

Review of Research on Factors at Play in Perpetration



Senior researchers: Carol Hagemann-White, Barbara Kavemann, Heinz Kindler, Thomas Meysen, Ralf Puchert

Researchers: Mart Busche, Sandra Gabler, Bianca Grafe, Melanie Kungl, Gila Schindler, Hartwig Schuck

Multi-level visual perpetration model: IT Design: Kevin Eschweiler, Karolina Schmitz



October 2010

Content

Review of Research on Factors at Play in Perpetration.....	1
1. Introduction: Purpose, scope and limits of the task, conceptual framing.....	4
2. Methodology	4
2.1. Review process.....	4
2.2. Defining levels and factors for a policy-oriented model	5
2.2.1. Levels.....	6
2.2.2. Factors	7
2.3. Methodology of assigning numerical values to factors	7
2.4. Limitations of the methodology and knowledge base.....	9
3. Factors conducive to gender-based violence and violence against children.....	11
3.1. Macro societal factors.....	11
3.2. Meso-societal Factors.....	14
3.3. Micro-social Factors.....	16
3.4. Ontogenetic Factors.....	17
4. Research knowledge on the perpetration of violence against women.....	18
4.1. Rape, sexual coercion and sexual assault.....	19
4.1.1. Meso level.....	19
4.1.2. Micro level.....	20
4.1.3. Ontogenetic level.....	21
4.1.4 Main factors and their effect size, power or impact.....	24
4.2. Intimate partner violence and stalking.....	25
4.2.1. Meso level.....	26
4.2.2. Micro level.....	28
4.2.3. Ontogenetic level.....	29
4.2.4 Main factors and their effect size, power or impact.....	34
4.3. Honour-based violence and forced marriage.....	35
4.3.1. Meso level.....	35
4.3.2. Micro level.....	36
4.3.3 Main factors and their effect size, power or impact.....	36
4.4. Trafficking.....	37
4.4.1. Meso level.....	37
4.4.2. Micro level.....	38
4.4.3. Ontogenetic level.....	38
4.4.4 Main factors and their effect size, power or impact.....	38
4.5. Sexual harassment.....	39
4.5.1. Meso level.....	39
4.5.2. Micro level.....	39
4.5.3. Ontogenetic level.....	40
4.5.4 Main factors and their effect size, power or impact.....	41
4.6. State of the research, its limitations and its utility for policy development.....	41
5. Research knowledge on the perpetration of violence against children.....	42
5.1. Introduction.....	42
5.2. Child physical and psychological abuse.....	43
5.2.1. Meso level.....	43
5.2.2. Micro level.....	44
5.2.3. Ontogenetic level; individual life history and personality.....	46
5.2.4 Main factors and their effect size, power or impact.....	49
5.3. Child neglect.....	49
5.3.1. Meso level.....	49
5.3.2. Micro level.....	52
5.3.3. Ontogenetic level: perpetrator's personality and life history	54
5.3.4 Main factors and their effect size, power or impact.....	58
5.4. Child sexual abuse.....	58

5.4.1. Meso level.....	59
5.4.2. Micro level.....	60
5.4.3. Ontogenetic level.....	65
5.4.4 Main factors and their effect size, power or impact.....	68
5.5. Child sexual exploitation.....	69
5.5.1. Meso level.....	69
5.5.2. Micro level.....	70
5.5.3. Ontogenetic level.....	70
5.5.4 Main factors and their effect size, power or impact.....	70
5.6. Overall assessment of the field	71
6. Research knowledge on the perpetration of violence based on gender identity or sexual orientation.....	72
6.1. Meso level.....	73
6.2. Micro level.....	73
6.3. Ontogenetic level.....	74
6.4. Overall assessment of the state of the research, its limitations and its utility for policy development.....	75
6.5. Main factors and their effect size, power or impact.....	75
7. Assessing the state of the research	76
7.1. What is known, what is not known, and what may be (mis-)understood.....	76
7.2. Emerging and under-researched issues.....	78
References	80

1. Introduction: Purpose, scope and limits of the task, conceptual framing

For the Feasibility Study the European Commission asked for a review of current knowledge on factors related to the perpetration of violence. This should allow a deeper understanding of the phenomena, so that consideration to enhancing legislation against Violence against Women, Violence against Children and Sexual Orientation Violence can be given in full cognizance of the complexity of the problem. The purpose is to assist the Commission in developing a more coherent and longer-term policy.

To this end, a scientifically founded overview of current research knowledge was prepared about what factors or conditions are conducive to the perpetration of gender-based violence and/or violence against children. The feasibility study itself could only include a concise summary of main results; the present full review aims to provide transparent information on the available evidence and the way in which this knowledge was prepared for use in a multi-level interactive model. Reviewing the knowledge base included critical assessment of where the research is inadequate to meet the needs of policy and practice, or is methodologically weak, or missing.

The analysis of the factors at play in perpetration shares the human rights perspective of the study, which is focussed on those specific kinds of interpersonal violence that are grounded in structures of unequal power and recognition in society or in the lack of full access to fundamental rights. Thus, the task at hand is not general crime prevention or improving the level of mental health in the population. Rather, the study seeks to identify the factors that lead specifically to disproportionate violence against women, against LGBT persons and against children.

Furthermore, the focus is on factors that arguably might be influenced by policy or policy-based prevention and intervention measures. For example, while the genetic makeup or severe psychopathology of some individuals makes them generally aggressive, the majority of perpetrators of violence against women and violence against children show no psychopathology, and genetic or medical intervention is not a policy option. The goal of identifying factors that make perpetration more probable also guided the decision not to include victim vulnerability factors, since vulnerability can equally stimulate protective responses; it does not cause the violence.

2. Methodology

2.1. Review process

The broad scope and limited time frame of the literature review called for techniques of rapid research review for policy relevance. In order to assess the current evidence base for the factors at play in perpetration and their interaction, the following methods were combined:

- inclusion in the team of five senior researchers with many years of international research experience in the different research areas in question;
- two teams carried out systematic thematic searches (on violence against children, violence against women and sexual orientation violence) in databases of journal articles and in key journals, with especial attention to locating comprehensive research reviews, meta-analyses and longitudinal studies, but also large-scale cross-sectional studies where these are the best evidence available;

- identification of reviews of the research evidence in recent book publications by internationally recognized authors or sources (such as APA handbooks);
- assessment of the results of evaluation studies from work with perpetrators and of well-designed relevant qualitative research;
- mining clinical and theoretical analyses of the dynamics and interplay of factors to construct path models of the confluence of factors.

Initially, 20 publications presenting the most important evidence were summarized as abstracts with a template constructed specifically for this study, thus permitting comparison of the evidence base across the fields of research and synthesis of variables. In the further in-depth exploration of the knowledge base for different forms of violence, information on the empirical data was extracted from a total of more than 130 selected scientific journal articles and over 90 other research-based publications. With this methodology, it was possible to capture state-of-the-art quantitative evidence on factors at play in the major fields of research on perpetration: intimate partner violence, sexual assault and rape and child maltreatment and to explore the knowledge base in other areas as well.

Considerably less empirical evidence is available on the motives and factors influencing sexual orientation violence, commercially profitable forms such as trafficking and child sexual exploitation, and practices that take reference to traditions or customs from the country of origin of immigrant communities. Stalking and sexual harassment are also under-researched with regard to the factors involved in perpetration. Only a few studies of sexual orientation violence could be found. Victimization studies in all of these areas throw some light on perpetration, but reliable assessments of factors and their effect sizes would require a developed body of research with perpetrators. Such research is lacking, and on some areas there are considerable barriers to identifying perpetrators. In-depth qualitative studies, interview data from victims, or reflective reports based on clinical or practical intervention experience throw light on relevant factors, but there are no systematic reviews, longitudinal studies or statistical analyses across studies, making general conclusions difficult. We have located no empirical research at all with perpetrators of trafficking or child sexual exploitation, nor with those who perpetrate honour-based violence, forced marriage or female genital mutilation. Where research was scarce, related forms of violence have been clustered in order to reflect the scope of the feasibility study as a whole.

2.2. Defining levels and factors for a policy-oriented model

Beginning with early work on child abuse in the 1960s, explanatory models for violence in the family tended each to have one central focus of assumed main causality. Although all of these single-factor explanations have been shown to be inadequate, they dominate everyday thinking across the whole area of violence to this day. Psychopathology, social and economic disadvantage, social learning modelled on parents behaviour, and alcohol abuse have each been proposed as the “real” or primary cause of child abuse, and they are called upon to explain violence against women in public discourse as well.

By the 1990s, a growing store of systematic research reviews and meta-analyses concluded that each of these presumed “causes” had only a weak explanatory power at best when taken alone. Only a minority of those who maltreat their children or their partners evince psychopathology; the majority of parents living in poverty neither abuse nor neglect their children, and many adults who were exposed to violence in their family of origin do not themselves become violent. Realizing that violence is not monocausally determined has led to widespread use of an ecological perspective that understands individuals in their environment on several levels.

A disadvantage of ecological models, however, is their tendency to suggest that there are “proximate” and “distal” causes, and that the latter, typically depicted as a larger surrounding circle, exert influence through the closer circle of direct personal relationships. Yet a brief

reflection on the influence of the media makes clear that some factors in the wider society also impact directly on the cognitive and emotional development of individuals. In addition, imagining the influence of factors in concentric circles cannot easily grasp the differences between developments leading towards the use of violence or away from it. For this, path models that show the interplay of factors on different levels are more useful.

For the present study, a modified ecological model was constructed in which all levels have an equal potential to influence the behaviour of individuals, so as to capture the interplay among factors as well as the relative strength of their impact. In addition, path models were built to suggest how different factors can work together or counteract each other in leading up to the likelihood of someone using violence. Defining factors and levels that integrate empirical variables in theoretically founded general terms was thus crucial for building a model.

2.2.1. Levels

There are widely varying uses of the concept of “levels” across disciplines and theoretical schools. For a policy-relevant model we use a sociological understanding of “levels” that facilitates addressing violence resulting from structural inequality of gender and generation. This analytical concept of levels differs from the conventions established in psychological research, and also takes a different approach again from that found in research primarily aimed at qualifying casework and family intervention, or in psychiatric intervention in the case of sexual violence. Nonetheless, evidence from all of these fields is integrated into the model.

The “**ontogenetic**” level can also be called the “life history approach”; it includes those factors in the biographies of individuals that contribute to a disposition to resort to violence or even to find satisfaction in violence. Much of this research identifies correlations but has only limited explanatory potential; in particular, with the phenomenon of violence it can be difficult to distinguish cause and effect. Longitudinal studies are useful for developing grounded hypotheses about causal links.

The “**micro**” level refers to dynamics and formations of the face-to-face group: peer groups, close relationships in the immediate family or household, the classroom or workplace as a site of day-to-day interaction. These can reinforce or mitigate the effects of ontogenetic factors. It is on this level that general social norms are translated into expected or socially approved practices. Thus, while gender and sexual stereotypes have historical and cultural roots, their impact on the perpetration of violence is most clearly recognizable when they shape perceptions of the “normal” way for men and women to think and behave.

The “**meso**” level refers to the larger institutions or organisations that regulate social life and within which individuals and families negotiate their lives. Norms and values about subordinate or compliant behaviour for women or children were placed on the meso level when they tend to be specific to a community or milieu. This level also includes presence or absence of a consistent policy, as well as the rules, procedures and (lack of) resources for agencies that could or should supervise, intervene, offer help or enforce sanctions; excessive caseloads, for example, or lack of even minimal training, can set parameters within which violence remains unchecked.

The “**macro**” level refers to overall cultural, historical and economic structures of a society. Persistent and tolerated gender inequality and failure to recognize and establish children’s rights belong here, as do deeply rooted attitudes devaluing women and/or children, or imperatives to conform to gender and heterosexual identities. Development and influence of the media permeate society on all levels. The law is a macro factor that defines some acts of violence as more serious than others, and establishes the responsibilities of agencies and the rights and claims of victims to redress and support.

Empirical research on violence against women and violence against children typically measures and compares characteristics and acts of individuals in their life history and personal environment. Thus, the empirical evidence base is strongest on the ontogenetic level, and on some micro-level aspects. At the same time, the patterns that emerge from this research only make sense, as research reviews regularly emphasize, when meso- and macrolevel factors, such as the gender hierarchy in society, are taken into account. While there are some studies comparing levels of violence in organisations or whole societies (cross-culturally or historically), they are few and at best suggestive for theorizing. Thus, different kinds of research are needed to understand the factors at play in perpetration.

2.2.2. Factors

There is a consensus across research and theory that interpersonal violence is multifactorial and arises through the confluence of interacting influences at different levels. Empirical evidence accumulates over a multitude of studies, each defining the variables in very specific ways, and each field of study has its own discourse and preferred concepts. A major aim of this research review was to integrate the vast amount of available information, not only across studies, as has been done in systematic research reviews for specific topics, but also across the fields of violence research, in order to pull out more general factors that can be useful for developing a coherent overall policy. The aim was to capture the complexity of the problem while structuring research knowledge for policy use, thus focussing on those factors which seem amenable to influence by legislation that is targeted to reducing violence

To this end, the numerous variables to be found in the research were clustered into composite "main factors"; these are presented in section 3 below. Theoretical discussions of how the variables are related to perpetration of violence provided the key to integrating multiple dimensions into a larger-scale factor of which they can be considered aspects. For example, in relation to physical violence, heavy drinking has been identified as a relevant variable; with child neglect, drug use becomes more significant as well; with regard to sexual violence the use of (violent) pornography or of child pornography has been studied. For the purpose of developing a model, all of these were grouped together under a concept of "stimulus abuse", meaning the excessive or habitual use of means of self-stimulation that correlate with use of violence. The differences in use of such stimulants re-appear in path models, which show how combinations and cumulative effects may lead to one form of violence rather than another.

2.3. Methodology of assigning numerical values to factors

In the areas of violence perpetration that have been extensively researched, and where research reviews provided a quantitative assessment of the best-studied variables, the selection criteria for risk factors¹ were: Replication in at least two longitudinal studies and/or a computed composite effect size $\geq .10$ based on all available studies including cross-sectional studies². The available evidence is presented below in more detail. The centrality given to longitudinal studies and meta-analytic results was intended to focus on the best available evidence. Replication and at least small effect size are necessary criteria for using empirical results in a policy relevant research synthesis. In addition temporal order is a recognized criterion for interpreting correlations to develop hypotheses about causal connections. Nevertheless it must be mentioned that, as some variables ordinarily co-vary, it is difficult to exclude third-variable effects (Rutter, Pickles, Murray & Eaves, 2001).

¹ The term „risk factors“ refers to the statistical probability of measured variables being linked to certain outcomes, in this case violence; such findings were identified only for the ontogenetic and (in part) micro levels of our model.

² Effect size is a statistical measure that quantifies the difference between two groups (for example, perpetrators and non-perpetrators) or measures the strength of the association between two variables, taking account of the spread of variation within each group as well as the average values. The most widely used measure is Pearson's r , which can vary between -1 and $+1$.

Even within overviews the variables are often very fine-grained, taking account of differences in measurement techniques, for example, and thus too numerous and detailed for the purpose of modelling. For each form of violence, the effect sizes of all significant variables from meta-analyses and major studies were placed on a uniform scale; this could only be done as an approximation, since the most widely used measures differ. The results for empirically significant variables were then combined for each composite factor to produce an average value. Whilst the result is an estimate rather than an exactly calculated statistical value, it permitted a weighting as a weak but measurable, moderate, or strong influence on the form of violence in question.

This process could be carried out rigorously for each of the main forms of child maltreatment. In the areas of intimate partner violence and rape/sexual assault, the research is much more varied; meta-analyses and longitudinal studies are fewer and tend to focus on specific aspects only, such as anger and hostility, or alcohol abuse, or include only specific populations, such as imprisoned offenders. Where available, the same criteria for effect sizes were used as with child maltreatment, but a combination of different kinds of studies made the construction of a unified scale for variable effect sizes impractical. In these areas, the procedure was to build on the strength of influence found in key empirical studies, categorizing them for each study as weak, moderate or strong, and move directly to their combination (without the aid of statistical analysis) to estimate an approximate value for the composite factor in question.

In all other areas, the state of empirical research on perpetration is unsatisfactory and effect sizes could only be assessed from an overall reading of existing studies, and by drawing on the good judgement of research experts in the team with accumulated knowledge, experience and familiarity with international discourse in the field. Three under-researched fields of violence – forced marriage, female genital mutilation and honour-based violence – were combined for the modelling, since the limited data available points to similarities among them. Stalking was grouped with intimate partner violence, since the research, where present, tends to be linked. All in all, the picture is incomplete, and more research on perpetrators would certainly identify differentiating aspects.

Where empirical research has produced no consistent evidence of the influence of a factor on a specific form of violence, the value of zero was assigned. Empirical research can never prove that something does not exist. Analytically, there is a difference between the absence of evidence, when the possibility of a link has not been empirically studied (or not studied adequately), and evidence of absence, when the research finds that there is no significant connection after controlling for other variables. For example, there has been no research on the life history or social milieus that might lead men (or women) to become traffickers³ or that might cause some families to subject a daughter (or son) to a forced marriage, while others do not. In these areas the value of all ontogenetic factors had to be recorded as zero because nothing is known. By contrast, there is some (not much) research on personal variables of sexual harassers, but it is largely inconclusive, and the present state of knowledge is that all sorts of men may harass women if the environment (for example the organization in which they work) is permissive and discriminatory. Zero value means here that research has not succeeded in discovering which men choose to harass and which do not (although comparison with “non-perpetrators” is generally problematic, since they are often recruited without reliable criteria)⁴. Finally, there are areas that have been researched extensively, such as the connections between drinking alcohol and perpetrating rape, for

³ There is some evidence that women who themselves were trafficked were offered recruitment as an alternative.

⁴ „Dark field“ studies in the population regularly find that there are many men who have never been reported to any agency as perpetrators, but who, by their own report, have used violence against a partner or sexual coercion. These men may be included in “control groups” in other research; in that case, what differentiates them is not the absence of perpetration but the fact that it is undetected.

which – in the most current authoritative reviews of the literature – a causal link cannot be confirmed at this time.

Mindful of the differences in quality and quantity of research, the influence of main factors was assessed relative to other factors within each area of violence and on each level of effect, without drawing comparisons between arenas in which the research is not comparably developed. Thus, the explanatory power of a factor is always to be seen relative to that field of research, and not in comparison to other forms and types of violence.

2.4. Limitations of the methodology and knowledge base

There are methodological problems in identifying factors with a causal influence on perpetration. Even in fields where research is more extensive, the great majority of findings are limited to correlations, which may or may not justify causal inferences; correlations also reveal little if anything about non-linear influences and/or statistical interaction effects. Some frameworks specifying criteria that can be used to approximate causal inferences have been proposed (see Murray et al 2009), but literature reviews seldom consider this systematically. As an example: When domestic violence is found to correlate strongly with high family conflict, we do not know whether the family conflict leads to violence, or (plausibly) violence generates a situation of family conflict, or whether (most probably) some third set of factors causes both. Longitudinal studies are a promising method for identifying causality, but temporal sequence alone is also insufficient. Thus, the factors at play can be read as if they cause perpetration, but the evidence for causality is generally weak and often absent.

To take account of some of these limitations, path models were created alongside presentation of the factors and their relevance for forms of violence. These are analytical confluence models: That is, they illustrate how factors interact cumulatively or conditionally to raise the probability of perpetration. The path models include all factors that are empirically supported with at least moderate weight. The decision to exclude weaker factors depended on whether, according to what is known about the dynamics of perpetration, they are likely to serve as a mediator or a condition for the effect of the factors with greater effect sizes. Note that the estimate of effect sizes for factors on the meso- and macro levels is not based on statistical data analysis. The model is thus necessarily heuristic, indicating probabilities, and should not be taken to reflect definite and reliable knowledge of causality.

The meta-analyses of variables empirically linked to perpetration of violence, while very useful for identifying the most relevant factors, cannot carry out the kind of complex statistical analysis that would yield a picture of cumulative effects or developmental sequences⁵. For this we must turn to in-depth studies. As so often the case in research, there is a trade-off between width of scope and depth of understanding. In the development of path models, both longitudinal study results and broadly-based qualitative or clinical research that can trace the development towards perpetration retrospectively were needed. In this way it was possible to represent different pathways leading to perpetration of the most frequent forms of violence. These pathways have not been statistically derived from datasets, and thus do not have direct empirical confirmation as yet; they do represent a synthesis of the best evidence currently available.

The decision to prioritize the best empirical evidence means that the knowledge of practitioners is not equally represented (although it does enter into the path models)⁶. Where significant aspects encountered in practical work are missing, the model serves to identify

⁵ Methodological tools are now available to derive path models statistically, and this has been done to describe trajectories of aggressive behaviour in childhood, but no studies have followed the paths leading to adult violence. This requires large data sets, as well as sustained research interest in understanding the sources of perpetration.

⁶ All of the senior researchers in the study have significant practical experience in work with victims and/or perpetrators, as well as in the scientific evaluation of practice.

research gaps, and should be used as such. Weaknesses in the overall body of research could not be compensated in this review. Three examples illustrate the problem.

- Research on all forms of child maltreatment, including sexual abuse, is closely linked to social work and to the conceptual approaches in that field; studies have overwhelmingly been done by interviewing mothers⁷, so that a reliable gender analysis of perpetration is not possible, although gender is certainly salient in sexual abuse.
- A large part of the research on perpetrators of rape and sexual assault, on the other hand, has been anchored in psychiatry and works with the conceptual framing of psychopathology, often missing the normal men who use sexual coercion. The orienting concern has been the question of whether a convicted rapist or child sexual abuser can be released without danger to society; thus, literature on perpetrators is often focussed entirely on typologies (see Laufersweiler-Dwyer & Dwyer 2005) or on predicting recidivism (see Hanson & Morton-Bourgon 2009).
- Again, a large proportion of the studies of intimate partner violence are anchored in the criminal justice system and use its definitions of the violent incident as criminal law captures it, thus often missing the context of coercion and control.

Such biases and specialized traditions of research or schools of thought have an impact on what factors have been sufficiently studied with quantitative methods to make an assessment of the effect size or power of influence possible.

The interest in building a solid knowledge base constitutes in itself a limitation, as researchers build on and replicate previous studies. Research reviews in child maltreatment implicitly or explicitly centre on families: “Effective assessment and treatment of child maltreatment, by its nature, must take place within the context of the family” (Scannapieco & Connell-Carrick 2005, 22; see also Belsky 1993). The family-centred focus fails even to recognize the existence of abuse, physical or sexual, in schools, residential care institutions, sports and music clubs, churches or other locations. Some of this abuse is coming to light in a wave of revelations and accusations in several countries, including Belgium, Germany, Ireland and the UK; yet there is little or no research on teachers, trainers, or priests who abuse the children in their care. The recent popularity of evolutionary psychology seems to reinforce the focus on biological parents.

Research on violence against women has been much more influenced by (emotional and political) controversies over feminism. While the debates on whether women perpetrate domestic violence as often as men have been moderated in the field of serious research by studies differentiating types of violence in relationships (Stark 2007, Johnson 2008), there are still tendencies to explain men’s violence against women either psychologically, as if men who are violent to women were marked out for this in childhood and later can’t help themselves, or on the contrary by reference to societal forces, implicating men in society generally. Research has not yet significantly addressed the ambivalence between clear data that men predominate across the spectrum of violence, and the fact that most men never kill or rape, and that there are many non-violent men in the world (Connell 2000, 215).

⁷ Recent studies are more likely to interview both parents or step-parents and differentiate perpetration more clearly, but there are not always enough of such studies to be reviewed separately.

3. Factors conducive to gender-based violence and violence against children

3.1. Macro societal factors

For factors on the level of the society as a whole, and to some extent for those on the meso-level, this review draws on analytic and theoretical work by researchers with broad empirical background or wide clinical experience. The focus is on “theories of the middle range”, since the purpose of the review is to capture connections on which policy can reasonably be expected to have an effect. The relevant authors argue from the breadth of their cumulative understanding and refer to indicators, rather than empirical measurement. As we seek to identify the factors at play in perpetration, we select explanatory models that help us to understand why some individuals or groups within society “choose” violence and others do not. They should be compatible with the state of our empirical knowledge on the levels that permit measurement or clinical confirmation. Theories of the middle range should further have the potential to discriminate among pathways that lead towards, or away from violence.

Five main macro-level factors have been drawn from the literature in the course of this review; Devaluing women, Masculinity, Children’s status, Media violence and Impunity. Each of them represents a cluster of influences that are interrelated and have effects on culture and society in the wider sense, on the various relevant institutions and environments within a society (meso-level), but also directly on the smaller social networks such as families and on the life history of individuals. Three of these factors describe the socio-cultural and socioeconomic relations of gender and of generations: we have chosen to look at the status of women, the status of men and the status of children separately because their influence may become salient at different points. A further macro-level factor, central to policy, is the law as a structure linking the way a society is organized with the rights and duties of the members of the society. Finally, in today’s world the media must be understood as powerful societal influence.

Each of the five factors can be modelled theoretically as a socialization theory, connecting general norms, beliefs and access to social positions and resources through institutions and interactions to individuals. The socialization perspective has the potential for a process-based understanding of how individuals in their social environments come to develop an affirmation or a rejection of violence that can change over time as well. Through a complex approach that goes beyond linear notions of causality, social analysis can thus be linked to the empirical results found on the other levels of the model. This also illustrates the fact that the factors, while situated in the model on one of the four levels, actually radiate out into the other levels. In particularly significant cases this is represented in the structure of the model, but it must also be understood as a general interactive principle within the entire construct.

Ideally, macro-level factors would be measurable by historical or cross-cultural comparison of the levels and forms of violence under different societal conditions (see Hagemann-White 2000, Kury et al 2004, Schrötle et al 2006). Since systematic collection of the data necessary for a methodologically sound comparison is difficult, most efforts to identify a relationship between social conditions and violence proceed by setting theoretical predictions against case study material. Overall, cross-cultural studies tend to confirm that male aggression toward women is more common in societies in which female alliances are weak, and when male alliances are particularly important and well-developed (Smuts 1996). Generally, male control of resources makes women more vulnerable to men’s violence. In many cultures, as well as in European history, gender ideologies legitimize a man’s right to beat or rape a woman with impunity, and in such societies both rape and physical abuse of women indeed seem to be more prevalent than in societies in which gender relations rest on a greater degree of mutual respect or dependency. Furthermore, Hearn and Whitehead (2006) summarize the anthropological evidence indicating that the predominant definition of masculinity has a significant impact on the extent of both interpersonal and inter-society

violence. Studies on the history of childhood in Europe, while controversial, generally confirm that under conditions of male dominance violence against children is also considered legitimate and even obligatory.

1) “DEVALUING WOMEN” represents the material and cultural subordination of women, gender inequality of power, and patriarchal ideas of femininity and of sexuality, underpinned by normative beliefs about the proper spheres of women and men, the relative value of these spheres in society, and the legitimate distribution of power between women and men in each sphere. They include values for sexual and for family relationships that idealize women’s compliance with men’s wishes and needs, and thus give the appearance of legitimacy to men imposing their will on women (see Kelly 1988, Weissberg 1996, Harway & O’Neil 1999, Stark 2007).

While numerous indicators commonly used in the comparative study of the status of women (such as women’s social and economic rights, political participation) show substantial progress, especially in Western industrial societies, de facto discrimination and restricted access of women to employment, income, and political power persist, as does the gendered division of responsibilities and the unequal value attached to them. Although there is diversity in “gender cultures” across Europe, they all comprise shared normative beliefs about the spheres of work of women and men, the societal value of these spheres, and the legitimate relative power balance between women and men in each sphere. “Gender is the way bodies are drawn into history; bodies are arenas for the making of gender patterns.” (Connell 2000, 12) Connell calls these patterns “gender regimes” within institutions (in our model, the meso-level) and in society as a whole, the “gender order”. They include values for sexual and for family relationships that idealize women’s submission to men’s wishes and needs.

In their review of literature on the causes of men’s violence against women, Harway and Hansen (1993) conclude that the main causes of perpetration of intimate partner violence are societal acceptance of wife battering, cultural gender images such as male aggressiveness and dominance and female subordination, the power imbalance between men and women and the fact that female self defence contradicts traditional female gender role (see also Hamberger & Holzworth-Munroe 2009).

2) “MASCULINITY” serves on the macro-level as keyword for the hierarchical power and recognition of normative heterosexual masculinity, generating pressure to conform to masculine standards; it includes social recognition of claims and rights for men, while at the same time defining norms that men must fulfil. As a social institution, masculinity is innately hierarchical, generating both violence to sustain dominance over women and violence in transactions among men (see Connell 1995, Hearn 1998, Kimmel 2008); indeed it can be argued that the violence that men do to women stands primarily in the service of regulating social relations between men (Hearn & Whitehead 2006).

Masculinity studies suggest that traditional, rigid gender concepts of masculinity, associating masculinity with steeliness and competition and femininity with caring and vulnerability, function as a risk factor for interpersonal violence. From research with men in British prisons, Whitehead (2005) identifies the key features of such masculinity as heroism, meaning the ability of “transcending his fear of suffering harm or death through courageous acts”, and sexual conformity, meaning heterosexuality and successful sexual performance (cf. Bereswill 2006). It might be concluded that a context in which men or boys learn that (a) a man has to transcend his fear of suffering harm or death through courageous acts, and (b) people obligatorily have to be heterosexual, may be conducive to the exercise of gender-related violence, including intimate partner violence, sexual violence and sexual orientation based violence

Bridges Whaley (2001) analyzes data from 109 US cities over time in support of the theory that an increase in women’s status relative to men will, in the short run, be perceived as a

threat to men's collective interest and increase the prevalence of (retaliatory) rape, while the longer-term effect of gender equality is to reduce rape rates. Comparative anthropology suggests that in societies where men are permitted to acknowledge fear, levels of violence are low, while high levels of violence characterize societies that idealize masculine bravado (Hearn & Whitehead 2006).

3) "CHILDREN'S STATUS" refers to persisting traditions in which children are not recognized as the holders of fundamental and specific rights and are expected to submit to expectations and demands of adults. In this, children retain some elements of a legal and cultural status as property of the parents or families, and as subordinates to those responsible for their education or care. Children are also perceived as naturally weak and vulnerable and as not having a real capacity to know what they want or need or what is good for them (Deegener & Körner 2005). Most experts consider cultural approval of violence and in particular of corporal punishment to be a key societal factor conducive to maltreatment, especially in combination with the belief in the necessity of strong discipline in childrearing (Scannapieco & Connell-Carrick 2005). Miller-Perrin and Perrin summarize: "The subordination and dependency of children make them vulnerable to abuse, and family privacy norms make child maltreatment easy to conceal" (2007, 66).

The societal and cultural factors conducive to child abuse have received little attention; the relevant research focuses on families and follows an agenda of social service intervention. Abuse and maltreatment of children in schools, orphanages, residential care for children with behavioural problems or disabilities, in summer camps, church groups or in training centres for talented young people, such as elite choirs or sports centres has "surfaced" and broken into the political debate: For example the research by René Spitz on hospitalism in post WW2 British orphanages played a key role in understanding early emotional and developmental needs; the challenge to authoritarian educational methods in the context of student rebellion in the late 1960s set the stage for a paradigm shift away from strictly run residential care and towards assistance for parents and, if necessary, fostering; and in the past few years, victims of abuse in childhood have turned to the public with accounts of their suffering and demands for reparations. Historically, prohibition of physical means of discipline in European countries has been legislated at different times, from the 1920's to the period of EU expansion, but there has been no systematic research on how overall societal factors such as secular shifts in the concept of childhood, the value attached to children (controversially debated among historians such as Aries or de Mause) plays out in the acts of cruelty, abuse of power and seemingly wanton infliction of pain that go well beyond what has been considered necessary to maintain obedience and order.

4) "MEDIA VIOLENCE" characterizes the availability and socially accepted use of media that present violent actions as rewarding and successful, while sexualizing violence and portraying women and/or children as available and vulnerable sexual objects. The impact of the media, and more recently, the internet and interactive video games, on interpersonal violence is controversial (Oddone Paolucci et al. 2000, Anderson et al. 2010), but the media are clearly a powerful influence on the culture, through the constant representation of acts of violence and their linkage to sexuality and to images of gender. Research links sexualized violence in the media to increases in violence towards women, rape myth acceptance and anti-women attitudes. (The evidence on the excessive use of certain media by individuals will be reviewed under "stimulus abuse" as an ontogenetic factor; on the societal level, it is the constant presence of acts of violence and their linkage to sexuality and to images of gender that is at issue here.)

Over ten years ago, the UNESCO report (1998) found that globally nearly all children have access to TV and that violence is overwhelmingly presented as rewarding. The authors write: "Individual movies are not the problem. However, the extent and omnipresence of media violence (with an average of 5 to 10 aggressive acts per TV-program hour in many countries) contribute to the development of a global aggressive culture."

In an overview of the research on violence and the media, Lukesch (2002) summarizes a strong research basis both in the US and in Germany on the extent to which the media, in particular TV, present violence as a normal part of life every day. He also refers to research confirming that rising numbers of children see violent video and horror films at ever earlier ages. Numerous studies have suggested that sexualized violence in the media can be linked to increases in violence towards women, rape myth acceptance and anti-women attitudes. The easy availability of film sequences and images of gender violence and sexual coercion on the internet and via cell-phones have doubtless expanded this sphere of visual images: Acts of sexual coercion can be filmed and distributed at any time and in any location without delay (see Kindler et al 2009).

O'Neil and Harway (1999) conclude in their edited volume "What Causes Men's Violence against women?" with a focus on partner violence that persisting patterns in (American) society normalize and glorify violence, and that these as well as the media's negative portrayal of women both predispose men to violence against women. Kindler et al (2010) review the research evidence and conclude that child pornography does contribute to the risk of perpetration of child sexual abuse.

5) "IMPUNITY" describes the failure of the law to prohibit or sanction violence or to ensure protection, as with legal systems that confer (e.g. by exceptions) rights to the use of coercion, control or violence (Weissberg 1996, Kimmel 2008). The concept of impunity is used in international discourse on violence against women more broadly to characterize state inaction, both in not holding perpetrators accountable and in permitting power relations and structural conditions of discrimination to remain in place. The Study of the UN Secretary General on ending violence against women identifies "state inaction" as one of the key structural causal factors, stating that the failure of the criminal justice system "has particularly corrosive effects, as impunity for acts of violence against women encourages further violence and reinforces women's subordination" (UN 2006, 37). In the model developed here, to sharpen the focus on policy measures we wished to mark the difference between legislation and its effective implementation; thus impunity represents the absence of adequate legal provisions; lack of their implementation appears on the meso-level as 'failed sanctions'.

3.2. Meso-societal Factors

The empirical evidence for the influence of meso-level factors is more likely to be found in single studies comparing organisations or evaluating interventions, although there are a few research reviews, some using meta-analytic techniques. For the most part, however, the relevance and influence of these factors is drawn from analyses of process dynamics, for example in studies that explore the conducive context in which certain forms of violence emerge; for such studies, a quantitative comparison of systems is less salient.

6) "FAILED SANCTIONS" – Failure of agencies to set limits or implement sanctions despite existence of legal norms and agency duties. Research studies on rape, sexual harassment and intimate partner violence provide evidence that men see themselves as more likely to engage in violence against women, and actually do re-offend more often, when they perceive or experience that it has no negative consequences for them (Gondolf 2002). Based on their comprehensive research review Lalumière et al. conclude that "men who are more likely to devalue women and who incur or perceive lower costs for exhibiting sexual coercion are more likely to rape" (2005, 102). This factor should be understood broadly to include all actions by responsible agencies that should set limits to violence; it includes the failure, for example, of child protection agencies to follow up on reports of maltreatment and insist that parents accept help to raise a child without abuse.

7) "HONOUR CODES" – Community or collective enforcement of honour, shame and subordination based on gender, xenophobia, fundamentalism, or tradition. The term "harmful

traditional practices” established in UN documents on violence against women can be questioned, since practices harmful to women such as wife abuse and rape have been embedded in the dominant cultures of Europe for many centuries. Honour codes create an expectation of approval of certain acts by families, or within communities whose members immigrated from outside the EU at some time. They permit justification with reference to traditions or legal frameworks in countries of origin, based on control of women for the perceived good of the collective (family). Traditions and cultural values may of course be invoked as excuses for personally motivated acts of violence, or used to cover material motives such as securing an immigration or residence permit. (Welchman & Hossain 2005). Subgroups within the majority population, such as right-wing authoritarian groups, can also employ a concept of honour to enforce a rigid gender regime.

8) “HATE GROUPS” – Organized social groups promoting intolerance or hate as well as aggressive action. Although such groups can arise locally on the micro-social level, they do the greatest harm when they connect to larger organized networks such as right-wing extremist political parties or movements and their organizations, ideological networks that propagate notions of a mission to cleanse society of danger or evil attributed to homosexuals, ethnic minorities and/or other out-groups (McDevitt et al. 2002). In this context, gender and sexual norms are not ideals so much as imperatives to be defended and enforced, and there are often links to racism (Uhle 1994). Those who do not fit or conform to the norm are also, however, seen as easy prey for aggressive impulses.

9) “ENTITLEMENT” – Norms generating assumptions, for example, of men’s rights over women, supported by social beliefs in male entitlement to sex and services from women. Societal patterns of gender inequality, dominant masculinity and devaluing women converge in an expectation of men’s right to have their needs met by women (Gilligan 2000). Entitlement also can be perceived as the right to do as one likes with ones own children, or the right to enjoyable time with, or custody of children without corresponding responsibility for carework (Bancroft & Silverman 2002). Different forms of violence are linked to different substantive concepts of entitlement. Subjectively, the perpetrator’s experience is often one of not being respected or of being powerless, but loss of power or control is relative to an underlying premise that an intimate partner/husband/father/mother/authority figure (teacher, religious leader) has the right to unquestioned acceptance of his or her needs or demands.

10) “DISCRIMINATION” – Gender-based discrimination is embedded in social organisations such as workplaces or educational institutions, including the definition of relatively privileged territories reserved for (heterosexual) men. Discrimination weakens women’s access to economic and social independence. Depending on the area of violence being examined, the relevant factor can be primarily discrimination against women, or discrimination against anyone who does not fit the heterosexual mould and can be suspected of a “deviant” sexual identity or orientation (LGBT). Toleration of discrimination in organisations of all kinds creates a permissive environment for harassment (Pina et al. 2009).

11) “POVERTY POCKETS” – High concentrations of poverty and social exclusion create environments of depleted resources and often high rates of crime, in which violence - for example, on the streets or in schools - becomes an everyday experience. Research indicates that being poor or having a low educational level do not in themselves lead to violence. Living in a neighbourhood or region in which material resources, access to education and to regular employment or to cultural resources are very low, and in which social exclusion via racism or structural discrimination prevail, does contribute to violence in everyday life and in families (Lee & Goerge 1999).

3.3. Micro-social Factors

Research on perpetrators quite often gathers data on family situation, social networks, attitudes and stereotypes, as well as context variables describing conditions under which violence is contemplated or actually exercised. Thus most of these factors emerge as empirical research results on more specific variables in the areas that have been most extensively studied. However, in the under-researched areas, reports from interviewing victims or from practitioners as well as agency-based material often points to very similar aspects. From an overarching perspective it thus made sense to interpret the scope of these factors broadly. In particular “rewards” and “opportunities” may represent very different elements of the situation for the different forms of violence, but they stem from a common root: Using violence is certainly not inevitable, but more likely when the potential perpetrator can foresee an advantage, benefit or satisfaction, and when it seems easy and impediments are missing. The factors are conceptually framed to convey a sense of this commonality.

12) “STEREOTYPES” – Gender-unequal values and norms in family or immediate social networks, including personally endorsed gender-stereotyped perceptions of what men and women, girls and boys, good mothers and their children “naturally” are or should be like. In modern societies there is a considerable range of variation in permissible gender-related values and norms, but the face-to-face context of interaction specifies what is accepted, admired, considered abnormal or actively sanctioned (Harway & O’Neil 1999). Peer groups and families as well as certain social environments can maintain or revitalise stereotypical thinking about gender and form pockets of resistance to modernity.

13) “OBEDIENCE CODE” – This factor characterises established and recognized methods of coercive discipline and strict normative expectations of obedience from children, and these are traditionally different for daughters and sons. Traditionally, the obedience code also applied to wives, but while traces still can be seen, it is no longer widely accepted as an explicit code in much of the European Union, although here, too, there are “pockets of resistance to modernization”.

14) “FAMILY STRESS” – Multiple sources of current stress for and in families are clustered together in this factor: social isolation; depleted resources; high family conflict and low family cohesion; intrafamilial escalation of conflict processes. Indicators of family stress appear regularly as significant variables in the research on child maltreatment (Stith et al 2009), but some part of intimate partner violence, especially in the form of situational couple conflict (Johnson 2008, Stark 2007) is related to a cumulation of stress factors. Although conflict behaviour under stress does not always involve abuse of power, the existence of unequal power relations is a context in which patterns of abuse emerge.

15) “REWARDS” – A wide variety of sources of satisfaction and perceived rewards for violence are included in this factor: the meaning thus differs somewhat depending on the kind of violence in focus. Rewards can be social recognition and admiration (for example for having proven oneself a man), simple profit or material gain, the satisfaction of having silenced an irritating family member and gotten one’s way, sexual or other kinds of pleasure. “Conducive contexts” offer rewards for practicing dominance or control. Rewards are one clear motive behind economically profitable forms of violence such as trafficking or child sexual exploitation. But for some perpetrators, the acts of violence are themselves rewarding. Men who commit sexual assault have not fewer, but more sexual partners than their peers, and may develop a preference for what they experience as rewards of sexual aggression – feeling powerful, in control (see Harrell & Castaneda 2009).

16) “OPPORTUNITY” – This factor covers context conditions that facilitate the use of violence towards selected target persons, including ease of access to potential/vulnerable victims. In his classic explanatory model for child sexual abuse, Finkelhor (1984) counted opportunity as a key factor. Rewards and opportunity are often flip sides of the same coin, but this is also an

independent factor: knowing that an act will have no consequences, or that there will be no effective resistance, can in itself lead to using the means that are easily at hand. A number of experimental studies on sexual coercion have found that many young men, when offered an imaginary scenario in which rape or sexual harassment would have no consequences for them, said that they would take advantage of the situation (see Lalumière et al. 2005). Opportunity can also consist in doing what peers or colleagues also do and expect (Kimmel 2008).

17) “PEER APPROVAL” – Peer groups (especially in adolescence) supporting anti-social behaviour or violence and reinforcing hostile masculinity and aggression constitute a factor at this level. While childhood experiences predispose boys in particular to aggression, peer-groups in adolescence that practice and reinforce antisocial behaviour have been found to mediate the development into sexual aggression as well as violence within the family (both intimate partner violence and child abuse) (Capaldi & Clark 1998). Adult peers can also constitute an environment conducive to violence. Several studies have found that men’s likelihood of perpetrating sexual assault co-varies with the level of rape-supportive attitudes among their peers (Harrel & Castaneda 2009).

3.4. Ontogenetic Factors

Research on the perpetration of violence has a strong bias towards individual psychology and development, and research results are often too readily taken to mean that causes have been identified. Nonetheless, it is an advantage that on this level, large data bases have accumulated, and advanced statistical methods can overcome the more simplistic interpretations that often influence public debates. Methodologically, it is possible to follow developmental trajectories, and future research may yield a better picture of the conditions under which certain factors do lead up to using violence; at present, these aspects in the development of individuals are to be understood as contributing factors.

18) “POOR PARENTING” – Growing up in families that are unable to offer basic care and secure attachment, childhood experience of unskilled parenting summarizes a range of deficits, including those resulting from a parent’s own history of maltreatment or abuse. Longitudinal studies suggest that neither having witnessed violence in the home as “model” for imitation, nor suffering direct violence by a parent is a robust predictor of later own use of violence, but failure of parental care does predict later violence (Capaldi & Clark 1998). Unskilled parenting may inhibit or damage the basic emotional security and the images of relationships that a child acquires, as well as reducing the capacity for empathy.

19) “EARLY TRAUMA” – Early exposure to violence in the home, to an abusive father-figure, or to other (sexual or nonsexual) abuse of trust, as well as other traumatic childhood experiences fall into this category (Black et al. 2001, Stith et al. 2009, Whitaker et al. 2008). Additional conditions must be added for childhood exposure to violence to translate into a propensity to use violence actively. Violence in the family of origin, often both witnessing abuse of the mother and experiencing maltreatment, raises the probability of antisocial behaviour patterns, especially among boys (Capaldi & Clark 1998, Lalumière et al. 2005). Girls are more likely to grow up believing that no-one can or will protect them, and some of them may later be unable to protect their own daughters.

20) “EMOTIONS” – Negative childhood experiences damage the basic capacity for attachment, but emotional disturbances can also arise from other sources. There is considerable research evidence showing correlations between the use of violence and personality dysfunctions, including emotional dysregulation, empathy deficits, inability to handle aggression and depressive-avoidant tendencies (Brown et al. 1998, Harway & O’Neil 1999, Harrell & Castaneda 2009, Miller-Perrin & Perrin 2007). Severe psychopathology is not included in this model, as it has a much more general impact on anti-social behaviour and is not specific to the forms of violence based on gender or generational inequalities.

21) “COGNITIONS” – Poor or hostile social information processing, cognitive distortions, strongly inadequate perceptions of children, women, or those different from self (Wendell 2005, O’Leary & Woodin 2009). Batterers have been described as living in a “bubble” in which the perspective of a partner never enters into the perpetrator’s perception of reality (Jukes 1999). Cognitive and affective misapprehension of a child’s behaviour or developmental needs may trigger maltreatment (Miller-Perrin & Perrin 2007). Hostile attribution patterns – a disposition to assume what others do or say is intended to provoke or show disrespect - can be already present or can, for example, follow from the inability to understand child behaviour or development. Cognitive distortions acquired during adolescent sexual socialization support notions that conflate coerced sex with consensual sex.

22) “MASCULINE SELF” – Hostile and defensive masculine self-concept, including approval of violence against women, general hostility towards women and/or need to prove self as a “real man”. This factor includes the research variable “hostile masculinity”, a significant predictor of violence against women and sexual orientation violence; it is often measured by scales of acceptance of the use of force and violence for men, rape-myth acceptance, and adversarial beliefs about the relations between women and men (Lalumière et al 2005, Gondolf 2002). Masculinity of self promotes self-absorption (Bancroft & Silverman 2002) and has a very negative impact on emotional development, suppressing empathy and encouraging externalized aggression.

23) “DEPERSONALIZED SEX” – This factor characterises antisocial sexual scripts and intimacy deficits, ensuing patterns of arousal by domination, predatory sex without regard for needs of the other (Kimmel 2008). Childhood experiences of sexual abuse, interpreted through the lens of constructing a masculine self, may contribute to a depersonalized sexual socialization oriented to conquest and control (Ward & Siegert 2002; Malamuth et al 2005), but they are by no means a necessary background element; peer socialization can be influential as well.

24) “STIMULUS ABUSE” – Alcohol or drug abuse, habitual or excessive use of pornography or other encouraging or disinhibiting means of self-stimulation can all contribute to one or the other form of violence. The mechanism here may be to stimulate mood change or heighten (sexual) fantasies. Social psychological research has established that the effects of consuming alcohol (chemically a depressant) depend very much on the consumer’s expectations of what the effect will be (Field et al 2004). Alcohol abuse is linked to physical violence, but (contrary to widespread opinion) not to rape (Harrell & Castaneda 2009) while pornography is linked to sexual violence (Vega & Malamuth 2007, see also Kindler et al. 2010). More specific connections are indicated on the path models.

4. Research knowledge on the perpetration of violence against women

In the review that follows, the research evidence on factors at play on the meso-, micro- and ontogenetic levels is presented separately for each form of violence. Knowledge about the macro-level factors was described above; their influence is broad and typically affects a range of different forms of violence.

At the end of each section, a table shows the conclusions drawn for constructing the model, attributing, with a brief explanation, a numerical value to each factor that has been shown to be influential in the research. Factors for which no adequate evidence, relative to the overall body of research on the topic, are not included in the table for that form of violence; they may, of course, nonetheless have a real significance that has not yet been sufficiently demonstrated.

4.1. Rape, sexual coercion and sexual assault

Research on perpetrators of sexual assault and rape is strongly concentrated on the psychiatric evaluation of convicted offenders. The focus is primarily on developing typologies with a potential for predicting the risk of recidivism and/or assigning offenders to appropriate or promising treatment (for a meta-analysis of treatment and recidivism studies see Hanson et al. 2009). As a rule, perpetrators with a sentence of at least two years belong to a minority of particularly violent rapists, many of whom have a criminal record for other violent crime, which will usually both support the credibility of the victim and influence sentencing. Not surprisingly, therefore, some prison-based studies find that those who have committed rape do not differ a great deal from those in prison for other violent crimes (see Lussier et al 2009).

A second major field of research are studies in the non-prison population, comparing men who report having used sexual coercion, or who score high on a disposition to use coercion, with those who do not; these studies are often in a laboratory setting, and the majority are carried out with US college student populations. This field of research has been fuelled in part by concern about reported high levels of rape, including gang rape, on college campuses (see for example Loh et al 2005).

Neither prison populations nor first-year college students are representative of the population of those who attempt or perpetrate sexual assaults or rape in general. Studies in community samples are infrequent (but see Abbey et al 2007). Thus, the reviews of these specialized areas are of limited value for assessing the problem in society as a whole.

A review of the research on perpetrators of rape published by the American Psychological Association (Lalumière et al 2005) focuses squarely on individual differences in male propensity for sexual aggression, reviewing in detail the empirical evidence with especial attention to methodological issues. In tune with recent trends in psychology, it also gives extensive consideration to evolutionary theory, not discussed in the present study because of its minimal relevance to policy. A more recent comprehensive overview of the state of the art in research on sexual assault was prepared by the RAND Institute for the US Department of Defence (Harwell & Castaneda 2009); in annexes to each section it provides abstracts of numerous studies. This compendium gives particular attention to factors at play in perpetration and thus provided a foundation for assessing the relevance of specific studies that offered elements of explanatory models. An edited collection of the leading European research on rape emerged from a series of seminars held by the British Psychological Association (Horvath & Brown 2009); regarding perpetration this research is most informative about attitudes and cognitions favourable to rape, and particularly useful in view of differences between US and European sexual cultures. In addition, some meta-analyses and prospective studies are available on specific issues. In these overviews, macro-level effects of normative masculinity and femininity in society are mentioned, but the general effects of media portrayal of women and sexualisation of violence have not been studied.

4.1.1. Meso level

Overviews of research on sexual violence frequently begin with a discussion of rape across cultures or in history, discussing different definitions of rape and/or attempting to dispel widespread "rape myths". The implication that larger social environments and institutions have a major influence on the probability of rape is less often pursued. As mentioned above, there is some evidence that the failure of institutions to apply sanctions plays a significant role. On the one hand, a number of studies have found that men are more likely to imagine themselves committing sexual assault in a scenario suggesting that it will have no negative consequences. On the other hand, the expanding research on college campuses points to rape-supportive attitudes (and rituals) in fraternities and sports teams (numerous studies compiled in Harrell & Castaneda 2009). Kimmel (2008) has accumulated substantial evidence for the failure of educational institutions to set limits or implement sanctions even in

cases of gang rape. However, Harrell and Castaneda assess the overall research picture as uncertain with regard to the role of social or formal groups (2009, 26). Lalumière et al give more weight to rape-prone characteristics of all-male groups or organizations, pointing as well to findings that “men who report sexual aggression are more likely to report that they have friends who support physical violence against women and who have been sexually aggressive towards women” (2005, 153) The high prevalence of rape perpetrated by armies or paramilitary groups also support the relevance of “social support and low likelihood of punishment” (156).

A cluster of attitudes that may rest on an ideology with meso-level sources is reflected in the empirical construct of “Right-Wing Authoritarianism”; it contains three co-varying attitudinal clusters: authoritarian submission to perceived legitimate authorities, authoritarian aggression and conventionalism. This cluster is related to preference for right-wing political parties and fundamentalist religious beliefs, as well as to beliefs concerning women’s place in society. Several studies have found that this set of attitudes in fact relates closely to self-reported past and potential future sexually coercing behaviour (Lalumière et al 2005). Although the RWA scale necessarily measures attitudes of individuals, it points to a significant role of organized social groups promoting intolerance and enforcing gender and sexual norms. Although no research has been published on the role of honour codes in this context, it seems probable that groups that seek to revitalise and uphold an authoritarian social order and a related gender regime with the aid of strict religious precepts may well contribute to sexual coercion.

Entitlement is a recurring concept in the research on sexual assault. A study on men in programs for intimate partner violence who have also raped their partners concludes that the men “believe they have a right or entitlement to sex within the partnership” (Bergen & Bukovec 2006). The research on attribution of blame in cases of rape (for example, Gerber & Cherneski 2006) showing that men attribute less blame to the perpetrator than do women points to a possible assumption of entitlement to sex in view of a woman’s appearance conduct or other situational aspects.

4.1.2. Micro level

For sexual assault as well as sexual harassment, the research literature suggests a confluence of the meso-level organized social environments and the micro-level experience of peer approval. This is in part due to the fact that much of the research on undetected perpetrators or potential perpetrators in a non-prison population has been carried out with North American college students, typically in a campus environment, where peer attitudes and the social organisation of college life are more closely interwoven than later in life. Harrell and Castaneda summarize: “men’s likelihood of perpetrating sexual assault depended on the level of rape-supportive attitudes among their peers” (2009, 26).

A recurring finding in the research on sexual assault is the salience of gender stereotypes and high scores on measures of adherence to traditional gender ideology. In their prospective study of risk factors for perpetration Loh et al (2005) identified “hypergender ideology” as one of the factors most closely related to actual sexually aggressive or coercive acts.

More specific stereotypes and cognitive schemas supporting sexual coercion have been studied with “rape myth acceptance” (RMA) scales, comprising beliefs that blame the victim, exonerate the perpetrator and cast doubt on claims of rape. In recent years, statistical problems with the classic RMA scales suggest that the myths may have changed, with beliefs justifying rape becoming more subtle and less blatant. A new “Acceptance of modern myths about sexual aggression scale” (Gerger et al 2007) has been tested in German, English and Spanish. Across a number of studies using either older or such more recent measures of rape myth acceptance, evidence accumulates in the European research that

these stereotyped notions increase men's proclivity to rape, especially when peers are thought to share them (Bohner et al 2009).

Opportunity appears to be a very relevant factor for some perpetrators of coerced sex. Lussier et al (2009) suggested that an anti-social lifestyle may present opportunities to rape. One influential typology includes the category of "opportunistic rapists", falling into the subtypes of 'impulsive' or 'predator' rapists, whose offences do not seem to arise out of a specific sexual orientation or compulsion; rather, they show a more general antisocial behaviour pattern of taking what they want when the circumstances permit. Other types are more likely to show callousness, anger, specific resentment of women or have sexual fantasies involving the use of force. (For a more detailed overview of typologies see Laufersweiler-Dwyer & Dwyer 2005). A special case of opportunity arises when a pattern of violence and coercive control is established in an intimate partner relationship, and sexual submission is easily forced (see DeKeseredy et al 2004, Stark 2007).

4.1.3. Ontogenetic level

While there are numerous empirical studies measuring individual variables that might be linked to sexual violence, they have not been synthesized statistically. This section of the review thus primarily follows two major research overviews and the work of authors who have published a substantial body of research as well as some recent studies of interest. Because of the fragmentation of the research fields (psychiatric assessment; comparative study of imprisoned criminals, college students), overall values for the effect size could not be obtained.

Personality traits

Studies of sexual assault have given relatively little attention to possible differences in personality. Attempts to identify differences between rapists and other groups on psychopathology have been largely inconclusive (Lalumière et al 2005). The most frequent trait taken into consideration in college or community samples is the capacity for empathy, which is sometimes found to differentiate between rapists and those using less physically violent forms of sexual assault (Joliffe & Farrington 2004, Abbey et al 2007). A study with a sample of 521 college men (Voller & Long 2010), comparing those who reported having perpetrated rape, with those reporting sexual assault, found a few differences in overall personality traits, mostly in the domain of agreeableness and conscientiousness, but no difference to those who reported neither. Since the studies with college or community samples depend on self-reported sexual coercion, as well as measuring empathy by self description, the overall conclusion at present is that – with the exception of anti-social generally violent sex offenders – personality traits are not reliable predictors of sexual assault.

Negative childhood experience

There is relatively little research on how the emotional climate in the family of origin or the quality of parental care impact on later sexual offending. Experiences of paternal rejection may result in the development of dysfunctional, coercive, and contradictory strategies for achieving emotional regulation, and thus to the use of sexual coercion. A study based on self-reports of 162 male Australian students supports the hypothesis that childhood attachment can play a role in the development of coercive sexual behaviour (Smallbone & Dadds 2000). The role of paternal attachment seems to be particularly important, but without further research this remains a suggestive hypothesis.

Violence in the family of origin

A main topic of research on sexual violence is the cycle of abuse notion, explaining sexual violence of adult men from the perpetrator having been sexually abused as a child. Most studies are "methodologically very weak", due to "overdependence on self-report and retrospective data" (Lalumière 2005, 135). This is particularly a problem when the sample is

recruited through the criminal justice system, since self-reported histories of victimization may favourably affect sentences and later probation. Hearn (1998) has analyzed in detail how popular psychology emerges in the explanations that men give for their violence against women, serving as excuses. In addition, as several authors remark, the cycle of abuse hypothesis fails to account for the fact that almost all perpetrators of rape are male, while most child victims of sexual abuse (especially within the family) are female.

Among studies that have tried to overcome methodological problems, a few have sought corroborative information on childhood sexual abuse. Widom and Ames (1994) found that only a small proportion of those sexually abused during childhood were later reported for committing any kind of sexual offence. In other studies, a link between past victimization and sexual violence perpetration was found for offenders with male victims, but not for offenders with female victims, suggesting that childhood sexual abuse is more likely to be a precursor of abusing of a male child than to committing rape or sexual coercion of adult women (Lalumière 2005, 136).

In a meta-analysis of studies comparing sex offenders against adult women either with non-sex offenders or with sex offenders against children, Jespersen et al (2009) found that sex offenders had a higher odds ratio (weighted average odds ratio = 3.36) of having experienced sexual abuse as a child than did those who had committed other kinds of offences (no studies had comparison groups with no criminal offence history). Twelve of the fifteen studies with comparative data found a lower rate of childhood sexual abuse among rapists than among perpetrators of sexual violence against children (odds ratio = 0.51). Childhood experience of physical abuse was more prevalent among sexual offenders against adult women (odds ratio = 1.43). The authors also see grounds to hypothesize that the connection between early sexual victimization and later sexual offending may be specific to those who abuse children, and perhaps even to those with a paedophilic sexual orientation. The association also seems to be stronger with adolescent sex offenders.

Experiencing either sexual abuse or physical abuse (or both) in childhood does seem to contribute towards adolescent anti-social behaviour. Indeed, in a 5-year longitudinal study White and Smith (2004) found that childhood victimization elevated the likelihood of rape perpetration only in when it began in adolescence. The influence of peer groups may be a key element in the development of attitudes supporting violence, hostility to women and callous, exploitative sexual scripts. This would help explain why the abused-abuser link does not hold for women at least with regard to sexual coercion of adults. It also may explain why current overviews of the entire literature (including studies with populations not involved with criminal justice) conclude that a direct link between childhood victimization and later sexual coercion has not been confirmed (Harrell & Castaneda 2009).

Attitudes, cognitions and beliefs

A central construct in the research on perpetrators is “Hostile Masculinity”, measured by scales such as

- General approval of the use of interpersonal violence for men,
- Rape myth acceptance
- Adversarial sexual beliefs (the beliefs that relations between women and men are fundamentally exploitative)
- Hostility towards women.

This seems to be the most frequently identified psychological correlate that can predict sexual assault perpetration (Vega & Malamuth 2007, Harrell & Castaneda 2009). Lussier et al (2009) include this under the concept of “hypermasculinity”. Note, however that Abbey et al (2007) found hostility towards women not a significant factor in their community-based research. The authors suggest that it may be more typical of peer-group bonding in college campus settings. More influence came from the enjoyment of sexual dominance, experiencing rape as power over women, as well as peer approval of forced sex.

While the composite factor itself is thus quite strongly confirmed, it is not at all clear what part is played within the overall construct by its various components. Included under the umbrella of “hostile masculinity” are

- distorted cognitions such as inadequate social information processing (taking a woman’s lack of interest in sex as a personal insult, thinking that woman dress deliberately to tease men, believing that women actually like rape once they are forced to submit),
- emotional dysfunctions such as hostility, displaced anger (feeling that women are deceitful and that it isn’t safe to trust them, being angry at women in general, desire to punish women or get revenge for being rejected)
- pressures and imperatives from a masculine self-concept (having to be in control, needing to prove oneself a man by having frequent sex with a variety of partners, able to be “tough” by way of violent action if necessary).

In a mediation analysis, Malamuth (2005) found that the mediating factors leading from hostile masculinity to sexual coercion were, on the one hand, coercive sexual fantasies (see aggressive sexual scripts below), and on the other hand, non-sexual physical violence in the relationship.

Aggressive sexual scripts and preferences

A major factor emerging in the research on rape perpetrators is the sexual orientation involved in seeking sexual satisfaction through coercion. It is well established by now that men who commit rape do not suffer from lack of other opportunity to have sexual intercourse; in fact, perpetrators have, on the whole, more sexual contacts than non-perpetrators. Overall, they tend to have become sexually active earlier, have more different partners, and to have both coercive and non-coercive sex.

From factor analysis of the empirical correlates of sexual aggression by non-convicted men in the general population (usually the North American college population), Malamuth and his colleagues have developed a “confluence model” in which one major path towards perpetration derives from a “promiscuous, non-committal, game-playing orientation towards sexual relations” (Vega & Malamuth 2007) (hostile masculinity being the key construct in the other path). Other authors refer to this as “calloused and/or aggressive sexual beliefs” (Harrell & Casteneda 2009), and in our model we use the terms “depersonalized sex” and “predatory sex” as well, to underline the indifference to the feelings, wishes or needs of the other person in a sexual encounter. There are no meta-analyses or longitudinal studies to provide a composite effect size for this construct, but it is increasingly being used and regularly found a useful predictor of sexual aggression⁸.

While the “Impersonal Sex” factor centres on indifference to the person behind the sexual object, there is a second orientation to be found in at least some perpetrators in which the coercion itself is a sexualized goal. Malamuth (2005) conceptualizes this as “sexual arousal to force” and draws on experimental studies in which the physiologically measured arousal of self-identified sexually aggressive men was increased when force was introduced into a sexual scenario. Lalumière et al (2005) use the term “sexual arousal to rape” and present a number of studies that confirm this phenomenon, not to be confused with sadism as a psychological disorder. They suggest that it may be related to antisociality, defined as the disposition to criminal, delinquent or violent behaviour in which the interest of others is disregarded for the benefit of the actor.

While “Impersonal Sex” has primarily been measured by questionnaires, arousal to force has been physiologically studied. It is not clear to what extent these two sexual orientations overlap, but it does seem that they are not fully identical.

⁸ Lalumière et al (2005), coming from a framework of evolutionary psychology and comparing rape to forced copulation in the animal kingdom, choose to call this factor “mating effort”, which seems to lose touch with the difference between seeking sexual pleasure and reproduction.

Alcohol and Drug Abuse

Victimization surveys regularly find that the majority of perpetrators have used alcohol prior to sexual assaults. Some studies have shown that the effects of alcohol on male sexual arousal depend in part on his expectancy of how it will affect him, and also on the actual alcohol dose. Zawacki et al found in a community sample that “men who committed sexual assault that involved alcohol stood out primarily in terms of alcohol-related behaviours and beliefs” (Zawacki et al 2003, 376). That is, they tended to believe that alcohol would increase their own sex drive and that a woman’s drinking is a sign of sexual interest. Their total consumption of alcohol per month was not higher than that of non-perpetrators. More crucial is perhaps the fact that young men frequently drink to encourage or facilitate alcohol intoxication of a woman who might otherwise refuse to engage in sex or resist coercion; this appears to be a widespread pattern, not only on North American college campuses.⁹ Some studies have focussed, indeed on how alcohol consumption makes women more vulnerable. According to Lalumière et al (2005, 151): “The association between alcohol use and acquaintance rape might reflect a somewhat more deliberate male tactic aimed at lowering female resistance.” Drug facilitation of rape became sufficiently visible in the US that a specific law was passed in 1996 setting a penalty of up to 20 years imprisonment. UK research points in addition to evidence that men may target women who are drinking, striking up an acquaintance in the expectation of sexual gratification. Lovett & Horvath (2009) also found in two independent data sets that the extent to which the perpetrator had been drinking varied considerably among different contexts in which rapes occur, being highest when the context was a social occasion or a personal relationship, while rape by strangers or in public places is very rarely associated with perpetrator use of alcohol.

As a result, it is unclear what the correlation between drinking and sexual assault actually means; this is indeed a classic case in which correlations reveal nothing clearly about the nature of the connection. “Perhaps the most striking result of this research is its inconsistency”, according to Harrell & Casteneda (2009, 38). A causal relationship between alcohol consumption and the perpetration of sexual assault cannot be confirmed.

Use of pornography as a habitual stimulus, by contrast, has been linked to sexual coercion in a number of studies. Oddone Paolucci et al (2000) meta-analyzed 46 studies on the effects of pornography. Consistent negative effects were found in all studies, and the magnitude was large. The average weighted effect sizes for sexual deviancy ($d = .65$), sexual perpetration ($d = .46$) and belief in rape myths ($d = .64$) yield a clear picture that exposure to pornography increases the probability of all these outcomes. The authors note that, with the spread of new media, it is becoming increasingly difficult to find control groups that have not been exposed to pornography for comparison.

Vega and Malamuth (2007) studied the effects of regular and high consumption of pornography. Their findings indicate that the impact is confirmed for men who already have a high risk of sexual aggression (based on the factors general hostility, hostile masculinity and impersonal sex orientation). Under these conditions, using pornography increases the risk that these men will actually perpetrate rape or sexual assault.

4.1.4 Main factors and their effect size, power or impact

Each factor was assigned a value (weak =1, moderate=2, strong=3) for the model based on the available research data relative to the research field.

⁹ The connection often seen between drinking and rape is often drawn out of studies that confirm the prevalence (especially in North American college campus populations) of persuading the target victim to drink; victimization research has documented this practice extensively. By contrast, there is evidence that physical abuse of a partner is more likely to follow after heavy drinking by the perpetrator.

Macro level	Assessed as
<p>DEVALUING WOMEN: is the factor that appears with the highest impact in all of the research; it permeates the factors on all other levels Second, there seem to be forms of mental illness or personality vulnerability that are relevant for the etiology of neglect in some caregivers.</p>	3
<p>MEDIA VIOLENCE: Effects difficult to isolate, especially today; but availability of images and narratives congruent with rape myths suggest women's availability, even willingness to be forced</p>	2
<p>MASCULINITY: Norms of heterosexual success and competition underpin rape-prone environments. Alongside 'possession' there are ideals of protecting women - rapists are not high in the masculinity hierarchy</p>	2
Meso level	
<p>FAILED SANCTIONS: Low likelihood of punishment is conducive to rape, and most rapes remain unpunished, but both formal and informal sanctions are today uneven rather than completely absent</p>	2
<p>ENTITLEMENT: repeatedly confirmed in studies, underlies assignment of blame to women not to men, supported by authoritarianism, applies to different types of rapists</p>	3
Micro level	
<p>STEREOTYPES: "Rape myths", notions of women who "ask for" or "deserve" rape, "hypergender" ideology, norm of masculinity for self and peers, beliefs that women exploit men</p>	2
<p>REWARDS: Coerced sex perceived to satisfy of various needs, such as sense of having power, earning admiration of peers, enjoying forced sex</p>	2
<p>OPPORTUNITY: Some are "opportunistic" rapists. In relationships of coercion and recurring physical violence, domination creates a permanent opportunity for rape</p>	1
<p>PEER APPROVAL: can mean incitement to rape or group rape (young men), but also reinforcement of hostility to women and rape myths, social support for being a predator</p>	2
Ontogenetic level	
<p>EARLY TRAUMA: For some perpetrators, physical abuse and rejection by a father figure predisposes to sexual violence</p>	1
<p>EMOTIONS: Typical correlates of sexual coercion: reduced capacity for empathy, hostility, displaced anger against all women</p>	1
<p>COGNITIONS: Aggressive sexual scripts, often acquired in adolescence, but also more generally distorted social information processing, misinterpreting women's behaviour</p>	2
<p>MASCULINE SELF: Pressures and imperatives to prove and confirm self, need for power and to be in control, self-absorption, distancing self from anything feminine, proving self heterosexual</p>	3
<p>PREDATORY SEX: Perceiving sex as conquest and object as quarry to be hunted, game-playing orientation; for some: sexual arousal by force, for others: indifference</p>	3
<p>PORNOGRAPHY ABUSE: Regular and extensive use of pornography raises probability that men already disposed to coercion will in fact act out the fantasies</p>	1

4.2. Intimate partner violence and stalking

There is a large body of empirical research on perpetrators of violence towards women who are or were their intimate partners. With the increase in routine court referral to treatment

programs in the US and UK a considerable number of men could be interviewed during and after this process. Although there are some population-based studies of self-reported violence, and some clinical studies collecting data on IPV from men attending other programs, the largest part of the research is thus related to the treatment context. Some longitudinal studies do provide evidence of factors contributing to abusive relationships, most of them testing hypotheses on the intergenerational transmission of violence (Capaldi & Clark 1998; Ehrensaft et al. 2003; Fals-Stewart 2003; Shaffer & Sroufe 2005; Lussier et al 2009). Additionally, two recent meta-analytic reviews could be accessed (Norlander & Eckhardt 2005; Stith et al. 2000). As these reviews do not cover the complexity of the issues, research evidence from the evaluation of treatment programs as well as other evidence from cross-sectional studies that analyze correlations is included. Where possible, effect sizes are given.

Since intimate partner violence both includes and goes beyond criminal law concepts of assault and bodily harm, it is will be useful to provide a research-based definition backed by considerable clinical evidence:

“A batterer is a person who exercises a pattern of coercive control in a partner relationship, punctuated by one or more acts of intimidating physical violence, sexual assault, or credible threat of physical violence. This pattern of control and intimidation may be predominantly psychological, economic, or sexual in nature or may rely primarily on the use of physical violence.” (Bancroft & Silverman 2002, 3)

Empirical studies in quantitative research most frequently identify IPV perpetrators by the fact of their being participants in court-mandated batterers' programs, or by police records or court convictions, and sometimes by self-reported use of physical violence against a partner.

4.2.1. Meso level

Men who exercise intimate partner violence are “a heterogeneous group” even when the research focuses on participants in treatment programs (Hamberger & Holzworth-Munroe 2009). After some decades of controversy about the prevalence, the nature, the scope and the sources of domestic violence, recent advances have made it possible to distinguish different types of violent relationships and of perpetration on the meso-level of analysis.

This has been an emerging process. Researchers such as Kelly (1988) and Hanmer (1996) substantiated definitions of violence that centred on women's fear and inability to control the situation, rather than on single acts. From in-depth interviews with men violent to known women (usually but not always wives, partners or girlfriends), Hearn (1998) uncovered the “incidentalisation” shared by both the institutions (police, social services, courts) and the men themselves, by which most of the ongoing violence in the relationship becomes invisible. The “incident” is isolated and physical, these men recognize it as violence only when it causes visible damage, and define it as an exception. Criminal law and most agency interventions tend to follow the same logic.

Most recently, Johnson (2008) and Stark (2007) have undertaken quantitative analyses of larger scale data sets to develop typologies, showing that most of the debates on domestic violence have failed to realize that different research approaches may capture very different phenomena, which must of necessity lead to diverging figures and relevant factors. Johnson presents three main patterns of violent relationships:

- intimate terrorism
- situational couple violence and
- violent resistance.

These distinctions have to do with general patterns of power and control, not with the ostensible motives for specific incidents of violence. Situational couple violence is probably

the most widespread pattern for physical assaults between cohabiting couples. It is highly variable, but does not involve an attempt to gain control over the partner or the relationship in general. Violence is situational, provoked during an argument or in the course of a conflict. The violence may be minor or singular or frequent, if the situation that provokes the violence is recurring, and even severe, depending on the situation: it can be initiated by either women or men, and there can be a wide range of degrees of harm resulting, from almost none to severe injuries. Family stress, economic or otherwise, disagreements about the children or the housework, and communication deficits can spark off fighting.

Cases of violent resistance are much less frequent; here, the violent person is violent but not controlling and is faced with a partner who is both violent and exercises coercive control. This kind of violence appears in attempts to escape a long-standing abusive relationship, and sometimes involves desperate actions such as killing the abuser.

By contrast, intimate terrorism – Stark (2007) prefers the term “coercive control” – describes violence embedded in a larger pattern of power and control that permeates the relationship, involving multiple control tactics over time, recurring to male privileges and devaluation of women in general. Whereas in fighting, couples use physical aggression to settle a conflict, in abusive relationships the perpetrator aims to suppress conflict or to punish a partner for some (real or imagined) transgression, using physical superiority; often the threat of violence is enough. This pattern of intimidation, isolation and control entraps women in a situation in which the violence is ever-present and often terrifying. It is an overwhelmingly gender-specific pattern, and even with the numerous laws and intervention methods that have been introduced, the institutions entrusted with preventing or prohibiting violence are often unable to take effective action. This in turn underpins the apparent entitlement of the man to dominate his partner. Hanmer’s definition of violence against women fits here: “being unable to avoid becoming involved in situations, and, once involved, being unable to control the process and outcome” (Hanmer 1996, 8). Most empirical research has not differentiated between these types of violence and motives of perpetration. Graham-Kevan and Archer (2003) could identify subgroups corresponding to Johnson’s typology in their data from 4 British samples. To date there are few studies on the factors at play in different types or patterns of violent behaviour (but see, for example, Tanha et al 2010).

As Stark points out, it is deceptive to call this violence domestic or intimate, it rests rather on a presumption of intimacy and the perpetrator’s perceived right to domesticate the victim. Around 80% of the battered women living together as a couple leave the batterer at least once, and the majority of partner assaults occur while partners are separated (Stark 2007, 115). Since the presumption of intimacy and of entitlement to control and submission continues, the risk of severe or fatal injury increases with separation. So does the risk of being sexually assaulted or even brutally raped by the former partner. Data from the US National Crime Survey show that separated women were assaulted 3 times more often than divorced women and close to 25 times more than married women (DeKeseredy et al 2004, 676).

According to Harway and O’Neil (1999) negative markers of difference contribute additionally to the likelihood of violence: Community violence, discrimination and cultural oppression may affect the probability of men’s using violence against women, as do racial, cultural, ethnic, class, age, economic, and sociocultural factors. Research on the influence of social environments of relative deprivation is not consistent. In a review of the literature on perpetration for the Australian government, Pease (2004) criticizes the lack of attention to social class and to working class community norms and pressures. Gondolf (2002) found that among the 840 men enrolled in four batterers’ programs, lower socioeconomic status was more frequent, but a fifth of the perpetrators were professionals, administrators or managers. European prevalence studies vary as to whether intimate partner violence is more frequent with lower socioeconomic status; in the German representative survey no correlation was found even after secondary analysis by severity of violence (Schröttle 2009). It is possible

that the influence of pockets of poverty and resource-poor environments are mainly relevant to situational couple violence. However, the criminogenic impact of environments of persistent deprivation, correlating with gender-based violence, may also be stronger in some regions of Europe than in others.

Little attention has been given in this research field to the relationships of coercive control and violence that are embedded in community-based honour codes or enforced gender regimes. When the community in question has a history of migration and can be interpreted as coming from a different culture, men's violences to women tend to be seen as something separate and different. On the whole, the similarities to intimate partner violence as it appears in the majority population are greater than the differences (Reddy 2008, Gill 2009). The forms, purposes and methods of coercive control and violence are very similar. Probably the most important differences are in the existence of an explicit honour code as opposed to an idiosyncratic private set of rules, and the active involvement of women as enforcers of rules. Nonetheless, "Western" men may also belong to religious or political groups that imagine themselves as upholding morals, honour and the decency of women collectively, while men in immigrant communities may use the ostensible framework of "honour" to enforce their personal wishes or interests. In the interactive path model honour-based control of women is shown as one of the paths leading up to partner violence.

4.2.2. Micro level

From an in-depth analysis of his clinical work with extremely violent men, Gilligan (2000) concludes that (gender-based) feelings of impotence and shame are a key factor in men's use of violence. Trigger for violence between men can be a perception that the respect due to a man is being withheld. Shame can have manifold concrete causes, from personal (e.g. the wife leaving him, perhaps exposing his dependency on her) to structural forces such as unemployment. However, the definition of what is shameful rests on gender codes, of which a code of honour is still an integral part in Western societies. Men are honoured for activity (ultimately violence), women are honoured for passivity, for not engaging in forbidden activities, and men delegate to women the power to bring dishonour on men. Thus, honour, shame and possible recognition or scorn by real or imagined communities such as family, friends, neighbours, work or drinking companions play a significant part in men's striving to control "their" women as well as in the use of violence whenever the control is threatened.

In their Australian study exploring men's experience of their violence towards their female partners James et al (2002) found men's experience of their violence to be inseparable from how they experienced their relationships with the partners. While these differed, both groups of men felt driven to use violence because of what they felt to be intolerable emotions of anxiety or anger from feeling humiliated or shamed.

Both externally caused stress and internal conflict in families doubtless play a part, especially in the likelihood of violence becoming chronic, but family stress can also emerge as one of the effects of violence. Stith et al. (2003) found that career or life stress had a moderately strong effect on male violence; this may apply primarily to situational couple violence. Johnson (2008) also cites evidence that family stress factors can trigger physical fighting.

Positive attitudes towards violence against women and traditional sex role ideology also contribute as factors promoting perpetration (Hamberger & Holzworth-Munroe 2009). This is supported by the meta-analysis of Stith et al. (2003) in which attitudes condoning violence ($r = .30$) are a strong correlate of being physically abusive.¹⁰ In addition, traditional sex-role ideology ($r = .29$) and anger/hostility ($r = .26$) are moderate risk factors for perpetration of physical violence against a partner.

¹⁰ Magnitudes of effect sizes range from very large ($r = .49$) to very small ($r = .01$). Mean effect size is $r = .22$.

4.2.3. Ontogenetic level

With the growth of research on perpetrators, it has become evident that intimate partner violence is learned behaviour that can be acquired by many different kinds of men with differing personal histories (see for example Kernsmith 2005, Gondolf 2002). Typologies of abusive men vary. Hamberger and Holzworth-Munroe (2009) select a model with three subtypes: borderline/dysphoric batterers, generally violent/antisocial batterers, and family-only batterers. They point out that typologies do not seem stable across studies, and may fail to recognize a continuum. Their main use is diagnostic: Abusive men with coexistent psychopathology may need different treatment from batterers with no pathology (as is the case for family-only batterers). Risk factor studies find associations of IPV with self-reported violence victimization in childhood, psychopathology/ distress/ antisocial personality disorder, and substance abuse problems.

Most of this research focuses on physical aggression only, either based on self-reporting in questionnaires, or classifying men as “batterers” when they have been recruited for research through (usually court-mandated) batterer programs. Empirical instruments for measuring coercive control are at an early stage of development (for one see Graham-Kevan & Archer 2003). A further difficulty is that reports of aversive childhood experiences are often retroactive, and among those already identified as perpetrators or sanctioned by the criminal justice system, may be biased. However, there are some longitudinal studies that have gathered data on early maltreatment or psychosocial risk conditions and later collected data on perpetration of violence into early adulthood (White & Widom 2003, Lussier et al 2009).

Negative childhood experience and violence in the family of origin

In a meta-analysis of 39 studies Stith et al. (2000) examine the relationship between growing up in a violent home and becoming part of a violent marital relationship. The findings suggest that there is a weak to moderate connection:

Relationship experiencing child abuse and perpetrating spouse abuse	mean $r = .16$, $p < .001$
Witnessing interparental violence and perpetrating spouse abuse	mean $r = .18$, $p < .001$
Gender of the respondent: Males growing up in a violent home are much more likely to become perpetrators of spouse abuse than are females.	men: mean $r = .21$, $p < .001$ women: mean $r = .11$, $p < .001$
Gender of respondent: Relationship between experiencing child abuse and becoming a perpetrator of spouse abuse was significantly stronger for men than for women.	men: mean $r = .19$, $p < .001$ women: mean $r = .10$, $p < .001$
Impact of setting on the effect size for the relationship between experiencing child abuse and later becoming a perpetrator of spouse abuse	community: mean $r = .11$, $p = .001$ clinical: mean $r = .27$, $p < .001$
Impact of gender of respondent on the effect size for the relationship between witnessing interparental violence and later becoming a perpetrator of spouse abuse	men: mean $r = .21$, $p < .001$ women: mean $r = .13$, $p < .001$
Impact of setting on the effect size for the relationship between witnessing interparental violence and later becoming a perpetrator of spouse abuse	community: mean $r = .11$, $p < .001$ clinical: mean $r = .35$, $p < .001$

In comparison with studies that have measured other variables, the effect sizes calculated in this meta-analysis are not large. The authors suggest that in general, growing up in a violent home tends to have a weaker relationship to being in a violent adult relationship than does having a positive attitude toward violence or a traditional gender attitude, but a stronger relationship than does having a masculine gender orientation.

With data from the prospective longitudinal “Oregon Youth Study”, Capaldi and Clark (1998) investigated the link between family process constructs – unskilled parenting and parental dyadic aggression¹¹– and the possible prediction of IPV in young men. The study population was recruited from schools in one neighbourhood with higher-than-average delinquency rate. Assessment was multiagent and multimethod, comprising parent and son interviews and telephone interviews, home observation including interaction tasks, school data and court records. 31% of the young men aged 18-19 had used physical violence against a female partner.

The interactions of five assessed factors were analysed directly and in several comprehensive models: (a) Parental antisocial behaviour leading to (b) parental dyadic aggression and (c) unskilled parenting, both leading to (d) boys’ antisocial behaviour leading to (e) IPV. Overall, there was a significant direct association between unskilled parenting and aggression towards the partner. In the ‘couple subsample’¹² all correlations found between above-mentioned factors were of moderate magnitude and significant at least at the .01 level, except for the correlation of parental dyadic aggression and IPV. Removal of parental dyadic aggression did not worsen the fit of the model. Unskilled parenting was thus more strongly associated than parental dyadic aggression with the young man's aggression toward his partner.

Parental antisocial behaviour is significantly associated with both unskilled parenting and especially parental dyadic aggression. According to the authors, “the findings support an association between unskilled parenting in late childhood and early adolescence and the son's aggression toward a female intimate partner in young adulthood that was mediated by the boy's antisocial behaviour in mid-adolescence.” They indicate that “researchers in the area of domestic violence have overemphasized the role of witnessing aggression between parents and underestimated the role of unskilled parenting in intergenerational transmission” (Capaldi & Clark 1998).

Widom & White based their study on longitudinal data of a group of disadvantaged children with court substantiated records of abuse or neglect below the age of 12, comparing their development with that of a matched control group, the first such study to follow victimized children into young adulthood. Both women and men who had suffered abuse or neglect were significantly more likely ever to hit a partner, and the connection seems to be mediated by antisocial personality disorder. For women, but not for men, alcohol abuse mediated the connections as well. Since only relatively non-serious forms of IPV were included, the results suggest that common couple violence may be more frequent when there is a background of neglect or abuse; even then, however, the authors conclude that in their findings, it is behaviour in adulthood – especially antisocial behaviour – that is most proximal to the perpetration of IPV, not the childhood victimization itself.

Anger and hostility

In a meta-analytic review, Norlander and Eckhardt (2005) evaluated whether the constructs of anger and hostility discriminated between IPV perpetrators and non-violent comparison males. Although some theoretical models suggest a relationship between anger arousal and IPV, the authors underline that anger does not cause aggression, and not all aggressive individuals are angry. Qualitative reviews suggest that batterers are angrier and more hostile than non-violent men, but do not seem to differ from generally violent men. An earlier meta-

¹¹ The latter was less well substantiated, and in 40 single-mother families this construct could not be measured.

¹² At age 18-19 young men who were in a partner relationship were invited to separate assessment as a couple.

analytic review found anger and hostility to be consistent predictors of IPV, though effect sizes vary strongly between studies and measures. In their own meta-analysis, Norlander and Eckhardt find that IPV perpetrators consistently reported moderately higher levels of anger and hostility than nonviolent men across assessment methods (i.e., self-report, observational, and spouse-specific) ($d+ = 0.47$, $p < 0.001$).

Effect sizes of hostility were significantly higher than effect sizes of anger. IPV perpetrators also consistently reported moderately higher levels of anger and hostility than relationship-discordant nonviolent men ($d+ = 0.60$, $p < 0.001$) showing that perpetrator's higher levels of anger and hostility are not just a result of marital distress. While the results of this meta-analysis imply that high measures of anger and hostility are distinguishing characteristics of IPV perpetrators, conclusions in respect of the functional and contextual relationship between anger, hostility, and IPV remain difficult: "If the question is: 'Are men with a history of [perpetrating] intimate partner violence angrier than relationally nonviolent men?' than the answer is a firm yes." (Norlander & Eckhardt 2005, 144). "However, if the question is modified slightly to 'Do anger and hostility problems differentiate violent from nonviolent men during relationship conflicts?', the conclusions become more equivocal."

If anger expression (insulting etc.) is assessed by observations of disputing couples or records of males' reactions while imagining such conflict, a link appears between anger and IPV. However, it is less clear whether IPV perpetrators subjectively experience higher levels of anger and hostility than nonviolent men. Thus, the question of a functional relationship between anger/hostility and IPV remains open, since it is empirically not clear if the relative risk relationship permits conclusions about the acute effects of anger arousal preceding discrete episodes of male-to-female violence. The authors add as a methodological caution: "serious questions concerning construct validity and external validity are raised if such relatively static data are used to make more dynamic conclusions about IPV perpetration." (Norlander & Eckhardt 2005, 145)

According to Hamberger and Holzworth-Munroe (2009), case comparison studies find that some – but not all – batterers have high anger levels, and there is an overall association between anger and physical aggression towards the partner. A number of recent studies also have found a pattern of hostile attribution bias, especially in situations of low or moderate provocation; that is not, however, the same as anger level.

Personality disorders

During a 7-year multi-site evaluation of intervention programs for batterers, Gondolf (2002) employed clinical measures of psychopathology and found little evidence of a prevailing "abusive personality" with borderline tendencies (as suggested by Dutton 1995). 40% showed narcissistic or antisocial tendencies confirming the key role of a sense of entitlement and suggesting that batterers are more likely to have an inflated sense of self than low self-esteem. A minority of his sample showed evidence of severe mental disorders, often major depression. Dispositional characteristics did not predict re-assault, but severe psychopathology and prior non-domestic violence arrests did. None of the psychological batterer types contributed to predicting re-assault. The author describes three types of batterers with low, moderate and high personality dysfunctions with two main profiles: Narcissistic-paranoid continuum ranging from moderate dysfunction to pathology (more than 60% of the batterers); avoidant-borderline continuum (26%), of which most are at a low dysfunction level, and a small portion with severe disorder.

The majority with narcissistic tendencies confirms the assessment of a number of research reviews that male violence is generally linked to threatened egotism; these men may have been socialized into "hyper masculinity", learning a sense of manhood that leaves them expecting and imposing their own way. Borderline-avoidant types may be manifesting sex role strain from the conflict between stereotypes and the difficulty in attaining them.

Hostile masculinity

In a meta-analytic review of studies of patriarchal ideology and IPV, Sugarman and Frankel (1996) computed effect sizes for domestic violence and attitudes toward violence, attitudes toward women, and gender orientation. They reported a medium effect size ($d = .71$, $r = .34$) for positive attitudes toward the use of violence, and small effect sizes for traditional gender attitudes ($d = .54$; $r = .26$) and for masculine gender orientation ($d = 2.20$; $r = 2.10$).

A construct labelled “hostile masculinity” or “hypermasculinity” is usually measured empirically in relation to IPV by positive attitudes towards violence against women and traditional sex role ideology; these contribute to the perpetration of violence against a female partner (Hamberger & Holzworth-Munroe 2009). This is supported by the meta-analysis of Stith et al. (2003) in which attitudes condoning violence ($r = .30$) are a strong correlate of being physically abusive. In addition, traditional sex-role ideology ($r = .29$) and anger/hostility ($r = .26$) appear as moderate risk factors for perpetration of physical violence against a partner. In an earlier study testing a predictive model for IPV, Stith and Farley (1993) found that traditional sex role attitudes (measured by the Sex Role Egalitarianism scale) and approval of marital violence as justified or acceptable in response to certain spousal actions correlated directly with the use of severe violence against the partner. While these variables fall more clearly into the area of stereotypes and cognitions, they may also be indicators of a masculinity ideal for the self.

Relatively little psychological research on IPV has measured all aspects of the hostile masculinity construct as it is used in the study of sexual assault, such as the measures of hostility to women and of negative masculinity. Santana et al (2006) note that the “Male Role Attitudes Scale” used to assess attitudes in their study omits a number of important elements such as relationship scripts, behavioural norms and adversarial perceptions of relationship between women and men. Ogle et al (2009) also point to the need to develop the construct of hostility towards women so as to measure different facets, since acceptance of spousal aggression seems to be distinct and separate from acceptance of sexual coercion.

Based on their empirical studies with different groups of violent men, Hearn and Whitehead (2006) argue that men’s subjective experience of the impossibility of achieving the “ideal masculine self” is a key motivation for violence against women. The female partner, simply by being a woman, exposes the man’s inability to conform to the ideal; violence neutralizes this threat temporarily by denying the woman agency. This results in contradictory needs: he may “oscillate” between seeking reassurance that he can conform to masculinity and wanting to receive the message that he does not need to do so. The authors suggest that this explains the contradictory behaviour of many batterers, the unpredictable “triggers” of violence and the emotional dependency on an abused female partner. This dynamic has little or nothing to do with the woman personally, but centres on the man’s relations to other men, that is, on his perception of his relative masculinity status.

Alcohol and Drug Abuse

Research reviews and meta-analyses regularly find significant correlations between alcohol use and IPV; the relationship holds across different measures and levels of aggression (Hamberger & Holzworth-Munroe 2009). Binge drinking and heavy drinking are more highly related to IPV than drinking frequency. However, there are few longitudinal studies to assess the nature of the association. Furthermore, in detailed perpetrator profiles based on tracking police records on a case basis over three years, Hester (2009) found that the majority of perpetrators abused alcohol to some degree, but also that police were more likely to arrest when alcohol was an issue.

A study by Field et al. (2004) explored the association between alcohol, violence-related cognitive factors and impulsivity. 965 respondents who were current drinkers were asked about IPV in the past year, approval of marital aggression, alcohol as an excuse, impulsivity, and expectations of becoming aggressive after drinking. More males than females approved

of marital aggression, alcohol as an excuse for misbehaviour and impulsivity. Those who responded that there was a strong or very strong chance that they would get aggressive after drinking were more than 3 times as likely to have perpetrated IPV in the past year, after controlling for age, gender, education, income and ethnicity.

In a longitudinal diary study, Fals-Stewart (2003) found that the odds of male-to-female partner physical aggression were 8 to 11 times higher on days when men drank than on days of no alcohol consumption. (The study included men in a domestic violence treatment program as well as men in an alcoholism program who had also abused a partner.) There was a strong correlation between drinking respectively drug use and incidents of IPV. The temporal sequence for the immediate incidents was confirmed: men drink or take drugs first, and then violence follows. There is insufficient evidence on the relevance of drinking classification, quantity, or frequency, but overall, a higher level of drug dependence is associated with greater risk of IPV. This finding supports a proximal effect model of alcohol use and partner violence.

This can be interpreted as pointing to a violence-inducing effect of intoxication, but it is equally compatible with models suggesting that men build up emotionally to a violent attack by drinking and brooding over the “wrongs” or transgressions they attribute to the partner. The effect of consuming alcohol may also be mediated through the psychopharmacologic effects of ethanol on cognitive processing or through expectations associated with intoxication.

In a literature review, Fals-Stewart et al (2009) further address the controversy on the link between IPV and substance use in general and search for causal implications. The authors conclude that some causal link between IPV and substance use is established, they conclude that alcohol and drug use are best considered “contributing factors” (see also Foran & O’Leary 2005 a).

In Gondolf’s study of batterers (2002) the abuse of alcohol also played a role: More than half of the men showed alcoholic tendencies, about 1/3 had severe behavioural problems associated with heavy drinking (fights, drunken driving, alcohol-related arrests), 26% showed evidence of alcohol dependence. Men with problem-drinker parents were more likely to show alcohol dependence. The most influential risk marker found was intoxication: Drunkenness made a man three and a half times more likely to re-assault, getting drunk nearly every day made him 16 times more likely to do so. However, the author notes that this does not necessarily imply a causal link, drunkenness may be a manifestation of an underlying need for power; and combined with previous violence it may identify unruly men with chaotic and violent lifestyles, or be an indicator of some deep-seated attitudes and behaviour.

Thus, while there are consistent findings of links between alcohol and IPV, this may not be a linear connection. In a hierarchical logistic regression model predicting injury to a partner Ehrensaft et al (2003) calculates the effect size for emerging adult substance use disorder as an odds ratio of 2.14.¹³ O’Leary and Schumacher (2003), reanalyzing US data from the National Family Violence Survey as well as from the National Survey of Families and Households, found a weak linear association between drinking and abuse, with very small effect sizes. Only with heavy drinkers and binge drinkers was there a strong association with male to female partner violence.

Stith et al. (2003) found illicit drug use ($r = .31$) a strong correlate of being physically abusive. Alcohol abuse ($r = .24$) was a moderate risk factors for men using physical violence against their partners. In a meta-analysis, Foran and O’Leary (2005 b) found a small to moderate effect size for the association between alcohol and male-to-female partner violence. However, effect sizes vary significantly as a function of the type of sample and the type of alcohol measure selected, and the association is stronger in clinical versus non-clinical

¹³ Classification of odds ratio: 1.68 = small; 3.47 = medium; 6.71 = large (Chen et al 2010).

samples. This supports the assessment of Gondolf from his evaluation of treatment programs that there is a small group of batterers with severe alcohol problems, and that programs need to screen for alcohol abuse.

4.2.4 Main factors and their effect size, power or impact

Each factor was assigned a value (weak=1, moderate=2, strong=3) for the model based on the available research data relative to the research field.

Macro level	Assessed as
DEVALUING WOMEN Coercive control based on entrapment and subordination of women and societal barriers to equality, socialization to a dependent role as wife and mother	2
IMPUNITY Legal prohibitions often cover only part of IPV, e.g. only single physical incidents, are inadequate after separation, or make unrealistic demands on victim to self-protect	2
MASCULINITY Masculinity mystique and value system make dominance an imperative, power over women core element of hierarchy among men	2
Meso level	
FAILED SANCTIONS Institutions fail to recognize manipulative strategies, fail to confront batterers, fail to challenge men' claims to privilege, assume violent partner can be good-enough father	2
HONOUR CODES Domination justified as culture, women made responsible for honour of family and preservation of tradition	2
ENTITLEMENT Evaluation research and clinical work with batterers point to beliefs in male entitlement to sex and services from women and priority of man's needs in the home	3
DISCRIMINATION Women, especially with children, have a weak and vulnerable economic and social position and less access to resources when on their own	1
POVERTY POCKETS Environments of structural disadvantage and social exclusion with poverty, high crime rates, discrimination of minorities generate high rates of antisocial behaviour	2
Micro level	
STEREOTYPES Notions of respected husband and provider, good wife, good mother, negative stereotypes of women as deceitful, unfaithful	2
FAMILY STRESS Frequent context for couples: fighting over money, division of labour, children may develop into a pattern of male domination and battering	1
REWARDS Especially for men, resorting to violence is often successful in getting their way in the short run	2
OPPORTUNITY Disposition to use violence encounters few impediments in own home, wives and partners "easy targets"	1
PEER APPROVAL Antisocial peer groups in adolescence bolster self-esteem and establish use of violence; need for recognition by real and imaginary collectives directs violence against partner	3

Ontogenetic level	
POOR PARENTING Growing up in a home with parents failing in essentials of caring predisposes boys to adolescent antisocial behaviour, together strongest predictor of IPV	3
EARLY TRAUMA Being exposed to a batterer in childhood (both physical violence and devaluation of mother) or having been abused physically may contribute to later IPV	1
EMOTIONS Disposition to hostility and anger, inflated self-esteem, possessiveness, incapacity to recognize perspective of others in the intimate relationship (partner as extension of self)	2
COGNITIONS Traditional sex role ideology, hostile attributional bias and interpreting all actions of partner in relation to self, belief that men have to defend interests with violence	1
MASCULINE CONTROL Socialization fails to challenge self-absorption and self-centred attitudes in boys, hyper-masculinity, over-concern with masculinity ideals, being in control and getting respect	3
ALCOHOL ABUSE Alcohol, drug abuse both contribute to use of physical violence, excuses, also habitual technique of brooding over sense of being wronged, building up to battering incidents	2

4.3. Honour-based violence and forced marriage

The term “harmful traditional practices” established in UN documents on violence against women can be justifiably questioned, since practices harmful to women such as wife abuse and rape have been embedded in the dominant cultures of Europe for many centuries. Furthermore, many of the laws that lend the practices now seen as “traditional” their backing by the power of the state were in fact established under colonial rule, even making use of the British, French or Italian Penal Codes of the time. It can thus be argued that the European colonial powers played a key role in raising local or tribal practices of the domination of women to country-wide legitimacy (see Welchman & Hossain 2005). In addition, as Gilligan (2000) and other authors have shown, concepts of male honour and of the need to control women to prevent them from bringing dishonour on men or families are still deeply rooted in Western civilisation, despite the concept itself falling into disuse.

4.3.1. Meso level

For the present study, the common characteristics of honour-based violence and forced marriage¹⁴ is that they are typically exercised by or with the approval of families or within communities whose members immigrated from outside the EU at some time, and that they are justified with reference to traditions and sometimes legal frameworks in these countries of origin. Their justification is based on the view that controlling women and in particular preventing them from any sexual (or other) autonomy is necessary for the good of the collective (for example the family). While the reference to traditions and cultural values may be, and indeed often is, invoked as an excuse by individual men for personally motivated acts of violence, as well as covering material motives such as securing an immigration permit, the frame of reference tends to ensure that even the most selfishly motivated perpetrator can call upon the collective for support, especially when the immigrant group or minority in question experiences discrimination and social exclusion within the EU Member State where they reside.

¹⁴ Female genital mutilation is included in the feasibility study, but no research was located on perpetration among residents of the EU.

4.3.2. Micro level

There is no empirical research on why some families or segments of a minority community living in an EU Member State choose to exercise these forms of violence while others do not. Explanations calling the practices “cultural” or “religious” block any attempt to discover the differentiating factors from the start. Research on perpetrators poses both ethical and practical difficulties. From the existing literature, based either on practitioners working with communities in which these practices occur, or victimization studies, only the normative elements creating a conducive environment for the practices can be derived. On the macro-level they involve strong patterns of dominance-oriented masculinity and subordination of women, on the meso-level of communities they refer to collectively enforced honour codes and strict normative expectations of obedience from children (and in particular, young women in adolescence, who can be subjected to a wide range of forms of violence legitimated by codes of honour and obedience). In the dominant cultures of most EU countries, such norms for obedience can best be captured at the micro-level, since they are no longer widely considered valid; the same is true of personally held gender stereotypes. In minority communities these, too, may be more correctly considered meso-level factors. No research could be located on perpetrators on the ontogenetic level.

4.3.3 Main factors and their effect size, power or impact

Each factor was assigned a value (weak=1, moderate=2, strong=3) for the model based on the available research data relative to the research field.

Macro level	Assessed as
DEVALUING WOMEN In majority and minority cultures, codes of honour rest on gender codes that make women’s value dependent on their subordination and obedience to restrictions	3
CHILDREN’S STATUS Daughters (and sons) required to follow family dictates including marriage, tolerated as cultural tradition despite legal norms	2
IMPUNITY Laws have loopholes permitting disregard of women’s and children’s rights especially for minorities and immigrants with insecure residence status	1
MASCULINITY In majority and minority cultures masculinity mystiques and value systems demand respect for male dominance and power over women	3
Meso level	
FAILED SANCTIONS Violence justified as cultural tradition, leading to institutions failure to respond or protect	1
HONOUR CODES Women and girls subjected to severe restrictions and violence to prevent independent social participation or sexual activity, men exercising violence find collective support	3
ENTITLEMENT Fathers and husbands entitled to submission of women and girls to both collective and individually imposed rules and restrictions as well as to services for their wishes	2
Micro level	
STEREOTYPES Strong gender stereotyping legitimates norms of honour codes	2
OBEDIENCE CODE Girls and boys expected to obey adult males in the family implicitly	2

Ontogenetic level	
No research data available	

4.4. Trafficking

4.4.1. Meso level

Although the Council of Europe Convention on Action Against Trafficking in Human Beings (THB) gives an internationally binding definition, European policies and legal instruments for combating trafficking until today are influenced by discourses about prostitution, migration, and women's victimization. There is no research on perpetrators. Most literature refers to research on clients of prostitution, mingling the purchase of sexual services with the organisation of THB (for example Siegmund 2006, Schauer 2006).

Trafficking is primarily discussed in terms of (illegal) migration, prostitution or violence against women (O'Connell Davidson 2006).

- If the focus is on migration, THB is explained in economic terms, for example the breakdown of markets in Eastern Europe, the north-south-divide, aspects of supply and demand. But – as O'Connell Davidson indicates – the demand is for cheap sexual services or dependent / subjected workers, not for trafficked persons.
- If the focus is on prostitution, THB is explained as a result of male oppression and the demand for "exotic" women or cheap sex.
- If the focus is on violence against women, similar to prostitution THB is explained by male dominance and the need of men to exert power over subordinated women and practice violence respectively violent sex.

Research on trafficking consists almost exclusively of studies or case studies on victims or on police and justice intervention (Herz & Minthe 2005, 190; Dasi Hamke Center 2006, Rolf 2005; Geisler 2005; KOK 2008, Helfferich et al 2010). Data about perpetrators is only available from the victim perspective or from police perspective.

Police statistics and the UNDOC reports on trafficking in persons document information about (identified or suspected) perpetrators differentiated by age, gender and nationality, linking this statistically with nationality of the victim, but there is no data available on the perpetrator-victim relationship or perpetrator motivation.

While it is evident that recruitment of women for trafficking is most successful where there is a high concentration of chronic poverty and a lack of economic opportunity even at the survival level, the perpetrators in the countries of destination are not driven by poverty; trafficking is very profitable. Internal trafficking is a pathway into prostitution, and the research on prostitution indicates that this can target young girls from all social milieus escaping families in which there is violence or a high level of chronic conflict, or who have been drawn into drug dependency. Again, poverty or lack of resources is not a significant factor leading to perpetration, but only in regard to victimization.

Age and gender of perpetrators from police data

Research from Germany points to a perpetrator profile of young men: The average age in Germany was 33 years (Herz & Minthe 2005, 93). The report from the national rapporteur from the Netherlands confirms these findings: 70% of registered suspects were between 18 and 40 years old, the average age was 33 years, convicted offenders were even younger (Dettmeijer-Vermeulen 2008, 19 ff). In both countries the majority of perpetrators were born in Germany resp. in The Netherlands (see also Rolf 2005, 77).

Offenders are mostly male: 83% in The Netherlands (Dettmeijer-Vermeulen 2008, 24) and 85% in Germany (Herz & Minthe 2005:115). There are differences between the countries of origin: Few of the Dutch or German suspects were women, but more than 38% respectively 36% of the Bulgarian and Romanian suspects, and even 78% of the Nigerian suspects were women (Dettmeijer-Vermeulen 2008, 24).

Organisation of perpetrators

Perpetration of THB is often discussed in the media and by police in terms of organized crime (Sieber & Bögel 1993; Paoli 2003; Hofmann 2002). This is of high interest to police and law enforcement but it is only one side of the problem.

Research from Switzerland comes to the same conclusion: Organized crime is involved in THB but the dimensions and the talk about the mafia controlling the market are a myth. Perpetrators are mostly organised in small networks of acquaintances and family members of the victims (Moret et al 2007, 53; see also Geisler 2005, 103; Wijers & Lap-Chew 1997,113).

4.4.2. Micro level

A recent interview study with 53 victims of trafficking for sexual exploitation in Germany (Helfferrich et al 2010) gives detailed information on victim-perpetrator-relationship, the ways they met and the trafficking was organized. The results show a complex picture with organized crime being only a small part of perpetration.

- There are perpetrator networks, but they are not always organized crime. Often they are just bilateral, private business connections, family networks or small groups of people from the same region or village.
- Perpetrators are mostly men, but a significant number of women are involved. THB concerning women from Africa is organized by men in the home countries and by women in Germany. Thai women are involved in organizing brothels for trafficked women from Thailand, and women in east European countries act as “friends” of the victims, help avoid problems until the victims are at the place of destination, and profit economically.
- There is an overlap with domestic violence. Quite a number of victims were trafficked and forced into prostitution by their husband or lover. Very often these cases are not recognized as THB by police and justice system.
- There is an overlap with family violence. Some young women had been trafficked and exploited by family members.
- Organized crime – when reported – was described as typical red-light-organizations and/or motorcycle clubs. But here too there is an overlap with domestic violence.

4.4.3. Ontogenetic level

The literature does not give first hand information about the motivation of traffickers. From the victim’s perspective the motivation of perpetrators was simple and clear: Earning money in a most effective way (Helfferrich et al 2010). Violence was used in some cases for control and surveillance of the women. In some cases victims described additionally sadistic motives for excessive violence (Helfferrich et al 2010).

4.4.4 Main factors and their effect size, power or impact

Each factor was assigned a value (weak=1, moderate=2, strong=3) for the model based on the available research data relative to the research field.

Macro level	Assessed as
DEVALUING WOMEN is fundamental to the existence of a market for trafficked women	3
IMPUNITY While all EU countries have laws against trafficking, the requirements for identification do not cover all cases and many laws set unrealistic requirements for prosecution	1
MASCULINITY as a societal structure constitutes the market and legitimizes meeting the demand by procuring trafficked women	1
Meso level	
FAILED SANCTIONS Failure to identify victims as such, summary deportation of many victims, failure to ensure safety and support if victims testify	2
POVERTY POCKETS Informal networks may have their origins in the poverty of source regions, and formerly trafficked women may choose perpetration to escape their victim status	1
Micro level	
REWARDS The main known motive of traffickers is the considerable financial gain it offers	3
OPPORTUNITY Traffickers have flexible strategies to identify de facto openings for their illegal procedures as well as adjusting delivery to demand	2
Ontogenetic level	
No research data available	

4.5. Sexual harassment

4.5.1. Meso level

According to the recent literature review of Pina et al (2009) the importance of a permissive environment for sexual harassment is indisputable. The authors find considerable support for the predominant role of organizational factors for the risk of sexual harassment, as do Willness et al (2007) in their meta-analysis of antecedents and consequences of workplace harassment. The model proposed and tested in several data sets by Fitzgerald, suggesting that organizational climate and job gender context are critical antecedents of sexual harassment (Fitzgerald et al 1997), is supported by these more recent reviews.

Organisational tolerance is defined by the absence or ineffectiveness of organizational complaint procedures and remedies and by victims' assessment of the organization's willingness to investigate reports of harassment or provide redress. Job gender context is composed of gender traditionality of the job, gender ratio in the work group, and gender of supervisor; when these are predominantly masculine, harassment is more likely (Hesson-McInnis & Fitzgerald 1997).

4.5.2. Micro level

In the school-based study by Fineran and Bolen (2006), greater cultural and personal power also contributed to the perpetration of harassment by boys, but not by girls. An in-depth qualitative study with students in Australian schools describes harassing girls as an expected gender performance for boys that relates to issues of relative power within the male peer-group. Boys freely admitted to harassment as an everyday practice, frequently characterized as "just a joke" or "normal", while girls described many of the practices as deeply hurtful (Robinson 2005). These results suggest that harassment is learned in adolescence as a component of group solidarity and gaining peer approval, and that boys who reject or avoid

such practices can be at risk of being labelled homosexual and targeted for harassment or violence themselves.

Within the prospective, longitudinal Youth Development Study, with initial data from 1988, Uggen and Blackstone (2004) added questions on victimization by sexual harassment in the 1999 survey wave, and then contacted a subset of participants who had experienced some form of harassing behaviour at work for in-depth interviews. While these data could not tap the motives of perpetrators, they did confirm the links to masculinity and workplace power.

4.5.3. Ontogenetic level

“Conspicuously missing from the research data are studies on the characteristics of sexual harassers” (O’Donohue et al 1998, 123), an assessment that is still largely accurate. Reviewing what is available to date, different studies have come to different conclusions concerning the socio-demographic characteristics of perpetrators of sexual harassment, some finding perpetrators to be more likely to be married, older and more educated than their victims, while other studies found harassers to often be subordinates or peers of their victims. The present state of research seems to be that no typical profile exists and that sexual harassers appear to come from all social strata, occupational levels, and age categories.

One study with a community-based college sample of 104 men (Begany & Milburn 2002) found that the personality characteristic of authoritarianism, measured by the Right-Wing Authoritarianism scale, predicted higher scores on the “Likelihood to Sexually Harass” scale. (The scenario offers a non-violent opportunity to exchange benefits for sexual favours.) Support for rape myths mediated the relationship between authoritarianism and likelihood to harass, as did hostile sexism (a construct very similar to “hostile masculinity”). Authoritarianism is hypothesized to result from harsh, punitive child rearing. The authors conclude that harassment belongs to the same continuum as sexual assault.

A recent school-based study with 707 adolescents is of particular interest for exploring the emergence of harassment, including both perpetration and victimization experiences as well as substance use, violence in the family of origin, and other possible contributing factors (Fineran & Bolen 2006). Only a small minority both of girls and of boys had never experienced sexual harassment. Although generally, prior victimization increases the probability of perpetration (studies of physical violence in schools have found a similar pattern), in multivariate data analysis the risk factors for perpetration differed by gender. For girls, perpetration was more often a result of prior victimization, but becoming a victim of harassment was more likely when they had been exposed to violence in the family. For boys, victimization in the family made it more likely that they will actively perpetrate harassment at school, while having been a target of harassment by girls was more likely to follow upon the boy having been an active harasser. The path analysis thus shows that all influential factors, including substance use, converge for boys on perpetration, which may lead to their being the target of retaliatory victimization. For girls, the influential factors (family violence and victimization, substance use) converged onto victimization, which in turn could lead to perpetration. The authors conclude that the key point of protective school intervention would be to reduce boys’ perpetration of harassment.

Measures for the likelihood to harass exist and some limited research has been done on the personality traits and characteristics of those who score high on sexual harassment proclivity. Some studies suggest a similar pattern of belief in rape myths, hostile masculinity with acceptance of violence towards women, and callous sexuality to that associated with sexual assault. However, as Pina et al (2009) remark, sexual harassers are rarely interviewed, and measures of proclivity among college students do not offer a strong foundation for prediction of harassment. This is especially the case as the literature suggests that men who score high on measures of a proclivity to harass will not actually do so unless

they find themselves in a work environment that encourages such behaviour; the social climate permissive of harassment seems to be a necessary condition for it to occur (Willness et al 2007).

Lack of research on harassers and evidence that harassment crucially depends on organizational climate and meso-level conditions led to a decision not to assign values to factors on the ontogenetic level in the model.

4.5.4 Main factors and their effect size, power or impact

Each factor was assigned a value (weak=1, moderate=2, strong=3) for the model based on the available research data relative to the research field.

Macro level	Assessed as
DEVALUING WOMEN has a general influence on perceiving women at school or at work or elsewhere not as people doing their jobs but as sex objects	2
IMPUNITY Harassment is not directly liable to criminal penalties, but the responsibility for sanctions and redress lies solely with employers in most states	1
MASCULINITY Societal acceptance of men accosting women and pressing for sexual compliance as a normal expression of male sex drive; this framing is to be found in research as well	2
Meso level	
FAILED SANCTIONS Depend on employers and watchdogs such as trade unions and vary, none at all for harassment outside work context in most states, women mostly expected to cope	3
ENTITLEMENT Most harassment ensues from the harassers assumption of having a right to do so	2
DISCRIMINATION Highly masculine job gender context is a direct consequence of past and usually persisting discrimination against women entering certain (usually better paid) jobs	3
Micro level	
STEREOTYPES Frequent assertion that women like being accosted sexually, belief that it is a normal way for men to call attention to self, for some men, hostile negative images of women	2
OPPORTUNITY Disposition to harass is acted upon when organisational climate is permissive, lack of clear preventive policies creates opportunity	2
Ontogenetic level	
No research data available	

4.6. State of the research, its limitations and its utility for policy development

There is a wealth of research on the different forms of violence against women, most of which gives some consideration to the perpetrators, largely from the perspective of those who have interviewed or given advice and support to victims. Thus, the primary focus of much of the literature has been on describing how the forms of violence were perpetrated, under what conditions and circumstances, and with what effect on the victims' lives, well-being and enjoyment of fundamental rights. Practical and clinical experience confirms that victims can give a fuller picture of the violence and of the enabling context as well as being the most reliable sources for estimating the risk of future danger. Nonetheless, the state of research knowledge about perpetrators could and should be improved.

For many years, research with perpetrators in the general population was considered to be difficult or impossible, on the assumption that men would not admit to having committed crimes of violence against women. Thus, studies of perpetration have been primarily based on subgroups that have been convicted, penalized, or mandated to accept treatment to change their behaviour. These subgroups are not usually typical of the general population of perpetrators, although mandatory arrest policies and referral to batterers' programs has raised the level of representativity somewhat for this form of violence. In particular, there are whole arenas of violence perpetration about which practically nothing is known, because there are no groups in treatment programs. Overall the scope and extent of research on perpetration has tended to follow the development of treatment programs and methods, meaning that policy is only informed about the sub-groups of perpetrators that existing measures already capture.

In recent years, it has become clear that if confidentiality and anonymity are secured – computer supported self-interviewing can be a very effective tool to this end – large proportions of the male population admit to having perpetrated sexual assault, even rape in the narrow sense of coercion by use of force, and physical violence against an intimate partner. Such studies in North American and Australia may report that one third to one half of the men in the sample confirmed having perpetrated such clearly illegal acts.

This suggests that the widespread notion that assessment of prevalence can only be done by victimization surveys, and that representative knowledge about perpetrators is unlikely, may be obsolete. Without doubt, considerable methodological attention must be given to encourage the fullest possible reporting of the various forms of violence by perpetrators, and researchers need to be aware of tendencies to minimize or not to recognize acts that do not cause immediate physical harm, but it would doubtless be possible to measure and control for such tendencies, just as social science research has long controlled for the tendency to give socially desirable responses in other areas. Although there will certainly be under-reporting, it is simply not true that men will not talk about the violences that they commit in their relations with women.

Important as it is to make the voices of victims heard and to understand the full extent of their entrapment, endangerment, degradation and exclusion from rights, investing in high quality research on perpetrators, recognizing how and why perpetration of violence against women is embedded in everyday life, could be a key area of future research that can help to move the EU towards meeting the challenges of overcoming gender-based violence. Such research can only be fruitful if it builds on the body of knowledge that has accrued over the past 30 years, rather than standing in competition to it.

5. Research knowledge on the perpetration of violence against children

5.1. Introduction

The literature on child maltreatment indicates that different forms of maltreatment (sexual, physical, psychological abuse, neglect) need separate analysis. Based on recent meta-analyses and reviews of the literature, relevant risk factors for each form of abuse were excerpted. The selection criteria for risk factors were: Replication in a least two longitudinal studies and/or a computed composite effect size $\geq .10$ based on all available studies including cross-sectional studies (Kindler 2009a; Stith et al, 2009). The resulting list of risk factors is probably not exhaustive. There are some possible risk factors that have not been studied. The decision to focus on longitudinal studies and meta-analytic results was made in order to present the best available evidence. Replication and at least a small effect size are necessary criteria for policy relevant research synthesis. In addition temporal order is a

prerequisite of true risk processes. Nevertheless it must be mentioned that, as some variables ordinarily co-vary, it is difficult to exclude third-variable effects (Rutter et al. 2001).

5.2. Child physical and psychological abuse

Child physical abuse can be defined as behaviour by a parent or a caregiver resulting or being likely to result in non-accidental injury to the child. Although this is the predominant definition, there is some inconsistency across studies. Corporal punishment as such does not fall under the definition of child abuse, but is sometimes considered as a proxy variable for child physical abuse.

Child psychological abuse as a distinct type of maltreatment is more difficult to define. There is much inconsistency in the literature, and psychological abuse has received only marginal research attention. For their review of research on child psychological abuse Black et al (2001) identified only seven studies for inclusion. Some authors define psychological abuse narrowly by scores for verbal aggression towards the child; focussing only on one specific behaviour. Another approach uses records from child protective agencies and other mandated reporters such as teachers.

Due to lack of consistent research, the present review focuses on child physical abuse, but it should be noted that an important form of child maltreatment is thus missing.

5.2.1. Meso level

Research has examined community and cultural variables as well as socioeconomic factors primarily on the level in which they affect neighbourhoods or the life situation of families. The following factors, while grounded in overall conditions of society, have been considered in empirical research on the meso-level of their influence.

Poverty /welfare, socioeconomic status, unemployment

Meta-analyses		
Stith et al. (2009)	composite effect size - SES	$r = -.14^{15}$
Stith et al. (2009)	composite effect size - unemployment	$r = .15$
Longitudinal studies		
Altemeier et al. (1984)	In a study with a low-income sample 'left job in the last year' turned out as a weak but significant risk factor for child physical abuse	correlation: $r = -.08$
Chaffin et al. (1996)	examined community data and found the number of people living in the household to be a weak but significant risk factor for self-reported child physical abuse	odds ratio: 1.13^{16}
Brown et al. (1998)	In a 17-year prospective study with a community sample, living on welfare was found to be a moderate predictor of physical child abuse	odds ratio: 3.74
	Also low maternal education was found to be a weak predictor of physical child abuse	odds ratio: 2.59

¹⁵ classification of effect sizes: $\geq .10$ = small; $\geq .20$ = moderate; $\geq .30$ = large (Stith et al., 2009)

¹⁶ classification of odds ratio: 1.68 = small; 3.47 = medium; 6.71 = large (Chen et al., 2010)

Pears & Capaldi (2001)	with a sample of families residing in a high crime area and raising a son found SES to be associated with physical child abuse. Abuse in parents' childhood mediated the relationship between SES and abuse of next generation	effect size not available
Sidebotham et al. (2002)	In this prospective community study paternal and maternal unemployment, council housing, overcrowding and not owning a car were associated with child maltreatment (maltreatment forms not differentiated)	odds ratios: 2.33, 2.82, 7.65, 2.16, 2.33
Windham et al. (2004)	found an association between poverty level and later physical abuse in a risk sample.	composite effect sizes: not available
	The same was true with low educational level as a predictor	composite effect sizes: not available
Sidebotham et al. (2001)	In this community study mother's and father's educational level were associated with child maltreatment (maltreatment forms not differentiated); odds ratios	odds ratios: 2.61, 3.58
Factors that have been tested in a meta-analysis but found to be not relevant		
Stith et al. (2009)	parent gender	composite effect size: $r=.07$
	approval of corporal punishment	composite effect size: $r=.05$
	child gender	composite effect size: $r=.04$
	child age	composite effect size: $r=-.02$
	parenting stress	composite effect size: $r=.07$
	non-biological parent in home	composite effect size: $r=-.03$

5.2.2. Micro level

There is a quite uniform finding that children living in stressed families with depleted resources have a higher risk of experiencing physical maltreatment; however, effect sizes are not very large, suggesting a situation x person model.

Several small children to care for

Meta-analysis		
Stith et al. (2009)	family size	composite effect size: $r=.15$

Longitudinal studies		
Altemeier et al. (1984)	found with a low-income sample that 'two or more children under 5 to care for' acted as a weak but significant risk factor for child physical abuse	correlation: $r=.10$
Ovwigo et al. (2003)	Number of children in home' was a significant but weak predictor for child abuse and neglect in a sample of families in poverty	odds ratio: 1.1

Partner/family conflict, partner violence, marital satisfaction

Meta-analyses		
Stith et al. (2009)	family conflict	composite effect size: $r=-.39$
	marital satisfaction	composite effect size: $r=-.16$
	spousal violence	composite effect size: $r=.22$
Longitudinal studies		
Brown et al. (1998)	In a 17-year prospective study with a community sample 'poor marital quality' was associated with physical child abuse	odds ratio: 1.98
Windham et al. (2004)	in a risk sample found a strong association between partnership violence and later child physical abuse	adjusted odds ratio: 6.44
Dixon et al., (2005)	In a community sample 'residing with a violent adult' turned out to be a strong predictor of child maltreatment even if controlling for history of abuse in parent's childhood	adjusted odds ratio: 14.7
Palusci et al. (2005)	Violence between caretakers' predicted recurrent child physical abuse in a large child protection sample	risk ratio: 2.5

Social isolation, low social support and frequent moves

Meta-analysis		
Stith et al. (2009)	social support	composite effect size: $r=-.18$

Longitudinal studies		
Altemeier et al. (1984)	found with a low-income sample that frequent moves in the past year acted as a moderate risk factor for child physical abuse	correlation: $r=.21$
Brown et al. (1998)	In a community sample maternal dissatisfaction with the neighbourhood was found to be a significant but weak predictor of physical child abuse	odds ratio: 2.44
Sidebotham & Heron (2006)	In a community study 'high mobility and 'poor social network (mother)' were associated with child maltreatment	odds ratios: 2.81 and 3.09
Guterman et al. (2009)	Parental perception of neighbourhood quality was a directly and indirectly via parenting stress related to violent behaviour towards the child	no effect size available

Single parenthood

Meta-analysis		
Stith et al. (2009)	single parenthood	composite effect size: $r=.12$
Longitudinal studies		
Altemeier et al. (1984)	In a low-income sample 'never being married' turned out as a weak but significant risk factor for child physical abuse	correlation: $r=.07$
Brown et al. (1998)	In a community sample single parenthood was found to be a significant but weak predictor of physical child abuse	odds ratio: 2.26
Windham et al. (2004)	in a risk sample found a moderate association between being a single mother and later physical abuse	adjusted odds ratio: 4.92

5.2.3. Ontogenetic level; individual life history and personality

First, findings are consistent with the view that life history, especially own experiences of being neglected or abused, play some role in the perpetration of child physical abuse. However effect sizes make clear that there must be other developmental pathways leading to perpetration and/or partly independent mediating mechanisms.

Parents' own history of child maltreatment (intergenerational transmission)

Meta-analysis		
Stith et al. (2009)	This moderate effect size based on a systematic review including cross-sectional studies is endorsed by longitudinal data as well.	composite effect size: $r=.21$
Longitudinal studies		
Sidebotham et al. (2001)	found in a community sample that 'mother been sexually abused' increased the risk for child maltreatment significantly	odds ratio: 3.08
Dixon et al.(2005)	In a community sample, history of abuse during childhood predicted the maltreatment of own children	odds ratio: 16.7
Altemeier et al. (1984)	In a low-income sample a parent's perception of being punished unfairly or severely as a child as well as being placed in foster care were weak risk factors for child physical abuse	correlations $r=.08$ and $r=.09$
Pears & Capaldi (2001)	with a sample of families residing in a high crime area and raising a son found that in families with at least one parent having experienced abuse her- or himself, child abuse was significantly more likely.	risk ratio: 2.3

Second, there seem to be forms of mental illness or personality vulnerability that can be relevant in a minority of abusing caregivers. These may be especially important if they impede the ability of a caregiver to control impulses (e.g. borderline personality disorder), to focus on the child (e.g. alcohol dependence, depression) or to understand important needs and signals of the child (e.g. psychosis).

Substance abuse

Meta-analyses		
Stith et al. (2009)	alcohol abuse	composite effect size $r=.17$
Stith et al. (2009)	abuse of drugs	composite effect size $r=.08$
Longitudinal studies		
Chaffin et al. (1996)	if a community sample found that the abuse of substances moderately increased the risk for child physical abuse	odds ratio: 2.90

Windham et al. (2004)	Found maternal drug abuse and a child's level of caregiving demand jointly contributed to the onset of physical child abuse in a risk sample	adjusted odds ratio: 2.12
-----------------------	--	---------------------------

Parental psychopathology (excluding depression and anxiety)

Meta-analysis		
Stith et al. (2009)	parents' psychopathology	composite effect size: $r=.28$
Longitudinal studies		
Brown et al. (1998)	found that 'maternal sociopathology' considerably increased the risk for child physical abuse in a community sample	odds ratio: 4.91
Sidebotham et al. (2001)	found in a community sample that 'mother's psychiatric illness excluding depression' was a significant risk factor for child maltreatment	odds ratio: 2.34

Mother's or father's depression and anxiety

Meta-analysis		
Stith et al. (2009)	parental depression	composite effect size $r= .27$
Stith et al. (2009)	parental anxiety	composite effect size $r= .29$
Longitudinal studies		
Windham et al. (2004)	in a risk sample found a moderate association between maternal depressive symptoms and child physical abuse	adjusted odds ratio: 3.69
Chaffin et al. (1996)	In a community sample maternal depressive symptoms moderately increased the risk for self-reported child physical abuse	odds ratio: odds ratio: 3.45
Dixon et al. (2005)	In a prospective community sample a large effect of maternal depression on the onset of child maltreatment was found	odds ratio: 7.13
Sidebotham et al. (2001)	In a community sample 'father's depression' was a moderate risk factor for child maltreatment	odds ratio: 3.60

Pianta et al. (1989)	In a high risk sample mother's feeling depressed, confused or anxious was a significant antecedent of child physical abuse	no effect size available
----------------------	--	--------------------------

Low self-esteem and/or self-efficacy

Meta-analysis		
Stith et al. (2009)	self esteem	composite effect size $r = -.24$
Longitudinal studies		
Brown et al. (1998)	in a community sample found 'maternal external locus of control' to be associated with child physical abuse	odds ratio: 2.16
Christensen et al. (1994)	Data in a risk sample revealed low self-worth as family member as a parental risk factor for child physical abuse	no effect size available
Altemeier et al. (1984)	in a low-income sample found that mothers who viewed themselves as 'usually being unsuccessful' had a weakly higher risk to physically abuse the child	correlation $r = .08$

5.2.4 Main factors and their effect size, power or impact

Since child physical and psychological have been grouped together with child neglect in the multi-level factor model, please see section 5.3.4 for a summary table.

5.3. Child neglect

Child neglect can be defined as 'the failure by a parent or other guardian to provide necessary care to a child, resulting in harm or threat of harm to the child. Necessary care includes provision of age-appropriate levels of supervision, education, medical care and necessities (e.g., food, shelter, and clothing)' (Schumacher et al 2001). However, there is some inconsistency across studies in the definition. The UN Rapporteur's World Report on Violence Against Children defines neglect as: "The failure of parents or carers to meet a child's physical or emotional needs when they have the means, knowledge and access to services to do so; or failure to protect him or her from exposure to danger."

5.3.1. Meso level

Poor socioeconomic or educational conditions as well as a lack of social support seem to contribute to the perpetration of child neglect. It should be noted, however, that cases of neglect are considerably more likely to be identified in lower-income environments where the physical needs of children may not be met; the problem of emotional neglect in families that provide for the basic physical needs is seriously under-researched.

Social support

Meta-analysis		
Stith et al. (2009)	social support	composite effect size: -.16
Longitudinal studies		
Hunter et al. (1978)	In a with families of premature and ill newborns 'social isolation' was a significant risk factor for child maltreatment (maltreatment forms not differentiated)	effect size not available
Brayden et al. (1992)	Later neglectful mothers had significantly more aberrant responses on support systems scales compared to non-neglecting mothers in this risk sample	effect size not available

Poverty, socioeconomic status

Meta-analysis		
Stith et al. (2009)	SES	composite effect size: -.19
Longitudinal studies		
Wu et al. (2004)	'Medicaid beneficiary' was a predictor for child maltreatment (maltreatment form: 90% child neglect) one year after birth in a population sample	relative risk: 2.1
Chaffin et al. (1996)	Community data showed that SES was a weak but significant risk-factor for the onset of child neglect	odds ratio: 1.01
Brown et al. (1998)	Low income was moderately associated with child neglect in this community sample	odds ratio: 5.11
	'Being on welfare' was a strong predictor for child neglect in this sample	odds ratio: 11.01
Sidebotham et al. (2002)	In a community study the following risk factors of child maltreatment (maltreatment forms not differentiated) were identified: paternal unemployment	odds ratio: 2.33
	council housing	odds ratio: 7.65
	overcrowding (1 or more persons/room)	odds ratio: 2.16
	non-car-user	odds ratio: 2.33
	maternal unemployment	odds ratio: 2.82
	high mobility (> 3 houses in the previous years)	odds ratio: 2.81

	poor social network (social network scores for mothers)	odds ratio: 3.09
Hunter et al. (1978)	In a study with families of premature and ill newborns 'precarious financial situation' was a significant risk factor for child maltreatment (maltreatment forms not differentiated)	effect size not available
Costello et al. (2003)	indicate that poverty has an impact on educational neglect. In a 'natural experiment' decreased poverty lead to decreased educational neglect.	effect size not available
Lee & Goerge (1999)	found that children born in communities in which 40% or more of the children lived in poverty were almost 6 times more likely to become substantiated cases of neglect by age 5 compared to children in low-poverty areas	Risk Ratio: 5.9
Kotch et al. (1999)	In this risk sample 'participation in public income support programs' was a weak risk factor for child maltreatment (maltreatment form: > 80% child neglect)	odds ratio: 1.48
Ovwigho et al. (2003)	'Earnings' was a significant but weak predictor for child abuse and neglect in a sample of economically stressed families	odds ratio: 1.01-1.02
	'Food stamps' was a significant predictor for child abuse and neglect	odds ratio: 1.6 to 2.35

Educational level

Meta-analysis		
		not available
Longitudinal studies		
Brown et al. (1998)	'Low maternal education' was significantly associated with child neglect in a community sample	odds ratio: 5.12

Wu et al. (2004)	Maternal education was a predictor for child maltreatment (maltreatment form: 90% child neglect) one year after birth in a population sample	relative risk: HS 1.3; <HS 1.7
Brayden et al. (1992)	Neglectful mothers were significantly less likely to have completed high school compared to non-neglecting mothers in this risk sample	effect size not available
Sidebotham et al. (2001)	In a community sample mother's educational level (CSE/vocational training) was weakly associated with child maltreatment (maltreatment forms not differentiated)	odds ratio: 2.61
	Also father's educational level (CSE/vocational training) was associated with child maltreatment	odds ratio: 3.58
Kotch et al. (1999)	In this risk sample 'maternal education less than 12 years' was a risk factor for child maltreatment (maltreatment form: > 80% child neglect)	odds ratio: 0.63

5.3.2. Micro level

There is a quite uniform finding that children living in stressed families with depleted resources have a higher risk of experiencing child neglect. Neglecting parents seemed to be enmeshed within a multiproblem family (see Belsky 1993). Again however effect sizes are not very large, which might indicate a situation x person model. 'Single parenting' was examined by Stith et al. (2009), but not included below, because of the marginal composite effect size and no available longitudinal data.

Several small children to care for, family size

Meta-analysis		
Stith et al. (2009)	family size	composite effect size: .26
Longitudinal studies		
Brown et al. (1998)	'Large family size' was moderately associated with child neglect in this community sample	odds ratio: 3.21
	'Pregnancy interval \leq 15 months' was a predictor for child maltreatment (maltreatment form: 90% child neglect) one year after birth in a population sample	relative risk: 1.2

	'More than two siblings' was also a predictor for child maltreatment (maltreatment form: 90% child neglect) one year after birth	relative risk: 2.7
Brayden et al. (1992)	Neglectful mothers had significantly more children younger than 6 years of age compared to non-neglecting mothers in a risk sample	effect size not available
Kotch et al. (1999)	In this risk sample 'care for more than one dependent child' was a weak risk factor for child maltreatment (maltreatment form: > 80% child neglect)	odds ratio: 1.52
Ovwigo et al. (2003)	'Number of children in home' was a significant but weak predictor for child abuse and neglect (maltreatment forms not differentiated) in a sample of families in poverty	odds ratio: 1.14 to 1.17

Partner conflict or violence, marital quality

Meta-analysis		
		not available
Longitudinal studies		
Brown et al. (1998)	'Poor marital quality' was weakly but significantly associated with child neglect in this community sample	odds ratio: 2.66
	Also 'parental conflict' was significantly associated with child neglect	odds ratio: 2.44
Dixon et al. (2005)	'Residing with a violent adult' was very strongly associated with child maltreatment (maltreatment form: 33% child neglect) in this community sample	odds ratio: 14.71

Problematic care giving behaviour

Meta-analysis		
Stith et al. (2009)	care giving behaviour	composite effect size: .18
	parent-child relationship	composite effect size: -.41
Longitudinal studies		
Brown et al. (1998)	Low paternal involvement' was moderately associated with child neglect in this community sample	odds ratio: 3.54

	Also 'low paternal warmth' was significantly associated with child neglect	odds ratio: 2.13
Brayden et al. (1992)	Later neglectful mothers had significantly more aberrant responses on parenting skills scales compared to non-neglecting mothers in this risk sample	effect size not available
Dixon et al. (2005)	Poor quality of caregiving behaviour was moderately associated with child maltreatment (maltreatment form: 33% child neglect) in this community sample	odds ratio: 5.23

5.3.3. Ontogenetic level: perpetrator's personality and life history

First, findings reveal that perpetrator's life history (especially own experiences of being neglected, maltreated or sexually abused) plays some role in the perpetration of child neglect. However the small composite effect sizes indicate that there must be other developmental pathways leading to perpetration of child neglect and/or partly independent mediating mechanisms. Below, the risk factors concerning perpetrator's life history are summarized.

Parent's own history of child maltreatment (intergenerational transmission)

Meta-analysis		
Stith et al. (2009)	parent's own history of child maltreatment	composite effect size: .15
Longitudinal studies		
Sidebotham et al. (2001)	In this community sample 'mother sexually abused' was a significant risk factor for child maltreatment (maltreatment forms not differentiated)	odds ratio: 3.08
Dixon et al. (2005)	In this community sample history of abuse during childhood predicted the maltreatment (33% child neglect) of own children	odds ratio: 16.7
	This effect was partially mediated by the presence of 3 risk factors (53% of total effect): parenting under 21 years, history of mental illness or depression, residing with a violent adult	odds ratio controlling for the three mediating risk factors: 3.71

Mayer et al. (2007) (retrospective)	Child protection case files showed that neglected children compared to other reported children more often had parents with a history of child maltreatment.	No effect size available
Kim (2009)	In a representative community sample parents reporting neglect or physical victimization in their own childhood were 2.6 times more likely than non-maltreated parents to report neglectful parenting behaviour towards own children.	risk ratio 2.6 and 1.4

Poor relationship with own parents

Meta-analysis		
Stith et al. (2009)		composite effect size: $r = .19$
Longitudinal studies		
Sidebotham et al. (2001)	In a community sample 'mother's father absent in childhood' was a weak but significant risk factor for child maltreatment (maltreatment forms not differentiated)	odds ratio: 1.61
Brown et al. (1998)	In a community sample 'early separation from mother' was moderately associated with child neglect	odds ratio: 3.61
	Also 'maternal alienation in childhood' was significantly associated with child neglect	odds ratio: 2.73
Kotch et al. (1999)	In a risk sample 'separation from own mother at age 14' was a risk factor for child maltreatment (maltreatment form: > 80% child neglect)	odds ratio: 2.13
additional results		
Kovan, Chung and Sroufe (2009)	In a prospective two-generational observational longitudinal study parenting quality showed moderate stability from one generation to the next.	$r = .43$

Second, there seem to be forms of mental illness or personality vulnerability that are relevant for the etiology of neglect in some caregivers. Mental illnesses or personality vulnerabilities may be especially important if they impede the ability of a caregiver to control impulses, to focus on the child or to understand important needs and signals of the child.

Psychopathology and substance abuse

Meta-analysis		
Stith et al. (2009)	psychopathology	composite effect size: .25
Longitudinal studies		
Chaffin et al. (1996)	Prospective community data showed that substance abuse disorders were moderately associated with the onset of child neglect	odds ratio: 3.24
Brown et al. (1998)	In a community sample 'maternal sociopathy' was moderately associated with child neglect	odds ratio: 4.38
	'Paternal psychopathology' was weakly associated with child neglect	odds ratio: 2.28
	Also 'paternal sociopathy' was weakly associated with child neglect	odds ratio: 2.28
Kotch et al. (1999)	In a risk sample 'alcohol use' was a weak but significant risk factor for child maltreatment (maltreatment form: > 80% child neglect)	odds ratio: 1.77

Parent's depressive symptoms

Meta-analysis		
Stith et al. (2009)	parent's depressive symptoms	composite effect size: .21
Longitudinal studies		
Sidebotham et al. (2001)	In a community sample 'father's depression' was a moderate risk factor for child maltreatment (maltreatment forms not differentiated)	odds ratio: 3.60
Dixon et al. (2005)	'Treatment of mother or partner for mental illness or depression' was associated with child maltreatment (maltreatment form: 33% child neglect) in a community sample	odds ratio: 3.29
Kotch et al. (1999)	In a risk sample 'maternal depression' was a weak but significant risk factor for child maltreatment (maltreatment form: > 80% child neglect)	odds ratio: 1.41

Self-esteem, self-efficacy

Meta-analysis		
Stith et al. (2009)	self-esteem, self-efficacy	composite effect size: -.33
Longitudinal studies		
Brown et al. (1998)	'Maternal self-esteem' was significantly associated with child neglect in a community sample	odds ratio: 2.71
	Also 'mother's external locus of control' was significantly associated with child neglect	odds ratio: 1.79
Bugental & Schwartz (2009)	Results of an intervention study with a risk sample indicate, that 'strengthening of maternal self-esteem' was associated with significantly decreased rates of child neglect	no effect size available
Christensen et al. (1994)	Prospective data in a risk sample revealed several aspects of low self-esteem as a risk factor for child neglect,	Cohen d between 0.9 -1.1
Guterman et al. (2009)	Parental perception of low personal control was a significant predictor for child neglect in a large but non-representative community sample	no effect size available

Negative attributions, unrealistic expectations

Meta-analysis		
Stith et al. (2009)	perception of child as a problem	composite effect size: .41
Longitudinal studies		
Sidebotham et al. (2003)	In a community sample maltreating mothers were less likely to have reported positive attributes about their 4-week-old infant (lowest quintile, 0-4 positive attributes)	odds ratio: 2.29
Dixon et al. (2005)	Negative attributions and unrealistic expectations were strongly associated with child maltreatment (maltreatment form: 33% child neglect) in this community sample	odds ratio: 6.74

5.3.4 Main factors and their effect size, power or impact

Each factor was assigned a value (weak=1, moderate=2, strong=3) for the model based on the available research data relative to the research field.

Macro level	Assessed as
CHILDREN'S STATUS Children not recognized as rights holders, parental rights enforced by custom, law and practice	3
Meso level	
FAILED SANCTIONS Child protection agencies with heavy caseloads or insufficient training can fail to investigate reports of abuse or neglect or to intervene effectively	1
POVERTY POCKETS Neighbourhoods with high unemployment, low economic status, poverty, high crime rate significantly associated with child abuse and neglect	2
Micro level	
OBEDIENCE CODE Expectations of child obedience and compliance and approval of strict discipline including corporal punishment create a conducive context for abuse	3
FAMILY STRESS Partnership violence strongly predictive of child abuse, stressed families with depleted resources and social isolation strongly at risk for neglect	3
PEER APPROVAL Youth on an antisocial development path encouraged by peers with similar background to use violence are more likely to maltreat their children if they become parents	2
Ontogenetic level	
POOR PARENTING Childhood experience of, poor relationship with own parents: effect size is moderate with physical abuse and weak in studies of neglect	2
EARLY TRAUMA Exposure to IPV and own experience of being abused in childhood shows a moderate to strong effect on child abuse and a weak to moderate effect on neglect	2
EMOTIONS Personality dysfunctions such as depression, anxiety, other psychopathology have moderate to strong effects, but different symptoms measured for forms of maltreatment	2
COGNITIONS Negative attributions and unrealistic expectations predictive of physical child abuse (moderate to strong) and strongly related to neglect	3
STIMULUS ABUSE Substance abuse is weakly linked to physical abuse and has weak to moderate effect on the risk of neglect	1

5.4. Child sexual abuse

The literature on risk factors for child sexual abuse looks distinct from the literature on other forms of child maltreatment in several ways. First, most studies include sexual abuse committed by extrafamilial perpetrators. If however a child is beaten by a stranger on the street, or if a day care centre does not provide adequate care for a child, this usually is not covered by studies on physical child abuse or child neglect. One of the consequences of the inclusion of extrafamilial child sexual abuse is that the literature on risk factors for the perpetration of sexual abuse and on risk factors for victimization through sexual abuse has become more separated than is the case for other forms of child maltreatment.

As risk factors for victimization through child sexual abuse may hold promise for political action to enhance the protection of children we integrate both literatures here. However one

must be aware of the possibility that enhancing the protection of some children by ameliorating their risks for becoming victimized may simply lead to the victimization of other children. Second, nearly all of the studies and definitely all of the reviews focus on risk factors for child sexual abuse committed by male adults or adolescents. Therefore our review does not say anything about risk factors for sexually aggressive behaviour of children towards other children and about risk factors for female perpetration of child sexual abuse. However it has become well known that both forms of child sexual abuse do exist (e.g. Friedrich 2007; Gannon & Rose 2008).

Third, there are hardly any longitudinal studies examining risk factors for the onset of sexually abusive behaviour and the victimization of children through sexual abuse. This is understandable. For the onset of abusive behaviour, due to very low base rates of officially recorded or self-reported perpetration of child sexual abuse unrealistically large sample sizes would be necessary to gain adequate statistical power. Regarding the victimization through child sexual abuse officially recorded numbers during childhood are also low and there is a long waiting period from childhood to late adolescence and young adulthood until it may become ethically acceptable to ask study participants about non-registered incidents of sexual abuse they may have experienced during childhood.

There are some solutions to these problems, e.g. integrating questions about child sexual abuse in young adulthood measurement points in ongoing long-term studies starting during childhood and mainly serving other purposes or examining the onset of abusive behaviour in high risk groups. However few studies have done this (but see Salter et al 2003). Therefore we were able to identify only four studies with longitudinal data. Thus, most of the empirical knowledge on risk factors for child sexual abuse is based on studies with a cross-sectional or retrospective design, and temporal ordering between risk and outcome often can not be shown. Moreover biased reporting may be a serious problem in all retrospective studies on child sexual abuse, as self-reports on victimization have been shown to be unstable (e.g. Fergusson et al 2000) and perpetrator reports on exposure to risks change if control procedures (e.g. polygraph testing) are implemented (Hindman & Peters 2001), which have not been employed in the large majority of studies.

Overall, from a methodological point of view results on risk factors for child sexual abuse are less trustworthy compared to results on risk factors for other forms of child maltreatment. Moreover they tend to exclude abuse perpetrated by females or other children and they lump together risk factors for intrafamilial and extrafamilial sexual abuse. In particular, many studies have collected "family variables" (such as childhood victimization) from both non-offending parents and offenders, most often from mothers of sexual abused children; combining these (see Black et al 2001) in a meta-analysis makes the results quite ambiguous as to their causal relevance to perpetration. In sum, the knowledge base can only serve as a first step in the understanding of processes leading to the perpetration of child sexual abuse.

Child sexual abuse is not uniformly defined across studies. However a great majority of studies focuses on forms of sexual behaviour against minors that is relevant for prosecution or child protection in most countries of the western world. A majority of studies includes only men convicted for some type of sexual offence against a minor, introducing an additional potential bias, as convicted and non-discovered abusers may differ in several respects.

5.4.1. Meso level

While neighbourhood characteristics may be most intensely linked to rates of child neglect (for a review see Coulton et al. 2007) some studies have reported weak to moderate positive relationships between neighbourhood poverty or disorganization and rates of child sexual abuse.

Neighbourhood characteristics

Meta-analyses		
	victim neighbourhood	none available
	perpetrator neighbourhood	none available
Single cross-sectional studies – victim neighbourhood		
Drake & Pandey (1996)	Child protection service data for different postal codes showed an significant association between the percentage of families living in poverty and the number of child sexual abuse reports	effect size could not be computed
Ernst (2000)	Economic neighbourhood characteristics and social composition explained a significant amount of variance of the number of investigated sexual abuse reports across a number of neighbourhoods	effect size could not be computed

5.4.2. Micro level

There are some studies, even longitudinal studies showing that children living under circumstances of rejection, poor supervision and poverty with impaired, overwhelmed or socially isolated caregivers carry a greater risk to experience child sexual abuse. Moreover living with a stepfather and especially living with a male who has already abused a child are found to be risk factors. For perpetrators, beyond the fact that living with a child constitutes a risk, there has been little examination of the role of the current living situation for the onset or repetition of child sexual abuse. Thus, the following data cannot be interpreted as reflecting influences on individuals' likelihood to perpetrate abuse.

Quality of experienced care giving and relationship to (non-offending) caregivers

Meta-analyses		
		none available
Several single cross-sectional studies found a low care-giving quality or a low relationship quality to the child to be associated with a higher child sexual abuse risk.		
Boney-McCoy & Finkelhor (1995)	in a representative sample of children from 10 to 17 reported a higher risk of child sexual abuse in the previous year in children who also reported a poor relationship quality with parents	Risk Ratio: 2.1

Longitudinal studies		
Pianta et al. (1989)	In a longitudinal high risk sample low maternal responsivity to child signals and low overall quality of caregiving environment at 3.5 years were significantly associated with child sexual abuse at age 6	effect size not available
Fergusson et al. (1996)	In the prospective Christchurch birth cohort study an association between parent child relationships and child sexual abuse risk was found	
	effect size – lowest quartile of parent attachment score - non contact sexual abuse	risk ratio: 1.9
	effect size – lowest quartile of parent attachment score – contact sexual abuse	risk ratio: 1.8
	effect size – lowest quartile of parent attachment score – intercourse	risk ratio: 2.3
	effect size – lowest quartile of paternal care score – non contact sexual abuse	risk ratio: 2.1
	effect size – lowest quartile of paternal care score – contact sexual abuse	risk ratio: 1.5
	effect size – lowest quartile of paternal care score – intercourse	risk ratio: 2.3
	effect size – lowest quartile of maternal care score – non contact sexual abuse	risk ratio: 1.0
	effect size – lowest quartile of maternal care score – contact sexual abuse	risk ratio: 1.5
	effect size – lowest quartile of maternal care score – intercourse	risk ratio: 2.1
Brown et al. (1998)	In a prospective community sample harsh punishment was a risk factor for subsequent sexual abuse	odds ratio: 3.2
Finkelhor, Ormrod & Turner (2007)	In a representative sample children whose parents provided little supervision more often experienced revictimization in the year following an index sexual abuse	effect size: $r=0.14$

Problems of caregivers and family

Meta-analyses		
		none available
Several single cross-sectional studies have reported associations between caregiver and/or family problems and child sexual abuse risk.		
Finkelhor et al. (1997)	with a large sample found poverty and mother sexually abused during her childhood to be associated with child sexual abuse in the previous year	risk ratios: 4.9 and 10.2
Longitudinal studies		
Pianta et al. (1989)	In a longitudinal high risk sample, lower reported emotional support for the mother during five measurement points in the first five years of the child was associated with child sexual abuse at age 6	effect sizes could not be computed
Fergusson et al. (1996)	In the prospective Christchurch birth cohort study an association between marital conflict, parental mental health problems and child sexual abuse risk was found	
	effect size – highest quartile of marital conflict score – non contact sexual abuse	risk ratio: 0.9
	effect size – highest quartile of marital conflict score – contact sexual abuse	risk ratio: 1.5
	effect size – highest quartile of marital conflict score – intercourse	risk ratio: 1.9
	effect size – parental illicit drug use – non contact sexual abuse	risk ratio: 1.8
	effect size – parental illicit drug use – contact sexual abuse	risk ratio: 1.4
	effect size – parental illicit drug use – intercourse	risk ratio: 1.8
	effect size – parental alcohol problems – non contact sexual abuse	risk ratio: 1.2
	effect size – parental alcohol problems – contact sexual abuse	risk ratio: 1.8
	effect size – parental alcohol problems – intercourse	risk ratio: 2.5

Brown et al. (1998)	In a prospective community sample negative life events and maternal sociopathy found to be risk factors for subsequent sexual abuse	odds ratios: 4.4 and 6.3
---------------------	---	--------------------------

Single parenthood and stepfamily

Meta-analyses		
		none available
Several single cross-sectional studies with large sample sizes have reported higher rates of sexually abused children in single-parent families and in families with a stepfather		
Boney-McCoy & Finkelhor (1995)	In a representative sample of about 2000 youth between 10 and 16 years more children living with just one parent than children from two parent families reported sexual abuse in the previous year	risk ratio: 1.6
Finkelhor et al. (1997)	Interviews with a sample of more than 2000 parents revealed that children not living with both parents had a higher risk of sexual abuse during the previous year	risk ratio: 3.1
Turner, Finkelhor & Ormrod (2007)	In a recent probability sample of 1000 youth between 10 and 17 years, children living in a stepfamily reported a higher rate of sexual abuse victimization during the past year compared to children living with both or alone with one parent	effect size could not be computed
Longitudinal studies		
Fergusson et al. (1996)	In the prospective Christchurch birth cohort study an association between having a stepparent before age 15 and child sexual abuse risk was found	
	effect size –non contact sexual abuse	risk ratio: 0.6
	effect size –contact sexual abuse	risk ratio: 1.7
	effect size –intercourse	risk ratio: 3.0
Brown et al. (1998)	In a prospective community sample the presence of a stepfather found to be a risk factors for subsequent sexual abuse	odds ratio: 3.3

Children living with an abuser / abusers living with children

While the percentage of child sexual abusers with officially recorded recidivism remains low (e.g. 10% in a group of 295 intrafamilial child sexual abusers with a mean follow-up period of 10 years: Kingston et al. 2008), several studies have asked sexual abusers, grown-up victims or grown-up siblings of victims of intrafamilial child sexual abuse about non-reported abuse. Although it is not possible to calculate a Risk Ratio from these studies (because a comparison group is lacking) they suggest a high risk for children living with an abuser because most abusers and grown up victims or siblings reported multiple abusive relationships if more than one child was available to the abuser in the family (for a review of studies see Wilson 2004).

Vulnerability/ Opportunity

An important factor influencing the opportunity for abuse is typically discussed under the heading of “victim variables”. For an understanding of perpetration, this needs to be seen as an opportunity structure. Unlike child physical abuse, sexual abuse and sexual offending is typically driven by expectations of satisfying needs, and research on different forms of sexual violence has repeatedly confirmed that many (potential) perpetrators are influenced by the perception of the availability of the victim and the probability of no negative consequences. Finkelhor's influential work (Finkelhor 1984) pointed to this as a key factor. The pattern of secrecy imposed on victims of child sexual abuse is a further indicator of the perpetrator having identified an opportunity.

Studies from the area of developmental victimology, e.g. from the “Developmental Victimization Survey” (Finkelhor et al 2007) or the “National Survey of Children's Exposure to Violence” (Finkelhor et al. 2009), show that children of all ages can become victims of child sexual abuse. However compared to younger preadolescent children older children carry a higher risk. Also female children compared to male children become victimized more often. More important for prevention is the finding that *vulnerable children become victimized more often*. As there is no meta-analytic integration of the findings no composite effect sizes can be reported. Single study effect sizes are given as calculated or reported in Black et al. (2001). If longitudinal studies have not been included in this review the original publications from the study were consulted to see whether an effect size was given or could be computed.

Prior victimization

Meta-analyses		
		not available
Several single cross-sectional studies reported higher risks of child sexual abuse for children who had experienced one or more forms of prior victimization.		
Boney-McCoy & Finkelhor (1995)	Methodologically sound study with a (for the US) representative sample of children from 10 to 17 calculated the risk for child sexual abuse in the previous year for children with and without prior victimization	
	Effect size– previous sexual victimization	risk ratio: 7.8
	Effect size– previous physical maltreatment	risk ratio: 3.2
	Effect size– any previous victimization	risk ratio: 3.8

Longitudinal studies		
Finkelhor, Ormrod & Turner (2007)	The year one follow-up of the "Developmental Victimization Survey", a large US representative sample of children from 2 to 17 years, showed a heightened risk for experiencing sexual abuse given one or several previous forms of victimization reported at baseline	
	Effect size – previous sexual victimization	risk ratio: 6.9
	Effect size – previous maltreatment (all forms)	risk ratio: 4.3
	Effect size – previous crime victim (all forms)	risk ratio: 3.9
	Effect size – previous peer / sibling victimization	risk ratio: 3.2
	Effect size – previous witnessing violence	risk ratio: 6.4
	Effect size – previous poly-victimization	risk ratio: 6.8

5.4.3. Ontogenetic level

Findings are consistent with the view that life history, especially own experiences of being sexually or physically abused, play some role in the onset of sexually abusive behaviour towards children. However effect sizes make clear that there must be other developmental pathways leading to perpetration and/or partly independent mediating mechanisms.

Perpetrators own history of child maltreatment

Meta-analyses		
Whitaker et al. (2008)	child maltreatment	composite effect size: $r=.27^{17}$
	child sexual abuse	composite effect size: $r=.21$
	child physical abuse	composite effect size: $r=.35$
Longitudinal studies		
		none available

However one study (Widom & Ames 1994) was able to test the relationship between officially recorded maltreatment during childhood and subsequent sexual offences (child sexual abuse included) during adolescence and young adulthood. Only a small minority of maltreated children was reported as having committed a sexual offence ($\leq 5\%$). However compared to a matched control group subjects sexually abused during childhood had a heightened risk (RiskRatio =2.4) of being reported for a sexual offence. The same was true for subjects neglected (Risk Ratio=2.3) or physically abused during childhood (Risk Ratio=3.9).

Additional evidence:

There has been one longitudinal study (Salter et al. 2003) examining factors associated with the development of abusive behaviour in a group of sexually abused males. Being abused by

¹⁷ If not otherwise specified all effect sizes are for the comparison of child sexual abusers and non-offender comparison groups.

a female person (Risk Ratio=2.2), having witnessed partner violence as a child (Risk Ratio=1.4), having experienced physical neglect (Risk Ratio=1.7) and having experienced supervisory neglect (Risk Ratio=1.7) emerged as significant risk factors within the studied group of sexually abused males. Severity of sexual abuse, estimated duration of abuse, relationship to the abusive person and having experienced physical abuse or instability of care were not found to be risk factors. No protective factors were found.

Poor relationship with own parents

Meta-analyses		
Whitaker et al. (2008)	poor attachment	composite effect size: $r=.23$
	harsh discipline	composite effect size: $r=.45$
	poor overall family functioning	composite effect size: $r=.25$
Longitudinal studies		
		none available

Second, there seem to be forms of mental health problems or personality vulnerabilities that are relevant to the etiology of sexually abusive behaviour in a proportion of child sexual abusers. Especially a history of externalizing and/or antisocial behaviour as well as impulsivity, heightened hostility and mistrust are moderate to strong correlates of sexually abusive behaviour if child sexual abusers are compared to non-offenders.

Perpetrator mental health / personality

Meta-analyses		
Whitaker et al. (2008)	externalizing behaviour	composite effect size: $r=.61$
	violence	composite effect size: $r=.23$
	non-violent criminality	composite effect size: $r=.14$
	impulsivity	composite effect size: $r=.45$
	anger/hostility	composite effect size: $r=.15$
	social mistrust	composite effect size: $r=.25$
	substance abuse	composite effect size: $r=.20$
	antisocial personality disorder	composite effect size: $r=.35$
	anxiety	composite effect size: $r=.15$
	depression	composite effect size: $r=.23$
Longitudinal studies		
		none available

Third, there is convincing evidence that child sexual abusers describe themselves as lonely, unable to form intimate or secure attachment relationships with other adults and as lacking self-esteem. General social deficits and impaired ability to feel empathy seem to be weaker correlates of abusive behaviour. Such kinds of social deficits may play a role in the etiology of sexually abusive behaviour towards children.

Self-esteem / self perceived ability to form intimate or secure attachment relationships

Meta-analysis		
Whitaker et al. (2008)	self-esteem	composite effect size: $r=.24$
	reported difficulty forming intimate relationships	composite effect size: $r=.38$
	reported difficulty forming secure attachments	composite effect size: $r=.37$

Longitudinal studies		
		none available

Loneliness / general social skills

Meta-analysis		
Whitaker et al. (2008)	loneliness	composite effect size: $r=.45$
	general social skills deficits	composite effect size: $r=.14$
	general empathy deficits	composite effect size: $r=.15$
Longitudinal studies		
		none available

Fourth, a small number of studies have examined deviant sexual preferences, sexual problems and abuse-specific cognitive distortions (e.g. that some children are enjoying sexual abuse) in child sexual abusers and comparison groups. Generally moderate to weak association have been found, making it likely that a least in a subgroup of child sexual abusers deviant sexual preferences and cognitive distortions play a role in the development of abusive behaviour.

Sexual preferences and cognitive distortions

Meta-analysis		
Whitaker et al. (2008)	sexual interest in children	composite effect size: $r=.29$
	cognitions tolerant of sexual behaviour towards children	composite effect size: $r=.24$
	cognitions minimizing perpetrators responsibility	composite effect size: $r=.26$
Longitudinal studies		
		none available
Additional evidence		
Hanson & Morton-Bourgon (2004)	As reported in a meta-analysis, sexual interest in children and abuse-supportive cognitive distortions shown to predict recidivism in longitudinal studies examining convicted child sexual abusers	$r=.16$ and $r=.11$

Use of child pornography

There are multiple links between child sexual abuse and child pornography. First, production of child pornography generally requires abusing children, although digital technology may permit creating deceptive material in some cases. Second, causing children to watch pornography is an important element of grooming for sexual abuse (for both see Itzin 1997).

The key question concerning perpetration is whether consumption of child pornography, and in particular of internet child pornography, has a causal influence on the perpetration of child sexual abuse. In their overview of research findings Kindler et al (2010) examine the role of internet child pornography in the process that leads up to sexual abuse. Empirical studies are faced with the difficulty that both aspects are illegal and frequently undetected. Nonetheless, a range of research studies point to an overlap between consuming child pornography and

direct abuse of a child, and frequent use of child pornography may correlate with a higher probability of repeated sexual abuse. Kindler et al conclude that among individuals already at risk to use sexual coercion, consuming child pornography may confirm and legitimize a sexual preference for children and reduce inhibitions, so that direct sexual abuse of a child becomes more likely.

5.4.4 Main factors and their effect size, power or impact

Each factor was assigned a value (weak=1, moderate=2, strong=3) for the model based on the available research data relative to the research field.

Macro level	Assessed as
DEVALUING WOMEN Subordination of women makes girls prime targets for sexual abuse	1
CHILDREN'S STATUS Traditions, belief that family always best for children, children not seen as rights holders and taught not to say no to adults	2
MEDIA VIOLENCE Cultural messages and media images sexualizing children	3
MASCULINITY Society enshrines masculine superiority and suggests men's right to dominate	1
Meso level	
FAILED SANCTIONS Despite strong legal sanctions, children often not believed, agencies helpless or not trained to assess situation, afraid to confront possible abuser	2
Micro level	
OBEDIENCE CODE Children taught to accept that adults know better and to obey even when it contradicts their own experience, often no support for attempts to avoid abuser	2
FAMILY STRESS Families in poverty with overwhelmed or socially isolated parents, low caregiving quality, mother sexually abused in childhood	2
REWARDS Satisfaction of own needs and indifference to those of child	2
OPPORTUNITY Vulnerable victims, in particular children who have already been abused, at a higher risk; abuse by parent or authority figure makes use of opportunity	2
Ontogenetic level	
POOR PARENTING Poor attachment with own parents, emotional abuse	2
SEXUAL TRAUMA: Perpetrator sexually abused as a child, witnessing IPV may also have effect	2
EMOTIONS Externalizing or antisocial behaviour, impulsivity, hostility and mistrust; but in some: normal to high level of empathy, ability to manipulate	2
COGNITIONS Abuse-supportive cognitive distortions and sexual scripts	1
MASCULINE SELF Rarely studied , little data available, but men far more likely than women to be sexual abusers	1
DEPERSONALIZED SEX In some: sexual interest in children; in others: intimacy deficits and preference for impersonal sex	2
CHILD PORNOGRAPHY ABUSE In men already inclined to hostile masculinity and impersonal sex, use of child pornography increases risk of active child sexual abuse	2

5.5. Child sexual exploitation

As with trafficking, there is practically no research on perpetrators of child sexual exploitation. In addition, with this form of sexual violence the consumers can also be seen as perpetrators. Whereas men who seek out a prostitute do not usually wish specifically that she has been trafficked, but are more likely to be indifferent, or may assume that, if she came from some poor or distant country, that she did so willingly for the money she would earn, the consumers of child pornography or child prostitutes constitute a very specific demand. They are purchasing the opportunity to use children sexually. In view of this dual perpetration structure, estimating the salience of factors for this type of violence was carried out by assessing the conditions conducive to procuring and producing on the meso and micro levels, while the ontogenetic level was taken up to sketch – with the scarce available research – characteristics of consumers and users.

5.5.1. Meso level

A study on trafficking in children from the International Labour Office (ILO) puts the focus on “the people involved” (Kane 2005) and summons information not only about the victims but all persons playing a role in the process of trafficking. (Note, however, that trafficking in children is mostly trafficking for work exploitation not for sexual exploitation.) Kane introduces a distinction between several models of perpetration (Kane 2005, 35, referring to Schloenhardt 1999):

- The ‘corporate’ model is highly structured and generally involves organized crime groups. It is hierarchical, centrally controlled and bureaucratic, and is characterized by vertical relations between the members of the scheme. This model includes mafia-like groups. THB can be one of their occupations.
- The ‘network’ model involves criminal groups working loosely together in a diverse, decentralized way and is characterized by horizontal relations, with no ‘bosses’ making the decisions but each ‘specialist’ deciding on his/her contribution and communicating it to the others, or at least those working closely in the next stage of the process. These networks engage in complex and dynamic illegal markets. THB can be one of them.
- There are also small groups of well-organized criminals who specialise in leading victims (as well as irregular migrants) from one country to another along well known routes, very localised in the service they offer.
- Those most often involved in trafficking human beings, however, are ‘amateurs’. These are individuals – often family members – who provide a single service such as transport. They are also known as ‘intermediaries’, the people who are generally described as ‘facilitating’ trafficking.

Findings from the US National Juvenile Prostitution Study (Mitchell et al 2010) offer some insight into the structure of perpetration. Three types of juvenile prostitution were identified: (a) third-party exploiters, (b) solo prostitution, and (c) conventional child sexual abuse (CSA) with payment. Cases were classified into three initial categories based on police orientation toward the juvenile: (a) juveniles as victims (53%), (b) juveniles as delinquents (31%), and (c) juvenile as both victims and delinquents (16%). When examining the status of the juveniles by case type, the authors found that all the juveniles in CSA with payment cases were treated as victims, 66% in third-party exploiters cases, and 11% in solo cases.

In an analysis of trafficking, Goodey (2008) follows the above general model for THB, distinguishing four types of perpetrators of child trafficking:

- Individual perpetrators
- Loose small networks (local / regional)
- Larger organized networks

- International organized crime

She pinpoints a gap in criminological research concerning traffickers themselves.

Surtees (2008) collected primary data about traffickers from trafficked persons assisted in 10 countries in South-Eastern Europe (SEE). „Traffickers may be individuals acting alone (at a low level of organization), in small local criminal groups (at mid level) or well-organized criminal networks (at a high level). Organized criminal groups seem to predominate in South East European trafficking, but overall the trend seems to be toward loose network structures. Again, however, specific information on child traffickers was not available.

5.5.2. Micro level

Other than opportunity in the country of origin and expected profits in the destination country, little can be concluded about what leads some persons to traffick children for sexual exploitation. Some research points to links between child sexual abuse within the family and sexual exploitation. Sexually abused children may be used for child pornography, shared with, or sold to friends, and be groomed for use in organised sex rings (Itzin 1997), While some of the same factors as in child sexual abuse may influence these perpetration activities – there are indications that those who organize sexual exploitation of children are very likely to have been abused as children themselves –, no knowledge is available to explain why some sexually abused children grow up to be perpetrators of commercial child sexual exploitation, while the majority do not.

5.5.3. Ontogenetic level

Since no research is available on the individual paths leading to becoming producers and procurers, for this form of violence the consumers and users are considered as perpetrators. They are hypothesized to have similar profiles to child sexual abusers, especially since there is evidence that the use of child pornography increases the likelihood of sexual abuse, and the use of child prostitutes must be considered a direct case of abuse of a child.

5.5.4 Main factors and their effect size, power or impact

Each factor was assigned a value (weak=1, moderate=2, strong=3) for the model based on the available research data relative to the research field.

Macro level	Assessed as
CHILDREN'S STATUS Children not recognized as rights holders, children seen as vulnerable and available	2
IMPUNITY Effective legal measures underdeveloped	2
MASCULINITY fundamental to the market for child pornography and child prostitution	2
Meso level	
FAILED SANCTIONS Implementing legal sanctions encounters many practical obstacles	1
Micro level	
REWARDS Highly profitable business, financial gain	3
OPPORTUNITY Children already abused or on the streets easily available	2

Ontogenetic level	
EMOTIONS Externalizing or antisocial behaviour, impulsivity, hostility and mistrust	2
COGNITIONS Abuse-supportive cognitive distortions and sexual scripts	1
MASCULINE SELF Using what is “on the market” to achieve sexual satisfaction is considered normal for men	1
DEPERSONALIZED SEX In some: sexual interest in children; in others: intimacy deficits and preference for impersonal sex	2

5.6. Overall assessment of the field

Generally child neglect and child psychological abuse have been under-researched (Behl et al 2003) although within child protection system case loads they tend to be more prevalent than physical abuse and sexual abuse. It is not clear why this is the case. Possibly neglect and psychological abuse do not rouse enough moral indignation for research funds to flow.

Although there has been substantial progress in formulating consensus research definitions of child maltreatment, there are unsolved problems as well. First, as there is little research on taxons within the child maltreatment field, dimensional approaches tend to dominate, for example, there is the idea of a dimension ranging from very good to very bad care giving. For different purposes (e.g. criminal law vs. child protection law) different cut-off points, separating neglect from suboptimal care giving tend to be used. This however has consequences for the results of etiological studies. For example mental illness is much more important in explaining severe, especially lethal forms of violence against biological children than it is in explaining less severe forms of violence. Second as epidemiological data (e.g. Jonson-Reid et al. 2003) show, there is considerable overlap between different forms of child maltreatment, including child sexual abuse. Thus, it is clear that there are “mixed” or “multi-type” forms of perpetration that may have a special etiology. On the other hand psychological child abuse and child neglect tend to cover very different forms of caregiver behaviour. There is a difference between a caregiver who stops feeding a baby (physical neglect) and a caregiver who stops sending a preadolescent child to school (educational neglect) or between a caregiver scapegoating a child constantly and a caregiver requesting a child to steal (although both forms are seen as psychological abuse).

Third, factors explaining the onset of child maltreatment may differ from factors explaining the recurrence of child maltreatment. Fourth, some true risk factors for child physical abuse may be difficult to assess and/or may be under-researched. A further limitation is the inconsistency in some findings. There are some risk factors with a wide range of odds ratios associated in the longitudinal data. Furthermore, some studies did not differentiate between the various forms of child maltreatment. Finally, high quality studies have only been conducted in Anglo-American countries; there is an urgent need to test whether findings can be generalized to societies in continental Europe.

Although the empirical study of risk factors for child sexual abuse has already produced some results it is still very much at the beginning. There are relatively few studies, and some important methodological problems (e.g. the lack of time ordered data in the study of risk factors for the onset of abusive behaviour) have not been completely solved. Their results should thus be used with caution. In particular, there is very little research on the connections between child sexual abuse and child sexual exploitation.

The results of the literature review show that at least some males who have experienced sexual abuse in their own childhood are at risk to develop into perpetrators of sexual abuse. Therefore the quality of support for sexual abuse victims may also be of importance for the

prevention of sexual abuse. Moreover antisocial behaviour patterns, deviant sexual preferences, distorted cognitions regarding sexual behaviour towards children and deficits regarding close relationships put some men at risk for the perpetration of child sexual abuse. As most of the effect sizes are moderate there may be different risk mechanisms and chain effects leading to abusive acts. This is in accordance with theoretical and clinical work that has suggested multiple developmental pathways that may lead to sexually abusive behaviour towards children (for a review see Ward et al 2006). Although some abusers may choose victims at random or will only abuse children available in the family, research on victim characteristics indicates that vulnerable children from stressed families are at heightened risk to become sexually victimized. Prevention strategies should aim to reach these groups of children.

6. Research knowledge on the perpetration of violence based on gender identity or sexual orientation

Most research on SOV is based on victim surveys. There is no systematic information about perpetrators.

The major problem is that victims identify as victims of SOV without being sure that this was indeed the motivation of the aggressor. In particular, lesbians cannot say in most cases if they were attacked in public spaces by strangers because of being lesbian or of being a woman (Mason 1993). It depends on the circumstances and on the perception of the victim.

Another problem is the definition of violence: There is no clear distinction between discrimination and violence. In some studies (overview by Ohms & Stehling 2001) quite a large amount of verbal violence and silencing of sexual identity by family and friends is included in the category of verbal and/or psychological violence.

Ohms and Stehling (2001) found differences between the context and perpetration of violence against lesbians and against gay men.

- According to German research by NGOs and lobby organisations 24,2% of lesbians and 30,3% of gay men have suffered physical violence or threat of psychological violence.
- Lesbians reported 43,7% sexual violence, gay men reported 3,8% rape or other sexual violence. The authors explain the difference by the intensive feminist public discussion about sexual violence which lowered barriers for women to report such violence. There has not been a similar discussion for sexual violence against gay men and there continues to be a strong taboo. Gay men connect sexual violence most of all with certain locations where gay sexuality is acted out openly such as saunas, but also with male dominated organisations such as the military and prisons. Lesbians do not mention connections between sexual violence and certain locations.

The one factor in common is that perpetrators are mostly men.

- If lesbians and gay men are attacked by strangers in public spaces perpetrators are mostly young men or male youth. But lesbians also reported violent attacks by older men.
- Lesbians suffer the severest forms of sexual violence mostly by men in their close social context – often heterosexual ex-partners, not by strangers in public spaces. Gay men suffer sexual violence also by men, who are near to them: (ex)partners, friends and acquaintances.

An annual documentation of violence against lesbians and gay men in Germany, conducted by Landeskoordination der Anti-Gewalt-Arbeit für Lesben und Schwule in NRW (2006) shows a picture of different violence contexts similar to those that prevalence research finds for

violence against men and against women: Gay men suffer violence most of all in public spaces by acquaintances and strangers, not so often in partnerships; lesbians suffer violence most of all in their own flat, by (ex-)partners, not so often by strangers or in public spaces.

6.1. Meso level

In so-called mission hate crimes, the perpetrator seeks to rid the world of evil rather than to respond to any specific event that threatens him. He may join an organized hate group, such as the Ku Klux Klan or the National Alliance, or he may operate alone, as did Timothy McVeigh, the convicted murderer of 168 Americans in the bombing of the Murrow Federal Building in Oklahoma City. He makes hate a career rather than a hobby. (McDevitt et al 2002, 309)

6.2. Micro level

The research data on motivation of perpetrators focuses largely on violence committed in, or backed up by groups, perhaps because this is the context in which violence is most likely to be identified by police or other authorities. It yields a picture of micro-level motivation in which stereotypes and prejudices, peer approval, rewards and opportunities plan the major parts, while factors on the meso level hover in the background of the descriptions.

In an interview study with a group of young men who had been violent to gay men Uhle (1994) identified different motivations and patterns of perpetration:

- attacking gay men as a simple way of getting money without too many risks
- showing that one belongs to a group of youngsters of the same age
- finding acceptance in this group
- finding self confidence and courage while reducing fear
- having pleasure and fun and satisfaction, killing time and boredom, feeling strong
- reducing disgust and abhorrence and expressing them at the same time
- acting out unspecific or specific aggression
- keeping a traditional concept of the male role and demanding a male identity from gay men
- proving hard masculinity to oneself and the group
- protecting oneself from seduction by gay men, keeping distance, showing distance
- affirming ideological and religious ideas and communicating them.

From these data, Uhle developed 3 types of perpetrators of SIV.

- Type 1 is most of all interested in getting money. He has no explicit hatred against gay men, they are just convenient victims. He does not use (severe) violence.
- Type 2 is interested in money as well but uses severe violence and enjoys attacking gay men. These perpetrators seek acceptance from their group, they attack often and repeatedly with a diffuse hatred.
- Type 3 is less interested in money, only at the beginning. Afterwards hatred is predominant, most important is the brutal beating itself. There is extreme ideological and religious motivation; gay men are seen as danger to "normal" men and boys.

McDevitt, Levin and Bennet (2002) present a slightly different typology of perpetration, claiming that the basic underlying factor in all groups is bigotry, considered a primary motivation for the offences. However, offender categories differ with respect to the conditions, both psychologically and environmentally, that ultimately lead to a violent attack.

"In thrill crimes, for example, the offender is set off by a desire for excitement and power; defensive hate crime offenders are provoked by feeling a need to protect their resources under conditions they consider to be threatening; retaliatory offenders are inspired by a desire to avenge a perceived degradation or assault on their group; and mission offenders perceive themselves as crusaders who hope to cleanse the earth of evil." (2002, 306)

Three of these types were distinguished in an analysis of offender motivation in 169 Boston Police Department cases, 1991–1992:

Thrill was the motive in two thirds of the cases: the attack was triggered by an immature desire to display power and to experience a rush at the expense of someone else. In discussions with the police, several of these young offenders revealed that their only benefit from the attack was some vague sense of their own importance: a sadistic high as well as bragging rights with their friends who believed that hatred was cool.

Defensive bias attacks (25%): Unlike thrill-motivated crimes, these were committed, from the offender's prejudiced point of view, in order to protect his neighbourhood from those he considered to be outsiders or intruders. In interviews with police investigators and in several police reports, offenders expressed their belief that members of another group, whether Black, Latino, or Asian, had undeservedly moved into a home on their previously all-White block. According to these reports, the objective of these crimes was to convince the outsider to relocate elsewhere and also to send a message to other members of the victim's group that they too were not welcome in the neighbourhood. The precipitant for a defensive attack consists of an intrusion of outgroup members into the offender's neighbourhood, workplace, or campus. Consequently, these crimes often occur in or near the offender's turf (i.e., home, work, school) and involve groups of young offenders who have a history of previous acts of intimidation.

Retaliatory (8%): In retaliatory hate crimes, whether the original incident actually occurred is often irrelevant. Sometimes a rumour of an incident may cause a group of offenders to take vengeance, only to learn later that their original information was merely unfounded hearsay. According to interviews with investigators, some retaliatory hate crimes are committed before anyone has had a chance to verify the accuracy of the original rumour (McDevitt et al 2002). In retaliatory hate crimes, where the offender is getting even for a specific (real or perceived) hate attack, the perpetrator is more likely to act alone, to carry out the attack outside of his own turf, and possibly to use more extreme violence (McDevitt et al 2002).

"Mission" motivations were rare in this data set (see "meso-level" above).

6.3. Ontogenetic level

Ohms and Stehling (2001) hypothesize two main motivations for homophobic violence:

- Securing one's own masculinity by attacking men who are not defined as male, knowing that public opinion will support this kind of violence.
- Punishing lesbian women for not being available for men's wants and needs.

Violent acts against lesbians are thus defined in the context of patriarchal control of women and violence against gay men in the context of patriarchal definition of masculinity. Similar to gender violence, violence against homosexual people is within the norms, not violating the norms. A special side of motivation is seen in the fear of AIDS and that homosexual men are seen as spreading AIDS, justifying violence against them.

A wide range of acts of violence against persons identifying as LGBT or merely perceived as not conforming to gender norms do not fit the definition of "hate crimes" because the context is the immediate personal environment or private life – the family, neighbours, a colleague at work or schoolmates (Gordon & Meyer 2007). Most of the information on SOV is gathered by contacting samples of LGB respondents in communities, and the information about the perpetrators is thus reflects what the victims knew about their assailants. The resulting analysis describes patterns of fear, contempt and hostility that point to factors on the ontogenetic level, but the research is not able to uncover what influences lead some parents or relatives for example, to beat them and throw them out of the house. No research could be identified that tried to contact homophobic individuals to understand better their development towards violence.

6.4. Overall assessment of the state of the research, its limitations and its utility for policy development

Researching violence based on sexual orientation takes place for the most part either on the basis of police files or as victimization studies based on cooperation with lesbian or gay communities. Representative national surveys in Europe have generally not been able to include a sufficient number of openly gay or lesbian respondents for statistical analysis, so prevalence figures are lacking.

Study of the perpetration of SOV, of which there is very little, has not yet been connected with research on youth violence and on right wing authoritarian or racist violence. When conclusions from the study of hate crimes and hate speech are generalized to violence against LGBT persons, an important area of the latter becomes invisible: the (often but not always homophobic) violence within families, schools and informal social networks. This kind of violence may not be based on hatred against the social group, but anger, distress and disciplinary efforts against a close person who is felt to “betray” the norms of belonging. Furthermore, honour codes can lead to forcing a son with homosexual preferences to marry; religious groups or sects can, with the consent of the parents, undertake programs of “curing” a young person. Former heterosexual partners can use the full range of intimate partner violence, coercive control and stalking, as well as a heightened threat of removing children from the former partner’s custody, when women prefer same-sex relationships, thus blurring the lines to those forms of violence as well. This suggests that there is a need for both specialized studies across the full range of persons and types of violent acts involves, as well as integrated approaches that include the dimension of (attributed or expressed) sexual orientation of the victim into the research.

6.5. Main factors and their effect size, power or impact

Each factor was assigned a value (weak=1, moderate=2, strong=3) for the model based on the available research data relative to the research field.

Macro level	Assessed as
DEVALUING WOMEN Women’s sexual orientations traditionally ignored, now seen as a threat	1
IMPUNITY Anti-discrimination laws may have de facto loopholes and not recognize SOV as form of discrimination	1
MASCULINITY Norms and hierarchies deeply implicated in taboos of transgressions against gender norms and especially in the punitive degradation of male homosexuality	3
Meso level	
FAILED SANCTIONS LGBT persons reluctant to disclose violence to agencies, fearing treatment without respect, agencies may blame them rather than perpetrator	2
HATE GROUPS Group violence targets LGBT, enforcing gender regime, inciting each other to escalating violence	3
ENTITLEMENT Perpetrators may see violence as morally justified, necessary to preserve family or community values	2
LGBT DISCRIMINATION Work, school, housing discrimination creates opportunities for individuals to attack	2
POVERTY POCKETS Structurally disadvantaged environments often a fertile ground for hate crimes	1

Micro level	
STEREOTYPES Rigid notions of gender identity and gendered behaviour, attributing sexual deviance to all who do not fit the mould, targeting confirms perpetrators' normality	3
REWARDS Locations and contexts where LGBT are known to meet can be targeted for beatings and robbery, financial rewards as well as satisfaction in the violence	2
OPPORTUNITY Attacking those who are already in a weaker position in society is relatively easy	1
PEER APPROVAL All context groups – antisocial groups of young men, families, workmates – can let perpetrators feel proud of doing what others approve of	3
Ontogenetic level	
EMOTIONS Empathy deficits, in some: sadistic tendencies; in others: disgust and aversion; in former heterosexual partners: hatred and shame	1
COGNITIONS Misconceptions about homosexuality, gender variation, AIDS	2
MASCULINE SELF Need to secure and defend own masculinity by punishing lesbians and gays, being the defender of the community driving out intruders, getting a thrill out of power and control	3
ALCOHOL ABUSE Habitual heavy drinking often part of hate group subculture	1

7. Assessing the state of the research

7.1. What is known, what is not known, and what may be (mis-)understood

The task of this research review was to gather and present the best available evidence on the factors at play in the perpetration of different forms of violence. Several overall conclusions on the present knowledge base can be summarized in closing.

- **The knowledge base is extensive and permits modelling factors and pathways**

Although the level and extent of research on perpetration differs enormously across the forms of violence, there is indeed a vast amount of research available, and it was possible to extract factors that seem to apply, with appropriate variation in the specifics, across all three fields of violence in the present study. This made it possible to build a model showing the interplay among factors that can be useful in developing and monitoring an integrated policy framework.

Drawing especially on the knowledge from longitudinal and intervention-based studies, it was furthermore possible to construct plausible path models for the most frequent forms of violence. These are heuristic in nature, as a data-based statistical derivation of path models was beyond the scope of this study, and in most cases, beyond the present possibilities of existing data. Because the path models show the increased probability of certain forms of violence when factors converge, they can also show the effects of protective factors. These can be derived in part from research on resiliency – on those individuals who successfully overcome adverse childhood experiences and environments. Prevention can thus take its cues from what is known about protective factors, thus going beyond the focus on awareness-raising about violence.

Where the factors at play have been studied on the different levels, research knowledge suggests that there is more than one pathway leading to the form of violence in question.

Certain patterns of interacting factors emerge as typical, although they are by no means separate or independent of each other; modelling them in a path diagram is useful not only for understanding when negative effects are reinforced, but also to explore the potential of protective factors in the natural social environment, as well as of possible interventions.

- **European research has centred on victimization and needs to be expanded**

In the past few decades, a considerable body of European research on the victims of violence against women and violence against children has unfolded, and work on sexual orientation violence has begun. Some excellent and differentiated theoretical analyses have been developed, based on the extensive study of victimization through qualitative and biographical research, evaluation of innovative practical support services and reflection on clinical experience. In recent years, the importance of having regionally based quantitative data has been increasingly recognized and in countries with a strong research culture, national representative studies have been carried out and comparative work has begun, work that will help to understand differences in the extent, prevalence and context of violence between the countries and regions in Europe.

With regard to perpetrators, however, high-quality research, able to measure not only the presence of certain variables but the degree to which they affect outcomes, is overwhelmingly carried out in North America, with some studies from the UK and Australia, and a few European exceptions. There is a sprinkling of comparative studies, but with little systematic selection of countries for comparison. It is only possible to guess at which results are capable of transfer to Europe in general, much less to consider possible variation within Europe. By comparison with much of the European Union, the US has a distinct sexual culture especially for young people (such as dating, college campus drinking parties), a different degree of approval of violence, both in the media and in policy (in particular, wide approval of corporal punishment, not to mention the death penalty as a public enactment of ultimate power), very different availability of weapons and legal permission to use them (for example against intruders in the home), and a greater tolerance of poverty and deprivation. At the same time, the globalization of the media has spread the images and normative ideals related to these and other aspects of mainstream US culture into Europe. The majority of internet providers of child pornography are based in the US or Russia, where they have considerable leeway to operate; consumers, however, are to be found throughout the EU.

European research approaches and programs aimed at understanding perpetration systematically are sorely needed. They can build on the “state of the art” presented in the present study, in particular profiting from the sophisticated methodological tools now available, and advancing rapidly to the stage of testing models rather than merely accumulating measurements of correlations.

- **No simple explanations: Knowledge must be considered in context**

It is highly probable that knowledge about the dynamics of how individuals develop into perpetrators is capable of transfer across countries, but it is considerably less certain whether the prevalence of the factors and their effect sizes are similar. All research knowledge on perpetration points to the need for multi-factorial confluence models. This is easily and often stated, but it has implications: Whether certain identified factors increase the probability of someone using violence depends to a significant degree on context variables, on the presence or absence of protective factors, and on the interaction with other factors. These are precisely the kinds of connection that are likely to vary across (and within) countries and cultures. Thus, the results of the present research review must be used with caution, and should not be misunderstood as offering definitive causal explanations.

There is a strong tendency for empirical research to search for causal explanations within the individual, if only because such variables are easier to measure. In the broader field of violence research, however, it is recognized that the capacity to use violence is inherent in

the human condition. To understand how it comes about that some individuals use certain forms of violence and target specific kinds of victims requires analyzing the conditions and circumstances that make these actions seem, from the point of view of the perpetrator, acceptable, normal, advantageous, or even necessary. It is also vital to understand the social context in which inhibiting forces are weakened and use of coercion or causing pain or harm can become part of a habitual pattern of behaviour. The fact that ontogenetic factors have been more extensively studied and more frequently measured empirically should not be taken to mean that the primary causal influences are to be found within the individual's history and personality. For the vast majority of individuals, these factors will only lead to violent behaviour when there is a conducive context permitting or encouraging this outcome.

- **Ambivalence towards a focus on perpetration persists**

Finally, it must be said that research is still sometimes hesitant to focus clearly on perpetration and on the factors that contribute to it, and then fails to throw light on the processes that shape a conducive context in which a certain form of violence becomes a probable outcome. This ambivalence is noticeable when "risk factors", such as childhood victimization or mental health problems, are measured for offenders and non-offenders alike and the resulting data combined. The concern for recognizing whether a child is "at risk" within the family may thus take precedence over assessing which parent might be likely to use violence. Similarly, assessing certain types of relationships as at risk for violence can dilute the focus on the factors that make one or the other partner likely to use certain kinds and degrees of violence.

This ambivalence recurring in the research must be seen against the background of the large scale shift in thinking about interpersonal violence over the past decades – in society, in the social sciences and psychology, and in social and legislative policy. What was discussed 40 years ago as a "problem family" or a "conflict-ridden relationship" is today assessed as a situation in which, whatever problems or conflicts may exist, individuals are accountable for not using violence. Accountability for acts of violence, however "private" the situation, is the premise from which research methods for understanding perpetration must work. Since a research knowledge base is, by its nature, cumulative, and many older studies were focussed on families and on the calculation of risk for potential victims, it will take some time before the legacy of silence on perpetration can be filtered out.

7.2. Emerging and under-researched issues

In the course of the present review, strengths and weaknesses of the research have been noted chapter by chapter. In closing, it may be remarked that even in the best-studied areas there are astounding gaps.

- Research on sexual coercion, sexual assault and rape largely fails to capture representative samples of the general population;
- Research on intimate partner violence has not adequately tried to measure some of the most salient aspects highlighted in qualitative and evaluation based studies, such as masculinity, nor differentiated between incidents of physical assault and IPV as a course of conduct;
- Research on sexual harassment, one of the most widespread and frequent forms of violence, has not yet addressed the level of factors relevant to individual perpetrators, nor forms and sites of harassment outside the workplace;
- Studies of child sexual abuse do not sufficiently differentiate between family and non-family abuse, nor between factors leading to perpetration and factors leading to a failure to protect;

- While research on sexual harassment almost exclusively underlines the importance of organisational climate, this has been given little if any attention with regard to child sexual abuse in organized settings;
- The study of child physical abuse and neglect focuses almost entirely on the family, thus failing to address abuse in educational and non-school organized settings;
- The range of perpetrators of sexual orientation violence that appears in the research is extremely restricted and reflects more the concern over young violence-prone males in groups than a serious interest in understanding violent ways of defending or enforcing a rigid gender regime;
- “Honour-based” violence and forced marriage are typically explained by the catch-all concepts of “culture” and “tradition”, while trafficking and child sexual exploitation are subsumed under the framework of organized crime and/or illegal migration; in all of these areas there has been almost no effort to study perpetrators.

Overall, the path models that could be teased out by taking a multi-method approach to existing research need to be further operationalized and tested. Used heuristically, as has been done in the visual model based on the present review, path models suggest some possibilities for defining appropriate variables and collecting data. This could also be a fruitful approach to studying similarities and differences across the EU.

References

METHODOLOGY

- Chen, H., Cohen, P. & Chen, S. (2010) How big is a big odds ratio? Interpreting the magnitudes of odds ratios in epidemiological studies. *Communications in Statistics – Simulation and Computation*, 39, 860-864.
- Murray, J., Farrington, D.F. & Eisner, M. (2009) Drawing conclusions about causes from systematic reviews of risk factors: The Cambridge Quality Checklists. *J Exp Criminol*, 5, 1-21.
- Rutter, M., Pickles, A., Murray, R. & Eaves, L. (2001) Testing hypotheses on specific environmental causal effects on behavior. *Psychological Bulletin*, 127, 291-324.

VIOLENCE AND GENDER, VIOLENCE AND MEDIA

- Anderson, C.A., Shibuya, A., Ihori, N., Swing, E.L., Bushman, B.J., Sakamoto, A., Rothstein, H.R. & Saleem, M. (2010) Violent video game effects on aggression, empathy, and prosocial behavior in eastern and western countries: A meta-analytic review. *Psychological Bulletin*, 136, 2, 151-73.
- Bereswill, M. (2006) Männlichkeit und Gewalt. Empirische Einsichten und theoretische Reflexionen über Gewalt zwischen Männern im Gefängnis. *Feministische Studien* 24, 242-255.
- Jolliffe, D. & Farrington, D.P. (2004) Empathy and offending: A systematic review and meta-analysis. *Aggression and Violent Behaviour*, 9, 441-476.
- Kury, H., Oberfell-Fuchs, J., Woessner, G. (2004) The extent of family violence in Europe: A comparison of natural surveys. *Violence Against Women*, 10, 7, 749-769.
- Lukesch, H. (2002) Violence and the media. In Heitmeyer, W. & Hagan, J. (eds.) *International Handbook of Violence Research*. Dordrecht: Kluwer.
- Schlösser, A.-M. & Gerlach, A. (eds.) (2002) *Gewalt und Zivilisation. Erklärungsversuche und Deutungen*. Gießen: Psychosozial Verlag.
- Spierenburg, P. (ed.) (1998) *Men and Violence. Gender, Honor and Rituals in Modern Europe and America*. Columbus, OH: Ohio State University.
- Sutterlüty, F. (2003): *Gewaltkarrieren, Jugendliche im Kreislauf von Gewalt und Missachtung*. Frankfurt/Main: Campus.
- UNESCO (1998) *The UNESCO Global Study on Media Violence*
<http://www.hinifoto.de/gaming/unesco.html> accessed 03.08.2010.
- Wendell, A. (2005) *Bindungserfahrungen, Ärgerregulation und Aggression. Zusammenhänge zur sozialen Informationsverarbeitung bei reaktiv und proaktiv aggressiven Jugendlichen*. Hamburg: Verlag Dr. Kovač.
- Whitehead, A. (2005) Man to man violence. How masculinity may work as a dynamic risk factor. *Howard Journal of Criminal Justice*, 44, 4, 411-422.

VIOLENCE AGAINST WOMEN

- Bowker, L.H. (ed.) (1997) *Masculinities and Violence*. Thousand Oaks, London, New Dehli: Sage (= Research on Men and Masculinities Series. 10).
- Connell, R.W. (1995) *Masculinities*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.
- Connell, R.W. (2000) *The Men and the Boys*. London: Allen & Unwin.
- Dinges, M. (ed.) (2005) *Männer – Macht – Körper. Hegemoniale Männlichkeiten vom Mittelalter bis Heute*. Frankfurt/Main: Campus.
- Fawcett, B., Featherstone, B., Hearn, J. & Toft, C. (eds.) (1996) *Violence and Gender Relations. Theories and Interventions*. London: Sage.
- Gilligan, J. (2000) *Violence. Reflections on our Deadliest Epidemic*, London: Jessica Kingsley Publishers.
- Hagemann-White, C. (2000) Male violence and control: Constructing a comparative European perspective. In: Duncan, S. & Pfau-Effinger B. (eds.) *Gender, Economy and Culture in the European Union*, London/ New York.

- Hanmer, J. (1996) Women and violence: Commonalities and diversities. In: Fawcett, B., Featherstone, B., Hearn, J. & Toft, C. (eds.) *Violence and Gender Relations, Theories and Interventions*. London, Thousand Oaks, New Delhi: Sage.
- Hearn, J. (1998) *The Violences of Men. How Men Talk About and How Agencies Respond to Men's Violence to Women*. London, Thousand Oaks, New Delhi: Sage.
- Hearn, J. & Whitehead, A. (2006) Collateral damage: Men's 'domestic' violence to women seen through men's relations with men. *Probation Journal: Journal of Community and Criminal Justice*, 53, 1, 38–56.
- Heitmeyer, W. & Hagan, J. (eds.) (2003) *International Handbook of Violence Research*. Dordrecht: Kluwer (published simultaneously in German).
- Kassis, W. (2003) *Wie kommt die Gewalt in die Jungen? Soziale und personale Faktoren der Gewaltentwicklung bei männlichen Jugendlichen*. Bern: Haupt.
- Kelly, L. (1994) The interconnectedness of domestic violence and child abuse: Challenges for research, policy and practice. In Mullender, A. & Morley, R. (eds.) *Children Living with Domestic Violence*. London.
- Kelly, L. (1988) *Surviving sexual violence*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota.
- Kimmel, M. (2008) *Guyland. The Perilous World Where Boys Become Men. Understanding the Critical Years Between 16 and 26*. New York: HarperCollins.
- Malamuth, N.M., Addison, T., Koss, M. (2000) Pornography and sexual aggression: Are there reliable effects and can we understand them? *Annual Review of Sex Research*, 11, 26–91.
- Meuser, M. (1998, 2., revised ed 2006) *Geschlecht und Männlichkeit. Soziologische Theorien und kulturelle Deutungsmuster*. Opladen: Leske & Budrich.
- Miedzian, M. (1991) *Boys will be Boys. Breaking the Link Between Masculinity and Violence*. New York: Doubleday.
- Ogle, R.L., Noel, N.E. & Maisto, S.A. (2009) Assessing acceptance of violence toward women: A factor analysis of Burt's Acceptance of Interpersonal Violence scale. *Violence Against Women*, 15, 7, 799-809.
- Pease, B. (2004) Rethinking programs for men who are violent to women in the context of gender inequality, masculinities and the state: A critical review of the literature. In: Research and Education Unit on Gendered Violence, University of South Australia (ed.) *A Comparative Assessment of Good Practice in Programs for Men who use Violence Against Female Partners*. Commonwealth Government of Australia.
- Schröttle, M./ Martinez, M. et al. (2006) Comparative reanalysis of prevalence of violence against women and health impact data in Europe - obstacles and possible solutions. Testing a comparative approach on selected studies, available at <http://www.cahrv.uni-osnabrueck.de/reddot/190.htm> last accessed Oct 19 2010.
- Testa, M. (2004) The role of substance use in male-to-female physical and sexual violence: A brief review and recommendations for future research. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 19, 1494-1505.
- UN Study of the Secretary General (2006) *Ending Violence Against Women: From Words to Action*. E/06/IV/8.
- Weissberg, D.K. (ed.) (1996) *Applications of Feminist Legal Theory to Women's Lives. Sex, Violence, Work and Reproduction*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.

RAPE / SEXUAL COERCION AND ASSAULT

- Abbey, A., Parkhill, M.R., Clinton-Sherrod, A.M. & Zawacki, T. (2007) A comparison of men who committed different types of sexual assault in a community sample. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 22, 12, 1567-1580.
- Bergen, R.K. & Bukovec, P. (2006) Men and intimate partner rape: Characteristics of men who sexually abuse their partners. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 21, 1375-1384.
- Bridges Whaley, R. (2001) The paradoxical relationship between gender inequality and rape: toward a refined theory. *Gender and Society*, 15, 4, 531-555.
- Bohner, G., Eyssel, F., Pina, A., Siebler, F. & Viki, G.T. (2009) Rape myth acceptance: Cognitive, affective and behavioural effects of beliefs that blame the victim and exonerate

- the perpetrator. In Horvath, M. & Brown, J. (eds) *Rape, Challenging contemporary thinking*. Cullompton: Willan.
- Buss, D.M. & Malamuth, N.M. (eds.) (1996) *Sex, Power, Conflict. Evolutionary and Feminist Perspectives*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- DeGue, S., DiLillo, D. & Scalora, M. (2010) Are all perpetrators alike? Comparing risk factors for sexual coercion and aggression. *Sexual Abuse: A Journal of Research and Treatment*, published online before print August 6, 2010.
- DeKeseredy, W.S., Rogness, M. & Schwartz, M.D.(2004) Separation/divorce sexual assault: the current state of social scientific knowledge. *Aggression and Violent Behavior*, 9, 675-691.
- Ferguson, C.J. & Kilburn, J. (2009) The public health risks of media violence: A meta-analytic review. *The Journal of Pediatrics*, 154, 5, 759-63.
- Gerber, G. L. and Cherneski, L. (2006), Sexual aggression toward women: Reducing the prevalence. *Annals of the New York Academy of Sciences*, 1087, 35–46.
- Gerger, H., Kley, H., Bohner, G. & Siebler, F. (2007) The acceptance of modern myths about sexual aggression scale: Development and validation in German and English. *Aggressive Behavior*, 33: 422–440.
- Hanson, R.K., Morton-Bourgon, K.E. (2009) The accuracy of recidivism risk assessments for sexual offenders: A meta-analysis of 118 prediction studies. *Psychological Assessment*, 21, 1, 1–21.
- Harrell, M.C., Castaneda, L.W, (2009) *A Compendium of Sexual Assault Research. Technical Report*, RAND National Defense Research Institute.
- Horvath, M. & J. Brown (eds) (2009) *Rape: Challenging Contemporary Thinking*. Cullompton: Willan.
- Jespersen, A.F., Lalumière, M.L. & Seto, M.C. (2009) Sexual abuse history among adult sex offenders and non-sex offenders: A meta-analysis. *Child Abuse and Neglect*, 33, 3, 179-192.
- Lalumière, M.L., Harris, G.T., Quinsey, V.L. & Rice, M.E. (2005) *The Causes of Rape. Understanding Individual Differences in Male Propensity for Sexual Aggression*. Washington D.C.: American Psychological Association.
- Laufersweiler-Dwyer, D.L. & Dwyer, G. (2005) Rapists. In Reddington, F.P. & Kreisel, B.W. (eds.) *Sexual Assault. The Victims, the Perpetrators and the Criminal Justice System*, Durham, N.C., 205-231.
- Loh, C., Gidycz, C.A., Lobo, T.R. & Luthra, R. (2005) A prospective analysis of sexual assault perpetration: Risk factors related to perpetrator characteristics. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 20, 1325-1348.
- Lovett, J. & Horvath, M. (2009) Alcohol and drugs in rape and sexual assault. In Horvath, M. & Brown, J. (eds) *Rape, Challenging contemporary thinking*, Cullompton: Willan.
- Malamuth, N.M. & Check, J.V. P. (1981) The effects of mass media exposure on acceptance of violence against women: A field experiment. *Journal of Research in Personality*, 15, 4, 436-446.
- Malamuth, N.M., Huppert, M. & Paul, B. (2005) Sexual coercion. In Buss, D.M. (ed) *The Handbook of Evolutionary Psychology*, Hoboken NJ: Wiley.
- Marx, Brian P. (2005) Lessons learned from the last twenty years of sexual violence research. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 20, 225-230.
- Messman-Moore, T.L. & Brown, A.L. (2004) Child maltreatment and perceived family environment as risk factors for adult rape: Is child sexual abuse the most salient experience? *Child Abuse & Neglect*, 28, 1019-1034.
- Oddone Paolucci, E., Genuis, M. & Violato, C. (2000): *A Meta-Analysis of the Published Research on the Effects of Pornography*, in: Oddone Paolucci, E., Violato, C. & Genuis, M. (eds.), *The Changing Family and Child Development*. Ashgate: Aldershot.
- Rosenfeld, B. (2004): Violence risk factors in stalking and obsessional harassment: A review and preliminary meta-analysis. *Criminal Justice and Behavior*, Vol. 31, No. 1, 9-36.
- Smallbone, S. W. & Dadds, M. R. (2000) Attachment and coercive sexual behaviour. *Sexual Abuse: A Journal of Research and Treatment*, 12, 3-15.

- Smuts, B. (1996) Male aggression against women: an evolutionary perspective. In Buss, D.M. & Malamuth, N.M. (eds.) *Sex, Power, Conflict. Evolutionary and Feminist Perspectives*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Tomsen, Stephen A. (2009) *Violence, Prejudice and Sexuality*, New York: Routledge.
- Vega, V. & Malamuth, N.M. (2007) Predicting sexual aggression: The role of pornography in the context of general and specific risk factors. *Aggressive Behavior*, 33, 104-117.
- Voller, E.K. & Long, P.J. (2010) Sexual assault and rape perpetration by college men: The role of the big five personality traits. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 25, 457-480.
- White, J.W. & Smith, P.H. (2004) Sexual assault perpetration and re-perpetration: from adolescence to young adulthood. *Criminal Justice and Behavior*, 31,2, 182-202.
- Zawacki, T., Abbey, A., Buck, P.O., McAuslan, P. & Clinton-Sherrod, A.M. (2003) Perpetrators of alcohol-involved sexual assaults: How do they differ from other sexual assault perpetrators and nonperpetrators? *Aggressive Behavior*, 29, 366-380.

INTIMATE PARTNER VIOLENCE

- Archer, J. (2006) Cross-cultural differences in physical aggression between partners. A social-structural analysis. *Personality and Social Psychology*, 10, 133-153.
- Babcock, J.C., Greena, C.E., Robieb, C. (2004) Does batterers' treatment work? A meta-analytic review of domestic violence treatment, *Clinical Psychology Review* 23, 1023–1053.
- Bancroft, L. & Silverman, J.G. (2002) *The Batterer as Parent: Addressing the Impact of Domestic Violence on Family Dynamics*. Thousand Oaks, London, New Delhi: Sage.
- Bennett Cattaneo, L. & Goodman, L.A. (2005): Risk factors for reabuse in intimate partner violence: A cross-disciplinary critical review, *Trauma, Violence, & Abuse*, 6, 141-175.
- Capaldi, D.M. & Clark, S. (1998) Prospective family predictors of aggression toward female partners for at-risk young men. *Developmental Psychology*, 34, 6, 1175-1188.
- Dobash, R.E., Dobash, R.P., Cavanagh, K. & Lewis, R. (2004) Not an ordinary killer – just an ordinary guy. *Violence Against Women*, 10, 6, 577-60.
- Dutton, D.G. (1995) *The Domestic Assault of Women*. Psychological and Criminal Justice Perspectives. Vancouver: UBC.
- Ehrensaft, M. K. (2009) Family and relationship predictors of psychological and physical aggression. In O'Leary, K. D. & Woodin, E. M.: *Psychological and Physical Aggression in Couples*. Washington D.C. (APA).
- Ehrensaft, M.K., Cohen, P., Brown, J., Smailes, E., Chen, H. & Johnson, J. G. (2003) Intergenerational transmission of partner violence: A 20-year prospective study. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology*, 71, 4, 741-753.
- Eriksson, M., Hester, M., Keskinen, S. & Pringle, K. (eds.) (2005) *Tackling Men's Violence in Families*. Nordic Issues and Dilemmas. Bristol: Policy Press.
- Fals-Stewart, W. (2003) The occurrence of partner physical aggression on days of alcohol consumption: A longitudinal diary study. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology* 71, 41-52.
- Fals-Stewart, W., Klostermann, K. & Clinton-Sherrod, M. (2009) Substance abuse and intimate partner violence. In O'Leary, K.D. & Woodin, E.M. (eds.): *Psychological and Physical Aggression in Couples*. Washington D.C. (APA).
- Field, C.A., Caetano, R. & Nelson, S. (2004) Alcohol and violence related cognitive risk factors associated with the perpetration of intimate partner violence. *Journal of Family Violence*, 19, 4, 249-253.
- Fitzpatrick, M.K., Salgado, D.M., Suvak, M.K., King, L.A. & King, D.W. (2004) Associations of gender and gender-role ideology with behavioral and attitudinal features of intimate partner aggression. *Psychology of Men & Masculinity*, Vol 5, 2, 91-102.
- Foran, H.M. & O'Leary, K.D. (2008 a) Problem drinking, jealousy, and anger control: Variables predicting physical aggression against a partner. *Journal of Family Violence*, 23, 141–148.
- Foran, H.M. & O'Leary, K.D. (2008 b) Alcohol and intimate partner violence: A meta-analytic review. *Clinical Psychology Review*, 28, 7, 1222-1234.

- Gelles, R. (2002) Violence in the family. In Heitmeyer, W. & Hagan, J. (eds.) *International Handbook of Violence Research*. Dordrecht: Kluwer.
- Gidycz, C.A., Warkentin, J.B., Orchowski, L.M. (2007) Predictors of perpetration of verbal, physical, and sexual violence: A prospective analysis of college men. *Psychology of Men & Masculinity*, 8, 2, 79–94.
- Gondolf, E.W. (2002) *Batterer Intervention Systems. Issues, Outcomes and Recommendations*. Thousand Oaks: Sage.
- Graham-Kevan, N. & Archer, J. (2003): Intimate terrorism and common couples violence: A test of Johnson's predictions in four British samples. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 18, 1247-1270.
- Hamberger, L.K. & Holzworth-Munroe, A. (2009) Psychopathological correlates of male aggression. In O'Leary, K.D. & Woodin, E.M.: *Psychological and Physical Aggression in Couples*. Washington D.C. (APA).
- Hanmer, J. & Itzen, C. (eds.) (2000) *Home Truths About Domestic Violence: Feminist Influences on Policy and Practice*, London: Routledge.
- Hanson, K.R., Bourgon, G., Helmus, L. & Hodgson, S.(2009) The principles of effective correctional treatment also apply to sexual offenders: A meta-analysis. *Criminal Justice and Behavior*, 36; 865.
- Harway, M. & Hansen, M. (1993) An overview of domestic violence. In Hansen, M. & Harway, M. (eds.), *Battering and Family Therapy. A Feminist Perspective*. Newbury Park: Sage Publications, 1-12.
- Harway, M. & O'Neil, J.M. (1999) Preliminary multivariate model explaining the causes of men's violence against women. In Harway, M. & O'Neil, J.M. (eds.) *What Causes Men's Violence Against Women?* Thousand Oaks: Sage.
- Harway, M. & O'Neil, J.M. (eds.)(1999) *What Causes Men's Violence Against Women?* Thousand Oaks: Sage.
- Heckert, D.A. & Gondolf, E.W. (2004) Battered women's perceptions of risk versus risk factors and instruments in predicting repeat assault. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 19, 7, 778-800.
- Hester, M., Westmarland, N., Gangoli, G., Wilkinson, M., O'Kelly, C., Kent, A. & Diamond, A. (2006) *Domestic Violence Perpetrators: Identifying Needs to Inform Early Intervention*, Bristol: University of Bristol with the Northern Rock Foundation and the Home Office.
- Hester, M. (2009): Who does what to whom? Gender and domestic violence perpetrators. Bristol, available at http://www.nr-foundation.org.uk/publications_domabuse.html
- James, K., Seddon, B. & Brown, J. (2002) 'Using it' or 'losing it': Men's constructions of their violence towards female partners, The Australian Domestic and Family Violence Clearinghouse Research Paper No.1, Sydney, available at: http://www.austdvclearinghouse.unsw.edu.au/Occasional/James_et_al_research_paper_final.pdf
- Johnson, M.P. (2008) *A Typology of Domestic Violence: Intimate Terrorism, Violent Resistance and Situational Couple Violence*. Boston: Northeastern University Press.
- Jukes, A. E. (1999) *Men Who Batter Woman*. London: Routledge.
- Kaufmann Kantor, G. & Jasinski, J. L. (1998) Dynamics and risk factors in partner violence. In Jasinski, J.L., Williams, L.M. & Finkelhor, D. (eds.) *Partner violence. A comprehensive review of 20 years of research*. Thousand Oaks: Sage.
- Kernsmith, P. (2005) Treating perpetrators of domestic violence: Gender differences in the applicability of the theory of planned behavior. *Sex Roles*, 52, 11/12, 757-770.
- Lussier, P., Farrington, D.P. & Moffit, T.E. (2009) Is the antisocial child father of the abusive man? A 40-year perspective longitudinal study on the developmental antecedents of intimate partner violence. *American Society of Criminology*, 47, 3, 741-780.
- Malamuth, N.M., Sockloskie, R.J., Koss, M.P. & Tanaka, J.S. (1991) Characteristics of aggressors against women: Testing a model using a national sample of college students. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology* 59, 5, 670-681.
- Marshall, L.L. (1996) Psychological abuse of women: Six distinct clusters. *Journal of Family Violence* 11, 4, 379-409.

- McHugh, M.C. (1993) Studying battered women and batterers: Feminist perspectives on methodology. In Hansen, M. & Harway, M. (eds.), *Battering and Family Therapy. A Feminist Perspective*. Newbury Park: Sage.
- Moore, T.M. & Stuart, G.L. (2005) A review of the literature on masculinity and partner violence. *Psychology of Men & Masculinity*, 6, 1, 46–61.
- 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.
- O’Leary, K.D. & Schumacher, J.A. (2003) The association between alcohol use and intimate partner violence: Linear effect, threshold effect, or both? *Addictive Behaviors*, 28, 1575–1585.
- O’Leary, K.D. & Woodin, E.M., eds. (2009) *Psychological and Physical Aggression in Couples. Causes and Interventions*. Washington, D.C.: American Psychological Association.
- Rosenfeld, B. (2004): Violence risk factors in stalking and obsessional harassment: A review and preliminary meta-analysis, *Criminal Justice and Behavior*, 31, 1, 9-36.
- Santana, M.C., Raj, A., Decker, M.R., La Marche, A. & Silverman, J.G. (2006) Masculine gender roles associated with increased sexual risk and intimate partner violence perpetration among young adult men. *Journal of Urban Health*, 83, 4, 575-585.
- Schröttle, Monika (2009): Gewalt gegen Frauen in Paarbeziehungen: Sekundäranalytische Auswertung nach Schweregraden, Mustern, Risikofaktoren und Unterstützung. Bundesministerium für Familie, Senioren, Frauen und Jugend available at <http://www.bmfsfj.bund.de/bmfsfj/generator/BMFSFJ/Service/Publikationen/publikationsliste.did=120792.html>
- Schumacher, J. A., Smith Slep, A.M. & Heyman, R.E. (2001) Risk factors for male-to-female partner psychological abuse. *Aggression and Violent Behavior*, 6, 255-268.
- Shaffer, A. & Sroufe, A.L. (2005) The developmental and adaptational implications of general boundary dissolution: Findings from a prospective, longitudinal study. *Journal of Emotional Abuse*, 5, 2/3, 67-84.
- Stark, E. (2007) *Coercive Control: How Men Entrap Women in Personal Life*, Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Stark, E. (2009) Rethinking coercive control. *Violence Against Women* 15, 12, 1509-1525.
- Stith, S. M., Rosen, K.H.; Middleton, K.A, Busch, A.L., Lundeberg, K. & Carlton, R.P.(2000) Intergenerational transmission of spouse abuse. A meta-analysis. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, 62, 640–654.
- Stith, S. M. & Farley, S.C. (1993) A predictive model of male spousal violence. *Journal of Family Violence*, 8, 183-201.
- Stith, S. M., Smith, D.B., Penn, C.E., Ward, D.B. & Tritt, D. (2003) Intimate partner physical abuse perpetration and victimization risk factors: A meta-analytic review. *Aggression and Violent Behaviour*, 10, 65-98.
- Sugarman, D.B. & Frankel, S.L. (1996) Patriarchal ideology and wife assault: A meta-analytic review. *Journal of Family Violence*, 11, 13–40.
- Tanha, M., Beck, C.J.A., 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, 1836-1855.
- White, H.R. & Widom, C.S. (2003) Intimate partner violence among abused and neglected children in young adulthood: The mediating effects of early aggression, antisocial personality, hostility and alcohol problems. *Aggressive Behavior*, 29, 332-345.

HONOUR-BASED VIOLENCE AND/OR FORCED MARRIAGE

- Deutsches Institut für Menschenrechte (ed.) (2007) *Zwangsverheiratung in Deutschland*. Baden-Baden: Nomos.
- Gill, A. (2006) Patriarchal violence in the name of ‘honour’, *International Journal of Criminal Justice Sciences* 1, 1, 1-12.
- Gill, A. (2009) Honour killings and the quest for justice in black and minority ethnic communities in the United Kingdom, *Criminal Justice Policy Review*, 20, 475-494.

- Reddy, R. (2008). Gender, culture and the law: Approaches to 'honour crimes' in the UK, *Fem. Leg. Stud.* 16, 305-321.
- Welchman, L. & Hossain, S.(eds.) (2005) 'Honour'. Crimes, Paradigms and Violence against Women. London: Zed.

TRAFFICKING

- Anderson, B. & O'Connell Davidson, J. (2002) Trafficking – A Demand Led Problem? Stockholm: Save the Children Sweden.
- Dasi Hamkke Center (2006) Out of the Trap, Hope One Step. Case Studies of Prostitution and Sex Trafficking in Korea, Seoul: The Asia Foundation.
- Davies, J. (2002) The Role of Migration Policy in Creating and Sustaining Trafficking Harm, Migration Research Centre, European conference on preventing and combating trafficking in human beings: Global challenge for the 21st century, Brussels.
- Dettmeijer-Vermeulen, C.E., Boot-Matthijssen, M., van Dijk, E.M.H., de Jonge van Ellemeet, H. & Smit, M. (2008) Trafficking in Human Beings. Supplementary figures. Sixth report of the Dutch National Rapporteur, Den Haag.
- Doezema, J. (2002) Who gets to choose? Coercion, consent, and the UN trafficking protocol. In Masika, R. (ed) Gender, Trafficking and Slavery. Oxford: Oxfam Focus on Gender.
- Geisler, A. (2005) Gehandelte Frauen: Menschenhandel zum Zweck der Prostitution mit Frauen aus Osteuropa. Berlin: trafo.
- Helfferich, C., Kavemann, B. & Rabe, H. (2010) Determinanten der Aussagebereitschaft von Opfern des Menschenhandels zum Zweck sexueller Ausbeutung: Eine qualitative Opferbefragung, BKA (ed.) Polizei + Forschung 41. Köln: Luchterhand.
- Herz, A. & Minthe, E. (2005) Straftatbestand Menschenhandel: Verfahrenszahlen und Determinanten der Strafverfolgung; Polizei + Forschung Bd. 31 BKA (Hg.). Köln: Luchterhand.
- Hofmann, J. (2002) Menschenhandel: Beziehungen zur organisierten Kriminalität und Versuche der strafrechtlichen Bekämpfung. Frankfurt a. M..
- Kane, J. (2005) Child Trafficking – The People Involved. A Synthesis of Findings from Albania, Moldova, Romania and Ukraine. Geneva: International Labour Office.
- KOK (Bundesweiter Koordinierungskreis gegen Frauenhandel und Gewalt an Frauen im Migrationsprozess e.V.) Trafficking in Women in Germany, Berlin: Selbstverlag.
- Moret, J., Efonayi-Mäder, D. & Stants, F. (2007) Menschenhandel in der Schweiz. Opferschutz und Alltagsrealität, SFM-Studien 52D. Neuchatel: SFM - Forum suisse pour l'étude des migrations et de la population.
- O'Connell Davidson, J. (2006) Männer, Mittler, Migranten. *Osteuropa*, 56, 6, 7-20.
- O'Connell Davidson, J. (2006) 'Men, middlemen, and migrants: the demand side of trafficking' at: <http://www.eurozine.com/articles/2006-07-27-davidsonen.html> (accessed 20 June 2008).
- Paoli, L. (2003) The informal economy and organized crime. In Shapland, J., Albrecht, H.-J., Ditton, J. & Godefroy, T. (eds) *The Informal Economy: Threat and Opportunity in the City*. Freiburg.
- Rolf, R. (2005) Die Bekämpfung des Menschenhandels mit den Mitteln des Strafrechts und des Öffentlichen Rechts und des Zivilrechts. Göttingen: V&R Unipress,.
- Schauer, C. (2006) Jeder holt sich, was er will: Sexuelle Ausbeutung von Frauen und Kindern in einer tschechischen Grenzregion. *Osteuropa*, 56, 6, 235-245.
- Schloenhardt, A. (1999) Organized Crime and the Business of Migrant Trafficking. Canberra: Australian Institute of Criminology.
- Sieber, U. & Bögel, M. (1993) Logistik der Organisierten Kriminalität. Wiesbaden.
- Siegmund, J. (2006) Die unbekannteste Spezies. Ein Versuch, sich den Freiern zu nähern. *Osteuropa*, 56, 6, 87-98.
- UNDOC (2006) Trafficking in Persons. Global Patterns. Vienna: United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime.
- UNDOC (2009) Trafficking in Persons. Analysis on Europe, Vienna: United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime.

Wijers, M. & Lap-Chew, L. (1997) Trafficking in Women. Forced Labour and Slavery-like Practices in Marriage, Domestic Labour and Prostitution. Utrecht: Foundation against Trafficking in Women.

SEXUAL HARASSMENT

- Barak, A. (2005) Sexual harassment on the internet. *Social Science Computer Review*, 23, 1, 77-92.
- Begany, J.J. & Milburn, M.A. (2002) Psychological predictors of sexual harassment: authoritarianism, hostile sexism and rape myths. *Psychology of Men and Masculinity*, 3, 2, 119-126.
- Dekker, I. & Barling, J. (1998) Personal and organizational predictors of workplace sexual harassment of women by men. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, 3, 1, 7-18.
- Fineran, S., & Bolen, R.M. (2006) Risk factors for peer sexual harassment in schools. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 21, 9, 1169-1190.
- Fitzgerald, L.F., Drasgow, F., Hulin, C.L., Gelfand, M.J. & Magley, V.J. (1997) Antecedents and consequences of sexual harassment in organizations: A test of an integrated model. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 82, 4, 578-589.
- Hesson-McInnis, M.S. & Fitzgerald, L.F. (1997) Sexual harassment: A preliminary test of an integrative model. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 27, 10, 877-901.
- O'Donohue, W., Downs, K. & Yeater, E.A. (1998) Sexual harassment: A review of the literature. *Aggression and Violent Behavior*, 3, 2, 111-128.
- Pina, A., Gannon, T.A. & Saunders, B. (2009) An overview of the literature on sexual harassment: perpetrator, theory and treatment issues. *Aggression and Violent Behavior*, 14, 2, 126-138.
- Robinson, K.H. (2005) Reinforcing hegemonic masculinities through sexual harassment: issues of identity, power and popularity in secondary schools. *Gender and Education*, 17, 1, 19-37.
- Studd, M.V. (1996) Sexual harassment. In Buss, D.M. & Malamuth, N.M. (eds.): *Sex, Power, Conflict. Evolutionary and Feminist Perspectives*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Uggen, C. & Blackstone, A. (2004) Sexual harassment as a gendered expression of power. *American Sociological Review*, 69, 64-92.
- Willness, C.R., Steel, P. & Lee, K. (2007) A meta-analysis of the antecedents and consequences of workplace sexual harassment. *Personnel Psychology*, 60, 127-162.

VIOLENCE AGAINST CHILDREN

- Behl, L.E., Conyngham, H.A. & May, P.F. (2003). Trends in child maltreatment literature. *Child Abuse & Neglect*, 27, 215-229.
- Deegener G. & Körner W. (eds.) (2005) *Kindesmisshandlung und Vernachlässigung*. Göttingen: Hogrefe.
- Drake, B. & Pandey, C. (1996) Understanding the relationship between neighbourhood poverty and specific types of child maltreatment. *Child Abuse & Neglect*, 20, 11, 1003-1018
- Jonson-Reid, M., Drake, B., Chung, S. & Way, I. (2003). Cross-type recidivism among child maltreatment victims and perpetrators. *Child Abuse & Neglect*, 27, 899-917.
- Kindler, H. (2009 a) Wie könnte ein Risikoinventar für frühe Hilfe aussehen? In Meysen, T., Schönecker, L. & Kindler, H. *Frühe Hilfen im Kinderschutz*. Weinheim: Juventa.
- Kindler, H. (2009 b) Kindeswohlgefährdung: Ein Forschungsupdate zu Ätiologie, Folgen, Diagnostik und Intervention. *Prax. Kinderpsychol. Kinderpsychiatr.*, 58, 764-785.
- Kindler H., Derr R. & Herzig S. (2009). *Kinderschutz und neue Medien bzw. Kommunikationstechnologien. Teil 1. Ein Forschungsüberblick. Kindesmisshandlung und -vernachlässigung*, 12, 5-22.
- Miller-Perrin, C.L. & Perrin, R.D. (2007) *Child Maltreatment. An Introduction, Second Edition*. Thousand Oaks: Sage.
- Scannapieco, M. & Connell-Carrick, K. (2005) *Understanding Child Maltreatment. An Ecological and Developmental Perspective*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Windham, A.M., Rosenberg, L., Fuddy, L., McFarlane, E., Sia, C. & Duggan, A.K. (2004) Risk of mother-reported child abuse in the first 3 years of life. *Child Abuse & Neglect*, 28, 645–667.

CHILD ABUSE AND NEGLECT

- Altemeier, W. A. (1984) Prediction of child abuse: A prospective study of feasibility. *Child Abuse & Neglect*, 8, 4, 393–400.
- Altemeier, W. A., O'Connor, S., Sherrod, K. B., & Tucker, D. (1986) Outcome of abuse during childhood among pregnant low income women. *Child Abuse & Neglect*, 10(3), 319–330.
- Behl, L.E., Conyngham, H.A. & May, P.F. (2003) Trends in child maltreatment literature. *Child Abuse & Neglect*, 27, 215-229.
- Belsky, J. (1993) Etiology of Child Maltreatment: A Developmental-Ecological Analysis. *Psychological Bulletin*, 114, 413–434.
- Black, D. A., Heyman, R. E., & Slep, A. M. S. (2001) Risk factors for child physical abuse. *Aggression and Violent Behavior*, 6, 2-3, 121 - 188.
- Black, D., Slep, A. & Heyman, R. (2001) Risk factors for child psychological abuse. *Aggression and Violent Behavior*, 6, 2-3, 189-201.
- Brayden, R.M., Altemeier, W.A., Tucker, D.D., Dietrich, M.S., & Vietze, P. (1992) Antecedents of child neglect in the first two years of life. *The Journal of Pediatrics*, 120, 3, 426–429.
- Brown, J., Cohen, P., Johnson, J.G. & Salzinger, S. (1998) A longitudinal analysis of risk factors for child maltreatment: Findings of a 17-year prospective study of officially recorded and self-reported child abuse and neglect. *Child Abuse & Neglect*, 22, 1056–1078.
- Bugental, D.B. & Schwartz, A. (2009) A cognitive approach to child mistreatment prevention among medically at-risk infants. *Developmental Psychology*, 45, 284–288.
- Capaldi, D.M., Kim, H.K. & Pears, K.C. (2009) The association between partner violence and child maltreatment. A common conceptual framework. In Whitaker, D. J. & Lutzker J. R. (eds.), *Preventing Partner Violence: Research and Evidence-based Intervention Strategies*. Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.
- Chaffin, M., Kelleher, K. & Hollenberg, J. (1996) Onset of physical abuse and neglect: Psychiatric, substance abuse, and social risk factors from prospective community data. *Child Abuse & Neglect*, 20, 191–203.
- Christensen, M.J., Brayden, R.M., Dietrich, M.S. & McLaughlin, F J. (1994) The prospective assessment of self-concept in neglectful and physically abusive low income mothers. *Child Abuse & Neglect*, 18, 225–232.
- Costello, E.J., Compton, S.N., Keeler, G. & Angold, A. (2003) Relationships between poverty and psychopathology: A natural experiment. *JAMA: Journal of the American Medical Association*, 290, 2023–2029.
- Dixon, L., Browne, K., & Hamilton-Giachritsis, C. (2005) Risk factors of parents abused as children: A mediational analysis of the intergenerational continuity of child maltreatment (Part I). *Journal of Child Psychology and Psychiatry*, 46. 1, 47–57.
- Dixon, L., Hamilton-Giachritsis, C., & Browne, K. (2005) Attributions and behaviours of parents abused as children: A mediational analysis of the intergenerational continuity of child maltreatment (Part II). *Journal of Child Psychology and Psychiatry*, 46, 1, 58–68.
- Guterman, N.B., Lee, S.J., Taylor, C.A. & Rathouz, P.J. (2009) Parental perceptions of neighborhood processes, stress, personal control, and risk for physical child abuse and neglect. *Child Abuse & Neglect*, 33, 897-906.
- Hindley, N., Ramchandani, P.G. & Jones, D.P.H. (2010) Risk factors for recurrence of maltreatment: A systematic review. *Archives of Diseases of Childhood*, 91, 744-753.
- Hunter, R.S. & Kilstrom, N. (1979) Breaking the cycle in abusive families. *The American Journal of Psychiatry*, 136, 10, 1320–1322.
- Hunter, R.S., Kilstrom, N., Krabill, E.N. & Loda, F. (1978) Antecedents of child abuse and neglect in premature infants. A prospective study in a newborn Intensive care unit. *Pediatrics*, 61, 629–635.

- Kim, J. (2009) Type-specific intergenerational transmission of neglectful and physically abusive parenting behaviors among young parents. *Children and Youth Services Review*, 31, 761–767.
- Kotch, J.B., Browne, D.C., Dufort, V. & Winsor, J. (1999) Predicting child maltreatment in the first 4 years of life from characteristics assessed in the neonatal period. *Child Abuse & Neglect*, 23, 305–319.
- Kotch, J.B., Browne, D.C., Ringwalt, C.L., Dufort, V. & Ruina, E. (1997) Stress, social support, and substantiated maltreatment in the second and third years of life. *Child Abuse & Neglect*, 21, 1025–1037.
- Kovan, N.M., Chung, A.L. & Sroufe, L. A. (2009) The intergenerational continuity of observed early parenting: A prospective, longitudinal study. *Developmental Psychology*, 45, 1205–1213.
- Lee, B.J. & Goerge, R.M. (1999) Poverty, early childbearing and child maltreatment: A multinomial analysis. *Children and Youth Services Review*, 21, 755–780.
- Mayer, M., Lavergne, C., Tourigny, M. & Wright, J. (2007) Characteristics differentiating neglected children from other reported children. *Journal of Family Violence*, 22, 721–732.
- McCoy, M. L. & Keen, S.M. (2009) *Child abuse and neglect*. New York: Psychology Press.
- Ovwigo, P.C., Leavitt, K.L. & Born, C.E. (2003) Risk factors for child abuse and neglect among former TANF families: Do later leavers experience greater risk? *Children and Youth Services Review*, 25, 139–163.
- Palusci, V.J., Smith, E.G. & Paneth, N. (2005) Predicting and responding to physical abuse in young children using NCANDS. *Children and Youth Services Review*, 27, 667–682.
- Pears, K.C. & Capaldi, D.M. (2001) Intergenerational transmission of abuse: A two-generational prospective study of an at-risk sample. *Child Abuse & Neglect*, 25, 11, 1439–1461.
- Pianta, R., Egeland, B. & Erickson, M.F. (1989) The antecedents of maltreatment: Results of the mother-child interaction research project. In Cicchetti, D. & Carlson, V. (eds.), *Child Maltreatment: Theory and Research on the Causes and Consequences of Child Abuse and Neglect*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Schumacher, J.A., Slep, A.M.S. & Heyman, R.E. (2001) Risk factors for child neglect. *Aggression and Violent Behavior*, 6, 231–254.
- Sidebotham, P., Golding, J. & The ALSPAC Study Team (2001) Child maltreatment in the 'children of the nineties': A longitudinal study of parental risk factors. *Child Abuse & Neglect*, 25, 9, 1177–1200.
- Sidebotham, P. & Heron, J. (2003) Child maltreatment in the 'children of the nineties': The role of the child. *Child Abuse & Neglect*, 27, 3, 337–352.
- Sidebotham, P. & Heron, J. (2006) Child maltreatment in the 'children of the nineties': A cohort study of risk factors. *Child Abuse & Neglect*, 30, 5, 497–522.
- Sidebotham, P., Heron, J. & Golding, J. (2002) Child maltreatment in the 'children of the nineties': Deprivation, class, and social networks in a UK sample. *Child Abuse & Neglect*, 26, 12, 1243–1259.
- Stith, S.M., Liu, T., Davies, L.C., Boykin, E.L., Adler, M.C. & Harris, J.M. (2009) Risk-factors in child maltreatment: A meta-analytic review of the literature. *Aggression and Violent Behavior*, 14, 13–29.
- Windham, A.M., Rosenberg, L., Fuddy, L., McFarlane, E., Sia, C. & Duggan, A.K. (2004) Risk of mother-reported child abuse in the first 3 years of life. *Child Abuse & Neglect*, 28, 645–667.
- Wu, S.S., Ma, C.-X., Carter, R L., Ariet, M., Feaver, E.A., Resnick, M.B. & Roth, J. (2004) Risk factors for infant maltreatment: A population-based study. *Child Abuse & Neglect*, 28, 1253–1264.
- Yampolskaya, S., Greenbaum, P.E. & Berson, I.R. (2009) Profiles of child maltreatment perpetrators and risk for fatal assault: a latent class analysis. *Journal of Family Violence*, 24, 337-348.

CHILD SEXUAL ABUSE

- Black, D., Heyman, R. & Slep, A. (2001) Risk factors for child sexual abuse. *Aggression and Violent Behavior*, 6, 203-229.
- Boney-McCoy, S. & Finkelhor, D. (1995) Prior victimization: A risk factor for child sexual abuse and for PTSD-related symptomatology among sexually abused youth. *Child Abuse & Neglect*, 19, 401-421.
- Calder, M.C. (ed) (2008) *The Complete Guide to Sexual Abuse Assessment*. Dorset: Russell House.
- Coulton, C., Crampton, D., Irwin, M., Spilsbury, J. & Korbin, J. (2007) How neighborhoods influence child maltreatment: A review of the literature and alternative pathways. *Child Abuse & Neglect*, 31, 1117-1142.
- Craissati, J., McClurg, G. & Browne, K. (2002) Characteristics of perpetrators of child sexual abuse who have been sexually victimized as children. *Sexual Abuse: A Journal of research and Treatment* 14, 3, 225-239.
- Deegener, G. (ed.) (1999) *Sexuelle und körperliche Gewalt, Therapie jugendlicher und erwachsener Täter*. Weinheim: Psychologie Verlags Union.
- Ernst, J.S. (2000) Mapping child maltreatment: looking at neighborhoods in a suburban county. *Child Welfare*, 79, 5, 555-572.
- Fergusson, D.M., Lynskey, M.T & Horwood, J.L. (1996) Childhood sexual abuse and psychiatric disorder in young adulthood, I. prevalence of sexual abuse and factors associated with sexual abuse. *Journal of the American Academy for Child and Adolescent Psychiatry*, 34, 1355-1364.
- Fergusson, D., Horwood, L. & Woodward, L. (2000) The stability of child abuse reports: A longitudinal study of the reporting behaviour of young adults. *Psychological Medicine*, 30, 529-544.
- Finkelhor, D. (1984) *Child Sexual Abuse: New Theory and Research*. New York: Free Press.
- Finkelhor, D., & Jones, L. (2004) *Explanations for the Decline in Child Sexual Abuse Cases*. Washington: Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention.
- Finkelhor, D., D., Turner, H., Ormrod, R. & Hamby, S.L. (2009). Violence, abuse, and crime exposure in a national sample of children and youth. *Pediatrics* 124, 1411-1423.
- Finkelhor, D., Moore, D., Hamby, S. & Straus, M. (1997) Sexually abused children in a national survey of parents: Methodological issues. *Child Abuse & Neglect*, 21, 1-9.
- Finkelhor, D., Ormrod, R. & Turner, H. (2007) Re-victimization patterns in a national longitudinal sample of children and youth. *Child Abuse & Neglect*, 31, 479-502.
- Friedrich, W. (2007) *Children with Sexual Behavior Problems*. New York: Norton.
- Gannon, T. & Rose, M. (2008) Female child sexual offenders: Towards integrating theory and practice. *Aggression and Violent Behavior*, 13, 442-461.
- Guterman, N.B., Lee, S.J., Taylor, C.A. & Rathouz, P.J. (2009) Parental perceptions of neighborhood processes, stress, personal control, and risk for physical child abuse and neglect. *Child Abuse & Neglect*, 33, 897-906.
- Hanson, R. & Morton-Bourgon, K. (2004) *Predictors of Sexual Recidivism: An Updated Meta-Analysis (Corrections User Report No. 2004-02)*. Ottawa, Ontario, Canada: Public Safety Canada.
- Hindman, J. & Peters, J. (2001) Polygraph testing leads to better understanding of adult and juvenile sex offenders. *Federal Probation*, 65, 8-15.
- Kindler H., Derr R. & Herzig S. (2010). Kinderschutz und neue Medien bzw. Kommunikationstechnologien. *Forschungsüberblick: Teil 2. Kindesmisshandlung und – vernachlässigung*, 13, 4-19.
- Kingston, D., Firestone, P., Wexler, A. & Bradford, J. (2008) Factors associated with recidivism among intrafamilial child molesters. *Journal of Sexual Aggression*, 14, 3-18.
- McMillan, D., Hastings, R., Salter, D. & Skuse, D. (2008) Developmental risk factor research and sexual offending against children: A review of some methodological issues. *Archives of Sexual Behavior*, 37, 877-890.
- Peredaa, N., Guilerab, G., Fornsa, M. & Gómez-Benitob, J. (2009) The international epidemiology of child sexual abuse: A continuation of Finkelhor (1994). *Child Abuse & Neglect*, 33, 331-342.

- Salter, D., McMillan, D., Richards, M., Talbot, T., Hodges, J., Bentovim, A., Hastings, R., Stevenson, J. & Skuse, D. (2003) Development of sexually abusive behaviour in sexually victimised males: a longitudinal study. *The Lancet*, 361, 471–76.
- Turner, H., Finkelhor, D. & Ormrod, R. (2010). Child mental health problems as risk factors for victimization. *Child Maltreatment*, 15, 2, 132-143.
- Turner, H., Finkelhor, D. & Ormrod, R. (2007) Family structure variations in patterns and predictors of child victimization. *American Journal of Orthopsychiatry*, 77, 282-295.
- Ward, T. & Siegert, R.J. (2002) Toward a comprehensive theory of child sexual abuse: A theory knitting perspective. *Psychology, Crime & Law*, 8, 319-351.
- Ward, T., Polaschek, D. & Beech, A. (2006) *Theories of Sexual Offending*. New York: Wiley.
- Whitaker, D., Le, B., Hanson, K., Baker, C., McMahan, P., Ryan, G., Klein, A. & Rice, D. (2008) Risk factors for the perpetration of child sexual abuse: A review and meta-analysis. *Child Abuse & Neglect*, 32, 529-548.
- Widom, C.S. & Ames, A. (1994) Criminal consequences of childhood sexual victimization. *Child Abuse & Neglect*, 18, 303-318.
- Wilson, R. (2004) Recognizing the threat posed by an incestuous parent to the victim's siblings: part I: appraising the risk. *Journal of Child and Family Studies*, 13, 143-162.
- Windham, A.M., Rosenberg, L., Fuddy, L., McFarlane, E., Sia, C. & Duggan, A.K. (2004) Risk of mother-reported child abuse in the first 3 years of life. *Child Abuse & Neglect*, 28, 6, 645–667.

CHILD SEXUAL EXPLOITATION

- Goodey, J. (2008) Human trafficking: Sketchy data and policy responses, *Criminology and Criminal Justice*, 8, 421-442.
- Itzin, C. (1997) Pornography and the organization of intrafamilial und extrafamilial child sexual abuse: Developing a conceptual model. *Child Abuse Review*, 6, 94-106.
- Mitchell, K.J., Finkelhor, D. & Wolak, J. (2010): Conceptualizing juvenile prostitution as child maltreatment: Findings from the national juvenile prostitution study. *Child Maltreatment* 15, 1, 18-36.
- Seto, M.C. & Eke, A.W. (2005) The criminal histories and later offending of child pornography offenders. *Sexual Abuse. A Journal of Research and Treatment* 17, 200-210.
- Surtees, R. (2008) Traffickers and trafficking in Southern and Eastern Europe: Considering the other side of human trafficking, *European Journal of Criminology*, 5, 39-68.
- Webb, L., Craissati, J. & Keen, S. (2007) Characteristics of internet child pornography offenders: A comparison with child molesters. *Sexual Abuse. A Journal of Research and Treatment*, 19, 449-465.

VIOLENCE BASED ON SEXUAL ORIENTATION

- Craig, K.M. (2002) Examining hate-motivated aggression: A review of the social psychological literature on hate crimes as a distinct form of aggression, *Aggression and Violent Behaviour* 7, 85-101.
- Deutsches Forum für Kriminalprävention (ed.) (2003) Arbeitsgruppe: Primäre Prävention von Gewalt gegen Gruppenangehörige - insbesondere: junge Menschen - Materialsammlung: Tagungsband Symposium.
- Dobler, J. (1992) Antischwule Gewalt in Niedersachsen: Ausmaß, Delikte, Täter-Opfer-Maßnahmen. Hannover: Niedersächsisches Sozialministerium
- Gordon, A.R., Meyer, I.H. (2007) Gender nonconformity as a target of prejudice, discrimination, and violence against LGB individuals. *Journal of LGBT Health Research* 3, 3, 55-71.
- Jugendnetzwerk Lambda NRW e.V (ed.). (1996) Freundinnen – eine Studie zur Situation lesbischer Mädchen. Köln: Selbstverlag.
- Lesbenberatung Berlin e.V. (1998) Dokumentation der Fragebogenauswertung Gewalt gegen Lesben in Berlin 1996/1997. Berlin: Selbstverlag.
- LSVD-Sozialwerk e.V. (ed.) (2000) Hass-Verbrechen. Neue Forschung und Positionen zu anti-homosexueller Gewalt. Köln: Selbstverlag.

- MANEO (ed.) (2007) Gewalterfahrungen von schwulen und bisexuellen Jugendlichen und Männern in Deutschland - Ergebnisse der MANEO-Umfrage 2006/2007. Berlin: Selbstverlag.
- Mason, G. (1993) Violence Against Lesbians and Gay Men. Canberra: Australia Institute of Criminology.
- Mason, G. & Tomsen, S (eds.) (1997) Homophobic Violence. Sydney: Hawkins Press.
- McDevitt, J., Levin, J. & Bennett, S. (2002). Hate crime offenders: an expanded typology, *Journal of Social Issues*, 58, 2, 303–317.
- McDevitt, J. & Williamson, J. (2002) Hate crimes directed at gay, lesbian, bisexual and transgendered victims. In Heitmeyer, W. & Hagan, J.. (eds.) *International Handbook of Violence Research*. Dordrecht: Kluwer.
- Meyer, D. (2008) The Intersection of Gender and Sexuality: Homophobic Violence as a Social Control Mechanism, Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Sociological Association Annual Meeting, Sheraton Boston and the Boston Marriott Copley Place, Boston, MA available at http://www.allacademic.com/meta/p242094_index.html (2010-01-23).
- Meyer, D. (2009) "An Intersectional Analysis of LGBT Hate Crime Victims" Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Sociological Association Annual Meeting, Hilton San Francisco, San Francisco, CA, available at http://www.allacademic.com/meta/p306921_index.html
- Ohms, C. & Stehling, K (2001) Gewalt gegen Lesben - Gewalt gegen Schwule: Thesen zu Differenzen und Gemeinsamkeiten. In Lesben Informations- und Beratungsstelle e.V. (eds.): *Gewalt gegen Lesben /Violence against against Lesbians: 1. Europäisches Symposium*. Berlin: Querverlag.
- Stein-Hilbers, M., Holzbecher, M., Klodwig, B., Kroder, U. & Soine, S. (1999) Studie über Diskriminierungs- und Gewalterfahrungen lesbischer Frauen. Bielefeld: Ministerium für Frauen, Jugend, Familie und Gesundheit des Landes NRW.
- Uhle, J. (1994) Jugendgewalt gegen Schwule. Eine Studie zu psychosozialen Faktoren bei Tätern. Bericht. Berlin: Festland e.V. - Verein psychosozialer Projekte und Senatsverwaltung für Jugend und Familie.
- Van den Ven, P. (1995) Talking with juvenile offenders about gay males and lesbians: Implications for combating homophobia. *Adolescence*, 30, 117, 19-42.