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Abstract

The academic discipline of intimate partner violence (IPV) is currently divided into two prevailing perspectives: the feminist perspective, which asserts IPV is a product of the long history of acceptance and encouragement of wife-beating, stemming from patriarchal values; and the gender-inclusive model, that finds IPV reflects multifunctional etiologies, across the types and severities of IPV, with both men and women as perpetrators and victims at similar rates. However, a review of the extant literature does not support either of these conclusions. There is a growing body of research evidence that suggest women are more likely than men to commit IPV. The purpose of this research is to explore gender differences in IPV perpetration and victimization. Using a cross-sectional data collection approach, the study tested the following hypotheses: H1: women perpetrate IPV at a greater rate than men; H2: men experience IPV victimization at a greater rate than women. Results from both multivariate and bivariate analyses indicate women were more likely than men to commit IPV and psychological aggression. The findings further show that both genders reported IPV victimization at relatively equal rates.
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CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION TO THE STUDY

Introduction

Intimate partner violence (IPV) is a public health crisis that affects millions of men, women, and children every year (Breiding et al., 2013). The World Health Organization (2012) defines IPV as “physical, sexual, emotional abuse, and controlling behaviors perpetrated by an intimate partner” (p. 1) and further states that if a woman is to experience violence, she will most likely experience it at the hands of an intimate partner, that women’s violent acts are typically justified as self-defense, and while males are occasionally the victims of IPV, the problem is minimal. This perspective was emphasized by the highly publicized 1995 OJ Simpson murder trial (The murders occurred in June 1994.) that spurred a series of reactive and largely unidirectional policies including the passage of the Violence Against Women’s Act (VAWA, 1994) and nationwide mandatory arrest policies (Miccio, 2005; Stalans & Lurigio, 1995). In contrast, the 2022 Johnny Depp-Amber Heard defamation trial, brought public awareness to female perpetrated IPV (Hanley, 2022) as well as the use of false allegations as a form of abuse (see O’Connor, 2020).

For over 20 years there has been a call for researchers and policy makers to reassess the prevailing perspective that IPV is a gendered offense involving male perpetrators and female victims (see Fergusson et al., 2005). The academic discipline of IPV is currently divided into two prevailing perspectives: the feminist perspective and the gender inclusive perspective. The feminist perspective, also known as the traditional or gender perspective, asserts that IPV is a
product of the long history of acceptance and encouragement of wife-beating, stemming from patriarchal values (see Dobash & Dobash, 1979), and finds women are victims of IPV at greater rates than men (Rennison & Welchans, 2000). Conversely, the gender inclusive model, also known as gender symmetry or the family violence model, considers both men and women as perpetrators and victims at similar rates (see also Archer, 2000; Dutton & Nicholls, 2005; Fiebert, 2014; Stets & Straus, 2017; Straus, 2006; Whitaker et al., 2007) and that women’s perpetration of IPV and men’s victimization are equally important to study and consider in policy and decision making (Bates, Archer, & Graham-Kevan, 2017; Dutton, 2012; Straus, 2009).

However, these two perspectives are not sufficiently holistic to fully understand and explain the dynamics of IPV, its offenders, and victims. A third perspective of gender directionality of IPV—*the alternate asymmetric model*—must be considered. There is a growing body of research evidence that suggests that women commit intimate partner violence at greater rates than men (Archer, 2000; Langhinrichsen-Rohling, 2005, Moxon, 2011, 2020; Nicholls & Dutton, 2001; White & Kowalski, 1994). Despite popular belief, the literature suggests IPV is not a simple problem of violent, aggressive males battering their female partners. The majority of IPV is reciprocal. Reciprocal violence by women is not primarily in self-defense. Furthermore, when IPV is nonreciprocal, women perpetrate the majority (Whitaker et al., 2007; Williams & Frieze, 2005). This paper examines the research hypothesis that women are more likely to perpetrate physical violence and commit these violent acts with greater chronicity against an intimate partner and men are more likely than women to experience IPV victimization at the hands of a female partner.
Statement of the Problem

To date, the majority of gender-based research examining IPV has been divided into a binary debate between asymmetrical (male-perpetrator/female-victim) and symmetrical models. Some researchers claim that limitations of prior research, including omission of conflicting data and selection bias, have biased the prevailing understanding of IPV—that it is a product of male aggression (Bates et al., 2017; Bates et al., 2014; Dutton, 2007; Dutton & Nicholls, 2005; Straus, 2011). In fact, data shows greater female IPV perpetration (Fergusson et al, 2005; Graham-Kevan, 2007). The preponderance of the literature indicates that women may commit IPV at greater rates than their male counterparts (Archer, 2000; Desmarais et al., 2012; Fiebert, 2014). This departure from the prevailing rhetoric—that IPV is predominantly male perpetrated—has been comprehensively evidenced, as confirmed in the literature reviews across all sample types. While differing from the traditional feminist male-aggressor model, the data also refutes the current IPV gender symmetry theory. Mounting data suggests asymmetry in IPV. However, it is females rather than males who commit a greater percentage of IPV. The current default assumption of male batterer and female victim ignores at least 85% of the problem (Whitaker et al., 2007). These findings have profound implications for policy and the criminal and family justice systems. Directionality must be determined in order to implement and develop an effective treatment for female perpetrators and prevention strategies and resource allocation for male victims.

Purpose Statement

The purpose of this study is to expand on the current research and test gender directionality in IPV. Specifically, the objective is to examine the relationship between intimate
partner violence and gender using a modified version of the Revised Conflict Tactics Scale (CTS) to determine violent offending and victimization rates, examining individuals over the age of 18 years old who are/have been involved in at least one heterosexual married or dating relationship in the prior 12 months.
CHAPTER 2: LITERATURE REVIEW

Introduction

This chapter will provide a comprehensive discussion of the three perspectives of IPV introduced in Chapter 1: the feminist perspective, the gender symmetry model, and the alternate asymmetric model. It will examine each perspective’s theoretical framework(s)—specifically, feminist theory’s patriarchal power and control paradigm (see Buzawa & Buzawa, 2017; Dasgupta, 1999; Dobash & Dobash, 1979; Schwartz & DeKeseredy, 2008), the gender symmetry model as explained by the general theory of crime (see Felson, 2002; Gottfredson & Hirschi, 2022; Hirschi & Gottfredson, 1990) and lastly, the alternate asymmetric model explained through evolutionary biology and chivalry (see Bates, 2012; Bates et al., 2014; Felson, 2010; Moxon, 2014) and rational choice and deterrence theories (see Akers, 1990), and then present a comprehensive analysis of previous empirical studies and scholarly articles.

As discussed in the previous section, the academic discipline examining IPV is currently divided between two prevailing perspectives: the feminist perspective and the gender inclusive model. Similarly, the predominance of empirical research addressing IPV is also divided between these two schools. The feminist paradigm derives its data largely from female victims’ reports (see Mooney, 1994) and male perpetrators identified by law enforcement agencies (see Claes & Rosenthal, 1990) demonstrating that 85-95% of IPV (BJS, 1994; Catalano, 2012; Straus, 1999) and roughly 75% of intimate partner homicide (IPH) (Rennison & Welchans, 2000) is male perpetrated. These findings sharply conflict with the gender inclusive model that collects
its data primarily from family conflict surveys, finding that both men and women are perpetrators and victims at similar rates (see Aizenman & Kelley, 1988; Archer, 2002; Arias & Johnson, 1989; Basile, 2004; Breiding et al., 2013; Brush, 1990; Dutton, 2006; Dutton & Nicholls, 2005; Fiebert, 2014; Gelles, 2007; Stets & Straus, 1989; Straus, 2006, 2009). In addition to the two dominant perspectives of IPV, this paper will present substantial empirical literature supporting the alternate asymmetrical model, finding that IPV is committed at greater rates by women (see Archer, 2000; Whitaker et al., 2007). In order to accurately assess gender differences and directionality in IPV, it is necessary to account for gender differences in expressing aggression (e.g. disproportionate female use of legal and administrative abuse, proxy violence, and character assassination) as well as a comprehensive examination of research methods and measures of the prevailing IPV thought disciplines.

**Feminist Research**

Feminist theory attempts to explain IPV through a sociocultural context (Burelomova et al., 2018), claiming that IPV is the direct result of a patriarchal system/culture that emphasizes male dominance and superiority over females (Dutton & Nicholls, 2005; McPhail et al., 2007). Proponents of this theory assert that sexism and inequality between the genders is the primary cause of IPV (Bell & Naugle, 2008) and that IPV is a product of the long history of acceptance and encouragement of wife-beating, stemming from patriarchal values (Dobash & Dobash, 1979), and thus should be approached as a social problem for women (see Dobash & Dobash, 1977; Johnson, 1995; McLeod, 1984; Saunders, 1988). IPV is painted as a gendered crime, where men are the violent perpetrators and women are the innocent victims and in rare
circumstances when women hit men, the behavior is interpreted as retaliatory or committed in defense of self or others (Babcock et. al., 2003).

Garcia-Moreno et al. (2013) describe intimate male partners as the main perpetrators of violence against women worldwide and assert that IPV disproportionately (though not exclusively) affects women. The Bureau of Justice Statistics, in a 2014 special report on nonfatal domestic violence, using data obtained from the National Crime Victimization Survey 2003–2012, found the majority of domestic violence was committed against females (76%) compared to males (24%) (Truman & Morgan, 2014). Thus, advocates of the “violence against women” model contend further research should continue to focus on men as abusers and women as victims, citing evidence from police, hospital, and court records, as well as sample surveys from domestic violence clinics and shelters (Morse, 1995; Kurz, 1989).

According to feminist research, women are the victims in 72% of intimate murders and the victims of about 85% of nonlethal intimate violence (Catalano, 2012; Rennison & Welchans, 2000), 91% of violence between spouses was male perpetrated and directed against women (Brown, 1988), women were victims in 94% of reported IPV cases (Dobash & Dobash, 1979), 95% of reported IPV injuries are women (Berk, Berk, Loseke, & Rauma, 1983), that as many as 15 million women in the United States have been physically assaulted at least once by a male partner (Straus & Gelles, 1988), and that intimate violence is primarily a crime against women (Catalano, 2012; Rennison & Welchans, 2000). A 2014/15 UK study found that 27% of women and 15% of men had experienced IPV at some point in their life, confirming that women were far more likely than men to experience violence from a partner (McManus et al., 2022).

Data supporting the feminist position were largely derived from female victims' reports (see Mooney, 1994), male perpetrators identified by law enforcement agencies (see Claes &
Rosenthal, 1990), or from victims’ surveys (see Dobash & Dobash, 1977; Gaquin, 1977). Hospital and law enforcement protocols for abuse inquiries of injuries sustained by women, but not men (Brown, 2004; Jordan, 2004; McGrath, Schultz, & Franklin, 1980) must be considered. Hines et al. (2007), suggest that one reason male victims of IPV by women have been ignored in the typology is that they have rarely, if ever, been systematically studied.

Police statistics that indicate 80-95% of IPV is perpetrated by males (Straus, 2006) are likely influenced by officer bias, training (e.g. the Duluth Model, mandatory arrest policies, and primary aggressor laws), and the type of situations and cases that typically involve police action (Kantor & Straus, 2017; Kaufman Kantor & Straus, 1990; Straus, 1999). Higher ratios of male-to-female unidirectional violence were found in criminal justice studies that relied on police reports of IPV perpetration. Thus, using solely this data, a large portion of IPV cases is neglected (Kaufman Kantor & Straus, 1990; Straus, 1999).

In addition to police reports, much data commonly cited by feminist scholars includes information provided by hospital emergency rooms and other health care providers. For example, Glass and Campbell (1998), advocate for mandatory reporting policies, focus their entire body of research on battered women, and reported up to 30% of women admitted to ERs are due to IPV. Kivela et al. (2019) agreed that healthcare professionals have a vital role in identifying and providing IPV victims with treatment, support, and care, but warned that healthcare workers often have stereotypical beliefs about patients who experience IPV. Lupri and Grandin (2004) found men who were victims of domestic violence faced an increased likelihood of being overlooked by healthcare providers. Prior articles using hospital IPV screening data were reviewed (see Abbott et al., 1995; Glass & Campbell, 1998; Mooney &
Rodriguez, 1996; Tilden & Shepherd, 1987) and all focused exclusively on female victims, intentionally neglecting any consideration of male victims.

**Gender Symmetry in IPV**

The next section of this paper will present evidence and supporting theories that demonstrate gender symmetry in IPV—that IPV perpetration is not gender-dependent. The predominance of contemporary research which refutes the feminist theory has been collected through family conflict, rather than violence against women surveys, and indicates that IPV is symmetrically perpetrated by men and women (i.e. committed by male and female partners at relatively equal rates) (Aizenman & Kelley, 1988; Archer, 2002; Arias & Johnson, 1989; Basile, 2004; Breiding et al., 2013; Brush, 1990; Dutton, 2006; Dutton & Nicholls, 2005; Fiebert, 2014; Gelles, 2007; Straus, 2006; Stets & Straus). The gender symmetry model of IPV can be viewed under the general violence theoretical framework (Gottfredson & Hirschi, 2022; Hirschi & Gottfredson 1990)—that women and men commit IPV for much the same reasons. This model reflects multifactorial etiologies such as substance issues, lack of self-control, and a favorable view of violence in general, rather than a favorable view of wife beating (Blackwell & Piquero, 2005; Tittle et al., 2003; White & Chen, 2002). General theories of aggression (see Anderson & Bushman, 2002; Berkowitz, 1993; Finkel, 2007), view IPV as operating according to a set of principles that apply to all forms of aggressive behavior. Similarly, the general theory of violence (Felson, 2002) holds that IPV shares common features with other types of violent offending. These explanations propose that IPV perpetration is better understood when the issue is viewed through an individual framework rather than a structural one (Caetano et al, 2008; White & Chen, 2002).
In the past 30 years, over 200 published studies and literature reviews have demonstrated the bidirectionality of IPV (Straus, 2011) and have revealed that women's and men's rates of IPV perpetration are roughly equal (Archer, 2002; Dutton & Nicholls, 2005; Fiebert, 2004; Straus, 2009; Stets & Straus, 1989). A number of studies using the CTS have found that physical aggression between partners is bidirectional in a large proportion of cases (see Gray & Foshee, 1997; Langhinrichsen-Rohling et al., 1995; Morse, 1995; Stets & Straus, 1990). Perpetration of IPV by both partners within a relationship is somewhat common with varying degrees of violence occurring in roughly 25% of all relationships (Whitaker et al., 2007). Two National Family Violence Surveys (1975, 1985) and the National Survey of Families and Households (1990) found that in about half of the cases, violence was reciprocal, and the National Intimate Partner and Sexual Violence Survey (2010) reported approximately 1 in 17 women (5.9%) and 1 in 20 men (5.0%)—roughly equal rates—experienced rape, physical violence, and/or stalking by an intimate partner in the prior 12 months.

From a total sample of 12,313 young adults who responded to an Adolescent Health survey that assessed IPV, 21.1% reported perpetrating violence (38% male, 42% female) and 54.3% of the respondents reported the IPV was bidirectional (Renner & Whitney, 2010). Similarly, Williams et al. (2008) found that roughly 30% of Canadian high school students (n=621) reported perpetrating some level of physical aggression with no significant difference between genders. A large sample (n=8,080) of New York public high school students found boys and girls reported experiencing dating violence at similar rates (Olshen, McVeigh, Wunsch-Hitzig, & Rickert, 2007). Henton, Cate, Koval, Lloyd, and Christopher (1983) also concluded that the majority of high school dating violence was reciprocal with both partners initiating at similar rates. Hamed (2002), Jankey, Próspero, and Fawson (2011), Katz, Kuffel, and Coblentz
and Saewyc et al. (2009), in separate studies, found no gender differences in IPV perpetration among university students in dating relationships. In a representative sample of 325 college students, Lane and Gwartney-Gibbs (1985) found equal rates of violence for men and women but noted the girls reported using a wider array of violence, while the boys reported using more extreme forms of violence.

Coney and Mackey (1999), in a review of the literature, found that despite the predominance of media portrayals and society’s view of IPV as being committed by men against women, the evidence suggests the distribution of violent behavior between adult partners to be relatively equal. Similarly, Dutton (2007) noted while criminal justice and family justice interventions typically assume men are the more likely perpetrators of IPV, female violence towards intimate male partners is just as common, severe, and damaging as male violence toward women. Flynn (1990) also noted researchers consistently have found that men and women both in marital and dating relationships engage in comparable amounts of violence, but violence perpetrated by women and the men they abuse receives “selective attention” (p.194) from researchers, the public, and policymakers.

Fiebert (2014) found 270 empirical studies and 73 literature reviews with an aggregate sample size in the reviewed studies of over 440,850 that demonstrated IPV gender symmetry among couples which concluded, “Women are as physically aggressive, or more aggressive than men in their relationships” (p. 273), and in 17 studies based on victim reports from 1,140 women and men and separate a meta-analysis of 82 studies, Archer (2000) reached the same conclusion, noting women reported perpetrating physical aggression at rates “greater than or equal to men” (p 651). Subsequent research has also found that women use partner aggression at similar rates to men (Arias & Johnson, 1989; Breiding et al., 2013; Brush, 1990; Dutton et al., 2005;
Goodyear-Smith & Laidlaw, 1999; Harned, 2002; Katz, et al., 2002; Moffitt et al., 2001; Steinmetz, 1981; Stets & Straus; 1990; Straus, 1980; Straus & Gelles, 1986). Supporting perpetrator and victim-reported studies, Tang (1994) evaluated 382 undergraduates at the Chinese University in Hong Kong regarding their parents’ responses to family conflict and found 14% reported that their parents engaged in some level of physical violence and that mothers and fathers were equally likely to use actual physical force against their spouse.

A number of researchers found that while men and women exhibit different aggressive tendencies, the overall levels of psychological and physical aggression were statistically equal in terms of abuse (Basile, 2004). For example, women were more likely to slap, kick, bite, punch, and throw or hit with an object and men were more likely to strangle, choke, or beat up their partners (Archer, 2002). Ehrensaft et al. (2003) noted that although overall perpetration rates were similar, women were more likely than men to kick or hit or try to hit with objects (i.e. weapons). Cercone, Beach, & Arias (2005) found that while male and female subjects were equally likely to perpetrate acts of minor IPV, women were twice as likely as men to perpetrate severe IPV. Interestingly, Cascardi, Langhinrichsen, & Vivian (1992) also reported equal rates of male and female IPV perpetration, however, their study found that women reported sustaining twice as many injuries as a result of mild aggression.

The Alternate Asymmetric Model

The alternate asymmetric model of IPV is the concept that gender asymmetry (differences in terms of directionality pertaining to IPV) does exist, but it is females, rather than males, who perpetrate IPV at greater rates. Even if IPV is most often mutual or reciprocal (it must be noted that mutual and reciprocal do not equate to parity of rates), a major problem with
the perspective that IPV is non-gendered is that it forces IPV into a single “one size fits all”
model even when all evidence indicates significantly more female perpetration and male
victimhood.

As discussed earlier, a substantial number of researchers including Archer (2000), Fiebert
(2014), and Straus (2004) have concluded that women are “as physically aggressive as men (or
more)” within intimate relationships. However, if not a clear majority, a large number of studies
that claim gender symmetry in IPV use wording akin to “greater than or equal to” (Archer,
2000), women are as physically aggressive or more aggressive (Archer, 2013), women “initiate
and use violent behaviors against their partners at least as often” as men (Goodyear-Smith &
Laidlaw, 1999), “women inflict serious injuries at least as frequently as men” (Headey & de
Vaus, 1999), “women’s perpetuation of violence is surprisingly frequent, perhaps more so than
men’s” (Langhinirchen-Rohling, 2005), “women are as physically aggressive or more
aggressive as men” (Moxon, 2011), “men are as likely as women to be victims” of IPV (Nicholls
& Dutton, 2001), and White and Kowalski (1994) acknowledged that women equal or exceed
men in rates of aggression. The evidence from these studies, therefore, suggests that women are
more likely to perpetrate IPV at greater rates. For example, Riggs and O’Leary (1996) found
18.2% of women compared to 9% of men slapped their partners and 13.2% of women compared
to 2.5% of men reported kicking, biting, or hitting their partners, yet conclude similar rates of
violence. Similarly, McNeely and Robinson-Simpson (1987) conclude that women are “as
violent as men” (p. 485) using data that shows women to be more violent than men. Notably,
Straus and Ramirez (2007) reported finding no significant differences between males and
females in either the overall prevalence of physical aggression or the prevalence of severe attacks
as evidence of gender symmetry in IPV. However, when only one partner was violent it was
twice as likely to be the female as 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%).

**Patterns in Adolescents and Young Adults**

In a randomly selected study of sixth-grade students (n=5,404), girls were shown to be more physically aggressive in dating relationships (Simon et al., 2010). In a sample of 1,759 8th and 9th-grade students, Foshee et al. (2009) indicated girls perpetrated significantly more dating IPV than their male peers (16% mild and 9% severe vs. 10% mild and 3% severe) and in a separate study, Foshee et al. (2009), using 5 waves of data collected from 973 adolescents, found that at all ages boys reported more severe physical and sexual dating abuse than girls. Fossos, Neighbors, Kaysen, and Hove. (2007) in a sample of 780 college freshmen who met the criteria for heavy drinking revealed that girls were significantly more likely than boys to perpetrate both mild and severe acts of partner aggression. Wekerle et al. (2009) in an IPV study of 408 troubled youth found 67% of girls and 44% of boys reported perpetrating relationship violence in the prior 12 months. In terms of escalation, in a sample of 228 high school students, Schwartz, O’Leary, and Kendziora (1997) found 44% of girls vs. only 16% of boys reported perpetrating physical aggression against a dating partner during a verbal disagreement.

Capaldi, Kim, and Shortt (2007) found young women’s rate of initiation of physical violence was two times higher than men’s during late adolescence and young adulthood, concurring with Licter and McCloskey (2004), Fernandez-Fuertes and Fuertes (2010), and Wolf and Foshee (2003) who found that girls perpetrated physical aggression toward their male partners at significantly higher levels than boys did to their female partners at roughly 2:1. Jain, Buka, Subramanian, and Molnar, (2010) reached a similar conclusion using a sample of 633
young adults finding that women were over twice as likely (38.1% vs 17.8%) to commit IPV than young men. Cercone, Beach, and Arias (2005) reported that while male and female subjects perpetrated minor dating IPV at relatively equal rates, women were twice as likely as men to perpetrate severe violence (15.11% vs 7.41%), O’Leary, Smith Slep, Avery-Leaf, and Cascardi, (2008), using a sample of 2,363 students from seven New York high schools found 24% of boys reported perpetrating physical aggression compared to 40% of girls, and in a study of northern California high school students, when violence was unidirectional (nonreciprocal), nearly twice as many girls as boys admitted to being the sole perpetrator (O’Keefe, 1997).

Additionally, Herrenkohl et al. (2007) found that within college dating relationships, in terms of overall violence, women were at least twice as likely as men to perpetrate IPV (see also Luthra & Gidycz, 2006; Miller, 2011; Milletich et al, 2010; Simonelli et al., 2002; Stacy et al, 1994; and Thompson, 1990). Shockingly, Malik et al. (1997) found high school girls were nearly three times (300%) more likely than their male peers to perpetrate dating violence, with Plass and Gessner (1983) also finding high school girls significantly more likely than boys to be aggressors of dating violence. Specifically, in committed relationships, they were three times more likely to slap their partners and seven times more likely to kick, bite or hit with objects.

In a study on adolescent dating violence, Arriaga and Foshee (2004) found that girls reported being perpetrators of violence at greater rates and boys reported being victims of violence at greater rates. In a sample of 5671 rural students from North Carolina, Symons et al. (1994) found that boys were significantly more likely to experience dating violence than girls. Ackard and Neumark-Sztainer (2002) reported American Indian boys (7.1%) and African American boys (7.2%) experience dating violence at higher rates than American Indian girls (6.8%) and African American girls (3.6%) and Clark, Beckett, Wells, and Dungee-Anderson
similarly found African American male college students reported being abused by a dating partner at significantly greater rates than their female peers, and a sample of rural and urban high school students in upper New York found boys from each region were significantly more likely to report being victims of dating violence than girls from each region (Spencer & Bryant, 2000).

**Dating and Unmarried Partner Relationships**

Sugarman and Hotaling (1989) reviewed the results of 21 studies of violence in dating relationships and found a greater proportion of women self-reported perpetrating an assault on a partner than their male counterparts did. Foo and Margolin (1995) found approximately 24% of male and 39% of female college students surveyed reported perpetrating dating IPV, and Foshee (1996) found that roughly 28% of women and only 15% of men reported perpetrating dating IPV. Arias, Samios, and O'Leary (1987), Hendy et al. (2003), Hines and Saudino (2003), Katz et al. (2002), Kaura and Allan (2004), Nabors (2010), Perry and Fromuth (2005), Schnurr, Lohman, and Kaura (2010), Stets and Pirog-Good (1990), and Stets and Straus (1990) also found significantly higher rates of assault perpetrated by women than men in dating relationships. For example, using a sample of 667 unmarried college students, Caufield and Riggs (1992) found 19% women vs. 7% of men slapped their partner and 13% of women kicked, bit, or hit their partners with an object while only 3.1% of men perpetrated this activity.

Stets and Henderson (1991) conducted a random nation-wide telephone survey of daters (n=277) between the ages of 18 and 30, who were single, never married, and in at least one relationship during the past 12 months which lasted at least 2 months with at least six dates, finding over 30% of subjects experienced at least one instance of IPV, with 22% of the men and
40% of the women reported perpetrating some form of physical aggression. Women were six times more likely than men to report using severe aggression (19.2 vs. 3.4%) and men were twice as likely as women to report being victims of severe aggression perpetrated by a female dating partner (15.7 vs. 8%). Cascardi, Avery-Leaf, O'Leary, and Smith Slep (1999) found a significantly greater number of women (37.8%) than men (22.5%) reported perpetrating physical aggression toward their dating partners. Specifically, 18.1% of women vs. 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.

The International Dating Violence Research Consortium (2003) evaluated research on over 8,000 couples at 33 universities in 16 countries found that the pattern of equal or higher rates of IPV perpetrated by females is a global phenomenon. Straus (2004) examined dating aggression in 31 universities in 16 countries and found women committed the majority of assaults—including severe assaults. Chan et al. (2008) presented findings from the International Dating Violence study, reviewing responses of university students from 21 countries (n=16,000) and found men were victims of dating violence at greater rates than women. Munoz-Rivas, Grana, O’Leary, and Pilar Gonzalez (2007), from a sample of high school students (n=2,416) from 20 different schools in Madrid, Spain found that significantly more women (41.9% vs. 31.7% of men) admitted to perpetrating some form of physical aggression toward their dating partners and 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. Doroszewicz and Forbes (2008) revealed women to be significantly more aggressive than men in dating relationships among unmarried Polish college students. In Canada, a sample of 1,419 high school students from Ontario reported that girls perpetrated physical IPV at roughly 2.5 times the rate of boys (28% of
girls vs. 11% of boys) (Wolfe, Winters, Keams-Bodkin, Homish, and Kubiak, 2001), and a study of Canadian college students revealed that 38% of men and 27% women reported being victims of physical IPV and twice as many women as men reported inciting unidirectional nonreciprocal IPV (Sharpe & Taylor, 1999). Additionally, Herrenkohl et al. (2007), Luthra and Gidycz (2006), Miller (2011), Milletich et al. (2010), Simonelli et al. (2002), Stacy et. al. (1994), Thompson (1990) found that within college dating relationships in terms of overall violence, women were at least twice as likely as men to perpetrate IPV.  

Greater rates and frequency of female-perpetrated IPV apply to married and cohabitating relationships as well as dating relationships. Cui et al. (2005) found women in both dating and cohabitating relationships demonstrate higher levels of hostility towards their partners than men and Rouse, Breen, and Howell (1988) found that men were more likely to report being physically abused than women in both dating and married relationships. Similarly, McCarthy (2001), McKinney (1986), and Murphy (1988) determined that overall, men report higher rates of IPV victimization. For example, Murphy found 20.7% of men compared to 12.8% of women reported being kicked, bit, or hit with an object and 6% of men compared to 3.6% of women reported being beaten up by their heterosexual partner. 

Morse (1995) used the CTS to examine IPV between male and female married or cohabiting respondents in four separate surveys spaced three years apart: 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 total violence and severe violence were significantly higher for female-to-male perpetrated IPV than for male-to-female. The 1992 reports (n = 1,340) found bidirectional (reciprocal) violence accounted for 46.4% of IPV and women committed unidirectional violence at roughly twice the rate of men (30% female perpetrated vs. 16% male perpetrated).
In a review article critiquing the American Bar Association’s attempt to correct myths about domestic violence, Dutton, Corvo, and Hamel (2009) asserted that female-perpetrated IPV is committed at higher rates than male-perpetrated IPV. Archer (2000) conducted a meta-analysis using 56 studies examining gender differences in physical aggression and found that women were more likely than men to use one or more acts of physical aggression and to use such acts more frequently against an intimate partner (actual findings vs symmetric-leanings analysis cited above).

Brinkerhoff and Lupri (1988) found roughly twice as much wife-to-husband as husband-to-wife severe IPV with violence being significantly higher in younger and childless couples and that male IPV decreased with higher educational attainment, while female IPV increased. Ellison, Bartkowski, and Anderson (1999) also found that women were significantly more likely than men to perpetrate IPV, but regular attendance of religious services was inversely associated with IPV perpetration for both males and females.

George (1999), using a sample of 718 men and 737 women, completed the CTS and reported their experience as victims of physical assaults by women over a five-year period, finding that men (14%) reported greater victimization than women (7%). The majority (55%) of assaults on men were perpetrated by spouses, partners, or former partners. Cogan and Ballinger (2006) reported that significantly more men than women (35.4 vs. 26.0%) reported being victimized by their partners and Carrado et al. (1996) found that over twice as many men as women reported being IPV victims in their current relationship.

Many of the physically abusive behaviors these men experienced were expected considering that population and community-based studies (see Hines & Saudino, 2003; Morse, 1995; Straus & Gelles, 1986) show that women use such tactics as hitting, slapping, kicking,
punching, and grabbing their partners during conflicts more than men do. For example, Giordano et al. (1999) found 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 their spouse or partner with a knife. Similarly, Archer and Ray (1989) found women reported significantly higher rates of perpetrating IPV against their male partners (see also Baker & Stith, 2008; Cook, 1997; DeKeseredy & Schwartz, 1998; Graham-Kevan, 2007; Ramisetty-Mikler & Caetano, 2005; Riggs et al., 1990; Wright & Benson, 2010; Varley Thornton et al., 2010; and Vaeth et al., 2010). While Russell and Hulson (1992) found overall rates of violence to be similar, severe IPV was perpetrated by women at roughly twice the rate and Rouse (1988) found 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. Sommer (1994) conducted a study on married and cohabiting men and women and found 39.1% of women reported perpetrating IPV (16.2% perpetrated severe violence) vs. 26.3% of men (with 7.6% perpetrating severe violence), with 21% of males and 13% of females’ partners requiring medical attention. Furthermore, results indicated that more men (15%) than women (10%) perpetrated IPV in self-defense.

Cross-culturally, women appear to perpetrate IPV at higher rates than men. Caetano, Schafer, Field, and Nelson (2002) examined IPV among White, Black, and Hispanic couples in the United States and found that women significantly reported perpetrating more partner violence than men in all three ethnic groups. Similarly, Pekarek (2008) found no differences in IPV as a function of ethnicity, but women were significantly more likely to perpetrate violence toward their male partners than men toward women. In terms of religion, Boudouris, Straus, Gelles, R, and Steinmetz (1981) found that Jewish women reported perpetrating spousal violence at a rate
seven times higher than Jewish men (7% vs. 1%). In Asian couples, Chang, Shen, and Takeuchi (2009) found women perpetrated minor IPV on their partners at significantly higher rates, with women more than twice as likely as men to perpetrate severe IPV, and using a community sample of Hong Kong Chinese families, Tang (1999) found women were significantly more likely to perpetrate minor IPV but found no significant differences in the perpetration of severe IPV.

**Psychological Aggression**

Psychological aggression is considered a form of IPV (Straus 1980: Straus, Hamby, Boney-McCoy, and Sugarman, 1996). According to Shorey, Cornelius, and Bell (2008), approximately 80% of female college students in dating relationships exhibited psychological aggression--and psychological aggression is among the best predictors of physical aggression (Baker & Stith, 2008; Felson, Ackerman, & Yeon, 2003). In fact, psychological aggression often precedes physical assault (O’Leary, 1999). Winstok and Smadar-Dror (2021) found women to be more psychologically aggressive than men as well, and more motivated to “put their partner in his place” when compared with men. Jenkins and Aube (2002) concluded women in existing college dating relationships are consistently shown to be more aggressive than their male peers. For example, Milardo (1998) asked a sample of 180 college students whether they would be likely to hit their partner in several situations common within dating relationships and found 83% of the women said they would be likely to hit their partner vs. 53% of the men.
Multiple studies have consistently demonstrated that the majority of IPV is reciprocal (i.e. perpetrated by both parties) (Gray & Foshee, 1997; Straus, 2008; Whitaker et al., 2007; Williams & Frieze, 2005). However, it must be noted that reciprocal does not necessarily mean symmetry or parity, nor does it indicate who initiated the violence. In addition to committing IPV with more chronicity, women have been found to initiate IPV at greater rates than men (i.e. women are more likely to hit first) (Bland & Orne, 1986; O’Leary & Slep, 2006; Sorenson & Telles, 1991). Lewis and Fremouw (2001), in a scholarly review of the literature concluded that evidence suggests that women initiate IPV more frequently than men. Using data from the National Comorbidity Survey (n = 3,519), Williams and Frieze (2005) found that most IPV—both mild and severe—was mutual. However, when only one partner was violent it was more likely to be the female, and women were more likely than men to initiate both mild and severe violence. Billingham and Sack (1986) reported similar rates of mutual violence, but higher rates of female initiation and unilateral violence. Similarly, DeMaris (1992) remarked that when one partner is found to be the usual initiator of violence, that partner was most often the woman. LeJeune and Follette (1994) found that 42.4% of female respondents to a mail-in survey (n=465) reported that they usually initiate violent acts in their relationship compared to 14.3% of the male respondents. In terms of initiation of partner assaults, 34% of women vs. 12% of men reported initiating physical violence. Supporting these results, Deal and Wampler (1986) determined that while the majority of IPV is reciprocal, men were three times more likely to report being victims when the violence was unidirectional.

In nonreciprocally violent relationships, women were the perpetrators in over 70% of the cases (Straus, 2008; Whitaker et al., 2007). Anderson (2002) reported that when IPV
perpetration only involved one partner, women were twice as likely as men to be the sole perpetrator. In a sample of 13,601 students at 68 universities in 32 countries, Straus (2008) found that mutual aggression accounted for 68.6% of IPV, and women were the sole perpetrators 21.4% of the time and men 9.9% of the time. Gray and Foshee (1997) found mutual violence was present in 66% of cases (n=185). Twenty-six percent of males and 8% of females reported being victims of IPV and 29% of females and only 4% of males reported being sole perpetrators of unidirectional IPV. Another study of young married couples found that wife-only violent couples were five-times more prevalent than their husband-only counterparts (Leonard, Winters, Kearns-Bodkin, Homish, and Kubiak 2014). Likewise, Robertson, and Murachver (2007) and Williams and Frieze (2005) found similar results. In regard to escalation, Schwartz et al. (1997) found 44% of girls vs. 16% of boys reported IPV perpetration against their partner during a verbal argument. Halford, Farrugia, Lizzio, and Wilson (2010) found that in the previous 12 months, 225 couples experienced at least one act of IPV. The most common form of violence was female only (59%), followed by mutual violence (34%), and the least common was male only IPV (7%).

Langhinrichsen-Rohling et al. (2012) reported that among relationships with nonreciprocal violence, women were the perpetrators in a majority of cases and that men and women both reported women perpetrate a greater proportion of nonreciprocal violence than men. Specifically, unidirectional female to male violence accounted for 28.3% of IPV vs. unidirectional male to female violence which a totaled 13.8% of IPV, finding that higher ratios of male-to-female unidirectional violence were found only in criminal justice studies that relied on police reports. Similarly, Hines, Straus, and Douglas (2020) found much more female perpetrated IPV--both bidirectional and unidirectional. Furthermore, data do not support the
common perception that men who perpetrate nonreciprocal relationship violence are the traditional male “batterer”. The data suggest that women who are victims of nonreciprocal violence experienced less violence and a lower likelihood of injury than women who are victims of violence in reciprocally violent relationships (Whitaker et al., 2007) and a recent meta-analysis found that female perpetration of violence was the greatest predictor of her being a victim of IPV (Stith et. al. 2004; Whitaker et. al., 2007).

**Proxy Violence and Character Assassination (Legal and Administrative Abuse)**

Research consistently finds that females use indirect aggression to a greater extent than males (Archer & Coyne, 2005). Women disproportionately use violence by-proxy, using others (i.e. men) to commit violence on their behalf (Belknap et al., 2012; Bonomi, Holt, Martin, & Thompson, 2006). That also includes proxy use of State violence (AKA legal and administrative abuse), making false claims of abuse, which allow police to legally commit violence on their behalf, and when domestic violence-related suicides are combined with domestic homicides, the total numbers of domestic violence-related deaths are higher for males than females (Breitman et al., 2004; Davis, 2010).

Research confirms that false allegations are primarily used by women against men. For example, Henning, Renauer, and Holdford (2006), and Hines et al. (2007) suggested that false allegations of IPV, or threats of making false allegations, are often used by women to dominate their male partners. Cook (2009), Douglas, Hines, and McCarthy (2012), and Scott and Emery (2014) claim that when male victims of IPV seek help, women will often file a false allegation against her abused partner, which usually leads to his arrest. Avieli (2022) found false allegations of IPV to be prevalent and described the phenomenon as a form of IPV that causes
considerable pain to the individuals involved. Haselschwerdt, Hardesty, and Hans (2011) and Mazeh and Widrig (2016) identified false allegations of IPV as a primary tactic used by women in divorce and custody disputes and Harman, Kruk, and Hines (2018) called false allegations of IPV the "silver bullet" in custody disputes. Stockdale (1998) interviewed 20 male victims of domestic violence finding many had sustained severe acts of physical violence. Moreover, the men reported being more traumatized by the false accusations and their partners using their children against them than the actual physical abuse they experienced.

In a 1997 study on child custody evaluations, nearly half of the abuse allegations (physical, sexual, and emotional abuse) were deemed false or inflated (LaFortune & Carpenter, 1998). Similarly, Austin (2000), Cook (2009), Douglas et al. (2012), and Hines et al. (2007) describe the phenomenon (of false allegations of abuse) to be prevalent, and Davis, O’Sullivan, Susser, and Fields (2010) and Hardesty et al. (2015) found up to 50% of IPV allegations false. Shaffer and Bala (2003) examined the outcome of legal proceedings involving allegations of IPV and found that 26% of the abuse allegations were either false or unsubstantiated.

Douglas and Fell (2020) found motivation for false allegations of abuse to be identical as reasons given for other, more traditional, forms of IPV—namely to punish and control. In this context, it has been suggested that women use the criminal justice system to assert control over their male victims (Bates, 2019; Walker & Shapiro, 2010). Ward (2015) concluded that false allegations of IPV followed by other forms of abusive litigation were highly effective ways for abusers to exert control over survivors for years after a relationship had ended. Similarly, other scholars, such as Tilbrook, Allan, and Dear (2010) and Hines et al. (2007) acknowledged this phenomenon and named it "legal and administrative aggression" and "manipulating the system", fabricating abuse, using the system to their advantage, obtaining restraining orders under false
pretense, and ultimately labeling the male as the abuser. These authors postulated that this form of DV may be unique to men as victims and to women as perpetrators (Hines, Douglas, & Berger, 2015).

Like false allegations, acts of self-defense and attempts to restrain a violent female partner by a male victim is likely to be highly stigmatized and purposefully misinterpreted. This knowledge appears to play a role in female-perpetrated abuse strategies (Allen-Collinson, 2009). To many female abusers, once a man has put his hands on her, even if she is the aggressor, she still feels he is guilty of IPV and therefore she is justified in filing charges (Gadd, Farrall, Dallimore, & Lombard, 2003; Hines, 2014), even where abuse has not occurred. This is a common strategy and tantamount to false accusations used to victimize male partners (Tilbrook et al., 2010) and further clouds the quality of data on IPV perpetration. According to Allen-Collinson (2009), few men report their abuse to police due to lack of support services and out of fear they will not be believed. Sarantakos (2004) found that women often threaten their male victims with making false counter-allegations of assault if the police are called. This affects the statistics of the male victims of intimate partner violence. The precise number of male victims cannot be calculated due to male under-reporting of IPV. In addition to male under-reporting, the prevalence of false reporting of female victimhood is rarely considered in the literature despite being common covers for (and a separate form of) female perpetration. Furthermore, the common mischaracterization of male self-defense and attempts to restrain female IPV (Douglas & Hines, 2011) also influences and skews gender IPV directionality data.
Chapter Conclusion

This chapter examined the theories and literature supporting the three opposing models of gender directionality of IPV. The traditional and popular understanding of IPV, driven by feminist ideology, is that it is a product of male aggression, overwhelmingly perpetrated by men against women. Research supporting the feminist gender asymmetrical model was largely derived from samples that specifically and exclusively focused on female victims and male perpetrators. The contemporary alternative to the feminist model asserts gender symmetry in IPV—that men and women are both perpetrators and victims at similar rates and for similar reasons such as low self-control, substance issues, or a criminal mentality. Finally, a third and largely neglected perspective to gender directionality of IPV, the alternate asymmetric model finds comprehensive data suggests that there is asymmetry in IPV, but with females as the major perpetrators. The overall finding that women commit IPV at a greater rate than their male counterparts has been comprehensively evidenced for several decades and is confirmed in the exhaustive literature review across all sample types. Future research is needed to determine root causes for greater female perpetration. Whether it is due to evolutionary biology, natural male protection of females, or societal chivalry, it is clear that female violence against men is widely accepted, justified, and/or excused in contemporary western society and women feel they are permitted to hit men without consequence. Finally, proxy violence, including legal and administrative abuse, must be considered when reviewing IPV.
CHAPTER 3: METHODS

Introduction

This chapter discusses the methodology used in this study: specifically, the research questions, hypotheses, population and sample, data collection procedures, measures, and analytic strategy.

The Current Study

This study seeks to expand on the current literature by attempting to address important questions related to IPV offending and victimization. Using a volunteer sample, the study seeks to answer the following research questions:

1. What are the rates of female IPV offending?
2. What are the rates of male IPV offending?
3. What is the relationship between gender and IPV offending?
4. What are the rates of female IPV victimization?
5. What are the rates of male IPV victimization?
6. What is the relationship between gender and IPV victimization?

Based on the research questions, the study tests the following hypotheses:

H1. There is a significant association between IPV offending and gender. It is expected that females will commit IPV offenses more than males.
H2. There is a significant association between IPV victimization and gender. It is expected that males will be more likely to experience IPV victimization compared to females.

H0. There is no significant association between gender and IPV.

Description of Data Source

Data Source

Data were collected using a cross-sectional, self-administered survey on IPV (see Appendix A). Participants were recruited in person and online (see Appendix B), using a convenience strategy, including snowball, and social media recruitment strategies. The study’s researcher also recruited participants in person in Oxford, MS. However, the bulk of participants were obtained online through postings on FaceBook, Twitter, Buy Nothing, and Survey Circle and a mass emailing.

Ethical approval was obtained from the Internal Review Board of the researcher’s institution before administering the questionnaire. Participants were reminded that their participation was entirely voluntary, and participants were informed that they could withdraw from the study at any time (see Appendix C).

Population and Sample

The study’s population and sample include people over the age of 18 who are or have been in at least one heterosexual married, dating, or cohabiting relationship within the past 12 months. Of the 425 participants, roughly 25% (n = 101) indicated that had not been in a heterosexual married, dating, or cohabiting relationship within the past 12 months and were
therefore excluded from the current analysis. An additional 93 respondents who failed to answer key survey questions, such as the qualifying question or their gender, and those who failed to complete >70% of the survey were also excluded from the analysis.

**Measures**

**Dependent Variables**

This study’s dependent variables are *IPV victimization and perpetration*. Perpetration and victimization of IPV were assessed using a modified version of the Revised Conflict Tactics Scale (CTS). The CTS is a 60-item self-report measure of the frequency of aggression and assaults in dating, cohabiting, and marital relationships as well as couples’ use of reasoning or negotiating to deal with conflicts. The CTS asks about specific acts (as well as questions about initiation and escalation), rather than asking if the participants felt, perpetrated, or were victimized by undefined/open-ended/unspecified assaults. Because this study is designed to examine aggression, assault, and victimization, all six of the original CTS negotiation questions and six parallel questions pertaining to injury were omitted. Two questions of relating to initiation and escalation of IPV and four parallel questions pertaining to proxy-violence and character assassination were added.

The scale assesses IPV prevalence rates and chronicity for both perpetration and victimization measuring specific occurrences of IPV in the previous 12 months. The prevalence rate is the percentage of the sample who reported one of more instances of IPV in each scale. This variable was measured dichotomously as 0 = never and 1 = one or more acts of IPV occurred and has a good level of internal consistency (α = 0.91). In this study, chronicity indicates how often or frequently the acts measured in each scale occurred in the previous 12
months. Chronicity is measured as: 0 = never, 1 = once, 2 = twice, 3 = 3–5 times, 4 = 6–10
times, 5 = 11–20 times, 6= more than 20 times. The sum of these created the chronicity scale
which has a good level of internal consistency (α = 0.92). Total IPV victimization and
perpetration are based on sets of paired questions that reported acts of violence and aggression
committed or suffered at the hands of an intimate partner. Total IPV is segmented into
subcategories: physical assault, psychological aggression, sexual coercion, character
assassination and proxy violence, and initiation and escalation to examine prevalence rates and
chronicity of IPV perpetration and victimization more comprehensively between genders.
Overall, total IPV perpetration has a good level of internal consistency (α = 0.91) as does total
IPV victimization (α = 0.98).

The physical assault subscale consists of 12 paired questions: 1. “I threw something at
my partner that could hurt./My partner did this to me.” 2. “I scratched my partner./My partner
did this to me.” 3. “I pushed or shoved my partner./My partner did this to me.” “4. I used a knife
or gun on my partner./My partner did this to me.” 5. “I hit my partner with an object that could
hurt./My partner did this to me.” 6. “I choked my partner./My partner did this to me.” 7. I beat up
my partner./My partner did this to me.” 8. “I grabbed my partner./My partner did this to me.” 9.
“I slapped my partner./My partner did this to me.” 10. “I burned or scalded my partner on
purpose./My partner did this to me.” 11. “I punched or kicked my partner./My partner did this to
me.” 12. “I bit my partner./My partner did this to me.”

Factor analyses of the physical assault subscale were performed for both perpetration and
victimization. Factor analysis for the perpetration of physical assault revealed eight of the 12
items “I threw something at my partner that could hurt.” “I scratched my partner” “I pushed or
shoved my partner.” “I used a knife or gun on my partner.” “I hit my partner with an object that
could hurt.” “I grabbed my partner.” “I slapped my partner.” and “I punched or kicked my partner” correlated at least 0.4 and were found to be sufficient to measure perpetration of physical assault. Four items were eliminated from the scale because they did not contribute to a factor scale structure and failed to meet a minimum criteria of having a primary factor loading of >0.4. The item “I choked my partner.” did not load above 0.2. The item “I beat up my partner.” had a primary factor loading of 0.47. The item “I burned or scalded my partner on purpose.” did not load above 0.0, and the item “I bit my partner” did not load above 0.09. For physical assault victimization, 11 of the 12 items correlated at lease 0.4 and were found to be sufficient to measure perpetration of physical assault. Only one item, “I burned or scalded my partner on purpose.” failed to load above 0.07 and was eliminated from the physical assault victimization scale.

The psychological aggression subscale consists of 11 paired questions: 1. “I insulted or swore at my partner./My partner did this to me.” 2. “I disparaged my partner’s looks/My partner did this to me.” 3. “I destroyed something belonging to my partner./My partner did this to me.” 4. “I threatened to harm or take my partner’s pet./My partner did this to me.” 5. “I stomped out of the room or house or yard during a disagreement./My partner did this to me.” 6. “I accused my partner of being a lousy lover./My partner accused me of this.” 7. “I did something to spite my partner./My partner did this to me.” 8. “I threatened to hit or throw something at my partner./My partner did this to me.” 9. “I belittled my partner’s job, skills, position, or income./My partner did this to me.” 10. “I threatened to report my partner to the police./My partner did this to me.” 11. “I cried at my partner./My partner did this to me.”

Factor analyses of the psychological aggression subscale were performed for both perpetration and victimization. Factor analysis for perpetration of psychological aggression
revealed 10 of the 11 items: “I insulted or swore at my partner.” “I disparaged my partner’s looks.” “I destroyed something belonging to my partner.” “I stomped out of the room or house or yard during a disagreement.” “I accused my partner of being a lousy lover” “I did something to spite my partner.” “I threatened to hit or throw something at my partner.” “I belittled my partner’s job, skills, position, or income.” “I threatened to report my partner to the police.” “I cried at my partner.” correlated > 0.4 and were found to be sufficient to measure perpetration of psychological aggression. The item “I threatened to harm or take my partner’s pet.” failed to load above 0.17 and was eliminated from the psychological aggression perpetration scale.

Factor analysis for the victimization of psychological aggression subscale revealed eight of the 11 items correlated sufficient factor scores to be retained in this scale. Three items were eliminated from the scale because they did not contribute to a factor scale structure and failed to load into a single factor. The item “I threatened to harm or take my partner’s pet.” had a primary factor loading of 0.41. The item “I called my partner bad in bed.” did not load above 0.37. The item “I cried at my partner.” also failed to load above 0.37.

The sexual coercion subscale consists of three paired questions: 1. “I flirted or cheated with a member of the opposite sex to hurt my partner./My partner did this to me.” 2. “I demanded sex when my partner did not want to./My partner did this to me.” 3. “I purposely withheld sex to hurt my partner./My partner did this to me.” Factor analyses of the sexual coercion subscale were performed for both perpetration and victimization. Factor analysis for perpetration of sexual coercion revealed two of the three items correlated > 0.4 and were found to be sufficient to measure perpetration of sexual coercion correlated at lease 0.4 and were found to be sufficient to measure perpetration of physical assault. Only one item, “I demanded sex when my partner did not want to.” failed to load above 0.22 and was eliminated from the sexual
coercion perpetration scale. Factor analysis for the victimization of sexual coercion subscale found all three items loaded on a single factor (0.46-0.64) and were sufficient to be retained in the subscale.

The character assassination and proxy violence subscale consists of four paired questions: 1. “I spoke badly about my partner to friends and/or family./My partner did this to me.” 2. “I accused my partner of rape or abuse./My partner did this to me.” 3. “I asked or prompted someone else to physically hurt my partner./My partner did this to me.” 4. “I threatened to report my partner to the police./My partner did this to me.” Factor analyses of the character assassination and proxy violence subscale were performed for both perpetration and victimization. Factor analysis for perpetration of character assassination and proxy violence revealed three items failed to load and do not sufficiently measure perpetration of character assassination and proxy violence. The single item, “I threatened to report my partner to the police.” loaded sufficiently to be retained (0.50). Factor analysis for the victimization of character assassination and proxy violence subscale found all items loaded high enough (0.46-0.66) to be sufficient to be included in the subscale.

Lastly, The initiation and escalation subscale consists of one paired question and a single question about retaliation pertaining to perpetration only: 1. “I am usually the one to slap/hit/kick/push/grab my partner first./My partner usually does this to me first.” 2. “When my partner hurts me, I feel the need to retaliate.” Factor analyses of the initiation and escalation subscale were performed for both perpetration and victimization. Factor analysis for perpetration of initiation and escalation revealed both items loaded on a single factor and were found to be sufficient to measure initiation and escalation, with “I am usually the one to slap/hit/kick/push/grab my partner first.” loading at 0.74 and “When my partner hurts me, I feel
the need to retaliate.” loading at 0.65. All items that failed to load were omitted from the total IPV scale as well as the corresponding subscale.

**Independent Variables**

The focus of this study is to examine gender differences in frequency of perpetration of IPV. Therefore, *gender* is the study’s independent variable. This variable was measured dichotomously as 0 = male and 1 = female.

**Control Variables**

This study controlled for variables that could potentially confound the relationship between gender and the dependent variables: demographic variables such as age, race, marital status, education level, income, and religion as well as substance use. *Age* was measured in years (see Figure 1). A *race* variable was categorically coded: 1 = White, 2 = Black, 3 = Hispanic/Latino, 4 = Asian/Pacific Islander, 5 = American Indian or Alaskan, or 6 = other (see Figure 2). This information was then used to create White vs. non-white as a dichotomous variable. *Marital status* was categorized as 0 = single/never married, 1 = married, 2 = separated, 3 = divorced (see Figure 3). This information was then used to create Married vs. non-married as a dichotomous variable. *Education* was defined as last level of formal education completed at date of survey and categorized as a five-item ordinal variable: 0 = less than high school, 1 = high school diploma, 2 = some college, 3 = four-year college degree, and 4 = graduate degree. This information was then used to create a dichotomous variable for those who completed a four-year degree and have obtained university diploma or higher vs those who have not (see Figure 4). The (annual) *income* categories were coded as: 1 = less than $10,000; 2 = $10,001-$25,000; 3 =
$25,001-$50,000; 4 = $50,001-$75,000; 5 = $75,001-$100,000; 6 = $100,001-$250,000; and 7= 
>$250,001 (see Figure 5). A dichotomous variable was then created 0 = earning less than 
$75,000 a year and 1 = earning greater than $75,000 annually. Religion was coded: 1 = 
Christian, 2 = Muslim, 3 = Jewish, 4 = other, 5 = non-religious. This information was then used 
to create Christian vs. non-Christian as a dichotomous variable (see Figure 6).

Substance use data was assessed using a six-question modified version of the 
prevalidated CAGE substance abuse screening tool. Specifically, participants were asked: (1) 
“Have you ever felt you ought to cut down on your drinking or drug use?”; (2) “Have people 
annoyed you by criticizing your drinking or drug use?”; (3) “Have you ever felt bad or guilty 
about your drinking or drug use?”; (4) “Have you ever had a drink or used drugs first thing in the 
morning to steady your nerves or get rid of a hangover or get the day started?”; (5) Do you 
consume alcohol at least once a week?; (6) “Do you consume illegal substances (including non-
medical use of prescription drugs) at least once a week?” Items were scored and coded as 0 = no 
and 1 = yes. Higher scores indicate substance abuse issues. For the purposes of this study, a 
positive score is considered alcohol or substance use. A factor analysis was conducted on 
substance use and all items loaded sufficient (0.35-0.71) to be retained in this measure.

Substance use has a good level of internal consistency (α = 0.67) (see Figure 7).
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Analytic Strategy

To test the study’s hypotheses and achieve its purpose, several analyses were conducted. Specifically, frequency distribution was used to describe the distribution of the responses among the sample. T-tests and correlation matrices were conducted to assess the relationships at the bivariate level. To examine relationships at the multivariate level, regression models were used.

Due to the nature of the dependent variables that measure prevalence rates of IPV (dichotomous (0,1)), a binary logistic regression was determined to be the best approach to examine the effects of gender on the prevalence of IPV victimization and perpetration and gender. A linear regression model was used to examine chronicity of IPV perpetration and victimization.
CHAPTER 4: RESULTS

The aim of this study was to examine the scope and magnitude of differences in the directionality of perpetration and victimization of IPV between males and females within the bounds of heterosexual relationships and test two hypotheses: H₁: There is a significant association between IPV offending and gender and it is expected that females will commit IPV offenses more than males; and H₂: There is a significant association between IPV victimization and gender and it is expected that males will be more likely to experience IPV victimization compared to females. This chapter presents the study’s findings. Specifically, this chapter presents descriptive statistics for the study’s variables, correlation coefficients, a series of linear and logistic regression models analyzing the effects of predictors on variables, and a side-by-side mean comparison of IPV perpetration and victimization delineated by gender.

Table 1 summarizes descriptive statistics for the variables included in this study. Seventy-eight percent of men and 90% of women reported perpetrating IPV at least once against their partner with women almost three times as likely to report perpetration. Men reported greater rates of victimization, but not to a significant degree (89% vs 82%; OR = 0.59, p = 0.22). The sample is comprised of males (31%) and females (69%) between the ages of 18 and 78. The average age is 39.80 years. The average age of male respondents (M = 42.77) is slightly older than female respondents (M = 38.47). Approximately 85% of the sample is white, and the remaining 15% are comprised of other races and ethnicities. Approximately 43% of the sample is married and 57% are single, divorced or separated. Less than one percent do not have a high
school diploma, roughly six percent have a high school diploma, 38% have some college, 37% have college degrees, and 18% have graduate degrees. Approximately 62% are Christian, and roughly 42% reported some degree of substance use.

Table 1. Descriptive Statistics for Study Variables (N = 231)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Total M(SD) / %</th>
<th>Male M (SD) / %</th>
<th>Female M (SD) / %</th>
<th>χ²/R</th>
<th>ES</th>
<th>OR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Prevalence: Total Perpetration</td>
<td>0.86 (0.35)</td>
<td>0.78 (0.42)</td>
<td>0.90 (0.30)</td>
<td>6.14</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.89**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chronicity: Total Perpetration</td>
<td>6.82 (7.60)</td>
<td>4.25 (4.38)</td>
<td>8.09 (8.51)</td>
<td>19.90*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prevalence: Total Victimization</td>
<td>0.84 (0.36)</td>
<td>0.89 (0.32)</td>
<td>0.82 (0.38)</td>
<td>1.59</td>
<td>0.59</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chronicity: Total Victimization</td>
<td>10.61 (15.57)</td>
<td>12.61 (16.09)</td>
<td>9.79 (15.36)</td>
<td>35.96</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>0.69 (0.46)</td>
<td>31.17%</td>
<td>68.83%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age (18 to 78)</td>
<td>39.80 (14.84)</td>
<td>42.77 (15.79)</td>
<td>38.47 (14.25)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race (White)</td>
<td>0.85 (0.36)</td>
<td>0.89 (0.32)</td>
<td>0.83 (0.38)</td>
<td>1.33</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marital Status (Married)</td>
<td>0.43 (0.50)</td>
<td>0.44 (0.50)</td>
<td>0.42 (0.50)</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>2.66 (0.85)</td>
<td>2.63 (0.90)</td>
<td>2.68 (0.84)</td>
<td>4.16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income</td>
<td>4.54 (1.66)</td>
<td>4.51 (1.72)</td>
<td>4.56 (1.64)</td>
<td>10.45</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religion (Christian)</td>
<td>0.62 (0.49)</td>
<td>0.61 (0.49)</td>
<td>0.62 (0.48)</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 2 displays correlation coefficients for each of the study’s variables. Results indicate there are several significant correlations between variables of interest. Gender (female) was found to be significantly and positively correlated with both total IPV prevalence ($r = 0.29, p<0.05$) and chronicity ($r = 0.24, p<0.05$) and chronicity of psychological aggression perpetration ($r = 0.25, p<0.05$). Race (White) was significantly and negatively associated with total IPV perpetration chronicity ($r = -0.16, p<0.05$). Marital status was significantly and negatively correlated to total IPV victimization chronicity ($r = -0.19, p<0.05$), physical assault victimization chronicity ($r = -0.21, p<0.05$), and sexual coercion victimization prevalence ($r = -0.17, p<0.05$). Level of education (having obtained a college degree) was significantly and negatively associated with total IPV victimization prevalence ($r = -0.20, p<0.05$) and psychological aggression victimization prevalence ($r = -0.19, p<0.05$). Religion (Christianity) was found to be significantly and positively associated with both sexual coercion perpetration prevalence ($r = 0.14, p<0.05$) and chronicity ($r = 0.15, p<0.05$). Lastly, substance use was positively and significantly correlated to many forms of IPV, specifically total IPV perpetration prevalence ($r = 0.16, p<0.05$) and chronicity ($r = 0.23, p<0.05$), total IPV victimization prevalence ($r = 0.17, p<0.05$), and chronicity ($r = 0.22, p<0.05$).
prevalence ($r = 0.14, p < 0.05$) and total IPV victimization chronicity ($r = 0.21, p < 0.05$), physical assault victimization prevalence ($r = 0.17, p < 0.05$), psychological aggression perpetration prevalence ($r = 0.19, p < 0.05$), psychological aggression perpetration chronicity ($r = 0.26, p < 0.05$), psychological aggression victimization prevalence ($r = 0.15, p < 0.05$), psychological aggression victimization chronicity ($r = 0.22, p < 0.05$), sexual coercion victimization prevalence ($r = 0.15, p < 0.05$), and sexual coercion victimization chronicity ($r = 0.20, p < 0.05$).
Note: Y1 = Perpetration Prevalence; Y2 = Perpetration Chronicity; Y3 = Victimization Prevalence; Y4 = Victimization Chronicity; Y5 = Physical Assault Perpetration Prevalence; Y6 = Physical Assault Perpetration Chronicity; Y7 = Physical Assault Victimization Prevalence; Y8 = Physical Assault Victimization Chronicity; Y9 = Psychological Aggression Perpetration Prevalence; Y10 = Psychological Aggression Perpetration Chronicity; Y11 = Psychological Aggression Victimization Prevalence; Y12 = Psychological Aggression Victimization Chronicity; Y13 = Sexual Coercion Perpetration Prevalence; Y14 = Sexual Coercion Perpetration Chronicity; Y15 = Sexual Coercion Victimization Prevalence; Y16 = Sexual Coercion Victimization Chronicity; X1 = Gender; X2 = Age; X3 = Race; X4 = Marital Status; X5 = Education; X6 = Income; X7 = Religion; X8 = Substance Use.

*p<0.05. **p<0.01. ***p<0.001.
Table 3 presents the effects of the predictor variables on IPV. Model 1 displays the results of logistic regression models assessing the relationship between IPV perpetration prevalence and gender. In terms of total IPV (OR = 2.99, p<0.01), women have greater odds of committing IPV than men (2.99 times) and have 2.19 times the odds of committing psychological aggression (OR = 2.19, p<0.05). As expected, participants who reported substance use have 2.91 times greater odds of committing IPV (OR = 2.91, p<0.05) and 2.87 times the odds of committing psychological aggression (OR = 2.87, p>0.05). Model 2 displays the results of a series of linear regression models estimating the relationship between gender and IPV perpetration chronicity. Women were found to perpetrate total IPV (b = 3.62, p<0.01) and psychological aggression (b = 2.46, p<0.01) with significantly greater chronicity, or more frequently, than men. Like prevalence, participants who reported substance use reported significantly greater total IPV chronicity (b = 3.11, p<0.01) and chronicity of psychological aggression (b = 2.46, p<0.001). These findings support H1: that there is a significant association between gender and IPV offending--that females commit IPV at greater rates (prevalence) and more frequently (chronicity) than males. Therefore, we must reject the null hypothesis.

Table 4 presents the effects of predictor variables on IPV victimization. Model 1 displays the results of logistic regression models estimating the relationship between gender and IPV victimization prevalence and Model 2 displays the results of linear regression models assessing the relationship between gender and IPV victimization chronicity. Findings indicate that men and women report IPV victimization at similar rates. Age was significantly and positively associated with chronicity of psychological aggression (b = 0.08, p<0.05) victimization. Marital status was found to have a significant and positive association with victimization prevalence of physical assault (OR = 0.39, p<0.01) and sexual coercion (OR =
0.47, p<0.05), and a significant and negative association with victimization chronicity of total IPV (b = -8.03, p<0.05), physical assault (b = -3.24, p<0.01), and sexual coercion (b = -1.02, p<0.05). Education level has a significant and positive association with total IPV victimization prevalence (OR = 0.56, p<0.01). Lastly, substance use was significantly and positively associated with victimization prevalence of physical assault (OR = 1.94, p<0.05) and sexual coercion (OR = 1.77, p<0.05) and victimization chronicity of total IPV (b = 5.84, p<0.05), psychological aggression (b = 2.62, p<0.01), and sexual coercion (b = 0.91, p<0.05). These findings fail to support H2: that there is a significant association between gender and IPV victimization. Therefore, we fail to reject the null hypothesis.
Table 3: Gender and IPV Perpetration (N = 231)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Model 1 Prevalence</th>
<th>Model 2 Chronicity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total IPV</td>
<td>Psychological Aggression</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>OR</td>
<td>SE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender (Female)</td>
<td>2.99**</td>
<td>1.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race (White)</td>
<td>0.56</td>
<td>0.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marital Status (Married)</td>
<td>0.86</td>
<td>0.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education (College Graduate)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income (&lt;75k)</td>
<td>0.52</td>
<td>0.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religion (Christian)</td>
<td>1.90</td>
<td>0.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Substance Use</td>
<td>2.91*</td>
<td>1.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\chi^2/F$</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>0.03</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Model 1 entries are estimated logistic regression robust standard errors (SE), odds ratios (OR).

Model 2 entries are estimated linear regression coefficients (b), standard errors (SE).

*p<0.05. **p<0.01. ***p<0.001
Table 4: Gender and IPV Victimization (N = 231)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Model 1 Prevalence</th>
<th>Model 2 Chronicity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total IPV</td>
<td>Physical Assault</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>OR</td>
<td>SE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender (Female)</td>
<td>0.59</td>
<td>0.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>1.01</td>
<td>0.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race (White)</td>
<td>0.61</td>
<td>0.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marital Status (Married)</td>
<td>0.56</td>
<td>0.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education (College Graduate)</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income (&gt;75k)</td>
<td>0.86</td>
<td>0.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religion (Christian)</td>
<td>1.34</td>
<td>0.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Substance Use</td>
<td>2.20</td>
<td>0.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(\chi^2/F)</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.04</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Model 1 entries are estimated logistic regression robust standard errors (SE), odds ratios (OR).

Model 2 entries are estimated linear regression coefficients (b), standard errors (SE).

*p<0.05. **p<0.01. ***p<0.001.
Chapter Conclusion

This chapter presented the study’s findings. Overall, women reported committing total IPV and psychological aggression at greater rates and reported committing those acts with greater chronicity than men. Findings also indicated that men and women reported IPV victimization at relatively equal rates.
CHAPTER 5: DISCUSSION

Discussion

This study was designed to examine the relationship between gender and IPV. The basis of this study was to answer three primary questions: (1) Do females commit IPV at greater rates and more frequently than men? (2) Are men victimized more frequently or at greater rates than women? and (3) Is there a significant association between gender and IPV victimization and aggression? Specifically, the study’s aim was to test gender directionality, prevalence, and chronicity, of both IPV perpetration and victimization between heterosexual adults and to explore the extent to which contemporary findings of gender symmetry accurately characterize IPV.

The findings from this study suggest that women perpetrate IPV at significantly greater rates than and more frequently than men. In fact, women were found to be roughly three times more likely than men to commit violence against their partner and they reported committing those acts of violence with higher chronicity. Similarly, men and women reported victimization rates at roughly equal levels. It must be noted that while the relationship between gender and IPV victimization is not statistically significant, in a society where 85-95% of IPV arrests are men (BJS, 1994; Catalano, 2012; Straus, 1999, 2006) and the lion’s share of victims’ resources are allocated solely for women (Moore, 2021; Moreau, 2019), the findings that indicate near-equal or slightly more male victimization are of great significance.

Like similar contemporary studies on partner violence using the CTS (see Desmarais et al., 2012; Ehrensaft et al., 2003; Foo & Margolin, 1995; George, 1999; Giordano, Millhollin,
Cernkovich Pugh & Rudolph, 1999; Graham-Kevan & Archer, 2003) and consistent with findings from the U.S. National Intimate Partner and Sexual Violence Survey (2011), this study demonstrated that women are as or more violent and aggressive in their relationships as men—which in simpler terms equates to “more” aggressive. Women reported significantly higher rates and chronicity of psychological aggression. Results indicate that psychological aggression is more prevalent and habitual than physical assault. While this may seem insignificant, the dangers cannot be overlooked or dismissed as harmless. Psychological aggression is not only damaging, but it is also among the best predictors of physical aggression (Baker & Stith, 2008; Felson et. al., 2003). In fact, psychological aggression often precedes physical assault (O’Leary, 1999).

While females were more likely to be perpetrators, males and females reported being victims of IPV at relatively equal rates, similar to other research findings (see Arriaga & Foshee, 2004). This may be due to male underreporting and female overreporting victimization. Studies have found males severely underreport being victims of IPV for a variety of reasons (Dutton & Nicholls, 2005). Douglas and Hines (2011) and Machado et al. (2017) found that for men, seeking help for IPV had a negative impact. Professionals and IPV services offer little help and frequently accuse the male victim of being the perpetrator. Tsui et al. (2010), Moxon (2020), and Breiding, Black, and Ryan (2008) found males severely underreport being victims of violence (and are less inclined to seek help in general) due to social stigma and an aversion to showing weakness. Even in anonymous surveys designed to omit items known to elicit male under-reporting, males continue to under-report IPV (Archer, 2000). This may be due to the high social stigma male weakness carries. Unlike male weakness, female vulnerability is an attractive attribute that further widens the gender differential in reporting IPV (Rainville &
Gallagher, 1990; Goetz, Easton, Lewis & Buss, 2012). These factors may result in female over-reporting victimization and explain why women report greater rates of perpetration but relatively equal rates of victimization.

**Policy Implications**

This study represents important advances in partner violence research. The overall key findings support results from other self-reported family conflict studies (see Archer, 2000)—that both men and women report a larger proportion of violence is perpetrated by women—a finding that cannot be ignored. This finding stresses the need to reexamine the current default assumption of male blame. Domestic violence is not simply “violence against women”.

Furthermore, while vastly differing from the traditional feminist male-aggressor model, the data also refutes the current IPV gender symmetry theory.

The feminist approach (White & Gondolf, 2000), which currently dominates domestic violence response and intervention, needs to be reconsidered. Feminist sociology which has driven the gender paradigm and influences current criminal justice practice and thinking on domestic violence, focuses on male violence and power against women. Surveys that ask women only about victimization or men only about perpetration do not accurately measure partner violence, nor do crime statistics due to situational bias, officer bias, and anti-male training (e.g. Duluth Model) and policies (e.g. primary aggressor laws). The current gender-based intervention model of choice, the Duluth Model, focuses on the male-batterer/female-victim paradigm and is based on the view that men commit IPV to dominate women (Dutton & Carvo, 2006). Over fifty empirical studies have found batter treatment to be ineffective—or worse—, showing the Duluth model produces higher recidivism than untreated controls (Dutton
Considering the research findings of this and many like studies, partner violence is not the product of men hating women and when approached from that perspective, female violence is encouraged, violent women go untreated, and innocent men are punished. Furthermore, children’s exposure to violence is extremely damaging. Children are 2.5 times more likely to be exposed to maternal IPV and maternal violence is the number one predictor of children’s behavioral problems (McDonald et al., 2006, 2009). It is time for IPV to be viewed through the lens of science rather than radical ideology.

In addition, the “one size fits all” model proposed by gender symmetry proponents and researchers must also be reconsidered. If women are found to consistently perpetrate partner violence at higher rates than their male counterparts despite overwhelming empirical data indicating that men are far more disproportionately likely to use violence than are women in nearly every other area of life, it is likely that men and women do not commit IPV for the same reasons, as gender symmetry theorists claim. It is likely female perpetrated partner violence differs from traditional male aggression, that male perpetrators of partner violence are generalists, but female perpetrators specialize in that form of offending (Moxon, 2020). Because of this relationship, violence prevention programs should be gender-specific to better address unique risk factors that predict violence for each gender.

Limitations

There are several limitations of this work that must be acknowledged. The first limitation is the study’s small sample size. A larger sample would strengthen the statistical power and validity of the study’s findings.
The second limitation is selection bias. This study’s participants were recruited primarily via electronic means including a mass email, electronic bulletin boards (e.g. Buy Nothing and Craigslist), and social media sites (e.g. FaceBook and Twitter). This implies that only people that were tech-savvy and social media users were selected, hindering the study’s ability to generalize its findings to the entire population. In addition, all participants were asked to share the study with others. Because of that, many of those who chose to repost and pass on the study were researchers themselves and more educated than the general population. Similarly, in-person recruitment was conducted in a primarily white university town and on a university campus with a roughly 70% white population whose population is likely more educated and has a higher income than the general population. However, it must be noted that examining the relationship between education, income, or race was not the purpose of this study.

The third limitation centers around self-selection bias. From the beginning of the recruitment process, female volunteers consistently outnumbered males at roughly a 2:1 ratio despite the survey being distributed to roughly equal numbers of men and women. Nevertheless, in the individual statistical analyses (e.g., the logistic and linear regression models), the different sizes of the groups are accounted for.

The fourth limitation centers around the measures of partner violence. All measures were assessed using only participant reports about their own perpetration of violence and that of their partners. Because of this, the data are subject to all the biases and limitations inherent to this form of data collection, such as recall bias, social desirability bias, and reporting bias. A meta-analysis of the reliability of the conflict tactics scale concluded that there is evidence of underreporting by both genders—particularly male underreporting of victimization (Whitaker et al., 2007). Response avoidance represents a further limitation, including the assumption of
random missingness, and results are dependent on the accuracy or truthfulness of the participants’ responses. Another limitation centers around researchers’ failure to differentiate between participants who were perpetrators only, victims only, involved in mutually combative relationships. Lastly, it should be noted that this study neglected to differentiate between mild and severe violence in analysis (e.g. pushing and punching or threatening to take a pet vs killing a pet were considered with equal weight) or “victim” perception (i.e. do you mind if your partner shoves you?). Despite these limitations, this study’s findings are consistent with nearly 30 years of family violence research.

**Future Research**

There have been many survey-based studies (like this one) designed to determine the relationship between gender and IPV—most with similar findings: females perpetrate partner violence at greater rates than men. The next logical steps in addressing this issue are to explore “why?” and “what should be done?”

In order to achieve a more holistic view of IPV, future research must examine female perpetrators, male victims, social bias, and policy makers’ bias. Barriers to male participation must be considered in future research of this kind. Research should focus on empirical evidence, rather than feminist or patriarchal theory. It should also include comparing aggression toward intimate partners vs non-intimates, examining both perpetrators and victims’ attitudes regarding IPV, as well as community attitudes and perception of IPV. In addition, anti-male bias in law enforcement training and intervention services (e.g., social workers, counselors, and social services) must be comprehensively studied. Finally, future studies must consider policy—
specifically examining whether or not a criminal justice approach is even the best option for complex family conflict.

Conclusion

The two dominant contemporary models addressing IPV, the asymmetric feminist model and the gender inclusive symmetric model are challenged by an alternative asymmetric model that suggests women perpetrate IPV at greater rates and with greater chronicity than men. The feminist model views IPV as primarily male perpetrated, stemming from the patriarchal system which emphasizes male dominance and superiority over females. Conversely, the gender symmetry model regards gender as an insignificant factor in IPV, finding that men and women offend at similar rates and for similar reasons. Results support the alternate asymmetrical model, that women perpetrate IPV at greater rates and greater chronicity than men. These findings have important implications for criminal and family justice policy—particularly regarding law enforcement training and intervention strategies and arrest and carceral policies. Specifically, the Duluth Model, or any like model focusing solely on male perpetrators and female victims, should be abandoned, officer training should include awareness training regarding legal and administrative abuse and critical analysis of abuse allegations. Furthermore, victim and offender treatment should be gender specific and holistically address the needs of male victims and female offenders in addition to the current default assumption of the male offender and female victim. Future research should examine societal implications of violence — specifically, why female violence seems to be tolerated and male victimization seems to be marginalized.
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APPENDIX
APPENDIX A

QUESTIONNAIRE

Dear Participant,

This survey assesses gender differences and directionality of intimate partner violence. Your response is very important. Your participation is completely VOLUNTARY. You can refuse to answer any questions and stop responding at any point. By completing and returning this questionnaire, you are agreeing to be part of this research. This is an ANONYMOUS survey. Do NOT put your name on this form.

If you have any questions, please contact:
Nate Juda
University of Mississippi
njuda@olemiss.edu

Section 1 – Screening Question

Have you been involved in at least one heterosexual marital, cohabitating, or dating relationship (defined as at least 3 dates over a 4-week period) in the prior 12 months?

1. Yes ( )
2. No ( )

If yes, continue to answer the remaining questions.

Section 2 – Demographic Characteristics

1. Are you a University of Mississippi student?
   1. Yes ( )

96
2. No

2. What is your gender?
   1. Male
   2. Female

3. How old are you? ___________

4. How do you usually describe yourself?
   1. White – not Hispanic
   2. Black – not Hispanic
   3. Hispanic or Latino
   4. Asian or Pacific Islander
   5. American Indian or Alaskan Native
   6. Other______________________

5. What is your marital status?
   1. Single/never married
   2. Married
   3. Separated
   4. Divorced

6. What is your level of education?
   1. No high school diploma
   2. High school
   3. Some college
   4. Four year degree
   5. Graduate degree

7. What is your annual household income?
   1. <$10,000
   2. $10,000-$25,000
   3. $25,001-$50,000
   4. $50,001-$75,000
   5. $75,001-$100,000
   6. $100,001-$250,000
   7. >$250,000
8. What is your religion?
   1. Christian (   )
   2. Muslim (   )
   3. Jewish (   )
   4. Other (   )
   5. Non-religious (   )

Section 3 - Substance Use

The following six questions asks about alcohol and drug consumption in the prior 12-month. Please indicate (yes or no) to whether or not you have experienced any of these substance-related issues in the past 12 months.

1. Have you ever felt you ought to cut down on your drinking or drug use?
   1. Yes
   2. No

2. Have people annoyed you by criticizing your drinking or drug use?
   1. Yes
   2. No

3. Have you ever felt bad or guilty about your drinking or drug use?
   1. Yes
   2. No

4. Have you ever had a drink or used drugs first thing in the morning to steady your nerves or get rid of a hangover or get the day started?
   1. Yes
   2. No

5. Do you consume alcohol at least once a week?
   1. Yes
   2. No

6. Do you consume illegal substances (including non-medical use of prescription drugs) at least once a week?
   1. Yes
   2. No
Section 4 – Intimate Partner Violence

No matter how well a couple gets along, there are times when they disagree, get annoyed with their partner, expect or want different things from each other, or just have spats or fights because they are in a bad mood, are tired, intoxicated, or for some other reason. Couples also have many different ways of trying to settle their differences. This is a list of incidents that might occur when you have differences. Please indicate how many times you did each of these things in the past year, and how many times your partner did them in the past year. If you or your partner did not do one of these things in the past year, but it has happened before, mark "7."

How often did this happen?

0 = This has never happened  
4 = 6-10 times in the past year  
1 = Once in the past year  
5 = 11-20 times in the past year  
2 = Twice in the past year  
6 = More than 20 times in the past year  
3 = 3-5 times in the past year  
7 = Not in the past year, but it did happen before

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I insulted or swore at my partner.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My partner did this to me.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I threw something at my partner that could hurt.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My partner did this to me.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I scratched my partner.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My partner did this to me.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I pushed or shoved my partner.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My partner did this to me.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I spoke badly about my partner to friends and/or family.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My partner did this to me.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I used a knife or gun on my partner.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My partner did this to me.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I disparaged my partner's looks.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My partner did this to me.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When we fight, I slap/hit/kick/push/grab my partner first</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When we fight, my partner hits me first.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I flirted or cheated (or threatened to) to hurt my partner.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My partner did this to me.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I hit my partner with an object that could hurt.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My partner did this to me.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I destroyed something belonging to my partner.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My partner did this to me.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I choked my partner.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My partner did this to me.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I threatened to harm or take my partner’s pet.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My partner did this to me.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I beat up my partner.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My partner did this to me.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I falsely accused my partner of rape or abuse</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My partner did this to me.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I grabbed my partner.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My partner did this to me.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I stomped out of the room, house, or yard during a disagreement.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My partner did this to me.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I demanded sex when my partner did not want to.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My partner did this to me.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I slapped my partner.</td>
<td>My partner did this to me.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I accused my partner of being a lousy lover.</td>
<td>My partner did this to me.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I burned or scalded my partner on purpose.</td>
<td>My partner did this to me.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I did something to spite my partner.</td>
<td>My partner did this to me.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I threatened to hit or throw something at my partner.</td>
<td>My partner did this to me.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I punched or kicked my partner.</td>
<td>My partner did this to me.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I asked or prompted someone else to physically hurt my partner.</td>
<td>My partner did this to me.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I purposely withheld sex to hurt my partner.</td>
<td>My partner did this to me.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I disparaged my partner’s job, skills, position, or income.</td>
<td>My partner did this to me.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I threatened to report my partner to the police.</td>
<td>My partner did this to me.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I bit my partner.</td>
<td>My partner did this to me.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When my partner hurts me, I feel the need to retaliate.</td>
<td>When I hurt my partner, they do this to me.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX B

RECRUITMENT EMAIL AND VERBAL SCRIPT

Recruitment Email/Letter

Hello

Researchers are conducting this study to gain a better understanding of intimate partner violence (i.e. domestic violence). Participation will take approximately 15 minutes. If you are interested, please proceed by using the link below. Participation is voluntary and you may withdraw at any time. No identifiable information will be recorded; therefore, you cannot be identified from this study.

If you have any questions, please let me know.

Nate Juda
njuda@go.olemiss.edu
310.927.3914

Verbal Script: Recruitment First Contact

Hi! My name is Nate from the University of Mississippi. I am conducting a research study on gender differences and directionality of intimate partner violence. Participation will take approximately 15 minutes. If you are interested, please proceed by using the provided link to access the survey. Participation is voluntary and you may withdraw at any time. No identifiable information will be recorded; therefore, we do not think you can be identified from this study.
APPENDIX C

INFORMATION SHEET/INFORMED CONSENT FORM

Title: Gender Differences and Directionality of Intimate Partner Violence

Investigator
Nate Juda
Department of Criminal Justice & Legal Studies
The University of Mississippi
(310) 927-3914

Advisor
Francis D. Boateng, Ph.D.
Department of Criminal Justice & Legal Studies
84 Dormitory Row West M303
The University of Mississippi
(662) 915-7902

INCLUDE THE FOLLOWING ONLY IF YOU ARE COLLECTING DATA EXCLUSIVELY FROM ADULTS By checking this box I certify that I am 18 years of age or older.

Description
The purpose of this research project is to determine the relationship between gender and IPV perpetration. We would like to ask you a few questions about surveys. You will not be asked for your name or any other identifying information.

Time Commitment
It will take you approximately 15 minutes to complete this survey.

Risks and Benefits
You may feel uncomfortable with some of the questions pertaining to violent aggression and/or victimization. We do not think that there are any other risks. However, a lot of people enjoy taking questionnaires.

Confidentiality
No identifiable information will be recorded; therefore we do not think you can be identified from this study.
**Right to Withdraw**
You do not have to take part in this study, and you may stop participation at any time. No explanation is necessary. If you start the study and decide that you do not want to finish, all you have to do is stop. You may skip any questions you prefer not to answer.

**IRB Approval**
This study has been reviewed by The University of Mississippi’s Institutional Review Board (IRB). If you have any questions, concerns, or reports regarding your rights as a participant of research, please contact the IRB at (662) 915-7482 or irb@olemiss.edu.

**Statement of Consent**
I have read and understand the above information. By completing the survey/interview I consent to participate in the study.

**INCLUDE THE FOLLOWING PARAGRAPH ONLY IF YOU ARE COLLECTING DATA FROM STUDENTS IN YOUR CLASS**

**Student Participants in Investigators’ Classes**

Special human research subject protections apply where there is any possibility of undue influence – such as for students in classes of investigators. Investigators can recruit from their classes but only by providing information on availability of studies. They can encourage you to participate, but they cannot exert any pressure for you to do so. Therefore, if you experience any undue influence from your instructor, you should contact the IRB via phone (662-915-7482) or email (irb@olemiss.edu) and report the specific details. You will remain anonymous in an investigation.
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