Women fight back: Resistance violence in relationships with veterans with posttraumatic stress disorder

2012 National Conference on Health and Domestic Violence San Francisco, CA April Gerlock PhD, ARNP, PMHNP-BC, PMHCNS-BC The Relationships and PTSD Study: Detection of Intimate Partner Violence (NRI-04-040)

Research Study Team:

Principle Investigator: April Gerlock PhD, ARNP
Project Director: Jackie Grimesey, PhD;
Study Team: George Sayre, PsyD, LMFT; Ofer Harel, PhD;
Lynne Berthiaume, MN; Elaine Nevins, BA; Christina Cho, BA;
Koriann Brousseau, BA; Alisa Pisciotta, MSW

This material is based upon work supported by the US Department of Veterans Affairs, Office of Research and Development, Nursing Research Initiative. This research does not reflect VA policy and opinions expressed do not necessarily reflect those of the VA.



2

The Goals of the Study Phase II

- There were several goals for three separate study foci. (for results from phase 1 go to: <u>www.ajnonline.com</u> Nov. 2011)
- Phase II:
 - Describe the study sample in respect to substance use, exposure to IPV as children, PTSD severity, IPV severity, relationship mutuality/partnership, & demographic variables.
 - Discriminate between the IPV YES and NO groups.
 - Determine which variables reliably predict accurate detection by treatment providers of psychological and physical abuse.

Three Contexts of violence

- Violence in exercise of coercive control (battering)
 - Patterned set of behaviors.
 - Coercion and intimidation distinguish it from nonbattering.
 - Entrapment essential goal.
- Violent resistance
 - Part of a broader strategy to stop or contain the abuse, including violence directed at the abuser.
- Non-battering use of violence
 - NOT part of an attempt to establish an ongoing position of dominance in a relationship or in response to being battered (common couple, situational).

IPV Defined

- For purposes of this study IPV was defined as: The use of physical and/or sexual violence, or credible threat at any time during the current or past relationship; AND a current (within the past year) pattern of psychologically abusive and coercive behavior.
 - IPV was NOT a stand alone physical assault that occurred as part of a PTSD symptom.
 - IPV was NOT general psychological abusive behavior UNLESS there was also a physical and/or sexual assault (or credible threat).

The Sample

- Random selection of male Veterans actively in treatment in PTSD programs at VA Puget Sound Health Care System, and the Tacoma Vet Center.
 - Selected from ≈ 5600 male veterans in PTSD treatment.
 - Veteran either married or in a committed intimate relationship for at least one year.
 - Veteran's partner also willing to participate in the study.

The Sample

- Couples were interviewed separately.
- Focus on Veteran's level of relationship mutuality, war zone deployments, substance use, early life, PTSD, and IPV perpetration.
- Both Veteran and Partner:
 - Completed a semi-structured Relationship Behavior Interview (RBI).
 - Rated the Veteran's IPV severity (ABI).
 - Rated their own and their Partner's level of mutuality (MPDQ).

The Sample

- Sample size: 441 couples
 - Yes IPV 190 (44%) No IPV 251 (56%)
 Within IPV NO group: 3 women primary aggressors;
 Within IPV YES group: 2 mutual violence couples
- Male Veteran's age range (mean age 56)
 22 y.o. 88 y.o.
- Partner's age range (mean age 52)
 20 y.o. 85 y.o.
- Served in war zone:
 - 423 (96%) Yes

17 (4%) No

IPV Perpetration Across the Lifespan

Veteran's and Partner's Reports n = 441 couples (882 total sample)

Veteran currently violent in intimate relationship?

Veteran Report



Partner Report



Veteran previously violent in this relationship?

Veteran Report



Partner Report



Veteran physically violent in past relationship?

60% 50% 40% 30% 20% 10% 0% Yes(191)No(239)

Veteran Report

Partner Report



Partner's Use of Physical Force (Discussion)

Women's use of physical force is significantly related to the Veteran's current* and past* physical violence (or credible threat) in this relationship.

* [r=.465, p = .000] *[r=.500, p = .000]

Partner's use of physical force

Veteran report



Partner report



2 National Conference Health and I

IPV YES Group

- Both the Veteran and Partner agreed that there was abuse (ABI):
 [n = 190, rho = .173, p = .017)
- However, the *Partner rated* the psychological and physical abuse as *worse* than the Veteran's report (matched pairs):
 - Psychological: [n = 190, t = -4.143, p = .000]
 Physical: [n = 190, t = -4.324, p = .000]

IPV No Group

- Both the Veteran and Partner agreed that there was abuse based on the Veteran's self-rating of his abuse (ABI) and the Partner's rating of his abuse (ABI):
 [n = 251, rho = .333, p = .000]
- However, they did not differ on their report of current physical violence in a matched pair analysis, but did differ in their reports of psychological abuse. Partner's rated psychological abuse as higher:

 \circ [n = 251, t = -2.278, p = .024]

PTSD Severity and IPV Perpetration

- Veteran's and Partner's Reports
- n = 441 couples (882 total sample)

PTSD Severity and IPV Perpetration (Whole Sample)

 There is a significant relationship between both the Veteran's self rating of his PTSD (CAPS) and abuse (ABI)

o [n = 441 Veterans, rho = .168, p = .000]

 And, his self rating of PTSD severity (CAPS) and his Partner's rating of his abuse (ABI):

o [n = 441 couples, rho = .102, p = .031]

Deployments & IPV Severity



012 National Conference on Health and DV

Take Home Points

- Research on IPV should include data from both parties and CONTEXT of the violence should be considered.
- Veterans report that IPV severity is worse within the first few years after a war zone deployment. However, according to both Veterans and Partners, the IPV behaviors may persist across the Veteran's lifespan.
- Standard PTSD treatment (which usually includes both anger management and couple's work) does not correlate with a reduction in either physical or psychological violence.

Thank you!

April A Gerlock PhD, ARNP gerlockaprila@comcast.net

21