

A systematic literature review and consultation with IPV subject matter experts identified 14 domains as important for distinguishing perpetrator typologies and the context of violence. The domains are: (1) Stress and Emotional Regulation Skills, (2) General Aggression; (3) Adverse Childhood Events; (4) Acceptance of Violence; (5) Stalking; (6) Relationship Discord/Satisfaction; (7) Communication and Conflict Management; (8) Power and Control; (9) IPV Physical, Sexual, Emotional and Verbal Perpetration and Victimization; (10) Psychological Conditions; (11) Substance Use; (12) Sexual Preference and Attraction; (13) Gender Roles; (14) Self-esteem and Self-efficacy. The survey also includes socio-demographic questions.

Domain	Subdomain	Questions	Reason for Inclusion & Example References
Demographics	NA	Page 1 Questions: 1 - 12	Demographics information is necessary to describe the sample collected as well as potential differentiating characteristics among perpetrators. For example, certain typologies of perpetrators may be more likely to be male or to be younger. Johnson (2011)
Stress and Emotional Regulation Skills	Stress	Page 3 Questions: 13a - d	Experiencing high global stress coupled with an increased sense of loss of agency in one's life have been found to correlate to IPV perpetration. Ames et al. (2013); Buzawa & Buzawa, (2013)
	Anger	Page 4 Questions: 14a - o	IPV perpetrators frequently report high levels of anger. Holtzworth-Munroe et al., (2000); Persampiere et al., (2014) Smith-Darden et al., (2017)
	Hostility	Page 5 Questions: 15a - o	Hostility toward others has been shown to predict IPV perpetration. Norlander & Eckhardt, (2005) Ortiz (2015); Tharp et al., (2013)
General Aggression & Typologies	Aggressive thoughts, feelings, and behavior	Page 6 Questions: 16a - p; 18a - f; 19-22	General aggressivity is a strong predictor of IPV perpetration. However, some perpetrators may only be aggressive toward intimate partners and not generally aggressive. Distinguishing perpetrators by general or family specific aggression may be important. Holtzworth-Munroe et al., (2000) LaViolette, A. (2009) Parrott & Zeichner (2003) Salis et al., (2014)
	Reactive-Proactive Aggression	Page 7 Questions: 17a -i	A wealth of research suggests that there is a distinction between reactive and proactive aggression relating neurobiological and developmental differences. Importantly, these different forms of aggression likely have different implications for development and treatment and many researchers have suggested that IPV perpetrators may be distinguished based on these violence characteristics. Chase et al., (2001) Ross & Babcock (2009) Reidy et al., (2011) Stanford et al., (2008) Vitello & Stoff (1997)

Domain	Subdomain	Questions	Reason for Inclusion & Example References
Adverse Childhood Experience	Trauma in household	Page 11 Questions: 23a - i; 24-27	Adverse childhood experiences (such as abuse and neglect) are correlated with IPV perpetration and victimization across all ages. Additionally, current research suggests a relationship between growing up in a community with extensive violence and IPV perpetration as an adult. However, not all youth exposed to violence will perpetrate IPV and not all persons who perpetrate IPV have a history of violence exposure. Thus, adverse childhood experiences including exposure to violence may distinguish classes of perpetrators. Capaldi et al., (2012) Copp et al., (2015); Fox & Benson (2006)
	Violence in the Community	Page 13 Questions: 28a - d	Mair et al., (2012) Mbilinyi et al., (2012); Roberts et al., (2011) Reidy et al., (2017)
Acceptance of Violence	NA	Page 13 Questions: 29a - e; 30a - c; 31a - e	Beliefs about the propriety of violence correlate with IPV perpetration across ages and may differentially influence IPV perpetration based on gender. Additionally, some evidence suggests that changing these attitudes can reduce TDV perpetration. Ames et al., (2013) Eckhardt & Crane (2014) Foshee et al., (2001) Smith-Darden et al., (2017) Simon et al., (2001)
Stalking	NA	Page 15 Questions: 32a - h	Stalking is crucially linked to IPV and while not all IPV perpetrators engage in stalking, many do. Understanding which perpetrators go on to stalk partners may help understand which individuals will perpetrate more severe violence and potentially even intimate partner homicides. Likewise stalking intimate partners may differ by gender. Senkans et al., (2017) Hall et al., (2012). Melton, H. C. (2007) Smith-Darden et al., (2016) Black et al., (2011)
Relationship Context	NA	Page 16 Questions: 33 - 43	It is important to identify characteristics of the individuals' current and past dating history to understand opportunities for perpetration as well persistence vs. desistance within and across relationships.

A systematic literature review and consultation with IPV subject matter experts identified 14 domains as important for distinguishing perpetrator typologies and the context of violence. The domains are: (1) Stress and Emotional Regulation Skills, (2) General Aggression; (3) Adverse Childhood Events; (4) Acceptance of Violence; (5) Stalking; (6) Relationship Discord/Satisfaction; (7) Communication and Conflict Management; (8) Power and Control; (9) IPV Physical, Sexual, Emotional and Verbal Perpetration and Victimization; (10) Psychological Conditions; (11) Substance Use; (12) Sexual Preference and Attraction; (13) Gender Roles; (14) Self-esteem and Self-efficacy. The survey also includes socio-demographic questions.

Domain	Subdomain	Questions	Reason for Inclusion & Example References
Relationship Discord/Satisfaction	NA	Page 18 Questions: 44a – g; 45-48	Some research has pointed to general relationship discord as a risk factor for IPV. This risk factor may differentiate reciprocally violent relationships where the violence is instigated by anger versus unidirectional violent relationships where the violence is a mechanism of control and potentially more severe. Byun (2012) Capaldi et al., (2012) Slep et al., (2010) Stith et al., (2008)
Communication and Conflict Management	NA	Page 20 Questions: 49a – u	In general negative or hostile communication styles and poor conflict management skills are linked to perpetration by men and women both. Andrews et al., (2000) Babcock et al., (1993) Capaldi et al., (2012) Hamby (2009) Smith-Darden et al., (2017) Vives-Cases, et al., (2009)
Power & Control	NA	Page 22 Questions: 50a – l	The concept of “power and control” has been central to IPV research for decades. It is most frequently espoused in connection to unidirectional violence perpetrated by men against women as method of controlling and maintaining dominance over women. However, given that we know women can perpetrate IPV too, it is likely that this factor not associated with all forms of IPV perpetration. Likewise, some evidence suggests that perpetrators that are controlling and coercive may be more Spencer et al., (2016) Loree & Cook-Daniels (2015) Johnson, (2006, 2011) Messinger et al., (2014)
Intimate Partner Violence Perpetration & Victimization	Physical	Page 23 Questions: 51a – g; 52; 53; 54a – u; 55a – e; 56a – g; 57-59; 60a –g; 61	Perpetrators of intimate violence will vary in the frequency, intensity, severity, and modality. For example, verbal/emotional violence is far more prevalent than physical and sexual IPV is the least common. Understanding the different ways in which individuals perpetrate may help identify distinct classes of perpetrators and may be associated with different risk factors. Breiding et al., (2014)
	Sexual	Page 27 Questions: 62a-l; 63; 64; 65a – p; 66a – l; 67-70	

A systematic literature review and consultation with IPV subject matter experts identified 14 domains as important for distinguishing perpetrator typologies and the context of violence. The domains are: (1) Stress and Emotional Regulation Skills, (2) General Aggression; (3) Adverse Childhood Events; (4) Acceptance of Violence; (5) Stalking; (6) Relationship Discord/Satisfaction; (7) Communication and Conflict Management; (8) Power and Control; (9) IPV Physical, Sexual, Emotional and Verbal Perpetration and Victimization; (10) Psychological Conditions; (11) Substance Use; (12) Sexual Preference and Attraction; (13) Gender Roles; (14) Self-esteem and Self-efficacy. The survey also includes socio-demographic questions.

	Verbal / Emotional	Page 33 Questions: 71a -g; 72; 73; 74a -g; 75; 76; 77a -g; 78	Capaldi et al., (2012) Chase et al., (2001) Johnson, (2006, 2011) Messinger et al., (2014)
Psychological Conditions	NA	Page 36 Questions: 79a -i; 80; 81	Some psychological conditions are seen more frequently in IPV perpetrators as compared to men and women in nonviolent relationships. Different forms of psychopathology may differentiate types of perpetrators and point to different areas of intervention. Capaldi et al., (2012) Hoyt, et al., (2012). Huss & Langhinrichsen-Rohling, (2006) Ross & Babcock (2009)

Substance Use	NA	Page 37 Questions: 82a -i; 83a - i;	Substance use has frequently co-exists with IPV perpetration and been uniquely associated with violent incidents on days of consumption. Capaldi et al., (2012) Ruff et al., (2010) Testa et al., (2003) Ting et al., (2009)
Sexual Preference and Attraction	NA	Page 39 Questions: 84-86	Some research suggests that the rates and nature of IPV perpetration and victimization may be affected by the sexual orientation of the relationship (i.e., same-sex vs. heterosexual). Given that little is known about risk and protective factors and relationships dynamics among gay and lesbian populations, it critical to assess the potential that class of perpetrators may be influenced by sexuality. Edwards et al., 2015; Graham et al., 2016; Gonzalez-Guarda et al., (2013) Stiles-Shields & Carroll, 2015; Reidy et al., (2014) Walters et al., 2013
Gender Roles	NA	Page 40 Questions: 87a -k; 88a - p; 89a - k; 90a - k	Belief is rigid or stereotypical gender roles correlates to IPV. However there are number disitnctions among gender roles and the manner one (non)conforms and the potential forms of stress that may be associated with gender role conformity and IPV. Eaton & Matamala, (2014) Guerrero, (2009) Parrott & Zeichner (2003) Reidy et al., (2014)
Self-esteem and Self-efficacy	NA	Page 44 Questions: 91a -j; 92a -j	Research has found that both extremely high and low self-esteem correlate with IPV. Bassuk et al., (2006) Hamberger & Hastings, 1986; Kaufman Kantor & Straus, 1990; Pan et al., 1994 Straus, 1990a

References:

Ames, G. M., Cunradi, C. B., Duke, M., Todd, M., & Chen, M. J. (2013). Contributions of work stressors, alcohol, and normative beliefs to partner violence. *Journal of studies on alcohol and drugs*, 74(2), 195-204.

Andrews, J. A., Foster, S. L., Capaldi, D., & Hops, H. (2000). Adolescent and family predictors of physical aggression, communication, and satisfaction in young adult couples: a prospective analysis. *Journal of consulting and clinical psychology*, 68(2), 195.

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.

Bassuk, E., Dawson, R., & Huntington, N. (2006). Intimate partner violence in extremely poor women: Longitudinal patterns and risk markers. *Journal of Family Violence*, 21(6), 387-399.

Buzawa, E. S., & Buzawa, C. G. (2013). What does research suggest are the primary risk and protective factors for intimate partner violence (IPV) and what is the role of economic factors? *Journal of Policy Analysis and Management*, 32(1), 128-137.

Byun, S. (2012). What happens before intimate partner violence? Distal and proximal antecedents. *Journal of Family Violence*, 27(8), 783-799.

Capaldi, D. M., Knoble, N. B., Shortt, J. W., & Kim, H. K. (2012). A systematic review of risk factors for intimate partner violence. *Partner abuse*, 3(2), 231-280.

Chase, K. A., O'leary, K. D., & Heyman, R. E. (2001). Categorizing partner-violent men within the reactive-proactive typology model. *Journal of consulting and clinical psychology*, 69(3), 567.

Copp, J. E., Kuhl, D. C., Giordano, P. C., Longmore, M. A., & Manning, W. D. (2015). Intimate partner violence in neighborhood context: the roles of structural disadvantage, subjective disorder, and emotional distress. *Social science research*, 53, 59-72.

Eaton, A. A., & Matamala, A. (2014). The relationship between heteronormative beliefs and verbal sexual coercion in college students. *Archives of sexual behavior*, 43(7), 1443-1457.

Eckhardt, C. I., & Crane, C. A. (2014). Male perpetrators of intimate partner violence and implicit attitudes toward violence: Associations with treatment outcomes. *Cognitive therapy and research*, 38(3), 291-301.

Foshee, V. A., Benefield, T. S., Ennett, S. T., Bauman, K. E., & Suchindran, C. (2004). Longitudinal predictors of serious physical and sexual dating violence victimization during adolescence. *Preventive medicine*, 39(5), 1007-1016.

Fox, G. L., & Benson, M. L. (2006). Household and neighborhood contexts of intimate partner violence. *Public health reports*, 121(4), 419-427.

Gonzalez-Guarda, R. M., De Santis, J. P., & Vasquez, E. P. (2013). Sexual orientation and demographic, cultural, and psychological factors associated with the perpetration and victimization of intimate partner violence among Hispanic men. *Issues in mental health nursing*, 34(2), 103-109.

Guerrero, D. A. V. (2009). Hypermasculinity, intimate partner violence, sexual aggression, social support, and child maltreatment risk in urban, heterosexual fathers taking parenting classes. *Child welfare*, 88(4), 135.

Hall, J. E., Walters, M. L., & Basile, K. C. (2012). Intimate partner violence perpetration by court-ordered men: Distinctions among subtypes of physical violence, sexual violence, psychological abuse, and stalking. *Journal of interpersonal violence*, 27(7), 1374-1395.

Hamberger, L. K., & Guse, C. (2005). Typology of reactions to intimate partner violence among men and women arrested for partner violence. *Violence and Victims*, 20(3), 303.

Hamberger, L. K., & Hastings, J. (1986). Personality correlates of men who abuse their partners: A cross-validation study. *Journal of Family Violence*, 1, 323- 346.

Hamby, S. (2009). The gender debate about intimate partner violence: solutions and dead ends. *Psychological Trauma: Theory, Research, Practice, and Policy*, 1(1), 24.

Holtzworth-Munroe, A., Rehman, U., & Herron, K. (2000). General and spouse-specific anger and hostility in subtypes of maritally violent men and nonviolent men. *Behavior Therapy*, 31(4), 603-630.

Hoyt, T., Wray, A. M., Wiggins, K. T., Gerstle, M., & Maclean, P. C. (2012). Personality profiles of intimate partner violence offenders with and without PTSD. *Journal of Offender Rehabilitation*, 51(4), 239-256.

Huss, M. T., & Langhinrichsen-Rohling, J. (2006). Assessing the generalization of psychopathy in a clinical sample of domestic violence perpetrators. *Law and human behavior*, 30(5), 571-586.

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

Johnson, M. P. (2011). Gender and types of intimate partner violence: A response to an anti-feminist literature review. *Aggression and Violent Behavior*, 16(4), 289-296.

Kaufman Kantor, G. K., & Straus, M. A. (1990). The "drunken bum" theory of wife beating. In M. A. Straus & R. J. Gelles (Eds.), *Physical violence in American families: Risk factors and adaptations in 8,145 families* (pp. 203-224). New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction. *8,145 families* (pp. 203-224). New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction.

LaViolette, A. (2009). Assessing intimate partner violence: A context sensitive aggression scale. *Journal of Child Custody*, 6(3-4), 219-231.

Loree Cook-Daniels MSCM, G. C. T. C. (2015). Intimate partner violence in transgender couples: "Power and control" in a specific cultural context. *Partner Abuse*, 6(1), 126.

- Mair, C., Cunradi, C. B., & Todd, M. (2012). Adverse childhood experiences and intimate partner violence: testing psychosocial mediational pathways among couples. *Annals of epidemiology*, 22(12), 832-839.
- Mbilinyi, L. F., Logan-Greene, P. B., Neighbors, C., Walker, D. D., Roffman, R. A., & Zegree, J. (2012). Childhood domestic violence exposure among a community sample of adult perpetrators: What mediates the connection? *Journal of Aggression, Maltreatment & Trauma*, 21(2), 171-187.
- Melton, H. C. (2007). Predicting the occurrence of stalking in relationships characterized by domestic violence. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 22(1), 3-25.
- Miller, E., & Silverman, J. G. (2010). Reproductive coercion and partner violence: implications for clinical assessment of unintended pregnancy. *Expert review of obstetrics & gynecology*, 5(5), 511-515.
- Norlander, B., & Eckhardt, C. (2005). Anger, hostility, and male perpetrators of intimate partner violence: A meta-analytic review. *Clinical psychology review*, 25(2), 119-152.
- Ortiz, E. (2015). An examination of emotion regulation and alcohol use as risk factors for female-perpetrated dating violence. *Violence and victims*, 30(3), 417.
- Pan, H. S., Neidig, P. H., & O'Leary, D. (1994). Predicting mild and severe husband-to-wife physical aggression. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology*, 62, 975-981.
- Parrott, D. J., & Zeichner, A. (2003). Effects of hypermasculinity on physical aggression against women. *Psychology of Men & Masculinity*, 4(1), 70.
- Persampiere, J., Poole, G., & Murphy, C. M. (2014). Neuropsychological correlates of anger, hostility, and relationship-relevant distortions in thinking among partner violent men. *Journal of Family Violence*, 29(6), 625-641.
- Reidy, D. E., Berke, D. S., Gentile, B., & Zeichner, A. (2014). Man enough? Masculine discrepancy stress and intimate partner violence. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 68, 160-164.
- Reidy, D. E., Early, M. S., & Holland, K. M. (2017). Boys are victims too? Sexual dating violence and injury among high-risk youth. *Preventive medicine*, 101, 28-33.
- Reidy, D. E., Shelley-Tremblay, J. F., & Lilienfeld, S. O. (2011). Psychopathy, reactive aggression, and precarious proclamations: A review of behavioral, cognitive, and biological research. *Aggression and Violent Behavior*, 16(6), 512-524.
- Roberts, A. L., McLaughlin, K. A., Conron, K. J., & Koenen, K. C. (2011). Adulthood stressors, history of childhood adversity, and risk of perpetration of intimate partner violence. *American journal of preventive medicine*, 40(2), 128-138.
- Ross, J. M., & Babcock, J. C. (2009). Proactive and reactive violence among intimate partner violent men diagnosed with antisocial and borderline personality disorder. *Journal of Family Violence*, 24(8), 607-617.

Ruff, S., McCOMB, J. L., Coker, C. J., & Sprenkle, D. H. (2010). Behavioral Couples Therapy for the Treatment of Substance Abuse: A Substantive and Methodological Review of O'Farrell, Fals-Stewart, and Colleagues' Program of Research. *Family Process*, 49(4), 439-456.

Salis, K. L., Kliem, S., & O'Leary, K. D. (2014). Conditional inference trees: a method for predicting intimate partner violence. *Journal of marital and family therapy*, 40(4), 430-441.

Senkans, S., McEwan, T. E., & Ogloff, J. R. (2017). Assessing the Link Between Intimate Partner Violence and Postrelationship Stalking: A Gender-Inclusive Study. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, DOI: 0886260517734859.

Simon, T. R., Anderson, M., Thompson, M. P., Crosby, A. E., Shelley, G., & Sacks, J. J. (2001). Attitudinal acceptance of intimate partner violence among US adults. *Violence and Victims*, 16(2), 115.

Slep, A. M. S., Foran, H. M., Heyman, R. E., & Snarr, J. D. (2010). Unique risk and protective factors for partner aggression in a large scale Air Force survey. *Journal of Community Health*, 35(4), 375-383.

Smith-Darden, J. P., Kernsmith, P. D., Reidy, D. E., & Cortina, K. S. (2017). In search of modifiable risk and protective factors for teen dating violence. *Journal of Research on Adolescence*, 27(2), 423-435.

Smith-Darden, J.P., **Reidy, D.E.**, & Kernsmith, P.D. (2016). Adolescent stalking and risk of violence. *Journal of Adolescence*, 52, 191-200.

Spencer, C., Cafferky, B., & Stith, S. M. (2016). Gender differences in risk markers for perpetration of physical partner violence: results from a meta-analytic review. *Journal of family violence*, 31(8), 981-984.

Stanford, M. S., Houston, R. J., & Baldrige, R. M. (2008). Comparison of impulsive and premeditated perpetrators of intimate partner violence. *Behavioral sciences & the law*, 26(6), 709-722.

Stith, S. M., Green, N. M., Smith, D. B., & Ward, D. B. (2008). Marital satisfaction and marital discord as risk markers for intimate partner violence: A meta-analytic review. *Journal of Family Violence*, 23(3), 149-160.

Straus, M. A. (1990). Social stress and marital violence in a national sample of American families. In M. A. Straus & R. J. Gelles (Eds.), *Physical violence in American families: Risk factors and adaptations in 8,145 families* (pp. 181-202). New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction.

Testa, M., Quigley, B. M., & Leonard, K. E. (2003). Does alcohol make a difference? Within-participants comparison of incidents of partner violence. *Journal of Interpersonal violence, 18*(7), 735-743.

Tharp, A. T., Schumacher, J. A., Samper, R. E., McLeish, A. C., & Coffey, S. F. (2013). Relative importance of emotional dysregulation, hostility, and impulsiveness in predicting intimate partner violence perpetrated by men in alcohol treatment. *Psychology of women quarterly, 37*(1), 51-60.

Ting, L., Jordan-Green, L., Murphy, C. M., & Pitts, S. C. (2009). Substance use problems, treatment engagement, and outcomes in partner violent men. *Research on Social Work Practice, 19*(4), 395-406.

Vitiello, B., & Stoff, D. M. (1997). Subtypes of aggression and their relevance to child psychiatry. *Journal of the American Academy of Child & Adolescent Psychiatry, 36*(3), 307-315.

Vives-Cases, C., Gil-González, D., & Carrasco-Portiño, M. (2009). Verbal marital conflict and male domination in the family as risk factors of intimate partner violence. *Trauma, Violence, & Abuse, 10*(2), 171-180.