

Khader I. Alkhouri*

Bioethical and psychological perspectives on domestic violence

Abstract

Domestic violence poses critical ethical challenges at the intersection of bioethics, psychology, and law. This article analyzes tensions between autonomy and protection in healthcare, justice and due process in legal systems, and cultural competence in trauma-informed interventions. Highlighting global prevalence and severe neuropsychological consequences for survivors and children, it critiques current frameworks like mandatory reporting and Battered Woman Syndrome. The discussion extends to systemic reforms—economic policies, housing security, and primary prevention—while examining the dual role of religious institutions in perpetuating or mitigating abuse. Employing an intersectional lens, the study advocates for evidence-based, multidisciplinary approaches to address domestic violence’s structural roots while upholding ethical principles of justice and non-maleficence.

Keywords: Domestic violence, bioethics, trauma-informed care, legal ethics, intersectionality, systemic prevention

Introduction

The pervasive scourge of domestic violence constitutes one of the most egregious violations of fundamental human dignity, presenting a complex ethical dilemma that intersects with core bioethical principles of autonomy, justice, beneficence, and non-maleficence (World Health Organization, 2021). As a global public health crisis that transcends cultural, religious, and socioeconomic boundaries, domestic violence demands rigorous ethical scrutiny of the obligations borne by medical practitioners, legal institutions, and religious authorities in mitigating its devastating consequences (García-Moreno et al., 2015). The ethical complexities inherent in addressing intimate partner violence are manifold, encompassing

* PhD in Psychology of Religion, National and Kapodistrian University of Athens. E-mail: kalkhour@soctheol.uoa.gr • ORCID iD: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-9623-2468>.

profound tensions between patient confidentiality and mandatory reporting (Campbell, 2002), cultural relativism and universal human rights (Merry, 2006), and individual agency versus societal protection (Stark, 2007).

Contemporary research demonstrates alarming prevalence rates, with approximately one in three women worldwide experiencing physical or sexual violence from an intimate partner (World Health Organization, 2021), while male victims remain significantly underreported due to societal stigma and gender norms (Dutton & White, 2013). The psychological ramifications are equally devastating, with survivors exhibiting markedly higher rates of post-traumatic stress disorder, major depressive disorder, and suicidal ideation compared to the general population (Golding, 1999). Children exposed to domestic violence face particularly dire consequences, including impaired cognitive development, increased aggression, and heightened risk of perpetuating intergenerational cycles of abuse (Kitzmann et al., 2003; Felitti et al., 1998).

From a bioethical perspective, domestic violence presents unique challenges that demand nuanced analysis. Healthcare providers grapple with ethical dilemmas surrounding mandatory reporting laws that may inadvertently deter victims from seeking medical care (Warshaw et al., 2013), while simultaneously confronting the long-term health consequences of abuse, including chronic pain syndromes, traumatic brain injuries, and stress-related pathologies (Coker et al., 2002). Legal systems worldwide struggle to balance punitive justice with rehabilitative approaches (Ellsberg et al., 2015), particularly in cases involving immigrant victims who face potential deportation upon reporting abuse (Menjívar & Salcido, 2002). Religious institutions, meanwhile, confront the ethical imperative to reinterpret traditional doctrines that have historically been weaponized to justify domestic abuse (Nason-Clark et al., 2018; Mir-Hosseini, 2013).

Medical ethics and the clinician's dilemma

The ethical obligations of healthcare providers in cases of domestic violence present a profound professional paradox, requiring

careful navigation between respecting patient autonomy and fulfilling the duty to protect vulnerable individuals from harm (Warshaw et al., 2013). This tension manifests most acutely in the context of mandatory reporting laws, which compel medical professionals to disclose suspected abuse to authorities, often against the explicit wishes of competent adult patients (Campbell, 2002). Empirical research demonstrates that such requirements may inadvertently deter victims from seeking critical medical care, as fear of police involvement or retaliation from abusers frequently outweighs perceived benefits of disclosure (Hendy et al., 2003). The ethical principle of non-maleficence thus comes into direct conflict with legal mandates, raising fundamental questions about whether coercive intervention truly serves patients' best interests or merely satisfies institutional liability concerns (Varkey, 2021).

The clinical manifestations of domestic violence further complicate this ethical landscape, as victims frequently present with complex, overlapping physical and psychological trauma that demands integrated, trauma-informed care (Teicher & Samson, 2016). Chronic pain syndromes, traumatic brain injuries, and stress-related somatic disorders often coexist with post-traumatic stress disorder, depression, and substance abuse disorders, creating diagnostic challenges that require clinicians to maintain heightened ethical vigilance (Coker et al., 2002). Economic abuse—a particularly insidious form of coercion that restricts victims' access to financial resources—adds another layer of ethical complexity, as it may prevent patients from following through with recommended treatments or accessing follow-up care (Adams et al., 2008). This reality necessitates that healthcare providers adopt harm reduction strategies that prioritize patient safety while respecting autonomy, such as developing coded communication systems for victims who cannot speak openly about their abuse and ensuring that medical documentation does not inadvertently endanger patients (Iverson et al., 2011).

The pediatric dimension of domestic violence introduces additional ethical imperatives, as children exposed to intimate partner violence exhibit measurable neurobiological changes that can persist into adulthood, including alterations in brain structure and

function related to emotion regulation and stress response (Teicher & Samson, 2016). The Adverse Childhood Experiences (ACE) study established a clear dose-response relationship between childhood exposure to domestic violence and later-life health outcomes, including increased risks of ischemic heart disease, cancer, and autoimmune disorders (Felitti et al., 1998). These findings create an ethical mandate for early intervention, yet they must be balanced against the potential iatrogenic harm of removing children from their homes or inadvertently exposing them to further trauma through poorly executed child protection interventions (U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, 2019a). The ethical principle of justice demands that such interventions be implemented equitably across socioeconomic and racial groups, avoiding the well-documented disparities in child welfare reporting and removal rates that disproportionately affect marginalized communities (Sokoloff & Dupont, 2005).

Ultimately, the medical ethical framework for addressing domestic violence must evolve beyond simplistic binary choices between intervention and non-intervention, instead embracing nuanced approaches that recognize the complex psychosocial dynamics of abuse while upholding fundamental bioethical principles. This requires healthcare systems to invest in comprehensive training programs that enhance clinicians' ability to recognize subtle signs of coercion, implement trauma-informed care protocols, and navigate the ethical tensions inherent in balancing patient confidentiality with mandatory reporting requirements (Warshaw et al., 2013). Only through such multidimensional ethical engagement can medical professionals truly fulfill their duty to "first, do no harm" while still protecting the most vulnerable members of society from preventable suffering.

Reconciling protection with due process

The evolution of legal responses to domestic violence presents a complex ethical landscape where the imperative to protect victims must be carefully balanced against fundamental principles of judicial fairness and proportionality (Römken, 2013a). Modern legal

systems globally have increasingly recognized domestic violence as a distinct criminal offense rather than a private family matter, with landmark instruments like the Istanbul Convention establishing comprehensive frameworks for prevention, protection, and prosecution (Council of Europe, 2011). However, the implementation of these legal protections raises profound ethical questions about the appropriate balance between state intervention and personal autonomy, particularly when victims themselves may be ambivalent about involving law enforcement (Schneider, 2000). The criminalization of domestic violence has undeniably provided crucial protections for many survivors, yet critics argue that over-reliance on punitive measures may inadvertently harm the very populations they aim to protect, particularly in marginalized communities where distrust of law enforcement runs deep (Sokoloff & Dupont, 2005). This paradox is especially acute in cases involving immigrant women, where reporting abuse may trigger deportation proceedings or result in loss of child custody, creating ethical dilemmas for legal professionals torn between enforcing immigration laws and protecting vulnerable individuals (Menjivar & Salcido, 2002).

The legal recognition of Battered Woman Syndrome (BWS) as a defense in criminal cases represents another ethically contested frontier, where psychological research intersects with judicial decision-making (Walker, 2009). While this legal doctrine has helped contextualize the actions of abuse survivors who retaliate against their tormentors, it risks pathologizing victims' responses to trauma and reinforcing problematic stereotypes about female passivity (Dutton, 1993). The ethical tensions surrounding BWS are particularly pronounced in cases where cultural factors compound the psychological impact of abuse, as courts struggle to evaluate the reasonableness of a defendant's actions through both psychological and cultural lenses (Sokoloff & Dupont, 2005). Similarly, the growing recognition of male victims of domestic violence challenges long-held legal assumptions about gender and abuse, requiring judicial systems to adapt their frameworks to accommodate victims who don't conform to traditional stereotypes (Dutton & White, 2013). This evolution in legal understanding underscores the eth-

ical imperative for courts to base decisions on empirical evidence rather than societal preconceptions, while remaining sensitive to the gendered power dynamics that still characterize most domestic violence cases (Johnson, 2008).

Alternative dispute resolution mechanisms like religious arbitration tribunals present additional ethical quandaries for legal systems grappling with domestic violence (Bano, 2012). In multicultural societies, some communities have established parallel justice systems to handle marital disputes according to religious principles, raising concerns about whether these forums adequately protect victims' rights (Fournier, 2010). Studies of Sharia councils in the UK, for instance, reveal complex dynamics where women may voluntarily seek religious divorces but face pressure to reconcile with abusive partners or accept unequal settlements (Bano, 2012). The ethical challenge for secular legal systems lies in determining when to respect religious autonomy and when to intervene to prevent rights violations, particularly when victims themselves may view religious arbitration as more legitimate than state courts (Grillo, 2015). This tension reflects broader debates about legal pluralism in multicultural societies, where the desire to accommodate minority traditions must be balanced against the state's obligation to protect all citizens equally (Malik, 2012).

Emerging restorative justice approaches to domestic violence offer potential middle ground between punitive and permissive extremes, though they too raise significant ethical concerns (Voith et al., 2020). Proponents argue that victim-offender mediation programs, when carefully structured, can empower survivors and encourage genuine accountability from perpetrators. However, critics warn that these approaches may trivialize the seriousness of domestic violence and place undue pressure on victims to reconcile with their abusers (Stark, 2007). The ethical implementation of restorative justice in domestic violence cases requires rigorous safeguards, including thorough risk assessments, victim advocates, and judicial oversight to prevent coercion or retaliation (Ellsberg et al., 2015). Ultimately, the legal response to domestic violence must navigate these complex ethical waters by developing nuanced,

evidence-based approaches that prioritize victim safety while respecting due process rights and cultural diversity - a challenge that continues to evolve as our understanding of intimate partner violence deepens (Römken, 2013b).

Ethical considerations in treatment paradigms

The psychological dimensions of domestic violence present profound ethical challenges for mental health professionals, requiring careful navigation between therapeutic objectives and fundamental principles of patient welfare (Warshaw et al., 2013). Trauma-informed care has emerged as the dominant ethical framework for addressing the complex psychological sequelae of domestic violence, which frequently include post-traumatic stress disorder, complex trauma responses, and attachment disruptions that demand specialized clinical approaches (Herman, 2015). The ethical imperative to “do no harm” takes on particular significance in this context, as conventional therapeutic techniques may inadvertently retraumatize survivors if applied without proper understanding of trauma’s neurobiological impacts (Teicher & Samson, 2016). Research demonstrates that prolonged exposure to intimate partner violence can lead to measurable alterations in brain structure and function, particularly in regions governing emotional regulation and threat perception, necessitating treatment modalities that account for these physiological changes (Teicher & Samson, 2016). The Adverse Childhood Experiences (ACE) study further established the dose-dependent relationship between childhood exposure to domestic violence and later-life mental health outcomes, creating an ethical mandate for early intervention while simultaneously raising concerns about the potential stigmatization of at-risk youth (Felitti et al., 1998).

The treatment of perpetrators introduces additional ethical complexities, as mental health professionals must balance therapeutic goals with public safety considerations (Dutton & White, 2013). Traditional batterer intervention programs have faced criticism for their high attrition rates and limited efficacy, prompting ethical debates about whether rehabilitation or containment should constitute the primary objective (Gondolf & Fisher, 1988). Emerging neuropsycholog-

ical research suggests that many perpetrators exhibit distinct cognitive and affective processing patterns, including deficits in emotional regulation and empathy, which may require more targeted therapeutic approaches than conventional anger management programs provide (Jakupcak et al., 2002). However, the ethical implications of biological explanations for abusive behavior remain contentious, with some scholars warning against medicalizing violence in ways that diminish personal accountability (Dutton, 1993). This tension is particularly acute in cases involving substance abuse comorbidities, where the interplay between addiction and violence creates complex causation dilemmas that challenge traditional notions of moral responsibility (Foran & O'Leary, 2008). Mental health professionals working with perpetrators must therefore navigate delicate ethical terrain, acknowledging potential neuropsychological factors while maintaining clear boundaries against excuse-making or minimization of harmful behaviors (Dutton & White, 2013).

The psychological impact on children exposed to domestic violence presents particularly urgent ethical considerations, given the well-documented risks of intergenerational trauma transmission (Kitzmann et al., 2003). Developmental research demonstrates that even very young children exhibit measurable stress responses to parental conflict, with potential long-term consequences for emotional regulation, academic achievement, and future relationship patterns (Huth-Bocks et al., 2001). Ethical practice in this domain requires clinicians to balance family preservation ideals against child protection imperatives, particularly in cases where parents may be both victims and enablers of the abusive environment (U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, 2019b). The growing recognition of children's trauma symptoms has led to innovative therapeutic approaches like trauma-focused cognitive behavioral therapy, which must be implemented with careful attention to cultural factors and family dynamics to avoid inadvertently exacerbating existing tensions (Letourneau et al., 2007). The ethical challenges intensify when dealing with adolescent perpetrators of child-to-parent violence, where clinicians must distinguish between normative developmental conflicts and genuine abuse patterns while avoiding pathologization of typical family friction (Cottrell,

2001; Condry & Miles, 2014).

Cultural competence represents another critical ethical dimension in psychological interventions for domestic violence, as therapeutic approaches developed in Western contexts may prove ineffective or even harmful when applied cross-culturally (Sokoloff & Dupont, 2005). Research indicates that victims from collectivist cultures frequently prioritize family harmony over individual safety, requiring therapists to adapt conventional empowerment models to accommodate these value differences (Yoshihama, 1999). The ethical delivery of mental health services in diverse communities demands nuanced understanding of cultural explanatory models for distress, appropriate help-seeking pathways, and culturally-specific coping mechanisms (Pan et al., 2006). This challenge is particularly acute when working with refugee populations, where pre-migration trauma, acculturative stress, and post-migration instability can compound the psychological impacts of domestic violence (Raj & Silverman, 2002). Mental health professionals must therefore cultivate both cultural humility and trauma expertise to provide ethically sound care that respects survivors' worldviews while addressing the universal need for safety and healing (Warshaw et al., 2013). The integration of traditional healing practices with evidence-based psychotherapy offers promising avenues for culturally-grounded intervention, though such approaches require careful ethical scrutiny to ensure they don't inadvertently reinforce patriarchal norms or excuse abusive behaviors (Abugideiri & Alwani, 2003). Ultimately, the ethical practice of psychology in domestic violence contexts demands constant self-reflection, cultural attunement, and commitment to evidence-based practice that prioritizes survivor autonomy while recognizing the complex systemic factors that perpetuate intimate partner violence (Warshaw et al., 2013).

Sociostructural interventions and systemic prevention

The persistent prevalence of domestic violence across global societies underscores the ethical necessity for comprehensive sociostructural interventions that address root causes rather than merely managing symptoms (Heise, 1998). Ecological models of violence prevention emphasize the multilevel nature of risk factors, ranging from individual psychological traits to broader societal

norms that tacitly condone gender-based violence, requiring equally multifaceted ethical responses (García-Moreno et al., 2015). At the macroeconomic level, research consistently demonstrates the correlation between gender wage gaps, employment discrimination, and increased vulnerability to domestic violence, establishing an ethical imperative for policymakers to implement structural economic reforms that enhance women's financial autonomy (Adams et al., 2013). The insidious nature of economic abuse - wherein perpetrators systematically control victims' access to financial resources - highlights how macroeconomic policies intersect with intimate partner violence, demanding ethical consideration of how tax structures, social welfare programs, and employment laws either mitigate or exacerbate this form of coercion (Adams et al., 2008). Housing insecurity represents another critical structural determinant, with studies showing that lack of affordable shelter options constitutes the primary reason many victims remain in or return to abusive relationships, creating an ethical mandate for governments to prioritize domestic violence victims in social housing allocations (Willie et al., 2024). These systemic barriers disproportionately affect marginalized populations, including racial minorities, immigrants, and people with disabilities, necessitating an intersectional ethical framework that acknowledges how overlapping systems of oppression compound vulnerability to domestic violence (Sokoloff & Dupont, 2005).

Educational systems bear particular ethical responsibility for primary prevention, with compelling evidence that school-based programs challenging gender stereotypes and promoting healthy relationships can significantly reduce subsequent intimate partner violence. The ethical justification for mandatory prevention education rests on the public health principle of population-level intervention, though implementation must respect parental autonomy while avoiding cultural insensitivity (Ellsberg et al., 2015). Professional education similarly requires ethical scrutiny, as gaps in domestic violence training across medical, legal, and social service disciplines perpetuate systemic failures to identify and respond effectively to abuse (Warshaw et al., 2013). Accreditation bodies face ethical questions about whether to mandate domestic

violence competency standards, balancing professional autonomy against the demonstrated consequences of inadequate training (Campbell, 2002). The workplace represents another crucial intervention point, with growing recognition of employers' ethical obligations to implement domestic violence policies that protect both victim-employees and workplace safety, while navigating complex privacy concerns (Swanberg et al., 2005). This includes developing protocols for accommodating victims' needs without inadvertently enabling discrimination or violating confidentiality, illustrating how organizational ethics intersect with violence prevention (Swanberg et al., 2005).

Faith institutions occupy a uniquely influential position in many communities, presenting both ethical challenges and opportunities in addressing domestic violence (Nason-Clark et al., 2018). While some religious doctrines have historically been interpreted to justify male dominance and wifely submission, progressive faith leaders are increasingly leveraging religious authority to challenge abusive interpretations and promote gender equity (Istratii & Ali, 2023). The ethical transformation of religious institutions requires delicate navigation of theological traditions while upholding universal human rights principles, avoiding both cultural imperialism and moral relativism (Abugideiri & Alwani, 2003). Interfaith initiatives like the SASA! Faith program demonstrate how religious communities can become powerful allies in prevention efforts when interventions respect spiritual frameworks while challenging harmful norms (Raising Voices, 2016). This work highlights the ethical imperative for secular agencies to collaborate respectfully with faith leaders while maintaining clear boundaries against faith-based justification for abuse (Nason-Clark et al., 2018). Ultimately, the ethical response to domestic violence demands coordinated action across all societal institutions, recognizing that isolated interventions will remain inadequate against a problem so deeply embedded in our social fabric (Heise, 1998). This systemic approach must be guided by an intersectional feminist ethic that centers the most marginalized voices while holding all social institutions accountable for their role in either perpetuating or preventing intimate partner violence (Crenshaw, 1991).

Research Results

This study reveals that domestic violence generates profound ethical dilemmas across medical, legal, and psychological domains. Healthcare providers face critical tensions between patient autonomy and mandatory reporting, with evidence indicating that coercive interventions may deter victims from seeking care. Legal systems struggle to balance punitive justice with rehabilitative approaches, particularly in cases involving marginalized populations, where structural barriers exacerbate vulnerability. Psychological findings demonstrate severe neurobiological impacts, including altered stress responses and intergenerational trauma transmission, necessitating trauma-informed care models. Additionally, sociostructural factors—such as economic abuse and housing insecurity—perpetuate cycles of violence, underscoring the need for systemic reforms.

The research further highlights disparities in institutional responses, with marginalized groups experiencing disproportionate harm due to cultural insensitivity and systemic bias. Faith-based interventions present both risks and opportunities, as religious doctrines may either justify abuse or foster community-based support. Restorative justice models show promise but require stringent safeguards to prevent victim retraumatization. Ultimately, the findings advocate for an intersectional, ecological framework that integrates bioethical principles with structural prevention strategies, emphasizing coordinated policy reforms, professional training, and culturally adapted interventions to address domestic violence's multifaceted nature.

References

- Abugideiri, S. E., & Alwani, Z. (2003). *What Islam says about domestic violence: A guide for helping Muslim families*. Faith Trust Institute.
- Adams, A. E., Sullivan, C. M., Bybee, D., & Greeson, M. R. (2008). Development of the Scale of Economic Abuse. *Violence Against Women, 14*(5), 563–588. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1077801208315529>.
- Adams, A. E., Tolman, R. M., Bybee, D., Sullivan, C. M., & Kennedy, A. C. (2013). The impact of intimate partner violence on low-income women's economic well-be-

- ing: The mediating role of job stability. *Violence Against Women*, 19(10), 1222-1240.
- Bano, S. (2012). *Muslim Women and Shari'ah Councils: Transcending the Boundaries of Community and Law*. Palgrave Macmillan.
- Campbell J. C. (2002). Health consequences of intimate partner violence. *Lancet (London, England)*, 359(9314), 1331-1336. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736\(02\)08336-8](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736(02)08336-8).
- Coker, A. L., Davis, K. E., Arias, I., Desai, S., Sanderson, M., Brandt, H. M., & Smith, P. H. (2002). Physical and mental health effects of intimate partner violence for men and women. *American Journal of Preventive Medicine*, 23(4), 260-268. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0749-3797\(02\)00514-7](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0749-3797(02)00514-7).
- Condry, R., & Miles, C. (2014). Adolescent to parent violence: Framing and mapping a hidden problem. *Criminology and Criminal Justice*, 14 (3), 257-275.
- Cottrell, B. (2001). *Parent abuse: The abuse of parents by their teenage children*. National Clearinghouse on Family Violence.
- Crenshaw, K. (1991). Mapping the margins: Intersectionality, identity politics, and violence against women of color. *Stanford Law Review*, 43(6), 1241-1299.
- Dutton, D. G., & White, K. R. (2013). Male victims of domestic violence. *New Male Studies: An International Journal*, 2(1), 5-17.
- Dutton, M. A. (1993). Understanding women's responses to domestic violence: A redefinition of battered woman syndrome. *Hofstra Law Review*, 21(4), 1191-1242.
- Ellsberg, M., Arango, D. J., Morton, M., Gennari, F., Kiplesund, S., Contreras, M., & Watts, C. (2015). Prevention of violence against women and girls: What does the evidence say? *The Lancet*, 385(9977), 1555-1566.
- Felitti, V. J., Anda, R. F., Nordenberg, D., Williamson, D. F., Spitz, A. M., Edwards, V., Koss, M. P., & Marks, J. S. (1998). Relationship of childhood abuse and household dysfunction to many of the leading causes of death in adults. The Adverse Childhood Experiences (ACE) Study. *American journal of preventive medicine*, 14(4), 245-258. [https://doi.org/10.1016/s0749-3797\(98\)00017-8](https://doi.org/10.1016/s0749-3797(98)00017-8).
- Foran, H. M., & O'Leary, K. D. (2008). Alcohol and intimate partner violence: A meta-analytic review. *Clinical Psychology Review*, 28(7), 1222-1234.
- Fournier, P. (2010). *Muslim Marriage in Western Courts: Lost in Transplantation*. Ashgate.
- Garcia-Moreno, C., Zimmerman, C., Morris-Gehring, A., Heise, L., Amin, A., Abrahams, N., Montoya, O., Bhate-Deosthali, P., Kilonzo, N., & Watts, C. (2015). Addressing violence against women: a call to action. *Lancet (London, England)*, 385(9978), 1685-1695. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736\(14\)61830-4](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736(14)61830-4).
- Golding, J. M. (1999). Intimate partner violence as a risk factor for mental disorders: A meta-analysis. *Journal of Family Violence*, 14(2), 99-132. <https://doi.org/10.1023/A:1022079418229>.
- Gondolf, E. W., & Fisher, E. R. (1988). *Battered women as survivors: An alternative to treating learned helplessness*. Lexington Books/D. C. Heath and Com.
- Grillo, R. (2015). *Muslim Families, Politics and the Law: A Legal Industry in Multi-cultural Britain* (1st ed.). Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315597065>.
- Heise L. L. (1998). Violence against women: an integrated, ecological framework. *Vi-*

- olence against women, 4(3), 262–290. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1077801298004003002>.
- Hendy, H. M., Eggen, D., Gustitus, C., McLeod, K. C., & Ng, P. (2003). Decision to Leave Scale: Perceived reasons to stay in or leave violent relationships. *Psychology of Women Quarterly*, 27(2), 162–173. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1471-6402.00096>.
- Herman, J. (2015). *Trauma and recovery: The aftermath of violence—from domestic abuse to political terror*. Basic Books/Hachette Book Group.
- Huth-Bocks, A. C., Levendosky, A. A., & Semel, M. A. (2001). The direct and indirect effects of domestic violence on young children's intellectual functioning. *Journal of Family Violence*, 16(3), 269–290. <https://doi.org/10.1023/A:1011138332712>.
- Istratii, R., & Ali, P. (2023). A Scoping Review on the Role of Religion in the Experience of IPV and Faith-Based Responses in Community and Counseling Settings. *Journal of Psychology and Theology*, 51(2), 141–173. <https://doi.org/10.1177/00916471221143440>.
- Iverson, K. M., Gradus, J. L., Resick, P. A., Suvak, M. K., Smith, K. F., & Monson, C. M. (2011). Cognitive-behavioral therapy for PTSD and depression symptoms reduces risk for future intimate partner violence among interpersonal trauma survivors. *Journal of consulting and clinical psychology*, 79(2), 193–202. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0022512>.
- Jakupcak, M., Lisak, D., & Roemer, L. (2002). The role of masculine ideology and masculine gender role stress in men's perpetration of relationship violence. *Psychology of Men and Masculinity*, 3(2), 97–106. <https://doi.org/10.1037/1524-9220.3.2.97>.
- Johnson, M. P. (2008). *A typology of domestic violence: Intimate terrorism, violent resistance, and situational couple violence*. Northeastern University Press.
- Kitzmann, K. M., Gaylord, N. K., Holt, A. R., & Kenny, E. D. (2003). Child witnesses to domestic violence: a meta-analytic review. *Journal of consulting and clinical psychology*, 71(2), 339–352. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-006x.71.2.339>.
- Letourneau, N. L., Fedick, C. B., & Willms, J. D. (2007). Mothering and domestic violence: A longitudinal analysis. *Journal of Family Violence*, 22(8), 649–659. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10896-007-9099-6>.
- Malik, M. (2012). *Minority Legal Orders in the UK: Minorities, Pluralism and the Law*. British Academy Policy Centre.
- Menjívar, C., & Salcido, O. (2002). Immigrant Women and Domestic Violence: Common Experiences in Different Countries. *Gender and Society*, 16(6), 898–920. <https://doi.org/10.1177/089124302237894>.
- Merry, S. E. (2006). *Human rights and gender violence: Translating international law into local justice*. University of Chicago Press.
- Nason-Clark, N., Fisher-Townsend, B., Holtmann, C., & McMullin, S. (2018). *Religion and intimate partner violence: Understanding the challenges and proposing solutions*. Oxford University Press.
- Pan, A., Daley, S., Rivera, L. M., Williams, K., Lingle, D., & Reznik, V. (2006). Understanding the role of culture in domestic violence: the Ahimsa Project for Safe Families. *Journal of immigrant and minority health*, 8(1), 35–43. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11013-005-9011-1>.

- org/10.1007/s10903-006-6340-y.
- Raising Voices. (2016). *SASA! Faith: A guide for faith communities to prevent violence against women and HIV*. Raising Voices.
- Raj, A., & Silverman, J. (2002). Violence Against Immigrant Women: The Roles of Culture, Context, and Legal Immigrant Status on Intimate Partner Violence. *Violence Against Women, 8*(3), 367-398. <https://doi.org/10.1177/10778010222183107>.
- Römkens, R. (2013a). Law as a Trojan horse: Unintended consequences of rights-based interventions to support battered women. *Yale Journal of Law and Feminism, 25*(2), 265-306.
- Römkens, R. (2013b). *Violence against women: An EU-wide survey*. Main results report. European Union Agency for Fundamental Rights.
- Schneider, E. M. (2000). *Battered women and feminist lawmaking*. Yale University Press.
- Sokoloff, N. J., & Dupont, I. (2005). Domestic violence at the intersections of race, class, and gender: challenges and contributions to understanding violence against marginalized women in diverse communities. *Violence against women, 11*(1), 38-64. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1077801204271476>.
- Stark, E. (2007). *Coercive control: How men entrap women in personal life*. Oxford University Press.
- Swanberg, J. E., Logan, T., & Macke, C. (2005). Intimate partner violence, employment, and the workplace: consequences and future directions. *Trauma, violence and abuse, 6*(4), 286-312. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1524838005280506>.
- Teicher, M. H., & Samson, J. A. (2016). Annual Research Review: Enduring neurobiological effects of childhood abuse and neglect. *Journal of child psychology and psychiatry, and allied disciplines, 57*(3), 241-266. <https://doi.org/10.1111/jcpp.12507>.
- U.S. Department of Health and Human Services. (2019a). *What Is Child Abuse and Neglect? Recognizing the Signs and Symptoms*. <https://www.childwelfare.gov/pubpdfs/whatiscan.pdf>.
- U.S. Department of Health and Human Services. (2019b). *Child Maltreatment 2017*. Children's Bureau.
- Varkey B. (2021). Principles of Clinical Ethics and Their Application to Practice. *Medical principles and practice: International journal of the Kuwait University, Health Science Centre, 30*(1), 17-28. <https://doi.org/10.1159/000509119>.
- Voith, L. A., Logan-Greene, P., Strodthoff, T., & Bender, A. E. (2020). A paradigm shift in batterer intervention programming: A need to address unresolved trauma. *Trauma, Violence, and Abuse, 21*(4), 691-705.
- Walker, L. E. (2009). *The battered woman syndrome* (3rd ed.). Springer Publishing Company.
- Warshaw, C., Brashler, P., & Gill, J. (2013). Mental health consequences of intimate partner violence. In: *Intimate Partner Violence: A Health-Based Perspective* (pp. 147-171). Oxford University Press.
- Warshaw, C., Sullivan, C. M., & Rivera, E. A. (2013). *A systematic review of trauma-focused interventions for domestic violence survivors*. National Center on Domestic Violence, Trauma and Mental Health, 2, 1-27.

- Willie, T. C., Linton, S. L., Whittaker, S., Phillips, K. A., Knight, D., Gray, M. C., Gardner, G., & Overstreet, N. M. (2024). Housing insecurity among black women surviving intimate partner violence during the COVID-19 pandemic: an intersectional qualitative approach. *BMC public health*, *24*(1), 501. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s12889-024-17965-5>.
- World Health Organization. (2021). *Violence against women*. <https://www.who.int/news-room/fact-sheets/detail/violence-against-women>.
- Yoshihama, M. (1999). Domestic Violence Against Women of Japanese Descent in Los Angeles: Two Methods of Estimating Prevalence. *Violence Against Women*, *5*(8), 869-897. <https://doi.org/10.1177/10778019922181536>.