stress, emotions and coping as experienced by male IPH and non-IPH perpetrators. Increased understanding of perpetrator experiences is
important in providing further knowledge of the causes of violence. This exercise in no way excuses the perpetrators’ actions, but is aimed at further understanding offending behaviour. This is important in establishing effective prevention and intervention efforts. GST, the theoretical framework employed, highlights the importance of examining subjective experiences. Although GST is certainly not the only explanation of IPH, its focus on situational events, emotional reactions and the resources available to assist with legitimate coping strategies was found to hold conceptual and empirical validity.

This research has made significant contributions to the literature on male-perpetrated IPH. Analyses of quantitative and qualitative interviews conducted with male homicide perpetrators showed important differences between IPH and non-IPH for a number of factors relating to individual, relationship and situational contexts. The findings revealed that male IPH perpetration was particularly associated with experiences of partner infidelity, cognitive appraisals of injustice and relational devaluation, situational anger, feelings of hurt, jealous personality dispositions, experiences of accumulative strain and perceived lack of access to social support mechanisms. However, it was also recognised that male perpetrators of IPH are not a homogenous category. Further research on the diversity and complexity of IPH perpetrators is needed to expand the knowledge of male-perpetrated IPH to which this research has contributed.
Appendix A: Expression of Interest Form - Study 1

(Correctional Facilities in Queensland)

Dear Sir/Madam

In 2010 Griffith University is collecting information from about 300 women and men serving time in prison across Australia for murder and manslaughter offences.

As you are in prison for this type of offence you can take part in this research.

- Taking part means being interviewed by a researcher.
- You need to sign a consent form before you can be interviewed.
- If you take part you will receive $10.

Taking part is voluntary. Your personal information has not been given to Griffith University. Your name will not be known to the researcher unless you agree to be interviewed. What you say to the researchers is kept confidential.

The interview will take about one and half hours. The researchers want to know your experiences in relationships, contact with agencies, like the police, and what was happening in your life at the time of the offence. The information will be used to learn more about murder and manslaughter.

What you need to do:

- Complete the slip. Put it in the envelope
- Return the envelope to the staff member who gave this letter to you, even if you do not want to be interviewed.

Please return your response slip in the next 2 weeks.

Thank you
Homicide Research Project
RESPONSE SLIP

I want to take part in the interview:

☐ YES

My Prisoner ID number is ________________________________ (if you know it)

My name is ____________________________________________

I am currently located at ________________________________ Prison

If you agree to be interviewed, you will be contacted later about the interview time.

or

☐ NO

Please place the completed form in the envelope provided.

Give the envelope to the staff member who gave this form to you.
We will be gathering information from about 300 women and men serving time in correctional institutions across NSW, Victoria, Queensland and South Australia for murder and manslaughter offences. We are inviting inmates serving a sentence for murder and manslaughter to volunteer to participate in an interview. Eligible inmates will receive $10 for participating in the questionnaire interview.

**Why is this research being conducted?**

Violence is a significant problem in society but only a small number of violent incidents lead to deaths or homicide, it is important to understand how violence lead to homicide. This study is about the experiences of individuals who are in custody for murder or manslaughter. The study looks at the events leading up to, and circumstances around the death. The research will compare the experiences of individuals in custody for the
murder or manslaughter of an intimate partner (husband, wife, boyfriend or girlfriend) with those of individuals in custody for other types of murder or manslaughter.

**What will you be asked to do?**

We are interested in the experiences you have had in your relationships, your experiences with agencies, such as the police, and the circumstances around the incident leading to the death. As part of this study you are being asked to take part in an individual interview with the researchers to answer questions about your personal experiences of relationship, agencies, and the circumstances surrounding the incident. The researchers may also examine your Queensland Corrective Services offender data.

**What are the benefits of this research?**

The information collected through this research will be used to increase our understanding of violence, and particularly intimate partner violence, and identify areas where people can be helped so that homicide can be prevented. Information from this research will improve understanding about why intimate partner violence and homicide occurs, and develop better assistance for people experiencing violence. The research findings will be published in journals or books. No report, presentation, or publication will identify you, or link you to any information you provide.

**What are the risks to you?**

We are aware of the sensitive nature of conflict and violence in intimate relationships and that if you have had these experiences, these may have caused you emotional stress in the past. It is possible that thinking about or describing your experiences may be uncomfortable. If you are experiencing emotional stress while participating in the interview please let the interviewer know. If you become distressed after completing the interview please advise prison staff. They will organise for you to receive support.

**Confidentiality**

Any information that you provide for this study will remain anonymous and confidential and will only be used for the purposes of understanding intimate partner violence and homicide. You will not be asked to provide any identifying information, such as your name or address as part of the interview. Your individual responses to interview questions will be included with a much larger group of people, and your responses will not be identifiable through the research. Only the principal investigators of this study and the PhD students will have access to the information collected. Copies of your interview responses will not contain personal information and will be stored in locked filing cabinets in the Key Centre for Ethics, Law, Justice and Governance at Griffith University.

**Your participation is voluntary**

Your participation in this research is voluntary and there will be no loss or penalty should you choose not to participate. In addition, you do not need to answer any question during the interview unless you wish to do so, and you have the right to withdraw your participation from the interview at any time without explanation.

**Questions / further information**

You are welcome to contact one of the researchers to request a summary of the main study findings once the study is completed.

If you have any questions about the research please contact the principal investigators, Professor Paul Mazerolle, on (07) 37356994 or via email at p.mazerolle@griffith.edu.au, Professor Richard Wortley, on (07) 37355761 or via email
at r.wortley@griffith.edu.au, or Associate Professor Holly Johnson via email at Holly.Johnson@uottawa.ca.

This study has been cleared by the Ethics Committee of Griffith University in accordance with the *National Statement on the Ethical Conduct of Research Involving Humans*. Should you have any concerns about the ethical conduct of this study, you can contact the Manager, Research Ethics on 3735-5585 or research-ethics@griffith.edu.au.
CONSENT FORM to participate in the Questionnaire Interview

By signing below, I confirm that I have read and understood the information package and in particular that:

- I understand that my involvement in this research will involve participating in an interview with the researchers to answer questions about my relationships, my experiences with agencies (e.g. police), and the circumstances surrounding the incident leading to the death;
- I have had any questions that I have, answered to my satisfaction;
- I understand the risks involved are low;
- I understand that all the responses that I provide in the interview will remain confidential and will only be used to inform understanding about the precursors to intimate partner violence and homicide;
- I understand I will not be identified in any report, presentation, or publication of these research results. I understand that the researcher/s will record my responses on a questionnaire survey during the interview, and that this questionnaire will be stored in a locked cabinet and not be accessed by anyone apart from the research team;
- I understand that there will be no direct benefit to me from my participation in this research;
- I understand that my participation in this research is voluntary;
- I understand that if I have any additional questions I can contact the research team;
- I understand that I am free to withdraw at any time, without comment or penalty;
- I understand that I can contact the Manager, Research Ethics, at Griffith University Human Research Ethics Committee on 3735 5585 (or research-ethics@griffith.edu.au) if I have any concerns about the ethical conduct of the study;
- I consent to the release of my Queensland Corrective Services offender data;
- I agree to participate in the questionnaire interview and to permit the researchers to use the information I have provided for the purpose of the study

Name _____________________________________________
Signature__________________________________________
Date: __________/______________/_____________
Appendix C: Expression of Interest Form - Study 1  
(Probation and Parole in Queensland)

Dear Sir/Madam

You were recently contacted about a Griffith University research project. Griffith University is collecting information from about 300 women and men across Australia.

- Taking part means being interviewed by a researcher.
- You need to sign a consent form before you can be interviewed.
- You will get $20 if you take part in the interview.

Taking part is voluntary. Your personal information has not been given to Griffith University. Your name will not be known to the researcher unless you agree to be interviewed. What you say to the researchers is kept confidential.

The interview will take about one and half hours.

You will be interviewed by a university interviewer. The interview will be held at a time to suit you.

What you need to do:

- Complete the slip.
- Put it in the stamped envelope provided
- Post the envelope in an Australia Post mailbox

Please return your response slip in the next 2 weeks. You will be contacted to make a time for the interview.

Thank you
RESPONSE SLIP

I want to take part in the interview:

My name is ____________________________________________

I report to the following office (tick one box):

☐ Brisbane Central

☐ Brisbane South

☐ Mt Gravatt

If you agree to be interviewed, you will be contacted later about the interview time.

Put this slip in the stamped addressed envelope provided. Post the envelope in an Australia Post mailbox.
We will be gathering information from about 300 women and men across NSW, Victoria, Queensland and Western Australian who have been convicted of murder and manslaughter offences. We are inviting those serving a sentence for murder and manslaughter to volunteer to participate in an interview. Those who take part will receive $20 for participating in the questionnaire interview.

Why is this research being conducted?
Violence is a significant problem in society but only a small number of violent incidents lead to deaths or homicide, it is important to understand how violence leads to homicide. This study is about the experiences of individuals who have been convicted for murder or manslaughter. The study looks at the events leading up to, and circumstances around the death. The research will compare the experiences of individuals convicted for the murder or manslaughter of an intimate partner (husband, wife, boyfriend or girlfriend) with those of individuals who have been convicted for other types of murder or manslaughter.

What will you be asked to do?
We are interested in the experiences you have had in your relationships, your experiences with agencies, such as the police, and the circumstances around the incident leading to the death. As part of this study you are being asked to take part in an individual interview with the researchers to answer questions about your personal experiences of relationship, agencies, and the circumstances surrounding the incident. The researchers may also examine your Queensland Corrective Services offender data.

What are the benefits of this research?
The information collected through this research will be used to increase our understanding of violence, and particularly intimate partner violence, and identify areas where people can be helped so that homicide can be prevented. Information from this research will improve understanding about why intimate partner violence and homicide occurs, and develop better assistance for people experiencing violence. The research findings will be published in journals or books. No report, presentation, or publication will identify you, or link you to any information you provide.
What are the risks to you?
We are aware of the sensitive nature of conflict and violence in intimate relationships and that if you have had these experiences, these may have caused you emotional stress in the past. It is possible that thinking about or describing your experiences may be uncomfortable. If you are experiencing emotional stress while participating in the interview please let the interviewer know. If you become distressed after completing the interview please advise probation and parole staff. They will organise for you to receive support.

Confidentiality
Any information that you provide for this study will remain anonymous and confidential and will only be used for the purposes of understanding intimate partner violence and homicide. You will not be asked to provide any identifying information, such as your name or address as part of the interview. Your individual responses to interview questions will be included with a much larger group of people, and your responses will not be identifiable through the research. Only the principal investigators of this study and the PhD students will have access to the information collected. Copies of your interview responses will not contain personal information and will be stored in locked filing cabinets in the Key Centre for Ethics, Law, Justice and Governance at Griffith University.

Your participation is voluntary
Your participation in this research is voluntary and there will be no loss or penalty should you choose not to participate. In addition, you do not need to answer any question during the interview unless you wish to do so, and you have the right to withdraw your participation from the interview at any time without explanation.

Your privacy
The conduct of this research involves the collection, access and / or use of your identified personal information. The information collected is confidential and will not be disclosed to third parties without your consent, except to meet government, legal or other regulatory authority requirements. A de-identified copy of this data may be used for other research purposes. However, your anonymity will at all times be safeguarded. For further information consult the University’s Privacy Plan at http://www.griffith.edu.au/privacy-plan or telephone (07) 3735 5585.

Questions / further information
You are welcome to contact one of the researchers below to request a summary of the main study findings once the study is completed.

Chief Investigators: Professor Paul Mazerolle
Pro Vice Chancellor, Arts Education and Law
Griffith University
Brisbane, QLD 4111
Contact phone: (07) 3735-6994
Contact email: p.mazerolle@griffith.edu.au
If you have any questions about the research please contact the principal investigators.

This study has been cleared by the Ethics Committee of Griffith University in accordance with the *National Statement on Ethical Conduct in Human Research*. Should you have any concerns about the ethical conduct of this study, you can contact the Manager, Research Ethics on 3735-5585 or research-ethics@griffith.edu.au.
CONSENT FORM to participate in the Questionnaire Interview

By signing below, I confirm that I have read and understood the information package and in particular that:

- I understand that my involvement in this research will involve participating in an interview with the researchers to answer questions about my relationships, my experiences with agencies (e.g. police), and the circumstances surrounding the incident leading to the death;
- I have had any questions that I have, answered to my satisfaction;
- I understand the risks involved are low;
- I understand that all the responses that I provide in the interview will remain confidential and will only be used to inform understanding about the precursors to intimate partner violence and homicide;
- I understand I will not be identified in any report, presentation, or publication of these research results. I understand that the researcher/s will record my responses on a questionnaire survey during the interview, and that this questionnaire will be stored in a locked cabinet and not be accessed by anyone apart from the research team;
- I understand that there will be no direct benefit to me from my participation in this research;
- I understand that my participation in this research is voluntary;
- I understand that if I have any additional questions I can contact the research team;
- I understand that I am free to withdraw at any time, without comment or penalty;
- I understand that I can contact the Manager, Research Ethics, at Griffith University Human Research Ethics Committee on 3735 5585 (or research-ethics@griffith.edu.au) if I have any concerns about the ethical conduct of the study;
- I consent to the release of my Queensland Corrective Services offender data;
- I agree to participate in the questionnaire interview and to permit the researchers to use the information I have provided for the purpose of the study.

Name _____________________________________________
Signature__________________________________________
Date: __________/______________/__________
Appendix E: Research Participation Form - Study 1

(Probation and Parole in Queensland)

Griffith UNIVERSITY

RESEARCH PARTICIPATION

I have received $20 for taking part in the project *A National Study into Intimate Partner Homicide*.

Initials: ______________________

Date: ______________________
Appendix F: Respondent Rating Card (Example)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Never</th>
<th>Occasionally</th>
<th>Often</th>
<th>Very Often</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix G: Theoretical Constructs

Experiences in Close Relationships scale (Brennan et al., 1998)

- I prefer not to show a partner how I feel deep down
- I worry about being abandoned
- I am very comfortable being close to romantic partners
- I worry a lot about my relationships
- Just when my partner starts to get close to me I find myself pulling away
- I worry that romantic partners won't care about me as much as I care about them
- I get uncomfortable when a romantic partner wants to be very close
- I worry a fair amount about losing my partner
- I don't feel comfortable opening up to romantic partners
- I often wish that my partner's feelings for me were as strong as my feelings for him/her
- I want to get close to my partner, but I keep pulling back
- I often want to merge completely with romantic partners, and this sometimes scares them away
- I am nervous when partners get too close to me
- I worry about being alone
- I feel comfortable sharing my private thoughts and feelings with my partner
- My desire to be very close sometimes scares people away
- I try to avoid getting too close to my partner
- I need a lot of reassurance that I am loved by my partner
- I find it relatively easy to get close to my partner
• Sometimes I feel that I force my partners to show more feeling, more commitment
• I find it difficult to allow myself to depend on romantic partners
• I do not often worry about being abandoned
• I prefer not to be too close to romantic partners
• If I can't get my partner to show interest in me, I get upset or angry
• I tell my partner just about everything
• I find that my partner(s) don't want to get as close as I would like
• I usually discuss my problems and concerns with my partner
• When I'm not involved in a relationship, I feel somewhat anxious and insecure
• I feel comfortable depending on romantic partners
• I get frustrated when my partner is not around as much as I would like
• I don't mind asking romantic partners for comfort, advice, or help
• I get frustrated if romantic partners are not available when I need them
• It helps to turn to my romantic partner in times of need
• When romantic partners disapprove of me, I feel really bad about myself
• I turn to my partner for many things, including comfort and reassurance
• I resent it when my partner spends time away from me

**Impulsivity** (sub-scale on the Self-Control scale by Grasmick et al., 1993).

• I often act on the spur of the moment without stopping to think.
• I don’t devote much thought and effort to preparing for the future.
• I often do whatever brings me pleasure here and now, even at the cost of some distant goal.
• I’m more concerned with what happens to me in the short run than in the long run.

Peer Attitudes toward Wife Abuse (modified by research team based on the Revised Attitudes toward Wife Abuse scale, see Yoshioka et al., 2001)

Situation-Specific Approval of Violence sub-scale
• My friends thought that a husband/man has the right to hit his wife/girlfriend if she:
  o ...had sex with another man
  o ...refused to cook and keep the house clean
  o ...refused to have sex with him
  o ...made fun of him at a party
  o ...told friends that he was sexually pathetic
  o ...nags him too much

Endorsement of Male Privileges sub-scale
• My friends thought that a husband should have the right to discipline his wife
• My friends thought that a man is the ruler of his home
• My friends thought that a husband is entitled to have sex with his wife whenever he wants it
• My friends thought that some wives seem to ask for beatings from their husbands

Perceived Lack of Alternatives sub-scale
• My friends thought that a wife should move out of the house if her husband hits her
• My friends thought that a husband is never justified in hitting his wife
• My friends thought that a husband should be arrested if he hits his wife
• My friends thought that wife beating is grounds for divorce

Relational Entitlement and Proprietariness Scale (Hannawa et al., 2006) - modified version

  Behavioural Control sub-scale
  • My partner does what I tell him/her to do
  • I'm entitled to treat my partner however I choose
  • My partner can’t go until I tell him/her that he/she can go
  • Sometimes I have to remind my partner of who’s boss
  • A person has a right to control/discipline his or her partner
  • It’s important to keep partners in their place
  • If I can't have my partner, no one can
  • If my partner and I don't agree, I should have the final say
  • I believe it is appropriate to demand sex if two people have been dating long enough or if they are married
  • If my partner leaves me, I’ll make sure he/she regrets it
  • If my partner threatened to leave the relationship, I would have the right to tell them that they can't

  Social Control sub-scale
  • I have a right to know where my partner is all the time
  • I have a right to know who my partner is interacting with when I am not with him or her
  • I have a right to know who my partner is interacting with at all times
  • I have a right to be involved with anything my partner does
  • I insist on knowing where my partner is at all times
  • I have a right to know everything my partner does
• My partner can't leave without telling me where he or she is going

**Information Control sub-scale**

• I pay my partner a surprise visit just to see whom is with him or her
• I have the right to contact my partner's friends to see how he/she acts without me around
• I look through my partner's drawers, handbag, or pockets
• Once people are in a committed relationship, it is not okay for a partner to talk to the opposite sex
• I have a right to check my partner's cell phone and recent call list
• Some people must hold on tightly to their partner because people cannot be trusted
• I question my partner about his or her telephone calls
• I question my partner about his or her whereabouts
• It is natural for one spouse to be in control of the other
• If you don't show who's the boss in the beginning of a relationship you will be taken advantage of later

**Revised Attitudes toward Wife Abuse** (Yoshioka et al., 2001)

**Situation-Specific Approval of Violence sub-scale**

• A husband/man has the right to hit his wife/girlfriend if she:
  o ...had sex with another man
  o ...refused to cook and keep the house clean
  o ...refused to have sex with him
  o ...made fun of him at a party
  o ...told friends that he was sexually pathetic
  o ...nags him too much
Endorsement of Male Privileges sub-scale

- A husband should have the right to discipline his wife
- A man is the ruler of his home
- A husband is entitled to have sex with his wife whenever he wants it
- Some wives seem to ask for beatings from their husbands

Perceived Lack of Alternatives sub-scale

- A wife should move out of the house if her husband hits her
- A husband is never justified in hitting his wife
- A husband should be arrested if he hits his wife
- Wife beating is grounds for divorce

Social Support Network (adapted from Block, 2000)

Acceptance and Support sub-scale

- Someone I was close to made me feel confident in myself
- There was someone I could talk to openly about anything
- There was someone I could talk to about any problems in my relationship
- Someone I cared about stood by me through good times and bad times
- Someone I knew supported my decisions, no matter what they were

Emergency Help sub-scale

- I had someone to stay with in an emergency
- Someone I knew would help me if I was in danger
- I had someone to borrow money from in an emergency
- I had someone who would be there for me in times of trouble

Access to Resources sub-scale

- It was difficult for me to ask for help because people didn’t always speak my language (native language)
• I would have known where to tell a friend to get help if they were harmed or beaten by their partner

• I hesitated to tell anyone about my problems because I was worried that the authorities, like the (QLD) Department of Child Safety, (NSW) Department of Communities or (ALL) immigration, would find out

**Trait jealousy** (adapted from Salovey & Rodin, 1988)

• You phone your partner at home, and a voice you haven’t heard before answers. How upset would this make you feel?

• Your partner has lunch with an attractive person of the opposite sex. How upset would this make you feel?

• Your partner dances too closely with a person of the opposite sex at a party or bar. How upset would this make you feel?

• Someone is flirting with your partner. How upset would this make you feel?

• Your partner wants to go out with other people. How upset would this make you feel?

• Your partner visits the person he or she used to go out with. How upset would this make you feel?

• You find out your partner is having an affair. How upset would this make you feel?

• Your partner talks about an old lover. How upset would this make you feel?
Appendix H: Expression of Interest Form - Study 2
(Probation and Parole)

Dear Sir/Madam

You have previously participated in an interview and we are now inviting you to take part in a second interview. The second interview is different from the first interview as it is more in-depth and allows you to talk about situations and emotions in your own words.

We will not be asking you lots of questions. Instead, we want to talk about how you were feeling and how you were reacting to things that were going on in your life.

Your personal details and the information you provide will at all times be confidential to the research team.

The second interview will take approximately one hour. You will receive $20 for participating in this interview.

This information kit contains

- A response slip
- A reply paid envelope

Thank you
RESPONSE SLIP

I want to take part in the second interview:

My name is ________________________________________________

I report to the following office: ________________________________

If you agree to be interviewed, you will be contacted later about the interview time.

Put this slip in the stamped addressed envelope provided. Post the envelope in an Australia Post mailbox.
Appendix I: Information Sheet/Consent Form - Study 2

(Correctional Facilities)

A National Study into Intimate Partner Homicide
In depth interview INFORMATION SHEET

Chief Investigator: Professor Paul Mazerolle
Key Centre for Ethics, Law, Justice & Governance
Griffith University
Brisbane, QLD 4111
Contact phone: (07) 3735-6994
Contact email: p.mazerolle@griffith.edu.au

Student Investigator: Li Eriksson (PhD student)
Key Centre for Ethics, Law, Justice & Governance
Griffith University
Brisbane, QLD 4111
Contact phone: (07) 3735-5811
Contact email: l.eriksson@griffith.edu.au

Why is this research being conducted?
Violence is a significant problem in society and whilst only a small subset of violent incidents result in homicide, it is important to understand the pathways linking violence to homicide. This study examines the experiences of individuals who are in custody for intimate partner murder or manslaughter. The study explores the events and circumstances leading up to, and directly involved with the incident leading to the death. As part of this research we are looking at the effect of stress in interpersonal relationships on violence and homicide. This research is part of the student investigator's doctoral studies at Griffith University. Eligible inmates will receive $10 for participating in the interview.

What will you be asked to do?
You have previously participated in an interview for this study and we are now inviting you to provide further information in a separate, in-depth interview. This second interview should take about one hour. During the interview you will be asked more in-depth questions relating to events and situations leading up to the event. You will be asked to talk about your perceptions and emotions. This will be linked to the information you provided in the first interview.
With your permission the interview will be audio taped for transcription. You will not be able to be identified through the audio tape. The audio tape will be transcribed by a professional transcription agency and will be destroyed once analyses of the transcriptions have been completed and confirmed. Any information obtained will remain anonymous and confidential. The transcripts will not be accessed by anyone apart from the research team. Should you not want the interview to be audio taped the interviewer will instead take notes during the interview using pen and paper.

What are the benefits of the in depth interviews?
The results of this second interview will inform a doctoral thesis about the relationships between stress and intimate partner homicide. The results will be used to give us more understanding about why intimate partner violence and homicide happens. In other words, we will be gathering information about the precursors to intimate partner homicide. Specifically, the results may inform strategies for earlier intervention with couples who are experiencing violence that might lead to homicide. Aspects of the research will be published in journals or books. No report, presentation, or publication will identify you, or link you to any information you provide.

What are the risks to you?
We are aware of the sensitive nature of conflict and abuse in intimate relationships and that if you have had these experiences, your experiences may have caused you emotional stress in the past. It is therefore possible that thinking about or describing your experiences may be uncomfortable. If you are experiencing emotional stress while participating in the interview please advise the interviewer. If you become distressed after completing the interview please advise prison staff who will organise for you to receive appropriate support.

Confidentiality
Any information that you provide in the context of this study will remain anonymous and confidential and will only be used for the purposes of understanding intimate partner violence and homicide. You will not be asked to provide any identifying information, such as your name or address as part of the interview. Only members of the research team will have access to the information collected. Audio tapes will be destroyed once analyses of the transcriptions have been completed and confirmed. The transcripts will be stored in locked filing cabinets in the Key Centre for Ethics, Law, Justice and Governance at Griffith University.

Your participation is voluntary
Your participation in this research is voluntary and there will be no loss or penalty should you choose not to participate. In addition, you do not need to answer any question during the interview unless you wish to do so, and you have the right to withdraw your participation from the interview at any time without explanation.

Questions / further information
You are welcome to contact one of the investigators to request a summary of the main study findings once the study is completed.

If you have any questions about the research please contact the Chief Investigator, Professor Paul Mazerolle, on (07) 37356994 or via email at p.mazerolle@griffith.edu.au or the Student Investigator, Li Eriksson, (07) 37355811 or via email at l.eriksson@griffith.edu.au.

This study has been cleared by the Ethics Committee of Griffith University in accordance with the National Statement on the Ethical Conduct of Research Involving Humans. Should you have any concerns about the ethical conduct of this study, you
can contact the Manager, Research Ethics on (07) 3735 5585 or research-ethics@griffith.edu.au. For further information consult the University’s Privacy Plan at http://www.griffith.edu.au/about-griffith/plans-publications/griffith-university-privacy-plan or telephone (07) 3735 5585.
CONSENT FORM to participate in an in depth Interview

By signing below, I confirm that I have read and understood the information package and in particular that:

- I understand that my involvement in this research will involve participating in an interview with the researchers to answer questions about my relationships, my experiences with agencies (e.g. police), and the circumstances surrounding the incident leading to the death;
- I have had any questions answered to my satisfaction;
- I understand the risks involved are low;
- I understand that all the responses that I provide in the interview will remain confidential and will only be used to inform understanding about the precursors to intimate partner violence and homicide;
- I understand I will not be identified in any report, presentation, or publication of these research results;
- I understand that there will be no direct benefit to me from my participation in this research;
- I understand that my participation in this research is voluntary;
- I understand that if I have any additional questions I can contact the research team;
- I understand that I am free to withdraw at any time, without comment or penalty;
- I understand that I can contact the Manager, Research Ethics, at Griffith University Human Research Ethics Committee on 3735 5585 (or research-ethics@griffith.edu.au) if I have any concerns about the ethical conduct of the study,
- I agree to participate in an in depth interview;
- I understand that this interview will be:
  - [ ] voice-recorded, and that the transcripts will be stored in a locked cabinet and not be accessed by anyone apart from the research team
  - [ ] transcribed using paper and pen.

Name: __________________________________________

Signature: ______________________________________

Date: __________/____________/_____________
Appendix J: Data Collection Tool - Study 2

INTERVIEW GUIDE

Date: ___________________________  
Location: ___________________________  
Interviewer Initials: ___________________________  
Interviewee Code: ___________________________  
Start Time of Interview: ___________________________  
Finish Time of Interview: ___________________________

1) Interviewer to introduce themselves

2) Interviewer to read out Information Sheet and Consent Form and explain the purpose of the study

3) Interviewer to request that participant acknowledges consent on the Consent Sheet

Thank you for choosing to participate in our research. In this interview I would like us to focus on the time period before the incident. I am going to ask you a few questions about what happened during that time and about what sort of emotions you were feeling when things were happening.

I am interested in your story and I would like you to tell me about your experiences using your own words. There are no right or wrong answers. Remember, your answers are confidential, you will not be identified, and your answers will not be used against you.

Respondent gender:  □ Male  □ Female
BEFORE THE INCIDENT

STRAIN

Q: I want you to tell me a bit about the time period before the incident happened. Was there anything in that time period that…
   … wasn’t going your way?
   … was particularly stressful?
   … was particularly problematic in your life?

Follow-up: Can you tell me a bit more about that.
   What happened?
   Why were you feeling stressed?

Probe: When did it happen?
   Who was involved?
   How did it start?
   Why did it happen?

NEGATIVE EMOTIONS

Q: Can you tell me a bit about how you were feeling when this was happening?
   How did it make you feel?
   When that happened, what sorts of things were going on emotionally, for you, even between you and your partner?

Follow-up: Can you describe to me why were you feeling that way?

REACTIONS

Q: What were your reactions when you felt like that?
   What did you do when this happened?
   How did you cope when you felt like that?

Follow-up: Why do you think you reacted in that way?
   Did it help?
   Is this how you normally would react?
THE INCIDENT

STRAIN AND EMOTIONS

Q: What actually happened that led you to kill your partner?  
   Why did you kill your partner?

Follow-up: How were you feeling emotionally?

Q: Had any of this ever happened before?

Follow-up: Was this time different?  
   In what way was it different?  
   Did it cause different emotions, reactions?  
   Why did it happen?

PREVIOUS EXPERIENCES

Q: Had any of this ever happened before?

Follow-up: Was this time different?  
   In what way was it different?  
   Did it cause different emotions, reactions?  
   Why did it happen?
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