

**#3 Rates of Bi-directional versus Uni-directional Intimate Partner Violence
Across Samples, Sexual Orientations, and Race/Ethnicities:
A Comprehensive Review**

Jennifer Langhinrichsen-Rohling, Tiffany A. Misra, Candice Selwyn, & Martin L. Rohling

Full article available in *Partner Abuse*, Volume 3, Issue 2, 2012

(Article available for free at: <http://www.ingentaconnect.com/content/springer/pa>)

One hotly debated topic within the field of intimate partner violence is the degree to which IPV can be understood as primarily a unidirectional versus bi-directional phenomena. Early studies of IPV predominantly focused on men's perpetration of violence while women's involvement and/or participation in IPV has been largely neglected (Dobash, Dobash, Wilson, & Daly, 1992). However, researchers have increasingly challenged this notion and studies have found that women can and do perpetrate violence at similar or higher rates than men (Archer, 2000). Such findings have led to the gender symmetry versus asymmetry debate. Resolution of this debate has important prevention and intervention implications. In the current study, a comprehensive review of the literature was conducted and 50 studies ($n = 48$ empirical studies; $n = 1$ meta-analysis; $n = 1$ book chapter) that reported rates of bi-directional versus uni-directional violence were uncovered using a variety of search engines and key terms. Included studies were published in 1990 or later, appeared in peer-reviewed journals, and contained empirical data. These studies were then categorized by the nature of the sample they assessed as follows: large population samples (Table 1), smaller community samples (Table 2), University/school samples (Table 3), treatment seeking samples (Table 4), legal/criminal justice related samples (Table 5), and samples assessing the relationships of gay, lesbian, and bi-sexual individuals (GLB) (Table 7, in published manuscript only). Each table contains the rates of bi-directional and uni-directional violence. As reported, among uni-directional violence rates, male-to-female (MFPV) and female-to-male (FMPV) percentages were included or were derived on the basis of data contained within the article. Also, in the corresponding publication, specific additional results were calculated to determine the overall rate of IPV in each sample type. These rates were then weighted by the sample sizes from which they were derived. All studies included in this published review were also entered into an on-line summary table that includes the full reference for the study, the sample size and its characteristics, the study method and design, the measures

used, and the results relevant to the question of the commonality of bi-directional versus uni-directional violence.

According to the results presented in the manuscript that corresponds with this on-line table, among epidemiological/population samples, the average weighted rate of IPV reported was 16.3% (22.1% unweighted). Using weighted averages, among those reporting IPV, 57.9% of the IPV reported was bi-directional. Of the remaining 42.1% that was reported as uni-directional IPV, 13.8% was MFPV, 28.3% was FMPV, and the ratio of uni-directional FMPV to MFPV was 2.05 weighted (2.02 unweighted). Among community samples, the average weighted rate of IPV reported was 47.0%. Using weighted averages, among those reporting IPV, 59.6% was bi-directional. Of the remaining 40.4% that was reported as uni-directional IPV, 17.5% was MFPV, 22.9% was FMPV, and the ratio of uni-directional FMPV to MFPV was 1.30 weighted (1.98 unweighted). Among school and college samples, the average weighted rate of IPV reported was 39.2%. Using weighted averages, among those reporting IPV, 51.9% was bi-directional. Of the remaining 48.1% that was reported as uni-directional IPV, 16.2% was MFPV, 31.9% was FMPV, and the ratio of uni-directional FMPV to MFPV was 1.96 weighted (2.18 unweighted). Among legal or female-oriented clinical/treatment seeking samples that were not associated with the military, the average weighted rate of IPV reported was 70.6%. Using weighted averages, among those reporting IPV, 72.3% was bi-directional. Of the remaining 27.7% that was reported as uni-directional IPV, 13.3% was MFPV, 14.4% was FMPV, and the ratio of uni-directional FMPV to MFPV was 1.09 weighted (1.07 unweighted). Finally, among IPV treatment samples within the U.S. Military and at-risk males samples, the average weighted rate of IPV reported was 99.9%. Using weighted averages, among those reporting IPV, 39.3% was bi-directional. Of the remaining 60.7% that was reported as uni-directional IPV, 43.4% was MFPV, 17.3% was FMPV, and the ratio of uni-directional FMPV to MFPV was .40 weighted (.33 unweighted).

When using unweighted overall rates of IPV, the samples differed significantly. Follow-up comparisons revealed that the overall rate of IPV in school samples did not differ significantly from large population and community samples. All other comparisons of overall rates of violence revealed significant differences with the epidemiological studies yielding the lowest reported rates of IPV and the legal/criminal justice samples yielding the highest rates. When examining rates of bi-directional versus unidirectional IPV, the unweighted bi-directional IPV rates ranged from 49.2% to 69.7% whereas the uni-directional rates ranged from 30.3% to

50.4%. Bi-directional IPV is a prevalent phenomenon. These findings held even though the prevalence of violence differed greatly among the samples studied. This robust result suggests that the role of women in violent relationships is important to consider, even if all aspects of women's perpetration of IPV are not symmetrical to men's perpetration of IPV. Moreover, bidirectional IPV was the most common type of violence for all sample types except the legal/treatment seeking samples of military or at-risk men. However, even among this sample type the uni-directional rate was only slightly higher as compared to the rate of bi-directional violence (50.4% vs. 49.2%, respectively). This again suggests that clinicians and researchers in all settings should be routinely assessing for both perpetration and victimization.

Furthermore, statistical analyses indicated that among the five sample types, the unweighted percentages of bi-directional as compared to uni-directional IPV did not differ significantly. Thus, rates of uni-directional and bi-directional IPV were similar across all five sample types. However, significant differences did emerge within the group of unidirectional IPV perpetrators, such that a significantly higher rate of uni-directional MFPV (38% unweighted) and a significantly lower rate of FMPV (12.4% unweighted) was found among the military treatment/legal samples of males as compared to all other sample types. Post hoc analyses revealed that these rates did not differ from the female-oriented treatment/legal samples. But, in female-oriented treatment/legal samples, the rate of FMPV (15.7% unweighted) was significantly lower as compared to the rate of FMPV in every other sample type. Thus, the ratio of uni-directional female-to-male (FMPV) compared to male-to-female (MFPV) IPV differed significantly among samples with higher rates of female-perpetrated unidirectional violence found in four of the five sample types considered. A higher ratio of male-to-female unidirectional violence was only found in criminal justice/legal studies that relied on police reports of IPV perpetration and/or in samples drawn from the U.S. military. Competing explanations for the differing gender-based ratios were offered in the discussion section of the published manuscript. These considerations need to be systematically varied and tested empirically in order to fully understand differences in the reported expression of IPV across samples and settings.

In further exploratory analyses, differences in the extent of bi-directionality in the expression of IPV were not found across samples of gay, lesbian, or bi-sexual individuals; however, among a limited number of studies, rates of bi-directional violence were found to vary

significantly by race/ethnicity. Specifically, only 50.9% of IPV was bi-directional according to White reporters, as compared to 49.0% among Hispanic reporters, and 61.8% among Black reporters. Significantly different ratios of FMPV to MFPV were also obtained across the ethnic groups such that the ratio was 2.27 for Black reporters, 2.26 for White reporters, and 1.34 for Hispanic reporters. However, it must be noted that these ratios differ dramatically from those reported above when the sample is drawn from the military (0.61 for Black reporters, 0.50 for White reporters, and 0.00 for Hispanic reporters). These findings warrant additional investigation.

In conclusion, our results demonstrate the amount of overall IPV differed significantly among samples, but the percent that was categorized as bi-directional did not. This indicates that bi-directional violence is a common IPV pattern and suggests that women play a larger role in the occurrence of IPV than previously thought. Such findings have considerable implications for assessment, legal, intervention, and preventive efforts. It is suggested that if one resolution of the gender symmetry/asymmetry debate is to argue that there are subtypes of male and female intimate partner violence perpetrators, or that there are different patterns of violence amongst relationships characterized by IPV (Johnson, 2005; Johnson, 2006), researchers and clinicians will need to work together to determine how to reliably and meaningfully make these determinations in ways that will facilitate our ability to effectively prevent and treat all types of IPV.

About the Authors

Jennifer Langhinrichsen-Rohling, Ph.D. is a Professor in the Department of Psychology at the University of South Alabama. Dr. Langhinrichsen-Rohling earned her undergraduate degree in Psychology from Brown University and her M.S. and Ph.D. in Clinical Psychology from the University of Oregon. Dr. Langhinrichsen-Rohling completed her clinical internship at the Palo Alto V.A. and the Stanford Medical Center. She also served as an NIH post-doctoral fellow at The State University of New York Stony Brook where she conducted research, treated distressed and violent couples, volunteered at a local women's shelter, and participated on a NIMH grant to compare the effectiveness of gender-specific versus conjoint treatment for intimate partner violence. Dr. Langhinrichsen-Rohling is an author on over 100 peer reviewed publications and has received many awards both for her research and for her teaching and mentorship of students. Her IPV research has been supported by OJJDP for many years; however, her current research on couple and family resiliency is funded by SAMSHA and NIH.

Contact:

jl@usouthal.edu

Tiffany Misra, M.S. is a 4th year doctoral student in the Combined-Integrated Clinical Counseling Program at the University of South Alabama and is expected to graduate in 2013. Ms. Misra earned her undergraduate degree from the University of Georgia and her M.S. in Applied Psychology from the University of South Alabama. Before pursuing graduate training, Ms. Misra worked in the public health field predominantly with non-profit mental health organizations. While Ms. Misra has worked on research projects that include a variety of topics, currently her specific research interests are in the areas of intimate partner violence, nonsuicidal self-injurious behaviors, and issues concerning social justice. Ms. Misra has been conducting research with Dr. Langhinrichsen-Rohling for 5 years. Ms and her Master's Thesis investigated the perceptions of dating violence by comparing attributions of responsibility within the context of victim-committed sexual versus emotional infidelity. For her dissertation, she is investigating the Interpersonal-Psychological Theory of Suicidal Behavior among self-injurers, specifically

concentrating on the characteristics of self-injury that may increase an individual's acquired capability for suicide.

Contact:

tmiff@aol.com

Candice Selwyn, B.A. received her undergraduate degree in Psychology in 2010 from the University of South Alabama, where she is currently a second year student pursuing a Master of Science degree in Applied Psychology. Over the past three years, Candice has actively pursued research topics associated with her interest in aggressive behaviors. Specifically, she has been involved in research projects investigating issues such as intimate partner violence, psychopathy, non-suicidal self harm, suicide proneness, and suicidal behaviors. She is currently in the process of applying for doctoral programs in both Clinical and Counseling Psychology and ultimately aspires to obtain a career in academia.

Contact:

cns@jaguar1.usouthal.edu

Martin Rohling, Ph.D. received his Ph.D. in Clinical Psychology from the University of Alabama. He is currently a full Professor of Psychology at the University of South Alabama and also is the Director of Clinical Training for USA's Clinical and Community Psychology Ph.D. programs. Dr. Rohling is an expert in brain functioning and behavior. He is a renowned neuropsychologist with numerous empirical publications. He contributed statistical expertise to the current project.

Contact:

mrohling@usouthal.edu

PASK#3 Online Tables – Table 1: The rates of bidirectional versus unidirectional violence as reported in large population samples

Study (full reference)	N	Sample Size and Characteristics	Method and Design	Results
---------------------------	---	------------------------------------	-------------------	---------

Abbreviations:

IPV: Intimate Partner Violence

MFPV/UM: Male to Female perpetrated violence

FPP: Female primary perpetrator (type of mutual violence)

SYM: symmetrical

FMPV/UF: Female to Male perpetrated violence

MPV: Mutual Partner Violence

MPP: Male primary perpetrator (type of mutual violence)

Table 1: The rates of bidirectional versus unidirectional violence as reported in large population samples

Reference	n	Sample Characteristics	Methods/Design	Results
Stets, J. E. & Straus, M. A. (1989). The marriage license as a hitting license: A comparison of assaults in dating, cohabitating, and married couples. In M.A. Straus & R. J. Gelles (Eds.), <i>Physical violence in American families: Risk factors and adaptations to violence in 8,145 families</i> (pp. 33-52). New Jersey, Transaction Books.	n = 5,005 married couples n = 237 cohabitating couples n = 526 dating couples	Sample type: Dating couples from a University sample along with Married and Cohabitating couples from the National Family Violence Resurvey, which was conducted in 1985 Couple status: Dating, cohabitating, and married Race: N/R Age: NR Income/SES: NR Geography: Large Midwestern University and National sample	Cross-sectional design The CTS was used to assess violence	Percentage of IPV within the total sample = 16% Percentage of no IPV within the total sample = 84% Bidirectional: Overall rate of Bidirectional IPV within total sample = 7.8% Rate of Bidirectional IPV within IPV sample = 48.8% Among dating couples, rate of Bidirectional IPV within IPV sample = 50.0% Among cohabitating couples, rate of Bidirectional IPV within IPV sample = 52.4% Among married couples, rate of Bidirectional IPV within IPV sample = 48.2% Unidirectional: Percentage of Unidirectional IPV within

PASK#3 Online Tables – Table 1: The rates of bidirectional versus unidirectional violence as reported in large population samples

Study (full reference)	N	Sample Size and Characteristics	Method and Design	Results
				<p>the total sample = 8.2% Percentage of MFPV within the total sample = 4.7% Percentage of FMPV within the total sample = 3.5%</p> <p>Percentage of Unidirectional IPV within the IPV sample = 51.2% Percentage of MFPV within the IPV sample = 21.6% Percentage FMPV within the IPV sample = 29.6%</p> <p>Among dating couples, rate of FMPV within IPV sample = 39.4% Among cohabitating couples, rate of FMPV within IPV sample = 26.9% Among married couples, rate of FMPV within IPV sample = 28.6%</p> <p>Among dating couples, rate of MFPV within IPV sample = 10.5% Among cohabitating couples, rate of MFPV within IPV sample = 20.7% Among married couples, rate of MFPV within IPV sample = 23.2%</p>

PASK#3 Online Tables – Table 1: The rates of bidirectional versus unidirectional violence as reported in large population samples

Study (full reference)	N	Sample Size and Characteristics	Method and Design	Results
<p>Umberson, D., Anderson, K., Glick, J., & Shapiro, A. (1998). Domestic violence, personal control, and gender. <i>Journal of Marriage and Family</i>, 60, 442-452. Retrieved from: http://www.jstor.org/stable/353860</p>	<p><i>n</i> = 5,939 Men = 2,660 Women = 3,297</p>	<p>Sample type: Large population sample From National Survey of Families and Households (NSFH2) Couple status: N/R Race: N/R Age: <i>M</i> age = 44.51 yrs Income/SES: Men annual income = \$28,438 Women annual income = \$12,909 Geography: Nationally representative sample of the 48 contiguous United States</p>	<p>Face-to-face interviews were conducted with 10,008 individuals for the NSFH2. Data presented here are from a subsample of individuals within the NSFH2 over the age of 18 years who were involved in ongoing relationships. A single item was used to assess for the occurrence of violence during an argument in the relationship.</p>	<p>Percentage of IPV within the total sample = 7% Percentage of no IPV within the total sample = 93%</p> <p>Bidirectional: Overall rate of Bidirectional IPV within total sample = 4.3% Rate of Bidirectional IPV within IPV sample = 63.8%</p> <p>Unidirectional: Percentage of Unidirectional IPV within the total sample = 2.4% Percentage of MFPV within the total sample = 1.3% Percentage of FMPV within the total sample = 1.1%</p> <p>Percentage of Unidirectional IPV within the IPV sample = 36.2% Percentage of MFPV within the IPV sample = 20.0% Percentage FMPV within the IPV sample = 16.2%</p> <p>Other/Summary: -The sample includes 5,538 individuals who claim that no domestic violence occurred in the previous year and 401 individuals who claim that they or their partner engaged in acts of domestic violence during the previous year. 64% (<i>n</i> = 256) of the cases of domestic violence reported in the NSFH2 involved common couple violence, 15% (<i>n</i> = 61) involved</p>

PASK#3 Online Tables – Table 1: The rates of bidirectional versus unidirectional violence as reported in large population samples

Study (full reference)	N	Sample Size and Characteristics	Method and Design	Results
<p>Kessler, R. C., Molnar, B. E., Feurer, I. D., & Appelbaum, M. (2001). Patterns and mental health predictors of domestic violence in the United States: Results from the National Comorbidity Survey. <i>International Journal of Law and Psychiatry</i>, 24(4-5), 487-508. doi:10.1016/S0160-2527(01)00080-2</p>	<p>$n = 3,537$ Men = 1,738 Women = 1,799</p>	<p>Sample type: Large population sample from the National Comorbidity Survey Couple status: Married or cohabitating couples Race: N/R Income/SES: N/R Age: N/R Geography: National study</p>	<p>Cross-sectional design; Respondents were sampled using a multistage area probability design. Interviews were carried out face-to-face in the homes of respondents. The response rate was 82.4%. The Part II interview phase subsample, which included questions about domestic violence, are used in the current report. The CTS was used to assess violence.</p>	<p>Percentage of Men reporting IPV within the total sample = 20.9% Percentage of Men reporting no IPV within the total sample = 79.1% Percentage of Women reporting IPV within the total sample = 23.9% Percentage of Women reporting no IPV within the total sample = 76.1%</p> <p><u>Minor Violence:</u> Percentage of Men reporting victimization = 18.4% Percentage of Men reporting perpetration = 15.4% Percentage of Women reporting victimization = 17.4% Percentage of Women reporting perpetration = 17.7%</p> <p><u>Severe Violence:</u> Percentage of Men reporting victimization = 5.5% Percentage of Men reporting perpetration = 2.7% Percentage of Women reporting victimization = 6.5% Percentage of Women reporting perpetration = 6.2%</p> <p>Bidirectional: <u>Minor Violence among Women's report,</u></p>

PASK#3 Online Tables – Table 1: The rates of bidirectional versus unidirectional violence as reported in large population samples

Study (full reference)	N	Sample Size and Characteristics	Method and Design	Results
				<p>among Men’s report: Both do same: 10.5%, 11.7% I do more: 0.5%, 0.9% Spouse does more: 1.3% , 0.4%</p> <p><u>Severe Violence among Women’s report, Men’s report:</u> Both do same: 10.5%, 11.7% I do more: 0.5%, 0.9% Spouse does more: 1.3%, 0.4%</p> <p>Unidirectional: <u>Minor Violence among Women’s report:</u> Only spouse (MFPV): 5.1% Only me (FMPV): 5.3% Neither: 77.1%</p> <p><u>Minor Violence among Men’s report:</u> Only spouse (FMPV): 5.4% Only me (MFPV): 2.4% Neither: 79.1%</p> <p><u>Severe Violence among Women’s report:</u> Only spouse (MFPV): 1.9% Only me (FMPV): 1.6% Neither: 91.7%</p> <p><u>Severe Violence among Men’s report:</u> Only spouse (FMPV): 3.0% Only me (MFPV): 0.1% Neither: 94.3%</p>

PASK#3 Online Tables – Table 1: The rates of bidirectional versus unidirectional violence as reported in large population samples

Study (full reference)	N	Sample Size and Characteristics	Method and Design	Results
				<p>Other/Summary:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -17.4% of married or cohabiting women and 18.4% of comparable men in the NCS reported that they were victims of minor physical violence perpetrated by their current spouses or partners. -70.7% of the women who reported minor violence victimization and exactly the same percent of comparable men (70.7%) said that they reciprocated minor violence. A very similar percent of women who admitted perpetrating minor violence reported that their partner reciprocated (69.5%). However, a significantly higher percent of men who admitted perpetrating minor violence said that their partner reciprocated (84.4%, $z = 4.4, p < .001$). -The percent of respondents who reported perpetration of minor violence in the absence of reciprocation from their spouse was less than half as large among men (2.4% of the sample) as women (5.3% of the sample, $z = 3.3, p < .001$). We also see a gender difference in reported relative frequency of minor violence. While the vast majority of both women (85.4%) and men (90.0%) who reported reciprocal minor violence said that frequency is the same for both partners, a significantly higher proportion

PASK#3 Online Tables – Table 1: The rates of bidirectional versus unidirectional violence as reported in large population samples

Study (full reference)	N	Sample Size and Characteristics	Method and Design	Results
				<p>of the women than the men said that their spouse is violent more often than they are (10.6% vs. 3.1%, $z = 2.0, p = .046$).</p> <p>-Comparable results were found for severe violence. The percent of reported women victims who said that they reciprocate (70.8%) is significantly lower than the proportion of reported men perpetrators who said that their partners reciprocate (96.2%, $z = 5.0, p \leq .001$). Furthermore, the proportion of reported women perpetrators who said that their partners reciprocate (74.2%) is significantly higher than the proportion of reported men victims who said that they reciprocate (45.5%, $z = 4.8, p < .001$).</p>
<p>Anderson, K. L. (2002). Perpetrator or victim? Relationships between intimate partner violence and well being. <i>Journal of Marriage and Family</i>, 64, 851-863. doi: 10.1111/j.1741-3737.2002.00851.x</p>	<p>$n = 7,395$ couples Men = 7,395 Women = 7,395</p>	<p>Sample type: Large population sample Couple status: Married and cohabitating Race: N/R Income/SES: N/R Age: N/R Geography: National Survey of Families and Households (NSFH-1)</p>	<p>Cross-sectional design; Single item on self-report questionnaire asked respondents and their partners to indicate whether any of their arguments became physical during the past year.</p>	<p>Percentage of IPV within the total sample, according to men = 10% Percentage of no IPV within the total sample, according to men = 90%</p> <p>Percentage of IPV within the total sample, according to women = 9% Percentage of no IPV within the total sample, according to women = 91%</p> <p>Bidirectional: Percentage of Men reporting Bidirectional IPV within the total sample = 7% Percentage of Men reporting Bidirectional IPV within the IPV sample = 70%</p>

PASK#3 Online Tables – Table 1: The rates of bidirectional versus unidirectional violence as reported in large population samples

Study (full reference)	N	Sample Size and Characteristics	Method and Design	Results
		<p>which covers the contiguous United States. Study oversampled recently married and cohabitating couples</p>		<p>Percentage of Women reporting Bidirectional IPV within the total sample = 6% Percentage of Women reporting Bidirectional IPV within the IPV sample = 66.7%</p> <p>Unidirectional: <u>Percentage of Unidirectional IPV within the total sample, as agreed upon by both men and women = 3%</u> Endorsement of MFPV within the total sample = 1% Endorsement of FMPV within the total sample = 2%</p> <p><u>Overall percentage of men reporting Unidirectional IPV within the IPV sample = 30%</u> Percentage of men reporting MFPV within IPV sample = 20% Percentage of men reporting FMPV within IPV sample = 10%</p> <p><u>Overall percentage of women reporting Unidirectional IPV within the IPV sample = 33%</u> Percentage of women reporting MFPV within IPV sample = 22% Percentage of women reporting FMPV</p>

PASK#3 Online Tables – Table 1: The rates of bidirectional versus unidirectional violence as reported in large population samples

Study (full reference)	N	Sample Size and Characteristics	Method and Design	Results
<p>Galvan, F. H., Collins, R., Kanouse, D. E., Burnam, M. A., Paddock, S. M., Beckman, R., & Mitchell, S. R. (2004). Abuse in the close relationships of people with HIV. <i>AIDS and Behavior</i>, 8(4), 441-451. doi: 10.1007/s10461-004-7328-z</p>	<p><i>n</i> = 1, 421 of people with HIV</p> <p>Overall Men = 917 Hetero-sexual Men = 291 Homo-Sexual Men = 626</p> <p>Women = 504</p> <p>51% of the sample had had a close relations hip in the past</p>	<p>Sample type: Large population sample from the HCSUS (HIV Cost and Services Utilization Study) study from 1996-1997</p> <p>Couple status: N/R</p> <p>Race: 51.4% White 32.6% African Am 12.7% Latino 3.4% Other</p> <p>Income/SES: 0-5,000 = 18.5% 5,001-10,000 = 25.8 10,001-25,000 = 25.3% > 25,000 = 30.5%</p> <p>Age: N/R</p> <p>Geography: Metropolitan or rural areas</p>	<p>Cross-sectional design; Interviews and computer assisted administration of items modeled after CTS assessed IPV perpetration 6 months prior to assessment.</p>	<p>within IPV sample = 11%</p> <p>Percentage of IPV within the total sample = 26.8% Percentage of no IPV within the total sample = 73.2%</p> <p>Bidirectional: Percentage of Bidirectional IPV within the total sample = 12.5% Percentage of Bidirectional IPV within the IPV sample = 48%</p> <p>Unidirectional: Overall percentage of unidirectional violence in total sample = 14.3% Overall percentage of unidirectional violence in IPV sample = 52% Percentage reporting perpetration within the total sample = 20% Percentage reporting victimization within the total sample = 19.7%</p> <p>Other/Summary: -Individuals who reported being African American, younger, a binge drinker, having a current drug dependence history, and having a psychiatric disorder were more likely to report being both perpetrators and victims of abuse. -Latinos also reporting significantly higher</p>

PASK#3 Online Tables – Table 1: The rates of bidirectional versus unidirectional violence as reported in large population samples

Study (full reference)	N	Sample Size and Characteristics	Method and Design	Results
<p>Caetano, R., Ramisetty-Mikler, S., & Field, C.A. (2005). Unidirectional and bidirectional intimate partner violence among White, Black, and Hispanic couples in the United States. <i>Violence and Victims</i>, 20(4), 393-406. doi: 10.1891/vivi.2005.20.4.393</p>	<p>six months</p> <p>$n = 1,440$ couples</p> <p>Men = 1,440 Women = 1,440</p>	<p>Sample type: Large population sample of adults from 48 continental United States</p> <p>Couple status: Married or cohabitating</p> <p>Race: Oversample of Blacks and Hispanics 38.5% White 24.9% Black 36.6% Hispanic</p> <p>Income/SES: N/R</p> <p>Age: N/R</p> <p>Geography: Contiguous 48 US states</p>	<p>Longitudinal design; Data presented here are from Wave I only (see Schafer, Caetano, & Clark, 1998 for more information). Multistage random probability community sample. 1 hour face-to-face interviews conducted in participant's home. The CTS was used to assess violence.</p>	<p>rates of both perpetration and victimization than did Whites or other ethnicities.</p> <p>Percentage of IPV within the total sample = 25% Percentage of no IPV within the total sample = 75%</p> <p>Bidirectional: Percentage of Bidirectional IPV within the total sample = 13% Percentage of Bidirectional IPV within the IPV sample = 50%</p> <p><u>Bidirectional IPV by ethnicity within the total sample:</u> White 8% Black 20% Hispanic 12%</p> <p><u>Bidirectional IPV by ethnicity within the IPV sample:</u> White 44% (46 of 103) Black 61% (72 of 118) Hispanic 45% (63 of 139)</p> <p>Unidirectional: Percentage of Unidirectional IPV within the total sample = 12% Percentage of MFPV within the total sample = 4% Percentage of FMPV within the total</p>

PASK#3 Online Tables – Table 1: The rates of bidirectional versus unidirectional violence as reported in large population samples

Study (full reference)	N	Sample Size and Characteristics	Method and Design	Results
				<p>sample = 8%</p> <p>Percentage of Unidirectional IPV within the IPV sample = 50%</p> <p>Percentage of MFPV within the IPV sample = 15%</p> <p>Percentage of FMPV within the IPV = 34%</p> <p><u>Unidirectional MFPV by ethnicity within the total sample:</u> White 3% Black 3% Hispanic 3%</p> <p><u>Unidirectional FMPV by ethnicity within the total sample:</u> White 7% Black 10% Hispanic 9%</p> <p><u>Unidirectional MFPV by ethnicity within the IPV sample:</u> White 17% (17 of 100 white IPV couples) Black 8% (9 of 118 Black IPV couples) Hispanic 19% (27 of 139 Hispanic IPV couples)</p> <p><u>Unidirectional FMPV by ethnicity within the IPV sample:</u> White 38% (39 of 103) Black 31% (36 of 118)</p>

PASK#3 Online Tables – Table 1: The rates of bidirectional versus unidirectional violence as reported in large population samples

Study (full reference)	N	Sample Size and Characteristics	Method and Design	Results
				<p>Hispanic 35% (49 of 139)</p> <p>Other/Summary:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Unidirectional MFPV occurs at about half of the rate of Unidirectional FMPV -Among Black couples, the rate of Bidirectional partner violence is two times that of Unidirectional FMPV and about six times higher than unidirectional MFPV -About a fifth of the Black couples compared to about a tenth of White and Hispanic couples report that they are involved in a relationship characterized by Bidirectional partner violence. -Rates for Whites and Hispanics are similar across the three types of violence. -Bidirectional IPV is positively associated with younger age, Black ethnicity, men and women alcohol problems, women history of childhood physical abuse, approval of violence as a means for conflict resolution, and number of drinks consumed per week by the women
<p>Field, C. A., & Caetano, R. (2005). Longitudinal model predicting mutual partner violence among White, Black, and Hispanic couples in</p>	<p><i>n</i> = 1,136 couples</p> <p>Men = 1,025 Women = 1,025</p>	<p>Sample type: Large population sample Participants constituted a multistage random probability sample representative of married and cohabiting couples in the 48</p>	<p>Cross-sectional design; Interview asked about child abuse, parental violence, alcohol consumption. The CTS was used to assess violence.</p>	<p>Percentage of IPV within the total 1995 sample = 23%</p> <p>Percentage of no IPV within the total 1995 sample = 87%</p> <p>Percentage of IPV within the total 2000 sample = 19%</p> <p>Percentage of no IPV within the total 2000</p>

PASK#3 Online Tables – Table 1: The rates of bidirectional versus unidirectional violence as reported in large population samples

Study (full reference)	N	Sample Size and Characteristics	Method and Design	Results
<p>the United States general population. <i>Violence and Victims, 20</i>, 499-511. doi: 10.1891/vivi.2005.20.5.499</p>		<p>contiguous in US Couple status: Married & cohabitating Race: 39.6% White 22.6% Black 37.8% Hispanic Income/SES: N/R Age: N/R Geography: 48 states</p>		<p>sample = 81%</p> <p>Bidirectional rates for 1995: Percentage of Bidirectional IPV within the total sample = 11% Percentage of Bidirectional IPV within the IPV sample = 47%</p> <p><u>Percentage of Bidirectional IPV by ethnicity within the IPV sample:</u> White 44% Black 53% Hispanic 43%</p> <p>Unidirectional Rates for 1995: Percentage of Unidirectional IPV within the total sample = 12% Percentage of MFPV within the total sample = 4% Percentage of FMPV within the total sample = 8%</p> <p><u>Percentage of MFPV by ethnicity within the total sample:</u> White 3.6% Black 3.3% Hispanic 5.3%</p> <p><u>Percentage of FMPV by ethnicity within the total sample:</u> White 5.7%</p>

PASK#3 Online Tables – Table 1: The rates of bidirectional versus unidirectional violence as reported in large population samples

Study (full reference)	N	Sample Size and Characteristics	Method and Design	Results
				<p>Black 9.5% Hispanic 9.1%</p> <p>Percentage of Unidirectional IPV within the IPV sample = 53% Percentage of MFPV within the IPV sample = 19% Percentage of FMPV within the IPV sample = 34%</p> <p><u>Percentage of MFPV by ethnicity within the IPV sample:</u> White 22% Black 13% Hispanic 21%</p> <p><u>Percentage of FMPV by ethnicity within the IPV sample:</u> White 34% Black 34% Hispanic 35%</p> <p>Bidirectional rates for 2000: Percentage of Bidirectional IPV within the total sample = 12% Percentage of Bidirectional IPV within the IPV sample = 63%</p> <p><u>Percentage of Bidirectional IPV within the IPV sample:</u> White 64%</p>

PASK#3 Online Tables – Table 1: The rates of bidirectional versus unidirectional violence as reported in large population samples

Study (full reference)	N	Sample Size and Characteristics	Method and Design	Results
				<p>Black 69% Hispanic 60%</p> <p>Unidirectional Rates for 2000: Percentage of Unidirectional IPV within the total sample = 7% Percentage of MFPV within the total sample = 3% Percentage of FMPV within the total sample = 4%</p> <p><u>Percentage of MFPV by ethnicity within the total sample:</u> White 1.1% Black 2.8% Hispanic 5.7%</p> <p><u>Percentage of FMPV by ethnicity within the total sample:</u> White 3.0% Black 5.1% Hispanic 4.5%</p> <p>Percentage of Unidirectional IPV within the IPV sample = 37% Percentage of MFPV within the IPV sample = 16% Percentage of FMPV within the IPV sample = 21%</p> <p><u>Percentage of MFPV by ethnicity within</u></p>

PASK#3 Online Tables – Table 1: The rates of bidirectional versus unidirectional violence as reported in large population samples

Study (full reference)	N	Sample Size and Characteristics	Method and Design	Results
				<p>the IPV sample: White 9% Black 10% Hispanic 23%</p> <p><u>Percentage of FMPV by ethnicity within the IPV sample:</u> White 27% Black 21% Hispanic 42%</p> <p>Other/Summary: -Regardless of ethnicity, the most common form of partner violence in couples reporting partner violence was mutual (MPV). -With regard to mutual violence, Blacks and Hispanics reported this form of violence 17% and 15%, respectively, in comparison to 7% of White couples. These trends are similar to ethnic differences in the various forms of partner violence reported at baseline in 1995. -At follow-up, the difference in prevalence among the various forms of violence across ethnic groups was more pronounced. For example, in 1995 MPV was 1.5 times more likely than FMPV among Black couples and more than 4 times more likely than MFPV. While in 2000, MPV among Black couples was 3 times more likely than</p>

PASK#3 Online Tables – Table 1: The rates of bidirectional versus unidirectional violence as reported in large population samples

Study (full reference)	N	Sample Size and Characteristics	Method and Design	Results
				<p>FMPV and 15 times more likely than MFPV. -MPV among Black couples in comparison to White couples was 2 times more likely in 1995 and 2.5 times more likely in 2000.</p>
<p>Williams, S. L. & Frieze, I. H. (2005). Patterns of violent relationships, psychological distress, and marital satisfaction in a national sample of men and women. <i>Sex Roles</i>, 52, 771-784. doi: 10.1007/s11199-005-4198-4</p>	<p><i>n</i> = 3,519 Men = 1,727 Women = 1,792</p>	<p>Sample type: Large population sample from the National Comorbidity Survey Couple status: N/R Race: N/R Income/SES: N/R Age: N/R Geography: National study</p>	<p>Cross-sectional design; Self report. The CTS was used to assess violence.</p>	<p>Percentage of IPV within the total sample = 18% Percentage of no IPV within the total sample = 82%</p> <p>*Divided into 6 IPV categories: mutually severe, mutually mild, severe Unidirectional victimization or perpetration (excludes mutual cases), or mild Unidirectional victim or perpetration (excludes mutual cases)</p> <p>Bidirectional: Percentage reporting Bidirectional IPV within the total sample = 9.0% Percentage reporting Bidirectional IPV within the IPV sample = 49.0%</p> <p>Percentage of Men reporting Bidirectional IPV within the total sample = 3.6% Percentage of Women reporting Bidirectional IPV within the total sample = 5.4%</p> <p>Percentage of Men reporting Bidirectional</p>

PASK#3 Online Tables – Table 1: The rates of bidirectional versus unidirectional violence as reported in large population samples

Study (full reference)	N	Sample Size and Characteristics	Method and Design	Results
				<p>IPV within the IPV sample = 19%</p> <p>Percentage of Women reporting Bidirectional IPV within the IPV sample = 30%</p> <p>Unidirectional: Percentage of Unidirectional IPV within the total sample = 9%</p> <p>Percentage of Unidirectional IPV within the IPV sample = 51%</p> <p>Overall percentage of MFPV in IPV sample = 20%</p> <p>Overall percentage of FMPV in IPV sample = 31%</p> <p><u>Victimization:</u> Percentage of Women reporting MFPV within the total sample = 2.5%</p> <p>Percentage of Men reporting FMPV within the total sample = 2.5%</p> <p>Percentage of Women reporting MFPV within the IPV sample = 14%</p> <p>Percentage of Men reporting FMPV within the IPV sample = 14%</p> <p><u>Perpetration:</u> Percentage of Men reporting MFPV within the total sample = 1%</p> <p>Percentage Women reporting FMPV within</p>

PASK#3 Online Tables – Table 1: The rates of bidirectional versus unidirectional violence as reported in large population samples

Study (full reference)	N	Sample Size and Characteristics	Method and Design	Results
				<p>the total sample = 3%</p> <p>Percentage of Men reporting MFPV within the IPV sample = 6%</p> <p>Percentage of Women reporting FMPV within the IPV sample = 17%</p> <p>Other/Summary:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -The most frequent pattern of violent relationship was mutually mild (5.4% of total sample or 29% of violent relationships, <i>n</i> = 189), followed by mutually severe violence (3.6% of total sample or 20% of violent relationships, <i>n</i> = 127) and mild perpetration (3.5% of total sample or 19% of violent relationships, <i>n</i> = 122). -There were significant differences in reporting of mutually severe violence by men (2.5%, <i>n</i> = 44) and women (4.6%, <i>n</i> = 83), and similar differences were found in mild perpetration reported by men (2.3%, <i>n</i> = 39) and women (4.7%, <i>n</i> = 83). -Women reported being victims of severe violence more frequently than men reported perpetrating severe violence. Women reported receiving and performing more violence than did men. -There were no significant gender differences for associations between mutual violence and psychosocial

PASK#3 Online Tables – Table 1: The rates of bidirectional versus unidirectional violence as reported in large population samples

Study (full reference)	N	Sample Size and Characteristics	Method and Design	Results
				<p>outcomes, suggesting men and women experience mutual violence similarly.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Of those violent relationships that were considered non- distressed, 26.3 were in mutually severe violent relationships and 25.5 were in mutually mild violent relationships. -Of those reporting poor relationships, 43.1% were in mutually mild violent relationships -Of those in high distress relationships, 30.7% were in mutually mild violent relationships and 18.3% were in mutually severe relationships
<p>Cunradi, C. B. (2007). Drinking level, neighborhood social disorder, and mutual intimate partner violence. <i>Alcoholism: Clinical and Experimental Research</i>, 31(6), 1012-1019. doi: 10.1111/j.1530-0277.2007.00382.x</p>	<p><i>n</i> = 19,035 Men = 8,590 Women = 10,445</p>	<p>Sample type: Large population sample from the 2000 National Household Survey on Drug Abuse (NHSDA) Couple status: Married and cohabitating adults Race: Non-Hispanic black, Hispanic, and Non-Hispanic white Did not report #'s for each ethnicity Income/SES: N/R</p>	<p>Cross-sectional design; One item on a self-report questionnaire was used to measure victimization: “How many times during the past 12 months did your spouse or partner hit or threaten to hit you?” A second question was used to measure perpetration: It was: “How many times during the past 12 months did you hit or threaten to hit your spouse or partner?”</p>	<p>Percentage of IPV within the total sample = 7% Percentage of no IPV within the total sample = 93%</p> <p>Bidirectional: Percentage of Bidirectional IPV within the total sample = 3.3% Percentage of Bidirectional IPV within the IPV sample = 60%</p> <p>Percentage of Men reporting Bidirectional IPV within the total sample = 3.1% Percentage of Men reporting Bidirectional IPV within the IPV sample = 29.4%</p> <p>Percentage of Women reporting</p>

PASK#3 Online Tables – Table 1: The rates of bidirectional versus unidirectional violence as reported in large population samples

Study (full reference)	N	Sample Size and Characteristics	Method and Design	Results
		<p>Age: N/R</p> <p>Geography: National study</p>		<p>Bidirectional IPV within the total sample = 3.2%</p> <p>Percentage of Women reporting Bidirectional IPV within the IPV sample = 30.4%</p> <p>Unidirectional: Percentage of MFPV and FMPV within the total sample = 4.1%</p> <p>Percentage of MFPV and FMPV within the IPV sample = 40%</p> <p><i>*These individuals were excluded and no other rates/numbers were provided about these individuals.</i></p> <p>Other/Summary:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Men who were categorized as having experienced mutual IPV reported a higher mean number of past-12 month drinking days than those who did not experience mutual IPV (86.7 vs 69.3 days). Similar results were seen for women (51.3 vs 36.2 days). -Neighborhood disorder was significantly associated with increased risk for mutual IPV (OR 5 1.61; 95% CI 1.39, 1.87). -Compared with men who were ages 35 years and older, men aged 18 to 25 and 26 to 34, were at a threefold and twofold risk for mutual IPV, respectively. -Regarding other socio-demographic

PASK#3 Online Tables – Table 1: The rates of bidirectional versus unidirectional violence as reported in large population samples

Study (full reference)	N	Sample Size and Characteristics	Method and Design	Results
				<p>factors, non-Hispanic black women were at a 3-fold risk for mutual IPV (OR 5 3.09; 95% CI 1.81, 5.26) compared with non-Hispanic white women. Compared with women who were ages 35 years and older, women aged 18 to 25, and aged 26 to 34, were at a 4- and 2-fold risk for mutual IPV, respectively.</p> <p>-Regarding educational level, women with less than a high school diploma were at elevated risk for mutual IPV (OR 5 3.10; 95% CI 1.71, 5.62) compared with women with at least some college or higher.</p>
<p>Whitaker, D., Haileyesus, T., Swahn, M., & Saltzman, L. (2007). Differences in frequency of violence and reported injury between relationships with reciprocal and nonreciprocal intimate partner violence. <i>American Journal of Public Health, 97</i>, 941-947. doi: 10.2105/AJPH.2005.079020</p>	<p><i>n</i> = 11,370 Men = 5,219 Women = 6,151</p>	<p>Sample type: Large population sample from National Longitudinal Study of Adolescent Health. Wave III during 2001</p> <p>Couple status: 62.7% Never married or living together 24.5% Lived together but not married 12.8% Married</p> <p>Race: 69.9% White 15.1% Black 10.7% Hispanic 4.3% Other</p> <p>Income/SES:</p>	<p>Longitudinal design; Data presented here are from Wave III only. To assess perpetration of physical violence in intimate relationships, 2 questions were asked: "How often in the past year have you threatened your partner with violence, pushed or shoved him-her, or thrown something at him-her that could hurt?," and "How often in the past year have you slapped, hit, or kicked your</p>	<p>Percentage of IPV within the total sample = 24% Percentage of no IPV within the total sample = 76%</p> <p>Bidirectional: Percentage Bidirectional IPV within the total sample = 12% Percentage Bidirectional IPV within the IPV sample = 49.7%</p> <p>Unidirectional: Percentage of Unidirectional IPV in total sample = 12% MFPV reporting Unidirectional IPV within the total sample = 4.7% FMPV reporting Unidirectional IPV within the total sample = 7.7%</p>

PASK#3 Online Tables – Table 1: The rates of bidirectional versus unidirectional violence as reported in large population samples

Study (full reference)	N	Sample Size and Characteristics	Method and Design	Results
		<p>N/R</p> <p>Age: <i>M</i> age = 22 yrs</p> <p>Geography: National sample</p>	<p>partner?" on a scale from 0 to 7.</p> <p>Two parallel questions assessed the partner's perpetration of violence toward the respondent. Injuries from partner violence were assessed with a single question for the perpetration of injuries upon the partner ("How often has partner had an injury, such as a sprain, bruise, or cut because of a fight with you?"), and a parallel question assessed the partner's perpetration of injuries to the respondent.</p>	<p>Percentage of Unidirectional IPV in the IPV sample = 50.3%</p> <p>MFPV reporting Unidirectional IPV within the IPV sample = 14.5%</p> <p>FMPV reporting Unidirectional IPV within the IPV sample = 36.2%</p> <p>Other/Summary:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Women reported a significantly greater proportion of violent relationships that were reciprocal versus nonreciprocal than did men (women = 51.5%; men = 46.9%; $p < .03$). -A greater percentage of women in reciprocally violent relationships perpetrated medium and high levels of violence (29.1% and 13.7%, respectively), than did women perpetrators in non-reciprocally violent relationships (18.9% and 6.1%, respectively). -Injury was more likely when violence was perpetrated by men than by women (men = 28.8% vs women = 18.8%; AOR = 1.30), and in relationships for which IPV was reciprocal versus nonreciprocal (reciprocal = 28.4% vs nonreciprocal = 11.6 %; AOR = 4.41).
Caetano, R., Vaeth, P. A. C., & Ramisetty-Mikler, S. (2008).	<i>n</i> = 1,136 couples	Sample type: Large population sample of the 85% from	Longitudinal design; Data presented here are from Wave II only.	Percentage of IPV within the total sample = 13% Percentage of no IPV within the total

PASK#3 Online Tables – Table 1: The rates of bidirectional versus unidirectional violence as reported in large population samples

Study (full reference)	N	Sample Size and Characteristics	Method and Design	Results
<p>Intimate partner violence victim and perpetrator characteristics among couples in the United States. <i>Violence and Victims</i>, 23, 507-518. doi: 10.1007/s10896-008-9178-3</p>	<p>Men = 1,136 Women = 1,136</p>	<p>Caetano et al., (2005) 72% of these adults were used for Wave 2 Couple status: 95 % Married 5% cohabitating Race: 36% White 20% Black 34% Hispanic 10% Mixed ethnicity Income/SES: N/R Age: Men <i>M</i> age = 52 yrs Women <i>M</i> age = 50 yrs Geography: 48 contiguous US states</p>	<p>Multistage random probability community sample. Wave II from longitudinal study (see Caetano, Ramisetty-Mikler, & Field, 2005 for more information on sample and procedure). 1 hour face-to-face interviews conducted in participant's home. Violence was measured with the CTS.</p>	<p>sample = 87%</p> <p>Bidirectional: Percentage of Bidirectional IPV within the total sample = 8% Percentage of Bidirectional IPV within the IPV sample = 62%</p> <p><u>Percentage of Bidirectional IPV by ethnicity within the total sample:</u> White 7% Black 17% Hispanic 15% Mixed 10%</p> <p><u>Percentage of Bidirectional IPV by ethnicity within the IPV sample:</u> White 63% Black 67% Hispanic 60% Mixed 45%</p> <p>Unidirectional: Percentage of Unidirectional IPV within the total sample = 6% Percentage of MFPV within the total sample = 4% Percentage of FMPV within the total sample = 2%</p> <p>Percentage of Unidirectional IPV within</p>

PASK#3 Online Tables – Table 1: The rates of bidirectional versus unidirectional violence as reported in large population samples

Study (full reference)	N	Sample Size and Characteristics	Method and Design	Results
				<p>the total sample = 38%</p> <p>Percentage of MFPV within the IPV sample = 16%</p> <p>Percentage of FMPV within the IPV sample = 22%</p> <p><u>Percentage of MFPV by ethnicity within the total sample:</u></p> <p>White 1%</p> <p>Black 3%</p> <p>Hispanics 6%</p> <p>Mixed 2%</p> <p><u>Percentage of FMPV by ethnicity within the total sample:</u></p> <p>White 3%</p> <p>Black 5%</p> <p>Hispanics 4%</p> <p>Mixed 9%</p> <p><u>Percentage of MFPV by ethnicity within the IPV sample:</u></p> <p>White 10%</p> <p>Black 12%</p> <p>Hispanic 23%</p> <p>Mixed 9%</p> <p><u>Percentage of FMPV by ethnicity within IPV sample:</u></p> <p>White 27%</p> <p>Black 20%</p>

PASK#3 Online Tables – Table 1: The rates of bidirectional versus unidirectional violence as reported in large population samples

Study (full reference)	N	Sample Size and Characteristics	Method and Design	Results
				<p>Hispanic 16% Mixed 45%</p> <p>Overall/Summary:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Mutual violence was higher than Unidirectional violence in all ethnic groups, but especially so among Blacks and Hispanics. - Employed men and women had particularly high rates of involvement in mutually violent relationships. -Men and women living with their partner were 5 times more likely to have been in a mutually violent relationship than married partners. -For both men and women, length of relationship was associated with perpetration, victimization and mutual violence, with higher rates observed among couples in shorter relationships. -Women with higher levels of powerlessness were more at risk for mutual violence -Women with depression were less likely to than non-depressed women to be in a mutually violent relationship - For women, mutually violent relationships were most likely to occur among Black and Hispanic couples, and least likely to occur among White couples.
McKinney, C. M.,	<i>n</i> = 1615	Sample type:	Longitudinal design;	Percentage of IPV within the total sample =

PASK#3 Online Tables – Table 1: The rates of bidirectional versus unidirectional violence as reported in large population samples

Study (full reference)	N	Sample Size and Characteristics	Method and Design	Results
<p>Caetano, R., Ramisetty-Mikler, S., & Nelson, S. (2008). Childhood family violence and perpetration and victimization of intimate partner violence: Findings from a national population-based study of couples. <i>Annals of Epidemiology</i>, 19(1), 25-32. doi: 10.1016/j.annepidem.2008.08.008</p>	<p>couples Men = 1,615 Women = 1,615</p>	<p>Large population sample of heterosexual couples from the U.S. household population by using multistage cluster sampling Couple status: N/R Race: Non-reciprocal MFPV- 74.8% White Non-reciprocal FMPV- 70.9% White Reciprocal IPV- 61.9% White No IPV- 80.4% White Income/SES: Non-reciprocal MFPV- 45% > \$40,000/year Non-reciprocal FMPV- 44.6% > \$40,000 Reciprocal IPV- 36.5% > \$40,000 No IPV- 48.5% > \$40,000 Age: Non-reciprocal MFPV- 38.7% between ages of 30-39 Non-reciprocal FMPV-</p>	<p>Data presented here are from Wave II only. Wave II data from longitudinal study (see Caetano, Ramisetty-Mikler, & Field, 2005 for more information on sample and procedure). Survey conducted through face to face interviews of couples aged 18 years and older (with an 85% response rate) in the 48 contiguous United States by using a multistage random probability sampling method. Violence was measured with the CTS.</p>	<p>28% Percentage of no IPV within the total sample = 72% <u>Percentage of no IPV by ethnicity within the total sample:</u> White, non-Hispanic 80.4% Black, non-Hispanic 5.7% Hispanic 6.5% Mixed/Other 7.5% Bidirectional: Percentage of Bidirectional IPV within the total sample = 15% Percentage of Bidirectional IPV within the IPV sample = 53% <u>Percentage of Bidirectional IPV by ethnicity within the total sample:</u> White, non-Hispanic 61.9% Black, non-Hispanic 13% Hispanic 7.9% Mixed/Other 17.2% Unidirectional: Percentage of Unidirectional IPV within the total sample = 13% Percentage of MFPV within the total sample = 4% Percentage of FMPV within the total sample = 9%</p>

PASK#3 Online Tables – Table 1: The rates of bidirectional versus unidirectional violence as reported in large population samples

Study (full reference)	N	Sample Size and Characteristics	Method and Design	Results
		<p>31.3% between ages of 30-39 Reciprocal IPV- 39.6% between ages of 30-39 No IPV- 45.8% > 50 years Geography: Texas</p>		<p>Percentage of Unidirectional IPV within the IPV sample = 47% Percentage of MFPV within the IPV sample = 14% Percentage of FMPV within the IPV sample = 33%</p> <p><u>Percentage of MFPV by ethnicity within the total sample:</u> White, non-Hispanic 74.8% Black, non-Hispanic 5.5% Hispanic 10.8% Mixed/Other 9.0%</p> <p><u>Percentage of FMPV by ethnicity within the total sample:</u> White, non-Hispanic 70.9% Black, non-Hispanic 8.7% Hispanic 8.3% Mixed/Other 12.1%</p> <p>Overall/Summary: -Men who experienced severe childhood physical abuse, witnessed interparental threats or physical violence, or experienced severe child-family violence were more than 2 times as likely to engage in reciprocal IPV compared to men with no history of childhood family violence, - For men, a history of moderate childhood</p>

PASK#3 Online Tables – Table 1: The rates of bidirectional versus unidirectional violence as reported in large population samples

Study (full reference)	N	Sample Size and Characteristics	Method and Design	Results						
				<p>physical abuse, or moderate child-family violence was also positively associated with an increased risk of reciprocal IPV</p> <p>-Women who experienced severe child physical abuse or severe child-family violence were more than 3 times as likely to engage in reciprocal IPV compared with women with no childhood family violence history</p> <p>-For women, all other forms of childhood family violence were associated with a greater than 1.5 fold increased risk of reciprocal IPV.</p>						
<p>Straus, M. A. (2008). Dominance and symmetry in partner violence by male and female university students in 32 nations. <i>Children of Youth Services Review</i>, 30, 252-275. doi: 10.1016/j.childyouth.2007.10.004</p>	<p><i>n</i> = 13,609</p>	<p>Sample type: Large population sample from an international study of university students from 68 universities in 32 nations</p> <p>Couple status: Had to have been in a relationship lasting 1 month or more; 9.7% had been in their current relationship for 1 month; 38% from 2-12 months</p> <p>Race: See tables</p> <p>Income/SES: N/R</p>	<p>Cross-sectional design; Dominance scale of the Personal and Relationships Profile. Violence was measured with the CTS2.</p>	<p>Percentage of IPV within the total sample = 31%</p> <p>Percentage of no IPV within the total sample = 69%</p> <p>Bidirectional: Percentage Bidirectional IPV within the total sample = 21%</p> <p>Percentage Bidirectional IPV within the IPV sample = 68.6%</p> <p>Percentage of Bidirectional IPV within the IPV sample:</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="1363 1179 1887 1364"> <thead> <tr> <th data-bbox="1363 1179 1628 1290">National setting</th> <th data-bbox="1628 1179 1887 1290">% Bidirectional within IPV sample</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td data-bbox="1363 1290 1628 1325">Taiwan</td> <td data-bbox="1628 1290 1887 1325">59.4</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="1363 1325 1628 1364">Tanzania</td> <td data-bbox="1628 1325 1887 1364">66.6</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	National setting	% Bidirectional within IPV sample	Taiwan	59.4	Tanzania	66.6
National setting	% Bidirectional within IPV sample									
Taiwan	59.4									
Tanzania	66.6									

PASK#3 Online Tables – Table 1: The rates of bidirectional versus unidirectional violence as reported in large population samples

Study (full reference)	N	Sample Size and Characteristics	Method and Design	Results	
		Age: N/R Geography: World-wide study		Mexico Iran South Africa China Hong Kong Greece South Korea Great Britain Russia India Venezuela Hungary United States New Zealand Belgium Romania Canada Australia Lithuania Japan Israel Germany Guatemala Brazil Switzerland Portugal Netherlands Singapore Malta Sweden	64.8 66.6 56.2 38.8 47.4 58.5 70.9 60.5 62.2 61.5 62.5 42.1 56.6 40.0 48.2 42.4 62.6 52.0 48.4 80.0 61.5 54.3 55.5 70.5 61.9 69.5 47.8 46.1 12.5 25.0

PASK#3 Online Tables – Table 1: The rates of bidirectional versus unidirectional violence as reported in large population samples

Study (full reference)	N	Sample Size and Characteristics	Method and Design	Results															
				<p>Unidirectional: <u>Overall median minor assault rate:</u> Men = 24% Women = 32% <u>Overall median severe assault rates:</u> Men = 8% Women = 11%</p> <p>Percentage of Unidirectional IPV within the total sample = 9.3% Percentage of MFPV within the total sample = 3% Percentage of FMPV within the total sample = 6.6%</p> <p>Percentage of Unidirectional IPV within the IPV sample = 31.3% Percentage of MFPV within the IPV sample = 9.9% Percentage of FMPV within the IPV sample = 21.4%</p> <p>Percentage of MFPV and FMPV within the IPV sample:</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="1332 1141 1922 1365"> <thead> <tr> <th>al setting</th> <th>% MFPV within IPV sample</th> <th>% FMPV w IPV sample</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>n</td> <td>2.7</td> <td>37.8</td> </tr> <tr> <td>nia</td> <td>21.2</td> <td>12.1</td> </tr> <tr> <td>o</td> <td>16.2</td> <td>18.9</td> </tr> <tr> <td></td> <td>16.6</td> <td>16.6</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	al setting	% MFPV within IPV sample	% FMPV w IPV sample	n	2.7	37.8	nia	21.2	12.1	o	16.2	18.9		16.6	16.6
al setting	% MFPV within IPV sample	% FMPV w IPV sample																	
n	2.7	37.8																	
nia	21.2	12.1																	
o	16.2	18.9																	
	16.6	16.6																	

PASK#3 Online Tables – Table 1: The rates of bidirectional versus unidirectional violence as reported in large population samples

Study (full reference)	N	Sample Size and Characteristics	Method and Design	Results		
				South Africa	18.7	25.0
				China	19.7	41.3
				Hong Kong	9.0	43.4
				Greece	24.3	17.0
				South Korea	6.4	22.5
				Great Britain	11.2	28.1
				Russia	7.5	30.1
				India	15.3	23.0
				Venezuela	21.8	15.6
				Hungary	15.7	42.1
				United States	15.2	28.1
				New Zealand	0.0	60.0
				Belgium	18.3	33.3
				Romania	21.2	36.3
				Canada	12.1	25.2
				Australia	20.0	28.0
				Lithuania	15.1	36.3
				Japan	10.0	10.0
				Israel	15.3	23.0
				Germany	17.3	28.2
				Guatemala	16.6	27.7
				Brazil	11.7	17.6
				Switzerland	9.5	28.5
				Portugal	21.7	8.7
				Netherlands	8.7	43.4
				Singapore	7.6	46.1
				Malta	37.5	50.0
				Sweden	37.5	37.5
				Other/Summary:		

PASK#3 Online Tables – Table 1: The rates of bidirectional versus unidirectional violence as reported in large population samples

Study (full reference)	N	Sample Size and Characteristics	Method and Design	Results
				<p>-The most frequent pattern was Bidirectional, i.e., both were violent, followed by uni-directional “women-only” violence.</p> <p>-In all 32 settings, Bidirectional violence was the largest category</p> <p>-In the Bidirectional category, men inflicted more physical injury than women.</p> <p>-Dominance by the male partner was associated with a 3-fold increase in the probability of both partners being violent.</p> <p>-Each additional year of age was associated with a small but statistically significant decrease in the odds of both partners being violent.</p>
<p>Melander, L. A., Noel, H., & Tyler, K. A. (2010). Bidirectional, unidirectional, and nonviolence: A comparison of the predictors among partnered young adults. <i>Violence and Victims</i>, 25, 617-630. doi: 10.1891/0886-6708.25.5.617</p>	<p><i>n</i> = 6,563</p> <p>Men = 2,822</p> <p>Women = 3,741</p>	<p>Sample type: Large population sample drawn from Wave III and consisted of only those who reported having one current romantic relationship</p> <p>Couple status: 48.6% were dating, 26% were cohabiting, and 25% were married.</p> <p>Race: 72% White</p> <p>Income/SES: N/R</p> <p>Age:</p>	<p>Longitudinal design; Data presented here are from Wave III only. Researchers used some measures that were collected in Wave I to analyze qualifying Wave III participants; See Udry (1997) for a more detailed description of the methodological structure of this data set. See also Renner et al. (2010) for a different manuscript derived from this same data set.</p>	<p>Percentage of IPV within the total sample = 25%</p> <p>Percentage of no IPV within the total sample = 75%</p> <p>Bidirectional: Percentage of Bidirectional IPV within the total sample = 13%</p> <p>*Did not report rates by IPV sample</p> <p>Unidirectional: Percentage of perpetration only within the total sample = 7%</p> <p>Percentage of victimization only within the total sample = 5%</p> <p>*Did not report rates by gender</p>

PASK#3 Online Tables – Table 1: The rates of bidirectional versus unidirectional violence as reported in large population samples

Study (full reference)	N	Sample Size and Characteristics	Method and Design	Results
		<p><i>M</i> age = 22 yrs Geography: National sample</p>	<p>Intimate Partner Violence was assessed with two questions about perpetration and two questions about victimization.</p>	<p>*Did not report rates by IPV sample</p> <p>Other/Summary:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Childhood physical abuse was a risk factor for Bidirectional violence and perpetration only - Childhood sexual abuse was a risk factor for Bidirectional violence compared to non violent relationships. -Childhood neglect was a risk factor for victimization -More depression was a risk factor for a Bidirectional violent relationship as compared to a nonviolent relationship. -Cohabiting couples were more likely to experience Bidirectional, perpetration only, and victimization only compared to dating couples. -Women were less likely to experience Bidirectional violence compared to perpetration only and more likely to experience Bidirectional violence than victimization only, $Exp(B) = .22$ and $Exp(B) = 3.67$, respectively. -For those in a violent relationship, alcohol use was associated with Bidirectional violence rather than perpetration only, $Exp(B) = 1.19$. -Additionally, people who have used illicit drugs in the past month were more than twice as likely to be perpetrators only as

PASK#3 Online Tables – Table 1: The rates of bidirectional versus unidirectional violence as reported in large population samples

Study (full reference)	N	Sample Size and Characteristics	Method and Design	Results
				<p>compared to those in nonviolent relationships, $Exp(B) = 2.40$. -Blacks were consistently more likely to be in a violent relationship of any type compared to a nonviolent relationship. For example, Blacks were almost two and a half times more likely to be in a Bidirectional violent relationship compared to a nonviolent relationship, $Exp(B) = 2.46$. Asians and people who were classified as Native American-Other were more likely than Whites to report being in a Bidirectional violent relationship compared to a nonviolent relationship, $Exp(B) = 1.48$ and $Exp(B) = 2.09$, respectively.</p>
<p>Renner, L. & Whitney, S. (2010). Examining symmetry in intimate partner violence among young adults using socio-demographic characteristics. <i>Journal of Family Violence</i>, 25, 91-106. doi: 10.1007/s10896-009-9273-0</p>	<p>$n = 4,895$ Men = 2,196 Women = 2,699</p>	<p>Sample type: Large population sample from the National Longitudinal Study of Adolescent Health (Add Health) data set Couple status: 16.3% married, 16% cohabitating, 67.7% dating. 3.3% bisexual/homosexual, 96.7 % heterosexual Race: 23.5% Black 60.2% White 6.6% Asian</p>	<p>Longitudinal design; Data presented here are from Wave III only. Archival analysis of data from the longitudinal Add Health Survey Wave III cases with information on past romantic relationships over the 6 years from Wave 1 data collection; Only persons who indicated having a romantic relationship with at least one episode of IPV perpetration or</p>	<p>Percentage of IPV within the total sample = 40% Percentage of no IPV within the total sample = 60% The IPV sample ($n = 4,895$) was divided into three subsamples (perpetration-only, victimization only, and Bidirectional) Bidirectional: Physical Violence Only: Percentage of Bidirectional IPV within IPV sample = 59.2% ($n = 2,660$) Percentage of Men reporting Bidirectional IPV within IPV sample = 57.3% ($n = 1,185$) Percentage of Women reporting</p>

PASK#3 Online Tables – Table 1: The rates of bidirectional versus unidirectional violence as reported in large population samples

Study (full reference)	N	Sample Size and Characteristics	Method and Design	Results
		3.8% Native Am 6% Multiracial Income/SES: Average SES = \$14,620 Age: N/R Geography: National sample	victimization were included; If a respondent reported both an occurrence of perpetration and victimization within a certain sub-type of IPV, he or she was considered both a perpetrator and a victim of that type of IPV (Bidirectional). Self report questionnaire measured how often they were victims of threatening, physical, sexual and injury-related IPV. See also Melander et al. (2010) for a different manuscript derived from the same data set.	Bidirectional IPV with IPV sample = 60.7% ($n = 1,475$) Unidirectional Physical Violence Only: Percentage of Unidirectional Violence within the IPV sample = 40.3% Percentage of men reporting MFPV perpetration within the IPV sample = 17.0% Percentage of women reporting FMPV perpetration within the IPV sample = 23.2% Other/Summary: -Bidirectional IPV was much more common than either form of Unidirectional (perpetrator-only or victim-only) IPV.
Roberts, A. L., McLaughlin, K. A., Conron, K. J., & Koenen, K. C. (2011). Adulthood stressors, history of childhood adversity, and risk of perpetration of intimate partner violence. <i>American</i>	$n = 34,653$ Men = 14, 564 Women = 20, 089	Sample type: Large population sample from the National Epidemiologic Survey on Alcohol and Related Conditions (NESARC) Representative sample of the civilian, non-institutionalized population aged 18	Longitudinal design; Data presented here are from Wave II only Archival analysis of data in National Epidemiologic Survey on Alcohol and Related Conditions data primarily from the Wave II follow-up interview	Percentage of IPV within total sample = 7.8% Percentage of no IPV within total sample = 92.2% Bidirectional: Percentage of Bidirectional IPV within the total sample = 3.6% Percentage of Bidirectional IPV within the IPV sample = 45.5%

PASK#3 Online Tables – Table 1: The rates of bidirectional versus unidirectional violence as reported in large population samples

Study (full reference)	N	Sample Size and Characteristics	Method and Design	Results
<p><i>Journal of Preventive Medicine</i>, 40(2), 128-138. doi:10.1016/j.amepre.2010.10.016</p>		<p>years or more residing in the U.S. at Wave 1 in 2001–2002 Couple status: Married or in a romantic relationship in the past year, excluded respondents not in a relationship Race: N/R Income/SES: N/R Age: N/R Geography: National Sample</p>	<p>conducted in 2004 – 2005, which assessed IPV perpetration, childhood adversities, and past-year stressors</p> <p>Violence was measured with a modified version of the CTS that consisted of six questions.</p>	<p>Unidirectional: Percentage of Unidirectional IPV within the total sample = 4.3% Percentage of MFPV within the total sample = 1.4% Percentage of FMPV within the total sample = 2.9%</p> <p>Percentage of Unidirectional IPV within the IPV sample = 54.4% Percentage of MFPV within the IPV sample = 17.3% Percentage of FMPV within the IPV sample = 37.1%</p> <p>Other/Summary: -Men and women reported similar levels of perpetrating the most-severe acts: 0.55% of men and 0.69% of women reported cutting or bruising their partner and 0.41% (SE 0.07, <i>n</i> = 56) of men and 0.34% (SE 0.06, <i>n</i> = 60) of women reported forcing sex. -Serious IPV perpetration was also more common among women than men, with 2.2% of women versus 1.2% of men endorsing serious perpetration.</p>

PASK#3 Online Tables - Table 2: The rate of bidirectional versus unidirectional violence in community or purposive samples

Study (full reference)	N	Sample Size and Characteristics	Method and Design	Results
---------------------------	---	------------------------------------	-------------------	---------

Abbreviations:

IPV: Intimate Partner Violence

MFPV/UM: Male to Female perpetrated violence

FPP: Female primary perpetrator (type of mutual violence)

SYM: symmetrical

FMPV/UF: Female to Male perpetrated violence

MPV: Mutual Partner Violence

MPP: Male primary perpetrator (type of mutual violence)

Table 2: The rate of bidirectional versus unidirectional violence in community or purposive samples

Reference	n	Sample Characteristics	Methods/Design	Results
Kwong, M. J., Bartholomew, K., & Dutton, D. (1999). Gender differences in patterns of relationship violence in Alberta. <i>Canadian Journal of Behavioural Science</i> , 31, 150-160. doi: 10.1037/h0087083	n = 707 Men = 356 Women = 351	Sample type: Community sample in 1987 Couple status: Marital or “marital like relationship” one year prior Race: N/R Income/SES: N/R Age: N/R Geography: Alberta, Canada	Cross-sectional design; The CTS-short form was used to assess violence	Percentage of IPV within the total sample = 29% Percentage of no IPV within the total sample = 71% Bidirectional: Percentage of Bidirectional IPV within the total sample = 16.5% Percentage of (both men and women report) Bidirectional IPV within the IPV sample = 57.1% <u>Men report:</u> Percentage of Bidirectional IPV within the total sample = 9.1% Percentage of Bidirectional IPV within the IPV sample = 31.2% <u>Women report:</u> Percentage of Bidirectional IPV within the total sample = 7.5% Percentage of Bidirectional IPV within the

PASK#3 Online Tables - Table 2: The rate of bidirectional versus unidirectional violence in community or purposive samples

Study (full reference)	N	Sample Size and Characteristics	Method and Design	Results
				<p>IPV sample = 25.9%</p> <p>Unidirectional: Percentage of Unidirectional IPV within the total sample = 12.4% Percentage of MFPV within the total sample = 4.8% Percentage of FMPV within the total sample = 7.6%</p> <p>Percentage of Unidirectional IPV within the IPV sample = 42.9% Percentage of MFPV within the IPV sample = 16.6% Percentage of FMPV within the IPV sample = 26.3%</p> <p><u>Men report:</u> Percentage of MFPV within the total sample = 3.0% Percentage of FMPV within the total sample = 2.7%</p> <p>Percentage of MFPV within the IPV sample = 10.2% Percentage of FMPV within the IPV sample = 9.3%</p> <p><u>Women report:</u> Percentage of MFPV within the total</p>

PASK#3 Online Tables - Table 2: The rate of bidirectional versus unidirectional violence in community or purposive samples

Study (full reference)	N	Sample Size and Characteristics	Method and Design	Results
				<p>sample = 1.8% Percentage of FMPV within the total sample = 5.0%</p> <p>Percentage of MFPV within the IPV sample = 6.3% Percentage of FMPV within the IPV sample = 17.1%</p> <p>Other/Summary: -60% of women who reported perpetration also reported receiving IPV -79% of women who reported receiving also perpetrated violence 76% of men who reported perpetrating also reported receiving violence -77% of men who reported receiving also reported perpetrating violence -women who reported suffering consequences from violence also reported experiencing the highest frequencies of abuse both as perpetrators and victims</p>
Capaldi, D. M., & Owen, L. D. (2001). Physical aggression in a community sample of at-risk young couples: Gender comparisons for high frequency,	n = 318 Men = 159 Women = 159	<p>Sample type: Community sample Oregon Youth Study sample of young men at risk for antisocial behavior who were recruited from schools with a higher than usual</p>	Longitudinal design; Data presented here are from the young adult assessment time period only. Retention rates of the original 206 men averaged	<p>Percentage of IPV within the total sample = 24.3% Percentage of no IPV within the total sample = 76.7%</p> <p>Bidirectional: Percentage of Bidirectional IPV within the total sample = 18%</p>

PASK#3 Online Tables - Table 2: The rate of bidirectional versus unidirectional violence in community or purposive samples

Study (full reference)	N	Sample Size and Characteristics	Method and Design	Results
<p>injury, and fear. <i>Journal of Family Psychology</i>, 15(3), 425-440. doi:10.1037/0893-3200.15.3.425</p>		<p>incidence of delinquency in the neighborhood for the medium-sized metropolitan area. Couple status: 37% Living together 18% Married Race: 90% White Income/SES: 75% lower class/working class Age: Men <i>M</i> age = 21.3 yrs Women <i>M</i> age = 20.8 yrs Geography: Oregon</p>	<p>98% in young adulthood. Data with an intimate partner were collected at two time points, namely late adolescence (17-20 years of age) and young adulthood (20-23 years of age). Only the young adult assessment was used in the current study. The young adult couples' assessment was collected during Year 12 of the study or in Year 13 or Year 14, depending on when the man was in a relationship. Participation for the couples' assessment was 77% (<i>n</i> = 159). All of these assessments involved a women partner. Reasons for nonparticipation included: not having a partner (14%), gave no reason(4%), incarcerated (1%), and other (3%). Violence was measured</p>	<p>Percentage of Bidirectional IPV within the IPV sample = 56.5%</p> <p>Unidirectional: Percentage of Unidirectional IPV within the total sample = 6.3% Percentage of Unidirectional IPV within the IPV sample = 43.5%</p> <p>Percentage of MFPV within the total sample = 1% Percentage of FMPV within the total sample = 5% Percentage of MFPV within the IPV sample = 8.7% Percentage of FMPV within the IPV sample = 34.8%</p> <p>Other/Summary: -The predominant pattern of frequent physical aggression was Bidirectional, such that for just over half of the couples with one frequently physically aggressive partner, both partners were frequently aggressive. -Men in the frequently aggressive and Bidirectional group were significantly higher in antisocial behavior than those in the partner-only frequently aggressive or both partners low-frequency group.</p>

PASK#3 Online Tables - Table 2: The rate of bidirectional versus unidirectional violence in community or purposive samples

Study (full reference)	N	Sample Size and Characteristics	Method and Design	Results
			with the CTS.	-For the women, there was also a significant effect of antisocial behavior by group, $F(3, 155) = 10.73, p < .001$. Women in the frequent and Bidirectional group were significantly higher in antisocial behavior than those in the group in which both partners were infrequently physically aggressive.
<p>Temple, J. R., Weston, R., & Marshall, L. L. (2005). Physical and mental health outcomes of women in nonviolent, unilaterally violent, and mutually violent relationships. <i>Violence and Victims</i>, 20, 355–379. doi: 10.1891/vivi.20.3.335</p>	<p>Phase 1 - $n = 835$ Women only</p> <p>Phase 2 - used 535 of the 835 Women participants from Phase I</p>	<p>Sample type: Community sample Data used was from project HOW</p> <p>Couple status: 24.1% Dating 34.5% Cohabiting 41.4% Married</p> <p>Race: 36.2% African Am 32.7% Euro-Am 31.1% Mexican Am</p> <p>Income/SES: Average income = 107% of poverty (7% above the threshold)</p> <p>Age: M age = 33.2 yrs</p> <p>Geography: Texas</p>	<p>Longitudinal design; Phase 1 assessed Patterns of IPV. Phase 2 assessed health related outcomes associated with IPV. Violence was measured with Marshall’s (1992) Severity of Violence Against Women Scale. A 46-item checklist was used to indicate threats, physical violence, and sexual aggression sustained by women and their partners was followed by questions about treatment for injury—and Marshall’s Severity of Violence Against Men Scale.</p>	<p>Percentage of IPV within the total sample = 77% Percentage of no IPV within the total sample = 23% ($n = 188$)</p> <p>Within Phase 1, the researchers created groups based on women's reports of physical violence. -Violence was not present (NV) or was unidirectional. -Perpetrated by the Men (UM) or by the Women (UF) -When the violence was Bidirectional, the groups were classified as: -Symmetrical (SYM) -Men Primary Perpetrator (MPP) -Women Primary Perpetrator (FPP)</p> <p>Bidirectional: Percentage of Bidirectional IPV within the total sample = 53% Percentage of FPP within the total sample</p>

PASK#3 Online Tables - Table 2: The rate of bidirectional versus unidirectional violence in community or purposive samples

Study (full reference)	N	Sample Size and Characteristics	Method and Design	Results
				<p>= 5.8% (48 of 832) Percentage of MPP within the total sample = 28.8% (240 of 832) Percentage of SYM within the total sample = 18.6% (155 of 832)</p> <p>Percentage of Bidirectional within the IPV sample = 69% Percentage of FPP within the IPV sample = 7.5% (48 of 644) Percentage of MPP within the IPV sample = 37.3% (240 of 644) Percentage of SYM within the IPV sample = 24.1% (155 of 644)</p> <p>Unidirectional: Percentage of Unidirectional IPV within the total sample = 24% Percentage of MFPV within the total sample = 15.1% (126 of 832) Percentage of FMPV within the total sample = 9% (75 of 832)</p> <p>Percentage of Unidirectional IPV within the IPV sample = 31% Percentage of MFPV within the IPV sample = 19.6% (126 of 644) Percentage of FMPV within the IPV sample = 11.6% (75 of 644)</p>

PASK#3 Online Tables - Table 2: The rate of bidirectional versus unidirectional violence in community or purposive samples

Study (full reference)	N	Sample Size and Characteristics	Method and Design	Results
				<p>Other/Summary:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -The women in the MPP group sustained the most threats, violence, sexual aggression, and psychological abuse. They also reported the most fear. Injury was highest in the MPP and FPP groups. -Women in the MPP group also experienced more severe violence and more frequent psychological abuse than women in the FPP, SYM, or UM groups -Asymmetric Bidirectional IPV was more frequent and severe compared to unidirectional IPV -Among each of the IPV groups, fewer women were in the 2 groups that represented women dominated violence (UF and FPP) than were in the men dominated violence groups. -Women in the MPP group were less optimistic about their health and had the poorest mental health -The same proportion of men and women in the MPP and FPP groups sustained an injury, but more women in the MPP group than men in the FPP group reported an injury
Weston, R., Temple, J., & Marshall, L.L. (2005). Gender symmetry and	<i>n</i> = 835 Women only	Sample type: Community sample First wave of HOW: Health Outcomes of	Longitudinal design; Data presented are from Wave I only. Marshall's Subtle and	Percentage of IPV within the total sample = 77.4% Percentage of no IPV within the total sample = 22.6% (<i>n</i> = 189 of 835).

PASK#3 Online Tables - Table 2: The rate of bidirectional versus unidirectional violence in community or purposive samples

Study (full reference)	N	Sample Size and Characteristics	Method and Design	Results
<p>asymmetry in violent relationships: patterns of mutuality among racially diverse women. <i>Sex Roles</i>, 53, 553-571. doi: 10.1007/s11199-005-7142-8</p>		<p>Women-study began in 1995 Couple status: Required to be in a relationship lasting at least 1 year 21.1% dating 37.5% cohabitating 41.3% legally married Race: 35.5% African Am 31.9% non-Hispanic Euro-Am 32.6% Mexican Am Income/SES: Low income Age: M age = 32.5 yrs Geography: N/R</p>	<p>Overt Psychological Abuse Scale. Marshall’s Severity of Violence Against Women scale. To create groups: “We first had to approximate the severity of each behavior. Therefore, the first step was to multiply each subjective frequency response by its associated weight (shown in the appendix), resulting in a weighted frequency score. Second, we calculated a difference score for each item by subtracting the weighted frequency score of women’s behaviors from their male partners’ behaviors. Third, these difference scores were summed to create total scores that represented differences between partners and women’s violence. A negative</p>	<p>Percentage of SYM within the total sample = 19% (156 of 835) Percentage of FPP within the total sample = 6% (48 of 835) Percentage of MPP within the total sample = 29% (241 of 835) Bidirectional: Percentage of Bidirectional IPV within the total sample = 53% Percentage of Bidirectional IPV within the IPV sample = 68.9% Percentage of SYM within the Bidirectional sample = 35% (156 of 445) Percentage of FPP within the Bidirectional sample = 11% (48 of 445) Percentage of MPP within the Bidirectional sample = 54% (241 of 445) Unidirectional: Percentage of Unidirectional IPV within the total sample = 24% Percentage of Unidirectional IPV within the IPV sample = 31.1% Other/Summary: -More relationships were classified as MPP (54%) than SYM (35%) or FPP (11%).</p>

PASK#3 Online Tables - Table 2: The rate of bidirectional versus unidirectional violence in community or purposive samples

Study (full reference)	N	Sample Size and Characteristics	Method and Design	Results
			<p>difference score indicated women were perpetrating physical IPV more often than they were experiencing physical IPV. As the appendix shows, weights are always higher for men than for women, reflecting the perception that a behavior done by women has less impact than the same behavior done by men. While this would result in difference scores indicating men are more violent if women perceived they and their partners perpetrated the same behaviors with equal frequency, it is possible for difference scores to reflect women are primary perpetrators when they perpetrate behaviors more often than their men partners. For example, if a woman perpetrated the nine least severe acts of violence</p>	<p>-Comparing women's and men's perpetration of several types of IPV (e.g., threats, severe physical), MPP-pattern women experienced all IPV types more often and were more likely to sustain injury than their men partners. -Men in the MPP pattern perpetrated violence, including severe IPV, most often. Consequently, men's IPV in the MPP pattern resulted in proportionately more injuries than those inflicted by their women counterparts in the FPP pattern. -Moreover, in comparing unilateral violence by women to unilateral violence by men, women's IPV was not as severe as men's, even when the women were the sole perpetrators. Results also indicated women's IPV was generally not as frequent or severe as their partners'.</p>

PASK#3 Online Tables - Table 2: The rate of bidirectional versus unidirectional violence in community or purposive samples

Study (full reference)	N	Sample Size and Characteristics	Method and Design	Results
			(i.e., items 20–29 in the appendix) twice when her partner only perpetrated them once, the negative value of the weighted difference score would indicate that she was the primary perpetrator.” “Scores less than –2 were categorized as women primary perpetrator (FPP) ($n = 48$, 10.8%). Scores greater than +2 were categorized as MPP ($n = 241$, 54.2%), with the remainder categorized as symmetrical ($n = 156$, 35.1%).”	
Forgey, M. A., & Badger, L. (2006). Patterns of intimate partner violence among married women in the military: Type, level, directionality, and consequences. <i>Journal of Family Violence, 21</i> , 369-	$n = 248$ Women only	Sample type: Community sample; Enlisted active duty women married to civilian spouses at a large Army Installation Couple status: Married Race: 40% Black 37% White	Cross sectional design; Women reported on themselves and their partners. Violence was measured with the CTS2	Percentage of IPV within the total sample = 59.7% Percentage of no IPV within the total sample = 40.3% <u>Divided sample up into types of violence:</u> Bidirectional symmetrical: both partners perpetrated at equal rates and severity Bidirectional asymmetrical: one partner perpetrated minor acts while the other perpetrated severe acts of IPV

PASK#3 Online Tables - Table 2: The rate of bidirectional versus unidirectional violence in community or purposive samples

Study (full reference)	N	Sample Size and Characteristics	Method and Design	Results
<p>380. doi: 10.1007/s10896-006-9033-3</p>		<p>11% Hispanic 5% Asian Pacific 3% Native Am. 4% Other Income/SES: N/R Age: <i>M</i> age = 29.8 yrs Geography: N/R</p>		<p>Unilateral: only one partner perpetrated IPV</p> <p>Bidirectional: Percentage of Women reporting Bidirectional IPV within the total sample = 45.5% Percentage of Women reporting Bidirectional symmetrical IPV within the total sample = 36.2% Percentage of Women reporting Bidirectional asymmetrical IPV (men severe, women minor) within the total sample = 6.1% Percentage of Women reporting Bidirectional asymmetrical IPV (women severe, men minor) within the total sample = 3.2%</p> <p>Percentage of Women reporting Bidirectional IPV within the IPV sample = 76.3% Percentage of Women reporting Bidirectional symmetrical IPV within the IPV sample = 60.8% Percentage of Women reporting Bidirectional asymmetrical IPV (men severe, women minor) within the IPV sample = 10.1% Percentage of Women reporting</p>

PASK#3 Online Tables - Table 2: The rate of bidirectional versus unidirectional violence in community or purposive samples

Study (full reference)	N	Sample Size and Characteristics	Method and Design	Results
				<p>Bidirectional asymmetrical IPV (women severe, men minor) within the IPV sample = 5.4%</p> <p><u>Percentage of Bidirectional symmetrical severe IPV by ethnicity:</u> White 9.7% Black 10.2% Hispanic 7.4% Other 24.1%</p> <p>Unidirectional: Percentage of Women reporting unidirectional IPV within the total sample = 14.1% Percentage of Women reporting MFPV within the total sample = 10.9% Percentage of Women reporting FMPV within the total sample = 3.2%</p> <p>Percentage of Women reporting unidirectional IPV within the IPV sample = 23.2% Percentage of Women reporting MFPV within the IPV sample = 18.2% Percentage of Women reporting FMPV within the IPV sample = 5.0%</p> <p><u>Unilateral/Bidirectional asymmetrical violence by race:</u></p>

PASK#3 Online Tables - Table 2: The rate of bidirectional versus unidirectional violence in community or purposive samples

Study (full reference)	N	Sample Size and Characteristics	Method and Design	Results
				<p>Inflicted by enlisted women: White = 7.5% Black = 9.2% Hispanic = 0% Other = 3.4%</p> <p>Inflicted by civilian spouse: White = 15.1% Black = 14.3% Hispanic = 33.3% Other = 17.2%</p> <p>Other/Summary: -47.3% of White participants reported no violence -36.7% of Black participants reported no violence -29.6% of Hispanic participants reported no violence -41.4% of participants who described themselves as Other in terms of their race reported no violence</p>
Stanley, J. L., Bartholomew, K., Taylor, T., Oram, D., & Landolt, M. (2006). Intimate violence in male same-sex relationships. <i>Journal of Family Violence</i> ,	n = 69 of the 195 gay or bisexual men who reported at least	<p>Sample type: Community sample Gay and Bisexuals who reported one IPV episode</p> <p>Couple status: 75.4% exclusively gay 20.3% predominately gay</p>	Cross sectional; Semi-structured interview that obtained descriptions of violent episodes. History of Attachments Interview	<p>Percentage of Men reporting IPV within the total sample = 39% Percentage of Men reporting no IPV within the total sample = 61%</p> <p>Only 69 individuals reported data about violence in a men-men gay relationship that could be coded.</p>

PASK#3 Online Tables - Table 2: The rate of bidirectional versus unidirectional violence in community or purposive samples

Study (full reference)	N	Sample Size and Characteristics	Method and Design	Results
<p>21(1), 31-41. doi: 10.1007/s10896-005-9008-9</p>	<p>one IPV experien ce in a relations hip</p>	<p>4.2% varying degrees of bisexuality Race: 44.9% British/Irish/Scottish/W elsh 31.9% Other European Income/SES: Median income range = \$30,000–\$39,000 Age: M age = 38.6 yrs Geography: Vancouver</p>		<p>Bidirectional: Percentage of Men reporting Bidirectional IPV within the total sample = 17% (34 of 195) Percentage of Men reporting Bidirectional IPV within the IPV sample = 50% (34 of 69)</p> <p>Unidirectional: Percentage of Unidirectional IPV within the total sample = 17% Percentage of Men reporting perpetration within the total sample = 7% Percentage of Men reporting of victimization within the total sample = 10%</p> <p>Percentage of Men reporting Unidirectional IPV within the IPV sample = 50% Percentage of Men reporting perpetration within the IPV sample = 22% Percentage of Men reporting victimization within the IPV sample = 28%</p>
<p>Capaldi, D. M., Kim, H. K., & Shortt, J. W. (2007). Observed initiation and reciprocity of physical aggression in young at risk couples.</p>	<p><i>n</i> = 206 couples Men = 206 Women = 206</p>	<p>Sample type: Community sample from Oregon Youth Study Men at risk for delinquency-recruited from higher crime areas</p>	<p>Longitudinal design; Archival analysis of previously collected data from longitudinal study. Interview and self report questionnaire for men and their partners from</p>	<p>Unweighted percentage of IPV in the total sample across time = 35% 56% at T1 38% at T2 27% at T3 19% at T4</p>

PASK#3 Online Tables - Table 2: The rate of bidirectional versus unidirectional violence in community or purposive samples

Study (full reference)	N	Sample Size and Characteristics	Method and Design	Results																											
<p><i>Journal of Family Violence</i>, 22, 101-111. doi: 10.1007/s10896-007-9067-1</p>		<p>Couple status: N/R Race: 90% European Am Income/SES: 75% Lower and working class Age: N/R Geography: Pacific NW</p>	<p>the National Survey of Health and Stress. Men reported on their own rates of perpetration and victimization. Their partners separately reported on their own rates of perpetration and victimization.</p>	<p>Unweighted percentage of no IPV in the total sample across time = 65% 44% at T1 62% at T2 73% at T3 81% at T4</p> <p>Bidirectional: Reciprocation of violence when initiated by men and women during a videotaped discussion:</p> <table border="0"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th>M's initiation %</th> <th>W's recip. rate</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>T1</td> <td>10</td> <td>.25</td> </tr> <tr> <td>T2</td> <td>10</td> <td>.25</td> </tr> <tr> <td>T3</td> <td>7</td> <td>.10</td> </tr> <tr> <td>T4</td> <td>8</td> <td>.50</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>W's initiation% M's recip. rate</p> <table border="0"> <tbody> <tr> <td>46</td> <td>.24</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>28</td> <td>.20</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>20</td> <td>.30</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>11</td> <td>.22</td> <td></td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p><u>Men and Women's reports of perpetration:</u> According to either the men's or their partner's report: At T1, 30.5% of the men and 35.5% of their partners perpetrated violence at least once. At T2, 31% of the men and 39.9% of their partners perpetrated violence</p>		M's initiation %	W's recip. rate	T1	10	.25	T2	10	.25	T3	7	.10	T4	8	.50	46	.24		28	.20		20	.30		11	.22	
	M's initiation %	W's recip. rate																													
T1	10	.25																													
T2	10	.25																													
T3	7	.10																													
T4	8	.50																													
46	.24																														
28	.20																														
20	.30																														
11	.22																														

PASK#3 Online Tables - Table 2: The rate of bidirectional versus unidirectional violence in community or purposive samples

Study (full reference)	N	Sample Size and Characteristics	Method and Design	Results
				<p>at least once. At T3, 23.5% of the men and 27.7% of their partners perpetrated violence at least once At T4 18.6% of the men and 23% of their partners perpetrated violence at least once.</p> <p>Overall/Summary:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The rate of reported violence decreased across the four time periods. -The probability of reciprocation appeared to be relatively equal for men and women at T1 and T2. -However, the women were more likely to initiate physical aggression at all time points. Of the 85 observation sessions in which physically aggressive acts were perpetrated by men, the men’s aggression followed women’s prior aggression in 41% of the sessions. -Of the 170 observation sessions in which physically aggressive acts were committed by women, only 8.2% of the sessions had the women’s aggression following the men’s prior aggression. -Of the 49 observation sessions across the four time points involving mutual physical aggression, 71.4% involved men reciprocating women initiated aggression. Conversely, 28.6% involved women

PASK#3 Online Tables - Table 2: The rate of bidirectional versus unidirectional violence in community or purposive samples

Study (full reference)	N	Sample Size and Characteristics	Method and Design	Results
				<p>reciprocating men initiated aggression. -The average rates of reciprocation across the 4 time points appeared to be similar for men and women. Women and men appeared more likely to report injuries if the couples experienced mutual physical aggression in their interactions.</p>
<p>Jaeger, J. R., Spielman, D., Cronholm, P. F., Applebaum, S., & Holmes, W. C. (2008). Screening male primary care patients for intimate partner violence perpetration. <i>Journal of General Internal Medicine</i>, 23(8), 1152-1156. doi:10.1007/s11606-008-0634-9</p>	<p>n = 128 Men only</p>	<p>Sample type: Community sample Men recruited from primary health provider office Response rate: 36% Couple status: 68% had an intimate partner 66% married 69% currently lived with partner Race: N/R Income/SES: N/R Age: Range = 18–84 yrs M age = 52 yrs Geography: Pennsylvania</p>	<p>Cross-sectional design; Self-report questionnaires given to participants at end of their primary health provider visit and anonymously returned through mail in unmarked pre-stamped envelope. 128 men were screened and 46 of those men returned the survey they were given. The CTS2 was used to assess violence.</p>	<p>Percentage of IPV within the total sample = 31% Percentage of no IPV within the total sample = 69%</p> <p>Bidirectional: Percentage of Bidirectional IPV within the total sample = 8% Percentage of Bidirectional IPV within the IPV sample = 26%</p> <p>Unidirectional: Percentage of Unidirectional IPV within the total sample = 23% Percentage reporting MFPV within the total sample = 9% Percentage reporting FMPV within the total sample = 14%</p> <p>Percentage of Unidirectional IPV within the IPV sample = 74% Percentage reporting MFPV within the IPV sample = 29%</p>

PASK#3 Online Tables - Table 2: The rate of bidirectional versus unidirectional violence in community or purposive samples

Study (full reference)	N	Sample Size and Characteristics	Method and Design	Results
				Percentage reporting FMPV within the IPV sample = 45%
Rhodes, K.V., Houry, D., Cerulli, C., Straus, H., Kaslow, N.J., & McNutt, L. A. (2009). Intimate partner violence and comorbid mental health conditions among urban male patients. <i>Annals of Family Medicine</i> , 7(1), 47-55. doi: 10.1370/afm.936	n = 712 Men only	<p>Sample type: Community sample Emergency department patients</p> <p>Couple status: For the participants who had experienced IPV (IPV Positive): 68.2% Single; 20.5% Separated, Widowed, or Divorced; and 11.2% Married For the participants who had not experienced IPV (IPV Negative): 72.2% Single; 12.9% Separated, Widowed, or Divorced; and 14.9% Married</p> <p>Race: IPV Positive: 9.2% White, 87.7% Black, 0.4% Hispanic,</p>	Cross sectional design; Computer based self assessment health questionnaire; Victimization was assessed using The George Washington University Universal Violence Prevention Screening Protocol; To assess perpetration, the authors used a modified version of a scale developed by the first author that consisted of 8 questions assessing controlling behavior, verbal aggression, attitudes toward physical and sexual aggression, and both physical and sexual abuse of a current partner.	<p>Percentage of IPV within the total sample = 36%</p> <p>Percentage of no IPV within the total sample = 64%</p> <p>Bidirectional: Percentage of Men reporting Bidirectional IPV within the total sample = 11% Percentage of Men reporting Bidirectional IPV within the IPV sample = 30%</p> <p>Unidirectional: Percentage of Unidirectional IPV within the total sample = 25% Percentage of Men reporting MFPV only within the total sample = 5% Percentage of Men reporting FMPV only within the total sample = 20%</p> <p>Percentage of Unidirectional IPV within the IPV sample = 70% Percentage of Men reporting MFPV only within the IPV sample = 15% Percentage of Men reporting FMPV only within the IPV sample = 55%</p>

PASK#3 Online Tables - Table 2: The rate of bidirectional versus unidirectional violence in community or purposive samples

Study (full reference)	N	Sample Size and Characteristics	Method and Design	Results
		0.4% Asian, 2.3% Other IPV Negative: 7.8% White, 90.5% Black, 0.4% Hispanic, 0.2% Asian, 1.1% Other Income/SES: N/R Age: Range = 18-55 IPV Positive <i>M</i> age = 35.4 yrs IPV Negative <i>M</i> age = 35.2 yrs Geography: Southeast US		Other/Summary: -Mental health scores in the clinical range (mod/sev) were highest among those reporting both victimization and perpetration -The prevalence ratios of drug, tobacco, and alcohol use increased as abuse and violence in the relationship increased, with bidirectional IPV having the greatest risk of poor mental health and unhealthy behaviors
Tyler, K.A., Melander, L.A., & Noel, H. (2009). Bidirectional partner violence among homeless young adults: Risk factors and outcomes. <i>Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 24</i> (6), 1014-1035. doi:	<i>n</i> = 199 Men = 119 Women = 80 The final sample consisted of 166	Sample type: Community sample Homeless young adults; Data from the Homeless Young Adult Project Study eligibility required young people to be between the ages of 19 and 25 and homeless. Couple status: N/R	Cross- sectional Respondent Perpetrated Partner Violence Scale based on 14 items from the CTS2 was used to assess violence. An interview was also conducted.	Percentage of IPV within the total sample = 75% Percentage of no IPV within the total sample = 25% Bidirectional: Percentage of Bidirectional IPV within the total sample = 59% Percentage of Bidirectional IPV within the IPV sample = 78.7% Unidirectional:

PASK#3 Online Tables - Table 2: The rate of bidirectional versus unidirectional violence in community or purposive samples

Study (full reference)	N	Sample Size and Characteristics	Method and Design	Results
10.1177/0886260508319364	young adults who were homeless	Race: 80% White Income/SES: N/R Age: M age = 21.45 yrs Geography: Northwestern US		Percentage of Unidirectional IPV within the total sample = 16% Percentage reporting perpetration only within the total sample = 6% Percentage reporting victimization only within the total sample = 10% Percentage of Unidirectional IPV within the IPV sample = 21.3%
Panuzio, J., & DiLillo, D. (2010). Physical, psychological, and sexual intimate partner aggression among newlywed couples: Longitudinal prediction of marital satisfaction. <i>Journal of Family Violence</i> , 25(7), 689-699. doi:10.1007/s10896-010-9328-2	n = 404; 202 couples Men = 202 Women = 202	Sample type: Community sample Heterosexual couples recruited during the first year of marriage Couple status: Married or cohabitating Race: 96% of women and 92% of men = European Am Income/SES: 67.5% < \$60,000/ year Age: Men M age = 27.23 yrs Women M age = 25.75 yrs Geography: Lancaster County, Nebraska	Longitudinal design; Data presented here are from a cross-sectional sample of previously collected longitudinal data. All participants were part of a larger study examining the longitudinal effects of child maltreatment on adult intimate relationships (see DiLillo et al. 2009); however, the current investigation focused exclusively on present marital functioning. The CTS2 was used to assess violence.	Percentage of IPV within the total sample = 36.6% Percentage of no IPV within the total sample = 63.4% Bidirectional: Percentage of Bidirectional IPV within the total sample = 27.2% Percentage of Bidirectional IPV within the IPV sample = 74.3% Unidirectional: Percentage of Unidirectional IPV within the total sample = 9.4% Percentage of MFPV within the total sample = 3% Percentage of FMPV within the total sample = 6.4% Percentage of Unidirectional IPV within

PASK#3 Online Tables - Table 2: The rate of bidirectional versus unidirectional violence in community or purposive samples

Study (full reference)	N	Sample Size and Characteristics	Method and Design	Results
				<p>the IPV sample = 25.7% Percentage of MFPV within the IPV sample = 8.1% Percentage of FMPV within the IPV sample = 17.6%</p> <p>Other/Summary: -directionality of physical IPV was not related to either husband or wife marital satisfaction at T2 and T3</p>
<p>Kelly, B. C., Izienicki, H., Bimbi, D. S., & Parsons, J. T. (2011). The intersection of mutual partner violence and substance use among urban gays, lesbians, and bisexuals. <i>Deviant Behavior, 32</i>(5), 379-404. doi:10.1080/01639621003800158</p>	<p><i>n</i> = 2,200 Men = 1,782 Women = 418</p>	<p>Sample type: Community sample Couple status: 90.3% Gay/Lesbian 9.6% Bisexual Race: 57.1% White 20.2% Latino 12.1% Asian/Pacific Islander 10.6% African American Income/SES: 25.1% \$40, 000 – \$60,000 Age: Range = 18–78 <i>M</i> age = 37.07 yrs Geography: New York City and Los</p>	<p>Cross-sectional design; A cross-sectional street-intercept survey method (Miller et al, 1997) was used to survey 2,200 members of the GLB community at four large GLB community events in New York City and Los Angeles in 2004 through the Sex and Love Project. Participants were asked if they had experienced different forms of physical partner violence by a primary partner in the past five years by answering “yes” or “no” to questions such</p>	<p>Percentage of IPV within the total sample = 44.1% Percentage of no IPV within the total sample = 55.9%</p> <p>Bidirectional: Percentage of Bidirectional IPV within the total sample = 23.4% Percentage of Bidirectional IPV within the IPV sample = 53%</p> <p>Unidirectional: Percentage of Unidirectional IPV within the total sample = 20.7% Percentage of victimization within the total sample = 16.6% Percentage of perpetration within the total sample = 4.1% Percentage of Unidirectional IPV within</p>

PASK#3 Online Tables - Table 2: The rate of bidirectional versus unidirectional violence in community or purposive samples

Study (full reference)	N	Sample Size and Characteristics	Method and Design	Results
		Angeles	as: ‘‘Hit you with fists or an open hand?’’ or ‘‘Thrown something at you?’’ and so on. Similar questions were used to assess IPV perpetration.	<p>the IPV sample = 47.0% Percentage of victimization within the IPV sample = 37.7% Percentage of perpetration within the IPV sample = 9.3%</p> <p>Other/Summary: -Those who reported MPV consistently reported the highest prevalence of drug involvement -For men reporting MPV, they had significantly higher prevalence of alcohol use, cocaine, ecstasy, and substance abuse treatment compared to men with no IPV -For women reporting MPV, they were significantly more likely to report alcohol use and substance abuse treatment compared to those with no IPV</p>

PASK#3 Online Tables – Table 3. The rates of bidirectional versus unidirectional violence as reported in school and university samples

Study (full reference)	N	Sample Size and Characteristics	Method and Design	Results
---------------------------	---	------------------------------------	-------------------	---------

Abbreviations:

IPV: Intimate Partner Violence

MFPV/UM: Male to Female perpetrated violence

FPP: Female primary perpetrator (type of mutual violence)

SYM: symmetrical

FMPV/UF: Female to Male perpetrated violence

MPV: Mutual Partner Violence

MPP: Male primary perpetrator (type of mutual violence)

Table 3: The rates of bidirectional versus unidirectional violence as reported in school and university samples

Reference	n	Sample Characteristics	Methods/Design	Results
Henton, J., Cate, R., Koval, J., Lloyd, S., & Christopher, S. (1983). Romance and Violence in Dating Relationships. <i>Journal of Family Issues</i> , 4(3), 467-482. doi: 10.1177/019251383004003004	n = 644 Boys = 351 Girls = 293	Sample type: High school sample Couple status: N/R Race: N/R Income/SES: N/R Age: M age = 17.1 yrs Geography: Oregon	Cross-sectional design; High school students were administered a self-report questionnaire where they reported incidents of premarital interpersonal violence. The CTS was used to assess violence.	Percentage of IPV within the total sample = 12.1% Percentage of no IPV within the total sample = 81.9% Bidirectional: Percentage of Bidirectional IPV within the total sample = 7.8% Percentage of Bidirectional IPV within the IPV sample = 71.4% Unidirectional: Percentage of Unidirectional within the total sample = 3.1% Percentage MFPV within the total sample = 1.6% Percentage of FMPV within the total sample = 1.6% Percentage of Unidirectional IPV within the IPV sample = 28.6% Percentage of MFPV within the IPV

PASK#3 Online Tables – Table 3. The rates of bidirectional versus unidirectional violence as reported in school and university samples

Study (full reference)	N	Sample Size and Characteristics	Method and Design	Results
				<p>sample = 14.3% Percentage of FMPV within the IPV sample = 14.3%</p> <p>Other/Summary: -Of the total sample, 12.1% reported that they had been involved in a violent premarital relationship as an abuser or victim of abuse. -In 71.4% of the abusive relationships, each partner had been both the victim and aggressor at some point in time. -In 48.7% of the abusive relationships, the respondents perceived that both partners were responsible for “starting” the violence.</p>
<p>Gray, H. M. & Foshee, V. (1997). Adolescent dating violence: Differences between one-sided and mutually violent profiles. <i>Journal of Interpersonal Violence</i>, 12(1), 126-141. doi: 10.1177/088626097012001008</p>	<p><i>n</i> = 77 of 185 students in 6th to 12th grade who reported DV in most recent or current dating</p>	<p>Sample type: 6-12 graders in public middle and high school in 1992 Couple status: All participants reported being in a past or current dating relationship Race: 62% White 35% Black 3% Other Income/SES: N/R Age:</p>	<p>Cross sectional design; Questionnaires-DV profile, Amount of DV, Severity of DV, Injuries, Length of relationship, # of dates, exclusiveness, effects of viol, witnessing spousal abuse, experiencing physical abuse at home, acceptance of DV, experience of violence in past relationship</p>	<p>Percentage of IPV within the total sample = 41.6% Percentage of no IPV within the total sample = 58.4%</p> <p>Bidirectional: Percentage reporting Bidirectional IPV within the total sample = 27.8% Percentage reporting Bidirectional IPV within the IPV sample = 66.2%</p> <p>Unidirectional: Percentage of Unidirectional IPV within the total sample = 14% Percentage reporting victimization only</p>

PASK#3 Online Tables – Table 3. The rates of bidirectional versus unidirectional violence as reported in school and university samples

Study (full reference)	N	Sample Size and Characteristics	Method and Design	Results
	<p>relations hip</p> <p>Boys = 28</p> <p>Girls = 49</p>	<p>N/R</p> <p>Geography: North Carolina</p>		<p>within the total sample = 5.9%</p> <p>Percentage reporting perpetration only within the total sample = 8.1%</p> <p>Percentage of Unidirectional IPV within the IPV sample = 33.8%</p> <p>Percentage reporting victimization only within the IPV sample = 14.3%</p> <p>Percentage reporting perpetration only within the IPV sample = 19.5%</p> <p>Other/Summary:</p> <p><u>Mutually violent group vs. one-sided</u> -sustained & initiated violence, amount of violence, and injuries was significantly higher in mutual IPV</p> <p><u>Mutually violent group vs. victim only</u> -violence sustained, severe types, and injuries was significantly higher in mutual IPV</p> <p><u>Mutually violent group vs. perpetration only</u> -violence initiated and severe types was significantly higher for mutual IPV -mutual IPV had a higher # of past dating partners who were violent vs. perpetration only -Overall, severity sustained was equal to severity initiated for mutual IPV. Adolescents in mutually violent relationships were more accepting of</p>

PASK#3 Online Tables – Table 3. The rates of bidirectional versus unidirectional violence as reported in school and university samples

Study (full reference)	N	Sample Size and Characteristics	Method and Design	Results
<p>Hines, D., & Saudino, K. (2003). Gender differences in psychological, physical, and sexual aggression among college students using the Revised Conflict Tactics Scales. <i>Violence and Victims</i>, 18(2), 197-217. doi : 10.1891/vivi.2003.18.2.197</p>	<p><i>n</i> = 481 Men = 179 Women = 302</p>	<p>Sample type: College sample Couple status: Been in a romantic relationship within the previous 6 months 97% currently dating partners, 3% unmarried, cohabitating Race: 77% White 13% Asian 5% Hispanic 2% Black 3% Other Income/SES: Upper middle class university Age: <i>M</i> age = 19.1 yrs Geography: Northeastern university</p>	<p>Cross-sectional design The CTS2 was used to assess violence.</p>	<p>violence and also sustained and initiated greater amounts of violence.</p> <p>Percentage of IPV within the total sample = 39% Percentage of no IPV within the total sample = 61%</p> <p>Bidirectional: Percentage of Bidirectional IPV within the total sample = 21.0% Percentage of Bidirectional IPV within the IPV sample = 54.3%</p> <p>Unidirectional: Percentage that reported Unidirectional IPV within the total sample = 17.3% Percentage of MFPV within the total sample = 4.8% Percentage of FMPV within the total sample = 12.5%</p> <p>Percentage of Unidirectional IPV within the IPV sample = 44.7% Percentage of MFPV within the IPV sample = 12.4% Percentage of FMPV within the IPV sample = 32.3%</p> <p>Other/Summary: -29% men and 35% of women reported perpetrating physical aggression</p>

PASK#3 Online Tables – Table 3. The rates of bidirectional versus unidirectional violence as reported in school and university samples

Study (full reference)	N	Sample Size and Characteristics	Method and Design	Results
				<p>-25.5% of men and 34% of women reported perpetrating minor aggression -10.5% men and 7.5% women reported perpetrating severe aggression</p>
<p>Orcutt, H. K., Garcia, M., & Pickett, S. M. (2005). Female-perpetrated intimate partner violence and romantic attachment style in a college student sample. <i>Violence and Victims</i>, 20(3), 287-302. doi: 10.1891/vivi.20.3.287</p>	<p><i>n</i> = 457 Women only</p>	<p>Sample type: College sample; undergraduate students Couple status: Only data from women in a dating relationship lasting at least 1 month Race: 61 % White 25% Black 4.8% Latino 6.4% Asian American 4% American Indian 2.4% Other Age: 98% < 24 yrs 53% = 18 yrs Geography: large Midwestern university</p>	<p>Cross-sectional design; Self-report questionnaire. The CTS2 was used to assess violence.</p>	<p>Percentage of IPV within the total sample = 45% Percentage of no IPV within the total sample = 55%</p> <p><u>Percentage of IPV by ethnicity within the total sample:</u> Black 52% White 39% Other 41%</p> <p>Bidirectional: Percentage of Bidirectional IPV within the total sample = 28.5% Percentage of Bidirectional IPV within the IPV sample = 63%</p> <p><u>Percentage of Bidirectional IPV by ethnicity within the total sample:</u> Black 28% White 22% Other 27.6%</p> <p>Unidirectional: Percentage of Unidirectional IPV within the total sample = 16.5% Percentage of MFPV within the total</p>

PASK#3 Online Tables – Table 3. The rates of bidirectional versus unidirectional violence as reported in school and university samples

Study (full reference)	N	Sample Size and Characteristics	Method and Design	Results
				<p>sample = 5.5% Percentage of FMPV within the total sample = 11%</p> <p>Percentage of Unidirectional IPV within the IPV sample = 37% Percentage of MFPV within the IPV sample = 12% Percentage of FMPV within the IPV sample = 25%</p> <p><u>Unidirectional MFPV by ethnicity within the total sample:</u> Black 4% White 6% Other 2.6%</p> <p><u>Unidirectional FMPV by ethnicity within the total sample:</u> Black 10% White 11% Other 11%</p> <p>Other/Summary: -Bidirectionally violent women reported significantly higher rates of perpetration of minor and overall acts of physical assault and overall acts of sexual coercion than Unidirectional perpetrators. -The Bidirectionally violent group reported experiencing significantly</p>

PASK#3 Online Tables – Table 3. The rates of bidirectional versus unidirectional violence as reported in school and university samples

Study (full reference)	N	Sample Size and Characteristics	Method and Design	Results
				<p>higher rates of minor and overall acts of psychological aggression, minor acts of physical assault, and minor and overall acts of sexual coercion than victims alone.</p> <p>-Bidirectionally violent women reported higher rates of inflicted injury than Unidirectionally violent perpetrators.</p> <p>-Seventy-six of the Bidirectionally violent women reported causing no injury to their partners. Of those women, 87% reported no injury was inflicted onto them, 8% reported being victims of minor injury only, and 5% reported being victims of .severe injury (which may also include a minor type) as a result of intimate partner aggression.</p> <p>-Attachment anxiety scores were significantly lower for women in the nonviolent versus the bidirectionally violent group only.</p>
<p>Straus, M. A. & Ramirez, I. L. (2007). Gender symmetry in prevalence, severity, and chronicity of physical aggression against dating partners by university students in Mexico and the United States. <i>Aggressive Behavior</i>,</p>	<p><i>n</i> = 1, 541 Men = 511 Women = 1,030</p>	<p>Sample type: College sample Couple status: New Hampshire: 93.4% Dating 4.3% Engaged 2.3% Married Texas- non Mexican: 71.4% Dating 8.6% Engaged 20.0% Married</p>	<p>Cross-sectional design; Self report data were obtained by administering questionnaires to students in introductory sociology and psychology classes at the Universidad Autonoma de Ciudad Juarez, Mexico, University of Texas at El</p>	<p>Percentage of IPV within the total sample = 34% Percentage of no IPV within the total sample = 64%</p> <p>Bidirectional: Percentage of Bidirectional IPV within the IPV sample = 71.2% Percentage of Bidirectional IPV within the severe IPV sample = 56.6%</p>

PASK#3 Online Tables – Table 3. The rates of bidirectional versus unidirectional violence as reported in school and university samples

Study (full reference)	N	Sample Size and Characteristics	Method and Design	Results
<p>33, 281-290. doi: 10.1002/ab.20199</p>		<p>Texas- Mex Am: 65.5% Dating 13.3% Engaged 21.2% Married Ciudad Juarez: 82.3% Dating 5.6% Engaged 12.0% Married Race: N/R Income/SES: N/R Age: <i>M</i> age: New Hampshire = 19.5 yrs Texas- non Mex = 21.2 yrs Texas- Mex Am = 21.6 yrs Ciudad Juarez = 19.9 yrs Geography: Mexico, Texas, and New Hampshire</p>	<p>Paso, Texas Technological University, and the University of New Hampshire. These are the first four samples assessed with the International Dating Violence Study Survey. The CTS2 was used to measure violence.</p>	<p>New Hampshire Sample (<i>n</i> = 267) Percentage of Bidirectional IPV within the IPV sample = 69.7%</p> <p>Texas: Non-Mexican Sample (<i>n</i> = 62) Percentage of Bidirectional IPV within the IPV sample = 71.0%</p> <p>Texas: Mexican American Sample (<i>n</i> = 95) Percentage of Bidirectional IPV within the IPV sample = 72.6%</p> <p>Mexico Sample (<i>n</i> = 130) Percentage of Bidirectional IPV within the IPV sample = 73.8%</p> <p>Unidirectional: Percentage of Unidirectional IPV within the IPV sample = 28.8% Percentage of MFPV within the IPV sample = 9.8% Percentage of FMPV within the IPV sample = 19.0%</p> <p>Percentage of MFPV within the severe IPV sample = 13.7% Percentage of FMPV within the severe IPV sample = 29.8%</p> <p>New Hampshire Sample (<i>n</i> = 267) Percentage of MFPV within the IPV</p>

PASK#3 Online Tables – Table 3. The rates of bidirectional versus unidirectional violence as reported in school and university samples

Study (full reference)	N	Sample Size and Characteristics	Method and Design	Results
				<p>sample = 9.7% Percentage of FMPV within the IPV sample = 20.6%</p> <p>Texas: Non-Mexican Sample (<i>n</i> = 62) Percentage of MFPV within the IPV sample = 12.9% Percentage of FMPV within the IPV sample = 16.1%</p> <p>Texas: Mexican American Sample (<i>n</i> = 95) Percentage of MFPV within the IPV sample = 7.4% Percentage of FMPV within the IPV sample = 20.0%</p> <p>Mexico Sample (<i>n</i> = 130) Percentage of MFPV within the IPV sample = 10.0% Percentage of FMPV within the IPV sample = 16.2%</p> <p>Other/Summary: -Percentage of men who carried out one or more of the 12 acts assessed by the CTS = 30% -Percentage of women who carried out one or more of the 12 acts assessed by the CTS = 34.6% -Percentage of entire sample (<i>n</i> = 1,541) who carried out one or more of the 12 acts</p>

PASK#3 Online Tables – Table 3. The rates of bidirectional versus unidirectional violence as reported in school and university samples

Study (full reference)	N	Sample Size and Characteristics	Method and Design	Results
<p>Prospero, M. (2008). The effect of coercion on aggression and mental health among reciprocally violent couples. <i>Journal of Family Violence</i>, 23, 195-202. doi: 10.1007/s10896-007-9143-6</p>	<p><i>n</i> = 609 Men = 248 Women = 361</p>	<p>Sample type: College sample; university students Couple status: 82.3% not cohabitating 17.7 cohabitating Required to have an intimate relationship within the past year that lasted at least 3 months Race: 29% White 27% Hispanic 24% Asian 18% African American 2% Other Income/SES: N/R Age: <i>M</i> age = 21.4 yrs Geography: Utah</p>	<p>Cross-sectional design; The CTS2 and the Revised Controlling Behaviors Scale were used to assess for violence and to create groups.</p>	<p>assessed by the CTS = 33.7% -Among the 205 couples with severe aggression, Bidirectional violence was a less common occurrence.</p> <p>Percentage of IPV within the total sample = 47% Percentage of no IPV within the total sample = 53%</p> <p>Used Johnson’s proposed IPV typology (2001) to form categories: -SCV (situational couple violence) both partners are violent and low in coercive control -IT (intimate terrorism) one partner is violent and controlling and the other partner can be violent or not -VR (violent resistance) requires both partners to be violent but only one partner is violent and controlling -MVC (mutual violent control) requires both partners to be violent and high in coercive control</p> <p><u>Percentage within the IPV sample:</u> Percentage reporting SCV = 68% Percentage reporting IT = 7% Percentage reporting VR = 6.7% Percentage reporting MVC = 18.3%</p> <p>Other/Summary:</p>

PASK#3 Online Tables – Table 3. The rates of bidirectional versus unidirectional violence as reported in school and university samples

Study (full reference)	N	Sample Size and Characteristics	Method and Design	Results
				<p>-Participants in the mutual violent control (MVC) group were significantly more likely to report higher physical perpetration, psychological perpetration, and sexual perpetration compared to those in the situational couple violence group (SCV).</p> <p>-Participants in the MVC group were more likely to report higher physical injuries than those in the SCV group</p> <p>-Participants in the MVC group were significantly more likely to report higher anxiety, depression, hostility, somatic symptom, than those in the SVC group.</p>
<p>Swahn, M., Alemdar, M., & Whitaker, D. (2010). Nonreciprocal and reciprocal dating violence and injury occurrence among urban youth. <i>Western Journal of Emergency Medicine</i>, 11(3), 264-268. Retrieved from: http://escholarship.org/uc/item/7s77g3gr</p>	<p><i>n</i> = 4,131 Analyses restricted to 1,158 who reported dating violence</p> <p>Boys = 486 Girls = 570</p>	<p>Sample type: Middle/High school sample Public school students from 16 schools who were in grades 7, 9, 11, 12. All students were living in a high risk community</p> <p>Couple status: N/R</p> <p>Race: N/R</p> <p>Income/SES: N/R</p> <p>Age: N/R</p> <p>Geography:</p>	<p>Cross-sectional design; Data from Youth Violence Survey. Dating violence perpetration and victimization were assessed through two identical 10-item scales to determine if participants had experienced certain forms of violence in the past 12 months. Response options for each scale were as follows: never, 1-3 times, 4-9 times, and 10 or more</p>	<p>Percentage of IPV within the total sample = 25.5% Percentage of no IPV within the total sample = 74.5%</p> <p>Bidirectional: Percentage of Bidirectional IPV within the total sample = 11.5% Percentage of Bidirectional IPV within the IPV sample = 45.1%</p> <p>Percentage of boys reporting Bidirectional IPV within the total sample = 4.6% Percentage of girls reporting Bidirectional IPV within the total sample = 6.9% Percentage of boys reporting Bidirectional IPV within the IPV sample = 38.9%</p>

PASK#3 Online Tables – Table 3. The rates of bidirectional versus unidirectional violence as reported in school and university samples

Study (full reference)	N	Sample Size and Characteristics	Method and Design	Results
		High-risk, urban school district in US	times.	<p>Percentage of girls reporting Bidirectional IPV within the IPV sample = 50.4%</p> <p>Unidirectional: Percentage of Unidirectional within the total sample = 14% Percentage of Unidirectional within the IPV sample = 54.9%</p> <p>Percentage of MFPV only within the total sample = 4.5% Percentage of FMPV only within the total sample = 9.6%</p> <p>Percentage of MFPV only within the IPV sample = 17.5% Percentage of FMPV only within the IPV sample = 37.4%</p> <p>Other/Summary: -There were no statistical significant differences in terms of reciprocity and participants' race/ethnicity or grade level. -Reciprocity was associated with the frequency of violence ($p < .0001$) and of injury occurrence ($p < .00001$), with reciprocal violence associated with more frequent violence and greater injury occurrence.</p>
Testa, M., Hoffman,	$n = 499$	Sample type:	Cohort-sequential design;	Percentage reporting IPV within the total

PASK#3 Online Tables – Table 3. The rates of bidirectional versus unidirectional violence as reported in school and university samples

Study (full reference)	N	Sample Size and Characteristics	Method and Design	Results
<p>J. H., & Leonard, K. E. (2011). Female intimate partner violence perpetration: Stability and predictors of mutual and nonmutual aggression across the first year of college. <i>Aggressive Behavior</i>, 37(4), 362-373. doi:10.1002/ab.20391</p>	<p>Women only</p>	<p>College sample College women freshmen who were recruited from households in Erie County, NY, at the time of high school graduation. The subsample consisted of women from the 2005, 2006, and 2007 cohorts Couple status: N/R Race: 93% White Income/SES: Median household income = \$75,000 Age: N/R Geography: New York</p>	<p>Archival analysis of data gathered from participants who were part of a larger study ($n = 5,978$) that tested the impact of a parent-based intervention designed to reduce college heavy episodic drinking (HED) and sexual assault [see Testa et al., 2010]. Physical aggression was measured with 5 minor violence and 6 severe violence items from the CTS2.</p>	<p>sample = 35% Percentage reporting no IPV within the total sample = 65%</p> <p>Bidirectional: Percentage of Bidirectional IPV within the total sample = 20% Percentage of Bidirectional IPV within the IPV sample = 57%</p> <p>Percentages of IPV within the 99 mutually violent couples: -68.7% reported more frequent female-to-male physical aggression -24.2% reported equal amounts -7.1% reported higher levels of male-to-female aggression</p> <p>Unidirectional: Percentage of Unidirectional IPV within the total sample = 15% Percentage of MFPV within the total sample = 1% Percentage of FMPV within the total sample = 14%</p> <p>Percentage of Unidirectional IPV within the IPV sample = 43% Percentage of MFPV within the IPV sample = 3% Percentage of FMPV within the IPV</p>

PASK#3 Online Tables – Table 3. The rates of bidirectional versus unidirectional violence as reported in school and university samples

Study (full reference)	N	Sample Size and Characteristics	Method and Design	Results
				sample = 41% Other/Summary: -Aggressive acts were more frequent when the aggression was mutual, suggesting that reciprocity contributes to escalation and maintenance of violence.

PASK#3 Online Tables – Table 4: The rates of bidirectional versus unidirectional violence in samples drawn from clinical populations

Study (full reference)	N	Sample Size and Characteristics	Method and Design	Results
---------------------------	---	------------------------------------	-------------------	---------

Abbreviations:

IPV: Intimate Partner Violence

MFPV/UM: Male to Female perpetrated violence

FPP: Female primary perpetrator (type of mutual violence)

SYM: symmetrical

FMPV/UF: Female to Male perpetrated violence

MPV: Mutual Partner Violence

MPP: Male primary perpetrator (type of mutual violence)

Table 4: The rates of bidirectional versus unidirectional violence in samples drawn from clinical populations

Reference	N	Sample Characteristics	Methods/Design	Results
Cascardi, M., Langhinrichsen, J., & Vivian, D. (1992). Marital aggression: Impact, injury, and health correlates for husbands and wives. <i>Archives of Internal Medicine, 152</i> , 1178- 1184. doi:10.1001/archinte. 152.6.1178	n = 93 Couples seeking marital therapy Men = 93 Women = 93	Sample type: Clinical sample; Couples who sought marital therapy at a university marital clinic Couple status: Married M marriage length = 12 yrs Race: N/R Income/SES: M income = \$48,051 Age: M age Husbands = 38 yrs M age Wives = 35 yrs Geography: Stony Brook, NY	All couples seeking therapy during the time period in question were recruited for the current study. During their first visit to the clinic, each member of the couple separately completed a clinical interview and a survey packet. The self-report packet contained a 29- item modification of the Conflict Tactics Scale which was used to assess violence	Percentage of clinic sample reporting IPV = 71% Percentage of clinic sample reporting no IPV = 29% Bidirectional : Percentage reporting Bidirectional IPV within the IPV sample = 86% Unidirectional Percentage reporting Unidirectional IPV within the IPV sample = 14% Percentage of MFPV only within the IPV sample = 7% Percentage of FMPV only within the IPV sample = 7%
Vivian, D., Langhinrichsen- Rohling, J. (1994)	n = 145 Couples seeking	Sample type: Clinical sample; Couples who sought	Cross-sectional sample of couples seeking marital therapy;	Percentage of clinic sample reporting IPV = 76.5% Percentage of clinic sample reporting no

PASK#3 Online Tables – Table 4: The rates of bidirectional versus unidirectional violence in samples drawn from clinical populations

Study (full reference)	N	Sample Size and Characteristics	Method and Design	Results
<p>Are bi-directionally violent couples mutually victimized? A gender sensitive comparison. <i>Violence and Victims</i>, 9, 107-124. Retrieved from: http://www.springerpub.com/product/08866708#.TwoAKNX6fIU</p>	<p>marital therapy</p> <p>Men = 145 Women = 145</p> <p><i>n</i> = 111 couples who reported IPV</p> <p><i>n</i> = 34 couples who reported no IPV</p>	<p>marital therapy at a university marital clinic</p> <p>Couple status: Married</p> <p>Race: N/R</p> <p>Income/SES: N/R</p> <p>Age: N/R</p> <p>Geography: Stony Brook, NY</p>	<p>Multidimensional assessment of physical victimization; A modification of the CTS was used to assess violence.</p>	<p>IPV = 23.5%</p> <p>Bidirectional: (<i>n</i> = 57) Percentage reporting Bidirectional IPV within the total sample = 39% Percentage reporting Bidirectional IPV within the IPV sample = 51%</p> <p>Three different groups of Bidirectionally violent couples were identified:</p> <p><u>Highly victimized wife (HVW) (<i>n</i> = 15)</u> Percentage within the total sample = 10% Percentage within the IPV sample = 14%</p> <p><u>Mutually low (Mut/Low) (<i>n</i> = 32)</u> Percentage within the total sample = 22% Percentage within the IPV sample = 29%</p> <p><u>Highly victimized husband (HVH) (<i>n</i> = 10)</u> Percentage within the total sample = 7% Percentage within the IPV sample = 9%</p> <p>Unidirectional: (<i>n</i> = 54) Percentage of Unidirectional IPV within the total sample = 37% Percentage of Unidirectional IPV within the IPV sample = 49%</p> <p>Other/Summary: -HVW reported greater partner verbal</p>

PASK#3 Online Tables – Table 4: The rates of bidirectional versus unidirectional violence in samples drawn from clinical populations

Study (full reference)	N	Sample Size and Characteristics	Method and Design	Results
				<p>hostility and higher frequency of and more negative impact from the psychological victimization than their husbands, and then couples in the Mut/Low victimization and non aggressive groups. But their reports did not differ from the HVH group.</p> <p>-HVH group showed a trend toward reporting lower levels of marital satisfaction compared to couples in the Mut/Low group</p> <p>-Thus highly victimized spouses regardless of gender were negatively affected by the marital violence.</p> <p>-Marriages of the two highly victimized groups did differ: HVH reported experiencing more frequent psychological abuse than their wives, both spouses in the HVH group reported equivalent levels of partner verbal hostility and similar negative impact from the psychological victimization. These findings did not occur in the HVW group which suggests that HVW's tend to be more "unilaterally" victimized than HVH.</p> <p>-No gender differences were observed in the Mut/Low group. They did report more marital and individual distress than spouses in the clinic nonaggressive group. They were more similar in their satisfaction, impact of partner psychological abuse, and dysphoria to spouses in the highly</p>

PASK#3 Online Tables – Table 4: The rates of bidirectional versus unidirectional violence in samples drawn from clinical populations

Study (full reference)	N	Sample Size and Characteristics	Method and Design	Results
				<p>victimized subgroups than to the nonaggressive clinic spouses. -HVW, Mut/Low, and HVH couples reported similar and elevated levels of depressive symptomology which were significantly higher than those of couples in the nonaggressive group.</p>
<p>Langhinrichsen-Rohling, J., Neidig, P., & Thorn, G. (1995). Violent marriages: gender differences in levels of current violence and past abuse. <i>Journal of Family Violence, 10</i>(2), 159-176. doi: 10.1007/BF02110598</p>	<p><i>n</i> =199 military couples mandate to IPV treatment</p> <p>Men = 199 Women = 199</p>	<p>Sample type: Military sample; Military couples mandated for marital violence treatment</p> <p>Couple status: Married</p> <p>Race: husbands 48.7% African American 47.7% Caucasian 3.5% missing wives 46.7% African American 47.2% Caucasian 6% missing</p> <p>Income/SES: N/R</p> <p>Age: Men <i>M</i> age = 26 yrs Women <i>M</i> age = 25 yrs</p> <p>Geography:</p>	<p>Cross sectional design; Couples were interviewed conjointly about past experiences about violence, In addition, a modification of the CTS was administered to both spouses</p>	<p>Percentage of mandated DV sample reporting IPV = 98% Percentage of mandated DV sample reporting no IPV = 2%</p> <p>Bidirectional: Percentage of Bidirectional IPV within the IPV sample = 83%</p> <p>Unidirectional: Percentage of Unidirectional IPV within the IPV sample = 15% Percentage of MFPV only within the IPV sample =12% Percentage of FMPV only within the IPV sample = 3%</p>

PASK#3 Online Tables – Table 4: The rates of bidirectional versus unidirectional violence in samples drawn from clinical populations

Study (full reference)	N	Sample Size and Characteristics	Method and Design	Results
<p>McCarroll, J. E., Ursano, R. J., Fan, Z., & Newby, J. H. (2004). Patterns of mutual and nonmutual spousal abuse in the Army (1998-2002). <i>Violence and Victims</i>, 19, 453-468. Retrieved from: http://www.springerpub.com/</p>	<p><i>n</i> = 20, 959 victims in 5 years</p>	<p>N/R</p> <p>Sample type US Army personnel and their spouses</p> <p>Couple status: married</p> <p>Race: 40.1% White 45% Black 10.9% Hispanic 3% Asian/PI 0.9% Am Indian/Alaskan Native</p> <p>Income/SES: N/R</p> <p>Age: <i>M</i> age = 26 yrs</p> <p>Geography: N/R</p>	<p>Cross-sectional design; Retrospective examination of Domestic violence cases from the ACR (a database) of enlisted victims and offenders from the years 1998-2002</p> <p>Coders categorized the cases as mutual same day, mutual different day, or victimized only</p>	<p>Mutual same-day abuse: both partners physically aggressive towards one another in the same day</p> <p>Different day mutual: one partner aggressed one day and the other partner aggressed another day</p> <p>Percentage of incidents in which Women were victimized = 63.4%</p> <p>Percentage of incidents in which Men were victimized = 36.6%</p> <p>42% of the Incidents were classified as bi-directional (same day or different day)</p> <p>Bidirectional:</p> <p><u>Same Day Mutual Abuse:</u> Percentage of same day mutual abuse = 39%</p> <p>Percentage of Black victims = 49%</p> <p>Percentage of White = 38%</p> <p>Percentage of Hispanic = 10%</p> <p><u>Different Day Mutual Abuse:</u> Percentage of different day mutual abuse = 3%</p> <p>Percentage of Black victims = 57%</p> <p>Percentage of White = 32%</p> <p>Percentage of Hispanic = 8.5%</p> <p>Unidirectional:</p>

PASK#3 Online Tables – Table 4: The rates of bidirectional versus unidirectional violence in samples drawn from clinical populations

Study (full reference)	N	Sample Size and Characteristics	Method and Design	Results
				<p>Percentage of incidents that were Unidirectional = 58%</p> <p>Percentage of Women victims of non-mutual abuse = 73%</p> <p>Percentage of Men victims of non-mutual abuse = 27%</p> <p>Percentage of Black victims of non-mutual abuse = 42%</p> <p>Percentage of White Victims of non-mutual abuse = 42%</p> <p>Other/Summary:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -The number of non-mutual abuse cases was three times higher for women compared to men -There were higher rates of non white victims of same day mutual abuse, different day mutual abuse, and non mutual abuse than White victims. -In mutual abuse cases, women were more severely abused than men. -Non-mutual physical abuse was more severe than mutual abuse.
<p>Drapkin, M. L., McCrady, B. S., Swingle, J. M., & Epstein, E. E. (2005). Exploring bidirectional couple violence in a clinical</p>	<p><i>n</i> = 109 couples</p> <p>Men = 109</p> <p>Women = 109</p>	<p>Sample type: Clinical sample; Women recruited from the community who were diagnosed with alcohol</p>	<p>Cross-sectional design; Randomized clinical trial comparing individual and couple treatment for women alcoholics. A modification of the CTS was used to assess</p>	<p>Percentage of couples reporting IPV = 61%</p> <p>Percentage of couples reporting no IPV = 39%</p> <p>Bidirectional: Percentage of Bidirectional IPV within the total sample = 41%</p>

PASK#3 Online Tables – Table 4: The rates of bidirectional versus unidirectional violence in samples drawn from clinical populations

Study (full reference)	N	Sample Size and Characteristics	Method and Design	Results
<p>sample of female alcoholics. <i>Journal of Studies on Alcohol</i>, 66, 213-219. Retrieved from: http://alcoholstudies.rutgers.edu/journal/index.html</p>		<p>abuse and their partners Couple status: committed relationships for 1 yr or more 88% married Race: 96% White Income/SES: Median income for women was \$76,000 Median household income for NJ is \$55,146 Age: Men <i>M</i> age = 48.2 yrs Women <i>M</i> age = 44.9 yrs Geography: New Jersey</p>	<p>violence</p>	<p>Percentage of Bidirectional IPV within the IPV sample = 68%</p> <p>Percentage of women minor, men minor IPV within the IPV sample = 29%, within the total sample = 17%</p> <p>Percentage of women severe, men severe within the IPV sample = 15%, within the total sample = 9%</p> <p>Percentage of women severe, men minor within the IPV sample = 21%, within the total sample = 13%</p> <p>Percentage of women minor, men severe within the IPV sample = 3%, within the total sample = 2%</p> <p>Unidirectional: Percentage of Unidirectional IPV within the total sample = 19%</p> <p>Percentage of MFPV within the total sample = 9%</p> <p>Percentage of FMPV within the total sample = 10%</p> <p>Percentage of Unidirectional IPV within the IPV sample = 32%</p> <p>Percentage of MFPV within the IPV sample = 15%, within the Unidirectional IPV sample = 47%</p> <p>Percentage of FMPV within the IPV sample = 16%, within the Unidirectional</p>

PASK#3 Online Tables – Table 4: The rates of bidirectional versus unidirectional violence in samples drawn from clinical populations

Study (full reference)	N	Sample Size and Characteristics	Method and Design	Results
<p>Taylor, L., & Pittman, J. F. (2005). Sex of spouse abuse and directionality of abuse as predictors of personal distress, interpersonal functioning, and perceptions of family climate. <i>Journal of Family Violence, 20</i>, 329-339. doi: 10.1007/s10896-005-6609-2</p>	<p><i>n</i> = 7,253 IPV offenders Men = 5,222 Women = 2,031</p>	<p>Sample type: Military sample. All were IPV offenders treated by the US Air Force from 1988-1996 75% of the offenders were USAF personnel and the remaining offenders were spouses of USAF personnel. Couple status: N/R Race: 64.6% White 27.1% Black, 5% Hispanic 2.9% Asian, and .4% American Indian Income/SES: Junior enlisted pay grades accounted for 81.7% of the cases, 15.2% were “senior enlisted,” 2.8% were “company-level officers,” and .2% were “field grade officers.” Age: <i>M</i> age = 27.5 yrs Geography:</p>	<p>Cross-sectional design; Archival analysis of data collected between 1988 and 1996 by the US Air Force Family Advocacy Program. Severity of aggression was a clinical assessment originally measured on a 4-point scale: 1 was reserved for cases that were not substantiated as abusive, 2 indicated low severity, 3 indicated moderate severity, and 4 indicated severe severity. Trained clinicians used specific criteria to make this designation.</p>	<p>IPV sample = 52% Percentage of sample reporting IPV = 100% Percentage of sample reporting no IPV = 0% Bidirectional: Percentage of Bidirectional IPV within the total sample = 42% Percentage of men Bidirectional IPV offenders = 32% Percentage of women Bidirectional IPV offenders = 68% Unidirectional: Percentage of Unidirectional IPV within the total sample = 58% Percentage of men Unidirectional IPV offenders = 68% Percentage of women Unidirectional IPV offenders = 32% Other/Summary: -Bidirectional abuse was linked with an increased incidence of repeat offense and to an increased likelihood that the offender grew up in an abusive family -Offenders who were also victims reported less distress and unhappiness than offenders in the aggressor only role -Offenders involved in Bidirectional</p>

PASK#3 Online Tables – Table 4: The rates of bidirectional versus unidirectional violence in samples drawn from clinical populations

Study (full reference)	N	Sample Size and Characteristics	Method and Design	Results
		National		aggression perceived more conflict but less independence in the family than Unidirectional offenders
<p>Goldenson, J., Geffner, R., Foster, S. L., & Clipson, C. R. (2007). Female domestic violence offenders: Their attachment security, trauma symptoms, and personality organization. <i>Violence and Victims</i>, 22(5), 532-545. doi:10.1891/088667007782312186</p>	<p>n = 65 Women Offender group = 33 Clinical comparison group = 32</p>	<p>Sample type: Clinical sample; Women offenders attending court-mandated domestic violence groups (offender group) and women who sought clinical treatment from a variety of different agencies or privately practicing psychotherapists in San Diego County (clinical comparison group). Couple status: Offender group: 33% currently single, 0% dating, and 48.5% married or cohabiting with a partner Clinical comparison group: 31% currently single, 3% dating, and 62.5% married or cohabiting with a</p>	<p>Cross-sectional design; Analyses of variance and chi-square analyses showed that the offender group and clinical comparison group did not differ in age, ethnicity, education, SES, number of treatment sessions, or relationship status. Participant inclusion criteria: (a) Participants were heterosexual women; (b) They were 18 years old or older; (c) They had been in a married or cohabiting relationship with their partner within the last 2 years (for the offender group, “partner” referred to the person with whom they had the domestic violence incident that precipitated mandated treatment); (d) They were within their first 16 weeks of</p>	<p>Percentage of offender sample reporting IPV = 100% Percentage of offender sample reporting no IPV = 0%</p> <p>Bidirectional: Percentage of Bidirectional IPV within the offender sample = 55%</p> <p>Unidirectional: Percentage of Unidirectional IPV within the offender sample = 45% Percentage of MFPV only = 21% Percentage of FMPV only = 24%</p> <p>Other/Summary: -Within the offender group: 24% of these women were dominant aggressors (primarily initiated violence on most occasions for reasons other than self-defense), 55% experienced Bidirectional aggression (both offender and partner were equally responsible for violence in the relationship), and 21% reported being largely victims of aggression.</p>

PASK#3 Online Tables – Table 4: The rates of bidirectional versus unidirectional violence in samples drawn from clinical populations

Study (full reference)	N	Sample Size and Characteristics	Method and Design	Results
		partner. Race: Offender group: 42.4% White, 21.2% African American, 15.2% Hispanic, and 21.1% Other Clinical comparison group: 62.5% White, 15.6% African American, 6.3% Hispanic, and 15.6% Other Income/SES: N/R Age: Offender group: <i>M</i> age = 30.9 yrs Clinical comparison group: <i>M</i> age = 32.0 yrs Geography: San Diego, CA	treatment; (e) They had at least a sixth-grade education; and (f) Participants did not present with symptoms of an active thought disorder. The CTS2 was used to assess violence.	
McCarroll, J. E., Fan, Z., & Bell, N. S. (2009). Alcohol use in nonmutual and mutual domestic violence in the U.S.	<i>n</i> = 25,526 victims of IPV Men =	Sample type: Military sample U.S. Army enlisted soldiers and their spouses who experienced an IPV	Cross-sectional design; Archival analysis of incident data from 1998- 2004 from the ACR, a confidential victim-based database of incidents of	Percentage of sample reporting IPV = 100% Percentage of sample reporting no IPV = 0% Bidirectional:

PASK#3 Online Tables – Table 4: The rates of bidirectional versus unidirectional violence in samples drawn from clinical populations

Study (full reference)	N	Sample Size and Characteristics	Method and Design	Results
<p>army: 1998-2004. <i>Violence & Victims</i>, 24(3), 364-379. doi: 10.1891/0886-6708.24.3.36</p>	<p>9,342 Women = 16,184</p>	<p>incident during fiscal years 1998–2004 Couple status: Married Race: 41.1% White, 43.5% Black, 11% Hispanic, 3.1% Asian/Pacific Islander, 1% American Indian/ Alaskan Native, and .4% Missing Income/SES: N/R Age: Men <i>M</i> age = 26.7 yrs Women <i>M</i> age = 25.9 yrs Geography: National sample</p>	<p>child and spouse maltreatment. The ACR includes demographic data on the offender and victim, the type and severity of maltreatment, whether alcohol or drugs were involved in the incident, whether the incident happened on or off the military installation, and other information. The severity of maltreatment was coded as mild, moderate, or severe.</p>	<p>Percentage of incidents that were Bidirectional = 36%</p> <p>Percentage of mutual incidents in which women were victimized = 50%</p> <p>Percentage of mutual incidents in which men were victimized = 50%</p> <p>Percentage of mutual abuse victims that were White = 38%</p> <p>Percentage of mutual abuse victims that were Black = 48%</p> <p>Unidirectional: Percentage of incidents that were Unidirectional = 64%</p> <p>Unidirectional incidents of MFPV = 72%</p> <p>Unidirectional incidents of FMPV = 28%</p> <p>Percentage of Unidirectional IPV sample victims who were White = 43%</p> <p>Percentage of Unidirectional IPV sample victims who were Black = 41%</p> <p>Other/Summary: -The number of men and women victims in mutual abuse was identical (<i>n</i> = 4,883 each), but women were overrepresented for nonmutual abuse: 72% of nonmutual abuse victims were women (<i>n</i> = 11,301).</p>

PASK#3 Online Tables – Table 4: The rates of bidirectional versus unidirectional violence in samples drawn from clinical populations

Study (full reference)	N	Sample Size and Characteristics	Method and Design	Results
				<p>-Across the study period, there was an overall decrease of 23% for nonmutual and 57% decrease for mutual abuse incidents.</p> <p>-When only the offender was drinking during the incident, the offenders' rates of non-mutual abuse were over four times higher than the rates of mutual abuse, $t = 20.94$, $df = 12$, $p < .0001$.</p> <p>-When only the victim was drinking, the rates were significantly higher for mutual abuse (mean rate = .19/1,000) than for nonmutual abuse (mean rate = .30/1,000).</p> <p>-When neither was drinking, the rates of nonmutual abuse were about double the rate of mutual abuse.</p> <p>-Offender drinking was associated with more severe violence in both mutual and nonmutual abuse incidents but particularly in nonmutual abuse incidents. When the offender was drinking, 12.8% ($n = 541$) of nonmutual abuse incidents involved injury.</p> <p>-For mutual abuse incidents, Whites (22%) and Hispanics (23%) were more likely to be drinking than were Blacks (15%).</p>

PASK#3 Online Tables - Table 5: The rates of bidirectional versus unidirectional violence in samples drawn from criminal justice or police-related settings

Reference	N	Sample Characteristics	Methods/Design	Results
-----------	---	------------------------	----------------	---------

Abbreviations:

IPV: Intimate Partner Violence

MFPV/UM: Male to Female perpetrated violence

FPP: Female primary perpetrator (type of mutual violence)

SYM: symmetrical

FMPV/UF: Female to Male perpetrated violence

MPV: Mutual Partner Violence

MPP: Male primary perpetrator (type of mutual violence)

Table 5: The rates of bidirectional versus unidirectional violence in samples drawn from criminal justice or police-related settings

Reference	N	Sample Characteristics	Methods/Design	Results
Busch, A. L., & Rosenberg, M. S. (2004). Comparing women and men arrested for domestic violence: A preliminary report. <i>Journal of Family Violence</i> , 19(1), 49-57. doi: 10.1023/B:JOFV.0000011582.05558.2e	n = 90 arrestees for Domestic Violence between 1996 and 1998 Men = 45 Women = 45	Sample type: Justice/Legal Sample Court mandated to attend DV treatment program- Arrested for IPV Couple status: N/R Race: 77% Caucasian 11% Hispanic 7% African Am, 2% Asian Am 1% Other Income/SES: N/R	Cross-sectional design; Archival analysis of data collected before treatment program. Injury was measured utilizing the method described by Langhinrichsen-Rohling et al. (1995) and the CTS was used to assess violence.	Percentage of the sample reporting a current arrest for IPV = 100% Percentage of sample reporting no current arrest for IPV = 0% Percentage of Men who had a prior domestic violence arrest within the total sample = 29% Percentage of Women who had a prior domestic violence arrest within the total sample = 14% Percentage of Men using severe violence within the total sample = 43% Percentage of Women using severe violence within the total sample = 46%

PASK#3 Online Tables - Table 5: The rates of bidirectional versus unidirectional violence in samples drawn from criminal justice or police-related settings

Reference	N	Sample Characteristics	Methods/Design	Results
		<p>Age: N/R</p> <p>Geography: CA</p>		<p>Percentage of Men who inflicted severe injuries within the total sample = 14%</p> <p>Percentage of Women who inflicted severe injuries within the total sample = 12%</p> <p>Bidirectional:</p> <p>Percentage of Men who reported or showed evidence of victimization during their arrest = 7% (<i>n</i> = 3) or 3% of total sample</p> <p>Percentage of Women who reported or showed evidence of victimization during their arrest = 24% (<i>n</i> = 11) or 12% of total sample</p> <p>Other/Summary:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -On average, men used a greater number of severely violent tactics (e.g., punching, kicking, choking, etc.) in the arrest incident than women (2.27 versus 1.44). -However, men and women did not differ in their likelihood of using at least one form of severe violence. 92% of women and 87% of men used some type of severe violence when they assaulted their partner and were arrested. -There were no differences in the percentages of women and men who inflicted severe to extreme levels of injury on their partners. When women inflicted severe injuries on their partners, in most cases they used a weapon or object. In contrast, the men who

PASK#3 Online Tables - Table 5: The rates of bidirectional versus unidirectional violence in samples drawn from criminal justice or police-related settings

Reference	N	Sample Characteristics	Methods/Design	Results
<p>Muftic, L. R., Bouffard, L. A., & Bouffard, J. A. (2007). An exploratory analysis of victim precipitation among men and women arrested for intimate partner violence. <i>Feminist Criminology</i>, 2(4), 327-346. doi: 10.1177/1557085107306429</p>	<p>n = 203 cases Men = 123 arrestees Women = 80 arrestees</p>	<p>Sample type: Criminal sample; domestic violence arrestees who had been court ordered to monitoring by the local community corrections agency for an assessment of their need for domestic violence treatment</p> <p>Couple status: All were in or had had an intimate heterosexual relationship 63.6% current or former dating relationship 36.4% current or former spousal relationship</p> <p>Race:</p>	<p>Cross-sectional design; Archival analysis of data collected as part of a process evaluation of a community corrections agency in a medium-sized city in North Dakota. The narrative of the police report provided a description of the incident that was used to determine which party (arrestee or partner) first used physical violence.</p>	<p>inflicted this same degree of injury were more likely to use their bodies alone to assault their victims.</p> <p>Percentage of the sample reporting a current arrest for IPV = 100% Percentage of sample reporting no current arrest for IPV = 0%</p> <p>Percentage of arrestees who were the first to use physical violence =70% Percentage of the arrests that involved the partner initiating the physical violence =14% Percentage of the arrests that fell into the “unable to determine” category = 16%</p> <p>When men were arrested, 13% said their partner initiated the IPV When women were arrested, 15.8% said their partner initiated the IPV</p> <p><u>Arrest (dual vs. sole) and precipitation</u> -When the arrestee initiated the violence, they were the only individuals arrested in 86% of the cases. Otherwise, both partners were arrested -When the partner initiated the violence, the informant was the only individual arrested in only 32% of the cases</p>

PASK#3 Online Tables - Table 5: The rates of bidirectional versus unidirectional violence in samples drawn from criminal justice or police-related settings

Reference	N	Sample Characteristics	Methods/Design	Results
		<p>80% of arrestees were White Income/SES: N/R Age: <i>M</i> age = 30 yrs Geography: Medium size city in North Dakota</p>		<p>Other/Summary: - Women partners of men arrestees were significantly less likely to have a prior history of intimate violence (4.8%) compared to men partners of women arrestees (19.4%), $\chi^2 = 9.22, p < .01$. -No significant differences by arrestee gender were found in terms of which partner initiated physical violence ($\chi^2 = .57, p = .75$) or whether injuries were noted on the arrestee ($\chi^2 = .40, p = .53$). -The arrestee was significantly more likely to suffer visible injury in incidents where the partner had been using alcohol ($\chi^2 = 5.20, p < .05$). -In addition, arrestee injury was more likely when the arrestee and partner were White. -Cases in which the partner was the only party to suffer visible injuries were extremely unlikely to produce a dual-arrest response (only 1.2% of incidents). In contrast, dual arrest occurred in more than 65% of cases in which the arrestee suffered visible injuries noted by police ($\chi^2 = 80.37, p < .01$).</p>
Robertson, K., & Murachver, T. (2007). It takes two to tangle: Gender symmetry	<p><i>n</i> = 172 67 university</p>	<p>Sample type: University, Community, and Justice/Legal sample Couple status:</p>	<p>Cross sectional design; Participants were recruited through notices displayed at</p>	<p>Percentage of sample reporting IPV = 46.4% Percentage of sample reporting no IPV = 53.6%</p> <p>Overall rates of Bidirectional violence: Percentage of Bidirectional IPV within the total sample</p>

PASK#3 Online Tables - Table 5: The rates of bidirectional versus unidirectional violence in samples drawn from criminal justice or police-related settings

Reference	N	Sample Characteristics	Methods/Design	Results
<p>in intimate partner violence. <i>Basic & Applied Social Psychology</i>, 29 (2), 109-118. doi:10.1080/01973530701331247</p>	<p>students (Men = 31 Women = 36), 66 general sample participants (Men = 30 Women = 36), 39 incarcerated participants (Men = 24 Women = 15).</p>	<p>N/R Race: Student = 83.6% Caucasian, General = 92.4% Caucasian, Incarcerated = 64.1% Caucasian Income/SES: N/R Age: N/R Geography: New Zealand</p>	<p>the university, within the community, and in local organizations' newsletters. The incarcerated sample was recruited with the ethical approval and assistance of the New Zealand Department of Corrections who helped inform inmates about the study. The CTS2 was used to assess violence.</p>	<p>= 24.4% Percentage of Bidirectional IPV within the IPV sample = 52.2%</p> <p>Overall rates of Unidirectional violence: Percentage of Unidirectional IPV within the total sample = 22% Percentage of MFPV within the total sample = 5.2% Percentage of FMPV within the total sample = 16.8%</p> <p>Percentage of Unidirectional IPV within the IPV sample = 47% Percentage of MFPV within the IPV sample = 11% Percentage of FMPV within the IPV sample = 36%</p> <p>Men (n = 85) Percentage of Bidirectional IPV within the total sample = 27.1% Percentage of Unidirectional IPV within the total sample = 22.4%</p> <p>Percentage of MFPV within the total sample = 2.4% Percentage of FMPV within the total sample = 20.0%</p> <p>Women (n = 87) Percentage of Bidirectional IPV within the total sample = 21.8%</p>

PASK#3 Online Tables - Table 5: The rates of bidirectional versus unidirectional violence in samples drawn from criminal justice or police-related settings

Reference	N	Sample Characteristics	Methods/Design	Results
				<p>Percentage of Unidirectional violence within the total sample = 21.8%</p> <p>Percentage of MFPV within the total sample = 8.0%</p> <p>Percentage of FMPV within the total sample = 13.8%</p> <p>Students (<i>n</i> = 67):</p> <p>Percentage of Bidirectional IPV within the student sample = 13.4%</p> <p>Percentage of Bidirectional IPV within the student IPV sample = 31%</p> <p>Percentage of Unidirectional IPV within the student sample = 29.8%</p> <p>Percentage of victimization within the student sample = 16.4%</p> <p>Percentage of perpetration within the student sample = 13.4%</p> <p>Percentage of Unidirectional IPV within the student IPV sample = 69%</p> <p>Percentage of victimization of IPV within the student IPV sample = 38%</p> <p>Percentage of perpetration of IPV within the student IPV sample = 31%</p> <p>General (<i>n</i> = 66)::</p> <p>Percentage of Bidirectional IPV within the general</p>

PASK#3 Online Tables - Table 5: The rates of bidirectional versus unidirectional violence in samples drawn from criminal justice or police-related settings

Reference	<i>N</i>	Sample Characteristics	Methods/Design	Results
				<p>sample = 19.7%</p> <p>Percentage of Bidirectional IPV within the IPV general sample = 56.5%</p> <p>Percentage of Unidirectional IPV within the general sample = 15.1%</p> <p>Percentage of Victimization within the general sample = 10.6%</p> <p>Percentage of Perpetration within the general sample = 4.5%</p> <p>Percentage of Unidirectional within the IPV general sample = 43.4%</p> <p>Percentage of Victimization within the IPV general sample = 30.4%</p> <p>Percentage of Perpetration within the IPV general sample = 13%</p> <p>Incarcerated (<i>n</i> = 39):</p> <p>Percentage of Bidirectional IPV within the incarcerated sample = 51.3%</p> <p>Percentage of Bidirectional IPV within the IPV incarcerated sample = 71.4%</p> <p>Percentage of Unidirectional IPV within the incarcerated sample = 20.5%</p> <p>Percentage of Victimization within the incarcerated</p>

PASK#3 Online Tables - Table 5: The rates of bidirectional versus unidirectional violence in samples drawn from criminal justice or police-related settings

Reference	N	Sample Characteristics	Methods/Design	Results
				<p>sample = 15.4% Percentage of Perpetration within the incarcerated sample = 5.1%</p> <p>Percentage of Unidirectional IPV within the IPV incarcerated sample = 28.6% Percentage of victimization within the incarcerated IPV sample = 21.4% Percentage of perpetration within the incarcerated IPV sample = 7.1%</p> <p>Other/Summary: -The percentage of participants reporting being a victim or perpetrator did not vary as a function of sample; but the incarcerated sample was significantly more likely to report Bidirectional violence compared to the general and student samples</p>
Capaldi, D. M., Shortt, J. W., Kim, H. K., Wilson, J., Crosby, L., & Tucci, S. (2009). Official incidents of domestic violence: Types,	n = 206 men initially recruited in 4 th grade. Time 1, n = 158,	<p>Sample type: Archival collection of criminal activity reports from a community sample. Men originally recruited for the Oregon Youth Study</p> <p>Couple status:</p>	Longitudinal design; Investigation of individuals who had at least one incidence of violence in which a police report was filed; Combined these with archival analysis of	<p>The relative balance of the men’s and women’s contributions to the physical fight during the incidents was coded on a 7-point scale from <i>all or almost all</i> the man (7) to <i>all or almost all</i> the woman (1). This rating scale was created by Capaldi, Shortt, and Wilson, 1999.</p> <p><u>The physical aggression arrest incidents (n = 47) were coded as follows:</u></p>

PASK#3 Online Tables - Table 5: The rates of bidirectional versus unidirectional violence in samples drawn from criminal justice or police-related settings

Reference	N	Sample Characteristics	Methods/Design	Results
<p>injury, and associations with nonofficial couple aggression. <i>Violence and Victims</i>, 24(4), 502-519. doi: 10.1891/0886-6708.24.4.502</p>	<p>Time 2, <i>n</i> = 148, Time 3, <i>n</i> = 161 men and their women partners</p>	<p>Married: 18% at T1 to 42% at T3; Cohabiting: 37% at T1 to 38% at T3; Dating or engaged: 45% at T1 to 20% at T3. Race: Predominantly Euro-American Income/SES: 64% of the families' annual income was less than \$20,000 Age: Women <i>M</i> age = 20.8 yrs at T1, 23.1 yrs at T2, and 24.9 yrs at T3. Geography: Pacific Northwest</p>	<p>previously collected data from the OYS longitudinal study. 47 IPV arrest incidents were tracked (85% were arrest of OYS men, 6% were arrests of their women partners, and 9% involved the arrest of both partners) and police reports were examined. Levels of nonofficial violence were also available from ongoing longitudinal assessments.</p>	<p>Percentage coded “all or almost all from the man” = 51% Percentage coded as “being more the man than the woman” = 30% Percentage coded as “mutual” = 11% Percentage coded as “being more the woman than the man” = 6% Percentage coded “all or almost all the woman” = 2% Overall percentage considered to be bi-directional = 47% Overall percentage considered to be uni-directional = 53% <u>Regarding first physical contact:</u> Percentage of cases where men made the first physical contact = 66% Percentage of cases where women made the first physical contact = 15% Percentage of the cases that were ambiguous for first physical contact = 17% 2% of these cases did not have these data available for coding</p>

PASK#3 Online Tables - Table 5: The rates of bidirectional versus unidirectional violence in samples drawn from criminal justice or police-related settings

Reference	N	Sample Characteristics	Methods/Design	Results
<p>Fusco, R. A. (2010). Intimate partner violence in interracial couples: A comparison to white and ethnic minority monoracial couples. <i>Journal of Interpersonal Violence</i>, 25(10), 1785-1800. doi: 10.1177/0886260509354510</p>	<p>n = 1, 562 couples involved in a police recorded IPV event</p> <p>Men = 1,562 Women = 1,562</p>	<p>Sample type: Large sample of couples involved in IPV events in which police were called and responded to scene</p> <p>Couple status: N/R</p> <p>Race: Of the couples, 279 were Interracial 880 were same race, Ethnic Minority and 403 were same race, White</p> <p>Income/SES: N/R</p> <p>Age: N/R</p> <p>Geography: Fairly affluent county in Suburban population in Northeast United States</p>	<p>Cross-sectional design; Archival analysis of database from police department. Data were collected by police officers when they were responding to IPV events in the county. The officers thoroughly interviewed the victim, perpetrator, and any witnesses to determine whether the violence was unidirectional (or had a primary aggressor) or whether it was mutual assault. Mutual assault was defined as events where both couples played an equal role in perpetrating</p>	<p>Approximately 1562 IPV events were reported.</p> <p><u>Percentage of IPV by ethnicity of couple:</u> Interracial couples = 17.9% White couples = 25.8% Ethnic minority mono-racial couples = 56.3%</p> <p>Bidirectional: <u>Percent of Bidirectional IPV by ethnicity of couple:</u> Interracial couples = 31.2% White couples = 13.4% Ethnic Minority = 16.2%</p> <p>Unidirectional: <u>Percent of MFPV by ethnicity of couple:</u> Interracial couples = 87.0% White couples = 83.4% Ethnic Minority couples = 86.3%</p> <p>Other/Summary: -When the violence within interracial couples was considered to be mutual, almost half of the couples consisted of an African American paired with a White. -The odds ratios showed some differences between interracial and ethnic minority monoracial couples. Interracial couples were more likely to have a history of prior abuse (OR =</p>

PASK#3 Online Tables - Table 5: The rates of bidirectional versus unidirectional violence in samples drawn from criminal justice or police-related settings

Reference	<i>N</i>	Sample Characteristics	Methods/Design	Results
			<p>violence. Mutual assault cases did not include events in which violence was used in self-defense.</p>	<p>2.60), engage in mutual assault (OR = 2.36), and have the perpetrator arrested (OR = 1.71) than ethnic minority monoracial couples. -Interracial couples were more likely to engage in mutual assault than white couples, but 50% less likely to use drugs or alcohol before the IPV event.</p>

PASK#3 Online Tables – Table 6: Meta-analytic results of associations between perpetrating and experiencing violence in relationships

Study (full reference)	N	Sample Size and Characteristics	Method and Design	Results
---------------------------	---	------------------------------------	-------------------	---------

Abbreviations:

IPV: Intimate Partner Violence

MFPV/UM: Male to Female perpetrated violence

FPP: Female primary perpetrator (type of mutual violence)

SYM: symmetrical

FMPV/UF: Female to Male perpetrated violence

MPV: Mutual Partner Violence

MPP: Male primary perpetrator (type of mutual violence)

Table 6: Meta-analytic results of associations between perpetrating and experiencing violence in relationships

Reference	N	Sample Characteristics	Methods/Design	Results
Archer, J. (2000). Sex differences in aggression between heterosexual partners: A meta-analytic review. <i>American Psychological Association Psychological Bulletin</i> , 126, 651-680. doi: 10.1037//0033-2909.126.5.651	n = 82 articles Journal articles n = 56 Books or book chapters n = 4 Dissertations n = 15 Other unpublished sources n = 7 M	Sample type: Meta-analysis Married/ dating partners Couple status: 40 = M proportion of sample that were married or cohabitating Race: N/R Income/SES: N/R Age: M age = 25.3 yrs Geography: N/R	Meta-analysis	Summary: -The proportions of men and women who physically aggressed were highly correlated (and a least squares regression weighted by the reciprocal of the variance indicated an even higher association of $R = .94$) These associations would be expected on the basis of the finding that physical aggression between partners tends to be reciprocal and/or bidirectional. -Despite the high correlations, only the proportion of physically aggressive men was significantly (positively) correlated with the effect size for the sex differences, the proportion of physically aggressive women was unrelated to the effect size. -This supports the prediction that it is the level of men's aggression that is associated with the variation in sex differences obtained in different studies.

PASK#3 Online Tables – Table 6: Meta-analytic results of associations between perpetrating and experiencing violence in relationships

Study (full reference)	N	Sample Size and Characteristics	Method and Design	Results
	number of men in each sample = 373 <i>M</i> number of women in each sample = 412			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Women were slightly more likely ($d = -.05$) than men to use one or more acts of physical aggression and to use such acts more frequently. -Men were more likely ($d = .15$) to inflict an injury, and overall, 62% of those injured by a partner were women. -There was a highly significant difference both in the case of injuries, $QB(1) = 120.9, p < .0001$; and in receiving medical care, $QB(1) = 39.8, p < .0001$, indicating men's violence produces more physical effects than does women's violence. -When measures were based on the physical consequences of aggression (visible injuries or injuries requiring medical treatment), men were more likely than women to have injured their partners, but again, effect sizes were relatively small ($d = .15$ and $d = .08$).