



OXFORD JOURNALS
OXFORD UNIVERSITY PRESS



The Myth of Sexual Symmetry in Marital Violence

Author(s): Russell P. Dobash, R. Emerson Dobash, Margo Wilson and Martin Daly

Source: *Social Problems*, Vol. 39, No. 1 (Feb., 1992), pp. 71-91

Published by: Oxford University Press on behalf of the Society for the Study of Social Problems

Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/3096914>

Accessed: 01-08-2016 13:57 UTC

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of the Terms & Conditions of Use, available at

<http://about.jstor.org/terms>

JSTOR is a not-for-profit service that helps scholars, researchers, and students discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content in a trusted digital archive. We use information technology and tools to increase productivity and facilitate new forms of scholarship. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.



Oxford University Press, Society for the Study of Social Problems are collaborating with JSTOR to digitize, preserve and extend access to *Social Problems*

The Myth of Sexual Symmetry in Marital Violence*

RUSSELL P. DOBASH, *University of Wales College of Cardiff*

R. EMERSON DOBASH, *University of Wales College of Cardiff*

MARGO WILSON, *McMaster University*

MARTIN DALY, *McMaster University*

A currently fashionable claim is that violence against husbands is about as prevalent as violence against wives; spousal violence has been said to be symmetrical in its extent, severity, intentions, motivational contexts, and even its consequences. The evidence for this alleged symmetry derives from two sources: (1) surveys employing the "Conflict Tactics Scales" (CTS), a checklist of self-reported "acts" perpetrated or experienced, and (2) U.S. homicide data. We criticize the claim of sexual symmetry by reviewing other contradictory survey evidence; by showing that the CTS provides an account of marital violence that is neither reliable nor valid; and by demonstrating that the sexual symmetry of spousal homicide victimization does not reflect sexually symmetrical motivation or action—and is in any case peculiar to the United States. Confining self-report data to a checklist of acts, devoid of motives, meanings and consequences cannot insure objectivity, validity or an adequate development of theory to explain violence.

Long denied, legitimized, and made light of, wife-beating is at last the object of widespread public concern and condemnation. Extensive survey research and intensive interpretive investigations tell a common story. Violence against wives (by which term we encompass *de facto* as well as registered unions) is often persistent and severe, occurs in the context of continuous intimidation and coercion, and is inextricably linked to attempts to dominate and control women (e.g., Counts, Brown, and Campbell 1992, Dobash and Dobash 1979, Martin 1976, Pagelow 1984). Historical and contemporary investigations further reveal that this violence has been explicitly decriminalized, ignored, or treated in an ineffectual manner by criminal justice systems, by medical and social service institutions, and by communities (e.g., Bowker 1983, Dobash and Dobash 1977/78, 1979, 1981a, 1992, Dobash, Dobash, and Cavanagh 1985, Gordon 1988, Pahl 1985, Pleck 1987, 1989, Smith 1989, Stark and Flitcraft 1983, Stark, Flitcraft, and Frazier 1979). Increased attention to these failures has inspired increased efforts to redress them, and in many places legislative amendments have mandated arrest and made assault a crime whether the offender is married to the victim or not.

A number of researchers and commentators have suggested that assaults upon men by their wives constitute a social problem comparable in nature and magnitude to that of wife-

* The order of authorship was determined by a random process upon the completion of the manuscript. The authors wish to acknowledge the financial support of NATO, the Rockefeller Foundation, the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council of Canada, the Natural Sciences and Engineering Research Council of Canada, and the Harry Frank Guggenheim Foundation; in addition, we thank several people for facilitating the development of the homicide datafiles, including K. Shaw of the British Home Office in London, F. Hird of the Scottish Home Office in Edinburgh, J. Turner and J. LaCroix of the Centre for Justice Statistics, Statistics Canada, as well as C.R. Block, R. Block, R.L. Drake, R. Gartner, and A. Wallace. This paper was written while M. Wilson and M. Daly were Fellows of the Center for Advanced Study in the Behavioral Sciences with financial support from the John D. and Catherine T. MacArthur Foundation, The National Science Foundation #BNS87-008, the Harry Frank Guggenheim Foundation, and the Gordon P. Getty Trust, and while M. Daly was a Fellow of the John Simon Guggenheim Foundation. Correspondence to: R.P. Dobash, School of Social and Administrative Studies, University of Wales College of Cardiff, Cardiff, Wales CF 1 3AS.

beating (Farrell 1986, McNeely and Mann 1990, McNeely and Robinson-Simpson 1987, Shupe, Stacey, and Hazelwood 1987, Steinmetz 1977/78, Steinmetz and Lucca 1988, Straus and Gelles 1986, 1990a, Straus, Gelles, and Steinmetz 1980). Two main bodies of evidence have been offered in support of these authors' claims that husbands and wives are similarly victimized: (1) self-reports of violent acts perpetrated and suffered by survey respondents, especially those in two U.S. national probability samples (Straus and Gelles 1986); and (2) U.S. homicide data. Unlike the case of violence against wives, however, the victimization of husbands allegedly continues to be denied and trivialized. "Violence by wives has not been an object of public concern," note Straus and Gelles (1986:472). "There has been no publicity, and no funds have been invested in ameliorating this problem because it has not been defined as a problem."

We shall argue that claims of sexual symmetry in marital violence are exaggerated, and that wives' and husbands' uses of violence differ greatly, both quantitatively and qualitatively. We shall further argue that there is no reason to expect the sexes to be alike in this domain, and that efforts to avoid sexism by lumping male and female data and by the use of gender-neutral terms such as "spouse-beating" are misguided. If violence is gendered, as it assuredly is, explicit characterization of gender's relevance to violence is essential. The alleged similarity of women and men in their use of violence in intimate relationships stands in marked contrast to men's virtual monopoly on the use of violence in other social contexts, and we challenge the proponents of the sexual symmetry thesis to develop coherent theoretical models that would account for a sexual monomorphism of violence in one social context and not in others.

A final thesis of this paper is that resolution of controversies about the "facts" of family violence requires critical examination of theories, methods, and data, with explicit attention to the development of coherent conceptual frameworks, valid and meaningful forms of measurement, and appropriate inferential procedures. Such problems are not peculiar to this research domain, but analysis of the claims regarding violence against husbands provides an excellent example of how a particular approach to construct formation and measurement has led to misrepresentation of the phenomena under investigation.

The Claim of Sexually Symmetrical Marital Violence

Authoritative claims about the prevalence and sexual symmetry of spousal violence in America began with a 1975 U.S. national survey in which 2,143 married or cohabiting persons were interviewed in person about their actions in the preceding year. Straus (1977/78) announced that the survey results showed that the "marriage license is a hitting licence," and moreover that the rates of perpetrating spousal violence, including severe violence, were higher for wives than for husbands. He concluded:

Violence between husband and wife is far from a one way street. The old cartoons of the wife chasing the husband with a rolling pin or throwing pots and pans are closer to reality than most (and especially those with feminist sympathies) realize (Straus 1977/78:447-448).

In 1985, the survey was repeated by telephone with a new national probability sample including 3,520 husband-wife households, and with similar results. In each survey, the researchers interviewed either the wife or the husband (but not both) in each contacted household about how the couple settled their differences when they had a disagreement. The individual who was interviewed was presented with a list of eighteen "acts" ranging from "discussed an issue calmly" and "cried" to "threw something at him/her/you" and "beat him/her/you up," with the addition of "choked him/her/you" in 1985 (Straus 1990a:33). These acts constituted the Conflict Tactics Scales (CTS) and were intended to measure three constructs: "Reasoning," "Verbal Aggression," and "Physical Aggression" or "Violence," which

was further subdivided into "Minor Violence" and "Severe Violence" according to a presumed potential for injury (Straus 1979, Straus and Gelles 1990a). Respondents were asked how frequently they had perpetrated each act in the course of "conflicts or disagreements" with their spouses (and with one randomly selected child) within the past year, and how frequently they had been on the receiving end. Each respondent's self-reports of victimization and perpetration contributed to estimates of rates of violence by both husbands and wives.

According to both surveys, rates of violence by husbands and wives were strikingly similar (Straus and Gelles 1986, 1990b, Straus et al. 1980). The authors estimated that in the year prior to the 1975 survey 11.6 percent of U.S. husbands were victims of physical violence perpetrated by their wives, while 12.1 percent of wives were victims of their husbands' violence. In 1985, these percentages had scarcely changed, but husbands seemed more vulnerable: 12.1 percent of husbands and 11.3 percent of wives were victims. In both surveys, husbands were more likely to be victims of acts of "severe violence": in 1975, 4.6 percent of husbands were such victims versus 3.8 percent of wives, and in 1985, 4.4 percent of husbands versus 3.0 percent of wives were victims. In reporting their results, the surveys' authors stressed the surprising assaultiveness of wives:

The repeated finding that the rate of assault by women is similar to the rate by their male partners is an important and distressing aspect of violence in American families. It contrasts markedly to the behavior of women outside the family. It shows that within the family or in dating and cohabiting relationships, women are about as violent as men (Straus and Gelles 1990b:104).

Others have endorsed and publicized these conclusions. For example, a recent review of marital violence concludes, with heavy reliance on Straus and Gelles's survey results, that "(a) women are more prone than men to engage in severely violent acts; (b) each year more men than women are victimized by their intimates" (McNeely and Mann 1990:130). One of Straus and Gelles's collaborators in the 1975 survey, Steinmetz (1977/78), used the same survey evidence to proclaim the existence of "battered husbands" and a "battered husband syndrome." She has remained one of the leading defenders of the claim that violence between men and women in the family is symmetrical (Steinmetz 1981, 1986, Steinmetz and Lucca 1988, Straus et al. 1980). Steinmetz and her collaborators maintain that the problem is not wife-beating perpetrated by violent men, but "violent couples" and "violent people" (see also Shupe et al. 1987). Men may be stronger on average, argues Steinmetz, but weaponry equalizes matters, as is allegedly shown by the nearly equivalent numbers of U.S. husbands and wives who are killed by their partners. The reason why battered husbands are inconspicuous and seemingly rare is supposedly that shame prevents them from seeking help.

Straus and his collaborators have sometimes qualified their claims that their surveys demonstrate sexual symmetry in marital violence, noting, for example, that men are usually larger and stronger than women and thus able to inflict more damage and that women are more likely to use violence in self-defense or retaliation (e.g. Stets and Straus 1990, Straus 1980, 1990b, Straus and Gelles 1986, Straus et al. 1980). However, the survey results indicate a symmetry not just in the perpetration of violence but in its initiation as well, and from this further symmetry, Stets and Straus (1990:154-155) conclude that the equal assaultiveness of husbands and wives cannot be attributed to the wives acting in self-defense, after all.

Other surveys using the CTS in the United States and in other countries have replicated the finding that wives are about as violent as husbands (Brinkerhoff and Lupri 1988, Browning and Dutton 1986, Brutz and Ingoldsby 1984, Jouriles and O'Leary 1985, Kennedy and Dutton 1989, Mason and Blankenship 1987, Meredith, Abbott, and Adams 1986, Nisonoff and Bitman 1979, Rouse, Breen, and Howell 1988, Steinmetz 1981, Stets 1990, Szinovacz 1983). The CTS has also been used to study violence in dating relationships, with the same sexually symmetrical results (e.g., Arias and Johnson 1989, Arias, Samios, and O'Leary 1987, Cate et al. 1982, DeMaris 1987, Lane and Gwartney-Gibbs 1985, Laner and Thompson 1982, Makepeace 1986, Marshall and Rose 1990, Rouse et al. 1988, Sigelman, Berry, and Wiles 1984).

Some authors maintain not only that wives initiate violence at rates comparable to husbands, but that they rival them in the damage they inflict as well. McNeely and Robinson-Simpson (1987), for example, argue that research shows that the "truth about domestic violence" is that "women are as violent, if not more violent than men," in their inclinations, in their actions, and in the damage they inflict. The most dramatic evidence invoked in this context is again the fact that wives kill: spousal homicides—for which detection should be minimally or not at all biased because homicides are nearly always discovered and recorded—produce much more nearly equivalent numbers of male and female victims in the United States than do sublethal assault data, which are subject to sampling biases when obtained from police, shelters and hospitals (McNeely and Robinson-Simpson 1987, Steinmetz 1977/78, Steinmetz and Lucca 1988, Straus et al. 1980). According to McNeely and Mann (1990:130), "the average man's size and strength are neutralized by guns and knives, boiling water, bricks, fireplace pokers, and baseball bats."

A corollary of the notion that the sexes are alike in their use of violence is that satisfactory causal accounts of violence will be gender-blind. Discussion thus focuses, for example, on the role of one's prior experiences with violence as a child, social stresses, frustration, inability to control anger, impoverished social skills, and so forth, without reference to gender (e.g., Hotaling, Straus, and Lincoln 1990, Shupe et al. 1987, Steinmetz 1986, Straus et al. 1980). This presumption that the sexes are alike not merely in action but in the reasons for that action is occasionally explicit, such as when Shupe et al. (1987:56) write: "Everything we have found points to parallel processes that lead women and men to become violent. . . . Women may be more likely than men to use kitchen utensils or sewing scissors when they commit assault, but their frustrations, motives and lack of control over these feelings predictably resemble men's."

In sum, the existence of an invisible legion of assaulted husbands is an inference which strikes many family violence researchers as reasonable. Two lines of evidence—homicide data and the CTS survey results—suggest to those supporting the sexual-symmetry-of-violence thesis that large numbers of men are trapped in violent relationships. These men are allegedly being denied medical, social welfare, and criminal justice services because of an unwillingness to accept the evidence from homicide statistics and the CTS surveys (Gelles 1982, Steinmetz 1986).

Violence Against Wives

Any argument that marital violence is sexually symmetrical must either dismiss or ignore a large body of contradictory evidence indicating that wives greatly outnumber husbands as victims. While CTS researchers were discovering and publicizing the mutual violence of wives and husbands, other researchers—using evidence from courts, police, and women's shelters—were finding that wives were much more likely than husbands to be victims (e.g., Byles 1978, Chester and Streather 1972, Dobash and Dobash 1977/78, 1979, Levinger 1966, Lystad 1975, Martin 1976, O'Brien 1971, Stark et al. 1979, Vanfossen 1979). After an extensive review of extant research, Lystad (1975) expressed the consensus: "The occurrence of adult violence in the home usually involves males as aggressors towards females." This conclusion was subsequently supported by numerous further studies of divorce records, emergency room patients treated for non-accidental injuries, police assault records, and spouses seeking assistance and refuge (e.g., Fergusson et al. 1986, Goldberg and Tomlanovich 1984, Kincaid 1982, McLeer and Anwar 1989, Okun 1986, Warshaw 1989, Watkins 1982). Analyses of police and court records in North America and Europe have persistently indicated that women constitute ninety to ninety-five percent of the victims of those assaults in the

home reported to the criminal justice system (Berk et al. 1983, Dobash and Dobash 1977/1978, Kincaid 1982, McLeod 1984, Quarm and Schwartz 1985, Vanfossen 1979, Watkins 1982).

Defenders of the sexual-symmetry-of-violence thesis do not deny these results, but they question their representativeness: these studies could be biased because samples of victims were self-selected. However, criminal victimization surveys using national probability samples similarly indicate that wives are much more often victimized than husbands. Such surveys in the United States, Canada and Great Britain have been replicated in various years, with essentially the same results. Beginning in 1972 and using a panel survey method involving up to seven consecutive interviews at six-month intervals, the U.S. National Crime Survey has generated nearly a million interviews. Gaquin's (1977/78) analysis of U.S. National Crime Survey data for 1973-1975 led her to conclude that men "have almost no risk of being assaulted by their wives" (634-635); only 3 percent of the violence reported from these surveys involved attacks on men by their female partners. Another analysis of the National Crime Survey data from 1973 to 1980 found that 6 percent of spousal assault incidents were directed at men (McLeod 1984).¹ Schwartz (1987) re-analyzed the same victimization surveys with the addition of the 1981 and 1982 data, and found 102 men who claimed to have been victims of assaults by their wives (4 percent of domestic assault incidents) in contrast to 1,641 women who said they were assaulted by husbands. The 1981 Canadian Urban Victimization Survey (Solicitor General of Canada 1985) and the 1987 General Social Survey (Sacco and Johnson 1990, Statistics Canada 1990) produced analagous findings, from which Johnson (1989) concluded that "women account for 80-90 percent of victims in assaults or sexual assaults between spouses or former spouses. In fact, the number of domestic assaults involving males was too low in both surveys to provide reliable estimates" (1-2). The 1982 and 1984 British Crime Surveys found that women accounted for all the victims of marital assaults (Worrall and Pease 1986). Self-reports of criminal victimization based on national probability surveys, while not without methodological weaknesses,² are not subject to the same reporting biases as divorce, police and hospital records.

The national crime surveys also indicate that women are much more likely than men to suffer injury as a result of assaults in the home (Langan and Innes 1986, Schwartz 1987, Solicitor General of Canada 1985, Worrall and Pease 1986). After analyzing the results of the U.S. National Crime Surveys, Schwartz (1987:67) concludes, "there are still more than 13 times as many women seeking medical care from a private physician for injuries received in a spousal assault." This result again replicates the typical findings of studies of police or hospital records. For example, women constituted 94 percent of the injury victims in an analysis of the spousal assault cases among 262 domestic disturbance calls to police in Santa Barbara County, California (Berk et al. 1983); moreover, the women's injuries were more serious than the men's. Berk et al. (1983:207) conclude that "when injuries are used as the outcome of interest, a marriage license is a hitting license *but for men only*." Brush (1990) reports that a U.S. national probability sample survey of over 13,000 respondents in 1987-1988 replicated the evident symmetry of marital violence when CTS-like questions about acts were posed, but also revealed that women were much more often injured than men (and that men downplayed women's injuries).

1. McLeod (1984:191) claims that a higher proportion of the few assaulted husbands than of the numerous assaulted wives were seriously injured. Unfortunately, in much-cited conclusions, she misdescribed this result in terms implying absolute frequencies: "violence against men is much more destructive than is violence against women. . . . Male victims are injured more often and more seriously than are female victims." See Schwartz (1987) for correction and elaboration of this point.

2. Interviewees participating in a survey of criminal victimization may be unlikely to report incidents of domestic violence as criminal assaults, with resultant underestimation of the prevalence of such assaults. However, we know of no evidence that such underreporting is strongly biased by sex, as the sexual-symmetry-of-violence thesis demands. The limited available evidence suggests that husbands are no more reluctant to report spousal assaults than are wives (Schwartz 1987).

In response, defenders of the sexual-symmetry-of-violence thesis contend that data from police, courts, hospitals, and social service agencies are suspect because men are reluctant to report physical violence by their wives. For example, Steinmetz (1977/78) asserts that husband-beating is a camouflaged social problem because men must overcome extraordinary stigma in order to report that their wives have beaten them. Similarly, Shupe et al. (1987) maintain that men are unwilling to report their wives because "it would be unmanly or unchivalrous to go to the police for protection from a woman" (52). However, the limited available evidence does not support these authors' presumption that men are less likely to report assaults by their spouses than are women. Schwartz's (1987) analysis of the 1973-1982 U.S. National Crime Survey data found that 67.2 percent of men and 56.8 percent of women called the police after being assaulted by their spouses. One may protest that these high percentages imply that only a tiny proportion of the most severe spousal assaults were acknowledged as assaults by respondents to these crime surveys, but the results are nonetheless contrary to the notion that assaulted men are especially reticent. Moreover, Rouse et al. (1988), using "act" definitions of assaults which inspired much higher proportions to acknowledge victimization, similarly report that men were likelier than women to call the police after assaults by intimate partners, both among married couples and among those dating. In addition, a sample of 337 cases of domestic violence drawn from family court cases in Ontario showed that men were more likely than women to press charges against their spouses: there were 17 times as many female victims as male victims, but only 22 percent of women laid charges in contrast to 40 percent of the men, and men were less likely to drop the charges, too (Kincaid 1982:91). What those who argue that men are reluctant or ashamed to report their wives' assaults overlook is that women have their own reasons to be reticent, fearing both the loss of a jailed or alienated husband's economic support and his vengeance. Whereas the claim that husbands underreport because of shame or chivalry is largely speculative, there is considerable evidence that women report very little of the violence perpetrated by their male partners (e.g., Dobash and Dobash 1979, Kantor and Straus 1990, Solicitor General of Canada 1985, Schwartz 1987).

The CTS survey data indicating equivalent violence by wives and husbands thus stand in contradiction to injury data, to police incident reports, to help-seeking statistics, and even to other, larger, national probability sample surveys of self-reported victimization. The CTS researchers insist that their results alone are accurate because husbands' victimizations are unlikely to be detected or reported by any other method. It is therefore important to consider in detail the CTS and the data it generates.

Do CTS Data Reflect the Reality of Marital Violence?

The CTS instrument has been much used and much criticized. Critics have complained that its exclusive focus on "acts" ignores the actors' interpretations, motivations, and intentions; that physical violence is arbitrarily delimited, excluding, for example, sexual assault and rape; that retrospective reports of the past year's events are unlikely to be accurate; that researchers' attributions of "violence" (with resultant claims about its statistical prevalence) are based on respondents' admitting to acts described in such an impoverished manner as to conflate severe assaults with trivial gestures; that the formulaic distinction between "minor" and "severe violence" (whereby, for example, "tried to hit with something" is definitionally "severe" and "slapped" is definitionally "minor") constitutes a poor operationalization of severity; that the responses of aggressors and victims have been given identical evidentiary status in deriving incidence estimates, while their inconsistencies have been ignored; that the CTS omits the contexts of violence, the events precipitating it, and the sequences of events by which it progresses; and that it fails to connect outcomes, especially injury, with the acts producing them

(e.g., Berk et al. 1983, Breines and Gordon 1983, Browning and Dutton 1986, DeKeseredy 1991, Dobash and Dobash 1979, 1981b, 1990, 1992, Ferraro and Johnson 1983, Frieze and Browne 1989, Kurz 1989, Makepeace 1986, Okun 1986, Pagelow 1985, Pleck et al. 1977/78, Russell 1982, Saunders 1986, 1988, Walker 1984).

Straus (1990b) has defended the CTS against its critics, maintaining that the CTS addresses context with its "verbal aggression" scale (although the assessment of "verbal aggression" is not incident-linked with the assessment of "violence"); that the minor-severe categorization "is roughly parallel to the legal distinction between 'simple assault' and 'aggravated assault'" (58); that other measurement instruments have problems, too; and that you cannot measure everything. Above all, the defense rests on the widespread use of the instrument, on its reliability, and on its validity. That the CTS is widely used cannot be gainsaid, but whether it is reliable or valid is questionable.

Problems with the Reliability and Validity of CTS Responses

Straus (1990b:64) claims that six studies have assessed "the internal consistency reliability" of the CTS. One of the six (Barling and Rosenbaum 1986) contains no such assessment, a second is unreferenced, and a third unpublished. However, a moderate degree of "internal consistency reliability" of the CTS can probably be conceded. For example, those who admit to having "beat up" their spouses are also likely to admit to having "hit" them.

The crucial matter of interobserver reliability is much more problematic. The degree of concordance in couples' responses is an assay of "interspousal reliability" (Jouriles and O'Leary 1985), and such reliability must be high if CTS scores are to be taken at face value. For example, incidence estimates of husband-to-wife and wife-to-husband violence have been generated from national surveys in which the CTS was administered to only one adult per family, with claims of victimization and perpetration by male and female respondents all granted equal evidentiary status and summated (Straus and Gelles 1990a). The validity of these widely cited incidence estimates is predicated upon interspousal reliability.

Straus (1990b:66) considers the assessment of spousal concordance to constitute an assay of "concurrent validity" rather than "interspousal reliability," in effect treating each partner's report as the violence criterion that validates the other. But spousal concordance is analogous to interobserver reliability: it is a necessary but by no means sufficient condition for concluding that the self-reports accurately reflect reality. If couples generally produce consistent reports—Mr. and Mrs. Jones both indicate that he struck her, while Mr. and Mrs. Smith both indicate that neither has struck the other—then it is possible though by no means certain that their CTS self-reports constitute valid (veridical) information about the blows actually struck. However, if couples routinely provide discrepant CTS responses, data derived from the CTS simply cannot be valid.

In this light, studies of husband/wife concordance in CTS responses should be devastating to those who imagine that the CTS provides a valid account of the respondents' acts. In what Straus correctly calls "the most detailed and thorough analysis of agreement between spouses in response to the CTS," Szinovacz (1983) found that 103 couples' accounts of the violence in their interactions matched to a degree little greater than chance. On several CTS items, mainly the most severe ones, agreement was actually below chance. On the item "beat up," concordance was nil: although there were respondents of both sexes who claimed to have administered beatings and respondents of both sexes who claimed to have been on the receiving end, there was not a single couple in which one party claimed to have administered and the other to have received such a beating. In a similar study, Jouriles and O'Leary (1985) administered the CTS to 65 couples attending a marital therapy clinic, and 37 control couples from the local community. For many of the acts, the frequency and percentage data reported are impossible to reconcile; for others, Jouriles and O'Leary reported a concordance statistic

(Cohen's Kappa) as equalling zero when the correct values were negative.³ Straus (1990b) cites this study as conferring validity on the CTS, but in fact, its results replicated Szinovacz's (1983): husband/wife agreement scarcely exceeded chance expectation and actually fell below chance on some items.

Straus (1990b) acknowledges that these and the other studies he reviews "found large discrepancies between the reports of violence given by husbands and by wives" (69). He concludes, however, that "validity measures of agreement between family members are within the range of validity coefficients typically reported" (71), and that "the weakest aspect of the CTS are [*sic*] the scales that have received the least criticism: Reasoning and Verbal aggression" (71), by which he implies that the assessment of violence is relatively strong.

Ultimately, Straus's defense of the CTS is that the proof of the pudding is in the eating: "The strongest evidence concerns the construct validity of the CTS. It has been used in a large number of studies producing findings that tend to be consistent with previous research (when available), consistent regardless of gender of respondent, and theoretically meaningful" (Straus 1990b:71). And indeed, with respect to marital violence, the CTS is capable of making certain gross discriminations. Various studies have found CTS responses to vary as a function of age, race, poverty, duration of relationship, and registered versus de facto marital unions (Brinkerhoff and Lupri 1988, Ellis 1989, Lockhart 1987, Okun 1986, Smith 1990, Stets 1990, Stets and Straus 1990, Straus and Gelles 1990b, Straus et al. 1980, Yllo and Straus 1981), and these effects have generally been directionally similar to those found with less problematic measures of violence such as homicides (Block 1991, Daly and Wilson 1988a,b, Goetting 1989, Mercy and Saltzman 1989). However, the CTS has also failed to detect certain massive differences, and we do not refer only to sex differences.

Consider the case of child abuse by stepparents versus birth parents. In various countries, including the United States, a stepparent is more likely to fatally assault a small child than is a birth parent, by a factor on the order of 100-fold (Daly and Wilson 1988a,b, Wilson, Daly and Weghorst 1980); sublethal violence also exhibits huge differences in the same direction (Creighton 1985, Daly and Wilson 1985, Fergusson, Fleming and O'Neill 1972, Wilson and Daly 1987). Using the CTS, however, Gelles and Harrop (1991) were unable to detect any difference in self-reports of violence by step- versus birth parents. Users of the CTS have sometimes conceded that the results of their self-report surveys cannot provide an accurate picture of the prevalence of violence, but they have made this concession only to infer that the estimates must be gross underestimates of the true prevalence (Straus et al. 1980:35, Straus and Gelles 1990b:96). However, the CTS's failure to differentiate the behavior of step- versus birth parents indicates that CTS-based estimates are not just underestimates but may misrepresent between-group differences in systematically biased ways. One must be concerned, then, whether this sort of bias also arises in CTS-based comparisons between husbands and wives.

Problems with the Interpretation of CTS Responses

With the specific intention of circumventing imprecision and subjectivity in asking about such abstractions as "violence," the CTS is confined to questions about "acts": Respondents are asked whether they have "pushed" their partners, have "slapped" them, and so forth, rather than whether they have "assaulted" them or behaved "violently." This focus on "acts" is intended to reduce problems of self-serving and biased definitional criteria on the part of the

3. Impossible data in the Jouriles and O'Leary (1985) paper include such anomalies as no whole number constitutes 99 percent of a sample of 37 or 79 percent of a sample of 65, and no 2 x 2 array of husbands' and wives' responses could produce the summary statistics presented for certain items. As an example of Kappa miscalculations, 3 men in the "community sample" of 37 professed to have "thrown something at partner" in the last year, but the two women who professed to have been recipients of such acts were members of other couples (an "occurrence agreement" of 0 percent); Jouriles and O'Leary present a Kappa value of 0 for this case, but the correct value is $-.07$.

respondents. However, any gain in objectivity has been undermined by the way that CTS survey data have then been analyzed and interpreted. Any respondent who acknowledges a single instance of having "pushed," "grabbed," "shoved," "slapped" or "hit or tried to hit" another person is deemed a perpetrator of "violence" by the researchers, regardless of the act's context, consequences, or meaning to the parties involved. Similarly, a single instance of having "kicked," "bit," "hit or tried to hit with an object," "beat up," "choked," "threatened with a knife or gun," or "used a knife or fired a gun" makes one a perpetrator of "severe violence."

Affirmation of any one of the "violence" items provides the basis for estimates such as Straus and Gelles's (1990b:97) claim that 6.8 million U.S. husbands and 6.25 million U.S. wives were spousal assault victims in 1985. Similarly, estimates of large numbers of "beaten" or "battered" wives and husbands have been based on affirmation of any one of the "severe violence" items. For example, Steinmetz (1986:734) and Straus and Gelles (1987:638) claim on this basis that 1.8 million U.S. women are "beaten" by their husbands annually. But note that any man who once threw an "object" at his wife, regardless of its nature and regardless of whether the throw missed, qualifies as having "beaten" her; some unknown proportion of the women and men who are alleged to have been "beaten," on the basis of their survey responses, never claimed to have been struck at all. Thus, the "objective" scoring of the CTS not only fails to explore the meanings and intentions associated with the acts but has in practice entailed interpretive transformations that guarantee exaggeration, misinterpretation, and ultimately trivialization of the genuine problems of violence.

Consider a "slap." The word encompasses anything from a slap on the hand chastizing a dinner companion for reaching for a bite of one's dessert to a tooth-loosening assault intended to punish, humiliate, and terrorize. These are not trivial distinctions; indeed, they constitute the essence of definitional issues concerning violence. Almost all definitions of violence and violent acts refer to intentions. Malevolent intent is crucial, for example, to legal definitions of "assault" (to which supporters of the CTS have often mistakenly claimed that their "acts" correspond; e.g., Straus 1990b:58). However, no one has systematically investigated how respondents vary in their subjective definitions of the "acts" listed on the CTS. If, for example, some respondents interpret phrases such as "tried to hit with an object" literally, then a good deal of relatively harmless behavior surely taints the estimates of "severe violence." Although this problem has not been investigated systematically, one author has shown that it is potentially serious. In a study of 103 couples, Margolin (1987) found that wives surpassed husbands in their use of "severe violence" according to the CTS, but unlike others who have obtained this result, Margolin troubled to check its meaningfulness with more intensive interviews. She concluded:

While CTS items appear behaviorally specific, their meanings still are open to interpretation. In one couple who endorsed the item "kicking," for example, we discovered that the kicking took place in bed in a more kidding, than serious, fashion. Although this behavior meets the criterion for severe abuse on the CTS, neither spouse viewed it as aggressive, let alone violent. In another couple, the wife scored on severe physical aggression while the husband scored on low-level aggression only. The inquiry revealed that, after years of passively accepting the husband's repeated abuse, this wife finally decided, on one occasion, to retaliate by hitting him over the head with a wine decanter (1987:82).

By the criteria of Steinmetz (1977/78:501), this incident would qualify as a "battered husband" case. But however dangerous this retaliatory blow may have been and however reprehensible or justified one may consider it, it is not "battering," whose most basic definitional criterion is its repetitiveness. A failure to consider intentions, interpretations, and the history of the individuals' relationship is a significant shortcoming of CTS research. Only through a consideration of behaviors, intentions and intersubjective understandings associated with specific violent events will we come to a fuller understanding of violence between men and

women (Dobash and Dobash 1983, 1984, Eisikovits and Peled 1990). Studies employing more intensive interviews and detailed case reports addressing the contexts and motivations of marital violence help unravel the assertions of those who claim the widespread existence of beaten and battered husbands. Research focusing on specific violent events shows that women almost always employ violence in defense of self and children in response to cues of imminent assault in the past and in retaliation for previous physical abuse (e.g., Browne 1987, Campbell 1992, Dobash and Dobash 1979, 1984, Jones 1980, Pagelow 1984, Polk and Ranson 1991, Saunders 1986). Proponents of the sexual-symmetry-of-violence thesis have made much of the fact that CTS surveys indicate that women "initiate" the violence about as often as men, but a case in which a woman struck the first blow is unlikely to be the mirror image of one in which her husband "initiated." A noteworthy feature of the literature proclaiming the existence of battered husbands and battering wives (McNeely and Robinson-Simpson 1987, Shupe et al. 1987, Steinmetz 1977/78, Steinmetz and Lucca 1988) is how little the meager case descriptions resemble those of battered wives and battering husbands (e.g., Browne 1987, Dobash and Dobash 1979, Dobash et al. 1977/78, Pagelow 1984). Especially lacking in the alleged male victim cases is any indication of the sort of chronic intimidation characteristic of prototypical woman battering cases.

Any self-report method must constitute an imperfect reflection of behavior, and the CTS is no exception. That in itself is hardly a fatal flaw. But for such an instrument to retain utility for the investigation of a particular domain such as family violence, an essential point is that its inaccuracies and misrepresentations must not be systematically related to the distinctions under investigation. The CTS's inability to detect the immense differences in violence between stepparents and birth parents, as noted above, provides strong reason to suspect that the test's shortcomings produce not just noise but systematic bias. In the case of marital violence, the other sorts of evidence reviewed in this paper indicate that there are massive differences in the use of confrontational violence against spouses by husbands versus wives, and yet the CTS has consistently failed to detect them. CTS users have taken this failure as evidence for the null hypothesis, apparently assuming that their questionnaire data have a validity that battered women's injuries and deaths lack.

Homicides

The second line of evidence that has been invoked in support of the claim that marital violence is more or less sexually symmetrical is the number of lethal outcomes:

Data on homicide between spouses suggest that an almost equal number of wives kill their husbands as husbands kill their wives (Wolfgang 1958). Thus it appears that men and women might have equal potential for violent marital interaction; initiate similar acts of violence; and when differences of physical strength are equalized by weapons, commit similar amounts of spousal homicide (Steinmetz and Lucca 1988:241).

McNeely and Robinson-Simpson (1987:485) elevated the latter hypothesis about the relevance of weapons to the status of a fact: "Steinmetz observed that when weapons neutralize differences in physical strength, about as many men as women are victims of homicide."

Steinmetz and Lucca's citation of Wolfgang refers to his finding that 53 Philadelphia men killed their wives between 1948 and 1952, while 47 women killed their husbands. This is a slender basis for such generalization, but fuller information does indeed bear Steinmetz out as regards the near equivalence of body counts in the United States: Maxfield (1989) reported that there were 10,529 wives and 7,888 husbands killed by their mates in the entire country between 1976 and 1985, a 1.3:1 ratio of female to male victims.

Husbands are indeed almost as often slain as are wives in the United States, then. However, there remain several problems with Steinmetz and Lucca's (as well as McNeely and

Robinson-Simpson's) interpretation of this fact. Studies of actual cases (Campbell 1992, Daly and Wilson 1988b, Goetting 1989, Lundsgaarde 1977) lend no support to the facile claim that homicidal husbands and wives "initiate similar acts of violence." Men often kill wives after lengthy periods of prolonged physical violence accompanied by other forms of abuse and coercion; the roles in such cases are seldom if ever reversed. Men perpetrate familicidal massacres, killing spouse and children together; women do not. Men commonly hunt down and kill wives who have left them; women hardly ever behave similarly. Men kill wives as part of planned murder-suicides; analogous acts by women are almost unheard of. Men kill in response to revelations of wifely infidelity; women almost never respond similarly, though their mates are more often adulterous. The evidence is overwhelming that a large proportion of the spouse-killings perpetrated by wives, but almost none of those perpetrated by husbands, are acts of self-defense. Unlike men, women kill male partners after years of suffering physical violence, after they have exhausted all available sources of assistance, when they feel trapped, and because they fear for their own lives (e.g., Browne 1987, Campbell 1992, Daly and Wilson 1988b, Jones 1980, Polk and Ranson 1991, Wallace 1986, Wilbanks 1983).

A further problem with the invocation of spousal homicide data as evidence against sex differences in marital violence is that this numerical equivalence is peculiar to the United States. Whereas the ratio of wives to husbands as homicide victims in the United States was 1.3:1 (Maxfield 1989), corresponding ratios from other countries are much higher: 3.3:1 for a 10-year period in Canada, for example, 4.3:1 for Great Britain, and 6:1 for Denmark (Wilson and Daly forthcoming). The reason why this is problematic is that U.S. homicide data and CTS data from several countries have been invoked as complementary pieces of evidence for women's and men's equivalent uses of violence (e.g., Steinmetz and Lucca 1988). One cannot have it both ways. If the lack of sex differences in CTS results is considered proof of sexually symmetrical violence, then homicide data must somehow be dismissed as irrelevant, since homicides generally fail to exhibit this supposedly more basic symmetry. Conversely, if U.S. homicide counts constitute relevant evidence, the large sex differences found elsewhere surely indicate that violence is peculiarly symmetrical only in the United States, and the fact that the CTS fails to detect sex differences in other countries must then be taken to mean that the CTS is insensitive to genuine differences.

A possible way out of this dilemma is hinted at in Steinmetz and Lucca's (1988) allusion to the effect of weapons: perhaps it is the availability of guns that has neutralized men's advantage in lethal marital conflict in the United States. Gun use is indeed relatively prevalent in the U.S., accounting for 51 percent of a sample of 1706 spousal homicides in Chicago, for example, as compared to 40 percent of 1060 Canadian cases, 42 percent of 395 Australian cases, and just 8 percent of 1204 cases in England and Wales (Wilson and Daly forthcoming). Nevertheless, the plausible hypothesis that gun use can account for the different sex ratios among victims fails. When shootings and other spousal homicides are analyzed separately, national differences in the sex ratios of spousal homicide remain dramatic. For example, the ratio of wives to husbands as gunshot homicide victims in Chicago was 1.2:1, compared to 4:1 in Canada and 3.5:1 in Britain; the ratio of wives to husbands as victims of non-gun homicides was 0.8:1 in Chicago, compared to 2.9:1 in Canada and 4.5:1 in Britain (Wilson and Daly forthcoming). Moreover, the near equivalence of husband and wife victims in the U.S. antedates the contemporary prevalence of gun killings. In Wolfgang's (1958) classic study, only 34 of the 100 spousal homicide victims were shot (15 husbands and 19 wives), while 30 husbands were stabbed and 31 wives were beaten or stabbed. Whatever may explain the exceptionally similar death rates of U.S. husbands and wives, it is not simply that guns "equalize."

Nor is the unusual U.S. pattern to be explained in terms of a peculiar convergence in the United States of the sexes in their violent inclinations or capabilities across all domains and relationships. Although U.S. data depart radically from other industrialized countries in the sex ratio of spousal homicide victimization, they do not depart similarly in the sex ratios of

other sorts of homicides (Wilson and Daly forthcoming). For example, in the United States as elsewhere men kill unrelated men about 40 times as often as women kill unrelated women (Daly and Wilson 1990).

Even among lethal acts, it is essential to discriminate among different victim-killer relationships, because motives, risk factors, and conflict typologies are relationship-specific (Daly and Wilson 1988b). Steinmetz (1977/78, Steinmetz and Lucca 1988) has invoked the occurrence of maternally perpetrated infanticides as evidence of women's violence, imagining that the fact that some women commit infanticide somehow bolsters the claim that they batter their husbands, too. But maternal infanticides are more often motivated by desperation than by hostile aggression and are often effected by acts of neglect or abandonment rather than by assault (e.g., Daly and Wilson 1988b, Jones 1980). To conflate such acts with aggressive attacks is to misunderstand their utterly distinct motives, forms, and perpetrator profiles, and the distinct social and material circumstances in which they occur.

How to Gain a Valid Account of Marital Violence?

How ought researchers to conceive of "violence"? People differ in their views about whether a particular act was a violent one and about who was responsible. Assessments of intention and justifiability are no less relevant to the labelling of an event as "violent" than are more directly observable considerations like the force exerted or the damage inflicted. Presumably, it is this problem of subjectivity that has inspired efforts to objectify the study of family violence by the counting of "acts," as in the Conflict Tactics Scales.

Unfortunately, the presumed gain in objectivity achieved by asking research subjects to report only "acts," while refraining from elaborating upon their meanings and consequences, is illusory. As noted above, couples exhibit little agreement in reporting the occurrence of acts in which both were allegedly involved, and self-reported acts sometimes fail to differentiate the behavior of groups known to exhibit huge differences in the perpetration of violence. The implication must be that concerns about the validity of self-report data cannot be allayed merely by confining self-reports to a checklist of named acts. We have no more reason to suppose that people will consensually and objectively label events as instances of someone having "grabbed" or "hit or tried to hit" or "used a knife" (items from the CTS) than to suppose that people will consensually and objectively label events as instances of "violence."

If these "acts" were scored by trained observers examining the entire event, there might be grounds for such behavioristic austerity in measurement: whatever the virtues and limitations of behavioristic methodology, a case can at least be made that observational data are more objective than the actors' accounts. However, when researchers have access only to self-reports, the cognitions of the actors are neither more nor less accessible to research than their actions. Failures of candor and memory threaten the validity of both sorts of self-report data, and researchers' chances of detecting such failures can only be improved by the collection of richer detail about the violent event. The behavioristic rigor of observational research cannot be simulated by leaving data collection to the subjects, nor by active inattention to "subjective" matters like people's perceptions of their own and others' intentions, attributions of loss of control, perceived provocations and justifications, intimidatory consequences, and so forth. Moreover, even a purely behavioristic account could be enriched by attending to sequences of events and subsequent behavior rather than merely counting acts.

Enormous differences in meaning and consequence exist between a woman pummeling her laughing husband in an attempt to convey strong feelings and a man pummeling his weeping wife in an attempt to punish her for coming home late. It is not enough to acknowledge such contrasts (as CTS researchers have sometimes done), if such acknowledgments neither inform further research nor alter such conclusions as "within the family or in dating

and cohabiting relationships, women are about as violent as men" (Straus and Gelles 1990b: 104). What is needed are forms of analysis that will lead to a comprehensive description of the violence itself as well as an explanation of it. In order to do this, it is, at the very least, necessary to analyze the violent event in a holistic manner, with attention to the entire sequences of distinct acts as well as associated motives, intentions, and consequences, all of which must in turn be situated within the wider context of the relationship.

The Need for Theory

If the arguments and evidence that we have presented are correct, then currently fashionable claims about the symmetry of marital violence are unfounded. How is it that so many experts have been persuaded of a notion that is at once counterintuitive and counterfactual? Part of the answer, we believe, is that researchers too often operate without sound (or indeed any) theoretical visions of marital relationships, of interpersonal conflicts, or of violence.

Straus (1990a:30), for example, introduces the task of investigating family violence by characterizing families as instances of "social groups" and by noting that conflicts of interest are endemic to groups of individuals, "each seeking to live out their lives in accordance with personal agendas that inevitably differ." This is a good start, but the analysis proceeds no further. The characteristic features of families as distinct from other groups are not explored, and the particular domains within which the "agendas" of wives and husbands conflict are not elucidated. Instead, Straus illustrates family conflicts with the hypothetical example of "Which TV show will be watched at eight?" and discusses negotiated and coerced resolutions in terms that would be equally applicable to a conflict among male acquaintances in a bar. Such analysis obscures all that is distinctive about violence against wives which occurs in a particular context of perceived entitlement and institutionalized power asymmetry. Moreover, marital violence occurs around recurring themes, especially male sexual jealousy and proprietariness, expectations of obedience and domestic service, and women's attempts to leave the marital relationship (Campbell 1992, Counts et al. 1992, Daly and Wilson 1988b, Daly, Wilson and Weghorst 1982, Dobash and Dobash 1979, 1984, Ellis 1989, Pagelow 1984, Polk and Ranson 1991, Smith 1990, Wilson 1989, Wilson and Daly 1992a, 1992b). In the self-consciously gender-blind literature on "violent couples," these themes are invisible.

Those who claim that wives and husbands are equally violent have offered no conceptual framework for understanding why women and men should think and act alike. Indeed, the claim that violence is gender-neutral cannot easily be reconciled with other coincident claims. For example, many family violence researchers who propose sexual symmetry in violence attribute the inculcation and legitimation of violence to socializing processes and cultural institutions (Baron and Straus 1988, Straus and Gelles 1990a), but then overlook the fact that these processes and institutions define and treat females and males differently. If sexually differentiated socialization and entitlements play a causal role in violence, how can we understand the alleged equivalence of women's and men's violent inclinations and actions?

Another theoretical problem confronting anyone who claims that violent inclinations are sexually monomorphic concerns the oft-noted fact that men are larger than women and likelier to inflict damage by similar acts. Human passions have their own "rationality" (deSousa 1987, Frank 1988), and it would be curious if women and men were identically motivated to initiate assaults in contexts where the expectable results were far more damaging for women. Insofar as both parties to a potentially violent transaction are aware of such differences, it is inappropriate to treat a slap (or other "act") by one party as equivalent to a slap by the other, not only because there is an asymmetry in the damage the two slaps might inflict, but because the parties differ in the responses available to them and hence in their control over the dénouement. Women's motives may be expected to differ systematically from those of men

wherever the predictable consequences of their actions differ systematically. Those who contend that women and men are equally inclined to violence need to articulate why this should be so, given the sex differences in physical traits, such as size and muscularity, affecting the probable consequences of violence.

In fact, there is a great deal of evidence that men's and women's psychologies are not at all alike in this domain. Men's violent reactions to challenges to their authority, honor, and self-esteem are well-known (e.g., Athens 1980, Luckenbill 1977, Toch 1969); comparable behavior by a woman is a curiosity. A variety of convergent evidence supports the conclusion that men (especially young men) are more specialized for and more motivated to engage in dangerous risk-taking, confrontational competition, and interpersonal violence than are women (Daly and Wilson 1990). When comparisons are confined to interactions with members of one's own sex so that size and power asymmetries are largely irrelevant, the differences between men and women in these behavioral domains are universally large (e.g., Daly and Wilson 1990, Goetting 1988, Wilson and Daly 1985, 1991).

We cannot hope to understand violence in marital, cohabiting, and dating relationships without explicit attention to the qualities that make them different from other relationships. It is a cross-culturally and historically ubiquitous aspect of human affairs that women and men form individualized unions, recognized by themselves and by others as conferring certain obligations and entitlements, such that the partners' productive and reproductive careers become intertwined. Family violence research might usefully begin by examining the consonant and discordant desires, expectations, grievances, perceived entitlements, and preoccupations of husbands and wives, and by investigating theoretically derived hypotheses about circumstantial, ecological, contextual, and demographic correlates of such conflict. Having described the conflicts of interest that characterize marital relationships with explicit reference to the distinct agendas of women and men, violence researchers must proceed to an analysis that acknowledges and accounts for those gender differences. It is crucial to establish differences in the patterns of male and female violence, to thoroughly describe and explain the overall process of violent events within their immediate and wider contexts, and to analyze the reasons why conflict results in differentially violent action by women and men.

References

- Arias, Ileana, and P. Johnson
1989 "Evaluations of physical aggression among intimate dyads." *Journal of Interpersonal Violence* 4:298-307.
- Arias, Ileana, Mary Samios, and K. Daniel O'Leary
1987 "Prevalence and correlates of physical aggression during courtship." *Journal of Interpersonal Violence* 2:82-90.
- Athens, Lonnie
1980 *Violent Criminal Acts and Actors*. New York: Routledge.
- Barling, Julian, and Alan Rosenbaum
1986 "Work stressors and wife abuse." *Journal of Applied Psychology* 71:346-348.
- Baron, Larry, and Murray A. Straus
1988 "Cultural and economic sources of homicide in the United States." *Sociological Quarterly* 29:371-390.
- Berk, Richard A., Sarah F. Berk, Donileen R. Loseke, and D. Rauma
1983 "Mutual combat and other family violence myths." In *The Dark Side of Families*, ed. David Finkelhor, Richard J. Gelles, Gerald T. Hotaling, and Murray A. Straus, 197-212. Beverly Hills, Calif.: Sage.

- Block, Carolyn R.
 1991 "Lethal violence in the Chicago Latino community." In *The Dynamics of the Victim-Offender Interaction*, ed. Anna V. Wilson. Cincinnati, Ohio: Anderson.
- Bowker, Lee H.
 1983 *Beating Wife Beating*. Lexington, Mass.: Lexington Books.
- Breines, Wini and Linda Gordon
 1983 "Review essay: The new scholarship in family violence." *Signs: Journal of Women in Culture and Society* 8:490-531.
- Brinkerhoff, Merlin B., and Eugene Lupri
 1988 "Interspousal violence." *Canadian Journal of Sociology* 13:407-434.
- Browne, Angela
 1987 *When Battered Women Kill*. New York: Free Press.
- Browning, James, and Donald Dutton
 1986 "Assessment of wife assault with the Conflict Tactics Scale: Using couple data to quantify the differential reporting effect." *Journal of Marriage and the Family* 48:375-379.
- Brush, Lisa D.
 1990 "Violent acts and injurious outcomes in married couples: Methodological issues in the National Survey of Families and Households." *Gender and Society* 4:56-67.
- Brutz, Judith L., and Bron B. Ingoldsby
 1984 "Conflict resolution in Quaker families." *Journal of Marriage and the Family* 46:21-84.
- Byles, Jack A.
 1978 "Family violence: Some facts and gaps. A statistical overview." In *Domestic Violence: Issues and Dynamic*, ed. Vincent D'Oyley, 53-83. Toronto: The Ontario Institute for Studies in Education.
- Campbell, Jacqueline C.
 1992 "If I can't have you, no one can: Issues of power and control in homicide of female partners." In *Femicide: The Politics of Woman Killing*, ed. Jill Radford and Diana E.H. Russell. New York: Twayne.
- Cate, Rodney M., June M. Henton, James Koval, F. Scott Christopher, and Sally Lloyd
 1982 "Premarital abuse. A social psychological perspective." *Journal of Family Issues* 3:79-90.
- Chester, Robert and Jane Streather
 1972 "Cruelty in English divorce: Some empirical findings." *Journal of Marriage and the Family* 34:706-710.
- Counts, Dorothy C., Judith Brown, and Jacqueline C. Campbell, eds.
 1992 *Sanctions and Sanctuary: Cultural Perspectives on the Beating of Wives*. Boulder Colo.: Westview Press.
- Creighton, Susan J.
 1985 "An epidemiological study of abused children and their families in the United Kingdom between 1977 and 1982." *Child Abuse and Neglect* 9:441-448.
- Daly, Martin, and Margo Wilson
 1985 "Child abuse and other risks of not living with both parents." *Ethology and Sociobiology* 6:197-210.
 1988a "Evolutionary social psychology and family homicide." *Science* 242:519-524.
 1988b *Homicide*. Hawthorne, N.Y.: Aldine de Gruyter.
 1990 "Killing the competition: Female/female and male/male homicide." *Human Nature* 1:81-107.
- Daly, Martin, Margo Wilson, and Suzanne J. Weghorst
 1982 "Male sexual jealousy." *Ethology and Sociobiology* 3:11-27.
- DeKeseredy, Walter
 1991 "In defense of self-defense: Demystifying female violence against male intimates." In *Debates in Canadian Society*, ed. Ronald Hinch. Toronto: Nelson Canada.
- DeMaris, Alfred
 1987 "The efficacy of a spouse abuse model in accounting for courtship violence." *Journal of Family Issues* 8:291-305.
- deSousa, Ronald
 1987 *The Rationality of Emotions*. Cambridge, Mass.: Massachusetts Institute of Technology.

- Dobash, R. Emerson, and Russell P. Dobash
 1977/78 "Wives: The 'appropriate' victims of marital violence." *Victimology* 2:426-442.
 1979 *Violence against Wives: A Case against the Patriarchy*. New York: Free Press.
 1981b "Social science and social action: The case of wife beating." *Journal of Family Issues* 2:439-470.
 1984 "The nature and antecedents of violent events." *British Journal of Criminology* 24:269-288.
 1992 *Women, Violence and Social Change*. London: Routledge.
- Dobash, Russell P., and R. Emerson Dobash
 1981a "Community response to violence against wives: Charivari, abstract justice and patriarchy." *Social Problems* 28:563-581.
 1983 "The context-specific approach." In *The Dark Side of Families*, ed. David Finkelhor, Richard J. Gelles, Gerald T. Hotaling, and Murray A. Straus, 261-276. Beverly Hills, Calif.: Sage.
 1990 "How research makes a difference to policy and practice." In *Family Violence: Research and Public Policy Issues*, ed. Douglas J. Besharov, 185-204. Washington, D.C.: AEI Press.
- Dobash, R. Emerson, Russell P. Dobash, and Katherine Cavanagh
 1985 "The contact between battered women and social and medical agencies." In *Private Violence and Public Policy*, ed. Jan Pahl, 142-165. London: Routledge.
- Dobash, Rebecca, Russell P. Dobash, Cathy Cavanagh, and Monica Wilson
 1977/78 "Wife beating: The victims speak." *Victimology* 2:608-622.
- Eiskowitz, Zvi, and Einat Peled
 1990 "Qualitative research on spouse abuse." In *Family Violence: Research and Public Policy Issues*, ed. Douglas J. Besharov, 1-12. Washington, D.C.: AEI Press.
- Ellis, Desmond
 1989 "Male abuse of a married or cohabiting female partner: The application of sociological theory to research findings." *Violence and Victims* 4:235-255.
- Farrell, Warren
 1986 *Why Men Are the Way They Are: The Male-Female Dynamic*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Fergusson, David M., Joan Fleming, and David P. O'Neill
 1972 *Child Abuse in New Zealand*. Wellington: Government of New Zealand Printer.
- Fergusson, David M., L. John Horwood, Kathryn L. Kershaw, and Frederick T. Shannon
 1986 "Factors associated with reports of wife assault in New Zealand." *Journal of Marriage and the Family* 48:407-412.
- Ferraro, Kathleen J., and John M. Johnson
 1983 "How women experience battering: The process of victimization." *Social Problems* 30:325-338.
- Frank, Robert J.
 1988 *Passions Within Reason: The Strategic Role of the Emotions*. New York: Norton.
- Frieze, Irene H. and Angela Browne
 1989 "Violence in marriage." In *Family Violence*, ed. Lloyd Ohlin and Michael Tonry, 163-218. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Gaquin, Deirdre A.
 1977/78 "Spouse abuse: Data from the National Crime Survey." *Victimology* 2:632-643.
- Gelles, Richard J.
 1982 "Domestic criminal violence." In *Criminal Violence*, ed. Marvin E. Wolfgang and Neil A. Weiner, 201-235. Beverly Hills, Calif.: Sage.
- Gelles, Richard J., and John W. Harrop
 1991 "The risk of abusive violence among children with nongenetic caretakers." *Family Relations* 40:78-83.
- Goetting, Ann
 1988 "When females kill one another." *Criminal Justice and Behavior* 15:179-189.
 1989 "Patterns of marital homicide: A comparison of husbands and wives." *Journal of Comparative Family Studies* 20:341-354.
- Goldberg, Wendy G. and Michael C. Tomlanovich
 1984 "Domestic violence victims in the Emergency Department: New findings." *Journal of the American Medical Association* 251:3259-3264.

- Gordon, Linda
 1988 *Heroes of Their Own Lives. The Politics and History of Family Violence.* Boston 1880-1960. New York: Viking.
- Hotaling, Gerald T., Murray A. Straus, and Alan J. Lincoln
 1990 "Intrafamily violence and crime and violence outside the family." In *Physical Violence in American Families*, ed. Murray A. Straus, and Richard J. Gelles, 431-470. New Brunswick, N.J.: Transaction Publishers.
- Jones, Ann
 1980 *Women Who Kill.* New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.
- Johnson, Holly
 1989 "Wife assault in Canada." Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Society of Criminology, November, Reno, Nevada.
- Jouriles, Ernest N., and K. Daniel O'Leary
 1985 "Interspousal reliability of reports of marital violence." *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology* 53:419-421.
- Kantor, Glenda K., and Murray A. Straus
 1990 "Response of victims and the police to assaults on wives." In *Physical Violence in American Families*, ed. Murray A. Straus and Richard J. Gelles, 473-487. New Brunswick N.J.: Transaction Publishers.
- Kennedy, Leslie W., and Donald G. Dutton
 1989 "The incidence of wife assault in Alberta." *Canadian Journal of Behavioral Science* 21: 40-54.
- Kincaid, Pat J.
 1982 *The Omitted Reality: Husband-Wife Violence in Ontario and Policy Implications for Education.* Maple, Ontario: Learners Press.
- Kurz, Demie
 1989 "Social science perspectives on wife abuse: Current debates and future directions." *Gender and Society* 3:489-505.
- Lane, Katherine E., and Patricia A. Gwartney-Gibbs
 1985 "Violence in the context of dating and sex." *Journal of Family Issues* 6:45-59.
- Laner, Mary R., and Jeanine Thompson
 1982 "Abuse and aggression in courting couples." *Deviant Behavior* 3:229-244.
- Langan, Patrick A. and Christopher A. Innes
 1986 *Preventing Domestic Violence Against Women.* Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Justice.
- Levinger, George
 1966 "Sources of marital dissatisfaction among applicants for divorce." *American Journal of Orthopsychiatry* 36:803-806.
- Lockhart, Lettie L.
 1987 "A reexamination of the effects of race and social class on the incidence of marital violence: A search for reliable differences." *Journal of Marriage and the Family* 49:603-610.
- Luckenbill, David F.
 1977 "Criminal homicide as a situated transaction." *Social Problems* 25:176-186.
- Lundsgaarde, Henry P.
 1977 *Murder in Space City.* New York: Oxford University Press.
- Lystad, Mary H.
 1975 "Violence at home: A review of literature." *American Journal of Orthopsychiatry* 45:328-345.
- Makepeace, James M.
 1986 "Gender differences in courtship violence victimization." *Family Relations* 35:383-388.
- Margolin, Gayla
 1987 "The multiple forms of aggressiveness between marital partners: How do we identify them?" *Journal of Marital and Family Therapy* 13:77-84.
- Marshall Linda L., and Patricia Rose
 1990 "Premarital violence: The impact of family of origin violence, stress, and reciprocity." *Violence and Victims* 5:51-64.

- Martin, Del
1976 *Battered Wives*. San Francisco, Calif.: Glide Publications.
- Mason, Avonne, and Virginia Blankenship
1987 "Power and affiliation motivation, stress, and abuse in intimate relationships." *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 52:203-210.
- Maxfield, Michael G.
1989 "Circumstances in Supplementary Homicide Reports: Variety and validity." *Criminology* 27:671-695.
- McLeer, Susan R., and R. Anwar
1989 "A study of battered women presenting in an emergency department." *American Journal of Public Health* 79:65-66.
- McLeod, Maureen
1984 "Women against men: An examination of domestic violence based on an analysis of official data and national victimization data." *Justice Quarterly* 1:171-193.
- McNeely, R.L., and CoraMae Richey Mann
1990 "Domestic violence is a human issue." *Journal of Interpersonal Violence* 5:129-132.
- McNeely, R.L., and Gloria Robinson-Simpson
1987 "The truth about domestic violence: A falsely framed issue." *Social Work* 32:485-490.
- Mercy, James A., and Linda E. Saltzman
1989 "Fatal violence among spouses in the United States, 1976-1985." *American Journal of Public Health* 79:595-599.
- Meredith, William H., Douglas A. Abbott, and Scot L. Adams
1986 "Family violence: Its relation to marital and parental satisfaction and family strengths." *Journal of Family Violence* 1:299-305.
- Nisonoff, Linda, and Irving Bitman
1979 "Spouse abuse: Incidence and relationship to selected demographic variables." *Victimology* 4:131-140.
- O'Brien, John E.
1971 "Violence in divorce-prone families." *Journal of Marriage and the Family* 33:692-698.
- Okun, Lewis
1986 *Woman Abuse: Facts Replacing Myths*. Albany N.Y.: SUNY press.
- Pagelow, Mildred D.
1984 *Family Violence*. New York: Praeger.
1985 "The 'battered husband syndrome': Social problem or much ado about little?" In *Marital Violence*. Sociological Review Monograph, Vol. 3, ed. Norman Johnson, 172-195. London: Routledge.
- Pahl, Jan
1985 *Private Violence and Public Policy: The Needs of Battered Women and the Response of the Public Services*. London: Routledge.
- Pleck, Elizabeth
1987 *Domestic Tyranny. The Making of Social Policy Against Family Violence from Colonial Times to the Present*. New York: Oxford University Press.
1989 "Criminal approaches to family violence, 1640-1980." In *Family Violence*, ed. Lloyd Ohlin and Michael Tonry], 19-57. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Pleck, Elizabeth, Joseph H. Pleck, Marlyn Grossman, and Pauline B. Bart
1977/78 "The battered data syndrome: A comment on Steinmetz' article." *Victimology* 2:680-683.
- Polk, Kenneth, and David Ranson
1991 "The role of gender in intimate violence." *Australia and New Zealand Journal of Criminology* 24:15-24.
- Quarm, Daisy and Martin D. Schwartz
1985 "Domestic violence in criminal court." In *Criminal Justice Politics and Women: The Aftermath of Legally Mandated Change*, ed. C. Schweber and C. Feinman, 29-46. New York: Haworth.
- Rouse, Linda P., Richard Breen, and Marilyn Howell
1988 "Abuse in intimate relationships. A comparison of married and dating college students." *Journal of Interpersonal Violence* 3:414-429.

- Russell, Diana E.H.
1982 *Rape in Marriage*. New York: Macmillan.
- Sacco, Vincent F. and Holly Johnson
1990 *Patterns of Criminal Victimization in Canada*. Ottawa: Statistics Canada.
- Saunders, Daniel G.
1986 "When battered women use violence: Husband-abuse or self-defense?" *Violence and Victims* 1:47-60.
1988 "Wife abuse, husband abuse, or mutual combat?" In *Feminist Perspectives on Wife Abuse*, ed. Kersti Yllo and Michele Bograd, 90-113. Newbury Park, Calif.: Sage.
- Schwartz, Martin D.
1987 "Gender and injury in spousal assault." *Sociological Focus* 20:61-75.
- Shupe, Anson, William A. Stacey, and Lonnie R. Hazelwood
1987 *Violent Men, Violent Couples: The Dynamics of Domestic Violence*. Lexington Mass.: Lexington Books.
- Sigelman, Carol K., Carol J. Berry and Katharine A. Wiles
1984 "Violence in college students' dating relationships." *Journal of Applied Social Psychology* 14:530-548.
- Smith, Lorna J.F.
1989 *Domestic Violence: An Overview of the Literature*. Home Office Research Study No. 107. London: HMSO.
- Smith, Michael D.
1990 "Sociodemographic risk factors in wife abuse: Results from a survey of Toronto women." *Canadian Journal of Sociology* 15:39-58.
- Solicitor General of Canada
1985 *Female Victims of Crime*. Canadian Urban Victimization Survey Bulletin No. 4. Ottawa: Programs Branch/Research and Statistics Group.
- Stark, Evan, and Anne Flitcraft
1983 "Social knowledge, social policy, and the abuse of women. The case against patriarchal benevolence." In *The Dark Side of Families* ed. David Finkelhor, Richard J. Gelles, Gerald T. Hotaling, Murray A. Straus, 330-348. Beverly Hills, Calif.: Sage.
- Stark, Evan, Anne Flitcraft, and W. Frazier
1979 "Medicine and patriarchal violence: The social construction of a "private" event." *Internal Journal of Health Services* 9:461-493.
- Statistics Canada
1990 "Conjugal violence against women." *Juristat* 10 (7):1-7.
- Steinmetz, Suzanne K.
1977/78 "The battered husband syndrome." *Victimology* 2:499-509.
1981 "A cross-cultural comparison of marital abuse." *Journal of Sociology and Social Welfare* 8:404-414.
1986 "Family violence. Past, present, and future." In *Handbook of Marriage and the Family*, ed. Marvin B. Sussman and Suzanne K. Steinmetz, 725-765. New York: Plenum.
- Steinmetz, Suzanne K., and Joseph S. Lucca
1988 "Husband battering." In *Handbook of Family Violence* ed. Vincent B. Van Hasselt, R.L. Morrison, A.S. Bellack and M. Hersen, 233-246. New York: Plenum Press.
- Stets, Jan E.
1990 "Verbal and physical aggression in marriage." *Journal of Marriage and the Family* 52:501-514.
- Stets, Jan E., and Murray A. Straus
1990 "Gender differences in reporting marital violence and its medical and psychological consequences." In *Physical Violence in American Families*, ed. Murray A. Straus and Richard J. Gelles, 151-165. New Brunswick, N.J.: Transaction Publishers.
- Straus, Murray A.
1977/78 "Wife-beating: How common, and why?" *Victimology* 2:443-458.
1979 "Measuring intrafamily conflict and violence: The Conflict Tactics (CT) Scales." *Journal of Marriage and the Family* 51:75-88.

- 1980 "The marriage license as a hitting license: Evidence from popular culture, law, and social science." In *The Social Causes of Husband-Wife Violence*, ed. Murray A. Straus and Gerald T. Hotaling, 39-50. Minneapolis, Minn.: University of Minnesota Press.
- 1990a "Measuring intrafamily conflict and violence: The Conflict Tactics (CT) Scales." In *Physical Violence in American Families*, ed. Murray A. Straus and Richard J. Gelles, 29-47. New Brunswick, N.J.: Transaction Publishers.
- 1990b "The Conflict Tactics Scales and its critics: An evaluation and new data on validity and reliability." In *Physical Violence in American Families*, ed. Murray A. Straus and Richard J. Gelles, 49-73. New Brunswick, N.J.: Transaction Publishers.
- Straus, Murray A., and Richard J. Gelles, eds.
1990a *Physical Violence in American Families*. New Brunswick, N.J.: Transaction Publishers.
- Straus, Murray A., and Richard J. Gelles
1986 "Societal change and change in family violence from 1975 to 1985 as revealed by two national surveys." *Journal of Marriage and the Family* 48:465-480.
- 1987 "The costs of family violence." *Public Health Reports* 102:638-641.
- 1990b "How violent are American families? Estimates from the National Family Violence Resurvey and other studies." In *Physical Violence in American Families* ed. Murray A. Straus and Richard J. Gelles, 95-112. New Brunswick, N.J.: Transaction Publishers.
- Straus, Murray A., Richard J. Gelles, and Suzanne K. Steinmetz
1980 *Behind Closed Doors: Violence in the American Family*. New York: Doubleday/Anchor.
- Szinovacz, Maximiliane E.
1983 "Using couple data as a methodological tool: The case of marital violence." *Journal of Marriage and the Family* 45:633-644.
- Toch, Hans
1969 *Violent Men: An Inquiry into the Psychology of Violence*. Chicago: Aldine.
- Vanfossen, B.E.
1979 "Intersexual violence in Monroe County, New York." *Victimology* 4:299-305.
- Walker, Lenore E.
1984 *The Battered Woman Syndrome*. New York: Springer.
- Wallace, Alison
1986 *Homicide: The Social Reality*. Sydney: New South Wales Bureau of Crime Statistics and Research.
- Warshaw, Carole
1989 "Limitations of the medical model in the care of battered women." *Gender and Society* 3:506-517
- Watkins, Carol R.
1982 *Victims, Aggressors and the Family Secret: An Exploration into Family Violence*. St. Paul, Minn.: Minnesota Department of Public Welfare.
- Wilbanks, William
1983 "The female homicide offender in Dade County, Florida." *Criminal Justice Review* 8:9-14.
- Wilson, Margo
1989 "Marital conflict and homicide in evolutionary perspective." In *Sociobiology and the Social Sciences*, ed. Robert W. Bell and Nancy J. Bell, 45-62. Lubbock, Tex.: Texas Tech University Press.
- Wilson, Margo, and Martin Daly
1985 "Competitiveness, risk taking, and violence: The young male syndrome." *Ethology and Sociobiology* 6:59-73.
- 1987 "Risk of maltreatment of children living with step-parents." In *Child Abuse and Neglect: Biosocial Dimensions*, ed. Richard J. Gelles and Jane B. Lancaster, 215-232. New York: Aldine de Gruyter.
- 1991 "Lethal confrontational violence among young men." In *Adolescent and Adult Risk-Taking*, ed. Nancy J. Bell and Robert W. Bell, 87-110. Lubbock, Tex.: Texas Tech University Press.
- 1992a "Til death us do part." In *Femicide: The Politics of Woman Killing*, ed. Jill Radford and Diana E.H. Russell. New York: Twayne.

- 1992b "The man who mistook his wife for a chattel." In *The Adapted Mind: Evolutionary Psychology and the Generation of Culture*, ed. Jerome Barkow, Leda Cosmides and John Tooby, 243-276. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Forth- "Who kills whom in spouse-killings? On the exceptional sex ratio of spousal homicides coming in the United States." *Criminology*.
- Wilson, Margo, Martin Daly, and Suzanne J. Weghorst
1980 "Household composition and the risk of child abuse and neglect." *Journal of Biosocial Science* 12:333-340.
- Wolfgang, Marvin E.
1958 *Patterns in Criminal Homicide*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.
- Worrall, A., and Ken Pease
1986 "Personal crime against women: Evidence from the 1982 British Crime Survey." *The Howard Journal* 25:118-124.
- Yllo, Kersti, and Murray A. Straus
1981 "Interpersonal violence among married and cohabiting couples." *Family Relations* 30:339-347.