University of Cumbria

Bates, Elizabeth ORCID: https://orcid.org/0000-0001-8694-8078 and Poynton, Meagan (2021) Women's use of non-lethal violence against men. In: Shackelford, Tom K., (ed.) The SAGE handbook of domestic violence. SAGE, London, UK, pp. 224-240.

Downloaded from: http://insight.cumbria.ac.uk/id/eprint/5255/

Usage of any items from the University of Cumbria's institutional repository 'Insight' must conform to the following fair usage guidelines.

Any item and its associated metadata held in the University of Cumbria's institutional repository Insight (unless stated otherwise on the metadata record) may be copied, displayed or performed, and stored in line with the JISC fair dealing guidelines (available here) for educational and not-for-profit activities

provided that

- the authors, title and full bibliographic details of the item are cited clearly when any part of the work is referred to verbally or in the written form
- a hyperlink/URL to the original Insight record of that item is included in any citations of the work
- the content is not changed in any way
- all files required for usage of the item are kept together with the main item file.

You may not

- sell any part of an item
- refer to any part of an item without citation
- amend any item or contextualise it in a way that will impugn the creator's reputation
- remove or alter the copyright statement on an item.

The full policy can be found here.
Alternatively contact the University of Cumbria Repository Editor by emailing insight@cumbria.ac.uk.

Women's use of non-lethal violence against men

Elizabeth A. Bates[1] and Meagan Poynton[2]

[1] University of Cumbria, Fusehill Street, Carlisle, CA12HH, UK. Elizabeth.Bates@cumbria.ac.uk

[2] University of Cumbria, Fusehill Street, Carlisle, CA12HH, UK. Meagan.mcandrew@googemail.com

Abstract

Much of the early research explored domestic violence and abuse through a gendered lens; that is, focusing on violence against women with its root causes lying in patriarchy, gender inequality, and male privilege (e.g., Dobash & Dobash, 1979). This approach excluded male victims from the narrative, and had a focus on women's victimisation, seeing any perpetration by women as likely stemming from self-defence (e.g., Saunders, 1988). The development of gender-neutral surveying methods (e.g., Conflict Tactics Scale [CTS]; Straus, 1979, followed by the CTS2; Straus, Hamby, Boney-McCoy & Sugarman, 1996) started a wave of research that highlighted the prevalence of both women's violence and men's victimisation. Since then, there has been a wealth of literature including meta-analyses (e.g., Archer, 2000) that has highlighted men's and women's propensity for violence within intimate relationships that shows almost equal rates. The aim of this chapter is to consider the extant literature that has explored men's victimisation. It will start by exploring the emergence of male victimisation within the literature including reference to research that has explored historical accounts (e.g., George, 1994) and the term "battered husband syndrome" (Steinmetz, 1978). The chapter will then discuss what we know about men's experience from the international literature including research exploring their experiences of physical violence, and psychological and emotional abuse. Domestic violence and abuse do not always end with the breakdown of the relationship and a further element of the discussion will include men's experience of post-separation abuse that includes controlling behaviour seen through false allegations, harassment, and parental alienation. The chapter will conclude by making recommendations for future research, as well as discussing the implications for current interventions and practice.

Key words: domestic violence; domestic abuse; male victims; women's violence; coercive control

Women's use of non-lethal violence against men

Introduction and aim

Much of the early research explored intimate partner violence (IPV) through a feminist or gendered lens; that is, focusing on violence against women with its root causes lying in patriarchy, gender inequality, and male privilege (e.g., Dobash & Dobash, 1979). This movement represented an important step in revealing the prevalence, severity, and impact of men's violence against women, as pre-1970s IPV was routinely ignored within the United Kingdom (UK), United States (US), and Canada in what Dutton (2006) has labelled the "age of denial" (p. 16). It was also the foundation of the development of the first intervention programme to tackle men's violence; the Duluth Model was established in the US in 1981 as an intervention with a curriculum developed that saw the "Power and Control Wheel" as central to understanding IPV as being motivated by men's need for power and control over women (Pence & Paymar, 1993). As both a theoretical research model, and a model that underpins work with both perpetrators and victims, it is still very influential within practice today (see Bates, Graham-Kevan, Bolam & Thornton, 2017), despite evidence that suggests it is ineffective (Babcock, Green & Robie, 2004).

This gendered approach to IPV in both research and practice excluded, and indeed often continues to exclude, male victims from the narrative, and has a focus only on women's victimisation, seeing any perpetration by women as likely stemming from self-defence (e.g., Saunders, 1988). The development of gender-neutral surveying methods (e.g., Conflict Tactics Scale [CTS]; Straus, 1979, followed by the CTS2; Straus et al., 1996) started a wave of research that highlighted the prevalence of both women's violence and men's victimisation. Since then, there has been a wealth of literature including meta-analyses (e.g., Archer, 2000) that has highlighted men's and women's propensity for violence within intimate relationships. The aim of this chapter is to explore women's use of non-lethal violence against and efforts to control their male partners[1]. It will involve an exploration of the emergence of male victims within the history of the literature, men's experiences of physical violence, their experiences of coercive control, and how this abuse continues and changes post-separation. The chapter concludes with a series of recommendations for future research and practice, and the need to change legislation to ensure it covers all aspects of IPV.

[1] This chapter is working exclusively with IPV within opposite-sex relationships. Where cisgendered women are violent towards cisgendered men

Emergence of male victims

The 1970s saw a shift in attitudes towards IPV, with the issue transcending the sanctity of the family to become part of the public consciousness. Work of IPV advocates such as Martin (1976) and Pizzey (1974) inspired an array of legal and political initiatives and resulted in increased coverage of IPV by modern mass media (George, 1994). This, in turn, generated further attention from researchers, and a body of literature has amassed in the years since. However, a major focus of this was the plight of women at the hands of their abusive husbands (George, 2007). Early studies in this period (e.g., Gelles, 1974) indicated that IPV was perpetrated by both men and women (George, 2007). Yet, it was an article 'The Battered Husband Syndrome' that marked the first academic reference of male victims; in this study, Steinmetz (1978) proposed that the abuse of husbands, not wives, was the significantly underreported form of IPV, questioning whether the ignorance around battered husbands as a whole was a result of "selective inattention" (p. 499).

Criticism of this study was copious and scathing, with fellow scholars accusing Steinmetz of failing to address the context of the assaults and insinuating female-perpetrated abuse, in all likelihood, could be explained within the realm of self-defence (George, 1994). Interestingly, perpetrated abuse, despite subsequent studies continuing to evidence equivalent levels of IPV across gender, and the frequency of bidirectional abuse. Often, in cases of mutual or bilateral violent activity, men and women were found to be almost equally responsible for starting the aggression (Straus & Gelles, 1986, Langhinrichsen-Rohling, Misra, Selwyn & Rohling, 2012).

George (2007) describes male victims of IPV by their female partners as the "Great Taboo" in this field of study and proposes this is a result of two 'forbidden' (p. 8) beliefs in society. The first is that a man can be beaten by a woman, and the second is that, despite the enduring stereotypical notions of femininity, women can be and are aggressive and violent. Despite these taboos, historical discussion of battered or dominated husbands are plentiful. Notably, in the early modern period, countries across mainland Europe adopted customs called "Charivari", whereby those who transgressed societal norms were exposed to noisy and humiliating demonstrations. Historical records indicate husbands who were thought to have been beaten by their wives were subjected to particularly demeaning measures under the Charivari customs (George, 2002). In France, for instance, custom dictated a battered husband should be paraded through the town riding a donkey backwards while holding its tail, while abused husbands in England were strapped to a cart, paraded around and subjected to people's mockery and contempt (George 1994; 2002; Steinmetz, 1978). Records indicate these customs varied considerably depending on location, but the majority served

one purpose; humiliation of the battered husband for failing to uphold the patriarchal values of the time (Dobash & Dobash, 1979; George, 1994).

More recently the discussion around the role of gender in IPV has become more open but is still contentious. Dutton (2006) proposes the enduring gender debate is a result of feminist researchers' commitment to the notion that IPV was the by-product of patriarchy and, therefore, only something a man carries out. Dutton describes phenomena such as "belief perseverance" and "groupthink" (p. 109) whereby contradictory data are discounted, thereby protecting the group ideology. Dutton explains that social scientists often strive to achieve social change and, therefore, become aligned with contemporary notions of social justice, increasing the likelihood of failing to objectively report data. He asserts that, in the case of IPV research, the protection of women and their rights has prevailed over questions of scientific accuracy, dictating the direction of investigation, as well as how data are reported and interpreted. This sentiment was echoed by George (2007) who stated that defining the issue of IPV as one based on the patriarchy and the oppression of women allowed advocacy to overwhelm research, and falsehoods were able to develop and be sustained.

Due to this positioning, research framed under this gendered or feminist model tends to use crime statistics, such as police data. For example, Melton and Belknap (2003) support the assertion that more men are perpetrators than women by noting that, within police and court data, 86% of the defendants are male and only 14% female. These figures are skewed in a number of ways including that they do not account for unreported IPV, and there is a body of literature that details the stigma attached to male victimization which would prevent men reporting when they were abused (e.g., Steinmetz, 1978; Hines, Brown & Dunning, 2007; Bates, 2019b); and also the literature that suggests that women's IPV is judged less harshly than men's (e.g., Sorenson & Taylor, 2005) and men are less likely to receive a protection order from their female partner (e.g., Russell, 2012). Furthermore, when these researchers acknowledge the existence of male victimisation, there is the assertion that men are still the perpetrators; recent crime statistics indicate otherwise, with some arguing it is a deliberate falsehood designed to continue to diminish the experiences of male victims in opposite-sex relationships (ManKind Initiative, 2019).

One of the first measures that revealed the frequency of women's violence was the Conflict Tactics Scale (CTS: Straus, 1979); it was designed as an act-based measure of IPV that asked about conflict resolution within a set period of time. It is usually used with community and undergraduate samples of married or dating couples, and involves respondents reporting their own and their partner's behavior (Archer, 1999). Criticisms of the CTS have mainly revolved around the lack of

context; some researchers believe that the way the items are presented ignores their meaning and the situation in which the act took place (e.g., see DeKeseredy & Schwartz, 1998). Dobash, Dobash, Wilson and Daly (1992) strongly criticised the CTS stating, “Confining self-report data to a check list of acts, devoid of motives, meanings and consequences cannot insure objectivity, validity or an adequate development of theory to explain violence” (p. 71). They strongly argue that sexual symmetry in IPV is a myth created by the use of data out of context. Indeed, according to McHugh (2005), the measurement of violent acts alone cannot account for the context of violence in an intimate relationship; specifically, that “slaps are equal to slaps regardless of whether one breaks the partner’s jaw and the other’s slap leaves only a light redness” (p. 720).

Straus (e.g., 1990, 2012) argued that these criticisms were based on a misunderstanding of the research design behind the use of the measure, and believes that the claim of the CTS ignoring context assumes that quantitative measures cannot accommodate context. In fact, the CTS does measure this by keeping the context and violence variables separate, and by asking participants to answer the questionnaire whilst thinking about a conflict they had with their partner (or ex-partner); it can further be used alongside other context variables (e.g., dominance). There is divided opinion on this issue of context as some researchers (e.g., Gelles, 1997) would suggest that violent acts are only those where there is an intent on the part of the perpetrator to cause harm, mainly those meant to injure and cause pain. Hamby, Poindexter and Gray-Little (1996) compared four measures of IPV and found the CTS gave the lowest prevalence rate of the four. However, Dutton (2006) believes that the CTS is a far more sensitive measure than any of the government surveys of victimization, sometimes capturing 16 times the amount the violence that these surveys do. When considering the use of survey data compared to crime data, neither “hold a monopoly on the truth” (Hamby, 2005; p. 739).

Men as victims of intimate partner physical violence

Proponents of the gendered or feminist approach to IPV (e.g., Dobash & Dobash, 1979, 2004) believe that the cause of IPV is gender (Dutton, 2006) and that IPV should always be studied in the context of gender (e.g., McHugh, Livingston & Ford, 2005). Specifically, they believe that violence against women is caused by sexism and patriarchy (Felson, 2002); consequently, perpetrators of IPV are not punished because society tolerates it, and when women report it to the police they are in fact blamed for it. This is viewing IPV from what Felson (2002) termed a “gender perspective”. Felson, in contrast, takes what he terms a “violence perspective” which holds that IPV should be studied within the context of violence, which would include same-sex non-intimate

violence that occurs outside the home. In his 2006 paper, he discusses the "selective focus" that many researchers take when studying IPV and how it affects our understanding of the violence.

When adopting this "violence perspective" as an approach to research, it allows the exploration of IPV without the gendered lens and allows exploration of all victim groups. Indeed, the creation of the CTS (Straus, 1979) represented a key milestone in the development of research literature that explored men's victimisation. Quantitative investigations have highlighted the prevalence with which men experience IPV within their relationships with women; indeed, crime surveys (e.g., Office for National Statistics, 2019), national population-based surveys (e.g., Tjaden & Thoennes, 2000; Smith et al., 2018), and self-report quantitative measures (e.g., Bates, Graham-Kevan & Archer, 2014; Archer, 2000) have demonstrated men's victimisation. Whilst the prevalence figures and statistics vary across the different sources, there is still evidence of a significant number of male victims of IPV.

The differences in prevalence for men and women are likely to be in part attributable to the method and sample choice (e.g., for more in-depth discussion see Desmarais, Reeves, Nicholls, Telford & Fiebert, 2012a). For example, when research focuses on representative community samples, there are figures that show that women are as violent, if not more so, towards their partners as men (e.g., Archer, 2000, Desmarais, Reeves, Nicholls, Telford & Fiebert, 2012b), whereas researchers that choose to work with samples that represent the most severe violence (e.g., men in prisons, women in shelters) paint a different picture about what IPV looks like. Choosing to work only with victims from these clinical-level samples will reveal an understanding of IPV within that specific group, but not one that is generalisable. We already know that shelter-based samples of women report more frequent and more severe violence, with some researchers positing that this sample has as much as 11 times more violence compared to other community samples (Straus, 1992). This is also particularly concerning because there are significantly fewer resources allocated to supporting male victims, and so less refuge or shelter space, meaning there is no equivalent sample to work with (e.g., see Brooks, 2019).

The data revealing this prevalence led to a body of research specifically focusing on men's experiences. Denise Hines and her colleagues were some of the first researchers to study male victims of IPV (e.g., see Hines et al., 200; Hines & Douglas 2010a, 2010b). Across their extensive body of work, they have demonstrated the prevalence of men's victimisation in terms of physical violence, and emotional or psychological abuse. For example, Hines et al. (2007) quantitatively explored the experiences of men who called a helpline in the US, and they found the most common physical aggression reported was being slapped or hit, pushed, kicked, grabbed, punched, and choked. This is

supported by research across Europe; for example, Drijber, Reijnders, and Ceelan (2013) found through an online questionnaire in Netherlands that the most common types of physical violence were hitting, pelting or stabbing with an object, kicking, biting, scratching, and seizing by the throat.

These quantitative studies are supported by qualitative work that provides further evidence of the severity and impact of IPV. For example, Bates (2019a) utilised an online, anonymous, qualitative questionnaire to explore the experiences of men who had been abused. The study purposefully utilised a sample that was not from help-seeking populations (e.g., those who have sought help and support from police, IPV organisations, health services, or national helplines; Hines et al., 2007), those self-identifying as victims of IPV (e.g., Hogan, 2016), or studies that required participants to engage in a face-to-face interview (e.g., Nybergh, Enander & Krantz, 2015). Anonymity facilitates disclosure (Brooks, 2019). Bates found significant experiences of physical aggression; this included the use of objects, and violence when the men were asleep. The use of objects or weapons as part of a violent attack were noted in other research; for example, Drijber et al. (2013) found that 54% of the attacks men had experienced involved an object. Similarly, the choice to attack when the men were asleep may represent a less risky strategy; indeed, women's greater fear is thought to be the reason that they engage less frequently in non-intimate partner aggression (see Campbell, 2006); use of these strategies may be a way to equalise sex differences in strength. Aggressive strategies in conflict are based on an assessment of effect/danger ratio, so women may perceive a greater usefulness of covert and indirect strategies (Björkqvist, 1994).

Women's lesser size and strength has thought to mean men's victimisation and injury would not be as significant, but this is not the case; for example, Hines and Douglas (2010a) found that 80% of the men in their sample reported experiencing an injury, and 35.1% reported this as a serious injury. We know from the women's victimisation literature that IPV is impactful and is associated with short- and long-term adverse outcomes (e.g., Marshall, 1996; Straight et al., 2003). It is important to consider the impact of these experiences on men. The literature includes conflicting evidence around factors such as the extent and rates at which men and women experience effects such as anxiety, depression, and PTSD symptoms as a result as abuse, but highlights that, regardless of gender, victims of abuse are likely to experience mental health consequences (Lagdon, Armouer & Stringer, 2014).

The Crime Survey for England and Wales for the year ending in March 2018 asked those who had been victims of IPV in the year before the survey to answer questions on the effects of this abuse. There was no significant difference between the prevalence of physical or non-physical effects of IPV overall when comparing men and women. Both men and women were most likely to

report mental or emotional problems as a result of victimisation, with more men reporting they had tried to kill themselves as a result of the abuse (Office for National Statistics, 2019). Where there has been research exploring the impact on men, IPV has been seen to result in injury (Hines & Douglas, 2010a; Tsui, 2014), and to negatively affect their physical and mental health (Coker, Smith, Bethea, King & McKeown, 2000), their relationships with their children (Bates, 2019c), and their willingness to become involved in new relationships (e.g., Bates, 2019b).

Hines' work with several colleagues has further demonstrated that for male victims there are associations with personality and personality disorders (e.g., Hines, 2008; Hines & Saudino, 2008) and with PTSD (e.g., Hines & Douglas, 2011). These studies indicate that men suffer psychological and physical effects of IPV victimization. Hines is critical of the lack of research comparing abused and non-abused men; much of the research has focussed on comparing abused men to abused women and concludes that these men do not suffer to the same degree as do the women (e.g., Hines & Douglas, 2009). However, men may be more likely to externalise symptomatology (e.g., by using alcohol and drugs) whereas women may be more likely to internalize symptomatology, with the result that it is difficult to make a direct gender comparison on this dimension (Hines & Malley-Morrison, 2001).

The historical research originating in the gendered model (e.g., Yllo, 1993) has positioned women's violence as driven by self-defence, however this has not found to be wholly correct as evidenced through a number of areas of research. First, the most common pattern of IPV is bidirectional abuse, where both partners are violent, and often followed by equal proportions of male and female unilateral violence (e.g., Stets & Straus, 1989; Próspero & Kim, 2009), and research suggesting women are more commonly the unilateral perpetrator (so violent in the absence of their partner's violence; e.g., Gray & Foshee, 1997). Second, women's violence is motivated or predicted by factors similar to those predicting men's violence (Medeiros & Straus, 2006), including childhood adversity (e.g., Ehrensaft, Moffitt & Caspi, 2004), personality psychopathology (e.g., Goldenson, Geffner, Foster & Clipson, 2007), and a history of prior criminal activity (Straus & Ramirez, 2004). This indicates that women's violence is as complex as men's in terms of understanding the risk and protective factors, and certainly not easily explained by self-defence alone.

Men as victims of intimate partner coercive control

Within the broader IPV and family violence literature, there has been a tendency to focus on physical aggression, at the cost of a lesser understanding of other forms of abuse which are more prevalent and more impactful over the longer term (Straight et al., 2003). The term coercive control is used here to represent a range of behaviours that have also been labelled emotional abuse and

psychological abuse; it is a term that captures behaviours such as jealously and possessive behaviour, name calling and denigration, threats and intimidations, economic or financial manipulation (Graham-Kevan & Archer, 2005), harassment, criticism, isolation due to restriction of social contact (Walker, 1979), overt or more subtle behaviours (Marshall, 1999), destabilisation through intimidation and degradation, control over personal freedom (Follingstad & DeHart, 2000), ridicule (Follingstad, Rutledge, Berg, Hause & Polek, 1990), and subtle threats of physical or emotional abandonment (Loring, 1994). Whilst this type of non-physical aggression has been less explored compared to physical violence, research has demonstrated its prevalence and impact as a distinct form of aggression.

Psychological abuse has unique impacts on victims, after controlling for effects of physical aggression (Straight et al., 2003), and has found to be a unique predictor of Post-Traumatic Stress Disorder (PTSD; Street & Arias, 2001). Follingstad et al. (1990) found that 99% of battered women experienced this form of coercive control and 72% reported this type of abuse has the worst impact. Stark (2007) describes the way controlling behaviour seeps into a person's existence; the "controllers devise tactics to penetrate these zones using microregulation to quash the last vestiges of free time or space" (p. 209). It impacts in an insidious way and has potential to undermine a person's sense of self (Marshall, 1996). This type of abuse is difficult to address because consequences are harder to evidence (Williamson, 2010) and the victims of coercive control are "often invisible" (Candela, 2016; p113); indeed, victims rarely recognise themselves as victims of such abuse (Loring, 1994) and the subtle nature of it makes it harder for an outsider or observer to see the nature of the harm (Marshall, 1999).

Research exploring perpetration and victimisation of coercive control reveals variation in findings depending on the method and sample. As part of the Partner Abuse State of Knowledge project, Carney and Barner (2012) conducted a systematic review of coercive and controlling behavior consisting of emotional abuse, sexual coercion, and stalking or obsessive behaviour. They found that some prevalence rates were as high as 80% but that there was a significant range in this due to what the researchers described as a lack of consensus around the definition of the term across the literature. There was significant overlap in terms of the behaviours reported by men and women, but also some differences. Women more than men were called names, insulted, humiliated and made fun of. Men described having their whereabouts monitored, being demeaned, and being fearful of an angry partner.

The prevalence of men's victimization is supported by other research that suggest men and women are equally likely to perpetrate and be victimized along these types of behaviours. For

example, Black et al. (2011) found 48.4% of women and 48.8% of men reported lifetime experience with psychological aggression. Similarly, Bates et al. (2014) found that controlling behaviour was a significant predictor of both men's and women's IPV, and that women reported perpetrating these behaviours significantly more frequently than men did. This supports research that suggests women use significantly more social manipulation, a type of covert and coercive aggression, where the perpetrator is able to disguise their intentions to avoid retaliation or social condemnation (Björkqvist, Österman & Lagerspetz, 1994).

Specific explorations of men's experiences of this type of abuse are relatively recent. Hines et al. (2007) found that 90% of the men within their help-seeking sample had reported that their partners had used controlling behaviour; the most common form of control included coercion and threats, emotional manipulation, blaming, minimising or denying abuse, and manipulating the system. Studies have demonstrated men's experiences with manipulation (Hines et al., 2007), gaslighting (Bates, 2019a), isolation (Entilli & Cipolletta, 2016), and children used as a means of control (e.g., Drijber et al., 2013). Women's psychological abuse of men has been alongside other forms of violence; for example, in forced-to-penetrate cases, the use of blackmail and threats is most frequent aggressive strategy used (Weare, 2017). For many men who are fathers, this use of control extends to fear of losing their children (Bates, 2019c).

For men who have experienced significant emotional and psychological abuse, the barriers to leaving are greater, and the impact on their sense of self and well-being is substantial. Attacks on "self" (e.g., ridicule) are more impactful, and psychological abuse is a greater predictor of fear (Sackett & Saunders, 1999). Capitulating to an abuser's notion of reality (rather than trusting oneself) can negatively affect psychological wellbeing and notions of self (Williamson, 2010), such that victims lose their autonomy in a way similar to gaslighting (Gass & Nicols, 1988).

Coercive control was thought to be an aspect that might differentiate "types" of IPV; specifically, Johnson (1995) proposed that the presence or absence of control was what could distinguish the conflicting findings seen with the "gender" and "violence" perspectives. Johnson (1995) contended that the two approaches relied on different samples and methods and, therefore, were finding two types of IPV. The first was labelled "Patriarchal Terrorism" (later renamed Intimate Terrorism) which was described as the most serious type of IPV that occurred when men use physical violence as part of a wider pattern of control and dominance against their female partners. This was the type of violence seen in the clinical samples such as women in shelters and men in prison or intervention programmes. Johnson posited that "common couple violence" (later renamed situational couple violence) was the type of violence seen where conflict between a couple got out

of control and escalated to physical violence. He believed this was the type of IPV seen within the family violence literature that demonstrated similar prevalence rates in men's and women's violence. He further suggested that this type of violence was not as serious, did not include the presence of a wider pattern of coercion, and was not likely to escalate.

The typology was later extended to capture mutual IPV (Johnson, 2006), and included Mutual Violent Control where both partners used a pattern of coercive violence, and Violent Resistance which represented the violence used by a partner in self-defence after being abused. The typology has been broadly supported in terms of reflecting the different patterns of violence in relationships (Graham-Kevan & Archer, 2003a; 2003b), but Johnson's (2006) hypotheses about gender are not as well supported. Johnson posits that the controlling and serious violence is committed by men to women, whereas men and women are equally likely to be involved in situational couple violence.

Research has not supported Johnson's assertions about gender; Bates et al. (2014) utilised a large sample (n = 1104) to test the male control theory of men's IPV alongside the utility of Johnson's typology. Contrary to the predictors that men would be most likely to be classified as intimate terrorists, women were in fact more likely to be classified in this category. Indeed, coercive control in this sample was also predictive of men's and women's general aggression, which points to a more generally aggressive and coercive interpersonal style (e.g., see Corvo & deLara, 2009) rather than having its origins in patriarchy and gender inequality. Their overall conclusions were that IPV, contrary to some feminist assertions, does not have a special etiology and is better understood when studied within the context of general aggression.

Indeed, the initial selection of samples by Johnson (1995), the use of general surveys and those where there was a high proportion of men's violence towards women (e.g., men in treatment programmes, women in shelters), could explain the original findings around gender (Archer, 2009). However, other research utilising larger scale surveys of non-selected samples that have categorised based on this typology have found that men and women are equally likely to categorised as Intimate Terrorists.

When utilising a sample of male victims that would be similarly matched to a shelter sample of women in terms of prevalence and severity of abuse, a stronger pattern of intimate terrorism can also be seen. Hines and Douglas (2010b) examined intimate terrorism in 302 men who had sustained IPV from their female partner and had sought help, matched with a sample of men from the community. Their findings supported the two types of IPV found within Johnson's typology, with the men from the community sample closely matching situational couple violence. For the help-seeking

sample, women perpetrated all types of IPV at a greater rate and they fit the intimate terrorism pattern in the use of control. This group also had higher rates of injury than their female partners. Hines and Douglas concluded that, contrary to many feminist assertions (e.g., Dobash et al., 1992), male victimisation in the form of intimate terrorism is not trivial, and these men need to be able to seek support. Contrary to Johnson's claims, there is also evidence that women perpetrate controlling behaviours and that they are equally likely to be classified as "high control" (e.g., Bates & Graham-Kevan, 2016). Bates (2019a) described extensive experience with coercive control reported by men; this included men "walking on eggshells" (p. 8). Their descriptions of their partner's behaviours would have categorised them as victims of intimate terrorism.

Control within a relationship, and the threats that this involves, is likely to be one barrier that prevents men from leaving abusive relationships. The literature details numerous barriers that men face in reporting their experiences or asking for help, including feelings of shame or embarrassment (e.g., Hogan, 2016), and experiencing gender stereotyped treatment (Machado, Santos, Graham-Kevan & Matos, 2017). Machado, Hines, and Matos (2016) found that male victims used more informal than formal sources of support related to men facing difficulties seeing themselves as victims which impacts on their help-seeking behaviour. For men experiencing abuse who are also fathers, this is exacerbated be either implicit or explicit threats that they will lose their children if they tell anyone or tried to leave (e.g., Bates, 2019a).

This fear of losing their children is significant. For many men, their partners threaten to (or indeed do) manipulate systems that prevent access to their children. This manipulation represents a type of IPV that is thought to be almost unique to men; legal and administrative aggression is defined as when one partner manipulates legal and other administrative systems as a way to hurt their partner (Hines, Douglas & Berger, 2015). It is a type of aggression that is thought to be unique to men due to service provider and system stereotypes (Tilbrook, Allan & Dear, 2010), and is something that men report experiencing more than perpetrating (Hines et al., 2015). It has also been found to be associated with more PTSD and depression symptoms even after controlling for other influences (Berger, Douglas & Hine, 2015).

A key part of the use of legal and administrative aggression for men who are fathers is the real or threatened manipulation of access to children. The previous literature has indicated the use of children as a key coercive tactic, and this indeed affects men and leads them to stay in abusive relationships. Fear of losing contact with the children is one of the most cited reasons for not leaving the relationships from both the academic research (e.g., Hines & Douglas, 2010a; Bates, 2019a) and data from helplines (e.g., Brooks, 2019). Supporting evidence for women's use of legal and

administrative aggression is seen through false allegations of abuse (e.g., Hines & Douglas, 2010b, Bates, 2019b), manipulation of court systems (Hines & Douglas, 2010a), and parental alienation (Bates, 2019c). Many of these experiences with services and systems are related to the stereotypes and perceptions we hold societally about IPV.

Despite the evidence of men's experiences with IPV, we see that the historical norms and perceptions of IPV are still pervasive in the current societal narrative. Our perceptions of gender roles and their associations with violent behaviour have been demonstrated within the research literature as persistent (e.g., Bates, Kaye, Pennington & Hamlin, 2019). Gender-based stereotypes dictate men are dominant, strong, and aggressive which is more compatible with the role of an abuser (Gerber, 1991), with women as weaker, vulnerable, and in need of protection, more in line with the role of a victim. The research has demonstrated that perceptions of IPV differ based on the gender of perpetrator and victim, for example: violence by men towards women is seen as the most serious (e.g., Seelau & Seelau, 2005), women's violence is judged less likely to be illegal (Sorenson & Taylor, 2005), male victims are blamed more (Taylor & Sorenson, 2005), violence against women is judged as more likely to need intervention (Seelau, Seelau & Poorman, 2003), and it is assumed that women's violence has been "provoked" (Scarduzio, Carlyle, Harris & Savage, 2017). Legal and administrative aggression is so impactful because the historical narrative can still be seen through these contemporary empirical examples that are still widespread today.

Post-Separation Abuse

One area of IPV when considering men's experiences for which there is still a lack of research is around how the abuse can change or continue after separation. There is the perception that once the relationship ends so does the abuse, but this is not the case for many men and women. Indeed, for some, relationship separation is a trigger for escalation through continued attempts to control or punishment for rejection (Jaffe, Crooks & Poisson, 2003). The 1999 Canadian General Social Survey revealed that of those who had identified they had been in a violent relationship, 40% of women and 32% of men reported that some violence occurred after the end of the relationship (Hotton, 2001). For 24% of those reporting this post-separation experience, the violence had become more serious than before and for 39% the violence began after the end of the relationship. Indeed, other research has found that a previous history of violence is negatively related to separation-based violence, which challenges the notion that post-separation abuse is simply a continuation of IPV behaviours (Spiwak & Brownridge, 2005). Post-separation abusive behaviours are also seen within the stalking literature where ex-intimate partners are estimated to make up 50-60% of stalkers (Douglas & Dutton, 2001), with typologies representing the continuum

of behaviour from trying to reconnect, to violent confrontation (Burgess et al., 1997). The issue of post-separation harassment and abuse could be considered to be exacerbated when there are children present.

Less has been explored in terms of men's experiences with post-separation IPV. In one of the only such studies, Bates (2019c) reports findings from an interview-based study with 13 men who had experienced (and for some continued to experience) post-separation abuse. The men in this study reported that they had experienced continued harassment (for some over a period of years), experiences with false allegations (e.g., of IPV or rape), and experiences with having their relationship with their children manipulated either through withholding contact or through alienating behaviours. Parental alienation is a result of a child becoming alienated from a parent through the other parent (here the mother) manipulating the child as a way to control interactions with the other (target) parent (in this case, the father). Critics argue that the term is oversimplifying what are complex and challenging cases, and risks obscuring dangerous behaviour by target parents (e.g., Kelly & Johnston, 2001; Bruch, 2001). Indeed, the evidence for this is mixed and often grounded in anecdotal evidence; as a type of aggression it is often seen as atypical due to a lack of widespread acceptance of the concept (Harman, Kruk & Hines, 2018). Bates (2019c) described men's accounts of their children being used as a weapon, used as part of the abuse, and having their contact withheld. This included one instance where a man described why his daughter was scared of him: "*she is scared of me because she thinks that I have murdered her pet cat, which is not true...that I am going to kill her, her sister and her mother, and bury them in the backyard. That's what this 6 almost 7-year-old has been told, and she believes it*" (see p. 347). There is more evidence needed to better understand the impact on parents and children, as well as how best to intervene and prevent the adverse consequences.

This exploration of post-separation abuse raises some issues about the current legislation in the UK. In 2015, a new law was introduced to criminalise the use of emotional abuse, psychological abuse, and coercive control in the absence of physical violence (see Section 76 of the Serious Crime Act, 2015; Crown Prosecution Service [CPS], 2017). This legislation was welcomed by some as a way to meaningfully acknowledge and address non-physical forms of abuse, especially when the literature details that these behaviours are often the most damaging to victims (e.g., Follingstad et al, 1990). The guidance given around this legislation is that it is appropriate to be considered for those within a romantic or intimate relationship, those who are not in a relationship anymore but are still living together, or where they are members of the same family and are related. The guidance further dictates that for coercive and controlling behaviour that occurs outside of these circumstances, including ex-partners who are no longer living together, the stalking and harassment

legislation should be applied instead. Whilst this latter legislation does cover some behaviours described above (e.g., fear of violence, harassment or continued contact), there are other behaviours that are not captured such as parental alienation, and the manipulation of legal and administrative systems. The advice by the CPS states that "where there is an ongoing relationship then the offence of controlling or coercive behaviour should be considered" (CPS, 2017); for those who are experiencing ongoing post-separation abuse and are also parents, there is an ongoing relationship there that can be manipulated. The literature details the way men and women can influence their partners or ex-partners through the children (e.g., Berger et al., 2015), so there is a relationship and connection that can be manipulated.

Final Thoughts and Recommendations

The evidence reviewed here presents a complex picture of men's experiences with IPV from their female partners. This complexity is seen through their experiences of abuse including physical violence, being attacked when vulnerable, experiences of coercive control, and continued abuse post-separation. Yet there is more research needed to understand how men's experiences are impacted by a gendered system, societal stereotypes, a lack of resources, and male specific factors (e.g., masculinity). A move towards more inclusive research that sees value in exploring the experiences of all perpetrator and victim groups, regardless of gender or sexuality, would be valuable to informing practice.

There is a need for more research that explores men's experiences in more detail and the nuances of how this impacts on their help-seeking behaviour. We need to better understand how to encourage men to come forward and ask for help. Hogan (2016) describes that men feel shame and embarrassment for not meeting gender role expectation in terms of dominant cultural expectations of heterosexual men. In terms of their help-seeking, we see in the research that many men may be eligible to use services, but they may not be perceived by these men as either available or helpful (Tsui, 2014).

Furthermore, we need a better understanding of post-separation experiences for men and women. This type of abuse is still under-researched and yet the evidence suggests it is impactful and has adverse outcomes for victims and their children. This is particularly relevant for men when considering their experiences of legal and administrative manipulation and parental alienation. The current literature on parental alienation is not developed enough to afford an understanding of the issue, its impact, or how we can best intervene to prevent it.

References

Archer, J. (1999). Assessment of the reliability of the conflict tactics scale: A meta analytic review. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 14,* 1263-1289 doi: 10.1177/088626099014012003

Archer, J. (2000). Sex differences in aggression between heterosexual partners: A meta-analytic review. *Psychological Bulletin, 126*, 651-680. doi:10.1037MJ033–2909.I26.5.651

Archer, J. (2009). Does sexual selection explain human sex differences in aggression? *Behavioral and Brain Sciences, 32*, 249-311 doi:10.1017/S0140525X09990951

Babcock, J. C., Green, C. E. & Robie, C. (2004) Does batterer's treatment work? A meta-analytic review of domestic violence treatment. *Clinical Psychology Review, 23*, 1023-1053. doi: 10.1016/j.cpr.2002.07.001

Bates, E. A. (2019a). "Walking on egg shells": A qualitative examination of men's experiences of intimate partner violence. *Psychology of Men & Masculinities*. Advance online publication. doi: 10.1037/men0000203

Bates, E. A. (2019b). "No one would ever believe me": An exploration of the impact of intimate partner violence victimization on men. *Psychology of Men & Masculinities*. Advance online publication. doi: 10.1037/men0000206

Bates, E. A. (2019c). "I am still afraid of her": Men's experiences of post-separation abuse. *Partner Abuse, 10*(3), 3336-358. doi: 10.1891/1946-6560.10.3.336.

Bates, E. A. & Graham-Kevan, N. (2016). Is the presence of control related to help-seeking behavior? A Test of Johnson's Assumptions Regarding Sex-Differences and the Role of Control in Intimate Partner Violence. Partner Abuse, 7(1) 3-25. doi: 10.1891/1946-6560.7.1.3

Bates, E. A., Graham-Kevan, N., & Archer, J. (2014). Testing predictions from the male control theory of men's partner violence. *Aggressive Behavior, 40*(1) 42-55. doi: 10.1002/ab.21499

Bates, E. A., Graham-Kevan, N., Bolam, L. T., & Thornton, A. J. V. (2017). A review of domestic violence perpetrator programs in the UK. *Partner Abuse, 8*, 3-46. doi:10.1891/1946-6560.8.1.3

Bates, E. A., Kaye, L. K., Pennington, C. R., & Hamlin, I. (2019). What about the male victims? Exploring the impact of gender stereotyping on implicit attitudes and behavioural intentions associated with intimate partner violence. *Sex Roles, 81*, 1-15. doi: 10.1007/s11199-018-0949-x

Berger, J. L., Douglas, E. M., & Hines, D. A. (2016). The mental health of male victims and their children affected by legal and administrative partner aggression. *Aggressive behavior*, *42*(4), 346-361.doi: 10.1002/ab.21630

Björkqvist, K. (1994). Sex differences in physical, verbal, and indirect aggression: A review of recent research. *Sex Roles, 30*(3-4), 177-188. doi: 10.1007/BF01420988

Björkqvist, K., Österman, K., & Lagerspetz, K. M. (1994). Sex differences in covert aggression among adults. *Aggressive Behavior, 20*(1), 27-33. doi: 10.1002/1098-2337(1994)20:1<27::AID-AB2480200105>3.0.CO;2-Q

Black, M. C., Basile, K. C., Breiding, M. J., Smith, S. G., Walters, M. L., Merrick, M. T., & Stevens, M. R. (2011). The national intimate partner and sexual violence survey: 2010 summary report. *Atlanta, GA: National Center for Injury Prevention and Control, Centers for Disease Control and Prevention*, *19*, 39-40.

Brooks, M. (2018). Male victims of domestic and partner abuse: 45 key facts. Retrieved from: https://www.mankind.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/2019/09/45-Key-Facts-Male-Victims-March-2019-Final-September-19-revision.pdf

Bruch, C. S. (2001). Parental alienation syndrome and parental alienation: Getting it wrong in child custody cases. *Fam. LQ*, *35*, 527.

Burgess, A. W., Baker, T., Greening, D., Hartman, C. R., Burgess, A. G., Douglas, J. E., & Halloran, R. (1997). Stalking behaviors within domestic violence. *Journal of Family Violence*, *12*(4), 389-403. doi: 10.1023/A:1021931509143

Campbell, A. (2006). Sex differences in direct aggression: What are the psychological mediators?. *Aggression and Violent Behavior*, *11*(3), 237-264. doi: 10.1016/j.avb.2005.09.002

Candela, K. (2016). Protecting the invisible victim: Incorporating coercive control in domestic violence statutes. *Family Court Review, 54*(1), 112-125. doi: 10.1111/fcre.12208

Carney, M. M. & Barner, J. R. (2012). Prevalence of partner abuse: Rates of emotional abuse and control. *Partner Abuse, 3*(3) 286-335. doi: 10.1891/1946-6560.3.3.286

Coker, A. L., Smith, P. H., Bethea, L., King, R. K., & McKeown, R. E. (2000). Physical health consequences of physical and psychological intimate partner violence. *Archives of Family Medicine, 9*, 451-457.

Corvo, K. & deLara (2009) Towards an integrated theory of relational violence: Is bullying a risk factor for domestic violence. *Aggression and Violent Behavior, 15*, 181-190 doi:10.1016/j.avb.2009.12.001

Crown Prosecution Service (2017). Controlling or coercive Behaviour in an intimate or family Relationship: Legal guidance, domestic abuse. Retrieved from: https://www.cps.gov.uk/legal-guidance/controlling-or-coercive-behaviour-intimate-or-family-relationship

DeKeseredy, W., & Schwartz, M. (1998). Measuring the extent of woman abuse in intimate heterosexual relationships: A critique of the Conflict Tactics Scales. *U.S. Department of Justice Violence Against Women Grants Office.* Retrievedfrom:http://www.vawnet.org/research/printdocument.php?doc_id=388&find_type=web_desc_AR

Desmarais, S. L., Reeves, K. A., Nicholls, T. L., Telford, R. P., & Fiebert, M. S. (2012a). Prevalence of physical violence in intimate relationships, Part 1: Rates of male and female victimization. *Partner Abuse, 3*(2), 140-169. doi: 10.1891/1946-6560.3.2.140

Desmarais, S. L., Reeves, K. A., Nicholls, T. L., Telford, R. P., & Fiebert, M. S. (2012b). Prevalence of physical violence in intimate relationships, Part 2: Rates of male and female perpetration. *Partner Abuse, 3*(2), 170-198. doi: 10.1891/1946-6560.3.2.170

Dobash, R.E., & Dobash, R.P. (1979). *Violence against wives: A case against the patriarchy*. London: Open Books

Dobash, R. P. & Dobash, R. E. (2004). Women's violence to men in intimate relationships: Working on a Puzzle. *British Journal of Criminology, 44*, 324-349. doi: 10.1093/bjc/azh026

Dobash, R. P., Dobash, R. E., Wilson, M. & Daly, M. (1992). The myth of sexual symmetry in marital violence. *Social Problems, 39*, 71-91. doi: 10.2307/3096914

Douglas, K. S., & Dutton, D. G. (2001). Assessing the link between stalking and domestic violence. *Aggression and violent behavior*, *6*(6), 519-546. doi: 10.1016/S1359-1789(00)00018-5

Drijber, B. C., Reijnders, U. J., & Ceelen, M. (2013). Male victims of domestic violence. *Journal of Family Violence*, *28*(2), 173-178. doi: 10.1007/s10896-012-9482-9

Dutton (2006). The History of Spouse Assault. In Dutton, D. G. (Ed.) *Rethinking domestic violence* (pp. 3-17) Vancouver: UBS Press.

Ehrensaftt, M. K., Moffitt, T. E. & Caspi, A. (2004). Clinically abusive relationships in an unselected birth cohort: Men's and women's participation and developmental antecedents. *Journal of Abnormal Psychology, 113*, 258-271. doi: 10.1037/0021-843X.113.2.258

Entilli, L., & Cipolletta, S. (2017). When the woman gets violent: the construction of domestic abuse experience from heterosexual men's perspective. *Journal of Clinical Nursing, 26*(15-16), 2328-2341. doi: 10.1111/jocn.13500

Felson, R. B (2002). *Violence & Gender Re-examined*. American Psychological Association, Washington D. C.

Follingstad, D. R., & DeHart, D. D. (2000). Defining psychological abuse of husbands toward wives: Contexts, behaviors, and typologies. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 15*(9), 891–920. doi: 10.1177/088626000015009001

Follingstad, D. R., Rutledge, L. L., Berg, B. J., Hause, E. S., & Polek, D. S. (1990). The role of emotional abuse in physically abusive relationships. *Journal of Family Violence*, *5*(2), 107-120. doi: 10.1007/BF00978514

Gass, G. Z., & Nichols, W. C. (1988). Gaslighting: A marital syndrome. *Contemporary Family Therapy*, *10*(1), 3-16. doi: 10.1007/BF00922429

Gelles, R. J. (1974). *The violent home. A study of physical aggression between husbands and wives.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Gelles, R. J. (1997) *Intimate Violence in Families*. (3rd Edition). Thousand Oaks: Sage.

George, M. J. (1994). Riding the donkey backwards: Men as the unacceptable victims of marital violence. *The Journal of Men's Studies, 3* (2) 137-159. doi: 10.1177/106082659400300203

George, M. J. (2002). Skimmington Revisited. *The Journal of Men's Studies, 10*, 111-127. doi: 10.3149/jms.1002.111

George, M. J. (2007). The "great taboo" and the role of patriarchy in husband and wife abuse. *International Journal of Men's Health, 6*, 7-21. doi: 10.3149/jmh.0601.7

Gerber, G. L. (1991). Gender stereotypes and power: Perceptions of the roles in violent marriages. *Sex Roles*, *24*(7-8), 439-458.

Goldenson, J., Geffner, R., Foster, S. L. & Clipson, C. R. (2007). Female domestic violence offenders: Their attachment security, trauma symptoms, and personality organization. *Violence and Victims 22*,532 – 45.

Graham-Kevan, N. & Archer, J. (2003a) Physical aggression and control in heterosexual relationships: The effect of sampling. *Violence and Victims, 18*, 181-196. doi:10.1891/vivi.2003.18.2.181

Graham-Kevan, N. & Archer, J. (2003b) Intimate terrorism and common couple violence: A test of Johnson's prediction in four British samples. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 18*, 1247-1270. doi:10.1177/0886260503256656

Graham-Kevan, N. & Archer, J. (2005). Investigating three explanations of women's relationship aggression. *Psychology of Women Quarterly, 29*, 270-277. doi:10.1111/j.1471-6402.2005.00221.x

Gray, H. M. & Foshee, V. (1997). Adolescent dating violence: Differences between one-sided and mutually violent profiles. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 12*, 126-141. doi: 10.1177/088626097012001008

Hamby, S. L. (2005). Measuring gender differences in partner violence: Implications from research on other forms of violent and socially undesirable behavior. *Sex Roles, 52*, 725-742. doi: 10.1007/s11199-005-4195-7

Hamby, S. L., Poindexter, V. C. & Gray-Little, B. (1996). Four measures of partner violence: Construct similarity and classification differences. *Journal of Marriage and the Family, 58*, 127-139. doi: 10.2307/353382

Harman, J. J., Kruk, E., & Hines, D. A. (2018). Parental alienating behaviors: An unacknowledged form of family violence. *Psychological Bulletin, 144*(12), 1275-1299. doi: 10.1037/bul0000175

Hines, D. A. (2008). Borderline personality traits and intimate partner aggression: An international multisite, cross-gender analysis. *Psychology of Women Quarterly*, *32*(3), 290-302. doi: 10.1111/j.1471-6402.2008.00437.x

Hines, D. A., Brown, J. & Dunning, E. (2007). Characteristics of callers to the domestic abuse helpline for men. *Journal of Family Violence, 22*, 63-72. doi:10.1007/s10896-006-9052-0

Hines, D. A., & Douglas, E. M. (2009). Women's use of intimate partner violence against men: Prevalence, implications, and consequences. *Journal of Aggression, Maltreatment & Trauma*, *18*(6), 572-586.doi: 10.1080/10926770903103099

Hines, D. A., & Douglas, E. M. (2010a). A closer look at men who sustain intimate terrorism by women. *Partner Abuse*, *1*(3), 286-313. doi: 10.1891/1946-6560.1.3.286

Hines, D. A. & Douglas, E. M. (2010b) Intimate terrorism by women towards men: does it exist? Journal of Aggression, Conflict and Peace Research, 2 (3) 36-56. doi: 10.5042/jacpr.2010.0335

Hines, D. A. & Douglas, E. M. (2011). Symptoms of posttraumatic stress disorder in men who sustain intimate partner violence: A study of help-seeking and community samples. *Psychology of Men and Masculinity, 12*, 112-127. doi: 10.1037/a0022983

Hines, D. A., Douglas, E. M., & Berger, J. L. (2015). A self-report measure of legal and administrative aggression within intimate relationships. *Aggressive Behavior*, *41*(4), 295-309. doi: 10.1002/ab.21540

Hines, D. A., & Malley-Morrison, K. (2001). Psychological effects of partner abuse against men: A neglected research area. *Psychology of Men & Masculinity*, *2*(2), 75-85. doi: 10.1037/1524-9220.2.2.75

Hines, D. A., & Saudino, K. J. (2008). Personality and intimate partner aggression in dating relationships: the role of the "Big Five". *Aggressive Behavior: Official Journal of the International Society for Research on Aggression*, *34*(6), 593-604.doi: 10.1002/ab.20277

Hogan, K. (2016). *Men's experiences of female-perpetrated intimate partner violence: A qualitative exploration* (Doctoral dissertation, University of the West of England).

Hotton, T. (2011). Spousal violence after marital separation. *Statistics Canada, 21*(7) Retrieved from: https://www150.statcan.gc.ca/n1/en/pub/85-002-x/85-002-x2001007-eng.pdf?st=5xt1xMI2

Jaffe, P. G., Crooks, C. V., & Poisson, S. E. (2003). Common misconceptions in addressing domestic violence in child custody disputes. *Juvenile and Family Court Journal*, *54*(4), 57-67. doi: 10.1111/j.1755-6988.2003.tb00086.x

Johnson, M. P. (1995). Patriarchal terrorism and common couple violence: Two forms of violence against women. *Journal of Marriage and the Family, 57*, 282-94 doi:10.2307/353683

Johnson, M. P. (2006). Conflict and control: Gender symmetry and asymmetry in domestic violence. *Violence Against Women, 12*, 1003-1018. doi:10.1177/1077801206293328

Kelly, J. B., & Johnston, J. R. (2001). The alienated child: A reformulation of parental alienation syndrome. *Family Court Review*, *39*(3), 249-266. doi: 10.1111/j.174-1617.2001.tb00609.x

Lagdon, S., Armour, C., & Stringer, M. (2014). Adult experience of mental health outcomes as a result of intimate partner violence victimisation: a systematic review. *European Journal of Psychotraumatology, 5*(1), 24794.doi: 10.3402/ejpt.v5.24794

Langhinrichsen-Rohling, J., Misra, T. A., Selwyn, C., & Rohling, M. L. (2012). Rates of bidirectional versus unidirectional intimate partner violence across samples, sexual orientations, and race/ethnicities: A comprehensive review. *Partner Abuse, 3*(2), 199-230. doi: 10.1891/1946-6560.3.2.199

Loring, M. T. (1994). *Emotional abuse*. Lexington Books/Macmillan.

Machado, A., Hines, D., & Matos, M. (2016). Help-seeking and needs of male victims of intimate partner violence in Portugal. *Psychology of Men & Masculinity*, *17*(3), 255. doi: 10.1037/men0000013

Machado, A., Santos, A., Graham-Kevan, N., & Matos, M. (2017). Exploring help seeking experiences of male victims of female perpetrators of IPV. *Journal of Family Violence, 32*(5), 513-523. doi: 10.1007/s10896-016-9853-8

ManKind Initiative (2019). Male Victims of Domestic Abuse and Partner Abuse: Briefing on Gender and Sexuality of Perpetrators. [Online] Available at: https://www.mankind.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/2019/09/Male-Victims-of-Domestic-Abuse-Briefing-on-Gender-and-Sexuality-of-Perpetrators-September-2019.pdf

Marshall, L. L. (1996). Psychological abuse of women: Six distinct clusters. *Journal of Family Violence*, *11*(4), 379-409. doi: 10.1007/BF02333424

Marshall, L. L. (1999). Effects of men's subtle and overt psychological abuse on low-income women. *Violence and Victims*, *14*(1), 69-88.

Martin, D. (1976). *Battered Wives*. New York, NY: Pocket Books.

McHugh, M. C. (2005). Understanding gender and intimate partner abuse. Sex Roles, 52(11-12), 717-724. doi: 10.1007/s11199-005-4194-8

McHugh, M. C., Livingston, N. A. & Ford, A. (2005) A postmodern approach to women's use of violence: Developing multiple and complex conceptualizations. *Psychology of Women Quarterly, 29*, 323-336. doi:10.1111/j.1471-6402.2005.00226.x

Medeiros, A. & Straus, M. A. (2006). Risk factors for physical violence between dating partners: Implications for gender-inclusive prevention and treatment of family violence. In J. Hamel & T. Nicholls (Eds) *Family approaches in domestic violence: A practitioners' guide to gender inclusive research and treatment*. Springer.

Melton, H. C. & Belknap, J. (2003). He hits, she hits: Assessing gender differences and similarities in officially reported intimate partner violence. *Criminal Justice and Behavior, 30*, 328-348. doi: 10.1177/0093854803030003004

Nybergh, L., Enander, V., & Krantz, G. (2016). Theoretical considerations on men's experiences of intimate partner violence: an interview-based study. *Journal of Family Violence*, *31*(2), 191-202. doi: 10.1007/s10896-015-9785-8

Office for National Statistics (2019) Domestic abuse: findings from the Crime Survey for England and Wales: year ending March 2018. [Online] Available at: https://www.ons.gov.uk/peoplepopulationandcommunity/crimeandjustice/articles/domesticabusefindingsfromthecrimesurveyforenglandandwales/yearendingmarch2018#effects-of-partner-abuse-and-medical-support

Pence, E., & Paymar, M. (1993). *Education groups for men who batter: The Duluth model*. New York: Springer Publishing Company.

Pizzey, E. (1974). *Scream quietly or the neighbours will hear*. Baltimore: Penguin Books.

Próspero, M. & Kim, M. (2009) Mutual partner violence: Mental health symptoms among female and male victims in four racial/ethnic groups. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 24*, 2039-2056. doi: 10.1177/0886260508327705

Russell, B. L. (2012). Effectiveness, victim safety, characteristics and enforcement of protection order. *Partner Abuse, 3*(4), 531-552. doi: 10.1891/1946-6560.3.4.531

Sackett, L. A., & Saunders, D. G. (1999). The impact of different forms of psychological abuse on battered women. *Violence and Victims, 14*(1), 105–117.

Saunders, D. G. (1988). Wife abuse, husband abuse, or mutual combat? A feminist perspective on the empirical findings. In K. Yllo & M. Bograd (Eds.), *Feminist perspectives on wife abuse* (pp. 90-113). Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Scarduzio, J. A., Carlyle, K. E., Harris, K. L., & Savage, M. W. (2017). "Maybe she was provoked": Exploring gender stereotypes about male and female perpetrators of intimate partner violence. *Violence against Women, 23*(1), 89-113. doi: 10.1177/1077801216636240

Seelau, S. M., & Seelau, E. P. (2005). Gender-role stereotypes and perceptions of heterosexual, gay and lesbian domestic violence. *Journal of Family Violence, 20*, 363-371. doi:10.1007/s10896-005-7798-4

Seelau, E. P., Seelau, S. M., & Poorman, P. B. (2003). Gender and role-based perceptions of domestic abuse: Does sexual orientation matter?. *Behavioral Sciences & the Law*, *21*(2), 199-214. doi: 10.1002/bsl.524

Smith, S.G., Zhang, X., Basile, K.C., Merrick, M.T., Wang, J., Kresno, M.-J., Chen, J. (2018). National Intimate Partner & Sexual Violence Survey 2015 Data Brief – Updated Release 8-9. https://www.cdc.gov/violenceprevention/pdf/2015data-brief508.pdf

Sorenson, S. B., & Taylor, C. A. (2005). Female aggression toward male intimate partners: An examination of social norms in a community-based sample. *Psychology of Women Quarterly, 29*, 78-96. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1471-6402.2005.00170.x

Spiwak, R., & Brownridge, D. A. (2005). Separated women's risk for violence: an analysis of the Canadian situation. *Journal of Divorce & Remarriage*, *43*(3-4), 105-117. doi:10.1300/J087v43n03_06

Stark, E. (2007). *Coercive control: The entrapment of women in personal life*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Steinmetz, S. K. (1978) The battered husband syndrome. *Victimology, 2,* 499-509.

Stets, J. E. & Straus, R. J. (1989). The marriages license as a hitting license: A comparison of assaults in dating, cohabiting and married couples. In M. A. Straus & R. J. Gelles (Eds.) *Physical violence in American families: Risk factors and adaptations to violence in 8, 145 families* (pp. 227-244) New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction Publishing.

Straight, E. S., Harper, F. W., & Arias, I. (2003). The impact of partner psychological abuse on health behaviors and health status in college women. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, *18*(9), 1035-1054. doi: 10.1177/0886260503254512

Straus, M. A. (1979). Measuring intrafamily conflict and violence: The Conflicts Tactics (CT) scales. *Journal of Marriage and the Family, 41*, 75-88.

Straus, M. A. (1990) The Conflict Tactics Scales and its critics: An evaluation and new data on validity and reliability. In M.A. Straus & R.J. Gelles (Eds.), *Physical Violence in American Families: Risk Factors and Adaptations to Violence in 8,145 Families.* New Brunswick, N.J.: Transaction Publishers

Straus, M. A. (1992). Injury and frequency of assault and the "representative sample fallacy" in measuring wife beating and child abuse. In M. Straus & R. J. Gelles (Eds.), *Physical Violence in American Families* (pp. 75-91). New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction Publishers

Straus, M. A. (2012). Blaming the messenger for the bad news about partner violence by women: The methodological, theoretical, and value basis of the purported invalidity of the Conflict Tactics Scales. *Behavioral Sciences & the Law, 30*(5), 538-556. doi: 10.1002/bsl.2023

Straus, M. A., & Gelles, R. J. (1986). Societal change and in family violence from 1975 to 1985 as revealed by two national surveys. *Journal of Marriage and the Family, 48*, 465-479.

Straus, M. A., Hamby, S. L., Boney-McCoy, S., & Sugarman, D. B. (1996). The revised conflict tactics scales (CTS2) development and preliminary psychometric data. *Journal of Family Issues, 17*(3), 283-316. doi: 10.1177/019251396017003001

Straus, M. A. & Ramirez, I. L. (2004) Criminal history and assault of dating partners: the role of type of prior crime, age of onset, and gender. *Violence and Victims, 19*, 413-434

Street, A. E., & Arias, I. (2001). Psychological abuse and posttraumatic stress disorder in battered women: Examining the roles of shame and guilt. *Violence and Victims*, *16*(1), 65.

Taylor, C. A., & Sorenson, S. B. (2005). Community-based norms about intimate partner violence: Putting attributions of fault and responsibility into context. *Sex Roles*, *53*(7-8), 573-589. doi: 10.1007/s11199-005-7143-7

Tilbrook, E., Allan, A., & Dear, G. (2010). *Intimate partner abuse of men*. Perth, Western Australia: Men's Advisory Network.

Tjaden, P., & Thoennes, N. (1999). *Extent, nature, and consequences of intimate partner violence: Findings from the national violence against women survey*. Washington, DC: National Institute of Justice/Centers for Disease Control and Prevention.

Tsui, V. (2014). Male victims of intimate partner abuse: Use and helpfulness of services. *Social Work*, *59*(2), 121-130. doi: 10.1093/sw/swu007

Walker, L. E. (1979). *The battered woman*. New York: Harper & Row.

Weare, S. (2017). Forced-to-penetrate cases: Lived experiences of men-Baseline Research Findings. Retrieved from: http://wp.lancs.ac.uk/forced-to-penetrate-cases/files/2016/11/Project-Report-Final.pdf

Williamson, E. (2010). Living in the world of the domestic violence perpetrator: Negotiating the unreality of coercive control. *Violence Against Women, 16*(12), 1412-1423. doi: 10.1177/1077801210389162

Yllo, K. A. (1993). Through a feminist lens: Gender, power and violence. In R. J. Gelles and D. R. Loseke (Eds.) *Current Controversies on Family Violence,* Newbury Park, CA.: Sage.