



1 patriarchy. Paralleling this is the evolutionary view  
 2 that male violence is the consequence of mate-guarding  
 3 arising from paternity uncertainty [e.g. Wilson and  
 4 Daly, 1992, 1996]. However, some research suggests  
 5 that women's IPV is not solely motivated by self-  
 6 defense [Gray and Forshee, 1997; Straus and Gelles,  
 7 1988; Stets and Straus, 1990] as women can be violent  
 8 toward nonviolent partners [Morse, 1995; Simmons  
 9 et al., 2005; Straus and Ramirez, 2007], and the risk  
 10 factors for intimate partner violence (IPV) are present  
 11 3 years before dating [Moffitt et al., 2001]. Therefore,  
 12 self-defense cannot reliably account for women's  
 13 perpetration of IPV. If men and women differ in their  
 14 use of general violence and antisocial behavior, but are  
 15 similar in their use of IPV, the risk factors for these  
 16 two types of behavior need to be investigated  
 17 separately, for men and women.

18 Few studies have assessed general violence, IPV,  
 19 and nonviolent offending behavior in men and  
 20 women at the same time. These three areas are  
 21 usually researched separately, although there is  
 22 research to suggest that the offenses may partially  
 23 overlap [Farrington et al., 2006; Gottfredson and  
 24 Hirschi, 2007; Moffitt et al., 2000; Straus and  
 25 Ramirez, 2004], providing a rationale for assessing  
 26 them all in one population. When the three crime  
 27 types have been assessed in the same population,  
 28 different measures, with different response formats,  
 29 have been used to assess each one. Some authors [e.g.  
 30 Straus and Ramirez, 2004] have commented that the  
 31 one limitation of their research is the brevity of the  
 32 measure of general violence and nonviolent offend-  
 33 ing. To overcome this limitation, this research used a  
 34 measure which assesses all three offense types, has  
 35 equal questions for partner and general violence, and  
 36 uses the same response format throughout.

37 Earlier research has typically not separated involve-  
 38 ment in general violence and nonviolent offending,  
 39 combining them into one category. Moffitt et al.  
 40 [2000] included general violence with nonviolent  
 41 offenses as "general crime," and compared this with  
 42 IPV, finding that general crime was predicted by low  
 43 self-control but that IPV was not. They did not assess  
 44 whether general violence and nonviolent crimes were  
 45 distinct. This study extends this research by analyzing  
 46 the three offenses as three separate domains, although  
 47 with the limitation that this study involved a relatively  
 48 small student sample, whereas that of Moffitt et al. was  
 49 a large representative longitudinal study.

51 **Personality and Offending Behavior**

52 There has been a lot of research interest in  
 53 the relationship between personality and offending

54 behavior. Psychoticism, extraversion, and neuroticism  
 55 have been found to be predictors of self-reported  
 56 nonviolent offending [Eysenck, 1996; Walker and  
 57 Gudjonsson, 2006]. Similarly, Heaven [1996] found  
 58 that conscientiousness correlated negatively with self-  
 59 reported offending in men and women, and that  
 60 agreeableness correlated negatively with self-reported  
 61 offending in men. Personality traits have also been  
 62 correlated with aggression. Low agreeableness and  
 63 conscientiousness and high neuroticism were found to  
 64 be associated with physical aggression in men and  
 65 women [Caprara et al., 1996; Gleason et al., 2004;  
 66 Sharpe and Desai, 2001; Tremblay and Ewart, 2005].  
 67 Heaven [1996] found that low agreeableness was  
 68 correlated with partner violence for men and women,  
 69 but neuroticism only related to partner violence  
 70 perpetration for women. Similarly, Sommer et al.  
 71 [1992] found that women with higher scores on the  
 72 psychoticism and neuroticism scales were most at risk  
 73 for partner violence perpetration. This research  
 74 suggests that men and women who offend (whether  
 75 violently or not) have lower adaptive personality traits.

76 Personality disorders (PDs) have also been asso-  
 77 ciated with offending behavior. However, most  
 78 studies focus on borderline and antisocial PDs, so  
 79 that empirical data on the remaining eight PDs is  
 80 sparse [Emmelkamp and Kamphuis, 2007]. Cluster  
 81 B PDs consist of antisocial, borderline, histrionic,  
 82 and narcissistic, which together are known as the  
 83 "dramatic" disorders, and have been associated with  
 84 perpetration of crime and violence. Antisocial PD is  
 85 characterized by a lack of regard for others,  
 86 aggressiveness, and impulsivity, and a lack of  
 87 remorse for actions. Patients with antisocial PD  
 88 may also get pleasure from the suffering they inflict  
 89 on others [Emmelkamp and Kamphuis, 2007].  
 90 Antisocial PD has been associated with nonviolent  
 91 offending, as well as violent behavior in and out of  
 92 the home, for men and women [Barros and Serafim,  
 93 2008; Emmelkamp and Kamphuis, 2007; Holtzworth-  
 94 Munroe et al., 2000]. Borderline PD is characterized  
 95 by general instability across many areas of life,  
 96 including relationships, as well as unpredictable  
 97 mood swings from extreme anger to despondency.  
 98 Borderline PD has been associated with partner  
 99 violence perpetration, and also with violence out of  
 100 the home, in both men and women [Emmelkamp  
 101 and Kamphuis, 2007; Henning et al., 2003; Holtz-  
 102 worth-Munroe and Stuart, 1994]. Narcissistic PD has  
 103 also been associated with violence within and outside  
 104 relationships. The initial idea for the link between  
 105 narcissism and aggression came from Baumeister  
 106 et al. [1996], who established that physical aggression  
 107 was the result of a combination of threatened egotism

1 and favorable self-appraisals. Similarly, Lawrence  
 2 [2006] has found that an unstable self-concept  
 3 combined with high narcissism is linked with aggres-  
 4 sion. Narcissists may react with aggression if they feel  
 5 humiliated, socially rejected, or if their self-esteem is  
 6 challenged, and they report low levels of empathy for  
 7 their victims [Emmelkamp and Kamphuis, 2007;  
 8 Henning et al., 2003].

9 Cluster C PDs consist of avoidant, dependent, and  
 10 obsessive-compulsive, which together are known as  
 11 the “anxious” disorders, and have been associated  
 12 with perpetration of violence [Emmelkamp and  
 13 Kamphuis, 2007] and IPV in men [Dutton, 2002;  
 14 Dutton and Kerry, 1999; Munroe and Stuart, 1994]  
 15 and women [Henning et al., 2003]. However, Ehrensaft  
 16 et al. [2006] found that cluster C PDs were protective  
 17 in relation to IPV perpetration in men and women.

18 Cluster A PDs consists of paranoid, schizoid, and  
 19 schizotypal, which together are known as the “odd”  
 20 disorders. Cluster A PDs (i.e. schizoid) have been  
 21 associated with violent and criminal behavior in the  
 22 borderline subtype of men [Holtzworth-Munroe  
 23 et al., 2000], and have been associated with men’s  
 24 and women’s IPV [Ehrensaft et al., 2006]. Therefore,  
 25 research findings suggest that many perpetrators of  
 26 violence, in and out of the home, and perpetrators  
 27 of nonviolent offending behavior will show evidence  
 28 of PDs.

29 There seems to be no studies investigating *both*  
 30 adaptive and maladaptive personality in violent *and*  
 31 nonviolent offending behavior, so this study ad-  
 32 dresses this gap. It is important to investigate  
 33 adaptive as well as maladaptive personality, so as  
 34 to avoid labeling people with a “deviant person-  
 35 ality” and to assess how adaptive traits may also be  
 36 involved. Focusing only on the maladaptive part of  
 37 personality is a very narrow approach and can lead  
 38 to over psychopathologizing of offenders. There-  
 39 fore, considering personality on a dimension of  
 40 adaptive and maladaptive traits is a more rounded  
 41 approach and also considers protective factors.

42 The purpose of this study was twofold: first, to  
 43 investigate sex differences in offending behavior;  
 44 and second, to investigate predictors of violent and  
 45 nonviolent offending separately for men and wom-  
 46 en, to assess whether there were offense-specific  
 47 and sex-specific risk factors.

49 **METHOD**

51 **Participants**

53 Participants were a convenience sample recruited  
 on a British university campus. There were 297

participants, 116 (39.1%) men and 181 (60.9%) 55  
 women. Ages ranged from 18 to 49 with a mean of 57  
 23.83 years (men: 23.08; women: 24.31). The  
 response rate was 71.6%. Of the 358 returned 59  
 questionnaires, 61 were removed either owing to  
 missing data, respondents not having had a partner 61  
 in the past 12 months, or respondents not being in a  
 heterosexual relationship; therefore, 297 were re- 63  
 tained for analysis. Individuals in homosexual  
 relationships were not included in this study, 65  
 because the number of responses was very low.

67 **Measures and Procedure**

68 The following questionnaire was distributed to 69  
 university students on campus, along with return 70  
 envelopes. Participants were recruited from open- 71  
 access computer rooms, the university library, and 72  
 from large lectures. Participants were from a variety 73  
 of courses, including Psychology. Students did not 74  
 receive course credit or compensation for taking 75  
 part in the research. Participants were told that the 76  
 data would be anonymous and that they could 77  
 withdraw anytime before handing in the question- 78  
 naire, but once they had returned it, this would not 79  
 be possible. Participants were told about the 80  
 purpose of the research on the front cover sheet of 81  
 the questionnaire and were given the opportunity to 82  
 ask any questions in the debriefing following the 83  
 completion of the questionnaire.

85 **Violent and Nonviolent Offending Behavior**  
 86 **Scale (Thornton et al., unpublished manuscript)**

87 The scale developed measured IPV perpetration 88  
 (20 items) and victimization (20 items), general 89  
 violence perpetration (20 items), and perpetration of 90  
 nonviolent offenses (30 items). All items were pulled 91  
 from already existing measures and were adapted 92  
 for use in this study, so that all items had the same 93  
 scoring procedure. Participants were asked to self- 94  
 report the extent to which they had been violent 95  
 toward their partners and others, and engaged in 96  
 nonviolent offenses in the past 12 months. Partici- 97  
 pants were also asked to self-report their own IPV 98  
 victimization in the past 12 months. This time period 99  
 is commonly used in both studies of IPV [e.g. Straus, 100  
 1979; Straus et al., 1996] and in general aggression 101  
 research [e.g. Richardson and Green, 1999, 2003]. 102  
 Items were answered on a 7-point scale of 0 (Never 103  
 happened) to 6 (Happened more than 25 times). 104  
 Straus et al. [1996] recommend recoding the 105  
 responses to weigh the data by creating midpoints 106  
 for each of the items as follows: 4 (3–5 times), 8 107  
 (6–10 times), 15 (11–20 times), and 25 (more than

20 times). These midpoints could then be summed to obtain a yearly frequency score for each offense category. Cronbach's  $\alpha$  was used to assess scale reliability and found to be  $\alpha = .90$  for general violence,  $\alpha = .75$  for IPV, and  $\alpha = .75$  for nonviolent offending. This demonstrates good scale reliability.

**International Personality Item Pool (IPIP; Goldberg, 1999)**

The IPIP is a self-report personality measure, based on the "Big Five" [Costa and McCrae, 1992], and was used to measure adaptive personality across five personality factors: Extraversion, Agreeableness, Conscientiousness, Neuroticism, and Openness/Intellect. The IPIP consists of 50 items that are answered on a 5-point Likert scale (1, very inaccurate to 5, very accurate). Scores were summed for each of the "Big Five" traits.

**International Personality Disorder Examination—Screening Questionnaire (IPDE-SQ; Loranger et al., 1997)**

The IPDE-SQ was used to measure maladaptive personality. It measures ten PDs: Paranoid, Schizoid, Schizotypal, Histrionic, Antisocial, Narcissistic, Borderline, Compulsive, Dependent, and Avoidant. The IPDE-SQ consists of 77 items answered on a dichotomous scale of True or False. A score of 1 was assigned to True and 0 was assigned to False. Scores were then summed for each of the ten PDs. PD traits are referred to throughout rather than PDs, because the IPDE-SQ is a screening questionnaire and not a diagnostic tool.

**RESULTS**

Before analysis, the data was screened for accuracy, missing data, outliers and, normality

[Tabachnick and Fidell, 2007]. Outliers were reduced, so that extreme scores were one more than the next most extreme score. There were no multivariate outliers. Once outliers had been adjusted, there were no violations of normality. A  $P$  value of .05 was deemed not to be stringent enough, as it may result in type I errors; therefore,  $\alpha$  level of .01 was used throughout.

Frequency scores were calculated for each offense category, separately for men and women. The means and standard deviations for the number of offenses, along with  $F$  and  $d$  values for the sex differences, are shown in Table I. A series of one-way between subjects analyses of covariance were used to test for sex differences for each offense category, controlling for the effect of age. Research has shown that violence [e.g. Archer, 2004] and offending [Gottfredson and Hirschi, 2007] decreases with age. Comparing younger men with older women may increase the sex difference; therefore, it was necessary to adjust for age. After adjusting for age, it was found that men were more violent outside relationships than women and men perpetrated significantly more nonviolent offenses than women. Women reported perpetrating significantly more IPV than men. All these results were a medium-sized effect, according to Cohen's [1988] criteria (Table I).

**Correlational Analyses**

Table II shows the Pearson correlations between individual difference variables and each offense category, separately for men and women. There are similarities and differences between the correlations for men and women. General violence was significantly related to IPV perpetration and non-violent offending in both men and women, demonstrating that general violence overlaps to some degree with perpetration of other offenses. However, IPV was only significantly related to nonviolent

**TABLE I. Means and Standard Deviations for Number of Offenses Within Each Category, for Men and Women (N = 116 Men, 181 Women), and F and d Values for Sex Differences Controlling for Age**

Offense category	Men		Women		F (df)	d <sup>a,b</sup>
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD		
General violence	7.74	9.87	4.33	5.81	12.21 (1, 294)*	0.44 (0.41)
IPV perpetration	0.91	1.53	2.91	4.11	27.39 (1, 294)**	-0.59 (-0.62)
IPV victimization	2.37	3.52	1.54	2.56	5.31 (1, 294)	0.28 (0.27)
Nonviolent offending	10.05	11.12	6.13	7.31	12.20 (1, 295)*	0.43 (0.41)

<sup>a</sup>Minus sign signifies higher values for women than men.

<sup>b</sup>d values in brackets are computed from the  $F$  value when controlling for age. The  $d$  values not in brackets were calculated from the means and standard deviations.

\*Significant at  $P < .01$ , \*\*significant at  $P < .001$ .

**TABLE II. Pearson's Correlations Between General Violence (GV), IPV, Nonviolent Offending (NV), Personality Disorder Traits, Personality Traits and Age, for Men's and Women's Self-Reports (N = 116 Men, 181 Women)**

	Men			Women		
	GV	IPV	NV	GV	IPV	NV
GV	–	.40**	.50**	–	–.39**	.33**
IPV		–	–.24		–	.38**
Age	–.35*	–.10	–.19	–.33**	–.17	–.19
Paranoid	.23	.26	.19	.19*	.26**	.17
Schizoid	.14	.37**	.16	–.12	.06	–.002
Schizotypal	.30*	.42**	.40**	.07	.11	.05
Cluster A total	.31**	.46**	.33*	.10	.18	.14
Histrionic	.33*	.18	.47**	.21*	.15	.30**
Antisocial	.36*	.24*	.41**	.19*	.26**	.26**
Narcissistic	.27*	.04	.19*	.16	.16	.21*
Borderline	.34**	.35**	.49**	.15	.30**	.22*
Cluster B total	.46**	.29*	.55**	.25*	.32**	.36**
Compulsive	.07	.04	–.07	–.02	.10	.08
Dependent	.41**	.23	.27*	.03	.13	.04
Avoidant	.19	.11	.11	.09	.14	.01
Cluster C total	.29*	.16	.13	.06	.17	.08
Extraversion	.12	–.02	.10	.09	.002	.15
Agreeableness	–.02	–.11	–.17	–.31**	–.14	–.15
Conscientiousness	–.07	.09	–.31*	–.13	–.06	–.14
Neuroticism	–.20	–.18	–.32**	–.14	–.24*	–.16
Openness	–.18	–.07	–.01	–.07	.002	–.02

\*Significant at the .01 level, \*\*significant at the .001 level.

offending in women, suggesting less overlap in this case for men (although the correlation was in the same direction for men). Age was significantly related to general violence, but not IPV or non-violent offending, for both men and women, showing that both sexes are less generally violent with age. Cluster A PD traits (paranoid, schizoid, schizotypal) were significantly correlated with IPV and nonviolent offending in men. Cluster B PD traits (histrionic, antisocial, narcissistic, borderline) were related to all three offense types in both men and women. Cluster C PD traits (compulsive, dependent, avoidant) were not significantly related to any of the offense types in either sex. Of the “Big Five” traits, men’s nonviolent offending was linked negatively with conscientiousness and with neuroticism, whereas women’s IPV was linked negatively with neuroticism and their general violence was linked negatively with agreeableness. These findings indicate sex differences in the associations between offense types and personality variables.

**Multiple Regression Analysis**

Six hierarchical multiple regressions were conducted, to assess the predictors of general violence, IPV, and nonviolent offending, separately for men and women. Hierarchical regression was used so that

age could be controlled in step 1, because research has shown that offending behavior decreases with age and there were consistent negative correlations in this study (Table II); step 2 added the other six predictor variables, three of the “big five” personality traits (agreeableness, conscientiousness, neuroticism) and the three PD trait clusters (A, B, and C). Table III displays the standardized regression coefficients (β), R<sup>2</sup> for step 1, and R<sup>2</sup> change for step 2.

**General Violence for Men**

Hierarchical regression showed that age explained a significant proportion of variance in general violence for men in step 1. In step 2, age and cluster B PD traits significantly explained a further 17.4% of the variance. The increase in explained variance contributed by the final model was significant ( $F(7, 106) = 3.73, P < .01$ ). Age was negatively associated with general violence, suggesting that men get less violent as they get older. Cluster B PD traits were positively associated with violence, so that men scoring higher on these traits are more likely to be physically aggressive toward other people. Overall, the model accounts for 29.6% of the variability (24.2% adjusted) in general violence for men and the overall regression model was significant ( $F(8, 106) = 5.56, P < .001$ ).

**TABLE III. Summary of Hierarchical Regression Analyses Displaying the Standardized Regression Coefficients ( $\beta$ ) for Personality Traits and Personality Disorder Traits, as Predictors of (1) General Violence, (2) IPV, and (3) NonViolent Offending, for Men ( $N = 116$ ) and Women ( $N = 181$ )<sup>a</sup>**

Variable	General violence		IPV		Nonviolent offending	
	Men	Women	Men	Women	Men	Women
Step 1						
Age	-.35**	-.32**	-.10	-.16	-.19	-.16
Step 2						
Age	-.28*	-.25*	-.09	-.10	-.03	-.11
Cluster A	.16	.01	.49**	.03	.17	.03
Cluster B	.35*	.24*	.07	.29*	.47**	.40**
Cluster C	.11	-.10	-.23	-.0	-.23	-.20
Agreeableness	.00	-.22*	.00	-.08	-.07	-.07
Conscientiousness	-.03	.03	.16	.08	-.23*	.01
Neuroticism	.06	-.04	.01	-.12	-.10	-.06

$R^2 = .12$  for step 1;  $\Delta R^2 = .17$  for step 2 ( $P < .01$ ).—General violence men,  $R^2 = .10$  for step 1;  $\Delta R^2 = .10$  for step 2 ( $P < .005$ ).—General violence women.  $R^2 = .01$  for step 1;  $\Delta R^2 = .26$  for step 2 ( $P < .001$ ).—IPV men.  $R^2 = .03$  for step 1;  $\Delta R^2 = .11$  for step 2 ( $P < .01$ ).—IPV women.  $R^2 = .04$  for step 1;  $\Delta R^2 = .37$  for step 2 ( $P < .001$ ).—Nonviolent men.  $R^2 = .03$  for step 1;  $\Delta R^2 = .15$  for step 2 ( $P < .001$ ).—Nonviolent women.

<sup>a</sup>Multiple regressions were also conducted using the yes/no variety scoring method (as advocated by Moffitt et al., 2000); however, the overall results remain unchanged. The same variables predicted the criterion variables.

\* $P < .01$ ; \*\* $P < .001$ .

### General Violence for Women

For women, a significant proportion of the variance in general violence was again explained by age in step 1. In step 2, age, cluster B PD traits, and agreeableness significantly explained a further 10.2% of the variance. The increase in explained variance contributed by the final model was significant ( $F(7, 168) = 3.08, P < .01$ ). The negative association with age indicates that women's general violence decrease as they get older. Agreeableness was also negatively associated with general violence, and there was a positive association for cluster B PD traits (as there was for men). Overall, the model accounts for 20.5% of the variability (16.7% adjusted) in general violence for women and the overall regression model was significant ( $F(8, 168) = 5.42, P < .001$ ).

### IPV Men

Age did not explain a significant proportion of the variance in IPV for men in step 1. In step 2, cluster A PD traits significantly explained 25.6% of the variance in IPV for men. The increase in explained variance contributed by these traits was significant ( $F(7, 106) = 5.27, P < .001$ ). The positive association for cluster A PD traits indicates that higher scores were associated with more physical aggression toward partners. Overall the model accounts for 26.5% of the variability (21% adjusted) in IPV for men and the overall regression model was significant ( $F(8, 106) = 4.78, P < .001$ ).

### IPV Women

Age did not explain a significant proportion of the variance in IPV for women in step 1. In step 2, cluster B PD traits significantly explained 11.2% of the variance. The increase in explained variance contributed by cluster B PD traits was significant ( $F(7, 168) = 3.12, P < .01$ ). The positive association between these two variables indicates that the higher women score on cluster B PD traits the more likely they are to be physically aggressive toward their partner. The overall model accounts for 13.7% of the variability (9.6% adjusted) in IPV for women and the overall regression model was significant ( $F(8, 168) = 3.34, P < .005$ ).

### Nonviolent Offending for Men

Age did not explain a significant proportion of the variance in nonviolent offending for men in step 1. In step 2, cluster B PD traits and conscientiousness significantly explained 36.8% of the variance. The increase in explained variance contributed by these variables was significant ( $F(7, 106) = 9.35, P < .001$ ). The positive sign for cluster B PD traits indicates that men scoring higher on these traits are more likely to perpetrate nonviolent offenses. The negative association for conscientiousness indicates that men scoring higher on this trait are less likely to perpetrate nonviolent offenses. The overall model accounts for 40.4% of the variability (35.9% adjusted) in nonviolent offending for men and the

1 overall regression model was significant ( $F(8, 106) =$   
 2 8.99,  $P < .001$ ).

3 **Nonviolent Offending for Women**

4 Age did not explain a significant proportion of the  
 5 variance in nonviolent offending for women in  
 6 step 1. In step 2, cluster B PD traits significantly  
 7 explained 14.6% of the variance. The increase in  
 8 explained variance contributed by cluster B PD  
 9 traits was significant ( $F(7, 169) = 4.25$ ,  $P < .001$ ). The  
 10 positive association indicates that women scoring  
 11 higher on cluster B PD traits are more likely to  
 12 perpetrate nonviolent offenses. The overall model  
 13 accounted for 17.2% of the variability (13.3%  
 14 adjusted) in nonviolent offending for women  
 15 and the overall regression model was significant  
 16 ( $F(8, 169) = 4.39$ ,  $P < .001$ ).

17 **Conclusions from Multiple Regression**  
 18 **Analyses**

19 Multiple regressions show similarities and differ-  
 20 ences in the predictors of men's and women's  
 21 offending. For general violence, men's and women's  
 22 offending share two predictors: a negative associa-  
 23 tion with age and a positive association with cluster  
 24 B PD traits. However, women's general violence was  
 25 also predicted by lower agreeableness and men's was  
 26 not. The predictors of IPV perpetration were  
 27 different for men and women. Men's perpetration  
 28 of IPV was predicted by cluster A PD traits, whereas  
 29 women's perpetration of IPV was predicted by  
 30 cluster B PD traits, but to a lesser extent. Both  
 31 men's and women's nonviolent offending was  
 32 predicted by higher cluster B PD traits. However,  
 33 men's nonviolent offending was also predicted by  
 34 lower conscientiousness and women's was not.  
 35 Overall, these results suggest that although men's  
 36 and women's offense perpetration shares similar risk  
 37 factors, there are also risk and protective factors  
 38 that are more relevant to one sex than the other.

39 **DISCUSSION**

40 In this study, self-reported offending was mea-  
 41 sured in men and women, together with personality  
 42 variables. The aim was to investigate sex differences  
 43 in offending and whether individual differences  
 44 could predict offending separately for men and  
 45 women. The results not only revealed some con-  
 46 sistent predictors of violent and nonviolent offend-  
 47 ing, but also revealed some unique risk and  
 48 protective factors. In many ways, these findings

support earlier research that has investigated one or  
 two of the variables investigated in this study  
 (offending behavior, personality traits, and PD  
 traits), but not all have earlier been investigated  
 together in the same sample.

When controlling for age, it was found that men  
 perpetrated significantly more violence out of the  
 home than women. This was an expected finding, as  
 earlier research in this area shows that men are  
 usually more aggressive than women outside in-  
 timate relationships [Archer, 2004, 2009; Moffitt  
 et al., 2001]. The results also revealed that women  
 perpetrated more physical aggression toward their  
 intimate partners than men did. This sex difference  
 in the perpetration of partner violence supports  
 earlier research findings which indicates that, within  
 intimate relationships, women can be as physically  
 aggressive as men, or slightly more so [Archer, 2000,  
 2006; Mirrlees-Black et al., 1998; Moffitt et al.,  
 2001]. This finding is influenced by culture and  
 occurs more in developed Western nations, such as  
 the United Kingdom, United States, and Canada,  
 where gender equality and individualism are both  
 high [Archer, 2006, 2009]. However, reporting issues  
 may have influenced the finding that women are  
 more physically aggressive in relationships than  
 men. Research has shown that both men and  
 women underreport their perpetration of IPV, but  
 this bias is more pronounced for men [Archer, 1999],  
 leading to sex differences being slightly more in the  
 female direction for perpetrators' reports than for  
 victims' reports [Archer, 2000]. This reporting bias  
 may have affected the current results for perpetra-  
 tion if men disclosed less of their IPV perpetration  
 than women did. This seems likely, in view of the  
 absence of a significant sex difference in IPV  
 victimization, although this was slightly higher in  
 men than women. This result supports British Crime  
 Survey data which found that equal numbers of men  
 and women reported being victims of IPV in the last  
 year [Coleman et al., 2007; Mirrlees-Black et al.,  
 1998]. These results support the view that there is  
 similarity in the acts of physical aggression perpe-  
 trated by men and women in unselected samples  
 [Archer, 2000, 2002; Felson, 2002; Straus and  
 Ramirez, 2007]. The correlations between IPV  
 perpetration and victimization were large and  
 significant for men and women in the sample, which  
 also supports the argument of mutual combat within  
 relationships [e.g. Cascardi et al., 1992; Straus and  
 Ramirez, 2007].

We found that men perpetrated more nonviolent  
 offenses than women, which supports earlier re-  
 search findings, such as that of Moffitt et al. [2001]

1 and Steffensmeier and Allan [1996], who report that  
 2 men are generally more antisocial than women.  
 3 Women's involvement in nonviolent offenses is  
 4 consistent with the forensic literature, which sug-  
 5 gests that they generally perpetrate offenses where  
 6 there is a low risk of physical harm [Campbell, 1999,  
 7 2002].

8 Current findings show moderate-to-high correla-  
 9 tions between the three offense categories for men  
 10 and women, which suggests that perpetration of one  
 11 type of offense is associated with perpetration of  
 12 other types of offense. However, we did find that  
 13 IPV and nonviolent offending were unrelated for  
 14 men, which suggests less overlap of offending  
 15 behavior in men than in women. Our results support  
 16 and extend to those of Farrington [2006] and  
 17 Gottfredson and Hirschi [2007], who found that  
 18 offenders commit a wide variety of criminal acts.  
 19 They also support the findings of Moffitt et al. [2000]  
 20 that many partner violence perpetrators are also  
 21 violent toward others. This was indicated by the  
 22 moderate correlations between perpetration of gen-  
 23 eral violence and IPV for men and women.  
 24 However, similar to Moffitt et al. [2000], this study  
 25 shows that although there are moderate relation-  
 26 ships between the three offense types both sexes,  
 27 there are also some differences in predictors between  
 28 offense types and between men and women. This  
 29 suggests that the three offense types may have both  
 30 shared unique risk and protective factors in terms of  
 31 their associations with personality variables.

32 There were some shared predictors for general  
 33 violence in men and women. Age and cluster B PD  
 34 traits were significant predictors of general violence  
 35 for both sexes, but agreeableness was a protective  
 36 factor for women's general violence. The first  
 37 association supports the well-known finding that  
 38 offending behavior in general [Gottfredson and  
 39 Hirschi, 2007; Quetelet, 1833–1984] and violence in  
 40 particular [e.g. Archer, 2004; Courtwright, 1996;  
 41 Daly and Wilson, 1990, 2001; Eisner, 2003] decrease  
 42 with age. Cluster B PDs, such as borderline and  
 43 antisocial PDs, have been associated with men's  
 44 general violence in the batterer typology of  
 45 Holtzworth-Munroe and Stuart [1994], but there is  
 46 little earlier research on women's general violence  
 47 and maladaptive PD traits. The correlational results  
 48 showed that men's and women's general violence  
 49 was related to cluster B PD traits, but the relation-  
 50 ship was stronger for men. Earlier research has  
 51 shown that agreeableness is a protective factor with  
 52 aggression in both sexes [Gleason et al., 2004;  
 53 Sharpe and Desai, 2001], but in this study this  
 association was only found for women. These results

54 suggest that men and women have some common  
 55 risk factors for general violent offending, but that  
 56 agreeableness may protect women. 57

58 Predictors for IPV were different for men and  
 59 women. Men's IPV was predicted by higher cluster  
 60 A PD traits, whereas women's IPV was predicted by  
 61 higher cluster B PD traits. Both cluster A and B PD  
 62 traits correlated significantly with IPV for men, but  
 63 the relationship was stronger for cluster A and only  
 64 cluster B was a significant correlate of IPV in  
 65 women. Cluster A PDs are the least researched  
 66 cluster [Emmelkamp and Kamphuis, 2007], and  
 67 have not typically been linked with offending  
 68 behavior, so this is a novel finding from this study.  
 69 However, one cluster A PD (schizoid) has been  
 70 associated with violent and criminal behavior in the  
 71 borderline subtype of IPV men [Holtzworth-  
 72 Munroe et al., 2000]. Individuals with cluster A  
 73 PDs have also been found to score higher on  
 74 neuroticism and lower on agreeableness [Emmelkamp  
 75 and Kamphuis, 2007], results that correspond with  
 76 earlier links found between aggression and these two  
 77 "Big Five" factors [Gleason et al., 2004; Sharpe and  
 78 Desai, 2001]. This could account for the link  
 79 between IPV and cluster A PD traits in this sample  
 80 of men. Cluster A PD is the cluster that is closest to  
 81 mental illness. It is possible that men need to be  
 82 more disordered than women before they perpetrate  
 83 IPV, owing to the inhibiting factor of negative social  
 84 attitudes toward perpetrators of IPV, especially  
 85 male perpetrators [Harris and Cook, 1994; Simon  
 86 et al., 2001; Taylor and Sorenson, 2005]. In this  
 87 sample, both men's and women's IPV correlated  
 88 with borderline PD traits, which has earlier been  
 89 linked to men's [Dutton, 2002; Holtzworth-Munroe  
 90 and Stuart, 1994] and women's [Spidell et al., 2004]  
 91 perpetration of partner violence. However, cluster B  
 92 PD traits only emerged as a significant predictor of  
 93 IPV for women in this study. Our findings suggest  
 94 that although men and women perpetrators of IPV  
 95 show similar correlations with personality and PD  
 96 traits, the predictors vary overall, indicating that  
 97 there are likely to be risk factors for IPV that are  
 98 unique for each sex.

99 Cluster B PD traits were also a significant  
 100 predictor of nonviolent offending in both sexes,  
 101 but conscientiousness was a protective factor for  
 102 men's (but not women's) nonviolent offending.  
 103 Earlier research has found an association of  
 104 antisocial PD and nonviolent offending behavior  
 105 [Barros and Serafim, 2008; Emmelkamp and  
 106 Kamphuis, 2007], so that the present findings are  
 107 consistent with these results. Earlier research has  
 also found low conscientiousness to be associated

1 with nonviolent offending [Heaven, 1996], which  
 2 supports the present findings for men but not for  
 3 women. Again, there are not only similarities in  
 4 men's and women's risk factors for offending  
 5 behavior, but there is also a protective factor,  
 6 conscientiousness, which is specific to one sex.  
 7 To conclude, this study found that adaptive  
 8 personality traits were not consistent predictors of  
 9 offending in men and women: men's nonviolent  
 10 offending was inversely related to conscientiousness  
 11 and women's general violence was inversely related  
 12 to agreeableness. Maladaptive traits were related to  
 13 all three offense types. Cluster B PD traits were a  
 14 consistent predictor of offending behavior in women  
 15 and predicted involvement in general violence, IPV,  
 16 and nonviolent offending. These traits were not as  
 17 consistent a predictor for men, predicting only  
 18 general violence and nonviolent offending. Men's  
 19 IPV was instead predicted by cluster A PD traits, so  
 20 that predictors of men's and women's IPV perpetration  
 21 differed. This supports the view that there may  
 22 be different risk factors involved in men's and  
 23 women's partner violence perpetration. Overall, the  
 24 results suggest that offending behavior is related to  
 25 similar intra-personal factors for men and women,  
 26 with the exception of IPV. In order to advance  
 27 research in this area, other variables need to be  
 28 investigated to determine whether predictors con-  
 29 sistent vary between the offense types and sexes, or  
 30 if there are further shared risk factors.

31  
 32 **ACKNOWLEDGMENTS**

33 We thank Professor Jane L. Ireland for her  
 34 valuable contributions toward this article.

35  
 36  
 37  
 38 **REFERENCES**

39  
 40  
 41 Archer J. 1999. Assessment of the reliability of the Conflict  
 Tactics Scales: A meta-analytic review. *J Interpers Violence* 14:  
 1263-1289.  
 42 Archer J. 2000. Sex differences in aggression between heterosexual  
 partners: A meta-analytic review. *Psychol Bull* 126:651-680.  
 43 Archer J. 2002. Sex differences in physically aggressive acts between  
 heterosexual partners: A meta-analytic review. *Aggress Violent*  
 44 *Behav* 7:313-351.  
 45 Archer J. 2004. Sex difference in aggression in real-world settings:  
 A meta-analytic review. *Rev Gen Psychol* 8:291-322.  
 46 Archer J. 2006. Cross-cultural differences in physical aggression  
 between partners: A social-role analysis. *Pers Soc Psychol Rev*  
 47 *10:133-153*.  
 48 Archer J. 2009. Does sexual selection explain human sex differences  
 in aggression? *Behav Brain Sci* 32:249-311.  
 49 Barros DM, Serafim A. 2008. Association between personality  
 disorder and violent behavior pattern. *Forensic Sci Int* 179:19-22.

Baumeister RF, Smart L, Boden JM. 1996. Relation of threatened  
 egotism to violence and aggression: The dark side of high self-  
 esteem. *Psychol Rev* 103:5-23. 55  
 Campbell A. 1999. Staying alive: Evolution, culture, and women's  
 intrasexual aggression. *Behav Brain Sci* 22:203-525. 57  
 Campbell A. 2002. *A Mind of Her Own: The Evolutionary*  
*Psychology of Women*. New York: Oxford University Press. 59  
 Caprara GV, Barbaranelli C, Zimbardo PG. 1996. Understanding  
 the complexity of human aggression: Affective, cognitive, and  
 social dimensions of individual differences in propensity toward  
 aggression. *Eur J Pers* 10:133-155. 61  
 Cascardi M, Langhinrichsen J, Vivian D. 1992. Impact, injury and  
 health correlates for husbands and wives. *Arch Intern Med*  
 152:1178-1184. 63  
 Cohen J. 1988. *Statistical Power Analysis for the Behavioral*  
*Sciences*, 2nd edition. Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Earlbaum  
 Associates. 67  
 Coleman K, Jansson K, Kaiza P, Reed E. 2007. Homicides, firearm  
 offences and intimate violence 2005/2006 (supplementary volume  
 1 to crime in England and Wales 2005/2006). Home Office  
 Statistical Bulletin 02/07. 69  
 Costa PT, McCrae RR. 1992. Normal personality assessment in  
 clinical practice: The NEO personality inventory. *Psychol Assess*  
 4:5-13. 71  
 Courtwright DT. 1996. *Violent Land: Single Men and Social*  
*Disorder from the Frontier to the Inner City*. Cambridge,  
 MA: Harvard University Press. 73  
 Daly M, Wilson M. 1990. Killing the competition: Female/female  
 and male/male homicide. *Hum Nature* 1:81-107. 75  
 Daly M, Wilson M. 2001. Risk-taking, intrasexual competition, and  
 homicide. *Nebr Symp Motiv* 47:1-36. 77  
 Dobash RP, Dobash RE. 2004. Women's violence to men in intimate  
 relationships. *Br J Criminol* 44:324-349. 79  
 Dobash RP, Dobash RE, Wilson M, Daly M. 1992. The myth of  
 sexual symmetry in marital violence. *Soc Probl* 39:71-85. 81  
 Dutton DG. 2002. *The Abusive Personality: Violence and Control in*  
*Abusive Relationships*, 2nd edition. New York: Guilford. 83  
 Ehrensaft MK, Moffitt TE, Caspi A. 2004. Clinically abusive  
 relationships in an unselected birth cohort: Men's and women's  
 participation and developmental antecedents. *J Abnorm Psychol*  
 113:258-271. 85  
 Ehrensaft MK, Cohen P, Johnson JG. 2006. Development of  
 personality disorder symptoms and the risk for partner violence.  
*J Abnorm Behav* 115:474-483. 87  
 Eisner M. 2003. Long-term historical trends in violent crime. *Crime*  
*Justice* 30:83-142. 89  
 Emmelkamp PMG, Kamphuis JH. 2007. *Personality Disorders*.  
 USA: Psychology Press. 91  
 Eysenck HJ. 1996. Personality and crime. *Psychol Crime Law*  
 2:143-152. 93  
 Farrington DP, Coid JW, Harnett L, Jolliffe D, Soteriou N,  
 Turner R, West DJ. 2006. Criminal careers and life success:  
 New findings from the Cambridge study in delinquent behaviour.  
 Home Office research study No. 281. London: Home Office. 95  
 Felson RB. 2002. *Violence and Gender Reexamined*. Washington,  
 DC: American Psychological Association. 97  
 Gleason KA, Jensen-Campbell LA, Richardson DS. 2004. Agree-  
 ableness as a predictor of aggression in adolescence. *Aggr Behav*  
 30:43-61. 99  
 Goldberg LR. 1999. A Broad-bandwidth, public domain, personality  
 inventory measuring the lower-level facets of several five-factor  
 models. In: Mervielde I, Dreary I, De Fruyt F, Ostendorf F (eds).  
*Personality Psychology in Europe*. The Netherlands: Tilburg  
 University Press. 101  
 103  
 105  
 107

- 1 Gottfredson MR, Hirschi T. 2007. *A General Theory of Crime*, 3rd  
 edition. USA: Stanford University Press.
- 3 Graham-Kevan N, Archer J. 2003. Physical aggression and control  
 in heterosexual relationships: The effect of sampling. *Violence  
 Vict* 18:181–198.
- 5 Gray HM, Forshee V. 1997. Adolescent dating violence: Differences  
 between one-sided and mutually violent profiles. *J Interpers  
 Violence* 12:126–141.
- 7 Harris RJ, Cook CA. 1994. Attributions about spouse abuse:  
 It matters who batterers and victims are. *Sex Roles* 30:  
 553–565.
- 9 Heaven PCL. 1996. Personality and self-reported delinquency:  
 Analysis of the “Big Five” personality dimensions. *Pers Individ  
 Dif* 20:47–54.
- 11 Henning K, Jones A, Holdford R. 2003. Treatment needs of women  
 arrested for domestic violence: A comparison with male  
 offenders. *J Interpers Violence* 18:839–856.
- 13 Holtzworth-Munroe A, Stuart GL. 1994. Typologies of male  
 batterers: Three subtypes and the differences among them.  
*Psychol Bull* 116:476–497.
- 15 Holtzworth-Munroe A, Meehan C, Herron K, Rehman U,  
 Stuart GL. 2000. Testing the Holtzworth-Munroe and Stuart  
 (1994) batterer typology. *J Consult Clin Psychol* 68:1000–1019.
- 17 Lawrence C. 2006. Measuring individual responses to aggression-  
 triggering events: Development of the situational triggers of  
 aggressive responses (STAR) scale. *Aggr Behav* 32:241–252.
- 19 Loranger AW, Janca A, Sartorius N. 1997. *Assessment and  
 Diagnosis of Personality Disorders: The ICD-10 International  
 Personality Disorder Examination (IPDE)*. Cambridge, UK:  
 Cambridge University Press.
- 21 Lussier P, Farrington DP, Moffitt TE. 2009. Is the antisocial child  
 father of the abusive man? A 40-year prospective longitudinal  
 study on the developmental antecedents of intimate partner  
 violence. *Criminology* 47:741–780.
- 23 Mirrlees-Black C, Budd T, Partridge S, Mayhew P. 1998. *The 1998  
 British Crime Survey*. London: Government Statistical Service  
 (Home Office, London).
- 25 Moffitt TE, Kreuger RF, Caspi A, Fagan J. 2000. Partner abuse and  
 general crime: How are they the same, how are they different?  
*Criminology* 38:199–232.
- 27 Moffitt TE, Caspi A, Rutter M, Silva PA. 2001. *Sex Differences in  
 Antisocial Behaviour. Conduct Disorder, Delinquency, and  
 Violence in the Dunedin Longitudinal Study*. Cambridge, UK:  
 Cambridge University Press.
- 29 Morse BJ. 1995. Beyond the conflict tactics scale: Assessing gender  
 differences in partner violence. *Violence Vict* 10:251–272.
- 31 Povey D (ed.), Coleman K, Kaiza P, Roe S. (2009). *Homicides,  
 firearm offences and intimate violence 2007/2008 (supplementary  
 volume 2 to crime in England and Wales 2007/2008)*. Home Office  
 Statistical Bulletin, 02/09.
- 33 Q4 Quetelet A. 1833–1984. *Recherches sur le Penchant au Crime aux  
 Differentes Ages*. Bruxelles: M. Hayez (Translated by S.F.  
 Sylvester as *Research on the Propensity for Crime at Different  
 Ages*). Cincinnati, Ohio: Anderson.
- 35 Richardson DR, Green LR. 1999. Social sanction and threat  
 explanations of gender effects on direct and indirect aggression.  
*Aggr Behav* 25:425–434.
- 37 Richardson DR, Green LR. 2003. Defining direct and indirect  
 aggression: The Richardson Conflict Response Questionnaire. *Int  
 Rev Soc Psychol* 16:11–30.
- 39 Sharpe JP, Desai S. 2001. The revised NEO personality inventory  
 and the MMPI-2 psychopathology five in the prediction of  
 aggression. *Pers Individ Dif* 31:505–518.
- 41 Simmons C, Lehmann P, Cobb N, Fowler C. 2005. Personality  
 profiles of women and men arrested for domestic violence: An  
 analysis of similarities and differences. *J Offender Rehabil*  
 41:63–81.
- 43 Simon TR, Anderson M, Thompson MP, Crosby AE, Shelley G,  
 Sacks JJ. 2001. Attitudinal acceptance of intimate partner  
 violence among US students. *Violence Vict* 16:115–126.
- 45 Sommer R, Barnes GE, Murray RP. 1992. Alcohol consumption,  
 alcohol abuse, personality and female perpetrated spouse abuse.  
*Pers Individ Dif* 13:1315–1323.
- 47 Spidell A, Nicholls TL, Kendrick K, Klein C, Krop RP. 2004.  
 Characteristics of female intimate partner assaulters. In:  
 Dutton DG, Nicholls TL, Spidell A. (2005). *Female perpetrators  
 of intimate abuse*. *J Offender Rehabil* 41:1–31.
- 49 Steffensmeier D, Allan E. 1996. Gender and crime: Toward a gendered  
 theory of female offending. *Annu Rev Sociol* 22:459–487.
- 51 Stets JE, Strauss MA. 1990. Gender differences in reporting marital  
 violence and its medical and psychological consequences. In:  
 Strauss MA, Gelles RJ (eds). *Physical Violence in American  
 Families: Risk Factors and Adaptation to Violence in 8,145  
 Families*. New Brunswick: Transaction, pp. 227–244.
- 53 Straus MA. 1979. Measuring intrafamily conflict and violence: The  
 Conflict Tactics (CT) Scales. *J Marriage Fam* 41:75–88.
- 55 Straus MA. 2008. Dominance and symmetry in partner violence by  
 male and female university students in 32 nations. *Child Youth  
 Serv Rev* 30:252–275.
- 57 Straus MA, Gelles RJ. 1988. Violence in American families: How  
 much is there and why does it occur? In: Nunnally EW,  
 Chelmau CS, Cox FM (eds). *Families in Trouble*. Newbury  
 Park: Sage, pp. 141–162.
- 59 Straus MA, Ramirez IL. 2004. Criminal history and assault of dating  
 partners: The role of type of prior crime, age of onset, and  
 gender. *Violence Vict* 19:413–434.
- 61 Straus MA, Ramirez IL. 2007. Gender symmetry in prevalence,  
 severity, and chronicity of physical aggression against dating  
 partners by university students in Mexico and USA. *Aggr Behav*  
 33:281–290.
- 63 Straus MA, Hamby SL, Boney-McCoy S, Sugarman DB. 1996. The  
 revised Conflict Tactics Scales (CTS2): Development and  
 preliminary psychometric data. *J Fam Issues* 17:283–316.
- 65 Tabachnick BG, Fidell LS. 2007. *Using Multivariate Statistics*, 5th  
 edition. USA: Pearson Education.
- 67 Taylor CA, Sorenson SB. 2005. Community-based norms about  
 intimate partner violence: Putting attributions of fault and  
 responsibility into context. *Sex Roles* 53:573–589.
- 69 Tremblay PF, Ewart LA. 2005. The buss and perry aggression  
 questionnaire and its relation to values, the big five, provoking  
 hypothetical situations, alcohol consumption patterns, and  
 alcohol expectancies. *Pers Individ Dif* 38:337–346.
- 71 Walker JS, Gudjonsson GH. 2006. The maudslay violence ques-  
 tionnaire: Relationship to personality and self-reported offend-  
 ing. *Pers Individ Dif* 40:795–806.
- 73 Wilson MI, Daly M. 1992. The man who mistook his wife for a  
 chattel. In: Barkow JH, Cosmides L, Tooby J (eds). *The Adapted  
 Mind*. New York: Oxford University Press, pp. 289–321.
- 75 Wilson MI, Daly M. 1996. Male sexual proprietariness against wives.  
*Curr Dir Psychol Sci* 5:2–7.

