OPEN ACCESS Freely available online

ISSN: 2475-319X
Journal of
Forensic Psychology

Review Article

The Invisible Perpetrator: Systemic Blindness to Female Violence in Forensic Mental Health Settings

ABSTRACT

This critical analysis examines the systematic invisibilization of female-perpetrated violence within mental health and judicial systems. Despite emerging evidence of substantial female violent behavior, institutional blindness persists through multiple interconnected mechanisms that operate across individual, interpersonal, institutional, and societal levels. Our analysis reveals a profound disconnect between actual violence prevalence and official recognition, most strikingly exemplified by the discrepancy between self-reported rates of violence at merely 1% *versus* observational studies documenting rates of 47.1% in female populations. This dramatic under-recognition cannot be attributed to simple methodological variance but rather reflects a complex web of cultural mythologies, diagnostic practices, research limitations, and systemic biases that collectively render female violence invisible. The phenomenon of invisibilization operates through deeply embedded societal narratives that position women exclusively as victims rather than potential perpetrators, diagnostic frameworks that pathologize female aggression as mental illness rather than recognizing it as violence, and criminal justice practices that systematically filter out female violent offenders at every stage of the legal process. The consequences of this invisibility extend far beyond academic concern, resulting in missed opportunities for early intervention, inadequate risk assessment and management strategies, continued victimization of those harmed by unrecognized female violence, and the perpetuation of intergenerational cycles of aggression. We argue that addressing this pervasive invisibilization requires nothing less than a fundamental reconceptualization of how violence is defined, measured, and addressed within mental health and criminal justice systems. Without comprehensive systemic reform that challenges deeply held assumptions about gender and aggression, a significant proportion of female violence will remain undetected, untreated, and ultimately unpreventable, with serious implications for public safety and clinical practice.

Keywords: Invisibilization; Female violence; Systemic bias; Gender stereotypes; Detection failure; Methodological blindness; Forensic mental health.

INTRODUCTION

The paradox of the invisible perpetrator

Within the landscape of forensic mental health, a profound and troubling paradox persists. While violence is predominantly conceptualized, studied, and treated as a fundamentally male phenomenon, a growing body of evidence suggests that female-perpetrated violence occurs at rates far exceeding official recognition [1]. This systematic invisibilization represents not merely an academic oversight or statistical anomaly, but rather a pervasive systemic failure that penetrates every level of our mental health and criminal justice institutions, with far-reaching consequences for public safety, clinical practice, and our fundamental understanding of human aggression.

Citation: Borrajo RH, de Castro-Manglano P (2025). The Invisible Perpetrator: Systemic Blindness to Female Violence in Forensic Mental Health Settings. J Foren Psy. 10:378.

The construction of violence as inherently masculine and victimization as essentially feminine creates a powerful cognitive and institutional blind spot that shapes how we perceive, measure, respond to, and ultimately fail to recognize female aggression [2]. This deeply embedded conceptual framework operates so fundamentally that it renders invisible a significant proportion of violent behavior, creating a reality where female violence can exist simultaneously as both a widespread phenomenon and a cultural impossibility. This analysis seeks to interrogate and illuminate the complex mechanisms through which female violence becomes systematically invisible, examining how institutional practices, research methodologies, cultural narratives, and clinical approaches conspire to obscure what may be one of the most significant unrecognized patterns in contemporary mental health.

Consider the implications of this striking statistical revelation: While only 1% of women in research studies self-report engaging in violent behavior, careful observational studies utilizing multiple informants indicate actual rates approaching 47.1% [3]. This forty-seven-fold discrepancy cannot be adequately explained by simple underreporting, social desirability bias, or methodological variation. Instead, it reveals a fundamental failure in how we conceptualize, measure, recognize, and respond to female aggression at every level of scientific inquiry and clinical practice. This invisibilization operates through multiple interconnected mechanisms that we must understand if we hope to develop more accurate and effective approaches to violence prevention and intervention.

The significance of this invisibilization extends far beyond theoretical concern. When we fail to recognize female violence, we fail to protect victims, miss critical opportunities for early intervention, perpetuate intergenerational cycles of aggression, and ultimately undermine the effectiveness of our violence prevention efforts. Moreover, by maintaining the fiction of female non-violence, we deny women the interventions they need, infantilize their capacity for moral agency, and perpetuate a form of benevolent sexism that ultimately serves no one's interests.

LITERATURE REVIEW

The architecture of invisibility: Understanding the conceptual frameworks

The invisibilization of female violence does not occur through simple oversight or individual bias, but rather through complex, interlocking conceptual frameworks that shape perception at every level. These frameworks operate so fundamentally that they create what might be termed a "cultural scotoma"-a blind spot in our collective vision that renders certain forms of violence literally unseeable, even when directly observed.

Cultural mythology and the construction of the "non-violent woman"

At the deepest level, the invisibilization of female violence begins with powerfully embedded cultural myths about the essential nature of gender and aggression. The archetype of woman as inherently nurturing, naturally victimized, and constitutionally incapable of violence creates a profound cognitive dissonance when confronted with evidence of female-perpetrated harm [4]. This dissonance is resolved not through updating our conceptual frameworks to accommodate contradictory evidence, but rather through a complex process of perceptual and cognitive filtering that renders the violence invisible even as it occurs.

This mythology of female non-violence operates through multiple subtle but powerful mechanisms that shape how violence is perceived, interpreted, and responded to when the perpetrator is female. When women engage in objectively violent behavior, a series of cognitive and linguistic transformations occur that reframe the violence as something else entirely [5]. Physical aggression becomes "acting out," calculated harm becomes "emotional dysregulation," and deliberate violence becomes a "cry for help." This semantic reframing is not merely a matter of language but fundamentally alters how the behavior is understood and addressed.

The process of motivational attribution further invisibilizes female violence by providing alternative explanations that preserve the myth of female non-violence [6]. Female aggression is systematically explained away as defensive rather than offensive, reactive rather than proactive, relationally motivated rather than instrumentally driven. Even when women engage in clearly premeditated violence, the cultural imperative to maintain the fiction of female non-violence leads to post-hoc constructions of provocations, threats, or circumstances that transform the perpetrator into a victim forced to defend herself.

Alongside semantic reframing and motivational attribution, the physical consequences of female violence are systematically minimized through a process of perceptual filtering. Injuries inflicted by women are perceived as less severe, weapons used by women are seen as less dangerous, and the potential for female-inflicted harm is consistently underestimated [7]. This minimization occurs even among trained professionals who should be capable of objective injury assessment, suggesting the power of gender schemas to override empirical observation.

Perhaps most significantly, violent behavior in women undergoes a process of pathologization that transforms criminality into symptomatology. What would be recognized as antisocial behavior requiring criminal justice intervention when perpetrated by men becomes evidence of mental illness requiring therapeutic intervention when perpetrated by women [8]. This diagnostic transformation not only invisibilizes the violence but fundamentally alters the institutional response, routing

violent women away from accountability and toward a medical model that may inadequately address their risk of future violence.

The diagnostic disguise: How clinical labels systematically hide violence

Within mental health settings, the invisibilization of female violence operates through diagnostic practices that systematically reframe aggressive behaviors as symptoms of mental illness rather than recognizing them as violence requiring risk assessment and management [9]. This diagnostic disguising of violence represents a particularly insidious form of invisibilization because it occurs within institutions specifically tasked with accurate behavioral assessment and occurs through the very mechanisms supposedly designed to enhance understanding [10].

The overdiagnosis of Borderline Personality Disorder (BPD) in violent women exemplifies this phenomenon with striking clarity. Our analysis reveals that 60.6% of female forensic patients receive BPD diagnoses, with an additional 21% documented as showing "borderline traits". This diagnostic tendency serves to medicalize and thereby neutralize the recognition of violent behavior. Violence becomes not a behavior requiring risk management and accountability but a symptom to be treated through therapy and medication [11]. The woman who engages in calculated violence becomes a patient suffering from emotional dysregulation, and the need for public safety interventions is replaced by an emphasis on therapeutic alliance and trauma processing.

This diagnostic invisibilization operates through multiple mechanisms that deserve careful examination. First, the diagnostic criteria for disorders commonly applied to violent women emphasize emotional and relational dysfunction while minimizing or excluding aggressive behavior [12]. When violence is mentioned at all in these diagnostic frameworks, it is typically framed as self-directed or as a secondary consequence of emotional dysregulation rather than as a primary behavioral pattern requiring intervention.

Second, the diagnostic process itself is shaped by gendered assumptions about the meaning and significance of violent behavior [13]. When a woman presents with a history of violence, clinicians are primed to search for explanations in terms of trauma, victimization, and emotional dysfunction rather than to assess antisocial traits, instrumental aggression, or violence risk. This diagnostic bias is so powerful that even clear patterns of predatory violence may be reframed as desperate attempts at self- protection or misguided efforts to maintain relationships.

Third, once applied, these diagnoses create a conceptual framework that continues to invisibilize violence throughout treatment. Treatment planning focuses on emotional regulation, interpersonal effectiveness, and trauma processing while violent behavior itself receives minimal direct attention. Progress is measured in terms of mood stability and relationship functioning rather than violence cessation, and discharge planning may inadequately address ongoing risk to others.

Methodological myopia: How research design perpetuates invisibility

The invisibilization of female violence is powerfully reinforced through methodological limitations in how violence is studied, measured, and analyzed within the research literature [14-17]. These methodological blind spots do not represent simple oversights or technical limitations but rather reflect deeper conceptual failures that systematically exclude or minimize female violence from scientific view.

The fundamental problem of male-normed violence measures

Current violence research suffers from a fundamental methodological flaw that systematically undercounts female aggression: The reliance on definitions, measures, and analytical frameworks designed around prototypically male patterns of violence [18]. Traditional violence measures focus overwhelmingly on direct, physical aggression punching, kicking, stabbing, shooting-while failing to adequately capture the indirect, relational, and psychological forms of aggression that research suggests may be more common among women.

This methodological bias begins with operational definitions of violence that privilege physical harm over other forms of damage. When violence is defined primarily in terms of physical injury or the use of physical force, forms of aggression that operate through social relationships, psychological manipulation, or indirect means become invisible. A woman who destroys another person's social relationships, ruins their reputation, or engages in systematic psychological torture may inflict profound harm while never meeting narrow definitions of violence focused on physical contact [19].

The measurement instruments used in violence research further perpetuate this invisibility by focusing on behaviors and contexts more typical of male aggression. Questionnaires ask about bar fights rather than relational sabotage, focus on stranger assault rather than intimate terrorism, and measure physical injury rather than psychological destruction. Even when researchers attempt to include measures of indirect aggression, these are often relegated to secondary status or analyzed separately from "real" violence, maintaining the implicit hierarchy that positions physical aggression as the most significant form of harm [20].

Sampling strategies in violence research additionally contribute to the systematic undercounting of female violence [21]. Studies frequently recruit from populations where male violence is overrepresented-prisons, forensic hospitals, batterer intervention programs-while missing contexts where female violence may be more prevalent. The focus on convicted offenders particularly biases against detecting female violence given evidence that women are less likely to be arrested, charged, convicted, and incarcerated for violent behavior even when it occurs [22].

Finally, analytical frameworks employed in violence research often assume rather than investigate gender differences, leading to circular reasoning that perpetuates invisibility [23]. When studies begin with the assumption that violence is predominantly male, they design analyses that confirm this assumption. Gender

is treated as a control variable rather than a focus of investigation, violent women are excluded as outliers, and findings that challenge conventional wisdom about female non-violence may be minimized or explained away [24].

The self-report paradox and the problem of violent identity

The reliance on self-report measures in violence research creates a particularly acute problem for detecting female violence, revealing a paradox that strikes at the heart of how we understand violent behavior. While self-report methodology assumes that individuals can and will accurately report their own violent behavior when assured of confidentiality, the data suggest a massive disconnect between what women report and what they actually do [25].

This self-report paradox cannot be adequately explained by simple dishonesty or conscious deception. Instead, it reflects deeper psychological and social processes that render female violence invisible even to the perpetrators themselves [26]. For many women, acknowledging violent behavior requires overcoming not just social desirability concerns but fundamental challenges to identity and self-concept. Violence is so antithetical to feminine identity that engaging in violent behavior may create intolerable identity incongruence that must be resolved through denial, minimization, or reframing [27].

The process by which violent behavior becomes cognitively inaccessible to female perpetrators deserves careful analysis. When behavior conflicts with core identity, psychological defense mechanisms operate to maintain coherence [28]. A woman who sees herself as nurturing and peaceful cannot simultaneously recognize herself as violent and aggressive. This is not simple hypocrisy but reflects deep psychological processes that protect identity stability. The violent act may be forgotten, reframed as justified protection, or attributed to external forces beyond personal control [29].

Social conditioning further reinforces this cognitive inaccessibility by providing ready narratives that explain away female violence. Women learn from early childhood that their aggression is unacceptable, that good girls don't hit, that female anger must be suppressed or channeled into acceptable forms. When violence does occur, culturally available scripts help reframe it as something else: momentary loss of control, desperate self-defense, or the understandable response to intolerable circumstances. These narratives become so internalized that women may genuinely not recognize their behavior as violent even when it objectively meets any reasonable definition of violence [30].

Institutional invisibilization: System-level blindness

Beyond individual and methodological factors, the invisibilization of female violence operates through institutional mechanisms that systematically filter out recognition of female-perpetrated harm at every level of official response. These institutional blind spots do not represent random failures but rather reflect systematic biases built into the very structure of our criminal justice and mental health systems.

Criminal justice system as a filtering mechanism

The criminal justice system serves as a powerful multi-stage filter that systematically renders female violence invisible through differential processing at every decision point [31]. From initial police response through final sentencing, female violent offenders are diverted, excused, and redefined in ways that remove them from official violence statistics and public awareness.

This filtering process begins at the moment of initial police contact. Law enforcement officers, shaped by the same cultural schemas that position women as victims rather than perpetrators, are significantly less likely to arrest women for violent behavior even when probable cause exists. When called to domestic violence scenes where women are the aggressors, officers may reframe the situation as "mutual combat," focus on de- escalation rather than arrest, or even arrest male victims under the assumption that they must be the "real" aggressors. Our analysis shows that women have twice as many police contacts without convictions compared to men, suggesting systematic filtering at this earliest stage [32].

For those cases where women are arrested for violent crimes, prosecutorial discretion provides another layer of invisibilization. Prosecutors, concerned about conviction likelihood given jury biases favoring female defendants, may decline to file charges, reduce violent felonies to non-violent misdemeanors, or offer diversion programs that route women away from criminal conviction. The same violent act that would result in aggressive prosecution for a male defendant may be pled down to disorderly conduct or dismissed entirely for a female defendant, contributing to the statistical invisibility of female violence [33].

When cases do proceed to trial, jury dynamics provide yet another filter removing female violence from official recognition. Research consistently demonstrates that juries are less likely to convict women of violent crimes, require higher standards of evidence, and are more receptive to defense narratives that reframe violence as victimization. The "battered woman syndrome" defense, while addressing real cases of reactive violence, has created a cultural template that allows any female violence to be potentially reframed as self-defense regardless of actual circumstances [34].

Finally, even when convictions occur, sentencing disparities ensure that female violence is treated as less serious than equivalent male violence. Women receive lighter sentences, are more likely to receive probation rather than incarceration, and are routinely diverted to mental health treatment rather than correctional facilities [35]. While such diversions may sometimes be appropriate, they contribute to the broader pattern of invisibilization by reinforcing the message that female violence is a mental health problem rather than a criminal justice concern.

Clinical practice blindness and professional denial

Within mental health settings, the invisibilization of female violence operates through clinical practices and professional blind spots that prevent accurate recognition even among

trained professionals. Mental health providers, despite extensive training in objective assessment and diagnostic formulation, demonstrate systematic blindness to female violence through multiple mechanisms that deserve careful examination [36].

The therapeutic alliance, foundational to mental health treatment, can paradoxically contribute to violence invisibilization when working with female clients. Clinicians, trained to develop empathic connections and to see clients in their best light, may experience cognitive dissonance when confronted with evidence of female-perpetrated violence. The warm, engaged woman in the therapy room seems incompatible with reports of violent behavior, leading clinicians to minimize, doubt, or reframe violent acts as uncharacteristic responses to extreme circumstances.

Risk assessment procedures, supposedly objective tools for violence prediction, fail systematically when applied to women due to their development and validation on predominantly male samples. The variables that predict male violence-criminal history, substance abuse, antisocial peers-may have different relevance for female violence, while factors crucial to female violence risk-relational instability, particular trauma histories, specific psychiatric symptoms-may be absent from standard assessment protocols. Even when female-specific risk factors are known, they may be weighted incorrectly or interpreted through gender-biased lenses that minimize apparent risk [37].

Treatment planning for violent women reflects and perpetuates invisibilization by focusing overwhelmingly on victimization experiences while neglecting perpetration behaviors. A violent woman entering mental health treatment will likely receive extensive assessment of her trauma history, detailed exploration of her victimization experiences, and comprehensive treatment for PTSD or other trauma-related conditions. Meanwhile, her violent behavior may receive cursory attention, be framed exclusively as trauma re-enactment, or be addressed only indirectly through emotion regulation skills [38]. This treatment approach, while addressing real needs, fails to directly target violent behavior or develop specific violence prevention strategies.

Documentation practices within mental health settings further contribute to invisibilization through selective recording and biased language that obscures violent behavior [39]. Clinical notes may describe "interpersonal altercations" rather than assaults, "emotional dysregulation" rather than violence, or "relationship conflicts" rather than abuse. Violent incidents may be buried in lengthy notes, minimized through passive language, or omitted entirely in favor of focusing on the client's distress or victimization. These documentation practices not only invisibilize violence in the moment but create clinical records that fail to alert future providers to violence risk [40].

The consequences of invisibility: Mapping the damage

The systematic invisibilization of female violence produces consequences that ripple outward from individual victims through families, communities, and society as a whole. These consequences represent not merely abstract concerns but concrete harms that accumulate wherever female violence goes unrecognized and unaddressed.

Missed opportunities for early intervention

Perhaps the most tragic consequence of invisibilization lies in the countless missed opportunities for early intervention that could prevent escalating violence and protect potential victims. When aggressive behavior in girls is systematically reframed as "relational difficulties," "emotional problems," or "developmental phases," critical windows for violence prevention close forever.

Consider the typical trajectory of a girl who exhibits early aggressive behavior. Rather than receiving interventions targeted at aggression reduction, she is more likely to be referred for therapy focusing on self-esteem, emotional expression, or social skills. Her violent behavior, reframed as symptomatic of underlying emotional distress, receives indirect attention at best. Years pass as the aggression continues, escalates, and solidifies into stable behavioral patterns, all while being consistently invisibilized by well-meaning professionals focused on her emotional needs rather than her violent behavior.

The educational system provides particularly stark examples of missed intervention opportunities. When boys engage in physical aggression at school, the response typically involves clear consequences, behavioral interventions, and sometimes law enforcement involvement. When girls engage in equally harmful relational aggression-destroying reputations, orchestrating social exclusion, engaging in psychological warfare the response often involves mediation, counseling, and attempts to repair relationships. The differential response not only fails to address the aggressive behavior but sends clear messages about the acceptability and invisibility of female-perpetrated harm [39].

By the time female violence becomes undeniable-often only after severe injury or death results-years or decades of opportunities for early intervention have been lost. The woman who kills her child might have been the girl whose early aggression toward siblings was dismissed as jealousy. The woman who murders her partner might have been the teenager whose relational violence was minimized as adolescent drama. Each missed opportunity represents not just institutional failure but preventable tragedy.

Intergenerational transmission and the cycle of invisible violence

The invisibilization of female violence perpetuates intergenerational cycles of aggression through mechanisms that operate both directly and indirectly across generations. When maternal violence goes unrecognized, children remain in harmful environments where they simultaneously experience victimization and learn that female violence is normal, acceptable, or invisible.

The statistic that 81% of violent women in forensic settings had their children removed but only after forensic involvement-reveals the temporal dynamics of this intergenerational transmission. These removals typically occur only after violence has escalated to undeniable levels, meaning children may have spent years exposed to maternal violence that was consistently

invisibilized by systems supposedly designed to protect them. During these years, children not only suffer direct harm but internalize complex lessons about violence, gender, and visibility that shape their own future behavior.

Children exposed to invisibilized maternal violence face unique developmental challenges that differ from those experiencing recognized paternal violence. When father's violence is acknowledged as wrong, children receive clear messages that violence is unacceptable even as they suffer its effects. When mother's violence is invisibilized, reframed, or excused, children receive contradictory messages that may be even more psychologically damaging. They learn that their perceptions cannot be trusted, that their suffering is invalid, and that certain forms of violence are acceptable or even normal.

The gendered nature of this learning creates different trajectories for boys and girls exposed to invisibilized maternal violence. Boys may internalize that they are legitimate targets for female violence, developing patterns of victimization that persist into adult relationships. Alternatively, they may develop reactive aggression that leads to their identification as perpetrators while their victimization remains invisible. Girls may internalize that female violence is an acceptable form of power and control, developing their own aggressive patterns while maintaining the cognitive frameworks that keep this violence invisible even to themselves.

Victim silencing and secondary trauma

The invisibilization of female violence creates unique dynamics of victim silencing that compound the original harm through secondary trauma. Victims of female violence face systematic disbelief, minimization, and even blame that differs qualitatively from the response to victims of male violence. This societal gaslighting creates a form of secondary trauma that may be as damaging as the original violence [40].

Male victims of female violence face particularly acute challenges to being heard and believed. Cultural schemas that position men as inherently more powerful than women create cognitive dissonance when men report victimization by female partners. The man who reports being abused by his wife faces not just disbelief but often ridicule, with his masculinity questioned and his victimization reframed as weakness. Law enforcement may refuse to take reports seriously, friends and family may minimize the abuse, and support services designed for victims may be unavailable or unwelcoming to male victims.

Child victims of maternal violence encounter different but equally damaging forms of silencing. The cultural sanctity of motherhood creates powerful resistance to recognizing mothers as capable of serious violence toward their children. When children report maternal abuse, they may be disbelieved, accused of exaggeration, or told they must have done something to provoke it. The mother-child bond is so culturally sacred that acknowledging maternal violence requires overcoming enormous psychological and social barriers.

Even when female violence is partially acknowledged, victims face pressure to minimize, excuse, or reframe their experiences in ways that preserve the fiction of female non-violence. A woman violent toward her partner must have been provoked beyond endurance. A mother who harms her children must have been overwhelmed by circumstances. The victim is recruited into participating in the invisibilization of their own victimization, required to provide explanations and excuses that maintain cultural mythologies while denying their own experience.

Mechanisms of invisibilization: A multi-level analysis

To fully understand how female violence becomes systematically invisible, we must examine the specific mechanisms operating at multiple levels of analysis, from individual cognition through societal structures. These mechanisms do not operate independently but rather interact in complex ways that create redundant systems of invisibilization resistant to simple intervention [41].

At the individual cognitive level, the invisibilization of female violence operates through fundamental psychological processes that shape perception and memory. Cognitive dissonance, arising when observations conflict with deeply held beliefs about female nature, is resolved through perceptual filtering that literally prevents conscious recognition of female violence. Observers may watch a woman engage in clearly violent behavior yet process and remember it as something entirely different. This is not conscious deception but reflects the powerful influence of cognitive schemas on perception itself [42].

Confirmation bias further reinforces invisibilization by directing attention toward evidence that confirms beliefs about female non-violence while filtering out contradictory evidence. When people expect women to be non-violent, they notice and remember instances that confirm this expectation while overlooking or forgetting instances of female aggression. This selective attention and memory create self-reinforcing cycles where the absence of recognized female violence is taken as evidence that female violence does not exist [43].

Attribution processes provide cognitive mechanisms for explaining away female violence when it cannot be entirely ignored. The fundamental attribution error, already powerful in social perception, becomes supercharged when interpreting female violence. Male violence is attributed to stable internal characteristics-he is violent, aggressive, dangerous. Female violence is attributed to unstable external circumstances-she was provoked, threatened, or temporarily overwhelmed. These differential attributions preserve core beliefs about gendered nature while explaining away contradictory evidence.

Moving to the interpersonal level, invisibilization operates through dynamic processes between perpetrators, victims, and witnesses that collectively maintain the fiction of female non-violence. Relational reframing transforms violence into relationship problems requiring mutual responsibility rather than perpetration requiring accountability. When a woman violently attacks her partner, the focus shifts to "what's going on in this relationship" rather than "this person has committed assault." The violent act disappears into a fog of relational dynamics, communication problems, and mutual dysfunction [44].

At the institutional level, organizational practices and professional cultures create systematic blindness to femaleviolence through mechanisms that operate below conscious awareness. Intake procedures at mental health facilities may screen extensively for victimization experiences while barely assessing perpetration history. Risk assessment protocols may focus on factors relevant to male violence while missing female-specific indicators. Treatment philosophies emphasizing trauma-informed care may inadvertently excuse violent behavior by framing all problematic actions as trauma responses requiring understanding rather than accountability.

These institutional mechanisms are reinforced by professional cultures that make recognizing female violence professionally risky. The clinician who documents female violence clearly, assesses risk accurately, and recommends accountability-focused interventions may face criticism for being unprofessional, lacking empathy, or failing to understand trauma. Professional advancement may depend on maintaining comfortable fictions about female clients as exclusively victims rather than acknowledging their capacity for perpetration [45].

At the societal level, broad structural forces maintain the invisibilization of female violence through resource allocation, policy frameworks, and public discourse that systematically exclude or minimize female perpetration. Research funding priorities direct resources toward studying male violence while proposals to investigate female violence may be seen as less significant or even anti-feminist. Policy frameworks designed around male patterns fail to address female-specific dynamics, while attempts to develop female-specific approaches may be resisted as unnecessary or discriminatory [46].

Breaking through: Strategies for making the invisible visible

Addressing the systematic invisibilization of female violence requires comprehensive strategies operating at multiple levels simultaneously. Single interventions, no matter how well-designed, cannot overcome the redundant mechanisms maintaining invisibility. Instead, we need coordinated approaches that challenge fundamental assumptions while building new frameworks for recognition and response.

Reconceptualizing violence itself represents a crucial first step [47]. Current definitions that privilege physical aggression and direct harm fail to capture the full spectrum of human violence. We must expand our understanding to explicitly include relational violence that operates through social connections, maternal violence that exploits caregiving relationships, psychological terrorism that destroys minds rather than bodies, and proxy violence that uses others as weapons. These forms of violence, while perhaps more common among women, are no less serious than physical assault and may cause equal or greater harm.

This reconceptualization must extend beyond academic definitions to shape how violence is measured, studied, and addressed in practice. Assessment tools must capture the full spectrum of violent behavior regardless of gender-typical patterns. Research must investigate female violence with the same rigor applied to male violence, using methodologies sensitive to different patterns of perpetration. Clinical interventions must address all forms of violence directly rather than assuming that treating trauma or mental illness will automatically reduce violent behavior [48].

Methodological innovations in violence research could significantly improve recognition of female-perpetrated harm. Multi-informant designs that triangulate self- report, victim report, and observer report can overcome the limitations of single-source data. Behavioral observation in naturalistic settings can capture violence that goes unreported through traditional channels. Longitudinal studies following aggressive girls through adulthood can identify developmental trajectories and intervention points specific to female violence.

Clinical practice reforms require fundamental changes in how mental health professionals are trained, how they assess and treat female clients, and how they document and communicate about violence risk. Universal violence screening should be standard practice for all clients regardless of gender, using tools validated for female as well as male patterns [49]. Treatment planning must maintain dual focus on victimization and perpetration, addressing trauma while also directly targeting violent behavior. Documentation standards must require clear, specific recording of violent behavior using behaviorally descriptive language that avoids minimizing or excusing violence.

Theoretical implications: Toward an integrated framework

The phenomenon of female violence invisibilization reveals fundamental limitations in our theoretical understanding of gender, aggression, and human nature. Traditional frameworks that position masculinity and femininity as opposite poles, with aggression belonging exclusively to the masculine domain, fail to account for the full complexity of human behavior. Women's capacity for violence and society's capacity to deny this violence-requires new theoretical frameworks that integrate rather than dichotomize human potential.

An adequate theoretical framework must recognize that gendered patterns of violence reflect complex interactions between biological predispositions, developmental experiences, social learning, and situational factors. While men and women may show different patterns of aggressive behavior on average, these differences are far smaller than within-gender variation and do not support categorical assumptions about female non-violence [50]. Moreover, focusing exclusively on gender differences obscures important similarities in the functions, motivations, and consequences of violence across gender lines.

We propose a theoretical framework that recognizes violence as a human capacity that manifests differently across individuals and contexts rather than as a gendered phenomenon. This framework acknowledges that social conditioning powerfully shapes how aggression is expressed, with women more likely to

use indirect and relational forms while men more often employ direct physical aggression. However, these modal patterns do not negate the reality that some women engage in severe physical violence while some men specialize in psychological torture.

This framework must also grapple with the complex relationships between victimization and perpetration, recognizing that these are not mutually exclusive categories [51]. Many violent women have extensive victimization histories, and their violence may sometimes represent maladaptive attempts at self-protection or trauma re-enactment. However, victimization does not excuse perpetration, and understanding origins does not negate the need for accountability and behavior change. A sophisticated theoretical framework can hold multiple truths simultaneously: That trauma often precedes violence, that understanding context matters, and that violent behavior requires intervention regardless of its origins.

CONCLUSION

The imperative of visibility

The systematic invisibilization of female violence represents one of the most significant blind spots in contemporary mental health and criminal justice practice. This invisibility is not a minor oversight but a fundamental failure that perpetuates cycles of violence, abandons victims, misses crucial intervention opportunities, and maintains damaging mythologies about human nature. The consequences ripple across generations, creating patterns of harm that could be prevented if we could simply see what is directly in front of us.

Making female violence visible requires more than minor adjustments to existing systems. It demands fundamental challenges to deeply held beliefs about gender and aggression, comprehensive reforms to assessment and intervention practices, and sustained commitment to following evidence wherever it leads. This is not about demonizing women or denying the reality of male violence, which remains a serious social problem requiring continued attention. Rather, it is about developing a complete and accurate understanding of human violence that recognizes the full spectrum of perpetrators and victims.

The path forward requires courage to challenge comfortable myths, wisdom to develop nuanced responses that avoid simplistic solutions, and commitment to protecting all victims regardless of perpetrator gender. We must build systems capable of recognizing and responding to violence wherever it occurs, whoever commits it, and whatever form it takes. Only through such comprehensive reform can we hope to prevent violence effectively, protect vulnerable individuals, and build a society where safety does not depend on maintaining comfortable fictions about who is capable of causing harm.

The cost of continued blindness is measured not in abstract concepts but in real human suffering-children who endure years of maternal abuse while systems designed to protect them look the other way, partners who suffer in silence because their victimization is culturally impossible, and women themselves who are denied the interventions they need because their violence cannot be acknowledged. Making the invisible visible is not merely an academic exercise but a moral imperative with profound implications for individual lives and social justice.

As we move forward, we must remember that acknowledging female violence does not diminish the significance of male violence or the reality of female victimization. Rather, it represents a maturation in our understanding that recognizes the full complexity of human behavior. Women, like men, are complete human beings capable of the full range of human behavior, including violence. Denying this capacity through systematic invisibilization serves no one's interests and perpetuates the very conditions that allow violence to flourish unchecked. Only by seeing clearly can we hope to respond effectively, and only by responding effectively can we hope to create a world with less violence for everyone.

PRACTICE AND POLICY IMPACT STATEMENT

This analysis of the systematic invisibilization of female violence has immediate and far-reaching implications for forensic mental health practice, criminal justice policy, and violence prevention efforts. Clinicians must recognize that current assessment tools and therapeutic approaches may systematically miss or minimize female-perpetrated violence, requiring immediate implementation of gender-informed screening protocols and risk assessment procedures. Mental health training programs should incorporate substantial content on recognizing and addressing female violence patterns, challenging prevailing assumptions that may blind practitioners to significant risk factors. Criminal justice professionals require education about unconscious biases that lead to differential processing of female offenders, with policy reforms needed to ensure consistent responses to violence regardless of perpetrator gender. Violence prevention programs must expand beyond male-focused interventions to address the full spectrum of aggressive behavior, including relational and indirect forms more common among females. Research funding priorities should be examined to ensure adequate resources for studying female violence, addressing the current knowledge gaps that perpetuate invisibility. Public awareness campaigns are needed to challenge cultural myths about female non-violence while avoiding sensationalization or backlash. Most critically, integrated system reforms are required to ensure that female violence is recognized, documented, and addressed appropriately across all institutional settings. The cost of continued invisibilization-measured in unprotected victims, missed prevention opportunities, and perpetuated cycles of intergenerational violence-demands immediate action to make the invisible visible.

REFERENCES

1. Belsky DW, Caspi A, Arseneault L, Bleidorn W, Fonagy P, Goodman M, et al. Etiological features of borderline personality related characteristics in a birth cohort of 12-year-old children. Dev Psychopathol. 2012;24(1):251-265.
2. Brennan PA, Mednick SA, Hodgins S. Major mental disorders and criminal violence in a Danish birth cohort. Arch Gen Psychiatry. 2000;57(5): 494-500.

3. Broidy LM, Tremblay RE, Brame B, Fergusson DM, Horwood JL, Laird R, et al. Developmental trajectories of childhood disruptive behaviors and adolescent delinquency: A six-site, cross-national study. Dev Psychol. 2003;39(2):222-245.
4. Budhiraja M, Pereira JB, Lindner P, Westman E, Jokinen J, Savic I, et al. Cortical structure abnormalities in females with conduct disorder prior to age 15. Psychiatry Res Neuroimaging. 2019;289:37-44.
5. Chesney-Lind M, Pasko L. The female offender: Girls, women, and crime. Sage Publications. 2012.
6. Cote SM, Vaillancourt T, Barker ED, Nagin D, Tremblay RE. The joint development of physical and indirect aggression: Predictors of continuity and change during childhood. Dev Psychopathol. 2007;19(1):37-55.
7. Crocker AG, Nicholls TL, Seto MC, Charette Y, Cote G, Caulet M. The national trajectory project of individuals found not criminally responsible on account of mental disorder in Canada. Part 2: The people behind the label. Can J Psychiatry. 2015;60(3):106-116.
8. Dackis MN, Rogosch FA, Cicchetti D. Child maltreatment, callous–unemotional traits, and defensive responding in high-risk children: An investigation of emotion-modulated startle response. Dev Psychopathol. 2015;27(4pt2):1527-1545.
9. Dadds MR, Allen JL, Oliver BR, Faulkner N, Legge K, Moul C, et al. Love, eye contact and the developmental origins of empathy v. psychopathy. Br J Psychiatry. 2012;200(3):191-196.
10. De Vogel V, Bruggeman M, Lancel M. Gender-sensitive violence risk assessment: Predictive validity of six tools in female forensic psychiatric patients. Cri Justice Behav. 2019;46(4):528-549.
11. De Vogel V, De Spa E. Gender differences in violent offending: Results from a multicentre comparison study in Dutch forensic psychiatry. Psychol Crime Law. 2019;25(7):739-751.
12. De Vogel V, Lancel M. Gender differences in the assessment and manifestation of psychopathy: Results from a multicenter study in forensic psychiatric patients. Int J Forensic Mental Health. 2016;15(1):97-110.
13. De Vogel V, Nicholls TL. Gender matters: An introduction to the special issues on women and girls. Int J Forensic Ment Health. 2016;15(1):1-25.
14. De Vogel V, Stam J, Bouman YH, Ter Horst P, Lancel M. Violent women: A multicentre study into gender differences in forensic psychiatric patients. J Forensic Psychiatry Psychol. 2016;27(2): 145-168.
15. Degl'Innocenti A, Hassing LB, Lindqvist AS, Andersson H, Eriksson L, Hanson FH, et al. First report from the Swedish National Forensic Psychiatric Register (SNFPR). Int J Law Psychiatry. 2014;37(3):231-237.
16. Fontaine NM, Rijsdijk FV, McCrory EJ, Viding E. Etiology of different developmental trajectories of callous-unemotional traits. J Am Acad Child Adoles Psychiatry. 2010;49(7):656-664.
17. Frick PJ, Ray JV, Thornton LC, Kahn RE. Can callous-unemotional traits enhance the understanding, diagnosis, and treatment of serious conduct problems in children and adolescents? A comprehensive review. Psychol Bull. 2014;140(1):1-57.
18. Hodgins S, Alderton J, Cree A, Aboud A, Mak T. Aggressive behaviour, victimisation and crime among severely mentally ill patients requiring hospitalisation. Br J Psychiatry. 2007;191(4): 343-350.
19. Hodgins S, Checknita D, Lindner P, Schiffer B, De Brito S. Antisocial personality disorder. Wiley Blackwell Handbook Forensic Neuro. 2018;1:229-271.
20. Hodgins S, Larm P, Ellenbogen M, Vitaro F, Tremblay RE. Teachers' ratings of childhood behaviours predict adolescent and adult crime among 3016 males and females. Can J Psychiatry. 2013;58(3): 143-150.
21. Hodgins S, Piatosa MJ, Schiffer B. Violence among people with schizophrenia: phenotypes and neurobiology. Neuro Aggression. 2013;7:329-368.
22. Hunt E, Bornovalova MA, Patrick CJ. Genetic and environmental overlap between borderline personality disorder traits and psychopathy: Evidence for promotive effects of factor 2 and protective effects of factor 1. Psychol Med. 2015;45(7):1471-1481.
23. Karsten J, De Vogel V, Lancel M. Characteristics and offences of women with borderline personality disorder in forensic psychiatry: A multicentre study. Psychol Crime Law. 2016;22(3):224-237.
24. Kimonis ER, Fanti KA, Isoma Z, Donoghue K. Maltreatment profiles among incarcerated boys with callous-unemotional traits. Child Maltreat. 2013;18(2):108-121.
25. Kljakovic M, Hunt C. A meta-analysis of predictors of bullying and victimisation in adolescence. J Adolesc. 2016;49:134-45.
26. Kruttschnitt C, Savolainen J. Violence against women and the invisibility of gender. Child Law. 2009;287-314.
27. Lindner P, Budhiraja M, Westerman J, Savic I, Jokinen J, Tiihonen J, et al. White matter correlates of psychopathic traits in a female community sample. Soc Cog Affect Neurosci. 2017;12(9): 1500-1510.
28. Lindner P, Savic I, Sitnikov R, Budhiraja M, Liu Y, Jokinen J, et al. Conduct disorder in females is associated with reduced corpus callosum structural integrity independent of comorbid disorders and exposure to maltreatment. Transl Psychiatry. 2016;6(1):e714-.
29. Logan C, Blackburn R. Mental disorder in violent women in secure settings: Potential relevance to risk for future violence. Int J Law Psychiatry. 2009;32(1):31-38.
30. Lynam DR, Charnigo R, Moffitt TE, Raine A, Loeber R, Stouthamer-Loeber M. The stability of psychopathy across adolescence. Dev Psychopathol. 2009;21(4):1133-1153.
31. Mancke F, Herpertz SC, Bertsch K. Aggression in borderline personality disorder: A multidimensional model. Personal Disord. 2015;6(3):278.
32. Miller SL, Meloy ML. Women's use of force: Voices of women arrested for domestic violence. Violence Against Women. 2006;12(1):89-115.
33. Moffitt TE, Caspi A. Childhood predictors differentiate life-course persistent and adolescence-limited antisocial pathways among males and females. Dev Psychopathol. 2001;13(2):355-375.
34. Newhill CE, Eack SM, Mulvey EP. Violent behavior in borderline personality. J Personal Dis. 2009;23(6):541-554.
35. Nicholls TL, Petrila J. Gender and psychopathy: An overview of important issues and introduction to the special issue. Behav Sci Law. 2005;23(6):729-741.
36. Odgers CL, Moffitt TE, Broadbent JM, Dickson N, Hancox RJ, Harrington H, et al. Female and male antisocial trajectories: From childhood origins to adult outcomes. Dev Psychopathol. 2008;20(2): 673-716.
37. Oliver BR, Hodgins S. Understanding violence in girls with substance misuse problems. InGirls at risk: Swedish longitudinal research on adjustment 2012. Soc Psychiatry Psychiatr Epidemiol. 2019;627-638.
38. Penney SR, Seto MC, Crocker AG, Nicholls TL, Grimbos T, Darby PL, et al. Changing characteristics of forensic psychiatric patients in Ontario: A population-based study from 1987 to 2012. Soc Psychiatry Psychiatr Epidemiol. 2019;54(5):627-638.
39. Robbins PC, Monahan J, Silver E. Mental disorder, violence, and gender. Law Hum Behav. 2003;27(6):561-571.
40. Robitaille MP, Checknita D, Vitaro F, Tremblay RE, Paris J, Hodgins S. A prospective, longitudinal, study of men with borderline

personality disorder with and without comorbid antisocial personality disorder. Borderline Personal Disord Emot Dysregul. 2017;4(1):25.

41. Rowe R, Maughan B, Moran P, Ford T, Briskman J, Goodman R. The role of callous and unemotional traits in the diagnosis of conduct disorder. J Child Psychol Psychiatry. 2010;51(6):688-695.
42. Sariaslan A, Lichtenstein P, Larsson H, Fazel S. Triggers for violent criminality in patients with psychotic disorders. JAMA Psychiatry. 2016;73(8):796-803.
43. Silverthorn P, Frick PJ. Developmental pathways to antisocial behavior: The delayed-onset pathway in girls. Dev Psychopathol. 1999;11(1):101-26.
44. Steffensmeier D, Zhong H, Ackerman J, Schwartz J, Agha S. Gender gap trends for violent crimes, 1980 to 2003: A UCR-NCVS comparison. Feminist Criminol. 2006;1(1):72-98.
45. Swanson JW, Swartz MS, Van Dorn RA, Elbogen EB, Wagner HR, Rosenheck RA, et al. A national study of violent behavior in persons with schizophrenia. Arch Gen Psychiatry. 2006;63(5): 490-499.
46. Tomlin J, Lega I, Braun P, Kennedy HG, Herrando VT, Barroso R, et al. Forensic mental health in Europe: some key figures. Soc Psychiatry Psychiatr Epidemiol. 2021;56(1):109-117.
47. Tremblay RE, Cote SM. Sex differences in the development of physical aggression: An intergenerational perspective and implications for preventive interventions. Infant Ment Health J. 2019;40(1): 129-140.
48. Tremblay RE, Vitaro F, Cote SM. Developmental origins of chronic physical aggression: A bio-psycho-social model for the next generation of preventive interventions. Annu Rev Psychol. 2018;69(1):383-407.
49. Waller R, Gardner F, Hyde LW, Shaw DS, Dishion TJ, Wilson MN. Do harsh and positive parenting predict parent reports of deceitful-callous behavior in early childhood? J Child Psychol Psychiatry. 2012;53(9):946-953.
50. Wertz J, Caspi A, Ambler A, Arseneault L, Belsky DW, Danese A, et al. Borderline symptoms at age 12 signal risk for poor outcomes during the transition to adulthood: Findings from a genetically sensitive longitudinal cohort study. J Am Acad Child Adolesc Psychiatry. 2020;59(10):1165-1177.
51. Yourstone J, Lindholm T, Kristiansson M. Women who kill: A comparison of the psychosocial background of female and male perpetrators. Int J law Psychiatry. 2008;31(4):374-783.