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PLEASE NOTE! CHANGES IN THE APPLICATION PROCESS

- Privacy Certificate—requirements have been revised
- Protection of Human Subjects—new form (310) required
- National Environmental Policy Act—there is a compliance advisory
- Items 10 (Catalog of Federal Domestic Assistance number) and 12 (Geographic Areas Affected by Project—new form) of the SF 424 (Application for Federal Assistance)—there are now full instructions for completing these items.

For complete information about these changes, consult the Guidelines for Submitting Proposals for National Institute of Justice-Sponsored Research

Context and Consequences of Mutual Intimate Partner Violence

I. Introduction

The National Institute of Justice (NIJ) is soliciting proposals for research on the context and consequences of mutual intimate partner violence including research that will further our understanding of gender symmetry in the measurement of intimate partner violence, and the issue of dual arrests or arrests of women offenders. **NIJ anticipates awarding up to two grants with a funding total of $800,000.**

II. Background

The Violence Against Women Act of 2000 (VAWA 2000) was signed by the President on October 29, 2000, reauthorizing grant programs created by the Violence Against Women Act of 1994 and establishing new programs as well as strengthening federal law. VAWA 2000 gave NIJ continued responsibility for developing a research agenda based on the findings of the National Academy of Sciences report *Understanding Violence Against Women*. This report, which was

---


NIJ is streamlining its process to accommodate the volume of proposals anticipated under this and other solicitations. Researchers can help in a significant way by sending NIJ a *nonbinding* letter of intent by April 20, 2001. The Institute will use these letters to forecast the numbers of peer panels it needs and to identify conflicts of interest among potential reviewers. There are two ways to send these letters. You can reach NIJ by Internet by sending e-mail to tellnij@ncjrs.org and identifying the solicitation and section(s) you expect to apply for. You can write a letter with the same information to Context and Consequences of Mutual Intimate Partner Violence, 810 Seventh Street N.W., Washington, DC 20531.

Jointly commissioned by NIJ and the National Center for Injury Prevention and Control (NCIPC) of the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC), recommended a research infrastructure and research agenda that included the nature and scope of violence against women, causes and consequences of violence against women, and prevention and intervention.
Since the passage of the Violence Against Women Act of 1994, NIJ has funded over 100 studies including basic research and program evaluations in a variety of areas involving violence against women. While much has been accomplished, there are some significant gaps in our knowledge and understanding of this subject. This solicitation is divided into two parts, each dealing with significant gaps in information about the context and consequences of mutual intimate partner violence, as they relate to understanding violence against women. It is the intention of NIJ to fund one study from Part A and one from Part B.

III. Areas of Research Required

Part A: Going Beyond the “Gender Symmetry” Debate in the Measurement of Intimate Partner Violence

Background

One of the most controversial measurement issues associated with violence against women research is that of gender symmetry. This refers to the results of a substantial body of research using the Conflict Tactics Scales (CTS) and its derivatives, that shows women self-reporting initiating as much violence as men, and sometimes more. There has been a great deal of speculation as to why this is the case, both among originators of the CTS and its critics. Some of the objections that researchers had to early versions of the CTS have been resolved in more recent versions (the CTS2), but the debate around the issue of gender symmetry continues.


One resolution to this controversy has been suggested by Johnson, who has argued that intimate partner violence is not a unitary phenomenon and that failure to recognize this has resulted in confusion in the research literature. He suggests that intimate partner violence may comprise at least two major subtypes which he refers to as “patriarchal terrorism” (later renamed “intimate terrorism”) and “common couple violence.” He suggests that the former is a more serious, less common form of violence motivated by a wish to exert general control over one’s partner (which might include for example, imposing restrictions on mobility, social contacts, and access to economic resources). This type of violence, he suggests, involves male perpetration, escalates over time, is more likely to cause injury, and is more likely to be detected in crime studies. The second type of violence he identifies is a less serious, more common form arising out of specific arguments in a relationship and is equally likely to be perpetrated by females as by males. This type of violence does not escalate over time, and is more likely to be detected in surveys of the general population.

Johnson later expanded his typology to incorporate four types of violence, taking the relationship context into account: (1) violence by either or both partners in the context of a relationship that is non-controlling is referred to as “common couple violence”; (2) violence by one partner in the context of a relationship where the other partner is violent and controlling, referred to as “violent resistance”; this includes self defense and “fighting back” and is perpetrated primarily by women; (3) violence by the controlling partner is referred to as “intimate terrorism”; and (4) “mutual violent control,” considered to be rare, involves partners who are both violent and controlling.


The essence of Johnson’s distinctions lie in the interaction of violence and a general pattern of control. However, a practical difficulty in examining his theory lies in the absence of a clear definition and a widely-accepted valid measure of control. Johnson notes that while the CTS has provided a standard approach to assessing violence, there is no standard approach to assessing control. Furthermore, he points out that few studies have included adequate measures of both violence and control by both parties in the relationship in a way that would enable us to assess the prevalence of these four different types of violence.

**Research Issues**

Proposed studies should examine context, meaning, and motive in the perpetration of specific acts of intimate partner violence by individuals of either gender, and the usefulness of a typology of intimate partner violence in understanding gender symmetry. Consideration should be given to the following issues:

- The context, motive and meaning of acts of intimate partner violence elicited by self-report instruments such as the CTS;
- The development of a standardized measure of non-violent coercive control in intimate relationships;
- The validation of models distinguishing different types of intimate partner violence; whether derived from Johnson’s typology or any other typology;
- Developing prevalence estimates of different types of intimate partner violence in specific populations, for example in shelter samples or community samples.

**Part B: Women Arrested in Situations Involving Intimate Partner Violence**

**Background**

Researchers and advocates have noted for some time that one of the consequences of mandatory arrest policies is the phenomenon of “dual” or “mutual” arrest, in which the police arrest both parties in a domestic violence dispute. However, there is little empirical evidence examining what decision criteria are used in making dual or mutual arrests, how consistent these criteria are across arrests, police officers, and agencies, or the context and motivations for the use of violence by women arrested in intimate partner situations. Also unexamined are the consequences of dual arrest with regard to the recurrence of violence, and the appropriateness of various treatment modalities in these cases. Women who engage in intimate partner violence have been divided into subgroups:7

- self defending victims;
- angry victims (fighting back);
- primary aggressors;
- mutually combatant women.

While some researchers believe that the majority of women arrested for domestic violence have acted in self defense, precise estimates are not available. Also unknown is how Johnson’s typology might relate to the phenomenon of dual arrest, for example, whether mutually combatant women are engaging in common couple violence or mutual violent control.

**Research Issues**

Consideration should be given to one or more the following issues:

- Types of women arrestees, for example whether they are engaged in self defense, retaliation, violent resistance, or are primary aggressors;
- Women who are arrested for other offenses related to domestic violence such as prostitution, drug abuse, or child abuse;
- The prevalence of dual arrest throughout the country;

---

In-depth intensive examination of high and low dual arrest jurisdictions, and the relationship to training, policies, and the prevalence of domestic violence;

How the criminal justice system (e.g., prosecution or sentencing) treat women who are arrested for domestic violence, and the appropriateness of the kinds of batterer interventions to which they are referred;

Impact of dual arrest on recurrence of violence.

IV. How to Apply

Those interested in submitting proposals in response to this solicitation must complete the required application forms and submit related required documents. (See below for how to obtain application forms and guides for completing proposals.) Applicants must include the following information/forms to qualify for consideration:

- Standard Form (SF) 424—application for Federal assistance
- Geographic Areas Affected Worksheet NEW FORM
- Assurances
- Certifications Regarding Lobbying, Debarment, Suspension, and Other Responsibility Matters; and Drug-Free Workplace Requirements (one form)
- Disclosure of Lobbying Activities
- Budget Detail Worksheet
- Budget Narrative
- Negotiated indirect rate agreement (if appropriate)
- Names and affiliations of all key persons from applicant and subcontractor(s), advisors, consultants, and advisory board members. Include name of principal investigator, title, organizational affiliation (if any), department (if institution of higher education), address, phone, and fax
- Proposal abstract
- Table of contents
- Program narrative or technical proposal
- Privacy certificate REVISED
- Form 310 (Protection of Human Subjects Assurance Identification/ Certification/ Declaration) NEW FORM
- Environmental Assessment (if required) NEW
- References
- Letters of cooperation from organizations collaborating in the research project
- Résumés
- Appendixes, if any (e.g., list of previous NIJ awards, their status, and products [in NIJ or other publications])

Confidentiality of information and human subjects protection. NIJ has adopted new policies and procedures regarding the confidentiality of information and human subjects protection. Please see the Guidelines for Submitting Proposals for National Institute of Justice-Sponsored Research for details on the new requirements.

Proposal abstract. The proposal abstract, when read separately from the rest of the application, is meant to serve as a succinct and accurate description of the proposed work. Applicants must concisely describe the research goals and objectives, research design, and methods for achieving the goals and objectives. Summaries of past accomplishments are to be avoided, and proprietary/confidential information is not to be included. Length is not to exceed 400 words. Use the following two headers:

Project Goals and Objectives:

Proposed Research Design and Methodology:

Page limit. The number of pages in the “Program Narrative” part of the proposal must not exceed 30 (double-spaced pages), no matter the amount of funding requested.

Due date. Completed proposals must be received at the National Institute of Justice by the close of business on May 30, 2001. Extensions of this deadline will not be permitted.

Award period. In general, NIJ limits its grants and cooperative agreements to a maximum period of 12
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or 24 months. However, longer budget periods may be considered.

Number of awards. NIJ anticipates supporting two grants under this solicitation.

Award amount. Awards totaling $800,000 will be made available for this NIJ solicitation.

Applying. Two packets need to be obtained: (1) application forms (including a sample budget worksheet) and (2) guidelines for submitting proposals (including requirements for proposal writers and requirements for grant recipients). To receive them, applicants can:

- Access the Justice Information Center on the Web: http://www.ncjrs.org/fedgrant.htm#nij or the NIJ Web site: http://www.ojp.usdoj.gov/nij/funding.htm

These Web sites offer the NIJ application forms and guidelines as electronic files that may be downloaded to a personal computer.

- Request hard copies of the forms and guidelines by mail from the National Criminal Justice Reference Service at 800–851–3420 or from the Department of Justice Response Center at 800–421–6770 (in the Washington, D.C., area, at 202–307–1480).

- Request copies by fax. Call 800–851–3420 and select option 1, then option 1 again for NIJ. Code is 1023.

Guidance and information. Applicants who wish to receive additional guidance and information may contact the U.S. Department of Justice Response Center at 800–421–6770. Center staff can provide assistance or refer applicants to an appropriate NIJ professional. Applicants may, for example, wish to discuss their prospective research topics with the NIJ professional staff.

Send completed forms to:

Context and Consequences of Mutual Intimate Partner Violence
National Institute of Justice
810 Seventh Street N.W.
Washington, DC 20531
[overnight courier ZIP code 20001]

This document is not intended to create, does not create, and may not be relied upon to create any rights, substantive or procedural, enforceable at law by any party in any matter civil or criminal.
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