



Domestic violence - piercing the fog

A study of
Aggression and Violent Behaviour by Gender

St. Neots Abuse Project
P.O. Box 57
St. Neots
Cams.
PE19 1AA
Tel: 01480 396500
Fax: 01480 356342

www.snapdomesticviolence.org.uk

Patrons: Pat Gregory – Ex-Mayor of St. Neots, David Harty – St Neots Town, District & County Councillor, Lord Vincent Constantine B.KTO.

Registered Charity No. 1082185

WHAT CAN I DO IF I AM IN A VIOLENT RELATIONSHIP?

**SNAP (St Neots Abuse Project)
runs a help-line for ALL
victims of domestic abuse.**

**No matter how trivial you
think the abuse might be
we are here to help you.**

Telephone SNAP and speak confidentially to one of our experienced and friendly help-line advisors.

**Help-line:
01480 396500**

Lines are open between 11.00am and 11.00pm every day.

Occasionally you may get the answer-phone but if you leave a message we will get back to you as soon as possible. Alternatively, you can send a Fax.

WHAT SERVICE CAN SNAP OFFER?

- Someone to talk and confide with.
- Friendly and constructive advice.
- Complete confidentiality.
- Understanding Advisors.

WHAT IS DOMESTIC VIOLENCE?

Domestic violence is the physical, emotional/mental, sexual or financial abuse of one person on another within the context of a close relationship which includes partners, ex-partners and family members. It affects people from all walks of life regardless of gender, race, class or sexual orientation.

Physical abuse can include slapping, beating, kicking and physical injuries, scarring or even death.

Sexual abuse means being forced to have sex against your will, being forced to have sex with other people or in ways that hurt you.

But that is not all, constant criticism and being told that you are useless, ugly or worthless can be abuse too. So is threats to kill you (or harm you – or the children), bullying, being locked in, not being allowed to see your friends or family, and not letting you eat or sleep. These are all unacceptable.

It is very much harder for men to report their abuse because they are often not believed. They are derided, and feel humiliated and ashamed. Many men put up with their abuse because they do not wish to lose contact with their children.

Domestic Violence does not mean just physically assaulting another human being.

Domestic violence - piercing the fog

A study of
Aggression and Violent Behaviour by Gender

Translated into plain English by:
Robert Whiston FRSA

<http://www.ukfathers.co.uk/domesticviolence-piercingthefogjuly2006.htm>

“The gender paradigm in domestic violence research and theory: Part 1 - The conflict between theory and data”

Written by Donald G. Dutton, T. Tonia, L. Nicholls

University of British Columbia

Department of Psychology, University of British Columbia, 2513 West Mall, Vancouver, B.C., Canada, V6T 1Y7

First published in 'Aggression and Violent Behaviour' 10 (2005) 680–714

including :

- An examination of the Feminist theory of intimate violence
- A critical analysis of the methodology of these studies with particular reference to the Conflict Tactics Scale (CTS) developed and utilised by Straus and his colleagues.
- Co-morbidity as a factor in determining incidence

SNAP has Donald G. Dutton & T.Tonia Nicholls' approval for this booklet

July 2006

Published by SNAP (Cambridgeshire) Tel 01480 396500

Contents

1. Abstract	3
2. Key Quotes	4
3. Introduction	5
4. The radical feminist paradigm	7
5. The CTS debate: Context	11
6. The self-defence debate: Female intimate violence is defensive	13
7. Government incidence surveys	16
8. Male under-reporting	20
9. Data on gender differences	21
10. Effects more severe for women	26
11. Back to the context of violence	28
12. Greater fear by female victims	29
13. The Archer study	31
14. Escalation	33
15. Patriarchal terrorism	33
16. Feminist belief perseverance	36
17. Paradigm perpetuation	36
18. Conclusion	38
Annex A & Annex B	41
Acknowledgments	41
References	41

1. Abstract (Executive Summary)

A paradigm is more than just a theoretical model or one-dimensional template. It is a set of assumptions, concepts, values, and practices that constitutes a way of viewing reality for the community that shares them, especially in an intellectual discipline.

Feminist theorists have for 40 years constructed several gender paradigms as a means of rebutting and confounding what they see as the prevailing and oppressive patriarchal society. One of their most successful paradigms (the viewing of reality as they see it) has been the one aimed at understanding 'intimate violence', which is more commonly called domestic violence.

This paper by the world-renown researcher Donald Dutton, and his colleague Tonia Nicholls, is a critical review of what the actual data really says about domestic violence and whether the conclusions often reported in newspaper articles have any foundation in fact or are only partly founded in fact. To undertake this review very many studies have been objectively examined; the methodology used then critically analysed (with particular reference to the Conflict Tactics Scale (CTS) developed and utilised by Straus and his colleagues), and any trends with regard perpetrator frequency by age groups and gender searched for.

Contrary to feminist dogma and popular beliefs, the conclusions show that after examining all the studies 'intimate violence', i.e. domestic violence, is more frequently perpetrated not by men but by women and it more likely to occur among the younger age groups.

Feminist produced studies have majored on the victim status of women and the amount and or degree of injury caused to women by violent men.

Dutton and Nicholls do not limit themselves to examining one sexes experience but have collected data on both sexes experience with domestic violence. Their results reverse, rebut and invert the received wisdom. The differences in injuries from domestic violence were found to be less than originally portrayed by feminist theory. Women did not suffer far more injuries only marginally more (of both the slight and more severe variety).

In reviewing these many studies high levels of unilateral violence by females to both males and females was found; something that had remained largely unpublished

A common thread throughout all the reports is the under-reporting by men of the violence they have suffered at the hands of women. In fact, many men do not view female violence against them as a crime (or as 'domestic violence'). Hence, when compared with women they differentially under-report being victimized by partners on crime victim surveys.

The final part of this report by Dutton concludes that feminist theory is contradicted by the findings; that the call by feminists for 'qualitative' studies is a means to avoid empirical observations and, therefore, a defence mechanism aimed at evading this inevitable conclusion. In contrast to normal empirical research, 'qualitative' studies, sometimes called advocacy research, or 'research from a feminists perspective' is more likely to find the answers because of the propensity to permit manipulation and interferences of the data or sample.

Dutton makes a case for this paradigm having been developed amongst family violence activists and researchers that excludes any possibility of female violence occurring. In so doing it has trivialised injuries to males and conjured up a monolithic but misleading view of a complex social problem that has subsequently been presented in a slanted manner by journalists

NB. Whenever a sentence is prefixed with 'NB' it is an indication that the adjacent additional comment has been added for ease of understanding. Amendments to the original text amount to about 5%.

2. Key quotes:

1. Women were four times more likely to report partner violence to police (81% vs. 19%) [than men]
2. found women were 10 times more likely to call police in response to partner assault.
3. peer reviewed studies have found women to use violence to about the same extent as men, even serious violence, to be somewhat more likely to be injured than men, and to be arrested less often than men.
4. there was no significant gender difference in the prevalence of minor physical victimization reported by the women (17.4%) and the men (18.4%).
5. A survey of 596 men and 616 women in Vancouver found equal [violence] rates (1% difference, males higher) for male and female perpetrated violence.
6. The female severe physical violence rate was more than triple that of males (18.6% vs. 5.7%).
7. an emergency clinic study in Ohio revealed that 72% of men admitted because of spousal violence had been stabbed.
8. When no one was injured, men were 16 times more likely to be charged than women
9. The higher arrest of men occurs despite injuries to male victims.
10. in a study of 721 young adults found that women were more likely than men to threaten to use a knife or gun.
11. those women who engage in violence against their family members are more likely than other offenders to do so with high frequency
12. Women were found to be more likely than men to suffer minor injuries, but men were more likely to suffer serious injuries.
13. the injuries to female partners tend to be less serious than the injuries to male partners.
14. violence by male partners is just as likely to be victim-precipitated as violence by female partners. . .
15. because gender was not predictive of use of aggression.
16. they found that psychological factors in both genders predicted aggression
17. When calculated as percentage of the entire population, the results were 2.5% of men and 4% of women had severe injuries,
18. Women reported receiving lower levels of violence than they perpetrated
19. Since these data are contradictory to feminist theory, they have been suppressed, ignored, or explained away.

3. Introduction

Domestic violence, i.e. family violence, achieved growing headline status in the early 1970s after a period when no one had paid it much attention. Early researches were undertaken for example by Gelles in 1975, Steinmetz in 1977 and Nisonoff & Bitman in 1979).

This curiosity or phenomenon - as it was seen then – was seized upon by activists of a given persuasion and effort began to be put into more research which purported to show that family violence was far more prevalent than previously believed.

At this point governments were prompted into action by these activists and so began to take a more aggressive attitude toward the problem.

In North America where the professionalism of the activists was spectacularly successful Gov't funding was made available for sheltered housing for female victims of Domestic Violence (DV) while at the same time mandatory treatment for male perpetrators became commonplace.

The research that followed found immediate resonance in the media where the revelations made for a good story. This was in no small part due to the methods used to gather the sensational data.

In far too many instances cases samples were drawn from those shelters (i.e. woman-victims). This had the effect of nullifying the research value or point of the surveys, but the public and the journalist were not to know this (or at least, not for another 20 years).

Other research surveys into this phenomenon drew upon the experiences of court-mandated treatment groups, i.e. male-perpetrators.

Few if any of the early DV studies were 'gender neutral', that is to say both men and women were asked the same questions about DV. Most studies only asked one sex or had a different set of questions for men.

Many early DV studies were 'attitudinal' surveys where the sample size was less than 1,000 and often less than 500 (which cannot be called credible or particularly scientific). Betsy Stanko's often quoted East London survey falls into this category.

The reason why attitudinal surveys proliferated in this segment of scientific enquiry was that they were quicker and cheaper to launch compared with longitudinal ones (they also gave more sensational headlines). Longitudinal studies by contrast, are more extensive, take many months or years to complete and involve sample sizes of 10,000, or 25,000 or sometimes 100,000. These expensive and usually university based studies (e.g. Oxford, the LSE, Cambridge and US universities, and US or UK government departments) are far more accurate and more authoritative. Yet they have received far less publicity

From an empirical, objective and scientific perspective both sample methods were tainted because they were from what is termed "self-selecting" samples of the general population. Feminism overcame this obstacle of amateurism by claiming "a feminist perspective" to science and to the contextualising of events and emotions. It was not what was suffered but how it was suffered that would henceforth be measured and be of value to feminist researchers

As a result of this flawed sample selection and of the prevailing ideology of feminism, the notion it was but a small step to declare that spousal assault was exclusively male perpetrated. This feminist mantra did concede that women were occasionally violent but insisted that such violence was purely defensive or inconsequential.

This view was held by the left-wing husband and wife team Dobash & Dobash, followed by Wilson, & Daly (1992) and Jaffe, Lemon, & Poisson (2003).

Subsequent research in later years showing equivalent rates of serious female violence has been greeted with scepticism, especially by the activist-research community. Invariably these studies failed to be embraced by the media and even the British government's own Home Office report in to DV (HORS 191, pub'd 1999) was never mentioned by minister for 5 years.

Surveys by the eminent researchers Straus, Gelles, & Steinmetz (1980) and Stets & Straus (1992) and Straus & Gelles (1992) was similarly all greeted with by scepticism and overt criticism, especially by feminist researchers who were committed to the view that intimate violence was the by-product of patriarchy and hence, an exclusively male activity (see Bograd, 1988). So agitated were some feminist advocates that serious personal harm was threatened and carried out against the researchers who disagreed with their views.

That initial dogma perpetrated by a media receptive to the then fashionably new feminist dogma has persevered despite data to the contrary – some of which is presented below.

The feminist perspective is a type of error in social judgment. This is demonstrated in research studies by social psychologists such as Janis (1982), Kahneman, Slovic, and Tversky (1982), and by Lord, Ross, and Lepper (1979).

They show that something called 'confirmatory bias' (also called 'biased assimilation') and 'belief perseverance' occurs when research subjects have a strongly held belief and are exposed to research findings inconsistent with the belief (for example, when a group of say 100 women who work in a group of refugees are told that only 2% of all women experience DV).

The subjects (the women refuge workers) reconcile the contradiction and maintain the prior belief by discounting the research methodology.

Conversely, they are too eager to believe research findings that confirm their prior beliefs but do not apply the same rigorous standards to research findings that disprove their beliefs.

As a basis for making social judgment personal experience is especially erroneous. We tend to give too much weight to single, salient experiences and to subsequently discount contrary data to the 'confirmatory bias' we have established. Work by Lord shows how contradictory data is systemically discounted by the subject.

Further work by Janis also demonstrates how social groups evolve a social reality called 'groupthink'. This is where a group ideology serves to protect and sustains itself by rationalizations and discounting contradictory data.

This is where the social psychological phenomena of 'groupthink' collides with 'belief perseverance'. A conjunction of the social psychological phenomena of groupthink and belief perseverance appears to give rise to the feminist 'paradigm' (or 'worldview') of domestic violence. The ensuing Urban Myth surrounding domestic violence is then to be found in academic journals.

In matters of domestic violence research, there is a palpable sense that a greater good is being served. For the sake of women's rights and the protection of women scientific accuracy should not be allowed to prevail and that data reported, interpretations, and applications of the data should be subservient to that ideal.

In concert with these value-laden theories, the focus of attention on male violence has deflected any study of, or the acceptance of female violence.

In effect, the 'paradigm' of domestic violence in academic literature has so evolved that the only permitted perpetrators are exclusively, or disproportionately, male (cf. Kuhn, 1965). Any and all data inconsistent with this view is instantly dismissed or ignored.

The function of the gender paradigm was originally social engineering. It was meant to generate a social change in a direction that corrected a perceived imbalance against women. This view was advocated by Dobash & Dobash (1978, 1979), Dobash et al. (1992), Patai (1998), Walker (1989), Yllo & Bograd, (1988).

The result, however, has been tragic. It has misdirected social and legal policy, it has misinformed custody assessments, and left police, and judges stranded with an unworkable set of parameters. It has led to the disregarding of data that while contradictory to the prevailing theory would have alleviated human misery. In this role it has mislead many attempts at therapeutic change for perpetrators (see also Corvo & Johnson, 2003; Dutton, 1994; George, 2003).

4. The radical feminist paradigm

In an earlier paper of 1994 Dutton described feminist theory as being a "paradigm", roughly translated as a set of guiding assumptions or worldview, commonly shared within a group and serving to ward off recognition of data that would be clash with the paradigm's central tenets.

The theory draws heavily from the vocabulary of early communism and uses a system of substitution for classical Marxist ideological terms. To achieve separateness a whole new lexicography has been compiled where capitalist oppression of the workers is replaced with oppression by a hidden patriarchy; men and fathers have been substituted for the terms 'lackey' and 'running dogs' etc.

Having successfully hidden its links with Marxist doctrines, which would have severely limited its appeal especially in America it was then possible to view all social relations through the prism of gender relations. Radical feminism holds, in its neo-Marxist view, that men (the bourgeoisie) hold power advantages over women (the proletariat) in patriarchal societies. This they believe has always been the case and the situation can only be overthrown by revolution or progressively punitive sanctions against men that leaves them impotent. In their eyes all domestic violence is either male physical abuse to maintain that power advantage or female defensive violence, used for self-protection. Feminist-speak can frequently be detected by the use of the words 'power', 'empower' and 'struggle' as code or ciphers.

Radical feminist values found in the paradigm, believe domestic violence springs from a society that silently applauds male violence against women. So convinced are they that discussion is brushed aside regarding the instinctive cry "Women and children first" when disaster strikes, e.g. the Titanic.

When women are violent they are always responding defensively and reactively. This is the view held by, among others, Bograd (1988), Dobash (1992). When women are instigators their actions are excused by seeing it as a "pre-emptive strike" against an inevitable male attack.

In contrast, male violence is not excused, i.e. 'contextualized'. Instead, it is always attributed to a broader more evil male social agenda. As a result feminists tend to generalize greatly about violent men, about men in general (who they have not studied in most instances) and they ignore the impact of female pathology.

Dobash & Dobash, long time feminist supporters, conceded in a 1979 paper that "Men who assault their wives are actually living up to cultural prescriptions that are cherished in Western society - aggressiveness, male dominance and female subordination - and they are using physical force as a means to enforce that dominance" (p. 24). Put more plainly could it be, in the words of a popular song, women are "Looking for a hero"?

Author Warren Farrell represents a view diametrically opposed to Dobash & Dobash et al with regard gender relationships. In his book "The Myth of Male Power" Farrell points to the significant role biological determinism plays in relationships. For instance, it is expected that males will protect, i.e. be unpaid bodyguards, provide, i.e. be the main wage earner, and to court the women, i.e. to pursue her.

Bograd (in a 1988 paper) defined feminist researchers as asking the fundamental question, "Why do men beat their wives?" Bograd also wrote "Feminists seek to understand why men in general use physical force against their partners and what functions this serves in a given historical context" (p.13). It could be argued that these remarks betray a total ignorance of and absence of any attempt to seriously understand the male psyche. The verbal inflexibility of men and their general lack of language articulation when compared to women wholly escape them.

In fact, the data demonstrate that while feminists are accurate in portraying abuse in intimate relationships as rampant, they are totally unaware that the reality is that most often both parties male and female engage in aggression. This aggression has been given the term 'mutual combat' (see Kessler, Molnar, Feurer, & Appelbaum, 2001; Nicholls & Dutton, 2001; Stets & Straus, 1992).

It is interesting to note that in dealing with gender issues women are usually portrayed as having experiences that have to be understood but men have experiences that have to be stamped out. So it is that feminism favours strong arrest policies and "intervention" rather than treatment for men since treatment implies that society is less to blame (see Pence & Paymar, 1993). For example, when a mother murders her children she is rarely "evil" but is portrayed as most likely suffering from some sort of enormous personal pressure at the time to make her do such a thing.

Feminism does not adequately discuss why men should be held individually responsible when the 'patriarchy' is to blame. Feminism fails to explain the differences in attitudes that are the rejection or acceptance, towards violence in the male population as a whole. The same silence falls when poor treatment of men arises. It is never seen as oppression by the same patriarchy.

Regrettably, research data confounding the feminist view of DV appears to have had little impact on supporters of this perspective over the past two decades. The accepted orthodoxy has travelled 180 degrees and today it is widely believed by the public that DV is widespread and is perpetrated only by men.

For instance, Serran & Firestone speaking about intimate partner homicide said in 2004 that we live in "... a society where almost every major institute accepts or ignores the problems of gender inequality", and "The law and the patriarchal hierarchy have legitimised wife beating and control, resulting in unequal power relationships between men and women" (p. 12).

In fact, considerable evidence suggests that there are strong social and cultural standards that prohibit men from being aggressive towards women. The most striking of these are chivalry and of teaching boys not to pick on girls (see Arias & Johnson, 1989; Archer, 2000a). Overlaying these cultural inhibitions are the legal and judicial sanctions against men who transgress. Men know - and it is statistically proven - they are more likely to be sent to jail and to face a longer term than if they were woman (see Brown, 2004, George, 1999).

These legal and social policies, well intended though they might be, are based on erroneous information both about the causes and incidence of most intimate violence. The wife beating referred to earlier rarely occurs in married couples but is frequently found in cohabiting couples that are aggregated into the married couple category by the statistical agencies of government.

HORS 191 usefully disaggregates the numbers for readers and also defines the age group where 'beating' is most common – it is in the 16 to 24 year old age group, i.e. before most people marry or cohabit. (The reader is cautioned that the inferences and emotive connotations regarding the word 'beating' and 'battering' are substantially different in US usage than in the UK).

Intimate violence (DV) has evolved based on the needs (experiences) of a small but significant proportion of women who experience chronic “wife battering”. It has done little to serve the much larger majority of men, women, and children coping with the more frequently encountered “common couple abuse” (Johnson, 1995; Stets & Straus, 1992b).

Among the data sets cited by Dutton in 1994 as contradictory to the feminist view were the following:

- (1) uni-directional “severe” female intimate violence was more common than male unidirectional intimate violence (Stets & Straus, 1992b);
- (2) lesbian abuse rates were higher than heterosexual male–female abuse rates (Lie, Schilit, Bush, Montague, & Reyes, 1991);
- (3) only a small percentage of males were violent over the life course of a marriage (Straus et al., 1980);
- (4) as many females as males were violent (Straus et al., 1980);
- (5) very few males approved of the spouse abuse (Stark & McEvoy, 1970) .
- (6) only 9.6% of males were dominant in their marriage (Coleman & Straus, 1986); and,
- (7) male violence was not linearly related to cultural indicators of patriarchy across US states (Yllo & Straus, 1990).

See Annex A (Page 41)

Each of these data sets, all available by 1993, have routinely been ignored by the feminist paradigm.

The initial effect of the feminist paradigm in practice was to focus so exclusively on male intimate violence that female violence was ignored. In fact the Canadian Kennedy Dutton study of 1987 was not released in full for over 10 years. The only portion released was that section which dealt specifically with female victims.

Corvo and Johnson (2003) outlined the bedrock view of feminist thought in these words, “... that battering (by males) is NEVER. . . provoked, hereditary, out of control, accidental, an isolated incident. Nor is it caused by disease, diminished intellect, alcoholism/addiction, mental illness or any external person or event. It is a means for men to systematically dominate, dis-empower, control and

devalue women. . . it is greater than an individual act, it supports the larger goal of oppression of women”

NB. It is quite common for feminism to accuse allegedly violent or falsely accused men of “being in denial” about their propensity to be violent. This is particularly so when examining how the “Duluth wheel” works which is used in perpetrator programmes to ascertain whether a man is a threat to women or not. If he answers that he is, that confirms their view; if he denied the charge he confirms that the problem is more deeply seated than they first suspected. In this regard it shares common characteristics with wartime brain washing techniques of the North Koreans and later by Mao’s Red Guard ‘re-education’ of the elite.

In societies where violence against women is not generally accepted, such as North America and western Europe, violent men are not living up to a “cultural norm”.

That norm of violence may exist in countries we regard as more patriarchal societies, such as Korea or Islamic countries (see Kim & Cho, 1992, Frenkiel, 1999; Haj-Yahia, 1998; Moin, 1998), but the general public does not have first hand knowledge to back their assumptions or prejudices.

However, Archer in a paper covering 51 countries cites the lack of a positive correlation between social-structural factors that “empower” women and frequency of wife assault - called the Gender Development Index). It therefore appears contradictory that women's organisations opposed to male violence should be funded most generously in counties where it happens least.

Conversely, in the U.S., Canada, Britain, and New Zealand (nations supplying the bulk of data on spousal assault) gender ‘empowerment’ for women is the highest of all 51 countries and so-called ‘structural factors’ have the least impact on wife/female assault.

This discrepancy could be due to several factors; the politics of the issue; the way data is collated; the way DV is defined; the state’s policies and manner of implication.

NB whenever assault is cited the word spouse or wife is always used when, more accurately, as spouses are the least likely to suffer DV, the phrase should be ‘girlfriend’ or ‘cohabitee’. Britain’s ONS routinely cites married couples as including non-married couples.

Dutton argues that intimate violence (DV) is not specific to men and cannot be explained on the basis of gender or gender roles. It is the intimacy of lesbian and heterosexual relationships that gives rise to rates of abuse which are similarly high; the impact of attachment and related anxieties produce anger and abuse. Dutton (in 1998, 2002) further elaborated on the psychological phenomena that would increase an individual’s propensity to experience such anxiety and react with abuse.

However, the “intimacy problem” explanation constitutes only one alternative to gender explanations and proposes that abusiveness in intimate relationships occurs for both genders and that certain psychological features increase the risks for individuals independent of gender.

Indeed, data from several studies of lesbian relationships showed that women who had been in past relationships experienced higher rates of DV than heterosexual couples. Dutton, in 1994, cited the study by Lie et al. (1991) where abuse rates were higher for all forms of abuse in relationships with women: physical, sexual, emotional.

An alternative would be to view intimate violence as having psychological causes common to both genders. Psychological explanations for intimate violence have come from numerous sources.

One good review by Holtzworth-Munroe, Bates, Smutzler, and Sandin (1997) cited psychopathology, attachment, anger, arousal, alcohol abuse, skills deficits, head injuries, biochemical correlates, attitudes, feelings of powerlessness, lack of resources, stress, and family of origin as sources for male (not female) intimate violence.

Follingstad, Bradley, Helff, and Laughlin (2002) found anxious attachment and angry temperament predicted dating violence in both sexes.

Feminist “intervention” discounts all of these as “excuses” despite empirical support for the relationship of each to marital aggression and the utility of these risk factors for prevention and intervention.

But work done by Terrie Moffitt into ‘Co-morbidity’, which will be touched on later, offers an challenging alternatives to the above, see Dunedin, Sect 9.

5. The CTS debate: context

In common with any religion, the ‘belief perseverance’ of radical feminists requires some Holy Cows, some unassailable tenants, impenetrable dogmas and a range of blasphemies. In other words anything that can be used to disparage, disfigure or cause discomfiture to a competing methodology to their world-view.

Such a competing methodology to the feminist world-view is the Conflict Tactics Scale (CTS). When this method was introduced by Gelles and Strauss in 1980 to bring some commonality to DV studies they were bitterly attacked. The Conflict Tactics Scale (CTS) showed unmistakably that female violence really did exist. As a result attacks on the instrument of measurement (CTS) were inevitable.

As one would expect Dobash & Dobash (1992) were heavily critical of CTS. In their comprehensive review of the literature over the last 20 years the Dobash’s represented CTS as a “currently fashionable claims” (p. 83) and criticized all studies using the CTS as misrepresenting intimate violence. They and their supporters picked an example involving a woman “playfully” kicking at her spouse and pointed out that such behaviour would be classified as a severe act on the CTS.

That this could also be true of interpretations of male violence to women appears, because of their blinkers, to have escaped them.

Another point of criticism, but more valid, is that males and females within-couples do not agree on the amount of violence used. Their implication is that males are under-reporting their use of violence, whereas we now know (2006) that the under-reporting by men is of DV against them by women. The original CTS, in common with any new broadly based measuring device, reduced data into essential components out of necessity. In the revised version, the CTS2, Straus included refinement including degrees of injuries to partially counter these criticisms.

Dr Malcom George (2003) discusses the over-and under-reporting of controversy, citing a study by Morse (1995) that showed both sexes tend to over-report minor acts they commit, under-report serious acts they commit, and over-report serious acts they suffer.

In surveys using representative community samples the same results were obtained regarding relative frequency of male and female violence, regardless of whether the respondents are male or female

(Kwong, Bartholomew, & Dutton, 1999; Stets & Straus, 1992a, 1992b), hence, an apparent lack of agreement between each couple is a non-issue.

The ultimate criterion that Dobash et al. (1992) used against CTS survey data is that the “meagre case descriptions do not resemble those of battered wives and battering husbands” (p. 80). In other words, the community sample does not resemble the extreme clinical samples upon which they have based their paradigm (but when the ‘clinical samples’ are the extremes found in life and not a cross-section that is bound to be their reaction).

By way of example, patient at a GP’s surgery do not fit the profile of the extremes that a consultant at a hospital might see).

From this perspective, the authors dismiss the representative samples and accuse the CTS of “inaccuracies and misrepresentations” based on their own non-representative subjective perception and samples.

Kahneman et al. (1982) called this *faux pas* the “representative-ness heuristic”, that people hold incorrect personal notions (stereotypes), based on salient personal experiences that underestimate selective bias, baseline incidence of characteristics, etc., and lead to erroneous social judgments. (NB. Heuristic can mean: a speculative formulation serving as a guide).

Unabashed, Dobash *et al* continue to this day to stereotype men despite data on heterogeneity of male attitudes to women, violence use, and marital power (Coleman & Straus, 1986).

Dobash et al. (1992) goes further and complained that no “conceptual framework for understanding why women and men should think and act alike” exists.

But in fact such a framework does exist (see Dutton, 1994, 1995, 1998, 2002; Eckhardt, Barbour, & Stuart, 1997; Ehrensaft, Moffitt, & Caspi, 2004; Follingstad et al., 2002; Fortunata & Kohn, 2003; Hamberger & Hastings, 1991; Holtzworth-Munroe & Stuart, 1994; Zandarini et al., 2003, to cite just a few among many others).

This psychological literature clearly demonstrates how intimacy produces emotional states such as anxiety and anger that are “abusogenic”, especially in persons with Axis II personality disorders. (NB Dict’y. ‘abusogenic’, abuse, genic; of, relating to, produced by, or being genes or a gene).

Furthermore, the behaviour occurs regardless of gender (see Ehrensaft et al., 2004; Follingstad et al., 2002). Males and females with a variety of borderline identity disorder think and feel differently than ‘normal’ persons in intimate relationships (see studies by Terrie Moffitt re: Dunedin, below). The framework is psychological and involves issues such as attachment, trauma reactions, and intimacy issues. Substantial literatures exist on each of these topics and their empirical relationship to

intimate abusiveness has been established (e.g. Cassidy & Shaver, 1999; Dutton, 2002; Van der Kolk, McFarlane, & Weisaeth, 1996) (Dutton, 2002; Ehrensaft et al., 2004; Follingstad et al., 2002).

There have been several large-scale studies including an impressive array of epidemiological data (e.g., Kessler et al., 2001), that have consistently concluded that female violence rates are as high as, or higher, than male violence rates in intimate relationships (see also HORS 191, 1999). Even when the CTS/CTS2 is not used to measure abuse, men are found to often report victimization and women to often report perpetrating that abuse (e.g., government surveys reviewed below).

See Annex B (Page 41)

6. The self-defence debate: ‘Female intimate violence is defensive’

Two papers by Walker (in 1984) and Saunders (in 1988) acknowledged the fact that female violence exists but then argued that it was purely ‘defensive’ or, in some extreme cases, a pre-emptive strike to forestall greater violence being inflicted upon them.

What undermines the arguments contained in these two studies is that both were drawn from women in women’s shelters or from participants who self-selected themselves as battered women.

NB. the American florid use of the English language may falsely give the impression to the English readers of someone battered had been cudgelled out of all recognition.

By definition, the samples they tested contained women who were physically abused but who may not be representative of community samples of women. In other words, a survey at a mental hospital would unsurprisingly reveal a higher incidence of mental illness.

Saunders did not comment on this problem caused by skewed sampling methodology but simply commented that as a “feminist researcher” he had an obligation to examine motives in addition to hit counts (not all ‘feminist’ researchers are women). He argued that social science must be a “tool for social change”.

Here is ample evidence that research “from a feminist perspective” deliberately ignores data that is awkward to explain and prefers to select data that fits the preferred pre-existing model.

In another suspect conclusion Saunders asserts that female violence is always self-defence, even when the woman uses severe violence and the man uses only mild violence. This, he contends, is because of the woman’s smaller size and weight. To support this view he analysed data created by Straus et al. in their 1980 paper. However, this data never asked who used violence first. So the question of self-defence cannot be answered by that set of data.

On the other hand, in a survey conducted in Canada, in 1986, Bland and Orn did ask who used violence first and their results must have stunned if not dismayed the Dobash camp. Of the women who reported using violence against their husbands, 73.4% said they used violence first.

Stets and Straus (in 1992) reported that females said they struck first 52.7% of the time (see below).

NB and the much delayed Alberta survey, by Kennedy and Dutton, mentioned previously found 67% of women admitted initiating “severe” violence.

Stets and Straus (1992a, 1992b) combined the 1985 US National Family Violence Resurvey (with a sample size of 5,005) with a sample of 526 dating couples to generate a large and representative sample of male–female relationships, in which they reported the incidence of intimate violence by gender. Their data table on relationship form and gender is reproduced below (see Table 1).

Using a subset of 825 respondents who reported experiencing at least one or more assaults, Stets and Straus found that in half (49%) of the incidents the couples reported reciprocal (mutual) violence. In a quarter (23%) of the cases the couples reported that the husband alone was violent, and 1/4 (28%) reported the wife alone was violent.

Table 1. Gender differences in intimate violence in three types of relationships (%)

Physical violence type II (m = male, f=female)

	M—minor F—none (%)	M—none F—minor (%)	Both minor (%)	M—severe F—none (%)	M—none F—severe (%)	M—severe F—minor (%)	M—minor F—severe (%)	Both severe (%)	N
Dating	9.6	26.9	21.2	.1	12.5	4.8	13.5	10.6	104
Cohabit	3.5	13.4	23.2	7.3	13.4	1.2	6.1	22.0	82
Married	7.5	18.9	28.3	5.7	9.6	2.4	7.1	10.5	736

Violent couples: percent in physical violence type II by marital status.

$\chi^2 = 33.9$, $p < .01$, $df = 14$.

Note: Compare Female Severe – Male None, and Male Severe–Female None columns.

From Stets and Straus (1992b), used with permission.

Men, who represented 297 out of the 825 respondents, reported striking the first blow in 43.7% of cases and that their female partner struck the first blow in 44.1% of the cases. The women ($n = 428$ out of the 825) reported striking the first blow in 52.7% of the cases and that their partner struck first in 42.6% of the cases.

Stets and Straus concluded that not only do women engage in a comparable amount of violence, they are “at least as likely” to instigate violence. The results also indicated that women were more likely to hit back (24.4%) than men (15%) in response to violent provocation by a partner (Straus & Gelles, 1992, Table 9.1). This latter result is difficult to explain from the feminist assertion that women are more afraid of male violence than the reverse. In all, these data do not support the argument that female violence is solely defensive.

There was another finding from the Stets and Straus (1992) data that proved problematic for the self-defence and pre-emptive strike arguments. Many women reported using severe violence against non-violent men.

If you examine the 4th and 5th columns from the left on Table 1 above you will see the gender difference. Married couples have a low, almost parity, level but dating and cohabiting couples have extraordinarily high figures, e.g. 13.4, 12.5. The headings Female-Severe/Male-None column refers to instances where severe violence has been perpetrated by women in circumstances where no violence has been displayed by the male in the partnership. The Male-Severe/ Female-None column to the exact opposite, i.e. instances where severe violence has been perpetrated by males but where no violence has been displayed by the female.

A comparison, where ‘severe violence’ is defined by the CTS, the Female reveals that the unilateral Female only pattern is about three times more prevalent at $M = 11.8\%$ than the Male-at only ($M = 4.3\%$) pattern across all types of relationships. This is true whether males or females are reporting the data ($p < .240$).

Such predominance of the more severe violence pattern by females is also true in the Severe versus Minor violence, i.e. columns 6 and 7 from the left.

NB. But perhaps the most interesting pair of columns is that of the None and Minor shown in the 1st and 2nd columns (Table 1). Here is displayed a sequence where male non-violence is met with overwhelming female minor violence.

Despite the data on female violence, where little or no male violence occurred, Saunders (1988), Dobash et al. (1992) and Tutty (1999) have all continued to report that female violence is exclusively self-defensive.

In reply, Stets and Straus (1992b) described their data as “surprising” but pointed out that similar results had been reported in previous studies. The “surprising” pattern they alluded to is that men had higher violence rates outside intimate relationships but not in intimate relationships (see also Straus & Gelles, 1992). Straus & Gelle’s 1992 findings that the pattern is more pronounced in younger couples were later endorsed by HORS 191, in 1999.

In a 1998 survey of young adults, that confounds Dobash *et al* beliefs, DeKeseredy and Schwartz found that 62.3% of women said the violence they committed was never in self-defence. Only 6.9% of the sample said it was always in self-defence.

An interesting study by Follingstad, Wright, Lloyd, and Sebastian (1991) asked, firstly, victims what they thought were the motivations of those that had perpetrated violence against them and secondly, asked perpetrators to report what they thought were their motivations for assaulting the victim. The total sample size of 495 undergraduate subjects in South Carolina (NB not a very large sample) found that 115 respondents (23%) reported they have been victimized by a partner using physical force. The 23% was made up of 16% men and 28% women). But women reported being victimized and perpetrating physical aggression twice as often as men. The authors found that there was no significant difference in the percentage of men (17.7%) and women (18.6%) who endorsed using aggression in self-defence.

Furthermore, a greater percentage of women than men reported using aggression to feel more powerful (3.4% vs. 0), to get control over the other person (22.0% vs. 8.3%), or to punish the person for wrongful behaviour (16.9% vs. 12.5%). The results are shown in Table 1a below.

Table 1a. The reported use of aggression and purpose. (%). (N = 495)

	Female	vs	Male
To feel more powerful	3.4%		0%
To get control over the other person	22.0%		8.3%
To punish the person for wrongful behaviour	16.9%		12.5%

The ‘victims’ group – both men and women who has been asked what they thought were the motivations of those that had perpetrated violence against them – most usually nominated just two motives, namely 1). the assaulter not knowing how to express themselves verbally and 2). self-defence. The differences in responses given by both sexes were very similar. Women endorsed the lack of verbal articulation reason in 32.7% instances, and men in 28.2% instances. The self-defence reason was also very similar with women citing it at 4.1% and men 4.8%.

Conventional 'feminist' dogma concerning men's perennial abuse of women holds that the male motive is control (sometimes called oppression). However, this study found that few men endorsed that motive. In fact, women were far more likely to use violence to achieve control. (22% vs 8.3%). As if to forestall the inevitable criticism from feminist camp the authors noted that while it was possible that men had under-endorsed their motives they had nonetheless admitted in the collection of data to many other socially undesirable motivations not listed in their main (and this) report.

A survey with a larger sample size of 968 California college age women looking into their initiation of physical assaults on their male partners was undertaken by Fiebert and Gonzalez (1997).

Twenty-nine percent of the women, i.e. 285 of the 968, revealed that they had initiated assaults during the past five years. Women in their 20s were more likely to exhibit aggression toward a male partner than women aged 30 years and older.

In terms of reasons, women reported aggressing because they did not believe that their male victims would be injured or would retaliate (NB. This is the perennial dilemma faced by men who know the law will not treat both parties' claims equally).

Women also claimed that they assaulted their male partners because they wished to gain/engage their attention, particularly emotionally. (NB. This seems an extraordinary and particularly weak excuse given the superior manipulative powers of women when compared with the average man).

The above studies, taken as a whole are totally inconsistent with the feminist view of female violence being solely self-defensive.

Women report using violence for reasons of self-defence in only a tiny percentage of instances. In contrast, women repeatedly report using violence against male partners for reasons other than self-defence. Women report using violence against non-violent male partners which in the male Code of Conduct hand book is absolutely taboo.

7. Government incidence surveys

The U.S. National Violence Against Women Survey (NVAWS; Tjaden & Thoennes, 1998) often is cited as strong evidence refuting data indicating similar rates of aggression committed by men and women. On page 2 Tjaden and Thoennes (1998) reported that, "women experience significantly more partner violence than men do".

This report is most significant as it could well be the origin of the by now universal cry that "1 in 4" women suffer domestic violence.

The report indicated that out of 8,000 women questioned 22.1% of women (almost 1 in 4) reported some form of physical assault by an intimate partner across the lifetime;

NB. However, this must be put into context with similar claims made about rape ratios, where coercion (e.g. cajoling) into or towards a sexual intercourse/encounter is categorised as a rape. The other variable undermining accuracy is the definitions of 'lifetime' given some couples are only in their 30s while others might be in their 50s. We know that the frequency tapers off after the age of 30.

Of the 8,000 men questioned only 7.4% reported any physical assault by an intimate partner across the lifetime.

What is also significant is that the public interprets statistics over a 1 year period and this is usually how statistical information is imparted. The Tjaden and Thoennes (1998) found that in the preceding 12month period only 1.3% of women and 0.9% of men reported a physical assault by a partner.

NB. This maps onto the finding of HORS 191 and of Canadian data of 2% for married couples.

Tjaden and Thoennes study provides a prime example of selective manipulation by activists and selective hearing by the media and politicians.

The study provided essential information about violence against women in the US. Unfortunately, the methodology was suspect if not biased because it was presented to the survey respondents (both male and female) as a study of victimization of women. The study also contained “filters” and included characteristics that would make men less likely to report their own victimization

Statistics Canada (sometimes shortened to ‘StatsCan’) attempted to overcome the under-detection of family violence in earlier crime victim surveys by specifically asking questions about family violence victimization of a sample of about 26,000 people over the age of 15 in an annual random digit telephone survey called the General Social Survey (GSS).

The rationale for this method is given in Statistics Canada’s 1999 report; “Because the GSS asks a sample of the population about their personal crime experiences, it captures information on crimes that have been reported to the police as well as those that have gone unreported” (p. 4).

The focus of all government action, particularly that of the Canadian government, in relation to abuse in intimate relationships has been defined repeatedly in press and public announcements as assaults involving wives as a crime.

What this rationale overlooks is that in downplaying violence against men so much even the police are reluctant to arrest a woman (Brown, 2004; Buzawa, Austin, Bannon, & Jackson, 1992). When this police reluctance is coupled with men’s reluctance to acknowledge victimization (because all that is broadcast or published in the press refers to women), it becomes questionable whether men would view female assaults against them as crimes.

NB Indeed, in 1999 a survey undertaken in Britain by the TV programme ‘Dispatches’ found that of the men who telephoned for police to rescue them from violent women, 25% of the men were arrested or detained in police cells. See section 8 below

In another development Brown (in 2004) reported that data from the 1999 Canadian GSS survey showed men were less willing to respond to the survey than were women (p. 7).

The overall response rate for this survey was 81.3% (p. 10). It was also found that 33% of women and 51% of men reported being “kicked, bit or hit” “by a current or previous spouse in the previous 5 years”. The survey used CTS items, although not in a “conflict” context but in a crime victimization context.

(Note, Confusingly, on page.5 the survey reports 44% of women and 56% of men in its “Highlights”, but reports the 33% and 51% figures in its data table, on p. 12).

For the item “hit with something”, the results were women 23%, men 26%. For “beat” it was 25% women, 10% men, and for “choked” it was 20% of women, 4% of men. For “used or threatened to use a knife or gun” it was 13% and 7% (Table 2.1, p.12). The overall victimization rates were 8% for women and 7% for men (p. 5).

Table 1b, below, depicts these findings.

Table 1b. Summary of Brown (2004) findings, re: Canadian GSS 2000

Victims	<u>Women</u>	<u>Men</u>
Hit with something	23%	26%
‘Beat’ (UK punched ?)	25%	10%
Choked	20%	4%
Threat gun or knife	13%	7%
Overall	8%	7%

Brown has shown numerous data errors and anomalies in the Canadian GSS survey data and pointed out that, for reasons unknown, Statistics Canada never provided raw data totals but instead projected estimates to the entire Canadian population.

In Britain a recent survey of 22,000 people was done by the Home Office (Walby & Allen, 2004), which asked if respondents had been a victim of domestic violence in the prior year (2.8% said 'yes' in a self-report, .6% said 'yes' in a face-to-face interview).

Of victims subjected to more than four incidents, 89% were women and 11% were men. As a result of the "most serious incident", 20% of women suffered moderate injuries such as severe bruising) and 6% suffered severe injuries (such as broken bones).

Male injuries were not reported.

Of those surveyed by Walby & Allen (2004), 64% did not think what had happened to them was a crime (this dropped to 33% if they had been subjected to multiple attacks). Men were most likely to have not told anyone about the victimization than were women, 31% of women had not told anyone.

In Washington State, 3,381 persons were surveyed as part of an ongoing Risk Factor Surveillance System survey (Bensley, Macdonald, Van Eenwyk, Simmons, & Ruggles, 2000). Using items from the CTS, the authors found that 23.6% of women and 16.4% of men reported lifetime experiences with intimate partner violence.

Women reported minor injuries 18.8% of the time, while men reported them only 6.2% of the time.

Women reported severe injuries 7.4%, and men reported them 1.7%.

Overall reported injuries that could be classified as minor (sprain, bruise, small cut), or severe (broken bone, knocked unconscious) were found to be 21.6% of women and 7.5% of men.

The upshot is that four large-sample government funded victim surveys in the U.S., Canada, and the U.K. have found women to be more victimized, to use violence less, and to be injured more than men. In the Canadian survey, which presented as a study of "perception of crime", the differences were less than in the other two national surveys which were presented as surveys in more absolutist terms as "victims of crime".

The Washington State survey asked whether the respondent had experienced intimate partner violence. In contrast to these findings, many independent 'peer reviewed' studies (to evaluate a colleague's work by other professional experts) have found women to use violence to about the same extent as men, even serious violence, to be somewhat more likely to be injured than men, and to be arrested less often than men.

NB. This may reflect more on who was asked to undertake the survey rather than that it was initiated and funded by any government.

Furthermore, men are less likely to define themselves as victims, and are less likely than women to view an assault on them by a woman as a crime. They are also less likely to report victimization than women (Straus & Gelles, 1992). In other words, we have two distinct vocabularies.

To understand this Straus and Gelles (1992) broke down violence rates on the basis of who did the reporting, men or women. The largest discrepancy is for males under 25 years who under-reported female perpetrated violence compared to wives' who reported of their own violence (i.e. man says it happened 50 times, but the woman says her violence happened 75 times).

Reports by husbands of their own victimization by their wives are only 72% of their wives' report as their (female) perpetration of violence. Conversely, husbands' who report perpetrating DV are only 79% of what their wives reports as her victimization (p. 553).

If we assume that wives' reports of perpetrating DV may themselves be an under-estimate (or representation), then men's victimization reports are a gross under-representation.

Wives' own perpetration reports are 208% of husbands' victimization reports. This data suggests men grossly under-report both perpetration and victimization by severe violence.

In common with most crime surveys, the government surveys reviewed above may have implicitly included demand characteristics (i.e. skew) because of their emphasis on "personal safety", "violence", and "criminal victimization".

NB. These are items, phrases and issues where men are not, generally, 'sensitised' to respond. Men do not usually see 'personal safety' as an issue or deterrent from leading a normal life).

Moreover, in large government surveys although the main authors are known, the sex of each and every interviewer is rarely specified when this could, it can be argued, have a grave influence on reporting, especially where intimate or private experiences are concerned. This applies not only to women but to men who might feel intimidated by a female interviewer.

The inherent biases in much of the literature, as shown above for example in the case of 'biased assimilation' and Tjaden and Thoennes's work which contained "filters" and included characteristics that would make men less likely to report their own victimization, and of stereotypes, i.e. incorrect personal notions, as per, Kahneman et al. (1982), was confirmed by Archer in 2000.

He noted the NVAWS was also presented to respondents as "a survey of violence toward women, thus giving the message that men's victimization was not a concern" (p.698).

The NVAWS, Britain's Home Office, and the Statistics Canada government surveys described above either presented the surveys as a "crime victim survey", a perceptions-of-crime survey (Canada), or worse, rely on police 'reported' data which is then cited as evidence for greater violence incidence against women (e.g., Malloy, McCloskey, Grigsby, & Gardner, 2003; Statistics Canada, 1999, 2003, 2004). NB StatsCan boast that it has a flourishing training programme used by many workers employed by the world's various statistical departments.

Despite the methodological improvements Straus and colleagues have made in developing and using the CTS and in the collecting of data about conflict resolution tactics from representative samples, the reporting biases of the original Uniform Crime Reports continue to be repeated (see Dutton, 1995, p. 10; Straus, 1999; Straus & Gelles, 1992).

These methodological biases have the effect of limiting the reporting of intimate violence rates by both women and men, but even more so by men (Brown, 2004, p. 10; Statistics Canada, 2003, p. 4; Straus & Gelles, 1992).

In the conflict surveys by Straus and his colleagues, annual assault rates are reported that are about 16 times higher than in the NVAWS (Straus, 1999). It was for this reason that Straus avoided the label of 'crime victim' from the earlier Uniform Crime Reports studies that routinely found extremely low reported rates of domestic violence.

NB. This does create a dilemma, if not a conflict. We have to choose to believe whether DV is at low levels, as per the Gov't surveys, or 16 times higher as per the specialist surveys. There might be a motive for each side to down play or heighten their findings. Part of the answer could be in the meaning of words used in surveys, for instance, 'conflict' may not mean actual 'assault' or a 'crime' has occurred or that someone is being 'victimization'. Similarly, an assault (i.e. intimidation) may not constitute a crime but is being victimization, and so on (see Sect 8 below).

Interviews into personal safety or crime contexts typically elicit responses only from those who were injured. The annual assault rate on the NVAWS was 1.1%, close to the weighted average for injuries to men and women. Mihalic and Elliott (1997) found that phrasing questions about partner assaults in the context of criminal assaults reduced reporting of serious partner assaults by 83%, compared to questions phrased as being about relationships.

In fact, the CTS/CTS2, which Dobash et al. (1992) malign, is a far more sensitive measure of intimate violence than any government survey based on crime victimization.

Straus (1999) has demonstrated that the CTS generates a violence report rate about 16 times greater than crime survey questions (see Table 2).

Table 2 Comparison of sensitivity of the CTS with crime victim surveys

	Family conflict studies	Family conflict studies	National crime victim survey	Nat'l crime data	Nat'l crime study [1]	Police call	NVAW
Annual assault rate	16%	(10–35%)[2]	0.2%	0.9%	0.2%	0.2%[3]	1.1%
Fraction of family Y	-	-	1/80th	1/18th	1/80th	1/80th	1/15th
Conflict rate injury rate	1–3%		75%	52%	unknown	unknown	76%
Male rate (top)	12.2%		0.4%	0.76%	90% male [5]		1.3
Female rate	12.4%	[4]	0.03%	0.11%	--	--	0.9
Male to female ratio	1:1		13:1	7:1	9:1	9:1	1.4:1

Note: From Straus (1999). Used by Dutton with permission.

8. Male under-reporting

Brown (2004) found huge discrepancies in arrest and prosecution of spousal assault as a function of gender.

Women were four times more likely to report partner violence to police than were men (81% vs. 19%). Stets and Straus (1992a) found women were 10 times more likely to call police in response to partner assault.

Brown also found women were more likely to have the police arrest their assailant when reporting (75% vs. 60%) than were men reporting an assault by a woman. The higher arrest of men occurs despite injuries to male victims.

When men are injured, female perpetrators are arrested only 60.2% of the time, compared to 91.1% of cases involving in the reverse situation (Brown, 2004, p. 34). A combination of men's unwillingness to report and the police being unwilling to arrest female perpetrators means only 2% of female perpetrators are arrested (Brown, 2004; Statistics Canada, 2003, p.4).

When no one was injured, men were 16 times more likely to be charged than women (Brown, 2004, p. 35) but this was not because male injuries were always less serious.

In fact, Buzawa et al. (1992), in a study of the police arrest policy in Detroit, found that "male victims reported three times the rate of serious injury as their female counterparts, 38% compared to 14%" (p. 263).

Hence, government surveys of intimate violence estimates based on crude crime report data (police arrest, etc.) under-estimate male victimization. For this reason, the Straus studies using the CTS, that introduces questions of conflict rather than crime victimization, obtain a fuller estimate of actual violence (Straus & Gelles, 1992, see Footnote 1; Straus, 1999, see Table 2 above).

9. Data on gender differences

In recent years many independent, 'peer-reviewed' studies of gender differences have been published. In general, these studies were not presented as "crime victim" studies and in many cases assessed intimate violence as part of another research focus.

For instance, George (1999) reported on female perpetrated assaults (in any context or relationship) in the United Kingdom from a nationally representative sample of 1,455 (718 males and 737 females) adults (N15 years old). Using a single question derived from the CTS (Straus, 1979) the following was asked:

"During the past five years, which, if any, of the following have you experienced or suffered that you consider to have been an assault on you personally from one or more women aged 10 years or older" (A) threw a heavy or dangerous object directly at you; (B) pushed shoved, grabbed, or tripped you; (C) slapped you; etc.

Men reported greater victimization and more severe assaults than did women. Specifically, 14% of men compared to 7% of women reported being assaulted by women. The highest risk group was single men. The majority (55%) of assaults on men were perpetrated by spouses, partners, or former partners. NB This will come as no surprise to men but may surprise many women.

Using a modified version of the CTS in a clinic sample of 97 couples seeking marital therapy (and so therefore self-selecting to a large degree), Langhinrichsen-Rohling and Vivian (1994) found that 61% of the husbands and 64% of the wives were classified as aggressive, Husbands accounted for 25% of all those identified as mildly aggressive and 11% of the wives fell into that category. But in the severely aggressive category 36% of husbands and 53% of wives were so classified. NB. Female aggression was therefore causing marital strife and/or complications to the extent that therapy was sought. Aggression levels were identified in this study as "non-violent, mildly violent, or severely violent." Sixty-eight percent of couples were in agreement with regard to husbands' overall levels of aggression and 69% of couples were in agreement on wives' overall levels of aggression.

Where there was disagreement, 65% of husbands were under-reporting aggression and 35% of husbands were over-reporting aggression. In contrast 57% of wives were under-reporting aggression and 43% of wives were over-reporting aggression.

Women reported receiving lower levels of violence than they perpetrated for overall, minor, and severe violence.

Kennedy and Dutton (1989) had collected data on intimate violence incidence in Alberta, Canada, reporting only the male data. A decade later, Earl Silverman and two female colleagues pushed for the publication of all the data (Kwong et al., 1999).

NB. This is a key point. Publication of only one half of the Dutton report saw Canada launch a one sided CAN\$ 10 million enquiry lasting several years and enabled feminist activists in Canada to radically change laws dealing with intimate violence and sexual offences. This led in turn to the total elimination of the centuries old 'Common Law' - which other nations find inviting - with Canada's Charter of Rights and Freedoms, a legal instrument where equality for females is enshrined as preferential treatment.

Four other surveys in Canada that reported both male to female and female to male violence also found higher rates of female perpetrated violence (Bland & Orn, 1986; Brinkerhoff & Lupri, 1988; DeKeseredy & Schwartz, 1998; Grandin & Lupri, 1997).

Similarly, in a U.S. sample, O'Leary et al. (1989) found that, of 272 couples planning on marrying, more women than men had been physically violent towards their partners (44% vs. 31%).

Sommer, Barnes, and Murphy (1992) surveyed a random sample of residents of a Canadian city between ages 18 and 65 (survey size of 1,257). Thirty-nine percent of female participants in the survey reported "participation in some form of spouse abuse" and 16.2% reported severe violence perpetration.

The risk factors for female participation were being young, having high scores on the Eysenck psychoticism scale, neuroticism index, and MacAndrews alcoholism scale. In other words, psychological disturbance and alcohol abuse predicted female violence.

Ridley and Feldman (2003) examined 153 volunteer females from a community sample (community public health clinic) in a study of conflict and communication. These women reported the following physical abuse frequencies directed at their male partners: kicking (20.2%), choking/strangling (9.1%), physically attacked the sexual parts of his body (7.1%), using a knife or gun against him (7.8%). Those who reported these acts, reported using them repeatedly (i.e., 40 incidents of kicking (per perpetrator who reported using this action.), 6.5 incidents of "physical attacks to the sexual parts", 4.25 acts of choking per perpetrator, etc.).

In other words, community sample women who used violence used it repeatedly.

A survey of 596 men and 616 women in Vancouver by Kwong and Bartholomew (1998) found equal rates (1% difference, males higher) for male and female perpetrated violence (when women reported) and higher rates (9% difference, females higher) of female perpetrated (when males reported). Women who were victimized were about twice as likely to report severe injuries (14% vs. 7%) and to feel physical pain the next day (38% vs. 18%) than men who were victimized. These "effect" data were for the percentage of victims who experienced injury or pain.

When calculated as percentage of the entire population, the results were 2.5% of men and 4% of women had severe injuries, 6.5% of men and 11% of women experienced physical pain. Hence, the method of reporting the proportion can increase gender differences (when calculated as effect per victim) or decrease them (when reported as population proportions).

Basile (2004) compared the nature (i.e., type) and severity of abuse alleged in same-sex and opposite-sex litigants applying for abuse prevention orders. He concluded that despite the widespread belief that intimate abuse involves an abusive male and a victimized female, male ($n=69$) and female ($n=288$) plaintiffs alleged very nearly identical behaviours by male ($n=298$) and female ($n=83$) defendants. The only statistically significant difference was that male defendants (5%) were more likely than female defendants (0) to be accused of forced sex ($p=.047$).

The U.S. National Co-morbidity Survey (NCS: Kessler et al., 2001) was a nationally representative household survey completed between September 1990 and March 1992 to assess mental illness. The NCS involved face-to-face interviews with 8,098 people between the ages of 15 and 54. A probability sub-sample was then generated to assess the social consequences of mental disorders. Of that sample, 3,537 participants ($n=1,738$ men, 1,799 women) were co-habiting or married and completed the CTS (Straus, 1979).

Kessler et al. reported there was no significant gender difference in the prevalence of minor physical victimization reported by the women (17.4%) and the men (18.4%). Similarly, the percentage of both men (17.7% vs. 18.4%) and women (15.4% vs. 17.4%) who reported committing minor domestic violence is lower than the proportion of women and men reporting victimization.

The reported prevalence of severe victimization also did not differ significantly by gender (Kessler et al., 2001; 6.5% of female respondents and 5.5% of male respondents). Men reported significantly less severe violence perpetration (2.7%) than women reporting severe violence victimization (6.5%). NB. See also below the Dunedin research studies by Ms Terrie Moffitt et al.

Kessler et al. (2001) also examined reciprocal aggression (i.e., couple aggression in which both partners perpetrate aggressive acts and also are victimized by their partner). Consistent with prior studies (for a review, see Nicholls & Dutton, 2001) reciprocity, sometimes referred to as 'mutual combat', was the norm.

Similar percentages of women (10.5%, SD=1.2) and men (11.7%, SD=1.2) reported both partners engaged in the same amount of minor violence. On page 492 (Kessler et al., 2001, report that of the participants reporting reciprocal minor aggression, "... 70.7% of the women who reported minor violence victimization and exactly the same percent of comparable men (70.7%) said that they reciprocated minor violence"

The vast majority of women and men (85.4% and 90.0%, respectively) who reported reciprocal minor violence described the frequency by each partner as the same. With those who reported committing severe aggression, each gender was more likely to report their partner as reciprocating than was the partner likely to report this.

Most participants, both men and women (96% and 80.4%, respectively), who reported reciprocal severe aggression, stated the abuse frequency was the same for both partners. Kessler et al replicated Stets and Straus' (1992b) findings on this issue of reciprocity.

Studying a birth cohort of 980 individuals, Ehrensaft et al. (2004) found 9% to be in "clinically abusive relationships", defined as those that required intervention by any professional (e.g., hospital, police, lawyers).

As can be demonstrated below, more such help exists for women, so the results may be skewed. However, the authors found comparable rates of violence, with 68% of women and 60% of men self-reporting injury (self-reported - admitted by person being interviewed). Both male and female perpetrators evidenced signs of personality disturbance.

The authors noted, for instance, that the women had "aggressive personalities and/or adolescent conduct disorder" (p. 267).

As the authors put it, "these findings counter the assumption that if clinical abuse was ascertained in epidemiological samples, it would be primarily man-to woman, explained by patriarchy rather than psychopathology" (p. 258). NB Epidemiology is a branch of medicine that deals with the study of the causes, distribution, and control of disease in the population under examination.

Watson, Cascardi, Avery-Leaf, and O'Leary (2001) sampled 475 high school students (266 males and 209 females) from a large, metropolitan area on Long Island. Using a modified CTS, they found that 45.6% of students with past or current romantic relationships (n =401) reported at least one incident of physical aggression by a partner and just 9% reported exclusive victimization (i.e., had been physically victimized but had not perpetrated physical aggression).

Using a measure that the authors developed, Watson and colleagues also studied gender differences in responding to aggression by a dating partner. Female students were significantly more likely than male students to report an aggressive response. Specifically, 42% of girls were significantly more likely to fight back than boys (26%).

Male students were more likely than female students to do nothing in response to abuse by a partner (male (24%, female 6%). There was a trend for female students (28%) to be more likely to report breaking up with an abusive partner than male students (21%).

Magdol, Moffitt, Caspi, Fagan, and Silva (1997) followed a birth cohort of 1,037 subjects in Dunedin, New Zealand. As Magdol et al. put it:

“Early studies of partner violence assumed that men’s perpetration rates exceeded those of women, in part because those studies relied almost exclusively on clinical samples of women who sought assistance or of men in court mandated counselling programs.” (p. 69).

At the age of 21, 425 women and 436 men who were in intimate relationships from the Magdol et al. cohort answered CTS questions about their own violence and their partners’ use of violence. Both minor and severe physical violence rates were again higher for women whether self-reported or partner-reported.

The female severe physical violence rate was more than triple that of males (18.6% vs. 5.7%). Stranger violence was also measured and was again more prevalent by women than men (36% vs. 25%).

This preponderance of female stranger aggression was replicated in the United States National Youth Survey (Elliott, Huizinga, & Morse, 1985; Morse, 1995), a longitudinal study of self-reported problem behaviour involving a national probability sample of 1,725 respondents.

The study was begun in 1976 and involved nine waves of data over 17 years. Respondents were interviewed annually using structured, face-to-face, confidential interviews.

Violence was measured using the eight-item sub-scale from the CTS. Injury was also assessed and for the years 1983, 1986, 1989, and 1992, female to male violence and severe violence was about double the rate of male to female violence and severe violence.

By way of example, in 1992 female to male severe violence was reported by 13.8% of respondents, male to female was reported by 5.7% (Morse, 1995, Table 1, p. 255). At this stage respondents were 27 - 33 years old. There was little or no change in the ratio of female to male vs. male to female violence over the years, with slightly over twice as much female initiated as male initiated violence. On the intimate violence scale, females were higher than males on the following acts: kick/bit/hit with fist, hit with object, threaten with knife or gun, and use knife or gun. (On the latter identical victimization rates were reported, higher perpetration rates were reported by women). Men were higher than women on the following acts: beat up, and choke/strangle.

Katz, Washington-Kuffel, and Coblenz (2002) studied intimate violence in two samples of undergraduates at a US university. In the first study (of 184 women and 103 men), participants had been in exclusive heterosexual dating relationships of at least three months duration (Median = 1 year, Std Deviation = 6 months).

Dating abuse, assessed with the CTS (Straus, 1979), was common in 133 instances (47%) with the sample reporting a current relationship in which their partner had used physical aggression against them. Men sustained higher levels of moderate violence than women.

Severe violence was rare for both women (n =6) and men (n =4). The frequency data also showed few gender differences, 55% of the women had non-abusive partners, 18% had partners who had been abusive once, and 26% (n =48) had repeatedly abusive partners. Similarly, about 50% of the men had non-abusive partners, 13% had partners who had been abusive once, and 38% had repeatedly abusive partners.

A structural equation model was developed by Follingstad *et al* (2002) to predict dating violence in a sample of 412 college students roughly equally divided by gender. Their model did not include gender (because gender was not predictive of use of aggression).

Instead, they found that psychological factors in both genders predicted aggression. These were found to be; anxious attachment and angry temperament that influenced the need to control one's partner which in turn predicted use of aggression.

This finding, that psychological factors rather than gender was most predictive of intimate partner violence (IPV but commonly known as DV), was also obtained by Ehrensaft, Cohen, and Johnson in a longitudinal study of a large (n =543) community sample. In their study stability of personality disorder symptoms were most predictive of IPV for both sexes.

Callahan, Tolman, and Saunders (2003) studied dating violence in a sample of 190 high school students (53% boys, 47% girls). Dating violence was evaluated by severity, frequency, and injury. For girls, increasing dating violence was related to PTSD (Post Traumatic Stress Disorder) and dissociation. (NB. PTSD could also be related to school bullying. Could PTSD be linked to divorce or family disruption?).

Contrary to the radical feminist assertion that abuse by females against males is unlikely to result in significant harm, increasing levels of dating violence was associated with anxiety, depression, and PTSD in boys, even after controlling for demographic, family violence, and social desirability items.

Hines and Saudino (2003) used the CTS2 in a study of 481 college students (302 females, 179 males) in romantic relationships during the previous six months. Males reported perpetrating physical aggression in 29% of cases and of females reported in 35%,

Males reported receiving severe physical aggression in 12.5% cases and the females in 4.5% and 14% of females reported that they were the sole perpetrator of aggression.

There were no significant gender differences in perpetration of either psychological aggression or severe physical aggression.

Further, 8.4% of males and 5% of females reported sustaining an injury. The study was designed to counter criticisms of the original CTS, that its physical aggression scale was too limited and that it did not include psychological aggression.

With these criticisms answered, females were still more aggressive than males. Since reporting was anonymous, response tendencies were minimized.

NB. It should be noted that government DV surveys produce tendencies that indicate DV is more prevalent among younger people, i.e. of college age.

The largest and most comprehensive of all dating violence studies was a recent cross cultural study of partner violence in a sample of 6,900 university students from 17 nations by Douglas and Straus (2003). They found adolescent girls were more likely to assault male partners than adolescent boys were to assault female partners by an average of 115%.

This held true regardless of whether overall assault or severe assault rates were considered.

Severe assault was much more likely to be female-perpetrated in Scotland (552% of male rate), Singapore (457%), and New Zealand (296%).

In this study, male perpetrated injury rates were 8.1% (serious injury 2.6%), female perpetrated injury rates were 6.1% (serious injury 1.2%).

There are now over 159 family conflict studies demonstrating relatively consistently that there is a rough gender equivalency of conflict, abuse, and violence in intimate relationships in North America (Straus, 1999; also see Archer, 2000a; Fiebert, 1997, 2004; Sugarman & Hotaling, 1989).

To summarise this section, these studies, with a composite sample size of 109,000 - and varying demographic compositions - show that intimate violence (DV) is more likely perpetrated by female than male youths. While dating and marital relationships are different both are intimate relationships where intimacy problems play out.

The literature reviewed above demonstrates this abuse results in injuries in an important minority of

young men and women and further supports the original findings of Stets and Straus (1992a, 1992b). These findings clearly run counter to the common assertion that female aggression in intimate relationships is uncommon and inconsequential.

They also lead us to query, first, if the rate of intimate abuse is at risk of increasing rather than decreasing with the next generation; and, second, to note that large social changes have been made in other relevant areas (e.g., smoking, drinking and driving, bullying, undermining parental control). It might be the case that similar strategies, aimed at least in part at our youth, through school education and public information campaigns, for instance, might be an effective strategy for reducing the prevalence of this serious public health issue.

10. Effects more severe for women

Radical feminists assert women's aggression against male partners is less likely than male aggression against female partners to result in serious physical or psychological harm. The Archer (2000a) study revealed a much smaller effect size for injuries (1/6th of a Std Deviation) and hospitalisation (1/11th of a SD) by gender than had been claimed by prior feminist theory (Dobash & Dobash, 1979). Other studies also have supported this finding. Felson (1996) found evidence that size and strength are important in explaining gender differences in violence generally. Men were much more likely than women to injure their adversaries, and women were more likely to be injured, at least in incidents where the offender was unarmed.

The effects of the genders of the two antagonists were additive. Gender differences were reduced when physical size and strength were controlled. In addition, physical power was unrelated to whether the respondent was injured in incidents involving guns or knives. These results suggest that physical differences between men and women are important in explaining gender differences in injury.

Felson and Cares (in press) re-analysed the NVAW data (Tjaden & Thoennes, 2000) and compared patterns of intimate violence with stranger violence.

They found that violence between people who were living together or related was much more frequent than violence in other relationships or contexts. Assaults were much more frequent when they involved spouses, co-habiting partners, and family members than when they involved strangers or other known offenders. NB. Are some cohabiting couples calling themselves married or being categorised by the survey as such given that today this is a popular trait ?

They also found that men were more likely than women to produce minor injuries, but they were not particularly likely to produce severe injuries. Women were found to be more likely than men to suffer minor injuries, but men were more likely to suffer serious injuries.

The authors concluded, "We also observe evidence that contradicts the idea that violence by male partners tends to be more serious.

First, the injuries to female partners tend to be less serious than the injuries to male partners. Second, violence by male partners is just as likely to be victim-precipitated as violence by female partners. . . . However, prior research also suggests that the frequency of men's violence against their partners is low relative to the frequency of verbal conflict among partners (Felson, Ackerman, & Yeon, 2003). Some factors are apparently inhibiting men, who are generally much more violent than women, from using violence against their female partners. NB This must be a cultural construct where social imperatives, i.e. taught from an early age, make it unacceptable. The fact that injuries are in the main superficial indicates an ability to stop an undesired action with limited counter-action. This is perhaps borne out by the more frequent use by men of hands and body strength rather than resorting to knives

or guns. Purely as an aside, the culture of a 'fair fight' and of knowing when to stop learnt in the playground appears absent in some reports of female aggression.

The results in this study show that those men who do engage in violence against their spouse and those women who engage in violence against their family members are more likely than other offenders to do so with high frequency (p. 11–12). NB The latter, ie family members, may have huge implications for levels of child abuse.

It is surprising that these results were obtained in what was essentially presented to respondents as a study of violence against women (see Straus, 1999, above).

Coker, Davis, and Arias (2002) also re-analysed data from the NVAW survey using a sample of 6,790 women and 7,122 men, to assess associations between physical, sexual, and psychological abuse and the current and long term physical and psychological effects in men and women.

Results indicated that psychological and physical abuse were associated with much the same outcomes and had similar effects for both men and women.

The authors cautioned that it is possible male victims were also perpetrators and their mental health status resulted from inflicting abuse rather than from being victimized; this same hypothesis was not presented for women. NB. This inference is also present in the 2002 report by David Gadd to the Scottish Executive into male victims of DV. <http://www.scotland.gov.uk/cru/resfinds/crf61-00.asp>.

An emergency clinic in Philadelphia found that 12.6% of all male patients over a thirteen week period (N =866) were victims of domestic violence. These patients reported having been kicked, bitten, punched, or choked by female intimate partners in 47% of cases and 37% reported a weapon being used against them (Mechem, Shofer, Reinhard, Hornig, & Datner, 1999). The authors reported that the numbers would have been higher except for the fact that they had A). stopped counting after midnight and B). screened out "major trauma" cases (ie life threatening ?) which could have upped the percent injured by female partners.

Research conducted at an emergency clinic study in Ohio (Vasquez & Falcone, 1997) revealed that 72% of men admitted because of spousal violence they had been stabbed.

The most frequent cause of admission for women victims was assault (53%). The authors reported that burns obtained in intimate violence were as frequent for male victims as female victims. As this study demonstrates, community samples, unless they require subjects to self-report as crime victims, show a different and more equivalent pattern of violence by gender than that alleged by the radical feminist perspective. NB. The implication is that a husband will not want to report his wife's violence to the police to save his own embarrassment and avoid her being arrested, persecuted or jailed

The argument is sometimes made that men use threats more frequently than women but Straus, Hamby, Boney-McCoy, and Sugarman (1996) found that women reported using somewhat more psychological aggression than did men. The sub-heading entitled "threatened to hit or throw something at partner" of which it is a part., correlated .52 with this scale.

Also, Giordano, Millhonin, Cernkovich, Pugh, and Rudolph (1999) in a study of 721 young adults found that women were more likely than men to threaten to use a knife or gun.

Feminist authors also allege that females are universally more vulnerable to abuse by men than men are to abuse by women, this perspective also has found only mixed support.

Several studies indicate male victims are as likely (e.g., Hines & Saudino, 2003) or significantly more likely (e.g., George, 1999) than female victims to experience assaults involving the use of weapons (e.g., Brown, 2004; Buzawa & Buzawa, 1990, 1996). George separated kicking and punching in his

nationally representative sample and recommended that disaggregating these variables might be an important methodological improvement. Given women's lesser upper body strength in comparison to males it is conceivable they are more likely to use their legs during an altercation (see Basile, 2004).

Pimlatt-Kubiak and Cortina (2003) carried out a large scale (N =16,000) study of gender differences in traumatic reactions to intimate violence, stalking, and emotional abuse. Arguing that earlier studies had focused too specifically on PTSD, the authors broadened their assessment of trauma reactions and found eight distinct profiles of exposure experience, gender, and mental and physical health.

No meaningful interactive effects of gender and interpersonal aggression were found once lifetime exposure to aggressive events was adequately taken into account.

The authors concluded that their findings argued against theories of greater female vulnerability to pathological outcomes.

Regardless of the variations in the studies, two conclusions seem reasonable: (1) women are injured more than men, and (2) men are injured too, and are not immune to being seriously injured. Simply because the injury rates are lower, men should not be denied protection.

In the best studies, with the largest and most representative samples (i.e. community or epidemiological), presented without a "crime victim" filters on the data, violence rates perpetrated by female are higher than male rates (see Archer, 2000a; Douglas & Straus, 2003; Ehrensaft et al., 2004; Magdol et al., 1997; Morse, 1995 inter alia).

Also, in the largest study done on effects of abuse, no gender differences were found (Pimlatt-Kubiak & Cortina, 2003). Since these data sets are contradictory to feminist theory, they have been suppressed, ignored, or explained away.

11. Back to the context of violence

The vague but catch-all attack on the CTS has been premised on its alleged "failure to examine context" (see Dobash & Dobash, 1979; Propper, 1997; inter alia). NB This is a most important tenet that must be grasped in order to comprehend why feminist research is not empirical or objective research and cannot be thought of as reliable, detached or universal. It is not acceptable to go back to the respondent and to ask for greater clarification or elaboration on various points, nor to ask respondents how they 'felt' about certain aspects.

Nonetheless, in order to answer such criticism, some of the above studies did ask both male and female perpetrators their motives for violence, thus supplying some "context".

Those studies (e.g., Bland & Orn, 1986; DeKeseredy & Schwartz, 1998; Follingstad et al., 1991) clearly showed that self-defence was a minor motive for female violence.

Similarly, the notion that abuse stems from "power" and "control" by males is contradicted by the Stets (1991) study that showed no gender difference in the amount of control exhibited in dating relationships.

Cascardi and Vivian (1995) evaluated the context of the worst incidents reported by 62 couples in marital treatment who reported at least one incident of marital aggression (NB 'worst incidents reported'). The authors found "in most cases, marital aggression appears to reflect an outgrowth of conflict between both partners" (p. 265) (see also Jacobson et al., 1994).

Work and financial stress was the most frequently reported background (context) stressor. Only 5% of aggressive wives attributed their aggression to self-defence, while 50% attributed it to their own anger or wish to coerce. Therefore in actuality, 'context' does not really support feminist self-defence views

about female aggression. Female violence is not somehow always reactive in one form or another because the data shows otherwise.

12. Greater fear by female victims

Feminists have long alleged that 'fear of violence' is as important to combat as actual violence and much legislation has addressed to this point. As for the claim or argument about "greater fear", there are three problems with the proposition.

The first is that males are taught by sex role conditioning not to admit fear. They are also taught from a tender age to protect and not to 'pick on' the vulnerable that includes women.

The second problem is that fear is engendered in women as a consequence of violence. The feminist view is that all male violence is designed to generate fear to enable coercion of female. But the notion of greater female fear, even if accepted at face value, cannot explain the high rates of female initiated violence.

Thirdly, men have rarely had their fears of female violence assessed

With regards the first point, i.e. sex role conditioning and not to admit fear. Fasteau, 1974; Goldberg, in 1979, and Malloy et al in 2003 cited (inter alia) a sample of only ten men in the Dasgupta study to make the argument that women are more fearful of male perpetrated abuse than men are of female perpetrated abuse.

They also rely on a Cantos, Neidig, and O'Leary study (1994), which was a sample drawn from a men's treatment group and hence, not representative of community samples (i.e. self-selecting).

Brown (2004) found that women had quite different perceptions of danger than men (even among those who had self-selected for dangerous occupations). Brown estimated that women were twice as likely to fear death from a partner as men adjusted for objective probability of being killed (p. 12). Hence, women may over react to objective threats, men probably under react.

The research support for greater female fear also comes from Jacobson et al. (1994) who found that "only husband violence produces fear in the partner" (p. 986). This finding was based on reactions of women in 60 abusive couples who interacted in a research lab.

However, Dutton and his colleagues (Dutton, Webb, & Ryan, 1994; Strachan & Dutton, 1992) found that women reported greater fear to exposure to any family conflict video. Women use a fear scale in a more extreme fashion than do men.

The fear they reported had no possible connection to personal danger in the Dutton studies.

Furthermore, in the Jacobson et al study, women demonstrated higher levels of belligerence than did the men. Finally "according to the wives themselves, almost half would have qualified for our DV group if wife violence had been the criterion" (p. 983). Yet this study and several others stemming from this laboratory focused exclusively on types of abusive husbands.

The second problem - that of fear as the consequences of violence - was tackled by, for example, DeKeseredy & Schwartz, 1998; Follingstad et al., (1991) where the data suggested that the motivational profile for use of violence by either gender is far more complex than imagined.

The question for feminists therefore remains how to begin explaining away the research that clearly indicates high levels of female violence. Not only that, but to explain why much of it is aimed against non-violent males and which cannot be classified as self-defence. How can that form of unprovoked violence be different from similar male violence?

How can male violence still be depicted as being in pursuit of power and control when female violence is also frequent and, according to the women themselves, not defensive? The answer, of course, is that feminists still view males as having power, whereas, Coleman and Straus (1986) showed male dominant couples were only 9.4% of U.S. families.

Another confounding factor is that the new generation of men and women, i.e. those currently aged 16 to 34, will have grown up in a feminist influenced environment of school and media. Their profile no longer fits the feminist stereotypes of male dominance of the 1970s. Yet the present era and generation, currently aged 16 to 34, is the most violent measured. Despite these obvious developments, radical feminist models, paradigms, stereotypes and theory in general have not been adjusted or moved with the times.

The third problem area, namely that men have rarely had their fear of female violence assessed can, in the absence of proper research, at the moment best be answered by examining calls on domestic violence hotlines for men.

The first national (U.S) domestic violence hotline for men was established in 2000 and a study by Hines, Brown, and Dunning (in 2003) examined its calls from men (www.noexcuse4abuse.org). As the authors pointed out, it would be unlikely for male perpetrators or co-perpetrators to use this line.

When the line first was opened it received one call a day. When it was advertised in state telephone directories, it began to receive 250 calls a day. Given that 2.6 million men are victims of severe violence (Straus & Gelles, 1992), this usage increase is to be expected.

All but a few callers experienced physical abuse from their female partners (only 4% were gay), and a substantial minority feared their partners' violence and were stalked.

Over 90% experienced controlling behaviours, and several men reported frustrating experiences with the domestic violence system with 52.4% of males who were currently in an abusive relationship. Data indicated that men were fearful that their female partners would cause a serious injury if she found out that they had called the help-line. This serious injury potential can be summed up in this quote, "According to qualitative accounts, several physical attacks were reported to have occurred to the groin area".

Callers reported forms of violence that are not measured in surveys or incorporated into any CTS2, such as having their partner try to drive over them with a car, or run them down on the street (NB. Or being set on fire).

Twenty-nine percent of men reported being stalked by their female partners. Callers' reports indicated that their female abusers had a history of trauma, alcohol/drug problems, mental illness, and homicidal and suicidal ideations.

The study authors concluded that the "system in place to prevent IPV (inter-personal violence, more usually known as DV) re-victimizes these men and hence, no help is available for half the population" (p. 21). The violent actions reportedly experienced by these men are listed in Table 3 below.

Table 3. Types of "Female Violence" reported by callers to a domestic abuse hotline for men

Type of physical aggression	Sample size; n=158 men who were asked this series of questions	
	% Who experienced it (n)	
Slapped/Hit	43.7%	(69)
Pushed	41.8%	(66)
Kicked	39.2%	(62)
Grabbed	31.0%	(49)
Punched	24.7%	(39)
Choked	22.2%	(35)

Spit on	9.5%	(15)
Stabbed	1.9%	(3)
Scratched	1.3%	(2)

Table 3. Con't

Type of controlling behaviours (n=155 men who were asked this series of questions)

Does your partner try to control you? 94.8% (147)

Of those who were controlled, how were they controlled?

Through coercion and threats	77.6%	(114)
Through emotional abuse	74.1%	(109)
Through intimidation	63.3%	(93)
Through blaming, minimizing, and denying	59.9%	(88)
Through manipulating the system	50.3%	(74)
Through isolation	41.5%	(61)
Through economic abuse	38.1%	(56)
Through the children (n=107)	64.5%	(69)

Note: The types of controlling behaviours were coded according to the Power and Control Wheel of the Duluth Model. Table 2 from Hines et al. (2003). Used with permission.

It should be noted that the figures in this table are not representative of national samples any more than figures from battered women's shelters are representative of women in the general population. The point is that the feminist paradigm has kept psychopathology away from the explanations for domestic violence and has largely precluded asking about male fears.

NB. What should worry the reader is the manipulative manner of control at 94% especially the use of isolation, of children and 'manipulating the system' by which is probably meant the law and order agencies.

13. The Archer study

The most comprehensive study on gender differences in intimate violence was conducted by Archer (2000a). This was a meta-analytic⁴ study that examined combined results from 82 independent studies (including the National Violence Against Women Survey) where data were available for comparing gender rates of abuse perpetration.

Based on the combined data across the studies (a combined data sample of 64,487), women were slightly more likely than men to use physical abuse (defined using the CTS) against an intimate partner (effect size or $dV = .05$).

This was true whether or not outliers were removed or whether studies with a ceiling 'n of 800' were considered to off-set swamping of the outcome by studies with huge samples. (NB. This is a sentence and a few of the following are of a technical nature which none but those in the social sciences will fully understand).

⁴Meta-analysis is the process or technique of synthesizing (i.e. combining) many research results by using various statistical methods to retrieve, select, and combine results from previous separate but related studies.

Samples from shelters were unrepresentative of community samples, since, by definition they were male violent-female victim samples. This was not true of community samples. As with the dating samples reported above, the younger the sample, the higher the level of female violence relative to male violence. Medical treatment for injuries across studies revealed an effect size of $+0.08$, with women being slightly more likely than men to seek treatment (Archer, 2000a). Neither the use of violence nor medical treatment resulted in a large effect size. An effect size of $dV=0.08$ is less than 1/10 of a standard deviation difference between genders.

Given the methodology employed by Archer, his work has to be considered the “gold standard” of studies in gender usage of violence. Archer’s main results (Archer, 2000a, ref: Table 3) are re-produced below in Table 4.

Table 4 Sex differences in partner aggression (Archer’s Table 3, 2000a)

Study	d	CI	p	k	Qw	p	N men	N women
Composite								
All studies	-.05	-.07 / -.04	<.0001	82	183.1	<.0001	30,434	34,053
Outliers removed _a	-.05	-.07 / -.04	<.0001	75	99.0	.05	29,251	32,605
All studies, with ceiling								
N=800 _b	.07	-.09 / .05	<.0001	82	57.4	<.0001	12,708	14,715
Self								
All studies	-.12	-.14 / -.10	<.0001	81	278.4	<.0001	24,635	28,358
Outliers removed _c	-.14	-.17 / -.12	<.0001	67	88.9	.06	18,079	21,511
All studies with ceiling								
N=800 _b	-.16	-.18 / -.13	<.0001	81	206.0	<.0001	12,793	16,344
Partner								
All studies	-.016	-.03 / .00	.05	75	311.3	<.0001	27,396	30,574
Outliers removed _d	-.09	-.11 / -.07	<.0001	61	78.2	.11	12,450	14,712
All studies with ceiling								
N=800 _b	-.04	-.07 / -.02	<.0001	75	217.6	<.0001	11,910	14,595
Injury								
All studies _e	.15	.12 / .18	<.0001	17	107.1	<.0001	7,011	7,531
Outliers removed _f	.08	.04 / .11	<.0001	13	19.3	.08	5,487	5,787
All studies with ceiling								
N=800 _b	.17	.12 / .22	<.0001	17	88.7	<.0001	2,984	3,349
Medical treatment								
All studies	.08	.04 / .12	<.0001	14	64.8	<.0001	4,936	6,323
Outliers removed _g	.05	.01 / .09	<.01	10	16.7	.05	4,204	5,528
All studies with ceiling								
N=800 _b	.11	.05 / .16	<.0001	14	62.2	<.0001	2,440	2,925

Meta-analyses of studies summarized to show sex differences in physical aggression, for composite, self-, and partner reports, in injuries, and in injuries requiring medical treatment. Note: Table 3 from Archer (2000a). Used with permission.

Archer cites the norms regarding use of violence, the so-called “acceptance norm” repeatedly cited by Dobash and Dobash (1978). This is not only contradicted by the evidence of what constitutes violence.

but is also contrary Dobash's norms for against physical aggression to women. NB a definition and usage that resembles a one way street?

Studies by Stark and McEvoy (1970) and others (eg Simon et al., 2001; Straus et al., 1980) have consistently found norms against wife assault. As Dutton (1994) and Dutton and Hemphill (1992) pointed out, court mandated male batterers typically under-report violence, indicating guilt or shame about their violence not an "acceptance of violence" norm.

A subsequent analysis of these data (Archer, 2002) in which violence was disaggregated into discrete acts, found that women were more likely than men to slap, bite, kick, punch, or hit with an object. Men were more likely to beat-up or choke and strangle, although "a substantial minority of endorsements of 'beat up' and 'choke or strangle' involved women perpetrators" (p. 339). Gender differences ranged from 'very small to medium'.

Samples selected for marital problems showed large effects in the male perpetrator direction, student samples showed effects more in the female direction than community samples.

The patterns of findings did not differ whether it was based on the perpetrator or the victim who were reporting. Archer concluded that 'concern with the (female) victims in such cases is certainly not misplaced but regarding them as the only victims of partner violence is too narrow a view of the problem according to the present findings' (Archer 2002, p. 340).

14. Escalation

The treasured feminist cannon, namely that male violence will escalate if unchecked appears to have no empirical support whatsoever.

Feld and Straus (1990) found data that argued against escalation by conducting one year follow ups of 420 respondents of the 1985 survey. In fact, the evidence supported de-escalation more than escalation. Johnson (1995) re-analysed previous data and found that, among husbands who had perpetrated no acts of minor or severe violence in year one (the year prior to the 1985 interview), only 2.6% had moved to severe violence in year two. Among those that committed at least one act of minor violence, only 5.8% had moved to severe violence, among those who had committed severe violence in year 1, 30.4% had repeated severe violence in year two, and 69.6% had de-escalated.

Johnson concluded that the data favoured de-escalation more than escalation.

NB By inverse reasoning, the US has for 20 years federally funded perpetrator programmes but now conclude that their re-education and Duluth et al regime do not work for those who are the main offenders, i.e. the younger age groups and /or those who are compulsives. Though this group shows a marginal change there is no increase in the incident rate. Among the minority middle-to-older generations there is a noticeable change and subsequent less re-offending.⁵

15. Patriarchal terrorism

The argument is sometimes made that males 'terrorise' women in a fashion that is not found with female perpetrators.

⁵"Do batterer programs work ? Two studies" Sept 2003. NIJ part of the Dept of Justice. This report is based on a longer research report: *Batterer Intervention Programs: Where Do We Go From Here?* By Shelly Jackson, Lynnette Feder, David R. Forde, Robert C. Davis, Christopher D. Maxwell, and Bruce G. Taylor, Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Justice, National Institute of Justice, June 2003, NCJ 195079.

Setting aside the Stets and Straus data for a moment, the argument could be made that those males who do use Severe Abuse against non-violent or minimally violent women generate a state of terror and domination that is not equally reflected by female perpetrators.

NB This feminist paradigm of domestic violence hinges on this crucial concept of double standards and wholly different impact on victims, i.e. the female victim is terrified but the male victim cannot be or never is simply because he is a male.

In a highly cited article, Johnson (1995) argued for a distinction between “common couple violence” and “patriarchal terrorism”. Why any serious debate ensued from this obviously misconceived view remains a mystery. Johnson discussed the issue of patriarchal terrorism mainly to show that evidence for it from community samples was scant. The idea of ‘patriarchal terrorism’ seems more likely to be found in samples drawn from shelter samples (that are non-representative) than from the more fully representative samples taken from the community at large. So it is not surprising that the alleged ‘patriarchal terrorism’ syndrome/phenomenon is more likely to be found in one sample rather than another. Nevertheless, data from shelter sources is not totally useless; there are some useful conclusions that can be gingerly drawn from them.

Time has moved on and so too has the question. The question has now become whether, over time, the never-existent patriarchal terrorism profile has simply degenerated into a propaganda stereotype?

Patriarchal terrorism is not representative of men, not even of intimately violent men.

Why is rejection of the stereotypical patriarchal terrorism so valid? Because the Johnson et al debate completely overlooked the Stets and Straus data from Table 1. This showed female severe violence towards non-violent (or minimally violent) males to be more prevalent than “patriarchal terrorism”. Stets and Straus showed that over-arching female violence was 3 times as common as any over-arching male violence that might fashionably be termed ‘patriarchal terrorism’.

The data Stets and Straus presented (first in 1989 and again in 1992) clearly showed that a female severe violence towards male minor pattern was about 12%, and female severe violence towards a male’s non-violence was 11.8%. This was three times the incidence of alleged “patriarchal terrorism” (i.e. male severe violence to female minor or none).

Hence, while an academic debate raged about whether “common couple violence” existed, unilateral violence stemming from females and impacting men and children was completely overlooked.

This, Dutton argues, is another effect of the feminist paradigm; it misdirects attention (see Kuhn, 1965). It has had the effect of perpetuating the high incidence of child abuse and child homicides.

Erin Pizzey has coined the terms ‘family terrorists’ and ‘emotional terrorists’; these neatly sums up what both sexes can do inside intimate relationships.

“Those of us working in the field of domestic violence are confronted daily by the difficult task of working with women in problematical families. In my work with family violence, I have come to recognize that there are women involved in emotionally and/or physically violent relationships who express and enact disturbance beyond the expected (and acceptable) scope of distress. Such individuals, spurred on by deep feelings of vengefulness, vindictiveness, and animosity, behave in a manner that is singularly destructive; destructive to themselves as well as to some or all of the other family members, making an already bad family situation worse. These women I have found it useful to describe as ‘family terrorists.’ In my experience, men also are capable of behaving as ‘family terrorists’ but male violence tends to be more physical and explosive. ..” ‘WORKING WITH VIOLENT WOMEN’, by Erin Pizzey”⁶

⁶See also, “A Terrorists Within the Family”, by Erin Pizzey

NB. Violent and or terroristic women is a completely new area of inquiry outside the scope of this paper so we will continue to concentrate on male violence and the feminist paradigm.

According to the Stets and Straus data, the sub-group that could be called patriarchal terrorists represents a minority of severely intimately violent men (about 33%).

This figure is based solely on violence patterns where the figure for male predominant and/or-Male Severe violence towards Female None or Minor violence is divided by the Mutually Severe pattern of male violence.

According to the Straus surveys, 2/3 of this minority, i.e. categorised as 'severely violent men' would repeat this potentially terroristic pattern.

This would mean that 7.7% of all men who are severely violent in a given year (2/3rd of 11.3%) would be potential intimate terrorists, i.e. would use severe violence repeatedly (Straus & Gelles).

For the 'general population' (sometimes referred to as community samples), that would be less than 3% of all men (Straus & Gelles, 1992: p. 118). The calculations are: 7.7%_33% male predominant violence rate for men (compared to mutually violent and female predominantly violent couples).

Dutton found only about 20% of men in a court mandated treatment sample met the criteria for terrorism (defined as severe male violence, plus threats and sexual violence reported by the wife).

Those men that met the criteria had significantly higher likelihood of having a personality disorder than those who did not.

Of men convicted of wife assault, about 1/5 would qualify as terrorists.

Men who qualify as patriarchal / family terrorism are a secondary sub-group of a primary sub-group who, in turn, are a sub-set of men who use violence against their spouse or partner (Straus & Gelles, 1992

Men who use extreme violence in the principal sub-set account for 8%. Men in the primary sub-group, i.e. who are arrested and/or convicted account for 10% of the 8%. Men who qualify in the secondary sub-group i.e. patriarchal / family terrorist total 20% of the resultant figure.

In other words, about one in 200 men arrested for partner abuse would qualify for the patriarchal terrorist test.

However, this "stereotype" labelling of male violence is commonplace (see Pagelow, 1992; Walker, 1984, 1989; Yllo, 1988) and is thus used indiscriminately to label all forms of male violence.

As a result of the feminist 'gender paradigm', the debate over Johnson's (1995) study became bogged down in comparing a group that constitutes about 3% of intimate violence per year with another that constitutes 38.8% of violence in married couples and 45% of violence in co-habiting couples (Stets & Straus, 1992a, 1992b p.234).

The remaining (female only) violent group (about 12%) never entered the debate.

It is questionable whether intervention programmes for these 'terrorist' groups should be structured in the same way as others who use violence in an intimate context. The two groups would differ in dangerousness, dynamics of violence, the presence of personality disorder, and therapy of choice.

They are extreme and non-representative. NB. The observations at footnote 5, above, regarding the failure of NIJ programmes (US National Institute of Justice, June 2003, NCJ 195079) would indicate this to be the case.

Instead, we should improve our ability to detect and intervene more effectively with real patriarchal terrorists, develop triage assessments to separate them from other arrested men, and respond in a less

politically-driven and more psychologically sophisticated fashion to the continuum that represents the various patterns of violence

16. Feminist belief perseverance

Feminist core beliefs about domestic violence rest entirely on the following blind assertions:

- o that most men are violent (and all have a latent propensity)
- o that women's violence is only in self-defence
- o that male violence escalates and
- o that women are by far, the most injured.

As we have seen throughout this paper that has reviewed all the data something very different is revealed. Contrary to the bullet points just made both genders use violence.

Women, we can see, use violence against non-violent men, and that it is more likely for violence to de-escalate than for it to escalate. We can see survey results unequivocally confirm that both groups (men and women) are injured, with women somewhat more likely to experience negative outcomes.

To persist, sometimes obstinately, in believing in one's own bigotry, prejudices and value systems are rightly described as "belief perseverance".

This "belief perseverance" has been refined into a process and is used extensively against new data sets in order (as in a rear guard action) to maintain a feminist paradigm.

This second feminist paradigm include the following:

- o first, to deny female violence while generalizing male violence patterns from the "patriarchal terrorist" group to all batterers and in some cases, all men (disconfirmed by the Straus surveys).
- o Secondly, to attack the Straus surveys for ignoring the "context of violence":
- o Thirdly suggesting that females were using violence defensively (disconfirmed by Stets and Straus and other studies cited above,)
- o Fourthly, that females were substantially more injured (disconfirmed by Archer).
- o Fifthly, when all of these conceptual shields then fail, the final step is to attack quantitative research in general (e.g. Bowman, 1992; Yllo, 1988).

17. Paradigm perpetuation

In order to perpetuate and protect their 'gender paradigm', feminists have been forced to construct counter arguments.

The defensive argument comes in by way of a bizarre and unsupportable interpretation of data. For instance Arias, Dankwort, Douglas, Dutton, and Stein (2002) completely misreported the Stets and Straus data.

Arias et al., quoting Stets and Straus (1992a) as a source, claimed "women were seven to fourteen times more likely to report that intimate partners had beaten them up, choked them, threatened them with weapons, or attempted to drown them" (p. 157).

Of course, Stets and Straus say no such thing. There is no action-by-action analysis reported (such as choking or drowning) and they conclude that male and female violence rates are identical.

Other instances include:

Jacobson (1994), who totally ignored the violent women in their sample⁷; Malloy et al. (2003) explains away the Dunedin data of Magdol *et al.* as “victimized women were ten times more likely to perpetrate than non-victimized women and male perpetrators were 19 times more likely to be victimized than non-perpetrator males” (p. 41). The male perpetrators, though, were said to be “more deviant”, so it implied that they started the violence and the fact that female violence is more frequent, is ignored.

Malloy *et al.* cited a study by Dagueta (1999) wherein women who were court ordered for assault were asked about their own motives for violence. But a reading of the eight motives offered by the researcher show they are all self-serving and blame the male.

Moreover, the sample size is a pitiable 32 (N =32). Nevertheless, Malloy *et al.* accept the answers of this forensic population as veridical (truthful) and compare them to male “patterns of coercion” (the basis for “male coercion” is the infamous Duluth Model of Pence & Paymar, 1993). NB. The Duluth Model is made infamous by the use of the Duluth Wheel which provides set answers to interrogator’s questions, e.g. if a man denies DV he is more of a danger than one that admits DV. Thus a probably innocent person is branded more severely than a guilty person.

The Pence and Paymar (1993) “model” is actually a ‘gender-political intervention’ model not one based on empirical evidence - yet, Malloy *et al.* (2003) offer it as empirical evidence.

This is how a paradigm perpetuates itself. At the end of their “review of existing research” Malloy *et al.* cited single results from particular studies, which support their position.

For instance, they noted that in a study by Giordano et al. (1999) of 721 young adults it was found that men were more likely to “beat up a partner with their hands.” What Malloy and colleagues failed to report was that the same study also found that women were more likely to hit or throw something at a partner, hit a partner with an object, or threaten to use a knife or gun.

Similarly when Malloy *et al.* cited Morse (1995) to support the claim that men were more likely to repeatedly beat up their partner during a year they did not cite Douglas and Straus (2003) who found the exact opposite.

Eventually, in this welter of contradictory findings, Malloy *et al.* fall back on the last ditch arguments of the feminist position; this is that women are more troubled by intimate victimization and the “context” of violence is not adequately studied.

The statement by Dobash *et al.* (1992) that the research studies did not conform to their clinical experience is another example of what Lord et al. (1979) found in their studies of flawed social cognition called “belief perseverance.”

What is the point of scientific investigation if non-confirmation is a given?

NB. It could be argued, ‘Which is more scientific; examining a self-selecting clinical sample, or examining a random cross-section?’

Another manifestation of the process called ‘groupthink’ is the tendency to label any dissenters as ‘reactionary’ regarding women’s rights (e.g., Faludi, 1981; Worcester, 2002).

NB. This is an interesting ‘giveaway’ at a psychological, mindset and lexicographic level. It hints of political affiliations and overtones. Although a distinct topic worthy of separate investigation the

⁷Arias subsequently acknowledged this finding was from the NVAWS; however, no qualifiers were given in the original paper about differential gender reporting in that survey.

phrase 'reactionary' would more likely be used to besmirch an opponent by someone of left-wing leanings than someone with right wing views. This points us in the direction of Marxist dialectics as the true origin of feminist thought. But the exchange of logical arguments is not what feminism is all about. Feminism and Marxism are alike in hiding their true agendas that is the seeking and wresting of power for themselves.

In true slogan terms of "the ends justify the means", the over use of the concept of 'equality' is merely a handy vehicle to gain backdoor entry for their ends. It will take a substantial effort for society to realise that radical feminism is an aficionado of morally wrong actions sometimes being necessary to achieve what is seen for a minority as morally right outcomes.

Worcester (2002) described the "anti-feminist backlash", which she equates with the "anti-domestic violence movement", as picking up on "conflict tactics"-type studies (her quotations) and hints at "limitations and dangers of a gender-neutral approach to anti-violence work".

NB. It is tragic that someone with a supposed academic background can misunderstand/distort what is plain to even the lay reader who does not have to be convinced of the idea that a large gender-neutral approach to anti-violence work is always the best path to chose.

In other words, Worcester believes that anyone who believes that violence performed by females might exist is 'anti-feminist' and 'anti-domestic violence' movement.

The notion of backlash reduces all dissent to reactionary anxiety driven fear of loss of power by the 'out-group' (males/dissenters) while maintaining the illusion of moral perfection of the 'in-group', This is a critical pre-condition for successful 'groupthink' (Janis, 1982).

This projection onto the 'out-group' (all dissenters) becomes a technique of stifling dissenting views about the interpretation of intimate violence data, i.e. DV issues.

Such a position, of course, becomes epistemologically equivalent to religious belief in that it requires no empirical confirmation in order to guarantee its ability to survive and persevere.

It is really an epistemological cop-out; an unwillingness to admit that feminist theory cannot account for an accumulating set of empirical studies.

18. Conclusion

The findings reported above can not all be dismissed as by-products of a measurement issue.

Even government 'victimization' surveys in which men under-report, still find sizeable numbers of male victims.

Conflict studies, which are more sensitive, produce roughly equal perpetration rates by gender.

However, a question remains from the review of these studies, namely, why do government surveys consistently find that women use less violence and are more injured, while independent studies find that women use more violence and are only slightly more likely to be injured?

It may be that this difference is just the differential 'crime victim' filter problem discussed above.

It may also be that government agencies (more than independent researchers) pattern and interpret their research in a way more allied with feminist defined causes.

NB This is more than a possibility in Britain given the number of reports funded by government departments and the gender and known affiliations of the report authors.

One detects a tendency to dismiss male victimization in reports where the female victimization rate is higher. It raises the question as to why this comparison is so often made.

If group B is victimized less than Group A, it is nevertheless being victimized and the social mandate should be to reduce victimization of all citizens, not just certain groups. NB. This is the excuse given repeatedly by Baroness Scotland for government not acting to help male victims of DV in Britain.

We would not accept this argument for any other pair of groups. Although women may be injured at a higher rate, men are injured as well. The inevitable conclusion is that feminist theory on intimate violence is flawed. It cannot accept the reality of female violence.

While male violence is viewed as never justified, female violence is viewed as always justified. The data does not support this double standard.

Women commit intimate violence frequently and do not do so only in self-defence. A more reasonable interpretation of the data from these numerous studies would be that people (not just men) use violence in intimate relationships and use whatever form they have learned will be effective.

Men, having greater upper body strength use direct physical violence more than women. Women use weapons more often than men to generate an advantage (see also Morse, 1995).

The negative effects of disregarding male victimization by intimate violence include a re-enactment of the age of denial displayed toward female victimization in the early 1970s. Quite rightly feminists complained in those days about the 'denial' factor. They should be moved with a sense of justice, if not utter embarrassment, to accept that it is now their turn to be 'in denial' about male victims.

Secondly, the risk to children from female child abuse is seriously underestimated in the literature (but not in the data). From the perspective of child safety, this needs more attention. NB. The statistics in every westernised nations point out clearly how deadly and dangerous female violence can be, but in reviews of behaviour for custody issue or DV surveys this lethality is never mentioned

Thirdly, feminists are interfering with the delivery of effective treatment intervention through state laws or policy that holds up the gender based but ineffective Duluth Model as the 'intervention' model of choice.

This disadvantages women partnered with men in treatment by precluding the availability of more effective psychologically based treatment. As Ehrensaft et al. (2004) put it, '... studies suggest that this single-sex approach is not empirically supported, because both partners' behaviours contribute to the risk of clinically significant partner abuse, and both partners should be treated. Women's partner abuse cannot be explained exclusively as self-defence against men's partner abuse, because a woman's pre-relationship history of aggression towards others predicts her abuse toward her partner, over and above controls for reports of his abuse towards her' (p. 268).

A dangerous 'in-group-out-group' form of siege mentality has engulfed feminist activists and those researchers who share their dogma (e.g. Audrey Mullender's admission of embracing 'the feminist perspective' in her research of family violence, Regents Park Conference, 2001).

This siege mentality is based on a perceived threat that somehow, services for women will disappear if male victimization is recognised.⁸ It can also be turned against those who raise issues about female violence or intervention are somehow against progressive goals for women's equality.

⁸Women's Aid have known about the problem of male victims for years. In 1992 Sandra Horley, the director of the Chiswick Family Refuge, was quoted by Isabel Wolff as saying, "Refuges for women are struggling to survive, and if we put across this idea that the abuse of men is as great as the abuse of women, then it could seriously affect our funding". (*Domestic Violence: the other side*, The Spectator, 28

That is not the case.

We neither wish, nor believe, that protection for women would be diminished by the above suggestions. We simply hold the view that more effective intervention and treatment could be implemented if a more humanistic, complex, and community mental health model were implemented.

Clearly, the demand for sheltered housing (i.e. refuges) for battered women (i.e. victims of DV) demonstrates that they are still required. What is absent is the non-existence of refuges for battered men (i.e. male victims of DV).

Moreover, outside of North American and Northern Europe, gender inequality is still the norm (Archer). It is incongruous that those countries that have been most 'progressive' about women's equality have witnessed female violence increase as male violence has decreased (Archer).

There is not one solution for every domestically violent situation; some require incarceration of a 'terrorist' perpetrator, others can be dealt with through court-mandated treatment, still others may benefit from couples therapy.

One outcome of this paradigm, that is of feminist inspired 'intervention' standards, is the precluding of therapists in many [US] states from doing effective therapy with male batterers. (where 'batterer' would, in Britain, be understood to mean 'male perpetrator of DV').

The failure to recognize female threat to husbands, female partners, or children is another. Straus et al., 1980 found 10% higher rates of child abuse reported by mothers than by fathers.

The 'one size fits all' policy driven by a simplistic notion that intimate violence is a recapitulation of the Marxist class war does not most effectively deal with this serious problem or represent the variety of spousal violence patterns revealed by research.

At some point, one has to ask whether feminists are more interested in diminishing violence within a population or promoting a political ideology (and the funding it attracts).

If they are interested in diminishing violence, it should be diminished for all members of a population and by the most effective and utilitarian means possible.

This would mean an intervention/treatment approach based on other success-proven approaches from the spheres of criminology and psychology.

ANNEX A

¹The most “patriarchal” sample found to date were Palestinian men (Haj-Yahia, 1998). Even in this sample, 55% agreed that “there is no excuse for a man to beat his wife”. Straus et al. (1980) found a 31% agreement rate in the U.S. to the phrase term “I can think of a situation when it would be appropriate for a husband to slap a wife”. Douglas and Straus (2003), in a cross-national study of 17 nations, found average agreement with the statement “I can think of a situation when it would be appropriate for a husband to slap a wife” to be 45% (that is, 45% did not strongly disagree with that statement). It is arguable whether this item constitutes a measure of approval. Some respondents may believe that slapping cures hysteria or can imagine slapping their spouse to protect their children or in self-defence. We do not know whether this item measures approval or imagination. Simon et al. (2001) collected data from a nationally representative sample of 5,238 adults.

Although the authors concluded, based on a multiple regression that acceptance of interpersonal violence was higher among participants who were male and younger than 35, were non-white, were divorced, separated or had never been married, in fact acceptance rates were low in all samples. Overall about only 9.8% of males (and 7.2% of females) approved of a man hitting a woman even “if she hits him first”. Only 2.1% of men (and 1.4% of females) approved of a man hitting a woman “to keep her in line”. However, with the genders reversed, 33.8% of men approved of a woman hitting a man (if he hits her first), 5% approved of her hitting him (“to keep him in line”). Corresponding figures for female respondents were 27% and 4.4%. The highest acceptance rate for a man hitting a woman “to keep her in line” was 12.9% found in the “Hispanic/Other” category (summed across genders). Apart from reinforcing the finding that the majority of respondents do not approve of intimate violence, the Simon et al. study also underscores the importance of stating the context in the survey question, something that was missing in the Stark and McEvoy study. It also strongly refutes the feminist claim that society accepts violence towards women (see Dobash & Dobash, 1979). An overwhelmingly high percentage of both males and females do not accept violence toward women under any circumstances. To our knowledge, a majority agreeing with the use of physical aggression against a female partner has never been reported.

¹‘Philosophy: Alternatives to Domestic Violence’ //comnet.org/adacss/philosophy.html).

ANNEX B

¹Dobash et al. (1992) criticize all studies using the CTS as misrepresenting intimate violence. One source of criticism is that males and females, within-couples do not agree on the amount of violence used. The implication is that males are under-reporting their use of violence. Straus and Gelles (1992) break down violence rates on the basis of who did the reporting. The largest discrepancy is for males under 25 to underreport wife violence compared to wives reports of own violence. Husbands’ reports of own victimization are only 72% of wives perpetration reports for all assaults. Conversely, husbands’ perpetration reports are 79% of wives victimization reports (p. 553). Wives perpetration reports are 208% of husbands’ victimization reports. Men grossly underreport both perpetration and victimization by severe violence. However, whether violence rates are based on male or female reports, Female Only Violence rates are higher than Male Only violence rates (Stets & Straus, 1992a, 1992b, p. 240). George (2003) discusses the over and under reporting controversy, citing Morse (1995) who showed both sexes tend to underreport serious acts they commit and over report serious acts they suffer. In surveys, using representative community samples, the same results are obtained regarding relative frequency of male and female violence, regardless of whether the respondent is male or female (Stets & Straus, 1992a, 1992b; Douglas & Straus, 2003), hence, lack of agreement by gender, as posed by Dobash and Dobash, is a non-issue.

Acknowledgements:

We would like to thank Kim Bartholomew, Ken Corvo, Richard Felson, Eugen Lupri, John Archer, and Ferrel Christiansen for critical comments on this paper.

References:

Archer, J. (2000a). ‘Sex differences in aggression between heterosexual partners: A meta-analytic review’. *Psychological Bulletin*, 126, 651–680.



Men's Aid provides advice, help, support and information for men suffering abuse. Key areas covered include domestic abuse, family law, human rights and sex discrimination.

Men's Aid also recognises the value of fatherhood and supports the concept of equal parenting where parents work together for and in the best interests of their children.

www.mensaid.com

087 1223 9986

8am to 8pm

7 days a week