How perpetrators see themselves?

Aldona Stodulska – Blaszke[1][A,D,E,F], Anna Wójcicka[2][A,B,D,E,F]

[1.] II Klinika Psychiatrii i Rehabilitacji Psychiatrycznej Katedry Psychiatrii Uniwersytetu Medycznego w Lublinie
[2.] I Klinika Psychiatrii, Psychoterapii i Wczesnej Interwencji Katedry Psychiatrii Uniwersytetu Medycznego w Lublinie

Abstract

The aim of our study was to investigate the relationship between self-image and the intensity of various kinds of aggressiveness in the imprisoned perpetrators of domestic violence pursuant to Art. 207 of the Penal Code (physical and mental abuse) based on data obtained from these perpetrators regarding functioning of their generational family.

The study involved 37 men - perpetrators of domestic violence, currently serving a sentence of imprisonment. They were convicted due to the recognition of their guilt for physical abuse and psychological torment of their families. The average age of subjects was 42.3 years. The control group consisted of 32 men, never convicted. The average age was 37 years. The following research methods were used: Adjective Test ACL, the scale "Moods and humors" and the Community Interview of own design.

Statistically significant difference is visible in indirect aggression – it is higher in the group of perpetrators who experienced domestic violence in their generational families; however in general there is a higher severity and also various kinds of global aggression in the group of offenders who experienced violence in their generational families. Stepwise linear regression results indicate that the use of violence are explained by the following characteristics of the self-image: rejecting attitude towards other people, lack of persistence and impulsiveness, tendency to break the social norms, lack of accountability, autonomy, planning and predicting the effects of own actions.

The results show an important role of generational family environment and parents' attitudes in particular for future satisfactory social functioning.

Keywords: domestic violence, aggression perpetrators of domestic violence, self - image

Introduction

There is a multilevel phenomenon of domestic violence. According to quite vast literature the factors influencing domestic violence are the following: biological factors (for example micro-damages), psychological ones (for example perpetrator's personality traits including weak self-control), environmental (learning about violent behaviors in generational families). Using psychoactive substances is not without significance, either. The rest and equally important factors are lack of work, difficult financial situation, slackness of social norms [1].

The newest results of the report of The European Union Agency for Fundamental Rights show Poland in a positive light. According to the Agency, in Poland the index of violence experienced by women from their partners is the lowest in the European Union (three times lower than in Sweden) and the index of recording violent acts by the police is very high. The results of the Agency research indicate that women experience the most violence in Nordic countries: in Denmark 52%, Finland – 47%, Sweden – 46%, Netherlands – 45%, France and Great Britain – 44% and Poland – 19%. The average result for the countries of the European Union is 33% [2].

Although Poland compares favorably with other countries but the phenomenon of violence is present in our country and it is important that anti-violence strategies are still performed; it includes formation of organization offering support and help for victims of domestic violence. Despite of the fact the many works and research (including ours ones) regarding risk factors of domestic violence have been reported, it is still significant to describe and study this phenomenon and these data could be used in the therapy process in both victims and perpetrators of domestic violence.

Aim

The aim of the research was to study correlations between self-picture and severity of various kinds of aggressiveness in perpetrators of domestic violence who are imprisoned pursuant to Art. 207 of the Penal Code (physical and mental abuse) - based on data obtained from them, regarding functioning of their generational family.

Material and method

We examined 37 men, perpetrators of domestic violence currently taking imprisonment. All individuals were convicted by the final judgement due to pronouncing them guilty for physical and psychological abuse of their intimates.

The following research methods were used: Gough's and Heilbrun's Adjective Test ACL (in Polish Płużek development), the scale "Moods and humors " by Busse and Durkee and the Community Interview of own design.

Results

The average age of the group was 42.35 years. The largest group was perpetrators with vocational education - 40.5%, next with primary education – 27.7%, higher education – 16.2% and secondary – 13.5%. The most of the group (54.05%) lived in cities with over 100,000 inhabitants, 16.22% of them lived in smaller towns and 29.73% lived in the countryside. Before the arrest most of individuals had a regular job (29.73%) or casual work (21.62%) and 16.22% had sickness pension. Social assistance was in the case of 10.81% . As concerns the marital status, 67.57% of examined people were married and the remainders were in other relationships.

The picture of the generational family was as follows: perpetrators' parents had mainly primary and secondary education. Higher education was reported by16% of fathers and 13% of mothers. Parents of majority of the examined people were married (59.46%) and 13.51% were divorced. The significant problem in the generational families was parental alcohol abuse (37.84%). Similar results were obtained in the field of presence of violence at family home – it was reported in 40.54% of families. Sexual abuse by father in childhood was confirmed by 5.41% of the examined individuals . In 51.43% of perpetrators physical punishment was experienced during childhood and 30.56% of them often heard vulgarisms then.

The control group consisted of 32 men who have never been convicted of any crime. The average age was 37 years in this group. More than 60% of them lived in the city. The most individuals had vocational and primary education. None of the persons in the control group met the criteria for alcohol dependence. Physical abuse from the parents was experienced by 6.25% of them.

The results (Table 1) indicate that domestic violence perpetrators appeared as pessimistic individuals as far as vision of the future is concerned, unstable in behaviors, easily and quickly undergoing aggression, revealing hostility toward other people. They easily engage in behaviors that emotionally hurt others. Their reactions are rather strong, impulsive, often not enough controllable. They pay no heed to the rules and accepted environmental norms. They easily get angry, are rather indifferent to the others' affairs and their narcissism makes them almost insensitive to reactions they provoke. They care little about the reactions what their behaviors may cause in others. They feel uneasy about adult life requirements, they rather easily become disorganized under stress and various situations that they subjectively assess as difficult ones. At the same time the examined perpetrators revealed a need to emotional support, kindness and good feelings from other people. They have a need of getting help from some close persons, they want to be encouraged, to get advice and forgiveness; they do not feel enough strong to confront stress and crises of everyday life. It is connected with (revealed in the study) their need to self-humiliate through expression of the feeling of inferiority by the self-criticism, admitting to mistakes and failures, experiencing low self-confidence. Realizing own character traits they revealed readiness to advice and help from other people to improve their own situation, their role and place in life.

The results of the ACL from domestic violence perpetrators coming from families where violence was used and not used – were compared by t-Student test to verify the hypothesis that self-pictures of perpetrators who experienced violence in the generational family are different from self-picture of perpetrators who did not experience such violence. Test t-Student was used because – if there is more than 30 individuals in each of compared groups then the assumption of normality of the distribution is not critical assumption due to central boundary theorem which says that distribution of the sample is normal regardless of the distribution of the variable in population [3,4,5].

Table 1. Results of ACL scale in perpetrators group (mean and standard deviation)

	M	SD
1.No-Ckd (number of adjectives checked)	38,78	9,08
2. Fav (number of favorable adjectives)	42,86	9,42
3. Unfav (number of unfavorable adjectives)	52,97	14,53
4.Com (communality)	37,17	8,13
5. Ach (achievement)	46,36	11,73
6. Dom (dominance)	46,47	9,90
7. End (endurance)	45,69	13,15
8. Ord (order)	47,78	11,88
9. Int (intraception)	42,22	8,62
10. Nur (nurturance)	45,67	9,11
11. Aff (affiliation)	43,75	8,87
12. Het (heterosexuality)	48,42	12,02
13. Exh (exhibition)	49,31	9,67
14. Aut (autonomy)	51,00	9,19
15. Agg (aggression)	52,78	10,11
16. Cha (change)	44,97	7,22
17. Suc (succorance)	53,58	11,05
18.Aba (abasement)	52,06	8,86
19. Def (deference)	49,06	9,09
20. Crs (counselling readiness scale)	50,00	10,14
21. S-Cn (self-control)	47,44	10,60
22. S-Cfd self-confidence)	46,19	11,78
23. P-adj (personal adjustment)	43,89	9,60
24. Iss (ideal self scale)	47,61	14,60
25. Cps (creative personality scale)	47,69	8,58
26. Mls (military leadership scale)	42,97	9,53
27. Mas (masculine attributes scale)	48,86	9,24
28. Fem (feminine attributes scale)	47,56	6,65
29. 30. Cp (critical parent)	50,97	8,28
30. Np (nurturing parent)	46,11	10,90
31. A (adult)	41,25	11,67
32. Fc (free child)	46,44	8,78
33. Ac (adapted child)	53,86	10,20

Table 2. The comparison of self-picture in violence perpetrators who experienced and not experienced violence in generational family

	Perpetrators without violence in family		Perpetrators with violence in family			
	M	SD	M	SD	t	p
1.No-Ckd (number of adjectives checked)	36,35	7,67	42,13	9,98	-1,94	**0,061**
2. Fav (number of favorable adjectives)	44,70	11,25	40,80	5,86	1,22	0,231
3. Unfav (number of unfavorable adjectives)	50,95	14,79	56,73	13,97	-1,17	0,250
4.Com (communality)	38,05	9,80	36,00	5,25	0,73	0,468
5. Ach (achievement)	46,95	14,66	46,20	6,52	0,18	0,855
6. Dom (dominance)	47,10	11,71	46,27	7,19	0,24	0,810
7. End (endurance)	47,85	15,23	43,40	9,63	0,99	0,329
8. Ord (order)	49,90	13,44	45,67	9,31	1,04	0,304
9. Int (intraception)	44,45	9,16	39,60	7,22	1,69	0,100
10. Nur (nurturance)	47,25	8,06	44,13	10,36	1,00	0,324
11. Aff (affiliation)	44,75	10,14	42,87	7,05	0,62	0,542
12. Het (heterosexuality)	47,25	10,50	50,73	13,93	-0,84	0,404
13. Exh (exhibition)	47,55	9,19	52,47	9,88	-1,52	0,139
14. Aut (autonomy)	49,55	7,97	53,87	10,36	-1,39	0,173
15. Agg (aggression)	50,80	9,02	56,47	10,87	-1,69	0,101
16. Cha (change)	44,00	6,72	46,80	7,78	-1,14	0,262
17. Suc (succorance)	54,35	11,94	53,67	10,14	0,18	0,859
18.Aba (abasement)	53,15	7,29	51,60	10,81	0,51	0,616
19. Def (deference)	51,40	8,34	46,73	9,64	1,53	0,135
20. Crs (counselling readiness scale)	51,55	10,80	48,80	9,32	0,79	0,435
21. S-Cn (self-control)	50,25	8,87	44,40	12,05	1,66	0,107
22. S-Cfd self-confidence)	46,50	13,66	46,40	9,16	0,02	0,981
23. P-adj (personal adjustment)	46,00	11,11	41,53	6,64	1,38	0,177
24. Iss (ideal self scale)	48,60	14,66	47,00	14,97	0,32	0,753
25. Cps (creative personality scale)	47,35	8,62	48,87	8,75	-0,51	0,612
26. Mls (military leadership scale)	44,65	11,41	41,13	6,03	1,08	0,287
27. Mas (masculine attributes scale)	48,85	8,80	49,67	10,09	-0,26	0,800
28. Fem (feminine attributes scale)	46,60	5,93	49,53	7,37	-1,31	0,201
29. 30. Cp (critical parent)	51,05	8,18	51,80	8,67	-0,26	0,795
30. Np (nurturing parent)	47,85	12,18	44,40	8,95	0,92	0,362
31. A (adult)	44,20	12,18	37,60	10,14	1,70	0,098
32. Fc (free child)	44,85	8,47	49,20	8,83	-1,48	0,149
33. Ac (adapted child)	52,95	12,09	56,20	6,94	-0,93	0,359

The comparison of self-pictures of domestic violence perpetrators who experienced and not experienced such violence in the generation family indicated that these individuals differed in global number of chosen adjectives. Perpetrators who experienced domestic violence in their generational family seem to be more unstable in reactions, self-centred, less responsible, less constant and reflective than perpetrators who did not experience violence from their nearest people in the generational family (table 2).

In the next stage we compared self-pictures between domestic violence perpetrators and the subjects who did not use violence (control group) to characterise the perpetrators group more precisely (table 3).

The comparison of self-picture between domestic violence perpetrators and the subjects not using violence (control group) revealed that statistically significant differences concern global number of chosen adjectives (in perpetrators group: higher instability in relations, self-concentration, low responsibility, lower stability and reflectiveness), the need to have achievements (higher in control group), the need to dominate (higher in control group), the need to persist and order (higher in control group). More detailed comparison performed between self-pictures of perpetrators who experienced domestic violence in generational family and control group provides similar data as in comparison between the whole group of perpetrators and the control group, adding some more information (table 3).

Statistically significant differences concern the global number of chosen adjectives, the number of positive and negative adjectives, the need to have achievements, the need to persist, order, understanding of oneself and others, the need to have affiliation. Violence perpetrators who experienced violence in their generational families appeared as pessimistic in future vision, unstable in action, more easily showing aggression in comparison with the subjects from the control group (table 4).

Table 3. The comparison of self-picture between domestic violence perpetrators and men not using violence (control group)

	Control group		Violence perpetrators			
	M	SD	M	SD	t	p
1.No-Ckd (number of adjectives checked)	34,08	4,29	38,83	9,08	-2,81	**0,007**
2. Fav (number of favorable adjectives)	46,57	7,96	43,03	9,42	1,73	0,089
3. Unfav (number of unfavorable adjectives)	48,35	8,53	53,43	14,53	-1,80	0,078
4.Com (communality)	39,08	7,87	37,17	8,13	1,01	0,315
5. Ach (achievement)	52,65	7,55	46,63	11,73	2,57	**0,013**
6. Dom (dominance)	51,27	9,98	46,74	9,90	1,93	**0,058**
7. End (endurance)	53,89	9,67	45,94	13,15	2,93	**0,005**
8. Ord (order)	55,51	10,50	48,09	11,88	2,81	**0,006**
9. Int (intraception)	45,84	7,40	42,37	8,62	1,83	0,071
10. Nur (nurturance)	49,11	6,04	45,91	9,11	1,74	0,086
11. Aff (affiliation)	49,22	8,20	43,94	8,87	2,62	**0,011**
12. Het (heterosexuality)	48,22	9,89	48,74	12,02	-0,20	0,839
13. Exh (exhibition)	52,46	9,16	49,66	9,67	1,26	0,211
14. Aut (autonomy)	48,73	4,72	51,40	9,19	-1,54	0,130
15. Agg (aggression)	51,59	6,75	53,23	10,11	-0,80	0,426
16. Cha (change)	43,51	8,44	45,20	7,22	-0,91	0,367
17. Suc (succorance)	49,35	8,11	54,06	11,05	-2,07	**0,042**
18.Aba (abasement)	48,81	7,71	52,49	8,86	-1,88	0,064
19. Def (deference)	48,38	5,60	49,40	9,09	-0,57	0,571
20. Crs (counselling readiness scale)	46,89	10,24	50,37	10,14	-1,45	0,152
21. S-Cn (self-control)	49,73	8,02	47,74	10,60	0,90	0,371
22. S-Cfd self-confidence)	52,19	9,98	46,46	11,78	2,23	0,029
23. P-adj (personal adjustment)	47,78	7,33	44,09	9,60	1,84	0,070
24. Iss (ideal self scale)	55,08	9,85	47,91	14,60	2,43	0,018
25. Cps (creative personality scale)	49,03	8,66	48,00	8,58	0,51	0,615
26. Mls (military leadership scale)	46,73	6,66	43,14	9,53	1,84	0,070
27. Mas (masculine attributes scale)	47,84	8,30	49,20	9,24	-0,66	0,512
28. Fem (feminine attributes scale)	46,30	9,22	47,86	6,65	-0,82	0,415
29. 30. Cp (critical parent)	51,78	6,90	51,37	8,28	0,23	0,819
30. Np (nurturing parent)	50,54	7,13	46,37	10,90	1,91	0,061
31. A (adult)	48,16	8,48	41,37	11,67	2,84	0,006
32. Fc (free child)	51,11	9,66	46,71	8,78	2,02	0,048
33. Ac (adapted child)	49,08	8,33	54,34	10,20	-2,40	0,019

Table 4. Comparison of self-picture between perpetrators who experienced domestic violence in generational family and men not using violence (control group)

	Perpetrators experiencing violence in family		Control group			
	M	SD	M	SD	t	p
1.No-Ckd (number of adjectives checked)	42,13	9,98	34,08	4,29	3,01	**0,008**
2. Fav (number of favorable adjectives)	40,80	5,86	46,57	7,96	-2,54	**0,014**
3. Unfav (number of unfavorable adjectives)	56,73	13,97	48,35	8,53	2,17	**0,044**
4.Com (communality)	36,00	5,25	39,08	7,87	-1,39	0,170
5. Ach (achievement)	46,20	6,52	52,65	7,55	-2,89	**0,006**
6. Dom (dominance)	46,27	7,19	51,27	9,98	-1,76	0,084
7. End (endurance)	43,40	9,63	53,89	9,67	-3,55	**0,001**
8. Ord (order)	45,67	9,31	55,51	10,50	-3,16	**0,003**
9. Int (intraception)	39,60	7,22	45,84	7,40	-2,77	**0,008**
10. Nur (nurturance)	44,13	10,36	49,11	6,04	-1,74	0,098
11. Aff (affiliation)	42,87	7,05	49,22	8,20	-2,63	**0,011**
12. Het (heterosexuality)	50,73	13,93	48,22	9,89	0,74	0,465
13. Exh (exhibition)	52,47	9,88	52,46	9,16	0,00	0,998
14. Aut (autonomy)	53,87	10,36	48,73	4,72	1,84	0,083
15. Agg (aggression)	56,47	10,87	51,59	6,75	1,61	0,123
16. Cha (change)	46,80	7,78	43,51	8,44	1,30	0,200
17. Suc (succorance)	53,67	10,14	49,35	8,11	1,62	0,112
18.Aba (abasement)	51,60	10,81	48,81	7,71	1,05	0,299
19. Def (deference)	46,73	9,64	48,38	5,60	-0,62	0,543
20. Crs (counselling readiness scale)	48,80	9,32	46,89	10,24	0,62	0,535
21. S-Cn (self-control)	44,40	12,05	49,73	8,02	-1,58	0,131
22. S-Cfd self-confidence)	46,40	9,16	52,19	9,98	-1,94	0,058
23. P-adj (personal adjustment)	41,53	6,64	47,78	7,33	-2,86	0,006
24. Iss (ideal self scale)	47,00	14,97	55,08	9,85	-1,93	0,069
25. Cps (creative personality scale)	48,87	8,75	49,03	8,66	-0,06	0,952
26. Mls (military leadership scale)	41,13	6,03	46,73	6,66	-2,82	0,007
27. Mas (masculine attributes scale)	49,67	10,09	47,84	8,30	0,68	0,502
28. Fem (feminine attributes scale)	49,53	7,37	46,30	9,22	1,21	0,232
29. 30. Cp (critical parent)	51,80	8,67	51,78	6,90	0,01	0,994
30. Np (nurturing parent)	44,40	8,95	50,54	7,13	-2,61	0,012
31. A (adult)	37,60	10,14	48,16	8,48	-3,84	0,000
32. Fc (free child)	49,20	8,83	51,11	9,66	-0,66	0,512
33. Ac (adapted child)	56,20	6,94	49,08	8,33	2,92	0,005

Table 5. Comparison of self-picture between perpetrators who did not experienced domestic violence in their generational families and men not using violence (control group)

	Perpetrators who have not experienced violence in their families		Control group			
	M	SD	M	SD	t	p
1.No-Ckd (number of adjectives checked)	36,35	7,67	34,08	4,29	1,22	0,232
2. Fav (number of favorable adjectives)	44,70	11,25	46,57	7,96	-0,73	0,469
3. Unfav (number of unfavorable adjectives)	50,95	14,79	48,35	8,53	0,72	0,476
4.Com (communality)	38,05	9,80	39,08	7,87	-0,43	0,667
5. Ach (achievement)	46,95	14,66	52,65	7,55	-1,63	0,117
6. Dom (dominance)	47,10	11,71	51,27	9,98	-1,42	0,162
7. End (endurance)	47,85	15,23	53,89	9,67	-1,61	0,119
8. Ord (order)	49,90	13,44	55,51	10,50	-1,74	0,087
9. Int (intraception)	44,45	9,16	45,84	7,40	-0,62	0,537
10. Nur (nurturance)	47,25	8,06	49,11	6,04	-0,98	0,329
11. Aff (affiliation)	44,75	10,14	49,22	8,20	-1,80	0,077
12. Het (heterosexuality)	47,25	10,50	48,22	9,89	-0,34	0,732
13. Exh (exhibition)	47,55	9,19	52,46	9,16	-1,93	0,059
14. Aut (autonomy)	49,55	7,97	48,73	4,72	0,42	0,676
15. Agg (aggression)	50,80	9,02	51,59	6,75	-0,38	0,708
16. Cha (change)	44,00	6,72	43,51	8,44	0,22	0,825
17. Suc (succorance)	54,35	11,94	49,35	8,11	1,67	0,105
18.Aba (abasement)	53,15	7,29	48,81	7,71	2,07	**0,044**
19. Def (deference)	51,40	8,34	48,38	5,60	1,45	0,157
20. Crs (counselling readiness scale)	51,55	10,80	46,89	10,24	1,61	0,113
21. S-Cn (self-control)	50,25	8,87	49,73	8,02	0,23	0,823
22. S-Cfd self-confidence)	46,50	13,66	52,19	9,98	-1,80	0,077
23. P-adj (personal adjustment)	46,00	11,11	47,78	7,33	-0,65	0,523
24. Iss (ideal self scale)	48,60	14,66	55,08	9,85	-1,77	0,087
25. Cps (creative personality scale)	47,35	8,62	49,03	8,66	-0,70	0,488
26. Mls (military leadership scale)	44,65	11,41	46,73	6,66	-0,75	0,460
27. Mas (masculine attributes scale)	48,85	8,80	47,84	8,30	0,43	0,669
28. Fem (feminine attributes scale)	46,60	5,93	46,30	9,22	0,15	0,881
29. 30. Cp (critical parent)	51,05	8,18	51,78	6,90	-0,36	0,721
30. Np (nurturing parent)	47,85	12,18	50,54	7,13	-0,91	0,372
31. A (adult)	44,20	12,18	48,16	8,48	-1,44	0,156
32. Fc (free child)	44,85	8,47	51,11	9,66	-2,43	0,018
33. Ac (adapted child)	52,95	12,09	49,08	8,33	1,42	0,160

Table 6. Comparison of various kinds of aggression in perpetrators who experienced and did not experienced violence in generational family

Buss-Durkee	Perpetrators without violence in generational family		Perpetrators with violence in generational family			
	M	SD	M	SD	t	p
Physical aggression	0,84	0,51	1,08	0,51	-1,38	0,177
Intermediate aggression	0,87	0,63	1,25	0,44	-1,96	**0,058**
Irritation	0,99	0,61	1,21	0,41	-1,21	0,234
Negativism	1,00	0,64	1,16	0,39	-0,87	0,393
Resentment	0,77	0,48	0,93	0,47	-0,98	0,332
suspiciousness	1,03	0,44	0,95	0,39	0,53	0,597
Verbal aggression	0,94	0,39	1,11	0,39	-1,26	0,216
Guilt	1,48	0,48	1,35	0,54	0,79	0,436
General aggression	60,86	28,05	72,47	18,33	-1,40	0,170
Indicator of aggression	9,86	4,90	12,43	4,22	-1,65	0,109
Indicato of hostility	7,14	3,27	7,58	2,30	-0,44	0,661

Individuals from the control group were found to be more adapted, protective of intimates, better coping with difficulties than perpetrators from families where violence was used. Moreover, the subjects from the control group were more oriented to goals realization, seemed to be more energetic and enterprising, had strong sense of duty, were more conscientious, insisted on order, organization and planning of their own actions, better felt in the company of other people than perpetrators who experienced violence in generational families (table 4).

To get a complete picture we compared self-picture of perpetrators who did not experience domestic violence in their generational families with the group of subjects not using violence (control group) (table 5).

The comparison of self-picture between perpetrators who did not experience domestic violence in their generational families with the group of subjects not using violence (control group) showed that only one difference appeared; it concerns need to self-humiliation consisting of expression of feeling of inferiority by self-criticism, admitting to mistakes and failures. experiencing low self-confidence; this need was greater in the perpetrators group as compared with the control group (table 5).

Next we compared the aggression syndrome in violence perpetrators who experienced and did not experience violence in generational families (table 6).

Results shown in Table 6 indicate that there is only one statistically significant difference between groups (higher intermediate aggression in perpetrators group who experienced violence in their generational families); although higher severity of general aggression and par-

ticular kinds of aggression is visible in the group of perpetrators with domestic violence experienced in their generational families. The latter group is characterised by greater tendency toward physical aggression, intermediate aggression which is expressed not directly and not against the particular person, higher level of irritation, touchiness, greater severity of behaviours consisting of opposing to others (negativism), more frequent revealing of anger that is caused by subjectively perceived bad treatment (resentment), greater tendency to expression of verbal aggression, lower guilt for own behaviours –in comparison with perpetrators who did not experience violence in their generational family. It is interesting to compare the aggression and hostility indicators between these two groups. The group of perpetrators who experienced violence in family is characterised by impulsivity, weak control of aggression and also accumulation of aggression what often leads to "trigger" reaction. Both hostility and aggression indicators are higher in the perpetrators with experience of violence in generational family.

Table 7. Correlations between self-picture and particular kinds of aggression in the perpetrators group

Whole perpetrators group	Physical aggression	Intermediate aggression	Irritation	Negativism	Resentment	Suspiciousness	Verbal aggression	Guilt	General aggression	WSP_AGRE	WSP_WROG
No-Ckd											
Fav	-0,34*	-0,57***	-0,78***	-0,70***	-0,44**		-0,58***		-0,67***	-0,65***	-0,49**
Unfav		0,40*	0,63***	0,57***			0,55***		0,54***	0,53***	0,38*
Com			-0,33*								
Ach			-0,49**	-0,43**					-0,33*		
Dom											
End		-0,57***	-0,69***	-0,59***	-0,34*		-0,55***		-0,60***	-0,61***	-0,38*
Ord		-0,51**	-0,62***	-0,54***			-0,49**		-0,52***	-0,54***	
Int		-0,36*	-0,48**	-0,56***	-0,34*		-0,44**		-0,47**	-0,40*	-0,48**
Nur	-0,53***	-0,56***	-0,71***	-0,63***			-0,59***		-0,66***	-0,68***	-0,40*
Aff		-0,57***	-0,67***	-0,58***	-0,47**		-0,45**		-0,61***	-0,56***	-0,50**
Het	-0,40*	-0,45**	-0,69***	-0,48**			-0,49**		-0,51**	-0,58***	
Exh											
Aut	0,37*		0,53***	0,40*			0,50**		0,45**	0,49**	
Agg	0,55***	0,54***	0,64***	0,46**			0,64***		0,66***	0,67***	0,41*
Cha											
Suc											
Aba											
Def	-0,49**	-0,51**	-0,63***	-0,50**			-0,59***		-0,61***	-0,63***	-0,37*
Crs											
S-Cn	-0,46**	-0,39*	-0,46**				-0,38*		-0,46**	-0,48**	
S-Cfd			-0,43**	-0,49**	-0,43**				-0,34*		-0,33*
P-adj		-0,54***	-0,72***	-0,67***	-0,40*		-0,54***		-0,63***	-0,59***	-0,49**
Iss	-0,40*	-0,53***	-0,73***	-0,66***	-0,37*		-0,58***		-0,65***	-0,64***	-0,45**
Cps				-0,37*							
Mls			-0,35*								
Mas											
Fem											
Cp	0,48**	0,40*	0,51**	0,56***		0,35*	0,58***		0,59***	0,56***	0,45**
Np	-0,42**	-0,60***	-0,77***	-0,71***			-0,59***		-0,68***	-0,68***	-0,44**
A	-0,44**	-0,63***	-0,67***	-0,64***	-0,49**		-0,60***		-0,69***	-0,66***	-0,52**
Fc											
Ac		0,54***	0,60***	0,55***	0,40*		0,53***		0,57***	0,53***	0,47**

*p<0,05; **p<0,01; ***p<0,001

No-Ckd-number of adjectives checked; Fav-number of favorable adjectives; Unfav-number of unfavorable adjectives; Com-communality; Ach-achievement; Dom-dominance; End-endurance; Ord-order; Int-intraception; Nur-nurturance; Aff-affiliation; Het-heterosexuality; Exh-exhibition; Aut-autonomy; Agg-aggression; Cha-change; Suc-succorance; Aba-abasement; Def-deference; Crs-counselling readiness scale; S-Cn-self-control; S-Cfd-self-confidence; P-adj-personal adjustment; Iss-ideal self scale; Cps-creative personality scale; Mls-military leadership scale; Mas-masculine attributes scale; Fem-feminine attributes scale; Cp-critical parent; Np-nurturing parent; A-adult; Fc-free child; Ac-adapted child

Table 8. Results of stepwise linear regression for dependent variable (using of violence) with independent variables of ACL test

variables	R	R^2	F	p	β	t	p
UNFAV	0,21	0,05	3,31	0,073	0,21	1,82	0,073
END	0,33	0,16	8,61	0,005	-0,33	-2,93	0,005
S_CFD	0,26	0,23	4,98	0,029	-0,41	-3,10	0,003
MAS	0,36	0,36	4,85	0,031	0,29	2,20	0,031
A	0,32	0,46	8,04	0,006	-0,32	-2,84	0,006

The study showed many correlations although significant correlations between particular adjectives of ACL and kinds of aggression concern mainly general aggression and indicator of aggression (table 7). Higher level of aggression in perpetrators, lower need to order, caring of other people, affiliation. Higher level of aggression, worse personal adaptation and maturity. As far as particular kinds of aggression are concerned – higher level of Irritation, Negativism and Verbal Aggression correlate with low need to persistence, order, caring of other people, affiliation, need to be subordinated. Higher irritation and general and verbal aggression in perpetrators, worse social adaptation and filling the role of nursing parent and lower maturity.

Linear stepwise progressive regression was used to find group of variables being the best predictors of dependent variable. Dependent variable is using violence and independent variables are features of self-picture found in ACL (table 8). Independent variables were entered respectively into the model of ACL subscales: modus operandi. scales of needs. thematic scales and scales of transactional analysis.

Results of regression (table 8) indicate that using of violence is explained by the following traits of self-picture:
- in 5% hostile, rejecting attitude toward oneself and other people
- in 11% lack of perseverance in realisation of tasks, impulsivity
- in 13% lack of self-confidence and tendency to breaking the rules and social norms
- in 10% lack of responsibility, autonomy, ability to copying with stress and tasks of adult life, solving the problems, planning and predicting outcomes of own actions.

Discussion

The value of the study is homogeneity of the group, since all of the examined subjects were sentenced by the court by a final judgement for using violence against intimates to a term of imprisonment. Results of our earlier studies [6] showed that generational family – as the first upbringing environment – is a place where parents have decisive contribution in formation of children personality. Family is the place where children create the picture of their own "self" under the influence of significant persons [7]. Parents' attitudes are crucial for formation of children personality. Disharmony in family provides children patterns of aggression, lack of stability, hostility which they take on the basis of modelling process. Results of our work again indicate that generational family, particularly parents' attitudes are extremely important environment for later satisfactory social functioning.

Using of linear stepwise progressive regression allowed for extraction of variables being the best predictors of using of violence. As results indicate, the most important factors of them are: hostile rejecting attitude toward oneself and other people, lack of persistence in tasks realization, impulsivity, lack of self-confidence and tendency to breaking rules and social norms and also lack of responsibility, autonomy, ability to copying with stress and tasks of adult life, solving problems, planning and predicting of results of own activities.

References

1. Diagnoza dotycząca osób stosujących przemoc w rodzinie: komentarz do wyników badań. Raport z badania eksperckiego Ideablog zrealizowanego na zamówienie Min. Pracy i Polityki Społ., 2011 r.
2. European Union Agency for Fundamental Rights, „Violence against women: an EU-wide survey. Main results" Luxembourg 2014.
3. Juros A, Oleś P. Struktura czynnikowa i skupieniowa Testu Przymiotnikowego ACL H.G. Gougha i A.B. Heilbruna. W: Brzeziński J, Hornowska E. red. Z psychometrycznych problemów diagnostyki psychologicznej. Poznań: Wydawnictwo Naukowe Uniwersytetu im. A. Mickiewicza; 1993. s. 171–201.
4. Stanisz A. Przystępny kurs statystyki z zastosowaniem STATISTICA PL na przykładach z medycyny. Kraków: StatSoft; 2006.
5. Francuz P., Mackiewicz R. Przewodnik po metodologii i statystyce, nie tylko dla psychologów. Lublin: Wydawnictwo KUL; 2005.
6. Stodulska-Blaszke A., Wójcicka A. Sprawcy przemocy domowej, – dlaczego stosują przemoc? Próba wyjaśnienia zjawiska. Badania pilotażowe. Current Problems of Psychiatry 2010; 11(4): 346-349
7. Browne K.D. Violence in the family and its links to child abuse. Baillieres Clinical Peadiatrics, 1993; 1(1): 149-164.

Correspondence address

II Klinika Psychiatrii i Rehabilitacji Psychiatrycznej
20-867 Lublin
ul. Głuska 1
aldonastodulska@gmail.com