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Abstract

The present study compared the differences in severity of violence and number of injuries of couples between couples with reciprocal violence and non-reciprocal violence in Arequipa, Peru. Two hundred and eighty adults of both genders, who were married and/or cohabiting with a partner at the time of the study participated. The sample was obtained from three districts in Arequipa city and participants were approached and interviewed at their homes. They completed a socio-demographic questionnaire and the Conflicts Tactics Scale Revised, which included questions about physical abuse incidents perpetrated by both partners. Sixty one percent of the participants reported reciprocal violence, and 11.4% of the participants reported non-reciprocal violence in their relationship. The results showed significant differences between reciprocally and non-reciprocally violent couples in minor (t = -11.77, p<.001) and severe (t = - 9.03, p<.001) physical abuse incidents, and also in minor (t = -7.02, p<.001) and severe (t = - 4.83, p<.001) reported injuries. Participants in reciprocally violent couples reported more incidents of minor and severe physical abuse and more minor and severe injuries.
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Chapter 1: Introduction

Several studies conducted about Intimate Partner Violence against women in Peru report a prevalence of physical violence between 30.9% and 38.9% (Flake, 2005; Gonzales de Olarte & Gavilano Llosa, 1999). However, a study of the World Health Organization in Peru showed that the prevalence of physical violence against women in provincial settings was 61.0%, and in Lima, the capital, was 48.6%. Even though the sample for this study was not nationally representative, the results of this study show the importance of addressing Intimate Partner Violence, given the fact that Peru had the highest prevalence of violence compared to the other nine countries analyzed in the study with similar methodologies (Garcia-Moreno, Jansen, Ellberg, Heise & Watts, 2006). Flake (2005) describes that the high occurrence of Intimate Partner Violence in Peru can be related to the country’s legacy of political and social violence and rigid gender scripts, where gender-based norms tend to reinforce male dominance. On the other hand, a recent study in Peru has shown that men and women have the same risk of being victims of Intimate Partner Violence (Fiestas, Rojas, Gushiken & Gozzer, 2012).

Despite the fact that Intimate Partner Violence in Peru is a common problem, there are not many related or explanatory factors that have studied the interactional patterns or when the violence is directed against men. The vast majority of studies in these areas have studied North American samples, which present several major cultural differences from the sample of the present study.

Purpose of the Study

Intimate Partner Violence increases the risk of developing mental health disorders and is associated with higher risks of injuries and even death (Coker et al., 2002; Coker, Smith, Bethea, King & McKeown, 2000; Golding, 1999; Plichta, 2004).
Increasing the knowledge about Intimate Partner Violence in Peru is necessary in order to develop effective interventions and prevention strategies. This investigation is relevant and important since available information is limited and current interventions seem ineffective. López Pons (2010) described how between 2003 and 2005, in Peru 39% of the women killed by their partners had previously reported the existence of violence to governmental institutions. Intimate Partner Violence literature also identifies different types of violence in relationships (Johnson, 1995, 2011). The characteristics of the different types of violence vary greatly and so can vary the approaches to the interventions (Stith & McCollum, 2011).

Therefore the aim of the present study is to contribute to the investigation and understanding of Intimate Partner Violence in Peru, in order to further identify the main characteristics of this phenomenon.

**Research Questions**

The present study attempts to answer the following questions about the relationships between pattern of violence, both reciprocal and non-reciprocal, and injuries in couples:

1. What is the difference in the severity of violence between reciprocal and non-reciprocal violent couples in Arequipa?
2. What is the difference between reported injuries of people in reciprocal violent couples compared to non-reciprocal violent couples?
Chapter 2: Review of Literature and Hypotheses Statement

Intimate Partner Violence

Intimate Partner Violence is defined as the physical, emotional, psychological and sexual abuse that takes place between intimate partners (Hattery, 2009). However, since this study will be focusing on physical abuse, only this aspect of couples’ relationships will be examined. Physical violence is defined as “any action that is intended to cause physical harm or pain to another person” (Gonzales de Olarte & Gavilano Llosa, 1999, p.36). The harm may be inflicted with the aggressor’s use of any body parts or with using some objects.

The prevalence of physical violence against women by their partner in Peru is between 30.9% and 38.9% (Flake, 2005; Gonzales de Olarte & Gavilano Llosa, 1999). Studies about the national prevalence of Intimate Partner Violence against men in Peru are non-existent, but a recent study reported that the risk of being victim of Intimate Partner Violence is the same for women and men (Fiestas, et al., 2012). The studies also do not report how many couples present reciprocal or bidirectional violence. In studies in the United States, Whitaker, Haileyesus, Swahn and Saltzman (2007) and Renner and Whitney (2012) found that in almost half of the relationships where Intimate Partner Violence was present the violence was reciprocal. The reciprocal violence in couples was also related to the frequency of violence from women against their partners, which was increased when the violence was reciprocal (Whitaker et al., 2007). Similar to that, Cascardi and Vivian (1995) also found that in most cases of marital aggression it looked like it was a reflection of outgrowth of conflict between both partners. Moreover, Feld and Straus (1989) reported that minor assaults could be precedents to more severe violence in the relationship later.
The consequences of Intimate Partner Violence are broad and detrimental not only for the victim, but for the family and society. Direct costs of Intimate Partner Violence include the costs of health care, judicial and social services, while the socioeconomic costs of violence include lower worker productivity and the value of lifetime earnings for women who die as a result of violence (Morrison, Ellsberg & Bott, 2004). Physical and psychological abuse in couples are related to a decrease in health and higher probability of psychological disorder, such as depression, post-traumatic stress disorder and substance abuse, physical injuries and chronic difficulties (Coker et al., 2000; Coker, et al., 2002; Golding, 1999). Intimate Partner Violence increases the risk of injuries and the risk of dying as a result of violence (Plichta, 2004). In the United States, 63% of the female victims of Intimate Partner Violence suffered physical injuries as a result (Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, 1998). Multiple injuries in women that come to emergency rooms are also more frequent for victims of violence (Wu, Hutt & Bhandari, 2010).

**Theoretical Perspectives**

Different theories have been proposed to explain Intimate Partner Violence. Each of these theories has found some sorts of empirical support (Bell & Naugle, 2008). But most of them are still limited because they fail to address the complexity of these variables. Their impact on prevention or treatment is also limited. Some of the main perspectives that describe Intimate Partner Violence are the feminist, systems, and ecological theories.

**Feminist Perspective on Intimate Partner Violence**

The feminist approach proposes that societies are structured by gender, and because of this structure women are typically a class that is oppressed or devalued (White & Klein, 2008). Related to the study of the family, family is often viewed as
having an important role in the creation of such gender differences and maintenance of oppression by socialization and social expectations. Therefore, the domination and oppression of women are viewed as prescribed by cultural norms and therefore violence against women is perceived as a mean to an end; a way in which men try to assure their control and social benefits (Dutton, 1995). Based on this perspective, gender is a social construct, and ideologies related to masculinity and femininity reinforce each other and maintain gender oppression and inequality (Radford, Kelly & Hester, 1996; Hattery, 2009). Mainstream feminists propose that our patriarchal society permits men to batter women. Since they maintain physical, financial and social privileges, they might try to reassert their masculinity through violence when they feel emasculated. Women also stay in abusive relationships because of strong and inescapable impact of patriarchy (Mill, 2003; Hattery, 2009). Based on this perspective, women’s violence against their partners is viewed as a response to prior abuse, as acts of self-preservation, self-defense, or as responses to injustices (Radford et al., 1996). Some of these ideas are often supported by the greater number of women in shelters and in hospital emergency care facilities compared to the number of men, and also based on the fact that men have higher rates of violence in every other aspects of life (Kimmel, 2002). The results of some studies also support several of these propositions. For example, Saunders (1992) found that among different types of batterers, the ones that maintained the most rigid attitudes about women’s roles and hold traditional patterns of beliefs were also more likely to be the most severely violent in general. Another study in Turkey and Brazil reported that hostile sexism, described as the antagonism toward women violating traditional roles, was also related to attitudes that justify violence acts among married couples (Glick, Sakalli-Ugurlu, Ferreira & Aguiar de Souza, 2002).
Patriarchy interacts also with other power structures (Radford & Stanko, 1996). For example, patriarchy interacts with capitalism where men are supposed to be the breadwinner in the family and when they do not succeed in this role they might feel emasculated and act violently against their partners (Radford & Stanko, 1996; Hattery, 2009). Also the socioeconomic class of women might affect the amount of respect they receive from professionals: Radford et al. (1996) stated that lower class women have less support. These ideas might indicate that women from lower socio-economic levels would report a higher prevalence of Intimate Partner Violence, which is consistent with what Smith (1990) described in his literature review.

In an attempt to also connect the prevalence of violence from women against their male partners to the feminist approach, Johnson (1995, 2011) described three different types of violence based on American samples. The first two mostly describe what the feminist framework proposed originally: intimate terrorism, and violent resistance. Intimate terrorism is defined by systematic use of violence, and other control tactics, such as emotional and economic abuse, threats, and intimidation, use of children, monitoring behaviors, and blaming the victim. This type of violence is more frequently present in male-to-female aggression. The second type is the violent resistance that describes the cases in which victims of intimate terrorism react violently at the first expression of violence or when they realize that violence may continue forever. The third type of violence is the common couple’s violence, which is also called situational couple’s violence. This type of violence is not necessarily described or taken into account by the feminist perspective. In this type of violence the dynamic is related to conflict getting out of hand, which leads to minor and eventually escalating to more serious forms of violence. The difference between this form of violence and intimate terrorism is that in situational couple’s violence the aggressor is not trying to
gain general control of his or her partner (Johnson, 2011). The differences between the types proposed by Johnson are also perceived in different studies depending on the sample used. Samples from shelters often include victims of patriarchal or intimate terrorism. On the other hand, community samples used in large surveys include in their majority cases of situational couple violence. This is due to the fact that victims of intimate terrorism are most likely to fear reporting violence leading to a lower participation rate and situational couple’s violence represents the majority of cases of Intimate Partner Violence (Johnson, 1995, 2011).

**Systems Theory on Intimate Partner Violence**

Systems theory proposes that families and other social groups are integrated units of interconnected members, which are better understood by perceiving the whole (White & Klein, 2008). Systems are controlled and directed by feedback, which is described as “the circular loop that brings some of the system’s output back as input” (p. 159). There are two types of feedback, positive and negative feedback. Positive feedback is intended to create change or a deviation from what is normal in interactions, creating morphogenetic processes, while negative feedback tries to maintain the normal patterns, and the homeostasis (Olson, DeFrain & Skogrand, 2011; White & Klein, 2008). Giles-Sims (1983) states that responses to feedback send information back about how the preceding act is perceived, which increases or decreases the probability of that behavior to be repeated. Therefore, interactions in these systems are better understood as an ongoing pattern of interrelationships, more than simply behavioral cause and effect (Giles-Sims, 1983). It proposes that family is a cybernetic system in which the strains of everyday interaction generate accommodation and conflict (Lenton, 1995). Giles-Sims’s (1983) systems theory approach to conflict describes that conflict escalates because of the reciprocity in couples’ interactions; this can result in symmetrical
escalation of conflict. Therefore conflict is an ongoing interactional process between members of a system.

Straus’s model (1973) explains violence in family relationships from the systemic perspective, which included the concepts of positive and negative feedback in order to explain the maintenance of violence, the change in violent relationships and the termination of such violent relationships, by either divorce or death of one of the members. The model proposed by Straus (1973) is based on the main assumption that violence is a product of the system. Straus based his model in eight propositions. The first one is that violence has different causes, such as cultural expectations, personality traits and conflicts. The second proposition is that the occurrence of family violence is extremely high. Third, most of the violence is denied or not labeled as deviance, which explains how violence occurs frequently and how it is institutionalized in the role structure of the family. Fourth, stereotypes of family violence are learned in early childhood from family and friends, where the child can learn that violence is effective to control others’ behaviors. Fifth, interactions, and even mass media can re-affirm the stereotypes of family violence. Sixth, violence often rewards the violent person by producing the expected results, and this reinforcement increases the probability of more violence. Seventh, when the use of violence is contrary to the family norms and creates another conflict about the use of violence, it creates a secondary conflict that tends to produce more violence. Finally, the person labeled as violent may be encouraged to continue playing that role, because the description of being violent can be integrated to his or her own self-concept. The model specifies that violent interactions increase due to positive feedback through the following processes: labeling, creation of secondary conflict caused by violence, reinforcement of violent behaviors when they are
successful and development of role expectations and/or self-concept as violent or aggressive.

Straus’s model describes how personal and interactional aspects of systems or members can create either positive or negative feedback. This model considers the different responses of the system to violent acts, for example how some responses can change the roles of the members of the system to prevent more violence and therefore increase the use of other strategies to respond to conflict or how others might provoke the dissolution of the system, like in cases of divorce, desertion, or homicide. Straus also considers how larger systems like extended family or community can intervene in families when there are cases of violence.

Straus (1976) also proposes that several contextual issues such as police repeated failure to protect the victim, existence of male authority, climate of mutual antagonism between the sexes, burdens of child care, economic constrains, and work related discrimination against women, among many others, influence the development and acceptance of Intimate Partner Violence. These issues can also be explained by systems theory’s main premises that families respond to broader sociostructural conditions that can produce stress and conflict. Additionally there may be lack of social support which legitimizes violent behavior as a mean to cope with high level of stress (Lenton, 1995).

**Human Ecology Theory on Intimate Partner Violence**

Human ecology theory states that in order to fully understand human behavior it is required to observe the interaction between systems in which the person is placed, rather than only examining the immediate situation (Brofenbrenner, 1977). Human ecology theory examines the interaction between the individual and the changing environments. This model includes specific variables like individual and couple’s interactions, and also broader variables, like cultural aspects (Dutton, 2006). The nested
ecological variables on Intimate Partner Violence, described by Dutton (2006), includes three ecological levels first proposed by Brofenbrenner: macrosystem, exosystem and microsystem, and the one later proposed by Belsky (1980), the ontogenic level, and finally a suprasystem level proposed by Dutton himself.

The macrosystem is comprised of the broad cultural values and beliefs systems, the general prototypes that set patterns for structures (Bronfenbrenner, 1977; Dutton, 2006). Patriarchy, women’s socioeconomic position, and women’s political power are examples of aspects of this level that might affect the probability of violent behaviors in couple’s relationships (Dutton, 2006). Sex-role stereotyping, general acceptance of violence and norms about family relationships in general are also important parts of the macrosystem (Carlson, 1984).

The exosystem includes the formal and informal social structures that affect the immediate context of the individual, meaning the groups that are connected to the family (Dutton, 2006). Work stress and lack of social support are examples of characteristics of an exosystem that might increase the probability of Intimate Partner Violence. Other broader factors of the exosystem that are related to Intimate Partner Violence are the community and neighborhood characteristics, law enforcement and criminal justice practices (Carlson, 1984). These factors can contribute to Intimate Partner Violence through norms, laws and informal rules and through the ways they choose to ignore or respond to violence as a problem.

The microsystem is comprised of the family unit or the immediate context. In this level, characteristics that have to be observed in order to understand Intimate Partner Violence are the interactional patterns, conflicts between members of the couple, antecedents and consequences of the assault that happen in the family system, and family role structure (Carlson, 1984; Dutton, 2006).
Belsky’s ontogenetic level describes the individual’s development, history, and backgrounds (Belsky, 1980; Carlson, 1984; Dutton, 2006). It also describes the internal context of the individual like alcohol abuse, self-esteem of the perpetrator or victim, previous experiences of exposure to or direct abuse by violent role models, the repertoire of responses to handle conflict and emotional reactions to conflict are all examples of characteristics that would be included at the ontogenetic level.

On the other hand, Dutton’s suprasystem includes power conflicts between groups in society that are deeper than cultural attitudes. For example, sex as a power base for women and economy as a power base for men in history would be included at this level.

Some of the strengths of the model include recognizing multiple causation factor for violence at different levels, recognizing the interaction between these factors, analyzing violence on time and differentiating between factors causing and maintaining violence (Carlson, 1984). Nevertheless some of the limitations for the present model are lack of knowledge to exhaustively identify all the factors that cause and affect domestic violence. This model has also not been able to define how the factors should be weighted to explain domestic violence.

Reciprocal Violence

Several articles studying American samples describe that reciprocal violence in couples is the most common type of violence. Williams and Frieze (2005) studied the different patterns of violence in couples and found that the two most common forms of violence were the mutually mild violence (which included minor incidents of violence such as pushing, grabbing and shoving from both partners) and mutually severe violence (which included severe violent behaviors from both partners such as beating up their partner). Similar to this Caetano, Vaeth and Ramisetty-Mikler (2008) found that
mutual violence was present in 8% of the couple’s participant in their study, compared to 4% with only male to female violence and 2% with only female to male violence. A revision of literature by Langhinrichsen-Rohling et al. about reciprocal violence in western populations, such as European, North American and Australian populations, also shows similar results in different samples (Langhinrichsen-Rohling, Misra, Selwyn & Rohling, 2012). In all reviewed studies, 57.8% of the violence in couples was bidirectional, compared to 28.3% of unidirectional violence of women against men and 13.8% of unidirectional violence of men against women. The percentages varied a little in the different types of relationships. In dating couples 50% of the violence was bidirectional. In married couples 48.2% was bidirectional, and in college, high school and middle school couples bidirectional violence was present in 51.8% of the violent couples. Some studies also suggest that reciprocal violence is more related to the severity of violence experienced by women in couple’s relationships. For example, Whitaker et al. (2007) found that the frequency of violence from women against their partners was influenced by the reciprocity of violence in the relationship. The results of their study showed a higher frequency of violence from women against their partners in reciprocally violent couples. Another study also found that the women’s violence against their partners was the most consistent predictor of men’s violence, with the exception of aggressors with Borderline Personality Disorder (Ross and Babcock, 2009). Cascardi and Vivian (1995) also described that the level of coercion and psychological abuse that women used toward their partners increased when conflict escalated. Women also tend to use severe physical aggression in self-defense when attacked by their partners.

Swan and Snow (2002, 2003) proposed a typology of female aggression against their male partners based on the patterns of violence. They described four patterns of
women violence. The first pattern is when women are more likely to be victims of aggression, which means that their partner commits more severe acts of violence and coercion against the woman than the violence she commits against him. In Swan and Snow studies, this type of pattern was present in 34% of the sample of women in New England. They were described as the most dangerous and violent relationships and they reported more injuries. Violence in these relationships was mostly initiated by men (88% of the time initiated by men compared to 9% by women). The use of violence by women was mostly about self-defense. The second pattern of violence was described as women as aggressors, where the woman commits more severe violence and coercion against her partner than he commits against her. This pattern was reported in 12% of the sample. The female aggressors in this group reported suffering more traumatic experiences of abuse when they were younger. The incidence of injuries in women in this group is also high, and not significantly different from the ones in the first pattern of violence. The women categorized in this group reported the highest level of anger directed to others and lowest levels of anger control. Similarly, the reasons behind their violence were control of their partner or getting even. In this category, women tended to report initiating violence most of the times (83% of the times compared to 17% of the times initiated by men). The third pattern of violence in women is when women are in a mixed-male coercive relationship, where their partners use more coercive control relative to the women, but women report an equivalent or greater use of severe violence than used by their partners. This type of pattern was present in 32% of the cases. In these cases, women were more likely to initiate violence in 66% of the cases compared to 28% initiated by men. The fourth pattern of violence was mixed-female coercive relationships, and 18% of the participants were classified under this pattern. In these cases women’s use of coercive control is equivalent or greater than their partners’, but
the use of severe violence by their partner is equivalent to or greater than violence used by women. These were the cases with lowest levels of abuse, and women in this category show the highest levels of avoidance coping. In this pattern, women also tend to initiate violence, and in similar rates to the mixed-male coercive relationships (63% to 26%). Swan and Snow (2002) have also described the similarities of some of these patterns to Johnson’s typologies of violence. The women as victims pattern is most likely related to intimate terrorism descriptions by Johnson (1995, 2011). However, the mixed-female coercive relationships present some of the characteristics of Johnson’s common couples violence and the mixed-male coercive is similar to violent resisters.

**Reciprocal Violence and Injuries**

The most direct effects of Intimate Partner Violence are fatal and non-fatal physical injuries (World Health Organization, 2013). As described above, female victims of Intimate Partner Violence have a higher risk of suffering injuries (Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, 1998; Plichta, 2004). Some results show that the fear of serious bodily injuries or death are greater for women compared to men (Tjaden & Thoennes, 2000). They also tend to report more injuries as a result of Intimate Partner Violence (Whitaker et al., 2007), usually associated to the fact that men have more physical strength than women. But an important question is whether being part of a reciprocal violent relationship, or being part of a unidirectional violent relationship with a pattern of control and coercion of the other member should result in a greater number of injuries. Different perspectives and results of several studies cast a doubt about the answer to this question. For example, Johnson (1995) describes that common couple violence, which tends to be symmetrical and conflictual, is related to minor use of violence. Another study (Johnson & Leone, 2005) supports the ideas of Johnson, where victims of Intimate Terrorism suffer more incident of violence than victims or
participants of common couple’s violence. The violence in cases of Intimate Terrorism was also more severe and couples reported more injuries. Similar to what Johnson proposed, Swan & Snow (2003) reported that injuries are more probable in relationships with a very skewed distribution of power and control, where reciprocal violence can exist but the rates of male-to-female and female-to-male violence are different. However, their sample was comprised of violent women, which means that although patterns of control and power can be perceived as more dangerous and with a higher risk of injuries, this patterns can also be present in reciprocal violent couples that Johnson called violent resistance (Johnson, 2011). On the other hand, Whitaker et al. (2007) found that reciprocally violent couples also reported higher rates of injuries, and even the probability of injuries in men in reciprocally violent couples was higher than the probability of injuries in non-reciprocally violent couples for women (25.2% versus 20.0% of women who reported injuries in unidirectional violent relationships).

**Hypotheses**

Based on the studies reviewed and the assumption that this study will mostly include cases of situational couple’s violence, the hypotheses for the present study are the following:

1. The severity of violence reported by people in a reciprocally violent relationship is greater compared to the severity of violence reported by people in a nonreciprocal violent relationship.

2. The number of reported injuries by people in reciprocally violent couple relationships is greater than the number of reported injuries by people in nonreciprocal violent couples.
Chapter 3: Method

Overview

The present study followed a survey research design (Heppner, Wampold & Kivlighan, 2008) examining the presence of unidirectional or bidirectional forms of violence, severity of intimate partner violence and injuries. This study also examined how these variables are related.

Three hundred adults living in Arequipa City in Peru participated. Arequipa is the second largest city in Peru. It is composed of 14 districts and has a total population of 786,432 (Instituto Nacional de Estadística e Informática, 2011). The sample for the study was selected from three of these fourteen districts that represent all the socio-economic levels of the population. These three districts were Paucarpata, Cerro Colorado, and Hunter. The surveyors approached houses in the selected districts looking for people who would fit the characteristics of the expected sample and that would be willing to participate in the study. They knocked on the door and asked the person responding about any person in the household that would fit the characteristics for the sample, such as being married or cohabiting with their partner and being an adult with ages between 18 and 65. The sample was also stratified by gender, to recruit a similar number of participants from both genders. Once in contact with that person, the surveyor would ask them if they would like to participate in a study about couple interactions. Table 1 shows the socio-demographic characteristics of the participants.

Participants

The initial sample was composed of 300 adults currently living in Arequipa. However, the sample was reduced to 280 because 20 participants reported being single at the time of the study or did not complete all the questions on the scales. The sample had a similar number of male and female participants (49.3% and 50.7% respectively).
The participants’ ages were between 18 and 65. The participants lived in Paucarpata (36.1%), Cerro Colorado (42.9%) and Hunter (20.4%). By their characteristics, the sample is representative of Arequipa’s population (see Table 1). For ethical purposes, only one member of the couple was interviewed in order to prevent possible retaliation for reporting incidents of violence.

Table 1

*Socio-demographic Characteristics of Participants (n = 280)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>District</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paucarpata</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>36.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cerro Colorado</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>42.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hunter</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>20.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gender</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>50.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>49.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Marital Status</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Married</td>
<td>237</td>
<td>84.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cohabiting</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>15.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Age</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 – 24</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>12.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 – 34</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>32.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35 – 44</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>21.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45 – 54</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>21.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55 – 64</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>12.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Type of Violence</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-violent</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>27.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-reciprocal</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>11.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reciprocal</td>
<td>172</td>
<td>61.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Instruments

**Demographic questionnaire.** Socio-demographic characteristics of the participants were gathered using a questionnaire. It included information about their age, gender, marital status, and district of residence.

**Revised Conflict Tactics Scale.** The presence of physical violence and past injuries was measured with the Revised Conflict Tactics Scale (Straus, Hamby, Boney-McCoy & Sugarman, 1996). This scale contains questions of the relationship behaviors where the participant responds to what behaviors he or she used against his/her partner, and what behaviors were used against him/her in order to measure reciprocity or bidirectionality of violence. The scale includes 78 questions with eight options of response going from “this has never happened” to “it happened more than 20 times in the last year”. The scale has 5 subscales: physical assault, injuries, psychological aggression, sexual coercion, and negotiation. For the present study only the first two subscales were used. In order to be applicable in a sample from Arequipa, the translation of the questionnaire was revised and a few words in the questions were changed in order to be understandable by the Peruvian population. The changes in the language and the use of the scale were approved by Western Psychological Services (WPS). The internal reliability of the translated version was measured using Cronbach’s alpha for the sample of the present study (n = 280). The reliability for the physical assault subscales were .822 for the questions regarding perpetration and .837 for the questions regarding victimization. In the case of the injury subscale, the reliability for the questions about perpetration was .878 and for the questions regarding victimization was .801. For the application of the questionnaire, the surveyors were trained to solve doubts about the questions if the participants requested any help. However, they were
suggested to intervene as little as possible because of the sensitive content of the questionnaire.

**Procedures**

This study was approved by the Saint Cloud State University Internal Review Board. The coordinator of the study in Peru, the field coordinator and the surveyors received training regarding the main purpose of the study, basic information about Intimate Partner Violence, and safety recommendations and procedures for the present study. Due to the sensitive content included in the Revised Conflict Tactic Scale the informed consent was obtained orally, to avoid possible identification of the participants. The purpose of the study, the content of the instruments, the possible benefits and risks of participating in the study, and the possibility of obtaining the results of the study by contacting the principal researcher were explained to the participants. They were also offered information about resources in cases of Intimate Partner Violence in case they needed them.

The participants were first approached by the surveyor at the door of their house and asked to participate in the study specifying that the study was about couple interactions. Once alone with the participant, the surveyor explained that the study included questions about violence, and would once again given the opportunity not to participate, and would also give other information described previously in order to obtain informed consent. The surveyor asked the questions about socio-demographic information, and handed out the Conflict Tactics Scale Revised for the participant to fill out. The surveyors gave the participants time to complete the scale, but they would stay close to the participants in order to be able to respond to any question about the scale and for the safety purpose. Contact information of agencies dealing with violence in intimate relationships was provided if the participant asked for such resources.
Surveyors were trained to postpone the survey taking if the participant would ask to be contacted another time. All ethical considerations and recommendations provided by the World Health Organization for studies about violence against women were followed (Watts, Heise, Ellsberg & Garcia Moreno, 2001).

**Method of Analysis**

All statistical analyses were performed using SPSS 20.0 (IBM Corp, 2011). The data was analyzed using t-test for independent samples in order to examine the differences in the severity of Intimate Partner Violence and injuries reported in reciprocal and non-reciprocal violence. In order to do so, couples where physical violence existed in the last year were separated in two groups, reciprocally violent couples and non-reciprocally violent couples. Non-reciprocally violent couples included couples where the participant reported at least one incident of violence from the participant towards his/her partner or from his/her partner towards him/her. On the other hand, reciprocally violent couples include couples where the participant reported at least one incident of violence from the participant towards his/her partner and at least one incident of violence from the partner towards the participant.

Two scales of the Conflict Tactics Scale were used (physical assault and injury) and each was divided in two subscales, physical assault minor and severe, and injury minor and severe. In the case of physical assault, minor violence included throwing something that could hurt, twisting their partner’s arm or hair, pushing or shoving, grabbing and slapping. Severe violence included using a knife or gun, punching or hitting with an object that could hurt, choking, slamming against the wall, beating up, burning or scalding, and kicking. On the other hand, minor injuries included sprain, bruises or small cuts, as well as having pain the day after the conflict. Severe injuries described passing out, needing to go to a doctor after a fight, and broken bones. Each
subscale included questions about perpetration and victimization. For each participant, a mean of his or her responses to all the questions in each subscale was obtained using the response options from the Conflict Tactics Scale Revised (0 = Never has happened, 1 = Happened before, but not in the last year, 2 = One time in the last year, 3 = Two times in the last year, 4 = Three to five times in the last year, 5 = Six to ten times in the last year, 6 = Eleven to twenty times in the last year, 7 = More than twenty times in the last year). The means of these subscales were analyzed using t-test to examine the differences between the reciprocal and non-reciprocal violent couples.
Chapter 4: Results

Both hypotheses in this study were statistically supported.

Hypothesis 1

The results of the t-test intended to determine if the severity of violence in a reciprocally violent relationship is greater than the severity of violence in a nonreciprocally violent relationship. The means for minor physical assault (such as pushing, shoving, grabbing and slapping, among others) and severe physical assault (such as choking, kicking and burning or scalding, among others) were higher for couples where reciprocal violence exists (M = 2.13, SD = 1.04 for minor physical assault and M = .86, SD = .72 for severe physical assault) than the ones from couples with non-reciprocal violence (M = .58, SD = .60 for minor physical assault and M = .25, SD = .23 for severe physical assault). Results of the t-test analyses show a statistically significant difference in the means for the participants in non-reciprocally violent couple relationship and the ones in a reciprocally violent couple relationships for minor physical assault (t = -11.77, p<.001) and severe physical assault (t = - 9.03, p<.001). This indicates that the participants in reciprocally violent couple relationships reported a higher frequency of minor and severe physical assault incidents than participants in non-reciprocally violent couple relationships. See Table 2 for t-test results for minor and severe physical assault and descriptive statistics.
Table 2

Results of t-tests and Descriptive Statistics Minor and Severe Physical Assault

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Violence</th>
<th>Non-reciprocal</th>
<th>Reciprocal</th>
<th>95% CI for Mean Difference</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>df</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Minor Physical Assault</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>n</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.58</td>
<td>.60</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>2.13</td>
<td>1.04</td>
<td>172</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Severe Physical Assault</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>n</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.25</td>
<td>.23</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>.86</td>
<td>.72</td>
<td>172</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Unequal variance t-test employed due to unequal group variances
*** p < .001

Hypothesis 2

In the case of injuries, t-test for independent samples was also used to determine if the number of injuries for reciprocally violent couples was higher than the number of injuries for non-reciprocally violent couples. The mean for minor injuries for non-reciprocally violent couples (M = .10, SD = .26) was smaller than the mean for minor injuries for reciprocally violent couples (M = .80, SD = 1.14). Similarly, the mean of severe injuries was higher for reciprocally violent couples (M = .36, SD = .77) compared to the mean of severe injuries for non-reciprocally violent couples (M = .05, SD = .15).

The results of the t-test analyses show that the difference in the means for the participant in a non-reciprocally violent couple relationship and the ones in a reciprocally violent couple relationship for minor injuries (t = -7.02, p<.001) and severe injuries (t = - 4.83, p<.001) are statistically significant. These results indicate that the participants in reciprocally violent couples’ relationship have a higher frequency of minor and severe injuries than the participants in non-reciprocally violent couples’ relationship. See Table 3 for t-test results for minor and severe injuries and descriptive statistics.
Table 3

Results of t-tests and Descriptive Statistics Minor and Severe Injuries

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Violence</th>
<th>95% CI for Mean Difference</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>df</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Minor Physical Injuries</td>
<td>-0.89, -0.50</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>0.26</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>0.80</td>
<td>1.14</td>
<td>172</td>
<td>-7.02***</td>
<td>195.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Severe Physical Injuries</td>
<td>-0.43, -0.18</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>0.36</td>
<td>0.77</td>
<td>172</td>
<td>-4.83***</td>
<td>201.69</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Unequal variance t-test employed due to unequal group variances

*** p < .001
Chapter 5: Discussion

Intimate Partner Violence can be detrimental for the psychological and physical health of members of the couple, as well as for the couple relationship. Several studies have recognized the negative impact that violence has for the victim and the relationship (Coker et al., 2000; Coker et al., 2002; Feld and Straus, 1989; Golding, 1999; Plichta, 2004). The present study attempted to identify the differences between reciprocal and nonreciprocal violent couples in order to expand the knowledge about interactional aspects of Intimate Partner Violence, and some of its risks, such as in this case, the number of injuries. Similar studies with different methodologies have studied the impact of interactions in the expression of violence in relationships (Caetano, et al., 2008; Feld & Straus, 1989, Langhinrichsen- Rohling, et al., 2012; Whitaker et al., 2007; Williams and Frieze, 2005). However, no study has addressed these variables in a Peruvian sample. This is particularly important to address due to the high prevalence of Intimate Partner Violence reported in Peru (Flake, 2005; Garcia-Moreno, et al., 2006; Gonzales de Olarte & Gavilano Llosa, 1999).

The results of this study revealed a very high percentage of couples that had at least an incident of Intimate Partner Violence in the last year (72.8% any type of violence, 61.4% reciprocal violence). Compared to previous studies about violence, the number of couples reporting violence in the last year in this study was close to double to the national prevalence of Intimate Partner Violence against women (Flake, 2005; Gonzales de Olarte & Gavilano Llosa, 1999), and it showed an even greater difference from the only study that included men in the sample (Fiestas, et al., 2012). However, a study from the World Health Organization also reported a higher percentage of Intimate Partner Violence in provincial settings (Garcia-Moreno, et al., 2006). On the other hand, this study also highlights the high number of couples where both members are violent.
against each other. This high number of couples with reciprocal violence can be an example of a general acceptance of violence in close relationships in the cultural context. However, the average number of incidents of violence for the couples in this present study is low, which states that in most couples relationship violence is present, but in the majority of situations it is not very frequent or severe. Nevertheless, there is a great need for the topic to be addressed and intervention programs developed in order to prevent further risks.

The present study also showed that reciprocally violent couples have a higher number of physical assault incidents, both minor and severe. A previous study with an American sample has also shown similar results (Whitaker et al., 2007). Based on Johnson’s categorization of Intimate Partner Violence (Johnson, 1995, 2011), it would be easy to assume that non-reciprocal violent couples would show higher rates of physical assault and severity of the violent incidents. However, it has been previously mentioned by Johnson (2011) that community samples or surveys applied to the general population are more likely to involve in its majority cases of situational couple’s violence. This type of violence is the most common type of violence in relationships and in some of these cases violence can escalate to more severe types of aggression (Johnson, 2011). According to this idea and the results of the present study, situational couple’s violence is more likely to escalate to more severe expressions of violence if both members of the couple are aggressive toward each other. Feld and Straus (1989) stated that it is possible that once violence appears in couples’ relationships, it becomes perceived as tolerable or permissible, which can lead to more severe violence toward each other. These interchanges can also increase the likelihood of violence to continue and escalate even more. In their study, Feld and Straus (1989) also found that assaults by both members in the couple were related to escalation and continuance of violence.
The results of the present study also demonstrated that injuries are more common in reciprocally violent couples than in non-reciprocally violent couples. This is the case for minor and severe injuries. Whitaker et al. (2007) obtained similar results, when they also found that the increment in the possibility of suffering injuries in reciprocally violent couples was not only for men, but also for women. Similar explanations to the higher frequency or severity of violence in reciprocally violent couples can be assumed for the case of the resultant difference in injuries in reciprocally violent and non-reciprocally violent couples. The escalation of violence can lead to more severe expressions of violence, and therefore a higher likelihood of injuries. This issue is very significant when addressing the risks and the urgent need to prevent violence from happening in couples’ relationships and, according to the result of this study, more specifically, in reciprocal violence.

According to Johnson’s typology of Intimate Partner Violence, the participants would be more likely to describe situational couple’s violence. The results do not appear to support what is stated by feminist theory, however further information would be needed to rule out the possibility of the participants describing a pattern of interaction that includes patriarchal terrorism and violent resistance. On the other hand, the results of this study relate to the systemic perspective on Intimate Partner Violence. The symmetrical escalation of conflict, as proposed by Giles-Sims (1983), is the result of reciprocity in the use of physical violence. Also, as mentioned by Feld and Straus (1989), the use of violence by a member of the couple could establish that physical violence is permissible. However, such norms in the couple allowing physical violence in cases of conflict would have to be established based on the response of the system to the initial event, or feedback from the system. Nevertheless, it is important to highlight that the systems theory’s explanation of Intimate Partner Violence and the description
of how violence occurs in relationships often does not consider factors such as the power difference, especially related to gender and how it relates to culture and patriarchal practices (Dell, 1989). Finally, further expanding how the results relate to the human ecology perspective, the general acceptance of violence in relationships in the society and the responses of the community to these events might increase the probability of violence happening in a relationship and further expanding to more severe and reciprocal violence (Carlson, 1984).

The results of this study reflect the need for further prevention and intervention strategies against Intimate Partner Violence. First, the current existing intervention resources in Peru are developed on the assumption that women are the ones suffering from Intimate Partner Violence. Without minimizing the significance of violence against women and the great need for proper interventions especially in terms of Intimate Terrorism, other resources need to be developed in order for couples to accede to prevention and intervention programs. This might also be highly important for men, which most of the times are perceived as the perpetrators and little resources are offered to them. Interventions for conjoint treatment for couples have been developed in the United States for cases of mild and moderate Intimate Partner Violence (Stith & McCollum, 2011). However, further studies would need to be developed to identify the potential of such treatments for Peruvian couples that need to be adapted or changed due to the Peruvian cultural aspects. Broader interventions like this could also have a beneficial impact in identifying and preventing cases of Intimate Partner Violence. If resources are less perceived as attempts to punish the perpetrator, or to turn the victim against the perpetrator in the legal system, they might have a higher likelihood to attract ambivalent victims or conflicted perpetrators, at least initially. A broader spectrum of interventions for Intimate Partner Violence could also have a preventive function in the
long term, since the permissiveness of violence in relationships is often learned by kids when they are exposed to violence between their parents.

Also, general cultural norms tend to permit or encourage minor expressions of violence from women (Straus, 2004), which relates to the high number of reciprocal violence in couples and increased likelihood of injuries in reciprocal patterns of assault. This phenomenon was reported in the present study and a previous study in the United States (Whitaker et al., 2007), which indicate the probability of higher incidence of abuse against women and higher perpetuation of violence in couples’ relationships. Therefore, sensitization of the population is needed to address the risks of retaliation or further use of violence in couples as a response mechanism in decreasing violence. As Feld and Straus (1989) stated, the use of violence is the least effective strategy to prevent further incidents of assault.

**Limitations**

Even though the present study is helpful to further understand violence in couples in Peru, its limitations can be used for recommendations for further research. The data for this study was obtained from a self-report instrument. Self-report instruments in cases of reporting violence can be affected by attempts of impression management (Archer, 1999), which is particularly important in the present study since the reports of violence for both members of the couple were obtained only from one member. Archer (1999) described that self-reports of violence often tend to be lower than both partner’s reports of violence.

The present study only offered a basic examination and description of reciprocity of violence in couples’ relationships. The present study did not examine the causes or reasons for the violence, which could have helped with identifying further interactional aspects of the couple’s relationship needed for intervention and prevention
strategies. Also, interactional and other factors that can increase or decrease the probability of escalation of abuse in couples need to be studied in order to gain a broader understanding of reciprocity of violence in couples’ relationships. The present study also did not analyze the gender differences in the severity of violence or when violence was non-reciprocal.

Other types of violence that might affect the expression of physical abuse in couples and victim’s fear, such as psychological or sexual abuse, were not considered. It was assumed that the participants who reported abuse in this sample were in majority cases victims of situational couple violence. However, with more information about other related variables this could have been also assessed. On the other hand, if the majority of cases in the present study were, as assumed, cases of situational couple’s violence, the results would not be applicable to more severe cases of Intimate Partner Violence, such as intimate terrorism and violent resistance.

Even with these limitations, this study is beneficial in expanding our knowledge about interactional patterns and their relationships to injuries, especially for the under researched area of Intimate Partner Violence in Peru.

**Recommendations for Future Research and Implications**

The findings of the present study can offer important information for future research in identifying interactional and systemic factors that are related to the use of violence in intimate relationships, including causes and reasons for the use of aggression. If such factors could be identified, it would be beneficial for the development of appropriate programs to prevent and intervene in cases of Intimate Partner Violence. Also, identifying factors that are present in the non-violent couples’ relationships, which prevent them from using aggression, would be helpful.
Longitudinal studies about relational violence are needed in order to better explain the development of escalation and other related factors. Further, the reasons behind why some couple do not develop reciprocal patterns of violence in their relationship, need to be explored. Feld and Straus (1989) addressed desistance in violent relationships, which was more common in non-reciprocally violent couples, even though, factors affecting such change have not been studied. The development of larger and nationally representative studies in Peru is needed in order for the results to be more applicable to the general Peruvian population.
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Information for Informed Consent

INFORMACION PARA CONSENTIMIENTO INFORMADO

Estimado participante:

Usted ha sido elegido aleatoriamente para participar en un proyecto investigación sobre interacciones y conflictos en la pareja como parte de una tesis de Maestría de Saint Cloud State University en Minnesota, Estados Unidos. Los participantes de este proyecto de investigación deben tener una edad entre 18 y 64 años y estar en este momento casados o conviviendo con su pareja. Los datos recogidos con la siguiente encuesta serán analizados grupalmente y el contenido será confidencial. Ninguna información que lo/la identifique será compartida. La encuesta (Conflict Tactics Scale Revised) contiene 78 preguntas sobre comportamientos que usted y/o su pareja utiliza cuando tienen algún conflicto. Algunas de estas preguntas incluyen aspectos de violencia física, psicológica y sexual, por lo tanto si en algún momento usted desea modificar la hora o lugar de participación, nosotros estamos dispuestos a acomodarnos a sus facilidades. Además su participación es voluntaria y usted puede decidir no seguir participando si así desea. Hay algunos riesgos que pueden aumentar si usted desea participar en esta investigación. A pesar de las precauciones que podemos tomar, su pareja puede volverse suspicaz sobre su participación en el estudio y si hay incidentes de violencia estos pueden incrementar. Ademas le recomendamos no dejar nada escrito sobre la investigación para que su pareja pueda encontrarlo. Algunas veces, las encuestas psicológicas pueden causar malestar emocional causado por el contenido de las preguntas. Los posibles beneficios de tomar esta encuesta es que este estudio puede ayudar a ampliar el conocimiento sobre interacciones en parejas y que posteriormente puede ser utilizado para diseñar intervenciones más efectivas para casos de violencia. Si usted desea, nosotros (los entrevistadores) tenemos información sobre centros de tratamiento para casos de violencia, puede solicitar esta información, no dude en solicitarla.

Para obtener un resumen de los resultados de esta investigación puede escribir al correo electrónico del investigadora depa1301@stcloudstate.edu. Si usted tiene alguna duda o pregunta puede comunicarse al número telefónico 949076143, con la coordinadora del proyecto, o puede enviar un correo electrónico a depa1301@stcloudstate.edu para comunicarse con la investigadora Paula Delgado, o a mdaneshpour@stcloudstate.edu para comunicarse con la asesora de tesis Manijeh Daneshpour (daries la información). El estudio será posiblemente publicado en internet, y los participantes podrán ubicarlo en google académico.

INFORMATION FOR IMPLIED INFORMED CONSENT

Dear participant:

You have been randomly selected to participate in a research project about couple interactions and conflicts as part of a thesis for a Master degree from Saint Cloud State University in Minnesota, USA. The participants of the present study must be between 18 and 64 years and must be living with their partner or married. The data collected with this survey will be analyzed as a group and the content of each survey will be confidential. No identifying information will be shared. The scale (Conflict Tactics Scale Revised) contains 78 questions about behaviors that you and/or your partner have used when there is a conflict. Some of these questions include aspects of physical, psychological and sexual violence, therefore if at any moment you decide to change the time or place to participate, we are willing to adapt to your conditions. Also, your participation is voluntary and you can decide not to continue to participate if you wish to do so. There are some risks that might increase if you decide to participate in this study. Despite all the precautions that we might take, your partner can become more suspicious about your participation in the study and if there have been incidents of violence before they might increase. We also recommend not to leave anything written from the study for your partner to see. Sometimes, psychological scales can cause or increase emotional discomfort due to the content of the questions being asked. The possible benefits of taking the survey for this study are that it can help to increase knowledge about interactions in couples and that can be used to develop more effective interventions in case of violence. If you wish, we (the interviewers) have information about treatment centers for domestic violence, so please don’t hesitate to ask about this information.

If you wish to obtain a summary of the results of the study, please write an email to the researcher at depa1301@stcloudstate.edu. If you have any doubts or questions you can call 949076143,
and talk to the project coordinator, or you can send an email to depa1301@stcloudstate.edu to communicate with the researcher Paula Delgado, or to mdaneshpour@stcloudstate.edu to communicate with the thesis advisor professor Manijeh Daneshpour (hand out information). The study will probably be published online, and then study participants would be able to access it from google scholar.
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Sociodemographic Questionnaire

QUESTIONARIO DE INFORMACION DEMOGRAFICA

Edad:
18 – 25 ____
26 – 35 ____
36 – 45 ____
46 – 55 ____
56 – 64 ____

Género:

Distrito de residencia:

Estado civil:

SOCIODEMOGRAPHIC QUESTIONNAIRE

Age:
18 – 25 ____
26 – 35 ____
36 – 45 ____
46 - 55 ____
56 - 64 ____

Gender:

______________

District of residence:

______________________________

Marital status:

______________________________
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Appendix E

Interview Protocol

Reciprocal Violence and Injuries in Couples in Arequipa, Peru

I. Introduction

II. Coordinator’s Qualifications and Role

III. Interviewer’s Qualifications and Role

IV. Interview/Survey
   a. Interviewer’s Training
   b. Safety Guidelines
   c. Interview/Survey Procedure
      Initial contact
      Informed consent
      Sociodemographic questionnaire
      Codification
      Conflict Tactics Scale Revised (CTS2)
      Summary
      Giving out researcher’s information
      Giving out resources’ information
      Extenuating circumstances

V. Post-Interview/Survey Information Handling Procedure
I. Introduction

The present protocol is a main description of the procedures for the data collection process for the study “Reciprocal Violence and Injuries in Couples in Arequipa, Peru”, which will include a sample of 400 participants living in Arequipa from both sexes, who are currently married or cohabiting with their partners. For ethical reasons only one member of the couple will be interviewed. The interviewers will ask them some sociodemographic information questions and the participants will fill out the Conflict Tactics Scale Revised. The research team will be composed by the interviewers, the project coordinator and the principal researcher, who will be out of the country for most of the data collection process.

II. Coordinator’s Qualifications and Role

The coordinator will be a female, psychologist, with basic experience in research. Her main role is to be a link between the principal researcher and the team of interviewers. The coordinator will also be trained in general aspects of the study and the procedures of the interviews, since it is expected that she will offer support to the interviewers in cases of immediate response. Her number will be given to the participants, since the principal researcher will only be available through email; therefore the coordinator’s role includes responding to questions about the study and resources for victims of violence.

III. Interviewer’s Qualifications and Role

The interviewers will be females, which have attended at least some classes at a university. Their main roles are to explain the study to the participants, interview the participant and had out the CTS2 and the resources information about the principal researcher and the coordinator, and of agencies that offer family mental health services and agencies that work with domestic abuse cases.

IV. Interview/Survey

a. Interviewer’s Training

Interviewers will be trained in one session. The training will be composed of the three main parts. First, they will receive a basic outline of the study objectives, the significance of the study, sample and sampling procedures. The second part is training about the safety guidelines proposed by the WHO, and this study in particular. The third part is about the procedures to follow in the interview.

b. Safety Guidelines

The safety guidelines are based on the considerations described by the World Health Organization (Watts, Heise, Ellsberg, & Garcia Moreno, 2001. Putting Women First: Ethical and Safety Recommendations for Research on Domestic Violence Against Women). First, the most important aspect is the safety of the participant and the interviewer. Therefore the interview will not introduce the study as a study on violence, they will first introduce it to the participants.
as a study on couple interactions. The study will not be introduced to the community as a study on violence either, in order to prevent other people in the household to get the information from the community and increase the potential harmful consequences for participants. Once alone with the participant in a private setting, the interviewers will explain the content of the scale and the participants will have to consent on the information about the study purpose and possible risks and benefits (the full content of the informed consent will be described in the informed consent procedure later in the training). Interviews will have to be conducted in private settings (they will be relocated or rescheduled if needed). Only one person per household will be interviewed. The interviewers will change the topic of the questions or description of the study if anyone comes close to the interviewer and participant. In order to ensure the safety of the interviewer, they will carry a cellphone with emergency contacts at all time and they will go in pairs if the area is unsafe.

Second, in order to ensure that the participants feel sure to report violent incidents when they exist, empathy from the interviewers has to be emphasized.

Third, protection confidentiality is a main aspect also, since it might place the participants in harmful situation, and if confidentiality is not well managed it can also decrease the probability of participants reporting violent incidents, affecting the quality of the data. Therefore identifiable information will be codified. The district and marital status of the participants will be written in codes. The interviewer will mark the age using age groups, also.

Fourth, team members should receive support due to the content of the study. Interviewers will receive basic information about violence and power inequality. They will receive emotional support or counseling from the program coordinator and the principal researcher if needed. They will be suggested to help participants, in case they need help with issues related to domestic violence (aspects related to this will be better described in extenuating circumstances in the interview procedure), but not give counseling to the participants.

Fifth, the stress of the participants must be minimized. Therefore they interviewers have to avoid using judgmental or blaming language with the participants.

Sixth, a list with help resources will be given to the participants. Nevertheless it will be small enough to be hidden (as suggested in the recommendations from the WHO), and will include information about agencies that offer also services to families or couples in general. The participants will also receive the information of the principal researcher and the program coordinator, if they need to contact them.

c. Interview/Survey Procedure

Initial contact: The interviewers will perform door to door home visits, they will contact either a woman or man currently in a relationship living in each household and ask them to participate in a
study on couples interactions. If the participant agrees to participate
they will ask them for a private location to start the information
intake in order to ensure honesty when responding. They can
reschedule the time for the interview or relocate the interview to a
place where the participant feels safer (they can choose to do so at
any moment of the interview/survey procedure). Once in the private
location, the interviewer will further explain the study and the
informed consent information.
Informed consent: Once in a private setting with the participant, the
interviewer will explain all the following points to the participant:
- How they were selected (randomly)
- Who is performing the present research and why (Name of the
  principal researcher and project as a part of master thesis from
  Saint Cloud State University)
- What are the inclusion criteria (being 18 or older, and being
  married or cohabiting with a partner)
- How the data is going to be analyzed (as a group)
- Emphasize the confidentiality
- What scale is going to be used and what it consists of (conflict
tactic scale revised, consists of questions that include domestic
violence)
- The possibility of rescheduling or relocating the interview
- Emphasize that participation is voluntary and they can withdraw
from participating
- The risks of participating (increasing psychological distress,
  increasing the probability of other incidents of violence), and the
  recommendation to not leave any written information for them
to see
- Possible benefits (increasing knowledge, developing effective
  interventions)
- Inform about information about helpful resources when dealing
  with violence at home that the interviewer has
- How to contact the primary researcher to obtain results
- Contact information of the coordinator, the principal researcher
  and the thesis advisor
If once having all this information the participant chooses to fill out
the scale, he or she will be given implied consent. After the
participant gives implied consent to participate, the interviewer will
ask the questions of the socio-demographic questionnaire.
Socio-demographic questionnaire: The interviewer will ask the
participant a few questions about their age, gender, marital status
and district of residence. Some of these questions will be codified.
For example:
A- District 1
B- District 2
C- District 3
P- Married
Q- Cohabiting
The sociodemographic questionnaire will have numbered codes, which should match to the same numbered code for the CTS2 being filled out by the same person.

Conflict Tactics Scale Revised: The CTS2 will be handed out to the participant to fill out, they will write their responses and the interviewer will be there to respond any questions about the scale. The interviewer must also clarify that they have to stay with the participant for safety concerns, but that they are not in any kind of rush or timed schedule, so the participant feels free to take his or her time to respond. The interviewer should stay calmly while the participant responds to the questionnaire and try not to seem to be looking to what the participant’s responses.

Summary: After the participant finished filling out the conflict tactics scale, the interviewer will remind the participant that they have information about resources if they would like to have them, if the participant says yes, they will give them a small piece of paper with information about agencies that work with families, couples and cases of domestic violence and suggest them not to show it to their partner if it can increase incidents of violence. They will also handle out the contact information of the researcher and coordinator in case they need to contact them.

Extenuating circumstances: There are a few cases when the previously described procedure will be affected.

If the participant agrees to participate, but does not have a private space available at home to fill out the scales - In such situation, the privacy of the data collection has to be emphasized and give them the opportunity to reschedule to a more appropriate time or place where the scale can be filled out without disruptions. Safety and honesty in the responses are main aspects of the present research, therefore the no-participation of a few subjects due to not being able to ensure safety or confidentiality of the respondents is not a significant factor.

If the participant is currently suffering from domestic violence and asks for help to the interviewer - In such situations the interviewer can help the participant reach services that can give her or him a more specialized help, calling a shelter, or agency with the participant so he or she can have more information about what to do is a good response, even if they have to go there with the participant. The interviewer role is not to give the participant counseling, suggestions or orders, but to connect them by phone or physically to more specialized resources.

Situations where the interviewer or the participant are in circumstances where the safety of one or both of them is no longer possible to maintain – the interviewer should have an cellphone and should be able to call emergency contacts (police station), the project coordinator and, if other members of the research team are close by, to them too. After he incident the interviewer will suggest to contact agencies dealing with domestic violence for further procedures.
VI. Post-Interview/Survey Information Handling Procedure

After the data collection, all the written information used in the project and the surveys will be handled to the project coordinator. The project coordinator will enter the data in SPSS. After the data is entered the coordinator will revise the data to check that there are no errors. The program coordinator will send through email the encrypted data base (a password will be used) to the principal researcher and the surveys will be stored in double locked file cabinet in Peru.
CONFIDENTIALITY AND NONDISCLOSURE AGREEMENT

I, ________________________________ , understand that when employed as an interviewer, my responsibility is to facilitate communication sufficient for participants to understand what they are consenting to if they proceed with taking the survey. All information discussed during this process is considered “confidential.”

I agree to hold the identity of interviewees/participants of this study confidential and any information disclosed during the interview in trust and confidence, and agree this information or any other discussed shall be used only for the purposes of this study and shall not be used for any other purpose, or disclosed to a third party.

Furthermore, at the conclusion of the interview/study in general, I agree to return all written information (i.e., forms, notes, etc.) to the researcher.

I understand that if I violate this agreement in any way, I will have to abide by my local organization’s breach of confidentiality terms, will be terminated from this project and not be paid for my services to this study.

AGREED AND ACCEPTED BY:

______________________________
Interviewer

______________________________
Date
Reciprocal Violence and Injuries in Couples in Arequipa, Peru

Cronograma: La información será obtenida entre Diciembre 15 y Mayo 15

ACUERDO DE CONFIDENCIALIDAD

Yo, ____________________________, entiendo que al ser empleado como entrevistador, mi responsabilidad es facilitar información suficiente a los participantes para entender a qué están consintiendo si acceden llenar esta encuesta. Toda la información brindada durante este proceso es “confidencial”. Yo, estoy de acuerdo con mantener en confidencialidad la identidad de los entrevistados/entrevistas y otra información reportada durante la entrevista en confianza y confidencia, y estoy de acuerdo con que esta información sea utilizada únicamente para fines de esta investigación y no para otros propósitos, o reportadas a terceros. Además, al terminar las entrevistas/investigación en general, accedo a regresar toda la información escrita (por ejemplo, formularios, notas, etc.) al investigador. Entiendo que si hay un violación de este acuerdo por mi parte de alguna forma, me someteré a los términos de ruptura de la confidencialidad de mi organización, seré suspendida de participar en este Proyecto de investigación y no se me pagara por mis servicios.

ACEPTADO POR:

______________________________
Entrevistador

______________________________
Fecha
Reciprocal Violence and Injuries in Couples in Arequipa, Peru
Timeframe: Data will be collected between December 15 and May 15

CONFIDENTIALITY AND NONDISCLOSURE AGREEMENT

I, ________________________________, representative of ____________, understand that when paid to coordinate the data collection of this study, our responsibility is to facilitate that all information discussed during the process of data collection is considered “confidential.”

At the conclusion of the study, we agree to return all written information (i.e., forms, notes, etc.) to the researcher and agree that the information obtained shall be used only for the purposes of this study and shall not be used for any other purpose, or disclosed to a third party.

I understand that if the interviewers violate this agreement in any way, they will have to abide by the organization's breach of confidentiality terms, will be terminated from this project and not be paid for the services to this study.

AGREED AND ACCEPTED BY:

________________________________________
Representative

________________________________________
Date
Reciprocal Violence and Injuries in Couples in Arequipa, Peru

Cronograma: La información será obtenida entre Diciembre 15 y Mayo 15

ACUERDO DE CONFIDENCIALIDAD

Yo, ____________________________, representante de ____________, entiendo que al ser empleados para coordinar la recolección de datos de este estudio, nuestra responsabilidad es facilitar que toda la información brindada durante la recolección de datos sea considerada “confidencial”.

Al terminar la investigación, accedo a regresar toda la información escrita (por ejemplo, formularios, notas, etc.) al investigador y estoy de acuerdo con que esta información sea utilizada únicamente para fines de esta investigación y no para otros propósitos, o reportadas a terceros.

Entiendo que si hay un violación de este acuerdo por parte de algún entrevistador de alguna forma, se someterá a los términos de ruptura de la confidencialidad de mi organización, será suspendido/a de participar en este Proyecto de investigación y no se le pagará por los servicios.

ACEPTADO POR:

__________________________

Representante

__________________________

Fecha