

References Examining Assaults by Women on Their Spouses or Male Partners: An Updated Annotated Bibliography

Martin S. Fiebert

Published online: 19 June 2013
© Springer Science+Business Media New York 2013

Abstract This annotated bibliography describes 343 scholarly investigations (270 empirical studies and 73 reviews) demonstrating that women are as physically aggressive as men (or more) in their relationships with their spouses or opposite-sex partners. The aggregate sample size in the reviewed studies exceeds 440,850 people.

Ackard, D. M., & Neumark-Sztainer, D. (2002). Date violence and date rape among adolescents: associations with disordered eating behaviors and psychological health. *Child Abuse & Neglect*, 26, 455–473. (A Minnesota statewide school sample of 81,247 students <40,301 boys, 40,946 girls > in the 9th and 12th grade responded to the question of whether they ever experienced date related violence. Over 90 % of students reported never experiencing dating violence. In terms of grades, 3.3 % of 9th grade girls and 2.8 % of 9th grade boys reported experiencing violence, while 5.5 % of 12th grade girls and 2.3 % of 12th grade boys reported experiencing violence. In terms of ethnicity, American Indian boys <7.1 %> and African American boys <7.2 %> reported experiencing higher rates of dating violence than American Indian girls <6.8 %> and African American girls <3.6 %>).

Aizenman, M., & Kelley, G. (1988). The incidence of violence and acquaintance rape in dating relationships among college men and women. *Journal of College Student Development*, 29, 305–311. (A sample of actively dating college students <204 women and 140 men >responded to a survey examining courtship violence. Authors report that there were no significant differences between the sexes in self reported perpetration of physical abuse.)

Earlier versions of this paper appeared in *Sexuality & Culture* 1997, 1, 273–286, *Sexuality & Culture* 2004, 8(3–4), 140–177, and *Sexuality & Culture* 2010, 14(1), 49–91.

M. S. Fiebert (✉)

Department of Psychology, California State University, Long Beach, CA, USA
e-mail: martin.fiebert@csulb.edu

Allen-Collinson, J. (2009). A marked man: Female perpetrated intimate partner abuse. *International Journal of Men's Health*, 8(1), 22–40. (A case study of an abused heterosexual man. Article examines themes obtained from interviews and personal diary material.)

Amendt, G. (2008). *I didn't divorce my kids!: How fathers deal with family break-ups*. Campus Verlag Publishers. (In Chapter 5 author presents data from an internet survey of 3,600 divorced German fathers. Results reveal that 1/3 of men reported episodes of physical violence during the divorce process and 2/3 of these were initiated by ex-partners.)

Anderson, K. L. (2002). Perpetrator or victim? Relationships between intimate partner violence and well-being. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, 64, 851–863. (Data consisted of 7,395 married and cohabiting heterosexual couples drawn from wave 1 of the National Survey of Families and Households <NSFH-1>. In terms of measures: subjects were asked “how many arguments during the past year resulted in ‘you hitting, shoving or throwing things at a partner.’ They were also asked how many arguments ended with their partner, ‘hitting, shoving or throwing things at you.’” Author reports that, “victimization rates are slightly higher among men than women <9 vs. 7 %> and in cases that involve perpetration by only one partner, more women than men were identified as perpetrators <2 vs. 1 %>.”)

Archer, J. (2000). Sex differences in aggression between heterosexual partners: A meta-analytic review. *Psychological Bulletin*, 126, 651–680. (Meta-analyses of sex differences in physical aggression indicate that women were more likely than men to “use one or more acts of physical aggression and to use such acts more frequently.” In terms of injuries, women were somewhat more likely to be injured, and analyses reveal that 62 % of those injured were women.)

Archer, J. (2002). Sex differences in physically aggressive acts between heterosexual partners: A meta-analytic review. *Aggression and Violent Behavior*, 7, 213–351. (Analyzing responses to the Conflict Tactics Scale and using a data set somewhat different from the previous 2000 publication, the author reports that women are more likely than men to throw something at their partners, as well as slap, kick bite, punch and hit with an object. Men were more likely than women to strangle, choke, or beat up their partners.)

Archer, J. (2006). Cross cultural differences in physical aggression between partners: A social-role analysis. *Personality & Social Psychology Review*, 10, 133–153. (A review article which suggests that “women’s empowerment is associated with lower victimization rates from their partners.” Greater individualism and empowerment by women, however, are also associated with higher perpetration rates.)

Archer, J. (2013). Can Evolutionary principles explain patterns of family violence? *Psychological Bulletin*, 139(2), 403–440. (A sophisticated analysis of the application of evolutionary principles to findings in the area of family violence. With regard to partner violence, author reports that in non-Western nations women are more likely to be victims of male partner violence while in nations with high gender empowerment, women are as physically aggressive or more aggressive than men. Author also points out that violence surveys are more reliable as measure of victimization when presented as family or health surveys than when presented as crime surveys.)

Archer, J., & Ray, N. (1989). Dating violence in the United Kingdom: a preliminary study. *Aggressive Behavior*, *15*, 337–343. (Twenty-three dating couples completed the Conflict Tactics scale. Results indicate that women were significantly more likely than their male partners to express physical violence. Authors also report that, “measures of partner agreement were high” and that the correlation between past and present violence was low.)

Arias, I., Samios, M., & O’Leary, K. D. (1987). Prevalence and correlates of physical aggression during courtship. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, *2*, 82–90. (Used Conflict Tactics Scale with a sample of 270 undergraduates <95 men, 175 women> and found 30 % of men and 49 % of women reported using some form of aggression in their dating histories with a greater percentage of women engaging in severe physical aggression.)

Arias, I., & Johnson, P. (1989). Evaluations of physical aggression among intimate dyads. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, *4*, 298–307. (Used Conflict Tactics Scale-CTS-with a sample of 103 male and 99 female undergraduates. Both men and women had similar experience with dating violence, 19 % of women and 18 % of men admitted being physically aggressive. A significantly greater percentage of women thought self-defense was a legitimate reason for men to be aggressive, while a greater percentage of men thought slapping was a legitimate response for a man or woman if their partner was sexually unfaithful.)

Arriaga, X. B. & Foshee, V. A. (2004). Adolescent dating violence. Do adolescents follow in their friends’ or their parents’ footsteps? *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, *19*, 162–184. (A modified version of Conflict Tactics Scale was administered on two occasions, 6 months apart, to 526 adolescents, <280 girls, 246 boys> whose median age was 13. Results reveal that 28 % of girls reported perpetrating violence with their partners <17 % moderate, 11 % severe> on occasion one, while 42 % of girls reported perpetrating violence <25 % moderate, 17 % severe> on occasion two. For boys, 11 % reported perpetrating violence <6 % moderate, 5 % severe> on occasion one, while 21 % reported perpetrating violence <6 % moderate, 15 % severe> on occasion two. In terms of victimization, 33 % of girls, and 38 % of boys reported being victims of partner aggression on occasion one and 47 % of girls and 49 % of boys reported victimization on occasion two.)

Baker, C. R. & Stith, S. m. (2008). Factors predicting dating violence perpetration among male and female college students. *Journal of Aggression, Maltreatment & Trauma*, *17*(2), 227–244. (The CTS2 was administered to 439 undergraduate students <118 men, 321 women> who were in a relationship for at least a month. Results reveal that 31.8 % of men and 41.4 % of women reported being physically violent toward their partners.)

Basile, S. (2004). Comparison of abuse by same and opposite-gender litigants as cited in requests for abuse prevention orders. *Journal of Family Violence*, *19*, 59–68. (Author examined court documents in Massachusetts for the year 1997 and found that, “male and female” defendants, who were the subject of a complaint in domestic relations cases, while sometimes exhibiting different aggressive tendencies, measured almost equally abusive in terms of the overall level of psychological and physical aggression.)

Bernard, M. L., & Bernard, J. L. (1983). Violent intimacy: The family as a model for love relationships. *Family Relations*, 32, 283–286. (Surveyed 461 college students, 168 men, 293 women, with regard to dating violence. Found that 15 % of the men admitted to physically abusing their partners, while 21 % of women admitted to physically abusing their partners.)

Billingham, R. E., Bland, R., & Leary, A. (1999). Dating Violence at three time periods: 1976, 1992, 1996. *Psychological Reports*, 85, 574–578. (Data was collected from college students in 1986 <401 women, 202 men>, 1992 <210 women, 204 men> and 1996 <342 women, 229 men>. Subjects completed the CTS and results reveal a significant decrease in partner violence over a 10 year period. However, in terms of subjects' self reported violence and report of partner violence, women were consistently more aggressive than men.)

Billingham, R. E., & Sack, A. R. (1986). Courtship violence and the interactive status of the relationship. *Journal of Adolescent Research*, 1, 315–325. (Using CTS with 526 university students <167 men, 359 women> found Similar rates of mutual violence but with women reporting higher rates of violence initiation when partner had not—9 vs. 3 %.)

Bland, R., & Orne, H. (1986). Family violence and psychiatric disorder. *Canadian Journal of Psychiatry*, 31, 129–137. (In interviews with 1,200 randomly selected Canadians <489 men, 711 women> found that women both engaged in and initiated violence at higher rates than their male partners.)

Bohannon, J. R., Dosser Jr., D. A., & Lindley, S. E. (1995). Using couple data to determine domestic violence rates: An attempt to replicate previous work. *Violence and Victims*, 10, 133–141. (Authors report that in a sample of 94 military couples 11 % of wives and 7 % of husbands were physically aggressive, as reported by the wives.)

Bookwala, J. (2002). The role of own and perceived partner attachment in relationship aggression. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 17, 84–100. (In a sample of 161 undergraduates, 34.3 % of women <n=35> reported being victims of partner aggression compared to 55.9 % <n=33> of men.)

Bookwala, J., Frieze, I. H., Smith, C., & Ryan, K. (1992). Predictors of dating violence: A multivariate analysis. *Violence and Victims*, 7, 297–311. (Used CTS with 305 college students <227 women, 78 men> and found that 133 women and 43 men experienced violence in a current or recent dating relationship. Authors reports that “women reported the expression of as much or more violence in their relationships as men.” While most violence in relationships appears to be mutual—36 % reported by women, 38 % by men—women report initiating violence with non violent partners more frequently than men <22 vs. 17 %>).

Breitman, N., Shackelford, T. K., & Block, C. R. (2004). Couple age discrepancy and risk of intimate partner homicide. *Violence and Victims*, 19(3) 321–342. (Authors analyzed all intimate partner homicides <a total of 2,577> in Chicago from 1965 to 1996 and found the murder rate perpetrated by women was 48.7 % while the murder rate perpetrated by men was 51.3 %.)

Brinkerhoff, M., & Lupri, E. (1988). Interspousal violence. *Canadian Journal of Sociology*, 13, 407–434. (Examined Interspousal violence in a representative sample of 562 couples in Calgary, Canada. Used Conflict Tactics Scale and found twice as

much wife-to-husband as husband-to-wife severe violence <10.7 vs. 4.8 %>. The overall violence rate for husbands was 10.3 % while the overall violence rate for wives was 13.2 %. Violence was significantly higher in younger and childless couples. Results suggest that male violence decreased with higher educational attainment, while female violence increased.)

Brown, G. (2004). Gender as a factor in the response of the law-enforcement system to violence against partners. *Sexuality and Culture*, 8, (3–4), 3–139. (Summarizes partner violence data from the 1999 Canadian General Social Survey <GSS>. The GSS is based on a representative sample of 25,876 persons. Overall in the 12-month period preceding the survey, an estimated 3 % of Canadian women and 2 % of Canadian men reported experiencing violence from their partners. During the 5 year period from 1995 to 1999, an estimated 8 % of Canadian women and 7 % of Canadian men reported violence from their partners. Reviewed police and legal responses to partner violence in Edmonton, Canada and concludes that “...men who are involved in disputes with their partners, whether as alleged victims or as alleged offenders or both, are disadvantaged and treated less favorably than women by the law-enforcement system at almost every step.”)

Brush, L. D. (1990). Violent Acts and injurious outcomes in married couples: Methodological issues in the National Survey of Families and Households. *Gender & Society*, 4, 56–67. (Used the Conflict Tactics scale in a large national survey, n = 5,474, and found that women engage in same amount of spousal violence as men.)

Brutz, J., & Ingoldsby, B. B. (1984). Conflict resolution in Quaker families. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, 46, 21–26. (Used Conflict Tactics Scale with a sample of 288 Quakers <130 men, 158 women> and found a slightly higher rate of female to male violence <15.2 %> than male to female violence <14.6 %>.)

Burke, P. J., Stets, J. E., & Pirog-Good, M. A. (1988). Gender identity, self-esteem, and physical and sexual abuse in dating relationships. *Social Psychology Quarterly*, 51, 272–285. (A sample of 505 college students <298 women, 207 men> completed the CTS. Authors reports that they found “no significant difference between men and women in reporting inflicting or sustaining physical abuse.” Specifically, within a 1 year period they found that 14 % of the men and 18 % of the women reported inflicting physical abuse, while 10 % of the men and 14 % of the women reported sustaining physical abuse.)

Caetano, R., Schafer, J., Field, C., & Nelson, S. M. (2002). Agreement on reports of intimate partner violence among white, Black, and Hispanic couples in the United States. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 17, 1308–1322. (A probability sample of 1,635 couples was interviewed and assessed with the CTS. Agreement concerning intimate partner violence was about 40 %, with no differences reported across ethnicities. Women significantly reported perpetrating more partner violence than men in all three ethnic groups.)

Callahan, M. R., Tolman, R. M., & Saunders, D. G. (2003). Adolescent dating violence victimization and psychological well-being. *Journal of Adolescent Research*, 18(6), 664–681. (Subjects were 190 high school students <53 % male; 47 % female; approximately 50 % African-American> who completed a modified

version of the CTS2. In terms of injuries, 22 % of girls and 17 % of boys reported being injured by their dating partners. Note this difference was non-significant.)

Carbone-Lopez, K. (2013). Across Racial/Ethnic boundaries: Investigating intimate partner violence within a national sample. *Journal of Interpersonal violence*, 28(1), 3–24. (Intimate partner violence data from the National Violence against women survey <see Tjaden & Thoennes, 2000> was examined for interracial and monoracial couples. Results reveal that interracial couples were at no greater risk for IPV than White couples. Both monoracial Black and Hispanic couples had higher rates of IPV than White or interracial couples.)

Capaldi, D. M., & Crosby, L. (1997). Observed and reported psychological and physical aggression in young at-risk couples. *Social Developments*, 6, 184–206. (A sample of 118 young men and aggression in young, at-risk couples. Their dating partners were surveyed regarding their own physical aggression as well as that of their partners. Findings reveal that 31 % of men and 36 % of women engaged “in an act of physical aggression against their current partner.”)

Capaldi, D. M., Kim, H. K., & Shortt, J. W. (2004). Women’s involvement in aggression in young adult romantic relationships. In M. Putallaz and K. L. Bierman (Eds.) *Aggression, antisocial behavior, and violence among girls* (pp. 223–241). New York: Guilford Press. (A review chapter which reports on data obtained from Oregon Youth Study and Couples Study. Authors conclude that “Young women were observed to initiate physical aggression toward their partners more frequently than were the young men.” And “the relative prevalence of frequent physical aggression by women and of injury and fear for men was surprisingly high.”)

Capaldi, D. M., Kim, H. K., & Shortt, J. W. (2007). Observed initiation and reciprocity of physical aggression in young at-risk couples. *Journal of Family Violence*, 22 (2) 101–111. (A longitudinal study using subjects from the Oregon Youth and Couples Study. <see above> Subjects were assessed 4 times across a 9 year period from late adolescence to mid-20’s. Findings reveal that young women’s rate of initiation of physical violence was “two times higher than men’s during late adolescence and young adulthood.” By mid-20’s the rate of initiation was about equal. Mutual aggression increased the likelihood of injury for both men and women.)

Capaldi, D. M. & Owen, L. D. (2001). Physical aggression in a community sample of at-risk young couples: Gender comparisons for high frequency, injury, and fear. *Journal of Family Psychology*, 15(3), 425–440. (Drawn from a community based at-risk sample, 159 young couples were assessed with the Conflict Tactics scale and measures of self-reported injuries. Findings indicated that 9.4 % of men and 13.2 % of women perpetrated frequent physical aggression toward their partners. Contrary to expectations, 13 % of men and 9 % of women, indicated that they were physically injured at least once. Authors report “2 % of the men and none of the women indicate that they had been hurt by their partners between five and nine times.”)

Carlson, B. E. (1987). Dating violence: a research review and comparison with spouse abuse. *Social Casework*, 68, 16–23. (Reviews research on dating violence and finds that men and women are equally likely to aggress against their partners and that “the frequency of aggressive acts is inversely related to the likelihood of their causing physical injury.”)

Carney, M., Buttell, F., & Dutton, D. (2007). Women who perpetrate intimate partner violence: A review of the literature with recommendations for treatment. *Aggression and Violent Behavior*, 12, 108–115. (An excellent review of the literature on women who perpetrate violence in intimate relationships. Also summarizes intervention programs for such women.)

Carrado, M., George, M. J., Loxam, E., Jones, L., & Templar, D. (1996). Aggression in British heterosexual relationships: a descriptive analysis. *Aggressive Behavior*, 22, 401–415. (In a representative sample of British men $\langle n=894 \rangle$ and women $\langle n=971 \rangle$ it was found, using a modified version of the CTS, that 18 % of the men and 13 % of the women reported being victims of physical violence at some point in their heterosexual relationships. With regard to current relationships, 11 % of men and 5 % of women reported being victims of partner aggression.)

Cascardi, M., Avery-Leaf, S., O'Leary, K. D., & Slep, A. M. S. (1999). Factor Structure and convergent validity of the Conflict Tactics Scale in high school students. *Psychological Assessment*, 11, 546–555. (A sample of 2,320 high school students $\langle 1,180$ males, $1,140$ females \rangle from seven high schools in Long Island, New York were assessed with a modified CTS. A significantly greater number of women $\langle 37.8 \% \rangle$ compared to $\langle 22.5 \% \rangle$ men reported perpetrating physical aggression toward their dating partners. Of specific note 18.1 % of women compared to 4.3 % of men reported slapping their partners and 16.9 % of women compared to 5.5 % of men reported “kicking, biting or hitting” their partners.)

Cascardi, M., Langhinrichsen, J., & Vivian, D. (1992). Marital aggression: Impact, injury, and health correlates for husbands and wives. *Archives of Internal Medicine*, 152, 1178–1184. (Examined 93 couples seeking marital therapy. Found using the CTS and other information that 71 % reported at least one incident of physical aggression in past year. While men and women were equally likely to perpetrate violence, women reported more severe injuries. Half of the wives and two-thirds of the husbands reported no injuries as a result of all aggression, but wives sustained more injuries as a result of mild aggression.)

Caulfield, M. B., & Riggs, D. S. (1992). The assessment of dating aggression: Empirical evaluation of the Conflict Tactics Scale. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 4, 549–558. (Used CTS with a sample of 667 unmarried college students $\langle 268$ men and 399 women \rangle and found on a number of items significantly higher responses of physical violence on part of women. For example, 19 % of women slapped their male partner while 7 % of men slapped their partners, 13 % of women kicked, bit, or hit their partners with a fist while only 3.1 % of men engaged in this activity.)

Cercone, J. J., Beach, S. R. H., & Arias, I. (2005). Gender Symmetry in Dating Intimate Partner Violence: Does Behavior Imply Similar Constructs? *Violence and Victims*, 20 (2), 207–218. (A sample of 414 college students $\langle 189$ men, 225 women \rangle responded to the CTS2. Results reveal that male and female subjects were equally likely to be perpetrators of minor violence in intimate dating relationships, but women were twice as likely as men to perpetrate severe violence $\langle 15.11$ vs. $7.41 \% \rangle$).

Chan, K. L., Straus, M. A., Brownridge, D. A., Tiwari, A., & Leung, W. C. (2008). Prevalence of dating partner violence and suicidal ideation among male and

female university students worldwide. *Journal of Midwifery & Women's Health*, 53 (6) 529–537. (Authors present findings from the International Dating Violence study which reports responses from 16,000 university students from 22 sites in 21 countries. Subjects responded to the CTS2 and results reveal that in 17 of the 22 sites the rates of victimization were higher for men than women.)

Chang, D. F., Shen, B.-J., & Takeuchi, D. T. (2009). Prevalence and demographic correlates of intimate partner violence in Asian Americans. *International Journal of Law & Psychiatry*, 32, 167–175. (Study reports the first national estimate of IPV among Asian Americans. Sample consisted of 1,470 <47 % men, 53 % women> individuals of varying Asian ethnicities who responded to items on the CTS. Data reveals that 5.02 % of men and 8.48 % of women perpetrated minor violence on their partners. With regard to severe violence women were more than twice as likely as men to perpetrate violence <1.54 vs. .71 %>).

Chermack, St. T., Walton, M. A., Fuller, B. E., & Blow, F. C. (2001). Correlates of expressed and received violence across relationship types among men and women substance abusers. *Psychology of Addictive Behavior*, 15, 140–151. (A sample of substance abusers <126 men, 126 women> ranging in age from 17 to 83 completed a modified version of the CTS. Results reveal no differences in expressed or received partner violence for men and women.)

Clark, M. L., Beckett, J., Wells, M., & Dungee-Anderson, D. (1994). Courtship Violence among African-American college students. *Journal of Black Psychology*, 20(3), 264–281. (A sample of 311 African-American college students <76 men, 235 women> responded to the CTS. Findings reveal that 41 % of men and 33 % of women reported being physically abused by a dating partner.)

Claxton-Oldfield, S. & Arsenault, J. (1999). *The initiation of physically aggressive behaviour by female university students toward their male partners: Prevalence and the reasons offered for such behaviors*. Unpublished manuscript. (In a sample of 168 actively dating female undergraduates at a Canadian university, 26 % indicated that they initiated physical aggression toward their male partners. Most common reason for such behavior was because partner was not listening to them.)

Cogan, R., & Ballinger III, B. C. (2006). Alcohol Problems and the differentiation of partner, stranger, and general violence. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 21(7) 924–935. (A sample of 457 college men and 958 college women completed the CTS. Results revealed that significantly more men than women <35.4 vs. 26.0 %> reported being victimized by their partners.)

Coker, A. L., McKeown, R. E., Sanderson, M., Davis, K. E., Valois, R. F., & Huebner, E. S. (2000). Severe dating violence and quality of life among South Carolina high school students. *American Journal of Preventive Medicine*, 19(4), 220–227. (A stratified sample of 5,414 <2,836 female, 2,578 male> public high school students grades 9 through 12 responded to the South Carolina Youth Risk Behavior Survey in 1997. Severe physical dating violence was assessed by responses to the question of how many times during the past 12 months were you physically beaten up by the person you date or go out with? And how many times during the past 12 months did you beat up the person you date or go out with? Results reveal that 8.9 % of girls reported perpetrating violence compared to 6.1 % of boys. In terms of victimization, 9.7 % of girls reported being victims compared to 5.3 % of boys.)

Coleman, D. H., & Straus, M. A. (1986). Marital Power, Conflict, and Violence in a Nationally Representative Sample of American Couples. *Violence and Victims, 1*, 141–157. A sample of 2,143 couples from a 1975 nationally representative survey responded to the CTS and a measure developed by Blood and Wolfe to assess marital power. Couples were classified as *equalitarian*, *female-dominant*, *male-dominant* or *divided power*. Equalitarian couples had the lowest rates of partner violence while female-dominant couples had the highest rate of partner violence followed by male dominant couples.)

Coney, N. S., & Mackey, W. C. (1999). The feminization of domestic violence in America: The woosle effect goes beyond rhetoric. *Journal of Men's Studies, 8*, (1) 45–58. (Authors review the domestic violence literature and report that while society in general as well as the media portray women as “recipients of domestic violence ... epidemiological surveys on the distribution of violent behavior between adult partners suggest gender parity.”)

Connolly, J., Nocentini, A., Menesini, E., Pepler, D., Craig, W., & Williams, T. S. (2010). Adolescent dating aggression in Canada and Italy: A cross-national comparison. *International Journal of Behavioral Development, 34*(2), 98–105. (A modified version of the CTS2 was administered a cohort of 16 year olds in Canada <297 boys, 367 girls> and Italy <315 boys, 263 girls>. Similar levels of dating aggression were found in Canada <32.5 %> and Italy <33.6 %>. Boys were slightly more aggressive than girls in Canada while no differences between girls and boys were found in Italy.)

Cook, P. W. (1997). *Abused men. The hidden side of domestic violence*. Westport, CN.: Praeger. (Presents the evidence, empirical and personal, for male spousal victimization. Examines resistance to acceptance of findings and offers solutions to reduce domestic violence.)

Corry, C. E., Fiebert, M. S., & Pizzy, E. (2002) Controlling Domestic Violence against men. Available: www.familytx.org/research/Control_DV_against_men.pdf. Earlier version presented at Sixth International Conference on Family Violence, San Diego, CA. (A critical examination of men as victims of partner violence.)

Cross, C. P., Tee, W., & Campbell, A. (2011). Gender symmetry in intimate partner aggression: an effect of intimacy or target sex? *Aggressive Behavior, 37*(3), 268–277. (A sample of 174 individuals <59 men, 115 women> responded to vignette scenarios in which they were provoked by a same sex best friend, opposite sex best friend and an intimate partner. Results reveal that women were significantly more likely than men to report physically aggressing against an intimate partner.)

Cui, M., Lorenz, F. O., Conger, R. D., Melby, J. N., & Bryant, C. M. (2005). Observer, Self-, and partner reports of hostile behaviors in romantic relationships. *Journal of Marriage and Family, 67*, 1169–1181. (Examined a sample of 236 young people <48 % married, 52 % dating; 56 % women, 44 % men> who completed questionnaires regarding their hostile toward their partners. Findings reveal that couples living together have higher levels of hostility than dating couples and that women in both conditions demonstrate higher levels of hostility towards their partners than men.)

Cunradi, C. B., Caetano, R., Clark, C. L., & Schafer, J. (1999). Alcohol-related problems and intimate partner violence among white, Black, and Hispanic couples

in the U.S. *Alcoholism: Clinical and experimental research*, 23, 1492–1501. (A probability sample of 1,440 couples <565 white, 358 Black, 527 Hispanic> was obtained from the 1995 National Alcohol Survey. Subjects completed the Conflict Tactics Scale. Ethnicity results reveal that overall rates of partner aggression were similar for whites and Hispanics while Black rates were significantly higher. In terms of gender, white men and women had similar rates of partner aggression, Hispanic women were somewhat more aggressive than Hispanic men and Black men were more aggressive than Black women. Alcohol related problems were a predictor of intimate partner violence in Black couples.)

Davis, R. L. (2010). Domestic Violence-related deaths. *Journal of Aggression, Conflict, and Peace Research*, 2 (2), 44–52. (A review article which examines domestic violence-related suicides. Author concludes that “when domestic violence-related suicides are combined with domestic homicides, the total numbers of domestic violence-related deaths are higher for males than females.”)

Deal, J. E., & Wampler, K. S. (1986). Dating violence: The primacy of previous experience. *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships*, 3, 457–471. (Of 410 university students <295 women, 115 men> responding to CTS and other instruments, it was revealed that 47 % experienced some violence in dating relationships. The majority of experiences were *reciprocal*. When not reciprocal men were *three times* more likely than women to report being victims. Violent experiences in previous relationships were the best predictor of violence in current relationships.)

DeKeseredy, W. S. & Schwartz, M. D. (1998). *Woman abuse on campus. Results from the Canadian National survey*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage. (A large sample <1,835 women; 1,307 men> of Canadian college students completed the Conflict Tactics Scale. Results reveal that women report engaging in higher rates of violence than men. Specifically, 46.1 % of women reported engaging in some physical violence in intimate relationship since leaving high school. With 38 % employing “minor” violence and 19 % employing “severe” violence.)

DeMaris, A. (1992). Male versus female initiation of aggression: The case of courtship violence. In E. C. Viano (Ed.), *Intimate violence: interdisciplinary perspectives*. (pp. 111–120). Bristol, PA: Taylor & Francis. (Examined a sample of 865 white and black college students with regard to the initiation of violence in their dating experience. Found that 218 subjects, 80 men and 138 women, had experienced or expressed violence in current or recent dating relationships. Results indicate that “when one partner could be said to be the usual initiator of violence, that partner was most often the women. This finding was the same for both black and white respondents.”)

Desmarais, S. L., Reeves, K. A., Nicholls, T. L., Telford, R. P. & Fiebert, M. S. (2012a). Prevalence of physical violence in intimate relationships, part 1: Rates of male and female victimization. *Partner Abuse*, 3 (2), 140–169. (A gold standard article for review of research in IPV. Focus of part 1 is on male and female victimization. Examined all research published between 2000 and 2010 in industrialized English speaking countries. Across studies found that 1 in 4 women and 1 in 5 men experienced physical violence in intimate relationship.)

Desmarais, S. L., Reeves, K. A., Nicholls, T. L., Telford, R. P. & Fiebert, M. S. (2012b). Prevalence of physical violence in intimate relationships, part 2: Rates of

male and female perpetration. *Partner Abuse*, 3, (2), 170–198. (Focus of this review is on male and female perpetration of violence in intimate relationships. Literature search revealed 750 articles published between 2000 and 2010. Pooled prevalence estimates revealed that more than 1 in five men (21.6 %) and 1 in 4 women (28.3 %) reported perpetrating physical violence in an intimate relationship.)

Doumas, D. M., Pearson, C. L., Elgin, J. E., & McKinley, L. L. (2008). Adult attachment as a risk factor for intimate partner violence: The “mispairing” of partner attachment styles. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 23, 616–634. (A sample of 70 heterosexual couples completed the CTS. Results reveal that 35 % of men and 36 % of women reported perpetrating IPV.)

Doroszewicz, K., & Forbes, G. B. (2008). Experiences with dating aggression and sexual coercion among Polish college students. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 23, 58–73. (The CTS2 was used to study dating aggression in a sample <men = 100, women = 100> of unmarried Polish college students. Results reveal that women were overall significantly more aggressive than men <48 vs. 35.6 %>).

Dowd, L. (2001). Female Perpetrators of Partner Aggression: Relevant Issue and Treatment. *Journal of Aggression, Maltreatment and Trauma*, 5(2), 73–104. (A review article examining female partner aggression with a focus on treatment issues.)

Drumm, R. D., Popescu, M., & Riggs, M. L. (2009). Gender variation in partner abuse. Findings from a conservative Christian denomination. *Affilia: Journal of women and Social work*, 24 (1), 56–68. (A stratified random sample of 1,431 of conservative Christian members from 49 churches in the Northwest region of the United States responded to survey items adapted from the CTS. Results reveal that 33.8 % of women and 20.1 % of men reported being physically abused by their partners at some point during their lives).

Dutton, D. G. (2006). *Rethinking Domestic Violence*. Vancouver: UBC Press. (A thoughtful and scholarly analysis and integration of research and treatment in the area of Domestic Violence. Offers much insight, particularly to therapists and policy makers with regard to Intimate Partner Violence <IPV>. Concludes that men are as likely as women to be victims and both suffer similar physical and psychological consequences of IPV.)

Dutton, D. G. (2007). Female intimate partner violence and developmental trajectories of abusive families. *International Journal of Men's Health*, 6, 54–71. (A review article which concludes that female violence towards intimate male partners is just as severe and has similar consequences as male violence toward women. However, most criminal justice interventions and custody evaluations assume that males are more likely to be IPV perpetrators.)

Dutton, D. G., Corvo, K. N., & Hamel, J. (2009). The gender paradigm in domestic violence research and practice part II: The information website of the American Bar Association. *Aggression and Violent Behavior*, 14, 30–38. (A review article critiquing the American Bar Association's attempt to correct myths about domestic violence. Specifically authors state, “...female IPV is more commonplace than male IPV.”)

Dutton, D. G., & Nicholls, T. L. (2005) The gender paradigm in domestic violence research and theory. Part 1: the conflict of theory and data. *Aggression and*

Violent Behavior, 10, 680–714. (A review and analysis of the data regarding male victimization. Critical of feminist approaches that minimize female perpetration and trivialize male injury.)

Dutton, D. G., Nicholls, T. L., & Spidel, A. (2005). Female perpetrators of intimate abuse. *Journal of Offender Rehabilitation*, 41 (4), 1–31. (A review article examining issues related to female abusers. Authors conclude, based on survey and epidemiological studies, that females are as abusive as males in intimate relationships. They note that this is “especially so for younger cohort samples followed longitudinally.”)

Dutton-Greene, L. B., & Straus, M. A. (2005, July). *The relationship between gender hostility and partner violence and injury*. Paper presented at the 9th International Family Violence Research Conference, Portsmouth, NH. (Report of findings from international dating violence study which collected data from over 11,000 <70 % women> college students from 50 universities in 24 countries. Subjects responded to the revised Conflict Tactics Scale, gender hostility scales and injury scales. Findings reveal that women perpetrated greater partner violence than men, that women were more seriously injured than men and that hostility toward the opposite sex was significantly and similarly correlated with partner violence for men and women.)

Eaton, D. K., Davis, K. S., Barrios, L., Brener, N. D., & Noonan, R. K. (2007). Associations of dating violence victimization with lifetime participation, co-occurrence, and early initiation of risk behaviors among U. S. high school students. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 22, 585–602. (Data was examined from the 2003 national Youth Risk Behavior Survey. Subjects were 15,214 students from the 9th to the 12th grade and consisted of 48.7 % female, 61.5 % white, 13.9 % black, 16.6 % Hispanic, and 8.1 % other race or ethnicity. Physical dating violence was assessed by response to the question: “During the past 12 months, did your boyfriend or girlfriend ever hit, slap, or physically hurt you on purpose?” Results reveal that 8.8 % of girls and 8.6 % of boys reported being victims of dating violence.)

Ehrensaft, M. K., Cohen, P., Brown, J., Smailes, E., Chen, H., & Johnson, J. G. (2003). Intergenerational transmission of partner violence: A 20-year prospective study. *Journal of Counseling and Clinical Psychology*, 71, 741–753. (A sample of 541 subjects from New York State <298 women, 243 men> who had been followed for over 20 years responded to the CTS. While overall similar rates of perpetration of partner abuse were reported by men and women <21 vs. 22 %> women were more likely than men to kick or hit <9 vs. 5 %> or hit or try to hit with objects <7 vs. 2 %>.)

Ehrensaft, M. K., Moffitt, T. E., & Caspi, A. (2004). Clinically abusive relationships in an unselected birth cohort: men’s and women’s participation and developmental antecedents. *Journal of Abnormal Psychology*, 113 (2), 258–270. (Assessed 980 individuals, ages 24–26, who were participants in longitudinal study in New Zealand. Subjects were examined with the CTS, the Partner Conflict Calendar, PCC, a measure of the consequences of abuse and a variety of personality and psychopathology scales. Findings reveal that an equal number of men and women, 9 %, were victims of clinical abuse in their relationships with partners.)

Ellison, C., G., Barkowski, J. P., & Anderson, K. R. (1999). Are there religious variations in domestic violence? *Journal of Family Issues*, 20, 87–113. (Subjects were selected from the first wave of The National Survey of Families & Households and consisted of 2,420 women and 2,242 men. Self administered surveys revealed that females were significantly more likely than males to perpetrate violence toward their partners. Authors report that “regular attendance at religious services is inversely associated” with domestic violence for men and women.)

Ernst, A. A., Nick, T. G., Weiss, S. J., Houry, D., & Mills, T. (1997). Domestic violence in an inner-city ED. *Annals of Emergency Medicine*, 30, 190–197. (Assessed 516 patients <233 men, 283 women> in a New Orleans inner-city emergency Department with the Index of Spousal Abuse, a scale to measure domestic violence. Found that 28 % of the men and 33 % of the women <a nonsignificant difference>, were victims of past physical violence while 20 % of the men and 19 % of the women reported being current victims of physical violence. In terms of ethnicity, 82 % of subjects were African-American. Authors report that there was a significant difference in the number of women vs. men who reported past abuse to the police, 19 % of women, 6 % of men.>.)

Farrell, W. (1999). *Women can't hear what men don't say*. New York: Tarcher/Putnam. See Chapter 6. (Pp. 123–162; 323–329.) An excellent social and political analysis of couple violence.)

Feather, N. T. (1996). Domestic violence, gender and perceptions of justice. *Sex Roles*, 35, 507–519. (Subjects <109 men, 111 women> from Adelaide, South Australia, were presented a hypothetical scenario in which either a husband or wife perpetrated domestic violence. Participants were significantly more negative in their evaluation of the husband than the wife, were more sympathetic to the wife and believed that the husband deserved a harsher penalty for his behavior.)

Felson, R. B. (2002). *Violence and Gender Reexamined*. Washington, DC: American Psychological Association. (Scholarly review and analysis of the literature. Author concludes that, “Women are just as likely as men to be victims of violence from their partners.” Also “casts doubt on the battered wife syndrome as an explanation for why women kill their male partners.”)

Felson, R. B. (2006). Is violence against women about women or about violence? *Contexts*, 5, 21–25. (Reports that while men are eight times more likely to commit overall violence than women, there is gender parity in partner violence. Author suggests that violent men are “less likely to assault their partners because of *the chivalry norm*.”)

Felson, R. B. (2008). The legal consequences of intimate partner violence for men and women. *Children and Youth Services Review*. 30, 639–646. (Author reports that “evidence does not support the idea that assaults by male partners are particularly likely to be underreported or treated leniently. Rather, the results suggest that offenders who assault women are more likely to suffer legal consequences than those who assault men...” In the article author summarizes an unpublished study examining whether gender and marital status affect whether people think the police should be notified about a partner assault. In a telephone survey, 800 subjects responded to a scenario of an argument between a couple in which one strikes the other bruising their arm. Results indicate that subjects were

more likely <80–60 %> to condemn men's assaults on women than women's assaults on men, even though injuries were identical.)

Felson, R. B., & Outlaw, M. (2007). The control motive and marital violence. *Violence and Victims*, 22, 387–407. (Study based on an analysis of data obtained through the National Violence Against Women Survey <see Tjaden & Thoennes, 2000>. Authors looked at 10,000 respondents out of 16,000 total sample who were currently married. Results reveal that adult women are just as controlling and jealous toward their male partners as the other way around. Also report that, "While controlling spouses in current marriages are more likely to act violently there is no evidence that this relationship is gendered.")

Felson, R. B., & Pare, P. (2005). The reporting of domestic violence and sexual assault by nonstrangers to the police. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, 67, 597–610. (Authors analyzed data from The National Violence Against Women Survey and found that "male victims are particularly reluctant to report assaults by their female partners." Reasons for nonreporting include: fear of reprisal, thought that police could do nothing to help and charges would not be believed.)

Felson, R. B., & Pare, P. (2007). Does the criminal justice system treat domestic violence and sexual offenders leniently? *Justice Quarterly*, 24, (Authors analyzed data from the National Violence Against Women Survey and conclude that "women who assault their male partners are particularly likely to avoid arrest.")

Fergusson, D. M., Horwood, L. J., & Ridder, E. M. (2005). Partner Violence and mental health outcomes in a New Zealand birth cohort. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, 67, 1103–1119. (Examined extent of domestic violence experience and perpetration in a sample of 828 <437 women, 391 men> young adults who were 25 years old. Subject were part of a long term longitudinal study and were administered the CTS2. Results reveal that "there were more men exposed to severe domestic violence than women and that mild and moderate rates were similar for men and women. Overall, 39.4 % of women and 30.9 % of men reported perpetration scores of 3 or higher. Authors report that men and women reported similar rates of injury <3.9 % for women vs. 3.3 % for men>. In terms of initiation of partner assaults, 34 % of women and 12 % of men reported initiating physical assaults.)

Fernandez-Fuertes, A. A., & Fuertes, A. (2010). Physical and Psychological aggression in dating relationship of Spanish adolescents: Motives and consequences. *Child Abuse & Neglect*, 34(3), 183–191. (A sample of 567 students <236 males, 331 females> from 5 hh schools in Salamanca, Spain responded to items examining partner abuse. Results reveal girls perpetrated physical aggression toward their male partners at significantly higher levels than boys did to their female partners <30.2 vs. 16.1 %>).

Fiebert, M. S., & Gonzalez, D. M. (1997). Women who initiate assaults: The reasons offered for such behavior. *Psychological Reports*, 80, 583–590. (A sample of 968 women, drawn primarily from college courses in the Southern California area, were surveyed regarding their initiation of physical assaults on their male partners. 29 % of the women, n = 285, revealed that they initiated assaults during the past 5 years. Women in their 20's were more likely to aggress than women aged 30 and above. In terms of reasons, women appear to aggress because they did not

believe that their male victims would be injured or would retaliate. Women also claimed that they assaulted their male partners because they wished to engage their attention, particularly emotionally.)

Fiebert, M. S. (1996). College students' perception of men as victims of women's assaultive behavior. *Perceptual & Motor Skills*, 82, 49–50. (Three hundred seventy-one college students <91 men, 280 women> were surveyed regarding their knowledge and acceptance of the research finding regarding female assaultive behavior. The majority of subjects (63 %) were unaware of the finding that women assault men as frequently as men assault women; a slightly higher percentage of women than men (39 vs. 32 %) indicated an awareness of this finding. With regard to accepting the validity of these findings a majority of subjects (65 %) endorsed such a result with a slightly higher percentage of men (70 vs. 64 %) indicating their acceptance of this finding.)

Flynn, C. P. (1990). Relationship violence by women: issues and implications. *Family Relations*, 36, 295–299. (A review/analysis article that states, “researchers consistently have found that men and women in relationships, both marital and premarital engage in comparable amounts of violence.” Author also writes, “Violence by women in intimate relationships has received little attention from policy makers, the public, and until recently, researchers ... battered men and abusive women have receive ‘selective inattention’ by both the media and researchers.”)

Follingstad, D. R., Wright, S., & Sebastian, J. A. (1991). Sex differences in motivations and effects in dating violence. *Family Relations*, 40, 51–57. (A sample of 495 college students <207 men, 288 women> completed the CTS and other instruments including a “justification of relationship violence measure.” The study found that women were twice as likely to report perpetrating dating violence as men. Female victims attributed male violence to a desire to gain control over them or to retaliate for being hit first, while men believed that female aggression was based on their female partner's wish to “show how angry they were and to retaliate for feeling emotionally hurt or mistreated.”)

Foo, L. & Margolin, G. (1995). A multivariate investigation of dating aggression. *Journal of Family Violence*, 10, 351–377. (A sample of 290 college students <111 men, 179 women> responded to the CTS. Results reveal that 24.3 % of men and 38.5 % of women reported perpetrating physical violence toward their dating partners.)

Forke, C. M., Myers, R. K., Catalozzi, M., & Schwarz, D. F. (2008). Relationship violence among female and male college undergraduate students. *Archives of Pediatric Adolescent Medicine*, 162, 634–641. (A sample of 910 college students <520 women, 390 men> from three college campuses responded to select items from the CTS. Results indicate that women were significantly more likely to report perpetrating physical violence on their male partners than men on their female partners.)

Foshee, V. A. (1996). Gender differences in adolescent dating abuse prevalence, types and injuries. *Health Education Research*, 11, (3), 275–286. (Data collected from 1965 adolescents in eighth and ninth grade in 14 schools in rural North Carolina. Results reveal that 36.5 % of dating females and 39.4 % of dating males

report being victims of physical dating violence. In terms of perpetrating violence 27.8 % of females while only 15.0 % of males report perpetrating violence.)

Foshee, V. A., Fletcher, L., MacDoughall, J. E., & Bangdiwala, S. (2001). Gender differences in the longitudinal predictors of adolescent dating violence. *Preventive Medicine*, 32, 128–141. (A sample of 1,759 8th & 9th grades from 14 different public schools completed the CTS. Results reveal that at baseline 16 % of girls perpetrated mild and 9 % perpetrated severe IPV while 10 % of boys perpetrated mild and 3 % perpetrated severe IPV.)

Fossos, N., Neighbors, C., Kaysen, D., & Hove, M. C. (2007). Intimate partner violence perpetration and problem drinking among college students: The role of expectancies and subjective evaluations of alcohol aggression. *Journal of Studies on Alcohol and Drugs*, 68(5), 706–713. (A sample of 780 college freshmen <333 men, 447 women> who met the criteria for “heavy drinking” completed the CTS2. Results reveal that women were more likely than men to engage in mild <35.38 vs. 21.67 %> and severe <6.41 vs. 2.44 %> acts of partner aggression.)

Gass, D., Stein, D. J., Williams, D. R., & Seedat, S. (2011). Gender differences in risk for intimate partner violence among South African adults. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 26(14), 2764–2789. (A representative sample of South African married or cohabiting adults <641 men, 1,074 women> responded to items from the CTS. Results reveal similar rates of perpetration of partner violence <25.2 % for women and 26.5 % for men>).

Gelles, R. J. (1994). Research and advocacy: Can one wear two hats? *Family Process*, 33, 93–95. (Laments the absence of objectivity on the part of “feminist” critics of research demonstrating female perpetrated domestic violence.)

Gelles, R. J. (2007). The politics of research: The use, abuse, and misuse of social science data—the case of intimate partner violence. *Family Court Review*, 45, 42–51. (An analysis examining the issue of how social science data has been “abused and misused in policy and practice in the area of Intimate Partner Violence <IPV>.” Challenges “supposed” facts in the area and faults feminists for not acknowledging the empirical findings that men are equal victims of IPV.)

George, M. J. (1994). Riding the donkey backwards: Men as the unacceptable victims of marital violence. *Journal of Men’s Studies*, 3, 137–159. (A thorough review of the literature which examines findings and issues related to men as equal victims of partner abuse.)

George, M. J. (1999). A victimization survey of female perpetrated assaults in the United Kingdom. *Aggressive Behavior*, 25, 67–79. (A representative sample of 718 men and 737 women completed the CTS and reported their experience as victims of physical assaults by women during a 5 year period. Men reported greater victimization and more severe assaults than did women. Specifically, 14 % of men compared to 7 % of women reported being assaulted by women. Highest risk group were single men. The majority <55 %> of assaults on men were perpetrated by spouses, partners, or former partners.)

George, M. J. (2002). Skimmington Revisited. *Journal of Men’s Studies*, 10, No. 2, 111–127. (Examines historical sources and finds that men who were victims of spousal aggression were subject to punishment and humiliation. Inferences to contemporary trivialization of male victims of partner aggression is discussed.)

George, M. J. (2003). Invisible touch. *Aggression & Violent Behaviour*, 8, 23–60. (A comprehensive review and analysis of female initiated partner aggression. Historical, empirical and case evidence presented to demonstrate reality of “battered husband syndrome.”)

George, M. J. (2007). The “great taboo” and the role of patriarchy in husband and wife abuse. *International Journal of Men’s Health*, 6, 7–22. (A scholarly examination of key myths and taboos surrounding the concept of patriarchy. Emphasizes the point that IPV will be successfully combated only when male victimization is acknowledged and addressed by both men and women.)

Giordano, P. C., Millhollin, T. J., Cernkovich, S. A., Pugh, M. D., & Rudolph, J. L. (1999). Delinquency, identity, and women’s involvement in relationship violence. *Criminology*, 37, 17–40. (Reports the responses of 721 young adults <45 % male, 55 % female; 47 % white, 53 % nonwhite> who had been involved in delinquent activities 10 years earlier. Subjects responded to a modified version of the CTS. Findings reveal that women were more likely to perpetrate violence than men. Specifically, 27.6 % of women compared to 19.2 % of men hit or threw at their partner and 8.3 % of women compared to 0.4 % of men threatened spouse or partner with a knife.)

Goldberg, W. G., & Tomlanovich, M. C. (1984). Domestic violence victims in the emergency department. *JAMA*, 251, 3259–3264. (A sample of 492 patients <275 women, 217 men> who sought treatment in an emergency department in a Detroit hospital were surveyed regarding their experience with domestic violence. Respondents were mostly African-American (78 %), city dwellers (90 %), and unemployed (60 %). Victims of domestic violence numbered 107 (22 %). While results indicate that 38 % of victims were men and 62 % were women this gender difference did not reach statistical significance.)

Gonzalez, D. M. (1997). *Why females initiate violence: A study examining the reasons behind assaults on men*. Unpublished master’s thesis, California State University, Long Beach. (225 college women participated in a survey which examined their past history and their rationales for initiating aggression with male partners. Subjects also responded to 8 conflict scenarios which provided information regarding possible reasons for the initiation of aggression. Results indicate that 55 % of the subjects admitted to initiating physical aggression toward their male partners at some point in their lives. The most common reason was that aggression was a spontaneous reaction to frustration).

Goodyear-Smith, F. A. & Laidlaw, T. M. (1999). Aggressive acts and assaults in intimate relationships: Towards an understanding of the literature. *Behavioral Sciences and the Law*, 17, 285–304. (An up to date scholarly analysis of couple violence. Authors report that, “...studies clearly demonstrate that within the general population, women initiate and use violent behaviors against their partners at least as often as men.”)

Gover, A. R., Kaukinen, C. & Fox, K. A. (2008). The relationship between violence in the family of origin and dating violence among college students. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 23(12), 1667–1693. (A sample of 2,541 students at two universities responded to items from the CTS2. Results reveal that 24 % of men and 32 % of men perpetrated IPV.)

Graham, K., Plant, M., & Plant, M. (2004). Alcohol, gender and partner aggression: a general population study of British adults. *Addiction Research and Theory, 12*, 385–401. (A cross sectional sample of 2027 <1,052 women, 975 men> adults were interviewed regarding their experience with partner aggression. Results indicate that 16 % of women reported physically aggressing their male partners within a 2 year period, while 13 % of males reported physically aggressing their female partners.)

Graham-Kevan, N. (2007). Domestic violence: Research and implications for batterer programs in Europe. *European Journal of Criminal Policy & Research, 13*, 213–225. (A review article in which author cites evidence which challenges traditional feminist conceptualizations of “domestic violence as unilateral male-to-female violence enacted to control and dominate women, supported by the patriarchal beliefs and systems of the wider society.”)

Graham-Kevan, N., & Archer, J. (July, 2005.) *Using Johnson’s domestic violence typology to classify men and women in a non-selected sample*. Paper presented at the 9th Annual Family Violence Research Conference, Portsmouth, NH. (A total of 1,339 subjects, students and staff from the University of Central Lancashire, responded to a modified version of the CTS. Authors report that, “the proportion of women and men using any act of physical aggression towards their partners was as follows: from self-reports 29 % for women and 17 % for men, and from partner reports 31 % of women and 22 % for men.”)

Grande, E. D., Hickling, J., Taylor, & Woollacott, T. (2003). Domestic violence in South Australia: A population survey of males and females. *Australian and New Zealand Journal of Public Health, 27*(5), 543–550. (A representative random sample of South Australian adults responded to items related intimate partner violence. Results reveal that 2.9 % of 2,596 men and 3.4 % of 2,884 women reported experiencing physical violence perpetrated by their partners.)

Grandin, E. & Lupri, E. (1997). Intimate violence in Canada and the United States: A cross-national comparison. *Journal of Family Violence, 12* (4), 417–443. (Authors examine data from the 1985 U.S. National Family Violence Resurvey and the 1986 Canadian National Family Life Survey. Report that “although the United States exhibits significantly higher rates of societal violence crime than Canada, Canadian women and men were more likely than their American counterparts to use severe and minor intimate violence.” This finding is counter to the “culture of violence theory.” Moreover, in both cultures the rates of violence of wives to husbands were higher than husbands to wives. Specifically, the overall violence index for men in America was 10.6 and in Canada it was 18.3; while the overall violence index for women in America was 12.2 and in Canada it was 25.3.)

Gray, H. M. & Foshee, V. (1997). Adolescent dating Violence. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 12*, 126–142. (A sample of 185 adolescents responded to a questionnaire about dating violence; 77 students reported being involved in physical violence in their current or most recent dating relationship. Mutual violence was present in 66 % of cases; while 26 % of males and 8 % of females reported being victims of violence and 29 % of females and 4 % of males reported being sole perpetrators of violence.)

Gryl, F. E., Stith, S. M., & Bird, G. W. (1991). Close dating relationships among college students: differences by use of violence and by gender. *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships*, 8, 243–264. (A sample of 280 first year college students <156 women, 124 men> at a mid-Atlantic university completed the violence subscale of the Conflict Tactics Scale. Results reveal that almost 30 % of the females and 23 % of males reported that they had been violent in the current relationship. Also almost 28 % of women and 39 % of men reported sustaining violence in their current relationship.)

Halford, W. k., Farrugia, C., Lizzio, A., & Wilson, K. (2010). Relationship aggression, violence and self-regulation in Australian newlywed couples. *Australian Journal of Psychology*, 62(2), 82–92. (A sample of 379 newlywed couples in Australia responded to a short version of the CTS. Results reveal that 22 % of couples experienced a least one act of physical violence in the past year. Female perpetration of violence was more common than male perpetration. Authors report that in violence couples the more common pattern was for women to be violent <59 %> followed by violence by both partners <34 %> and least common was violence by men only <7 %>).

Halpern, C. T., Oslak, S. G., Young, M. L., Martin, S. L. & Kupper, L. L. (2001). Partner violence among adolescents in opposite-sex romantic relationships: Findings from the National Longitudinal Study of Adolescent Health. *American Journal of Public Health*, 91, 1679–1685. (A sample of 7,493 subjects <3,405 boys, 4,088 girls> were drawn in 1994–1995 from a stratified random sample of high school students in the United States. Subjects responded to items from the CTS and results reveal similar rates (12 %) of reported physical violence for boys and girls.)

Hamel, J. (2005). *Gender Inclusive Treatment of Intimate Partner Abuse*. New York: Springer. (Reviews the “most reliable and empirically sound research” and concludes that “men and women physically and emotionally abuse each other at equal rates...” Offers a comprehensive gender inclusive treatment approach to domestic violence.)

Hamel, J. (2007). Toward a gender-inclusive conception of intimate partner violence research and theory: Part 1-traditional perspectives. *International Journal of Men's Health*, 6, 36–54. (A review article which examines research in the area of Intimate Partner Violence (IPV) and finds that until recently the primary focus was on the physical and psychological abuse of women by their male partners. Concludes that the reluctance to objectively investigate the area is due to a “prevailing patriarchal conception of intimate partner violence.”)

Hamel, J. (2009). Toward a gender-inclusive conception of intimate partner violence research and theory: Part 2-new directions. *International Journal of Men's Health*, 8, (1), 41–59. (A review article critical of Johnson's post-patriarchal typology of intimate partner violence. The author presents and discusses a gender-inclusive model for prevention, intervention and policy. This model is consistent with latest findings that reveal most domestic violence is mutual.)

Hampton, R. L., Gelles, R. J., & Harrop, J. W. (1989). Is violence in families increasing? A comparison of 1975 and 1985 National Survey rates. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, 51, 969–980. (Compared a sample of 147 African Americans from the 1975 National Survey with 576 African Americans from the

1985 National Survey with regard to spousal violence. Using the CTS found that the rate of overall violence (169/1,000) of husbands to wives remained the same from 1975 to 1985, while the rate of overall violence for wives to husbands *increased* 33 % (153 to 204/1,000) from 1975 to 1985. The rate of severe violence of husbands to wives decreased 43 % (113 to 64/1,000) from 1975 to 1985, while the rate of severe violence of wives to husbands *increased* 42 % (76 to 108/1,000) from 1975 to 1985. In 1985 the rate of abusive violence by black women was nearly 3 times greater than the rate of white women.)

Harned, M. S. (2002). A multivariate analysis of risk markers for dating violence victimization. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 17*, 1179–1197. (In a university sample of 874 daters <489 women, 385 men> assessed with the revised CTS, 22 % of women and 21 % of men reported experiencing physical aggression from dating partners.)

Harders, R. J., Struckman-Johnson, C., Struckman-Johnson, D. & Caraway, S. J. (1998). *Verbal and physical abuse in dating relationships*. Paper presented at the meeting of American Psychological Association, San Francisco, CA. (Surveyed 274 college students <92 men, 182 women> using a revised form of the Conflict Tactics Scale. Found that women were significantly more physically aggressive than men, particularly in the areas of: pushing, slapping and punching.)

Headey, B., Scott, D., & de Vaus, D. (1999). Domestic violence in Australia: Are women and men equally violent? Data from the International Social Science Survey/Australia 1996/1997 was examined. A sample of 1,643 subjects (804 men, 839 women) responded to questions about their experience with domestic violence in the past 12 months. Results reveal that 5.7 % of men and 3.7 % of women reported being victims of domestic assaults. With regard to injuries results reveal that women inflict serious injuries at least as frequently as men. For example 1.8 % of men and 1.2 % of women reported that their injuries required first aid, while 1.5 % of men and 1.1 % of women reported that their injuries needed treatment by a doctor or nurse.

Hendy, H. M., Weiner, K., Bakerofskie, J., Eggen, D., Gustitus, C., & McLeod, K. C. (2003). Comparison of six models for violent romantic relationships in college men and women. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 18*, 645–665. (A sample of 608 students <164 men, 444 women> were surveyed with the Conflict Tactics Scale. Results indicate that 16 % of men and 26 % of women report inflicting violence on their current romantic partner.)

Henton, J., Cate, R., Koval, J., Lloyd, S., & Christopher, S. (1983). Romance and violence in dating relationships. *Journal of Family Issues, 4*, 467–482. (Surveyed 644 high school students <351 men, 293 women> and found that abuse occurred at a rate of 121 per 1,000 and appeared to be reciprocal with both partners initiating violence at similar rates.)

Herrenkohl, T. I., Kosterman, R., Mason, W. A., & Hawkins, J. D. (2007). Youth violence trajectories and proximal characteristics of intimate partner violence. *Violence and Victims, 22* (3), 259–274. (Subjects were drawn from a longitudinal study in Seattle, WA. At age 24, 644 subjects <51.6 % female, 48.4 % male; 48 % Euro-American, 25 % African-American, 22 % Asian-American) who were partnered were assessed with a modified version of the CTS. Results reveal that 19 % of

subjects perpetrated one or more acts of IPV in the past year. Overall 25 % of women and 13 % of men reported having perpetrated IPV.)

Hettrich, E. L. & O'Leary, K. D. (2007). Females' reasons for their physical aggression in dating relationships. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 22, 1131–1143. (Examined a sample of 446 dating college females <38.6 % Caucasian, 23.6 % Asian, 18.1 % Hispanic, 7.9 % African-American, 6.3 % Caribbean American, 4.8 % other> and found that 32 % reported in engaging in physical aggression toward their male partners. Primary reasons for aggression were anger and poor communication.)

Hines, D. A., Brown, J., & Dunning, E. (2007). Characteristics of callers to the domestic abuse helpline for men. *Journal of Family Violence*, 22, 63–72. (Study examines experiences of 190 men who called the Domestic Abuse Helpline for men. Results reveal that all callers “experienced physical abuse from their female partners, and a substantial minority feared their wives’ violence and were stalked.”)

Hines, D. A. & Douglas, E. M. (2010). Intimate terrorism by women towards men: does it exist? *Journal of Aggression, Conflict and Peace Research*, 2, (3), 36–56. (Study investigates Johnson’s theory of partner violence which differentiates common couple violence <CCV> from intimate terrorism <IT>. Johnson maintains IT is caused by patriarchy and primarily committed by men. The authors examined a sample of 302 men who sought help as victims of partner violence and compared their responses to the CTS2 and other measures to a sample of 520 men from the community. Female partners of the help seeking sample were significantly more likely to aggress against and injure their male partners than female partners of the community sample. For example, males sustained injuries 5 to 1 in the help seeking sample <35–7 %> and 1.5–1 <1.5–1 %> in the community sample. Authors indicate that the majority of male aggression in the help seeking sample was “likely a reaction to their female partner’s violence.” Results were interpreted as a repudiation of Johnson’s theory.)

Hines, D. A. & Malley-Morrison, K. (2001). Psychological effects of partner abuse against men: a neglected research area. *Psychology of Men and Masculinity*, 2, 75–85. (A review article that examines the issue of men as victims of partner abuse. Considers reasons why men would remain in an abusive relationship.)

Hines, D. A. & Saudino, K. J. (2003). Gender differences in psychological, physical, and sexual aggression among college students using the revised Conflict Tactics Scales. *Violence and Victims*, 18(2) 197–217. (A sample of 481 college students <179 men, 302 women> responded to the revised Conflict Tactics scale. Results indicate that 29 % of men and 35 % of women reported perpetrating physical aggression in their relationships.)

Hird, M. J. (2000). An empirical study of adolescent dating aggression in the U.K. *Journal of Adolescence*, 23, 69–78. (A sample of U.K. high school students <279 male, 269 female> were assessed with a modified version of the CTS. Results indicate that 15 % of males and 14 % of females reported experiencing physical aggression from their dating partner within the past 12 months.)

Hoff, B. H. (1999). The risk of serious physical injury from assault by a woman intimate. A re-examination of National Violence against women survey data on type of assault by an intimate. WWW.vix.com/menmag/nvawrisk.htm. (A re-examination

of the data from the most recent National violence against women survey (Tjaden & Thoennes, 1998) shows that “assaulted men are more likely than assaulted women to experience serious attacks by being hit with an object, beat up, threatened with a knife or being knifed.”)

Holt, J. L., Gillespie, W. (2008). Intergenerational transmission of violence, threatened egoism, and reciprocity: A test of multiple psychosocial factors affecting intimate partner violence. *American Journal of Criminal Justice*, 33, 252–266. (A sample of 423 students <275 women, 148 men> completed the CTS. Results reveal that 23 % of women and 13 % of men reported perpetrating IPV.)

Holt, M. K., & Espelage, D. L. (2005). Social support as a moderator between dating violence victimization and depression/anxiety among African American and Caucasian adolescents. *School Psychology Review*, 14, 309–328. (A sample of 681 middle and high school students <319 males, 362 females, 267 African Americans and 414 Caucasians> responded to the Victimization in Dating Relationships scale. Results reveal that 43 % of males and 32 % of females reported physical violence dating victimization. More African American than Caucasians reported physical violence dating victimization <45 vs. 32 %>.)

Holtzworth-Munroe, A. (2005). Female Perpetration of Physical Aggression Against an Intimate Partner: A Controversial New Topic of Study. *Violence and Victims*, 20 (2), 251–259. (Examines the changing zeitgeist, methodological issues, and research findings regarding female perpetrated violence.)

Jackson, S. M., Cram, F. & Seymour, F. W. (2000). Violence and sexual coercion in high school students' dating relationships. *Journal of Family Violence*, 15, 23–36. (In a New Zealand sample of senior high school students <200 women, 173 men> 21 % of women and 19 % of men reported having been physically hurt by their heterosexual dating partner.)

Jain, S., Buka, S. L., Subramanian, S. V., & Molnar, B. E. (2010). Neighborhood predictors of dating violence victimization and perpetration in young adulthood: A multi-level study. *American Journal of Public Health*, 100(9), 1737–1744. (A sample of 633 young adults <352 women, 281 men> completed the CTS2. Results reveal that women were significantly more likely to perpetrate physical violence toward their male partners than were men to perpetrate violence toward their female partners <38.1 vs. 17.8 %>).

Jankey, O, Prospero, M, & Fawson, P. (2011). Mutually violent attitudes: effects on intimate partner violence and mental health symptoms among couples in Botswana, Africa. *Journal of Aggression, Conflict and Peace Research*, 3, (1) 4–11. (A sample of 562 university students in Botswana <71 % female> completed the CTS2. No significant differences between men and women were found with regard to physical perpetration of partner violence.)

Jenkins, S. S., & Aube, J. (2002). Gender differences and gender-related constructs in dating aggression. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 28, 1106–1118. (Used the CTS with a university sample of 85 dating couples. Authors' report that, “women in existing college dating relationships are more aggressive than men.”)

Jezi, D. R., Molidor, C. E., & Wright, T. L. (1996). Physical, sexual, and psychological abuse in high school dating relationships: Prevalence rates and self-esteem issues. *Child and Adolescent Social Work Journal*, 13(1) 69–87. (Examined

an ethnically diverse sample of currently dating subjects <114 male, 118 female> who responded to a modified version of the Conflict Tactics Scale. Results indicate that 50.9 % of subjects <63 % of males and 39 % of females> reported being victims of moderately abusive behaviors such as “being kicked, slapped, having your hair pulled, and being intentionally scratched.”)

Jouriles, E. N., & O’leary, K. D. (1985). Interpersonal reliability of reports of marital violence. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology*, *53*, 419–421. (Used the Conflict Tactics Scale with a sample of 65 couples in marriage therapy and 37 couples from the community. Found moderate levels of agreement of abuse between partners and similar rates of reported violence between partners.)

Kalmuss, D. (1984). The intergenerational transmission of marital aggression. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, *46*, 11–19. (In a representative sample of 2,143 adults found that the rate of husband to wife severe aggression is 3.8 % while the rate of wife to husband severe aggression is 4.6 %.)

Kan, M. L., & Feinberg, M. (2010). Measurement and correlates of intimate partner violence among expectant first-time parents. *Violence and Victims*, *25*, 319–331. (A sample of 169 heterosexual couples expecting their first child responded to the CTS2. Results reveal that 30 % of women and 17 % of men perpetrated IPV in the past year.)

Katz, J., Carino, A., & Hilton, A. (2002). Perceived verbal conflict behaviors associated with physical aggression and sexual coercion in dating relationships: a gender-sensitive analysis. *Violence & Victims*, *17*, 93–109. (A sample of 223 <115 males, 108 females> heterosexual dating undergraduates completed the CTS2. Results indicate that there were no differences for men and women in the perpetration of physical aggression toward partners.)

Katz, J., Kuffel, S. W., & Coblenz, A. (2002). Are there gender differences in sustaining dating violence? An examination of frequency, severity, and relationship satisfaction. *Journal of Family Violence*, *17*, 247–271. (Authors report two studies where dating men and women experienced violence at comparable levels, “although men experienced more frequent moderate violence.” In the first study n = 286, <183 women, 103 men> 55 % of women had nonviolent partners, while 50 % of men had nonviolent partners; in the second study n = 123 <78 women, 45 men> 73 % of women had nonviolent partners, while 58 % of men had nonviolent partners.)

Kaura, S. A. & Allan, C. M. (2004). Dissatisfaction with relationship power and dating violence perpetration by men and women. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, *19*, 576–588. (A university sample of 352 men and 296 women completed the revised Conflict Tactics Scale. Authors report, “Suprisingly, significantly more dating violence perpetration is reported by women than by men.” Also found that “male perpetration of dating violence is related to mother’s violence, whereas female perpetration of dating violence is related to father’s violence.”)

Kelly, L. (2003). Disabusing the definition of domestic abuse: how women batter men and the role of the feminist state. *Florida State Law Review*, *30*, 791–855. (A scholarly examination of the issue of male victimization which is critical of feminist perspectives.)

Kessler, R. C., Molnar, B. E., Feurer, I. D., & Appelbaum, M. (2001). Patterns and mental health predictors of domestic violence in the United States. *International Journal of Law and Psychiatry*, 24, 487–507. (A sample of 3,537 subjects <1,738 men, 1,799 women> were drawn from the National Co-morbidity Survey, a nationally representative survey conducted between 1990 and 1992. Subjects were married or cohabitating men and women between the ages of 15–54 who were assessed using the CTS. Results indicated that, “17.4 % of women and 18.4 % of men reported that they were victims of minor physical violence perpetrated by their current spouses or partners.”)

Kim, K., & Cho, Y. (1992). Epidemiological survey of spousal abuse in Korea. In E. C. Viano (Ed.) *Intimate Violence: Interdisciplinary Perspectives*. (pp. 277–282). Bristol, PA: Taylor and Francis. (Utilized the Conflict Tactics scale in interviews with a random sample of 1,316 married Koreans <707 women, 609 men>. Compared to findings with American couples, results indicate that Korean men were victimized by their wives twice as much as American men, while Korean women were victimized by their spouses three times as much as American women.)

Kim, J.-Y., & Emery, C. (2003). Marital power, conflict, norm consensus, and marital violence in a nationally representative sample of Korean couples. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 18, 197–219. (A sample of 1,500 South Koreans were surveyed. Marital power, conflict and norm consensus were correlated with marital violence. Findings reveal that the incidence of husband to wife violence was 27.8 %, while wife to husband was 15.8 %.)

Kirschner, M., & Fiebert, M. (2008, April). *Interracial dating and partner abuse: A pilot study*. Poster session presented at the annual meeting of Western Psychological Association, Irvine, Ca. (A convenience sample of 40 subjects, 15 men, 25 women who were currently involved in an interracial relationship were evaluated using the CTS2. No relationship between partner aggression and ethnicity was found. However, women were significantly more likely to perpetrate violence toward their male partners than men were toward women.)

Korman, L. M., Collins, J., Dutton, D., Dhayanathan, B., Littman-Sharp, N. & Skinner, W. (2008). Problem gambling and intimate partner violence. *Journal of Gambling Studies*, 24, 13–23. (A sample of 245 problem gambler <43 women, 202 men> completed the CTS2. Results reveal that 40 % of men and 44 % of women reported perpetrating IPV in the past year.)

Kumar, A. (2012). Domestic violence against men in India: A Perspective. *Journal of Human Behavior in the Social Environment*, 22, 290–296. (References an earlier study <see Sakar et al., 2008> which reported that 25.1 % of violence experienced by Indian men is physical. Examines men as victims of violence as a function of changing gender roles and power relationships in India.)

Kwong, M. J., Bartholomew, K., & Dutton, D. (1999). Gender differences in patterns of relationship violence in Alberta. *Canadian Journal of Behavioural Science*, 31(3) 150–160. (A representative sample of men <n=356> and women <n=351> from Alberta using the Conflict Tactics Scale, reported on their experience of marital aggression during a 1 year period. Similar levels of reported perpetration of physical violence were found, viz., husband to wife 12.9 %, wife to husband, 12.3 %.)

Lane, K., & Gwartney-Gibbs, P.A. (1985). Violence in the context of dating and sex. *Journal of Family Issues*, 6, 45–49. (Surveyed 325 students <165 men, 160 women> regarding courtship violence. Used Conflict Tactics Scale and found equal rates of violence for men and women.)

Laner, M. R., & Thompson, J. (1982). Abuse and aggression in courting couples. *Deviant Behavior*, 3, 229–244. (Used Conflict Tactics Scales with a sample of 371 single individuals <129 men, 242 women> and found similar rates of male and female violence in dating relationships.)

Langhinrichsen-Rohling, J. (2005). Top 10 greatest hits. Important findings and future directions for intimate partner violence research. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 20, 108–118. (Authors spells out her choices of the 10 most important recent findings in the field of intimate partner violence. Specifically states, “data indicate that women’s perpetuation of violence is surprisingly frequent, perhaps more so than men’s...”)

Langhinrichsen-Rohling, J. (2010). Controversies involving gender and intimate partner violence in the United States. *Sex Roles*, 62, 179–193. (Scholarly examination and analysis of the issues related to intimate partner violence. Author states that, “using behavioral measures like the Conflict Tactics Scale in general or in community samples, women have been shown rather consistently to perpetrate acts of intimate partner violence at rates comparable to or even higher than men...”)

Langhinrichsen-Rohling, J., & Vivian, D. (1994). The correlates of spouses’ incongruent reports of marital aggression. *Journal of Family Violence*, 9, 265–283. (In a clinic sample of 97 couples seeking marital therapy, authors found, using a modified version of the CTS, that 61 % of the husbands and 64 % of the wives were classified as aggressive, 25 % of the husbands and 11 % of the wives were identified as mildly aggressive and 36 % of husbands and 53 % of wives were classified as severely aggressive. Sixty-eight percent of couples were in agreement with regard to husband’s overall level of aggression and 69 % of couples were in agreement on wives overall level of aggression. Aggression levels were identified as “nonviolent, mildly violent, or severely violent.” Where there was disagreement, 65 % of husbands <n=20> were under-reporting aggression and 35 % of husbands <n=11> were over-reporting aggression; while 57 % of wives <n=17> were under-reporting aggression and 43 % of wives <n=13> were over-reporting aggression.)

Laroche, D. (2005) *Aspects of the context and consequences of domestic violence—Situational couple violence and intimate terrorism in Canada in 1999. Table 8.* Quebec City: Government of Quebec. (Author presents a reanalysis of Canadian General Social Survey <see Brown, 2004> and reports great similarity in male and female victimization. Specifically, 83 % of men and 77 % of women feared for their lives because they were unilaterally terrorized by their partners. A similar percentage <84 %> of men and women who were terrorized by their partners received medical attention. Reports 8 % of women and 7 % of men report being physically abused within last 5 years.)

Leisring, P. A. (2013). Physical and emotional abuse in romantic relationships: Motivation for perpetration among college women. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 28(7), 1437–1454. (A sample of 348 heterosexual women in a romantic relationship completed the CTS2 and a scale to assess motivation for a perpetration

of partner aggression. Results reveal that 30.5 % of women perpetrated at least one act of physical aggression toward their male partners. Most common motives for aggression were to “show anger” and to “retaliate for emotional hurt.”)

Leising, P. A., Dowd, L., & Rosenbaum, A. (2003). Treatment of Partner Aggressive Women. *Journal of Aggression, Maltreatment and Trauma*, 7, (1/2), 257–277. (Article discusses information regarding gender parity in partner aggression. Authors provide a rationale for the study of female offenders and describe characteristics of partner aggressive women. Included is a presentation of the treatment program for partner aggressive women at University of Massachusetts medical school.)

LeJeune, C., & Follette, V. (1994). Taking Responsibility. Sex Differences in reporting dating violence. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 9, 133–140. (A sample of 465 college students <58.3 % male, 41.7 % female> responded to a mailed survey of CTS items. Results reveal that 42.4 % of female respondents report that they “usually initiate violent acts in their relationship” compared to 14.3 % of male respondents who report “that they usually initiate violence.” Females also report that 39.4 % of their male partners initiate violence while 52.4 % of males report that violence is initiated by their female partners. Authors speculate that this discrepancy suggests that “females are more likely than males to accept responsibility for initiating violence.”)

Leung, P. & Cheung, M. (2008). A prevalence study on partner abuse in six Asian American ethnic groups in the USA. *International Social Work*, 51, 635–649. (A large sample of Asian Americans were surveyed with the original CTS in the greater Houston area of Texas. Sample consisted of 1,577 respondents: 610 Chinese, 517 Vietnamese, 154 Indians, 123 Koreans, 101 Filipinos and 72 Japanese. In terms of partner abuse high rates were reported for Vietnamese (22.4 %) and Filipinos (21.8 %) and low rates for Japanese and Chinese (9.7 %). Overall women were more abusive than men (17.6 vs. 15.3 %).)

Lewis, A. & Sarantakos, S. (2001). Domestic Violence and the male victim. *Nuance*, #3. (Based on interviews with 48 men in Australia and New Zealand, authors present findings that domestic violence by women toward men exists, that the refusal to examine the prevalence of this abuse is a “disempowerment” of men and that official policy should be changed to provide help for abused men.)

Lewis, S. F., & Fremouw, W. (2001). Dating violence: A critical review of the literature. *Clinical Psychology Review*, 21, 105–127. (Authors examine the literature and state that, “there is ample evidence that females initiate more violence than males.” Discusses explanations for these findings as well as “deficits in the present body of literature including sampling methods, dependent measures and data analyses.”)

Licter, E. L., & McCloskey, L. A. (2004). The effects of childhood exposure to marital violence on adolescent gender-role beliefs and dating violence. *Psychology of Women Quarterly*, 28(4), 474–501. (A sample of 105 girls and 107 boys, ages 13–21, responded to items from the CTS. Results reveal that girls were twice as likely (3.7 vs. 7.7 %) to perpetrated violence toward their male partners as boys were toward their female partners.)

Lillja, C. M. (1995). *Why women abuse: A study examining the function of abused men*. Unpublished master's thesis, California State University, Long Beach. (A review of the literature examining the issue of men as victims of female assaults. Includes an original questionnaire to test assumption that women who lack social support to combat stress are likely to commit domestic violence.)

Lipsky, S. & Caetano, R. (2008). Is intimate partner violence associated with the use of alcohol treatment services? Results from the National Survey on Drug Use and Health. *Journal of the Study of Alcohol and Drugs*, 69, 30–38. (A sample of 3,050 married or cohabiting couples responded in a face-to-face interview. Results reveal that 10 % of women and 7 % of men reported perpetrating physical violence toward their partners.)

Lo, W. A., & Sporkowski, M. J. (1989). The continuation of violent dating relationships among college students, *Journal of College Student Development*, 30, 432–439. (A sample of 422 college students completed the Conflict Tactics Scale. Authors report that “women were more likely than men to claim themselves as abusers and were less likely to claim themselves as victims.”)

Lottes, I. L., & Weinberg, M. S. (1996). Sexual coercion among university students: a comparison of the United States and Sweden. *Journal of Sex Research*, 34, 67–76. (A sample of 507 Swedish students <211 men, 359 women> and 407 U.S. students <129 men, 278 women> responded to items on the CTS. Results reveal that 31 % of U.S. men compared to 18 % of Swedish men reported being victims of physical violence by female partners during the previous 12 months. While 31 % of U.S. women compared to 19 % of Swedish women reported being victims of physical violence by male partners during the previous 12 months.)

Luthra, R., & Gidycz, C. A. (2006). Dating violence among college men and women. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 21, 717–731. (A sample of 200 college students, <100 men, 100 women> responded to the CTS. Results reveal that 25 % of women and 10 % of men reported perpetrating violence on their dating partners.)

Lysova, A. V. & Douglas, E. M. (2008). Intimate partner violence among male and female Russian University students. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 23 (11) 1579–1599. (A sample of 338 Russian students from 3 universities completed the CTS2. Results reveal that women compared to men significantly perpetrated more minor <35.6 vs. 20.6> and severe <13.5 vs. 8.1> violence.)

Macchietto, J. (1992). Aspects of male victimization and female aggression: Implications for counseling men. *Journal of Mental Health Counseling*, 14, 375–392. (Article reviews literature on male victimization and female aggression.)

Magdol, L., Moffitt, T. E., Caspi, A., Fagan, J., Newman, D. L., & Silva, P. A. (1997). Gender differences in partner violence in a birth cohort of 21 year olds: bridging the gap between clinical and epidemiological approaches. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology*, 65, 68–78. (Used CTS with a sample of 861 21 year olds <436 men, 425 women> in New Zealand. Physical violence perpetration was reported during the previous 12 months by 37.2 % of women and 21.8 % of men, with severe violence perpetration by women at 18.6 % and men at 5.7 %.)

Makepeace, J. M. (1986). Gender differences in courtship violence victimization. *Family Relations*, 35, 383–388. (A sample of 2,338 students <1,059 men, 1,279

women> from seven colleges were surveyed regarding their experience of dating violence. Courtship violence was experienced by 16.7 % of respondents. Authors report that “rates of commission of acts and initiation of violence were similar across gender.” In term of injury, both men (98 %) and women (92 %) reported “none or mild” effects of violence.)

Maker, A. H., & deRoon-Cassini, T. A. (2007). Prevalence, perpetrators, and characteristics of witnessing parental violence and adult dating violence in Latina, East Asian, and Middle Eastern women. *Violence and Victims*, 22, 632–647. (A sample 279 undergraduate women completed the CTS2. Results reveal that 29 % of South Asian/Middle Eastern women, 21 % of East Asian women, and 38 % of Latina women reported perpetrating physical IPV.)

Malik, S., Sorenson, S. B., & Aneshensel, C. S. (1997). Community and dating violence among adolescents: perpetration and victimization. *Journal of Adolescent Health*, 21, 291–302. (A sample of 707 high school students <281 boys, 426 girls> responded to the CTS. Results reveal that girls were almost 3 times more likely than boys to perpetrate dating violence. In terms of ethnicity African-Americans had the highest level of dating violence, followed by Latinos, whites, and Asian Americans.)

Malloy, K. A., McCloskey, K. A., Grigsby, N., & Gardner, D. (2003). Women’s use of violence within intimate relationships. *Journal of Aggression, Maltreatment & Trauma*, 6 (2), 37–59. (Reviews research which examines women’s use of violence in intimate relationships. Reports a number of studies which document the increased arrests of women in domestic disputes.)

Malone, J., Tyree, A., & O’Leary, K. D. (1989). Generalization and containment: Different effects of past aggression for wives and husbands. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, 51, 687–697. (In a sample of 328 couples it was found that men and women engaged in similar amounts of physical aggression within their families of origin and against their spouses. However, results indicate that women were *more* aggressive to their partners than men. Aggression was more predictable for women, i.e., if women observed parental aggression or hit siblings they were more likely to be violent with their spouses.)

Margolin, G. (1987). The multiple forms of aggressiveness between marital partners: how do we identify them? *Journal of Marital and Family Therapy*, 13, 77–84. (A paid volunteer sample of 103 couples completed the Conflict Tactics Scale. It was found that husbands and wives perpetrated similar amounts of violence. Specifically, the incidence of violence, as reported by either spouse was: husband to wife = 39; wife to husband = 41.)

Marshall, L. L., & Rose, P. (1987). Gender, stress and violence in the adult relationships of a sample of college students. *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships*, 4, 299–316. (A survey of 308 undergraduates <152 men, 156 women> revealed that 52 % expressed and 62 % received violence at some point in their adult relationships. Overall, women report expressing more physical violence than men. Childhood abuse emerged as a predictor of violence in adult relationships.)

Marshall, L. L., & Rose, P. (1990). Premarital violence: The impact of family of origin violence, stress and reciprocity. *Violence and Victims*, 5, 51–64. (454

premarital undergraduates <249 women, 205 men> completed the CTS and other scales. Overall, women reported expressing more violence than men, while men reported receiving more violence than women. Female violence was also associated with having been abused as children.)

Mason, A., & Blankenship, V. (1987). Power and affiliation motivation, stress and abuse in intimate relationships. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 52, 203–210. (Investigated 155 college students <48 men, 107 women> with the Thematic Apperception Test <TAT>, Life Experiences Survey and the CTS. Found that there were no significant gender differences in terms of the infliction of physical abuse. Men with high power needs were more likely to be physically abusive while highly stressed women with high needs for affiliation and low activity inhibition were the most likely to be physically abusive. Results indicate that physical abuse occurred most often among committed couples.)

Matthews, W. J. (1984). Violence in college couples. *College Student Journal*, 18, 150–158. (A survey of 351 college students <123 men and 228 women> revealed that 79 <22.8 %> reported at least one incident of dating violence. Both men and women ascribed joint responsibility for violent behavior and both sexes, as either recipients or expressors of aggression, interpreted violence as a form of “love.”)

Maxfield, M. G. (1989). Circumstances in supplementary homicide reports: Variety and validity. *Criminology*, 27, 671–695. (Examines FBI homicide data from 1976 through 1985. Reports that 9,822 wives & common law wives <57 %> were killed compared to 7,433 husbands and common law husbands <43 %>).

McCarthy, A. (2001). *Gender differences in the incidences of, motives for, and consequences of, dating violence among college students*. Unpublished Master’s thesis, California State University, Long Beach. (In a sample of 1,145 students <359 men, 786 women> found that 36 % of men and 28 % of women responding to the CTS2 reported that they were victims of physical aggression during the previous year. There were no differences in reported motives for aggression between men and women.)

McKinney, K. (1986). Measures of verbal, physical and sexual dating violence by gender. *Free Inquiry in Creative Sociology*, 14, 55–60. (Surveyed 163 college students, 78 men, 85 women, with a questionnaire designed to assess involvement in dating abuse. Found that 38 % of women and 47 % of men indicated that they were victims of physical abuse in dating relationships. Also found that 26 % of women and 21 % of men acknowledged that they physically assaulted their dating partners.)

McLeod, M. (1984). Women against men: An examination of domestic violence based on an analysis of official data and national victimization data. *Justice Quarterly*, 1, 171–193. (From a data set of 6,200 cases of spousal abuse in the Detroit area in 1978–1979 found that men used weapons 25 % of the time while female assailants used weapons 86 % of the time, 74 % of men sustained injury and of these 84 % required medical care. Concludes that male victims are injured more often and more seriously than female victims.)

McNeely, R. L., Cook, P. W. & Torres, J. B. (2001). Is domestic violence a gender issue or a human issue? *Journal of Human Behavior in the Social Environment*, 4(4), 227–251. (Argues that domestic violence is a human issue and

not a gender issue. Presents and discusses empirical findings and case studies to support this view. Expresses concerns about men's "legal and social defenselessness.")

McNeely, R. L., & Mann, C. R. (1990). Domestic violence is a human issue. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 5, 129–132. (A review article which discusses the findings that women are more prone than men to engage in severely violent acts and that "classifying spousal violence as a women's issue rather than a human issue is erroneous.")

McNeely, R. L., & Robinson-Simpson, G. (1987). The truth about domestic violence: A falsely framed issue. *Social Work*, 32, 485–490. (A review article which concludes that women are as violent as men in domestic relationships.)

McNulty, J. K., & Hellmuth, J. C. (2008). Emotion regulation and intimate partner violence in newlyweds. *Journal of Family Psychology*, 22, 794–797. (A sample of 72 newlywed couples responded to the CTS. Results reveal 16 % of men and 27 % of women reported perpetrating IPV in the past year.)

Mechem, C. C., Shofer, F. S., Reinhard, S. S., Hornig, S., & Datner, E. (1999). History of domestic violence among male patients presenting to an urban emergency department. *Academic Emergency Medicine*, 6, 786–791. (Data was collected over a 13 week period at an emergency clinic in Philadelphia which focused on injuries to male patients. Results revealed that 12.6 % of 866 men were victims of domestic violence. Authors cite published findings that 14.4 % of women treated in Emergency departments had been physically or sexually abused by an intimate partner. Compared to non-victims, victims were more likely to be single <52 %>, younger <7.5 yrs> and African-American <61 %>. In terms of assaults, 48 % of men reported being kicked, bitten, choked or punched by a female partner, while 37 % of men reported having a weapon used against them.)

Mercy, J. A., & Saltzman, L. E. (1989). Fatal violence among spouses in the United States, 1975–1985. *American Journal of Public Health*, 79, 595–599. (Examined FBI figures regarding spousal homicides. During the 10 year period from 1975 to 1985 found higher murder rates of wives than husbands <43.4 vs. 56.6 %>. Black husbands were at the greatest risk of victimization. Spousal homicide among blacks was 8.4 times higher than that of whites. Spouse homicide rates were 7.7 times higher in interracial marriages and the risk of victimization for both whites and blacks increased as age differences between spouses increased. Wives and husbands were equally likely to be killed by firearms <approximately 72 % of the time> while husbands were more likely to be stabbed and wives more likely to bludgeoned to death. Arguments apparently escalated to murder in 67 % of spouse homicides.)

Meredith, W. H., Abbot, D. A., & Adams, S. L. (1986). Family violence in relation to marital and parental satisfaction and family strengths. *Journal of Family Violence*, 1, 299–305. (Authors report that 6 % of men and 5 % of women in Nebraska indicated that they used severe violence at least once in the previous year.)

Merrill, L. L., Crouch, J. L., Thomsen, C. J., Guimond, J., & Milner, J. S. (2005). Perpetration of severe intimate partner violence: Premilitary and second year of service rates. *Military Medicine*, 170(8), 705–709. (Severe intimate partner violence <SIPV>, as assessed by 5 items from the CTS, was studied in a sample of Navy

personnel <542 women, 421 men> at two time periods: before joining the military and 2 years later. Results reveal that 20 % of women perpetrated SIPV before joining the military compared to 4 % of men who perpetrated violence. Two years later 12 % of women reported perpetrating violence compared to 16 % of men.)

Merrill, L. L., King, L. K., Milner, J. S., Newell, C. E., & Koss, M. P. (1998). Premilitary intimate partner conflict resolution in a Navy basic trainee sample. *Military Psychology, 10*, 1–15. (A sample of 2,987 <1,560 women, 1,427 men> Navy basic trainees responded to the CTS. More men <43.3 %> than women <40.3 %> reported receiving physical violence from an intimate partner, and more women <46.9 %> than men <31.9 %> reported at least one instance of inflicting physical violence on an intimate partner.)

Migliaccio, T. A. (2002). Abused husbands. A narrative analysis. *Journal of Family Issues, 23*, 26–52. (Narratives of 12 abused men are examined. Study finds that the accounts of battered men and women follow similar patterns, “including the structure of the relationships, acceptance of the abuse, and the social context of the situation.”)

Mihalic, S. W., & Elliot, D. (1997). A social learning theory model of marital violence. *Journal of Family Violence, 12*, 21–46. (Based on data from the National Youth Survey <see Morse, 1995> a social learning model of marital violence for men and women was tested. For men *ethnicity, prior victimization, stress and marital satisfaction* predicted both *perpetration* and *experience* of **minor** violence. With regard to **serious** violence *ethnicity, prior victimization, marital satisfaction* predicted men’s *experience* of marital violence, while *ethnicity, class and sex role attitudes* predicted the *perpetration* of male marital violence. For women the most important predictor of the *experience* of both minor and serious marital violence was *marital satisfaction, class* was also a predictor. With regard to female *perpetrators* of marital violence the *witnessing of parental violence* was an important predictor along with *class and marital satisfaction*. The social learning model worked better for women than men.)

Milardo, R. M. (1998). Gender asymmetry in common couple violence. *Personal Relationships, 5*, 423–438. (A sample of 180 college students <88 men, 72 women> were asked whether they would be likely to hit their partner in a number of situations common to a dating relationship. Results reveal that 83 % of the women, compared to 53 % of the men, indicated that they would be somewhat likely to hit their partner.)

Miller, L. M. (2011). Physical abuse in a college setting: A study of perceptions and participation in abusive dating relationships. *Journal of Family Violence, 26*(1), 71–80. (A sample of 1,530 <672 men, 858 women> students completed the CTS2. Results reveal that women were significantly more likely than men to perpetrate 2 or more incidents of physical abuse on the partners <30.4 vs. 17.0 %>).

Miller, S., Gorman-Smith, D., Sullivan T., Orpinas, P., & Simons, T. R. (2009). Parent and peer predictors of physical dating violence perpetration in early adolescence: Tests of moderation and gender differences. *Journal of Clinical Child & Adolescent Psychology, 38*(4), 538–550. (A diverse sample of 2,824 sixth graders <49 % male> from 37 schools completed a modified version of the CTS. Within the total sample 52.6 % of students were actively dating. Of these active daters,

31 % of the girls and 27 % of the boys admitted to perpetrating physical violence toward their dating partners.)

Milletich, R. J., Kelley, M. L., Doane, A. N., & Pearson, M. R. (2010). Exposure to interparental violence and childhood physical and emotional abuse as related to physical aggression in undergraduate dating relationships. *Journal of Family Violence*, 25(7), 627–637. (A sample of 658 college students <183 men, 475 women> completed the CTS2. Results reveal that in the past year 16 % of men and 40 % of women perpetrated IPV.)

Mirrlees-Black, C. (1999). Findings from a new British Crime Survey self-completion questionnaire. *Home Office Research, Development and Statistics Directorate report 191*. Home Office. London, HMSO. (In 1996, 16,000 completed questionnaires regarding crime victimization. Findings reveal 4.2 % of men and 4.2 % of women between the ages of 16–59 reported being physically assaulted by a current or former partner within the past year.)

Moffitt, T. E., Robins, R. W., & Caspi, A. (2001). A couples analysis of partner abuse with implications for abuse-prevention policy. *Criminology & Public Policy*, 1(1) 5–36. (A representative longitudinal sample of 360 young-adult couples in New Zealand completed a 13 item physical abuse scale. Results reveal that 40 % of males and 50 % of females had perpetrated at least one act of physical violence toward their partners.)

Molidor, C. & Tolman, R. M. (1998). Gender and contextual factors in adolescent dating violence. *Violence against Women*, 4(2), 180–194. (Subjects were 635 high school students <305 girls; 330 boys> who completed a modified version of the CTS. Results indicate that there was no significant difference between males and females in their experience of overall dating violence <37.1 % of males vs. 36.4 % of females. Males reported greater frequency of moderate violence and females reported greater frequency of severe violence.)

Monson, C. M., & Langhinrichsen-Rohling, J. (2002). Sexual and nonsexual dating violence perpetration: testing an integrated perpetrator typology. *Violence and Victims*, 17, 403–428. (A sample of 228 men and 442 women were assessed with a modified version of the CTS2. Results reveal 27 % of men and 37 % of women reported perpetrating physical violence on their partners.)

Morse, B. J. (1995). Beyond the Conflict Tactics Scale: Assessing gender differences in partner violence. *Violence and Victims*, 10 (4) 251–272. (Data was analyzed from the National Youth Survey, a longitudinal study begun in 1976 with 1,725 subjects who were drawn from a probability sample of households in the United States and who, in 1976, were between the ages of 11–17. This study focused on violence as assessed by the CTS between male and female married or cohabiting respondents during survey years 1983 <n=1,496>, 1986 <n=1,384>, 1989 <n=1,436>, and 1992 <n=1,340>. For each survey year the prevalence rates of any violence and severe violence were significantly higher for female to male than for male to female. For example, in 1983 the rate of any violence male to female was 36.7, while the rate of any violence female to male was 48; in 1986, the rate of severe violence male to female was 9.5, while the rate of severe violence female to male was 22.8. In 1992, the rate of any violence male to female was 20.2, with a severe violence rate male to female of 5.7; while the rate of any violence female to

male was 27.9, with a severe violence rate female to male of 13.8. Author notes that the decline in violence over time is attributed to the increase in age of the subjects. Results reveal <p. 163> that over twice as many women as men reported assaulting a partner who had not assaulted them during the study year.” In 1986 about 20 % of both men and women reported that assaults resulted in physical injuries. In other years women were more likely to self-report personal injuries.)

Moxon, S. (2011). Beyond staged retreat behind virtual ‘gender paradigm’ barricades: the rise and fall of the misrepresentation of partner-violence, and its eclipse by an understanding of mate-guarding. *Journal of Aggression, Conflict and Peace Research*, 3, 45–56. (Author offers an original analysis of findings in the area of partner violence. Suggests that gender-symmetries in intimate partner violence can best be understood from an evolutionary psychological perspective. In particular, “the greater need for women than for men to maintain the integrity of the pair bond” is offered as an explanation to account for the finding that women are as physically aggressive or more aggressive as men in their relationship with spouses or male partners.)

Munoz-Rivas, M. J., Grana, J. L., O’Leary, K. D., & Gonzalez, M. P. (2007). Aggression in adolescent dating relationships: prevalence, justification, and health consequences. *Journal of Adolescent Health*, 40, 298–304. (A sample of 2,416 high school students <1,416 women, 1,000 men> from 20 different schools in Madrid, Spain completed a modified CTS. Results reveal that significantly more women, 41.9 % compared to 31.7 % of men, admitted to perpetrating some form of physical aggression toward their dating partners. Women were significantly more likely to hit or kick <13.4 vs. 5.3 %>, slap <12.4 vs. 3.1 %> and shove or grab <22.5 vs. 11.9 %> than men.)

Murphy, J. E. (1988). Date abuse and forced intercourse among college students. In G. P. Hotaling, D. Finkelhor, J. T. Kirkpatrick, & M. A. Straus (Eds.) *Family Abuse and its Consequences: New Directions in Research* (pp. 285–296). Beverly Hills, CA: Sage. (A sample of 485 single college students <230 men, 255 women> completed the CTS. Overall men reported greater victimization than women. For example, 20.7 % of men compared to 12.8 % of women reported being kicked, bit or hit with a fist and 6 % of men compared to 3.6 % of women reported being beaten up by their heterosexual partner.)

Mwamwenda, T. S. (1998). Reports of husband battering from an undergraduate sample in Umtata. *Psychological Reports*, 82, 517–518. (Surveyed a sample of 138 female and 81 male college students in Transkei, South Africa, regarding their witnessing husbanding battery. Responses reveal that 2 % of subjects saw their mother beat their father, 18 % saw or heard female relatives beating their husbands, and 26 % saw or heard female neighbors beating their husbands.)

Nabors, E. L. (2010). Drug use and intimate partner violence among college students: An in-depth exploration. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 25(6), 1043–1063, (A sample of 1,635 <638 men, 997 women> undergraduates completed the CTS2. Results reveal that 32 % of women and 28 % of men perpetrated physical IPV in the past year.)

Niaz, U., Hassan, S., & Tariq, Q. (2002). Psychological consequences of intimate partner violence: forms of domestic abuse in both genders. *Pakistan Journal of*

Medical Science, 18(3), 205–214. (A sample of 140 <70 men, 70 women> outpatient psychiatric patients in Pakistan were assessed with the Karachi Domestic Violence Screening Scale. Findings reveal that 19 men <27 %> and 30 women <43 %> reported being victims of physical abuse in their domestic relationships.)

Nicholls, T. L. & Dutton, D. G. (2001). Abuse committed by women against male intimates. *Journal of Couples Therapy*, 10 (1) 41–57. (A comprehensive review of the literature which concludes that “men are as likely as women to be victims of intimate assaults”.)

Nisonoff, L. & Bitman, I. (1979). Spouse abuse: Incidence and relationship to selected demographic variables. *Victimology*, 4, 131–140. (In a sample of 297 telephone survey respondents <112 men, 185 women> found that 15.5 % of men and 11.3 % of women report having hit their spouse, while 18.6 % of men and 12.7 % of women report having been hit by their spouse.)

Nowinskia, S. N. & Bowen, E. (2012). Partner violence against heterosexual and gay men: Prevalence and correlates. *Aggression and Violent Behavior*, 17(1), 36–52. (A review article examining male victims of IPV both within opposite and same gender relationships. Also reviews studies of the relationship between IPV and ethnicity.)

O’Keefe, M. (1997). Predictors of dating violence among high school students. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 12, 546–568. (Surveyed 939 students <385 boys, 554 girls> ranging in age from 14 to 20. Sample was ethnically diverse: 53 % Latino, 20 % White, 13 % African-American, 6.7 % Asian American, and 7 % “other.” A modified version of the violence subscale of the Conflict Tactics Scale was used to assess dating violence. Results reveal that 43 % of females and 39 % of males reported that they perpetrated some form of physical aggression on their dating partners.)

O’Keeffe, N. K., Brockopp, K., & Chew, E. (1986). Teen dating violence. *Social Work*, 31, 465–468. (Surveyed 256 high school students from Sacramento, CA., 135 girls, 121 boys, with the CTS. Ninety percent of students were juniors or seniors, the majority came from middle class homes, 94 % were average or better students, and 65 % were white and 35 % were black, Hispanic or Asian. Found that 11.9 % of girls compared to 7.4 % of boys admitted to being sole perpetrators of physical violence. 17.8 % of girls and 11.6 % of boys admitted that they were both “victims and perpetrators” of physical violence.)

O’Leary, K. D., Barling, J., Arias, I., Rosenbaum, A., Malone, J., & Tyree, A. (1989). Prevalence and stability of physical aggression between spouses: A longitudinal analysis. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology*, 57, 263–268. (272 couples were assessed regarding physical aggression. More women reported physically aggressing against their partners at pre-marriage <44 vs. 31 %> and 18 months of marriage <36 vs. 27 %>. At 30 months there was a non-significant but higher rate for women <32 vs. 25 %>.)

O’Leary, K. D., Slep, A. M. S., Avery-Leaf, S., & Cascardi, M. (2008). Gender differences in dating aggression among multiethnic high school students. *Journal of Adolescent Health*, 42, 473–479. (A sample of 2,363 students <1,186 boys, 1,177 girls> from 7 multiethnic high schools in New York were assessed with a modified Conflict Tactics Scale. The vast majority of subjects were between 15 and 18 years

old and ethnicities included white, African-American, Hispanic and Asian. Results reveal that among those currently dating students <male = 543, female = 706> 24 % of males reported perpetrating physical aggression compared to 40 % of females who reported perpetrating physical aggression. Similar rates of victimization and injury were reported by males and females. No differences in ethnicities were reported except for the finding that Asian males were less aggressive toward their dating partners.)

O'Leary, S. G., & Slep, A. M. S. (2006). Precipitants of Partner aggression. *Journal of Family Psychology*, 20, 344–347. (A random sample of 453 couples, who were cohabiting and raising a child between the ages of 3–7, was assessed with the CTS2 and a scale to evaluate precipitants for Partner Aggression <PCPT>. Results reveal that women were more likely than men to perpetrate both mild <23.8 vs. 33.8 %> and severe <8.4 vs. 11.5 %> aggression. With regards to precipitation, the authors state that, “Men were more likely than women to report partner physical aggression as a precipitant for their own mild physical aggression.” While the physical aggression of women was more likely to be precipitated by their partner's verbal aggression, authors go on to conclude, “These findings suggest that women may often be the first to escalate a conflict and use physical aggression.”)

O'Leary, K. D., Tintle, N., Bromet, E. J., & Gluzman, S. F. (2008). Descriptive epidemiology of intimate partner aggression in Ukraine. *Social Psychiatry and Psychiatric Epidemiology*, 43, 619–626. (A nationally representative sample from the Ukraine consisting of 1,116 married or co-habiting adults <558 men, 558 women> responded to items modified from the CTS. Results indicate that an equal number <18.7 vs. 18.5 %> of men and women reported ever aggressing against their partners and equal numbers <11.4 vs. 11.3 %> report aggressing against their partners in the past year.)

Olshen, E., McVeigh, K. H., Wunsch-Hitzig, R. A., & Rickert, V. I. (2007). Dating violence, sexual assault and suicide attempts among urban teenagers. *Archives of Pediatric Adolescent Medicine*, 161, 539–545. (A representative sample consisting of 8,080 teenagers <4,118 girls, 3,962 boys> from 87 New York City public high schools were subjects in this investigation. Individuals responded to the question: “during the past 12 months did your boyfriend (or girlfriend) ever hit, slap or physically hurt you on purpose.” Results reveal that 10.6 % of girls and 9.5 % of boys reported an experience of dating violence.)

Panuzio, J., & DiLillo, D. (2010). Physical, psychological, and sexual intimate partner aggression among newlywed couples: Longitudinal prediction of marital satisfaction. *Journal of Family Violence*, 25, 689–699. (A sample of 202 newly married couples completed the TS. Results reveal that 30 % of men and 34 % of women perpetrated physical IPV.)

Pedersen, P. & Thomas, C. D. (1992). Prevalence and correlates of dating violence in a Canadian University sample. *Canadian Journal of Behavioural Science*, 24, 490–501. (A sample of 166 undergraduates <116 women, 50 men> responded to the CTS; 45.8 % of subjects reported experiencing physical violence in their current or most recent dating relationship. Of this total, 44.8 % of women and 48 % of men reported being physically aggressed upon by their partners. It was

also found that only 22 % of men and 40.5 % of women reported using physical aggression against a dating partner.)

Pekarek, C. (2008). *Intimate partner violence and interracial relationships: Prevalence, perceived social support and gender*. Unpublished master's thesis, California State University, Long Beach. Long Beach, Ca. (A total of 203 subjects, <36 men, 167 women> of various ethnicities responded to the CTS2. No differences in partner abuse were found as a function of ethnicity. Women were significantly more likely to perpetrate violence toward their male partners than were men toward women.)

Perry, A. R., & Fromuth, M. E. (2005). Courtship violence using couple data: Characteristic and perceptions. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 20(9), 1078–1095. (A sample 50 heterosexual dating couples completed the CTS2. Results reveal that women were more likely than men to perpetrate partner violence.)

Plass, M. S., & Gessner, J. C. (1983). Violence in courtship relations: a southern sample. *Free Inquiry in Creative Sociology*, 11, 198–202. (In an opportunity sample of 195 high school and college students from a large southern city, researchers used the Conflict Tactics scale to examine courtship violence. Overall, results reveal that women were significantly more likely than men to be aggressors. Specifically, in, committed relationships, women were three times as likely as men to slap their partners, and to kick, bit or hit with the fist seven times as often as men. In casual relationships, while the gender differences weren't as pronounced, women were more aggressive than men. Other findings reveal that high school students were more abusive than college students, and that a "higher proportion of black respondents were involved as aggressors.")

Prospero, M. (2007). Mental health symptoms among female and male victims of partner violence. *American Journal of Men's Health*, 1, 269–277. (An ethnically diverse sample <27 % Hispanic, 18 % African-American, 24 % Asian, and 30 % White> of 573 college students <241 male, 332 female> responded to the CTS2 and a mental health symptom questionnaire. Results reveal no differences between males and females on partner abuse. Author reports that "higher mental health problems were *not* related to whether the victim was female or male, but rather to the amount of partner violence that the victim experienced.")

Prospero, M. (2009). Sex-symmetric effects of coercive behaviors on mental health? Not exactly. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 24(1), 128–146. (A diverse sample of 573 <332 female, 241 male> university students <30 % White, 27 % Hispanic, 24 % Asian, and 18 % African American responded to items from the CTS. Results reveal that 46.4 % of females reported being physically victimized by their male partners, while 41.9 % of males reported being victimized by their female partners.)

Ramisetty-Mikler, S., & Caetano, R. (2005). Alcohol use and intimate partner violence as predictors of separation among US couples: A longitudinal model. *Journal of Studies on Alcohol*, 66(2), 205–212. (A representative sample 1,392 predominantly white couples responded to the CTS. Of the couples still together 12 % of men and 15 % of women perpetrated intimate partner violence, and of the separated couples 27 % of men and 43 % of women perpetrated IPV.)

Randle, A. A. & Graham, C. A. (2011). A review of the evidence on the effects of intimate partner violence on men. *Psychology of Men & Masculinity*, 12, (2) 96–111. (A review article that examines “empirical evidence on the effects of intimate partner violence in men.”)

Reid, R. J., Bonomi, A. E., Rivara, F. P., Anderson, M. S., Fishman, P. A., Carrell, D. S., & Thompson, R. S. (2008). Intimate partner violence among men. Prevalence, chronicity, and health effect. *American Journal of Preventive Medicine*, 34 (6) 478–485. (A telephone survey assessing IPV was conducted with 420 men enrolled in a healthcare system in Idaho and Washington. Results reveal that 28.8 % of men reported being victims of IPV over the course of their lifetimes with younger men experiencing significantly greater abuse than older men.)

Renner, L. M., & Whitney, S. D. (2010). Examining symmetry in intimate partner violence among young adults using socio-demographic characteristics. *Journal of Family Violence*, 25, 91–106. (From a total sample of 12,313 who responded to an Adolescent Health survey which assessed IPV, 4,895 young adults <2,697 women, 2,198 men> reported either perpetration or victimization of IPV. Of this sample, 21.1 % reported perpetrating violence <38 % male, 42 % female>, 24.6 % reported victimization and 54.3 % reported IPV was bidirectional.)

Ridley, C. A., & Feldman, C. M. (2003). Female Domestic Violence toward male partners: Exploring Conflict Responses and Outcomes. *Journal of Family Violence*, 18(3), 157–170. (Participants were 153 female volunteers who completed the Abusive Behavior Inventory. Results reveal that 67.3 % of participants reported at least one occurrence of perpetrating violent behavior in the past year. Most frequent behaviors included pushing, shoving, holding down <45.1 %> and slapping, hitting, biting <41.2 %>).

Riggs, D. S., & O’Leary, K. D. (1996). Aggression between heterosexual dating partners. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 11, 519–540. (A sample of 345 college students < 232 women, 113 men > were assessed with the CTS. Results reveal similar overall rates of physical violence toward dating partners: 30 % for men and 33.6 % for women. However, authors report that 18.2 % of women compared to 9.0 % of men slapped their partners and 13.2 % of women compared to 2.5 % of men reported “kicking, biting or hitting” their partners.)

Riggs, D. S., O’Leary, K. D., & Breslin, F. C. (1990). Multiple correlates of physical aggression in dating couples. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 5, 61–73. (Used CTS and studied 408 college students <125 men and 283 women>. Found that significantly more women <39 %> than men <23 %> reported engaging in physical aggression against their current partners.)

Rollins, B. C., & Oheneba-Sakyi, Y. (1990). Physical violence in Utah households. *Journal of Family Violence*, 5, 301–309. (In a random sample of 1,471 Utah households, using the Conflict Tactics Scale, it was found that women’s rate of severe violence was 5.3 % compared to a male rate of 3.4 %.)

Romito, P. & Grassi, M. (2007). Does violence affect one gender more than the other? The mental health impact of violence among male and female university students. *Social Science & Medicine*, 65, 1222–1234. (A sample of 502 Italian university students responded to a self report survey regarding experience with intimate partner violence. Ninety-two percent of subjects were 25 years old or

younger and 64 % were women. Results revealed no differences between men & women in terms of intimate partner violence. Specifically, 32 % of men reported some victimization and 37.1 % reported high victimization while 35.2 % of women reported some victimization and 28.3 % reported high victimization.)

Rosenfeld, R. (1997). Changing relationships between men and women. A note on the decline in intimate partner violence. *Homicide Studies*, 1, 72–83. (Author reports on homicide rates in St. Louis from 1968 to 1992. Findings indicate that while men and women were equally likely to be victims of partner violence in 1970, in subsequent years men, primarily black men, were more likely to be murdered by their intimate partners.)

Rouse, L. P. (1988). Abuse in dating relationships: A comparison of Blacks, Whites, and Hispanics. *Journal of College Student Development*, 29, 312–319. (The use of physical force and its consequences were examined in a diverse sample of college students. Subjects consisted of 130 whites <58 men, 72 women>, 64 Blacks <32 men, 32 women>, and 34 Hispanics <24 men, 10 women>. Men were significantly more likely than women to report that their partners used moderate physical force and caused a greater number of injuries requiring medical attention. This gender difference was present for Whites and Blacks but not for Hispanics.)

Rouse, L. P., Breen, R., & Howell, M. (1988). Abuse in intimate relationships. A Comparison of married and dating college students. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 3, 414–429. (A sample of 130 married (48 men, 82 women) college students and 130 college students in dating relationships (58 men, 72 women) reported their experience of physical abuse in intimate relationships. Men were more likely to report being physically abused than women in both dating and marital relationships.)

Russell, R. J. H., & Hulson, B. (1992). Physical and psychological abuse of heterosexual partners. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 13, 457–473. (In a pilot study in Great Britain 46 couples responded to the Conflict Tactics Scale. Results reveal that husband to wife violence was: Overall violence = 25 % and severe violence = 5.8 %; while wife to husband violence was: Overall violence = 25 % and severe violence = 11.3 %.)

Ryan, K. A. (1998). The relationship between courtship violence and sexual aggression in college students. *Journal of Family Violence*, 13, 377–394. (A sample of 656 college students <245 men, 411 women> completed the CTS. Thirty-four percent of the women and 40 % of the men reported being victims of their partner's physical aggression.)

Sack, A. R., Keller, J. F., & Howard, R. D. (1982). Conflict tactics and violence in dating situations. *International Journal of Sociology of the Family*, 12, 89–100. (Used the CTS with a sample of 211 college students, 92 men, 119 women. Results indicate that there were no differences between men and women with regard to the expression of physical violence.)

Saenger, G. (1963). Male and female relations in the American comic strip. In D. M. White & R. H. Abel (Eds.), *The funnies, an American idiom* (pp. 219–231). Glencoe, NY: The Free Press. (Twenty consecutive editions of all comic strips in nine New York City newspapers in October, 1950 were examined. Results reveal that husbands were victims of aggression in 63 % of conflict situations while wives

were victims in 39 % of situations. In addition, wives were more aggressive in 73 % of domestic situations, in 10 % of situations, husbands and wives were equally aggressive and in only 17 % of situations were husbands more violent than wives.)

Saewyc, E. M., Brown, D., Plane, M., Mundt, M. P., Zakletskaia, L., Wiegel, J. & Fleming, M. F. (2009). Gender Differences in violent exposure among University students attending campus health clinics in the United States and Canada. *Journal of Adolescent Health*. (Data was collected from a cross sectional survey of 2,091 students <717 men, 1,374 women> at five universities who came for routine primary care. Subjects were primarily white (82 %) and responded to items from the CTS. Results indicate that, “both men and women reported a similar prevalence of physical violence from intimate partners.”

Sarantakos, S. (2004). Deconstructing self-defense in wife-to-husband violence. *Journal of Men's Studies*, 12 (3) 277–296. (Members of 68 families with violent wives in Australia were studied. In 78 % of cases wives' violence was reported to be moderate to severe and in 38 % of cases husbands needed medical attention. Using information from husbands, wives, children and wives' mothers study provides compelling data challenging self defense as a motive for female-to-male violence.)

Sarkar, S., Dsouza, R., Dasgupta, A., & Fiebert, M. S. (2008, April). *Men as victims of domestic violence in India*. Poster session presented at the annual meeting of the Western Psychological Association, Irvine, Ca. (A convenience sample of married, middle class, men from all parts of India responded to modified version of the CTS. Findings reveal that 25.1 % of subjects reported at least one incident, within the past year, of physical violence from their wives.)

Schafer, J., Caetano, R., & Clark, C. L. (1998). Rates of intimate partner violence in the United States. *American journal of Public Health*, 88, 1702–1704. (Used modified CTS and examined reports of partner violence in a representative sample of 1,635 married and cohabiting couples. Both partners reports were used to estimate the following lower and upper bound rates: 5.21 and 13.61 % for male to female violence, and 6.22 and 18.21 % for female to male violence.)

Schnurr, M. P., Lehman, B. J., & Kaura, S. A. (2010). Variation in late adolescents' reports of dating violence perpetration: A dyadic analysis. *Violence and Victims*, 25, 68–82. (A sample of 214 college dating couples completed the CTS2. Results reveal that 26 % of men and 30 % of women perpetrated physical IPV.)

Schumacher, J. A. & Leonard, K. E. (2005). Husbands' and wives' marital adjustment, verbal aggression, and physical aggression as longitudinal predictors of physical aggression in early marriage. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology*, 73, 28–37. (A sample of 634 newly married couples <approximately 60 % Euro-American and 30 % African-American> completed the revised CTS on 3 occasions over 3 years. The prevalence of wife to husband aggression was 48, 45, and 41 %, while husband to wife aggression was 37, 38, and 37 %.)

Schwartz, M., O'Leary, S. G., & Kendziora, K. T. (1997). Dating aggression among high school students. *Violence and Victims*, 12, 295–305. (A sample of 228 <122 male, 106 female> high school students were assessed with the Conflict Tactics Scale as it related to the use of physical aggression during an argument with an opposite sex dating partner. Results indicate that 44 % of females and only 16 %

of males reported engaging in at least one physically aggressive behavior during a disagreement. Authors speculate that culturally boys have inhibited their dating aggression, girls have become less intimidated by their dating partners than they once were. Authors cite research which shows that parents are more likely to punish boys than girls when they fight with their siblings.)

Sharpe, D., & Taylor, J. K. (1999). An examination of variables from a social-developmental model to explain physical and psychological dating violence. *Canadian Journal of Behavioural Science, 31*:3, 165–175. (Canadian college students <110 men, 225 women> was surveyed with the Conflict Tactics Scale regarding dating violence. Results reveal that 38 % of men and 27 % women report receiving physical violence from their partners. Twice as many women compared to men reported inflicting violence without receiving physical violence from dating partners.)

Shook, N. J., Gerrity, D. A., Jurich, J. & Segrist, A. E. (2000). Courtship violence among college students: A comparison of verbally and physically abusive couples. *Journal of Family Violence, 15*, 1–22. (A modified Conflict Tactics Scale was administered to 572 college students <395 women; 177 men>. Results reveal that significantly more women than men, 23.5 vs. 13.0 %, admitted using physical force against a dating partner.)

Sigelman, C. K., Berry, C. J., & Wiles, K. A. (1984). Violence in college students' dating relationships. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology, 5*, 530–548. (Surveyed 504 college students <116 men, 388 women> with the Conflict Tactics Scale and found that men and women were similar in the overall amount of violence they expressed but that men reported experiencing significantly more violence than women.)

Simon, T. R., Miller, S., Gorman-Smith, D., Orpinas, P., & Sullivan, T. (2009). Physical dating violence norms and behavior among sixth-grade students from four U > S > sites. *Journal of Early Adolescence, 30*, 1–15. (A sample of 5,404 randomly selected sixth-grade students completed measures designed to assess dating violence. Results reveal that 31 % of girls and 26 % of boys reported being physically aggressive.)

Simonelli, C. J. & Ingram, K. M. (1998). Psychological distress among men experiencing physical and emotional abuse in heterosexual dating relationships. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 13*, 667–681. (Responses from 70 male undergraduates to the CTS and a Psychological Maltreatment Inventory revealed that 40 % reported being the target of some form of physical aggression from their female dating partners while only 23 % reported expressing physical aggression to their partners. Men who were victims of emotional and physical abuse also reported greater levels of distress and depression.)

Simonelli, C. J., Mullis, T., Elliot, A. N., & Pierce, T. W. (2002). Abuse by siblings and subsequent experiences of violence within the dating relationship. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 17*, 103–121. (A sample of 120 undergraduates <61 men, 59 women> completed the CTS. Ten percent of men and 33 % of women reported that they perpetrated at least one type of physical aggressive behavior against their dating partner and 18 and 15 % of women reported receiving physical aggression from their dating partner.)

Slep, A. M. S. & O'Leary, S. G. (2005). Parent and partner violence in families with young children: Rates, patterns, and connections. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology*, 73(3), 435–444. (A random sample of 453 couples in Suffolk county NY, who were raising young children were assessed with the CTS2. Results reveal, with regard to perpetrating severe physical aggression, wives were significantly more aggressive than husbands <19.9 vs. 13.5 %>).

Sommer, R. (1994). *Male and female partner abuse: Testing a diathesis-stress model*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Manitoba, Winnipeg, Canada. (The study was in two waves: the first was from 1989 to 1990 and included a random sample of 452 married or cohabiting women and 447 married or cohabiting men from Winnipeg, Canada; the second was from 1991 to 1992 and included 368 women and 369 men all of whom participated in the first wave. Subjects completed the CTS & other assessment instruments. 39.1 % of women reported being physically aggressive (16.2 % reporting having perpetrated severe violence) at some point in their relationship with their male partner. While 26.3 % of men reported being physically aggressive (with 7.6 % reporting perpetrating severe violence) at some point in their relationship with their female partner. Among the perpetrators of partner abuse, 34.8 % of men and 40.1 % of women reported observing their mothers hitting their fathers. Results indicate that 21 % of “males” and 13 % of females’ partners required medical attention as a result of a partner abuse incident.” Results also indicate that “10 % of women and 15 % of men perpetrated partner abuse in self defense.”)

Sommer, R., Barnes, G. E. & Murray, R. P. (1992). Alcohol consumption, alcohol abuse, personality and female perpetrated spouse abuse. *Journal of Personality and Individual Differences*, 13, 1315–1323. (The responses from a subsample of 452 women drawn from a sample of 1,257 Winnipeg residents were analyzed. Using the CTS, it was found that 39 % of women physically aggressed against their male partners at some point in their relationship. Younger women with high scores on Eysenck's P scale were most likely to perpetrate violence. Note: The sample of subjects is the same as the one cited in Sommer's 1994 dissertation.)

Sorenson, S. B., & Telles, C. A. (1991). Self reports of spousal violence in a Mexican–American and non-Hispanic white population. *Violence and Victims*, 6, 3–15. (Surveyed 1,243 Mexican-Americans and 1,149 non-Hispanic whites and found that women compared to men reported higher rates of hitting, throwing objects, initiating violence, and striking first more than once. Gender difference was significant only for non-Hispanic whites.)

Sorenson, S. B., Upchurch, D. M., & Shen, H. (1996). Violence and injury in marital arguments: risk patterns and gender differences. *American Journal of Public Health*, 66(1), 35–40. (Data analysis was based on findings from the National Survey of Families and Households conducted in 1987–1988. Subjects included 6,779 currently married White, Black and Hispanic individuals who completed a modified version of the Conflict Tactics Scale. Authors report that, “women <6.2 vs. 4.9 %> were slightly more likely than men to report that they had hit, shoved or thrown something at their spouse in the previous year.” Women also reported higher rates of causing injury than did men. Other findings of note: (1) Blacks were 1.58 times more likely and Hispanics 0.53 times less likely than Whites to report that

physical violence occurred in their relationship; (2) Subjects under 30 reported more violence and those above 50 reported less violence; 3) lower annual income was associated with higher rates of physical violence.)

Spencer, G. A. & Bryant, S. A. (2000). Dating violence: A comparison of rural, suburban and urban teens. *Journal of Adolescent Health, 25* (2), 302–305. (A sample of 2,094 high school students in upper New York State indicated their experience of physical dating violence. There were a similar number of boys and girls surveyed, with more subjects from urban areas than rural or suburban areas. The majority of subjects were white, non-hispanic. Males in each region were more likely to report being victims of physical dating violence than females in each region. Specifically, 30 % of rural boys and 20 % of urban and 20 % of suburban boys reported being victims of partner physical aggression while 25 % of rural girls and 16 % of suburban and 13 % of urban girls reported victimization.)

Stacy, C. L., Schandel, L. M., Flannery, W. S., Conlon, M., & Milardo, R. M. (1994). It's not all moonlight and roses: dating violence at the University of Maine, 1982–1992. *College Student Journal, 28*, 2–9. (Three separate samples of students were assessed in 1982, 1987 and 1992 with the CTS. Authors report that the rate of partner abuse has more than doubled over a 10 year period. In 1992 the data collected from 53 men and 106 women revealed the overall rate of violence perpetrated by men was 20.8 % while the rate perpetrated by women was 41.5 %.)

Steinmetz, S. K. (1977–1978). The battered husband syndrome. *Victimology: An International Journal, 2*, 499–509. (A pioneering article suggesting that the incidence of husband beating was similar to the incidence of wife beating.)
Steinmetz, S. K. (1980). Women and violence: victims and perpetrators. *American Journal of Psychotherapy, 34*, 334–350. (Examines the apparent contradiction in women's role as victim and perpetrator in domestic violence.)

Steinmetz, S. K. (1981). A cross cultural comparison of marital abuse. *Journal of Sociology and Social Welfare, 8*, 404–414. (Using a modified version of the CTS, examined marital violence in small samples from six societies: Finland, United States, Canada, Puerto Rico, Belize, and Israel <total n = 630>. Found that “in each society the percentage of husbands who used violence was similar to the percentage of violent wives.” The major exception was Puerto Rico where men were more violent. Author also reports that, “Wives who used violence ... tended to use greater amounts.”)

Stets, J. E. & Henderson, D. A. (1991). Contextual factors surrounding conflict resolution while dating: results from a national study. *Family Relations, 40*, 29–40. (Drawn from a random national telephone survey, daters <n=277; men = 149, women = 128> between the ages of 18 and 30, who were single, never married and in a relationship during the past year which lasted at least 2 months with at least six dates were examined with the Conflict Tactics Scale. Findings reveal that over 30 % of subjects used physical aggression in their relationships, with 22 % of the men and 40 % of the women reported using some form of physical aggression. Women were “6 times more likely than men to use severe aggression <19.2 vs. 3.4 %> ... Men were twice as likely as women to report receiving severe aggression <15.7 vs. 8 %>.” Also found that younger subjects and those of lower socioeconomic status <SES> were more likely to use physical aggression.)

Stets, J. E., & Pirog-Good, M. A. (1987). Violence in dating relationships, *Social Psychology Quarterly*, 50, 237–246. (Examined a college sample of 505 white students. Found that men and women were similar in both their use and reception of violence. Jealousy was a factor in explaining dating violence for women.)

Stets, J. E. & Pirog-Good, M. A. (1989). Patterns of physical and sexual abuse for men and women in dating relationships: A descriptive analysis, *Journal of Family Violence*, 4, 63–76. (Examined a sample of 287 college students <118 men and 169 women> and found similar rates for men and women of low level physical abuse in dating relationships. More women than men were pushed or shoved <24 vs. 10 %> while more men than women were slapped <12 vs. 8 %>. In term of unwanted sexual contact 22 % of men and 36 % of women reported such behavior. The most frequent category for both men <18 %> and women <19 %> was the item, “against my will my partner initiated necking”).

Stets, J. E., & Pirog-Good, M. A. (1990). Interpersonal control and courtship aggression. *Journal of Personal and Social Relations*, 7, 371–394. (A random sample of white heterosexual college students <335 men, 448 women> were assessed with the CTS. Findings reveal that women compared to men perpetrated significantly more mild and severe aggression toward their dating partners and men compared to women sustained significantly more mild and severe aggression from their dating partners.)

Stets, J. E., & Straus, M. A. (1990). Gender differences in reporting marital violence and its medical and psychological consequences. In M. A. Straus & R. J. Gelles (Eds.), *Physical violence in American families: Risk factors and adaptations to violence in 8,145 families* (pp. 151–166). New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction. (Reports information regarding the initiation of violence. In a sample of 297 men and 428 women, men said they struck the first blow in 43.7 % of cases, and their partner hit first in 44.1 % of cases and could not disentangle who hit first in remaining 12.2 %. Women report hitting first in 52.7 % of cases, their partners in 42.6 % and could not disentangle who hit first in remaining 4.7 %. Authors conclude that violence by women is not primarily defensive.)

Stockdale, G. L. (1998). *Men's Accounts of Domestic Violence*. Unpublished master's thesis. Deakin University, Australia. (Twenty male victims of domestic violence were interviewed using a semi-structured protocol. Many subjects incurred severe physical violence and were “mostly disturbed by false accusations of violence on their part, and their partner's use of their children against them, which they felt were supported by the legal system and the community.”)

Straus, M. (1980). Victims and aggressors in marital violence. *American Behavioral Scientist*, 23, 681–704. (Reviews data from the 1975 National Survey. Examined a subsample of 325 violent couples and found that in 49.5 % of cases both husbands and wives committed at least one violent act, while husbands alone were violent in 27.7 % of the cases and wives alone were violent in 22.7 % of the cases. Found that 148 violent husbands had an average number of 7.1 aggressive acts per year while the 177 violent wives averaged 6.8 aggressive acts per year.)

Straus, M. A. (1995). Trends in cultural norms and rates of partner violence: An update to 1992. In S. M. Stich & M. A. Straus (Eds.) *Understanding partner violence: Prevalence, causes, consequences, and solutions* (pp. 30–33).

Minneapolis, MN: National Council on Family Relations. (Reports finding that while the approval of a husband slapping his wife declined dramatically from 1968 to 1994 <21 to 10 %> the approval of a wife slapping her husband did not decline but remained at 22 % during the same period. The most frequently mentioned reason for slapping for both partners was sexual unfaithfulness. Also reports that severe physical assaults by men declined by 48 % from 1975 to 1992–38/1,000 to 19/1,000 while severe assaults by women did not change from 1975 to 1992 and remained above 40/1,000. Suggests that public service announcements should be directed at female perpetrated violence and that school based programs “explicitly recognize and condemn violence by girls as well as boys.”)

Straus, M. A. (1998). *The controversy over domestic violence by women: A methodological, theoretical, and sociology of science analysis*. Paper presented at Claremont Symposium on Applied Social Psychology, Claremont, CA. (Examines issue of differential rates of assaults between crime studies and couple conflict studies. Provides a sociological explanation to account for assaults by women within the family.)

Straus, M. A. (2001). Prevalence of violence against dating partners by male and female university students worldwide. *Violence Against Women, 10*, 790–811. (Dating aggression was studied at 31 universities in 16 countries worldwide. Responding to the revised Conflict Tactics Scale were 8,666 students <5,919 women, 2,747 men>. Results reveal that overall 25 % of men and 28 % of women assaulted their dating partner in the past year. At 21 of the 31 universities studied a larger percentage of women than men assaulted their dating partner. In terms of severe assaults a higher rate of perpetration by women occurred in a majority (18 of the 31) of the sites.)

Straus, M. A. (2005). Women’s violence toward men is a serious social problem. In D. R. Loseke, R. J. Gelles, & M. M. Cavanaugh (Eds.), *Current Controversies on Family Violence, 2nd*. Edition, (pp. 55–77). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage. (A scholarly review of research showing that women initiate physical assaults on their male partners as frequently as men assault women. Examines the fact that injuries and fatalities result from such violence.)

Straus, M. A. (2006). Future research on gender symmetry in physical assaults on partners. *Violence Against Women, 12*, 1086–1097. (A review article and position statement in which author advocates a research focus on why gender symmetry in partner aggression is predominant and its implications for primary prevention and treatment. Suggests that such research is handicapped for a number of reasons including bias. Specifically cites concerns about some researchers who are blindly committed to a single causal theory—patriarchy & male dominance— as well as “denial of research grants to projects that do not assume most partner violence is by male perpetrators.” Authors also expresses concerns about “failure to investigate primary prevention & treatment for female offenders” and a suppression of evidence “of female perpetration by both researchers and agencies.”)

Straus, M. A. (2007). Processes explaining the concealment and distortion of evidence on gender symmetry in partner violence. *European Journal of Criminal Policy Research, 13*, 227–232. (Focuses on methods used to conceal and distort evidence of gender symmetry in partner violence. These include the suppression of

evidence, the avoidance of data inconsistent with “Patriarchal Dominance Theory,” the obstruction of the publication of articles & the funding of research that might contradict the idea that male dominance in the cause of PV, and the harassment of researchers who produce evidence that contradicts feminist beliefs.)

Straus, M. A. (2008). Dominance and symmetry in partner violence by male and female university students in 32 nations. *Children and Youth Services Review, 30*, 252–275. (A convenience sample of 13,601 students <71.5 % women, 28.5 % men> at 68 universities in 32 countries completed the CTS2. Findings reveal that almost a third of students assaulted their dating partners in a 12 month period. In terms of initiation, mutual aggression accounted for 68.6 % of physical violence, while women initiated violence 21.4 % of the time and men initiated violence 9.9 % of the time.)

Straus, M. A. (2009a). Gender symmetry in partner violence: evidence and implications for prevention and treatment. In J. R. Lutzker and D. J. Whitaker (Eds.). *Prevention of Partner Violence* (pp. 245–271). Washington, D. C.: American Psychological Association. (A review article that examines evidence of gender symmetry in partner violence. Also summarizes studies that show existing efforts at prevention and treatment have been limited by the conceptualization that partner violence is primarily violence against women.)

Straus, M. A. (2009b). Current controversies and prevalence concerning female offenders of intimate partner violence. Why the overwhelming evidence of partner physical violence by women has not been perceived and is often denied. *Journal of Aggression, Maltreatment & Trauma, 18*, 1–19. (A major review and analysis that examines gender symmetry in intimate partner violence. Discusses reasons why findings have not been perceived and accepted by practitioners and the public. Examines the issue of concealment and denial by academic researchers and the negative effect that misperception & denial has had on prevention and treatment programs.)

Straus, M. A. (2011). Gender symmetry and mutuality in perpetration of clinical-level partner violence: Empirical evidence and implications for prevention and treatment. *Aggression and Violent Behavior, 16*, 279–288. (A comprehensive review article which concludes that much of the controversy over gender symmetry “arises because those who assert gender symmetry do so on the basis of *perpetration* rates, whereas those who deny gender symmetry do so on the basis of the *effects* of victimization...” Straus presents findings from 36 general populations study comparisons of severe assaults by men and women. Overall the median percentage of men who severely assault their female partners was 5.1 %, while a median of 7.1 % of women severely assaulted their male partners. In terms of injuries, the rate for women injuring their male partners was 88 % of the male rate.)

Straus, M. A. (2012). Blaming the messenger for the bad news about partner violence by women: The methodological, theoretical, and value basis of the purported invalidity of the Conflict Tactics Scales. *Behavioral Sciences & the Law, 30*(5), 538–556. (A review and analysis in which the author presents a vigorous defense of the most widely used measure to assess intimate partner violence.)

Straus, M. A., & Gelles, R. J. (1986). Societal change and change in family violence from 1975 to 1985 as revealed by two national surveys. *Journal of*

Marriage and the Family, 48, 465–479. (Reviewed data from two large sample national violence surveys of married couples and report that men and women assaulted each other at approximately equally rates, with women engaging in minor acts of violence at a higher rate than men. Sample size in 1975 survey = 2,143; sample size in 1985 survey = 6,002.)

Straus, M. A., & Gelles, R. J. (1990). *Physical violence in American families. Risk factors and adaptations to violence in 8,145 families*. New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction.

Straus, M. A., Gelles, R. J., & Steinmetz, S. K. (1981). *Behind closed doors: Violence in the American family*, Garden City, NJ: Anchor. (Reports findings from National Family Violence survey conducted in 1975. In terms of religion, found that Jewish men had the lowest rates of abusive spousal violence (1 %), while Jewish women had a rate of abusive spousal violence which was more than double the rate for Protestant women <7 %>, pp. 128–133. Abusive violence was defined as an “act which has a high potential for injuring the person being hit,” pp. 21–22.)

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, 283–316. (The revised CTS has clearer differentiation between minor and severe violence and new scales to measure sexual coercion and physical injury. Used the CTS2 with a sample of 317 college students <114 men, 203 women> and found that: 49 % of men and 31 % of women reported being a victim of physical assault by their partner; 38 % of men and 30 % of women reported being a victim of sexual coercion by their partner; and 16 % of men and 14 % of women reported being seriously injured by their partners.)

Straus, M. A., & Kaufman Kantor, G. (1994, July). *Change in spouse assault rates from 1975–1992: A comparison of three national surveys in the United States*. Paper presented at the Thirteenth World Congress of Sociology, Bielefeld, Germany. (Reports that the trend of decreasing severe assaults by husbands found in the National Survey from 1975 to 1985 has continued in the 1992 survey while wives maintained higher rates of assault.)

Straus, M. A., Kaufman Kantor, G., & Moore, D. W. (1994, August). *Change in cultural norms approving marital violence from 1968 to 1994*. Paper presented at the American Sociological Association, Los Angeles, CA. (Compared surveys conducted in 1968 <n=1,176>, 1985 <n=6,002>, 1992 <n=1,970>, and 1994 <n=524>, with regard to the approval of facial slapping by a spouse. Approval of slapping by husbands decreased from 21 % in 1968 to 13 % in 1985, to 12 % in 1992, to 10 % in 1994. The approval of slapping by wives was 22 % in 1968 and has not declined over the years.)

Straus, M. A., & Medeiros, R. A. (2002, November). *Gender differences in risk factors for physical violence between dating partners by university students*. Paper presented at annual meeting of the American Society for Criminology, Chicago, Illinois. (A sample of 232 men and 334 women responded to revised CTS. Results indicate that for minor violence the rates for both men and women are 22 % and for severe violence rates are 10 % for men and 11 % for women.)

Straus, M. A., & Mouradian, V. E. (1999, November). *Preliminary psychometric data for the Personal Relationships Profile (PRP): A multi-scale tool for clinical*

screening and research on partner violence. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Society of Criminology, Toronto, Canada. (In a study of 1,034 dating couples at two US universities injury rates based on responses to the revised CTS (CTS2) revealed that 9.9 % of men and 9.4 % of women report being injured by the opposite sex. In terms of inflicting injuries, 10.1 % of men and 8.0 % of women indicated that they inflicted injuries on their partners.)

Straus, M. A., & Ramirez, I. L. (2007). Gender symmetry in prevalence, severity, and chronicity of physical aggression against dating partners by university students in Mexico and USA. *Aggressive Behavior*, 33, 281–290. (Reports findings from four samples of university students in Juarez, Mexico, El Paso and Lubbock, Texas, and New Hampshire. Subjects (N = 1,544) responded to the revised Conflict Tactics Scale. Results indicate that there were no significant differences between males and females in either the overall prevalence of physical aggression or the prevalence of severe attacks. However, when only one partner was violent it was twice as likely to be the female than the male <19.0 vs. 9.8 %>. Moreover, in terms of severe aggression females were twice as likely to be violent than men <29.8 vs. 13.7 %>).

Straus, M. A., & Scott, K. (2008). Gender symmetry in partner violence: The evidence and implications for primary prevention and treatment. In J. R. Lutzker & D. J. Whitaker (eds.), *Prevention of partner violence*. Washington, DC: American Psychological Association. (A major review article which examines evidence for gender symmetry in partner abuse and presents recommendations for primary prevention.)

Sugarman, D. B., & Hotaling, G. T. (1989). Dating violence: Prevalence, context, and risk markers. In M. A. Pirog-Good & J. E. Stets (Eds.) *Violence in dating relationships: Emerging social issues* (pp. 3–32). New York: Praeger. (Reviewed 21 studies of dating behavior and found that women reported having expressed violence at higher rates than men—329 per 1,000 vs. 393 per 1,000.)

Sugihara, Y., & Warner, J. A. (2002). Dominance and domestic abuse among Mexican Americans: gender differences in the etiology of violence in intimate relationships. *Journal of Family Violence*, 17(4), 315–340. (A sample of 316 Mexican Americans <161 men, 155 women> were evaluated with the CTS2. Subjects' average age was in the mid 30's, most were married, and all were English-speakers. Results reveal no differences in the victimization of physical assaults <35 vs. 37 %>. However, a greater percentage of men <14 vs. 10> reported physical injuries.)

Swahn, M. H., Simon, T. R., Arias, I., & Bossarte, R. M. (2008). Measuring sex differences in violence victimization and perpetration within date and same-sex peer relationships. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 23, 1120–1138. (Data was obtained from The Youth Violence Survey conducted in 2004 in a high risk community. All public school students in grades 7, 9, 11, 12 were surveyed. Items were similar to the CTS. Boys <n = 1,495> reported greater physical violence victimization than girls <n = 1,372> 32.6 % compared to 28.8 %.)

Swart, L. A., Seedat, M., Stevens, G., & Ricardo, I. (2002). Violence in adolescents' romantic relationships: findings from a survey amongst school-going youth in a South African community. *Journal of Adolescence*, 25(4), 385–395. (A sample of 928 students <494 female, 424 male> from 7 schools in South Africa

completed a modified version of the CTS2. Results reveal that 35.3 % of males and 43.5 % of females reported perpetrating physical violence in a romantic relationship within a 12 month period prior to the survey.)

Swaroop, S. & Dsouza, A. (September, 2007). Violence a home truth for India husband. <http://mynation.net/study-report-indianhusbands.htm> (A sample of 1,650 Indian husbands between the ages of 15 and 49 were interviewed regarding their experience with domestic violence. Authors report that 25.2 % of men report being victims of physical violence.)

Symons, P. Y., Groer, M. W., Kepler-Youngblood, P., & Slater, V. (1994). Prevalence and predictors of adolescent dating violence. *Journal of Child and Adolescent Psychiatric Nursing*, 7 (3) 14–23. (A sample of 561 rural North Carolina adolescents, predominantly female <77 %> and 40 % black and 58 % white completed a scale assessing dating violence and family violence. Results reveal that boys were significantly more likely to experience dating violence than girls.)

Szinovacz, M. E. (1983). Using couple data as a methodological tool: The case of marital violence. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, 45, 633–644. (Used Conflict Tactics Scale with 103 couples and found that the wives' rates of physical aggression was somewhat higher than husbands'.)

Tang, C. S. (1994). Prevalence of spouse aggression in Hong Kong. *Journal of Family Violence*, 9, 347–356. (Subjects were 382 undergraduates <246 women, 136 men> at the Chinese University in Hong Kong. The CTS was used to assess students' evaluation of their parents responses during family conflict. 14 % of students reported that their parents engaged in physical violence. "Mothers were as likely as fathers to use actual physical force toward their spouses.")

Tang, C. S. (1999). Marital power and aggression in a community sample of Hong Kong Chinese families. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 14(6), 586–602. (A Hong Kong sample of 1,270 Chinese families <518 men, 752 women> were assessed with the CTS. Across all conditions of marital power women were significantly more likely to perpetrate minor violence on their spouses. There was no significant differences in the perpetration of severe violence.)

Thompson Jr., E. H. (1990). Courtship violence and the male role. *Men's Studies Review*, 7, (3), 4–13. (Subjects were 336 undergraduates <167 men, 169 women> who completed a modified version of the CTS. Found that 24.6 % of men compared to 28.4 % of women expressed physical violence toward their dating partners within the past two years. Found that women were twice as likely as men to slap their partners.)

Thompson Jr., E. H. (1991). The maleness of violence in dating relationships: an appraisal of stereotypes. *Sex Roles*, 24, 261–278. (In a more extensive presentation of his 1990 article, the author concludes that, "a more masculine and/or less feminine gender orientation and variations in relationship seriousness proved to be the two strongest predictors of both men's and women's involvement in courtship violence.")

Thorton, A. J. V., Graham-Kevan, N., & Archer, J. (2010). Adaptive and maladaptive personality traits as predictors of violent and nonviolent offending behavior in men and women. *Aggressive Behavior*, 36(3), 177–186. (A sample of 116 men and 181 women responded to items adapted from the CTS. Results reveal

that women were significantly more likely than men to perpetrated intimate partner violence.)

Titterington, V. B., & Harper, L. (2005). Women as the aggressors in intimate partner homicide in Houston, 1980's to 1990's. *Journal of Offender Rehabilitation*, 41 (4), 83–98. (Studied prevalence of intimate partner homicide in Houston from 1985 to 1999. Results reveal that women were “over 40 % of the offenders in lethal domestic assaults. Both victims and offenders were disproportionately black...black women were equally (or more) likely than black men to be the perpetrators of intimate domestic homicide. Among non-Hispanic whites (including Asians, others) there were 63 female intimate partner homicide offenders for every 100 male offenders.” In the small number of cases involving Hispanic couples, “women were more likely to be the aggressors in intimate partner homicide in the latter time period” of the study.)

Tjaden, P. & Thoennes, N. (2000). Prevalence and consequences of male-to-female and female-to-male intimate partner violence as measured by the National Violence Against Women Survey. *Violence Against Women*, 6, 142–161. (Telephone interviews using a modified version of the CTS was obtained from 6,934 men and 7,278 women regarding prevalence and consequences of partner violence. Authors report that women, over the course of their lives were 2.9 times more likely to report being physically assaulted than men. However, it should be noted that overall reported estimate of annual intimate partner violence for women of 1.4 % is significantly lower than 11–12 % estimates from earlier national surveys. Straus (1998) characterizes the data from this study as being flawed and inaccurate. He cites the wording of items as possibly creating “demand characteristics” that led subjects to view the survey as a study of crime and thus restrict their responses to exclude behavior considered harmless, especially minor assaults by women. Thus, he states this unintended demand characteristics probably account for the low prevalence rate and 3 to 1 ratio of male to female physical assaults.)

Tyree, A., & Malone, J. (1991). *How can it be that wives hit husbands as much as husbands hit wives and none of us knew it?* Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Sociological Association. (Reviews the literature and discusses results from their study attempting to predict spousal violence. Found that women's violence is correlated with a history of hitting siblings and a desire to improve contact with partners.)

Vasquez, D., & Falcone, R. (1997). Cross gender violence. *Annals of Emergency Medicine*, 29(3), 427–429. (Reports equal cross gender violence treated at an Ohio trauma center during an 11 month period. Of 1,400 trauma admissions, 37 patients <18 men, 19 women> sustained injuries inflicted by members of the opposite sex. The severity score of injury was higher for men than women, 11.4 vs. 6.9. The majority of men were admitted for stab wounds, 72 %; the majority of women for assault, 53 %.)

Vaeth, P. A. C., Ramisetty-Mikler, S., & Catetano, R. (2010). Depression among couples in the United States in the context of intimate partner violence. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 25, 771–790. (A sample of 1,136 multi-ethnic couples <1/3 White, 1/3 Hispanic, 1/5 Black & rest mixed ethnicity> completed the revised CTS.

Results reveal that 10.2 % of men and 13.1 % of women reported perpetrating physical violence.)

Vivian, D., & Langhinrichsen-Rohling, J. (1996). Are bi-directionally violent couples mutually victimized? In L. K. Hamberger & C. Renzetti (Eds.) *Domestic partner abuse* (pp. 23–52). New York: Springer. (Authors found using a modified version of the CTS, that in a sample of 57 mutually aggressive couples, there were no significant differences between husbands' and wives' reports concerning the frequency and severity of assault victimization. With regard to injuries, 32 wives and 25 husbands reported the presence of a physical injury which resulted from partner aggression.)

Waiping, A. L., & Sporakowski, M. J. (1989). The continuation of violent dating relationships among college students. *Journal of College Student Development*, 30, 432–439. (Using a modified version of the CTS, authors examined courtship violence in a sample of 422 college students <227 women, 195 men>. Women more often than men <35.3 vs. 20.3 %> indicated that they physically abused their partners.)

Walton, M. A., Murray, R., Cunningham, R. M., Chermack, S. T., Barry, K. L., Booth, B. M., et al. (2009). Correlates of intimate partner violence among and women in an inner city emergency department. *Journal of Addictive Diseases*, 28, 366–381. (A large sample <10,744> of patients seeking treatment at the emergency department in Flint, Michigan responded to a survey which contained one item dealing with partner violence. Results reveal that 6 % of women and 2 % of men reported perpetrating IPV.)

Watson, J. M., Cascardi, M., Avery-Leaf, S., & O'Leary, K. D. (2001). High School students' responses to dating aggression. *Victims and Violence*, 16 (3) 339–348. (Using a modified version of the CTS, authors examined dating violence in a multi-ethnic sample <43 % Hispanic; 31.5 % Caucasian; 15.8 % African-American> of New York high school students <266 males, 209 females>. Overall, 45.6 % of students reported experiencing physical aggression from a current or past dating partner. There were significant differences in self-reported rates of victimization: African-American 60 %, Caucasian 47 % and Hispanic 41 %. The only ethnic group that showed significant gender differences were Hispanics, with females showing higher rates of victimization.)

Wekerle, C., Leung, E., Wall, A. M., MacMillan, H., Boyle, M., Trocme, N., & Waechter, R. (2009). *Child Abuse and Neglect*, 33(1), 45–58. (A sample of 408 troubled youths <51.6 % women> completed the Conflict in Adolescent Dating Relationships Inventory. Results reveal that 44 % of men and 67 % of women reported perpetrating violence in the past year.)

West, C. M. (2008). “A thin line between love and hate?” Black men as victims of perpetrators of dating violence. *Journal of Aggression, Maltreatment & Trauma*, 16(3) 238–257. (A review article which examines Black men as victims and perpetrators of dating violence. Author concludes that the rate of “dating violence perpetrated against Black men is unacceptably high.”)

West, C. M., & Rose, S. (2000). Dating aggression among low income African American youth. *Violence against Women*, 6, 470–494. (A sample of 171 <88 female, 83 male> low income African American youth were assessed using a

modified version of the CTS. Victimization and perpetration rates were high. Women were significantly more likely to threaten to hit their partners <66.3 vs. 49.4 %>, throw something at partners <62 vs. 45 %>, slap their partners <53.3 vs. 38.6 %>, and hit with something <47.1 vs. 30.9 %>.)

Whitaker, D. J., Haileyesus, T., Swahn, M., & Saltzman, L. S. (2007). Differences in frequency of violence and reported injury between relationships with reciprocal and nonreciprocal intimate partner violence. *American Journal of Public Health*, 97, 941–947. (A sample of 11,370 young adults <46 % male, 54 % female; 70 % white, 15 % Black, 10.7 % Hispanic, 4.3 % other> aged 18–28, who were drawn from the 2001 National Longitudinal Study of Adolescent Health, responded to a modified version of the CTS. Results indicate that almost 24 % of all relationships had some physical violence and that half the violence was reciprocal. In non-reciprocally violent relationships, women were the perpetrators 70 % of the time. While overall, women were somewhat more likely to be injured than men, the authors report that, “in fact, men in relationships with reciprocal violence were reportedly injured more often <25.2 %> than were women in relationships with nonreciprocal violence <20.0 %>.)

White, H. R., & Chen, P. H. (2002). Problem drinking and intimate partner violence. *Journal of Studies on Alcohol*, 63(2), 205–214. (A sample of 725 <400 women, 325 men> problem drinkers completed the CTS. Results reveal that 18 % of women and 13 % of men reported perpetrating IPV.)

White, J. W., & Humphrey, (1994). Women’s aggression in heterosexual conflicts. *Aggressive Behavior*, 20, 195–202. (Eight hundred and twenty-nine women <representing 84 % of entering class of women> 17 and 18 years old, entering the university for the first time completed the CTS and other assessment instruments. Results reveal that 51.5 % of subjects used physical aggression at least once in their prior dating relationships and, in the past year, 30.2 % reported physically aggressing against their male partners. Past use of physical aggression was the best predictor of current aggression. The witnessing and experiencing of parental aggression also predicted present aggression.)

White, J. W., & Kowalski, R. M. (1994). Deconstructing the myth of the nonaggressive woman: A feminist analysis. *Psychology of Women Quarterly*, 18, 487–508. (A review and analysis which acknowledges that “women equal or exceed men in number of reported aggressive acts committed within the family.” Examines a variety of explanations to account for such aggression.)

White, J. W., & Koss, M. P. (1991). Courtship violence: Incidence in a national sample of higher education students. *Violence and Victims*, 6, 247–256. (In a representative sample of 2,603 women and 2,105 men it was found that 37 % of the men and 35 % of women inflicted some form of physical aggression, while 39 % of the men and 32 % of the women received some form of physical aggression.)

Williams, J. R., Ghandour, R. M., & Kub, J. E. (2008). Female perpetration of violence in heterosexual relationships: Adolescence through adulthood. *Trauma, Violence & Abuse*, 9(4), 227–249. (This article reviews 62 empirical studies, published between 1996 and 2006, that examine female perpetrated intimate partner violence across adolescence, college students and adults. Authors conclude that

...“girls and women perpetrate a significant amount of IPV against their male partners.”)

Williams, S. L., & Frieze, I. H. (2005a). Courtship behaviors, relationship violence, and breakup persistence in college men and women. *Psychology of Women Quarterly*, 29, 248–257. (A sample of college students <215 women and 85 men; 77 % Caucasian, 13 % African-American, 5 % Asian and the rest mixed or other> responded to the revised Conflict Tactics Scale, CTS2. Results revealed that women were significantly more likely than men to engage in mild (40 vs. 23 %) and severe (14 vs. 4 %) acts of violence with their partners.)

Williams, S. L., & Frieze, I. H. (2005b). Patterns of violent relationships, psychological distress, and marital satisfaction in a national sample of men and women. *Sex Roles*, 52(11/12), 771–784. (Data from a National Comorbidity Survey was examined. In a sample of 3,519 men and women it was found that 18.4 % were involved in a violent relationship. Most violence, both mild and severe, was mutual. However, women were more likely than men to initiate both mild and severe violence.)

Williams, T. S., Connolly, J, Pepler, D., Craig, W., & Laporte, L. (2008). Risk models of dating aggression across different adolescent relationships: A developmental psychopathology approach. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology*, 76, 622–632. (A sample of 621 Canadian H.S. students <44 % boys, 56 % girls> were assessed with items from the CTS. Authors report that 32 % of students reported perpetrating some form of physical aggression toward their opposite sex partners. There were no significant differences between boys and girls in perpetration.)

Wilson, M. I. & Daley, M. (1992). Who kills whom in spouse killings? On the exceptional sex ratio of spousal homicides in the United States. *Criminology*, 30, 189–215. (Authors summarize research which indicates that between 1976 and 1985, for every 100 men who killed their wives, about 75 women killed their husbands. Authors report original data from a number of cities, e.g., Chicago, Detroit, Houston, where the ratio of wives as perpetrators exceeds that of husbands.)

Winstok, Z. & Straus, M. A. (2011). Gender differences in intended escalatory tendencies among marital partners. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 26 (18), 3599–3617. (A sample of 208 Israeli couples responded to a survey examining their tendencies to escalate aggression in eight hypothetical situations. Findings reveal that 54.6 % of men vs. 74 % of women indicated that they would respond aggressively if their partners provoked them verbally and 51 % of men vs. 76 % of women revealed that they would respond aggressively if their partner physically provoked them. Authors in discussing this disparity suggest that societies often view women’s violence against their male partners as “understandable, pardonable and sometimes humorous”.)

Wolf, K. A., & Foshee, V. A. (2003). Family violence, anger expression styles, and adolescent dating violence. *Journal of Family Violence*, 18, 309–316. (A sample of 1,405 adolescents in North Carolina responded to a questionnaire examining dating violence. Results reveal that 28 % of girls and 15 % of boys reported perpetrating IPV in their lifetime.)

Wolfe, D. A., Scott, K., Wekerle, C., & Pittman, A. (2001). Child maltreatment: Risk of adjustment problems and dating violence in adolescence. *Journal of American Academy of Child Adolescent Psychiatry*, 40, 282–289. (A sample of 1,419 high school students from Ontario, Canada completed a dating violence survey. Results reveal that 28 % of girls and 11 % of boys reported perpetrating physical IPV.)

Wong, F. Y., Huang, J., DiGangi, J. A., Thompson, E. E., & Smith, B. D. (2008). Gender differences in intimate partner violence on substance abuse, sexual risks, and depression among a sample of South Africans in Cape Town. South Africa. *AIDS Education and Prevention*, 20 (1), 56–64. (A total 395 Black and colored individuals <200 women, 195 men> in two South African townships responded to selected items from the CTS. Findings reveal that 99.4 % of men and 99 % of men reported exposure to IPV at some point in their life and one quarter of both men and women reported experiencing partner violence during the past 6 months.)

Wright, E. M., & Benson, M. L. (2010). Relational aggression, intimate partner violence, and gender: An exploratory analysis. *Victims & Offenders*, 5(4), 283–302. (A representative sample of 2,807 Chicago couples responded in face-to-face interviews and completed a CTS. Results reveal that 11 % of men and 16 % of women perpetrated IPV in the past year.)

Zacarias, A. E., Macassa, G., & Soares, J. J. F. (2009). Women as perpetrators of IPV: the experience of Mozambique. *Journal of Aggression, Conflict and Peace Research*, 4(1), 5–27. (A sample of 1,442 women in Mozambique were assessed regarding their perpetration of Intimate partner violence. Results reveal that 38.2 % of women reported physically assaulting their partners.)

Acknowledgments The author thanks Diane Roe for her assistance in updating this bibliography.

Addendum: Assaults By Women on Their Male Partners Bibliographic References Sorted By Category

The Author-Year citation style is used here. See the main article for the full bibliographical reference. Note some studies are sorted in more than one category. Items *bolded and underlined* have been selected by the author, based on number of citations, historical relevance and personal impact, as reflecting particularly significant reviews/analyses and empirical studies.

National Surveys and Representative Sample Studies (63)

Ackard et al., 2002
 Anderson, 2002
 Bland & Orne, 1986
 Brinkerhoff et al., 1988
 Brown, 2004
 Brush, 1990

- Caetano et al., 2002
Capaldi et al., 2007
Carrado et al., 1996
Cascardi et al., 1999
Chang et al., 2009
Coker et al., 2000
Coleman & Straus, 1986
Cunradi et al., 1999
DeKeseredy & Schwartz, 1998
Eaton, et al., 2007
Ehrensaft et al., 2003
Ehrensaft et al., 2004
Ellison et al., 1999
Felson & Outlaw, 2007
Gass et al., 2011
George, 1999
Graham et al. 2004
Grande et al., (2003)
Grandin & Lupri, 1997
Halpern et al. 2001
Hampton et al., 1989
Headey et al., 1999
Herrenkohl, et al., 2007
Hoff, 1999
Kessler et al., 2001
Kim & Emery, 2003
Kwong et al., 1999
Laroche, 2005
Lipsky & Caetano, (2008)
McLeod, 1984
Merrill et al., 1998
Merrill et al., 2005
Miller et al., 2009
Mirrlees-Black, 1999
Moffitt et al., 2001
Morse, 1995
O'Leary et al. 2008
Olshen et al., 2007
Renner & Whitney, 2010
Rollins & Oheneba-Sakyi, 1990
Saewyc et al., 2009
Schafer et al., 1998
Slep & O'Leary 2005
Sommer, 1994
Sorenson et al., 1996
Stets & Henderson, 1991

Straus & Gelles, 1986

Straus & Gelles, 1990
Straus et al., 1981
Straus & Kaufman Kantor, 1994
Swahn et al. 2008
Tjaden & Thoennes, 2000
Vaeth et al., 2010

Whitaker et al., 2007

White & Chen, 2002
White & Koss, 1991
Williams & Frieze, 2005b
Wright & Benson, 2010

International Studies (61)

Amendt, 2008
Archer & Ray, 1989
Bland & Orne, 1986
Brown, 2004
Chan et al. 2008
Carrado et al. 1996
Claxton-Oldfield & Arsenault, 1999
Connolly et al., 2010
DeKeseredy & Schwartz, 1998
Doroszewicz & Forbes, 2008
Dutton-Greene & Straus 2005
Ehrensaft et al., 2004
Feather. 1996
Fernandez-Fuertes & Fuertes, 2010
Gass et al., 2011
George, 1999
Graham-Kevan & Archer, 2005
Grande et al., (2003)
Grandin & Lupri, 1997
Halford et al., 2010
Headey et al., 1999
Hird, 2000
Jackson et al., 2000
Jankey, et al. 2011
Kalmuss, 1984
Kim & Cho, 1992
Kim & Emery, 2003
Kumar, 2012
Kwong et al., 1999
Laroche, 2005
Lewis & Sarantakos, 2001

Lottes & Weinberg, 1996
Lysova & Douglas, 2008
Magdol et al., 1997
Mirrless-Black, 1999
Moffitt, et al., 2001
Munoz-Rivas et al., 2007
Mwamwenda, 1998
Niaz et al., 2002
O'Leary et al., 2008
Pedersen & Thomas, 1992
Ramisetty-Mikler & Caetano, 2005
Romito & Grassi, 2007
Russell & Hulson, 1992
Sarkar et al., 2008
Sarantakos, 2004
Sharpe & Taylor, 1999
Sommer, 1994
Sommer et al., 1992
Steinmetz, 1981
Straus & Ramirez, 2007
Swaroop & Dsouza, 2007
Swart et al., 2002
Tang, 1994
Tang, 1999
Thorton et al., 2010
Williams et al., 2008
Winstok & Straus, 2011
Wolfe et al. 2001
Wong et al. 2008
Zacarias, et al., 2009

Dating Studies (123)

Ackard et al., 2002
Arias, et al., 1987
Arias & Johnson, 1989
Arriaga & Foshee, 2004
Baker & Stith, 2008
Bernard & Bernard 1983
Billingham et al., 1999
Bookwala, 2002
Bookwala et al., 1992
Burke et al., 1988
Callahan et al., 2003
Cascardi et al., 1999
Caulfield & Riggs, 1992

Cercone et al., 2005
Chan et al., 2008
Clark et al., 1994
Claxton-Oldfield & Arsenault 1999
Cogan & Ballinger III, 2006
Coker et al., 2000
Connolly, et al. 2010
Deal & Wampler, 1986
DeMaris, 1992
Doroszewicz & Forbes, 2008
Dutton-Greene & Straus 2005
Eaton et al., 2007
Fernandez-Fuertes & Fuertes, 2010
Follingstad et al., 1991
Foo & Margolin, 1995
Forke et al., 2008
Foshee, 1996
Foshee et al., 2001
Fossos et al., 2007
Gover et al., 2008
Gray & Foshee, 1997
Gryl et al., 1991
Halpern et al., 2001
Harned, 2002
Harders et al., 1998
Hendy et al., 2003
Henton et al., 1983
Hines & Saudino 2003
Hird, 2000
Holt & Espelage, 2005
Holt & Gillespie, 2008
Jain et al., 2010
Jankey, et al. 2011
Jenkins & Aube, 2002
Jezl et al., 1996
Katz, Carino, & Hilton, 2002
Katz, Kuffel, & Coblenz, 2002
Kaura & Allan,. 2004
Kirschner & Fiebert, 2008
Lane & Gwartney-Gibbs, 1985
Laner & Thompson, 1982
LeJune & Follette, 1994
Licter & McCloskey, 2004.
Lo & Sporkowski, 1989
Lottes & Weinberg, 1996
Luthra & Gidycz, 2006

Lysova & Douglas, 2008
Magdol et al., 1997
Makepeace, 1986
Maker & deRoos-Cassinin 2007
Malik et al. 1997
Mason & Blankenship, 1987
Mathews, 1984
McCarthy, 2001
McKinney, 1986
Miller, et al., 2009
Miller, 2011
Milletich et al., 2010
Molidor & Tolman, 1998
Monson & Langhinrichsen-Rohling, 2002
Munoz-Rivas et al., 2007
Murphy, 1988
Nabors, 2010
O'Keefe, 1997
O'Keefe et al., 1986
O'Leary et al., 2008
Olshen et al., 2007
Pedersen & Thomas, 1992
Pekarek, 2008
Perry & Fromuth, 2005
Plass & Gessner, 1983
Prospero, 2009
Ramisetty-Mikler & Caetano, 2005
Riggs & O. Leary, 1996
Riggs, et al., 1990
Rouse, 1988
Ryan, 1998
Sack et al., 1982
Saewyc et al., 2009
Schnurr et al., 2010
Schwartz, et al., 1997
Sharpe & Taylor, 1999
Shook et al., 2000
Sigelman et al., 1984
Simon et al., 2009
Simonelli & Ingram, 1998
Simonelli et al., 2002
Spencer & Bryant, 2000
Stacy et al., 1994
Stets & Pirog-Good, 1987
Stets & Pirog-Good, 1989
Stets & Pirog-Good, 1990

Straus, 2001.

Straus, 2008

Straus & Medeiros, 2002

Straus & Mouradian, 1999

Straus & Ramirez, 2007

Swart et al., 2002

Symons et al., 1994

Thompson, 1990

Thompson, 1991

Waiping & Sporakowski, 1989

Watson et al., 2001

West & Rose, 2000

White & Humphrey, 1994

White & Koss, 1991

Williams & Frieze, 2005a

Williams et al. 2008

Wolfe & Foshee 2003

Wolfe et al., 2003

ANALYSES (31)

Davis, 2010

Dutton, 2006

Dutton & Nicholls, 2005

Farrell, 1999

Felson & Pare, 2005

Felson & Pare, 2007

Flynn, 1990

Gelles, 1994

Gelles, 2007

George, 2007

Goodyear-Smith & Laidlaw, 1999

Graham et al., 2004

Hines & Malley-Morrison, 2001

Holtzworth-Monroe, 2005

Jackson et al., 2002

Kelly, 2003

Langinrichsen-Rohling, 2005

Langinrichsen-Rohling, 2010

Leisring et al., 2003

Lewis & Fremouw, 2001

McNeely, et al., 2001

Moxon, 2011

Steinmetz, 1977-8

Steinmetz, 1980

Straus, 1998

Straus, 2006

Straus, 2007

- Straus, 2009
Straus, 2012
White & Kowalski, 1994
Winstok & Straus, 2011
REVIEWS (41)
Archer, 2000.
Archer, 2002.
Archer, 2006.
Archer, 2013
Capaldi et al., 2004
Carlson, 1987
Carney et al., 2007
Coney & Mackey, 1999
Cook, 1997
Corry et al. 2002
Desmarais et al. 2012a
Desmarais et al. 2012b
Dowd, 2001
Dutton, 2007
Dutton et al., 2005
Dutton et al., 2009
Felson, 2002
Felson, 2006
Felson, (2008)
George, 1994
George, 2002
Graham-Kevan, 2007
Hamel, 2005
Hamel, 2007
Hamel, 2009
Lillja, 1995
Macchietto, 1992
Malloy et al., 2003
McNeely & Mann, 1990
McNeely & Robinson-Simpson, 1987
Nowinskia & Bowen, 2012
Nicholls & Dutton, 2001
Randle & Graham 2011
Straus, 2005
Straus, 2009b
Straus, 2011
Straus & Scott, 2008
Sugarman & Hotaling, 1989
Tyree & malone, 1991
West, 2008
Williams, et al., 2008

Ethnic and Inter-racial Partner Violence (20)

Ackard, 2002
Caetano et al., 2002
Carbone-Lopez, 2013
Chang et al., 2009
Cunradi et al., 1999
DeMaris, 1992
Ernst et al., 1997
Hampton et al., 1989
Kim & Cho, 1992
Kirschner & Fiebert, 2008
Malik et al., 1997
Mechem et al., 1999
Mercy & Saltzman, 1989
Leung & Cheung, 2008
O. Leary et al. 2008
Pekarek, 2008
Rouse, 1988
Sorenson & Telles, 1991
Sorenson et al., 1996
Sugihara & Warner, 2002

Case Studies (3)

Allen-Collinson, 2009
Lewis & Sarantakos, 2001
Migliacco, 2002

Books and Theses (12)

Amendt, 2008.
Cook, 1997
Dutton, 2006
Farrell, 1999
Gonzalez, 1997
Hamel, 2005
Lillja, 1995
McCarthy, 2001
Pekarek, 2008
Sommer, 1994
Stockdale, 1998
Straus et al., 1981

Other Empirical Studies (58)

- Basile, 2004
Aizenman et al., 1988.
Bohannon et al., 1995
Brutz & Ingoldsby, 1984
Capaldi & Crosby, 1997.
Capaldi & Owen 2001
Cascardi et al., 1992
Chermack et al. 2001
Cui et al., 2005
Cross et al., (2011)
Doumas et al., 2008
Drumm et al., 2009
Ernst et al., 1997
Feather, 1999
Fergusson et al., 2005
Fiebert & Gonzalez, 1997
Fiebert, 1996
Giordano et al., 1999
Goldberg & Tomlanovich, 1984
Gonzalez, 1997
Hettrich & O'Leary, 2007
Hines et al., 2007
Hines & Douglas, 2010
Jouriles et al., 1985
Kan & Feinberg, 2010
Korman et al., 2008
Langinrichsen-Rohling & Vivian, 1994
Leisring, 2013
Malone et al., 1989
Margolin, 1987
Marshall & Rose, 1990
McNulty & Hellmuth (2008)
Mechem et al., 1999
Mihalic & Elliot, 1997
Milardo, 1998
Nisonoff & Bitman, 1979
O. Leary et al., 1989
O'Leary & Slep, 2006
Panuzio & DiLillo, 2010
Prospero, 2007
Reid et al., 2008
Ridley & Feldman, 2003
Rouse et al., 1988
Saenger, 1963

Schumacher & Leonard, 2005
Sorenson & Telles, 1991
Stets & Straus, 1990
Straus, 1980
Straus, 1995
Straus et al., 1996
Straus, et al., 1994
Sugihara & Warner, 2002
Szinovacz, 1983
Tang, 1994
Vasquez & Falcone, 1997
Vivian & Langhinrichsen-Rohling, 1996
Walton et al., 2009
Wekerle et al., 2009

Homicide Studies (8)

Breitman et al. 2004
Davis, 2010
Maxfield, 1989
Mercy & Saltzman, 1989
Meridith et al., 1986
Rosenfeld, 1997
Titterington & Harper, 2005
Wilson & Daley, 1992