

Myra Marx Ferree

Professor of Sociology and Director, DAAD Center for German and European Studies
University of Wisconsin-Madison

23 September 2004

Assessing the science: key issues for research on violence against women

The research studies reported here today are raising critical questions about violence and its prevalence, its patterns of occurrence, and its effective prevention. In a world indisputably full of deadly violence against both women and men, we can not afford to overlook the pressing need to act to reduce violence in our homes and communities and to prevent its normalization.¹ In this international context, it is heartening to see a world-wide expansion of concern with domestic violence, sexual harassment in workplaces and sexual assaults both from intimate partners and others.² The women's movement at the grassroots level was a crucial voice raising concern with violence against women and thus putting these important questions on the policy agenda of many countries in a new and more inclusive way.³ Violence that was customary was questioned and governments challenged to respond to women's immediate needs for safety. However, these first steps in identifying the problem also raised new questions about the definitions and measurement of violence, about the patterns of abuse that were specific to women or to men, about the ability of interventions to prevent repeat victimization.⁴

This new generation of international research questions are today's focus of concern.⁵ Studies such as the ones discussed here today are increasing in both frequency and sophistication around the world. They are improving assessments of the frequency of specific problems, identifying the characteristic patterns they exhibit, and suggesting the institutional changes that are needed to address these problems. Moreover, they now allow more accurate comparisons across countries in the extent of the violence experienced and the effectiveness of strategies to combat it.

I want to commend the authors of the current set of studies for their important contributions to this international effort, and also to suggest that there is also much more work to be done, both with these data and in gathering additional data, to realize the full potential of this work. Central to the contributions as well as the limitations of the studies, in my view, is the conceptualization of gender as an issue of power. The social organization of opportunities for violence, the actual exercise of violence against others, and the ability of governments to intervene effectively against violence are all deeply gendered phenomena. Therefore, a full understanding of how violence matters and how

it can be reduced necessarily must begin from an understanding of gender as a social structural force that affects individuals' identities, interpersonal interactions, and institutional responsiveness. Adopting a gender perspective, and looking at these studies primarily as feminist methodologist, I turn to these studies to ask how they address the cutting-edge questions with important and high-quality data.

I begin with the issue of the frequency of specific problems of violence. The main prevalence study looks at a representative sample of over 10,000 women which is the sort of high-cost but essential basis we need for being able to draw statistically sound inferences about both common and rare forms of violence. The estimates for the more common forms of violence, like hitting and shoving, are very much in line with what is found in other, similarly large surveys in both Europe and North America.⁶ Most importantly, insofar as the actual questions that were used in the survey are replications of measures also employed in other surveys, this greatly increases the ability to make more detailed comparisons between them. We have been hampered for a long time in making inferences about whether there was or was not cross-national variation in the amount or types of violence against women by the variation in the measurement between the studies, and the researchers in this case have made exceptional, and largely successful, efforts to design the questionnaire to allow for maximum comparability. Even though, as Sylvia Walby also has pointed out in her remarks at the conference, this comparability has not yet been made evident in the analysis, the measurement done here has considerable potential for nuanced comparison with other countries' experiences, both in Europe and in North America.

This is a key contribution to the scientific quality of the research and I want to emphasize that these problems of basic measurement are not easy ones. There are always competing desiderata: one the one hand, one wants to echo what has been done before as identically as one can to remove alternative explanations for whatever discrepancies in results there may be, but on the other hand, one wants to take advantage of the experience of others to remove shortcomings and improve measurement to reflect the refinements of our understanding that have been achieved by previous work. The authors of the main prevalence study steered a mostly successful course through this narrow channel. They added some qualifying language that remedied the known problems of the Conflict Tactics Scale in over-reporting minor acts of violence, adding a focus on those that cause fear or actual harm, but without losing the full range of types of actions that express physical and psychological violence in the home. They have also made it possible to compare broad omnibus type questions about the experience of violence with the reports given in the list-form of the CTS, which offers two measurement advantages: they can accurately compare their results with studies that use the omnibus form as well with those that use the CTS list form, but they can also assess the reliability

of both through the internal comparison of the multiple measures, but they have not yet done either of these analyses.

Additionally, they combine in the same study, with the same population, two different designs that are more usually done only on separate populations: the general population approach to assessing reported incidents of victimization such as done in crime surveys and the focus on the types of violence and consequences of violence that are more characteristic of studies of couples and that focus on violence in the context of this partner relationship. By joining these two approaches, known as the crime victimization and the family conflict designs, in one single instrument, their study has the potential for adding a great deal to the interpretation of the data typically gathered in only one or the other format.⁷ Here again, there is a wealth of analysis waiting to be done.

The main prevalence study is also distinguished by the attention it gives to psychological violence, not just physical assaults. The importance of developing good measures of psychological violence is underscored by two findings from the international research literature.

First, one of the most distinguishing factors in violence against women is how psychological abuse figures into a pattern that some have called domestic terrorism.⁸ Reviews of international research suggest that the failure to find large sex differences in the one-time act of hitting or sporadic incidents of some sort of physical violence in the context of family conflict, which is also apparent in comparing the women's prevalence study with smaller and more exploratory study done with men here, should not surprise us. However it can not be seen as not an indication of gender symmetry in violence across the board but an indication of how much we still need to know about the patterns and processes, by which violence escalates, recurs and is most dangerous.⁹ Both are crucial types of information. As Murray Straus, the developer of the CTS, points out, "Research using a broad definition of violence [including the psychological forms] and emphasizing injury may be most useful in designing programs to treat offenders or help victims of repeated assault... [but] research focusing on the act of assault, most of which does not involve injury but does involve millions of couples, may be most useful in designing programs of primary prevention."¹⁰

The combination of the victimization approach with the family conflict approach is especially promising in this regard, for the evidence suggests women are distinguished from men in the degree to which they are subject to an integrated pattern of control and repeated verbal, sexual and physical violence in intimate partner relations, and experience injuries that send them to shelters and emergency rooms. To say that 90% of the more extreme and injurious instances of family violence affect women does not mean that the other 10% are trivial or less in need of our compassion. Concern for the victims of violence can not be a zero-sum game, whether between nations or genders. But the richness of the survey instrument on women should allow for a fuller analysis of

the data, one that moves away from a catalog of individual incidents toward identification of this significant and dangerous pattern of abuse, while the detailed qualitative data on men should finally allow us to understand the specifically gendered patterns and processes that make violence part of their experiences both inside and outside the family, and which may put some men in positions of particularly vulnerability or risk.

With regard to the main prevalence study for women, this is a more difficult methodological challenge than just adding up items that now figure in the separate scales. As the qualitative focus groups conducted in conjunction with this survey also indicated, the line between physical and psychological abuse often blurs in practice, and this is echoed in the way the measures in the survey are constructed. So, for example, the physical violence list includes whether the woman reports that someone “ernsthaft gedroht, mich körperlich anzugreifen oder zu verletzen” and the psychological violence list asks if “man mir angedroht hat oder mir Angst machte.” Asking essentially the same question twice in two different contexts can be a wonderful opportunity to test reliability, to look for context effects that might bias answers and to develop multi-indicator models of the underlying construct. But this richness in the measurement will need thoughtful multivariate analysis to use to good effect, and it simply cannot be captured appropriately in total percentages experiencing any form of physical or psychological violence. The ability to discern and analyze the differences between simple acts of violence and patterns of domestic terrorism are crucial. An analysis sensitive to such differences will then also feed in to improve the ability to recognize similarities and differences in the gendered pattern of violence to which the preliminary study of violence against men points, and should make it possible to design a future representative survey that would gather comparable data on men and women that would not obscure but illuminate the gender dynamics of their experiences.

A second reason why the attention to psychological violence in the context of physical and sexual violence is so critical is that efforts to predict the likelihood of repeat violence, of highly dangerous and even fatal violence, and of resistance to treatment efforts all point to the diagnostic capacity of the fear and perceptions of threat of the woman herself.¹¹ If we want to know just how dangerous and scary the violence is, our best measures come from the women who are victimized by it. Their fear of being harmed, their assessments of the offenders’ dangerousness and their own desire for help and protection are good indicators of the pattern of risk. Again, the main prevalence study responds to these international findings to focus in the situations such as pregnancy and divorce or separation that women regularly report can increase violence, so we have a better chance to see when proactive interventions may be most needed. And the men’s study, for the first time, begins to give us some insight into when and how German men feel truly endangered and at risk, and this seems to be found in non-family situations for the most part. Thus to see men and women as facing differently gendered patterns of

risk is not to divert concern from the specific needs of either, but to focus it more appropriately on the different contexts and processes characteristic of their gendered experiences.

Still, the downside of the admirable complexity of the measures chosen in this large, rich prevalence survey is that the analysis demanded to take full advantage of them is just as complex and demanding. With a solid sample and good measures, the survey calls out for a comparably high level of multivariate analysis which understandably could not be done yet in the press of work required to even be able to report so many interesting frequencies to you.

But reporting zero-order relationships (that is, those without control variables) and emphasizing single items reflect only the preliminary pass through the data, and can not really be relied on for statistical inference. There are two particular types of multivariate analysis that will still be required to bring the analysis of the data up to the level of quality of the measurement of the variables, namely scale construction and path analysis.

On the one hand, measurement models take advantage of multiple indicators of a construct to get a more valid and reliable picture of a theoretical construct in the form of indexes and scales. So, for example, the construct “severity of the violence” is an important one, but severity is not measurable just by asking a single question. Instead, multiple indicators of what we mean by severe violence – such as the repetition, the medical consequences, the type of assault – can and must be taken together to form a multivariate measurement model of severity, and the index formed then can be used in additional analyses of outcomes such as fear for one’s life and help-seeking. Maximum likelihood factor models, for example, are excellent means for developing multiple indicator models that are reliable and usable.

On the other hand, even with scales of major constructs in hand, one needs additional multivariate analyses to trace the pathways of effects. Path analyses distinguish between those factors that have direct effects on violence and those that may only be associated with the real causes or that operate indirectly. This is especially true in the nuanced data that is available to analyze violence in the current or most recent partner relationship. Thus, one needs to combine indicators of stress such as partner’s unemployment and ethnic group or immigration status with aggravating forms of compensation for stress such as drinking or drug use along with indicators of something awry in the gender dynamics of the relationship, such as expressions of jealousy, isolation, and control over the woman’s social life to begin to understand which are the stronger, weaker or spurious causes of psychological and/or physical violence and when any of these in turn are associated directly with fear for one’s life or probability of serious injury, above and beyond their effects on frequency or type of assault. Teasing out the effects of some men’s escalating control and domination of women compared to loss of control and stress on men, exhibited in violence associated with drinking and drug use

for example, can contribute to understanding just how risk of injury and fear for one's life are produced for women in different types of domestic terrorism.

As compelling as the prevalence study is to me in the richness of the data in the main survey, I also want to highlight the important contributions that are made by the associated smaller studies of special population groups of women, such as prostitutes and women in prison, the focus groups with abused women, and the entirely separate study of men's experiences of violence. These smaller studies are only in a limited degree comparable with the main one, in part because the samples that they are using were not drawn of the same degree of representativeness. But these are analyzed in ways that are suggestive of lines of research that could be carried out in the future, and indicate how new data collection would further enhance the value of the overall research initiative. Qualitative research designs are characteristically more theory-generating than theory-testing and this is true in these cases as well.

The study of men in particular suggests some important findings that will deserve more scrutiny in future population-based sample survey research in Germany or even more optimally in the EU as a whole. Most of what we know about men's experience of violence internationally again comes from either large systematic surveys of crime victimization or smaller studies of family conflict, and again we are lacking the kind of evidence that would enable us to relate processes of violence in the home to those that are found in workplaces, in schools, in the military or on the streets. Although the international research has fairly well established that men are overwhelmingly the perpetrators of violence against men and boys, sexual and otherwise, men's experience of being victimized by this violence has not been given the attention to process that this study offers. Instead, most of the previous research has singled out the small proportion of this violence inflicted by women on men in the home, and has offered more negative than positive findings: it shows no sex differences in the most common and least injurious forms of couple violence and indicates that when there is more severe violence against men in heterosexual partnerships the violence is different in character than what women face, but it doesn't say much at all about what the pattern for men actually looks like.¹² To say it is different is only the very beginning; there is more need for understanding how violence is interpreted and reported, and the continuum drawn here of what violence is noticed and responded to as violence is an important step in that direction. Even to say that 90% of the more extreme and injurious instances of family violence affect women does not mean that the other 10% that happen to men are trivial or not in need of our compassion. Concerns for the victims of violence cannot be a zero-sum game, whether between nations or between genders.

Thus while this study of men confirms that there is violence against men, that men are the perpetrators of nearly all of it, and that it is both individually and socially dangerous, it also offers an opportunity for more extensive data analysis than has been yet done. The

present study offers the possibility of connecting the patterns of violence across different settings in the lives of the men involved, including their experiences with verbal violence and physical abuse in military and work settings, as well as the minority of violence that occurs in couple relations. I do think that the research team's suggestion of a family conflict design, focused on men and women reporting on violence in the same relationship is not the best follow-up for this study. Not only does the minority of violence that happens to men in the home then become the only focus of interest, but it is far more complicated to interpret the divergent reports from the partners than the researchers seem to realize. As couple-based studies of the division of household labor show, for example, husbands report they do more specific housework than their wives do, but there is no way to tell which of these different reports is "more correct."¹³ And the complexity of the biases in regard to reports of doing housework provide no justification for assuming that gender taboos on men hitting women or fear of reporting oneself as dominated by a socially inferior wife will bias the data in any known direction. A further methodological issue is that the most highly unequal and conflicted couples will rarely get both husbands and wives to participate in independent couple-based reporting of what is happening in the family, leading to admittedly biased samples. While this poses a significant problem for division of labor studies, it is a devastating loss to violence studies that want to capture just such couples.

What the analysis could offer to make these connections useful for thinking about policy is to begin to ask about the nature of these patterns among men: how is schoolyard abuse related to persistence in education or later occupational success, and does this relate to abuse in an intimate relationship? Are incidents of taking verbal or physical abuse in national service settings, whether military or civilian, related to other experiences of being abused by coworkers or superiors on the job, and if so what types of privilege or disadvantage predict greater or lesser likelihood of such violence? Are working class men more likely to face physical and psychological violence from male peers and men in white-jobs jobs more likely to be psychologically abused by superiors? To begin to tease out patterns that indicate the ways that violence can serve to construct and enforce social hierarchies in men's lives will require thinking about their experiences as gendered in their own distinctive ways, including the ways men move back and forth from the perpetrator to the victim role, the location of men on a continuum of hegemonic masculinity that exposes some to extreme levels of violence, and the factors associated with experiencing intimate partner violence, at the hands of women or men.¹⁴ As additional process-focused, theory-generating analyses exploit the richness of this data more fully, I trust they will continue the admirable approach already taken here, one that does not misuse comparison with women to create a false competition for compassion, as has sometimes been done in the US, but instead moves us further toward understanding the way that gender and violence are linked in men's experiences, hurtful to men and open to social remediation as well.¹⁵

Finally, I turn from prevalence and patterns of violence to the WiBIG intervention study, which is an incredibly complex and extensive data collection effort to assess a quite diverse set of practical measures to improve police and prosecutors' responses to violence against women. Since it is clear that institutional pressures and competences significantly affect how well or poorly victims of violence are treated, assessments of how institutional change can be made to happen are vital.¹⁶ This problem is multi-institutional (crossing boundaries between police, prosecutors, health care professionals, welfare and housing agencies) and a re-orientation of each group toward recognizing the seriousness of this violence and responding more appropriately to stop it is critical. The WiBIG assessment provides a wealth of data across a variety of law enforcement jurisdictions and agencies that is quite powerful in how it addresses both of these concerns. Moreover, by the structure of the assessment process, feedback to the cooperating agencies is used to encourage further efforts to institutionalize the most effective interventions. This is an excellent way to bring the practitioners into the process, and such "buy-in" to the design makes evaluation less of a threat and more of an actual incentive to change in the organizations studied. For example, it would be ideal for the Bundeswehr to "buy-in" to a study of violence against men, in and out of military settings.

However, there are also some limitations in how far the current studies could go with this approach. On the one hand, a feedback process, once begun, should continue over the long term, lest the appearance be created that no further efforts are necessary. If models of good practice are being developed and first steps taken toward implementing them, as this set of studies so clearly documents, then to stop providing feedback and encouraging more implementation may create the false impression that there is no longer any need to improve. Especially as this research documents the great variation within police and prosecutors offices in individuals' degree of commitment to an approach that is more sensitive to the victims' needs for safety and support, it is important the institutional message about what is good practice remain clear. Both as a matter of encouragement to those on the more supportive end of the continuum and a visible sign to the wavering and unsupportive of new institutional norms, the cooperative process of research and practice documented here is critically important in sending the message that the state has a real desire both to know what works best for victims and to create that protection in practice. As these studies show, when that message is sent, it makes a difference in how the work of these organizations is done.

On the other hand, the assessment process also should ideally go beyond measures of whether organizational practices have changed and if so, how much and for how long, to find out whether these changes lead to better outcomes in terms of actually preventing future violence and decreasing the likelihood of repeat offenses. This is very, very hard to measure. There are some useful indicators here of how satisfied victims are with the

way police and prosecutors respond and some helpful indications of what is still lacking in policy terms that would make it more possible to prosecute these crimes effectively. And while the effectiveness of training interventions as measured by women's satisfaction is clearly good, the studies are not yet long-term enough to begin to be able to tell if actual repeat offending is reduced.

This type of work still remains to be done. The Journal of the American Medical Association, for example, reported a study by Wathen and MacMillan that reviewed all the assessment studies of interventions aimed at preventing the abuse or reabuse of women in the US done before 2002.¹⁷ Across the 22 major studies they looked at, they found that none could provide convincing evidence of improving outcomes for women, although proactive counseling and advocacy work combined did decrease the rate of reabuse. Most interventions were better at identifying the fact of abuse than at ending it. Although there is also some evidence that digital photography on site is associated with more successful prosecutions, the evidence for how successful prosecution is for ending abuse is mixed.¹⁸ There are some indications that it works better on men with a higher stake in conformity and less well among those who are unemployed, drug-abusing or already have an arrest record.¹⁹ As an intervention strategy, mandatory arrest or prosecution is often judged by women to be dangerous, and yet as Wathen and MacMillan note, the risks as well as the rewards of particular interventions are almost never assessed together.

The assessment done by WiBIG addresses interventions that are complex, multi-faceted and diverse. The legal tools provided to police and prosecutors are not substitutes for their ability to respond with compassion and judgment, but rather are necessary to channel their exercise of their discretion in more effective directions. Thus it is not surprising that the effectiveness of these organizational interventions depends in large measure on achieving a resocialization of police and prosecutors to greater awareness of the risks in the situation and their responsibilities to ensure the victim's safety. Normative change, not a mere passing along of procedural rules, seems to be most important, and this research finds, not surprisingly but convincingly, that reaching the level of norms is not as well accomplished when there is too much reliance on "multipliers" and voluntary participation in training, since those who are most in need of further learning are least likely to receive it.

The widespread implementation of restraining orders that remove the man from the house and bar his return seems to be effective, but this policy also faces the same limits as arrest and prosecution strategies, namely that offenders with the least stake in conformity and the highest level of threat are not much restrained by them. Therefore, as the WiBIG report makes clear, shelters will always continue to be needed to protect those most endangered, for whom bringing in the police – however well trained – is a very risky step indeed. I think it also important to note that this research strongly

supports the feminist claim that women need to be able to make their own judgment about the risks and rewards of filing charges. Indeed, women themselves are found to be the most accurate predictors of repeat, dangerous violence in international epidemiological research.²⁰

But the WiBIG research also and most helpfully points to factors that help women to make that choice when it is in their best interests. The findings and recommendations I found most significant were that proactive intervention strategies work – advocates and counselors taking the initiative to call the woman, rather than waiting to be called, the police officer at the scene taking pictures at the time rather than waiting to find out whether there was going to be a prosecution, the prosecutor and police making sure that the woman is interviewed promptly with regard to the facts of the assault rather than waiting to for her to decide about supporting the filing of charges or not -- all these systematically proactive interventions both give the victim the sense that the system cares about what happens to her and also make the taking the necessary next steps easier and more likely. Perhaps this should have been obvious to us without this WiBIG assessment, but clearly it was not and still is not obvious or it would be implemented everywhere and it is not. Even if the state cannot succeed every time in preventing recurrent violence, there is really no excuse for failing to convey to a victim that her life matters and that an affirmative effort will be made to protect her.

Like all good studies, this set of assessments of how institutions work -- and could work better -- leads in part to calls for still more research. In this case, I would particularly emphasize the need for long-term support for research integrated into the practice of police interventions to assure that best practices are not only identified but clearly marked as valuable, worth adopting, and made effectively part of the way the institution works. In addition to research in assuring that the quality of the work that police and prosecutors do with victims is measured and so remains a priority with them, there are two other important needs for long term support of institutional research that this set of studies could not include. First, follow up over a significant number of years to see if repeat abuse actually declines with more successful prosecution and/or with participation in batterers' programs, is necessary to see effects on reducing assault itself, not merely mitigating its harms. Second, intervention studies are needed with health care professionals, who are often identified in the existing studies as key gatekeepers to effective access to services, but where mandatory reporting to police may be risky and is suspected of suppressing use.

For the first, one would need to follow the changes over a considerably longer time period, and be able to track repeat offenders in large institutional databases, to get the best possible measures of real effects on prevention. For the second, since existing research in other countries on interventions with health care providers shows that it is often easier to improve the identification of problems than good responses to them in

this setting, both policy and research will have to work together to formulate innovative best practices in this area.²¹ The integrated feedback of research into the policy design process that the WiBIG approach takes with police and prosecutors offices, combining educated discretion and proactive intervention strategies across institutions, may be a good model to apply in the health-care area as well.

So overall, I commend the researchers for the high quality of the studies presented here, and commend the Federal Ministry for supporting the collection of such incredibly diverse, wide-ranging and important data. I am sure that all of you who have listened to the presentation of this work today are also impressed with all that has been accomplished already in assembling these data sets and providing a first-level analysis of the basic results they offer. I hope that the potential to analyze these data in much more detail will also be realized, since collecting wonderful data and making them analyzable is really only the first step toward reaching scientifically solid conclusions about what they show. With multivariate analyses, scale construction and cross-national comparison of the main prevalence study as well as more in-depth, cross-situational analysis of the processes affecting violence against men in this qualitative study, and with an on-going commitment to long-term assessment of the interventions in coordinating police and prosecutors, to measure repeat offending and real increases in women' safety, and to work with healthcare institutions as well as police and prosecutors to develop best practices across even ore institutional settings, the huge steps represented by this research will continue forward in ways that will clearly contribute to a better understanding of violence world-wide.

¹ Changes in criminal justice policies do affect social norms about violence against women, see LF Salazar, CK Baker AW Price and K Carlin "Moving beyond the individual: Examining the effects of domestic violence policies on social norms" *American Journal of Community Psychology*, 2003, 32(3-4): 253-264.

² The ISI Web of Knowledge database indicates that this research has more than quadrupled from the late 1980s to the late 1990s, and it continues to grow in extent and sophistication of measures and analysis.

³ See for example, J. Bond and R. Phillips, "Violence against women as a human rights violation: International responses" in C. Renzetti, J. Edelston and R. Bergen, *Sourcebook on Violence against Women*. London: Sage, 2001.

⁴ The history and new issues are well captured in the UK reader, Jalna Hanmer and C. Itzin (2000) *Home Truths about Domestic Violence: Feminist Influences on Policy and Practice*, Routledge, 2000, and in Maria Bevacqua, *Rape on the Public Agenda*. Boston: Northeastern University Press, 2000.

⁵ See recent reviews by Lynne Chancer, "Rethinking domestic violence in theory and practice," *Deviant Behavior*, 2004, 25(3): 255-275, Babcock, Green and Robie "Does batterers' treatment work? A meta-analytic review of domestic violence treatment" *Clinical Psychology Review*, 2004, 23 (8): 1023-1053, and Wathen and MacMillan "Interventions for violence against women: scientific review" *JAMA* 2004, 289(5): 589-600

⁶ Tjaden, P. and N. Thoennes, *Extent, nature and consequences of intimate partner violence*. Washington DC: US Dept of Justice and Centers for Disease Control, 2000; Statistics Canada. *Family Violence in Canada: A statistical Profile 2000*. Ottawa, Ontario: Canadian Center for Justice Statistics, 2002. Sylvia Walby and Jonathan Allen. *Domestic Violence, Sexual Assault and Stalking: Findings from the British Crime Survey*. Home Office Research Study 276. (London: Home Office, 2004).

⁷ In particular, one of the trickiest elements in comparing data gathered from these different types of designs is dealing in a conceptually sophisticated way with what is and is not being reported in each type; Michael Kimmel's review of this literature does an outstanding job of highlighting the way that insufficient attention to methodological issues such as these obscures rather than illuminates the process. See "Gender symmetry in domestic violence: a substantive and methodological research review" *Violence against Women*, 2002, 8(11): 1332-1363.

⁸ Michael P Johnson, "Patriarchal terrorism and common couple violence: two forms of violence against women" *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, 1995, 57: 283-294, see also the Chancer and Kimmel articles cited above.

⁹ In addition to Kimmel and Johnson above, see also Heather Melton and Joanne Belknap, "He hits, she hits: Assessing gender differences in officially reported intimate partner violence" *Criminal Justice and Behavior*, 2003, 30(3): 328-348 and P. Randall Kropp, "Some questions regarding spousal assault risk assessment" *Violence against Women*, 2004, 10(6): 676-697.

¹⁰ Page 39 in Murray Straus, "The controversy over domestic violence by women: a methodological, theoretical and sociology of science analysis" Pages 17-44 in XB Arriaga and Stuart Oskamp (eds) *Violence in intimate relations*. Thousand Oaks CA: Sage.

¹¹ See, for example, Cattaneo and Goodman "Victim reported risk factors for continued abusive behavior" *Journal of Community Psychology* 2003, 31(4): 349-369.

¹² Thus men are more likely not to experience injuries, not to report fear of retaliation, and not to be threatened with future violence in order to deter them from reporting current violence but what men do experience and when and how men are the victims of women's or men's dangerous assaults is rarely considered, as Melton and Belknap, above, make clear. See also Russell P. Dobash and R. Emerson Dobash, "Women's violence to men in intimate relationships: working on a puzzle." *British Journal of Criminology*, 2004, 44: 324-349. Kimmel notes that the "different rates of injury are so pronounced that when injury data have been obtained in studies using CTS,

the rate of violence drops to that predicted by crime victimization studies and the gender asymmetry of such studies is revealed as well" (p. 148). The health consequences for women are profound; for men, the injury and outcome evidence has been slim. See Campbell, JC. "Health consequences of intimate partner violence." *Lancet*, 2002, 359(9314): 1331-1336. See also Walby and Allen above.

¹³ The classic discussion of these methodological issues is in Linda Thompson and Alexis Walker "The dyad as the unit of analysis: conceptual and methodological issues" *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, 1982, 55: 557-559. On rationales for using one or two reporters on a couple, see also WT Anderson, "Deciphering Dyads - Concepts, Methods, And Controversies In Relational Research" *Psychology & Marketing*, 1994, 11(5): 447-466. For disagreements over housework as such see Myra Marx Ferree, "The gender division of labor in two-earner families" *Journal of Family Issues*, 1991, 12: 158-180.

¹⁴ According to the US National Violence Against Women survey, 15% of men with live-in male partners reported having experienced violence compared to 7.7% of those with female live-in partners (for women, the rate for same-sex violence was 11% compared to 30% with male partners), see Tjaden and Thoennes above.

¹⁵ See both Kimmel and Straus above for eloquent pleas on this point.

¹⁶ For an outstanding overview of the institutional issues in sexual assault, see Patricia Yancey Martin, *Rape Processing Work*, Routledge, forthcoming; see also the books reporting institutional studies reviewed in Linda McKie "Gender violence and health care: implications for research, policy and practice" *Sociology of Health and Illness*, 2003, 25(1): 120-131.

¹⁷ C. Nadine Wathen and Harriet MacMillan, "Interventions for Violence against Women: a scientific review" *Journal of the American Medical Association*, Feb 5, 2003, 289 (5): 589-599.

¹⁸ CA Garcia "Digital photographic evidence and adjudication of domestic violence cases." *Journal of Criminal Justice*, 2003, 31(6): 579-587. On the effects of arrest, see Wathen and Macmillan above and also J Wooldredge and A. Thistlethwaite, "Reconsidering domestic violence recidivism: Conditioned effects of legal controls by individual and aggregate stake in conformity" *Journal of Quantitative Criminology*, 2002, 18(1): 45-70.

¹⁹ In addition to Wooldredge and Thistlethwaite above, see RK Hansen and S Wallace-Capretta, "Predictors of criminal recidivism among male batterers." *Psychology, Crime and Law*, 2004, 10(4): 413-427.

²⁰ See for example, DA Heckart and EW Gondolf "Battered women's perceptions of risk versus risk factors and instruments in predicting repeat assaults" *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 2004, 19(7): 778-800 and PR Kropp "Some questions regarding spousal assault risk assessment." *Violence Against Women*, 2004, 10(6): 676-697.

²¹ See JC Campbell, JH Cohen, E McLoughlin, S Dearwater, G Nah, N Glass, D Lee and N Dubrow "An evaluation of a system-change training model to improve emergency department response to battered women" *Academic Emergency Medicine*, 2001, 8(2): 131-138 and RS Thompson, FP Rivera, DC Thompson, WE Barlow, NK Sugg, RD Maiuro and DM Rubinowice, "Identification and management of domestic violence: a randomized trial" *American Journal of Preventive Medicine*, 2000, 19(4): 253-263. For general considerations of networking with health care providers see JC Campbell "Making the health care system an empowerment zone for battered women: Health consequences, policy recommendations, introduction, and overview." *Empowering Survivors of Abuse: Health Care for Battered Women and their Children*. J. C. Campbell, editor. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage, 1998, pages 3-22.