

BATTERING MEN'S EXCUSES

Authored by
mohammad looti

November 4, 2025

RECOMMENDED CITATION

mohammad looti (2025). *BATTERING MEN'S EXCUSES*. PSYCHOLOGICAL SCALES.
Retrieved from <https://scales.arabpsychology.com/?p=67382>

BATTERING MEN'S EXCUSES

Primary Disciplinary Field(s): Psychology, Sociology, Criminology, Domestic Violence Studies

1. Core Definition and Context

The concept of **Battering Men's Excuses** refers specifically to the repertoire of justifications, rationalizations, and minimizing narratives employed by individuals--typically men--who perpetrate physical, sexual, or psychological abuse against their intimate partners. These statements are not genuine admissions of cause, but rather defensive mechanisms designed to deflect personal responsibility for violent actions, shift blame onto the victim, or mitigate the severity of the offense in the eyes of the perpetrator, the victim, or society. The fundamental characteristic of these excuses is their reliance on external factors--such as provocation, stress, substance abuse, or the partner's perceived failings--to explain behavior that is, fundamentally, an intentional exercise of power and control.

In the context of domestic violence, understanding these rationalizations is crucial because they serve to maintain the abuse cycle. By externalizing the cause of violence, the batterer avoids the internal conflict that results from committing heinous acts against someone they supposedly love. If the violence is framed as an uncontrollable reaction to a specific external trigger (e.g., "she made me angry," or "I was too stressed"), the perpetrator can maintain an identity that is not inherently violent or morally corrupt. This self-deception allows the violence to continue, as the underlying psychological and behavioral need for control remains unaddressed, while the immediate moral consequence is neutralized through cognitive maneuvering.

The origin of this concept lies within clinical studies and therapeutic interventions focused on male perpetrators of intimate partner violence (IPV), particularly models like the Duluth Model, which emphasize accountability and the pattern of control rather than focusing solely on anger management. Researchers recognized that perpetrators rarely admit full culpability, instead presenting a complex web of excuses that consistently minimize their agency. Therefore, the term encapsulates a systemic pattern of defensive language observed across diverse socioeconomic and cultural backgrounds, highlighting a universal psychological response to morally indefensible behavior.

2. Psychological Function of Rationalization

The psychological function underlying **battering men's excuses** is rooted primarily in the need to resolve **cognitive dissonance**. Cognitive dissonance occurs when an individual holds conflicting beliefs, attitudes, or behaviors--in this case, the conflict between believing oneself to be a "good person," or at least a non-criminal, while simultaneously engaging in brutal acts of violence against

a loved one. To reduce this uncomfortable psychological tension, the batterer engages in rationalization, developing coherent (though false) narratives that justify the violent behavior and preserve a positive self-image.

These rationalizations operate as powerful ego defense mechanisms. If the violence is viewed as self-defense, or as a necessary punitive measure, the perpetrator's moral identity is shielded from collapse. Attribution theory suggests that individuals tend to attribute successful or positive outcomes to internal factors (e.g., skill, character) and negative outcomes to external factors (e.g., luck, environment). Batterers utilize this bias drastically, attributing their violence--a profoundly negative action--entirely to external factors, typically the actions or words of the victim. This external attribution prevents self-reflection and blocks the necessary recognition that the problem resides within their own behavioral choices and control issues.

Furthermore, these excuses function within a broader psychological framework of **minimization, denial, and projection**. Minimization involves downplaying the severity of the abuse ("it was just a push," or "she wasn't really hurt"). Denial is the refusal to acknowledge the event or the extent of its impact. Projection involves attributing one's own unacceptable feelings or impulses onto the victim ("she wanted a fight," or "she is the one who is truly violent"). These defense mechanisms are essential tools for maintaining the batterer's sense of power and preventing the affective experience of shame or guilt, which could otherwise motivate behavioral change.

3. Common Categories of Excuses

Clinical studies of batterers have identified several recurring thematic categories within their excuses, demonstrating a predictable structure in how they attempt to evade accountability. One of the most pervasive categories is **Victim Blaming**. This involves asserting that the victim's behavior--such as nagging, infidelity (real or perceived), poor housekeeping, or simply arguing back--was the direct cause of the violence. The victim is thus presented not as the recipient of the abuse, but as the primary instigator, shifting the moral burden entirely away from the perpetrator. Phrases like "she pushed my buttons" or "she deserved it" exemplify this category.

A second significant category involves **Externalizing Blame to Situational Factors**. This includes citing transient states or external stressors as the determining factor. Common examples are claims of severe financial stress, job loss, alcohol or drug use, or mental fatigue. While these factors may lower inhibitions, they are consistently used by batterers as deterministic causes, implying that the violence was an inevitable, uncontrollable response rather than a deliberate choice. For instance, the statement "I was drunk, so I didn't know what I was doing" attempts to isolate the violence from the sober personality and character of the abuser, disconnecting the act from the self.

A third, more insidious category involves **Justification as Discipline or Teaching**. In highly

patriarchal contexts, or even subtle forms of traditional gender roles, the batterer may frame the violence as a necessary measure to maintain order, teach the victim a lesson, or enforce expected gender roles. This transforms the abuse from a criminal act into a righteous, if unfortunate, disciplinary action aimed at improving the victim's behavior or morality. This type of excuse leverages societal norms concerning male authority within the household to provide cultural legitimacy to the violence, making it particularly difficult for the victim to challenge without simultaneously challenging entrenched social systems.

4. Socio-Cultural Acceptance and Gender Norms

The persistence and effectiveness of **battering men's excuses** are heavily reinforced by socio-cultural structures, particularly those rooted in patriarchal ideologies. In cultures where men are granted inherent authority and dominance within the domestic sphere, the narrative that a man was "provoked" by a woman who failed to respect his authority often finds ready acceptance. This cultural context provides a reservoir of pre-approved justifications for violence, making the excuses highly effective not only for the batterer's own psyche but also for gaining tacit approval or minimizing societal condemnation.

Societal acceptance is frequently subtle, manifesting through judicial systems, law enforcement responses, and community attitudes that question the victim's behavior rather than the perpetrator's actions. When a victim reports abuse, the immediate question often revolves around what she did to "set him off." This cultural tendency to scrutinize the victim's conduct reinforces the batterer's internal narrative that the victim holds responsibility for managing the abuser's temper. The prevalence of terms like "crimes of passion," though outdated legally, still reflects a cultural willingness to mitigate male violence when linked to perceived emotional injury or provocation.

Furthermore, traditional conceptions of masculinity often link anger and violence to male strength and power. When a man expresses rage through violence, and then attributes that rage to external frustration (often caused by the partner), this act sometimes aligns with toxic masculine norms, where displaying powerful, even destructive, emotion is tolerated or even admired more than vulnerability or self-control. This societal validation ensures that the batterer receives minimal social pressure to abandon his excuses, thereby solidifying the abusive behavioral pattern.

5. Clinical and Legal Implications

In clinical settings, addressing **battering men's excuses** is the first and most critical step in effective perpetrator intervention programs. Therapists trained in IPV dynamics recognize that confronting and dismantling these rationalizations is paramount to achieving true accountability. Programs based on control theory, rather than psychopathology models, focus intensely on cognitive restructuring. The batterer is consistently challenged to replace external attributions ("she

caused it") with internal attributions ("I chose to use violence to gain control"). This process aims to penetrate the layers of denial and minimization that protect the abusive behavior.

The legal system also contends directly with these excuses, often finding them presented as mitigating factors during sentencing or defense arguments. Defense attorneys frequently utilize narratives of provocation or extreme emotional disturbance to reduce charges or sentences, essentially leveraging the cultural tolerance for these excuses within the courtroom. However, specialized domestic violence courts and legal advocates increasingly focus on exposing these excuses as deliberate strategies of evasion. The introduction of tools like the Power and Control Wheel helps judicial authorities to reframe the incident not as an isolated loss of temper, but as part of a sustained pattern of coercive control, thereby neutralizing the defense strategy built upon excuses.

The success of intervention, whether clinical or legal, hinges on the capacity to shift the focus from the purported trigger (the excuse) to the underlying behavioral choice (the violence). If the system accepts the excuse, it subtly colludes with the batterer, reinforcing the belief that violence is justifiable under specific circumstances. Conversely, by rigorously challenging excuses and demanding explicit ownership of the behavior, intervention programs pave the way for genuine remorse and sustainable non-violence.

6. The Fallacy of Provocation

The central and most frequently employed excuse--the claim of being "provoked into anger and violence"--is fundamentally flawed from a behavioral and therapeutic perspective. Violence in IPV is rarely a spontaneous reaction to overwhelming emotion; rather, it is a tool used instrumentally to establish or restore coercive control over the partner. The violence often occurs when the batterer feels their control slipping, not merely when they feel angry. If violence were purely an issue of poor anger management, batterers would exhibit similar levels of aggression toward their bosses, police officers, or strangers who genuinely provoke them, which is generally not the case.

The pattern of abuse reveals the deliberate nature of the violence. Batterers typically retain enough control during the incident to ensure the abuse occurs in private, avoids causing injuries that are too visible or lethal, and specifically targets areas of the victim's body that are hidden by clothing. This indicates a high degree of intentionality and behavioral control, directly contradicting the excuse that the violence was an automatic, uncontrolled explosion of rage caused by the partner. The "provocation" is merely the final narrative trigger used to justify the premeditated desire to reassert dominance.

Furthermore, focusing on provocation misrepresents the dynamic of accountability. In any healthy relationship, conflicts arise, and individuals express anger. The difference between a non-abusive and an abusive conflict is the choice of response. The batterer chooses violence as the response,

and then retroactively constructs the excuse of provocation. Therapeutic models stress that while external circumstances might create stress, the choice to use physical force is always an internal one, driven by the desire for power, not by the partner's alleged misdeeds. Recognizing the fallacy of provocation is essential to shifting societal and clinical focus back onto the batterer's decision-making process.

7. Intervention and Counter-Narratives

Effective intervention against the cycle perpetuated by **battering men's excuses** requires developing powerful counter-narratives that emphasize responsibility and choice. These interventions typically occur in mandated group settings where peers can challenge one another's rationalizations under expert guidance. The goal is to move the perpetrator from a position of external causality ("She caused me to hit her") to one of internal agency ("I chose to hit her because I felt entitled to control her").

Key strategies involve demanding concrete accountability for specific acts. Instead of allowing vague descriptions of "losing control," facilitators ask the perpetrator to detail the steps of the abusive incident and identify the exact moments when they had opportunities to stop or leave. This painstaking process of dissecting the timeline forces the perpetrator to acknowledge the choices made at each step, thereby stripping away the protective veneer of the excuse. This method helps the batterer understand that violence is a pattern of calculated behaviors, not an unpredictable outburst.

Moreover, promoting empathy and understanding the long-term impact on the victim and children serves as a crucial counter-narrative. By hearing the systemic harm caused by the abuse--which the excuses often minimize--the batterer begins to face the true consequences of their actions, moving them away from self-pity (often inherent in the excuse structure) toward genuine remorse and commitment to non-violence. The ultimate success of these interventions is measured by the complete abandonment of the excuses and the adoption of total, non-negotiable responsibility for all past and future violent actions.

8. Further Reading

[Domestic Violence \(Wikipedia\)](#)

[Rationalization \(Psychology Dictionary\)](#)

[Duluth Model \(Theories of Batterer Intervention\)](#)

[Coercive Control \(Legal and Sociological Context\)](#)