

6-22-2022

Work-Related IPV Among Latinos: Exploring the Roles of Fatherhood Status, Gendered Expectations, and Support for Intimate Partner's Employment

Adrian Luis Manriquez
Portland State University

Follow this and additional works at: https://pdxscholar.library.pdx.edu/open_access_etds



Part of the [Psychology Commons](#)

Let us know how access to this document benefits you.

Recommended Citation

Manriquez, Adrian Luis, "Work-Related IPV Among Latinos: Exploring the Roles of Fatherhood Status, Gendered Expectations, and Support for Intimate Partner's Employment" (2022). *Dissertations and Theses*. Paper 6043.

<https://doi.org/10.15760/etd.7913>

This Thesis is brought to you for free and open access. It has been accepted for inclusion in Dissertations and Theses by an authorized administrator of PDXScholar. Please contact us if we can make this document more accessible: pdxscholar@pdx.edu.

Work-Related IPV Among Latinos: Exploring the Roles of Fatherhood Status, Gendered
Expectations, and Support for Intimate Partner's Employment

by

Adrian Luis Manriquez

A thesis submitted in partial fulfillment of the
requirements for the degree of

Master of Science
in
Psychology

Thesis Committee:
Eric Mankowski, Chair
Greg Townley
Keith Kaufman

Portland State University
2022

© 2022 Adrian Luis Manriquez

Abstract

IPV can spill over from individuals' personal lives into their work lives. Men's work-related IPV perpetration has been found to negatively impact their work performance and employment outcomes (Mankowski et al., 2013; Schmidt & Barnett, 2011; Scott et al., 2017). Additionally, acculturation, lack of support for an intimate partner's maintenance employment, and traditional gender role expectations may have an impact on Latinos' work-related IPV perpetration (Galvez et al., 2011; Galvez et al., 2015). However, it is plausible that fatherhood can serve as a point of intervention for ending men's IPV perpetration (Areán & Davis, 2006). The current study aimed to examine the moderating effect of fatherhood status on the relationship between various risk factors for IPV perpetration and work-related IPV behaviors among Latinos. Additionally, work performance and employment outcomes as influenced by IPV behaviors were compared by fatherhood status. The current study used secondary data collected from a larger project involving the development and evaluation of an intervention for employed survivors of IPV. Participants ($n = 120$) were Latino heterosexual men enrolled in a batterer intervention program. Measures include the Work-Related Domestic Violence Perpetration Scale (Mankowski et al., 2013), a work performance scale, an employment outcomes scale, a gendered expectations scale, a support for intimate partner's employment scale, and the Language Use subscale of the Short Acculturation Scale for Hispanics (Marín et al., 1987). Results generated from the current study will be utilized to inform the curricula of abuse intervention programs with the intention of enhancing programming for Latinos.

Dedication

I dedicate this thesis document to my grandmas, Fidela Manriquez and Delia Rueda. The reason why I choose to do the work that I do is because of the both of you. I could never thank either of you enough for all of the sacrifices that both of you have made for our families, and for all the love both of you have given unconditionally to each and every single one of us. May your legacies of compassion, resilience, and love continue to live through my activism and scholarship.

Acknowledgements

Firstly, I would like to thank my doctoral advisor, Dr. Eric Mankowski, for his unwavering support, kindness, encouragement, and guidance throughout the entire process of my thesis research. I could not imagine being successful without his mentorship, and I am deeply grateful for it. I would also like to thank Dr. Greg Townley for consistently making me feel like I am capable of being a scholar and for always being thoughtful in our interactions with each other. Additionally, I want to thank Dr. Keith Kaufman for constantly making me think that I have something important to offer as both a researcher and as an individual. The three of you inspire me to no end.

I feel the need to thank my colleagues in the Applied Psychology program, as I could not have completed this research without their peer support. Emma O'Connor, Emily Leickly, and Dr. Jason Kyler-Yano, a tremendous “thank you” to each one of you for always acting as if you were my older academic siblings. The three of you have made my time at Portland State University (PSU) so memorable and worthwhile. And to my best friend, Jennifer Saucedo, thank you for always rooting for me, even when I am not rooting for myself.

I want to also thank all the amazing scholars who are not faculty at PSU but have provided me with endless support that has been so instrumental in my success as a PhD student. Dr. Olajide Bamishigbin Jr., you have been one of the biggest inspirations in my entire life, thank you for being such a great role model. To Dr. Sara Budge, thank you for always “pushing me up the mountain,” so to speak. It has meant more to me than you can imagine. Dr. Debi Brannan, you are the person who inspired me to pursue a career as an applied psychologist, thank you. Dr. Sinead Younge, I do not even possess the language

to express how grateful I am for your mentorship, and how much it has positively impacted my life. Truly, thank you

A very special “thank you” to my wife, Ashley Manriquez Luna, for being my foundation throughout the years. You keep me focused, grounded, and most importantly, hopeful.

I would like to acknowledge all of those who collaborated with the Gender and Violence Intervention Research (GVIR) Team in efforts of better understanding and preventing work-related IPV, and for ultimately making this thesis research a possibility: Gino Galvez, Ph.D. (now with California State University, Long Beach), Nan Yragui, Ph.D. (now with Washington State Department of Labor & Industries), Nancy Glass, Ph.D., MPH, RN (now with Johns Hopkins University), Nancy Perrin, Ph.D. (now with Johns Hopkins University), Ginger Hansen, Ph.D. (Kaiser Center for Health Research), Chiquita Rollins, Ph.D., (Multnomah Co. DV Coordinator’s Office), Maria Elena Ruiz, Ph.D., (Oregon Health & Sciences University), Mike McGlade, Ph.D., (Western Oregon University, SMG Foundation), Rebecca Hernandez, PhD, (Susannah Maria Gurule Foundation), Marie Dahlstrom, MA, (Susannah Maria Gurule Foundation), Lorraine Escribano, Ph.D., (now with Latino Network), and Brooks Fuentes (Portland State University).

I would also like to acknowledge all the Oregon battering intervention programs that collaborated with the GVIR Team in conducting research as it pertains to work-related IPV: Allies in Change, Cascadia Behavioral Health Care, ChangePoint, Hombres Autorresponsables Para Parar El Abuso, Manley Interventions, The Northwest Batterer’s

Intervention Program, Treatment Services Northwest, and Yamhill County Mental Health.

Finally, I would like to acknowledge the funding source that supported the work from which this thesis research draws upon: NIH/NINR R01 NR08771-01A1 (9/04-5/10), Nancy Glass, P.I.

Table of Contents

Abstract.....	i
Dedication	ii
Acknowledgements.....	iii
List of Tables.....	viii
Chapter 1: Introduction.....	1
The Fathering of Men Who Batter.....	4
Latinos as Fathers.....	8
Acculturation and IPV Among Latinos.....	12
Work-Related IPV Among Latinos.....	17
Current Study.....	23
Chapter 2: Method	27
Participants.....	27
Procedure.....	27
Measures.....	27
Data Analyses.....	32
Chapter 3: Results.....	37
Descriptive Statistics	37
Hypothesis Testing.....	38
Chapter 4: Discussion.....	45
Acculturation and Work-Related IPV.....	46
Gendered Expectations for Women and Work-Related IPV.....	49
Fatherhood Status and Work-Related IPV.....	53

Fatherhood, Acculturation and Work-Related IPV.....	55
Fatherhood Status, Gendered Expectations for Women, and Work-related IPV..	56
Fatherhood Status and the Impact of Work-Related IPV on Latino’s Employment and Work Performance.....	58
Measurement of Work-Related IPV Impacts and Gendered Work Expectations..	60
Conclusions.....	73
Tables.....	76
References.....	79
Appendix: Survey Measure Items.....	111

List of Tables

Table 1: Sociodemographic Characteristics of Participants.....76

Table 2: Results From Hypothesis Tests.....78

Chapter 1: Introduction

Approximately 10-20% of children are projected to be exposed to intimate partner violence (IPV) every year, with many overhearing or visually witnessing the violence (Carlson, 2000; Edleson, 1999; Hamby et al., 2011). A large number of IPV-related instances that children witness are perpetrated by their biological or social fathers, and a large body of research indicates that witnessing IPV as a child is associated with future IPV perpetration by men, thus contributing to the continuation of the cycle of family violence for multiple generations (Guille, 2002; Hamby et al., 2011; Huecker et al., 2020). These findings also extend to Latino communities, as exposure to IPV as a child has been shown to be a prominent and contributing risk factor for Latinos' IPV behaviors (Mancera et al., 2017). Such a pattern is alarming, as Raj and colleagues (2006) found that Latino males who reported perpetrating IPV within the last year were more likely to report being the father of at least three or more children compared to those who reported no instances of IPV perpetration. Moreover, the number of children Latinas have and whether their children live at home with them has also been identified as a risk factor for being a victim of IPV (Castro et al., 2003; Denham et al., 2007; Lown & Vega, 2001). Taken together, Latino children may be at heightened risk for observing IPV that is perpetrated by their fathers and susceptible to the harmful effects (e.g., depression, anxiety, or PTSD symptomology) of witnessing such family violence (Cummings et al., 2013; Evans et al., 2008; Wolfe et al., 2003).

Although a growing body of research literature surrounding the fathering experiences of men who batter suggests that fatherhood can serve as a motivating factor for men desiring to end their partner-abusive behaviors (e.g., Domoney & Trevillion,

2020; Håland et al., 2014; Stanley et al., 2012), it has not been directly centered around Latinos. This neglect indicates the need for a deeper examination of the role that fatherhood status plays in the lives of Latinos who perpetrate varying forms of IPV. Further research is required to explore the interplay between fatherhood in Latino culture and IPV, as occurrences and recurrences of IPV disproportionately affect Latino couples (Caetano et al., 2005; Cummings et al., 2013), and since fathers also play a central role in Latino families and are heavily involved with the parenting of their children (Coltrane et al., 2004; Parke et al., 2004; Taylor & Behnke, 2005). Moreover, IPV perpetration among Latinos can crossover from their individual family lives into their places of work (Galvez et al., 2011; Galvez et al., 2015; Mankowski et al., 2013). The expanding entrance of immigrant Latinas into the workforce might also give rise to instances of work-related IPV (Grzywacz et al., 2009), as Latinas' employment may threaten the traditional gendered representations of family held by immigrant Latinos who batter (Alcalde, 2011; Galvez et al., 2011; Gonzalez-Guarda et al., 2010). Even if immigrant Latinos may not support their partner's being employed, immigrant Latinas belonging to low-income families may still need to work in order to economically support the family system (Galvez et al., 2011). These circumstances may give room for domestic violence to transpire in traditional Latino families since Latino fathers are expected to be the sole financial provider of the household, while Latina mothers are expected to be stay-at-home caregivers (Baker et al. 2001; Castillo et al., 2010).

Research demonstrates that acculturation has a degree of influence on various forms of IPV perpetration among Latinos (Alvarez et al., 2020), including work-related IPV (Galvez et al., 2015; Mankowski et al., 2013). Work performance and employment

outcomes might also be negatively impacted by Latinos work-related IPV behaviors (e.g., Galvez et al., 2011; Mankowski et al., 2013). Additionally, traditional gender role expectations held by Latinos may also have an influence on their work-related IPV behaviors, especially as they relate to Latinas' roles in the family and at work (Alcalde, 2011; Davila et al., 2021; Galvez et al., 2011).

Based on the body of evidence reviewed, I conducted a study to investigate how fatherhood status may moderate the relationship between acculturation and overall work-related IPV behaviors, in addition to comparing work performance and employment outcomes by fatherhood status among Latinos enrolled in battering intervention programs (BIPs). Fatherhood status as a moderator of the relationship between gendered expectations regarding women and work and overall work-related IPV behaviors was examined as well. Lastly, this study also explored fatherhood status as a moderator of the relationship between support for intimate partner maintaining employment and overall work-related IPV behaviors.

First, the research literature surrounding the fathering experiences and practices of men who batter will be reviewed to provide an understanding of how partner-abusive men perceive fatherhood and how their fathering relates to their abusive behaviors, while drawing implications that fatherhood may have for BIPs as a point of intervention with partner-abusive men, particularly Latinos. Subsequently, the literature centered around father engagement among Latinos and the impact of acculturation on Latinos' fathering will be discussed in order to exemplify how fatherhood status may potentially serve as a protective against IPV behaviors when influenced by acculturation. Thus, relevant literature that describes the relationship between acculturation levels and IPV among

Latinos will be reviewed as a means to illustrate how acculturative processes might play a central role in the disproportionate rates of IPV experienced by Latino communities.

Lastly, pertinent literature pertaining to work-related IPV will be explored with the intention of demonstrating its varying effects on victims and perpetrators, while emphasizing on cultural factors that may accentuate risks of work-related IPV among Latinos. Consequently, the review of the research literature will necessitate further examination of prominent psychological and cultural factors (e.g., traditional gender role expectations) that may contribute to partner-abusive Latinos' overall work-related IPV behaviors, as well as an exploration of potential protective factors (i.e., fatherhood status) against higher levels of overall work-related IPV and its repercussions on Latinos' work performance and employment outcomes.

The Fathering of Men Who Batter

Earlier research centered around fathers that perpetrate IPV focused primarily on fathers' patterns of partner-abuse, abusive parenting behaviors, and profile characteristics (Bancroft et al., 2012), resulting in a lack of crucial information needed in order to understand the multi-faceted identities of fathers who batter (Perel & Peled, 2008). In more recent years, fatherhood status and experiences of fathering among men who perpetrate IPV has become increasingly explored as a potential focal point of intimate partner violence intervention (e.g., Håland et al., 2016; Poole & Murphy, 2019). However, this body of research has been conducted primarily on White fathers, perhaps adding limitations on the ways in which Latino fathers may be engaged by BIPs, as well as other domestic violence intervention programs, during treatment through the application of empirical evidence.

Areán and Davis (2006) posited that BIPs in particular are uniquely positioned to promote what positive fathering is to men who batter. Similarly, Peled (2000) noted that although centering IPV interventions around the parenting of battering fathers could have potential harmful consequences for women and children, such interventions would truly hold men accountable for their violent actions against their partners and/or children, while simultaneously having a positive impact on the well-being of abusive men's families. In addition to gender violence researchers' advocacy for BIP programs that target abusive men's parenting and roles as fathers, female survivors of IPV have also supported the notion for interventions surrounding their abusive partner's fathering (Areán & Davis, 2006; Atchison et al., 2003). Over the last 20 years, various IPV intervention programs aiming to eliminate the violent behaviors of partner-abusive fathers, while concomitantly enhancing father-child relationships, have emerged throughout various states and communities (Edleson, 2008; Labarre et al., 2016). Yet, the empirical effectiveness for many of these fathering-based violence intervention programs remains untested (Labarre et al., 2016). Furthermore, these programs are often designed and implemented without Latino fathers in mind (Carrillo & Tello, 2006), leaving program practitioners less equipped than ideal when working with Latino fathers who perpetrate IPV.

Areán and Davis (2006) suggests that engaging men who perpetrate IPV about their roles as fathers and enhancing their awareness of the negative impact that their partner-abusive behaviors have on their children could serve as a motivating factor in ending their abuse. Research has demonstrated that BIP participants who were fathers think of their children as a primary factor in being motivated to complete their program

and have also displayed higher change scores in behaviors and cognitions relating to IPV than non-fathers (Poole & Murphy, 2019; Stanley et al., 2012). Additionally, these abusive men often consider fatherhood to be the most valuable role in their lives and have been shown to express solicitude regarding the psychological implications of their children being exposed to their IPV perpetration (Curwood et al., 2011; Rothman et al., 2007; Salisbury et al., 2009). Moreover, when fathers are led to ponder about how their children perceive the events of their IPV perpetration and consider how witnessing IPV behaviors negatively impacts their children, fathers have been shown to display feelings of regret and sadness, propelling their inner desire to change their violent ways (Bourassa et al., 2017; Fox et al., 2001; Veteläinen, 2013).

Contrasting prior literature focused solely on the negative parenting practices of fathers who batter their intimate partners (e.g., Bancroft, 2002), Fox and colleagues (2004) revealed that partner-abusive fathers were very similar to fathers who did not perpetrate IPV on several parenting behavior outcomes (e.g., father involvement). Such findings are understandable, as partner-abusive fathers often state that they aspire to become “good fathers” (Domoney & Trevillion, 2020; Häland et al., 2014; Häland et al., 2016), and strive to achieve this very goal (Carlson & Casey, 2018; Perel & Peled, 2008). One key motivating factor for partner-abusive fathers in wanting to become an ideal parent is to be different than their own fathers who also battered their intimate partners (Carlson & Casey, 2018; Domoney & Trevillion, 2020; Häland et al., 2016). Additional factors that influence fathers’ wishes to end their partner-abusive behaviors is the idea of being socially redeemed by engaging more fully in fatherhood (Fox et al., 2001), as well

as not wanting to lose custody of their children to due to their IPV perpetration (Stanley et al., 2012).

Although partner-abusive fathers may desire to become “good fathers” and put forth their best efforts in achieving such a goal (Perel & Peled, 2008), it is important to note that these fathers in particular may still maintain harmful parenting practices (Fox et al., 2004; Mohaupt et al., 2020; Veteläinen et al., 2013). Further, this particular group of men does not invariably comprehend the psychological effects that their IPV behaviors have on their children, nor do they always desire to fully end their partner-abusive behaviors and stop subjecting their children to such violence (Bourassa et al., 2017; Rothman et al., 2007; Salisbury et al., 2009). This may be partly attributed to the idea that men who perpetrate IPV view their identities as fathers and abusive partners to be separate, rather than intertwined (Fox et al., 2001). Partner-abusive fathers may also perceive their intimate partners and children to be separate as well, contributing to their lack of understanding in how IPV behaviors negatively affects their children (Veteläinen et al., 2013).

Researchers have found that this specific group of fathers commonly exhibit authoritarian parenting styles, such that they are more controlling and stricter in their parenting practices (Mohaupt et al., 2020; Perel & Peled, 2008; Veteläinen et al., 2013). Partner-abusive fathers have been shown to experience difficulty in appropriately responding to their children’s negative emotions or emotional outburst in a manner that is healthy, non-aggressive, and non-violent (Häland et al., 2014; Mohaupt et al., 2020). It has also been uncovered that partner-abusive fathers may also use their children as a

means to further manipulate and control their current or former intimate partners (Bancroft et al., 2012; Galvez et al., 2011; Holden, 2003).

Collectively, these findings suggest that although fatherhood may be a promising point of intervention for men who perpetrate IPV, it alone is not an absolute resolution to ending men's abusive behaviors altogether. However, it remains important to assess the ways in which fatherhood status may serve as a protective factor against various forms of IPV, including work-related IPV perpetration, especially for marginalized men (i.e., Latinos) who have largely been left out of this area of research literature.

Latinos as Fathers

The body of empirical research literature directly centered around Latinos as fathers is relatively small-scale in comparison to the literature on the fathering of White men, as White fathers and families were the frame of reference among researchers for many years (Cabrera & Coll, 2004; Marsiglio et al., 2000; Saracho & Spodek, 2008). Historically, Latino fathers have been stereotyped as individuals that are absent in the lives of their children, dependent upon substances (i.e., drugs and alcohol), and aggressive batterers who inherently embrace the negative aspects of machismo (Cauce & Domenech-Rodríguez, 2002; Mayo, 1997). These fathers in particular have been perceived as being emotionally distant from and domineering over their children (Mirandé, 1991; Moreno & Chuang, 2012; Saracho & Spodek, 2007). Such poor understanding of Latino fathers crept into earlier research literature and ultimately furthered negative stereotypes about this group of men and the roles that they fulfill in their families (Mirandé, 1997; Saracho & Spodek, 2007). Contrary to these prevailing misconceptions, however, contemporary research reveals that Latino fathers are heavily

involved in the lives of their children in a manner that is positive (Behnke et al., 2008; Cruz et al., 2011; O’Gara et al., 2020), highly value their positions as role models and moral teachers to their children (Raikes et al., 2005; Taylor & Behnke, 2005), and are immensely invested in their children’s education and overall development (Reese et al., 1995; Quiñones & Kiyama, 2014; Taylor & Behnke, 2005). Latino fathers have also displayed greater levels of father involvement in certain areas of fathering (e.g., monitoring and time spent with children) than White fathers in some instances (Cabrera et al., 2008; Leavell et al., 2012; Toth & Xu, 1999).

Latino fathers’ devotion to their children can be traced all the way from the prenatal stage of development (Cabrera et al., 2009; Shannon et al., 2009; Tamis-LeMonda et al., 2009). Research suggests that most Latino males are intentional about becoming fathers and often want pregnancies when they occur (Cabrera et al., 2009). Hence, many Latino fathers are prenatally involved in varying ways that establish connections with their unborn children (e.g., buy things for unborn child) and are likely to live with them from the time of birth (Cabrera et al., 2009; Karberg et al., 2017; Shannon et al., 2009). Father involvement remains prominent even amongst non-residential Latino fathers (Cabrera et al., 2008). This group of fathers continue to display moderate levels of father engagement, particularly with active behaviors (e.g., playing with baby) and literacy activities (e.g., singing songs), during the infancy stage of their children’s development (Cabrera et al., 2009; Roubinov et al., 2016; Tamis-LeMonda et al., 2009). Additionally, Latino fathers have displayed higher levels of fatherhood involvement, especially in terms of warmth and monitoring, during their children’s adolescence (O’Gara et al., 2020). Lastly, Latino fathers have been shown to spend the

same amount of time with their daughters as they do their sons, as well as maintain fathering roles that are more egalitarian (Behnke et al., 2008; Hossain et al., 2015).

Even though Latino fathers have been shown to be exceedingly involved in their children's lives and share many similarities in parental practices (Cabrera & Coll, 2004), they are not entirely homogenous in their experiences of fatherhood (Karberg et al., 2017; Taylor & Behnke, 2005). Also, the fathering of Latinos may be influenced by multiple contextual factors, such as acculturation and immigration (e.g., Cabrera & Bradley, 2012; Planalp et al., 2021). When examining predictors of fatherhood involvement amongst primarily immigrant Mexican men, Coltrane and colleagues (2004) found that lower acculturated Mexican men were more likely to engage in activities with their children that were traditionally considered feminine (e.g., cooking and shopping) as well as spend more time supervising them than fathers higher in acculturation. Contrastingly, Cabrera et al. (2006) revealed that Latino fathers higher in acculturation maintained greater levels of father involvement (e.g., changing diapers) with their infants than fathers lower in acculturation. Interestingly, Glass and Owen (2010) discovered that acculturation to Latino culture was positively related to parental involvement for Latino fathers, while acculturation to U.S. culture had no association with paternal involvement. With regard to the influence of immigration on fathering, Taylor and Behnke (2005) observed that while most Mexican immigrant fathers maintained the same parenting practices they had when living in Mexico, as their parenting style fit the new social environment well, some fathers had to adapt their parenting style to the larger U.S. culture. For some Mexican immigrant fathers, part of this adaptation was influenced by U.S. laws centered around

domestic violence and child abuse, as well as the emphasis on equal opportunity and child education (Taylor & Behnke, 2005).

Other primary factors that may influence the fathering of Latinos is the quality of the mother-father relationship and interparental conflict, as well as the employment status of intimate partners (Cabrera & Bradley, 2012; Formoso et., 2007; Roubinov et al., 2016). The current review of the literature regarding the influence of relationship quality and interparental conflict on fathering is not meant to be compared directly to IPV victimization nor perpetration, but rather to simply illustrate a few key variables that impact the fathering experiences of Latinos. Latinos have been shown to maintain lower levels of father engagement (i.e., literacy activities) when they are less happy with their overall intimate relationship and experience more relationship conflict with their intimate partners (Cabrera et al., 2009a, Cabrera et al., 2009b). Formoso and colleagues (2007) found that interparental conflict among Latinos was predictive of poorer quality of fathering when mothers were unemployed, but not while they were employed. Latinos also display higher levels of father engagement when their intimate partners are employed (Roubinov et al., 2016). Supervision of children by Latino fathers also increases as intimate partners spend more time working (Coltrane et al., 2004).

While it is apparent that Latino fathers are exceedingly involved in the lives of their children, literature surrounding the fathering experiences of Latinos that batter is largely absent in both areas of fathering and IPV research (Baker et al., 2001). While researchers have postulated that fathering is of great importance to Latinos who batter (e.g., Perilla, 2007), there has been a minimal number of systematic investigations surrounding the interaction of Latino fatherhood and IPV behaviors. Thus, it is uncertain

as to whether fathering, particularly the identity of being a father, can serve as a protective factor against higher levels of IPV perpetration or if it could actually become a risk factor in some instances for Latinos enrolled in BIPs.

In addition, it may be particularly important to consider how fathering is related to IPV within the context of acculturation. Similar to how acculturation has been shown to influence the fathering of Latinos to varying extents (e.g., Cabrera et al., 2006; Cabrera & Bradley, 2012; Taylor and Behnke, 2005), it has also been shown to impact the IPV behaviors of partner-abusive Latinos to some degree (Alvarez et al., 2020; Galvez et al., 2015; Grest et al., 2018). However, it has not yet been investigated whether fatherhood status may moderate the effect of acculturation on IPV behaviors among Latinos. Considering Latinos' higher levels of father involvement and how their fathering practices may be impacted by acculturation, it is plausible that partner-abusive Latino fathers' IPV behaviors may be more or less affected by the influence of acculturation than partner-abusive Latino non-fathers.

Acculturation and IPV Among Latinos

Currently, there are approximately 28 million Latinas living in the U.S. (Ríos et al., 2014). Woefully, many of the Latinas living in the U.S. are projected to encounter a form of violence at some point in their lifetime, with IPV being the most common form of violence experienced by this group of women (Gonzalez et al., 2020). It is estimated that one in every six Latinas living in the U.S. will experience a form of IPV during their lifetime (Sabina et al., 2015). Prominent risk factors for experiencing IPV among Latinas include amount of time spent in the U.S., immigrant status, country of origin, and acculturation (Cummings et al., 2013; Gonzalez et al., 2020; Sabina et al., 2013). Time

spent in the U.S., immigrant status, and country of origin are also frequently utilized as proxies to measure the acculturation levels of Latinos, and acculturation is often employed as a predictor of IPV among Latino populations (Alvarez et al., 2020; Jasinski, 1998; Kantor et al., 1994).

The exploration of the association between IPV and acculturation among Latinos has largely been assessed through female's experiences and reports of victimization, and less so from male perpetrators reports and accounts (Alvarez et al., 2020; Cho et al., 2014; Garcia et al., 2005). Relatively few studies have examined this association through self-report responses from Latino male-female couples (e.g., Caetano et al., 2007; Cunradi, 2009). However, the research literature surrounding the influence of acculturation on Latino males' IPV perpetration, using samples of solely men, is increasing through the use of self-reports and qualitative methods (e.g., Galvez et al., 2011; Maldonado et al., 2020). Although the findings pertaining to the relationship between acculturation and IPV among Latinos is predominately mixed (Gonzalez et al., 2020), most likely as a result of psychometric issues (Alvarez et al. 2020; Kasturirangan et al., 2004), acculturation clearly has an effect on Latinos' IPV perpetration that warrants further exploration (e.g., Grest et al., 2018; Klevens, 2007), particularly as it relates to work-related IPV (Galvez et al., 2015; Mankowski et al., 2013).

A large body of research has demonstrated the positive association between acculturation and IPV victimization among Latinas (Alvarez et al., 2020; Newcomb & Carmona, 2004). When exploring the association between IPV victimization and country of origin among Mexican women in the U.S., Lown and Vega (2001) discovered that U.S.-born Mexican women were twice as likely to report experiencing IPV compared to

their counterparts originally born in Mexico, indicating that the most acculturated women had the highest likelihood of being victimized at some point in their lives. Similarly, Mexican women born in the U.S. have been shown to be more likely in reporting IPV victimization before and during pregnancy compared to Mexican American women born in Mexico (Jackson et al., 2015). Correspondingly, Garcia and colleagues (2005) found among a heterogeneous group of Latinas, those that were highly acculturated were twice as likely to report being victimized by an abusive partner compared to Latinas that displayed lower levels of acculturation. Furthermore, Latinas that were moderately acculturated were more likely to report IPV victimization compared to Latinas that were lower in acculturation (Garcia et al., 2005). Collectively, these findings may suggest that as Latinas adapt at a continually increasing rate to U.S. culture, they become increasingly likely to experiencing IPV (Alvarez et al., 2020).

Although positive associations between acculturation and IPV have been consistently detected among Latinas (e.g., Alvarez et al., 2020; Caetano et al., 2007; Sabina et al., 2015), researchers have occasionally detected either a negative association or no association between these two variables (Alvarez et al., 2020; Gonzalez, 2020). Moreover, some researchers have identified higher levels of acculturation as serving as a protective factor against IPV for Latinos (Cummings et al., 2013). Champion (1996) revealed that Mexican American women who exhibited lower levels of acculturation were at higher risk for experiencing IPV. Furthermore, Frías and Angel (2012) discovered that although more time spent in the U.S. was associated with greater risk for IPV victimization for Latinas, those that did not acculturate to some extent (i.e., learn and speak English) were also at risk for IPV victimization. Upon examining predictors of

domestic violence among Latina immigrants, Perilla and colleagues (1994) found that there was no association between levels of acculturation and IPV victimization.

Comparably, Cunradi (2009) found that acculturation was not related to IPV perpetration nor victimization among Latinas.

Researchers have periodically demonstrated the relationship between Latino males' IPV perpetration and U.S.-oriented acculturation levels. Grest et al. (2018) investigated longitudinal predictors of emerging adults' IPV perpetration and found that Latino males who maintained higher levels of U.S.-oriented acculturation in adolescence were more likely to perpetrate IPV during emerging adulthood than their Latino-oriented counterparts. Thus, remaining in-touch with one's Latino culture was deemed to be a protective factor against future IPV perpetration among Latino males (Grest et al., 2018). Maldonado et al. (2020) demonstrated that language-based acculturation (i.e., predominately speak Spanish to predominately speak English) was positively associated with IPV perpetration among U.S.-born Latinos.

Comparably, Galvez and colleagues (2015) explored the relationship between acculturation and work-related IPV among Latino male BIP participants and observed that acculturation was positively associated with Latino men's work-related IPV perpetration. Mankowski et al. (2013) discovered that Latino BIP participants whose patterns of work-related IPV could be distinguished as "low-level tactics" were less likely to be U.S.-acculturated, whereas Latino BIP participants whose patterns of work-related IPV could be recognized as "extreme abuse" were more likely to have higher levels of acculturation (Mankowski et al., 2013). Acculturation processes have also been shown to relate to how Latino BIP participants might understand their own work-related IPV

perpetration, such that they may perceive their partners' acculturation to U.S. culture to be problematic and a propelling factor of their relational conflict (Galvez et al., 2011). Contrasting these prior findings, Cunradi (2009) revealed that acculturative factors were unrelated to cohabitating and married Latino males' IPV perpetration.

As many authors have stated, the findings on IPV in relation to acculturation among Latino populations are inconsistent in the larger body of research (Alvarez et al., 2020; Galvez et al., 2011; Gonzalez et al., 2020). This can be largely attributed to the fact that the strength of the association between these two variables varies by which scale is employed to measure them (Alvarez et al., 2020; Kasturirangan et al., 2004). In a recent meta-analysis conducted by Alvarez et al. (2020), a significant, but rather small, positive correlation between acculturation to U.S. culture and IPV among Latinos was detected. Thus, even though acculturation has an effect on IPV, it is an overall small effect (Alvarez et al., 2020). It is worth noting, however, that most of the research studies incorporated in this recent meta-analysis conducted by Alvarez and colleagues (2020) were self-reports of IPV victimization among Latina survivors, and utilized few studies that solely assessed Latino males' self-reports of IPV perpetration.

The workplace appears to be a prominent social context for acculturation processes to transpire for migrants and immigrants alike as they adapt to their host culture, such as the U.S. (e.g., Jian, 2012; van Tonder & Soontiens, 2014). Immigrant Latinas in particular are steadily securing employment in the U.S., which may somewhat shift the power dynamics and traditional gender role expectations that currently exist within many immigrant Latino families (Grzywacz et al., 2009). For example, in traditional Latino families, it is expected that Latino fathers are the sole financial

providers or “breadwinners,” while Latina mothers are to remain at home and raise the children, as well as complete a substantial amount of the housework (Baker et al. 2001; Castillo et al., 2010), giving way to an unequal distribution of power among Latino couples (Perilla, 1999). However, such a transition in immigrant Latinas’ familial roles and autonomy may give rise to IPV victimization in some instances (Alcalde, 2011; Galvez et al., 2015; Gonzalez-Guarda et al., 2009), as immigrant Latinos who batter have been shown to negatively perceive their partner’s maintenance of employment and acculturation to U.S. culture to some extent (Galvez et al., 2011). Consequently, Latinos who batter have been shown to display distinct patterns of job interference tactics when attempting to sabotage their partner’s employment status (Davila et al., 2021; Galvez et al., 2011; Galvez, 2015). Thus, it is imperative to consider the workplace and employment contexts when investigating the influence of acculturation on IPV behaviors among Latinos.

Work-Related IPV Among Latinos

It is not uncommon for IPV to spillover from the small group level (i.e., the dyadic relationship) to the organizational level (i.e., the workplace) of analysis, such that IPV crosses over from victims and perpetrators homes into their workplaces (Galvez et al., 2011; Johnson et al., 2005; Wathen et al., 2018). Consequently, employees (victims or perpetrators), co-workers, and employers are all simultaneously impacted by the negative effects of work-related IPV in a variety of ways (Kulkarni et al., 2018; Mankowski et al., 2013; Wathen et al., 2015). One-third of women who are murdered in the workplace are murdered by an individual that they had a personal relationship with, often being their intimate partner (Tiesman et al., 2012). Work-related IPV has been

shown to have adverse effects on employed (or formerly employed) victims' physical and mental health, as well as their employment outcomes and work performance (Alasker et al., 2016; Garcia et al., 2017; Swanberg & Logan, 2005). Abusive men's work-related IPV perpetration has also been found to hinder their own work performance and employment outcomes (Lim et al., 2004; Mankowski et al., 2013; Schmidt & Barnett, 2011). Resultingly, it is estimated that IPV costs the U.S. approximately \$0.9 billion dollars in lost productivity, in addition to another \$0.9 billion dollars in homicide lost earning, on a yearly basis (National Center for Injury Prevention and Control, 2003). Given the exigent consequences that IPV has on women's health and economic well-being (Bonomi et al., 2007; Brush, 2011; Potter et al., 2020), in addition to the economy (Peterson et al., 2018), researchers and employers alike have attempted to examine the ways in which IPV's interaction with the workplace may be ended (MacGregor et al., 2019). Moreover, workplaces are uniquely positioned to engage in IPV prevention and advocacy work, as well as provide employees (i.e., victims or perpetrators) with essential IPV resources, as employees are dependent upon organizations to appropriately address and respond to work-related IPV (MacGregor et al., 2019). The current review of the literature centered around the impact of work-related IPV victimization among women, and perpetration by men, will be reviewed separately, below.

The most commonly studied aspects of IPV in relation to the workplace are centered around the impact of IPV on heterosexual, female victims' job performance and work participation, other work-related variables (e.g., work-family conflict or work stress), and employment outcomes (MacGregor et al., 2019; Swanberg et al., 2005). Due to being victimized by work-related IPV, female employees have reported to

experiencing difficulty in concentrating during work hours and completing standard work tasks (Alasker et al., 2016; Reeves & Leary-Kelly, 2007; Swanberg & Macke, 2006), in addition to maintaining lower levels of vitality and increased sleep deprivation, as well as decreased mental health (Beck et al., 2014; Brush, 2003; Kulkarni et al., 2018). These factors collectively diminish victims' work performance (Scott et al., 2017; Showalter, 2016). Correspondingly, employed victims of work-related IPV are increasingly likely to be tardy to or absent from work, call in sick, or leave work early (Anderson et al., 2014; Reeves & O'Leary-Kelly, 2007; Samuel et al., 2011). However, this may be attributed to abusive partners work interference tactics (Blodgett & Lanigan, 2018; Riger et al., 2000; Swanberg & Logan, 2005). Additionally, research has demonstrated that victims face obstacles in obtaining or remaining employed, as their abusive partners frequently attempt to sabotage their employment (Anderson et al., 2014; Swanberg & Logan, 2005; Logan et al., 2007), most likely to keep their partners financially dependent and to reinstate dominance over them (Adams et al., 2008; Galvez et al., 2011).

Latinas may be at increased risk for experiencing work-related IPV, especially those of immigrant status (Castro et al., 2003; Gonzalez-Guarda et al., 2010; Terrazas-Carrillo, 2015). Immigrant Latinas are increasingly entering the workforce in the U.S., which may lead to changes in autonomy and traditional gender roles for Latinas within Latino families, and ultimately give rise to instances of IPV victimization (Galvez et al., 2011; Gonzalez-Guarda et al., 2009; Grzywacz et al., 2009). Further, work-related IPV fatality rates have been shown to be significantly higher for Latinas than for non-Hispanic White females (Tiesman et al., 2012). Immigrant Latinas are also faced with

additional barriers to receiving the appropriate support and resources needed in response to work-related IPV victimization (e.g., Bloom et al., 2009; Samuel et al., 2011).

Since the majority of work-related IPV literature is focused on the victimization of women, which remains a crucial social problem that is imperative to further study by researchers, much less is known about abusive men who perpetrate work-related IPV and the factors that may serve as points of intervention to curtail such abusive behaviors (Galvez et al., 2011; MacGregor et al., 2019). Even less is known about Latinos who perpetrate work-related IPV as this population has seldomly been examined by researchers (Galvez et al., 2015). Nevertheless, there is a considerable body of literature regarding the work-related IPV behaviors that abusive men utilize in order to interfere with their partner's employment status, work performance, and work participation (Mankowski et al., 2013; Swanberg et al., 2005; Scott et al., 2017). Abusive men's work-related IPV behaviors are not homogenous, as not all abusive men perpetrate work-related IPV in the same ways nor at the same level (Mankowski et al., 2013). Additionally, some evidence suggests that there is a cultural context in which work-related IPV behaviors may be uniquely understood for Latinos (Galvez et al., 2011).

Mankowski and colleagues (2013) discovered five discrete patterns of work-related IPV perpetration among abusive men: low-level tactics, interference, inference with threatened or actual violence, extreme abuse without jealousy, and extreme abuse, all of which are characterized by the extent and severity of work-related IPV behaviors used. Swanberg and colleagues (2005) posited that nearly all of the job interference tactics abusive men use can be sorted into two main categories: 1) on-the-job stalking and harassment and 2) work disruption. Abusive men have been found to appear at either

their partner's place of employment or off-site work meetings in order to stalk and/or harass their partners (Al-Modallal et al., 2016; Galvez et al., 2011; Lein et al., 2001). These abusive males have also been shown to physically abuse their partners at their workplace during work hours as well (Anderson et al., 2014; Blodgett & Lanigan, 2018; MacGregor et al., 2016). Research also demonstrates that abusive men may also make frequent calls or emails to harass their partners or to gain information regarding their partners from their places of employment (Anderson et al., 2014; Logan & Swanberg, 2005; Pyles & Banerjee, 2010; Rothman & Perry, 2004). Prior findings suggest that employed men who perpetrate IPV have trouble concentrating while at work and performing daily work tasks (MacGregor et al., 2016; Mankowski et al., 2013; Scott et al., 2017), cause or almost cause work accidents (Schmidt & Barnett, 2012), and maintain increased rates of absenteeism due to their abusive behaviors (Rothman & Perry, 2004). Furthermore, men with extreme abuse work-related IPV perpetration patterns are almost four times as likely to experience negative outcomes on their job performance compared to men with low-level tactics patterns (Mankowski et al., 2013). Comparatively, abusive men's employment outcomes have also been shown to be impacted by their IPV perpetration, such that they may experience termination of employment as a direct result (Scott et al., 2017; Rothman & Perry, 2004).

While Latinos who perpetrate work-related IPV have been shown to use many of the same job interference tactics that have been previously documented in the literature (e.g., threatening and physically abusing partners at their workplace or stalking), distinctive work-related IPV behaviors have been detected among Latinos (Davila et al., 2021; Galvez et al., 2011; Galvez et al., 2015). These behaviors include sending one's

partner to another country (e.g., Mexico) in order to obstruct their employment or forbidding partners to drive in order to further monitor them, prevent partners from obtaining employment, and to keep partners dependent upon them for transportation (Galvez et al., 2011; Galvez et al., 2015). Additionally, Mankowski et al. (2013) found that abusive men who displayed patterns of low-tactics work-related IPV perpetration were more likely to be Latino and fathers compared to men that exhibited extreme abuse patterns of work-related IPV. However, the cause of these differences remains unclear (Mankowski et al., 2013). Moreover, Galvez et al. (2011) revealed that immigrant Latino males' conceptualizations of their work-related IPV perpetration are informed by their cultures of origin to some extent, such that their partner's obtainment or maintenance of employment may be viewed as a threat to the family system and a contradiction to the traditional gender role expectations. Immigrant Latinos who batter may also perceive their partners' employment to be emasculating due to shifts in gender role expectations and power dynamics, thus becoming a risk factor for work-related IPV perpetration (Alcalde, 2011). Collectively, these findings suggest that additional avenues of intervention are needed for Latinos who perpetrate work-related IPV, in such a way that addresses their traditional gender role expectations and identities as fathers.

It is worth noting that presently there appears to be only two published scales that measure partner-abusive men's work performance and employment outcomes as it is impacted by IPV behaviors (Mankowski et al., 2013). Although these two published scales developed by Mankowski and colleagues (2013) have been validated to some extent, the reliability of the scale response scores was never obtained nor reported. While reliable measures in this area of research are necessary in order to make statistical

inferences that are accurate, they are also needed to ensure that appropriate conclusions for effective work-related IPV intervention and programming are able to be drawn from the data. Furthermore, there are currently no published measures of partner-abusive men's support for intimate partner's employment status nor gendered expectations regarding women and work. Consequently, there is a limitation on the knowledge around protective and risk factors for men's work-related IPV behaviors.

Current Study

IPV disproportionately affects Latino communities (Caetano et al., 2005; Cummings et al., 2013; Sabina et al., 2015), and more specifically, Latino families (Perilla et al., 1994; Perilla, 2007; Perilla et al., 2012). Latino men who perpetrate IPV often assume the role of a father to several children, potentially putting Latino children at higher risk for witnessing family violence and suffering the health inequities that are associated with experiencing such events (Mancera et al., 2017; Mariscal, 2020; Meyers et al., 2018; Raj et al., 2006). IPV among Latino couples has the capacity to crossover from the dyadic relationship into places of employment with distinctive patterns of work-related abusive behaviors (Galvez et al., 2015), and this pattern has been detected for Latino fathers as well (Galvez et al., 2011; Mankowski et al., 2013). Moreover, acculturation has been shown to have a degree of influence over Latinos' IPV perpetration (Alvarez et al., 2020), including work-related IPV behaviors (Galvez et al., 2015). However, Mankowski et al. (2013) found that Latino BIP participants who displayed less severe patterns of work-related IPV behaviors were more likely to be fathers and less acculturated than those that used more extreme abusive IPV behaviors.

Taking into consideration the importance of fatherhood in Latino culture (Behnke et al., 2008; Cabrera & Coll, 2004; Perilla, 1999) and prior findings suggesting that fatherhood may be a promising point of intervention with men who batter in ending their IPV behaviors (Bourassa et al., 2017; Fox et al., 2001; Veteläinen, 2013), it is plausible that fatherhood status may act as a protective factor against higher levels of work-related IPV perpetration among Latinos. The current study will explore these associations to identify whether fatherhood status has a moderating effect with acculturation on Latinos' levels of overall work-related IPV behaviors, in addition to comparing Latinos' work performance and employment outcomes by fatherhood status. Fatherhood status will also be examined as moderator of the relationship between gendered expectations regarding women and work and overall work-related IPV behaviors. Finally, fatherhood status will be explored as a moderator of the relationship between support for intimate partner's maintenance of employment and overall work-related IPV behaviors. The reliability of the work performance scale and the employment outcomes scale created by Mankowski and colleagues (2013) will be assessed for the first time. Additionally, the reliability and concurrent validity of the support for intimate partner's employment subscale and the gendered expectations regarding women and work subscale will be assessed as well.

Appertaining to the research literature previously reviewed above, and in accordance with the aims of the current systematic investigation of work-related IPV behaviors among Latinos, the following hypotheses will guide the trajectory of this study:

H1: Fatherhood status will be negatively associated with overall work-related IPV behaviors. Specifically, being a non-father will be associated with increased overall work-related IPV behaviors compared with being a father.

H2: Acculturation will be positively associated with overall work-related IPV behaviors, such that higher levels of acculturation will be associated with increased overall work-related IPV behaviors.

H3: Gendered expectations regarding women and work will be positively associated with overall work-related IPV behaviors, such that higher levels of gendered expectations will be associated with increased overall work-related IPV behaviors.

H4: Support for intimate partner's maintenance of employment will be negatively associated with overall work-related IPV, such that higher levels of support for intimate partner's maintenance of employment will be associated with decreased overall work-related IPV behaviors.

H5: The effect of acculturation on overall work-related IPV behaviors will be moderated by fatherhood status, such that higher levels of acculturation for Latino non-fathers will be associated with higher levels of overall work-related IPV, whereas higher levels of acculturation will be associated with lower levels of overall work-related IPV for Latino fathers.

H6: The effect of gendered expectations regarding women and work on overall work-related IPV behaviors will be moderated by fatherhood status, such that gendered expectations will be more strongly related to overall work-related IPV for fathers than non-fathers.

H7: The effect of support for intimate partner's maintenance of employment on overall work-related IPV behaviors will be moderated by fatherhood status, such that support for intimate partner's maintenance of employment will be more strongly related to overall work-related IPV for fathers than non-fathers.

H8: Non-fathers will have poorer overall work performance (as it relates to their IPV behaviors) compared to fathers.

H9: Non-fathers will have poorer overall employment outcomes (as it relates to their IPV behaviors) compared to fathers.

Furthermore, the current study will attempt to contribute to the research literature surrounding the measurement of outcomes related to work-related IPV by addressing the following research questions:

Research question 1 (RQ1). What is the reliability of the work performance scale, the employment outcomes scale, the support for intimate partner's employment subscale, and the gendered expectations regarding women and work subscale?

Research question 2 (RQ2). What is the concurrent validity of the support for intimate partner's employment subscale and the gendered expectations regarding women and work subscale?

Chapter 2: Method

Participants

Study participants consisted of $n = 120$ Latino males at least 18 years or older ($M = 31.00$, $SD = 7.81$) that were enrolled in a community-based BIP ($n = 9$), either on a court-mandated or voluntary basis, located in Oregon. Of the 120 Latino males, 101 were identified as fathers and 19 were identified as non-fathers.

Procedure

The primary investigator of a larger research project (which this current study used secondary data from), along with a trained graduate research assistant, attended the regular, ongoing weekly BIP English/bilingual/Spanish group meetings in order to recruit participants. Latino men were informed in English and/or Spanish (whichever language was preferred by BIP participants) about the nature and purpose of the study and were given the opportunity to participate anonymously in responding to a self-administered survey. Men were informed that they would not be penalized for choosing not to participate in this cross-sectional survey study. During the survey sessions, BIP group facilitators were not in attendance. Men who provided verbal informed consent to the researchers were given a printed copy of the survey in the language that was preferred (i.e., English or Spanish) along with a pencil to record their responses. An iPod® portable music player was provided to participants with lower-literacy levels who needed to listen to the survey questions in audio format instead of reading (Galvez et al., 2009). Participants took approximately 45 minutes to complete either format of the survey and were given \$15 for their participation.

Measures

Participant demographics. Demographic information was obtained by asking participants to report their ethnicity, number of children living at home or not living with currently, age, income, education, country of origin, employment status, religious affiliation, relationship status, reason for enrolling in the BIP, time enrolled in the BIP, and current partner's demographic information.

Work-Related Domestic Violence Perpetration Scale. Men's work-related IPV behaviors were captured by using the Work-Related Domestic Violence Perpetration Scale (Mankowski et al., 2013), which is a 40-item measure that examines lifetime prevalence of work-related IPV behaviors inflicted upon one's current or former partner, using a 0 ("no") to 1 ("yes") dichotomous scale. This 40-item measure consists of five subscales, each of which examines a different form of work-related IPV behaviors used in one's lifetime: work control, work interference, work monitoring, coworker jealousy, and threatened or actual abuse. The work control subscale consists of four items that assess men's use of power to control current or former partners' work schedule and employment (e.g., "I have talked with my partner's (ex-partner's) boss about changing her work schedule."). The work interference subscale is comprised of 12 items that assess men's behaviors used to interfere with or inhibit current or former partners' job performance or employment (e.g., "I have spread rumors about my partner (ex-partner) at her job."). The work monitoring subscale is comprised of 10 items that assess men's furtive surveilling behaviors used to watch over their partners in a work context (e.g., "I have asked a friend to keep an eye on my partner (ex-partner) while she is at work."). The coworker jealousy subscale is comprised of three items that assess cognitions, feelings, and behaviors maintained by men when they perceive that their intimate relationship is

threatened by their current or former partners' coworker(s) or boss (e.g., "I have felt jealous of my partner (ex-partner) spending time with her male coworkers or boss."). The threatened or actual abuse subscale is comprised of 11 items that assess men's use of threatened or actual abuse (i.e., physical or emotional) or violence in the workplace or at home that affected their partners' job performance or employment (e.g., "I have physically hurt my partner (ex-partner) in front of her coworkers or boss."). Participants' responses to each subscale were summed to obtain a count of work-related IPV behaviors in each of these five domains as well as a total count for overall work-related IPV behaviors. The following four items were excluded from reliability analysis as they had zero variance due to all of the participants stating that they had never perpetrated these specific abusive behaviors: "I have threatened to hurt my partner with a weapon at her job," "I have hurt my partner with a weapon at her job," "I have used property of my job to hurt my partner," and "I have talked with my partner's boss to complain about her." However, these four items were still included in the creation of the work-related IPV variable for completeness. The overall scale was found to be reliable ($KR-20 = .87$).

Work performance. Men's work performance in relation to their IPV behaviors was explored by using a work performance scale comprised of four items (Mankowski et al., 2013). A sample item is, "I have made mistakes at work due to my abusive behavior." Responses to the four items were measured on a 0 ("no") to 1 ("yes") dichotomous scale. Participants' responses were summed to obtain a total count for work performance ratings. The scale demonstrated acceptable reliability for research ($KR-20 = .81$).

Employment outcomes. Men's employment outcomes in relation to their IPV behaviors was explored by using an employment outcomes scale comprised of three

items (Mankowski et al., 2013). A sample item is, “I have been denied a job because I had domestic violence on my record.” Responses to the three items were measured on a 0 (“no”) to 1 (“yes”) dichotomous scale. Participants’ responses were summed to obtain a total count for employment outcomes. Reliability analysis indicated that the scale had poor reliability and was unacceptable for research ($KR-20 = .50$). Upon further examination, the most discriminating item (i.e., “My boss has fired me because I missed work due to DV”) from the scale was retained for subsequent analysis, as it demonstrated a corrected item-total correlation of $r = .46$, which was the highest corrected item-total correlation among the three items. More specifically, this item was more highly correlated with the underlying dimension of variability under examination (i.e., employment outcomes) compared to the other two items, further justifying the decision to only retain this single item.

Gendered expectations regarding women and work. Men’s gendered expectations regarding women and work will be assessed using a subscale comprised of three items. A sample item is, “It is still my partner’s (ex-partner’s) responsibility to care for me, the family, and the house even if she works outside the home.” Responses to the three items are measured on a 1 (“strongly disagree”) to 6 (“strongly agree”) Likert-type scale. This subscale was derived from an exploratory factor analysis with principal axis factoring that was conducted to assess the dimensionality of a nine-item measure of men’s gendered attitudes towards women. Participants’ responses were averaged. The scale was found to have acceptable reliability for research (Cronbach $\alpha = .72$).

Support for intimate partner’s employment. Men’s support for intimate partner’s employment will be assessed using a subscale comprised of four items. A sample item is,

“I am supportive of my partner working for pay.” Responses to the four items are measured on a 1 (“strongly disagree”) to 6 (“strongly agree”) Likert-type scale. This subscale was derived from an exploratory factor analysis with principal axis factoring that was conducted to assess the dimensionality of a nine-item measure of men’s gendered attitudes towards women. Participants’ responses were averaged. Reliability analysis indicated that the scale demonstrated poor reliability (Cronbach $\alpha = .18$) and was unacceptable for research. Upon further investigation, the most discriminating item (i.e., “Our family needs the income from my partner’s job”) was retained for subsequent analysis, as it demonstrated a corrected item-total correlation of $r = .52$, which was the highest corrected item-total correlation among the four items. More specifically, this item was more highly correlated with the underlying dimension of variability under examination (i.e., support for intimate partner’s employment) compared to the other two items, further justifying the decision to only retain this single item.

Short Acculturation Scale. The Language Use subscale of the Short Acculturation Scale for Hispanics (SASH; Marín et al., 1987) was used to measure men’s acculturation levels. This subscale is comprised of five items that evaluate participants’ levels of acculturation, using a 1 (“only Spanish”) to 5 (“only English”) Likert-type scale. A sample item is, “In general, what languages do you usually speak with your friends?” Participants’ responses were averaged. Marín and colleagues (1987) report that using the Language Use subscale of the SASH is acceptable and maintains validity when used as one of many measures in a larger research study. Past research with BIP participants of Mexican origin (i.e., Galvez et al., 2015) has demonstrated that the Language Use subscale of the SASH has a Cronbach alpha that suggest higher levels of internal

consistency ($\alpha = .86$). The scale was found to be reliable for the current study (Cronbach $\alpha = .87$).

Fatherhood status. Men reported how many of their own children (or those they cared for as their own) they had currently living with and not living with them. Men with at least 1 child that was their own or cared for as their own were identified as fathers. A variable for fatherhood status was created (0 = non-fathers; 1 = fathers).

Data Analyses

All data analyses were conducted utilizing SPSS version 28.0. First, preliminary analyses to check missing data, variable distributions, and exploratory factor analyses of scale items are presented. Second, planned analyses to test study hypotheses are presented.

Preliminary analyses.

Missing data. Missing values analyses were conducted on all study variables.

While there is no agreed upon standard as to what percentage of missing data is acceptable, some literature supports that a missing rate of 5% or less is inconsequential for valid data analysis (Dong & Peng, 2013; Jakobsen et al., 2017; Shafer, 1999), and none of the predictor and outcome variables in the study exceeded that threshold. Therefore, multiple imputation was determined to not be necessary for the focal variables.

Distribution of measures. Q-Q plots, frequency histograms, and Shapiro-Wilk tests were conducted to examine the distributions of the focal variables and indicated that each of the outcome variables (i.e., work performance, employment outcomes, and overall work-related IPV behaviors) had distributions that substantially departed from

normality and were considerably skewed and kurtotic. More specifically, the work performance variable had a skewness value that was equal to $-.27$ and a kurtosis value of -1.45 , the employment outcomes variable had a skewness value that was equal to -2.51 and a kurtosis value of 6.43 , and the overall work-related IPV behaviors variable had a skewness value that was equal to 1.52 and a kurtosis value of 2.20 . IPV outcome variables have been commonly reported in the literature to have non-normal distributions that are both skewed and kurtotic, which is partly attributable to the nature of the phenomenon entailing extreme acts of violence by abusive partners, and are therefore typically reported without data transformations for interpretability purposes (Straus, 1990; Straus et al., 1996; Yun, 2011). For these reasons, transformations of the data were not conducted. While count variables with skewed and kurtotic distributions such as these may bias standard errors and tests of significance when analyzed with ordinary least squares (OLS) regression, negative binomial regression models are far more robust to such assumption violations than OLS regression models (Coxe et al., 2009). Consequently, negative binomial regression models were employed for subsequent analyses of these outcome variables.

Exploratory factor analysis. In order to ensure that the proposed measures for subsequent analyses would be developed with as much reliability and validity as possible, an exploratory factor analysis (EFA) was performed. An EFA with principal axis factoring was conducted to assess the dimensionality of a nine-item measure of men's gendered attitudes towards women and work-family roles. The number of factors to extract and rotate was determined based on the interpretation of a scree plot and the interpretability of the factor solution. According to the scree plot, there were two primary

dimensions of variability in the responses to the nine items, as the “elbow” or bend in the plot appeared at the third factor, indicating that the eigenvalues of the first two factors to be greater than 1.0. Therefore, two factors were obtained and rotated using Direct Oblimin rotation. Any items with loadings below .30 were removed, resulting in a two-factor structure with seven items that accounted for 44.21% of the variance in responses to the seven items. The rotated solution yielded two interpretable factors: support for intimate partner’s employment and gendered expectations regarding women and work. The support for intimate partner’s employment factor accounted for 16.81% of the item variance, and the gendered expectations regarding women and work accounted for 27.40% of the item variance. None of the items were found to load on both factors, and all of the items were salient on their respective factors. The two factors had a weak, negative correlation, $r = -.06$.

Covariates. In order to better assess the individual contribution of the proposed predictors of work-related IPV behaviors, temporally based variables were examined as potential covariates for subsequent negative binomial regression models. Some research indicates that rates of IPV perpetration varies among age groups (e.g., Theobald & Farrington, 2012), and thus, age was examined as a potential predictor of overall work-related IPV behaviors. A negative binomial regression model was used to examine the relation of age to overall work-related IPV behaviors. The predictor did not account for a significant amount of variance in work-related IPV behaviors, likelihood ratio $\chi^2(1) = .90$, $p = .34$. Age was a not significant predictor of overall work-related IPV behaviors, $B = -.011$, $SE = .01$, $p = .331$, $RR = .99$ ($e^{-.01} = .99$), 95% [CI = -.03, .01]. Several studies suggests that the length of batterer intervention programming may be related to decreases

in men's abusive behaviors, denial of IPV perpetration, and rates of recidivism over time (Edleson & Syers, 1990; 1991; Gondolf, 1999). Thus, time (in months) enrolled in a BIP was explored as a potential predictor of overall work-related IPV behaviors. A negative binomial regression model was used to examine the relation of the amount of time enrolled in a BIP to overall work-related IPV behaviors. The predictor did account for a significant amount of variance in overall work-related IPV behaviors, likelihood ratio $\chi^2(1) = 6.87, p = .009$. Time enrolled in a BIP was a significant predictor of overall work-related IPV behaviors, $B = .024, SE = .01, p = .02, RR = 1.02 (e^{.024} = 1.02), 95\% [CI = .01, .04]$. Therefore, time enrolled in a BIP was selected and entered as a covariate in subsequent negative binomial regression models.

Planned data analyses.

Negative binomial regression analyses. In order to test H1, H2, H3, H4, H8, and H9, I conducted a series of negative binomial regression analyses. Rationale for using the negative binomial regression model is supported given that the outcome variables have non-normal distributions, increasing the likelihood that the residuals are non-normal as well, the variables are all count data as they are counts of events (e.g., total number of overall work-related IPV behaviors), and for these very reasons, the outcome variables should not be analyzed with ordinary least squares (OLS) regression (Coxe et al., 2009; Hoef & Boveng, 2007). In these circumstances, the negative binomial or Poisson regression links are used for regression models with count data (Coxe et al., 2009; Hoef & Boveng, 2007). The reason the negative binomial regression model is selected in this instance is because the Poisson regression model assumes equidispersion, in which the conditional mean and the conditional variance of the dependent variable are equal (Coxe

et al., 2009; Vives et al., 2008; Yang & Berdine, 2015). Violations to this assumption, referred to as overdispersion, may bias standard errors and statistical tests (Coxe et al., 2009; Yang & Berdine, 2015). The negative binomial model does not require for this assumption to be met and thus allows for overdispersion to occur without biasing standard errors and statistical tests (Coxe et al., 2009; Yang & Berdine, 2015).

Additionally, with the results from a negative binomial regression model, one can demonstrate the odds increase in the outcome of interest for each unit increase in the predictor by using exponential transformation of the slope (Coxe et al., 2009). Therefore, one can test if being a non-father is associated with approximately X number of times more of an outcome of interest compared with being a father. For example, it may be that being a non-father is associated with 1.5 times more overall work-related IPV behaviors compared with being a father.

Moderation analyses. I conducted a series of moderation analyses utilizing negative binomial regression models containing an interaction term as a means to test H5, H6, and H7 (Coxe et al., 2009). In order to examine the moderating effect of fatherhood status on the relationship between acculturation and work-related IPV behaviors (i.e., H5), a moderation analysis was conducted. A negative binomial regression model containing an interaction term was used: the relationship between acculturation and overall work related-IPV behaviors moderated by fatherhood status. The acculturation and fatherhood status variables were mean centered and then an acculturation-by-fatherhood status interaction term will be computed (Aiken & West, 1991), and then the two predictors and the interaction term were entered into a negative binomial regression model. The same steps were followed in order to test H6 and H7.

Chapter 3: Results

Descriptive Statistics

The majority of participants enrolled in BIPs were mandated to attend by criminal court or the State of Oregon Department of Human Services (88.30%), whereas only a minority of the participants attended a BIP voluntarily (10.00%). Most of the participants were employed (95%) and only a select few were unemployed (4.2%). The average length of time enrolled in a BIP was 8.90 months ($SD = 9.51$). Nearly all the participants that were employed worked full-time jobs (87.50%), and almost a quarter of the participants worked more than one job (22.50%). Participants worked an average of 149.16 hours ($SD = 65.77$) outside the home and an average of 18.22 hours ($SD = 109.08$) from home on a monthly basis. The average years of formal education among participants in this sample was 9.03 years ($SD = 3.50$), and only a small number of participants had more than 12 years of formal education (8.30%). The average monthly income for this sample was 4.87 ($SD = 1.67$) which was anchored to the category \$1,001-\$1,500 monthly earnings before taxes. Close to half of the participants reported that their current intimate partner or ex-partner maintained employment status (47.50%).

A majority of participants identified as Mexican (77.50%), while others identified as Mexican American (5.00%), Central American (11.70%), Cuban (0.80%), Puerto Rican (0.80%), South American (0.80%), or identified with another group of Latin origin that was not included on the demographics survey (1.70%). Most participants reported to being born in Mexico (72.50%), and others reported to being either born in the U.S. (10.80%), Guatemala (5.80%), Honduras (3.30%), Cuba (0.80%), El Salvador (0.80%), Panama (0.80%), or Venezuela (0.80%). A vast number of participants identified as

Catholic (75.80%), while others identified as either Protestant (13.30%), another religion that was not included in the demographics survey (5.80%), or did not identify with any religion at all (4.20%). Participants reported to being either single (16.70%), married (36.70%), divorced (7.5%), separated (16.70%), or in an intimate relationship but unmarried (22.50%). Almost a quarter of the participants were living with their stepchildren (23.40%), almost half of the participants had at least one child that was not living with them (45.00%), and more than half of the participants reported to living with their biological child or with a child that they cared for as their own (67.50%).

Participants reported an average of 6.43 work-related IPV behaviors ($SD = 6.74$). Acculturation levels among Latinos in this sample were fairly low, as the average acculturation score for the Language Use subscale of the SASH (Marín et al., 1987) was 1.89 ($SD = 1.89$). Levels of gendered expectations regarding women and work were also lower among this sample ($M = 2.11$, $SD = 1.00$). There was moderate endorsement of the item “Our family needs the income from my partner’s job” among participants ($M = 4.23$, $SD = 1.47$). Participants’ reports of work performance outcomes (as influenced by their abusive behavior) were moderate overall ($M = 6.24$, $SD = 1.57$). A majority of participants reported that they had not been fired by their boss because they missed work to domestic violence (90.80%). See table 1 for sociodemographic information of participants.

Hypothesis Testing

Hypothesis testing is discussed in the following section of the current study. Each hypothesis will be reiterated along with its respective result. See table 2 for summary of results.

H1: Fatherhood status will be negatively associated with overall work-related IPV behaviors. Specifically, being a non-father will be associated with increased overall work-related IPV behaviors compared with being a father.

A negative binomial regression model was used to examine the relation of fatherhood status to overall work-related IPV behaviors, controlling for time enrolled in a BIP. The predictors accounted for a significant amount of variance in overall work-related IPV behaviors, likelihood ratio $\chi^2(2) = 7.23, p = .03$. Time enrolled in a BIP was a significant predictor of overall work-related IPV behaviors, $B = .025, SE = .01, p = .02, RR = 1.03 (e^{.025} = 1.03), 95\% [CI = .01, .04]$. Fatherhood Status was not a significant predictor of overall work-related IPV behaviors, $B = .159, SE = .26, p = .54, RR = 1.17 (e^{.159} = 1.17), 95\% [CI = -.35, .67]$.

H2: Acculturation will be positively associated with overall work-related IPV behaviors, such that higher levels of acculturation will be associated with increased overall work-related IPV behaviors.

A negative binomial regression model was used to examine the relation of acculturation to overall work-related IPV behaviors, controlling for time enrolled in a BIP. The predictors accounted for a significant amount of variance in overall work-related IPV behaviors, likelihood ratio $\chi^2(2) = 21.50, p = .001$. Time enrolled in a BIP was a significant predictor of overall work-related IPV behaviors, $B = .024, SE = .01, p = .01, RR = 1.02 (e^{.024} = 1.02), 95\% [CI = .01, .04]$. Acculturation was a significant predictor of overall work-related IPV behaviors, $B = .356, SE = .10, p = .001, RR = 1.43 (e^{.356} = 1.43), 95\% [CI = .16, .55]$.

H3: Gendered expectations regarding women and work will be positively associated with overall work-related IPV behaviors, such that higher levels of gendered expectations will be associated with increased overall work-related IPV behaviors.

A negative binomial regression model was used to examine the relation of gendered expectations towards women and work to overall work-related IPV behaviors, controlling for time enrolled in a BIP. The predictors accounted for a significant amount of variance in overall work-related IPV behaviors, likelihood ratio $\chi^2(2) = 6.86, p = .03$. Time enrolled in a BIP was a significant predictor of overall work-related IPV behaviors, $B = .024, SE = .01, p = .02, RR = 1.02 (e^{.024} = 1.02), 95\% [CI = .01, .04]$. Gendered expectations regarding women and work was not a significant predictor of overall work-related IPV behaviors, $B = .030, SE = .09, p = .75, RR = 1.03 (e^{.030} = 1.03), 95\% [CI = -.15, .21]$.

H4: Support for intimate partner's maintenance of employment will be negatively associated with overall work-related IPV, such that higher levels of support for intimate partner's maintenance of employment will be associated with decreased overall work-related IPV behaviors.

A negative binomial regression model was used to examine the relation of BIP participants' reports of their intimate partners needing to work in order to economically support the family system to overall work-related IPV behaviors, controlling for time enrolled in a BIP. The predictors did account for a significant amount of variance in overall work-related IPV behaviors, likelihood ratio $\chi^2(2) = 8.44, p = .02$. Time enrolled in a BIP was a significant predictor of overall work-related IPV behaviors, $B = .023, SE = .01, p = .02, RR = 1.02 (e^{.023} = 1.02), 95\% [CI = .00, .04]$. BIP participants' reports of

their intimate partners needing to work in order to economically support the family system was not a significant predictor of overall work-related IPV behaviors, $B = .080$, $SE = .06$, $p = .20$, $RR = 1.08$ ($e^{.080} = 1.08$), 95% [CI = -.04, .20].

H5: The effect of acculturation on overall work-related IPV behaviors will be moderated by fatherhood status, such that higher levels of acculturation for Latino non-fathers will be associated with higher levels of overall work-related IPV, whereas higher levels of acculturation will be associated with lower levels of overall work-related IPV for Latino fathers.

A negative binomial regression model was tested to investigate whether the association between acculturation and overall work-related IPV behaviors depends on fatherhood status. After centering acculturation variable and computing the acculturation-by-fatherhood status interaction term (Aiken & West, 1991), the two predictors were entered into a negative binomial regression model. The predictors did account for a significant amount of variance in overall work-related IPV behaviors, likelihood ratio $\chi^2(3) = 14.30$, $p = .003$. Results indicated that acculturation did not independently predict overall work-related IPV behaviors, $B = .420$, $SE = .26$, $p = .113$, $RR = 1.52$ ($e^{.420} = 1.52$), 95% [CI = -.01, .04]. Fatherhood status was not a significant predictor of overall work-related IPV behaviors, $B = .162$, $SE = .26$, $p = .53$, $RR = 1.18$ ($e^{.162} = 1.18$), 95% [CI = -.34, .67]. The interaction between acculturation and fatherhood status was not significant, $B = -.028$, $SE = .29$, $p = .92$, $RR = .97$ ($e^{-.028} = .97$), 95% [CI = -.60, .01], suggesting that the effect of acculturation on overall work-related IPV behaviors did not depend on the level of fatherhood status. Thus, analyses of the simple slopes to specify the non-significant interaction were not conducted.

H6: The effect of gendered expectations regarding women and work on overall work-related IPV behaviors will be moderated by fatherhood status, such that gendered expectations will be more strongly related to overall work-related IPV for fathers than non-fathers.

A negative binomial regression model was tested to investigate whether the association between gendered expectations regarding women and work and overall work-related IPV behaviors depends on fatherhood status. The predictors did not account for a significant amount of variance in overall work-related IPV behaviors, likelihood ratio $\chi^2(3) = 1.29, p = .73$. Results indicated that gendered expectations regarding women and work did not independently predict overall work-related IPV behaviors, $B = .059, SE = .20, p = .77, RR = 1.06 (e^{.059} = 1.06), 95\% [CI = -.34, .46]$. Fatherhood status was not a significant predictor of overall work-related IPV behaviors, $B = .212, SE = .29, p = .47, RR = 1.24 (e^{.162} = 1.24), 95\% [CI = -.36, .78]$. The interaction between gendered expectations regarding women and work and fatherhood status was not significant, $B = -.028, SE = .29, p = .92, RR = .97 (e^{-.028} = .97), 95\% [CI = -.60, .01]$, suggesting that the effect of gendered expectations regarding women and work on overall work-related IPV behaviors did not depend on the level of fatherhood status. Therefore, simple slopes were not explored.

H7: The effect of support for intimate partner's maintenance of employment on overall work-related IPV behaviors will be moderated by fatherhood status, such that support for intimate partner's maintenance of employment will be more strongly related to overall work-related IPV for fathers than non-fathers.

A negative binomial regression model was tested to investigate whether the association between BIP participants' reports of their intimate partners needing to work in order to economically support the family system and overall work-related IPV behaviors depends on fatherhood status. The predictors did not account for a significant amount of variance in overall work-related IPV behaviors, likelihood ratio $\chi^2(3) = 2.21, p = .53$. Results indicated that BIP participants' reports of their intimate partners needing to work in order to economically support the family system did not independently predict overall work-related IPV behaviors, $B = .020, SE = .13, p = .88, RR = 1.02 (e^{.020} = 1.02)$, 95% [CI = -.24, .28]. Fatherhood status was not a significant predictor of overall work-related IPV behaviors, $B = .158, SE = .27, p = .56, RR = 1.17 (e^{.158} = 1.17)$, 95% [CI = -.38, .69]. The interaction effect between BIP participants' reports of their intimate partners needing to work in order to economically support the family system and fatherhood status was not significant, $B = .082, SE = .16, p = .59, RR = 1.09 (e^{.082} = 1.09)$, 95% [CI = -.22, .38], suggesting that the effect of BIP participants' reports of their intimate partners needing to work in order to economically support the family system on overall work-related IPV behaviors did not depend on the level of fatherhood status. Therefore, simple slopes were not explored.

H8: Non-fathers will have poorer overall work performance (as it relates to their IPV behaviors) compared to fathers.

A negative binomial regression model was used to examine the relation of fatherhood status to work performance outcomes, controlling for time enrolled in a BIP. The predictors did not account for a significant amount of variance in work performance outcomes, likelihood ratio $\chi^2(2) = 4.31, p = .12$. Time enrolled in a BIP did not

independently predict of work performance outcomes, $B = -.007$, $SE = .004$, $p = .120$, $RR = .99$ ($e^{-.007} = .99$), 95% [CI = $-.02$, $.002$]. Fatherhood status was not a significant predictor of work performance outcomes, $B = -.121$, $SE = .10$, $p = .221$, $RR = .89$ ($e^{-.121} = .89$), 95% [CI = $-.31$, $.07$].

H9: Non-fathers will have poorer overall employment outcomes (as it relates to their IPV behaviors) compared to fathers.

A negative binomial regression model was used to examine the relation of fatherhood status to BIP participants' reports of whether they had been previously fired by their boss because of missing work due to domestic violence, controlling for time enrolled in a BIP. The predictors did not account for a significant amount of variance in BIP participants' reports of whether they had been previously fired by their boss because of missing work due to domestic violence, likelihood ratio $\chi^2(2) = .102$, $p = .95$. Time enrolled in a BIP did not independently predict of BIP participants' reports of whether they had been previously fired by their boss because of missing work due to domestic violence, $B = -.002$, $SE = .01$, $p = .78$, $RR = 1.00$ ($e^{-.002} = 1.00$), 95% [CI = $-.02$, $.01$]. Fatherhood status was not a significant predictor of participants' reports of whether they had been previously fired by their boss because of missing work due to domestic violence, $B = .024$, $SE = .19$, $p = .90$, $RR = 1.24$ ($e^{.024} = 1.24$), 95% [CI = $-.34$, $.39$].

Chapter 4: Discussion

The present study aimed to advance the current understanding of potential protective and risk factors of Latino males' work-related IPV perpetration by addressing relevant psychological and cultural factors that may influence Latinos' abusive behaviors within an employment context, utilizing a more ethnically diverse sample than previous research (e.g., Galvez et al., 2015). In addition to exploring potential predictors and correlates of Latinos' overall work-related IPV behaviors, the study also examines the fatherhood identity of Latinos who batter, in order to further contextualize IPV among this population. In particular, the study evaluated whether certain belief systems (i.e., support for intimate partner's maintenance of employment; gendered expectations regarding women and work) and sociocultural factors (i.e., acculturation levels) are related to the abusive behaviors of Latinos by subgroup (i.e., fathers and non-fathers). Therefore, the study investigated how fatherhood status might act as a protective factor against higher levels of work-related IPV perpetration among Latinos in some contexts (i.e., protective against IPV that is influenced by acculturation), while simultaneously examining how fatherhood may also be a risk factor for work-related IPV in relation to certain cultural beliefs (i.e., risk for IPV that is influenced by Latinos' gendered expectations).

The current study also aimed to assess the validity and reliability of the work performance and employment outcomes scales developed by Mankowski and colleagues (2013), which were utilized in a previous study that oversampled Latino males who batter in order to better assess patterns of work-related IPV behaviors among this understudied population of marginalized men. However, the validity of the aforementioned measures

has only been explored for Latinos in amalgamation with White males, and not independently. Prior to the current study, the reliability of the work performance and employment outcomes scales (Mankowski et al., 2013) had not been assessed. Another objective of the current study, related to measurement, was to explore the concurrent validity and reliability of the support for intimate partner's employment subscale and the gendered expectations regarding women and work subscale as well.

Acculturation and Work-Related IPV

Consistent with previous research conducted on the relationship between acculturation and IPV among Latinos who batter (Grest et al., 2018; Maldonado et al., 2020), particularly within an employment context (Galvez et al., 2011; Galvez et al., 2015; Mankowski et al., 2013), language-based acculturation was shown to be positively associated with overall work-related IPV behaviors among Latinos in the current study. In other words, as Latino males' levels of acculturation rose, their use of work-related IPV behaviors increased as well. Researchers have posited that the link between acculturation and work-related IPV is largely attributable to acculturation stress (i.e., Galvez et al., 2011; Galvez et al., 2015; Mankowski et al., 2011). While it certainly may be the case that Latino males who experience stress brought on by adapting to a new host culture that conflicts with their cultures of origin increases their risk of IPV perpetration (Galvez et al., 2015; Grest et al., 2018; Mankowski et al., 2011), the relationship between acculturation, acculturation stress, and work-related IPV perpetration might be more nuanced than this straightforward line of thought. Firstly, it might be a misattribution to assume that stress is inherent in the acculturation process, as Latinos who are higher in acculturation have been shown to experience acculturative stress to a lesser extent than

less acculturated Latinos, as they have a smaller discrepancy between their culture of origin and the new host society produced by giving up some of their cultural identity and norms in order to adapt to the host society (Alvarez et al., 2020; Caetano et al., 2007). If the men in the current study were to display lower levels of acculturative stress, then the observed positive relationship between acculturation and overall work-related IPV behaviors would become difficult to interpret. Therein, without employing measures of acculturation stress in empirical investigations of the relationship between work-related IPV and acculturation among Latinos, attributing the influence of acculturation on work-related IPV behaviors to acculturative stressors may be somewhat presumptive, as acculturation is not a proxy for acculturation stress (Caetano et al., 2007).

Past research suggests that the role acculturation stress plays in IPV among Latinos is directly related to acculturation gaps between intimate partners (Caetano et al., 2000; Caetano et al., 2004; Caetano, 2007). More specifically, there is heightened risk of IPV among heterosexual Latinos when the female partner is high in acculturation, but the male partner is low in acculturation and high in acculturation stress, or if both of the intimate partners are simultaneously high in acculturation stress (Caetano, 2007). It is very possible that these mechanisms are the factors underlying the observed positive association between acculturation and overall work-related IPV among Latinos in the current sample. For example, Galvez and colleagues (2011) found that Latino men who perpetrate various forms of work-related IPV perceived their intimate partners' maintenance of employment to be a part of acculturating to U.S. culture, which men viewed as problematic and obstructive to the traditional Latino family system. This view in turn, may have provided motivation to interfere with their intimate partner's

employment status. This line of thinking is consistent with the idea that Latino couples affected by work-related IPV could be negatively impacted by any existing acculturation gaps, and the workplace may exacerbate or accentuate such acculturation gaps between Latino couples and increase the risk for IPV to occur within Latinos' intimate relationships. Some research indicates that the workplace is a social context that facilitates acculturative processes for immigrant and migrant workers alike (Jian, 2012; van Tonder & Soontiens, 2014), and Latinas can become more acculturated to U.S. culture through employment, which can provide them increased autonomy and financial independence from one's intimate partner (Gonzalez-Guarda et al., 2009; Grzywacz et al., 2009). With this in mind, it is possible that Latinos who batter use work-related IPV behaviors as a means of shortening the acculturation gaps that exist between themselves and their intimate partners who are employed.

While the present study did not assess acculturation gaps between intimate partners nor did it measure acculturation stress, descriptive information about the sample reveals more context about the relationship between acculturation and overall work-related IPV behaviors among Latinos. The average level of acculturation among this sample of Latino males was relatively low, as indicated by their reports of using Spanish as their primary language and only some English. Additionally, the average number of work-related IPV behaviors perpetrated was six. While an average of six work-related IPV behaviors may seem small in view of the 40 total work-related IPV behaviors possible, it is still alarming that the average Latino BIP participant perpetrated six work-related IPV behaviors in their entire lifetime. Further, nearly half of the participants reported that their current intimate partner or ex-partner maintained employment status,

which is a sizeable amount of women maintaining employment when considering that they were largely partnered with immigrant Latino males who traditionally prefer their intimate partners to not be employed. Taken together, if either higher levels of acculturation stress among or acculturation gaps between intimate partners of Latin origin heightens the risk for IPV to occur (Caetano et al., 2007), then it is probable that acculturation gaps between Latino males and their employed intimate partners increased the likelihood for Latino males to perpetrate work-related IPV behaviors in the current study. Moreover, it is possible that the observed association between acculturation and work-related IPV behaviors documented in the literature (i.e., Galvez et al., 2015; Mankowski et al., 2013), and in the current study, happened to capture some of the variance attributable to this larger, more complex relationship between acculturation, acculturative stress, and IPV among Latinos. To better examine these possibilities, future studies should collect data from both intimate partners, in a manner that prioritizes the well-being and safety of victims.

Gendered Expectations for Women and Work-Related IPV

Prominent feminist models of IPV view patriarchal beliefs and societies, in which gender role norms and expectations are strictly defined and imposed upon individuals, to be the primary causes of men's perpetration of violence against their intimate partners (Bell & Naugle, 2008; George & Stith, 2014; Olmsted, 2003; Walker, 1984).

Correspondingly, gendered expectations of male dominance and privilege provide men with motives to assert and maintain power and control over their intimate partners through the use of violent behaviors (Graham-Kevan & Bates, 2020; Dobash & Dobash, 1979; Simister, 2012). This feminist model of IPV also suggests that men who heavily

endorse familial patriarchal ideologies are more inclined to perpetrate violence against their intimate partners than men who do not adhere to such ideologies (DeKeseredy & Kelly, 1993; Smith, 1990). Traditional Latino families function around patriarchal gender role norms and expectations that perpetuate male dominance and superiority, create unequal distributions of power among couples, promote gender inequality within Latino households, and contribute to the oppression of Latinas across the Americas, especially as it pertains to IPV (Flake & Forste, 2006; Perilla, 1999; Perilla, 2007). Additionally, gendered representations of the traditional Latino family system held by Latino males who batter may be threatened by their intimate partners' maintenance of employment, potentially increasing the risk work-related IPV perpetration (Alcalde, 2011; Galvez et al., 2011; Gonzalez-Guarda et al., 2010). Thereupon, it was hypothesized that Latinos' gendered expectations regarding women and work would be positively associated with overall work-related IPV behaviors. However, contrary to this hypothesis, gendered expectations regarding women and work were not found to be a predictor of overall work-related IPV behaviors in the current sample of Latino males who batter.

It is not astounding that a relationship between overall work-related IPV behaviors and gendered expectations regarding women and work was not established in the current study, as this sample of Latinos who batter displayed a fairly low level of gendered expectations regarding women and work. Specifically, in this sample of Latino BIP participants, the average response was "Disagree" to the three following statements: 1) It is still my partner's responsibility to care for me, the family, and the house, even if she works outside the home. 2) I expect a woman to call me and check in with me every day while I am at work. 3) I expect a woman to call me and check in with me every day

while she is at work. These responses indicate low levels of gendered expectations regarding women and work among Latino males who batter. While there may be a variety of reasons as to why the present sample of Latinos exhibited low levels of gendered attitudes regarding women and work, there are a few factors that are likely contributing to this observation, warranting further discussion.

While patriarchy might be intertwined with traditional Latino culture, it would be rather parochial to view the personhood of Latinos who batter solely in the context of male supremacy, when Latino males are constantly socialized by conflicting culturally based models of masculinity and manhood (Perilla, 2007). Although traditional machismo teaches Latino males to view women as subordinate servants inherently tasked with being homemakers and caregivers (Mayo & Resnick, 1996; Stevens, 1973), the positive facet of machismo, often referred to as *caballerismo*, explicates that Latino males are to be chivalrous, family-focused, socially responsible, and emotionally connected to their family (Arciniega et al., 2008; Mogro-Wilson & Cifuentes, 2021; Piña-Watson et al., 2016). Surprisingly, *caballerismo* has rarely been discussed in the analysis of Latino males' perpetration of IPV (Ojeda & Organista, 2016), even though it might provide insight on potential protective factors against IPV among Latinos, and also help explain Latinos' lower levels of gendered attitudes regarding women and work in the current sample. The present study did not examine Latino males' levels of adherence to *caballerismo* beliefs, but it is possible that a large proportion of the current sample held at least moderate levels of *caballerismo* beliefs, as immigrant Mexican males have been shown to be high in *caballerismo* (Arciniega et al., 2008). Additionally, it is reasonable to believe that *caballerismo* beliefs might be negatively associated with gendered

expectations regarding women and work, as this cultural construct emphasizes respect for Latinas and has been shown to promote gender equality among married Latino couples (Arciniega et al., 2008; Pardo, 2017). Altogether, this suggests that additional research is needed to further understand the relation of Latino males' caballerismo beliefs to gendered attitudes towards women's family and work roles, and its connection to IPV perpetration.

Even though there is a possibility that immigrant Latino males who batter might not support their intimate partners maintaining a job outside of the home (Alcalde, 2011; Galvez et al., 2011; Gonzalez-Guarda et al., 2010), immigrant Latinas may still need to secure employment outside of the home in order to provide additional income to economically support the family system (Sternberg, 2010). There is a possibility that these inequitable circumstances might increase the risk for Latinas being victimized by work-related IPV, as Latina mothers are often expected to be full-time homemakers and caregivers, while Latino fathers are typically supposed to be the only financial provider of the traditional Latino household (Baker et al. 2001; Castillo et al., 2010). It is imperative to note that women are never to be blamed for their position within these complicated dynamics, and that these factors were only explored in order to gain a broader understanding of Latino males' risk for work-related IPV behaviors, with intentions of generating new information to enhance IPV interventions. With this in mind, it was originally hypothesized that support for intimate partner's maintenance of employment would be negatively associated with overall work-related IPV behaviors. However, the support for intimate partner's employment subscale was found to be unreliable with the current sample. Instead, Latino BIP participants' reports of their

intimate partners needing to work in order to economically support the family system was explored as a predictor of overall work-related IPV behaviors, in order to obtain partial insight into the original hypothesis.

Contrary to this hypothesized relationship, the current study's findings indicated that there was no association between the aforementioned variables. It may be the case whether Latinos' intimate partners need to work in order to economically support their family is not a risk factor for Latino males' overall work-related IPV behaviors. Instead, the risk for increased work-related IPV behaviors among Latinos related to their intimate partners' employment status might be situated in their lack of support for their intimate partners becoming employed or perceiving their intimate partners' maintenance of employment to be emasculating due to shifts in power dynamics and gender role expectations (Alcalde, 2011; Galvez et al., 2011). However, further research is needed in this area of IPV among Latinos in order to draw such conclusions.

Fatherhood Status and Work-Related IPV

Overall, the current study did not find support for the hypothesis that fatherhood status serves as either a protective or risk factor for work-related IPV among Latinos who batter. Fatherhood status was shown not to be related to overall work-related IPV behaviors among Latinos, as fathers and non-fathers did not differ in their rates of work-related IPV behaviors. In contrast, since past research has shown fatherhood status to be a predictor of abusive males' engagement in and completion of court mandated partner abuse intervention attendance (Poole & Murphy, 2019), it is plausible that fatherhood status may be associated with men's willingness to participate in partner abuse intervention programming and motivations to successfully complete court-ordered

treatment for the sake of their children's well-being (Stanley et al., 2012), rather than serve as a predictor of differences in abusive men's likelihood of perpetrating work-related IPV behaviors. However, it must be noted that the work-related domestic violence perpetration scale (Mankowski et al., 2013) only assesses lifetime prevalence of work-related IPV behaviors, and therefore, any dissimilarities in the rates of Latino fathers' and non-fathers' reports of work-related IPV perpetration throughout the average eight-month time period of being enrolled in a BIP may have gone undetected in the current study.

Fatherhood status was not shown to be a moderator in any of the present study's hypothesized relationships between potential risk factors for Latino males' abusive behaviors and overall work-related IPV behaviors. More specifically, fatherhood status did not moderate any of the relationships between acculturation, gendered expectations regarding women and work, men's reports of their intimate partners needing to work in order to economically support the family system and overall work-related IPV behaviors. That is to say, fatherhood status was not found to be a protective factor against or risk factor for higher levels of work-related IPV perpetration among Latinos, regardless of external influences from cultural beliefs or sociocultural forces. This might suggest that the previously mentioned risk factors for Latinos' IPV behaviors do not differ between fathers and non-fathers. Nevertheless, this does not imply that distinctions should not be made between partner-abusive fathers and non-fathers of Latino origin for IPV intervention, as there may be an array of factors (e.g., machismo beliefs, motivations to engage in treatment, gender role stress) that these two groups of men differ on, which the study was not able to assess.

Although fatherhood status was not found to be predictive of work-related IPV behaviors among Latinos in the present study, Poole and Murphy (2019) found that towards the end of IPV intervention treatment, fathers showed larger change scores in self-reports of behaviors and cognitions related to IPV compared to non-fathers and displayed greater levels of engaging in change efforts than non-fathers at the end of intervention program participation. It is plausible there could be a unique process of change in partner-abusive fathers' acknowledgement of and accountability for their abusive behaviors, when enrolled in an abuse intervention program, one that is a developmental process which needs to be assessed longitudinally. Given that the present study was limited to using a cross-sectional research design, future studies may better assess the plausibility of differences in processes of change between partner-abusive fathers and non-fathers by employing nonequivalent control group interrupted time-series designs (Morling, 2017; Shadish & Cook, 2009).

Fatherhood, Acculturation and Work-Related IPV

Acculturation has been shown to have a degree of influence on the IPV behaviors of partner-abusive Latinos (Alvarez et al., 2020; Klevens, 2007; Mancera et al., 2017), as well as on the fathering behaviors of Latino males, who are often heavily involved in their children's lives (Cabrera et al., 2006; Cabrera & Bradley, 2012; Taylor and Behnke, 2005). For example, Latino fathers who are higher in acculturation have displayed greater levels of father engagement in a variety of parenting behaviors compared to fathers lower in acculturation (Cabrera et al., 2006). Additionally, Taylor and Behnke (2005) found that for some immigrant Mexican fathers, adapting their parenting styles to the fit in with the larger U.S. culture (i.e., acculturating) led to the use of less violent behaviors due to U.S.

laws centered around domestic violence and child abuse. Taking into consideration Latinos' higher levels of father involvement and the influence of acculturation on their positive fathering behaviors (Cabrera et al., 2006; Cabrera & Bradley, 2012), the current study tested the hypothesis that partner-abusive Latino fathers' overall work-related IPV behaviors would be affected to a lesser extent by the impact of acculturation than partner-abusive Latino non-fathers' overall work-related IPV behaviors. This hypothesis was not supported, as fatherhood status did not moderate the relationship between acculturation and overall work-related IPV behaviors among Latinos in this sample. This suggests that the influence of acculturation on Latino males' IPV behaviors may not differ between fathers and non-fathers. Additionally, partner abuse intervention programs that underscore the importance of acculturative processes among immigrants in their programming might have similar effects on both immigrant Latino fathers and non-fathers' abusive behaviors, but further research is needed in order to explore these specific outcomes of such intervention programs.

Fatherhood Status, Gendered Expectations for Women, and Work-related IPV

Since fathers are commonly privileged in the gendered constructions of the traditional Latino family system and are often viewed by traditional Latino culture to be the sole "bread winner" of the household (Perilla, 2007; Perilla et al., 1999), while Latina mothers and wives alike are typically regarded as full-time homemakers and caregivers (Castillo & Cano, 2007; Mayo & Resnick, 1996), the current study investigated fatherhood status as a potential risk factor for partner-abusive Latinos' work-related IPV behaviors as influenced by gendered expectations regarding women and work. It was hypothesized that fatherhood status would moderate the relationship between overall

work-related IPV behaviors and gendered expectations regarding women and work, such that gendered expectations would be more strongly related to overall work-related IPV behaviors for fathers than non-fathers of Latino origin. The data from the current study did not support this hypothesis, as fatherhood status was not found to be a moderator of the relationship between overall work-related IPV behaviors and gendered expectations regarding women and work among Latinos who batter. Given that gendered expectations regarding women and work were not shown to be a predictor of Latinos' overall work-related IPV behaviors, these findings further support the idea that such gendered expectations might not pose differing risk for work-related IPV behaviors between father and non-fathers of Latino origin.

In traditional Latino families, Latinas are normally encumbered with the responsibility of keeping the family together by whatever means necessary, and as previously mentioned, this typically entails staying at home full-time to consistently care for one's husband and children, in addition to tending to any housework that needs to be completed (Castillo & Cano, 2007; Perilla et al., 1999). Traditional Latino culture also tasks fathers with being the primary financial provider of their households (Mirandé, 1997; Perilla et al., 1999). Latino partner-abusive fathers that have been socialized in this manner may perceive their intimate partner's maintenance of employment to hinder the traditional Latino family functioning (e.g., Baker et al., 2001; Galvez et al., 2011). Therefore, the current study investigated if fatherhood is a risk factor for elevated levels of overall work-related IPV behaviors as influenced by BIP participants' reports of their intimate partners needing to work in order to economically support the family system. More specifically, the current study explored the hypothesis that the association between

BIP participants' reports of their intimate partners needing to work in order to economically support the family system and overall work-related IPV behaviors depends on fatherhood status. This hypothesis was not supported by the data, as fatherhood status did not moderate the relationship between BIP participants' reports of their intimate partners needing to work in order to economically support the family system and overall work-related IPV behaviors. These null findings could suggest that intimate partners securing employment in order to provide additional income to support their family is not a risk factor for either Latino fathers or non-fathers' work-related IPV behaviors. However, since this this outcome variable was measured with only a single item, interpretation of this null finding necessitates additional caution and discretion. Evidently, further psychometric development and validation work needs to be conducted in order to establish more reliable and valid measures that thoroughly assess abusive men's support for intimate partner's maintenance of employment, and for the purpose of making more accurate conclusions of how such support might be related to men's IPV behaviors, particularly within an employment context.

Fatherhood Status and the Impact of Work-Related IPV on Latino's Employment and Work Performance

Some research indicates that abusive men's work performance and employment outcomes can be negatively impacted by their IPV behaviors (Lim et al., 2004; Mankowski et al., 2013; Schmidt & Barnett, 2011). More precisely, men who perpetrate IPV may experience difficulty concentrating during work hours and carrying out daily job tasks (MacGregor et al., 2016; Mankowski et al., 2013; Scott et al., 2017), or even be terminated by their employers as a result of their partner-abusive behaviors (Scott et al.,

2017; Rothman & Perry, 2004). Additionally, men with more extreme abuse work-related IPV perpetration patterns have been shown to undergo much higher odds of experiencing negative work performance outcomes compared to men with low-level tactics patterns of work-related IPV (Mankowski et al., 2013). Interestingly, researchers have uncovered that men who display less severe patterns of work-related IPV perpetration are more likely to be Latino fathers than men who hold more extreme patterns of work-related IPV (Mankowski et al., 2013). However, differences in work performance and employment outcomes (as influenced by IPV) among Latino fathers and non-fathers who batter had not previously been explored, ergo, the present study sought to compare Latinos' work performance and employment outcomes by fatherhood status.

It was hypothesized that Latino non-fathers would have poorer overall work performance (as it relates to their IPV behaviors) compared to fathers. Nonetheless, the findings were not in accord with this hypothesis, as there were no differences detected in work performance outcomes among Latinos by fatherhood status. It is possible that the impact of IPV on Latinos' work performance outcomes effects both fathers and non-fathers in a similar or identical manner, as neither group of men was found to significantly differ from each other. This could potentially implicate that the identity of being a father is not a protective factor against experiencing poorer overall work performance outcomes (as influenced by IPV) relative to being a non-father.

Similarly, it was originally hypothesized that Latino non-fathers would have poorer overall employment outcomes (as it relates to their IPV behaviors) compared to fathers. However, the employment outcomes scale (Mankowski et al., 2013) was found to be unreliable with the current sample of Latinos and thus, the relation of fatherhood

status to BIP participants' reports of whether they had been previously fired by their boss because of missing work due to domestic violence was explored instead, as a means of gaining partial insight on this initial hypothesis. Contrary to what was expected, fatherhood status was not related to BIP participants' reports of whether they had been previously fired by their boss because of missing work due to domestic violence. This null finding in particular is rather unsurprising, considering that most of the participants in the current study responded that they had never been fired by their boss because of missing work due to domestic violence. Unfortunately, this finding alone does not reveal any crucial or exceedingly useful information about employment outcomes among Latino fathers and non-fathers who batter. Thus, additional research is needed in order to acquire a comprehensive understanding of potential differences in employment outcomes among partner-abusive fathers and non-fathers of Latino origin. More specifically, constructing a modified version of the employment outcomes scale (Mankowski et al., 2013) in a manner that further ensures measurement reliability and validity, and administering it to Latinos who batter might allow for researchers to approximate estimates that are more informative about any existing differences between fathers and non-fathers in terms of being fired or denied employment in relation to their abusive behaviors.

Measurement of Work-Related IPV Impacts and Gendered Work Expectations

Currently, it appears there are only two published scales that measure men's work performance and employment outcomes as influenced by IPV behaviors (i.e., Mankowski et al., 2013). While the validity of these two scales has been established to some extent (Mankowski et al., 2013), the reliability of the scale response scores has never been obtained nor reported in the literature. That being the case, the current study aimed to

assess the reliability of the aforementioned scales developed by Mankowski and colleagues (2013) for a sample of Latino males who batter. The work performance scale (Mankowski et al., 2013) was found to be reliable and acceptable for research with the current sample of Latinos. With regard to the psychometric quality of the work performance scale (Mankowski et al., 2013), the current study suggests that it adequately measures Latino males' work performance outcomes as influenced by their IPV behaviors with precision. Additionally, the current study's indication of the work performance scale (Mankowski et al., 2013) being a reliable measure for Latino males with histories of perpetrating IPV further supports the validity of prior findings pertaining to the influence of Latinos' patterns of work-related IPV perpetration on their work performance outcomes (Mankowski et al., 2013). For the purpose of obtaining additional evidence of the validity and reliability of the work performance scale (Mankowski et al., 2013) for Latino populations, researchers should consider employing this specific measure in predictive validity studies (i.e., longitudinal investigations) and with more heterogenous samples of Latinos.

The employment outcomes scale (Mankowski et al., 2013) was not found to be reliable for this sample of Latinos who batter. There are a several possible explanations as to why this scale was found to be unreliable for the current sample. First of all, it is plausible that the reliability coefficient obtained for the current sample was negatively impacted by group homogeneity (Crocker & Algina, 2006), such that there may have been a reduction in the observed reliability coefficient, given the homogeneity of this group of participants (i.e., predominately immigrant Latinos who batter), relative to Mankowski and colleagues' (2013) original sample (i.e., Latinos and white males who

batter) that may have been more heterogeneous on the outcome variable being measured (i.e., employment outcomes influenced by IPV). Additionally, item statistics indicated that the current sample of participants were highly homogeneous on employment outcomes, as most participants responded with “no” to all three items, and this homogeneity of responses on the outcome variable likely lowered the reliability estimate (Crocker & Algina, 2006).

Secondarily, in classical test theory, measures with fewer items are less reliable than similar measures with more items (Crocker & Algina, 2006; Murphy & Davidshofer, 2005). Therefore, it is probable that the poor reliability estimate for the current sample was obtained partially because the employment outcomes scale (Mankowski et al., 2013) only consisted of three items. While the majority of participants in the current study selected “no” in response to the three items, there may be other items that more accurately measure this construct domain for Latino participants, as these three items are just a small sample of an infinite pool of potential items surrounding this particular outcome (Crocker & Algina, 2006). It may be beneficial to conduct personal interviews with Latinos who batter about the employment outcomes they have experienced in relation to their IPV behaviors in order to develop a measure with greater coverage of the domain, as a means of developing an improved version of this scale (Crocker & Algina, 2006).

At the present time, there are no published measures of partner-abusive men’s support for their intimate partner’s maintenance of employment nor gendered expectations regarding women and work. Therefore, the current study sought to assess the reliability and concurrent validity of the support for intimate partner’s employment

subscale and the gendered expectations regarding women and work subscale.

Surprisingly, the support for intimate partner's employment subscale was not found to be reliable with the current sample of Latinos. It is likely that the estimation of the reliability scale score did not suffer from homogeneity of responses, as item statistics indicated that participants had a fair amount of spread in responses to the four items for this subscale.

Although the EFA indicated that there was a dimension of variability underlying participants' responses to these four items, the extremely poor reliability scale score that was obtained would suggest the construct domain of support for intimate partner's employment was not measured with precision. These four items may suffer from a lack of face validity, such that participants could not determine what the items were explicitly asking of them, and could have influenced their responses that were recorded. Moreover, the support for intimate partner's employment subscale might suffer from poor content validity, such that more suitable items to measure this construct domain were not captured in this subscale. Beyond the EFA conducted as part of this thesis, it would be worthwhile to conduct a confirmatory factor analysis to further assess the factor structure of this subscale, and to establish if these four items are truly measuring one and only one unique construct domain.

A concurrent validity coefficient could not be obtained for the support for intimate partner's employment subscale, as it was found to be unreliable, and therefore, was not employed in any regression analyses. The regression analyses involving the sole item, "Our family needs the income from my partner's job," cannot be used to make inferences about the concurrent validity of this subscale, as the entirety of the subscale would need to be employed in order to obtain the necessary evidence to establish

concurrent validity. Since the current study failed to demonstrate the reliability or concurrent validity of this subscale, further psychometric work needs to be completed in this area of work-related IPV intervention research with Latino populations. More specifically, personal interviews and/or focus groups may need to be conducted with Latinos who batter in order to acquire a deeper understanding of this subgroup of men's support for their intimate partner's employment and how such support (or a lack thereof) is descriptively perceived to be related to their work-related IPV.

The gendered expectations regarding women and work subscale was found to be reliable for this sample of Latinos, but it did not demonstrate any concrete evidence of concurrent validity in the current study. Concurrent validity coefficients are substantially reduced by restriction of range (Crocker & Algina, 2006), which might have occurred in the present study. Whenever the range of scores on either the predictor and/or outcome variables are restricted, restriction of range is said to occur, which leads to a reduction in the observed association between two variables (i.e., a smaller concurrent validity coefficient; Crocker & Algina, 2006). The scaling used for the gendered expectations regarding women and work subscale (i.e., one-to-six scaling) may be a source of restriction of range in the current study, as a scale with an additional option (i.e., one-to-seven scaling) for these three items may have resulted in greater item discrimination (Crocker & Algina, 2006). Items that are too difficult, such that a majority of participants obtain a low score (i.e., a floor effect), can also become a source of restriction of range (Crocker & Algina, 2006). Item statistics indicated that a majority of participants scored relatively low on all three of the items on this subscale, indicating that these three items may have been too difficult for participants in this present sample. Thus, it is complicated

to pinpoint whether there is a lack of association between the constructs of work-related IPV behaviors and gendered attitudes regarding women and work, or if the current study's inability to detect a relationship between these two variables is a result of measurement issues that require further investigation.

Limitations. While the current study presents several opportunities and ideas for future research and intervention in the area of fathering and IPV behaviors among Latinos, it is not without limitations. The research design of the current study imposes limitations on construct validity that necessitate acknowledgement and suggestions for subsequent investigations. The present cross-sectional study utilized a retrospective self-report measurement process (i.e., Work-Related Domestic Violence Perpetration Scale; Mankowski et al., 2013) in which participants self-reported work-related IPV behaviors committed in one's entire lifetime. Consequently, restrictions exist for the current study's capacity to assess the prevalence of Latinos' work-related IPV behaviors. For instance, a temporally precise assessment of Latinos' recent work-related IPV behaviors (e.g., IPV perpetration within the past year) was not made by the current study, and instead, only assessed Latinos' overall lifetime perpetration of work-related IPV behaviors. Therefore, the findings from the present study may be less helpful in understanding how work-related IPV has affected Latino men and their families in more recent periods of time and might actually reflect men's abusive behaviors before they had any children. This very possibility may have limited the potential for the current analysis to find fatherhood status as a moderator variable or as a protective factor against work-related IPV behaviors. Future psychometric studies should aim to develop and validate measures of work-related IPV that utilize more specified, recent time frames as other similar

measurement tools use (e.g., CTS2-SF; Straus & Douglas, 2004) in order to capture the currency of men's work-related IPV behaviors more fully.

A cross-sectional survey study design was employed in order to ensure that participants felt safer about truthfully reporting their histories of work-related IPV perpetration, as a longitudinal design would have required identifying information from the participants, which could have added restrictions on the authenticity of the data that was collected from this sample of men. However, the cross-sectional design of the current study still places limitations on being able to detect causal relationships between the predictor and criterion variables of interest that necessitate acknowledgement and recommendations for future research. Considering that the measured indicators of support for intimate partner's maintenance of employment, acculturation, work-related IPV behaviors, and gendered expectations regarding women and work were all recorded at one single time point, temporal precedence, and therefore causation, cannot be established. Thus, it cannot be said that acculturation caused any of the observed variations to occur in Latino males' overall work-related IPV behaviors. Subsequent investigations should consider employing a longitudinal design in order to establish temporal precedence, and to determine causal pathways between acculturation and work-related IPV behaviors among Latinos who batter. Moreover, a longitudinal design can further help exclude the possible influence of third variables on the observed correlations, such as more general attitudes and beliefs about gender, trauma and stress, or poverty. Such variables can undermine the internal validity of studies exploring the relationship between fathering-related variables, acculturation, and work-related IPV among Latinos.

It is also possible that the results of the current study would differ if men's work-related IPV behaviors were measured with more clearly-defined, recent time frames, further necessitating the development and validation of additional measures surrounding men's work-related IPV perpetration. Given the large retrospective time frame that the Work-Related Domestic Violence Perpetration Scale (Mankowski et al., 2013) utilizes, there may have been a greater likelihood for recall bias to occur in participants' responses to the items, potentially distorting any of the observed associations between the predictor variables (e.g., acculturation) and overall work-related IPV behaviors. For example, recall bias may lead participants to underreport their abusive behaviors, minimizing the actual frequency of their work-related IPV behaviors. Consequently, the associations between the predictor variables and overall work-related IPV behaviors may appear weaker than they truly are, and ultimately limited the current study's ability to reject the null hypotheses. There is also the chance that participants overreported abusive behaviors they have either never committed or only committed a few times due to recall bias, creating the possibility for associations (or lack thereof) to be obtained that would not otherwise be derived using different measurement tools.

The current study relied solely on male BIP participant's self-reports of their own work-related IPV behaviors, which invariably leaves room for potential bias or error in reporting for various reasons. It is crucial to note that men who batter have been shown to underestimate the prevalence of their IPV behaviors compared to reports given by their intimate partners (Edleson & Brygger, 1986). With this insight in mind, the frequency of Latinos' work-related IPV perpetration might be greater than what is captured by the current study. Future investigations may need to consider incorporating reports from BIP

participants' intimate partners, in a manner that prioritizes the well-being and safety of survivors and children, in order to obtain more accurate estimations of men's work-related IPV behaviors. Considering that employees appear to be aware of their co-workers IPV behaviors to some extent (MacGregor et al., 2016; Scott et al., 2017), it would be beneficial for researchers to engage organizations in which Latinos are heavily employed to participate in their survey studies to further assess Latinos' work-related IPV behaviors and outcomes.

The sample characteristics place limitations on the generalizability of findings. Namely, the men sampled in this current study are primarily immigrants of Mexican origin who have immigrated to Oregon. Latinos in the broader U.S. are an exceedingly heterogeneous group (Perilla, 1999), and while there are some shared overarching cultural values within this population, Latinos from different countries of origin and different migratory histories across regions of the U.S. also have their own unique cultural expectations, norms, beliefs, traditions, and histories that shape their distinctive experiences and behaviors (Kim et al., 2009; Perilla et al., 2012; Sánchez et al., 2017). Furthermore, while a substantial amount of the Latinos in the present study's sample are immigrants, most Latinos living in Oregon are born in the U.S. (Ruffenach et al., 2016). Thus, immigrant Latinos may be overrepresented in this current sample. Although the largest group of Latinos living in the U.S. are Mexicans (Noe-Bustamante et al., 2019) and Latino Oregonians are also predominately of Mexican origin, Latino groups (e.g., Cubans) that are much more prominent in other U.S. states (e.g., Florida) are underrepresented in this particular sample (Brown & Lopez, 2013). Moreover, Mexican men's responses to certain items included in the Work-Related Domestic Violence

Perpetration Scale (Mankowski et al., 2013), such as, “I have made my partner (ex-partner) quit her job,” could have less variability because of these immigration forces. For example, Mexican immigrants enrolled in BIPs have reported to making their intimate partners quit their jobs using various tactics, such as sending their intimate partner to Mexico (Galvez et al., 2011), which is geographically closer to Oregon than other Latin American countries. Immigrant Latinos from other countries might not be able to use this control strategy as readily. Consequently, the current study’s findings might reflect the IPV behaviors of immigrant Mexican men more so than those of Latinos from other countries. Therefore, the current study may not be generalizable to Latinos who perpetrate IPV as an entire group, nor solely to Mexican men who batter, but rather, works to extend our general understanding of the influence of acculturation on Latinos’ IPV behaviors.

Another limitation of the present study is the use of fatherhood status as the only fathering-related variable for negative binomial and moderation analyses. The identity of being a father does not come close to entirely encapsulating the behaviors, feelings, and cognitions that are associated with positive fathering. While men may identify as being a father due to having children, such identification does not describe men’s levels of father involvement or engagement, nor does it reflect their affect and attitudes centered around being a father. Latino fathers have been shown to engage in various caregiving or social activities with their children, like feeding their children or taking their children to visit with friends (Cabrera et al., 2009; Leavell et al., 2012). Additionally, Latino fathers have been found to engage in behaviors that communicate their feelings of warmth and love to their children, such as hugging or rough housing (Mogro-Wilson et al., 2016). Although

fathers often play a central role in the rearing of their children (Lamb, 2004), they can also be psychologically or physically absent in the lives of their children due to an array of life circumstances, such as family conflict, incarceration, divorce, extraneous work demands, and physical or mental illness (Bocknek, 2020; East et al., 2006). It is plausible that there is a link between positive fathering, or a lack thereof, with IPV behaviors. However, whether an individual identifies as a father does not reflect necessarily any of these factors. The amount of information that may be obtained from a descriptive variable such as fatherhood status is finite. Future studies should examine the relationship between positive fathering and Latinos' IPV behaviors in order to acquire a clearer picture as to how fatherhood for Latinos who batter may be utilized as a point of intervention.

Specifically, the current study lacks assessment of Latino fathers' subjective experiences of fatherhood and its relation to Latinos' IPV behaviors, as well as not being able to explore Latino fathers' perceptions of how their IPV behaviors may impact their children. It is plausible that Latino fathers who batter perceive themselves to be rather competent as parents, regardless of their IPV perpetration (Baker et al., 2001), and thus remain less motivated to change their abusive behaviors. There is also the possibility that the fathers in this sample do not understand how their abusive behaviors may negatively impact their children (Mohaupt et al., 2020), and thus, do not engage in less IPV behaviors. Taken together, these limitations highlight the need for further systematic examination of how Latinos' perceptions and experiences of fatherhood are related to their partner-abusive behaviors in order to make intervention with Latino fathers who batter as effective and efficient as possible.

The current study also has a limited exploration of the role of culture in Latinos' work-related IPV perpetration. While the present study recognizes that fatherhood is of great importance in Latino culture (Cabrera & Bradley, 2012; Taylor & Behnke, 2005) and therefore aimed to examine a variable related to fatherhood (i.e., fatherhood status) as a potential protective factor against higher levels of work-related IPV among Latinos, it did not investigate other cultural influences of Latino fathers' IPV behaviors. Latino fathers' IPV behaviors may be partly influenced by cultural factors such as traditional machismo, marianismo, familismo (familism), and respeto (respect) (Edelson et al., 2007; Perilla, 1999), none of which are considered by the current study. Traditional machismo may be broadly defined as a set of cultural expectations for how Latino men should behave in a manner that demonstrates their masculinity by being aggressive, violent, sexually active, domineering of women, and the primary financial provider (Arciniega et al., 2008; Giraldo, 1972; Perilla, 1999). Marianismo, the counterpart to traditional machismo, refers to the set of cultural expectations for Latinas to emulate the behaviors and characteristics of the Virgin Mary by abstaining from sexual activities until marriage and then remaining sexually faithful to one's husband, being a submissive wife and a homemaker, and also enduring any suffering that one's husband may place upon them for the sake of keeping the family together (Castillo & Cano, 2007; Flake & Forste, 2006; Stevens, 1973). Traditional machismo and marianismo beliefs have been noted by various researchers to be a risk factor in Latinos' perpetration of IPV (Mancera et al., 2017), perhaps due to the normalization of violence against women and male domination, as well as gender inequality that can be engendered by these two particular cultural scripts among intimate partners (Flake & Forste, 2006; Perilla et al., 1994). In the present

study's sample of Latino BIP participants, men that adhere to more traditional machismo and marianismo beliefs may experience gender role strain if their partners are employed outside of the home, and thus engage in more work-related IPV behaviors. Additionally, since there is a moderate amount of theoretical similarity between traditional machismo and marianismo beliefs with gendered expectations regarding women and work, it is probable that the former cultural scripts account for a certain amount of variance in the outcome (i.e., overall work-related IPV behaviors).

Familismo is a cultural value, often found in Latino families and endorsed by Latino fathers (Cabrera & Bradley, 2012; Moreno & Chuang, 2012; Zinn, 1982), that entails intense identification with one's immediate and extended family members, strong feelings of loyalty and responsibility to one's own family, and placing the interest of one's entire family before one's own individual needs and desires (Calzada, 2010; Ingoldsby, 1991; Sabogal et al., 1987). Baker and colleagues (2001) posited that familismo is a value that is likely to be held among Latino fathers who batter and Latina mothers who are survivors of domestic violence. Furthermore, higher levels of adherence to familismo have been shown to be associated with lower levels of family violence among Mexicans (Curry et al., 2018). Considering that the present study's sample of Latino BIP participants are predominately of Mexican origin, it is possible that familismo moderates the relationship between fatherhood status and overall work-related IPV behaviors.

Another cultural value held by Latinos that might be interconnected with familismo is respeto (Perez & Cruess, 2014), which delineates gendered expectations and has also been linked to IPV (Castillo et al., 2010; Edelson et al., 2007; Perilla, 1999).

Respeto describes that individuals are to interact with family members and authority figures according to their positions within a social hierarchy and in a manner that demonstrates the appropriate level of respect (Castillo & Cano, 2007; Moreno & Chuang, 2012; Perilla, 1999). This value prompts wives to be obedient to their husbands, while simultaneously teaches children to treat their fathers with paramount respect, as the Latino father is viewed as the main authority figure in the household (Castillo et al., 2010; Perilla, 1999). Latino fathers, as well as Latinos enrolled in abuse intervention programs, have been shown to greatly adhere to the value of respeto (Moreno & Chuang, 2012; Parra-Cardona et al., 2013; Welland & Ribner, 2010). It is conceivable that respeto adherence moderates the relationship between fatherhood status and work-related IPV perpetration. Collectively, these culturally specific values suggests that the current study only obtains a partial but not complete picture of how Latino culture interacts with fatherhood and IPV perpetration, particularly within an employment context.

Conclusions

In the U.S., IPV disproportionately impacts Latino communities (Caetano et al., 2005; Cummings et al., 2013), including Latino families (Baker et al., 2001; Perilla et al., 2012), with Latino fathers frequently being the perpetrators of this form of gender-based violence within Latino households (Perilla, 1999; Perilla et al., 1994; Raj et al., 2006). Additionally, Latino males', including Latino fathers', IPV behaviors have been found to cross over into their work lives, and ultimately negatively influence their work performance and employment outcomes (Mankowski et al., 2013; Schmidt & Barnett, 2011; Scott et al., 2017). Furthermore, acculturation (Alvarez et al., 2020; Galvez et al., 2015), gendered conceptualizations of Latinas' traditional work and family roles (Galvez

et al., 2011), and an overall lack of support for an intimate partner's maintenance of employment might play a role in Latino fathers' work-related IPV perpetration (Alvarez et al., 2020; Davila et al., 2021). Moreover, an increasing body of research literature indicates that fatherhood may serve as a promising point of intervention with partner-abusive fathers (e.g., Bourassa et al., 2017; Domoney & Trevillion, 2020; Häland et al., 2016). However, such research has not been directly centered around the unique identities and experiences of Latinos, even though fatherhood is held in high regard in Latino culture (Cabrera et al., 2013; Saracho & Spodek, 2007; Taylor & Behnke, 2005). Therefore, the current study sought to investigate the moderating effect of fatherhood status on the relationship between various risk factors for IPV perpetration and work-related IPV behaviors among Latinos. Also, the current study aimed to examine Latinos' work performance and employment outcomes as influenced by IPV behaviors by comparing men according to their fatherhood status.

Although the current study did not find support for eight out of nine of its proposed hypotheses, in addition to having several limitations that may have impacted the obtained results, it is crucial to continue the systematic investigation of work-related IPV perpetration in conjuncture with Latino fatherhood. While researchers previously viewed Latino fathers as being emotionally uninvolved with and absent in the lives of their children (Mirandé, 1997; Mirandé, 2008; Saracho & Spodek, 2007), a growing body of literature on Latino fatherhood has revealed Latino fathers to be highly involved in the caregiving and socialization of their children (Aldoney & Cabrera, 2016; Hossain et al., 2015; O'Gara et al., 2020), as well as emotionally invested in their children (Hernandez, 2010). However, the area of investigation concerning Latino fathers as men who batter

has remained stagnate throughout this expansion of Latino fatherhood research. More specifically, there has only been two studies that have intentionally explored the perceptions of Latino fathers who perpetrate IPV (i.e., Baker et al., 2001; Montalvo-Liendo et al., 2018), one of which fatherhood was not the primary focus of the study (i.e., Montalvo-Liendo et al., 2018). This suggests that our current understanding of the interaction between Latino fatherhood and IPV is insufficient, and places further restrictions on how Latino fathers who batter may be intervened with efficiently and effectively by abuse intervention programs. Thus, the current study offers a step in the right direction for future intervention research and practice with this particular subgroup of men.

Tables

Table 1. Sociodemographic Characteristics of Participants

Characteristic Variable	Total Sample (<i>n</i> = 120)		
	%	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>
Reason for Attendance			
Men mandated by criminal court or DHS	88.30	-	-
Men voluntarily attending	10.00	-	-
Employment Status			
Employed men	95.00	-	-
Unemployed men	4.20	-	-
Men employed full-time	87.50	-	-
Current or ex-intimate partners employed	47.50	-	-
Time Enrolled in BIP			
Months enrolled in BIP	-	8.90	9.51
Monthly Hours worked			
Hours worked outside home	-	149.16	65.77
Hours worked from home	-	18.22	109.08
Education			
Years of formal education	-	9.03	3.50
Men with 12+ years of formal education	8.30	-	-
Income			
Monthly income	-	4.87	1.67
Acculturation			
Acculturation levels	-	1.89	1.89
Work Performance and Employment			
Work performance outcomes	-	6.24	1.57

Participants fired by boss	90.80	-	-
IPV Behaviors			
Work-related IPV behaviors	-	6.43	6.74
Countries of Origin			
Mexico	72.50	-	-
U.S.	10.80	-	-
Guatemala	5.80	-	-
Honduras	3.30	-	-
Cuba	0.80	-	-
El Salvador	0.80	-	-
Panama	0.80	-	-
Venezuela	0.80	-	-
Religion			
Catholic	75.80	-	-
Protestant	13.30	-	-
Other	5.80	-	-
No religion	4.20	-	-
Relationship Status			
Single	16.70	-	-
Married	36.70	-	-
Divorced	7.50	-	-
Separated	16.70	-	-
In a relationship but unmarried	22.50	-	-
Biological and Social Fathers			
Living with stepchildren	23.40	-	-
Has at least one child but not living together	45.00	-	-
Living with biological or social child	67.50	-	-

Table 2. Results From Hypothesis Tests

Hypotheses	Support for Hypotheses
H1: Fatherhood status will be negatively associated with overall work-related IPV behaviors.	None
H2: Acculturation will be positively associated with overall work-related IPV behaviors	Complete
H3: Gendered expectations regarding women and work will be positively associated with overall work-related IPV behaviors	None
H4: Support for intimate partner's maintenance of employment will be negatively associated with overall work-related IPV	None
H5: The effect of acculturation on overall work-related IPV behaviors will be moderated by fatherhood status	None
H6: The effect of gendered expectations regarding women and work on overall work-related IPV behaviors will be moderated by fatherhood status	None
H7: The effect of support for intimate partner's maintenance of employment on overall work-related IPV behaviors will be moderated by fatherhood status	None
H8: Non-fathers will have poorer overall work performance (as it relates to their IPV behaviors) compared to fathers	None
H9: Non-fathers will have poorer overall employment outcomes (as it relates to their IPV behaviors) compared to fathers	None

References

- Adams, A. E., Sullivan, C. M., Bybee, D., & Greeson, M. R. (2008). Development of the scale of economic abuse. *Violence Against Women, 14*(5), 563–588.
doi:10.1177/1077801208315529
- Aiken, L., & West, S. (1991). *Testing Interactions in Multiple Regression*. Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Alasker, K., Moen, B., Baste, V., & Morken, T. (2016). How has living with intimate partner violence affected the work situation? A qualitative study among abused women in Norway. *Journal of Family Violence, 4*(31), 479-487.
doi:10.1007/s10896-016-9806-2
- Alcalde, M. (2011). Masculinities in motion: Latino men and violence in Kentucky. *Men and Masculinities, 14*(4), 450–469. doi:10.1177/1097184X10376743
- Aldoney, D., & Cabrera, N. J. (2016). Raising American citizens: Socialization goals of low-income immigrant Latino mothers and fathers of young children. *Journal of Child and Family Studies, 25*, 3607–3618. doi:10.1007/s10826-016-0510-x
- Al-Modallal, H., Al-Omari, H., Abujilban, S., & Mrayan, L. (2016). Intimate partner violence and female nurses' employment: Disclosure and consequences. *Journal of Family Violence, 31*(2), 161-166. doi:10.1007/s10896-015-9755-1
- Alvarez, M. J., Ramirez, S. O., Frieze, G., Field, C., & Zárate, M. A. (2020). A meta-analysis of Latinx acculturation and intimate partner violence. *Trauma, Violence, and Abuse, 21*(4), 844-854. doi:10.1177/1524838018801327
- Anderson, D. G., Fallin, A., & Al-Modallal, H. (2014). Workplace violence experiences of homeless women and women residing in battered women shelters. *Affilia:*

Journal of Women and Social Work, 29(1), 56–65.

doi:10.1177/0886109913509544

Arciniega, G. M., Anderson, T. C., Tovar-Blank, Z. G., & Tracey, T. J. G. (2008).

Toward a fuller conception of machismo: Development of a traditional machismo and caballerismo scale. *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, 55(1), 19–33.

doi:10.1037/0022-0167.55.1.19

Arditti, J. A., Kennington, M., Grzywacz, J. G., Jaramillo, A., Isom, S., Quandt, S. A., &

Arcury, T. A. (2014). Fathers in the fields: Father involvement among Latino migrant farmworkers. *Journal of Comparative Family Studies*, 45(4), 537–557.

doi:10.3138/jcfs.45.4.537

Areán, J. C., & Davis, L. (2006). Working with fathers in batterer intervention programs.

In J. L., Edleson, & O. J., Williams (Eds.), *Parenting by men who batter* (pp. 118-130). Oxford University Press, Inc.

Asbury, J. E. (1999). What do we know now about spouse abuse and child sexual abuse in families of color in the United States? In R. L., Hampton (Ed.), *Family violence* (2nd ed., pp. 148–167). Sage.

Austin, J. B., & Dankwort, J. (1999). Standards for batterer programs: A review and analysis. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 14(2), 152–168.

doi:10.1177/088626099014002004

Autry, A., Davis, L., & Mitchell-Clark, K. (2003). *Conversations with mothers of color who have experienced domestic violence regarding working with men to end domestic violence*. Family Violence Prevention Fund. Retrieved from

http://www.ncdsv.org/images/mothersof_color1.pdf

- Babcock, J., Armenti, N., Cannon, C., Lauve-Moon, K., Buttell, F., Ferreira, R., Cantos, A., Hamel, J., Kelly, D., Jordan, C., Lehmann, P., Leisring, P. A., Murphy, C., O'Leary, K. D., Bannon, S., Salis, K. L., & Solano, I. (2016). Domestic violence perpetrator programs: A proposal for evidence-based standards in the United States. *Partner Abuse, 7*(4), 355–460. doi:10.1891/1946-6560.7.4.355
- Baker, C. K., Perilla, J. L., Norris, F. H. (2001). Parenting stress and parenting competence among Latino men who batter. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 16*(11), 1139-1156. doi:10.1177/088626001016011003
- Bancroft, L. (2002). The parenting of men who batter. *Court Review, 39*, 44-49. Retrieved from <https://www.ncjfcj.org/wp-content/uploads/2021/03/cr39-2bancroft.pdf>
- Bancroft, L., & Silverman, J. G. (2012). *The batterer as parent: Assessing the impact of domestic violence on family dynamics*. SAGE Publications, Inc. doi:10.4135/9781452240480
- Beck, J. G., Clapp, J. D., Jacobs-Lentz, J., McNiff, J., Avery, M., & Olsen, S. A. (2014). The association of mental health conditions with employment, interpersonal, and subjective functioning after intimate partner violence. *Violence Against Women, 20*(11), 1321–1337. doi:10.1177/1077801214552855
- Behnke, A. O., Taylor, B. A., & Parra-Cardona, J. R. (2008). “I hardly understand English, but...”: Mexican origin fathers describe their commitment. *Journal of Comparative Family Studies, 39*(2), 187–205. doi:10.3138/jcfs.39.2.187

- Bell, K. M., & Naugle, A. E. (2008). Intimate partner violence theoretical considerations: Moving towards a contextual framework. *Clinical psychology review, 28*(7), 1096–1107. doi:10.1016/j.cpr.2008.03.003
- Blodgett, C., Lanigan, J. D. (2018). The prevalence and consequences of intimate partner violence intrusion in the workplace. *Journal of Aggression, Maltreatment & Trauma, 27*(1), 15–34. doi:10.1080/10926771.2017.1330297
- Bloom, T., Wagman, J., Hernandez, R., Yragui, N., Hernandez-Valdovinos, N., Dahlstrom, M., & Glass, N. (2009). Partnering with community-based organizations to reduce intimate partner violence. *Hispanic Journal of Behavioral Sciences, 31*(2), 244–257. doi:10.1177/0739986309333291
- Bocknek, E. (2020). A family systems perspective on father absence, presence, and engagement. In H. E., Fitzgerald, K., von Klitzing, N. J., Cabrera, J., Scarano de Mendonça, & T., Skjøthaug (Eds.), *Handbook of fathers and child development* (pp. 105-120). Springer. doi:10.1007/978-3-030-51027-5_7
- Bonomi, A. E., Anderson, M. L., Rivara, F. P., & Thompson, R. S. (2007). Health outcomes in women with physical and sexual intimate partner violence exposure. *Journal of women's health, 16*(7), 987–997. doi:10.1089/jwh.2006.0239
- Bourassa, C., Letourneau, N., Holden, G. W., & Turcotte, P. (2017). Fathers' perspectives regarding their children's exposure to intimate partner violence. *Journal of Public Child Welfare, 11*(3), 261–278. doi:10.1080/15548732.2016.1275919.
- Brown, A., & Lopez, M. H. (2013). *Mapping the Latino population, by state, county, and city*. Pew Research Center. Retrieved from

<https://www.pewresearch.org/hispanic/2013/08/29/mapping-the-latino-population-by-state-county-and-city/>

- Brush, L. D. (2003). Effects of work on hitting and hurting. *Violence Against Women*, 9(10), 1213–1230. doi:10.1177/1077801203255848
- Brush, L. D. (2011). *Poverty, battered women, and work in U.S. public policy*. Oxford University Press.
- Cabrera, N. J., Aldoney, D., & Tamis-LeMonda, C. S. (2013). Latino fathers. In N. Cabrera, & C. Tamis-LeMonda (Eds.), *Handbook of father involvement: Multidisciplinary perspectives* (pp. 244–260). Routledge/Taylor & Francis Group.
- Cabrera, N. J., & Bradley, R. H. (2012). Latino fathers and their children. *Child Development Perspectives*, 6(3), 232–238. doi:10.1111/j.1750-8606.2012.00249.x
- Cabrera, N. J., & Coll, C. G. (2004). Latino fathers: Uncharted territory in need of much exploration. In Lamb, M. E. (Ed.), *The role of the father in child development* (p. 98–120). John Wiley & Sons Inc.
- Cabrera, N. J., Ryan, R. M., Mitchell, S. J., Shannon, J. D., & Tamis-LeMonda, C. S. (2008). Low-income, nonresident father involvement with their toddlers: Variation by fathers' race and ethnicity. *Journal of Family Psychology*, 22(4), 643–647. doi:10.1037/0893-3200.22.3.643.
- Cabrera, N. J., Shannon, J. D., & La Taillade, J. J. (2009). Predictors of coparenting in Mexican American families and links to parenting and child social emotional development. *Infant Mental Health Journal*, 30(5), 523–548. doi:10.1002%2Fimhj.20227

- Cabrera, N. J., Shannon, J., Mitchell, S., & West, J. (2009). Mexican American mothers and fathers' prenatal attitudes and father prenatal involvement: Links to mother–infant interaction and father engagement. *Sex Roles, 60*(7-8), 510–526.
doi:10.1007/s11199-008- 9576-2
- Cabrera, N.J., Shannon, J.D., West, J., & Brooks-Gunn, J. (2006). Parental interactions with Latino infants: variation by country of origin and English proficiency. *Child Development, 77*(5), 1190–1207. doi:10.1111/j.1467-8624.2006.00928.x
- Caetano, R., Cunradi, C. B., Clark, C. L., & Schafer, J. (2000). Intimate partner violence and drinking patterns among white, Black, and Hispanic couples in the U.S. *Journal of substance abuse, 11*(2), 123–138. doi:10.1016/s0899-3289(00)00015-8
- Caetano, R., Field, C. A., Ramisetty-Mikler, S., & McGrath, C. (2005). The 5-year course of intimate partner violence among White, Black, and Hispanic couples in the United States. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 20*(9), 1039–1057.
doi:10.1177/0886260505277783
- Caetano, R., Ramisetty-Mikler, S., & McGrath, C. (2004). Acculturation, drinking, and intimate partner violence among Hispanic couples in the United States: A longitudinal study. *Hispanic Journal of Behavioral Sciences, 26*(1), 60–78.
doi:10.1177/0739986303261812
- Caetano, R., Ramisetty-Mikler, S., Caetano Vaeth, P. A., & Harris, T. R. (2007). Acculturation stress, drinking, and intimate partner violence among Hispanic couples in the US. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 22*, 1431–1447.
doi:10.1177/0886260507305568

- Calzada, E. J. (2010). Bringing culture into parent training with Latinos. *Cognitive and Behavioral Practice, 17*, 167–175. doi:10.1016/j.cbpra.2010.01.003
- Carlson, B. E. (2000). Children exposed to intimate partner violence: Research findings and implications for intervention. *Trauma, Violence, & Abuse, 1*(4), 321–342. doi:10.1177/1524838000001004002
- Carlson, J., & Casey, E. (2021). Disjunctures in experiences of support during the transition to fatherhood of men who have used intimate partner violence. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 36*(5–6), 3019–3043. doi:10.1177/0886260518769364
- Carrillo, R., & Tello, J. (2006). Latino fathers in recovery. In J. L., Edleson, & O. J., Williams (Eds.), *Parenting by men who batter* (pp. 131-136). Oxford University Press, Inc.
- Castillo, L. G., & Cano, M. A. (2007). Mexican American psychology: Theory and clinical application. In C., Negy (Ed.), *Cross-cultural psychotherapy: Toward a critical understanding of diverse client population* (2nd ed., pp. 85-102). Bent Tree Press, Inc.
- Castillo, L. G., Perez, F. V., Castillo, R., & Ghosheh, M. R. (2010). Construction and initial validation of the Marianismo Beliefs Scale. *Counselling Psychology Quarterly, 23*, 163–175. doi:10.1080/09515071003776036
- Castro, R., Peek-Asa, C., García, L., Ruiz, A., & Kraus, J.F. (2003). Risks for abuse against pregnant Hispanic Women. *American Journal of Preventive Medicine, 25*(4), 325-332. doi:10.1016/S0749-3797(03)00211-3
- Cauce, A. M., & Domenech-Rodríguez, M. (2002). Latino families: Myths and realities. In Contreras, J. M., Kerns, K. A., & Neal-Barnett, A. M. (Eds.), *Latino children*

and families in the United States: Current research and future directions (pp. 3–25). Praeger Publishers/Greenwood Publishing Group.

Champion, J. D. (1996). Woman abuse, assimilation, and self-concept in a rural Mexican American community. *Hispanic Journal of Behavioral Sciences*, *18*(4), 508–521.
doi:10.1177/07399863960184005

Cho, H., Velez-Ortiz, D., & Parra-Cardona, J. R. (2014). Prevalence of intimate partner violence and associated risk factors among Latinos/as: An exploratory study with three Latino subpopulations. *Violence Against Women*, *20*(9), 1041–1058.
doi:10.1177/1077801214549636

Coltrane, S., Parke, R.D. and Adams, M. (2004). Complexity of father involvement in low-income Mexican American families. *Family Relations*, *53*(2), 179-189.
doi:10.1111/j.0022-2445.2004.00008.x

Coxe, S., West, S. G., & Aiken, L. S. (2009). The analysis of count data: A gentle introduction to Poisson regression and its alternatives. *Journal of Personality Assessment*, *91*(2), 121-136. doi:10.1080/00223890802634175

Crocker, L., & Algina, J. (2006). *Introduction to Classical and Modern Test Theory*. Wadsworth Publishing Company.

Cruz, R. A., King, K. M., Widaman, K. F., Leu, J., Cauce, A. M., & Conger, R. D. (2011). Cultural influences on positive father involvement in two-parent Mexican-origin families. *Journal of Family Psychology*, *25*(5), 731–740.
doi:10.1037/a0025128

- Cummings, A. M., Gonzalez-Guarda, R.M., & Sandoval, M.F. (2013). Intimate partner violence among Hispanics: A review of the literature. *Journal of Family Violence*, 28, 153-171. doi:10.1007/s10896-012-9478-5
- Cunradi, C. B. (2009). Intimate partner violence among Hispanic men and women: The role of drinking, neighborhood disorder, and acculturation-related factors. *Violence and Victims*, 24(1), 83. doi:10.1891/0886-6708.24.1.83
- Curry, T.R., Morales, M.C., Zavala, E., & Hernandez, J. L. (2018). Why is family violence lower among Mexican immigrants? The protective features of Mexican culture. *Journal of Family Violence*, 33, 171–184 doi:10.1007/s10896-017-9947-y
- Curwood, S. E., DeGeer, I., Hymmen, P., & Lehmann, P. (2011). Using strength-based approaches to explore pretreatment change in men who abuse their partners. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 26(13), 2698–2715. doi:10.1177/0886260510388283
- Davis, M., Jonson-Reid, M., Dahm, C., Fernandez, B., Stroops, C., & Sabri, B. (2020). The men’s group at St. Pius V: A case study of a parish-based voluntary partner abuse intervention program. *American Journal of Men’s Health*, 14(1). doi:10.1177/1557988319891287
- Davila, A. L., Johnson, L., & Postmus, J. L. (2021). Examining the relationship between economic abuse and mental health among Latina intimate partner violence survivors in the United States. *Journal of interpersonal violence*, 36(1-2), 287–310. doi:10.1177/0886260517731311

- DeKeseredy, W. S., Kelly, K. (1993). Woman abuse in university and college dating relationships: The contribution of the ideology of familial patriarchy. *The Journal of Human Justice*, 4, 25–52. doi:10.1007/BF02619525
- Denham, A. C., Frasier, P. Y., Hooten, E. G., Belton, L., Newton, W., Gonzalez, P., Begum, M., & Campbell, M. K. (2007). Intimate partner violence among Latinas in eastern North Carolina. *Violence Against Women*, 13(2), 123-140. doi:10.1177/107780120629698
- Dobash, R.E., & Dobash, R.P. (1979). *Violence against wives: A case against the patriarchy*. Open Books.
- Domoney, J., & Trevillion, K. Breaking the cycle of intergenerational abuse: A qualitative interview study of men participating in a perinatal program to reduce violence. *Infant Mental Health Journal*, 42, 206-221. doi:10.1002/imhj.21886
- Dong, Y., & Peng, C. Y. J. (2013). Principled missing data methods for researchers. *SpringerPlus*, 222(2). doi:10.1186/2193-1801-2-222
- East, L., Jackson, D., & O'Brien, L. (2006). Father absence and adolescent development: A review of the literature. *Journal of Child Health Care*, 10(4), 283–295. doi:10.1177/1367493506067869
- Edleson, J. L. (1999). Children's witnessing of adult domestic violence. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 14(8), 839–870. doi:10.1177/088626099014008004
- Edleson, J. L. (2008). *Promising practices with men who batter. Report to King County Domestic Violence Council*. Minnesota Center Against Violence and Abuse. Retrieved from

<https://citeseerx.ist.psu.edu/viewdoc/download?doi=10.1.1.208.6818&rep=rep1&type=pdf>

- Edleson, J. L., & Brygger, M. P. (1986). Gender differences in reporting of battering incidences. *Family Relations: An Interdisciplinary Journal of Applied Family Studies*, 35(3), 377–382. doi:10.2307/584364
- Edelson, M.G., Hokoda, A. & Ramos-Lira, L. (2007). Differences in effects of domestic violence between Latina and Non-Latina women. *Journal of Family Violence*, 22, 1–10. doi:10.1007/s10896-006-9051-1
- Edleson, J. L., & Syers, M. (1990). Relative effectiveness of group treatments for men who batter. *Social Work Research and Abstracts*, 26(2), 10-17. Retrieved from <http://swra.oxfordjournals.org/>
- Edleson, J. L., & Syers, M. (1991). The effects of group treatment for men who batter: An 18-month follow-up study. *Research On Social Work Practice*, 3(1), 227-243. doi:10.1177/104973159100100301
- Evans, S.E., Davies, C. A., & DiLillo, D. K. (2008). Exposure to domestic violence: A meta-analysis of child and adolescent outcomes. *Aggression and Violent Behavior*, 13(2), 131-140. doi:10.1016/j.avb.2008.02.005
- Flake, D. F., & Forste, R. (2006). Fighting families: Family characteristics associated with domestic violence in five Latin American countries. *Journal of Family Violence*, 21(1), 19–29. doi:10.1007/s10896-005-9002-2
- Formoso, D., Gonzales, N. A., Barrera, M., Jr., & Dumka, L. E. (2007). Interparental relations, maternal employment, and fathering in Mexican American families.

Journal of Marriage and Family, 69(1), 26–39. doi:10.1111/j.1741-

3737.2006.00341.x

Fox, G. L., Sayers, J., Bruce, C. (2001). Beyond bravado: Redemption and rehabilitation in the fathering accounts of men who batter. *Marriage and Family Review*, 32, 137-163. doi:10.1300/J002v32n03_08

Fox, G. L., & Benson, M. L. (2004). Violent men, bad dads? Fathering profiles of men involved in intimate partner violence. In Day, R. D., & Lamb, M. E. (Eds.), *Conceptualizing and measuring father involvement* (p. 359–384). Lawrence Erlbaum Associates Publishers.

Frías, S. M., & Angel, R. J. (2012). Beyond borders: Comparative quantitative research on partner violence in the United States and Mexico. *Violence Against Women*, 18(1), 5–29. doi:10.1177/1077801212436420

Galvez, G., Mankowski, E. S., & Glass, N. (2015). Work-Related intimate partner violence, acculturation, and socioeconomic status among employed Mexican Men enrolled in batterer intervention programs. *Violence Against Women*, 21(10), 1218–1236. doi:10.1177/1077801215592719

Galvez, G., Mankowski, E. S., McGlade, M. S., Ruiz, M. E., & Glass, N. (2011). Work-related intimate partner violence among employed immigrants from Mexico. *Psychology of Men & Masculinity*, 12(3), 230–246. doi:10.1037/a0022690

Garcia, L., Hurwitz, E. L., & Kraus, J. F. (2005). Acculturation and reported intimate partner violence among Latinas in Los Angeles. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 20, 569–590. doi:10.1177/0886260504271582

- Garcia, P. M., Ng, C. H., Capezio, A., Restubog, S. D., & Tang, R. L. (2017). Distressed and drained: Consequences of intimate partner aggression and the buffering role of supervisor support. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 103*, 106–116.
doi:10.1016/j.jvb.2017.09.003
- George, J., & Stith, S. M. (2014). An updated feminist view of intimate partner violence. *Family process, 53*(2), 179–193. doi:10.1111/famp.12073
- Glass, J., & Owen, J. (2010). Latino Fathers: The relationship among machismo, acculturation, ethnic identity, and paternal involvement. *Psychology of Men and Masculinity, 11*(4), 251-261. doi:10.1037/a0021477
- Gondolf, E. W. (1999). A comparison of four batterer intervention systems: Do court referral, program length, and services matter? *Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 14*(1), 41–61. doi:10.1177/088626099014001003
- Gondolf, E. W. (2004). Evaluating batterer counseling programs: A difficult task showing some effects and implications. *Aggression and Violent Behavior, 9*(6), 605-631. doi:10.1016/j.avb.2003.06.001
- Gonzalez, F. R., Benuto, L. T., Casas, J. B. (2020). Prevalence of interpersonal violence among Latinas: A systematic review. *Trauma, Violence, and Abuse, 21*(5), 977-990. doi:10.1177/1524838018806507
- Gonzalez-Guarda, R. M., Ortega, J., Vasquez, E. P., & De Santis, J. (2010). La Mancha Negra: Substance Abuse, violence, and sexual risks among Hispanic males. *Western Journal of Nursing Research, 32*(1), 128–148.
doi:10.1177/0193945909343594

- González-Guarda, R. M., Peragallo, N., Vasquez, E. P., Urrutia, M. T., & Mitrani, V. B. (2009). Intimate partner violence, depression, and resource availability among a community sample of Hispanic women. *Issues in Mental Health Nursing, 30*, 227-236. doi:10.1080/01612840802701109
- Graham-Kevan, N., & Bates, E. A. (2020). Intimate partner violence perpetrator programmes: Ideology or evidence-based practice? In Wormith, J.S., Craig, L. A., & Hogue, T.E. (Eds.), *What works in violence risk management: Theory, research and practice*. Wiley-Blackwell.
- Grest, C.V., Amaro, H., & Unger, J. (2018). Longitudinal predictors of intimate partner violence perpetration and victimization in Latino emerging adults. *Journal of Youth Adolescence, 47*, 560–574. doi:10.1007/s10964-017-0663-y
- Grzywacz, J. G., Rao, P., Gentry, A., Marín, A., & Arcury, T. A. (2009). Acculturation and conflict in Mexican immigrants' intimate partnerships: The role of women's labor force participation. *Violence Against Women, 15*(10), 1194–1212. doi:10.1177/1077801209345144
- Giraldo, O. (1972). El machismo como un fenómeno psicocultural. *Revista Latinoamericana de Psicología, 4*(3), 295-309. Retrieved from <https://www.redalyc.org/pdf/805/80540302.pdf>
- Guendelman, S., Nussbaum, J., Soliday, A., Lahiff, M. (2018). Hispanic Immigrant father involvement with young children in the United States: A comparison with US-born Hispanic and White non-Hispanic fathers. *Maternal and Child Health Journal, 22*(8), 1118-1126. doi:10.1007/s10995-018-2496-z

- Guille, L. (2003). Men who batter and their children: An integrated review. *Aggression and Violent Behavior, 9*(2), 129-163. doi:10.1016/S1359-1789(02)00119-2
- Håland, K., Lundgren, I., Eri, T. S., & Lidén, E. (2014). The meaning of men's experiences of becoming and being fathers, in men who have subjected their partners to violence. *Fathering, 12*(2), 178-195. doi:10.3149/fth.1202.178
- Håland, K., Lundgren, I., Lidén, E., & Eri, T. S. (2016). Fathers' experiences of being in change during pregnancy and early parenthood in a context of intimate partner violence. *International Journal of Qualitative Studies on Health and Well-being, 11*(1). doi:10.3402/qhw.v11.30935
- Hamby, S., Finkelhor, D., Turner, H., & Ormrod, R. (2011). Children's exposure to intimate partner violence and other family violence. *Juvenile Justice Bulletin*, 1-12. Retrieved from <https://www.ncjrs.gov/pdffiles1/ojjdp/232272.pdf>
- Handcock, T. U., & Siu, K. A. (2009). A culturally sensitive intervention with domestically violent Latino immigrant men. *Journal of Family Violence, 24*, 123-132. doi:10.1007/s10896-008-9217-0
- Hernandez, C. (2010). Latino fathers' experiences of parenting in the context of immigration. *The University of Maryland McNair Scholars Undergraduate Research Journal, 2*, 87-103. Retrieved from <https://drum.lib.umd.edu/handle/1903/10717>
- Hoef, J. M. ver, Boveng, P. L., & ver Hoef, J. M. (2007). Quasi-Poisson vs. negative binomial regression: How should we model overdispersed count data? *Ecology, 88*(11), 2766-2772. doi:10.1890/07-0043.1
- Holden, G.A. (2003) 'Children exposed to domestic violence and child abuse:

- Terminology and taxonomy'. *Clinical Child and Family Psychology Review*, 6(3), 151–60. doi:10.1023/A:1024906315255
- Hossain, Z., Lee, S., & Martin-Cuellar, A. (2015). Latino mothers' and fathers' caregiving with their school-age children. *Hispanic Journal of Behavioral Sciences*, 37(2), 186–203. doi:10.1177/0739986315578663
- Huecker, M. R., King, K. C., Jordan, G. A., & Smock, W. (2021). *Domestic violence*. StatPearls Publishing. Retrieved from <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/books/NBK499891/>
- Ingoldsby, B. (1991). The Latin American family: Familism vs. machismo. *Journal of Comparative Family Studies*, 1, 57–64. doi:10.3138/jcfs.22.1.57
- Jackson, C. L., Ciciolla, L., Crnic, K. A., Luecken, L. J., Gonzales, N. A., & Coonrod, D. V. (2015). Intimate partner violence before and during pregnancy: Related demographic and psychosocial factors and postpartum depressive symptoms among Mexican American women. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 30(4), 659–679. doi:10.1177/0886260514535262
- Jakobsen, J. C., Gluud, C., Wetterslev, J., & Winkel, P. (2017). When and how should multiple imputation be used for handling missing data in randomised clinical trials - a practical guide with flowcharts. *BMC Medical Research Methodology*, 17(1). doi:10.1186/s12874-017-0442-1
- Jasinski, J. L. (1998). The role of acculturation in wife assault. *Hispanic Journal of Behavioral Sciences*, 20(2), 175-191. doi:10.1177/07399863980202003

- Jian, G. (2012). Does culture matter? An examination of the association of immigrants' acculturation with workplace relationship quality. *Management Communication Quarterly*, 26(2), 295–321. doi:10.1177/0893318912440178
- Johnson, L.B., Todd, M. & Subramanian, G. (2005). Violence in police families: Work-family spillover. *Journal of Family Violence*, 20, 3–12. doi:10.1007/s10896-005-1504-4
- Kantor, G. K., Jasinski, J. L., & Aldarondo, E. (1994). Sociocultural status and incidence of marital violence in Hispanic families. *Violence and Victims*, 9(3), 207-222. doi:10.1891/0886-6708.9.3.207
- Karberg, E., Guzman, L., Cook, E., Scott, M., & Cabrera, N. (2017). *A portrait of Latino fathers: Strengths and challenges*. Retrieved from <https://www.childtrends.org/publications/portrait-latino-fathers-strengths-challenges/>
- Kasturirangan, A., Krishnan, S., & Riger, S. (2004). The Impact of culture and minority status on women's experience of domestic violence. *Trauma, Violence, & Abuse*, 5(4), 318–332. doi:10.1177/1524838004269487
- Kim, B. S. K., Soliz, A., Orellana, B., & Alamilla, S. G. (2009). Latino/a Values Scale: Development, reliability, and validity. *Measurement and Evaluation in Counseling and Development*, 42(2), 71–91. doi:10.1177/0748175609336861
- Klevens, J. (2007). An overview of intimate partner violence among Latinos. *Violence Against Women*, 13(2), 111–122. doi:10.1177/1077801206296979

- Kramer, K. Z., Şahin, E., Gong, Q. (2020). Parental Involvement among first- and second-generation Latin Americans in the United States. *Journal of Family Issues, 00(0)*, 1-29. doi:10.1177/0192513X20948555
- Kulkarni, S. J., Mennicke, A. M., & Woods, S. J. (2018). Intimate partner violence in the workplace: Exploring gender differences in current health-related quality of life. *Violence and Victims, 33(3)*, 519–532. doi:10.1891/0886-6708.v33.i3.519
- Labarre, M., Bourassa, C., Holden, G. W., Turcotte, P., & Letourneau, N. (2016). Intervening with fathers in the context of intimate partner violence: An analysis of ten programs and suggestions for a research agenda. *Journal of Child Custody, 13(1)*, 1-29. doi:10.1080/15379418.2016.1127793
- Lamb, M. E. (2004). *The Role of the Father in Child Development*. Wiley.
- Leavell, A. S., Tamis-LeMonda, C. S., Ruble, D. N., Zosuls, K. M., & Cabrera, N. J. (2012). African American, White and Latino fathers' activities with their sons and daughters in early childhood. *Sex Roles, 66*, 53–65.
- Lein, L., Jacquet, S. E., Lewis, C. M., Cole, P. R., & Williams, B. B. (2001). With the best of intentions: Family violence option and abused women's needs. *Violence Against Women, 7(2)*, 193– 210. doi:10.1177/10778010122182398
- Lim, K. C., Rioux, J., & Ridley, E. (2004). *Impact of domestic violence offenders on occupational safety & health: A pilot study*. Maine Department of Labor, Family Crisis Services. Retrieved from https://www.maine.gov/labor/labor_stats/publications/dvreports/domesticoffendersreport.pdf

- Logan, T. K., Shannon, L., Cole, J., & Swanberg, J. (2007). Partner stalking and implications for women's employment. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 22*(3), 268–291. doi:10.1177/0886260506295380
- Lown, E. A., & Vega, W. A. (2001). Prevalence and predictors of physical partner abuse among Mexican American women. *American journal of public health, 91*(3), 441–445. doi:10.2105/ajph.91.3.441
- MacGregor, J. C. D., Oliver, C. L., MacQuarrie, B. J., & Wathen, C. N. (2019). Intimate partner violence and work: A scoping review of published research. *Trauma, Violence, & Abuse*. doi:10.1177/1524838019881746
- MacGregor, J. C. D., Wathen, C. N., MacQuarrie, B. J. (2016). Domestic violence in the Canadian workplace: Are coworkers aware? *Safety and Health at Work, 7*(3), 244-250. doi:10.1016/j.shaw.2016.01.003.
- Maldonado, A. I., Cunradi, C. B., & Nápoles, A. M. (2020). Racial/ethnic discrimination and intimate partner violence perpetration in Latino men: The mediating effects of mental health. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health, 17*(21), 8148. doi:10.3390/ijerph17218148
- Mancera, B. M., Dorgo, S., & Provencio-Vasquez, E. (2017). Risk factors for Hispanic male intimate partner violence perpetration. *American Journal of Men's Health, 9*69–983. doi:10.1177/1557988315579196
- Mankowski, E. S., Galvez, G., Perrin, N. A., Hanson, G. C., & Glass, N. (2013). Patterns of work-related intimate partner violence and job performance among abusive men. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 28*(15), 3041–3058. doi:10.1177/0886260513488681

- Maiuro, R., & Eberle, J. (2008). State standards for domestic violence perpetrator treatment: Current status, trends, and recommendations. *Violence and Victims, 23*(2), 133–155. doi:10.1891/0886-6708.23.2.133
- Marín, G., Sabogal, F., Marin, B. V., Otero-Sabogal, R., & Perez-Stable, E. J. (1987). Development of a short acculturation scale for Hispanics. *Hispanic Journal of Behavioral Sciences, 9*(2), 183–205. doi:10.1177/07399863870092005
- Mariscal, E. S. (2020). Resilience following exposure to intimate partner violence and other violence: A comparison of Latino and non-Latino youth. *Children and Youth Services Review, 113*, 104975. doi:10.1016/j.childyouth.2020.104975
- Marsiglio, W., Day, R.E., & Lamb, M.E. (2000). Exploring fatherhood diversity: Implications for conceptualizing father involvement. *Marriage and Family Review, 29*(4), 269-294. doi:10.1300/J002v29n04_03
- Mayo, Yolanda. (1997). Machismo, fatherhood and the Latino family: Understanding the concept. *Journal of Multicultural Social Work, 5*(1-2), 49-61. doi:10.1300/J285v05n01_05
- Meyers, J. L., Sartor, C. E., Werner, K. B., Koenen, K. C., Grant, B. F., & Hasin, D. (2018). Childhood interpersonal violence and adult alcohol, cannabis, and tobacco use disorders: Variation by race/ethnicity? *Psychological Medicine, 48*(9), 1540–1550. doi:10.1017/s0033291717003208.
- Mirandé, A. (1991). Ethnicity and fatherhood. In Bozett, F. W. & Hanson, S. M. H. (Eds.), *Fatherhood and families in cultural context* (pp. 53–82). Springer Publishing Co.
- Mirandé, A. (1997). *Hombres y machos: Masculinity and Latino culture*. Westview.

- Mirandé, A. (2008). Immigration and Latino fatherhood: A preliminary look at Latino immigrant and non-immigrant fathers. In Chuang, S. S., & Moreno, R. P. (Eds.), *On new shores: Understanding immigrant fathers in North America* (pp. 217-230). Lexington Books.
- Mogro-Wilson, C., Rojas, R., & Haynes, J. (2016). A cultural understanding of the parenting practices of Puerto Rican fathers. *Social Work Research, 40*(4), 237–248. doi:10.1093/swr/svw019
- Mohaupt, H., Duckert, F., & Askeland, I. R. (2020). How do men in treatment for intimate partner violence experience parenting their young child? A descriptive phenomenological analysis. *Journal of Family Violence, 35*, 863-875. doi:10.1007/s10896-019-00083-x
- Montalvo-Liendo, N., Matthews, D. W., Gilroy, H., Nava, A., & Gangialla, C. (2018). Men of Mexican origin who abuse women: A qualitative study. *Journal of Transcultural Nursing, 29*(5), 457–464. doi:10.1177/1043659618766215
- Moreno, R. P., & Chuang, S. S. (2012). Latino fathers and their involvement in their children's schooling. In Ho, H., & Hiatt-Michael, D. B. (Eds.), *Promising practices for fathers' involvement in their children's education* (pp. 59-73). Information Age.
- Morling, B. (2017). *Research methods in psychology* (3rd Ed.). W. W. Norton & Company, Inc.
- Murphy, K., & Davidshofer, C. O. (2005). *Psychological Testing: Principles and Applications* (6th Ed.). Pearson Education, Inc.

- National Center for Injury Prevention and Control. (2003). *Costs of intimate partner violence against women in the United States*. Retrieved from <https://www.cdc.gov/violenceprevention/pdf/ipvbook-a.pdf>
- Newcomb, M. D., & Carmona, J. V. (2004). Adult trauma and HIV status among Latinas: Effects upon psychological adjustment and substance use. *AIDS and Behavior*, 8(4), 417–428. doi:10.1007/s10461-004-7326-1
- Noe-Bustamante, L., Flores, A., Shah, S. (2019). *Facts on Hispanics of Mexican origin in the United States, 2017*. Pew Hispanic Research Center. Retrieved from <https://www.pewresearch.org/hispanic/fact-sheet/u-s-hispanics-facts-on-mexican-origin-latinos/>
- O'Gara, J. L., Calzada, E. J., & Kim, S. Y. (2020). The father's role in risk and resilience among Mexican-American adolescents. *The American journal of orthopsychiatry*, 90(1), 70–77. doi:10.1037/ort0000394
- Olmsted, Jennifer (2003). Reexamining the Fertility Puzzle in MENA. In Doumato, E. A., & Posusney, M. P. (Eds.), *Women and Globalization in the Arab Middle East: Gender Economy & Society* (pp. 73-94). Lynne Rienner.
- Parke, R. D., Coltrane, S., Borthwick-Duffy, S., Powers, J., & Adams, M. (2004). Assessing father involvement in Mexican-American families. In Day, R. D., & Lamb, M. E. (Eds.). *Conceptualizing and measuring father involvement* (pp. 15-33). Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Parra-Cardona, J. R., Escobar-Chew, A. R., Holtrop, K., Carpenter, G., Guzmán, R., Hernández, D., Zamudio, E., & González Ramírez, D. (2013). “En el grupo tomas conciencia (in group you become aware)”: Latino immigrants’ satisfaction with a

- culturally informed intervention for men who batter. *Violence Against Women*, 19(1), 107–132. doi:10.1177/1077801212475338
- Peled, E. (2000). Parenting by men who abuse women: Issues and dilemmas. *British Journal of Social Work*, 30(1), 25-36. doi:10.1093/bjsw/30.1.25
- Perel, G., & Peled, E. (2008). The fathering of violent men: Constriction and yearning. *Violence Against Women*, 14(4), 457-482. doi:10.1177/1077801208314846
- Perez, G. K., & Cruess, D. (2014). The impact of familism on physical and mental health among Hispanics in the United States. *Health Psychology Review*, 8, 95–127. doi:10.1080/17437199.2011.569936
- Perilla, J. L. (1999). Domestic violence as a human rights issue: The case of immigrant Latinos. *Hispanic Journal of Behavioral Sciences*, 21(2), 107–133. doi:10.1177/0739986399212001
- Perilla, J. (2007). *Working with men and boys to end domestic violence*. National Latino Alliance for the Elimination of Domestic Violence. Retrieved from http://dvalianza.org/images/stories/ResourcePubs/position_papers/WorkingWithMen.pdf
- Perilla, J. L., Bakeman, R., & Norris, F. H. (1994). Culture and domestic violence: The ecology of abused Latinas. *Violence and Victims*, 9(4), 325–339. doi:10.1891/0886-6708.9.4.325
- Perilla, J., & Perez, F. (2002). A program for immigrant Latino men who batter within the context of a comprehensive family. In Aldarondo, E., & Mederos, F. (Eds.), *Programs for men who batter* (pp. 11-1 – 11-31). Civic Research Institute.

- Perilla, J. L., Serrata, J.V., Weinberg, J., & Lippy, C. A. (2012). Integrating women's voices and theory: A comprehensive domestic violence intervention for Latinas. *Women & Therapy, 35*(1-2), 93-105. doi:10.1080/02703149.2012.634731
- Peterson, C., Kearns, M. C., McIntosh, W. L., Estefan, L. F., Nicolaidis, C., McCollister, K. E., Gordon, A., & Florence, C. (2018). Lifetime economic burden of intimate partner violence among U.S. adults. *American Journal of Preventive Medicine, 55*(4), 433–444. doi:10.1016/j.amepre.2018.04.049
- Planalp, E., Frausto, A., & Braungart-Rieker, J. (2021). Latino resident fathers' early involvement with infants. *Psychology of Men and Masculinities, 22*(3), 466–475. doi:10.1037/men0000325
- Poole, G. M., & Murphy, C. M. (2019). Fatherhood status as a predictor of intimate partner violence (IPV) treatment engagement. *Psychology of Violence, 9*(3), 340–349. doi:10.1037/vio0000124
- Potter, L. C., Morris, R., Hegarty, K., García-Moreno, C., & Feder, G. (2021). Categories and health impacts of intimate partner violence in the World Health Organization multi-country study on women's health and domestic violence. *International journal of epidemiology, 50*(2), 652–662. doi:10.1093/ije/dyaa220
- Pyles, L., & Banerjee, M. M. (2010). Work experiences of women survivors: Insights from the capabilities approach. *Affilia: Journal of Women and Social Work, 25*(1), 43–55. doi:10.1177/0886109909354984
- Quiñones, S., & Kiyama, J. M. (2014). Contra la corriente (against the current): The role of Latino fathers in family–school engagement. *The School Community Journal, 24*(1), 149–176. Retrieved from <https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ1032261.pdf>

- Raikes, H. H., Summers, J. A., & Roggman, L. A. (2005). Father involvement in Early Head Start research programs. *Fathering, 3*(1), 29-52. doi:10.3149/fth.0301.29
- Raj, A., Santana, M. C., La Marche, A., Amaro, H., Cranston, K., & Silverman, J. G. (2006). Perpetration of intimate partner violence associated with sexual risk behaviors among young adult men. *American journal of public health, 96*(10), 1873–1878. doi:10.2105/AJPH.2005.081554
- Reese, L., Balzano, S., Gallimore, R., & Goldenburg, C. (1995). The concept of educación: Latino family values and American schooling. *International Journal of Educational Research, 23*, 57–81. doi:10.1016/0883-0355(95)93535-4
- Reeves, C., & O'Leary-Kelly, A. M. (2007). The effects and costs of intimate partner violence for work organizations. *Journal of interpersonal violence, 22*(3), 327–344. doi:10.1177/0886260506295382
- Riger, S., Ahrens, C. E., & Blickenstaff, A. (2000). Measuring interference with employment and education reported by women with abusive partners: Preliminary data. *Violence and Victims, 15*(2), 161-172. doi:10.1891/0886-6708.15.2.161
- Ríos, M., Romero, F., & Ramírez, R. (2014). *Race reporting among Hispanics: 2010*. Population Division U.S. Census Bureau. Retrieved from <https://www.census.gov/content/dam/Census/library/working-papers/2014/demo/shedding-light-on-race-reporting-among-hispanics/POP-twps0102.pdf>
- Rothman, E. F., Mandel, D. G., & Silverman, J. G. (2007). Abusers' perceptions of the effect of their intimate partner violence on children. *Violence Against Women, 13*(11), 1179–1191. doi:10.1177/1077801207308260

- Rothman, E. F., & Perry, M. J. (2004). Intimate partner abuse perpetrated by employees. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology, 9*(3), 238–246. doi:10.1037/1076-8998.9.3.238
- Roubinov, D. S., Luecken, L. J., Gonzales, N. A., & Crnic, K. A. (2016). Father involvement in Mexican-origin families: Preliminary development of a culturally informed measure. *Cultural Diversity & Ethnic Minority Psychology, 22*(2), 277–287. doi:10.1037/cdp0000063
- Ruffenach, C., Worcel, S., Keyes, D., Franco, R., & Adams, V. (2016). *Latinos in Oregon: Trends and opportunities in a changing state*. Retrieved from https://oregoncf.org/Templates/media/files/reports/latinos_in_oregon_report_2016.pdf
- Sabina, C., Cuevas, C., & Schally, J. (2013). The effect of immigration and acculturation on victimization among a national sample of Latino women. *Cultural Diversity & Ethnic Minority Psychology, 19*(1), 13–26. doi:10.1037/a0030500
- Sabina, C., Cuevas, C. A., Zadnik, E. (2015). Intimate partner violence among Latino women: Rates and cultural correlates. *Journal of Family Violence, 30*(5), 35–47. doi:10.1007/s10896-014-9652-z
- Sabogal, F., Marin, G., Oteio-Sabogal, R., Marin, B. V., & Perez-Stable, E. J. (1987). Hispanic familism and acculturation: What changes and what doesn't? *Hispanic Journal of Behavioral Sciences, 9*(4), 397-412. doi:10.1177/07399863870094003
- Salazar, L. F., Baker, C. K., Price, A. W., Carlin, K. (2003). Moving beyond the individual: Examining the effects of domestic violence policies on social norms.

American Journal of Community Psychology, 32, 253-264.

doi:10.1023/B:AJCP.0000004746.31861.e7

Samuel, L. J., Tudor, C., Weinstein, M., Moss, H., & Glass, N. (2011). Employers' perceptions of intimate partner violence among a diverse workforce. *Safe Health Work*, 2(3), 250–259. doi:10.5491/SHAW.2011.2.3.250

Sánchez, B., Rivera, C., Liao, C. L., & Mroczkowski, A. L. (2017). Community psychology interventions and U.S. Latinos and Latinas. In Bond, M. A., Serrano-García, I., Keys, C. B., & Shinn, M. (Eds.), *APA handbook of community psychology: Methods for community research and action for diverse groups and issues* (pp. 491–506). American Psychological Association. doi:10.1037/14954-029

Salisbury, E. J., Henning, K., & Holdford, R. (2009). Fathering by partner-abusive men: attitudes on children's exposure to interparental conflict and risk factors for child abuse. *Child Maltreatment*, 14(3), 232–242. doi:10.1177/1077559509338407

Saracho O. N., & Spodek B. (2007). Challenging the stereotypes of Mexican American fathers. *Journal of Early Childhood Education*, 35, 223–231. doi:10.1007/s10643-007-0199-y

Saracho, O. N., & Spodek, B. (2008). Demythologizing the Mexican American father. *Journal of Hispanic Higher Education*, 7(2), 79-96. doi:10.1177/1538192707313936

Schafer, J. L. (1999). Multiple imputation: A primer. *Statistical Methods in Medical Research*, 8(1), 3–15. doi:10.1177/096228029900800102

- Schmidt, M. C., & Barnett, A. (2012). *Effects of domestic violence on the workplace: A Vermont survey of male offenders enrolled in batterer intervention programs*. Vermont Council on Domestic Violence. Retrieved from https://www.uvm.edu/sites/default/files/media/VTDV_WorkplaceStudy2012.pdf
- Scott, K. L., Lim, D. B., Kelly, T., Holmes, M., MacQuarrie, B. J., Wathen, C. N., MacGregor, J. C. D. (2017). *Domestic Violence at the workplace: Investigating the impact of domestic violence perpetration on workers and workplaces*. University of Toronto. Retrieved from http://dvatworknet.org/sites/dvatworknet.org/files/PAR_Partner_report-Oct-23-2017dl.pdf
- Shadish, W. R., & Cook, T. D. (2009). The renaissance of field experimentation in evaluating interventions. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 60(1), 607-629. doi:10.1146/annurev.psych.60.110707.163544
- Shannon, J. D., Cabrera, N. J., Tamis-LeMonda, C. S., & Lamb, M. E. (2009). Who stays and who leaves? Father accessibility across children's first 5 years. *Parenting: Science and Practice*, 9(1-2), 78–100. doi:10.1080/15295190802656786
- Showalter, K. (2016). Women's employment and domestic violence: a review of the literature. *Aggression and Violent Behavior*, 31, 37–47. doi:10.1016/j.avb.2016.06.017.
- Simister, J. (2012). More than a billion women face 'gender based violence': Where are most victims? *Journal of Family Violence*, 27, 607–623. doi:10.1007/s10896-012-9457-x

- Smith, M. D. (1991). Patriarchal ideology and wife beating: A Test of a feminist hypothesis. *Violence and Victims*, 5(4), 257–273. doi:10.1891/0886-6708.5.4.257
- Stanley, N., Graham-Kevan, N. and Borthwick, R. (2012), Fathers and domestic violence: Building motivation for change through perpetrator programmes. *Child Abuse Review*, 21(4), 264-274. doi:10.1002/car.2222
- Stevens, E. P. (1973). Machismo and marianismo. *Society*, 10(6), 57–63. doi:10.1007/BF02695282
- Straus, M. A. (1990). The Conflict Tactics Scales and its critics: An evaluation and new data on validity and reliability. In M. A. Straus & R. J. Gelles (Eds.), *Physical violence in American families: Risk factors and adaptations to violence in 8,145 families* (pp. 49-73). Transaction Publishers.
- Straus, M. A., & Douglas, E. M. (2004). A short form of the Revised Conflict Tactics Scales, and typologies for severity and mutuality. *Violence and victims*, 19(5), 507–520. doi:10.1891/vivi.19.5.507.63686
- Straus, M. A., Hamby, S. L., Boney-McCoy, S., & Sugarman, D. B. (1996). The revised conflict tactics scales (CTS2) development and preliminary psychometric data. *Journal of Family Issues*, 17(3), 283–316. doi:10.1177/019251396017003001
- Swanberg, J. E., & Logan, T. K. (2005). Domestic violence and employment: A qualitative study. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, 10(1), 3–17. doi:10.1037/1076-8998.10.1.3
- Swanberg, J. E., Logan, T., & Macke, C. (2005). Intimate partner violence, employment, and the workplace: consequences and future directions. *Trauma, Violence & Abuse*, 6(4), 286–312. doi:10.1177/1524838005280506

- Swanberg, J. E., & Macke, C. (2006). Intimate partner violence and the workplace: Consequences and disclosure. *Affilia: Journal of Women and Social Work, 21*(4), 391–406. doi:10.1177/0886109906292133
- Tamis-LeMonda, C. S., Kahana-Kalman, R., & Yoshikawa, H. (2009). Father involvement in immigrant and ethnically diverse families from the prenatal period to the second year: Prediction and mediating mechanisms. *Sex Roles, 60*, 496–509. doi:10.1007/s11199-009-9593-9
- Taylor, B. A., & Behnke, A. (2005). Fathering across the border: Latino fathers in Mexico and the U.S. *Fathering, 3*(2), 99–120. doi:10.3149/fth.0302.99
- Terrazas-Carrillo, E. C., & McWhirter, P. T. (2015). Employment status and intimate partner violence among Mexican women. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 30*(7), 1128–1152. doi:10.1177/0886260514539848
- Theobald, D., & Farrington, D. P. (2012). Child and adolescent predictors of male intimate partner violence. *Journal of Child Psychology and Psychiatry and Allied Disciplines, 53*(12), 1242–1249. doi:10.1111/j.1469-7610.2012.02577.x
- Tiesman, H. M., Gurka, K. K., Konda, S., Coben, J. H., & Amandus, H. E. (2012). Workplace homicides among U.S. women: The role of intimate partner violence. *Annals of epidemiology, 22*(4), 277–284. doi:10.1016/j.annepidem.2012.02.009
- Torres, L., Driscoll, M. W., & Voell, M. (2012). Discrimination, acculturation, acculturative stress, and Latino psychological distress: A moderated mediational model. *Cultural Diversity & Ethnic Minority Psychology, 18*(1), 17-25. doi:10.1037/A0026710

- Toth, J. F., & Xu, X. (1999). Ethnic and cultural diversity in fathers' involvement: A racial/ethnic comparison of African American, Hispanic, and White fathers. *Youth & Society, 31*(1), 76–99. doi:10.1177/0044118X99031001004
- van Tonder, C., & Soontiens, W. (2014). Migrant acculturation and the workplace. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences, 143*, 1041-1047. doi:10.1016/j.sbspro.2014.07.550
- Veteläinen, A., Grönholm, H., & Holma, J. (2013). Discussions of fatherhood in male batterer treatment group. *SAGE Open, 3*(2), 1-10. doi:10.1177/2158244013492083
- Wathen, C. N., MacGregor, J. C., & MacQuarrie, B. J. (2015). The impact of domestic violence in the workplace: Results from a Pan-Canadian survey. *Journal of occupational and environmental medicine, 57*(7), 65–71. doi:10.1097/JOM.0000000000000499
- Wathen, C. N., MacGregor, J., & MacQuarrie, B. J. (2018). Relationships among intimate partner violence, work, and health. *Journal of interpersonal violence, 33*(14), 2268–2290. doi:10.1177/0886260515624236
- Welland C, & Ribner N (2010). Culturally specific treatment for partner-abusive Latino men: A qualitative study to identify and implement program components. *Violence and Victims, 25*(6), 799–813. doi:10.1891/0886-6708.25.6.799
- Wolfe, D.A., Crooks, C.V., Lee, V., McIntyre-Smith, A., & Jaffe, P.G. (2003). The effects of children's exposure to domestic violence: A meta-analysis and critique. *Clinical Child and Family Psychology Review, 6*, 171–187. doi:10.1023/A:1024910416164

- Yang, S., & Berdine, G. (2015). Negative binomial regression. *The Southwest Respiratory and Critical Care Chronicles*, 3(10), 50-53.
doi:10.12746/swrccc2015.0310.135
- Yun, S. H. (2011). Factor structure and reliability of the revised conflict tactics scales' (CTS2) 10-factor model in a community-based female sample. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 26(4), 719–744. doi:10.1177/0886260510365857
- Zinn, M. B. (1982). Familism among Chicanos: A theoretical review. *Humboldt Journal of Social Relations*, 10(1), 224–238. Retrieved from
<http://www.jstor.org/stable/23261865>

Appendix

Survey Measure Items

Survey of Work-Related IPV

Instructions: Below is a short list of background questions. Please read each question carefully.

1. What is today's date? _____
2. How long have you been coming to this program? _____ months
_____ years
3. Why did you come? (*Please check all that apply*)
 - Volunteered (What motivated you to come? _____)
1 = yes 2 = no
 - DHS/Child Welfare (or SCF/CSD) referral
1 = yes 2 = no
 - Court mandate
1 = yes 2 = no
 - Probation
1 = yes 2 = no
 - Parole
1 = yes 2 = no
 - Other, please describe _____
4. What is your religious affiliation? (*Please check one response only*)
 - Catholic = *1*
 - Jewish = *2*
 - Protestant or other Christian denomination = *3*
 - Muslim = *4*
 - None = *5*
 - Other (*Please specify* _____)

5. What is your age? _____

6. What is your relationship status? (*Check more than one if appropriate.*)

Never married

1 = yes 2 = no

Single

For how long? (yrs) (mos)

1 = yes 2 = no

Now married

For how long? (yrs) (mos)

1 = yes 2 = no

Widowed

For how long? (yrs) (mos)

1 = yes 2 = no

Divorced

For how long? (yrs) (mos)

1 = yes 2 = no

Separated

For how long? (yrs) (mos)

1 = yes 2 = no

Single, living alone/children

For how long? (yrs) (mos)

1 = yes 2 = no

Single, living with a partner

For how long? (yrs) (mos)

1 = yes 2 = no

Other (*Please describe*) _____

7. Are you Spanish/Hispanic/Latino?

No, not Spanish/Hispanic/Latino = *1*

Yes. . . (*check appropriate box*)

Mexican = *2*

Mexican American, Chicano = *3*

Central American = *6*

Puerto Rican = 4

South American = 7

Cuban = 5
= 8

Other Spanish/Hispanic/Latino

8. What is your race? (*May check more than one category*)

White = 1

Black or African American = 2

Asian _____ = 3

American Indian or Alaska Native = 4 Name of Tribe

 Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander = 5

Other _____ = 6

Does not identify = 7

9. Where were you born? _____ (State) _____ (Country)

10. How many years did you live there? _____

11. How long have you been living continuously in the U. S.? _____ years
_____ months

12. What language(s) do you speak fluently? _____

Instructions: If you speak or read only Spanish or English, please answer questions # 13 – 17. If no, then skip to question # 18.

The Language Use subscale of the SASH (Marín et al., 1987): items 13-17.

13. In general, what language(s) do you read and speak?

Only Spanish = 1 Spanish better than English = 2 Both Equally =

3

English better than Spanish = 4 Only English = 5

14. What was the language(s) you used as a child?

Only Spanish = 1 Spanish better than English = 2 Both Equally = 3

English better than Spanish = 4 Only English = 5

15. What language(s) do you usually speak at home?

Only Spanish = 1 Spanish better than English = 2 Both Equally =

3

English better than Spanish = 4 Only English = 5

16. In which language(s) do you usually think?

Only Spanish = 1 Spanish better than English = 2 Both Equally =

3

English better than Spanish = 4 Only English = 5

17. What languages do you usually speak with your friends?

Only Spanish = 1 Spanish better than English = 2 Both Equally =

3

English better than Spanish = 4 Only English = 5

18. How many years of school have you finished? (*Please check off the last year completed*).

GRADE/HIGH SCHOOL

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

No school = 1

GED or high school diploma = 2

Some college = 3

Vocational graduate or associate degree = 4

4 year college degree = 5

Post baccalaureate = 6

19. Are you currently enrolled in school? (*or were you in the last 6 months?*)

Yes, full-time = 1 Yes, part-time = 2 No = 3

20. Are you currently employed at a job outside the home where you earn money?

Yes = 1 No = 2

21. If yes, are you working?

full-time = 1 part-time = 2

a. What is your job _____?

b. Are you a union member? Yes = 1 No = 2

22. If no, are you?

unemployed but looking for work = 1 not employed, not
looking for work = 2

Other _____

23. Do you have more than one job that earns money? Yes = 1 No = 2

24. How many hours last month did you work outside the home for money?

_____ hours

25. How many hours last month did you work inside the home for money?

_____ hours

26. How much do you usually earn each month? [Before taxes on average]

\$0 and \$99 a month = 1 \$2,001 and \$2,500 a month = 6

\$100 and \$500 a month = 2 \$2,501 and \$3,000 a month = 7

\$501 and \$1,000 a month = 3 \$3,001 and \$3,500 a month = 8

\$1,001 and \$1,500 a month = 4 \$3,501 and \$4,000 a month = 9

\$1,501 and \$2,000 a month = 5 more than \$4,001 = 10

27. How much money (*in dollars*) do you contribute from that amount to your family
(including child support payments, etc.) per month? _____

28. Including income from all sources, such as work, gifts, child support, social services,
what is your household income for the month? Give the answer that best fits your
household.

\$0 and \$99 a month = 1 \$2,001 and \$2,500 a month = 6

- \$100 and \$500 a month = **2** \$2,501 and \$3,000 a month = **7**
 \$501 and \$1,000 a month = **3** \$3,001 and \$3,500 a month = **8**
 \$1,001 and \$1,500 a month = **4** \$3,501 and \$4,000 a month = **9**
 \$1,501 and \$2,000 a month = **5** more than \$4,001 = **10**
 Don't know = **11**

29. How many people live in your household? _____

30. How many people contribute to the household income?

31. How many of your children (or those you care for as your own) under the age of 18 currently live with you? _____

32. How many of your children (or those you care for as your own) under the age of 18 are currently *not* living with you? _____ explain:

33. Who do you live with? (select the answer that fits best)

- my own household = **1** partner's family/relatives = **2**
 my family/relatives = **3** other _____

34. How many children living with you are step children? _____

35. Have you ever been in an intimate relationship with a coworker? No = **2**
 Yes = **1**

36. Is your partner (ex-partner) male or female? Male = **1** Female = **2**

37. What is your partner's ethnicity? (*May check more than one category*)

- Spanish/Hispanic/Latino = **1**
 White = **2**
 Black or African American = **3**
 Asian _____ = **4**
 American Indian or Alaska Native = **5** Name of Tribe _____

Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander = 6

Other _____ = 7

38. Where was your partner (ex-partner) born?

_____ (city) _____ (state) _____ (country)

39. How long has your partner (ex-partner) been living in the U.S.? _____ years

_____ months

40. Does your partner have a driver's license? Yes = 1 No = 2

Not Sure = 3

41. Is your partner (ex-partner) currently employed? Yes = 1 No = 2

Not Sure = 3

42. What is your partner's job? _____

43. Has your partner ever been employed outside the home during your relationship?

Yes = 1 No = 2 Not Sure = 3

What was your partner's job(s)? _____

Instructions: In the following questions, we are trying to understand your abusive behavior and how it has affected your partner, partner's boss/supervisor, and her coworkers. Questions 1-71 use a lifetime occurrence scale: Check 'yes' if you have ever done this behavior; check 'no' if you have never done this behavior. Please consider any current or past job and your boss and coworkers from these jobs.

Work-Related Domestic Violence Perpetration Scale (Mankowski et al., 2013): items 1-48, excluding items 2-3, 5-7, 10-12, 14, 17-18, 33-35, 40, and 47.

	Yes = 1	No = 0
--	------------	-----------

1. Have you ever made your partner (ex-partner) late or miss work or interfered with her ability to get to work?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
a. Did you do any of the following?		
i. Interfered with transportation	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
ii. Interfered with her sleep	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
iii. Caused her to be emotionally traumatized	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
iv. Interfered with childcare arrangements	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
v. Destroyed her personal property	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
vi. Injured her	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
vii. Took or hide items she needs for work	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	Yes = 1	No = 0
viii. Refused to take care of children	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
2. What are some of things that you may have done in the past that interfered with your partner's (ex-partner's) work, her workplace, or her ability to get to work? _____ _____		
3. I have not given my partner (ex-partner) phone messages about work from her boss/coworker.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
4. I have lied about our children (e.g., child is sick, babysitter is sick) to make my partner (ex-partner) miss or leave work.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
5. I have tried to stop my partner (ex-partner) from getting a driver's license.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
6. I have yelled at my partner (ex-partner) at her job.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
7. I have called my partner (ex-partner) insulting names at her job.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

8. I have threatened to hurt my partner (ex-partner) physically (e.g., slapped, hit, kicked, choked) at her job.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
9. I have physically hurt (e.g., slapped, hit, kicked, choked) my partner (ex-partner) at her job.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
10. I have yelled at my partner (ex-partner) her in front of her coworkers or boss.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
11. I have called my partner (ex-partner) insulting names in front of her coworkers or boss.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
12. My partner's (ex-partner's) coworkers or boss have overheard me threatening to hurt her.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
13. I have physically hurt (e.g., slapped, hit, punched, kicked, choked) my partner (ex-partner) in front of her coworkers or boss.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
14. I have picked up my partner's (ex-partner's) paycheck at her job.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	Yes <i>= 1</i>	No <i>= 0</i>
15. I have bothered my partner's (ex-partner's) coworkers or boss with frequent calls to her work.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
16. My partner (ex-partner) has gotten in trouble at her job because I frequently called her.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
17. On a daily basis, how many times did you contact or try to contact your partner (ex-partner) at her job?	_____ times	
18. I have yelled at my partner's (ex-partner's) boss or coworkers.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
19. I have threatened to hurt my partner (ex-partner) with a weapon (e.g., knife, gun) at her job.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
20. I have hurt my partner (ex-partner) with a weapon (e.g., knife, gun) at her job.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
21. My partner (ex-partner) has gotten in trouble at work because I visited her too often.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

22. I have checked up on my partner (ex-partner) at her job.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
23. I have followed my partner (ex-partner) to or from her job.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
24. I have argued with my partner (ex-partner) on the phone while she was at work.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
25. I have called my partner's (ex-partner's) job in order to check up on her.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
26. I have driven my partner (ex-partner) to and from work so that I can keep an eye on her.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
27. I have sent threatening messages to my partner (ex-partner) at her job (e.g., on a gift card).	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
28. I have told my partner (ex-partner) to quit her job.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
29. I have made my partner (ex-partner) quit her job.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	Yes = 1	No = 0
30. I have told my partner (ex-partner) to cut back her hours at work to spend more time at home.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
31. I have talked with my partner's (ex-partner's) boss about changing her work schedule.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
32. I have called my partner's (ex-partner's) boss to complain about her.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
33. I have disapproved of my partner (ex-partner) working overtime or staying late at work.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
34. I have tried to stop my partner (ex-partner) from spending extra time with her coworkers.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
35. I have asked my partner's (ex-partner's) coworkers or boss to keep an eye on her while she is at work.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

36. I have asked a friend to keep an eye on my partner (ex-partner) while she is at work.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
37. I have felt jealous of my partner (ex-partner) spending time with her male coworkers or boss.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
38. I have accused my partner (ex-partner) of having sex with her coworker or boss.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
39. I have spread rumors about my partner (ex-partner) at her job.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

40. Please check all of the following resources to which you have ever had access at your any of your jobs:		
	Yes = 1	No = 0
a. Email	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b. Phone	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c. Vehicle	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d. Weapon	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
e. Equipment or tools	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
41. I have sent email from my job to check up on my partner (ex-partner).	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
42. I have sent electronic messages from my job to check up on my partner (ex-partner).	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
43. I have used my company's computers or fax to send messages to my partner (ex-partner).	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
44. I have used my job's phone to check up on my partner (ex-partner).	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

45. I have asked one of my coworkers to keep an eye on my partner (ex-partner).	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
46. I have used company vehicles (e.g., truck, van) to check up on my partner (ex-partner).	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
47. I have used my job's computers or phone to gain information about my partner (ex-partner).	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
48. I have used property at my job (e.g., gun, knife, vehicle, staple gun, hammer) to hurt my partner (ex-partner).	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	Yes = 1	No = 0
49. I have used job resources (e.g., coworkers, computers, phones) to gain information about my partner (ex-partner).	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
50. I have learned from my coworkers or boss different ways of abusing or controlling my partner (ex-partner).	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Instructions: In the following questions, we are trying to understand how your abusive behavior has affected you at your job.		
Work Performance Scale (Mankowski et al., 2013): items 51-54.		
51. I have missed work because of my abusive behavior.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
52. I have not been able to concentrate at work because of my feelings/thoughts about my partner (ex-partner).	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
53. I have not been able to perform my work duties because my feelings/thoughts about my partner (ex-partner).	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
54. I have made mistakes at work due to my abusive behavior.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
a. What was the mistake? _____		
55. Have you ever been ordered to make child support payments?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

a. If yes: My abusive behavior has made it harder for me to make child support payments.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<p>Instructions: In the following questions, we are trying to understand how your boss and others have responded to your abusive behavior. This information will help to create recommendations to prevent abusive behavior in the workplace.</p> <p>Employment Outcomes Scale (Mankowski et al., 2013): items 65, 66, and 68.</p>		
	Yes <i>= 1</i>	No <i>= 0</i>
56. Have you ever been arrested for abusive behavior?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	Yes <i>= 1</i>	No <i>= 0</i>
a. If yes: My employer (or boss) has known that I was arrested for domestic violence.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
57. Have you ever had a restraining order put against you?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
a. My employer (or boss) has known that I had a restraining order against me.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
58. Have you ever been in jail for abusive behavior?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
a. My employer (or boss) has bailed me out of jail when I was arrested for abusive behavior.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
59. My employer (or boss) found out about my abusive behavior (e.g., I told him/her, they found out).	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
a. My employer (or boss) has supported me when he or she found out about my domestic violence.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
60. My employer (or boss) has given me time off work (e.g., let you off early; let you come late to work) to attend court dates for my abusive behavior.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
61. My employer (or boss) has disapproved of my domestic violence.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

What did they say or do? _____		
62. My employer (or boss) has approved of my domestic violence.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
What did they say or do? _____		
63. My employer (or boss) has given me time off work to attend batterer intervention group meetings.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
64. My employer (or boss) has given me my job back after being jailed for domestic violence.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
	Yes = 1	No = 0
65. My employer (or boss) has asked me to quit or fired me because I was arrested for abusive behavior.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
66. My employer (or boss) has fired me because I missed work due to abusive behavior.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
67. My employer (or boss) has referred me to a batterer intervention program.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
68. I have been denied a job because I had domestic violence on my record.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
69. I have told my coworkers about my abusive behavior.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
70. My employer (or boss) has expressed sympathy for my partner.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
71. My employer (or boss) has made me go to a batterer intervention program in order to keep my job.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
72. Did you learn new ways to manipulate or control your partner (ex-partner) from this survey?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
a. Will you use any of the new ways that you have learned from this survey to manipulate or control your partner (ex-partner)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Instructions: In the following questions, we are trying to understand more about abusive behavior that occurs in the workplace. You could also respond to these questions based on your past or current experiences with other coworkers who may have abused their partners or been abused by their partner at work.

73. What could you do to stop your abusive behavior at her job?

74. What could others do to help stop abusive behavior at her job?

75. What types of policies or programs could your employer have that would have helped you to stop abusing your partner (ex-partner)?

76. What types of policies or rules at your partner's (ex-partner's) job would have prevented you from abusing your partner (ex-partner) at her job?

77. Are there other things that you would like to tell us about your abusive behavior and how it affects the workplace?

Instructions: In the following questions, we are trying to understand your attitudes toward women in general. Please choose one of the responses for each statement. Questions 78-86 use a 1 to 6 scale: strongly disagree, disagree, slightly disagree, slightly agree, agree, and strongly agree.

partner (ex-partner) having a relationship with men at work.						
--	--	--	--	--	--	--