



Published in final edited form as:

*Health Care Women Int.* 2014 April ; 35(4): 476–491. doi:10.1080/07399332.2013.770003.

## **“I get angry if he’s always drinking and we have no money”: Exploring motivations for male and female perpetrated intimate partner violence in the Philippines**

**Jessica A. Fehringer** and

MEASURE Evaluation Carolina Population Center University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill  
Chapel Hill, NC

**Michelle J. Hindin**

Department of Population, Family and Reproductive Health Johns Hopkins Bloomberg School of  
Public Health Baltimore, MD

### **Abstract**

Our objective was to describe the context of and motivations for female and male perpetrated IPV in Cebu, Philippines using data from in-depth interviews with 19 married women. We found three categories of IPV motivations --self-defense or retaliation, reactivity, and control. Motivations differed by gender, with women acting out of self-defense more often and men acting out of control more often. Effective IPV prevention and treatment programs should take these gender differences into consideration. Moreover, it is important to look at how IPV occurs within relationships and how this may vary by context and gender.

While intimate partner violence is a well-known problem for both men and women in developing countries, we know relatively little about the context of violence in these settings. There is research from the U.S. on motivations for and other contextual aspects of female-perpetrated intimate partner violence (IPV) and a handful of studies in lower income countries, the U.S. and Canada on motivations for and contextual aspects of male-perpetrated IPV. To create effective prevention and treatment interventions for both male and female perpetrated IPV in developing countries, it is critical to understand how IPV occurs within relationships in these settings and how this may vary by context and gender. We carried out this study to explore the context of both male and female perpetrated IPV in the Philippines using in-depth interviews with married women. We report here the findings on IPV motives and forms of IPV.

---

### **Motivations for IPV**

Researchers have minimally explored male motivations for IPV perpetration in lower income countries. Women’s lack of fulfillment of gender expectations in marriage appears to be a common motivator for male perpetrated IPV in Mexico and Pakistan (Agoff et al., 2006; Rabbani et al. 2008). When a wife does not take good care of the household - the house is not clean, food is not acceptable and/or ready when the husband expects it, etc. - the husband may use violence as her “punishment”. Similarly, when a woman refuses sex and thus does not fulfill her marital sexual duties, she may face violence (Agoff et al., 2006; Rabbani et al., 2008).

Men may also be motivated to perpetrate IPV because of the suspected or actual infidelity of themselves or their partners. Researchers in Mexico and Uganda found that one motivation for male perpetrated IPV was men suspecting their wives had cheated (Agoff et al., 2006; Kaye et al., 2005), whereas researchers in Brazil and Peru showed that a motivation for male perpetrated IPV was their wives’ anger about men’s own infidelity (Cizino da Trindade et

al., 2008; Fuller, 2001). In Peru, researchers noted that this male perpetrated IPV was an attempt by men to regain control/authority in the marriage when the wife stepped outside her bounds; in this case, when a wife complains about her husband's infidelity, she is undermining his authority to behave as he wishes and violence helps to "remind her of her place" (Fuller, 2001). Researchers in Pakistan and Brazil found three additional motivations for male perpetrated IPV. In Pakistan, respondents explained that women demanding money and women not maintaining standards of beauty both independently motivated men to perpetrate IPV (Rabbani et al., 2008). Lastly, women in Brazil noted that men's alcohol consumption led to men perpetrating IPV against their wives (Cizino da Trindade et al., 2008). Turning to women's IPV perpetration, we know very little, in general, and much of what we do know comes from research in the United States and other developed countries. Studies on female motivations for IPV perpetration have been conducted only in the United States. Women most commonly use violence against their partners either out of self-defense, retaliation for previous male perpetrated IPV or desire to escape (Hamberger et al., 1997; Saunders, 1986; Seamans et al., 2007; Stuart et al., 2006). Some women also are motivated to use violence due to reactivity, or expressing anger and other emotions in response to a situation (Hamberger et al., 1997; Seamans et al., 2007; Stuart et al., 2006); for example, Stuart et al showed that more than one third of women arrested for IPV perpetration cited one or more of the following motivations for perpetration: "To show anger," "To show feelings that you couldn't explain in words," and "Because you were jealous" (Stuart et al., 2006). Kernsmith found that another motivation for female perpetrated IPV was getting back at partners for previously hurting them emotionally (Kernsmith, 2005). Finally, some women perpetrate IPV, albeit rarely, out of power and control motives. Following the power and control model, the perpetrator uses violence "in order to gain and maintain power and control in the relationship (Kernsmith, 2005). Seamans found several cases of women using violence out of an attempt to control their partners (Seamans et al., 2007); these women "described their relationships as mutual struggles for control" (Seamans et al., 2007).

### IPV in the Philippines

Anywhere from 6 to 26% of men perpetrate IPV in the Philippines (Cabaraban & Morales, 1998; David et al., 1998; Fehringer & Hindin MJ, 2009; Hassan et al., 2004; Hindin & Adair, 2002). We located two studies that have examined female perpetrated IPV in this setting using data from the Cebu Longitudinal Health and Nutrition Survey (CLHNS); one group of researchers found that, for adults, 13% of women reported female-only perpetrated IPV and 42% reported bi-directional perpetration in the past year (Ansara & Hindin, 2009); the other group of researchers looked at data from young adults and showed that 55.8% of young women and 30.5% of young men reported female perpetrated IPV (Fehringer & Hindin MJ, 2009).

We only found one qualitative study looking at the context of IPV in this setting. Lee conducted focus group discussions with men and found that many of the participants confessed to having physically abused their female partners, but none admitted their own victimization (Lee, 2004). Many of the incidents of physical violence were sparked by: arguments related to differing views; "displeasure or frustration over a questionable behavior of the other," and; women not fulfilling "their responsibilities at home or to their husbands/partners" (Lee, 2004). Subjects of arguments that led to violence included money, jealousy, real or suspected infidelity, "vices," child discipline, and "a man's inability to provide for his family" (Lee, 2004). These findings are consistent with research about male motivations for IPV perpetration in other developing countries and suggest that the dynamics of male IPV perpetration are similar across these settings.

There is clearly only limited understanding of the context of IPV in developing countries. Given the increasing interest in development of IPV-related programming in these settings, it is important to further explore this topic so that programs are responsive to local needs. In this study, we seek to understand the context of and motivations for female and male perpetrated IPV in Cebu, Philippines.

## Methods

### Study setting

Our study focuses on Cebu, an island and province in the Central Visayas in the center of the Philippines archipelago. With a population of over two million, Metro Cebu is the second largest city in the Philippines. Metro Cebu is a highly urbanized center and a major port city. Cebu Province has annual average family income of 110,367 Philippine pesos (\$2,611.76 US dollars), total fertility rate of 2.92, and 91.5% literacy rate (National Statistics Office (NSO) [Philippines] ).

### Data Collection

We interviewed women for this study between January and June 2009. Participants were part of the Cebu Longitudinal Health and Nutrition Survey (CLHNS). The CLHNS researchers began following all pregnant women in their 6<sup>th</sup> to 7<sup>th</sup> month of pregnancy in Cebu in 1983-84. Follow-up has continued for these women and the birth cohort (children who were born in 1983-84) in 1991, 1994, 1998–2000, 2002, and 2005.

We recruited women from the CLHNS cohort by telephone. Study interviewers called participants and asked if they wished to participate. 19 women were contacted, and all agreed to participate; one woman was not at home at the scheduled interview time and so was replaced with another CLHNS participant. None of the women contacted refused to participate. Women were eligible to participate if they were married and had reported IPV in the 2005 CLHNS survey. We used purposeful sampling methods. We selected participants as follows: 1) We divided women who reported IPV in 2005 into three categories, by type of violence - either female perpetrated IPV, male perpetrated IPV or bi-directional perpetration. We defined respondents experiencing female perpetrated IPV as those reporting only perpetration of physical violence against a partner during the last 12 months. We defined respondents experiencing male perpetrated IPV as those reporting only physical violence victimization by a partner during the last 12 months. We defined respondents experiencing bi-directional IPV as those married respondents reporting both IPV perpetration and victimization with a partner within the last 12 months; 2) We then subdivided each category by age range as of 2005 – 36-47 or 48-67; 3) For each category and age range, we selected 1 woman from a northern barangay (neighborhood), one from a central barangay, and one from a southern barangay. For reporting purposes in this article, we categorize respondents according to their violence report in the 2005 survey.

An institutional review board approved the study and instruments. Interviewers explained the risks and benefits to participants and obtained oral informed consent. Interviewers assured participants that their responses would be kept confidential. Interviewers also stripped names from the data, and only assigned identification numbers remained. While interviewers already had experience in handling sensitive questions, they also received thorough refresher training on this topic. Interviewers conducted the interviews privately in a location selected by the participant; if such privacy was compromised during the violence module, the interviewers moved to a less sensitive set of questions, returning to the violence questions once privacy was reestablished. In addition, interviewers referred respondents to appropriate local support if they requested such referrals.

Our study objective was to explore the context of and motivations for IPV perpetration. Study methods consisted of 19 qualitative in-depth (IDIs) using a semi-structured interview guide. Interviewers conducted IDIs in the local language, Cebuano, and audio recorded the IDIs following informed consent. The interviews covered: marital dynamics of household decision making and work and money management; relative status of the woman and her husband (age, education, and parental education/wealth); IPV (types of and usual causes of IPV in her relationship, when IPV is justified, and examples of IPV in her relationship), and; conversations with husband about and decision making on family planning.

### Data management and analysis

Interviewers transcribed the IDIs in Cebuano, and then translated these into English. We analyzed the interview transcript files using NVivo 8, a computer software program for text search, retrieval, and organization. We entered the transcript data into NVivo 8 and then as we read through the data, created codes to label key themes. The goal of this coding is to break up the data and then to organize it into categories which allow for the comparison of data within and between these categories and help to develop theoretical concepts (Maxwell, 1996). We then reread all transcripts in full so that any codes emerging from later interviews could be applied to earlier transcripts. Following coding, we ran all data output corresponding to a given coding category and read the data by category. We qualitatively compared the main themes. The intermediate step between coding and first drafts of the findings was processing the coded transcripts through memo-writing. Memo-writing helps to elaborate actions, processes and assumptions that lie beneath coding (Charmaz, 2001). We then wrote summaries and conclusions for each theme.

We tested the validity of the findings through negative case analysis. Negative case analysis is when one looks for evidence and incidents that refute relationships identified through the content analysis; this helps to assess whether it is more plausible to maintain or change the conclusions of the study (Maxwell, 1996; Strauss & Corbin, 1990). We also tested the validity and reliability of the findings through comparison with data from four focus group discussions that we held in CLHNS communities with men and women prior to the in-depth interviews. Lastly, we carried out a final reading of the original transcripts to further confirm the validity of the identified themes and conclusions.

## Results

### Who committed which types of violence: “I even hit him with bamboo”

All women reported that their partners used violence against them at some point in their marriages but only seven reported that they themselves used violence against their partners at some stage. 14 women reported recent experience of IPV: for five, the violence was mutual, for seven the husband primarily perpetrated violence, and for two the woman primarily perpetrated violence. These results on who was perpetrating IPV are inconsistent with participants' 2005 CLHNS report of IPV; at that time, six women reported female perpetrated IPV, six reported male perpetrated IPV, and seven reported bi-directional IPV. This inconsistency may have been due to changes in violence since the 2005 CLHNS survey and/or misreporting. The types of violence both women and their husbands used included hitting partner with an object such as a beer bottle, broom, or stick, punching, slapping, throwing an object at or near partner, kicking, pouring a liquid such as urine or hot water over the partner, and threatening with a knife. Women most commonly used hitting with an object and slapping.

Interviewer (I): And what did you hit him with?

Respondent (R): Whatever I get my hands on. I even hit him with bamboo (lipak). Like that one (flat bamboo, pointing at the floor material used upstairs) when he is drunk.

– Claudine, bi-directional IPV

Another woman remembered the time her husband was having an affair and shared:

There were times when I would lose my respect for him and I would slap him.

- Joana, female perpetrated IPV

Husbands most commonly used slapping and punching.

He slapped my mouth and hit my teeth. It was such a forceful slap that my lips were lacerated. I thought it was just light but when he saw I was bleeding he cried...

– Lisa, male perpetrated IPV

Women reported that only they carried out the following types of violence: pulling hair, turning over a table, pulling chair out from under husband, and hitting husband's head on the wall.

I grabbed his hair and hit his head on the wall that still had nails sticking out.

– Irene, no current IPV

Similarly, women reported that only their husbands carried out these violent acts: hitting/punching walls, squeezing partner's mouth, threatening with a block of wood, threatening with a gun, and threatening with his fist.

He pushed our big two-legged table until it broke. That was the start of our quarrel when he pointed the gun at me and I ran...

– Malina, male perpetrated IPV

Although seven women reported perpetrating more severe acts of violence such as kicking or threatening with a weapon, it was more common for men (11/19) to perpetrate such severe violence acts. For example, Polly's husband stabbed her in the arm and attempted to stab her in the chest with a knife, three other husbands threatened their wives with knives and one threatened to hit his wife with a block of wood; in contrast only two women threatened their husbands with weapons.

### **Motivations for violence: "He would beat me up if he didn't like what I did"**

Women described three types of motivation for violence by themselves and their husbands: reactivity (anger), retaliation/self-defense, and control (influencing the spouse's behavior).

**Reactivity**—In reaction to their spouse's undesirable behavior, such as cheating, child neglect, refusal of sex, and drinking, women and/or husbands became angry and acted out in violence. The following experiences, categorized by source of conflict, illustrate this "reactivity" or anger motivation for violence.

**Neglect: "He accused me of not looking after our children."**—Several women shared stories of their or their husband's violent acts stemming from anger over neglect of children or the other spouse. Joana (female perpetrated IPV) felt that her husband neglected her and their baby when he was not present during her long and arduous childbirth. She explained what she did when he finally arrived on the scene: "I said 'it is really too much, both of us could have died...'" and when he bent nearer I hit his head with the ice." Another

respondent, Ernestina (male perpetrated IPV), recounted violence in the context of her husband's accusation that she neglected their children:

It was a very big fight because he accused me of not looking after our children... How can I watch over the children all the time when I also have to do so many other things? And then he was always travelling. We kept fighting that time. He beat me up and then the children would scream when they saw him do it.

**Alcohol use: "I get angry if he's always drinking and we have no money."**—

About one-third of the women mentioned the husband's alcohol consumption as the source of conflict and spark for violent acts. In some situations it was the sheer drunkenness that angered the women and led to arguments and male and/or female perpetration. More commonly, however, it was the husband's use of scant household funds for alcohol that spurred arguments and violent outbursts by one or both spouses.

R: I get angry if he's always drinking and we have no money...He gets merchandise from the store, sells his carpentry tools [for money to drink] and comes home shouting to catch our attention. Eventually, the time comes that I can no longer tolerate his madness. I am put into a fighting mood when it really feels good to pull his hair.

I : What did you do to him?

R : I kick, beat him with anything . I even hit him with hot water.

- Polly, female perpetrated IPV

**Jealousy/infidelity: "He said he saw that there was a mustached man sitting beside me."**—

Jealousy and husband's affairs with other women were the sources of conflict for many respondents. Several women reported perpetrating violence in the middle of arguments about their husbands' affairs. For example, Cecilia (male perpetrated IPV) knew that her husband had just gone to his parent's house to seek permission to leave her for his mistress and was furious; when he returned to their house and acted as if nothing had happened, she threw a pot of orchids at him. Jealousy as a source of conflict was comparatively more common in the context of violence perpetration by the husbands. Husbands would either become jealous themselves and act out in violence or act out in violence because their wives were jealous and "nagging" them about affairs. Polly described her husband's drunken jealousy that once led him to stab her in the arm and to attempt to stab her in the chest with a large knife:

R: That time when he stabbed me, he said he saw that there was a mustached man sitting beside me. His jealousy comes out especially when he's drunk, even with his own son he feels jealous. If he's not drunk, he's okay.

I :Really? What does he do?

R: He will ask my second son, "What are you doing there with your mother?" He has such a dirty mind. I said, "I have never heard a father say that to his son." Even when I comment about how the neighborhood crazy man looks so handsome and fresh, he gets jealous.

– Polly, female perpetrated IPV

Patricia's case illustrates husband's violence related to the woman's jealousy:

R: He hit me because I kept nagging him...

I: How many times did that happen?

R: Many times. It's because he had another woman. And I would get angry, I would nag. I would go after him, and so he would hit me.

-Patricia, female perpetrated IPV

**Women's Refusal of Sex: "Sometimes if I don't let him have sex with me, we fight."**—For several women, their refusal of sex sparked anger and violent outbursts by their husbands. Sometimes this anger was related to jealousy – the husband assumed that the woman did not want to have sex because she had a lover – but other times it seemed to be just anger due to her refusal. This was not a reason for women's violent acts, except when women used violence out of retaliation/self-defense.

R: Sometimes if I don't let him have sex with me, we fight...

I: Does he get violent? Is it a reason for you to hit each other?

R: Yes. Sometimes if I don't want to, I really don't do it. And he gets angry.

I: And what does he do to you?

R: He punches me.

-Maria, bi-directional IPV

R: Indeed when I had my IUD removed, I found sex enjoyable. So I was afraid because my last child was still 3 years old. My friend told me just to control myself [avoid having sex] and I did. But this did not sit well with my husband, he started becoming jealous when I did not react favorably to his sexual advances.

I: That was the cause of his jealousy?

R: Yes that was it. He did not understand my fears and insisted on having sex. We had frequent quarrels because I did not want to have sex. I try to kick him away and he would try to stab me. How many times did the knife hit the side of my head?

-Margarita, bi-directional IPV

**Retaliation/self-defense**—Another common motivation for use of violence was retaliation or self-defense. While there were two women with husbands who used violence in retaliation, this motivation was more common for women's use of violence, with nine women reporting acting out of self-defense or retaliation. Georgie and Maria's experiences illustrate the use of kicking and hitting in response to violence instigation by husbands and Janine's experience illustrates the reverse situation:

You know he has no job and he comes home drunk. We were waiting for him to give whatever he can give to buy food for the children. I nagged at him and he can't take my nagging so he hits me and I fight him back by kicking.

– Georgie, male perpetrated IPV

R: ...And then he would come home drunk. He would just come and go. He was complacent that we were living with his mother. His mother would feed us. I felt ashamed so that's why we fought. We reached the barangay hall because I had many marks on my back. He hit me because he was also a drug addict before. He would forget himself...He hit me with a bamboo stick...

I: Who did the hitting first?

R: He did. He slapped me. And I fought back...

I: How did you fight back?

R: I also hit him.

- Maria, bi-directional IPV

R: At the time when we still had one child... he became so angry that I gave the child a lollipop to amuse him because he had a cough. He said it would make the cough worse. I was angry that he reprimanded me about it...I slapped his upper arm (she demonstrates the action)...Then he got angry and he also slapped my face (laughs).

- Janine, no current IPV

**Control**—Control of the spouse's behavior was markedly more common as a motivator for husband's use of violence than for violence by women. Women sought to control gambling or drinking, usually because of the money the husband was spending on the activity.

R: I was so angry, I was throwing things in the house. I was angry that the children kept asking for food and he was out drinking. I told him 'are you happy that your children are hungry?' and then he would say 'I have not been offered work yet' and I replied 'so if you don't have a job why are you spending it rotting away, drinking?... I got angry because I kept coming back after him.

I: Because you wanted him to go home?

R: Yes, but he wouldn't heed me.

-Claudine, bi-directional IPV

Husbands sought to influence or control more varied behaviors, including leaving the house without permission, talking too long with neighbors, borrowing money, gambling and not having dinner ready when they arrive home.

I: And why does he usually hurt you?

R:...when he arrives home I have not cooked. What does he expect? What will I cook if I have nothing to cook...

-Georgie, male perpetrated IPV

Several of the women with the most controlling husbands reported that if they did anything their husbands did not want them to do, then the husbands used violent acts against them. Ernestina's case illustrates this well:

R: But before, when the children were still small, he would beat me up if he didn't like what I did. He would hit me. Slap me.

I: In what instances for example?

R: When he just doesn't like what I'm doing, when I go against his wishes, if I talk back. That's what happens...

I: Before, what things did you fight about that would lead to him hitting you?

R: If he arrived home and I wasn't here. And I explain to him where I've been. But he wouldn't believe me. And then he hit me.

- Ernestina, male perpetrated IPV

Motivations for violence were not limited to a single motivation throughout the relationship - several of the experiences shared by women showed that the same woman or husband might have a different motivation for violence perpetration depending on the situation. For example, Claudine (bi-directional IPV) slapped her husband in retaliation for him dumping

water on her, but in another instance started the violence herself by hitting him with a broom when she was angry about the way he was disciplining the children (reactivity). Similarly, Joana (female perpetrated IPV) once tried to get her husband to stop gambling by pulling his chair out from under him at a gambling table (control), another time hit him with a bag of ice out of anger that he had not attended her difficult birth (reactivity), and in yet another situation threatened her husband with a knife after he slapped her (retaliation/self-defense).

## Discussion

As a result of this research, we have a greater understanding of the types of violent actions carried out by the women and their husbands, and motivations for this violence. We are among the first to look at these issues in the context of a developing country and the only researchers to include female perpetration in such an exploration. And while previous quantitative researchers have focused on IPV in the CLHNS sample (Ansara & Hindin, 2009; Fehringer & Hindin MJ, 2009; Hindin & Adair, 2002; Hindin & Gultiano, 2006), ours is the first qualitative study on IPV with CLHNS participants.

The women in this study reported a variety of violent acts. Some of these violent acts, such as pulling hair and pouring hot water over another, are not included in the Conflict Tactics Scale (CTS) (Straus, 1979), the most commonly used tool to measure IPV. These findings suggest the need to adapt the CTS for use in the Filipino context so that it includes culturally relevant violent actions. In addition, consistent with the few other studies to look at this topic, we showed that the types of violence used differed slightly in type and severity by gender, with men using several more severe forms of IPV (Swan & Snow, 2002; Temple, Weston, & Marshall, 2005). Swan and Snow found that women used higher levels of moderate IPV than their partners, and roughly the same level of more severe IPV (Swan & Snow, 2002), whereas Temple et al. demonstrated that the types of violence perpetrated by women were less severe than those by men (Temple et al., 2005).

The motivations for violence - self-defense or retaliation, reactivity, and control - compared to those reported in other IPV studies in both the U.S. and in developing countries (Agoff et al., 2006; Cizino da Trindade et al., 2008; Hamberger et al., 1997; Rabbani et al., 2008; Seamans et al., 2007). In addition, women reported specific reactivity or anger-triggering issues, such as child neglect, jealousy, and financial difficulties that were consistent with those identified in previous male IPV perpetration studies in the Philippines and other developing countries (Agoff et al., 2006; Lee, 2004; Rabbani et al., 2008). We have also showed that the sources of anger/reactivity were the same for male and female IPV perpetration, except in the case of women's refusal of sex (in this situation women only used violence out of self-defense).

While women used violence out of self-defense or retaliation more often than their husbands (9 women versus 2 men), they were not all entirely innocent victims, as some were the aggressors acting out of anger (7 women) or control (4 women) motivations; these results are supported by U.S. research in which women report using violence in an attempt to express anger and other emotions or an attempt to control their partners (Hamberger et al., 1997; Seamans et al., 2007). Women in our study less often reported that their own IPV perpetration was control-related, compared to their report of motivations for their husband's IPV perpetration (4 women versus 12 men). This is also consistent with researchers in the U.S. showing men as more likely than women to use violence to maintain or regain control in the relationship (Barnett et al., 1997; Ehrensaft et al., 1999).

It is difficult to ascertain how representative our findings are of the Philippines. The CLHNS has experienced attrition over time so that the most recent 2005 sample (sample from which this study's respondents were drawn) of women is biased towards rural and poor

households, less educated and older women (Feranil, 2008). It is possible, then, that our results, are not representative of Filipinos with different demographics. Also, there has been very little research on the topic of IPV in the Philippines so it is hard to compare our findings to other local studies. The one other qualitative study on this topic was with men; that researcher found similar motives (i.e., anger related to money and jealousy, and women not fulfilling expected household duties, etc.) for male perpetration, but the participants did not admit to having experienced violence victimization by their female partners (Lee, 2004). Lastly, we are not necessarily surprised by the levels of female perpetration in our research, as it is commonly noted that marital dynamics in the Philippines typically involve greater female power than in other parts of Asia and in other areas of the developing world (Mason, 1997).

There are limitations to our research. We did not corroborate women's reports of violence with their husbands; it is possible that women underreported violence, as this is a common problem in IPV research, or that the women's perceptions of motives or changes in IPV are very different from the perceptions of their husbands. Finally, what women told us about violence perpetration did not always match what they previously reported in the 2005 CLHNS survey. A partial explanation for this may be changes in violence since the 2005 CLHNS survey; the fact, however, that two women reported in 2005 that they had used violence against their husbands but then in the current study said that they had never done this, shows that there is clearly another factor, potentially underreporting, changes in perception of what constitutes violence, or altered memory since the 2005 survey, at play.

## Conclusions

Our results, although exploratory, underscore the importance of looking at how IPV occurs within relationships and how this may vary by context and gender. While there are many worldwide similarities in IPV, there are also meaningful cultural differences, particularly in definitions of violence, which are important to explore and incorporate into future programs and research. Moreover, motivations for and types of IPV perpetrated tend to differ by gender; IPV prevention and treatment program developers need to take these differences into consideration, as one intervention most likely would not serve for both male and female perpetrators. Our findings also support the need to understand the dynamics of IPV rather than solely employing measurement tools such as the CTS. Categorizing women or men as perpetrators or victims of IPV without understanding the couple dynamics ignores the complexity of the problem and limits our ability to create effective solutions.

## References

- Agoff C, Rajsbaum A, Herrera C. Women's perceptions on intimate partner violence in Mexico. [Perspectivas de las mujeres maltratadas sobre la violencia de pareja en México]. *Salud Publica De Mexico*. 2006; 48(SUPPL. 2)
- Aldarondo E. Cessation and persistence of wife assault: A longitudinal analysis. *American Journal of Orthopsychiatry*. 1996; 66(1):141–151. [PubMed: 8720651]
- Ansara DL, Hindin MJ. Perpetration of intimate partner aggression by men and women in the Philippines: Prevalence and associated factors. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*. 2009; 24(9): 1579–1590. [PubMed: 18768743]
- Barnett OW, Lee CY, Thelen RE. Gender differences in attributions of self-defense and control in interpartner aggression. *Violence Against Women*. 1997; 3(5):462–481.
- Burke JG, Gielen AC, McDonnell KA, O'Campo P, Maman S. The process of ending abuse in intimate relationships: A qualitative exploration of the transtheoretical model. *Violence Against Women*. 2001; 7(10):1144–1163.
- Cabaraban, MC.; Morales, BC. Social and economic consequences of family planning use in southern Philippines. *Family Health International*; 1998.

- Campbell J, Rose L, Joan K, Nedd D. Voices of strength and resistance: A contextual and longitudinal analysis of women's responses to battering. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*. 1998; 13(6):743–762.
- Charmaz, K. Grounded theory. In: Emerson, RM., editor. *Contemporary field research*. Waveland Press, Inc; Prospect Heights, IL: 2001. p. 335-352.
- Cizino da Trindade RF, de Almeida AM, Alves Rozendo C. Masculine infidelity and domestic violence: Experience of a group of women. [Infidelidade masculina e violência doméstica: Vivência de um grupo de mulheres]. *Ciencia y Enfermeria*. 2008; 14(2):39–46.
- David, FP.; Chin, FP.; Herradura, ES. Economic and psychosocial influences of family planning on the lives of women in western Visayas. final report. *Family Health International*; 1998.
- Ehrensaft MK, Langhinrichsen-Rohling J, Heyman RE, O'Leary KD, Lawrence E. Feeling controlled in marriage: A phenomenon specific to physically aggressive couples? *Journal of Family Psychology*. 1999; 13(1):20–32.
- Fehringer J, Hindin MJ. Like parent like child: Intergenerational transmission of partner violence in Cebu, Philippines. *Journal of Adolescent Health*. 2009; 44(4):363–371. [PubMed: 19306795]
- Feld SL, Straus MA. Escalation and desistance of wife assault in marriage. *Criminology*. 1989; 27(1): 141–161.
- Feranil AB, Gultiano SA, Adair LS. The Cebu Longitudinal Health and Nutrition Survey: Two decades later. *Asia-Pacific Population Journal*. 2008; 23(3):39–54.
- Fritz PAT, O'Leary KD. Physical and psychological partner aggression across a decade: A growth curve analysis. *Violence and Victims*. 2004; 19(1):3–16. [PubMed: 15179743]
- Fuller N. She made me go out of my mind: Marital violence from the male point of view. *Development*. 2001; 44(3):25–29.
- Hamberger LK, Lohr JM, Bonge D, Tolin DF. An empirical classification of motivations for domestic violence. *Violence Against Woman*. 1997; 3(4):401–423.
- Hassan F, Sadowski LS, Bangdiwala SI, Vizcarra B, Ramiro L, DePaula CS, et al. Physical intimate partner violence in Chile, Egypt, India and the Philippines. *Injury Control and Safety Promotion*. 2004; 11(2):111–116. [PubMed: 15370347]
- Hindin M, Adair L. Who's at risk? factors associated with intimate partner violence in the Philippines. *Social Science & Medicine*. 2002; 55(8):1385–1399. [PubMed: 12231016]
- Hindin M, Gultiano S. Associations between witnessing parental domestic violence and experiencing depressive symptoms in Filipino adolescents. *American Journal of Public Health*. 2006; 96(4): 660–663. [PubMed: 16507722]
- Kaye DK, Mirembe F, Ekstrom AM, Bantebya G, Johansson A. The social construction and context of domestic violence in Wakiso district, Uganda. *Culture, Health and Sexuality*. 2005; 7(6):625–635.
- Kernsmith P. Exerting power or striking back: A gendered comparison of motivations for domestic violence perpetration. *Violence and Victims*. 2005; 20(2):173–185. [PubMed: 16075665]
- Lee RB. Filipino men's familial roles and domestic violence: Implications and strategies for community-based intervention. *Health and Social Care in the Community*. 2004; 12(5):422–429. [PubMed: 15373821]
- Mason KO. How family position influences married women's autonomy and power in five Asian countries. *East-West Center Working Papers*. 1997:22.
- Maxwell, JA. *Qualitative research design: An interactive approach*. Sage; Thousand Oaks, CA: 1996.
- National Statistics Office (NSO) [Philippines]. [Retrieved 11/7, 2008] Quickstat on cebu. from <http://www.census.gov.ph/data/quickstat/region7/qs07020704.html>
- Rabbani F, Qureshi F, Rizvi N. Perspectives on domestic violence: Case study from Karachi, Pakistan. *Eastern Mediterranean Health Journal*. 2008; 14(2):415–426. [PubMed: 18561735]
- Saunders DG. When battered women use violence: Husband-abuse or self-defense? *Violence and Victims*. 1986; 1(1):47–60. [PubMed: 3154140]
- Seamans CL, Rubin LJ, Stabb SD. Women domestic violence offenders: Lessons of violence and survival. *Journal of Trauma and Dissociation*. 2007; 8(2):47–68. [PubMed: 17804383]
- Strauss, A.; Corbin, J. *Basics of qualitative research: Grounded theory procedures and techniques*. Sage Publications, Inc; Newbury Park, CA: 1990.

- Straus MA. Measuring intrafamily conflict and violence: The conflict tactics (CT) scales. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*. 1979; 41(1):75–88.
- Stuart GL, Moore TM, Gordon KC, Hellmuth JC, Ramsey SE, Kahler CW. Reasons for intimate partner violence perpetration among arrested women. *Violence Against Women*. 2006; 12(7):609–621.
- Swan SC, Snow DL. A typology of women’s use of violence in intimate relationships. *Violence Against Women*. 2002; 8(3):286–319.
- Temple JR, Weston R, Marshall LL. Physical and mental health outcomes of women in nonviolent, unilaterally violent, and mutually violent relationships. *Violence and Victims*. 2005; 20(3):335–359. [PubMed: 16180371]
- Woffordt S, Mihalic DE, Menard S. Continuities in marital violence. *Journal of Family Violence*. 1994; 9(3):195–225.
- Wuest J, Merritt-Gray M. A theoretical understanding of abusive intimate partner relationships that become non-violent: Shifting the pattern of abusive control. *Journal of Family Violence*. 2008; 23(4):281–293.