

ISSN: 1889-1861

***THE EUROPEAN JOURNAL
OF
PSYCHOLOGY APPLIED
TO
LEGAL CONTEXT***



Volume 1, Number 2, July 2009

The official Journal of the
SOCIEDAD ESPAÑOLA DE PSICOLOGÍA JURÍDICA Y FORENSE
Website: <http://www.usc.es/sepjf>

Editor

Ramón Arce, University of Santiago de Compostela (Spain).

Associate Editors

Gualberto Buela-Casal, University of Granada (Spain).

Francisca Fariña, University of Vigo (Spain).

Editorial Board

Rui Abrunhosa, University of O Miño (Portugal).

Ray Bull, University of Leicester (UK).

Thomas Bliesener, University of Kiel (Germany).

Fernando Chacón, Complutense University of Madrid (Spain).

Ángel Egido, University of Angers (France).

Antonio Godino, University of Lecce (Italy).

Günter Köhnken, University of Kiel (Germany).

Friedrich Lösel, University of Cambridge (UK).

María Ángeles Luengo, University of Santiago de Compostela (Spain).

Eduardo Osuna, University of Murcia (Spain).

Ronald Roesch, Simon Fraser University (Canada).

Francisco Santolaya, President of the Spanish Psychological Association (Spain).

Juan Carlos Sierra, University of Granada (Spain).

Jorge Sobral, University of Santiago de Compostela (Spain).

Max Steller, Free University of Berlin, (Germany).

Francisco Tortosa, University of Valencia (Spain).

Official Journal of the *Sociedad Española de Psicología Jurídica y Forense*

(www.usc.es/sepjf)

Published By: SEPJF.

Volume 1, Number, 2.

Order Form: see www.usc.es/sepjf

Frequency: 2 issues per year.

ISSN: 1889-1861.

D.L.: C-4376-2008

HOMICIDE AND DOMESTIC VIOLENCE. ARE THERE DIFFERENT PSYCHOLOGICAL PROFILES MEDIATED BY PREVIOUS VIOLENCE EXERTED ON THE VICTIM?

**Miguel Ángel Soria, Inmaculada Armadans, María Rosa Viñas
& Montserrat Yepes**

Department of Social Psychology, University of Barcelona (Spain).

(Received: 25 November 2007; revised 14 September 2008; accepted 17 September 2008)

Abstract

A sample of 46 men was evaluated with the DAPP (Questionnaire of Domestic Aggressor Psychological Profile). All were inmates convicted for various degrees of violence against their wives in different prisons. The sample was divided into three groups: homicides without previous violence against their wives (H) (n=11), homicides with previous violence (VH) (n=9) and domestic batterers without previous homicide attempts against their partners (B) (n=26). The aim of the study was to analyze the possible existence of three different kinds of profiles and more specifically if it's possible to obtain an independent profile for domestic homicides with previous episodes of violence against their wives. The results neither confirm the hypothesis as whole nor for the violent homicides. However, differences between groups were obtained in the admission and description of the facts, in the risk of future violence, in some sociodemographical characteristics (i.e., level of education, social status), in the couple relationship, in the dissatisfaction concerning the unachieved ideal woman, in the use of extreme physical force during the aggression, the time of the first aggression, the use of verbal threats during the aggression, explanation of the events to the family and the period of time between the beginning of the romantic relationship and the manifestation of violence. The implications of the results for the theoretical frameworks proposed and future research are discussed.

Key words: domestic homicide, psychological profile, domestic violence, crime, prediction violence.

Resumen

Una muestra de 46 hombres fueron evaluados mediante el PPAD (Cuestionario del Perfil Psicológico del Agresor Doméstico). Todos eran presos de diferentes centros penitenciarios por delitos de violencia contra sus mujeres en grado diverso. La muestra fue dividida en tres grupos, homicidas sin violencia previa hacia su mujer (11 Ss), homicidas con violencia previa (9 Ss) y agresores domésticos sin intentos previos de homicidio hacia su pareja (26 Ss). El objeto del estudio era analizar la posible existencia de perfiles diferentes para cada tipo de crimen, y especialmente si era posible obtener un perfil independiente para los homicidas con episodios previos de violencia hacia sus mujeres. Los resultados no confirmaron la hipótesis general ni la referida a los homicidas violentos. Sin embargo, hallamos diferencias entre los grupos de agresores en la admisión y descripción de los hechos, en el riesgo de futura violencia, en algunas variables sociodemográficas (v.gr., nivel escolar, estatus social), en la relación de pareja, en la insatisfacción con el ideal de mujer, en el uso extremo de violencia física, en el tiempo transcurrido desde la primera agresión, en el uso de amenazas verbales, en la explicación de los hechos a la familia, y en el período de tiempo entre el inicio de la relación y la manifestación de violencia. Se discuten las implicaciones de los resultados en relación con los modelos teóricos explicativos propuestos y la investigación futura.

Palabras clave: homicidio domestico, perfil psicológico, violencia doméstica, crimen, predicción violencia.

Introduction

Many authors confirm the existence of a link between aggression and homicide, especially during the period of preparation or actual breaking up of the relationship with the batterer (American Psychological Association, 1996; Browne, 1987; Brody & Tarling, 1980; Ewing, 1987; Walker, 1989; Walker & Meloy, 1998). Dobash, *Dobash and* Noaks, (1995) also remark how domestic violence strengthens the risk of homicide due to the emotional link between victim and aggressor. Nevertheless, as Walker and Meloy precisely point out (1998) the number of victims of domestic homicide is quite low if compared to the number of battered women; even though, Meloy (1992, 1996) remarks the fact that the risk of death increases when there is a conduct of harassment and moreover it is of an obsessive type.

But certain studies point out how erroneous it is to try to predict the death of the victim taking into account only the previous existence of domestic violence (Walker & Meloy, 1998) -there is statistical evidence pointing out that approximately half the dead women had not suffered violence at the hand of their couples previously (National Crime Victim Survey, 2004; Soria, 2003).

Sociological and psychosocial research on domestic violence proves the relevance –although not all authors agree on this point- of sociodemographical factors (employment, income, individual and familiar stress, etc) in the origin of aggressiveness, as they are elements that interact with the relationship of the couple (Lystad, 1986; Murray, Straus, & Hotaling, 1980; Straus, Gelles, & Steinmetz, 1980). They may not be direct causes, but due to the stress induced, they facilitate the burst of violent acts in the core of the couple as they reinforce the deficits in the psychological behaviour of aggressors regarding the way they manage the relationship with their wives, specially when they have a traditional point of view on sexual roles and take upon themselves the position of keeper of the stability of the family.

Research on childhood and youth relationships kept by the aggressor during the process of socialization shows how most of domestic homicides came from families torn apart when they were very young or marked by the absence of a father figure (McCord & McCord, 1958), as well as a negative identification towards the parent of

the same gender in domestic batterers (Cerezo, 1998). It also specifies that when the type of parent education tends to be authoritarian and physical punishment turns commonplace it is more likely for violent conducts to arise in the adult partner (Berkowitz, 1993; American Psychological Association, 1996).

The relevance of the age variable has been stressed in different studies concerning domestic violence –a bigger age difference between aggressor and victim is related with a higher probability of generational conflict turning up due to discrepancies in the activities and interests of each of the members of the couple or by the fact that the older partner might attribute him or herself with a higher power or authority over the other partner (Murray et al., 1980).

Another group of factors that are relevant in order to create a profile come from the analysis of relationships between the members of the couple and their internal and external characteristics. Various studies show how between 44 and 67% of batterers have had previous violent relationships. This is usually connected with individuals that tend to use violence to solve their interpersonal conflicts and so its appearance is not strictly linked to a specific victim (Carlson, 1977; Coleman, Weinman, & His, 1980; Gayford, 1975; Sonkin, Martin, & Walker, 1985). Other pieces of research stress the type of link set between the members of the couple. Battered women tend to show a high level of dependence due to the subordinate status of women in society and, in a later moment, to a harassment syndrome. The same type of connection turns up in relation to the batterer due to her low self-esteem and insecurities (Corsi, Domen, & Sotés, 1995; Currie, 1991; Dutton, 1995).

As regards the characteristics of the external social relationships kept by the couple it is necessary to stress the strong tendency of batterers to hide violent events in the privacy of their home. This would be due to a dual conduct –on one hand he follows the normative criteria of society, but once inside the home, he breaks those rules and cannot avoid anger bursts turning into violence (Dutton, 1995; Sonkin & Durphi, 1982). Social isolation is also positively connected to sexual abuse of women (Rusell, 1982) and child abuse (Finkelhor, 1979, 1984).

Different authors, such as Dutton (1995) analyzed the personality of the batterer describing the existence of three basic types: the psychopathic, the hyper controlled and the cyclic. The two first display controlled violence characterized by the

control and planning of the aggression, and will attack their victims in hidden places, while the third manifests a growing violence that will burst uncontrolled due to the fact that violence cycles start unforeseen –one of its most representative characteristics is the fact of attacking the victim in visible places.

This conception is backed up by various pieces of research on the low self-esteem of the aggressor in which it is stated that the lack of acceptance of the violent acts committed becomes a mechanism of psychological protection (Goldstein & Rosenbaum, 1985; Steele & Pollack, 1974). Due to the same reason, Dutton (1995) points out that commonly the aggressor uses defence mechanisms in the argumentation of the events such as rationalization, denial, projection, repression and minimization. But recent research goes beyond, indicating that it is related to a repetition of the violent conduct in the future (Hening & Oxford, 2006).

In connection with what triggers the aggression we can highlight various studies on the lack of control of impulses in the aggressor (Bowlby, 1984; Coleman, 1980; Currie, 1983), but there are also other pieces of research that state the contrary – they remark that aggressors aim most of their attacks towards their partners instead of towards other individuals from outside the couple (Bograd, 1988).

According to the literature on the subject, there are different psychological disorders that can bring about domestic violence: psychosis and behaviour disorders, also combined with excessive use of alcohol (Echeburúa, 1994), paranoia, described as jealousy delirium (Coleman et al., 1980; Dutton, 1995; Roy, 1982; Walker, 1979) as well as personality disorder, antisocial, paranoid and narcissistic conditions (Echeburúa, 1994) and borderline disorder (Dutton, 1995).

Different criminal psychology studies have been remarking for some time now the relevance of the role of the victim in the criminal act (Wolfgang, 1958; Wolfgang & Feracuti, 1967). The research of Berkowitz (1993), for instance, points out how in domestic homicides aggressiveness is essentially of the emotional type due to the kind of links between the people involved. Furthermore, the knowledge concerning the aggressor held by the victim forces the latter to remain inside the violent relationship because of the risk of death should she break the couple (Stronshine & Robinson, 2003).

Finally, in the analysis of the post-aggressive context we must take into account the apparition of different factors, particularly suicidal reactions after domestic

homicide. Just as important is to know the generic behaviour of the aggressor, specifically if he exerts some sort of action on the evidences, the type of behaviour towards his wife and the degree of acceptance of the facts with the police (Ressler, Douglas, Burgess, & Burgess, 1992).

Scientific research has not established a clear relationship between harassment, domestic violence and homicide. However, some data show that harassment can contribute and be a significant factor in the identification of domestic batterers (Meloy, 1996; Tjaden & Thoennens, 2000; Walker & Meloy, 1998), as well as in domestic homicides without a previous record of aggressive behaviour (Soria, 2005).

Thus, considering the criminal act to be a consequence of the interaction between the different areas of personality and the social context where the aggressor develops his criminal conduct, it is relevant to clarify which thematic areas coincide or diverge in the groups under study (Canter et al., 1990).

Based on the information of previous research on domestic violence, criminal profiles and the prediction of violent behaviour, this paper will try to distinguish the possible existence of a different profile for domestic homicides with a previous history of aggression towards their wives (VH), domestic homicides without previous violence (H) and batterers that had not previously attempted to murder their wives (B). We have subsequently obtained the information from convicted aggressors in order to infer the characteristics of a specific group of criminal actions, following the techniques frequently proposed to define a criminal psychological profile (Geberth, 1981; Holmes & De Burger, 1988).

In our field study, the areas of analysis developed in the search of a psychological profile are based on the background of the conduct and its planning, the crime scene, post-criminal conducts, victimology and forensic findings, as well as the psychosocial past of the aggressor (Geberth, 1981; Towl & Crighton, 1996).

Method

Participants

The sample was formed by 46 individuals convicted in prisons of Spain for crimes related to aggressions to their partners, homicides and/or domestic batterers. All of them were men with an average of 40 years of age ($SD=5.2$). For granting privacy and anonymity, more specific information about the characteristics of the sample is omitted.

Procedure and design

The individuals which could be part of the sample were identified from the whole of the inmate population using prison reports and/or court decisions. Once the records of the individuals that met the requirements to take part in the research were reviewed, they were located inside the prison. According to the type of crime committed, they were provisionally included in one of the three research groups, although their ultimate placing had to be confirmed later on during the interviews.

After they were informed of the aims of the research, the terms and conditions of confidentiality and the anonymity of the interview, they were asked to voluntarily accept to cooperate with the research. In a later moment they were given the DAPP (hetero-applied) by way of a personal semi-structured interview in the prison with an approximate length of 3 hours.

The sample was divided into three experimental conditions: 11 homicides without previous violence (H), 9 violent homicides (VH) and 26 batterers without previous homicide attempts (B). The inclusion criteria followed were the following: in the group of "homicides without violence" (H): being imprisoned for homicide with a romantic relationship between aggressor and victim and without episodes of physical, psychological or sexual violence prior to the criminal event or in situations in which the homicide was not perpetrated due to any accidental circumstance; in the group of violent homicides (VH): being imprisoned for homicide or homicide attempt failed due to accidental circumstances and having previously exerted violence of any type on their partner; "non homicidal batterers" (B): the existence of a romantic relationship between

aggressor and victim, at least two episodes of physical, psychological and/or sexual domestic violence and absence of any homicide attempt.

Measurement instrument

In order to reach the goals settled for the research an *ad hoc* questionnaire called DAPP (Domestic Aggressor Psychological Profile) was created. This comprised the following dimensions:

0. Identity information: this section comprises two parts related to *identification-assignment criteria* and *sincerity in the answers* (related with the admission and description of the facts given as proven in sentence).
1. Sociodemographical information: comprises age of both victim and aggressor, age difference between the two of them, level of education, social status, intellectual level, type of employment basis, and employment situation.
2. Sociofamiliar characteristics of the aggressor: comprises questions related to *structural characteristics of the family*, *internal characteristics of the family* and *personal experiences of the aggressor lived during childhood or teenage years*.
3. Couple relationship: comprises items *characteristics of previous relationships*, *internal characteristics of the current relationship* and *external characteristics of the current relationship*.
4. Domestic violence: comprises *general characteristics* and *profile of the aggressor* (related with the risk of violence).
5. Motivation of the aggressor: comprises questions about the *personality of the aggressor* and the *elements that triggered the aggression*.
6. Aggressive behaviour: comprises items about *generic criminal behaviour of the aggressor*, *harassment conduct* and *post-aggressive context*.

Results

All three groups were different in the sincerity variable (see Table 1). Post-hoc Scheffe test showed, in comparison with the VH ($p<.001$) and B ($p<.001$) groups, higher sincerity in the H group as regards the admission and description of the facts. Furthermore, the H group, exhibited a lower the risk of future violence than the VH ($p<.001$) and B ($p<.001$) groups.

Table 1. Sincerity and risk of future violence.

Variable	MS	F	p	M_H	M_{VH}	M_B
Sincerity	47.00	15.20	.000	7.45	5.88	3.95
Risk of future violence	60.88	15.08	.000	3.00	6.77	6.90

Note: $df(2,43)$.

As far as sociodemographical characteristics are concerned, in the B group the levels of education, $\chi^2(1)=5.11$; $p<.05$, and social status, $\chi^2(1)=17.43$; $p<.001$, were found to be lower as compared to the VH group, and in the B group intellectual capacity, $\chi^2(1)=9.01$; $p<.01$, and level of education, $\chi^2(1)=5.80$; $p<.05$, were also found to be lower as compared to the H group.

The analysis of the characteristics of development during childhood and youth didn't show any significant difference between groups. In other words, no differences were observed in the position in the order of brothers, in the presence of domestic violence in the family of reference; in aggressions to parents, in cruelty against animals and in property damage.

When analysing the couple relationship, it was observed how aggressors from the H group were more worried about offering the social image of a «good family», $\chi^2(1)=4.95$; $p<.05$, than those in the B group.

Results concerning motivation displayed remarkable differences, $\chi^2(1)=11.93$; $p<.001$, in the comparison of the H group with the B group: the former showed a stronger dissatisfaction concerning the unachieved ideal woman. Nevertheless, no

differences were observed mediated by personality. In the rest of motivation variables the three groups were analogous.

In relation to violent behaviour, differences appeared between the B and the VH, $\chi^2(1)=12.681$; $p<.001$, and H, $\chi^2(1)=11.93$; $p<.001$, groups in the use of extreme physical force during the aggression: The batterers use less physical force in their aggressions. Moreover, the H group, as compared to the B, carried out the first aggression later in time, $\chi^2(1)=5.8$; $p<.05$, used less verbal threats during the assault, $\chi^2(1)=11.2$; $p<.001$, didn't explain the inner conflicts of the couple to the extended family and tended to muffle domestic problems, $\chi^2(1)=7.34$; $p<.01$, and the period of time between the beginning of the romantic relationship and the manifestation of violence was lesser in the H group than in the violent groups, VH, $\chi^2(1)=9.71$; $p<.001$, and B, $\chi^2(1)=4.58$; $p<.05$. However, no groups' differences were registered in self-control during the events; the use of weapons; the perception of risk from the victim; the organization of the crime scene; the harassment; the place of the aggression; the level of dependency of the victim or the aggressor from their partner and the existence of sexual problems; suicidal reactions; and the acceptance of the events in front of the court.

Discussion

Prior to drawing conclusions and assumptions from the results, two limitations of this study should be addressed. First, previous results are biased to error type I by the small size of the subsamples. Second, as a transversal study, this should be complemented with a longitudinal one to generalize data from domestic violence to homicide, as the study seems to hint. Bearing in mind the previously mentioned limitations, the following implications may be drawn.

In conclusion, the results obtained in this research don't support firmly the independence of the three different psychological profiles defined. Moreover, the profiles designed by Dutton (1995; Dutton & Starzomski, 1994) based on the personality of the aggressor are not confirmed by the evidence. However, according to the proposal of Canter *et al* (1990), data draw an interaction between personality traits and criminal behaviour. Thus, the violent groups, B and VH, share more common

characteristics than homicidal, VH and H. This holds the existence of a continued pattern of aggressiveness that stands as a main axis in personality and the way of relating to the victim, acting as medium to grab and hold power in the couple (Berkowitz, 1993; Carlston, 1977; Cerezo, 1998).

The risk of future violence, that identifies the violent groups (VH and B), is in line with previous research on the prediction of domestic violence with batterers (Campbell, 1995; Echeburúa, 1994; Hotaling & Sugarman, 1986). In consequence, specific programs for relapse prevention in cases of violent offenders must be designed and implemented.

The differences found between groups VH and B in the level of education and social status, as well as those between groups H and B in the level of education and the intellectual capacity may be interpreted as a confirmation of the weight of these elements in stress mitigation, reducing the chances of aggressive conducts turning up on a regular basis depending on the psychological resources available to the person (Berkowitz, 1993).

The low need to display socially the appearance of a good family and not explaining the violent facts to the extended family in B group should be understood as an attempt to silent the inner conflicts in the couple (Wolfgang & Ferracuti, 1967), boosting the self-confidence of the offender due to the lack of an answer from society (Dutton, 1995; Goldstein & Rosenbaum, 1985), and eventually falling scarcely into his own perception of the violence exerted (Frieze, 1983). However, this assumption change to deny his responsibility in the events once has been detected as the literature has remarked (e.g., Henning & Holdford, 2006).

The smaller period of time between the beginning of the romantic relationship and the manifestation of violence in the VH as confronted to the H group contradicts previous research on domestic violence that supports the need by the aggressor of a variable period of time in order to position the victim inside a relationship of power (Coleman et al., 1980; Dobash & Dobash, 1979; Hasting & Hamberger, 1988; Straus, 1977-78, Straus, Gelles, & Steinmetz, 1980) starting at the same time a escalation process of violence (Erchak, 1984; Steinmetz, 1977a, 1977b) and linking it much more to cognitive-affective rumination processes (Cobo, 2007).

The temporary interruption of violence after the report to the police is a restraint that does not solve the aggression on the woman (Brody & Tarling, 1980; Sonkin et al., 1985) if no action is taken on its causes in situations where violent individuals are involved (Sonkin & Durphy, 1982). Accordingly, whenever the individual has no previous record of battering but desires his wife's death (H) the report to the police has little effect because the death is related to other issues that are not directly linked to domestic violence. On the contrary, when the individual is a batterer, it proceeds as a temporary restraint, but does not prevent the later return to violent actions, be them homicidal (VH) or not (B). This may be attributed to a temporary need to restructure, from a cognitive point of view, the new situations created after the report that do not affect the background of motivations that generate violence.

The higher use of verbal threats during the aggression in group H as compared to group B ratifies previous studies on domestic violence and serves as a way of submitting the victim to the will of the aggressor and advertising her of the negative consequences should she deny his requirements (Echeburúa, 1994; Gelles, 1974; Roy, 1982), acting as an element that boosts of the circle of violence (Steinmetz, 1977a, 1977b).

The high weight of the unachieved ideal of woman in group H as compared to group B, in concordance with previous studies, points out to a poor consideration of women in the latter (Roy, 1982; Sonkin et al., 1985), and especially a low perception of the risk of losing the partner as an object, consequence of a higher self-confidence (Goldstein & Rosenbaum, 1985; Hastings & Hamberger, 1988).

Finally, the sincerity variable points out the existence of different concerns in the acceptance of the facts and provide a chance to reach a deeper level of knowledge of the criminal psychological motivation.

In short, based on the results of the study two general conclusions may be drawn. First, the existence of two basic psychological profiles in domestic violence, one that is based on a recurring pattern of aggressiveness and may or may not end up in homicide, and another one, in line with recent Spanish research (Cobo, 2007), that leads to homicide without previous episodes of violence. Second, data do not support the pertinence of psychosocial and evolutionary factors showed in previous studies.

References

- American Psychological Association (1996). *Violence in the family: A report of the American Psychological Association*. Washington DC: Presidential Task Force on Violence and the Family.
- Baldry, A. C. (2002). From domestic violence to stalking: The infinite cycle of violence. In J. Boon, & L. Sheridan (Eds.), *Stalking and psychosexual obsession* (pp. 83-104). London: Wiley and Sons.
- Berkowitz, L. (1993). *Aggression: Its causes, consequences and control*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Bograd, M. (1988). Feminist perspectives on wife abuse: An introduction. In K. Yllo, & M. Bograd (Eds.), *Feminist perspectives on wife abuse* (pp. 3-28). Beverly Hills: Sage.
- Bowlby, J. (1984). Violence in the family disorder of the attachment and caregiving systems. *The American Journal of Psychoanalysis*, 44, 9-27.
- Brody, S., & Tarling, R. (1980). *Taking offenders out of circulation*. London: HMSO.
- Browne, A. (1987). *When battered women kill*. New York: Free press.
- Campbell, J. C. (1995). *Assessing dangerousness: Violence by sexual offenders, batterers and child abusers*. Thousand Oaks: Sage.
- Canter, D. V., & Heritage, R. C. (1990). *Developments in offender profiling*. Home Office: Guilford Press.
- Carlson, B. E. (1977). Battered women and their assailants. *Social Casework*, 22, 455-460.
- Cerezo, A. (1998). *La relación entre malos tratos domésticos y homicidios entre parejas. Tratamiento criminológico*. Málaga: Servicio de Publicaciones de la Universidad de Málaga.
- Cobo, J. A. (2007). *La prevención de la muerte homicida doméstica: Un nuevo enfoque*. Zaragoza: El Justicia de Aragón.

- Coleman, K. H. (1980). Conjugal violence: what 33 men report? *Journal of Marital Family Therapy*, 6, 207-213.
- Coleman, K. H., Weinman, M., & Hsi, B. (1980). Factors affecting conjugal violence. *Journal of Psychology*, 105, 197-202.
- Corsi, J., Domen, M. L., & Sotés, M. A. (1995). *Violencia masculina en la pareja. Una aproximación al diagnóstico y a los modelos de intervención*. Buenos Aires: Paidós.
- Currie, D. W. (1983). A Toronto model. *Social Work with Groups*, 6, 179-188.
- Dobash, R. E., & **Dobash, R.**, P. (1979). *Violence against wives: A case against the patriarchy*. New York: Free Press.
- Dobash, R. E., **Dobash, R.**, P., & Noaks, L. (1995). *Gender and crime*. Cardiff: University of Wales Press.
- Dutton, D. G. (1995). *The batterer: A psychological profile*. New York: Basic Books.
- Dutton, D. G., & Starzomski A. J. (1994). Psychological differences between court referred and self-referred wife assaulters. *Criminal Justice and Behaviour*, 22(1), 203-222.
- Echeburúa, E. (1994). *Personalidades violentas*. Madrid: Pirámide.
- Erchak, G. M. (1984). The escalation and maintenance of spouse abuse: A cybernetic model. *Victimology: An International Journal*, 2(9), 247-253.
- Ewing, C. (1987). *Battered women who kill*. New York: Lexington.
- Farrington, D. P. (1978). The family backgrounds of aggressive youths. In L. A. Hersov, M. Berger, & D. Shaffer (Eds.), *Aggression and antisocial behaviour in childhood and adolescence* (pp. 73-93). Oxford: Pergamon Press.
- Finkelhor, D. (1979). *Sexually victimized children*. New York: Free Press.
- Finkelhor, D. (1984). *Child sexual abuse*. New York: Free Press.
- Frieze, I. H. (1983). Investigating the causes and consequences of marital rape. *Signs*, 8(3), 532-533.
- Gayford, J. J. (1975). Wife battering: A preliminary summary of 100 cases. *British Medical Journal*, 1, 195-197.

- Geberth, V. (1981). Psychological profiling. *Law & Order*, 29, 46-49.
- Gelles, R. J. (1974). *The violent home*. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.
- Goldstein, D., & Rosenbaum, A. (1985). An evaluation of self-esteem of maritally violent men. *Family Relations*, 34, 425-428.
- Hastings, J. E., & Hamberger, L. K. (1988). Personality characteristics of spouse abusers: A controlled comparison. *Violence and Victims*, 3(1), 31-48.
- Henning, K., & Holdford, R. (2006). Minimization, denial and victim blaming by batterers: How much the truth matter? *Criminal Justice and Behavior*, 33(1), 110-130.
- Holmes R. M., & De Burger, J. (1988). *Serial murder*. Newbury Park: CA Sage.
- Hotaling, G. T., & Sugarman, D. B. (1986). An analysis of risk markers in husband to wife violence: The current state of knowledge. *Violence and Victims*, 1, 101-124.
- Koss, M. P. (1990). The women's mental health research agenda: Violence against women. *American Psychologist*, 45(3), 374-380.
- Lystad, M. (1986). *Violence in the home. Interdisciplinary perspectives*. New York: Brunner/Mazel, Publishers.
- McCord, J., & McCord, W. (1958). The effects of parental role model on criminality. *Journal of Social Issues*, 14, 66-74.
- Meloy, J. R. (1992). *Violent attachments*. Northvale: Jason Aronson.
- Meloy, J. R. (1996). Stalking (obsessional following): A review of some preliminary studies. *Aggression and Violent Behaviour*, 1, 47- 162.
- Murray, A., Straus, M., & Hotaling, G. T. (1980). *The social causes of husband –wife violence*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- National Crime Victim Survey (2004). Washington DC: National Institute of Justice.
- Ressler R. K., Douglas J. E., Burgess, A. W., & Burgess, A. G. (1992). *Crime classification manual*. New York: Simon & Schuster.
- Roy, M. (1982). *The abusive partners*. New York: Van Nostrand Reinhold.
- Russell, D. E. (1982). *Rape in marriage*. New York: Macmillan.

- Sonkin, D., Martin, D., & Walker, L. E. (1985). *The male batterer*. New York: Springer.
- Sonkin, D., & Durphy, M. (1982). *Learning to live without violence*. San Francisco: Volcano Press.
- Soria, M. A., & Rodríguez, L. (2003). Perfil psicológico del homicida doméstico. *Anuario de Psicología Jurídica*, 13, 9-26.
- Soria, M. A. (2005). La conducta de acoso en maltratadores y homicidas domésticos. *Intervención Psicosocial*, 14(2), 177-189.
- Steel, B. F., & Pollack, C. (1974). A psychiatric study of parents who abuse infants and small children. In R. Helfer, & C. Kempe (Eds.), *The battered child*. Chicago: Chicago University Press.
- Steinmetz, S. K. (1977a). *The cycle of violence: Assertive aggressive and abusive family interaction*. New York: Praeger.
- Steinmetz, S. K. (1977b). *The cycle of violence*. New York: Praeger.
- Straus, M. A., Gelles, R., & Steinmetz, S. (1980). *Behind the doors*. New York: Doubleday.
- Stroshine, M., & Robinson, A. (2003). The decision to end abusive relationships: the role of offender characteristics. *Criminal Justice and Behaviour*, 30(1), 97-117.
- Tjaden, P., & Thoennes, N. (2000). Prevalence and consequences of male-to-female and female-to-male partner violence as measured by national violence against women survey. *Violence against Women*, 6, 142-162.
- Towl, G. J., & Crighton, D. A. (1996). *Psychology for forensic practitioners*. New York: Routledge.
- Walker, L. E. A. (1979). *The battered women*. New York: Harper & Row.
- Walker, L. E. A. (1984). *The battered women syndrome*. New York: Springer.
- Walker, L. E. A. (1989). *Terrifying love: Why battered women kill and how society responds*. New York: Harper and Row.
- Walker, L.E.A., & Meloy, J. R. (1998). Stalking and domestic violence. In J. R. Meloy (Ed.), *The psychology of stalking: Clinical and forensic perspective* (pp. 139-160). San Diego, CA: Academic press.

Wolfgang, M. E. (1958). *Patterns in criminal homicide*. New York: Wiley.

Wolfgang, M. E., & Ferracuti, F. (1967). *Victims, aggressors and the family secret: An exploration into family violence*. Minnesota: Department of Public Welfare.

Instructions

Presentation

The *European Journal of Psychology Applied to Legal Context*, the Official Journal of the Sociedad Española de Psicología Jurídica y Forense, publishes empirical articles, theoretical studies and focused reviews of topics dealing with psychology and law (e.g., legal decision making, eyewitness). Papers driven to both legal systems, inquisitorial and adversarial, will be welcome as well as papers based in concrete laws of a European country. Neither the Editors nor Publishers accept responsibility for the views or statements expressed by the authors.

Paper submission

Manuscripts should be submitted electronically to the Editors to the e-mail address of the journal (ejpalc@usc.es). Postal address should be used exceptionally (The European Journal of Psychology Applied to Legal Context, Facultad de Psicología, Universidad de Santiago de Compostela, E-15782 Santiago, Spain). Submission of a paper to this journal implies that it represents original work not previously published, and that it is not being considered elsewhere for publication.

Review

The manuscripts will be reviewed by two external blind referees. The reviews are anonymous for authors and reviewers. Author identities will be removed before sending out a manuscript to the reviewers.

Copyright

Authors submitting a manuscript do so with the understanding that if it is accepted for publication the copyright of the manuscript, including the reproduction of the paper in all forms and media, shall be transferred to the publisher.

Permissions and responsibility

The author is responsible for obtaining permission necessary to quote from other works, to reproduce material already published, and to reprint from other publications. The opinions expressed and the contents of the paper are under exclusive responsibility of the author(s) and do not reflect the point of view of The European Journal of Psychology Applied to Legal Context.

Style

Manuscripts must be adhere to the instructions on references, tables, figures, abstract, format, narrative style, etc. as described in the Publication Manual of the American Psychological Association (5th edition). Manuscripts that do not fit to the style set forth in this manual will not be considered for publication.

Check list of requirements

The abstract should be 150-200 words.

Title page (include the authors' name, affiliations, full contact details).

Full paper text (double spaced with numbered pages and anonymised).

References (APA style).

Tables and figures placed at the end of the paper or attached separately.

CONTENTS

Articles

- A social desirability scale for the MMPI-2. Which of the two: Wiggins (WSD) or Edwards (ESD)?
Fernando Jiménez, Guadalupe Sánchez and Cristina Tobón 147
- Norms in social representations: Two studies with French young drivers
Sandrine Gaymard 165
- Implication degree and delay on recall of events: An experimental and HDV study
Antonio L. Manzanero, Sofián El-Astal and Javier Aróztegui 183
- Homicide and domestic violence. Are there different psychological profiles mediated by previous violence exerted on the victim?
Miguel Ángel Soria, Inmaculada Armadans, María Rosa Viñas and Montserrat Yepes 205
- Discriminating real victims from feigners of psychological injury in gender violence: Validating a protocol for forensic settings.
Manuel Vilariño, Francisca Fariña and Ramón Arce 221