

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 α 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, α 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 ^{a,b} |
|----------------------|-------|-------|-------|------|------------------|------------------|
| | 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) |

^aMinus sign signifies higher values for women than men.

^bd 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), R² for step 1, and R² 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 (β) 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 ($N = 181$)^a

| 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.

^aMultiple 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. Hillside, 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.

