Partner Abuse, Volume 3, Number 3, 2012

research

Prevalence of Partner Abuse: Rates of Emotional Abuse and Control

Michelle Mohr Carney, PhD
John R. Barner, PhD
University of Georgia

Partner abuse research over the past two decades has divided violent, threatening, or abusive phenomena into discrete areas of interest to researchers that, although distinct, are still broadly defined under the common category of "domestic abuse" or, more recently, intimate partner violence (IPV). Thus, any concerted attempt to typify the various substrata of IPV research must recognize the distinct features of each area regarding their component parts (i.e., behavioral or psychological sequelae, incidence and prevalence, and social or interpersonal context) while maintaining the overarching categorical commonality as variants of IPV.

This article constitutes a contemporaneous and systematic review of the research on three aspects of controlling coercive violence (CCV): emotional abuse, sexual coercion, and stalking or obsessive behavior, along with a separate examination of when these IPV substrata are combined with physical assaults on intimate partners. Each CCV substrata is operationally defined in research terms common to the social science research, and tabular and narrative data is provided on the incidence and prevalence of each substrata and the combined category. Notable findings derived from this review are reported for each of the three aspects of CCV. For emotional abuse, prevalence rates might average around 80%, with 40% of women and 32% of men reporting expressive aggression (i.e., verbal abuse or emotional violence in response to some agitating or aggravating circumstance) and 41% of women and 43% of men reporting some form of coercive control. For sexual coercion,

ONLINE TABLES: Detailed summaries of the 204 studies reviewed in this article can be found in five tables available online at http://www.springerpub.com/pa. Click on the link to the "Partner Abuse State of Knowledge Project," and go to Topic 5 in the online document.

© 2012 Springer Publishing Company
http://dx.doi.org/10.1891/1946-6560.3.3.286

national samples demonstrated the widest disparity by gender of victim, with 0.2% of men and 4.5% of women endorsing forced sexual intercourse by a partner. By far, the largest selection of highly variable studies, stalking and obsessive behaviors showed a range from 4.1% to 8.0% of women and 0.5% to 2.0% of men in the United States have been stalked at some time in their life. Women were reported as having a significantly higher prevalence (7%) of stalking victimization than men (2%). For all types of violence, except being followed in a way that frightened them, strangers were the most common perpetrators; as reported in approximately 80% of cases, women were most often victimized by men they knew, most frequently, their current or former intimate partners. Among women who reported repeated unwanted contact, current (15.9%) and former (32.9%) intimate partners were the perpetrators in nearly half of the most recent incidents and the largest subdivision of reports came from college or university student samples.

A separate examination reports of these types of IPV combined with physical assaults on intimate partners reported the strongest link was between stalking and other forms of violence in intimate relationships: 81% of women who were stalked by a current or former husband or cohabiting partner were also physically assaulted by that partner and 31% reported being sexually assaulted by that partner. Of the types of IPV reported on, most forms of violence that show the highest rates of reportage come from large national samples, with smaller samples showing increased variability. This article concludes with a brief section delineating conclusions that can be drawn from the review and the potential implications for research, practice, and IPV scholarship.

KEYWORDS: interpersonal violence; emotional abuse; prevalence; meta-analysis

Research in partner abuse has, over the past two decades, been subject to a dramatic increase in scholarly analysis and therapeutic scrutiny (Field & Caetano, 2005; Stover, 2005). Such a rise has subsequently divided violent, threatening, or abusive phenomena into discrete areas of interest to researchers that, although distinct, are still broadly defined under the common category of "domestic abuse" or more recently, intimate partner violence (IPV). Reasons for this dispersion of IPV behaviors as objects of scholarly or therapeutic inquiry are myriad and have their origins in several legal, clinical, and social changes occurring throughout the historical development of research into domestic abuse (Barner & Carney, 2011). Thus, any concerted attempt to typify the various substrata of IPV research is placed in an unenviable position of consolidating similar studies without overgeneralization and recognizing the distinct features of each area regarding their component parts (i.e., behavioral or psychological sequelae, incidence and prevalence, and social or interpersonal context) while maintaining the overarching categorical commonality as variants of IPV (Capaldi & Kim, 2007; Johnson & Ferraro, 2000; Rosen, Stith, Few, Daly, & Tritt, 2005).

The effort within the social science research literature that seeks to preserve the duality of typifying IPV as a singular construct while simultaneously delineating behavioral variance, in the words of Spitzberg and Cupach (2003), "tends to flow into two subtly but importantly distinct tributaries: clinical and relational . . . [that] clearly overlap in a wide variety of ways" (p. 348). Clinical studies of IPV with a view toward psychopathological indicators, behavioral patterns, or genetic predispositions would tend toward a monolithic conception of IPV, with each substrata (e.g., stalking behavior, sexual coercion, or emotional aggression) being emblematic of a larger, internalized propensity to violence. Relational studies tend to view IPV substrata "more as a dysfunction of the interactional and relational processes of courtship and relationship evolution, rather than a disorder of the individual's attachment system" (Spitzberg & Cupach, 2003, p. 348). As such, relational studies attend to external or environmental factors that may exacerbate aggressive tendencies or impede normative perceptions of power, control, or free agency in interpersonal relations (Babcock, Waltz, Jacobson, & Gottman, 1993; Macmillan & Gartner, 1999).

The empirical discernment of substrata of IPV that includes the delineation and comorbidity of relational and clinical characteristics and manifest differences between genders has dominated the past decade of partner abuse research (Archer, 2000; Graham-Kevan & Archer, 2003; Holtzworth-Munroe, Meehan, Herron, Rehman, & Stuart, 2000; Kelly & Johnson, 2008; Stark, 2007; Tanha, Beck, Figueredo, & Raghavan, 2010). Perhaps, most prominent among these typologies of violent behavior is separating out physical assault as a monolithic type of partner abuse from other violent or aggressive behaviors that share common clinical and relational features. Researchers such as Johnson (2008) and Stark (2007) have advanced such typological delineation under the label of controlling coercive violence (CCV). CCV, as a model of both clinical traits and relational characteristics, unites previously disparate substrata of violent or aggressive behaviors under a definitional "pattern of emotionally abusive intimidation, coercion, and control coupled with physical violence against partners" (Kelly & Johnson, 2008, p. 478).

This article constitutes a contemporaneous and systematic review of the research on three aspects of CCV: emotional abuse, sexual coercion, and stalking or obsessive behavior, along with a separate examination of when these IPV substrata are combined with physical assaults on intimate partners. In the sections that follow, each CCV substrata is operationally defined in research terms common to the social science research, and tabular and narrative data is provided on the incidence and prevalence of each substrata and the combined category. The studies sampled for this review are further categorized into those that study large populations, smaller communities, university or school-based samples, clinical samples, forensic or legal samples, and, when possible, samples of particularly relevant subpopulations, such as military personnel and veterans. The article concludes with a brief section delineating conclusions that can be drawn from the review and the potential implications for research, practice, and IPV scholarship.

DEFINING CONTROLLING COERCIVE VIOLENCE

Stark (2007) defines CCV as demarcated by

> general elements with other capture or course-of-conduct crimes such as kidnapping, stalking, and harassment, including the facts that it is ongoing and its perpetrators use various means to hurt, humiliate, intimidate, exploit, isolate, and dominate their victims. Like hostages, victims of coercive control are frequently deprived of money, food, access to communication or transportation, and other survival resources even as they are cut off from family, friends, and other supports through the process of "isolation." But unlike other capture crimes, coercive control is personalized, extends through social space as well as over time, and . . . it relies for its impact on . . . [a victim's] vulnerability. (p. 5)

To effectively operationalize previously independent abusive phenomena in the context of the CCV typology, it is necessary to briefly define each of the areas under review in terms of their cohesion to the typological parameters and the degree to which those parameters have been accepted within the empirical literature. In the sections that follow, each of the three CCV phenomena will be "defined" in terms consonant with both the typology and the relevant theoretical literature, particularly as it is reflected in the review studies. The fourth category under scrutiny in this review thus represents a combination of one or more of the CCV elements with the generally accepted phenomena of domestic physical assault or "battering" (Straus, Gelles, & Steinmetz, 1980; Walker, 1979).

Emotional/Psychological Abuse

Follingstad and DeHart (2000) summarized several schemas of emotional or psychological abuse prevalent in the IPV literature to include speech acts or behavioral dispositions, which result in infliction of "rejection, humiliation and degradation, threats and/or terrorization, exploitation and/or . . . isolation" (p. 895). Moreover, incidents of aggressive reactivity, accusatory behavior, and jealousy are also noted in studies that identify similar behaviors that may or may not emerge concomitantly with physical confrontation or assault (Gormley & Lopez, 2010; O'Leary & Jouriles, 1994). Generally speaking, although not addressing issues of severity, psychological aggression can be categorized as either expressive aggression such as "their partner acted angry in a way that seemed dangerous, told them they were a loser or a failure, insulted or humiliated them" or coercive control, "which includes behaviors that are intended to monitor and control or threaten an intimate partner" (Black et al., 2011, p. 37). Although such a wide variance of aggressive, abusive, or violent dispositions may evade attempts at clear categorization of emotional and psychological abuse, the empirical literature has been relatively uniform in delineating the "coercive" aspects of emotional abuse and its "terroristic" character as well as its subsequent effects on victims (Klein & Johnson, 2000; Stark, 2007).

Sexual Coercion

Sexual coercion widely defined refers to

> unwanted sexual penetration that occurs after a person is pressured in a non-physical way, including unwanted vaginal, oral, or anal sex after being pressured in ways that include being worn down by someone who repeatedly asks for sex or shows they were unhappy; feeling pressured by being lied to, being told promises that were untrue, having someone threaten to end a relationship or spread rumors; and sexual pressure due to someone using their influence or authority. (Black et al., 2011, p. 17)

In explicating CCV, Johnson (2008) notes that sexual coercion (i.e., forced sexual acts) is a common correlate to the physical abuse and assaults associated with IPV. Because with emotional or psychological abuse, this conception of sexually coercive partner abuse, as such, is a common area of IPV study but also faces several obstacles to achieving a uniform conceptual definition. Muehlenhard and Kimes (1999) explore this definitional problematic in three different ways. The first is that sexual coercion often takes on a monolithic definition, in both legalistic and social terms, that is separate from the commonly held definition of IPV. As such, sexual abuse, rape, sodomy, or aggravated sexual battery may occur within an IPV context, but are adjudicated differently and separately from domestic assault or physical abuse. The second is that sexually based abuse is routinely underreported and, because sexual coercion is often nested within a larger pattern of relationship violence, stands as an unreported or underreported correlate to the already underreported phenomena of physical IPV. As Coggins and Bullock (2003) noted, "just as the true scope of abuse experienced . . . is not known, it is not known how pervasive forced or coercive sex is in the general population" (p. 724) and efforts solely based on adjudication rates (e.g., incident reports, arrests, or convictions) may highlight one phenomenon while obscuring the other (Watts & Zimmerman, 2002).

A third obstacle to achieving a concise conceptual definition of sexual coercion within a CCV framework is the highly gendered nature of the phenomenon. Conceptually, sexually related violence has bolstered characterization of IPV as unidirectional, with studies predominantly viewing women as victims of male sexual perpetration (Coggins & Bullock, 2003; Watts & Zimmerman, 2002). However, as shown in landmark studies of same-sex sexual violence such as Waterman, Dawson, and Bologna (1989), Waldner-Haugrud (1999), and Johnson's (2008) own contention that IPV itself is multifaceted and as such sexual directionality of perpetration is subject to change, the conception of bidirectional sexual coercion in interpersonal relationships remains both a minority subset of the overall IPV literature and an area in need of further study in the general debate over gender symmetry in IPV (Tanha et al., 2010).

Stalking and Obsessive Behavior

Stalking has, perhaps more than any other aspect of CCV in this review, been subject to increased legal, empirical, and clinical scrutiny in the past two decades. Since 1990, every U.S. state and several international jurisdictions have instituted laws that criminalize stalking and link the phenomenon with a pattern of behavior consonant with CCV (Miller, 2001; Mullen, Pathé, & Purcell, 2008; Spitzberg & Cupach, 2003). Much of the literature on stalking comports with accepted definitions that correlate highly with CCV typologies. For example, Wallace and Kelty (1995) proposed a definition of stalking as "a knowing, purposeful course of conduct directed at a specific person that would cause a reasonable person to fear bodily injury or death to himself or herself or a member of his or her immediate family" (p. 99) or "a pattern of harassing or threatening tactics used by a perpetrator that is both unwanted and causes fear or safety concerns in the victim" (Black et al., 2011, p. 39). Consistent in the literature is that the behavior must be repeated and unwanted (Wigman, 2009).

However, as seen with sexual coercion, although the clinical and empirical research literature has supported a narrowing definitional context, the widening legal and forensic context of stalking has maintained a link with the adjudicative context of the phenomenon, that is, definitions of stalking continue to vary widely from state to state (Spitzberg & Cupach, 2003). States often place the definitional onus on the restraining order as the jurisdictional apparatus by which the behavior is defined and identified. This linkage has been upheld by the U.S. Supreme Court in the controversial decision, *Castle Rock v. Gonzales* (2005), seen by many as severing the link between stalking behaviors and the propensity for extreme physical violence. Given this major confounding variable between legal and clinical assessments of the prevalence of stalking behavior, and, in turn, its direct linkage to IPV may be difficult to quantify.

METHODOLOGY

Included in this review are findings from research studied that were published primarily after 1990 and appear in peer-reviewed journals. Specifically included in this review are the findings from research relative to prevalence rates for (a) emotional abuse/control; (b) sexual coercion; (c) stalking; (d) combined physical assaults and emotional abuse/control, sexual coercion, and stalking; and (e) controlling/coercive violence or combined rates of physical and nonphysical abuse, what Michael Johnson (2008) now calls, "controlling coercive violence (CCV)." Studies included rates for males and females and were all conducted in industrialized English-speaking countries. A differential/deviant case relational organizing framework of emotional abuse/control, sexual coercion, and stalking behavior within the schema of Johnson's (2008) CCV was used for summarizing the studies, given that the assumptions of CCV are, ostensibly, that these occur *within* (and *evolve* from) a once normative relational

context, namely through increase in incidence or prevalence. Various search engines were used to identify empirical work, including PsychINFO, Web of Science, Education Resources Information Center (ERIC), EBSCO (Social Work Abstracts; Criminal Justice Abstracts), ProQuest Research (Social Services Abstracts; Sociological Abstracts), and Google Scholar. More than 300 studies were reviewed; 204 studies met the identified criteria and are included in the extensive tabular listing of the reviewed research that can be found online at the *Partner Abuse* journal website. Included in the summary tables is the full reference for the study (authors, year, title, and journal information), the sample size of the study, characteristics of the sample (e.g., gender, sociodemographic information, and age range), study method and design, measures used, and resulting conclusions. Studies excluded from this review dealt with non-English-speaking populations and had some translation as part of the methodology, were unrelated to the purview of the current manuscript (animal abuse relative to IPV, etc.), or covered in other *Partner Abuse* State of the Knowledge summaries.

PREVALENCE OF CONTROLLING COERCIVE VIOLENCE: A REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

Emotional/Psychological Abuse

To speak generally about prevalence studies concerning emotional/psychological abuse (or simply verbal threats in some studies), it seems reasonable to declare that this is the most common form of IPV. Prevalence rates might average around 80%, but the variance and range in findings is wide. Contributing to this is that scholars examining similar rates of prevalence are not in agreement about what constitutes emotional abuse and it is clear that not all of these authors subject to this review are studying identical phenomena. When prevalence rates are very high, including some in the 90th percentile, the question has to be raised of whether the study is really identifying "abuse," or more generalized interpersonal phenomena, including anger, insults, or hurt feelings. Recent findings from the National Intimate Partner and Sexual Violence Survey (NISVS) found that nearly half of the men and women surveyed reported experiencing some form of psychological aggression by an intimate partner in their lifetime, with 40% of women and 32% of men reporting expressive aggression and 41% of women and 43% of men reporting some form of coercive control. Although rates appear similar between the genders, differences appear relative to the use of psychological aggression in intimate partner relationships. Female victims

> most commonly reported behaviors were expressive forms of aggression such as being called names like ugly, fat, crazy, or stupid (64.3%); witnessing an intimate partner act angry in a way that seemed dangerous (57.9%); being insulted, humiliated, or made fun of (58.0%); and being kept track of by demanding to know her whereabouts (61.7%). (Black et al., 2011, p. 46)

Men most commonly reported being kept track of (63%), being called names (52%) or insulted (40%), being demeaned (42%), or being fearful of an angry partner (40%; Black et al., 2011, p. 46). Table 1 graphically depicts all of the studies in the attendant subcategories of large population samples, smaller community samples, university and school-based samples, clinical samples, and forensic or legal samples. Studies of note are briefly described in the following sections.

Large Population Samples. Tjaden and Thoennes (1998, 2000) provide the earliest national data in the United States as part of the National Violence Against Women Survey (NVAWS). The survey data provides the largest sample of data on many aspects of the CCV categories discussed in this review, although the information is not delineated to include emotional or psychological abuse as a subtype of IPV. The NVAWS does identify the prevalence of specific acts, including threats, which they place in the category of physical violence but is considered emotional abuse in other studies. A subsequent study by Coker, Davis et al. (2002) examined the NVAWS national data and isolates specific acts of psychological violence to conclude that 12.1% of women and 17.3% of men had been victims of psychological abuse, which included abuse of power/control and verbal abuse.

Miller (2006) also examined national data from NVAWS female participants to reassess the types of abuse reported and found that jealousy, shouting, swearing, and a partner insisting on knowing the woman's whereabouts at all times were among the most common forms of controlling behaviors. In addition, nearly 4% of the women reported that their partners had threatened to harm or to kill them. Outlaw (2009) further assessed the Tjaden and Thoennes (2000) data and reported that respondents indicated that nonphysical abuse by a current partner is more than 4 times as common as physical violence by a current partner. Emotional abuse is significantly more common than the other types, with 15% of respondents reporting that their partners exhibited at least one of the "emotionally abusive" behaviors.

All forms of nonphysical abuse are shown to be more common among those experiencing physical abuse. Specifically, in each category of nonphysical abuse, the percentage of respondents experiencing the abuse is at least double and, in some cases, 3 or 4 times as large among those experiencing violence as compared to the overall sample. From analysis of the national data compiled as part of the NVAWS and subsequent analyses, there appear to be no significant differences in rates of reportage of emotionally abusive behaviors between men and women in emotional abuse. Charles and Perreira (2007) provided new national data for the United States (N = 4,898 females and 3,830 males), although the principal focus was delimited in prevalence from pregnancy to 1-year post-pregnancy. Findings showed that 13.1% of the sample experienced emotional abuse during their pregnancy and 27.0% experienced emotional abuse after their pregnancy. Forty-one percent reported experiencing coercion/control after pregnancy. Finally, Follingstad and Edmundson (2010) provide national data from the United States, although they do not summarize their findings in single statistics for emotional abuse and instead report the prevalence of

specific abusive acts. The study examines disparities between reports of victimhood versus perpetration and concludes that emotional abuse is highly reciprocal between both men and women.

Kaukinen (2004) did a national survey of Canadian women and found that 10% had experienced some sort of emotional abuse, which included financial abuse, limiting contact with family members, put-downs, sexual jealousy, threatening harm to others, controlling the respondent's movements, destruction of property, and threats of physical violence. Eight percent of women experienced emotional abuse without any type of physical abuse present. Romans, Forte, Cohen, Du Mont, and Hyman (2007) also looked at the Canadian population over a 5-year period and found the prevalence rate of emotional abuse for both women (19.3%) and men (18.8%) was much higher than the rate of physical and sexual abuse and was undifferentiated between genders. Daigneault, Hébert, and McDuff (2009) assessed rates of IPV and childhood sexual abuse among men and women in Canada and reported that 18.8% of men and 19.2% of women had experienced psychological IPV.

Smaller Community Samples. In a meta-analysis of 62 domestic studies of partner abuse, Williams, Ghandour, and Kub (2008) found that the highest rates were found for emotional violence, followed by physical and sexual violence. Prevalence rates varied widely within three distinct populations most likely because of methodological and sampling differences across studies. Williams et al. (2008) reported that results in these studies were highly variable, which is likely to be the result of methodological differences (including inconsistent definitions of psychological or emotional abuse, instrumental, and measurement differences) and socioeconomic differences across communities. The general consensus derived from the meta-analysis seems to be that emotional abuse is the most common form of IPV, with some communities reporting prevalence rates approaching 100% in some samples. Impact rates of emotionally abusive behavior appear to be equally distributed across genders and studies specifically targeting couples suggest that emotional abuse is often reported as reciprocal (Coker, Derrick, Lumpkin, Aldrich, & Oldendick, 2000).

Couple studies of emotional and psychological abuse rates were among the highest in terms of reportage of prevalence. Panuzio and DiLillo (2010) sampled Midwestern couples in the first year of marriage, deriving prevalence rates of emotional or psychological abuse in 92.6% of female respondents and 95.0% of male respondents. Similarly, in a longitudinal correlative study of partner abuse and sleep disturbance, Rauer, Kelly, Buckhalt, and El-Sheikh (2010) reported primary contact reportage of emotional abuse in 94% of husbands and 93% of wives responding, with a 40% positive response rate maintained for both reporting partners throughout the observation period of the study. Prevalence rates in these studies were comparable to early research conducted in the United Kingdom with a small convenience sample of married couples ($N = 106$), reporting an 88.7% prevalence of psychological abuse (Russell & Hulson, 1992). A similar study, conducted in Australia by Purcell, Pathé, and Mullen (2002), found an almost identical rate of prevalence for acute instances of

emotional or psychological aggression. Within the domestic literature, proportional rates of prevalence were found throughout smaller sample studies (Daly, Hartz, Stromquist, Peek-Asa, & Jogerst, 2007; Murty et al., 2003; O'Leary & Williams, 2006; Orzeck, Rokach, & Chin, 2010; Peek-Asa et al., 2005).

Most community-based studies, particularly those in North America, have solely sampled women. Although prevalence rates reported in these studies maintain a wider variance in reporting of incidence of emotional or psychological abuse than couple studies, they tend to be more uniform in methodology, instrumentation, and measurement. Smaller sample studies, for example, mainly relied on or adapted portions of the Conflict Tactics Scale (CTS; Straus, 1979) or Revised Conflict Tactics Scale (Straus, Hamby, Boney-McCoy, & Sugarman, 1996) to determine the incidence, extent, and severity of abuse behaviors (Banyard, Potter, & Turner, 2011; Kimerling et al., 2009; Mei-Chuan, Horne, Levitt, & Klesges, 2009; Mezey, Post, & Maxwell, 2002; Nancarrow, Lockie, & Sharma, 2009; Saudino & Hines, 2007; Zolotor, Theodore, Coyne-Beasley, & Runyan, 2007). The range of reported prevalence for emotional or psychological abuse in these studies was from 9.0% (Kimerling et al., 2009) to 78.8% (Saudino & Hines, 2007).

Community studies have specific sampling regarding race, ethnicity, and age. These studies, for the most part, reflect prevalence rates that are comparable with national and more general community-based studies. For example, Firestone, Lambert, and Vega (1999) conducted a study of Mexican American women (N = 1,516) from three geographic and socioeconomic strata, reporting an overall prevalence rate of 21% across urban, suburban, and rural samples. Hazen and Soriano (2007) conducted a study of Latina women (N = 292) and, through self-report interviews, derived a prevalence rate of 82.5% for emotional or psychological aggression. Specifically within the African American community, Wingood and DiClemente (1997) reported several findings consonant with emotional or psychological abuse within a CCV paradigm, with 32.1% reporting ongoing verbal abuse, 21.4% reporting being threatened with physical abuse by their partners, and 14.3% threatened with abandonment.

Within the American Indian tribal community in the southwestern United States, Robin, Chester, and Rasmussen (1998) reported that verbal forms of emotional abuse was the most frequent form of intimate violence perpetration of both men and women (72.9% and 73.2%, respectively), whereas Harwell, Moore, and Spence (2003) reported comparatively low responses (12% for men, 18% for women) in the seven Montana reservations. Thapa-Oli, Dulal, and Baba (2009) conducted a study of Nepalese women living in the United States (N = 45), reporting that 75.6% of women had been verbally insulted by their current partners and 62.2% had to seek permission from their partners to go to their friends' or relatives' houses. Thirty-four (75.6%) reported that their partners had verbally insulted them, 35 (77.8%) had been shouted or verbally assaulted, and 27 (60.0%) had been humiliated or put down in front of friends, all consistent with the controlling and isolating aspects of CCV. In one significant age-based study, Bonomi et al. (2007) studied prevalence of emotional abuse from women older than the age of 65 years, with 21.9% self-reporting psychological abuse, threats, and controlling behavior.

The one community-specific area of the literature that presents significant findings but remains very much in the minority is reportage of same-sex prevalence of emotional or psychological abuse. The earliest study of gay men cited for the purposes of this review was Turell (2000), in which at least one instance of emotional abuse was experienced by 83% of ethnically diverse gay men, lesbians, bisexual, and transgendered participants. In a study of men with male sexual partners (N = 2,002), Greenwood et al. (2002) reported a 34% prevalence rate for emotional or psychological abuse. A similar study conducted in Canada showed prevalence rates of gay men in Vancouver (N = 300) to be 99.8% in perpetrating emotional abuse, with all respondents endorsing being the victim of emotional abuse at some point (Stanley, Bartholomew, Taylor, Oram, & Landolt, 2006). Craft and Serovich (2005), using a U.S. HIV-positive sample, found that the majority (78.4%) of participants indicated they had perpetrated psychological aggression, whereas slightly fewer (72.5%) indicated they had been victims of psychological aggression.

Perhaps, the most marked finding within community-based samples is the high correlation between emotional and psychological CCV and excessive alcohol use and conditions of extreme poverty (Lemon, Verhoek-Oftedahl, & Donnelly, 2002; Zavala & Spohn, 2010). The literature would benefit greatly from further assessment into the predictive value of high-risk behavior and prevalence of all forms of IPV within community-based samples. Similarly, developmental antecedents, including childhood abuse and subsequent comorbidity of child maltreatment and emotional, psychological, or combined incidence of IPV has also been subject to recent study (Chang, Theodore, Martin, & Runyan, 2008) and may prove a fruitful avenue of continued research.

University/School Samples. Despite the prominence of university and school-based samples in the social scientific literature on aggression, there are far fewer studies that directly address emotional or psychological abuse. In the studies that do directly address this aspect of CCV, prevalence is found to be very common (often between 80% and 90%) and men and women seem to report being victims and perpetrators of this behavior about equally in high school and university environments (Barnes, 2001; Capaldi & Crosby, 1997; Coker, Sanderson, Cantu, Huerta, & Fadden, 2008; O'Hearn & Davis, 1997). As Hines and Saudino (2003) reported within the environment of a large, predominantly upper-middle-class Northeastern University, 82% of males and 86% of females reported that they used some type of psychologically aggressive act. Eighty-one percent of males and 80% of females reported that their partners used psychologically aggressive tactics. Comparable findings were reported by Straight, Harper, and Arias (2003) who reported a 92% prevalence rate among female students at a southeastern university, and Kasian and Painter (1992) who, when using the Psychological Maltreatment Inventory developed by Tolman (1989), reported interpersonal behaviors that comport to the CCV paradigm in between 63% and 65% of respondents. Specific to the dating population, Kasian and Painter (1992) found male respondents reported higher rates of received abuse, as measured by a

modified version of the Psychological Maltreatment of Women Inventory, for control, jealousy/isolation, verbal abuse, and withdrawal of affection, specifically, with no gender differences in rates of received emotional abuse.

High school–based samples continue the trend of high incidence and prevalence of emotional and psychological CCV. From a sample of students at a private, religiously affiliated coeducational high school, Jezl, Molidor, and Wright (1996) reported that 86.7% of males and 86.8% of females endorsed psychological maltreatment. The percentage for males increased to 97.4% and for females to 94.9% when the respondents (N = 232) self-reported to be in a dating relationship. Feiring, Deblinger, Hoch-Espada, and Haworth (2002) reported in a study of metropolitan public schools that 59% of the sample (N = 284; 160 females and 94 males in Grades 9 through 12) had experienced emotional abuse in their interpersonal relationships. Sears, Byers, and Price (2007) conducted a similar study in Canada, reporting that for male respondents, 35% of them had used psychologically abusive behavior in a dating relationship, 15% had been physically abusive, and 17% had been sexually abusive. In comparison, 47% of girls reported that they had used psychologically abusive behavior in a dating relationship, 28% had been physically abusive, and 5% had been sexually abusive. Although few, these studies point to the imperative for continued scrutiny into the developmental pathways for CCV and remain of significant interest for future research.

Clinical Samples. Studies of emotional and psychological CCV are prevalent in the IPV literature, with an overwhelming focus on women as victims. Studies are derived either from health care samples, generally surveyed on potential abuse victimization while seeking medical care, or a direct victim population wherein the sample is composed of women identified as abuse victims actively seeking treatment. As with community-based samples, there is significant variation in reported prevalence rates, with samples often yielding a lower prevalence rate for emotional abuse than other samples sources (i.e., community, forensic, or school-based).

The earliest clinical sample cited for the purposes of this review, Follingstad, Rutledge, Berg, Hause, and Polek (1990) reported that 98.7% of women who already endorsed a history of abuse or relationship violence claimed to be victims of emotional or psychological abuse. Subsequent studies have generally sampled from within a population of female victims presenting for care at hospital emergency rooms or clinics that routinely provided treatment for victims of domestic abuse in the United States and Canada (Ahmad, Hogg-Johnson, Stewart, & Levinson, 2007; Bauer, Rodríguez, & Pérez-Stable, 2000; Bhandari et al., 2011; Coker et al., 2007; Coker, Smith, McKeown, & King, 2000; Coker, Smith et al., 2002; Dearwater et al., 1998; Dienemann et al., 2000; Gandhi et al., 2010; Kramer, Lorenzon, & Mueller, 2004). These studies often used the same or similar screening instruments; for example, the Women's Experience with Battering (WEB) Scale (Smith, Earp, & DeVellis, 1995). Variance of prevalence rates was wide, ranging from 10.4% (Ahmad et al., 2007) to 86.2% (Coker, Smith, et al., 2000) with an average of 34.1% of

emotional abuse prevalence across all of the studies. Sample sizes also varied, from $N = 3{,}664$ (Coker et al., 2007) to $N = 202$ (Ahmad et al., 2007) with respondents endorsing significant overlap between emotional and psychological abuse and past acts of physical assault, described in detail in the subsequent section on combined CCV and physical assault.

Studies conducted in other English-speaking nations, including the United Kingdom and Australia, reported prevalence rates comparable to the North American reports. Johnson, John, Humera, Kukreja, Found, and Lindow's (2007) study of respondents in a British gynecological clinic reported 24% prevalence of emotional or psychological abuse, whereas Keeling and Birch (2004) sampled a hospitalized population of pregnant women, reporting a 26.7% prevalence rate. In Australia, Hegarty and Bush (2002) reported a clinic-based sample ($N = 1{,}836$) with 33.9% prevalence of emotional and psychological abuse.

Given the large number of clinical samples within the literature, some studies have further delineated emotional or psychological prevalence to include specific subgroups or specific samples regarding ethnicity, age, and co-occurrence with mental or psychological disorders. Bonomi, Anderson, Cannon, Slesnick, and Rodriguez (2009) compared a Latina and non-Latina clinic sample for rates of IPV (including emotional and psychological abuse) using the WEB Scale and found relatively equal rates of reportage. Latina versus non-Latina women prevalence of CCV was, respectively, 44.6% and 44% over respondent's lifetime.

Bhandari, Dosanjh, Tornetta, and Matthews (2006) found that, overall, emotional abuse was the most prevalent form of abuse, comprising 84% of their clinical sample. Also notable was that younger ages of respondents were significantly correlated to higher incidents of emotional or psychological CCV, along with other "high-risk" behaviors identified in comparable community-based samples, such as excessive alcohol use (Lemon et al., 2002; Zavala & Spohn, 2010). In a study of pregnant adolescents, Wiemann, Agurcia, Berenson, Volk, and Rickert (2000) found that approximately 33% of nonassaulted and 72% of previously assaulted participants experienced abuse that comports with emotional or psychological CCV. Approximately 11% of nonassaulted and 62% of assaulted participants reported being threatened with violence at some point in their relationships.

Perhaps the most marked need in continuing research into the prevalence of emotional and psychological abuse is more extensive mixed-gender studies. One area in which both males and females have been sampled is where prevalence of IPV is co-occurring with the psychological experience of trauma or depression. In a study of abuse-related trauma incorporating reports from both men and women, Orzeck et al. (2010) found that reports of emotional or psychological abuse was the sole form of IPV behaviors equally endorsed by both women and men. Twenty-eight percent of the sample further articulated that described abuse targeting the individual's self-worth, notions of safety, or personal freedom. Approximately 16% of the participants reported emotional abuse as being the most distressing part of the relationship.

Forensic/Legal Samples. Given that emotional and psychological abuse of a partner does not have the direct juridical correlate shared by sexually based offenses and stalking or obsessive behavior, studies of emotional or psychological are rare. Three such studies were found and included in this review. As Cole, Logan, and Shannon (2005) examined in a study of intimate sexual victimization (ISV), placed women in three groups: no ISV (N = 368), sexual insistence (N = 114), and threatened/forced sex (N = 117). The 97.8% of women in the no ISV group and 100% of women in the other groups reported being verbally threatened by their partners. The 88.3% of women in the no ISV group, 98.2% of women in the sexual insistence group, and 100% of women in the threatened/forced sex group reported being degraded by their partners. Reports of jealousy and control behaviors that comport with the CCV paradigm were 92.7%, 99.1%, and 100%, respectively. For symbolic violence, prevalence rates of 87.8%, 96.5%, and 98.3% were reported by respondents.

Moreover, Henning and Klesges (2003) found that prior psychological abuse was reported by a majority (80%) of the women in their sample and rarely did physical aggression occur in the absence of psychological abuse. Stuart, Moore, Gordon, Ramsey, and Kahler (2006) do not report prevalence rates but offer that, overall, the women reported both engaging in very high rates of aggression toward their partners and were frequently victimized by their partners in ways that comport with the CCV definition of emotional and psychological abuse.

Sexual Coercion

Prevalence studies concerning sexual coercion are generally characterized by two constructive elements. First, they must typify and consolidate various behaviors that could be considered coercive, ranging from verbal pressure to physical assaults that compel a victim to engage in a sexual activity against their will. Second, to empirically study such a wide spectrum of possible behaviors, a person can use to coerce another to engage in sexual activity, often delineation is made from within a pattern of existing IPV or CCV behaviors that may or may not be recognized by legal authorities as criminal behaviors. Thus, when prevalence rates are reported, variance is seen both between similar study samples and within samples themselves, depending on which coercive acts are instrumentalized or included as part of the empirical focus of the study. Table 2 graphically depicts all of the studies in the attendant subcategories of large population samples, smaller community samples, university and school-based samples, clinical samples, and forensic or legal samples. Studies of note are briefly described in the following sections.

National Samples. As with all of the CCV substrata included in this review, Tjaden and Thoennes (1998, 2000) provided an overarching national sample of sexual coercion prevalence and consequences of male-to-female and female-to-male intimate partner violence as measured by the NVAWS. As reported, 0.2% of men and 4.5% of women endorsed forced sexual intercourse by a partner. Additional coercive acts that

may comport with the CCV paradigm of sexual coercion were not included in NVAWS questions. However, two more recent studies using a nationally representative sample did expand the definitional context of sexual coercion. Wood, McConnell, Moore, Clarkwest, and Hsueh (2010) sampled men and women from several metropolitan U.S. cities (N = 5,102) in an experimental study connected to the Building Strong Families national relationship-building project. Using the CTS (Straus, 1979), the authors found that 2% of females and 1.7% of males reported sexual coercion within the prior year in the experimental group receiving the Building Strong Families group intervention. In the control group, 1.8% of females and 1.5% of males reported sexual coercion. A similar study (N = 5,857) designed to explore HIV-risk behavior in heterosexual women showed approximately one in four women reported a lifetime coerced sex experience, of whom 12.5% experienced a coerced first sexual intercourse. Among 1,408 women reporting sexual coercion, 34.6% were 15 years old or younger at the time of their first coerced sex. The largest proportion of this group of women reported being physically injured or held down (67.2%). The next largest group of women reported being pressured with words but without threats of harm (57.2%). Two fifths of women (41.0%) were threatened with injury at the time of their coerced sex experience. Approximately, 30% of women were given alcohol or drugs as a coercive agent (Stockman, Campbell, & Celentano, 2010).

Most recently, findings from NISVS found that nearly 19 million women (one in six) reported experiencing sexual coercion ("threatening to end the relationship, using influence or authority"; 10%), unwanted sexual contact ("unwanted kissing in a sexual way, fondling, or grabbing sexual body parts"; 6%), and noncontact unwanted sexual experiences ("exposing sexual body parts, being made to look at or participate in sexual photos or movies, harassed in a public place in a way that felt unsafe"; 8%) in intimate partner relationships in their lifetime. Approximately 9 million men (1 in 12) reported being made to penetrate an intimate partner ("being made to vaginally penetrate a female using one's own penis, orally penetrating a female's vagina or anus, anally penetrating a male or female, or being made to receive oral sex from a male or female"; 2%), sexual coercion (4%), unwanted sexual contact (3%), and noncontact unwanted sexual experiences (3%; Black et al., 2011, p. 17). Although sexual coercion is seemingly perpetrated by both genders, gender differences are apparent in the reporting of sexual violence. Men are rarely ever raped in the traditional sense by a female partner but are often verbally bullied and shamed into having sex when they do not want to, an estimated 2.4 million men during their lifetime according to recent NISVS findings. Whereas 1 out of 10 women in the United States has been raped by an intimate partner, no female NISVS respondents reported having been made to penetrate a partner (Black et al., 2011).

Smaller Community Samples. One of the earliest and most noteworthy of small community samples of sexually coerced women was conducted by Hanneke, Shields, and McCall in 1986. The study continues to be notable not only for its findings of prevalence of sexual coercion among women (N = 307), in which the

authors found that the overall prevalence of marital rape averaged 10%, but also for its methodological commentary. Hanneke et al. (1986) noted that when interviews were conducted in place of a survey instrument or questionnaire, reported rates of prevalence of marital rape were 3–4 times greater. Subsequent instrumental studies share similar reportage rates. For example, Coker, Derrick, et al. (2000) reported lifetime forced or coerced sexual activity at 14% for women and 3.5% for men in South Carolina, whereas a larger (N = 4,732) sample in Kentucky reported a prevalence rate of 20.2% for forced sex for women who had endorsed experiencing some form of IPV (Coker, Hopenhayn, DeSimone, Bush, & Crofford, 2009). By comparison, a recent study that again combined interviews with collected survey data to investigate the perpetration of sexual CCV found that 43% of men and 21% of women identified as perpetrators of sexual aggression during a 1-year period (O'Leary & Williams, 2006). Future research may endeavor to explore further the wide variance in reporting rates from studies that incorporate interview methods.

Studies of sexual coercion in other English-speaking nations have reported comparable rates of prevalence. Painter and Farrington (1998) conducted a study of 10 regions of Great Britain, reporting an overall prevalence of coerced sex for married respondents of 13%. The study further reported that socioeconomic status of respondents and marital status (i.e., separated or divorced) were highly correlated with incidence of partner sexual coercion. In a study of women in Auckland, New Zealand, Fanslow, Robinson, Crengle, and Perese (2010) reported 29.1% of Maori women, 14.9% of Pacific women, 3.8% of Asian women, and 16% of European women reported some form of sexually related IPV.

As with Fanslow et al. (2010), several U.S.-based studies of sexual coercion were linked directly to race, ethnicity, and age. Within the African American community, Kalichman, Williams, Cherry, Belcher, and Nachimson (1998) reported that 42% of women reported engaging in unwanted sex because a partner threatened force or used force to obtain sexual access. Thirteen percent reported having unwanted sexual intercourse because a man had threatened to leave the relationship, 18% had unwanted intercourse because a man threatened to use physical force, and 34% indicated that a man had used force to gain sexual access. One study has also shown that IPV exposure significantly increases risk of sexual CCV, which, when combined, increases risk of HIV infection (Josephs & Abel, 2009).

In the Latina community, Glass et al. (2009) reported 55.2% of Latina women endorsing forced sex or controlling behavior. Hazen and Soriano (2007) expanded on both sampling (using U.S.-born and immigrant Latina women) and prevalence of sexual coercion and noted that 21% of the sample experienced sexual coercion by an intimate partner in their lifetime, with 19.9% reporting less severe sexual coercion (such as a partner insisting on sex without a condom) and 6.5% reporting severe sexual coercion (such as a partner using physical force or a weapon to coerce sexual intercourse). Lifetime rates of any sexual coercion were highest in the U.S.-born group of respondents.

Hanson's (2010) study of IPV reportage among adolescent females sampled high school students (N = 1,608) on reportage of both IPV and forced sexual intercourse (FSI). From the entire sample, 450 (28.1%) reported no IPV or FSI, 457 (28.4 %) reported IPV, 473 (29.4%) reported FSI, and 228 (14.1%) reported experiencing both IPV and FSI. According to the study, adolescent females reporting either IPV or forced sex are more likely to be engaging in risky behaviors and less likely to be engaged in health-enhancing behaviors. In a study of women 65 years and older, Bonomi et al. (2007) reported physical or sexual partner violence at a lifetime rate of 18.4% and forced sex-sexual contact at 6.2% over respondent lifetimes. The 4.3% of respondents reported only experiencing forced sex contact and 95.7% experienced this form of abuse in conjunction with other forms of abuse. Given these results, studies of sexual CCV across the lifespan are a much needed component of the research in sexual IPV and continued study will likely illuminate areas such as underreporting of incidence and developmental aspects of IPV victimization and perpetration.

As with emotional and psychological CCV, same-sex studies that specifically examine sexual CCV behaviors represent a fractional percentage of the literature. Two studies were examined as a part of this review. One study, conducted by Turell (2000), was collected from various community organizations (N = 499) in which 98% of respondents identified as gay, lesbian, bisexual, or transgendered (GLBT). Life prevalence of sexually coerced behaviors was reported at 9%, whereas 1% of respondents reported experiencing sexual coercion in their current relationship. Another study sampled HIV-positive men (N = 54) recruited from HIV/AIDS service organizations in several communities. The authors found that forced sex at any time in the respondent's lifetime was reported by 32% of the sample. Ethnicity was a statistically significant factor in the report of forced sex by a primary partner; non-Whites (African American, 32%; Hispanic, 67%) reported a higher prevalence than Whites (8%). There was also a statistically significant difference in the prevalence of forced sex by several partners. The mean number of primary partners in a 12-month period was higher among those ever forced to have sex compared to those who were not.

University/School Samples. University and school-based samples represent a small percentage of the literature on sexual coercion but represent consistently higher prevalence rates of sexual CCV. The most comprehensive study was conducted with a worldwide sample (N = 15,927 with 6,861 from English-speaking countries). The study by Chan, Straus, Brownridge, Tiwari, and Leung (2008) was conducted with female subjects in all the country samples predominantly engaged in heterosexual relationships, with the range from 83% to 100%. The authors found that the rate of sexual coercion perpetrated by a dating partner in the previous 12 months in the median country was 20%. Students reported rates of perpetrating sexual coercion that ranged from 8% to 34%. The rate of students who were victims of sexual coercion in the previous 12 months in the median country was 24% (range, 9%–46%). For both reports of being a perpetrator and victim of sexual coercion, Canada and the United States consistently showed rates higher than the median. This study involving university students from 22 sites in

21 countries showed that although there were large differences between countries, male and female students were remarkably similar in the proportion of those who physically assaulted a partner or reported being a victim of sexual coercion (Chan et al., 2008).

Additional studies included a Canadian assessment of female university students, reporting 36.4% of the sample experienced sexual coercion, statistically linking intergenerational transmission to women's dating violence victimization. The most important mode of intergenerational transmission was imitation, suggesting that witnessing interparental violence must be addressed to improve the developmental health of exposed children (Brownridge, 2006). A U.S.-based study conducted by Crown and Roberts (2007) at a large, Midwestern university found higher percentages of sexual CCV, bracketing out the use of threats, force, or manipulation (22.2%) or ignoring respondents' protests (18.3%).

Clinical Samples. Clinical investigations into the prevalence of sexual CCV often examine the relationship between behaviors that comport with CCV and that of other health- or mental health–related conditions, such as pregnancy or depression (Martin et al., 2004; Moore, Frohwirth, & Miller, 2010). For example, Dienemann et al. (2000) noted that, among women seeking treatment for depression, 9.8% of participants reported sexual abuse only and 19.5% reported a combination of sexual and physical abuse. Some clinical samples, such as that collected by Moore et al. (2008), view prevalence from incidence of perpetration. As such, Moore et al. (2008) do not report prevalence but rather that the male perpetrators within the study sample ($N = 339$) reported perpetrating an average of 2.37 ($SD = 8.21$) acts of sexual coercion. Within the current available clinical literature, it is notable that very few studies separate IPV-related sexual CCV from incidence of rape by non-partner perpetrators, resulting in a lack of distillation of relevant samples and reportage. Additional material, in which significant overlap between sexual abuse and past acts of physical assault, is described in detail in the subsequent section on combined CCV and physical assault.

Forensic/Legal Samples. As with clinical samples, forensic or legal samples are not readily distinct from the larger pool of forensic investigations into rape and sexual assault, which may or may not relate directly to IPV or CCV behaviors. As such, identification of studies is overly reliant on the environment from which the sample was derived. In one study selected for inclusion in this review, the sample was derived from a shelter for female victims of IPV. Thiel de Bocanegra, Rostovtseva, Khera, and Godhwani (2010) reported an overall prevalence rate of 66% of women reported having been forced to have sex by their abusive partner.

Stalking and Obsessive Behavior

As with sexual CCV, studies examining stalking and obsessive behavior have developed within the IPV literature in parallel to a much larger literature on adjudication of stalker behavior and clinical and community-based interventions and victim

advocacy that may or may not comport with the perpetration of IPV by a domestic partner. For the purposes of this review, studies were examined that directly affirmed the link between stalking as a means of gaining or regaining control within established relationship and as a means of relational coercion, manipulation, or terrorizing of current and former partners by the perpetrators. Given the current jurisprudential framework within the United States varies from state to state and does not make any salient legal distinction regarding the existence or length of a previous relationship, efforts at approximating total prevalence may not reflect all possible instances of stalking that comport with relational CCV. As Perilla, Lippy, Rosales, and Serrata (2011) contended when comparing the findings from national samples, differences in legal definitions and the means by which data is collected all present salient gaps in the current IPV literature and are possible reasons for the drastically different reported rates of prevalence. Table 3 graphically depicts all of the studies in the attendant subcategories of large population samples, smaller community samples, university and school-based samples, clinical samples, and forensic or legal samples. Studies of note are summarized in the following sections.

National Samples. The NVAWS data collected by Tjaden and Thoennes (1998, 2000) provided the first nationally representative survey in the United States and found that 8% of women and 2% of men in the United States have been stalked at some time in their life, whereas 0.5% of men and 4.1% of women reported being stalked by a current or former marital/opposite-sex cohabiting partner in their lifetime. Basile, Swahn, Chen, and Saltzman (2006) reported 4.5% of both genders endorsing being stalked. Women were reported as having a significantly higher prevalence (7%) of stalking victimization than men (2%). Moracco, Runyan, Bowling, and Earp (2007) surveyed women in the contiguous United States and found that 772 (42.7%) women reported having been followed by a man in their lifetime, whereas 91 (5.9%) had been followed in the previous year. Four hundred forty-one (25.3%) had been repeatedly contacted in their lifetime, whereas 82 (5.5%) had been contacted in the previous year. For all types of violence except being followed in a way that frightened them, where strangers were the most common (80%) perpetrators, women were most often victimized by men they knew, most frequently their current or former intimate partners. Among women who reported repeated unwanted contact, current (15.9%) and former (32.9%) intimate partners were the perpetrators in nearly half of the most recent incidents.

Spitzberg (2002) conducted a meta-analysis ($N = 108$) and found an average prevalence across studies of 23.5% for women and 10.5% for men, with an average duration of almost 2 years. The average proportion of female victims across studies was 75%, and 77% of stalking emerged from some form of prior acquaintance, with 49% originating from romantic relationships. New typologies of stalking behavior, coping responses to stalking, and symptomology of stalking victimization are reported. Across 42 studies, the average physical violence incidence was 33%, and 17 studies produced an average sexual violence incidence of slightly greater than 10%. A summary of

32 studies of restraining orders indicated that they are violated an average of 40% of the time and are perceived as followed by worse events almost 21% of the time. Spitzberg and Cupach (2007) conducted an updated meta-analysis of 175 studies, including most of those cited in Spitzberg (2002), exploring obstacles to aggregation including the lack of fixed definitions of stalking. When examining studies using comparable legal definitions, lifetime prevalence estimates range from 2% to 13% for males and 8% to 32% for females. Approximately half of all stalking emerges from romantic entanglements, especially among university-based samples.

Most recently, findings from the NISVS found that nearly 13 million women (1 in 10) reported experiencing stalking in intimate partner relationships in their lifetime, where they "felt very fearful or believed that she or someone close to her would be harmed or killed as a result" (Black et al., 2011, p. 29). Consistent with the literature on stalking, behavior included unwanted phone calls (77%), showing up in places where they were not wanted (65%), and being watched or followed (37%). Similarly, 2.4 million men reported experiencing stalking in their lifetime including unwanted phone calls (84%), showing up in places where they were not wanted (52%), and being watched or followed (52%; Black et al., 2011). Gender differences can be seen in both the rates of stalking and the type of stalking behavior exhibited. In clinical and forensic samples, women are far more likely to be victims of stalking, yet studies involving college or university populations have not found similarly large differences between rates of men versus women as stalking victims (Spitzberg, Nicastro, & Cousins, 1998; Spitzberg & Rhea, 1999). Intimate partners often engage in stalking behavior in the pursuit of intimacy. According to Cupach and Spitzberg (2004), this repeated and unwanted behavior or obsessive relational intrusion is often used to regain or maintain intimacy with a partner. Although both genders may seek to force intimacy through stalking and privacy intrusion, men are more likely to physically stalk, whereas women are likely to make unwanted phone calls, and so forth. Similarly, men are more likely to use intimidation-type behaviors including the element of fear, whereas women are more likely to use privacy intrusion behaviors. Both genders reportedly use surveillance behaviors, although women report more surveillance behaviors at breakup (Williams & Frieze, 2005).

Comparable national data can also be found in other English-speaking countries. A U.K.-based study conducted by Budd and Mattinson (2000) found women (4.0%) were more likely to have experienced persistent and unwanted attention than men (1.7%). Risks were particularly high for young women aged between 16 and 19 years (16.8%). One third of incidents were perpetrated by someone who was in an intimate relationship with the victim at the start of the episode of persistent and unwanted attention or who was a former intimate. A comparable study by Walby and Allen (2004) found 8% of women and 6% of men had experienced stalking victimization within 12 months of data collection. When the findings are generalized to the U.K. population, these reports equate to approximately 1.2 million female and 900,000 male victims of stalking within 12 months of data collection. Of the cases of aggravated stalking (i.e., violence in addition to the stalking) against women, 37% were committed by

an intimate. For men in such cases, 8% were perpetrated by an intimate. Confining the sampling frame to Scotland, Morris, Anderson, and Murray (2002) found 7% of men and 17% of women reported experiencing persistent and unwanted attention at some point during their adult lives. Most of all incidents involved either a partner/ex-partner or someone else already known to the victim. In 35% of all cases and 48% of those defined by victims as "stalking," the offender was a partner or an ex-partner.

McLennan (1996) surveyed 6.9 million women (older than age 18 years) living in Australia. The 2.4% of women aged 18 years and older (165,700) had been stalked by a man in the previous 12-month period, and 15% (1.0 million) reported being stalked at some time during their life. The 7.5% of women who had been stalked (78,100) were still being stalked at the time of the survey. In the previous 12-month period, women were more likely to be stalked by stranger than by men they knew. Ninety-six thousand seven hundred women were stalked by a stranger, compared to 69,100 who were stalked by someone they knew. In this period, less than 1% of women who had been in a previous relationship had been stalked by their previous partner. However, if all incidents of stalking are considered, 6.1% of women who had been in a previous relationship reported that their partner had stalked them at some time.

Although the research suggests some variability in stalking rates across populations, research supports that males can be and are the victims of stalking and that their victimization can be just as serious, concerning, and threatening as female victimization experiences (Sheridan, Gillet, & Davies, 2002; Wigman, 2009, Yanowitz, 2006). Wigman (2009) also suggests that males view stalking differently from females and that the scant research on male former-intimate stalking victims is simply because males do not identify certain behaviors as stalking, do not view themselves as victims at all, or are not concerned by their "victimization."

Smaller Community Samples. Kohn, Flood, Chase, and McMahon (2000) surveyed Louisiana women aged 18 years or older (N = 1,171). One hundred seventy-six women (15%) reported having been stalked in their lifetime, whereas 23 (2%) were currently being stalked. Of the 176,132 (75%) women reported, they believed the stalking to be somewhat dangerous or life threatening. Of these, 67 (51%) identified the perpetrators as someone with whom they had had an intimate relationship. Those women who had been in an intimate relationship with their stalker were more than 4 times as likely to report that they had sustained an injury than those women who had not been in an intimate relationship with their stalker. Banyard et al. (2011) surveyed adult females (N = 1,079) in New Hampshire. Seven hundred five respondents reported stalking victimization since the age of 18 years.

In smaller community samples outside of the United States, comparable findings were reported. Purcell et al. (2002) surveyed 3,700 adult men and women as selected from the electoral roll in the city of Victoria, British Columbia, Canada. One in four respondents (23.4%; N = 432) had been stalked, the unwanted behavior they were subjected to being both repeated and fear provoking. One in 10 (N = 197) had experienced a protracted course of stalking involving multiple intrusions spanning a period

of at least 1 month. Women were twice as likely as men to report having been stalked at some time in their lives, although the rates of victimization in the 12 months prior to the study did not differ significantly according to gender. In a comparable Australian study, Thompson and Dennison (2008) surveyed 1,738 participants from the Southeast Queensland community (N = 932; 53.6%) and Griffith University student community (N = 712; 41.0%) and found that some form of unwanted pursuit was almost normative (75% of the sample). When higher levels of repetition were used to define stalking, the sample comprised participants who reported engaging in more serious forms of intrusive behavior. Applying durational limits appeared to have less of an effect on sample composition than did repetition.

In the United Kingdom, Sheridan, Gillett, and Davies (2000) surveyed women aged 18–55 years in the cities of Leicester and Liverpool (N = 80). Overall, 20% of the total sample was judged to have experienced at least one episode of stalking. None of the stalking experiences described were judged by the three raters to be "mild." In the opinion of the raters, 6.25% of the total sample was judged to have experienced a "moderate" episode of stalking and 13.75% a "severe" episode. In a similar study, Sheridan, Davies, and Boon (2001) surveyed 348 females, deriving a prevalence rate of 24% of respondents reporting at least one incident of stalking.

Turrell (2000) used a sample of 499 ethnically diverse heterosexual and GLBT persons. Findings reported 3% of respondents had been stalked in their current relationship and 17% in a past relationship. When tabulated by gender, 17% of men had been stalked, 23% of women, and 28% of transgendered individuals. When tabulated by identification/orientation, 25% of lesbians had been stalked, 19% of gay women, 17% of gay men, 19% of bisexuals, and 12% of heterosexuals. Tabulation by race and ethnicity also reported that 27% of African Americans had been stalked, 33% of Native Americans, 19% of Whites, 18% of Latinos, 67% of Asian Americans, and 28% of biethnic or multiethnic persons.

University/School Samples. University and school-based studies of stalking and obsessive behaviors constitute the largest subsection of the literature. However, many of these studies are not specifically concerned with stalking by intimate partners, do not differentiate between stalking by a stranger or partner, or do not articulate the existence or duration of a relationship prior to the stalking incidents. For the purposes of this review, stalking inquiries that do report the incidence of prior relationships in cases of stalking are included. Prevalence rates reported by these studies are highly variable but consistent in finding that women are generally victimized by stalking more often than men. The relevant studies are summarized in this section and their prevalence findings are provided in further detail in Table 3.

The earliest study cited for the purposes of this review was the Herold, Mantle, and Zemitis (1979) study examining types of sexually based offenses. Included in the results were prevalence rates for both "following-type" harassing behavior and the use of the phone to harass or intimidate. Eighty-four percent reported having been the victim of some form of sexual offense, with notable response for obscene,

harassing, or obsessive telephone calls (61%) or being followed (24%). Later studies have also shown an increase in stalking-type CCV taking place over the Internet (Alexy, Burgess, Baker, & Smoyak, 2005; Spitzberg & Hoobler, 2002). Although not exclusively reflective of IPV-related behavior, the prevalence rates reported in this study are comparable to those of subsequent studies that emerged after an initial link between stalking and harassment, and interpersonal violence was established by courts and the social scientific literature on abuse (Coleman, 1997; Jason, Reichler, Easton, Neal & Wilson, 1984; Spitzberg & Rhea, 1999).

Fremouw, Westrup, and Pennypacker (1997) reported that 30% percent of female students and 17% of the males in the sample reported having been stalked; 80% reported that they knew their stalker (many had been previously romantically involved with the stalker). Only 1% of the subjects acknowledged having stalked someone, which the authors indicate may be the result of underreporting, because, in part, of the perceived social undesirability of this behavior. Regarding perpetration, a later study by Davis, Ace, and Andra (2000) showed nearly 40% of students had engaged in at least one stalking behavior following a breakup. A total of 10.7% (Study 1) and 7.6% (Study 2) engaged in six or more stalking behaviors.

Most early studies focused primarily on females as victims of relational intrusion or stalking behavior. Mustaine and Tewksbury (1999) established a prevalence rate among their female sample ($N = 861$) of 10.5% of reported having been stalked, whereas Coleman (1997) reported 29.1% from an all-female sample, establishing figures slightly higher than subsequent national samples. Similar studies would report higher rates emerging from university samples (Langhinrichsen-Rohling, Palarea, Cohen, & Rohling, 2000; Logan, Leukefeld, & Walker, 2000; Sinclair & Frieze, 2000; Spitzberg et al., 1998; Spitzberg & Rhea, 1999). Fisher, Cullen, and Turner (2000, 2002) conducted a study that expanded the university-based sample to national levels ($N = 4{,}446$) and reported that 13.1% of the women in the sample had been stalked at least once since the academic year had begun—a period that averaged 6.91 months. Of those who had been stalked, 12.7% experienced two incidents and 2.3% experienced three or more incidents. Nearly all of the stalkers were male (97.6%). As Bjerregaard (2000) noted, females were significantly more likely to self-report being the victims of stalking at some point in their lifetime (24.7%, $N = 122$) than males (10.9%, $N = 29$). Forty percent of both males and females reported that their stalker was a former intimate partner, providing both a link to CCV and the potential for gender symmetry within the paradigm.

University-based studies of stalking and obsessive CCV became more prevalent in the last decade, during a period when anti-stalking criminalization efforts, adjudicative action, victim support, and legislation have gained ubiquity. Moreover, as Gallagher (2005, 2006, 2007, 2008, 2010) noted, university authorities have become more proactive in the adjudication of such behaviors and providing support services. Most studies from this time have reported varied rates of prevalence (Amar, 2006; Haugaard & Seri, 2004; Jordan, Wilcox, & Pritchard, 2007; LeBlanc, Levesque, Richardson, & Berka, 2001; Nobles, Fox, Piquero, & Piquero, 2009; Phillips, Quirk,

Rosenfeld, & O'Connor, 2004; Roberts, 2002). Reported prevalence rates varied from 12% (LeBlanc et al., 2001) to 34.4% (Roberts, 2002) for females and 2% (LeBlanc et al., 2001) to 25% (Nobles et al., 2009) for males. A significant linkage between these studies is that a large proportion of CCV-comparable behaviors were reported as occurring immediately after the dissolution of a relationship.

Perpetration-based prevalence has also increased as studies into stalking and obsessive CCV have evolved. Haugaard and Seri (2004) reported that 7% of the females and 11% of the males initiated intrusive contact that lasted at least 2 weeks after the end of their relationship. Williams and Frieze (2005) reported that, within the sample (N = 85 for men, N = 215 for women), the overwhelming majority of men (100%) and women (99%) performed one or more approach behaviors that comport with relational intrusion or unexpected "approach" and CCV during the beginnings of an intimate relationship. Similar findings were indicated for surveillance behaviors (96% and 99%, respectively). Many men (44%) and women (31%) performed intimidation-type behaviors, and similar findings were found for mild aggression behaviors (27% and 22%, respectively). Descriptive analysis of the breakup persistence behavior subscales revealed similar frequencies to those at initial courtship. Of those who had "broken up" or dissolved their relationship, the majority of men (97%) and women (94%) performed approach behaviors during the breakup. Surveillance behaviors also were common (72% and 86%, respectively), and women reported performing more surveillance behaviors at breakup than men. This type of reportage, including the gender distribution, has been replicated in other studies (Patton, Nobles, & Fox, 2010; Wigman, Graham-Kevan, & Archer, 2008)

Clinical Samples. In U.S. women's shelter-based clinical samples of only females, such as Roehl, O'Sullivan, Webster, and Campbell (2000) and Mechanic, Weaver, and Resick (2002), prevalence rates ranged from 16.1% (Roehl et al., 2000) to 29% (Mechanic et al., 2000). Most recent cases where a mixed-gender sample of stalking victims was analyzed for prevalence have often focused on various behavioral clusters or particular demographic factors but may or may not have included analysis of the relationship between the stalker and the victim. As with university or school-based samples, prevalence rates vary considerably across studies, but, given the extant literature, a general impression is affirmed that most intimate stalkers are men and most victims are women, and intimate stalkers seem to comprise somewhere between one third and one half of all stalkers (Harmon, Rosner, & Owens, 1998; Mullen, Pathé, Purcell, & Stewart, 1999; Pathé & Mullen, 1997).

In a study by Harris (2000), the most common reason given for harassment was that the complainant had ended an intimate relationship with the suspect (43%). Suspects were usually partners, ex-partners, or relatives (41%); acquaintances (41%); or neighbors (16%). Eighty percent of suspects were male, with female victims representing a proportional percentage. Sheridan and Davies (2001) reported that almost half of the stalkers (49% or 47%) were ex-partners of the victims surveyed, whereas Sheridan (2001) explored relationship types in which, of the sample, 96.6% were

female, with 26 of the 28 females (92.8%) stalked by a male, one was stalked by another female, and in one more case, gender of the perpetrator was unknown. The sole male victim was stalked by another male. Four were married to the person who became their stalker, three were cohabiting, and one more was in a dating relationship with the perpetrator, further articulating the divide between stalking by nonintimates and behaviors that comport with CCV within IPV. Purcell, Pathé, and Mullen (2001) examined a cohort (N = 190) in which female stalkers were outnumbered by male stalkers by approximately four to one. The nature of the prior relationship with the victim differed, with female stalkers more likely to target professional contacts and less likely to harass strangers. Female stalkers were also more likely than male stalkers to pursue victims of the same gender. Most female stalkers were motivated by the desire to establish intimacy with their victim, whereas men showed a broader range of motivations (Harmon, Rosner, & Owens, 1995).

Additional clinical samples examined further the types of behavior commonly typified as comporting with stalking or obsessive CCV. Burgess, Harner, Baker, Hartman, and Lole (2001) reported 90% of adjudicated batterers within the sample were male and 10% were female. The 48.5% of batterers admitted to contacting the victim at home, 26.7% contacted the victim at work, and 15.2% contacted victims in public places. The 40.0% of the sample sent flowers or gifts, 15.8% contacted friends/family of the victim, and 10.9% sent letters. Behaviors that, although not exclusively in the domain of IPV, did constitute potentially criminal behavior included 6.7% of perpetrators who watched victims without their knowledge, 4.2% made harassing ("hang-up") telephone calls, 3.0% who threatened to cause harm to the victim, 1.2% who threatened to kill the victim, 4.8% who entered the victim's home without permission, 3.6% who followed the victim to car, and 6.1% who reported physically harming the victim, leading to the battering charge and adjudicated clinical assessment.

Rosenfeld and Harmon (2002) provided a similar assessment, this time with a focus on harassment behaviors. In an assessment of referred cases to a metropolitan psychiatric clinic (N = 204), victims of harassment were found to be largely, although not exclusively, female, with 127 offenders (62.9%) only known to have harassed one woman and an additional 12 (6%) having harassed more than one woman; 125 of these 139 offenders who harassed women were male. Men were the victim of harassment in 19.3% of cases (N = 39), and in all but two of these cases, female perpetrators were known to have harassed only one victim. Women instigated the harassment of men in 17 cases, whereas men harassed other men in 22 cases. In 22 cases (10.9%), both men and women were harassed by the same offender and these offenders were largely male (N = 17; 77.3%). In 76 cases (39.1%), the victim of harassment was a former intimate partner, either a spouse or dating partner of the offender.

Forensic/Legal Samples. As with clinical studies, forensic and legal investigations of stalking and obsessive behavior use samples derived from general domestic abuse cases and documentary archival data (e.g., arrest reports, trial records, and conviction documents). Prevalence derived from such archival studies is highly varied. In the

summary to follow, cases that reported prevalence of stalking behaviors is reviewed and comparisons are drawn between studies that comport with stalking behavior from within the context of domestic violence and CCV perpetration.

Zona, Sharma, and Lane (1993) reported, in an early study, that presents a distinction between two aspects of interpersonal behavior: erotomania and obsessional behavior. Males (71%, $N = 5$) were found more often to be victims of erotomania stalking cases, whereas females were more often victims in obsessive cases (93%, $N = 30$). Meloy and Gothard (1995) further delineated cases of obsessive behavior, reporting that victims of the obsessive stalking behavior were almost evenly divided between strangers and former intimates: 15% ($N = 3$) pursued a former spouse, 40% ($N = 8$) pursued a former intimate (no legal marriage but a history of sexual intimacy), and 45% ($N = 9$) pursued a stranger. All the pursuits were heterosexual and most involved women as victims. Comparable cases in the Australia and Canada report that most percentage of victims in stalking cases were female and a significant number were stalked by former intimate partners (Kong, 1997; Swanwick, 1996). Kienlen, Birmingham, Solberg, O'Regan, and Meloy (1997) reported that most victims (58%, $N = 15$) were either a spouse divorced or separated from the subject or a former intimate partner (no legal marriage); 23 % ($N = 6$) of the victims were an estranged spouse and 35 % ($N = 9$) were a former intimate partner of the subject. Nonpsychotic stalkers pursued an estranged spouse or intimate partner more often (71%, $N = 12$) than psychotic stalkers (38%, $N = 3$).

Throughout the last two decades, several studies reported comparable rates of stalking with both predominantly female victims and from current or former intimate partners (Boon & Sheridan, 2001; Burgess et al., 1997; Farnham, James, & Cantrell, 2000; Marshall & Castle, 1998; Meloy, Davis, & Lovette, 2001; Melton, 2004; Mohandie, Meloy, McGowan, & Williams, 2006; Morrison, 2001; Nicolaidis et al., 2003; Schwartz-Watts & Morgan, 1998). Nicastro, Cousins, and Spitzberg (2000) reported that an overwhelming number of victims had existing or prior relationships with their perpetrators (60% had dated, 20% married, 9% acquainted, 6% separated/divorced, 2% related, and with only 4% of the sample reporting they had never met the perpetrator before). In addition, 20% of the victims claimed to be in current relationships with their pursuers, and 76% claimed to have been in former relationships with their pursuers (4% gave no indication). Over half (56%) of the victims were cohabiting with the suspects, and residence arrangements could not be determined in another 24% of the cases. The average length of relationship between victims who had preexisting relationships with the suspects was reported to have lasted 40 months (range 0–180 months; median = 24 months). These studies also provided significant and comparable reports of prevalence to nationally based samples, such as Tjaden and Thoennes (2001). In contrast, Hackett (2000) reexamined the gender dynamics of stalking from a police sample, reporting that prevalence of males being victims of stalking behavior increased 4% over a 4-year period. Pathé, Mullen, and Purcell (2000) also noted that same-sex stalkers tended to be female over opposite-sex perpetrators.

Several forensic studies examined stalking prevalence from a law enforcement perspective. Despite the trend toward stalking as highly prevalent based on forensic assessment within a context of IPV, Buzawa, Hotaling, and Klein (1998) noted that in a sample of domestic violence cases (N = 356), less than 1% of adjudicated male batterers were charged with stalking as the third most serious offense in their conviction. McFarlane, Campbell, and Watson (2002) found significance between stalking behaviors and female homicide; Cole et al. (2005) correlated stalking and forced sexual behavior; and Logan and Walker (2010) correlated stalking rates prior to and immediately following obtaining a protection order (PO) from law enforcement authorities. Overall, 61 % of the sample reported ever having been stalked, 56.2% reported being stalked in the year prior to obtaining the PO, and 50.5% reported being stalked during the 6 months before obtaining the PO by the perpetrator. Thus, most women who had ever been stalked by the PO-designated perpetrator reported being stalked shortly before obtaining the PO (92% of those ever stalked were stalked in the year prior to obtaining the PO). After the PO was obtained, 25.7% of women reported they were stalked during the follow-up period.

Combined Coercive Violence and Physical Assault

Only a small number of studies are designed explicitly to examine combined coercive violence alongside "traditional" IPV incorporating physical violence or assault (Basile & Hall, 2011; Hegarty, Bush, & Sheehan, 2005). Many of the studies included in this review were instead focused on a particular type of abuse or behavior, but collected data or reportage from victims that endorsed multiple acts or another behavior removed from the initial research focus (Christopher, Pflieger, Canary, Guerrero, & Holtzworth-Munroe, 2008; Silverman et al., 2010). As such, much of the literature on combined prevalence of CCV and physical assaults are embedded within studies of each or the other. In fact, many of the studies listed in Table 5 could also be found in the tabular data on sexual coercion (Table 2), stalking (Tables 3 and 4), or emotional abuse (Table 1). It is also this fact—the relative ubiquity of CCV and IPV co-occurrence—that presents a formidable obstacle to accurate reporting of prevalence.

Analysis of studies that report combined types of partner violence supports the consistent finding is that it is very common for different forms of IPV to co-occur. It also seems fair to say that where less common forms of abuse are present, more common forms of abuse are probable. However, researchers must be cautious of mistaking reported rates of co-occurrence as having predictive ability, presenting a linear behavior pattern, or representing accurate rates of prevalence because this review has shown that more common forms of partner violence are not always valid predictors of less common forms.

Large Population Samples. As with previous topics, the foundational work for national studies in the United States is Tjaden and Thoennes (1998), which compares the rates of emotional and psychological abuse with that of physical acts of violence,

stalking, and sexual abuse. The national NVAWS data provides compelling evidence of co-occurrence of acts that comport directly with the CCV categories under review, reporting a strong link between stalking and other forms of violence in intimate relationships: 81% of women who were stalked by a current or former husband or cohabiting partner were also physically assaulted by that partner and 31% reported being sexually assaulted by that partner. Domestically, much of the comparative prevalence on combined forms of IPV and nonphysical behaviors is based on the national sample and subsequent analysis of the data by the authors and others (Coker, Davis et al., 2002; Miller, 2006; Slashinski, Coker, & Davis, 2003; Tjaden & Thoennes, 2000, 2001).

Laroche (2005) analyzed the 1999 General Social Survey (GSS), involving 25,876 Canadians. Respondents were asked about their victimization by a current or previous spouse in the past 5 years. Respondents were asked about physical assaults and the following psychologically abusive and controlling behaviors by their partner, similar to those in the Duluth Power and Control Wheel: "Limits your contact with family or friends," "puts you down or calls you names to make you feel bad," "is jealous and doesn't want you to talk to other men/women," "harms or threatens to harm someone close to you," "demands to know who you are with and where you are at all times," "damages or destroys your possessions or property," and "prevents you from knowing about or having access to the family income, even if you ask." For the 5-year period prior to the study, 5% of the surveyed women and 4% of the men were counted as victims of severe *intimate terrorism* (IT), defined as having experienced severe and frequent physical violence and high levels of psychological abuse and control, and who would fit Ehrensaft's "clinical abuse cases" from injuries sustained, fear expressed, and use of police and other services. Graham-Kevan (2007) analyzed the same survey, except that she focused on abuse reported for the past year only, and found very comparable rates of intimate terrorism between the genders. This is a remarkable finding, considering the study's methodology (akin to the NVAWS in that its questionnaire framed IPV in terms of personal safety rather than conflict, thus suppressing male victimization rates) and "the inadequate assessment of controlling behaviors suffered by men" (Laroche, 2005, p. 11). Slashinski et al. (2003) reported that among 563 women experiencing some type of violence, 290 (51.5%) experienced physical aggression. One hundred eighty-nine (31.6%) experienced physical aggression alone, whereas 49 (8.7%) experienced physical aggression and stalking, 40 (7.1%) experienced physical aggression and sexual assaults, and 12 (1.2%) experienced all three. One hundred eighty-seven women (33.2%) experienced stalking. Of these, 106 (18.8%) experienced stalking alone, whereas 20 (3.6%) experienced stalking combined with sexual assault. Two hundred nineteen women (38.9%) experienced sexual assaults. Of these, 147 (26.1%) experienced sexual assault alone. Among 184 men experiencing some type of violence, 83 (45.1%) experienced physical aggression. Sixty-six (35.9%) experienced physical aggression alone, whereas 17 (9.2%) experienced physical aggression and stalking.

Outlaw (2009) also analyzed the NVAWS data and found that nonphysical abuses are often twice (sometimes three of four times) as common among subjects who

experience physical abuse. Basile (1999) focused on a very small subsample of a national sample and discussed the combined prevalence of verbal bullying and threats in sexual coercion. Thompson et al. (2006) used two all-female samples, one at the national level and one in Washington State, and found that 14.7% reported IPV of any type (physical, psychological, and sexual) in the past 5 years and 45.1% of abused women experienced more than one type. Moracco et al. (2007) did a national study of women and found that 60% had experienced some form of abuse and about one third of that percentage had experienced more than one form. Jun, Rich-Edwards, Boynton-Jarrett, and Wright (2008) examined data from the Nurses' Health Study (N = 54,200) and found that 8.4% had experienced emotional abuse with one report of physical or sexual abuse, whereas 3.1% had experienced emotional abuse with more than one report of physical or sexual abuse. Comparable data was found in Canada, as Kaukinen (2004) found that 10% reported emotional abuse and 8% reported emotional abuse alone, suggesting a 2% rate of combined physical and emotional abuse.

Smaller Community Samples. Among the earliest of studies to report combined rates of physical and nonphysical abuse, Wingood and DiClemente (1997) sampled African American women in the United States and reported that women who had a physically abusive primary partner, compared with those who did not, were 4.2, 9.2, and 3.7 times more likely, respectively, to report being verbally abused, threatened with physical abuse, and threatened with abandonment. In an analysis of data from the Michigan Violence Against Women Survey (MVAWS), Mezey et al. (2002) found that 6.3% of the sample (N = 1,249) experienced physical violence during the past year, 28% experienced psychological vulnerability, and 14% experienced autonomy-limiting behaviors.

When physical violence and nonphysical abuse are combined into one measure of IPV, 31.2% of sampled women experienced some form of IPV during the year preceding the survey. Community-based samples in both the United States and Canada that assessed for combined prevalence of CCV and IPV showed strong correlations between physical abuse and sexual coercion, high-risk alcohol consumption and physical and psychological IPV, and stalking and emotional or psychological CCV; and physical abuse and chronic pain in victims (Bensley, Van Eenwyk, & Wynkoop Simmons, 2003; Brewster, 2003; Lemon et al., 2002; Marshall & Holtzworth-Munroe, 2002; Wuest et al., 2008). Mei-Chuan et al. (2009) reported that among participants (N = 1,476), 50.7% (N = 749) had experienced at least one or more types of abuse (physical violence, emotional abuse, sexual assault, stalking, or threats) by current or previous intimate partners, with 23.6% of them reporting experience of more than two forms of abuse.

University/School Samples. As may be evident from the earlier section on stalking and obsessive behavior, the most common combined form of CCV and physical violence or assault found within literature using university or school-based samples is the prevalence of co-occurring stalking behaviors and physical abuse

(Bjerregaard, 2000; Davis et al., 2000; Logan & Leukefeld, 2000; McCann, 2000, 2001; Spitzberg, Marshall, & Cupach, 2001). Sinclair and Frieze (2005) endeavored to typify a cluster of behaviors that co-occurred with the greatest frequency. Thus, four different "types" of stalking-related behavior were measured. Across all behaviors, there was a significant main effect of perspective, such that pursuers reported doing less than rejecters reported being the recipient. The behaviors examined were all "unwanted"—that they occurred in a context the respondent acknowledged was an unrequited interest in which they had been refused. The behavior types examined included normal approach tactics, surveillance (indirect courtship) tactics, intimidation tactics (psychological aggression and coercion), and clearly violent behavior (threats, verbal, and physical attacks). Other than "normal courtship" behaviors, there were no significant gender differences in how often the various types of stalking-related behaviors were perpetrated. Similarly in the United Kingdom, Roberts (2005) connected co-occurring stalking clusters to violence within a sample of university undergraduates (N = 220), reporting nearly a third of participants (35.9%) experienced physical violence while being stalked.

Although stalking was the most prevalent of co-occurring CCV, its correlation to extreme or escalating acts of physical assault and abuse from within an intimate relationship was not always significant. Yazykova, Raghavan, and O'Connor (2006) explored a pattern of associations that suggests that different stalking clusters co-occur with different IPV victimization. Specifically, significant correlations were found between mild physical violence and stalking tactics on invasion, intimidation, pursuit, and hyperintimacy clusters, whereas sexual victimization was associated with pursuit and cyber- or Internet-based stalking. Severe IPV and stalking tactics were not associated. Other than pursuit behaviors, none of the stalking clusters were associated with more than one type of violence, suggesting that stalking may be composed of a conceptually different set of motivations that are differentially associated with sexual and physical violence in intimate contexts.

Some studies included in this review measured combined forms of emotional and psychological CCV and physical violence. Barnes (2001) found 15.6% of the women experienced physical abuse, 11.7% experienced psychological abuse, and 6 % had been both physically and psychologically abused. The combined physical and psychological abuse in this African American university sample (N = 179) was comparable to prevalence rates reported found in other studies (Prospero, 2008). As with many of the university-based studies reviewed, perpetration of all CCV and IPV behaviors were often exacerbated by the dissolution of a relationship or "breakup" (Williams & Frieze, 2005). In addition to emotional and psychological CCV and physical violence, Yazykova, Raghavan, O'Connor, and Dernizon (2006) explored significant correlations found between perpetration of sexual violence and engaging in invasion, intimidation, and pursuit stalking tactics. Moreover, the common motives of control and powerlessness were significantly correlated with both sexual violence and the same three stalking clusters, but the same motives were not associated with physical violence.

Clinical Samples. As with university or school-based samples in this review, clinical samples of combined rates of CCV and physical abuse or assault are often found embedded within reports of prevalence of either one or the other and are therefore not repeated in this section unless combined prevalence rates or significant correlations are separately reported. Clinical reportage on prevalence on combined CCV and physical violence or assault generally support findings of the individual CCV phenomena, including increased reportage of victimization by females, established relational context for the abuse (e.g., being or having been dating, married, or sexual partners), and indications that increased severity of physical IPV may correlate to increased likelihood of being a victim of emotional abuse, sexual coercion or stalking, and the physical and psychological trauma associated with victimization, including depression and posttraumatic stress disorder (PTSD; Brewster, 2000; Burgess et al., 2001; Coker, Derrick, et al., 2000; Dutton, Kaltman, Goodman, Weinfurt, & Vankos, 2005; Henning & Klesges, 2003; Johnson, Zlotnick, & Perez, 2008; McEwan, Mullen, MacKenzie, & Ogloff, 2009; Mechanic et al., 2000, 2008; Roehl et al., 2000; Rosenfeld & Harmon, 2002; Sheridan & Davies, 2001). The linkage of physical IPV to nonphysical forms of IPV or CCV is not without its practical correlate. As Gondolf, Heckert, and Kimmel (2002) noted in a study of batterer intervention programs and nonphysical forms of abuse, the established rates of the prevalence of control (19%), threats (19%), and combined nonphysical abuse (10%) decreased 60%–70% from preprogram levels during the participation phase of the batterer intervention program.

Similar advances in assessment of combined abuse have also occurred. Using the Revised Conflict Tactics Scale (CTS2), Carney and Buttell (2006) found that perpetrators of IPV acknowledged using psychologically aggressive tactics (88.6%), in combination with minor (74.6%) and severe (48.3%) physical violence, minor (32.5%) and severe (9.7%) sexual coercion, and violence resulting in both minor (36.8%) and severe (16.7%) injures to their intimate partners. In Australia, Hegarty et al. (2005) developed the Composite Abuse Scale (CAS), reporting that among a sample of female patients (N = 1,836), 4.8% of the sample experienced four distinct measurement dimensions of abuse, including physical, emotional, harassment, and severe combinations of these behaviors. The 2.3% experienced emotional abuse, harassment, and physical abuse; 1.8% experienced severe combined abuse, emotional abuse, and physical abuse; 0.3% experienced severe combined abuse, emotional abuse, and harassment; 0.06% experienced severe combined abuse, harassment, and physical abuse. The 6.2% experienced emotional and physical abuse; 1.5% experienced emotional abuse and harassment; 0.5% experienced severe combined abuse and emotional abuse; 0.2% experienced harassment and physical abuse; 0.1% experienced severe combined abuse and physical abuse; and 0.06% experienced severe combined abuse and harassment. The 9.0% experienced emotional abuse alone; 2.6% experienced physical abuse; 0.9% experienced harassment; and 0.3% experienced severe combined abuse.

Recent clinical studies that are trauma center or hospital based have reported significant rates of prevalence for combined CCV and IPV behaviors within specific demographics and populations of clinical significance. Houry, Kemball, Rhodes, and

Kaslow (2006) sampled African American females (N = 589) from a large, metropolitan public hospital and reported that 36% of those in a relationship within the past year (N = 461) disclosed that there were victims of IPV in the past year. In the past year, 22% experienced recent physical abuse, 9% experienced recent sexual abuse, and 32% experienced recent emotional abuse. Mechanic, Uhlmansiek, Weaver, and Resick (2010) sampled acutely battered women referred from local agencies serving battered and stalked women, including shelters, police departments, legal assistance agencies, hospital emergency departments, and other support service agencies. The authors reported that stalked women reported extremely high levels of concurrent emotional abuse, sexual assault, and physical violence resulting in severe injuries such as loss of consciousness.

Forensic/Legal Samples. Forensic and legal investigations of various criminal acts, including stalking, sexual assault, harassment, and domestic abuse use samples derived from legal documents, law enforcement records, and archival sources. Prevalence derived from such archival studies is highly varied and, like many instances where more than one type of criminal behavior is under scrutiny, are often embedded within reports of prevalence of additional criminal activity, including homicide, property crime, or drug- or alcohol-related offenses (Bhandari et al., 2006; McFarlane et al., 2002; Morrison, 2008). This review will not repeat summaries of studies in this section unless combined prevalence rates or significant correlations are separately reported and detail is provided for studies in Table 4.

Most studies using criminal records predominantly report prevalence of more than one form of CCV behavior associated with the adjudicated perpetrator, whereas studies that incorporate victims show more variance in the type of behaviors exhibited (Coker, Smith, et al., 2000; Dienemann et al., 2000; Farnham et al., 2000; Hackett, 2000; Meloy et al., 2001; Meloy et al., 2000; Morrison, 2001; Wiemann et al., 2000). In a court mandated sample (N = 95) of abused women who also perpetrated relationship violence, Swan and Snow (2003) reported that 8% both physical and emotional abuse, 6% both sexual and emotional abuse, 4% both physical and sexual abuse, and 21% all three types of abuse. Several studies reported similar or higher rates of prevalence for stalking and emotional or psychological CCV (Brewster, 2003; Nicolaidis et al, 2003), stalking and physical violence (Logan, Shannon, Cole, & Walker, 2006; Melton, 2004), sexual coercion and physical violence (Logan, Cole, & Shannon, 2007), and emotional or psychological CCV and physical violence (Ahmad et al., 2007; Coker et al., 2007; Gandhi et al., 2010).

Perhaps most compelling, from a forensic and legal framework, is the prevalence rates among perpetrators. Basile and Hall (2011) reported that 96.8% of participants who reported perpetration of all four types of violence; most men perpetrated multiple types of violence. The 1.4% committed acts of physical violence, stalking, and sexual violence; 0.3% physical violence, stalking, and psychological abuse; 0.9% physical violence and stalking; 0.3% stalking and sexual violence; 0.3% stalking only; and 0.3% reported no acts of violence. Although this study sampled only court-mandated male

perpetrators, its conclusions are compelling to develop similar studies that may look at female perpetrators and follow-up studies that examine recidivism and reconviction rates for similar criminal acts resulting from CCV/IPV behaviors.

CONCLUSIONS

General Conclusions of Intimate Partner Violence Prevalence

A general conclusion to be drawn from this review is that, as Johnson (2008) contends, there does seem to be two types of IPV: one that traditionally manifests in physical violence; and another, more nebulous, multifaceted, or perhaps stochastic type that comports with elements of power, control, and coercion. This review demonstrates that the two types are not, however, altogether conterminous. Some studies that have endeavored to investigate only one aspect of CCV have inevitably found a measure of overlap with another, whereas others have not.

A second conclusion to be drawn from this review is that IPV and CCV behaviors are generally supported by international studies from other English-speaking nations. None of the CCV substrata under review showed marked variance in the United Kingdom, Australia, Canada, or New Zealand studies contained as part of the literature reviewed. This finding bolsters the contention among IPV researchers that no particular aspect of IPV is constrained to a solely U.S. or North American research idiom.

A third conclusion that can be drawn from this review is that studies of IPV tend to vary, as Spitzberg and Cupach (2003) noted, in their perspective of combined coercive violence as having a clinical or relational locus. This can also be clearly evinced in the overlap of studies in this review from one aspect of CCV behavior and another (i.e., emotional abuse and stalking behavior). The data reported from single studies seemed to capture elements of both discrete CCV categories, which, although separately significant to the purposes of this review, complicates the ability to categorize a single study as capturing only one discrete form of IPV. Regarding emotional and psychological abuse, sexual coercion, and stalking, this report captures a notable conclusion regarding prevalence; namely, those studies that used the same or similar methodologies, instrumentation, and measurement reported a much higher variance, as seen with the community-based and clinical studies, than those that diversified the means of obtaining respondent data. In interview or mixed-methodological studies, variances in prevalence were often comparable and, in many cases, much higher.

A final conclusion involves the role of gender in the studies under review. This review shows that there are both gender similarities and gender differences in how IPV and CCV are reported and how data related to incidence and prevalence is collected and studied. For example, reportage of emotional and psychological abuse had the highest number of large-sample, national studies that sampled from both genders and reported incidence and prevalence data from national samples that seemed to indicate both pervasive reportage from males and females and approximately equal

rates of incidence for both genders (e.g., the NISVS). In contrast, studies of sexual coercion and stalking behaviors had the lowest number of male-inclusive samples, and those that did, like the NISVS, maintained the widest statistical margin between genders, with between 2 and 4 times as many women reporting as men (Black et al., 2011). For example, sexual coercion findings among dating populations show greater gender equivalency when sexual abuse is defined more broadly (i.e., including both IPV and CCV).

Within studies of stalking and obsessive behaviors, gender differences are much less when all types of obsessive pursuit behaviors are considered but more skewed toward female victims when the focus is on stalking. Disparities can also be seen in clinical, forensic, university, and smaller community samples, where sampling loci (i.e., women's shelters, sororities, police reports of domestic violence, or hospital intakes) seemed to indicate much higher levels of IPV and CCV reporting for women victims. Although these contrasts are striking, particularly as compared to the evidence for "bidirectional" emotional or psychological abuse, firm conclusions cannot be drawn in the absence of comparable samples of men. Moreover, the lack of venues and instruments for reporting by males may also compromise the rates of incidence and prevalence of IPV and CCV currently being studied.

Implications for Intervention and Policy

In each of the three categories of partner abuse under review, the enhancements and modifications from the historical development of coordinated community response to partner abuse have brought about needed increases in reportage, adjudication, and assessments of prevalence (Barner & Carney, 2011). However, as also seen in the community-based studies included in this review, often interventions meant to capture one particular aspect of CCV or IPV and have captured others or meant to capture one aspect and, in turn, capture many.

Regarding policies, advocates, practitioners, and researchers alike must sound the call for uniform definitions, legislation, and law enforcement standards that specifically address emotional and psychological abuse, sexual coercion, and stalking behaviors. Uniform policies are the stable basis from which victim-appropriate, empirically rigorous, and accurate prevalence studies are conducted; interventions are designed; and programs are initiated. Moreover, this review has identified the need for community-based practice models and typologies that encompass a range of behaviors from within IPV. More work is needed to transfer this same need to the arena of service provision and, perhaps most importantly, preventative care throughout the lifespan.

Recommendations for Future Research

Research into the three facets of CCV in this review have uncovered several potential areas of interest for researchers and avenues for further development where only one or a few studies have been conducted to date but which reported significant findings.

The following conclusions have been grouped according to the CCV category to which they apply.

Emotional and Psychological CCV. Given the wide range of findings and their overall similarity, this area of CCV study remains an important avenue for further community-based research. Correlates between such CCV behaviors and alcohol use, child maltreatment and child development are also notable gaps in the research and potential avenues for further study. Given the high levels of overlap observed in community and university or school-based samples, further research establishing the link between sexual CCV, rape and sexual assault occurrence, and IPV is strongly recommended. As with community and university-based samples, more research is needed in this area to continue to ascertain the relationship between age and emotional CCV. Given the continued debate over bidirectional abuse patterning among men and women in the literature on IPV, research into this area is paramount to continued advances in interventions and empirical discernment of emotional and psychological CCV in the general population. Given the high rates of reportage and the frequent overlap between emotional and physical violence prevalence in these studies, further research into emotional abuse from forensic samples is required.

Sexual Coercion. Given the wide variation between these studies and differences in their sampling foci, much further research is needed to shed empirical light on the sexual CCV phenomena in racial and ethnic communities and the GLBT community. Similarly, university-based and forensic studies of sexual coercion must endeavor to differentiate behaviors that do comport with CCV and IPV and those that, while still of interest to researchers, do not. Further research would greatly benefit from a strong empirical base that establishes relational correlates to sexual abuse perpetration, establishes constructs and typologies that isolate this behavior from non-IPV related forms of sexual assault, and longitudinal and durational studies that ascertain incremental increases in the terroristic nature of sexually based behaviors when combined with acts of physical violence.

Stalking and Obsessive Behavior. Given the legal aspects of stalking behavior, further research avenues would benefit from close linkages to forensic and legal aspects of stalking and obsessive CCV. As with sexual coercion, more efforts are needed to isolate these types of behaviors from non-IPV contexts. Moreover, more uniform methodologies, typologies, instrumentation, and measurement are needed to contextually define these behaviors from within the scholarship on CCV and IPV. As with all three of the salient CCV topics under review, the literature would benefit greatly from increased attention to gender symmetrical studies of both perpetration and victimization, as well as more racial, ethnic, and orientation-diverse studies. A unique aspect to stalking behavior may also lie in empirically determining rates of recidivism, reoffense, and reconviction for perpetrators from within a single abusive relationship as opposed to those that are serial in nature. Moreover, given the wide definitions of

harassment and other obsessive behaviors, further study into how criminal charges may be levied or changed from the time of incident to the time of trial is strongly recommended.

Combined Coercive Violence and Physical Assault. This review has articulated that whenever one aspect of partner abuse is prevalent, other forms of it may be present as well. Often, as this review has uncovered, co-occurrence and prevalence of multiple forms of CCV and IPV has yet to receive systematic treatment within the research and scholarship. Accurate rates of prevalence are not likely to be forthcoming until nationwide or multinational studies are conducted that reflect the current state of the knowledge of CCV and IPV incidence and prevalence. This review would seem to concur with findings from scholars that address what the *field* of IPV research must overcome before accurate rates of prevalence can be ascertained (Carney & Buttell, 2004; Dutton & Corvo, 2006; Hamel, Desmarais, & Nicholls, 2007; Stover, 2005). These include addressing sampling issues resulting from gender asymmetry, namely, that research samples are inclusive of both genders: developing assessment and treatment methods that encompass the range of behaviors that may impact victims, calling for strong state and federal level advocacy for legislation and law enforcement policy that is supported by and reflective of empirical literature and scholarship, and developing cross-disciplinary research toward unified areas of advocacy, research, scholarship, and practice.

REFERENCES

Ahmad, F., Hogg-Johnson, S., Stewart, D. E., & Levinson, W. (2007). Violence involving intimate partners: Prevalence in Canadian family practice. *Canadian Family Physician*, *53*(3), 461–468.

Alexy, E. M., Burgess, A. W., Baker, T., & Smoyak, S. A. (2005). Perceptions of cyberstalking among college students. *Brief Treatment and Crisis Intervention*, *5*(3), 279–289.

Amar, A. F. (2006). College women's experience of stalking: Mental health symptoms and changes in routines. *Archives of Psychiatric Nursing*, *20*(3), 108–116.

Archer, J. (2000). Sex differences in aggression between heterosexual partners: A meta-analytic review. *Psychological Bulletin*, *126*(5), 651–680.

Babcock, J. C., Waltz, J., Jacobson, N. S., & Gottman, J. M. (1993). Power and violence: The relation between communication patterns, power discrepancies, and domestic violence. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology*, *61*(1), 40–50.

Banyard, V., Potter, S., & Turner, H. (2011). The impact of interpersonal violence in adulthood on women's job satisfaction and productivity: The mediating roles of mental and physical health. *Psychology of Violence*, *1*(1), 16–28.

Barner, J. R., & Carney, M. M. (2011). Interventions for intimate partner violence: A historical review. *Journal of Family Violence*, *26*(3), 235–244.

Barnes, S. Y. (2001). Physical and psychological abuse among a predominantly African American sample. *The ABNF Journal*, *12*(2), 36–41.

Basile, K. C. (1999). Rape by acquiescence: The ways in which women "give in" to unwanted sex with their husbands. *Violence Against Women*, *5*(9), 1036–1058.

Basile, K. C., & Hall, J. E. (2011). Intimate partner violence perpetration by court-ordered men: Distinctions and intersections among physical violence, sexual violence, psychological abuse, and stalking. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, *26*(2), 230–253.

Basile, K. C., Swahn, M. H., Chen, J., & Saltzman, L. E. (2006). Stalking in the United States: Recent national prevalence estimates. *American Journal of Preventive Medicine*, *31*(2), 172–175.

Bauer, H. M., Rodríguez, M. A., & Pérez-Stable, E. J. (2000). Prevalence and determinants of intimate partner abuse among public hospital primary care patients. *Journal of General Internal Medicine*, *15*(11), 811–817.

Bensley, L., Van Eenwyk, J., & Wynkoop Simmons, K. (2003). Childhood family violence history and women's risk for intimate partner violence and poor health. *American Journal of Preventive Medicine*, *25*(1), 38–44.

Bhandari, M., Dosanjh, S., Tornetta, P., III, & Matthews, D. (2006). Musculoskeletal manifestations of physical abuse after intimate partner violence. *The Journal of Trauma*, *61*(6), 1473–1479.

Bhandari, M., Sprague, S., Dosanjh, S., Petrisor, B., Resendes, S., Madden, K., et al. (2011). The prevalence of intimate partner violence across orthopaedic fracture clinics in Ontario. *The Journal of Bone and Joint Surgery*, *93A*(2), 132–141.

Bjerregaard, B. (2000). An empirical study of stalking victimization. *Violence and Victims*, *15*(4), 389–406.

Black, M. C., Basile, K. C., Breiding, M. J., Smith, S. G., Walters, M. L., Merrick, M. T., et al. (2011). *The National Intimate Partner and Sexual Violence Survey (NISVS): 2010 summary report*. Atlanta, GA: National Center for Injury Prevention and Control, Centers for Disease Control and Prevention.

Bonomi, A. E., Anderson, M. L., Cannon, E. A., Slesnick, N. N., & Rodriguez, M. A. (2009). Intimate partner violence in Latina and non-Latina women. *American Journal of Preventive Medicine*, *36*(1), 43–48.

Bonomi, A. E., Anderson, M. L., Reid, R. J., Carrell, D., Fishman, P. A., Rivara, F. P., et al. (2007). Intimate partner violence in older women. *The Gerontologist*, *47*(1), 34–41.

Boon, J. C. W., & Sheridan, L. (2001). Stalker typologies: A law enforcement perspective. *Journal of Threat Assessment*, *1*(2), 75–97.

Brewster, M. P. (2000). Stalking by former intimates: Verbal threats and other predictors of physical violence. *Violence & Victims*, *15*(1), 41–54.

Brewster, M. P. (2003). Power and control dynamics in pre-stalking and stalking situations. *Journal of Family Violence*, *18*(4), 207–217.

Brownridge, D. A. (2006). Intergenerational transmission and dating violence victimization: Evidence from a sample of female university students in Manitoba. *Canadian Journal of Community Mental Health*, *25*, 75–93.

Budd, T., & Mattinson, J. (2000). *Stalking: Findings from the 1998 British crime survey* (Home Office Research, Research Findings No. 129). London: Research Development and Statistics Directorate.

Burgess, A. W., Baker, T., Greening, D., Hartman, C. R., Burgess, A. G., Douglas, J. E., et al. (1997). Stalking behaviors within domestic violence. *Journal of Family Violence*, *12*(4), 389–403.

Burgess, A. W., Harner, H., Baker, T., Hartman, C. R., & Lole, C. (2001). Batterers stalking patterns. *Journal of Family Violence*, *16*(3), 309–321.

Buzawa, E., Hotaling, G., & Klein, A. (1998). The response to domestic violence in a model court: Some initial findings and implications. *Behavioral Sciences and the Law*, *16*(2), 185–206.

Capaldi, D. M., & Crosby, L. (1997). Observed and reported psychological and physical aggression in young, at-risk couples. *Social Development*, *6*(2), 184–206.

Capaldi, D. M., & Kim, H. K. (2007). Typological approaches to violence in couples: A critique and alternative conceptual approach. *Clinical Psychology Review*, *27*(3), 253–265.

Carney, M. M., & Buttell, F. P. (2004). A multidimensional evaluation of a treatment program for female batterers: A pilot study. *Research on Social Work Practice*, *14*(4), 249–258.

Carney, M. M., & Buttell, F. P. (2006). Exploring the relevance of interpersonal dependency as a treatment issue in batterer intervention. *Research on Social Work Practice*, *16*(3), 276–286. http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/1049731505282836

Castle Rock v. Gonzales, 545 US 748 (2005).

Chan, K. L., Straus, M. A., Brownridge, D. A., Tiwari, A., & Leung, W. C. (2008). Prevalence of dating partner violence and suicidal ideation among male and female university students worldwide. *Journal of Midwifery & Women's Health*, *53*(6), 529–537. http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.jmwh.2008.04.016

Chang, J. J., Theodore, A. D., Martin, S. L., & Runyan, D. K. (2008). Psychological abuse between parents: Associations with child maltreatment from a population-based sample. *Child Abuse & Neglect*, *32*(8), 819–829.

Charles, P., & Perreira, K. M. (2007). Intimate partner violence during pregnancy and 1-year post-partum. *Journal of Family Violence*, *22*(7), 609–619.

Christopher, F. S., Pflieger, J. C., Canary, D., Guerrero, L. K., & Holtzworth-Munroe, A. (2008). Targeted neighborhood sampling: A new approach for recruiting abusive couples. *Journal of Family Violence*, *23*(2), 89–100. http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s10896-007-9130-y

Coggins, M., & Bullock, L. F. (2003). The wavering line in the sand: The effect of domestic violence and sexual coercion. *Issues in Mental Health Nursing*, *24*(6–7), 723–738.

Coker, A. L., Davis, K. E., Arias, I., Desai, S., Sanderson, M., Brandt, H. M., et al. (2002). Physical and mental health effects of intimate partner violence for men and women. *American Journal of Preventive Medicine*, *23*(4), 260–268. http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S0749-3797(02)00514-7

Coker, A. L., Derrick, C., Lumpkin, J. L., Aldrich, T. E., & Oldendick, R. (2000). Help-seeking for intimate partner violence and forced sex in South Carolina. *American Journal of Preventive Medicine*, *19*(4), 316–320.

Coker, A. L., Flerx, V. C., Smith, P. H., Whitaker, D. J., Fadden, M. K., & Williams, M. (2007). Partner violence screening in rural health care clinics. *American Journal of Public Health*, *97*(7), 1319–1325.

Coker, A. L., Hopenhayn, C., DeSimone, C. P., Bush, H. M., & Crofford, L. (2009). Violence against women raises risk of cervical cancer. *Journal of Women's Health*, *18*(8), 1179–1185. http://dx.doi.org/10.1089/jwh.2008.1048

Coker, A. L., Sanderson, M., Cantu, E., Huerta, D., & Fadden, M. K. (2008). Frequency and types of partner violence among Mexican American college women. *Journal of American College Health*, *56*(6), 665–673.

Coker, A. L., Smith, P. H., McKeown, R. E., & King, M. J. (2000). Frequency and correlates of intimate partner violence by type: Physical, sexual, and psychological battering.

American Journal of Public Health, *90*(4), 553–559. http://dx.doi/org/10.2105/AJPH.90.4.553

Coker, A. L., Smith, P. H., Thompson, M. P., McKeown, R. E., Bethea, L., & Davis, K. E. (2002). Social support protects against the negative effects of partner violence on mental health. *Journal of Women's Health & Gender-Based Medicine*, *11*(5), 465–476.

Cole, J., Logan, T. K., & Shannon, L. (2005). Intimate sexual victimization among women with protective orders: Types and associations of physical and mental health problems. *Violence and Victims*, *20*(6), 695–715.

Coleman, F. L. (1997). Stalking behavior and the cycle of domestic violence. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, *12*(3), 420–432.

Craft, S. M., & Serovich, J. M. (2005). Family-of-origin factors and partner violence in the intimate relationships of gay men who are HIV positive. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, *20*(7), 777–791.

Crown, L., & Roberts, L. J. (2007). Against their will: Young women's nonagentic sexual experiences. *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships*, *24*(3), 385–405. http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/0265407507077228

Cupach, W. R., & Spitzberg, B. H. (2004). *The dark side of relationship pursuit: From attraction to obsession and stalking*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Daigneault, I. I., Hébert, M. M., & McDuff, P. P. (2009). Men's and women's childhood sexual abuse and victimization in adult partner relationships: A study of risk factors. *Child Abuse & Neglect*, *33*(9), 638–647.

Daly, J. M., Hartz, A. J., Stromquist, A. M., Peek-Asa, C., & Jogerst, G. J. (2007). Self-reported elder domestic partner violence in one rural Iowa county. *Journal of Emotional Abuse*, *7*(4), 115–134.

Davis, K. E., Ace, A., & Andra, M. (2000). Stalking perpetrators and psychological maltreatment of partners: Anger-jealousy, attachment insecurity, need for control, and break-up context. *Violence and Victims*, *15*(4), 407–425.

Dearwater, S. R., Coben, J. H., Campbell, J. C., Nah, G., Glass, N., McLoughlin, E., et al. (1998). Prevalence of intimate partner abuse in women treated at community hospital emergency departments. *The Journal of the American Medical Association*, *280(*5), 433–438.

Dienemann, J., Boyle, E., Baker, D., Resnick, W., Wiederhorn, N., & Campbell, J. (2000). Intimate partner abuse among women diagnosed with depression. *Issues in Mental Health Nursing*, *21*(5), 499–513. http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/01612840050044258

Dutton, D. G., & Corvo, K. (2006). Transforming a flawed policy: A call to revive psychology and science in domestic violence research and practice. *Aggression and Violent Behavior*, *11*(5), 457–483.

Dutton, M. A., Kaltman, S., Goodman, L. A., Weinfurt, K., & Vankos, N. (2005). Patterns of intimate partner violence: Correlates and outcomes. *Violence & Victims*, *20*(5), 483–497.

Fanslow, J., Robinson, E., Crengle, S., & Perese, L. (2010). Juxtaposing beliefs and reality: Prevalence rates of intimate partner violence and attitudes to violence and gender roles reported by New Zealand women. *Violence Against Women*, *16*(7), 812–831. http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/1077801210373710

Farnham, F. R., James, D. V., & Cantrell, P. (2000). Association between violence, psychosis, and relationship to victim in stalkers. *The Lancet*, *355*(9199), 199.

Feiring C., Deblinger D., Hoch-Espada, A., & Haworth, T. (2002). Romantic relationship aggression and attitudes in high school students: The role of gender, grade, and attachment and emotional styles. *Journal of Youth and Adolescence*, *31*(5), 373–385.

Field, C. A., & Caetano, R. (2005). Intimate partner violence in the U.S. general population: Progress and future direction. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, *20*(4), 463–469.

Firestone, J., Lambert, L., & Vega, W. (1999). Intimate violence among women of Mexican origin: Correlates of abuse. *Journal of Gender, Culture, & Health*, *4*(2), 119–134.

Fisher, B. S., Cullen, F. T., & Turner, M. G. (2000). *The sexual victimization of college women*. Washington, DC: National Institute of Justice, Bureau of Justice Statistics, Department of Justice.

Fisher, B. S., Cullen, F. T., & Turner, M. G. (2002). Being pursued: Stalking victimization in a national study of college women. *Criminology and Public Policy*, *1*(2), 257–308.

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

Follingstad, D. R., & Edmundson, M. (2010). Is psychological abuse reciprocal in intimate relationships? Data from a national sample of American adults. *Journal of Family Violence*, *25*(5), 495–508. http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s10896-010-9311-y

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

Fremouw, W. J., Westrup, D., & Pennypacker, J. (1997). Stalking on campus: The prevalence and strategies for coping with stalking. *Journal of Forensic Sciences*, *42*(4), 666–669.

Gallagher, R. P. (2005). *National Survey of Counseling Center Directors*. Alexandria, VA: International Association of Counseling Services.

Gallagher, R. P. (2006). *National Survey of Counseling Center Directors*. Alexandria, VA: International Association of Counseling Services.

Gallagher, R. P. (2007). *National Survey of Counseling Center Directors*. Alexandria, VA: International Association of Counseling Services.

Gallagher, R. P. (2008). *National Survey of Counseling Center Directors*. Alexandria, VA: International Association of Counseling Services.

Gallagher, R. P. (2010). *National Survey of Counseling Center Directors*. Alexandria, VA: International Association of Counseling Services.

Gandhi, S., Rovi, S., Vega, M., Johnson, M. S., Ferrante, J., & Chen, P. H. (2010). Intimate partner violence and cancer screening among urban minority women. *Journal of the American Board of Family Medicine*, *23*(3), 343–353.

Glass, N., Perrin, N., Hanson, G., Mankowski, E., Bloom, T., & Campbell, J. C. (2009). Patterns of partners' abusive behaviors as reported by Latina and non-Latina survivors. *Journal of Community Psychology*, *37*(2), 156–170. http://dx.doi.org/10.1002/jcop.20286

Gondolf, E. W., Heckert, D. A., & Kimmel, C. M. (2002). Nonphysical abuse among batterer program participants. *Journal of Family Violence*, *17*(4), 293–314.

Gormley, B., & Lopez, F. G. (2010). Psychological abuse perpetration in college dating relationships: Contributions of gender, stress, and adult attachment orientations. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, *25*(2), 204–218.

Graham-Kevan, N. (2007). Distorting intimate violence findings: Playing with numbers. *European Journal on Criminal Policy and Research*, *13*, 233–234.

Graham-Kevan, N., & Archer, J. (2003). Intimate terrorism and common couple violence. A test of Johnson's prediction in four British samples. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, *18*(11), 1247–1270.

Greenwood, G. L., Relf, M. V., Huang, B., Pollack, L. M., Canchola, J. A., & Catania, J. A. (2002). Battering victimization among a probability-based sample of men who have sex with men. *American Journal of Public Health*, *92*(12), 1964–1969.

Hackett, K. (2000). Criminal harassment. *Juristat*, *20*(11), 1–16.

Hamel, J., Desmarais, S. L., & Nicholls, T. L. (2007). Perceptions of motives in intimate partner violence: Expressive versus coercive violence. *Violence and Victims*, *22*(5), 563–576.

Hanneke, C. R., Shields, N. M., & McCall, G. J. (1986). Assessing the prevalence of marital rape. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, *1*(3), 350–362. http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/088626086001003007

Hanson, M. J. (2010). Health behavior in adolescent women reporting and not reporting intimate partner violence. *Journal of Obstetric, Gynecologic, & Neonatal Nursing*, *39*(3), 263–276. http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1552-6909.2010.01138.x

Harmon, R. B., Rosner, R., & Owens, H. (1995). Obsessional harassment and erotomania in a criminal court population. *Journal of Forensic Sciences*, *40*(2), 188–196.

Harmon, R. B., Rosner, R., & Owens, H. (1998). Sex and violence in a forensic population of obsessional harassers. *Psychology, Public Policy, and Law*, *4*(1–2), 236–249.

Harris, J. (2000). *An evaluation of the use and effectiveness of the Protection from Harassment Act 1997* (Home Office Research Study No. 203). London: Home Office.

Harwell, T., Moore, K., & Spence, M. (2003). Physical violence, intimate partner violence, and emotional abuse among adult American Indian men and women in Montana. *Preventive Medicine*, *37*(4), 297–303.

Haugaard, J. J., & Seri, L. G. (2004). Stalking and other forms of intrusive contact among adolescents and young adults from the perspective of the person initiating the intrusive contact. *Criminal Justice and Behavior*, *31*(1), 37–54.

Hazen, A. L., & Soriano, F. I. (2007). Experiences with intimate partner violence among Latina women. *Violence Against Women*, *13*(6), 562–582.

Hegarty, K. L., & Bush, R. D. (2002). Prevalence of partner abuse in women attending Australian general practice: A cross-sectional survey. *Australian and New Zealand Journal of Public Health*, *26*(5), 437–442.

Hegarty, K. D., Bush, R. D., & Sheehan, M. D. (2005). Composite Abuse Scale: Further development and assessment of reliability and validity of a multidimensional partner abuse measure in clinical settings. *Violence and Victims*, *20*(5), 529–547.

Henning, K., & Klesges, L. M. (2003). Prevalence and characteristics of psychological abuse reported by court-involved battered women. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, *18*(8), 857–871.

Herold, E. S., Mantle, D., & Zemitis, O. (1979). A study of sexual offenses against females. *Adolescence*, *14*(53), 65–72.

Hines, D. A., & Saudino, K. J. (2003). Gender differences in psychological, physical, and sexual aggression among college students using the revised conflict tactics scales. *Violence and Victims*, *18*(2), 197–217. http://dx.doi.org/10.1891/vivi.2003.18.2.197

Holtzworth-Munroe, A., Meehan, J. C., Herron, K., Rehman, U., & Stuart, G. L. (2000). Testing the Holtzworth-Monroe and Stuart (1994) batterer typology. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology*, *68*(6), 1000–1019.

Houry, D., Kemball, R., Rhodes, K. V., & Kaslow, N. J. (2006). Intimate partner violence and mental health symptoms in African American female ED patients. *American Journal of Emergency Medicine*, *24*(4), 444–450. http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.ajem.2005.12.026

Jason, L. A., Reichler, A., Easton, J., Neal, A., & Wilson, M. (1984). Female harassment after ending a relationship: A preliminary study. *Alternative Lifestyles*, *6*(4), 259–269.

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

Johnson, D. M., Zlotnick, C., & Perez, S. (2008). The relative contribution of abuse severity and PTSD severity on the psychiatric and social morbidity of battered women in shelters. *Behavior Therapy*, *39*(3), 232–241. http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.beth.2007.08.003

Johnson, J. K., John, R., Humera, A., Kukreja, S., Found, M., & Lindow, S. W. (2007). The prevalence of emotional abuse in gynaecology patients and its association with gynaecological symptoms. *European Journal of Obstetrics and Gynecology*, *133*(1), 95–99. http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.ejogrb.2006.04.035

Johnson, M. P. (2008). *A typology of domestic violence: Intimate terrorism, violent resistance, and situational couple violence*. Boston: Northeastern University Press.

Johnson, M. P., & Ferraro, K. J. (2000). Research on domestic violence in the 1990s: Making distinctions. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, *62*(4), 948–963.

Jordan, C. E., Wilcox, P., & Pritchard, A. (2007). Stalking acknowledgment and reporting among college women experiencing intrusive behaviors: Implications for the emergence of a "classic stalking case." *Journal of Criminal Justice*, *35*(5), 556–569.

Josephs, L. L., & Abel, E. M. (2009). Investigating the relationship between intimate partner violence and HIV risk-propensity in Black/African-American women. *Journal of Family Violence*, *24*(4), 221–229. http://dx.doi.org10.1007/s10896-009-9223-x

Jun, H. J., Rich-Edwards, J. W., Boynton-Jarrett, R., & Wright, R. J. (2008). Intimate partner violence and cigarette smoking: Association between smoking risk and psychological abuse with and without co-occurrence of physical and sexual abuse. *American Journal of Public Health*, *98*(3), 527–535. http://dx.doi.org/10.2105/AJPH.2003.037663

Kalichman, S. C., Williams, E. A., Cherry, C., Belcher, L., & Nachimson, D. (1998). Sexual coercion, domestic violence, and negotiating condom use among low-income African American women. *Journal of Women's Health*, *7*(3), 371–378. http://dx.doi.org/10.1089/jwh.1998.7.371

Kasian, M., & Painter, S. L. (1992). Frequency and severity of psychological abuse in a dating population. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, *7*(3), 350–364.

Kaukinen, C. (2004). Status compatibility, physical violence, and emotional abuse in intimate relationships. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, *66*(2), 452–471.

Keeling, J., & Birch, L. (2004). Asking pregnant women about domestic abuse. *British Journal of Midwifery*, *12*(12), 746–749.

Kelly, J. B., & Johnson, M. P. (2008). Differentiation among types of intimate partner violence: Research update and implications for interventions. *Family Court Review*, *46*(3), 476–499.

Kienlen, K. K., Birmingham, D. L., Solberg, K. B., O'Regan, J. T., & Meloy, J. R. (1997). A comparative study of psychotic and nonpsychotic stalking. *Journal of the American Academy of Psychiatry and Law*, *25*(3), 317–334.

Kimerling, R., Alvarez, J., Pavao, J., Mack, K. P., Smith, M. W., & Baumrind, N. (2009). Unemployment among women: Examining the relationship of physical and psychological intimate partner violence and posttraumatic stress disorder. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, *24*(3), 450–463. http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/0886260508317191

Klein, R. C. A., & Johnson, M. P. (2000). Strategies of couple conflict. In R. M. Milardo & S. Duck (Eds.), *Families as relationships* (pp. 79–97). Chichester, United Kingdom: Wiley.

Kohn, M., Flood, H., Chase, J., & McMahon, P. M. (2000). Prevalence and health consequences of stalking—Louisiana, 1998–1999. *Morbidity and Mortality Weekly Report*, *49*(29), 653–655.

Kong, R. (1997). Criminal harassment. *Juristat*, *16*(12), 1–13.

Kramer, A., Lorenzon, D., & Mueller, G. (2004). Prevalence of intimate partner violence and health implications for women using emergency departments and primary care clinics. *Women's Health Issues*, *14*(1), 19–29.

Langhinrichsen-Rohling, J., Palarea, R. E., Cohen, J., & Rohling, M. L. (2000). Breaking up is hard to do: Unwanted pursuit behaviors following the dissolution of a romantic relationship. *Violence and Victims*, *15*(1), 73–90.

Laroche, D. (2005). Aspects of the context and consequences of domestic violence: Situational couple violence and intimate terrorism in Canada in 1999. Quebec, Canada: Government of Quebec.

LeBlanc, J. J., Levesque, G. J., Richardson, J. B., & Berka, L. H. (2001). Survey of stalking at WPI. *Journal of Forensic Sciences*, *46*(2), 367–369.

Lemon, S., Verhoek-Oftedahl, W., & Donnelly, E. F. (2002). Preventive healthcare use, smoking, and alcohol use among Rhode Island women experiencing intimate partner violence. *Journal of Women's Health & Gender-Based Medicine*, *11*(6), 555–562.

Logan, T. K., Cole, J., & Shannon, L. (2007). A mixed-methods examination of sexual coercion and degradation among women in violent relationships who do and do not report forced sex. *Violence and Victims*, *22*(1), 71–94. http://dx.doi.org/10.1891/vv-v22i1a005

Logan, T., Leukefeld, C., & Walker, R. (2000). Stalking as a variant of domestic violence: Implications from young adults. *Violence and Victims*, *15*(1), 91–111.

Logan, T. K., Leukefeld, C., & Walker, B. (2000). Stalking as a variant of intimate violence: Implications from a young adult sample. *Violence & Victims*, *15*(1), 91–111.

Logan, T. K., Shannon, L., Cole, J., & Walker, R. (2006). The impact of differential patterns of physical violence and stalking on mental health and help-seeking among women with protective orders. *Violence Against Women*, *12*(9), 866–886.

Logan, T. K., & Walker, R. (2010). Toward a deeper understanding of the harms caused by partner stalking. *Violence and Victims*, *25*(4), 440–455.

Macmillan, R., & Gartner, R. (1999). When she brings home the bacon: Labor-force participation and the risk of spousal abuse against women. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, *61*(4), 947–958.

Marshall, A. D., & Holtzworth-Munroe, A. (2002). Varying forms of husband sexual aggression: Predictors and subgroup differences. *Journal of Family Psychology*, *16*(3), 286–296. http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/0893-3200.16.3.286

Marshall, J., & Castle, C. (1998, February). Restraining orders and stalking offences in 1995 and 1996. *Information Bulletin*, 1–16.

Martin, S. L., Harris-Britt, A., Li, Y., Moracco, K. E., Kupper, L. L., & Campbell, J. C. (2004). Changes in intimate partner violence during pregnancy. *Journal of Family Violence*, *19*(4), 201–210. http://dx.doi.org/10.1023/B:JOFV.0000032630.50593.93

McCann, J. T. (2000). A descriptive study of child and adolescent obsessional followers. *Journal of Forensic Sciences*, *45*(1), 195–199.

McCann, J. T. (2001). *The development of stalking*. Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.

McEwan, T. E., Mullen, P. E., MacKenzie, R. D., & Ogloff, J. R. P. (2009). Violence in stalking situations. *Psychological Medicine*, *39*(9), 1469–1478.

McFarlane, J., Campbell, J. C., & Watson, K. (2002). Intimate partner stalking and femicide: Urgent implications for women's safety. *Behavioral Sciences & the Law*, *20*(1–2), 51–68.

McLennan, W. (1996). *Women's safety, Australia, 1996*. Canberra, Australia: Australian Bureau of Statistics.

Mechanic, M. B., Uhlmansiek, M. H., Weaver, T. L., & Resick, P. A. (2010). The impact of severe stalking experienced by acutely battered women: An examination of violence. Psychological symptoms and strategic responding. *Violence and Victims*, *15*(4), 443–458.

Mechanic, M. B., Weaver, T. L., & Resick, P. A. (2000). Intimate partner violence and stalking behavior: Exploration of patterns and correlates in a sample of acutely battered women. *Violence and Victims*, *15*(1), 55–72.

Mechanic, M. B., Weaver, T. L., & Resick, P. A. (2008). Mental health consequences of intimate partner abuse: A multidimensional assessment of four different forms of abuse. *Violence against Women*, *14*(6), 634–654.

Mechanic, M. B., Weaver, T. L., & Resick, P. A. (2002). Intimate partner violence and stalking behavior: Exploration of patterns and correlates in a sample of acutely battered women. In K. E. Davis, I. H. Frieze, & R. D. Maiuro (Eds.), *Stalking: Perspectives on victims and perpetrators* (pp. 62–88). New York: Springer Publishing.

Mei-Chuan, W., Horne, S. G., Levitt, H. M., & Klesges, L. M. (2009). Christian women in IPV relationships: An exploratory study of religious factors. *Journal of Psychology and Christianity*, *28*(3), 224–235.

Meloy, J. R., Davis, B., & Lovette, J. (2001). Risk factors for violence among stalkers. *Journal of Threat Assessment*, *1*(1), 3–16.

Meloy, J. R., & Gothard, S. (1995). Demographic and clinical comparison of obsessional followers and offenders with mental disorders. *American Journal of Psychiatry*, *152*(2), 258–263.

Meloy, J. R., Rivers, L., Siegel, L., Gothard, S., Naimark, D., & Nicolini, J. R. (2000). A replication study of obsessional followers and offenders with mental disorders. *Journal of Forensic Sciences*, *45*(1), 147–152.

Melton, H. C. (2004). Stalking in the context of domestic violence: Findings on the criminal justice system. *Women and Criminal Justice*, *15*(3–4), 33–58.

Mezey, N. J., Post, L. A., & Maxwell, C. D. (2002). Redefining intimate partner violence: Women's experiences with physical violence and non-physical abuse by age. *International Journal of Sociology & Social Policy*, *22*(7–8), 122–154.

Miller, J. (2006). A specification of the types of intimate partner violence experienced by women in the general population. *Violence Against Women*, *12*(12), 1105–1131.

Miller, N. (2001). *Stalking laws and implementation practices: A national review for policy makers and practitioners*. Alexandria, VA: Institute for Law and Justice. Retrieved March 12, 2011, from www.ilj.org/publications/docs/Stalking_Laws_Final_Report.pdf

Mohandie, K., Meloy, J. R., McGowan, M. G., & Williams, J. (2006). The RECON typology of stalking: Reliability and validity based upon a large sample of North American stalkers. *Journal of Forensic Sciences*, *51*(1), 147–155.

Moore, A. M., Frohwirth, L., & Miller, E. (2010). Male reproductive control of women who have experienced intimate partner violence in the United States. *Social Science & Medicine*, *70*(11), 1737–1744. http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.socscimed.2010.02.009

Moore, T. M., Stuart, G. L., McNulty, J. K., Addis, M. E., Cordova, J. V., & Temple, J. R. (2008). Domains of masculine gender role stress and intimate partner violence in a clinical sample of violent men. *Psychology of Men and Masculinity*, *9*(2), 82–89. http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/1524-9220.9.2.82

Moracco, K. E., Runyan, C. W., Bowling, J. M., & Earp, J. A. L. (2007). Women's experiences with violence: A national study. *Women's Health Issues*, *17*(1), 3–12.

Morris, S., Anderson, S., & Murray, L. (2002). *Stalking and harassment in Scotland*. Edinburgh, Scotland: Scottish Executive.

Morrison, K. A. (2001). Predicting violent behavior in stalkers: A preliminary investigation of Canadian cases in criminal harassment. *Journal of Forensic Sciences*, *46*(6), 1403–1410.

Morrison, K. A. (2008). Differentiating between physically violent and nonviolent stalkers: An examination of Canadian cases. *Journal of Forensic Sciences*, *53*(3), 742–751. http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1556-4029.2008.00722.x

Muehlenhard, C. L., & Kimes, L. A. (1999). The social construction of violence: The case of sexual and domestic violence. *Personality and Social Psychology Review*, *3*(3), 234–245.

Mullen, P. E., Pathé, M., & Purcell, R. (2008). *Stalkers and their victims* (2nd ed.). Cambridge, United Kingdom: Cambridge University Press.

Mullen, P. E., Pathé, M., Purcell, R., & Stuart, G. W. (1999). Study of stalkers. *The American Journal of Psychiatry*, *156*(1), 1244–1249.

Murty, S. A., Peek-Asa, C., Zwerling, C., Stromquist, A. M., Burmeister, L. F., & Merchant, J.A. (2003). Physical and emotional partner abuse reported by men and women in a rural community. *American Journal of Public Health*, *93*(7), 1073–1075. http://dx.doi.org/10.2105/AJPH.93.7.1073

Mustaine, E. E., & Tewksbury, R. (1999). A routine activity theory explanation for women's stalking victimizations. *Violence Against Women*, *5*(1), 43–62.

Nancarrow, H., Lockie, S., & Sharma, S. (2009). *Intimate partner abuse of women in a Central Queensland mining region (Trends and Issues in Crime and Criminal Justice No. 378)*. Canberra, Australia: Australian Institute of Criminology.

Nicastro, A. M., Cousins, A. V., & Spitzberg, B. H. (2000). The tactical face of stalking. *Journal of Criminal Justice*, *28*(1), 69–82.

Nicolaidis, C., Curry, M. A., Ulrich, Y., Sharps, P., McFarlane, J., Campbell, D., et al. (2003). Could we have known? A qualitative analysis of data from women who survived an attempted homicide by an intimate partner. *Journal of General Internal Medicine*, *18*, 788–794.

Nobles, M. R., Fox, K. A., Piquero, N. L., & Piquero, A. R. (2009). Career dimensions of stalking victimization and perpetration. *Justice Quarterly*, *26*(3), 476–503.

O'Hearn, R. E., & Davis, K. E. (1997). Women's experience of giving and receiving emotional abuse: An attachment perspective. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, *12*(3), 375–391.

O'Leary, K. D., & Jouriles, E. N. (1994). Psychological abuse between adult partners: Prevalence and impact on partners and children. In L. L'Abate (Ed.), *Handbook of*

developmental family psychology and psychopathology (330–349). Oxford, United Kingdom: Wiley.

O'Leary, K. D., & Williams, M. C. (2006). Agreement about acts of aggression in marriage. *Journal of Family Psychology*, *20*(4), 656–662. http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/0893-3200.20.4.656

Orzeck, T. L., Rokach, A., & Chin, J. (2010). The effects of traumatic and abusive relationships. *Journal of Loss and Trauma*, *15*(3), 167–192. http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/15325020903375792

Outlaw, M. (2009). No one type of intimate partner abuse: Exploring physical and non-physical abuse among intimate partners. *Journal of Family Violence*, *24*(4), 263–272. http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s10896-009-9228-5

Painter, K., & Farrington, D. P. (1998). Marital violence in Great Britain and its relationship to marital and non-marital rape. *International Review of Victimology*, *5*(3–4), 257–276.

Panuzio, J., & DiLillo, D. (2010). Physical, psychological, and sexual intimate partner aggression among newlywed couples: Longitudinal prediction of marital satisfaction. *Journal of Family Violence*, *25*(7), 689–699. http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s10896-010-9328-2

Pathé, M., & Mullen, P. E. (1997). The impact of stalkers on their victims. *British Journal of Psychiatry*, *170*, 12–17.

Pathé, M., Mullen, P. E., & Purcell, R. (2000). Same-gender stalking. *Journal of the American Academy of Psychiatry and the Law*, *28*(2), 191–197.

Patton, C. L., Nobles, M. R., & Fox, K. A. (2010). Look who's stalking: Obsessive pursuit and attachment theory. *Journal of Criminal Justice*, *38*(3), 282–290.

Peek-Asa, C. C., Zwerling, C. C., Young, T. T., Stromquist, A. M., Burmeister, L. F., & Merchant, J. A. (2005). A population-based study of reporting patterns and characteristics of men who abuse their female partners. *Injury Prevention*, *11*(3), 180–185.

Perilla, J. L., Lippy, C. A., Rosales, A., & Serrata, J. V. (2011). Domestic violence prevalence. In J. W. White, M. P. Koss, & A. E. Kazdin (Eds.), *Violence against women and children: Mapping the terrain*. Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.

Phillips, L., Quirk, R., Rosenfeld, B., & O'Connor, M. (2004). Is it stalking? Perceptions of stalking among college undergraduates. *Criminal Justice and Behavior*, *31*(1), 73–96.

Prospero, M. (2008). The effect of coercion on aggression and mental health among reciprocally violent couples. *Journal of Family Violence*, *23*(3), 195–202.

Purcell, R., Pathé, M., & Mullen, P. E. (2001). A study of women who stalk. *American Journal of Psychiatry*, *158*(12), 2056–2060.

Purcell, R., Pathé, M., & Mullen, P. E. (2002). The prevalence and nature of stalking in the Australian community. *The Australian and New Zealand Journal of Psychiatry*, *36*(1), 114–120. http://dx.doi.org/10.1046/j.1440-1614.2002.00985.x

Rauer, A. J., Kelly, R. J., Buckhalt, J. A., & El-Sheikh, M. (2010). Sleeping with one eye open: Marital abuse as an antecedent of poor sleep. *Journal of Family Psychology*, *24*(6), 667–677. http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/a0021354

Roberts, K. A. (2002). Stalking following the breakup of romantic relationships: Characteristics of stalking former partners. *Journal of Forensic Sciences*, *47*(5), 1070–1077.

Roberts, K. A. (2005). Women's experience of violence during stalking by former romantic partners: Factors predictive of stalking violence. *Violence Against Women*, *11*(1), 89–114.

Robin, R. W., Chester, B., & Rasmussen, J. K. (1998). Intimate violence in a southwestern American Indian tribal community. *Cultural Diversity and Mental Health*, *4*(4), 335–344. http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/1099-9809.4.4.335

Roehl, J., O'Sullivan, C., Webster, D., & Campbell, J. (2000). *Intimate partner violence risk assessment validation study, final report* (NCJRS 209731).Washington DC: U.S. Department of Justice.

Romans, S., Forte, T., Cohen, M. M., Du Mont, J., & Hyman, I. (2007). Who is most at risk for intimate partner violence? A Canadian population-based study. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, *22*(12), 1495–1514.

Rosen, K. H., Stith, S. M., Few, A. L., Daly, K. L., & Tritt, D. R. (2005). A qualitative investigation of Johnson's typology. *Violence and Victims*, *20*(3), 319–334.

Rosenfeld, B., & Harmon, R. (2002). Factors associated with violence in stalking and obsessional harassment cases. *Criminal Justice and Behavior*, *29*(6), 671–691.

Russell, R. J. H., & Hulson, B. (1992). Physical and psychological abuse of heterosexual partners. *Personality and Individual Differences*, *13*(4), 457–473.

Saudino, K., & Hines, D. (2007). Etiological similarities between psychological and physical aggression in intimate relationships: A behavioral genetic exploration. *Journal of Family Violence*, *22*(3), 121–129. http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s10896-006-9059-6

Schwartz-Watts, D., & Morgan, D. W. (1998). Violent versus nonviolent stalkers. *Journal of the American Academy of Psychiatry and Law*, *26*(2), 241–245.

Sears, H. A., Byers, E. S., & Price, E. L. (2007). The co-occurrence of adolescent boys' and girls' use of psychologically, physically, and sexually abusive behaviours in their dating relationships. *Journal of Adolescence*, *30*(3), 487–504.

Sheridan, L. (2001). The course and nature of stalking: An in-depth victim survey. *Journal of Threat Assessment*, *1*(3), 61–79.

Sheridan, L., & Davies, G. M. (2001). Violence and the prior victim-stalker relationship. *Criminal Behaviour and Mental Health*, *11*(2), 102–116.

Sheridan, L., Davies, G., & Boon, J. (2001). Stalking: Perceptions and prevalence. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, *16*, 151–167.

Sheridan, L., Gillett, R., & Davies, G. (2000). Stalking: Seeking the victim's perspective. *Psychology, Crime, & Law*, *6*, 267–280.

Sheridan, L., Gillett, R., & Davies, G. M. (2002). Perceptions and prevalence of stalking in a male sample. *Psychology, Crime, & Law*, *8*(4), 289–310.

Silverman, J. G., Decker, M. R., McCauley, H. L., Gupta, J., Miller, E., Raj, A., et al. (2010). Male perpetration of intimate partner violence and involvement in abortions and abortion-related conflict. *American Journal of Public Health*, *100*(8), 1415–1417. http://dx.doi.org/10.2105/AJPH.2009.173393

Sinclair, H. C., & Frieze, I. H. (2000). Initial courtship behavior and stalking: How should be draw the line? *Violence and Victims*, *15*(1), 23–40.

Sinclair, H. C., & Frieze, I. H. (2005). When courtship persistence becomes intrusive pursuit: Comparing rejecter and pursuer perspectives of unrequited love. *Sex Roles*, *52*(11–12), 839–852.

Slashinski, M. J., Coker, A. L., & Davis, K. E. (2003). Physical aggression, forced sex, and stalking victimization by a dating partner: An analysis of the National Violence Against Women Survey. *Violence and Victims*, *18*(6), 595–617.

Smith, P. H., Earp, J. A., & DeVellis, R. (1995). Measuring battering: Development of the women's experience with battering (WEB) scale. *Women's Health*, *1*(4), 273–288.

Spitzberg, B. (2002). The tactical topography of stalking victimization and management. *Trauma, Violence and Abuse*, *3*(4), 261–288.

Spitzberg, B. H., & Cupach, W. R. (2003). What mad pursuit? Obsessive relational intrusion and stalking related phenomena. *Aggression and Violent Behavior*, *8*(4), 345–375.

Spitzberg, B. H., & Cupach, W. R. (2007). The state of the art stalking: Taking stock of the emerging literature. *Aggression and Violent Behavior*, *12*(1), 64–86.

Spitzberg, B. H., & Hoobler, G. D. (2002). Cyberstalking and the technologies of interpersonal terrorism. *New Media & Society*, *14*(1), 67–88.

Spitzberg, B. H., Marshall, L., & Cupach, W. R. (2001). Obsessive relational intrusion, coping, and sexual coercion victimization. *Communication Reports*, *14*(1), 19–30.

Spitzberg, B. H., Nicastro, A. M., & Cousins, A. V. (1998). Exploring the interactional phenomenon of stalking and obsessive relational intrusion. *Communication Reports*, *11*(1), 33–48.

Spitzberg, B. H., & Rhea, J. (1999). Obsessive relational intrusion and sexual coercion victimization. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, *14*(1), 3–20.

Stanley, J., Bartholomew, K., Taylor, T., Oram, D., & Landolt, M. (2006). Intimate violence in male same-sex relationships. *Journal of Family Violence*, *21*(1), 31–41. http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s10896-005-9008-9

Stark, E. (2007). *Coercive control: How men entrap women in personal life*. Oxford, United Kingdom: Oxford University Press.

Stockman, J. K., Campbell, J. C., & Celentano, D. D. (2010). Sexual violence and HIV risk behaviors among a nationally representative sample of heterosexual American women: The importance of sexual coercion. *Journal of Acquired Immune Deficiency Syndromes*, *53*(1), 136–143. http://dx.doi.org/10.1097/QAI.0b013e3181b3a8cc

Stover, C. S. (2005). Domestic violence research: What have we learned and where do we go form here? *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, *20*(4), 448–454.

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

Straus, M. A. (1979). Measuring intrafamily conflict and violence: The conflict tactics scales. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, *41*(1), 75–88.

Straus, M. A., Gelles, R. J., & Steinmetz, S. K. (1980). *Behind closed doors: Violence in the American family*. Garden City, NY: Doubleday.

Straus, M. A., Hamby, S. L., Boney-McCoy, S., & Sugarman, D. B. (1996). The revised conflict tactic scales (CTS2). *Journal of Family Issues*, *17*(3), 283–316.

Stuart, G. L., Moore, T. M., Gordon, K. C., Ramsey, S. E., & Kahler, C. W. (2006). Psychopathology in women arrested for domestic violence. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, *21*(3), 376–389.

Swan, S. C., & Snow, D. L. (2003). Behavioral and psychological differences among abused women who use violence in intimate relationships. *Violence Against Women*, *9*(1), 75–109.

Swanwick, R. (1996). Stalkees strike back—The stalkers stalked: A review of the first two years of stalking legislation in Queensland. *The University of Queensland Law Journal*, *19*(1), 26–44.

Tanha, M., Beck, C. J., Figueredo, A. J., & Raghavan, C. (2010). Sex differences in intimate partner violence and the use of coercive control as a motivational

factor for intimate partner violence. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, *25*(10), 1836–1854.

Thapa-Oli, S., Dulal, H. B., & Baba, Y. (2009). A preliminary study of intimate partner violence among Nepali women in the United States. *Violence Against Women*, *15*(2), 206–223.

Thiel de Bocanegra, H., Rostovtseva, D. P., Khera, S., & Godhwani, N. (2010). Birth control sabotage and forced sex: Experiences reported by women in domestic violence shelters. *Violence Against Women*, *16*(5), 601–612. http://dx.doi/org/10.1177/1077801210366965

Thompson, C. M., & Dennison, S. M. (2008). Defining relational stalking in research: Understanding sample composition in relation to repetition and duration of harassment. *Psychiatry, Psychology and Law*, *15*(3), 482–499.

Thompson, R. S., Bonomi, A. E., Anderson, M., Reid, R. J., Dimer, J. A., Carrell, D., et al. (2006). Intimate partner violence. *American Journal of Preventive Medicine*, *30*(6), 447–457. http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.amepre.2006.01.016

Tjaden, P., & Thoennes, N. (1998). *Prevalence, incidence, and consequences of violence against women: Findings from the national violence against women survey*. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Justice, National Institute of Justice.

Tjaden, P., & Thoennes, N. (2000). *Extent, nature, and consequences of intimate partner violence: Findings from the national violence against women survey*. Rockville, MD: National Institute of Justice.

Tjaden, P., & Thoennes, N. (2001). Coworker violence and gender: Findings from the National Violence Against Women Survey. *American Journal of Preventive Medicine*, *20*(2), 85–89.

Tolman, R. M. (1989). The development of a measure of psychological maltreatment of women by their male partners. *Violence and Victims*, *4*(3), 159–177.

Turrell, S. C. (2000). A descriptive analysis of same-sex relationship violence for a diverse sample. *Journal of Family Violence*, *15*(3), 281–293. http://dx.doi.org/10.1023/A:1007505619577

Walby, S., & Allen, J. (2004). *Domestic violence, sexual assault and stalking: Findings from the British Crime Survey* (Home Office Research Study 276). London: Home Office Research, Development and Statistics Directorate.

Waldner-Haugrud, L. K. (1999). Sexual coercion in lesbian and gay relationships: A review and critique. *Aggression and Violent Behavior*, *4*(2), 139–149.

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

Wallace, H., & Kelty, K. (1995). Stalking and restraining orders: A legal and psychological perspective. *Journal of Crime and Justice*, *18*(2), 99–111.

Waterman, C., Dawson, L., & Bologna, M. (1989). Sexual coercion in gay male and lesbian relationships: Predictors and implications for support services. *The Journal of Sex Research*, *26*(1), 118–124.

Watts, C., & Zimmerman, C. (2002). Violence against women: Global scope and magnitude. *The Lancet*, *359*(9313), 1232–1237.

Wiemann, C. M., Agurcia, C. A., Berenson, A. B., Volk, R. J., & Rickert, V. I. (2000). Pregnant adolescents: Experiences and behaviors associated with physical assault by an intimate partner. *Maternal and Child Health Journal*, *4*(2), 93–101.

Wigman, S. A. (2009). Male victims of former-intimate stalking: A selected review. *International Journal of Men's Health*, *8*(2), 101–115.

Wigman, S. A., Graham-Kevan. N., & Archer, J. (2008, July). *Investigating former-intimate harassment*. Paper presented at the XVIII World Meeting of the International Society for Research on Aggression, Budapest, Hungary.

Williams, J. R., Ghandour, R. M., & Kub, J. E. (2008). Female perpetration of violence in heterosexual intimate relationships: Adolescence through adulthood. *Trauma, Violence & Abuse*, *9*(4), 227–249.

Williams, S. L., & Frieze, I. H. (2005). Courtship behaviors, relationship violence, and breakup persistence in college men and women. *Psychology of Women Quarterly*, *29*(3), 248–257.

Wingood, G. M., & DiClemente, R. J. (1997). The effects of an abusive primary partner on the condom use and sexual negotiation practices of African-American women. *American Journal of Public Health*, *87*(6), 1016–1018.

Wood, R. G., McConnell, S., Moore, Q., Clarkwest, A., & Hsueh, J. (2010). *The building strong families project: Strengthening unmarried parents' relationship. The early impacts of building strong families*. Princeton, NJ: Mathematica Policy Research.

Wuest, J., Merritt-Gray, M., Ford-Gilboe, M., Lent, B., Varcoe, C., & Campbell, J. C. (2008). Chronic pain in women survivors of intimate partner violence. *Journal of Pain*, *9*(11), 1049–1057.

Yanowitz, K. (2006). Influence of gender and experience on college students' stalking schemas. *Violence and Victims*, *21*(1), 91–100.

Yazykova, K., Raghavan, C., & O'Connor, M. (2006, November). *Categories of stalking tactics and their associations with intimate partner violence*. Paper presented at the 2006 Annual Meeting of the American Society of Criminology, Los Angeles, CA.

Yazykova, K., Raghavan, C., O'Connor, M., & Dernizon, A. (2006, November). *Associations between stalking tactics, intimate partner violence, and underlying motivations*. Paper presented at the 2006 Annual Meeting of the American Society of Criminology, Los, Angeles, CA.

Zavala, E., & Spohn, R. (2010). Emotional abuse and controlling behaviors in heterosexual relationships: The role of employment and alcohol use for women and their partners. *Sociological Spectrum*, *30*, 526–549.

Zolotor, A. J., Theodore, A. D., Coyne-Beasley, T., & Runyan, D. K. (2007). Intimate partner violence and child maltreatment: Overlapping risk. *Brief Treatment and Crisis Intervention*, *7*(4), 305–321.

Zona, M. A., Sharma, K. K., & Lane, J. (1993). A comparative-study of erotomanic and obsessional subjects in a forensic sample. *Journal of Forensic Sciences*, *38*(4), 894–903.

Correspondence regarding this article should be directed to John R. Barner, PhD, College of Family and Consumer Sciences, Department of Human Development and Family Science, University of Georgia, 114 Dawson Hall, Athens, GA 30602. E-mail: jrbarner@uga.edu