

IS DOMESTIC VIOLENCE A GENDER ISSUE, OR A HUMAN ISSUE?

This manuscript has been accepted for publication in: *Journal of Human Behavior in the Social Environment*

R.L. McNeely, Ph.D., J.D.
Attorney, and Professor of Social Welfare
School of Social Welfare
University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee

Philip W. Cook, B.S.
Author, Journalist, and President
Arrowdot Productions, Inc.
P.O. Box 951
Tualatin, Oregon

Jose B. Torres, Ph.D.
Assistant Professor
School of Social Welfare
University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee

R.L. McNeely is a professor of social welfare at the University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee, and a practicing attorney. He has published two edited volumes, and more than sixty articles in social science and education journals, particularly on work satisfaction in the human services, balancing work and family life, organizational effectiveness in public schools, and on race and crime. Formerly a Fellow of the American Council on Education, he is a Research Fellow of the Gerontological Society of America, he has testified before Congress on the issue of domestic violence, and he has served as a domestic violence consultant for the U.S. Army.

Philip W. Cook, author of the volume, *Abused Men: The Hidden Side of Domestic Violence* (Praeger, 1997), is a former broadcast journalist who has won awards for his reporting from the Associated Press, and from The Professional Journalism Society. His book, *Abused Men*, has received widespread praise from, among others, the West Coast Review of Books, The London Observer, the University of New Hampshire Family Research Laboratory, *The Detroit News*, and from "Dear Abby" (Abigail Van Buren). He is also president of Arrowdot Productions, a recently incorporated publishing company that has been established to produce broadcast media documentaries, and educational materials for the print media, focusing upon selected human rights issues, including domestic violence.

Jose B. Torres is an assistant professor of social welfare at the University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee, and also is an associate scientist with the Center of Addictions and Behavioral Health Research Center at the University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee. He teaches courses that focus on direct social work and social work with multicultural populations. He is a certified marriage and family therapist, and an approved supervisor for trainees of the American Association for Marriage and Family Therapy.

Keywords: Domestic violence, spousal abuse, abused men, gender abuse, human issue

A PAPER PRESENTED AT THE NATIONAL MEN'S HEALTH CONFERENCE, SPONSORED BY THE PHILADELPHIA, PA., DEPT. OF PUBLIC HEALTH, AND OTHER SPONSORS, PENNSYLVANIA CONVENTION CENTER, PHILADELPHIA, PA., JUNE 3-4, 1999.

IS DOMESTIC VIOLENCE A GENDER ISSUE, OR A HUMAN ISSUE?

Abstract

Domestic violence, like all violence, is a human issue. It is not merely a gender issue. Classifying spousal and partner violence as a women's issue, rather than a human issue, is erroneous. In domestic relations, women are as inclined as men to engage in physically abusive acts. Yet most reports appearing in the popular press, and in scholarly journals, have framed the issue as essentially a masculine form of assaultive behavior, thereby imbedding into the national consciousness a false and inaccurate view of the problem. This article presents the results of selected empirical studies that contradict the popular view of domestic violence, briefly focuses on the phenomenon as it relates to race, offers several elucidating case accounts, and suggests that the popular view of domestic violence not only contributes to men's increasing legal and social defenselessness, it also leads to social policies that obstruct efforts to address the problem of domestic violence successfully.

IS DOMESTIC VIOLENCE A GENDER ISSUE, OR A HUMAN ISSUE?

Introduction

The question of whether domestic violence is a human issue remains nearly as vibrant and compelling today as when it was posed, first, more than ten years ago (cf. McNeely and Robinson-Simpson, 1987). When that question was asked and then answered in the affirmative by McNeely and Robinson-Simpson, in an article published by the National Association of Social Workers, the reaction of incredulous readers was, mildly stated, shock, disbelief, and anger (cf. Saunders, 1988; McNeely and Robinson-Simpson, 1988).¹ Among other reactions, the chancellor of author McNeely's university was sent a letter from a women's group threatening to do everything in its power to terminate McNeely's federal funding, and co-author Robinson-Simpson, then a female assistant professor, was characterized as a woman, duped, and under the domination of male professor, McNeely, despite the fact that Robinson-Simpson had uncovered some of the most compelling scientific evidence undergirding the position that women are no less violent than men (Cook, 1997: 118-120). But the reaction to McNeely and Robinson-Simpson has by no means been unique.² Among other things, in efforts to stop researchers from presenting evidence to professional and other audiences of the proclivity of women to engage, as do men, in the production of domestic violence, false reports of sexual harassment and wife abuse have been asserted, and bombing threats have been made, as have threats against the safety of the researchers's children (cf. Cook, 1997: 112-116).

But why should presentation of scientific proof provoke such reaction? Readers contemplating this question need look no further than to the historically documented fates of those who had the audacious guile to question conventional wisdom, such as Socrates, Copernicus, and Galileo. Indeed, and returning to the present day, those who insist either on denying or repudiating countless, empirically sound studies, showing women to be no less violent than men, are very much like those who once vehemently insisted that the earth is flat, and then proceeded to brand the purveyors of new knowledge as heretics. But it is not just that the idea of women's complicity in interpersonal violence³ challenges old ideas, and challenges what many regard as common sense, it generates fear among those with vested interests in the perpetuation of federal and other funding that is based on the notion that spousal

¹ See also the numerous letters to the editor, as published in Social Work 33(2) 1988, that assailed authors McNeely and Robinson-Simpson. Indeed, the journal's editor, in the same issue of the journal, noted that the journal had been challenged for publishing the McNeely and Robinson-Simpson article. Perhaps in deferential response to the hundreds of letters sent in opposition to the article, the journal failed to publish even one letter supporting McNeely's and Robinson-Simpson's article, although many supportive letters were received.

² Indeed, Murray Straus, who was accused falsely of wife abuse and of harassing female students after publishing articles showing women to be as likely as men to commit domestic abuse, has compared his plight, at the hands of feminists, to that of Salman Rushdie, who was condemned to death by Islamic fundamentalists for what they regarded as Rushdie's heretical views on the Islamic religion (Straus, forthcoming).

³ "Interpersonal violence," as used in this paper, refers only to spousal/partner violence. It does not include other forms of violence, such as violence against elders, dating violence, or parent-child violence. Readers may be surprised to learn that women, historically, have been the primary perpetrators of infanticide (Steinmetz, 1977b: 89), that women are 62 percent more likely than males to abuse children, that male children are more than twice as likely as female children to suffer physical injury (Steinmetz, 1980), that typical infanticide victims are male children (Mitchel, 1987), and that women are twice as likely as men to assault an elderly spouse (Satel, 1997). They may be surprised also to learn that women are not less likely than men to engage in violence during dating, or in other forms of non-stranger violence, such as in non-marital cohabitation, etc. (cf. Fiebert and Tucci, 1998; Fiebert and Gonzalez, 1997; Lane and Gwartney-Gibbs, 1985; Szinovacz, 1983; Laner and Thompson, 1982).

violence is a male-perpetrated phenomenon (cf. George, 1998:4; Hoff-Sommers, 1995). Too, it is perceived by some feminist advocates as undercutting power derived from the presentation of women *only* as culpable victims, a power that leads uninformed and well-meaning sponsors to fund women's services (not people's services), and to enact legislation, such as the \$1.6 billion 1994 Violence Against *Women* Act, and legal doctrines, such as the "battered woman's defense", that empowers women, not people (cf. Rittenmeyer, 1981). Consequently, the notion that women are no less violent than men *is* threatening to those wishing to empower one gender at the expense of the other gender (cf. Straus, 1991), particularly given the fact that there are virtually no data demonstrating that federally-funded feminist approaches to resolving domestic violence are effective (cf. Satel, 1997).

None of this denies the fact that many women are victimized, brutally, at the hands of vicious males. Indeed, prior to working with Robinson-Simpson, and after asking the same questions ("Who are these men?" and "Why do these men do it?") as did Erin Pizzey, whose seminal (1974) work launched the era in which woman battering became classified as a severe social problem, McNeely was publishing articles encouraging the development of domestic abuse shelters exclusively for women (cf. McNeely and Jones, 1980). What happened in the interim? What happened in the interim is that a review of astonishing scientific and other evidence compelled the asking of a new question: "Is domestic violence a human issue, rather than a gender issue?" (cf. McNeely and Mann, 1990; Fiebert, 1998). Travelling an analogous road, this article's co-author, Philip Cook, who recently published the seminal (1997) work, Abused Men: The Hidden Side of Domestic Violence, found his previously conventional views on domestic relations to be equally challenged when in performing work for a charitable organization he found an astonishing number of male questionnaire respondents who checked "yes" to the question of whether they had ever been a victim of physical attack by a domestic partner. This led him to a more rigorous study of the phenomenon that ultimately resulted in the publication of his controversial volume on abused men. But neither the road travelled by McNeely, nor the road travelled by Cook, are unique: It is clear from presentations made at professional conferences and elsewhere that nearly every scholar conducting domestic violence studies has found data obtained by survey research to be astonishing. Simply put, it is initially astonishing, even to domestic relations professionals, that the robust belief of men being the more-or-less exclusive perpetrators of interpersonal violence is false.

But those who subscribe to the view of women's more-or-less equal propensity to initiate, engage, and perpetuate interpersonal violence, base their view, principally, on a particular type of data. More, subscribers to the view that women are no less likely than men to engage in interpersonal violence regard the data upon which their view rests as being superior to other forms of evidence. The evidence being referred to here is data generated by survey research methods. Survey data, where people selected by known sampling techniques comprise sample frames that are representative of the general population, yield a different view of interpersonal violence than research based on interviewing known victims of domestic violence. Known victims of domestic violence, most often, are women who are, or have been, housed in domestic abuse shelters. Indeed, some images of the problem are formed by sample frames composed exclusively of women. It seems to us that a sine qua non with respect to research methods is that *if* one wishes to generate a full view of a social problem, one must utilize research methods that represent the entire population. Obviously, sample frames that include only known victims who currently or formerly have been housed in domestic violence shelters (who invariably are women), or sample frames that include only women, will not be representative of the domestic violence phenomenon with respect to male victims (McNeely and Robinson-Simpson, 1987;

Stets and Straus, 1990:151).

So what have been the findings of research utilizing samples representative of the population, or at least those utilizing samples not limited exclusively to women? A selected chronology of this research, which is intended to be illustrative, not exhaustive, follows. Before proceeding to those investigations, however, a caveat is in order. Readers must appreciate that the results of social science investigations are rarely completely consistent. This is due to a variety of factors, including, for example, the fact that different researchers use different sampling techniques that can cause findings to vary in unknown ways, various protocols used by researchers also can cause research findings to vary in unknown ways, the relationship of respondents to those who collect the data can vary, affecting findings, and concepts such as "violence" can be defined differently by different researchers, causing research findings to vary (cf. Straus, 1990a). Consequently, the findings generated by survey and other forms of research can, and do, vary.⁴

If one appreciates this fact about the domestic violence literature, and if one limits one's analysis to methodologically sound domestic violence studies involving samples not constructed exclusively of known female victims of abuse, it is difficult to argue that women are less likely than men to engage in interpersonal violence. Indeed, to date, every empirical study surveying both men and women has found that women comprise a significant percentage of domestic violence perpetrators. As noted by Satel (1997:9), an analysis of the domestic violence literature reveals that about 25 to 30 percent of violence among married and cohabiting couples is initiated solely by women, about 25 five percent is initiated solely by men, and the remainder is mutually initiated (Straus, 1980; Straus et. al, 1980; cf. Nisonoff and Bitman, 1979:138).

Purpose

⁴ Research findings generated by the National Crime Survey (NCS) as originally designed provide a good illustration of how varying research protocols and varying definitions of "violence" may significantly affect domestic violence findings. The NCS also is a good illustration because it demonstrates that some studies utilizing survey research methods have resulted in the finding that women are *less* likely than men to engage in domestic violence. The NCS is a longitudinal study funded by the Department of Justice that was begun in 1973 and conducted by the Bureau of the Census (cf. McNeely, 1983: 138). Data obtained by the NCS have shown women to be victimized by domestic violence at a rate of about 3.9 per 1,000, while men were victimized at a much lower rate of .3 per 1,000. However, seeking to estimate all types of victimizations, the NCS differs from studies reported in the section of this article titled *The Investigations* because it was not specifically designed initially to answer questions on domestic abuse. Spouse abuse was defined by NCS researchers as: "Assault without theft in which the offender was the victim's spouse or ex-spouse" (Gaguin 1977-78: 635). Consequently, data obtained from respondents reporting domestic victimization involving co-habiting couples or those involving theft were excluded. Additionally, no special interviewing protocols sensitive to the peculiar problems involved in obtaining domestic violence data were incorporated into the study. This is especially important because, without such protocols, men are particularly less likely to report domestic abuse victimizations than are women (cf. Szinovacz, 1983: 641). Indeed, NCS researchers have stated their conviction that male victimization is much higher in the general population than that reported by NCS data (McNeely and Robinson-Simpson, 1987: see footnote 19) and, perhaps, this was part of the reason it was later redesigned to include some specific domestic violence questions, and renamed as the National Crime Victimization Survey (NCVS). Consequently, the NCS should underscore for readers how different research protocols can significantly affect a study's findings, and that even if survey research methods are used, such findings may be at odds with the weight of findings obtained by other survey research studies employing methods that are designed specifically to examine domestic violence. Studies reported in the *Investigations* section were designed from their inception specifically to examine domestic violence. For a recent critique and analysis of why crime studies (national crime surveys, police calls, etc.) underestimate male victimization, see: Straus, (forthcoming).

The purpose of this article is to demonstrate that domestic violence, like all violence, is a human issue, and not merely a women's issue. To achieve this purpose, illustrative survey research investigations, conducted over three decades, are reviewed, and elucidating anecdotal evidence also is presented.

The Investigations

1970s

In the same year as Pizzey's previously cited seminal volume was published, Murray Straus, commenting in the foreword of a 1974 volume on family violence, noted that selective attention had characterized prior research on family violence, "because husband-wife violence has been a taboo topic" (Gelles, 1974: 13,15). The publication, in 1974, of Gelles's The Violent Home constituted a step of substantial research importance because the study, unlike prior investigations utilizing divorce-prone individuals or subjects who were known abusers, involved a comparison group of individuals presumed to be more representative of "normal" families. Pointing out that at the time of the study family violence was assumed to be a rare event, Gelles noted that the possibility of drawing a random sample was ruled out because of common agreement that too many subjects would have to be interviewed to generate a sufficient number of abusers (Gelles, 1974:33). Admittedly, because the comparison group consisted mainly of neighbors of subjects classified by police, or a social service agency, as abusive, no claim could be made that the neighbor group was truly representative. Nonetheless, the neighbor families provided the best data then available on family violence occurring among families with no known history of domestic violence. Among other findings, Gelles's study determined that 26 percent of all families participating in the study engaged in domestic violence regularly, that whereas 2.5 percent of neighbor wives had been victimized between two and five times during the course of marriage, 12.5 percent of husbands had been so victimized. Five percent of both husbands and wives had been victimized as much as once every two months, and 7.5 percent of wives compared to 2.5 percent of the husbands were victimized at least once per month, in some cases, daily. As stated by Gelles: "Although the wives were less violent than their husbands, they were far from passive" (1974:52).

Suzanne Steinmetz, who was later victimized by bombing threats and threats against her children's safety, published the results of two family violence studies, in 1977. One was a small exploratory study involving self reports generated by students at a large urban university (1977a), and the second involved 57 families residing in New Castle County, Delaware (1977b). In the first study, students enrolled in two sections of a university course were requested to fill out questionnaires designed to assess the modes of conflict resolution employed by family members. Each participating student also was requested to obtain two additional questionnaires to be filled out by individuals 18-30 years of age who were not affiliated with the university. Among other findings, Steinmetz determined that 95 percent of all husbands and wives employed verbal aggression against each other (arguing a lot, yelling, screaming and insulting each other, sulking, stomping out of the room), and that 30 percent employed physical aggression (throwing and smashing things; threatening to hit or throw something at a spouse; did throw something at a spouse; pushed, grabbed or shoved; hit or tried to hit the other; hit or tried to hit the other person with something).

Perhaps because no claims could be made as to the sample's representativeness, Steinmetz secured a public-opinion polling company to select subjects for a second study. Subjects who were members of intact families with at least two children between the ages of three and eighteen were selected randomly until quotas proportionately representative of the population were filled. Findings indicated that 93 percent of the families used verbal aggression, and 60 percent had used physical aggression at least once to resolve marital conflicts. Thirty-

nine (39%) percent of husbands versus 37 percent of wives had thrown things. Thirty-one (31%) percent of husbands compared to 22 percent of wives had pushed, shoved, or grabbed. Twenty (20%) percent of both husbands and wives had struck their spouses with their hands, and 10 percent of both husbands and wives had hit spouses with a hard object. Steinmetz observed that there were few differences between husbands and wives in the type and frequency of physical aggression, that wives were sometimes the aggressors, husbands were the aggressors in other cases, and that many families experienced reciprocal aggression. Steinmetz also noted that women were as likely as men to select and initiate physical violence to resolve marital conflicts, and that men and women were equal in their intentions when using physical violence. Having reviewed homicide data, Steinmetz noted further that when differences in physical strength were neutralized by weapons use, about as many men as women were victims of homicide. [Additionally, compelling evidence refutes the notion that female killers are helpless angels avenging former abuse: About eighty percent of murderesses have been found to have prior arrest records (Mann, 1996)].

Murray Straus, in 1977, presented findings (during a conference held at Stanford University) from the first study of domestic violence in the U.S. involving a large and nationally representative sample. Subsequently, the findings were published in a journal article appearing later that year (Straus, 1977-78), in books Straus published with George Hotaling (1980), and with Richard Gelles and Suzanne Steinmetz (1980). The study involved a national probability sample of 2,143 married and unmarried couples, examined in 1975, whose demographic profile closely matched the nation as a whole in regard to age, race, and socioeconomic status. Straus used an ascending continuum (The Conflict Tactics Scale) of violent acts including the following: (1) Throwing things at spouse; (2) pushing, shoving or grabbing; (3) slapping; (4) kicking, biting, or hitting with the fist; (5) hit or tried to hit with something; (6) beat up; (7) threatened with a knife or a gun; and (8) used a knife or a gun. Items 1-4 were regarded as an overall "Violence Index" whereas items 4-8 were considered to constitute a "Severe Violence Index."

So what did Straus find? Findings indicated that, in a given year, men perpetrate an average (median) of 2.5 "assaults" per year (items 1-8), but women perpetrate an average of 3.0 "assaults per year (items 1-8). When means rather than medians were used to assess central tendencies, men engaged in an average of 8.8 assaults per year, but women were found to engage in 10.1 assaults per year. Women also engaged more often than men in serious transgressions (items 4-8). Whereas males perpetrated a yearly average (median) of 2.4 acts of severe violence, women committed an average (median) of 3.0 acts of severe violence against male intimates. The mean severe violence rate for men was 8.0 acts per year, but women committed 8.9 acts of severe violence. But men beat up women more often (1.7 times per year) than females beat up men (1.4 times per year). But when all severely violent acts (items 4-8) were examined, violent females were found to transgress against males more often than males transgressed against females, and numerically more males (2.1 million) are victimized by females than females are victimized by males (1.8 million).

These findings were, and are, stunning to casual observers of the domestic violence phenomenon. This is because people have difficulty with the notion of women inflicting injuries on men because men, on average, are larger, stronger, and more adept at fighting. But the average man's size and strength are neutralized by guns and knives, boiling water, fireplace pokers, bricks, and baseball bats. Many fail to realize that domestic assaults do not involve pugilistic fair play, or to consider that attacks occur when males are asleep, or incapacitated by alcohol, age, or infirmities (McNeely and Mann, 1990). Perhaps more surprising is that young husbands are not spared victimization. Military men in their fighting prime are not uncommonly

stabbed or shot in unprovoked episodes of violence (Ansberry, 1988).

1980s

In 1985, Straus and Gelles presented the findings of a study (at the annual conference of the American Society of Criminology) that sought to replicate the Straus survey reported above. Subsequently, the presented paper was published (Straus and Gelles, 1986). Although the original sample frame consisted of 2,143 families, 3,250 families were involved in the second survey. Both samples were representative of the nation, and a primary purpose of the study was to compare domestic violence rates for 1975 versus 1985. Again, the Conflict Tactics Scale was utilized to assess violence.

Findings revealed that the incidence of violence against females decreased between 1975 and 1985.⁵ About 12.1 percent of all women had experienced at least one instance of violence in 1975, whereas 11.3 percent reported being victimized in 1985. Severe violence against women also decreased, from 3.8 percent having been assaulted in 1975, to only 3.0 percent having been assaulted in 1985. As noted by Straus and Gelles, this meant that approximately 432,000 fewer females were beaten than would have been the case if the 1975 rate had prevailed (Straus and Gelles, 1986: 470). However, although a slightly smaller percentage (4.4%) of men were victimized in 1985 by severe violence compared to 1975 (4.6%), a higher proportion of men were victimized in 1985 (12.1%) versus 1975 (11.6%). Additionally, while the incidence of males using objects to strike females decreased from 2.2 percent in 1975 to 1.7 percent in 1985, no change was reported for women, with 3.0 percent using objects to strike males in both 1975 and 1985. Contemplating their findings, Straus and Gelles reported:

Violence by wives has not been an object of public concern...no funds have been invested in ameliorating (violence against males) because it has not been defined as a problem...Our 1985 finding of little change in the rate of assaults by women on their male partners is consistent with the absence of ameliorative programs (1986:472).

But antagonists assailed the conclusions of Straus and Gelles, asserting that their research was faulty because their instrument, the Conflict Tactics Scale, critics argued, failed to take into account the context of violence. Simply put, the critics had argued that the scale failed to assess whether women's violence was in response to male aggression, and failed to assess if abused women were injured more seriously than male abuse victims. Responding to these criticisms, Straus thereafter compared rates generated in his surveys to self-reported rates of female-to-male assaults reported exclusively by women. What did Straus find? He found no significant differences in the rates reported by the general surveys, and the self-reported rates disclosed by the women (Straus, 1993:69; cf: Straus, 1997:217-218; Straus, 1990b). What differences were found were not substantive with women, again, perpetrating more violence: Violence by men occurred in 23 percent of the cases while violence by women occurred in 28 percent of the cases, and women reported that they struck the first blow in 52.7 percent of the cases although, when the severest forms of violence were examined, women were more likely than men to require medical care, to take time off from work, and to be bedridden, but the differences in comparison to men were not particularly strong or large (Stets and Straus, 1990: 154-158). This latter finding, of women being more likely to need medical care, contrasts with findings reported by Maureen McLeod for a study group in which 77 percent of the male victims were African

⁵ Despite the decline in violence against females, authors such as Satel argue that a one-sided treatment approach focusing only on men ultimately exposes women to more danger (Satel, 1997:10).

American. Analysis of her data led McLeod to state: "Clearly, violence against men is much more destructive than violence against women...Male victims are injured more often and more seriously than are female victims" (McLeod, 1984). Given the fact that Straus's study group did not have such a disproportionate number of African-American males, it is possible that African-American males, when acts of severe violence are perpetrated against them, tend to be more severely brutalized than male European-Americans. Indeed, whereas European-American women receive "slap the cad" instructions from mothers, lower-class African-American women typically receive specific instructions in the use of hot water, hot cooking oil, etc. for scaldings.

1990s

Just as had been the case in the U.S., most British studies of domestic violence initially focused exclusively on battered women (Smith, 1989), or on community samples of women (Andrews and Brown, 1988). To correct this, Carrado, et. al (1996), decided to conduct a study with a nationally representative sample of both male and female heterosexual respondents in 1994. Their sample frame was comprised of 1,978 adults residing in the United Kingdom who, to enhance confidentiality, completed questionnaires in their homes instead of being interviewed on a face-to-face basis in their homes. Anticipating that criticism of their study might focus on the oft-repeated arguments that survey research (1) does not identify whether female aggression is in response to male aggression, (2) does not identify if female aggression is in response to anticipated male aggression, (3) does not identify if female aggression is in response to prior male aggression, and (4) does not differentiate expressive female violence, versus instrumental male violence, Carrado, et. al designed their instrument to ascribe reason and context to reports of victimization.

Findings revealed that about 10 percent of the men admitted committing an act of physical aggression, whereas 11 percent of women indicated committing these acts. Although men were more likely to push or grab intimates, women were more likely to slap their intimates, but women also were more likely to punch, kick, throw objects, and to strike their intimates with a sharp object. The study also found that with respect to multiple transgressions, about one-third of assaulted women experienced three or more types of assaults, whereas about one-fourth of men experienced three or more types of assaults. Women who were married or cohabiting reported less overall

victimization than single women, but relationship status had little effect in mitigating the victimization of men, and men, compared to women, suffered a higher overall incidence of victimization, and a higher incidence of more severe forms of violence. The latter finding, that of men suffering more victimization, was consistent with prior smaller scale United Kingdom studies showing females to commit more severe violence than their male partners (Cf. Archer and Ray, 1989; Russell and Hulson, 1992). Finally, as has been the case with studies performed in other countries (Cf. Sommer, 1994), data obtained by Carrado, et. al did not corroborate the erroneous notion indicated above that female violence is only in response to male violence. The study also failed to find substantive contrasts in the reasons given for violence, with prevalent reasons given by both men and women for inflicting violence including a number of motives, such as to (1) get a partner to do something the perpetrator wanted, as (2) a response to something said or threatened, to (3) stop a partner from doing something, or (4) as the means by which a perpetrator "got through" to a partner.

But the U.S. and Great Britain are not the only countries in which survey research involving national samples has trumpeted similar findings. Presenting his Canadian findings in a German journal, Eugen Lupri reported that approximately 2.5 percent of Canadian men and 6.2 percent of Canadian women admitted to having beaten up their partners, that women reported

more acts of violence than did men, that 18 percent of the men compared to 23 percent of the women reported directing physical aggression against their mates, and that 10 percent of the men, but 13 percent of the women, had perpetrated acts of severe violence (Lupri, 1990).

It comes as a shocking surprise that military men, who are in their fighting primes, also are victimized by female-perpetrated domestic violence. In a study commissioned by the U.S. Army that was conducted by Behavioral Research Associates, data obtained from a final sample that included 33,762 randomly selected married active duty respondents stationed at 38 installations, located in all fifty states, revealed the following: More than nineteen (19.3%) percent of married males reported having been victimized by moderate wife-to-husband violence, and 6.6 percent reported having been victimized by severe violence. This contrasts with 18.5 percent of married females who reported being victimized by moderate level husband-to-wife violence, with 9.7 percent indicating having been victimized by severe violence. Interestingly, when males were asked to report their own aggression against their spouses, 17.6 percent indicated having perpetrated moderate violence, and 5.2 percent indicated perpetrating severe violence. When females were asked to report their aggression against spouses, 24.6 percent indicated having engaged in moderate-level assaults against husbands, and 6.5 percent indicated having engaged in severe violence (Heyman, et. al, 1996).⁶

Another question has to do with the extent to which verbal and symbolic aggression directed against partners is gender related. Straus and Sweet (1992) turned their attention to this issue by examining verbal/symbolic aggression among a nationally representative sample of 5,232 American couples (the study had 6,002 respondents; some respondents were not involved in coupled relationships). Pointing out that the literature provides little in the way of findings on the questions as to whether one gender is more verbally aggressive than the other, Straus and Sweet utilized telephone surveys to interview respondents during the summer of 1985. Categories of verbal/symbolic aggression included: insulting, swearing at, sulking, refusing to talk, stomping out of the room or yard, saying things to spite a partner, threatening to strike a partner, threatening to throw something at a partner, and actually throwing, hitting, kicking, or smashing something. Findings revealed that 74 percent of the men, and 75 percent of the women, engaged in verbal/symbolic aggression. Consequently, similar to physical aggression, there is no significant difference between man-to-woman and woman-to-man aggression.

African American Males

A common misconception is that African American males are more violent in their treatment of women than European American males. Even Straus and his co-investigators, whose survey is the most comprehensive and methodologically sound of all domestic violence investigations, have contributed to this misconception. Reporting in 1980 that wife abuse was 400 percent higher among African American couples than among European American couples (Straus, Gelles, and Steinmetz, 1980), the researchers failed to take into account that social class differences between the races, rather than race itself, might explain discrepant rates. But in a premier study that was specifically designed to take social class into account, Lockhart (1985; 1991) found virtually no differences between the races. Although a higher percentage of African American women reported at least one victimization event, the median rate of violent episodes experienced by middle-class European American women was somewhat higher than that experienced by middle-class African American women. Subsequent research has shown the

⁶ Contrary to recent reports in the print and broadcast media that domestic violence rates are much higher in the Army than in the civilian population, Heyman and Neidig (forthcoming) have shown that once age and race are controlled, husband-to-wife violence is only slightly higher in the military than in the U.S. civilian population.

salience of other factors, such as a residential areas's percentage of female-headed families, level of population density, and residential mobility (cf: Hampton, et. al, 1998: 15-19).

Anecdotal Evidence

Many readers of scientific research find it difficult to digest what they regard as abstract numbers and statistical analyses needing, instead, concrete examples in order to place the nature of a problem, such as domestic violence, into perspective. Although anecdotal evidence in the form of violent female-to-male episodes are replete in the media, such events often are regarded as being rare. One stunning example of anecdotal evidence appeared when an emergency room physician wrote to Time Magazine to report his objection to the claim, reported in a previous issue of the magazine, that because women are smaller than men, they are not as likely to inflict serious injury. Injuries this physician had treated included ax assaults, scaldings, smashings with fireplace pokers and bricks, and many gunshot wounds. As noted by the physician:

[I]n my experience as an emergency room physician, I treated more men than women for [domestic violence] injuries, perhaps because a woman is more likely to use a weapon (Letter to the Editor, Time, January 11, 1988, pg. 12).⁷

Although this sort of abbreviated evidence is replete in the popular press (usually presented to evoke humor), it is presented only episodically, and only in disparate fashion. But numerous substantive case accounts presented systematically are now available for the first time in a single source. That source is Philip Cook's volume, Abused Men: The Hidden Side of Domestic Violence. Selected briefs from some of the case accounts appearing in that volume follow.

Selected Case Accounts

The briefs presented herein profile cases of domestic violence, including accounts of verbal/symbolic as well as actual physical aggression, ranging from those that were very minor to those that were quite serious. Readers should be aware that few published accounts of abused men appear in the literature. The sum total of published accounts amounts only to about 90 referenced cases. Although a study of a large number of cases (N=150) has been performed by clinical psychologist, Carole Hammond-Saslow (1997), her work remains an unpublished doctoral dissertation. Additionally, although Erin Pizzey (1982) has detailed accounts of male victimization, these accounts have been presented only from the viewpoints of female perpetrators.

Incidents reported below regarded as being minor involved slapping, pushing, grabbing, shoving and/or throwing things, while serious incidents involved hitting, kicking, biting, threatening to use a weapon and/or actual use of a weapon. Male victims, in many respects, appeared to be similar to female victims. A significant number of male victims, for example, believed that their spouses used violence or threats of violence to control their behavior. One male victim, Steve J., expressing frustration with his marriage, stated the following:

⁷ Domestic assault patients in hospital emergency rooms have been surveyed by confidential self-administered questionnaires. When one such survey was performed in Detroit, Michigan, researchers Goldberg and Tomlanovich failed to find any statistically significant differences between the number of male and female victims (1984). In another survey of hospital room patients, conducted in Pennsylvania, fully thirty percent of the battered women questioned were identified positively as batterers (McLeer and Anwar, 1989).

"She made all the decisions, about everything. She would decide how and where to spend money, what discipline there would be for the children, when we could make love, just everything. After awhile, I began to view my own opinions as wrong...She would constantly contradict me, especially in front of the children... I would make a decision, say about not having any TV because homework wasn't done, that kind of thing, and she would find out about it, and then overturn it, saying they could have TV. This happened constantly, and it became another area where I just gave up trying."⁸

Males interviewed by Cook for his volume, Abused Men, also expressed difficulty in leaving their abusive situations. Patricia Overberg, Director of the Valley Oasis Crisis Center in Sacramento California, one of the rare shelters that admits men, contends that men have a more difficult time not only admitting they are victims and seeking help, but they also have a more difficult time leaving the abusive relationship: "Because if you leave, you are abdicating your responsibility, and you are less than a man" (Cook, 1997: 60). Mark K., who was frequently kicked, hit, scratched, and had things thrown at him, says this sense of responsibility was the primary reason he didn't leave his marriage sooner. Asked the question, "*Did you feel responsible, as a man, for the family?*", Mark replied:

"Yes, definitely. Just like when she quit working. I said to heck with it, stay home, take care of the baby- -I'll just work overtime; and that's what I did.

Noted twenty years ago by Steinmetz (1977-78:506), and more recently by Cook (1997), male abuse victims tend to find that leaving an abusive situation is especially difficult. Many of those interviewed by Cook expressed the belief that it was their responsibility to provide for their children, and in many cases they acted as protector or buffer between their spouses and children, sometimes becoming the targets of physical aggression that otherwise would have been directed to their children. Many of the interviewed men also strongly believed that no matter what their partner did to them, the judicial system would be against them. Thus, not only would they fail to gain custody of their children, if they left the marital relationship, visitation also would be blocked by their spouses as a continuation of controlling and abusive behavior, with husbands having little or no recourse under the law. Tom W.'s wife, for example, had thrown knives at him, resulting in a cut on one occasion, and she also was verbally and emotionally abusive. He explained the aftermath when he lost physical custody, and visitation thereafter was controlled by his former spouse, as follows:

"She is still very controlling. She enjoys the power she has. I've been denied visitation many, many times. She had moved, and I would get there, and I couldn't see the children because they had done something, or not done something, that she wanted them to do. I'd try calling the police, but there's nothing they would do, because it's a civil domestic situation, and I was told I would have to go back to family court. Well, that still meant I would lose my weekend visitation, and going back to court meant an expense, and lawyers, and I just couldn't afford it."

Abused males often are victimized when they step in to protect their children from being abused (Steinmetz, 1977-78). However, males also expressed to Cook what Cook regarded as

⁸ Married couples in which the female is dominant frequently result in situations where the male partner loses libido or becomes impotent (cf: Crowe and Ridley, 1990).

masculine reasons for staying in a relationship, and not hitting back, after being physically assaulted by wives. Jeff W. explains:

"It's almost like it was ingrained in me, from the time I was a little kid. You don't hit girls, you just don't. I would hold her arms, I guess pretty tightly in the heat of the moment. She did get some finger mark bruises on her arms once, but what was I supposed to do, just let her keep hitting me? Still, I couldn't hit back."

Abused males also are more restrained than women in revealing their victimization (cf. Szinovacz, 1983) partly for fear of being ridiculed. Many of the men interviewed had never even told close family members about the abuse. Tim S. a twenty-five year old college student, never told anyone, until he was interviewed: "Because they would assume that I had done something to her, or that I deserved it."

While both abused women and men often feel shame over revealing instances of marital violence, men, unlike women, fear being characterized as a "wimp", or worse. Sacramento California's Valley Oasis Crisis Center shelter director, Patricia Overberg, explains how the lack of empathy for male victims was expressed in one case:

"I worked with a man who was an ironworker. Now an ironworker is the epitome of macho. This guy was big, and his wife was tall, but thin, probably no more than a hundred pounds. She kept putting him in the hospital. She kept beating him up with a baseball bat. Every time he came out of the hospital, they [his co-workers] were laughing him off the girders. They had no sympathy or empathy for him."

A significant number of the interviewed men said they would not have called a crisis line even if they had known that one was available for men. However, a nearly equal number said they would have called, if there had been some place to call, as Tom W. explained:

"It seems as though I had no one to really turn to. To say, you know, 'How can I cope with this?' I felt as though I was out in a boat in the ocean all by myself. I saw so many opportunities for help for women in my situation. I don't deny them that opportunity, because I think there have been quite a few situations...But the other side is, I felt I had been an abused husband, and an abused parent, with really nowhere to turn."

Bewilderment and betrayal are the most common feeling of bruised men finding themselves in the above situation. Each interviewed man expressed this in one form or another. Many said it outright: "What was I supposed to do?" Their isolation was extreme. Shame and fear of ridicule helped keep their problems hidden⁹ while societal views of proper masculine behavior and a lack of resources insured that the most hidden form of domestic violence would remain hidden. One of the interviewed men said: "I wonder how many homeless men on the streets there are who were in my situation... I had resources, there are those who don't." Some of the men claimed to no longer trust women, others had difficulty adjusting to a new relationship, while others had little difficulty putting their abused past behind them. The longest lasting negative effects seemed present with those who were fathers. It did not seem to matter whether the fathers had physical custody of their children. Readers may wish to contemplate one

⁹ But, increasingly, male victimization is becoming more and more visible. For example, Ernst, et.al (1997a: 620), after examining patients in an "inner-city" emergency department, concluded: "Recognition of the global nature of violence may be more realistic than assuming that only women are victims." In this survey, 20% of the men and 19% of the women reported physical violence in their current domestic relations. It should be noted that data reported by emergency room studies that have been crime-focused have shown more female than male victimization (cf. Rand, 1997).

implication flowing from these remarks: Although the indicators reported above are sparse, the psychological harm visited upon men victimized by wife-to-husband violence tend to contradict those who subscribe to the view that abused men do not suffer psychologically. Indeed, when the issue of psychological harm was examined, empirically, findings revealed no significant gender differences in psychosomatic illness, or stress, although abused women were more likely than men to be depressed (Stets and Straus, 1990).

Discussion: Differential Rates

As noted previously, not all research, not even all survey research, shows such equivalent rates of violence for the sexes. Despite the fact that more than one hundred family conflict studies have shown approximately equal rates of violence in domestic relations (Straus, forthcoming), one type of survey tends repeatedly to show lower rates for women. The type of study being referred to is what might be characterized as "crime surveys" (such as the National Crime Victimization Survey/National Crime Survey discussed previously in footnote 4). Also, "crime studies" (such as those using official police call data or Uniform Crime Report data) show lower rates for females (but women are more likely than men to initiate official intervention, and men are less likely to obtain official intervention, even when it is sought). Straus, on this issue, was confronted by a *U.S. Today* reporter to explain why family conflict studies, which show equal gender rates of involvement in domestic violence, appear to be contradicted by crime surveys, such as the 1997 National Violence Against Women in America (NVAW) Survey (see: Tjaden and Thoennes, 1997), which showed men to be three times as likely as women to commit domestic abuse. Even were one to accept the findings of the NVAW survey, which examined victimization, rather than victimization *and* perpetration, it would mean that 835,000 men are victimized each year. Straus responded to the reporter's inquiries with the following paraphrased explanation:

Crime surveys are presented to respondents as studies of crime, whereas family conflict surveys are presented to respondents as studies of family problems. Although most people would regard being kicked by a spouse as horrendous, few would think of having been kicked by a spouse as a crime. Thus, respondents, who are likely to regard, e.g., the victimization event of kicking a spouse as a "family argument", would be unlikely to report the kicking instance as a "crime" to crime-survey interviewers (Straus, forthcoming).

Straus noted further that family conflict studies report injury rates of about three (3%) percent, whereas crime studies report injury rates ranging, recently, from fifty-two (52%) percent to seventy-six (76%) percent. Straus (forthcoming) also commented that:

"The implausibly high injury rates from the (crime surveys) are probably the result of the crime threat to safety focus of those studies, i.e., partner assaults tend to not be reported unless there is something, such as injury, that moves them from the category of a 'family fight' to a 'crime' or a threat to safety."

Straus reported other reasons for discrepant rates in crime survey/study data versus family conflict studies (see: Straus, forthcoming), and still other reasons for discrepant rates between family conflict studies and studies involving clinical populations (cf: Stets and Straus, 1990), in which he and Jan Stets implicitly reprimanded writers such as Daniel Saunders (cf: Saunders, 1988). Among the uniformed conclusions drawn and presented by Saunders, whose views of domestic violence had been based virtually exclusively on clinical samples, was the erroneous assertion that women rarely or never initiate assaults (Saunders, 1986). The danger of basing

views of a societal-wide phenomenon exclusively on the far "tail" of a distribution curve, such as on a subpopulation of women who sought clinical services at a battered women's shelter, were discussed, herein, previously (cf. McNeely and Robinson-Simpson, 1987; 1988).

Meanwhile, data obtained from nationally representative surveys designed specifically to assess domestic violence rates within the general public continues to accumulate. Most recently, British researchers, Catriona Mirrlees-Black and Carole Byron, who surveyed respondents comprising a nationally representative sample of the British population, found, as reported in banner headlines by London's *The Guardian*: "Both Sexes Equally Likely to Suffer Domestic Violence" (4.2% of both sexes reported being assaulted). Announced by the newspaper on January 22, 1999, one day after this British governmental study (Mirrlees-Black and Byron, 1999) was released to the public, some readers were overwhelmed. One of those readers was Erin Pizzey, whose startling 1974 seminal book, *Scream Quietly or the Neighbors Will Hear*, had founded the movement by which wife abuse ultimately became defined as a social problem. Pizzey, in fact, also established the world's first shelter for battered women, the Chiswick Women's Refuge. Writing to Phil Cook, Pizzey, who, after penning *Scream Quietly or the Neighbors Will Hear*, had travelled a road similar to that of McNeely and Cook, commented to Cook:

This morning, I opened *The Guardian* and saw the headlines...This should be a great day in our lives. So many of us have been fighting for so long but...I wonder how the feminists in this country will react...If the whole thing will be swept under the carpet...If this will affect other countries? Who will answer for all the years of fathers losing their families and in some cases, their lives, because of huge lies? Can you pass this on to as many people as possible? (Personal correspondence to Phil Cook, Jan. 22, 1999).

These comments may surprise many, but not those who know of Pizzey's plight after she published her 1982 volume, *Prone to Violence*. In this book, Pizzey, having interviewed women housed within Chiswick Women's Refuge, presented her findings that sixty-two (62%) percent had participated in a mutually violent relationship. Thereafter, Pizzey was excommunicated from feminist ranks, her publisher was threatened with having his windows smashed, Pizzey was picketed, she was required, officially, to have a police escort for her book tour in England, and someone shot at her in her home in the United States (Thomas, 1993:185-191). Commenting about her new status, Pizzey remarked:

Time and again I've dealt with men who are physically attacked by women. In fact, the ophthalmologist I used to go to in Santa Fe [New Mexico] said that one of the major injuries he saw was men who had [pieces of] bottles and glasses in their eyes...I suppose that at the end of five years in America...I just came to the conclusion that not only did I have hardly any American women friends, but they were the most aggressive and dangerous women I'd ever met in the world...terrifying (Cook, 1997: 121).

Concluding Remarks

Although there is compelling evidence showing the complicity of individual attributes in the interpersonal production of domestic violence, particularly where anti-social personality disorders and alcoholism are combined (cf. Bland and Orn, 1986), the influence of social-structural factors is an exceedingly complicitous precipitant of violence (cf. Straus, 1994). Such mezzo and macro-level factors are far ranging, including, for example: (1) highly *stressful environments*, including those associated with alienating working environments (McNeely, 1979), and including those associated with certain military bases, where domestic violence is

more pronounced than on lesser-stress military bases (Cook, 1997:5); (2) features inherent in the structure of nuclear family households, such as the fact that conflicts must be settled by the two antagonists (husbands and wives) themselves, rather than via tension-reducing mechanisms such as democratic majority-group consensus, and also because of traditional gender-related roles assigned by societal norms, such as male authoritarianism and dominance (Straus and Hotaling, 1980); and, as some writers have noted, (3) because interpersonal violence is but a natural reaction to inequalitarian structures (racism, sexism, class inequalities) in society that inhibit personal growth (Gil, 1986; 1984). Moreover, given the magnitude of the problem, it is unlikely that psychotherapeutic approaches can successfully address it, or even that psychological disturbance is the root of family violence in most instances. As noted by Gil (1996:77):

"The futility of violence prevention efforts by government, professional organizations, and social advocacy movements should not be surprising, since the aim of these efforts has been primarily to control, punish, and modify the behavior of individuals involved in violence, rather than to discern and eliminate its root causes in the fabric of societies."

Indeed, in the view of psychiatrist and previously cited author, Sally Satel, as stated in a conversation occurring on February 15, 1999, with the instant article's senior author: "I am writing a book on public health and want to mention in it that feminist-run batterer treatment should be considered malpractice."

Solutions that involve gender inclusion practices within the provider community can be achieved fairly easily. Staff of some shelter and crisis-line services have been trained to properly differentiate between perpetrators and abusers of both genders, and to recognize predominantly mutual combat situations. Funding is not affected. What seems to be lacking is a coordinated educational effort that supports workers in victim assistance, law enforcement, and those in the legal and social service systems who desire more information about an underserved victim population in order to aid their efforts to serve this population.

One-sided governmental policies that fund women-only resources, based on the assumption that women rarely, or never, engage as perpetrators in domestic violence, is key to the problem. Given this, we agree with Stets and Straus who have argued that primary prevention efforts to curb domestic violence, rather than concentrating on male violence, should pay as much attention as possible to assaults by women on their partners (1990:165). On the other hand, we disagree with Straus, who has urged that priority be given to women victims because they are more likely to sustain serious injuries, and because of greater financial and emotional injury (Straus, forthcoming). In our view, priority needs to be assigned to the victims of domestic violence, regardless of gender, particularly given the fact that men can be victimized brutally (McLeod, 1984; Cook, 1997), suffer serious financial hardship (Steinmetz, 1977-78: 506), and evidence no robust differences in their need to see physicians, take time off from work, or become bedridden, following victimization (Stets and Straus, 1990:158) We would agree, however, that a disproportionate share of governmental resources should be targeted to women because, among people who are victimized by severe violence, proportionately more women than men suffer very serious injuries. Yet, in our view, to give less priority to the victimization experiences of men, compared to women, would be discriminatory (cf: Young, 1999). After all, domestic violence is a human problem.

REFERENCES

- Andrews, B. and G.W. Brown, "Marital Violence in the Community: A Biographical Approach," British Journal of Psychiatry, 153, 1988: 305-312.
- Ansberry, Clare, "Calling Sexes Equal in Domestic Violence, Article Stirs Clash Among Rights Groups," The Wall Street Journal, May 5, 1988: 27.
- Archer, J., and N. Ray, "Dating Violence in the United Kingdom: A Preliminary Study," Aggressive Behavior, 15, 1989: 337-343.
- Bland, Roger and Helene Orn, "Family Violence and Psychiatric Disorder," Canadian Journal of Psychiatry, 31 (March) 1986: 129-137.
- Carrado, Michelle, Malcom J. George, Elizabeth Loxam, L. Jones, and Dale Templar, "Aggression in British Heterosexual Relationships: A Descriptive Analysis," Aggressive Behavior, 22, 1996: 401-415.
- Cook, Philip W., Abused Men: The Hidden Side of Domestic Violence, Westport, Conn: Praeger Publishers, 1997.
- Crowe, M. and J. Ridgely, Therapy With Couples: A Behavioural Systems Approach to Marital and Sexual Problems, Oxford, England: Blackwell Scientific, 1990.
- Ernst, Amy A., Todd G. Nick, Steven J. Weiss, Debra Houry, Trevor Mills, "Domestic Violence in an Inner-City Emergency Department," JAMA, 278, 1997a; Also published in: Annals of Emergency Medicine, 30 (2) 1997b.
- Fiebert, Martin S., "References Examining Assaults by Women on Their Spouses/Partners," Sexuality and Culture 1, 1998: 273-286.
- Fiebert, Martin S. and Lisa M. Tucci, "Sexual Coercion: Men Victimized by Women," The Journal of Men's Studies, 6(2) 1998: 127-1333.
- Fiebert, Martin S. and Denise M. Gonzalez, "College Women Who Initiate Assaults on Their Male Partners and the Reasons Offered For Such Behavior," Psychological Reports 80: 1997:583-590.
- Gaguin, Deidre, "Spouse Abuse: Data from the National Crime Survey," Victimology, 2(3-4) 1977-78: 632-643.
- Gelles, R.J., The Violent Home: A Study of Physical Aggression Between Husbands and Wives, Beverly Hills, Calif: Sage Publications, 1974.
- George, Malcolm J., Beyond all Help?, London: DeWar Research (Tel: 01344 621167), 1998.
- Gil, David, "Reversing Dynamics of Violence by Transforming Work," Journal of International and Comparative Social Welfare, 1 (1) 1984: 1-15.
- Gil, David, "Sociocultural Aspects of Domestic Violence," Pp: 124-149 in M. Lystad (Ed.) Violence in the Home. New York: Brunner/Mazel Publishers, 1986.
- Gil, David, "Preventing Family Violence in a Structurally Violent Society: Mission Impossible," American Journal of Orthopsychiatry, 66 (1) 1996: 77-84.

- Goldberg, W., and M. Tomlanovich, "Domestic Violence Victims in the Emergency Department," Journal of the American Medical Association, 251 (24), June 22-29, 1984: 3259-3264.
- Hammond-Saslow, Carole, Domestic Abuse and Levels of Depression Self-Esteem and Assertiveness. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, U.S. International University (San Diego), 1997.
- Hampton, Robert, Ricardo Carrillo, and Joan Kim, "Violence in Communities of Color," Pp: 1-30 in Ricardo Carrillo and Jerry Tello (Eds.), Family Violence and Men of Color, New York, N.Y: Springer Publishing Co., 1998.
- Heyman, Richard, and Peter Neidig, "A Comparison of Spousal Aggression Prevalence Rates in U.S. Army and Civilian Representative Samples," Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, (forthcoming).
- Heyman, Richard, Rebecca Schaffer, Cynthia Gimbel, and Susan Kerner-Hoeg, A Comparison of the Prevalence of Army and Civilian Spouse Violence: Final Report, U.S. Army Community and Family Support Center, August, 1996.
- Hoff-Sommers, Christine, Who Stole Feminism: How Women Have Betrayed Women, New York: Simon and Schuster, 1995.
- Lane, Katherine, and Patricia Gwartney-Gibbs, "Violence in the Context of Dating and Sex," Journal of Family Issues 6(1):1985: 45-59.
- Laner, Mary, and Jeanine Thompson, "Abuse and Aggression in Courting Couples," Deviant Behavior: An Interdisciplinary Journal, 3, 1982: 229-244.
- Lockhart, Lettie, "Methodological Issues in Comparative Racial Analyses: The Case of Wife Abuse," Social Work Research and Abstracts, 21(2) 1985: 35-41.
- Lockhart, Lettie, "Spousal Violence: A Cross-Racial Perspective," Pp: 85-101 in R.L. Hampton (Ed.) Black Family Violence: Current Research and Theory, Lexington, Massachusetts, Lexington Books, 1991.
- Lupri, Eugen, "Harmonie und Aggression: Uber die Dialektick Ehlicher Gewalt," Kolner Zeitschrift fur Soziologie und Sozialpsychologie, 42(3) 1990: 5, 479-501.
- Mann, Coramae Richey, When Women Kill, Albany, N.Y: Suny Press, 1996.
- McLeer, S.V., and R. Anwar, "A Study of Battered Women Presenting in an Emergency Department," American Journal of Public Health, 79 (1) January, 1989: 65-66.
- McLeod, Maureen, "Women Against Men: An Examination of Domestic Violence Based on an Analysis of Official Data and National Victimization Data," Justice Quarterly 1(2) 1984: 171-193.
- McNeely, R.L., "Sources of Alienation at Work and Household Violence Within Middle-Class Families: A Theoretical Perspective," Social Development Issues, 3 (1) 1979: 12-34.
- McNeely, R.L., and Joan M. Jones, "Refuge from Violence: Establishing Shelter Services for Battered Women," Administration in Social Work, 4(4) 1980: 71-82.
- McNeely, R.L., "Race, Sex, and Victimization of the Elderly," Pp: 137-152 in R.L. McNeely and J.N. Colen (Eds.), Aging in Minority Groups, Beverly Hills, CA: Sage Publications, 1983.

- McNeely, R.L., and Gloria Robinson-Simpson, "The Truth About Domestic Violence: A Falsely Framed Issue," Social Work, 32(6) 1987: 485-490.
- McNeely, R.L., and Gloria Robinson-Simpson, "The Truth About Domestic Violence Revisited: A Reply to Saunders," Social Work 33(2) 1988: 184-188.
- McNeely, R.L., and Coramae Richey Mann, "Domestic Violence is a Human Issue," Journal of Interpersonal Relations, 5(1) 1990: 129-132.
- Mirrlees-Black, Catriona and Carole Byron, Domestic Violence: Findings From a New British Crime Survey Self-completion Questionnaire, Home Office Research Study 191, HMSO, London: 126 pp.
- Mitchel, Leslie, "Child abuse and Neglect Fatalities: A Review of the Problem and Strategies for Reform," Working Paper 838. Monograph of the National Center on Child Abuse Prevention Research, National Committee for the Prevention of Child Abuse, Chicago, Illinois, 1987.
- Nisonoff, Linda and Irving Bitman, "Spouse Abuse: Incidence and Relationship to Selected Demographic Variables," Victimology 4(1) 1979: 131-140.
- Pizzey, Erin, Scream Quietly or the Neighbors Will Hear, Middlesex, England: Penguin Books, 1974.
- Pizzey, Erin, Prone to Violence, Feltham, Middlesex, England: Hamlyn Publishing, 1982.
- Rand, Michael R., Violence-Related Injuries Treated in Hospital Emergency Departments, Washington, D.C: U.S. Department of Justice, Bureau of Justice Statistics, August, 1997 (Report NCJ-156921).
- Rittenmeyer, S.D., "Of Battered Wives, Self-Defense and Double Standards of Justice," Journal of Criminal Justice, 9(5) 1981: 389-395.
- Russell, R.J.H., and B. Hulson, "Physical and Psychological Abuse of Heterosexual Partners," Personality and Individual Differences 34, 1992: 457-473.
- Saunders, Daniel G., "When Battered Women Use Violence: Husband-Abuse or Self-Defense?" Violence and Victims 1, 1986: 47-60.
- Saunders, Daniel G., "Other 'Truths' About Domestic Violence: A Reply to McNeely and Robinson-Simpson," Social Work 33(2) 1988: 179-183.
- Satel, Sally L., "It's Always His Fault," The Women's Quarterly, Summer (12) 1997:4-10.
- Smith, L.F.J., Domestic Violence: An Overview of the Literature (Monograph), Home Office Research Study No. 107. London: HMSO.
- Sommer, R., Male and Female Perpetrated Partner Abuse: Testing a Diathesis-Stress Model. Unpublished doctoral dissertation. Winnipeg, Canada: University of Manitoba (1994).
- Steinmetz, Suzanne K., "The Use of Force for Resolving Family Conflict: The Training Ground for Abuse," The Family Coordinator, 26(1), 1977a: 19-26.
- Steinmetz, Suzanne K., The Cycle of Violence: Assertive, Aggressive, and Abusive Family Interaction, New York: Praeger Publishers, 1977b.
- Steinmetz, Suzanne K., "The Battered Husband Syndrome," Victimology 2 (3-4), 1977-78: 499-509.
- Steinmetz, Suzanne K., "Women and Violence: Victims and Perpetrators," American Journal of

Psychotherapy, 34(3) 1980: 334-350.

Szinovacz, Maximiliane, "Using Couple Data as a Methodological Tool: The Case of Marital Violence," Journal of Marriage and the Family, 45(3) 1983: 633-644.

Stets, Jan E. and Murray A. Straus, "Gender Differences in Reporting Marital Violence and Its Medical and Psychological Consequences," Pp: 151-165 in M.A. Straus and R.J. Gelles (eds.), Physical Violence in American Families: Risk Factors and Adaptations to Violence in 8,145 Families, New Brunswick, N.J: Transaction Publishers, 1990.

Straus, Murray A., "Wife-beating, How Common and Why?," Victimology, 2(3-4), 1977-78: 443-458.

Straus, Murray A., "Victims and Aggressors in Marital Violence," American Behavioral Scientist 23, 1980: 681-704.

Straus, Murray A., "The Conflicts Tactics Scale and its Critics: An Evaluation and New Data on Validity and Reliability," Pp: 49-74 in M.A. Straus and R.J. Gelles, Physical Violence in American Families: Risk Factors and Adaptations to Violence in 8,145 Families, New Brunswick, N.J: Transaction Publishers, 1990(a).

Straus, Murray A., "Injury and Frequency of Assault and the 'Representative Sample Fallacy' in Measuring Wife Beating and Child Abuse," Pp: 75-92 in M. A. Straus and R.J. Gelles (Eds.), Physical Violence in American Families: Risk Factors and Adaptations to Violence in 8,145 Families, New Brunswick, N.J: Transaction Publishers, 1990(b).

Straus, Murray A., "New Theory and Old Canards About Family Violence Research," Social Problems 38 (2) 1991: 180-197.

Straus, Murray A., "Physical Assaults by Wives: A Major Social Problem," Pp: 67-87, in R.J. Gelles and D.R. Loseke (Eds.), Current Controversies on Family Violence, Newbury Park, California: Sage Publishing Company, 1993.

Straus, Murray A., "State-to-State Differences in Social Inequality and Social Bonds in Relation to Assaults on Wives in the United States," Journal of Comparative Family Studies 25(1) 1994: 7-24.

Straus, Murray A., "Physical Assaults by Women Partners: A Major Social Problem," Pp: 210-221 in M.R. Walsh (Ed.), Women, Men and Gender: Ongoing Debates, New Haven: Yale University Press, 1997.

Straus, Murray A., "The Controversy Over Domestic Violence by Women: A Methodological, Theoretical, and Sociology of Science Analysis," to appear in X.B. Arriaga and S. Oskamp (Eds.), Violence in Intimate Relationships, Thousand Oaks, California: Sage Publications (Forthcoming).

Straus, Murray A., and George Hotaling (eds.), The Social Causes of Husband-Wife Violence, Minneapolis, Minn: University of Minnesota Press, 1980.

Straus, M. A., R. Gelles, and S. Steinmetz, Behind Closed Doors: Violence in the American Family, New York: Doubleday/Anchor, 1980; (Also published by Newbury Park, California: Sage Publications).

Straus, Murray, and Richard Gelles, "Societal Change and Change in Family Violence from 1975 to 1985 as Revealed by Two National Surveys," Journal of Marriage and the Family, 48 (August) 1986: 465-479.

Straus, Murray, and Stephen Sweet, "Verbal/Symbolic Aggression in Couples: Incidence Rates and

Relationships to Personal Characteristics," Journal of Marriage and the Family, 54 (May) 1992: 346-357.

Thomas, D., Not Guilty: The Case in Defense of Men, New York: William Morrow and Co., 1993.

Tjaden, Patricia G., and Nancy Thoennes, "The Prevalence and Consequences of Intimate Partner Violence: Findings from the National Violence Against Women Survey." A paper presented at the 49th Annual Meeting of the American Society of Criminology, San Diego, CA, 1997; Also: P. Tjaden and N. Thoennes, Prevalence, Incidence, and Consequences of Violence Against Women: Findings From the National Violence Against Women Survey (Research in Brief), Wash. D.C: National Institute of Justice Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, 1998: 17 pp.

Young, Cathy, Ceasefire! Why Women and Men Must Join Forces to Achieve True Equality, New York, N.Y: The Free Press, 1999.