



Original Article

Development and Validation of Tam's Intimate Partner Violence Scale for Measuring Abuse among Filipino Adults

Margaret S. Sanapo

Department of Psychology, College of Arts and Sciences
Far Eastern University Manila
Nicanor Reyes St., Sampaloc, Manila 1015
msanapo@feu.edu.ph

Abstract

The main aim of this two-phase study is to construct an intimate partner violence (IPV) scale that truly reflects the common situation Filipino couples are in. Therefore, all respondents were either in a relationship at the time of data gathering or had previously been in one. The majority of respondents in Phase 1 (79%) and Phase 2 (75%) were within the 18-21 age range. Definitions of IPV from literature review, along with the Duluth model, provided bases for the initial 52 items. Cronbach's alpha was used to determine the internal consistency of test items and three experts validated them. During Phase 1, 100 respondents answered the 52-item scale. All items with an item-total correlation coefficient of 0.64 were retained ($n=20$). In Phase 2, 102 respondents took the reduced scale of 20 items. The results showed that 5 out of 20 had an item-total correlation coefficient below 0.50 and 4 between 0.51-0.55; however, the overall consistency was 0.85. Items with an item-total correlation coefficient lower than 0.51 were discarded and the overall consistency improved to 0.87. Though the 4 items in the 0.51-0.55 range also had a low item-total correlation coefficient, discarding them lowered the overall consistency of the scale. Thus, the three experts recommended that they be retained inasmuch as the study was just in its exploratory stage. In the final scale of 15 items, seven of them belonged to the psychological violence category, four controlling behavior, three physical aggression, and 1 sexual coercion. The inclusion of more items from the psychological violence category is consistent with related literature that says that psychological violence is the most common form of intimate partner violence. It is recommended that similar research in the future be done with a gender- and age-diverse populations to truly capture the dynamics of IPV in the Philippine context.

Keywords: intimate partner violence, intimate partner violence scale, Filipino couples

How to cite:

Sanapo, M. (2025). Development and Validation of Tam's Intimate Partner Violence Scale for Measuring Abuse among Filipino Adults. *Sorsogon Multidisciplinary Research Journal*, 4(1), 19-36. <https://doi.org/10.71343/sorsu.sormrj.4.2.1>

Introduction

Intimate partner violence, popularly known by its acronym IPV, is often assumed to be a problem that primarily affects women (Ellsberg & Emmelin, 2014; Jordan, 2016; Martin-Fernandez et al., 2018; Patra et al., 2018; Troisi, 2018; World Health Organization [WHO], 2024; WHO, 2021). This is understandable because women in most societies are prone to gender-based biases and power imbalance that are being perpetrated due to existing societal norms and traditions that favor men (Mutisya et al., 2024; Prakash, 2018; Philippine Commission on Women, n.d.; United Nations Bangladesh, 2024). This is supported by studies that show that indeed, when it comes to IPV, women are more likely the victims rather than the perpetrators (Bogat et al., 2016; Fanslow et al., 2023; Lee et al., 2014; Patra et al., 2018; Troisi, 2018). However, it should be noted that IPV can happen to both men and women (Ahmadabadi et al., 2021; Bogat et al., 2022; Capinha et al., 2022; Cunningham & Anderson, 2023; Scott-Storey et al., 2022) and can be as traumatic (Dokkedahl et al., 2019).

IPV is defined by WHO (2010) as “a behavior within an intimate relationship that causes physical, sexual, or psychological harm, including acts of physical aggression, sexual coercion, psychological abuse and controlling behaviors” (p. 11). A similar definition is adapted by Clark (2013) and Ford-Gilboe et al. (2018); however, instead of simply using “within an intimate relationship,” (WHO, 2010, p. 11) they specified the actors involved and these could either be current or ex-partners. Therefore, victims who experienced abuses from previous relationships can still claim they are victims of IPV although they are no longer related with their perpetrator.

IPV is also known as domestic violence or wife abuse and dating violence when young dating couples are involved (Clark, 2013). Since IPV could start during adolescence as young people begin to pursue a romantic relationship with others, early interventions are said to be necessary which target middle to high school students (Bogat et al. 2022). These interventions can be appropriately applied if there are effective measures of individuals' IPV experience. To date, there is no locally developed standardized test on IPV that measures abuses perpetrated by both men and women. Existing instruments used in the Philippines are largely adapted from international scales (e.g. the Conflict Tactic Scale [CTS], the National Demographic and Health Survey [NDHS], and WHO instruments). Although these instruments are valid measures of IPV in the Philippine context, most of these assume that men are the primary perpetrators, as they focus more on violence against women (e.g. WHO instruments and NDHS) rather than on both genders (WHO, 2005; Yount et al., 2022).

Inasmuch as IPV is often associated with violence (Clark, 2013; Patra et al., 2018), many existing scales focus more on physical or sexual aggression (Ford-Gilboe et al., 2018). However, it should be noted that psychological or emotional abuse as well as controlling behaviors are as traumatic (Ford-Gilboe et al., 2018) and more pervasive (Dokkedahl et al., 2019; Martin-Fernandez et al., 2019; Mojahed et al., 2024) than physical or sexual violence.

Statement of the Problem

This study sought to examine whether Filipinos experience intimate partner violence in ways that may differ from existing conceptualizations. Specifically, this study answered the following questions:

- 1) Which type of intimate partner violence (e.g. physical, sexual, emotional, psychological) was most frequently experienced by Filipino participants?
- 2) To what extent do the items in the final scale reflect the domains of abuse outlined in the Power and Control Wheel or the Duluth Model?

- 3) To what extent do the items in the final scale consistent with findings reported in previous intimate partner violence literature?

Purpose of the Study

Many existing IPV scales were constructed with women as victims in mind (Ford-Gilboe et al., 2018; Martin-Fernandez et al., 2018; Sullivan et al., 2023; Troisi, 2018; Yount et al., 2014). But since research have pointed out that IPV can happen to both men and women (Bogat et al. 2022; Bogat et al., 2016; Clark, 2013), the current scale, Tam's IPV Scale, was developed to measure the IPV experiences of both male and female adults. Thus, instead of using husband or boyfriend for perpetrators to signify men as the aggressors, it was changed to "my partner" to indicate that the perpetrator could either be a man or a woman.

Theoretical Framework

The Power and Control Wheel or the Duluth Model (Pence & Paymar, 2017) was used as a guide in developing the items for the Tams IPV Scale. According to the Duluth Model, there are eight (8) forms of power and control tactics used by a perpetrator in an abusive relationship, and these include the use of intimidation, emotional abuse, isolation; minimizing, denying, and blaming (shifting the responsibility to the victim); the use of children, male privilege, economic abuse, and coercion and threats (Pence & Paymar, 2017). The main objective of the perpetrator of abuse in the Duluth Model (Pence & Paymar, 2017) is to maintain dominance through acts of physical, sexual, psychological, and economic abuse. These forms of violence are also the core elements of the WHO definition of intimate partner violence. Thus, in developing specific items for the scale, these categories were used as a guide as well.

Notably many of the forms of IPV in the Duluth Model are non-physical (e.g. isolation, intimidation, emotional abuse) because the model assumes that power and control can be achieved through deliberate actions that may not necessarily stem from anger or provocation. Instead, these forms of violence may be part of a learned behavior to maintain power and dominance in the relationship.

Though the use of children was included in the eight (8) forms of power and control tactics in the Duluth Model, this was intentionally eliminated in the Tams IPV Scale even in the initial phase of the test construction. The main reasons for this are to: (1) avoid overlapping partners' abuse with child abuse; and (2) accurately capture the dynamics of power and control between partners, without complicating it with abuse involving children.

Significance of the Study

Since many existing IPV scales were developed in Western countries with non-Filipinos as the target norm (Ford-Gilboe et al., 2016; Hegarty et al., 1999; Straus, 1979; Straus et al., 1996; Sullivan et al., 2023), there is a great need to construct our very own scale that incorporates our own culture and social norms. Thus, this study was conceptualized to address this problem. Moreover, research evidence has shown that men as victims of IPV are getting more common (Nabe & Chavez, 2025) and the abuse they experience should also receive attention similar to that given to women victims.

Scope and Delimitations

This research focused on the development and validation of a scale designed to measure intimate partner violence among Filipino adults aged 18 years and older. Participants included individuals regardless of whether they had experienced IPV, as victimization was not the primary focus of the study. However, as an ethical safeguard, participants were informed that they could contact the researcher via email to seek assistance at any time should participation elicit distress or concerns related to IPV. No participant availed of this option during the course of the study.

Methodology

This study was part of a course requirement for a graduate class in psychological testing. It employed a two-phase, methodological, non-experimental research design to come up with appropriate items for the Tam's IPV Scale. A cross-sectional survey approach was used to collect data from respondents online.

The initial pool of items ($n=52$) was constructed based on the definition of the World Health Organization (2012) of IPV as well as the Duluth Model's power and control tactics (Pence & Paymar, 2017), in which they identified four major elements of IPV, namely: psychological/emotional abuse, physical aggression, sexual coercion, and controlling behavior. Of the 52 items, 21 were under psychological/emotional abuse, 9 for physical aggression, 6 for sexual coercion, and 16 for controlling behavior. The distribution of items under the four aforementioned categories were similar to that of Ford-Gilboe et al. (2016), which included more psychological/emotional and controlling behavior more than the other two categories. In addition, the inclusion of more of these types of items was based on the findings of Dokkedahl et al. (2019), Martin-Fernandez et al. (2019), and Mojahed et al. (2024) which mentioned that psychological-related violence is the most common type of IPV.

Respondents of the Study

The sample consisted of Filipino adults from different regions of the Philippines who had experienced being in a relationship. This relationship may either be current or in the past. Their ages ranged from 18 to 50 years, with the majority falling within 18 to 21 years age group in both Phase 1 ($n=79$; 79%) and Phase 2 ($n=77$; 75%).

All respondents were recruited online. The scale was administered via Google Forms, which was shared through Canvas, a web-based learning management system (LMS) used by educational institutions to deliver and manage students' online and blended learning, as well as through Facebook.

Section Criteria

For the two phases of the study, respondents were selected using a purposive sampling technique. The main criteria for selection were that they must have been in an intimate relationship, either current or in the past, and be at least 18 years of age. Additionally, they must be able to provide consent without the need for assistance and be willing to participate in the study.

Demographics

In Phase 1, a total of 100 respondents completed the 52-item scale. Of these, 63% were currently in a relationship, while 37% were single but had previously been in a relationship. In Phase 2, 102 respondents completed the 20-item scale. As to relationship status, 52% (n=53) were currently in a relationship, while 46% (n=47) were single but had previously been in a relationship.

All respondents completed the scale anonymously, and only their age, relationship status, and duration of their committed relationship were collected. Data gathering for both Phase 1 and Phase 2 occurred from April to May 2023.

Instruments of the Study

Phase 1: Item Construction

During the initial phase, referred to as Phase 1 in the study, a review of existing literature on intimate partner violence, both local and international, was conducted. Here, a number of intimate partner violence definition came out, but the ones offered by WHO (2012) and Pence and Paymar (2017) were adopted because they captured the basic elements of the phenomenon. In addition, Clarke (2013) and Ford-Gilboe et al. (2018) suggested including both current and former partners, which was also taken into consideration. These definitions formed the basis for constructing the initial pool of items (n = 52; see Table 1 for the distribution of items by category), which were included in the first survey. All these items were constructed by the researcher herself with guidance from existing literature and the Duluth Model.

Table 1

Tam's Intimate Partner Violence Scale

Psychological/Emotional Abuse

My partner and I argue a lot.

I am afraid of my partner.

I have experienced being insulted by my partner.

I have experienced being yelled at by my partner.

My partner humiliates me in public.

I lose confidence in my capabilities because my partner says I am not good at anything.

My partner says that if we broke up, I can never find someone again because I am ugly.

My partner says that if we broke up, I can never find someone again because I am worthless.

My partner says I am not good at anything.

My partner blames me for their violent behavior.

My partner is not available whenever I need them.

My partner disregard my feelings.

I do not feel safe around my partner.
My partner openly shows me they are cheating on me.
Whenever my partner gets drunk, they hurt me emotionally.
My partner insults me for no obvious reasons.
My partner does not want to be seen in public with me.
My partner has told me that I will never be successful.
My partner threatens to kill me if I do not give in to what they want me to do.
I have experienced being humiliated by my partner in front of my friends.
My partner gets mad when food is not ready when they get home.

Physical Aggression

When my partner and I argue, it often leads to physical fight.
I have experienced being hit by my partner.
I have experienced being strangled by my partner.
I have experienced being slapped by my partner.
I have experienced being shoved by my partner.
I have experienced being kicked by my partner.
My partner has threatened me with a knife, gun, or other weapon.
Whenever my partner gets drunk, they hurt me physically.
My partner has hit me with a hard object.

Sexual Coercion

I have experienced being sexually harassed by my partner.
I have experienced being forced by my partner to engage in sexual intercourse with them.
My partner gets mad at me if I refuse to do something sexual with them.
My partner is aggressive in bed.
I have experienced agreeing to have sex with my partner just so they will not get mad at me.
My partner is pressuring me to get into new sex acts which I do not want to do.

Controlling Behavior

My partner does not like me talking with people of the opposite sex.
My partner does not like me hanging out with my friends.
My partner checks my cell phone.
My partner gets mad at me if I refuse to let them check my cell phone.
My partner does not want me to explore things I may be interested in.
My partner does not support me in what I do.
My partner does not trust me that they often stalk me whenever I have to go out on my own.
I have experienced being stalked by my partner.
My partner does not respect my rights to privacy.
My partner does not want me to have a separate life from them.
I have experienced being followed by my partner every time I go out with my friends.
My partner pulls me away from my family.
My partner controls how I spend my money.
When my partner gets jealous, they threaten to harm me.
When my partner gets jealous, they threaten to harm my family.
My partner has threatened to stop supporting me financially if I leave them.

Phase 2: Item Construction

Out of the original 52 items, only 20 were retained for Phase 2 of the study. More than half of the original items (n=32) were excluded because they had a Cronbach alpha lower than 0.64. The 20 retained items were then administered to a different set of respondents with the same characteristics. Using a separate sample for the validation of the reduced scale minimized the risk of overfitting the scale to the initial group while enhancing the scale's generalizability. Table 2 presents the new version of the scale with reduced items.

Table 2

Phase 2 Tam's Intimate Partner Violence Scale with Reduced Items

Intimate Partner Violence Items

1. When my partner and I argue, it often leads to physical fight.
 2. My partner does not like me talking with people of the opposite sex.
 3. My partner does not like me hanging out with my friends.
 4. I have experienced being hit by my partner.
 5. I have experienced being insulted by my partner.
 6. My partner gets mad at me if I refuse to let them check my cell phone.
 7. I have experienced being yelled at by my partner.
 8. My partner humiliates me in public.
 9. When my partner gets jealous, they threaten to harm me.
 10. I have experienced being kicked by my partner.
 11. I have experienced being sexually harassed by my partner.
 12. I have experienced being forced by my partner to engage in sexual intercourse with them.
 13. My partner blames me for their violent behavior.
 14. My partner gets mad at me if I refuse to do something sexual with them.
 15. My partner does not want me to have a separate life from them.
 16. My partner disregard my feelings.
 17. My partner openly shows me they are cheating on me
 18. Whenever my partner gets drunk, they hurt me emotionally.
 19. My partner insults me for no obvious reasons.
 20. My partner has hit me with a hard object.
-

Ethical Considerations

Respondents received an invitation letter explaining the purpose of the study, along with an informed consent form outlining their tasks and those of the researcher. Participation was voluntary, and respondents were informed of their right to withdraw at any time without consequences. Confidentiality and anonymity were ensured, with identifying information removed and all data analyzed in a manner that could not be traced back to participants. To protect them from potential harm, they were instructed that if any items caused discomfort or negative emotions, they could contact the researcher for psychological assistance. Since no institutional review board was available at the time the study was conducted, the research was reviewed by the course facilitator, a licensed psychologist, and the study adhered to the ethical guidelines of the American Psychological Association (APA).

Validation Procedure

The scale was validated in two phases. During Phase 1, a 52-item IPV scale was administered online to willing participants. Internal consistency reliability was examined, and items that were poorly correlated with the overall scale or whose removal improved the Cronbach's alpha were subsequently removed. In Phase 2, the revised version of the scale which consisted of 20 items, was administered to a new sample to confirm their internal consistency. Again, items that performed poorly were eliminated; therefore, the final version consisted of 15 items. In addition, three experts, with backgrounds in both psychometrics and IPV research, evaluated the content validity of the final version of the scale. Items deemed appropriate and representative of the construct were retained. Content validity was assessed to ensure that the final version of the Tam's IPV Scale consisted of items that adequately represented the construct of IPV.

Data Analysis

Cronbach's alpha was used to assess the scale's inter-item reliability and overall consistency. This measure is appropriate for determining whether the items within the Tam's Intimate Partner Violence Scale measure the same construct - intimate partner violence. Items with low item-total correlation (i.e. below 0.64) were considered less consistent with the overall scale and were therefore removed. A lower cut-off was used in Phase 2 (i.e. 0.50) because the scale had already been refined, and many items with item-total correlation coefficient in the 0.50s were conceptually important. The overall consistency of the items was also computed before and after the removal of certain items during Phase 2, when the scale was being finalized. Using Cronbach's alpha ensures that the final scale has sound psychometric properties.

Results

During the initial survey (Phase 1), more than half of the 52 items ($n=32$, 61.5%) were eliminated due to a very low item-total correlation coefficient. As mentioned previously, those with item-total coefficient below 0.64 were excluded from the second survey (Phase 2) (see Table 3).

Table 3

Phase I Tam's Intimate Partner Violence Scale and Their Item-Total Correlation Coefficient

Intimate Partner Violence Items	Item-Total Correlation
1. My partner and I argue a lot.	0.45
2. When my partner and I argue, it often leads to physical fight.	0.74*
3. My partner does not like me talking with people of the opposite sex.	0.64*
4. My partner does not like me hanging out with my friends.	0.70*
5. I am afraid of my partner.	0.49
6. I have experienced being hit by my partner.	0.75*
7. I have experienced being insulted by my partner.	0.69*
8. My partner checks my cell phone.	0.49
9. My partner gets mad at me if I refuse to let them check my cell phone.	0.76*
10. My partner does not want me to explore things I may be interested in.	0.48
11. My partner does not support me in what I do.	0.48
12. I have experienced being slapped by my partner.	0.42
13. I have experienced being yelled at by my partner.	0.69*
14. My partner humiliates me in public.	0.80*
15. My partner does not trust me that they often stalk me whenever I have to go out on my own.	0.53
16. I have experienced being strangled by my partner.	0.61
17. When my partner gets jealous, they threaten to harm me.	0.64*
18. When my partner gets jealous, they threaten to harm my family.	0.62
19. I lose confidence in my capabilities because my partner says I am not good at anything.	0.42
20. My partner says that if we broke up, I can never find someone again because I am ugly.	0.43
21. My partner says that if we broke up, I can never find someone again because I am worthless.	0.63
22. I have experienced being shoved by my partner.	0.38
23. My partner says I am not good at anything.	0.36
24. I have experienced being kicked by my partner.	0.77*
25. I have experienced being sexually harassed by my partner.	0.78*
26. I have experienced being forced by my partner to engage in sexual intercourse with them.	0.75*
27. I have experienced being stalked by my partner.	0.33
28. My partner blames me for their violent behavior.	0.78*
29. My partner does not respect my rights to privacy.	0.73*
30. My partner controls how I spend my money.	0.39

31. My partner gets mad at me if I refuse to do something sexual with them.	0.70*
32. My partner is not available whenever I need them.	0.41
33. My partner does not want me to have a separate life from them.	0.67*
34. I do not feel safe around my partner.	0.62
35. My partner is aggressive in bed.	0.25
36. My partner has threatened me with a knife, gun, or other weapon.	0.29
37. My partner disregards my feelings.	0.67*
38. I have experienced agreeing to have sex with my partner just so they will not get mad at me.	0.62
39. My partner openly shows me they are cheating on me.	0.66*
40. Whenever my partner gets drunk, they hurt me physically.	0.60
41. Whenever my partner gets drunk, they hurt me emotionally.	0.79*
42. My partner insults me for no obvious reasons.	0.73*
43. My partner does not want to be seen in public with me.	0.51
44. I have experienced being followed by my partner every time I go out with my friends.	0.28
45. My partner has told me that I will never be successful.	0.27
46. My partner pulls me away from my family.	0.61
47. My partner has hit me with a hard object.	0.69*
48. My partner threatens to kill me if I do not give in to what they want me to do.	0.19
49. I have experienced being humiliated by my partner in front of my friends.	0.45
50. My partner has threatened to stop supporting me financially if I leave them.	0.27
51. My partner gets mad when food is not ready when they get home.	0.08
52. My partner is pressuring me to get into new sex acts which I do not want to do.	0.62
Overall consistency	0.93

Legend: * - included in Phase 2 IPV Scale

Excluded Items

The psychological/emotional abuse category had the highest number of items (n=13) that did not advance to the second-phase list, followed by the controlling behavior category with 11 items. Additionally, three items in the sexual coercion category and five items in the physical aggression category were excluded from the Phase 2 Tam's IPV Scale. Although the controlling behavior item, "*My partner does not respect my privacy,*" had an inter-item reliability score of 0.73, it was eliminated from the scale used in the second phase of the test construction because it lacked specificity. Instead, a related item from the same category, "*My partner gets mad at me if I refuse to let them check my cell phone,*" with an item-total correlation coefficient of 0.76 was retained. Because these two items were conceptually similar and could be interpreted as redundant, the more specific and clearly worded item was selected. After removing items with low item-total coefficients, the revised scale retained 20 items, including eight assessing psychological or emotional abuse, five assessing controlling behavior, three assessing sexual coercion, and four as-

sessing physical aggression (see Table 4). This version still showed more items from the psychological or emotional abuse rather than the other three categories.

The Revised Tam's IPV Scale

The 20-item Tam's IPV Scale were administered to 102 respondents who completed them online via Google Forms. This group of respondents were different from those who answered the survey during Phase 1. Cronbach's alpha was again used to measure the scale's internal consistency. With 20 items, the scale's overall internal consistency was 0.85. All items with an item-total correlation coefficient lower than 0.51 were eliminated. These items were: *My partner gets mad at me if I refuse to let them check my cell phone (CB)*; *I have experienced being forced by my partner to engage in sexual intercourse with them (SC)*; *My partner gets mad at me if I refuse to do something sexual with them (SC)*; *My partner openly shows me they are cheating on me (PEA)*, and; *My partner has hit me with a hard object (PA)*. After excluding these five (5) items, the overall internal consistency increased to 0.87 (see Table 4).

As mentioned previously, three experts with expertise in psychometrics and IPV research validated the 20-item scale. They unanimously believed that all the 20 items were valid measures of IPV. However, since five out of 20 had item-total correlation coefficients lower than 0.51, they were removed from the final scale (see Table 5). Their removal from the scale increased the overall internal consistency of the items from 0.85 to 0.87.

Table 4

Tam's IPV Scale Used in Phase 2 of the Study

Intimate Partner Violence Items	Item-Total Correlation
1. When my partner and I argue, it often leads to physical fight.	0.54
2. My partner does not like me talking with people of the opposite sex.	0.55
3. My partner does not like me hanging out with my friends.	0.82
4. I have experienced being hit by my partner.	0.62
5. I have experienced being insulted by my partner.	0.77
6. My partner gets mad at me if I refuse to let them check my cell phone.	0.44
7. I have experienced being yelled at by my partner.	0.71
8. My partner humiliates me in public.	0.70
9. When my partner gets jealous, they threaten to harm me.	0.68
10. I have experienced being kicked by my partner.	0.60

11. I have experienced being sexually harassed by my partner.	0.51
12. I have experienced being forced by my partner to engage in sexual intercourse with them.	0.44
13. My partner blames me for their violent behavior.	0.70
14. My partner gets mad at me if I refuse to do something sexual with him.	0.45
15. My partner does not want me to have a separate life from them.	0.63
16. My partner disregards my feelings.	0.70
17. My partner openly shows me they are cheating on me	0.45
18. Whenever my partner gets drunk, they hurt me emotionally.	0.52
19. My partner insults me for no obvious reasons.	0.66
20. My partner has hit me with a hard object.	0.42
Overall consistency for 20 Items	0.85
Overall consistency after eliminating 6, 12, 14, 17, and 20	0.87

Tam's IPV Final Scale

Of the five items eliminated from the 20-item scale, two assessed sexual coercion. The remaining three items represented psychological/emotional abuse (n=1), physical aggression (n=1), and controlling behavior (n=1). Table 5 presents the 15 items included in the final version of the Tam's IPV Scale. Notably, only one item related to sexual coercion was retained: "I have experienced being sexually harassed by my partner." Although this item had a borderline item-total correlation coefficient of 0.51, it was deemed conceptually important by experts and was therefore retained.

The final 15-item Tam's IPV Scale still contained more items from psychological/emotional abuse category (n=7, 47%), followed by controlling behavior (n=4, 27%), and physical aggression (n=3, 20%). The sexual coercion category was the only subscale with just one item included in the final scale.

Table 5

Tam's IPV Final Scale

Intimate Partner Violence Scale Items	Category
1. When my partner and I argue, it often leads to physical fight.	Physical Aggression
2. My partner does not like me talking with people of the opposite sex.	Controlling Behavior
3. My partner does not like me hanging out with my friends.	Controlling Behavior
4. I have experienced being hit by my partner.	Physical Aggression
5. I have experienced being insulted by my partner.	Psychological/Emotional Abuse

6. I have experienced being yelled at by my partner.	Psychological/Emotional Abuse
7. My partner humiliates me in public.	Psychological/Emotional Abuse
8. When my partner gets jealous, they threaten to harm me.	Controlling Behavior
9. I have experienced being kicked by my partner.	Physical Aggression
10. I have experienced being sexually harassed by my partner.	Sexual Coercion
11. My partner blames me for their violent behavior.	Psychological/Emotional Abuse
12. My partner does not want me to have a separate life from them.	Controlling Behavior
13. My partner disregard my feelings.	Psychological/Emotional Abuse
14. Whenever my partner gets drunk, they hurt me emotionally.	Psychological/Emotional Abuse
15. My partner insults me for no obvious reasons.	Psychological/Emotional Abuse

Discussion

One of the major criticisms of existing IPV scales found in the review of related literature was that most of these scales focus on physical or sexual aggression (Ford-Gilboe et al., 2018) because of the very nature of IPV which was often associated with violence (Bogat et al., 2022; Bogat et al., 2016; Clark, 2013; Jordan, 2016; Martin-Fernandez et al., 2018; Philippine Commission on Women, n.d.; Prakash, 2018; Yount et al., 2014) or physical abuse, especially against women (Ellsberg & Emmelin, 2014; Sullivan et al., 2023; Thomson et al., 2006; WHO, 2012; WHO, 2010). However, as mentioned previously, there were research evidence showing that psychological or emotional abuse and controlling behaviors are as traumatic as physical or sexual aggression (Ford-Gilboe et al., 2018), and more pervasive (Dokkendahl et al., 2019; Martin-Fernandez et al., 2019; Mojahed et al., 2024); thus, there were more items in these categories that were included in the initial list used in the Phase 1 of the study. Since they often co-occur with other forms of violence, such as physical or sexual abuse (Martin-Fernandez et al., 2019), capturing this domain in depth improves the measurement of the psychological and emotional abuse construct, as well as the Tam's IPV Scale overall.

One striking outcome of the first and second phase of test construction was that, out of the initial list of six (6) items belonging to sexual coercion, only one remained in the final list, although three (3) out of six (6) of them had an initial reliability coefficient of at least 0.70. One possible reason for this could be the age distribution of respondents. As mentioned previously, the majority who participated in Phase 1 (n=79; 79%) and 2 (n=77; 75%) were 18-21 years old. It is possible that many of these youngsters had not experienced serious relationships that could have challenged their patience. Additionally, as is common in the Philippines, these respondents may still be living with their parents, who provided for their basic needs as well as offer guidance in their relationships.

As to physical aggression, out of nine (9) items during Phase 1, it narrowed down to only having three in the final scale. Similarly, for controlling behavior, four out of 16 were selected. Both had a selection rate of just 25%-33%. The inclusion of fewer items belonging to physical aggression and controlling behavior categories may be due to the same factors as those affecting sexual coercion. These include respondents' age, the limited depth of their relationship experience, and the presence of their parents, which may have mitigated the impact of a less-than-ideal relationship with their partners.

As to the inclusion of fewer items for sexual coercion and physical aggression in the initial pool, this was intentional because, as previously mentioned, pieces of research evidence suggest that couples in

an abusive relationship often experiences more psychological or emotional violence rather than sexual or physical aggression (Dokkedahl et al., 2019; Martin-Fernandez et al., 2019; Mojahed et al., 2024). The focus here is on key indicators rather than exhaustive coverage. These well-targeted items also reduce respondents' burden and ethical risk.

As to the low reliability coefficients in many of the items of sexual coercion and physical aggression, this may be due to under reporting because of fear or the stigma associated with these experiences. The Philippine cultural norms emphasizing modesty and the avoidance of discussing sexual or violent behaviors may have contributed to a reduced variance in responses, which affected the reliability coefficient of these items.

Overall, the results of the two surveys contributed to the development of a scale that reflects the core principles of the Duluth Model, which emphasizes the exercise of power and control through both physical and non-physical forms of abuse.

Conclusion

The findings revealed that psychological or emotional abuse emerged as the most common form of IPV based on the Tam's Intimate Partner Violence Scale in the Philippine context. This result reflects the pervasive nature of psychological violence, as documented in previous literature, and aligns with the core principles of the Duluth model, which emphasizes that abuse is not limited to physical acts but includes non-physical patterns of behavior aimed at exerting power and control over a partner. Moreover, these findings support previous research indicating that psychological violence is more prevalent than other forms of IPV and often co-occurs with physical or sexual aggression.

The inclusion of relatively fewer items in the sexual coercion and physical aggression subscales may reflect the fear, stigma, and cultural sensitivity surrounding these forms of abuse within Philippine society. This pattern may also be influenced by the respondents' demographic characteristics, as the majority were between 18 and 21 years old. In the Philippines, individuals in this age group commonly continue to live with their parents, who may provide relationship guidance and support that could mitigate the long-term effects of unhealthy relationships.

Overall, the Tam's IPV Scale offers a culturally appropriate tool for assessing intimate partner violence in the Philippine context and holds promise for supporting future research and intervention efforts. Nevertheless, further validation among gender- and age-diverse populations, as well as the enhancement of IPV-related items, is recommended to strengthen its applicability and generalizability.

Recommendations

Although the current Tam's IPV Scale can be readily used to assess Filipino adults' experience with IPV, it is more appropriate with younger adults. To further polish the scale and widen its effectiveness and applicability, future research should validate the scale with diverse populations, including older adults, married couples, and rural and urban communities with varying economic status, and consider longitudinal designs to assess changes in IPV over time. Researchers are also encouraged to increase and refine items on sexual coercion and physical aggression, ensuring clarity and cultural sensitivity. This approach would enhance the construct validity of the subscales. Moreover, involving both IPV victims and

non-victims in the scale validation process could improve the discriminant validity of each subscale. Employing mixed-method assessments is also recommended for a more comprehensive evaluation. The qualitative component of the design could provide deeper insight into the participants' lived experience of IPV, shedding more light on the phenomenon in the Philippine context. Practitioners and policymakers should focus on raising awareness about psychological and emotional abuse and develop culturally appropriate prevention and intervention programs. Finally, ethical considerations, confidentiality, and cultural adaptation should remain central to all future IPV research and practice.

Limitations of the Study

The findings of this study should be interpreted in light of certain limitations arising from time constraint and limited resources. First, the sample has limited demographic diversity. The age distribution was uneven, with the majority of respondents being young people. This may be partly due to the method of data collection. In as much as the study was conducted within a limited time frame as part of a course requirement in a graduate class on psychological testing, data were collected online via Google Forms. This may have discouraged older individuals with lower levels of technological familiarity from participating in the survey. Additionally, these younger respondents may have limited relationship experience and may still have been living with their parents, which could have influenced their exposure to certain types of IPV, such as sexual coercion and physical aggression. Second, due to Philippine cultural and social norms that discourage open discussions of certain IPV domains (i.e., sexual and physical aggression), respondents may have underreported these experiences or may have responded in socially desirable ways. This may have affected the variance in responses, which in turn could have influenced the reliability coefficients. Third, because respondents were asked to recall their experience with current or previous partners, their responses may have been influenced by recall bias. Fourth, due to the sensitive nature of IPV, a limited number of items on sexual coercion and physical aggression were included to minimize distress among respondents, which may have reduced the reliability or depth of measurement. Fifth, because respondents completed the survey anonymously, follow-up for clarification or collection of additional data was not possible. Lastly, the findings may not generalize to non-Filipino populations or to older Filipino adults with more relationship experience. These limitations highlights the need for further refinement of the items, particularly those assessing sexual coercion and physical aggression, and for validation of the scale across more diverse populations and contexts.

References

- Ahmadabadi, Z., Najman, J. M., Williams, G. M., Clavarino, A. M., & d'Abbs, P. (2017). Gender differences in intimate partner violence in current and prior relationships. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 36*(1-2), 088626051773056. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0886260517730563>
- Bogat, G.A., Levendosky, A.A., & Cochran, K.A. (2022). Intimate partner violence. In *Reference Module in Neuroscience and Biobehavioral Psychology*. Elsevier, Inc. <https://doi.org/10.1016/B978-0-323-91497-0.00108-9>
- Bogat, G.A., Levendosky, A.A., & Garcia, A.M. (2016). Intimate partner violence. In *Encyclopedia of Mental Health* (2nd ed., pp. 411-416). Elsevier, Inc. <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/abs/pii/B9780123970459002378>
- Capinha, M., Rijo, D., Pereira, M., & Matos, M. (2022). The prevalence, directionality, and dyadic perpetration types of intimate partner violence in a community sample in Portugal: A gender-inclusive inquiry. *European Journal of Criminology, 19*(6), 1–18. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10610-022-09514-w>
- Clark, C.J. (2013). Intimate partner violence. In *Women and Health* (2nd ed, pp. 725-733.). Elsevier Inc. <https://doi.org/10.1016/B978-0-12-384978-6.00048-0>
- Cunningham, M., & Anderson, K. L. (2023). Women experience more intimate partner violence than men over the life course: Evidence for gender asymmetry at all ages in a national sample. *Sex Roles, 89*. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11199-023-01423-4>
- Ellsberg, M. & Emmelin, M. (2014). Intimate partner violence and mental health. *Global Health Action, 12*, 7:25658. doi: 10.3402/gha.v7.25658
- Dokkedahl, S., Kok, R.N., Murphy, S., Kristensen, T.R., Bech-Hansen, D., & Elklit, A. (2019). The psychological subtype of intimate partner violence and its effect on mental health: protocol for a systematic review and meta-analysis. *Systematic Review 8*, 198 (2019). <https://doi.org/10.1186/s13643-019-1118-1>
- Fanslow, J., Mellar, B. M., Gulliver, P., & McIntosh, T. (2023). Evidence of gender asymmetry in intimate partner violence experience at the population-level. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 38*(15-16), 9159–9188. <https://doi.org/10.1177/08862605231163646>
- Ford-Gilboe, M., Wathen, C.N., Varcoe, C., MacMillan, H.L., Scott-Storey, K., Mantler, T., Hegarty, K., & Perrin, N. (2018). Development of a brief measure of intimate partner violence experiences: The Composite Abused Scale Revised – Short Form (CAS_R-SF). *BMJ Open, 6*. DOI: 10.1136/bmjopen-2016-012824
- Hegarty, K., Sheehan, M., & Schonfeld, C. (1999). A multidimensional definition of partner abuse: Development and preliminary validation of the Composite Abuse Scale. *Journal of Family Violence, 14*(4), 399–415. <https://doi.org/10.1023/A:1022834216681>
- Jordan, C. E. (2016). Adult victims of intimate partner violence: Mental health implications and interventions. In H. S. Friedman (Ed.), *Encyclopedia of Mental Health* (2nd ed., pp. 23–28). Elsevier. <https://doi.org/10.1016/B978-0-12-397045-9.00172-5>

- Martín-Fernández, M., Gracia, E. & Lila, M. Psychological intimate partner violence against women in the European Union: a cross-national in variance study. *BMC Public Health* 19, 1739 (2019). <https://doi.org/10.1186/s12889-019-7998-0>
- Martin-Fernandez, M., Gracia, E., Marco, M., Vargas, V., Santirzo, F.A., & Lila, M. (2018). Measuring acceptability of intimate partner violence against women: Development and validation of the A-IPVAW Scale. *The European Journal of Psychology Applied to Legal Context*, 10(1), 26-34. DOI: 10.5093/ejpalc2018a3
- Mojahed A, Mack JT, Staudt A, Weise V, Shiva L, Chandra P, Garthus-Niegel S. Prevalence and risk factors of intimate partner violence during the COVID-19 pandemic: Results from the population-based study DREAMCORONA. *PLoS One*, 19(6):e0306103. doi: 10.1371/journal.pone.0306103
- Mutisya, R., Mberu, B., Mberia, H., & Kabiru, C. W. (2024). Prevalence and factors associated with intimate partner violence among women of reproductive age in Kenya: Findings from the 2022 Kenya Demographic and Health Survey. *BMC Public Health*, 24(1), Article 806. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s12889-024-19012-9>
- Patra, P., Prakash, J., Patra, B., Khanna, P. (2018). Intimate partner violence: Wounds are deeper. *Indian Journal of Psychiatry*, 60(4):494-498. doi: 10.4103/psychiatry.IndianJPsychiatry_74_17.
- Pence, E., & Paymar, M. (2017). *The development of the Power and Control Wheel*. The Duluth Model. <https://www.theduluthmodel.org/wp-content/uploads/2017/03/The-Development-of-the-Power-and-Control.pdf>
- Philippine Commission on Women. (n.d.). *Violence against women*. <https://pcw.gov.ph/violence-against-women/>
- Straus, M. A. (1979). Measuring intrafamily conflict and violence: The Conflict Tactics (CT) Scales. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, 41(1), 75–88. <https://doi.org/10.2307/351733>
- 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. <https://doi.org/10.1177/019251396017003001>
- Sullivan, T. P., Chiamonte, D., Clark, D. A., & Swan, S. C. (2023). Intimate Partner Violence Fear–11 Scale: An item response analysis. *Psychology of Violence*, 13(2), 161-170. <https://doi.org/10.1037/vio0000440>
- Troisi, G. (2018). Measuring intimate partner violence and traumatic affect: Development of VITA, an Italian scale. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 9 (2018). <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2018.01282>
- United Nations Bangladesh. (2024, May 15). *2024 Violence against women survey: Intimate partner violence remains widespread in Bangladesh*. <https://bangladesh.un.org/bn/node/290080>
- World Health Organization. (2024, July 29). *Adolescent girls face alarming rates of intimate partner violence*. <https://www.who.int/news/item/29-07-2024-adolescent-girls-face-alarming-rates-of-intimate-partner-violence>

World Health Organization. (2021, March 9). *Devastatingly pervasive: 1 in 3 women globally experience violence*. <https://www.who.int/news/item/09-03-2021-devastatingly-pervasive-1-in-3-women-globally-experience-violence>

World Health Organization. (2010). *Violence against women: Intimate partner violence* (WHO/RHR/10.09). https://www.who.int/reproductivehealth/publications/violence/rhr10_09/en/

World Health Organization. (2005, February 10). *WHO multi-country study on women's health and domestic violence against women: Initial results on prevalence, health outcomes and women's responses* (Situation report). <https://apps.who.int/iris/handle/10665/43309>

Yount, K. M., VanderEnde, K., Zureick-Brown, S., Anh, H. T., Schuler, S. R., & Minh, T. H. (2014). Measuring attitudes about intimate partner violence against women: the ATT-IPV scale. *Demography*, 51(4), 1551-1572. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s13524-014-0297-6>