

#6: Partner Abuse in Ethnic Minority and Gay, Lesbian, Bisexual, and Transgender Populations

Carolyn M. West, Ph.D.

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

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

In the second decade of the 21st century, a growing percentage of the U.S. population has self-identified as Hispanic/Latino, African American/Black, Asian American, or American Indian/Alaska Native. In addition, there is a growing recognition of gay, lesbian, bisexual, and transgendered (GLBT) citizens and their relationships. Consequently, it is imperative that researchers continue to investigate the differences in the incidence and prevalence of IPV based on racial/ethnic background and sexual orientation of victims and perpetrators. Accordingly, the goal of this review is to 1) synthesize the current state of knowledge regarding gender differences in rates of physical and psychological IPV prevalence among the four largest ethnic/racial groups; 2) compare rates of physical and psychological IPV between sexual minorities and heterosexuals and among subgroups of sexual minorities (gay men, lesbians, bisexuals); 3) summarize correlates and risk factors that are associated with rates of IPV in both ethnic and sexual minorities.

Studies that were published after 1975 and appeared in peer-review journals are included in this review. A systematic search of the published literature was carried out using a variety of search engines including PubMed, PsycINFO, and Academic Search Complete. The review identified 55 studies that met the criteria (257 fell under the topic and were considered, but were determined to not meet criteria for inclusion). Included in the summary tables is the full reference for the study (author, year, title, journal information), the sample size, characteristics of the sample (e.g., sociodemographic information, age), study method and design, measures used, and results (gender differences in prevalence rates and correlates/risk factors). Most of the articles focused on African Americans, Hispanics, and sexual minorities.

Among African Americans (see table 1), in earlier national studies, researchers discovered higher rates of male perpetrated violence. In more recent studies longitudinal surveys, psychological aggression was most frequently reported, followed by mutual physical IPV. Unidirectional female-to-male partner violence (FMPV) was significantly higher than male-to-female partner violence (MFPV). Regardless of gender, Black couples most often inflicted and sustained minor or moderate aggression, such as throwing objects, pushing, grabbing, and shoving. Overall, there were no gender differences in rates of psychological and physical victimization among Black undergraduates; however, women tended to inflict more dating violence than men. Moreover, both men and women acknowledged that women had a propensity to inflict more physical aggression.

Among Hispanic Americans (see table 2), in general population studies, psychological aggression was most frequently reported, followed by mutual physical aggression. The overall rates of MFPV and FMPV were comparable and primarily took the form of minor aggression. Overall physical victimization and perpetration, severe acts of physical aggression, and psychological aggression did not vary based on gender in a Hispanic college sample. Although female migrant farm workers reported more IPV than their male counterparts, non-migratory farm workers and Mexican American communities members.

Only one general population study in this sample focused on Asian Americans (see table 3). Reciprocal violence, which accounted for one-third of the aggression, was most frequently reported and comparable rates of women and men reported minor physical victimization and perpetration. Vietnamese women and men reported the lowest rates of IPV. In contrast, a community sample found higher rates of IPV among Vietnamese women and men. However, overall, lifetime and past year rates of victimization did not vary by gender in community or college samples.

Three community samples focused on IPV among American Indians (see table 4). Using a one-item measure of IPV, researchers discovered very low, nonsignificant rates of victimization. In a larger sample of six Native American tribes, women reported higher rates than men, almost one-half vs. one-third, respectively. In addition, another sample

found that more Native American women required medical attention due to their injuries and were more likely to use weapons in self-defense against an abusive partner.

My second objective of this review was to compare rates of physical and psychological IPV between sexual minorities and heterosexuals and among subgroups of sexual minorities (gay men, lesbians, bisexual men and women). In most cases, respondents who reported a history of same-sex cohabitation and those who identified as sexual minorities reported higher rates of IPV than those who reported only a history of opposite-sex cohabitation and those who identified as heterosexual (see table 5). Regarding sexual minority subgroup differences, there were no consistent findings. Some studies found no significant differences across sexual orientation, while another study found that lesbians experienced higher rates of IPV than gay men. Bisexuals also appear to be at risk for IPV and rates of victimization among transgendered populations has largely been unexamined in the literature.

The final objective of this review was to identify correlates and risk factors of IPV among ethnic and sexual minorities. Substance abuse and use, marginalized socioeconomic status in the form of family and neighborhood poverty, exposure to violence during childhood as a witness or victim of violence in the family of origin are all factors that have been consistently linked to elevated rates of intimate partner assaults. Associations also have been found between level of acculturation and minority stress in the form of internalized homophobia and frequency of discrimination based on sexual orientation. However, the complex association among these variables is less clear across racial groups and sexual orientation.

These findings should be understood in the context of some limitations. First, most of the studies in this review focused on African Americans and Hispanics, while the research on Asian Americans and Native Americans remain sparse. Second, prevalence rates and correlates/ risk factors of IPV were primarily based on two general population surveys. Although these studies were methodologically strong, the typical respondents were married individual and couples in their mid-40s, populations that are generally at lower risk of IPV. Third, the majority of the studies used the Conflict Tactics Scales. Therefore, there was limited information about frequency of aggression. Moreover, this review did not include prevalence of sexual aggression. Finally, the studies on sexual

minorities should be interpreted with extreme caution. Several of the studies used non-standardized measures and there was not consistent definition of sexual orientation used across studies. These are methodological limitations that make it difficult to draw firm conclusions.

About the Author

Dr. Carolyn West is Associate Professor of Psychology at the University of Washington, where she teaches courses on Family Violence and Human Sexuality. She writes, trains, consults, and lectures internationally on interpersonal violence and sexual assault, with a special focus on African American women. She has developed culturally sensitive domestic violence/sexual assault training material for a variety of organizations, including the Supreme Court of Ohio and City of Seattle Human Services Division. Dr. West frequently delivers keynote addresses and workshops for State Coalitions Against Domestic Violence and Sexual Assault (California, Maryland, Oregon, Washington, Wisconsin). Dr. West has lectured internationally and conducted workshops and presented papers at more than 100 conferences, including those of the American Psychological Association. She has given invited presentations at universities around the country, including Harvard University, Howard University School of Divinity, and Columbia University Law School. Dr. West also has given television, radio, newspaper, and magazine interviews (*Essence*, *Washington Post*, National Public Radio). She has served as an expert witness in domestic violence cases involving victim-defendants (women who use violence in self-defense) and testified at Congressional Briefings in Washington, DC.

As an award-winning scholar, Dr. West has authored or co-authored more than 40 journal articles and book chapters. She is editor/contributor of *Violence in the Lives of Black Women: Battered, Black, and Blue* which was published by Haworth Press in 2002 (winner of the 2004 Carolyn Payton Early Career Award). In recognition of her scholarship, she received the *Outstanding Research Award in the Field of Domestic Violence in the African American Community* from the University of Minnesota's Institute on Domestic Violence in the African American Community (2000). In 2005, she

was honored as the first holder of the Bartley Dobb Professorship for the Study and Prevention of Violence. Dr. West also is a Fellow of the American Psychological Association.

Contact:

<http://www.drcarolynwest.com/>

carwest@u.washington.edu

Table 1. Intimate partner abuse among African Americans

Large Population Samples--Studies based on National Survey Data

Study	N	Sample Characteristics	Method and Design	Results
Hampton, R. L., Gelles, R. J., & Harrop, J. W. (1989). Is violence in Black families increasing? A comparison of 1975 and 1985 National survey rates. <i>Journal of Marriage and the Family, 51</i> , 969-980.	146	Black current couple households (married or cohabitating). 40% of respondents in \$6-11,999 income range.	Cross-sectional, retrospective data from the First National Family Violence Survey (NFVS). Face-to-face interviews with a national probability sample of one member of the couple.	<i>Measures:</i> IPV: CTS-R past year physical aggression. <i>Results:</i> Overall (169 per 1,000) and severe (113 per 1,000) Black husband-to-wife was higher than overall (153 per 1,000) and severe (76 per 1,000) wife-to-husband violence.
Hampton, R. L., Gelles, R. J., & Harrop, J. W. (1989). Is violence in Black families increasing? A comparison of 1975 and 1985 National survey rates. <i>Journal of Marriage and the Family, 51</i> , 969-980.	576	Black current couple households (married or cohabitating). Mean age 42.6. Median family income \$27,500.	Cross-sectional retrospective data from the 1985 Second National Family Violence Resurvey (NFVR). National probability sample of one member of the couple. Over sample of Blacks.	<i>Measures:</i> CTS-R past year physical aggression. <i>Results:</i> Both overall (204 per 1,000) and severe (108 per 1,000) wife-to-husband aggression was more frequently reported than overall (169 per 1,000) and severe (64 per 1,000) husband-to-wife aggression.
Cunradi, C. B., Caetano, R., Clark, C. L., & Schafer, J. (1999). Alcohol-related problems and	1,440 couples	Couple sample, representative of married and cohabitating couples in the 48 contiguous United States. In 1995,	Longitudinal survey data. 1995 National Longitudinal Couples Surveys (NCLS). Sample of couples from the 1995	<i>Measures:</i> IPV: CTS-R, 11- items measure past year physical aggression; Sociodemographic: age of respondent, cohabitating relationship length, education, employment status, ethnic identity, gender,

PASK#6: Online Tables – Table 1. Intimate partner abuse among African Americans

Study	N	Sample Characteristics	Method and Design	Results
<p>intimate partner violence among White, Black, and Hispanic couples in the U.S. <i>Alcoholism: Clinical and Experimental Research</i>, 23, 1492-1501.</p>		<p>358 Black couples were interviewed. Mean age was 45.2 for men and 42 years for women. 86% were married and 14% were cohabitating. Mean years in the relationship was 16.6 years. Mean years of education was 12. Midpoint for income was \$33,680.</p>	<p>National Alcohol Survey, a national multistage area household probability sample with oversamples of African American and Hispanic households. In person interviews conducted separately with each partner. Follow-up survey in 2000.</p>	<p>income, marital status, number of children. Psychosocial variables: alcohol consumption 11-items; approval of marital IPV 4-items; childhood violence victimization 5-items; impulsivity 3-items. <i>Results:</i> After adjustments were made for the partners' alcohol problems, sociodemographic and psychosocial variables, Black couples with male alcohol problems were 10 times more likely to report MFPV and couples with female alcohol problems were 5 times more likely to report MFPV than couples who did not have male or female alcohol problems, respectively. Black couples with male alcohol problems had a nearly threefold risk of FMPV and Black couples with female alcohol problems were at a sixfold risk for FMPV compared to Black couples who did not report a male or female with an alcohol problem.</p>
<p>Caetano, R., Cunradi, C. B., Clark, C. L., & Schafer, J. (2000). Intimate partner violence and drinking patterns among White, Black, and Hispanic couples in the U. S. <i>Journal of</i></p>	<p>1,440 couples</p>	<p>Couple sample, representative of married and cohabitating couples in the 48 contiguous United States. In 1995, 555 White, 527 Hispanic, and 358 Black couples were interviewed. Mean age was 45.2 for Black</p>	<p>Longitudinal survey data. 1995 National Longitudinal Couples Surveys (NCLS). Sample of couples from the 1995 National Alcohol Survey, a national multistage area household probability sample with oversamples</p>	<p><i>Measures:</i> IPV: CTS-R-11 items measure past year physical aggression; Alcohol consumption prior 12 months; Sociodemographic: age, cohabiting relationship length, education, employment status, ethnic identification, gender, income, marital status, number of children. Psychosocial: approval of marital aggression, impulsivity 3-items, childhood</p>

PASK#6: Online Tables – Table 1. Intimate partner abuse among African Americans

Study	N	Sample Characteristics	Method and Design	Results
<i>Substance Abuse, 11</i> , 123-138.		men and 42 years for Black women. 86% were married and 14% were cohabitating. Mean years in the relationship was 16.6 years. Mean years of education was 12. Midpoint for income was \$33,680.	of African American and Hispanic households. In-person interviews conducted separately with each partner. Follow-up survey in 2000.	violence victimization 7-items. <i>Results:</i> FMPV was more frequently reported than MFPV (30% vs. 23%, respectively). More Black women than men threw something (22.1% vs. 5.4%); pushed, shoved, or grabbed (21.3% vs. 19.7%); slapped (9.7% vs. 7.8%); kicked, bit, hit (9.9% vs. 4.1%); hit with something (15.8% vs. 5.1%); beat up (2.1% vs. 1.4%); burned (1.2% vs. 0.2%); threatened with a gun (3.1% vs. 0.6%). Among Black couples, risk factors for MFPV were: household income between \$30,000 and \$40,000, male approval of spousal aggression, and female reports of childhood victimization. Protective factors for MFPV were: retired employed status for females, longer relationship length, and male education. Risk factors for FMPV were: number of children in the home, heavy alcohol use by the female, female and male histories of childhood victimization, and male approval of spousal aggression.
Cunradi, C. B., Caetano, R., Clark, C., & Schafer, J. (2000). Neighborhood poverty as a predictor	1,440 couples	Couple sample, representative of married and cohabitating couples in the 48 contiguous United States. In 1995, 358 Black couples were	Longitudinal survey data. 1995 National Longitudinal Couples Surveys (NCLS). Sample of couples from the 1995 National Alcohol Survey,	<i>Measures:</i> IPV: <i>Measures:</i> IPV: CTS-R, 11- items measure past year physical aggression; Demographic variables: age of respondent, education, employment status, ethnicity, gender, income, marital status, number of children, relationship length.

PASK#6: Online Tables – Table 1. Intimate partner abuse among African Americans

Study	N	Sample Characteristics	Method and Design	Results
<p>of intimate partner violence among White, Black, and Hispanic couples in the United States: A multilevel analysis. <i>Annals of Epidemiology</i>, 10, 297-308.</p>		<p>interviewed. Mean age was 45.2 for men and 42 years for women. 86% were married and 14% were cohabitating. Mean years in the relationship was 16.6 years. Mean years of education was 12. Midpoint for income was \$33,680.</p>	<p>a national multistage area household probability sample with oversamples of African American and Hispanic households. In person interviews conducted separately with each partner. Follow-up survey in 2000.</p>	<p>Psychosocial variables: childhood violence victimization; approval of marital IPV; Impulsivity-3 items. Alcohol consumption; Alcohol-related problems: 11 items alcohol dependence and 15 items drinking related social consequences. Socioeconomic variables: neighborhood poverty measured by number of residents who were undereducated, unemployment, working class, or impoverished. <i>Results:</i> The risk for MFPV was threefold higher among Black couples who lived in impoverished neighborhoods compared to those not living in poor areas. The risk for FMPV was twofold higher among Black couples who lived in impoverished neighborhoods compared to those not living in poor areas.</p>
<p>Caetano, R., Schafer, J., Field, C., Nelson, S. M. (2002). Agreement on reports of intimate partner violence among White, Black, and Hispanic couples in the United States. <i>Journal of Interpersonal Violence</i>, 17, 1308-</p>	<p>1,440 couples</p>	<p>Couple sample, representative of married and cohabitating couples in the 48 contiguous United States. In 1995, 358 Black couples were interviewed. Mean age was 45.2 for men and 42 years for women. 86% were married and 14% were cohabitating. Mean years in the relationship</p>	<p>Longitudinal survey data. 1995 National Longitudinal Couples Surveys (NCLS). Sample of couples from the 1995 National Alcohol Survey, a national multistage area household probability sample with oversamples of African American and Hispanic households. In person interviews</p>	<p><i>Measures:</i> IPV: <i>Measures:</i> IPV: CTS-R, 11- items measure past year physical aggression; Alcohol consumption prior 12 months; Alcohol problems 14-items. Demographic variables: Ethnicity, respondents age, income, marital status, education. <i>Results:</i> 82 incidents of MFPV were reported, with 28% identified by women only and 32% identified by men only. Concordance was low, with 40% agreement on violent episodes. 113</p>

PASK#6: Online Tables – Table 1. Intimate partner abuse among African Americans

Study	N	Sample Characteristics	Method and Design	Results
1322.		was 16.6 years. Mean years of education was 12. Midpoint for income was \$33,680.	conducted separately with each partner. Follow-up survey in 2000.	incidents of FMPV were reported, with 36% identified by women only and 19% identified by men only. Concordance was low, with 45% agreement on violent episodes. Blacks have a higher level of agreement on: hit or tried to hit with something, choked, beat up, and threatened with knife or gun. Black women were more likely to identify themselves as perpetrators than Black men were to identify themselves as victims.
Cunradi, C. B., Caetano, R., & Schafer, J. (2002). Socioeconomic predictors of intimate partner violence among White, Black, and Hispanic couples in the United States. <i>Journal of Family Violence, 17</i> , 377-389.	1,440 couples	Couple sample, representative of married and cohabitating couples in the 48 contiguous United States. In 1995, 358 Black couples were interviewed. Mean age was 45.2 for men and 42 years for women. 86% were married and 14% were cohabitating. Mean years in the relationship was 16.6 years. Mean years of education was 12. Midpoint for income was \$33,680.	Longitudinal survey data. 1995 National Longitudinal Couples Surveys (NCLS). Sample of couples from the 1995 National Alcohol Survey, a national multistage area household probability sample with oversamples of African American and Hispanic households. In person interviews conducted separately with each partner. Follow-up survey in 2000.	<i>Measures:</i> IPV: <i>Measures:</i> IPV: CTS-R, 11- items measure past year physical aggression; Socioeconomic status: income, employment status, education. Alcohol consumption prior 12 months; Alcohol problems 14-items. Demographic variables: ethnicity, respondents age, marital status. <i>Results:</i> Annual household income had the greatest relative influence on the probability of partner violence. Black couples who reported MFPV (\$22,838) had significantly lower mean annual incomes than couples who did not report MFPV (\$32,685). Black couples who reported FMPV (\$23,238) had significantly lower mean annual incomes than couples who did not

PASK#6: Online Tables – Table 1. Intimate partner abuse among African Americans

Study	N	Sample Characteristics	Method and Design	Results
<p>Field, C. A., & Caetano, R. (2003). Longitudinal model predicting partner violence among White, Black, and Hispanic couples in the United States. <i>Alcoholism: Clinical and Experimental Research</i>, 27, 1451-1458.</p>	<p>1,025</p>	<p>Couple sample, representative of married and cohabitating couples in the 48 contiguous United States. In 2000, of the 358 Blacks interviewed in 1995, 232 Black couples were reinterviewed. Men's mean age was 52 and women's mean age was 49. Midpoint for Black income was \$42,680.</p>	<p>Longitudinal survey data. 2000 National Longitudinal Couples Surveys (NCLS). Sample of couples from the 1995 National Alcohol Survey, a national multistage area household probability sample with oversamples of African American and Hispanic households. In person interviews conducted separately with each partner. Follow-up survey in 2000.</p>	<p>report FMPV (\$33,541). <i>Measures:</i> IPV: CTS-R, 11- items measure past year physical aggression; Demographic variables: age, education, ethnicity, income. Psychosocial variables: childhood violence victimization 5-items; exposure to parental violence, impulsivity 3-items, approval of marital aggression. Alcohol consumption; Frequency of consuming 5 or more drinks per occasion; Alcohol-related problems: 11 items alcohol dependence and 15 items drinking related social consequences. <i>Results:</i> Among Blacks, MFPV in 1995 was a significant predictor of both MFPV and FMPV at follow-up.</p>
<p>Schafer, J., Caetano, R., & Cunradi, C. B. (2004). A path model of risk factors for intimate partner violence among couples in the United States. <i>Journal of Interpersonal Violence</i>, 19, 127-142.</p>	<p>1,440 couples</p>	<p>Couple sample, representative of married and cohabitating couples in the 48 contiguous United States. In 1995, 358 Black couples were interviewed. Mean age was 45.2 for men and 42 years for women. 86% were married and 14% were cohabitating. Mean years in the relationship was 16.6 years. Mean</p>	<p>Longitudinal survey data. 1995 National Longitudinal Couples Surveys (NCLS). Sample of couples from the 1995 National Alcohol Survey, a national multistage area household probability sample with oversamples of African American and Hispanic households. In person interviews conducted separately</p>	<p><i>Measures:</i> IPV: CTS-R, 11- items measure past year physical aggression; Alcohol problems 14-items. History of childhood physical abuse; Impulsivity 3-items. <i>Results:</i> Using a path model, history of childhood physical abuse, impulsivity, and drinking problems were risk factors for IPV. Among Black couples, the female's history of childhood physical abuse had a significant effect on men and women's reports of being victims of IPV. Higher impulsivity in Black women had a</p>

PASK#6: Online Tables – Table 1. Intimate partner abuse among African Americans

Study	N	Sample Characteristics	Method and Design	Results
		years of education was 12. Midpoint for income was \$33,680.	with each partner. Follow-up survey in 2000.	significant effect on higher probability of alcohol problems in the past 12 months and on higher reported levels of IPV perpetration and victimization. Higher levels of childhood physical abuse among Black men had a direct effect on higher levels of impulsivity and alcohol problems and higher reports of IPV victimization and perpetration.
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, 393-404.	1,440 couples	Couple sample, representative of married and cohabitating couples in the 48 contiguous United States. In 1995, 358 Black couples were interviewed. Mean age was 45.2 for men and 42 years for women. 86% were married and 14% were cohabitating. Mean years in the relationship was 16.6 years. Mean years of education was 12. Midpoint for income was \$33,680.	Longitudinal survey data. 1995 National Longitudinal Couples Surveys (NCLS). Sample of couples from the 1995 National Alcohol Survey, a national multistage area household probability sample with oversamples of African American and Hispanic households. In person interviews conducted separately with each partner. Follow-up survey in 2000.	<i>Measures:</i> IPV: CTS-R, 11- items measure past year physical aggression; bidirectional aggression when both MFPV and FMPV were reported together by either member of the couple. Alcohol consumption prior 12 months; Alcohol problems 14-items. Psychosocial variables: retrospective childhood exposure to parental aggression; childhood physical abuse; approval of marital IPV; Demographic variables: Ethnicity, respondents age and mean age of the couple, income, marital status, education. <i>Results:</i> When only the couples who reported violence were considered, 61% of the Black couples reported bidirectional violence; 31% reported unidirectional FMPV; and 8% reported unidirectional MFPV. 38% of Black couples who reported bidirectional violence described it as severe. Bidirectional partner violence was

PASK#6: Online Tables – Table 1. Intimate partner abuse among African Americans

Study	N	Sample Characteristics	Method and Design	Results
				independent of education, income, employment status, drinking, alcohol problems, and history of violence in the family of origin.
<p>Field, C. A., & Caetano, R. (2005). Longitudinal model predicting mutual partner violence among White, Black, and Hispanic couples in the United States general population. <i>Violence and Victims</i>, 20, 499-511.</p>	1,025 couples	<p>Couple sample, representative of married and cohabitating couples in the 48 contiguous United States. In 2000, of the 358 Blacks interviewed in 1995, 232 Black couples were reinterviewed. Men's mean age was 52 and women's mean age was 49. Midpoint for Black income was \$42,680</p>	<p>Longitudinal survey data. 2000 National Longitudinal Couples Surveys (NCLS). Sample of couples from the 1995 National Alcohol Survey, a national multistage area household probability sample with oversamples of African American and Hispanic households. In person interviews conducted separately with each partner. Follow-up survey in 2000.</p>	<p><i>Measures:</i> IPV: CTS2 used to measure minor and severe psychological and physical MFPV and FMPV. Bidirectional aggression when both MFPV and FMPV were reported together by either member of the couple. Demographic variables: age of respondent, ethnicity, income. Psychosocial variables: childhood violence victimization, exposure to parental violence. Alcohol consumption; Alcohol-related problems: 11 items alcohol dependence and 15 items drinking related social consequences.</p> <p><i>Results:</i> When only violent couples were considered, mutual partner violence (68%) was significantly more likely to be reported than unidirectional MFPV (12%) and unidirectional FMPV (20%).</p>
<p>Caetano, R., Field, C., Ramisetty-Mikler, S., & Lipsky, S. (2009). Agreement on reporting of physical, psychological, and sexual violence among White, Black,</p>	1,025 couples	<p>Couple sample, representative of married and cohabitating couples in the 48 contiguous United States. In 2000, of the 358 Blacks interviewed in 1995, 232 Black couples were</p>	<p>Longitudinal survey data. 2000 National Longitudinal Couples Surveys (NCLS). Sample of couples from the 1995 National Alcohol Survey, a national multistage area household probability</p>	<p><i>Measures:</i> IPV: CTS2 used to measure past year minor and severe psychological and physical MFPV and FMPV. Sociodemographic: age of respondent, education, ethnicity, income.</p> <p><i>Results:</i> Minor (15%) and severe (4%) physical aggression was comparable to minor (16%) and severe (4%) FMPV.</p>

PASK#6: Online Tables – Table 1. Intimate partner abuse among African Americans

Study	N	Sample Characteristics	Method and Design	Results
<p>and Hispanic couples in the United States. <i>Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 24</i>, 1318-1337.</p>		<p>reinterviewed. Men's mean age was 52 and women's mean age was 49. Midpoint for Black income was \$42,680.</p>	<p>sample with oversamples of African American and Hispanic households. In person interviews conducted separately with each partner. Follow-up survey in 2000.</p>	<p>Minor (53%) and severe (28%) MFPV psychological aggression was comparable to minor (51%) and severe (30%) FMPV psychological aggression. 38 incidents of MFPV physical aggression were reported, with 31% identified by women only and 44% identified by men only. Concordance was low, with 24% agreement on violent episodes. 39 incidents of FMPV were reported, with 38% identified by women only and 38% identified by men only. Concordance was low, with 24% agreement on violent episodes. 160 incidents of MFPV psychological aggression were reported, with 21% identified by women only and 16% identified by men only. Concordance was fairly high, with 63% agreement on violent episodes. 160 incidents of FMPV psychological aggression were reported, with 19% identified by women only and 10% identified by men only. Concordance was high, with 71% agreement on violent episodes.</p>

University Samples

PASK#6: Online Tables – Table 1. Intimate partner abuse among African Americans

Study	N	Sample Characteristics	Method and Design	Results
<p>Clark, M. L., Beckett, J., Wells, M., Dungee-Anderson, D. (1991). Courtship violence among African American college students. <i>Journal of Black Psychology, 20</i>, 264-281.</p>	<p>311</p>	<p>Sample Characteristics 76 African American men and 235 African American women undergraduates. Respondents were never married, currently dating or had dated within the year. Mean age was 20. 73% were freshmen and sophomores. 58% were reared in two parent homes and 29% were reared in single parent homes. Mean social class score was middle-class.</p>	<p>Method and Design Cross-sectional. Respondents were recruited from undergraduate courses at a Southeast university.</p>	<p>Results <i>Measures:</i> IPV: CTS-R to measure past year physical aggression (6-items verbal aggression and 9-items physical aggression). Modified Children's Report of Parental Behavior Inventory (CRPBI); Fundamental Interpersonal Relations Orientation-Behavior Scale (FIRO-B); Bem Sex Role Inventory (BSRI). <i>Results:</i> Comparable rates of men (92%) and women (94%) had used some form of verbal aggression in the previous year. Comparable rates of men (91%) and women (88%) had been victims of verbal aggression in the past year. More women (47%) perpetrated physical aggression against a boyfriend than men (35%) used against a girlfriend. Men also perceived their girlfriends to be more physically aggressive than women perceived their boyfriends to be physically aggressive. Comparable rates of men (41%) and women (33%) had been victims of physical aggression in the past year, which primarily took the form of being pushed, slapped, or hit. Significant correlations between the expression of verbal and physical aggression and the perception of the partners verbal and physical aggression</p>

PASK#6: Online Tables – Table 1. Intimate partner abuse among African Americans

Study	N	Sample Characteristics	Method and Design	Results
				<p>was found for both males and females. The use of physical aggression for males and the use of verbal aggression for females was associated with having a psychologically controlling father as measured by the CRPBI. As measured by the BSRI, low Masculinity was correlated with the use of physical aggression for males and low Femininity was correlated with the use of verbal aggression by females.</p>
<p>West, C. M., & Rose, S. (2000). Dating aggression among low income African American youth: An examination of gender differences and antagonistic beliefs. <i>Violence Against Women</i>, 6, 470-494.</p>	<p>171</p>	<p>88 Black women and 83 men. 73% single and currently dating. Mean age was 18. 52% reported violence in their family of origin. 56% were raised by single mothers and 35% were raised in two parent homes. 44% reported their parents' occupations as working-class.</p>	<p>Cross sectional, retrospective data from a government sponsored youth job training program and technical college. Self report.</p>	<p><i>Measures:</i> IPV: Lifetime physical aggression measured by the CTS-R. Psychological aggression-8 items. <i>Results:</i> Physical victimization: more women than men had been choked (35.2% vs. 18.5%). Physical perpetration: women than men had: threatened to hit or throw something (66.3% vs. 49.4%); threw, smashed, hit, or kicked something (62.1% vs. 45%); slapped (53.5% vs. 38.6%); and hit or tried to hit with something (47.1% vs. 30.9%). Psychological victimization: more women than men had their feelings hurt (86.2% vs. 74.7%); reported having their feelings hurt. Psychological perpetration: more women than men made a partner feel guilty (88.6% vs. 68.3%); more men than women made their partner feel inferior (57.5% vs. 36.5%); more men than women degraded a partner (53.7% vs.</p>

PASK#6: Online Tables – Table 1. Intimate partner abuse among African Americans

Study	N	Sample Characteristics	Method and Design	Results
<p>Bougere, A. A., Rowley, L. M., & Lee, G. M. (2004). Prevalence and chronicity of dating violence among a sample of African American university students. <i>The Western Journal of Black Studies</i>, 28, 458-478.</p>	<p>228</p>	<p>206 Women and 21 Men. Age range 30-39. 49.5% were dating, 11.4% engaged, or 29.3% married. Median income was \$20,000-29,000. 59.2% had been in a relationship for more than 2 years.</p>	<p>Cross-sectional, retrospective data from the International Dating Violence Research Consortium. African American college students from 3 historically Black universities and 1 historically White southern university were recruited from social work classes.</p>	<p>37.9%). <i>Measures:</i> IPV: CTS2 Psychological aggression, Physical aggression, and Injury scales in the previous 12 months. SES measured by parents' yearly income and education. <i>Results:</i> Comparable rates of men (38.8%) and women (40.6%) had perpetrated at least one act of physical aggression against a partner in the past year. More men (33.3%) than women (20.9%) had injured their partner. Comparable rates of men (82.3%) and women (83.5%) reported that they had insulted, shouted, threatened, or perpetrated at least one act of psychological aggression in the previous 12 months. SES did not predict dating violence.</p>

Table 2. Intimate partner abuse among Hispanic Americans

Large Population Samples--Studies based on National Survey Data

Study	N	Sample Characteristics	Method and Design	Results
<p>Straus, M. A. & Smith, C. (1990). Violence in Hispanic families in the United States: Incidence rates and structural interpretations. In Straus, M. A., & Gelles, R. J. (1990). <i>Physical violence in American families: Risk factors and adaptations to violence in 8,145 families</i> (pp. 341-367). New Brunswick: NJ: Transaction Publishers.</p>	<p>711</p>	<p>Hispanic current couple households (married or cohabitating). 41.5% lived in the Western U.S. and 38% lived in the South. 57.1% had a family annual income of \$20,000 or less. 77.2% of husbands were employed full time and 72.8% reported a blue-collar occupational status. 50% of wives were unemployed and 38.1% worked full time. 56% of wives reported their occupational status as blue collar.</p>	<p>Cross-sectional retrospective data from the 1985 Second National Family Violence Resurvey (NFVR). National probability sample of one member of the couple. Over sample of Blacks and Hispanics.</p>	<p><i>Measures:</i> CTS-R past year physical aggression. <i>Results:</i> Overall husband-to-wife (17.3 per 100) and severe husband-to-wife violence (7.3 per 100) was comparable to overall wife-to-husband (16.8 per 100) and severe wife-to-husband violence (7.8 per 100) was comparable.</p>
<p>Cunradi, C. B., Caetano, R., Clark, C. L., & Schafer, J. (1999). Alcohol-related problems and intimate partner violence among White, Black, and</p>	<p>1,440 couples</p>	<p>Couple sample, representative of married and cohabitating couples in the 48 contiguous United States. In 1995, 555 White, 358 Black, and 527 Hispanic couples (Latino, Mexican,</p>	<p>Longitudinal survey data. 1995 National Longitudinal Couples Surveys (NCLS). Sample of couples from the 1995 National Alcohol Survey, a national multistage area household probability</p>	<p><i>Measures:</i> IPV: CTS-R, 11- items measure past year physical aggression; Sociodemographic: age of respondent, cohabitating relationship length, education, employment status, ethnic identity, gender, income, marital status, number of children. Psychosocial variables: alcohol consumption 11-items; approval of marital</p>

PASK#6: Online Tables – Table 2. Intimate partner abuse among Hispanic Americans

Study	N	Sample Characteristics	Method and Design	Results
<p>Hispanic couples in the U.S. <i>Alcoholism: Clinical and Experimental Research</i>, 23, 1492-1501.</p>		<p>Central or South American, or other Hispanic origin) were interviewed. Mean age for Hispanic men 41.7 years and for Hispanic women 38 years for women. 87% married and 13% cohabitating. Mean number years in the relationship was 16. Mean years of education was 9 years. Midpoint for income \$24,000.</p>	<p>sample with oversamples of African American and Hispanic households. In person interviews (in Spanish or English) were conducted separately with each partner. Follow-up survey in 2000.</p>	<p>IPV 4-items; childhood violence victimization 5-items; impulsivity 3- items. <i>Results:</i> After adjustments for sociodemographic factors, psychosocial variables, and alcohol consumption, male and female alcohol problems were not predictive of MFPV among Hispanics. Male alcohol problems, adjusted for female alcohol problems, were associated with a twofold risk of FMPV.</p>
<p>Caetano, R., Cunradi, C. B., Clark, C. L., & Schafer, J. (2000). Intimate partner violence and drinking patterns among White, Black, and Hispanic couples in the U. S. <i>Journal of Substance Abuse</i>, 11, 123-138.</p>	<p>1,440 couples</p>	<p>Couple sample, representative of married and cohabitating couples in the 48 contiguous United States. In 1995, 555 White, 358 Black, and 527 Hispanic couples (Latino, Mexican, Central or South American, or other Hispanic origin) were interviewed. Mean age for Hispanic men 41.7 years and for Hispanic women 38</p>	<p>Longitudinal survey data. 1995 National Longitudinal Couples Surveys (NCLS). Sample of couples from the 1995 National Alcohol Survey, a national multistage area household probability sample with oversamples of African American and Hispanic households. In person interviews (in Spanish or English) were conducted separately</p>	<p><i>Measures:</i> IPV: CTS-R, 11- items measure past year physical aggression; Alcohol consumption prior 12 months; Sociodemographic: age, cohabiting relationship length, education, employment status, ethnic identification, gender, income, marital status, number of children. Psychosocial: approval of marital aggression, impulsivity 3-items, childhood violence victimization 7-items. <i>Results:</i> Hispanic FMPV was slightly higher than MFPV (21% vs. 17%). More Hispanic women than men threw something (22.1% vs. 5.4%); pushed, shoved, or grabbed (13% vs. 5.8%);</p>

PASK#6: Online Tables – Table 2. Intimate partner abuse among Hispanic Americans

Study	N	Sample Characteristics	Method and Design	Results
		<p>years for women. 87% married and 13% cohabitating. Mean number years in the relationship was 16. Mean years of education was 9 years. Midpoint for income \$24,000.</p>	<p>with each partner. Follow-up survey in 2000.</p>	<p>slapped (6.4% vs. 5.5%); kicked, bit, hit (5% vs. 2.6%); hit with something (7.5% vs. 4.2%); beat up (2.1% vs. 1.4%). Risk factors for Hispanic MFPV: lower household income (under \$20,000), male unemployment, female classified as infrequent drinker, and male impulsivity. Protective factors for MFPV: being married (vs. cohabitation), retired employment status for females, and male classified as less frequent drinker. Risk factors for FMPV: higher levels of male impulsivity and education. Protective factors for FMPV: older and retired Hispanic female less likely to report physical aggression than their younger and employed counterparts.</p>
<p>Caetano, R., Schafer, J., Clark, C. L., Cunradi, C. B., & Raspberry, K. (2000). Intimate partner violence, acculturation, and alcohol consumption among Hispanic couples in the United States. <i>Journal of Interpersonal Violence</i>, 15, 30-45.</p>	<p>1,440 couples</p>	<p>Couple sample, representative of married and cohabitating couples in the 48 contiguous United States. In 1995, 555 White, 358 Black, and 527 Hispanic couples (Latino, Mexican, Central or South American, or other Hispanic origin) were interviewed. Mean age for Hispanic</p>	<p>Longitudinal survey data. 1995 National Longitudinal Couples Surveys (NCLS). Sample of couples from the 1995 National Alcohol Survey, a national multistage area household probability sample with oversamples of African American and Hispanic households. In person interviews (in</p>	<p><i>Measures:</i> IPV: CTS-R, 11- items measure past year physical aggression. Level of Acculturation 12-items. Alcohol consumption. Sociodemographic: age, education, ethnicity, gender, income, marital status. Psychosocial variables: childhood violence victimization 5-items, approval of marital aggression, impulsivity 3-items. <i>Results:</i> MFPV and FMPV, respectively, were highest in the medium acculturation group, followed by the high acculturation group and the low acculturation group.</p>

PASK#6: Online Tables – Table 2. Intimate partner abuse among Hispanic Americans

Study	N	Sample Characteristics	Method and Design	Results
		men 41.7 years and for Hispanic women 38 years for women. 87% married and 13% cohabitating. Mean number years in the relationship was 16. Mean years of education was 9 years. Midpoint for income \$24,000.	Spanish or English) were conducted separately with each partner. Follow-up survey in 2000.	Couples with at least one medium acculturated couple member were 3 times more likely to experience MFPV than couples with two low acculturated partners.
<p>Cunradi, C. B., Caetano, R., Clark, C., & Schafer, J. (2000). Neighborhood poverty as a predictor of intimate partner violence among White, Black, and Hispanic couples in the United States: A multilevel analysis. <i>Annals of Epidemiology</i>, 10, 297-308.</p>	1,440 couples	<p>Couple sample, representative of married and cohabitating couples in the 48 contiguous United States. In 1995, 555 White, 358 Black, and 527 Hispanic couples (Latino, Mexican, Central or South American, or other Hispanic origin) were interviewed. Mean age for Hispanic men 41.7 years and for Hispanic women 38 years for women. 87% married and 13% cohabitating. Mean number years in the relationship was 16.</p>	<p>Longitudinal survey data. 1995 National Longitudinal Couples Surveys (NCLS). Sample of couples from the 1995 National Alcohol Survey, a national multistage area household probability sample with oversamples of African American and Hispanic households. In person interviews (in Spanish or English) were conducted separately with each partner. Follow-up survey in 2000.</p>	<p><i>Measures:</i> IPV: CTS-R, 11- items measure past year physical aggression; Demographic variables: age of respondent, education, employment status, ethnicity, gender, income, marital status, number of children, relationship length. Psychosocial variables: childhood violence victimization; approval of marital IPV; Impulsivity-3 items. Alcohol consumption; Alcohol-related problems: 11 items alcohol dependence and 15 items drinking related social consequences. Socioeconomic variables: neighborhood poverty measured by number of residents who were undereducated, unemployment, working class, or impoverished. <i>Results:</i> Among Hispanic couples, household income, rather than neighborhood poverty was a significant predictor of MFPV (each \$1,000 increase</p>

PASK#6: Online Tables – Table 2. Intimate partner abuse among Hispanic Americans

Study	N	Sample Characteristics	Method and Design	Results
		Mean years of education was 9 years. Midpoint for income \$24,000.		in reported household income was associated with 3% decrease in risk of MFPV).
<p>Caetano, R., Schafer, J., Field, C., Nelson, S. M. (2002). Agreement on reports of intimate partner violence among White, Black, and Hispanic couples in the United States. <i>Journal of Interpersonal Violence</i>, 17, 1308-1322.</p>	1,440 couples	<p>Couple sample, representative of married and cohabitating couples in the 48 contiguous United States. In 1995, 555 White, 358 Black, and 527 Hispanic couples (Latino, Mexican, Central or South American, or other Hispanic origin) were interviewed. Mean age for Hispanic men 41.7 years and for Hispanic women 38 years for women. 87% married and 13% cohabitating. Mean number years in the relationship was 16. Mean years of education was 9 years. Midpoint for income \$24,000.</p>	<p>Longitudinal survey data. 1995 National Longitudinal Couples Surveys (NCLS). Sample of couples from the 1995 National Alcohol Survey, a national multistage area household probability sample with oversamples of African American and Hispanic households. In person interviews (in Spanish or English) were conducted separately with each partner. Follow-up survey in 2000.</p>	<p><i>Measures:</i> IPV: CTS-R, 11- items measure past year physical aggression; Alcohol consumption prior 12 months; Alcohol problems 14-items. Demographic variables: Ethnicity, respondents age, income, marital status, education. <i>Results:</i> 88 incidents of MFPV were reported, with 25% identified by women only and 37% identified by men only. Concordance was low, with 38% agreement on violent episodes. Hispanics show higher levels of agreement for the items threw something; kicked, bit or hit; forced sex; beat up; or threaten with knife or gun. 112 incidents of FMPV were reported, with 45% identified by women only and 16% identified by men only. Thus, Hispanic women were more likely to identify themselves as perpetrators than men were to identify themselves as victims. Concordance was low, with 39% agreement on violent episodes. Hispanics had a high level of agreement on the item threw something.</p>
<p>Cunradi, C. B., Caetano, R., &</p>	1,440 couples	<p>Couple sample, representative of married</p>	<p>Longitudinal survey data. 1995 National</p>	<p><i>Measures:</i> IPV: CTS-R, 11- items measure past year physical aggression;</p>

PASK#6: Online Tables – Table 2. Intimate partner abuse among Hispanic Americans

Study	N	Sample Characteristics	Method and Design	Results
<p>Schafer, J. (2002). Socioeconomic predictors of intimate partner violence among White, Black, and Hispanic couples in the United States. <i>Journal of Family Violence, 17</i>, 377-389.</p>		<p>and cohabitating couples in the 48 contiguous United States. In 1995, 555 White, 358 Black, and 527 Hispanic couples (Latino, Mexican, Central or South American, or other Hispanic origin) were interviewed. Mean age for Hispanic men 41.7 years and for Hispanic women 38 years for women. 87% married and 13% cohabitating. Mean number years in the relationship was 16. Mean years of education was 9 years. Midpoint for income \$24,000.</p>	<p>Longitudinal Couples Surveys (NCLS). Sample of couples from the 1995 National Alcohol Survey, a national multistage area household probability sample with oversamples of African American and Hispanic households. In person interviews (in Spanish or English) were conducted separately with each partner. Follow-up survey in 2000.</p>	<p>Socioeconomic status: income, employment status, education. Alcohol consumption prior 12 months; Alcohol problems 14-items. Demographic variables: ethnicity, respondents age, marital status. <i>Results:</i> Hispanic couples who reported MFPV (\$17,168) had significantly lower mean annual incomes than couples who did not report MFPV (\$24,733). Hispanic couples, who reported FMPV had significantly higher mean years of education compared to couples who did not report FMPV (10.9 vs. 9.4 years, respectively). This finding may be confounded by acculturation level, which is associated with both IPV and education.</p>
<p>Field, C. A., & Caetano, R. (2003). Longitudinal model predicting partner violence among White, Black, and Hispanic couples in the United States. <i>Alcoholism: Clinical</i></p>	<p>1,025 couples</p>	<p>Couple sample, representative of married and cohabitating couples in the 48 contiguous United States. Of the 527 Hispanic couples interviewed in 1995, 365 were reinterviewed in 2000. Men's mean age</p>	<p>Longitudinal survey data. 2000 National Longitudinal Couples Surveys (NCLS). Sample of couples from the 1995 National Alcohol Survey, a national multistage area household probability</p>	<p><i>Measures:</i> IPV: CTS-R, 11- items measure past year physical aggression; Demographic variables: age, education, ethnicity, income. Psychosocial variables: childhood violence victimization 5-items; exposure to parental violence, impulsivity 3-items, approval of marital aggression. Alcohol consumption; Frequency of consuming 5 or more drinks per occasion;</p>

PASK#6: Online Tables – Table 2. Intimate partner abuse among Hispanic Americans

Study	N	Sample Characteristics	Method and Design	Results
<i>and Experimental Research, 27, 1451-1458.</i>		52; women mean age 49 years. Midpoint for income \$31,000 for Hispanics.	sample with oversamples of African American and Hispanic households. In person interviews conducted separately with each partner. Follow-up survey in 2000.	Alcohol-related problems: 11 items alcohol dependence and 15 items drinking related social consequences. <i>Results:</i> Male impulsivity was a risk factor for MFPV among Hispanics. FMPV at baseline in 1995 was a risk factor for MFPV at followup in 2000. Among Hispanic couples, FMPV at baseline predicted FMPV at followup.
Schafer, J., Caetano, R., & Cunradi, C. B. (2004). A path model of risk factors for intimate partner violence among couples in the United States. <i>Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 19</i> , 127-142.	1,440 couples	Couple sample, representative of married and cohabitating couples in the 48 contiguous United States. In 1995, 555 White, 358 Black, and 527 Hispanic couples (Latino, Mexican, Central or South American, or other Hispanic origin) were interviewed. Mean age for Hispanic men 41.7 years and for Hispanic women 38 years for women. 87% married and 13% cohabitating. Mean number years in the relationship was 16. Mean years of education was 9 years. Midpoint	Longitudinal survey data. 1995 National Longitudinal Couples Surveys (NCLS). Sample of couples from the 1995 National Alcohol Survey, a national multistage area household probability sample with oversamples of African American and Hispanic households. In person interviews (in Spanish or English) were conducted separately with each partner. Follow-up survey in 2000.	<i>Measures:</i> IPV: CTS-R, 11- items measure past year physical aggression; Alcohol problems 14-items. History of childhood physical abuse; Impulsivity 3-items. <i>Results:</i> Using a path model, history of childhood physical abuse, impulsivity, and drinking problems were risk factors for IPV. Among Hispanic couples, female partner's history of childhood physical abuse had a significant effect on higher levels of their reported impulsivity, of greater probability of reported alcohol problems, of higher reported levels of their IPV perpetration and victimization, and on higher reported levels of perpetration of IPV by their male partners. A history of childhood physical abuse among Hispanic men had a significant effect of higher levels of their reported impulsivity, IPV perpetration and victimization, and on higher levels of their partner's report of

PASK#6: Online Tables – Table 2. Intimate partner abuse among Hispanic Americans

Study	N	Sample Characteristics	Method and Design	Results
		for income \$24,000.		MFPV. The Hispanic men's presence of alcohol problems had significant effects on reported MFPV perpetration and FMPV victimization and Hispanic women's presence of alcohol problems were associated with higher levels of MFPV perpetration.
<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, 393-404.</p>	1,440 couples	<p>Couple sample, representative of married and cohabitating couples in the 48 contiguous United States. In 1995, 555 White, 358 Black, and 527 Hispanic couples (Latino, Mexican, Central or South American, or other Hispanic origin) were interviewed.</p> <p>Mean age for Hispanic men 41.7 years and for Hispanic women 38 years for women. 87% married and 13% cohabitating. Mean number years in the relationship was 16. Mean years of education was 9 years. Midpoint for income \$24,000.</p>	<p>Longitudinal survey data. 1995 National Longitudinal Couples Surveys (NCLS). Sample of couples from the 1995 National Alcohol Survey, a national multistage area household probability sample with oversamples of African American and Hispanic households. In person interviews (in Spanish or English) were conducted separately with each partner. Follow-up survey in 2000.</p>	<p><i>Measures:</i> IPV: CTS-R, 11- items measure past year physical aggression; bidirectional aggression when both MFPV and FMPV were reported together by either member of the couple. Alcohol consumption prior 12 months; Alcohol problems 14-items. Psychosocial variables: childhood exposure to parental aggression; childhood physical abuse 5-items; approval of marital IPV; Demographic variables: age of respondent and mean age of couple, education, ethnic identity, income, marital status.</p> <p><i>Results:</i> Among Hispanic couples who reported violence, the rates of bidirectional partner violence (45%) was higher than the rate of unidirectional FMPV (38%) and unidirectional MFPV (19%).</p>

PASK#6: Online Tables – Table 2. Intimate partner abuse among Hispanic Americans

Study	N	Sample Characteristics	Method and Design	Results
<p>Field, C. A., & Caetano, R. (2005). Longitudinal model predicting mutual partner violence among White, Black, and Hispanic couples in the United States general population. <i>Violence and Victims</i>, 20, 499-511.</p>	<p>1,025 couples</p>	<p>Couple sample, representative of married and cohabitating couples in the 48 contiguous United States. Of the 527 Hispanic couples interviewed in 1995, 365 were reinterviewed in 2000. Men's mean age 52; women mean age 49 years. Midpoint for income \$31,000 for Hispanics.</p>	<p>Longitudinal survey data. 2000 National Longitudinal Couples Surveys (NCLS) Sample of couples from the 1995 National Alcohol Survey, a national multistage area household probability sample with oversamples of African American and Hispanic households. In person interviews conducted separately with each partner. Follow-up survey in 2000.</p>	<p><i>Measures:</i> IPV: CTS2 used to measure minor and severe psychological and physical MFPV and FMPV. Bidirectional aggression when both MFPV and FMPV were reported together by either member of the couple. Demographic variables: age of respondent, ethnicity, income. Psychosocial variables: childhood violence victimization, exposure to parental violence. Alcohol consumption; Alcohol-related problems: 11 items alcohol dependence and 15 items drinking related social consequences. <i>Results:</i> When only violent couples were considered, mutual partner violence (59%) was significantly more likely to be reported than unidirectional FMPV (18%) and unidirectional MFPV (23%).</p>
<p>Caetano, R., Ramisetty-Mikler, S., Vaeth, P. A., & Harris, T. R. (2007). Acculturation stress, drinking, and intimate partner violence among Hispanic couples in the U.S. <i>Journal of Interpersonal Violence</i>, 22, 1431-</p>	<p>1,025 couples</p>	<p>Couple sample, representative of married and cohabitating couples in the 48 contiguous United States. Of the 527 Hispanic couples interviewed in 1995, 365 were reinterviewed in 2000. Men's mean age 52; women mean age 49 years. Midpoint for income \$31,000 for</p>	<p>Longitudinal survey data. 2000 National Longitudinal Couples Surveys (NCLS) Sample of couples from the 1995 National Alcohol Survey, a national multistage area household probability sample with oversamples of African American and Hispanic households. In</p>	<p><i>Measures:</i> IPV: CTS-R, 11- items measure past year physical aggression; Acculturation level 12-items and Acculturation Stress 11-items. Alcohol consumption, Binge drinking (frequency of 5 or more drinks on occasion). Sociodemographic: age, education, employment, income. <i>Results:</i> Among both Hispanic men and women, lower acculturation was positively associated with higher acculturation stress, which is directly related to greater</p>

PASK#6: Online Tables – Table 2. Intimate partner abuse among Hispanic Americans

Study	N	Sample Characteristics	Method and Design	Results
1447.		Hispanics.	person interviews conducted separately with each partner. Follow-up survey in 2000.	likelihood of involvement in IPV. For Hispanic women, there was an additional path linking higher levels of acculturation directly to IPV.
Caetano, R., Field, C., Ramisetty-Mikler, S., & Lipsky, S. (2009). Agreement on reporting of physical, psychological, and sexual violence among White, Black, and Hispanic couples in the United States. <i>Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 24</i> , 1318-1337.	1,025 couples	Couple sample, representative of married and cohabitating couples in the 48 contiguous United States. Of the 527 Hispanic couples interviewed in 1995, 365 were reinterviewed in 2000. Men's mean age 52; women mean age 49 years. Midpoint for income \$31,000 for Hispanics.	Longitudinal survey data. 2000 National Longitudinal Couples Surveys (NCLS) Sample of couples from the 1995 National Alcohol Survey, a national multistage area household probability sample with oversamples of African American and Hispanic households. In person interviews conducted separately with each partner. Follow-up survey in 2000.	<i>Measures:</i> IPV: CTS2 used to measure past year minor and severe psychological and physical MFPV and FMPV. Sociodemographic: age of respondent, education, ethnicity, income. <i>Results:</i> Minor (17%) and severe (4%) MFPV physical aggression and minor (15%) and severe (4.5%) FMPV physical aggression were comparable. Minor (53%) and severe (28%) psychological aggression and minor (51%) and severe (30%) FMPV was comparable. 77 incidents of MFPV physical aggression were reported, with 30% identified by women only and 49% identified by men only. Concordance was low, with 20% agreement on violent episodes. 76 incidents of FMPV physical aggression were reported, with 45% identified by women only and 36% identified by men only. Concordance was low, with 18% agreement on violent episodes. 269 incidents of MFPV psychological aggression were reported, with 20% identified by women only and 18% identified by men only. Concordance was fairly high, with 62% agreement on

PASK#6: Online Tables – Table 2. Intimate partner abuse among Hispanic Americans

Study	N	Sample Characteristics	Method and Design	Results
				<p>violent episodes. 263 incidents of FMPV psychological aggression were reported, with 25% identified by women only and 15% identified by men only. Concordance was fairly high, with 60% agreement on violent episodes.</p>
<p>Cunradi, C. B. (2009). Intimate partner violence among Hispanic men and women: The role of drinking, neighborhood disorder, and acculturation-related factors. <i>Violence and Victims</i>, 24, 83-97.</p>	<p>2,547</p>	<p>1,148 Hispanic men and 1,399 Hispanic women.</p>	<p>Secondary data analysis of the 2000 National Household Survey on Drug Abuse (NHSDA). 71,764 individuals 12 years or older were interviewed in their homes via computer-assisted personal interviewing and audio computer-assisted self-interviewing.</p>	<p><i>Measures:</i> IPV victimization and perpetration measured by "How many times during the past 12 months did your spouse or partner hit or threaten to hit you? or you did this to your partner. Drinking measures were past year alcohol abuse, past-month binge drinking, and number of past-year drinking days. Neighborhood disorder was measured by perceived level of neighborhood problems. Acculturation-related factors were nativity and survey interview language preference (Spanish vs. English). Demographics: age, education, household income, employment status. <i>Results:</i> Similar proportions of men and women reported IPV perpetration (6.1% vs. 6.5%) and IPV victimization (8.8% vs. 7.8%). For Hispanic men, neighborhood disorder was associated with IPV perpetration and victimization. For Hispanic women, neighborhood disorder and their alcohol abuse were associated with IPV victimization, but not perpetration. Acculturation-related factors were not associated with IPV victimization</p>

PASK#6: Online Tables – Table 2. Intimate partner abuse among Hispanic Americans

Study	N	Sample Characteristics	Method and Design	Results
				or perpetration for men or women.

University Sample

Study	N	Sample Characteristics	Method and Design	Results
<p>Ferguson, C. J. (2011). Love is a battlefield: Risk factors and gender disparities for domestic violence among Mexican Americans. <i>Journal of Aggression, Maltreatment, & Trauma, 20</i>, 227-236.</p>	151	<p>73 men and 78 women Mexican Americans. Mean age was 25 years. 86.8% were born in the United States. All were currently involved in a romantic relationship (18.5% were married).</p>	<p>Cross-sectional. Students were recruited from a Hispanic serving public university in the South. Questionnaires were in English and administered in a group format during class.</p>	<p><i>Measures:</i> IPV physical and psychology aggression measured by the CTS2. Measure of video game playing and television habits; exposure to domestic violence during childhood measured by Family Conflict Scale 49-items; Trait aggressiveness measured by Aggression Questionnaire-Short Form (AQ). General personality traits measured by the NEO-Five Factor Inventory (NEO-FFI) 60-items. <i>Results:</i> Comparable rates of women (32.1%) and men (38.2%) were victims of physical assault. Comparable rates of women (79.5%) and men (73.5%) reported being victims of psychological aggression. Comparable rates of women (46.8%) and men (35.3%) reported perpetrating some level of physical assault. Comparable rates of women (19.2%) and men (16.2%) committed severe acts of physical aggression. Witnessing domestic violence in the family was the most consistent predictor of IPV perpetration. Among men,</p>

PASK#6: Online Tables – Table 2. Intimate partner abuse among Hispanic Americans

Study	N	Sample Characteristics	Method and Design	Results
				<p>trait aggression, low openness, agreeableness, and exposure to physical abuse in childhood were significant predictors of physical assault. Male childhood abuse predicted perpetrating psychological aggression. Among women, trait aggression, childhood neglect, and exposure to domestic violence in the family of origin predicted physical assaults. For women, domestic violence exposure in childhood predicted perpetrating psychological aggression, but the personality trait of openness was a protective factor against psychological aggression.</p>

Community Samples

Study	N	Sample Characteristics	Method and Design	Results
<p>Sugihara, Y., & Warner, J. A. (2002). Dominance and domestic violence among Mexican Americans: Gender differences in the etiology of violence in intimate</p>	<p>316</p>	<p>161 Mexican American men, mean age was 34 years, mean years of education was 13.5, 71% were married, and 17% were single. 155 Mexican American women, mean age 32 years, mean years of education 13.6, 74%</p>	<p>Cross-sectional design. Undergraduate and graduate students who were enrolled in sociology classes recruited Mexican Americans from a South Texas community.</p>	<p><i>Measures:</i> IPV: CTS2 to measure physical and psychological IPV; 32-item Hamby Dominance Scale <i>Demographics:</i> education, family income. <i>Results:</i> There were no gender differences. 86% of men and 85% of women had inflicted psychological aggression and 45% of men and 48% of women had physically assaulted their partners at least once in the</p>

PASK#6: Online Tables – Table 2. Intimate partner abuse among Hispanic Americans

Study	N	Sample Characteristics	Method and Design	Results
relationships. <i>Journal of Family Violence</i> , 17, 315-340.		were married and 18% were single. All respondents were English speaking and educated in the U.S. Mean family income for sample was \$41,700.		past year. 17% of men and women reported that they had inflicted injury upon partner in the past year. Men who used psychological aggression, physical assault, and inflicted injury were more likely be low income, bossy, possessive, to be sole decision makers, and to look down on their partners. Physically and psychologically aggressive women were domineering, were disrespectful of their partners, possessive, and predominantly low income.
Kim-Goodwin, Y. S., & Fox, J. A. (2009). Gender differences in intimate partner violence and alcohol use among Latino-migrant and seasonal farmworkers in rural southwestern North Carolina. <i>Journal of Community Health Nursing</i> , 26, 131-142.	291	Latino-migrant and seasonal 153 male and 138 female farm workers. 93.8% Mexican descent. 73.1% first generation immigrants. 6.6 years average length in U.S. 58.2% were married. Mean age 31.3 years. Average 7th grade education.	Cross-sectional. Respondents were recruited from rural Southeastern North Carolina migrant camps/houses, during clinic waiting periods at a health department, and Hispanic churches. Interviews were conducted in Spanish.	<i>Measures:</i> IPV: HITS 4 items past year IPV; Alcohol measure: CAGE/4M. Demographic: gender, age, ethnicity, religion, migrant status, immigration status, length in U.S., marital status, current family status, social support, education. Perceptions of IPV 12 items. <i>Results:</i> Women reported higher mean scores on all 4 items: Hits, Insult, Threaten, and Scream and total scale. Mean for women (5.33) was close to the cut-off Spanish HITS, which is identified as victim of domestic violence (compared to mean of 4.76 for men). The respondents who had the higher IPV were more likely to drink alcohol, and indicate a strong association between alcohol use and IPV. Respondents who believed that it is God's will for couples to stay together, even if the husband is violent, reported more IPV.

PASK#6: Online Tables – Table 2. Intimate partner abuse among Hispanic Americans

Study	N	Sample Characteristics	Method and Design	Results
<p>Duke, M. R., & Cunradi, C. B. (2011). Measuring intimate partner violence among male and female farmworkers in San Diego County, CA. <i>Cultural Diversity and Ethnic Minority Psychology, 17</i>, 59-67.</p>	<p>100</p>	<p>37 men and 61 women who were nonmigratory farmworkers in San Diego, CA. 69% had spouse/partner working in agriculture. 97% were born in Mexico and respondents' had resided in U.S. for 12.1 years. 36.1 years was the mean age. 76% had completed a primary or secondary education. 77% had children under age 18.</p>	<p>Cross-sectional design. A convenience sample. Researchers entered the farm field in pairs and recruited respondents (spouse-partner not with them when recruited). Snowball sampling technique was used as well. Researchers made appointment with respondents and the survey was administered orally in Spanish.</p>	<p><i>Measures:</i> IPV: CTS2 past year IPV measured by Physical assault subscale. Migrant Farmworker Stress Inventor (MFWSI) 39-items; Impulsivity 4 items; Alcohol Use Disorders Identification Test (AUDIT). <i>Results:</i> 21.6% of men and 16.4% of women were victims of at least one act of aggression and 18.9% of men and 9.8% women perpetrated at least one act of aggression. There were no gender differences in victimization or perpetration. The MFWSI scores for men and women were not associated with IPV; however, factors associated with "work conditions" (i.e., not enough water to drink while working; being taken advantage of by employer or landlord; experiencing discrimination in the U.S.; and not getting enough credit from other family members for my work) were related to IPV perpetration. Impulsivity was associated with IPV for women. Men's AUDIT scores were associate with IPV.</p>

Table 3. Intimate partner abuse among Asian Americans

General Population Study

Study	N	Sample Characteristics	Method and Design	Results
<p>Chang, D. F., Shen, B., & Takeuchi, D. T. (2009). Prevalence and demographic correlates of intimate partner violence in Asian Americans. <i>International Journal of Law and Psychiatry</i>, 32, 167-175.</p>	<p>1,470</p>	<p>707 men and 763 women who were married/cohabitating with opposite sex partner. Vietnamese (13.9%), Filipino (21%), Chinese (28.8%), and Other Asians (36.1%). 82% were foreign-born, with 21 mean years residence in the U.S. Mean age was 44.4 years. 43.8% had 16 or more years of education. 77% were employed and 50% had incomes higher than \$75,000.</p>	<p>Cross-sectional. Data from the National Latino and Asian American Study (NLAAS), a psychiatric epidemiological study. Face-to-face interviews were conducted by multilingual interviewers with one member of married/cohabitating couple in their preferred language. Chinese, Vietnamese, Filipinos, and "other" Asians were oversampled.</p>	<p><i>Measures:</i> overall, minor, and severe physical IPV measured by CTS-R during the course of the relationship. Demographic: age, gender, ethnicity, education, household income, employment status, marital status, family size, nativity, number of years in U.S. Mental disorders: lifetime incidence of alcohol abuse and dependence, drug abuse and dependency, major depression. <i>Results:</i> Comparable rates of women (10.2%) and men (12%) reported minor violence victimization. Rates of perpetration for male-perpetrated minor violence was 14.7% and 19% for female-perpetrated minor violence. Reciprocal violence accounted for 35% of IPV reported by men and women. There were no gender differences. 19% of men and 21.8% of women admitted that they initiated physical aggression and 15% of men and 24% of women reported that their spouse typically initiated aggression. Reports of minor violence were lowest among Vietnamese women (3.2%) and men (1.7%) compared to Filipino women (6.4%) and men (4.8%), Chinese women</p>

PASK#6: Online Tables – Table 3. Intimate abuse violence among Asian Americans

Study	N	Sample Characteristics	Method and Design	Results
				(5.6%) and men (6.4%), and Other Asian women (5.3%) and men (6.9%). IPV was associated with younger age, substance- and alcohol-use disorders, and major depression. However, minor violence was positively associated with years of education. Immigrant respondents, regardless of length of residence, were less likely than U.S.-born respondents to report minor IPV.

University Samples

Study	N	Sample Characteristics	Method and Design	Results
Siewert, P. A., & Flanagan, A. Y. (2000). Filipino American dating violence: Definitions, contextual justifications, and experiences of dating violence. <i>Journal of Human Behavior in the Social Environment</i> ,	171	61% of the sample were women. The mean age of the sample was 20 years old and 58.5% were juniors or seniors. 15 years old was the average age that both men and women began dating. 64% were born in the U.S. and non-U.S. born respondents had lived in the U.S. for an average of 12 years.	Cross-sectional design. Filipino American undergraduate students were recruited from social sciences and humanities courses to participate in surveys and focus groups.	<i>Measures:</i> IPV 1-item: "ever experienced physical violence since dating such as being hit, pushed, grabbed, by boyfriend/girlfriend/partner?" Definitions of Dating Violence Scale, 9-items; Contextual Justification of Dating Violence Scale, 9-items; Attitude Toward Women Scale, 15-item. Demographic: age, gender, ethnicity, class, place of birth, length in U.S. <i>Results:</i> There were no significant gender differences, with 20.6% of men (n=13) and 31.4% of women (n=32) reported that they had ever experienced physical violence

PASK#6: Online Tables – Table 3. Intimate abuse violence among Asian Americans

Study	N	Sample Characteristics	Method and Design	Results
3, 115-133.				since they began dating.
Yick, A. G., & Agbayani-Siewert, P. (2000). Dating violence among Chinese American and White students: A sociocultural context. <i>Journal of Multicultural Social Work</i> , 8(1/2), 101-129.	289	Chinese American undergraduates (170 female and 118 male). 63% Juniors or Seniors and 6% fraternity/sorority affiliation. 61.% non-U.S. born; 12.9 mean years in the U.S. 16.3 mean years first started dating.	Cross-sectional. Students were recruited from Asian American studies, social welfare, and other social science classes at the Univ. of California, Los Angeles.	<p><i>Measures:</i> IPV physical perpetration and victimization since dating CTS-R 14-items; Definitions of Dating Violence Scale, 9-items; Contextual Justification of Dating Violence Scale, 9-items; Attitude Toward Women Scale, 15-item. Demographic: age, gender, ethnicity, class, place of birth, length in U.S.</p> <p><i>Results:</i> 25.2% of men and 18.8% of women had been victims of dating violence since they are started dating; 18.6% of men and 9.8% of women had been victims in prior 12 months; 17% of men and 27.6% of women had perpetrated dating violence in the prior 12 months. There were no gender differences. Chinese American men and women who defined physical acts of aggression as dating violence were less likely to be victims or perpetrators. Men and women who agreed that certain situations justified the use of violence were more likely to be victims or perpetrators.</p>

PASK#6: Online Tables – Table 3. Intimate abuse violence among Asian Americans

Study	N	Sample Characteristics	Method and Design	Results
-------	---	------------------------	-------------------	---------

Community Samples

Study	N	Sample Characteristics	Method and Design	Results
Yick, A. G. (2000). Predictors of physical spousal/intimate violence in Chinese American families. <i>Journal of Family Violence, 15</i> , 249-267.	262	133 males and 129 females. 62.7% had Bachelor's degree or higher, 71% were employed, mean income \$67,706, and 90.5% born outside the U.S.	Cross-sectional, retrospective. Respondents were randomly selected from Los Angeles County telephone directory using Chinese surnames as identifying marker. Intro letters were sent to 2,500 households. Interview conducted by bilingual interviewers in the language preference of respondent.	<i>Measures:</i> IPV measured by CTS-R; Attitude Toward Women Scale 15-items; Marin Acculturation Scale 12-items; Demographic: age, gender, years in U.S., income. <i>Results:</i> In the prior 12 months, 6.8% of the sample had experienced minor violence and 1.6% had experienced severe victimization. Lifetime minor victimization was 18.1% and severe was 8%. Gender was not a predictor of either past year or lifetime victimization. Employed respondents were .39 times more likely to have been victims of lifetime minor physical aggression. Respondents who were more acculturated were twice as likely to have been victims of severe IPV.
Leung, P., & Cheung, M. (2008). A prevalence study on partner abuse in six Asian American ethnic groups in the USA. <i>International Social Work, 51</i> (5), 635-649.	1,557	867 women and 687 men. 610 Chinese, 101 Filipino, 154 Indian, 72 Japanese, 123 Korean, and 517 Vietnamese. Average length of U.S. residency was 13.2 years. Mean age was 43.5 years. 63% were married and 24% were single. 65%	Cross-sectional. Respondents were recruited from 70 Asian organizations and gathering places in Houston, TX. Face-to-face interviews were conducted by 5 Asian graduate students.	<i>Measures:</i> past year IPV victimization measure CTS 8-items. <i>Results:</i> Comparable rates of women (15.3%) and men (17.6%) reported victimization. The most common: partners had thrown something at them (13.5%), been pushed, grabbed or shoved (6.8%), and had been slapped (5.1%). The overall prevalence for the entire sample was 16.4%, but the rates varied by ethnicity.

PASK#6: Online Tables – Table 3. Intimate abuse violence among Asian Americans

Study	N	Sample Characteristics	Method and Design	Results
		<p>were currently employed, with a median income of \$30,000-40,000. 48.2% had a bachelor's degree or above.</p>		<p>When the rates for men and women were combined, Vietnamese (22.4%) and Filipinos (21.8%) reported more IPV than other groups. Chinese (9.7%) and Japanese (9.7%) reported less IPV than Vietnamese (22.4%), Koreans (19.5%), Indians (19.5%), and Filipinos (21.8%).</p>

Table 4. Intimate partner abuse among American Indians

Community Samples

Study	N	Sample Characteristics	Method and Design	Results
<p>Robin, R. W., Chester, B., & Rasmussen, J. K. (1998). Intimate violence in a Southwestern American Indian tribal community. <i>Cultural Diversity and Mental Health</i>, 4, 335-344.</p>	<p>104</p>	<p>48 men and 56 women members of a Southwestern American Indian tribe who reported at least one intimate relationship for a year or longer during their lifetimes. Mean age was 37.5 years. 66.4% married and 27.9% separated or divorced. 62.5% had finished high school or had a college degree or attended trade school. 71.4% had income between \$7,000 and \$30,000.</p>	<p>Local tribe members conducted a structured psychiatric interview with 582 respondents (IPV questionnaire administered to 133).</p>	<p><i>Measures:</i> IPV: modified CTS included 5 additional items based on focus group suggestions. <i>Results:</i> Verbal and physical violence were experienced by 75% of men and women. A higher proportion of women than men reported being victims of every specific incident of IPV, with the exception of being hit with an object. Women were 9.53 times more likely than men to require medical attention for injuries. Women were more likely to be victims in incidents in which children were involved. Men were more likely to have the perpetrator use a weapon in self-defense. Verbal abuse was perpetrated by 73% of both men and women. Although not significant, more women (76.8%) inflicted more physical aggression than men (66.7%). Throwing or smashing objects were initiated more often by women. More women reported using a weapon for self-defense than men (31% vs. 6%), but more women used a weapon with intent to injure than men (20% vs. 2%). More women and than men reported that their violence was a reaction to their partners' abuse (76% vs. 46%).</p>

PASK#6: Online Tables – Table 4. Intimate partner abuse among American Indians

Study	N	Sample Characteristics	Method and Design	Results
<p>Harwell, T. S., Moore, K. R., & Spence, M. R. (2003). Physical violence, intimate partner violence, and emotional abuse among adult American Indian men and women in Montana. <i>Preventive Medicine, 37</i>, 297-303.</p>	<p>1006</p>	<p>588 women. Mean age 46 years. 55% were employed, 51% had household income less than \$20,000. 50% were living with a partner. 81% had less than 12th grade education. 418 men with mean age 45.2 years. 67% were employed and 59% had a household income of less than \$20,000. 80% had less than 12th grade education. and 65% were living with a partner.</p>	<p>A telephone survey of adult American Indians living on or near 7 Montana reservations.</p>	<p><i>Measures:</i> past year IPV 1 item: "hit, slapped, kicked, forced to have sex or otherwise physically hurt by someone" <i>Results:</i> There was no difference in the prevalence of past year IPV between women (3%) and men (1%). Women who reported IPV were more likely to be younger, and to report one or more days with mental health problems in the past month compared with women not reporting IPV. No significant risk factors for men and IPV.</p>
<p>Yuan, N. P., Koss, M. P., Polacca, M., & Goldman, D. (2006). Risk factors for physical assault and rape among six Native American tribes. <i>Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 21</i>, 1566-1590.</p>	<p>1,368</p>	<p>Native Americans (575 men and 793 women). Average age was 41. 39% were married. 75% were high school graduates. 42% had household incomes of less than \$15,000. 54% were fluent in their tribal language. 96% lived within tribal lands.</p>	<p>Cross-sectional. Face-to-face interviews with respondents who were randomly selected from tribal enrollment lists, voting registers, or health service registries. 3 tribes from the Southwest, 1 each from the Northwest Northern Plains, and Northeast. Interviews were conducted by members of the same or different tribe.</p>	<p><i>Measures:</i> IPV: CTS-R 12- items used to measure physical assault victimization since age 18. Demographic: age, marital status, household income, education. Risk factors: Adverse childhood exposure prior to age 18, 9-items; parental alcoholism, lifetime diagnoses of alcohol abuse and dependence measured by Alcohol Use Disorders and Associated Disabilities Interview Schedule (AUDADIS); Childhood Trauma Questionnaire 25-items; Acculturation measured by 48-item Cultural Stakes instrument. <i>Results:</i> Females reported significantly higher rates of physical assault compared to</p>

PASK#6: Online Tables – Table 4. Intimate partner abuse among American Indians

Study	N	Sample Characteristics	Method and Design	Results
				<p>males (45% vs. 36%). More women were slapped or hit (35%) and more men were pushed, grabbed, or shoved (29%). 80% of women and 61% of men were physically assaulted by a romantic partner. Predictors of women's victimization: diagnosis of alcohol dependence and having an alcoholic parent; cohabitation, being separated or divorced; history of childhood physical or sexual abuse; greater fluency in the tribal language. Predictors of male victimization: childhood emotional, physical, and sexual abuse; lifetime diagnosis of alcohol dependence. Men's greater value in the retention of tribal language were less likely to be physically assaulted (protective factor).</p>

Table 5: Intimate partner abuse in LGBT Populations

General Population Studies

Study	N	Sample Characteristics	Method and Design	Results
Tjaden, P., Thoennes, N., & Allison, C. J. (1999). Comparing violence over the life span in samples of same-sex and opposite-sex cohabitants. <i>Violence and Victims, 14</i> , 413-425.	16,000	65 men and 79 women same-sex cohabitants and a randomly selected subsample of 300 men and 300 women opposite-sex cohabitants. Same-sex male and female cohabitants more likely to be employed full time, college educated, and to have higher annual income of more than \$15,000.	Cross-sectional data from the National Violence Against Women Survey conducted between 1995 and 1996. Nationally representative sample selected by random-digit dialing. Computer assisted interview conducted in English or Spanish. Self-report.	<i>Measures:</i> IPV Lifetime physical victimization measured by CTS-R. Sexual orientation: coded opposite-sex cohabitants if they had only married/lived with a member of the opposite sex and same-sex cohabitants if they lived with a same-sex partner "as a couple" at some time in their lives. <i>Results:</i> Same-sex cohabitants reported more intimate partner violence than opposite-sex cohabitants. 23.1% of same-sex cohabitating men IPV vs. 7.7% of opposite sex. 39.2% same-sex cohabitating women vs. 20.3% opposite sex cohabitating women. IPV is primarily perpetrated by men, whether against same-sex or opposite partners. 26.6% of same-sex cohabitating women were physically assaulted by a male partner while 11.4% were assaulted by a female partner. 15.4% of same sex cohabitating men were raped and/or physically assaulted by a male partner, while 10.8% had been assaulted by a female partner.
Balsam, K. F., Rothblum, E. D., & Beauchaine, T. P.	1,254	Men: 185 Heterosexual, 38 Bisexual, 226 Gay. Women: 340	Cross-sectional. Lesbians, gays, bisexuals recruited via national	<i>Measures:</i> lifetime and last year physical assault measured by the CTS2. Self-rating of sexual orientation as heterosexual,

PASK#6: Online Tables – Table 5. Intimate partner abuse in LGBT populations

Study	N	Sample Characteristics	Method and Design	Results
(2005). Victimization over the life span: A comparison of lesbian, gay, bisexual, and heterosexual siblings. <i>Journal of Counseling and Clinical Psychology</i> , 73, 477-487.		heterosexual, 125 bisexual, 331 Lesbian. Mean age 36 years. 91.7% European American.	LGB email lists, periodicals, and organizations who then recruited one or more siblings for participation.	bisexual, lesbian, gay. Demographic: gender, age, race, employment status, occupational status, income. <i>Results:</i> LGB reported more lifetime psychological maltreatment than their heterosexual counterparts and more likely to report at least one physical assault by a partner. Sexual minority status not predictive of IPV assault in the past year or ever being injured by a partner. Men: 43% Heterosexual, 47.1% Bisexual, 38.8% Gay. Women: 39% Heterosexual, 49.2% Bisexual, 47.5% Lesbian. Bisexual women more likely to be abused by a male partner than a female partner (71.7% vs. 35%) whereas 56.3% of bisexual males are abused by a male partner and 68.8% of bisexual males are abused by a female partner.
Hughes, T., McCabe, S. E. Wilsnack, S. C., West, B. T., & Boyd, C. J. (2010). Victimization and substance use disorders in a national sample of heterosexual and	34,653	52% female; 71% White; 2% (n=577) were sexual minorities (lesbian, gay, bisexual). 38% between ages 25-44 and 34% between ages 45-64. 58% more than high school education. 53% employed full time.	Secondary data analyses used 2004-05 (wave 2) National Epidemiologic Survey on Alcohol and Related Conditions (NESARC) data collected in structured diagnostic face-to-face interviews in the U.S.	<i>Measures:</i> IPV measure: "Were you ever physically attacked or badly beaten up by your spouse or romantic partner?" Substance use disorders were defined according to the DSM-IV criteria and included past-year alcohol abuse and dependence and drug abuse and dependence. Respondents self-identified their sexual orientation.

PASK#6: Online Tables – Table 5. Intimate partner abuse in LGBT populations

Study	N	Sample Characteristics	Method and Design	Results
sexual minority women and men. <i>Addiction</i> , 105, 2130-2140.		63.7% married or cohabitating.		<i>Results:</i> More lesbians (43%) and bisexual women (40.9%) report IPV than heterosexual women (11.6%). More heterosexual men (39.1%) reported IPV than gay men (25.2%).
Carvalho, A. F., Lewis, R. J., Derlega, V. J., Winstead, B. A., & Viggiano, C. (2011). Internalized sexual minority stressors and same-sex intimate partner violence. <i>Journal of Family Violence</i> , 26, 501-509.	581	264 lesbians and 316 gay men; 79% Caucasian, 90% some college. 38% single and 49% in a committed relationship.	Cross-sectional. Recruited via gay/lesbian newspapers, nationwide professional psychology and gay/lesbian internet list serves, gay/lesbian festivals, bookstores, organizations. Respondents were recruited from multiple unidentified U.S. and foreign cities.	<i>Measures:</i> IPV: "Have you ever been a victim (or perpetrator) of domestic violence?" Self-identify sexual orientation. Outness Inventory, 10-items; Internalized Homophobia Scale, 9-items; Stigma-Consciousness Questionnaire, 10-items. Demographics: age, race, education, sexual orientation, relationship status, income. <i>Results:</i> IPV did not vary by sexual orientation. 25% of lesbians and 23% of gay men had been victims; 9.3% of lesbians and 8.3% of gay men had been perpetrators; 9% of lesbians and 7% of gay men had been both victims and perpetrators. Victims of IPV reported greater expectations of prejudice and discrimination, but were more open about their sexual orientation. Respondents higher in stigma consciousness were almost twice as likely to perpetrate IPV.
Messinger, A. M. (2011). Invisible victims: Same-sex IPV in the National Violence Against Women Survey.	16,000	14,038 Heterosexuals (men=6,860 and 7,178 women). 144 Gay, Lesbian, Bisexual(GLB) (65 men and 79 women).60 "Gay" (only	Cross-sectional data from the National Violence Against Women Survey conducted between 1995 and 1996. Nationally representative sample	<i>Measures:</i> IPV Lifetime physical victimization measured by CTS-R. Sexual orientation: coded heterosexual if the respondent only had an opposite-sex relationship history and coded GLB if at least one same sex relationship.

PASK#6: Online Tables – Table 5. Intimate partner abuse in LGBT populations

Study	N	Sample Characteristics	Method and Design	Results
<i>Journal of Interpersonal Violence</i> , 26, 2228-2243.		same-sex cohabitants) (32 men and 28 women). 84 Bisexuals (both same-sex and opposite sex cohabitants) (33 men and 51 women).	selected by random-digit dialing. Computer assisted interview conducted in English or Spanish. Self-report.	<i>Results:</i> Independent of sex, respondents with a history of same-sex relationships were more likely to be victims of IPV. When gender rates were combined, bisexuals had the highest rates of IPV and most likely abused by opposite-sex partner: 14.5% Heterosexuals 7.5% Heterosexual men 21.1% Heterosexual women 31.1% GLB 33.3% Gay men 25% Gay women 16.5% Bisexual men 42.8% Bisexual women

University Samples

Study	N	Sample Characteristics	Method and Design	Result
Bowman, R. L., & Morgan, H. M. (1998). A comparison of rates of verbal and physical abuse on campus by gender and sexual orientation. <i>College Student Journal</i> , 32, 43-53.	209	40% were males and 60% were females. 62% were heterosexual, 12% were gay men, 19% were lesbians, and 7% were bisexuals. First year students and seniors (50%), 27% were juniors.	Students, who were enrolled in English courses, were recruited mid-sized, public, 4 year institution.	<i>Measure:</i> IPV 22-items pertaining to verbal or physical abuse they received or inflicted. Demographic: age, gender, sexual orientation, and school classification. <i>Results:</i> Females who were both perpetrators or victims of dating violence were either bisexual or lesbian (compared to heterosexuals). In same sex relationship comparisons (lesbians and gay respondents), lesbians reported higher levels of violence in all instances of

PASK#6: Online Tables – Table 5. Intimate partner abuse in LGBT populations

Study	N	Sample Characteristics	Method and Design	Results
				significance. Gay respondents reported being less aggressive than every other gender or sexual orientation. The reported aggression of bisexuals was greater than or equal to the aggression of lesbians and both groups were more aggressive than heterosexuals.
Rhodes, S. D., McCoy, T. P., Wilkin, A. M., & Wolfson, M. (2009). Behavioral risk disparities in a random sample of self-identifying gay and non-gay male university students. <i>Journal of Homosexuality</i> , 56, 1083-1100.	11,217	3,961 Heterosexual men and 206 Gay men. Mean age was 20.5 years. 80% White. 58% resided on campus. 96% were enrolled full time. 40% attended monthly religious services.	Random cross-sectional sample of undergraduate students attending 10 universities in North Carolina. Online internet based assessment of risk behaviors. Recruited via posters and email.	<i>Measures:</i> IPV: "Has a date or boyfriend or girlfriend ever started a physical fight with you? and "Have you ever started a physical fight with a date or boyfriend or girlfriend". Sexual orientation: "How would you describe your sexuality?" <i>Results:</i> After adjusting for race, academic classification, residence type, student status, and religious service attendance, gay men reported a greater risk of IPV perpetration and victimization.

Community Samples

Study	N	Sample Characteristics	Method and Design	Results
Turrell, S. C. (2000). A descriptive analysis of same-sex relationship violence for a diverse sample.	499	265 women and 227 men. 39% identified as lesbian, 11% as "gay women", 43% as gay men, 5% as bisexual, and 2% as	Cross-sectional. Respondents recruited from social, political, religious, and community groups with	<i>Measures:</i> IPV: 47-items non-normed behavioral checklist of acts of physical, sexual, and emotional aggression. <i>Results:</i> Lesbians reported higher frequencies than gay men of physical abuse

PASK#6: Online Tables – Table 5. Intimate partner abuse in LGBT populations

Study	N	Sample Characteristics	Method and Design	Results
<i>Journal of Family Violence</i> , 15, 281-293.		heterosexual. 75% White, 9% African American, 8% Latino, 4% multi-ethnic, 3% Native American, 1% Asian. Mean age 38.1 years. Mean income \$39,500.	gay/lesbian/bisexual/transgendered membership in the Houston area; medical and mental health providers distributed surveys to clients; local bookstores, community centers, women's centers.	(55% vs. 44%), coercion (59% vs. 42%), threats (57% vs. 45%), shaming (77% vs. 62%), and children used as tools of control (12% vs. 5%).
Balsam, K. F., & Szymanski, D. M. (2005). Relationship quality and domestic violence in women's same-sex relationships: The role of minority stress. <i>Psychology of Women Quarterly</i> , 29, 258-269.	272	77% self-identified as lesbian or gay, 18% as bisexual, 4% as "other". 92% were currently in a relationship with a female partner. Mean length of current relationship was 4.2 years. Mean age 34.7 85% European American, 6% African American. 96% some college/college graduate. 51% of sample earned more \$50,000+	Cross-sectional. Participants were recruited at two regional "pride" events in Vermont and Georgia and returned the survey via mail. Also recruited via "snowball" sampling by distributing e-mails advertising the study on lesbian and bisexual listservs.	<i>Measures:</i> Lifetime and past year IPV with a female partner was measured by the CTS-2. Outness Inventory, 10-items; Lesbian Internalized Homophobia Scale, 52 items; frequency of discrimination based on sexual orientation; self-rating of "butch/femme continuum." Dyadic Adjustment Scale to measure relationship quality. Self identified sexual orientation. <i>Results:</i> Bisexual women (46.2%) compared to lesbians (15.2%) were more likely to report aggression against a female partner in the past year. Lesbians compared to bisexual women reported more lifetime psychological aggression against a female partner. Lifetime discrimination and internalized homophobia were predictors of victimization and perpetration. Internalized homophobia was a modest predictor of past year domestic violence, which was mediated by relationship quality.

PASK#6: Online Tables – Table 5. Intimate partner abuse in LGBT populations

Study	N	Sample Characteristics	Method and Design	Results
<p>Bimbi, D. S., Palmadessa, N. A., & Parsons, J. T. (2007). Substance use and domestic violence among urban gays, lesbians, and bisexuals. <i>Journal of LGBT Health Research</i>, 3, 1-7.</p>	<p>1,048</p>	<p>652 Men, mean age 37.8, 44.1% in a relationship; 61% European American, 57.6% graduate degree. 91% self-identified as gay. 396 Women, mean age was 31.9, 63.9% in a relationship, 55.5% European American. 62% college grad/graduate degree. 85.1% self-identified as lesbian.</p>	<p>Using a cross-sectional brief street-intercept survey respondents recruited at two large lesbian, gay, bisexual community events, Gay Life Expo, and Gay Business Expo.</p>	<p><i>Measures.</i> IPV measure: 6 physical and nonphysical forms of aggression by a same sex partner in the past 5 years. Self identified as gay, bisexual, lesbian or queer. <i>Results:</i> 22% reported physical victimization and 34.3% reported nonphysical victimization (entire sample). No significant differences in reported rates of physical or nonphysical IPV across ethnicities or sexual identities. Gender was a predictor, with women 1.5 times more likely to report physical violence (being pushed or shoved, having something thrown at them, and being kicked) than men. Recent substance use was associated with IPV among both men and women.</p>
<p>Stoddard, J. P., Dibble, S. L., & Fineman, N. (2009). Sexual and physical abuse: A comparison between lesbians and their heterosexual sisters. <i>Journal of Homosexuality</i>, 56, 407-420.</p>	<p>648</p>	<p>324 self-identified lesbian/heterosexual sister pairs. 87% White. 49.7 mean age. More lesbians were employed full time and living alone. More sisters were married/partnered.</p>	<p>Cross-sectional. Questionnaire packets mailed to interested individuals and distributed at lesbian gatherings. Lesbian participants gave a survey to her heterosexual sister.</p>	<p><i>Measure:</i> Single item used to measure physical abuse: "Were you ever physically abused as an adult" (16 or older). <i>Results:</i> No significant differences between lesbians (26.6%) and sisters (27.7%) who had been assaulted by partners.</p>
<p>Kelly, B. C., Izienicki, H., Bimbi, D. S., & Parsons, J. T. (2011). The</p>	<p>2,200</p>	<p>1,782 men and 418 women; 90.3 self-identified as gay or lesbian and 9.6% as</p>	<p>A cross-sectional street-intercept method used to survey participants who attended 4 large GLB</p>	<p><i>Measures:</i> IPV, 6-items of physical and nonphysical violence in the past 5 years. Substance use: respondents indicated if they had used various substances. Sexual</p>

PASK#6: Online Tables – Table 5. Intimate partner abuse in LGBT populations

Study	N	Sample Characteristics	Method and Design	Results
intersection of mutual partner violence and substance use among urban gays, lesbians, and bisexuals. <i>Deviant Behavior</i> , 32, 379-404.		bisexual. White (57.1%), Latino (20.2%), Asian (12%), Black (10%). 61.8% Bachelor's or graduate degree. 51.5% single.	community events in New York and Los Angeles.	identity was self-reported. <i>Results:</i> 16.6% were victims, 4.1% were perpetrators, and 23.4% were both (mutual violence). No differences between gay/bisexual men and lesbian/bisexual women. Those who reported mutual violence reported the highest prevalence of drug involvement (alcohol, marijuana, cocaine).