

Critique of Kate Orman's article,
"Telling the Truth about Domestic Violence."

by David Fontes, Psy.D., CEAP
5050 Laguna Blvd., Suite 112-400
Elk Grove, CA 95758
e-mail: Spindrift9@aol.com
August 29, 1998

Kate Orman wrote an article on March 24, 1997 entitled Telling the Truth about Domestic Violence this article can be found on her internet web site. She cites domestic violence research which indicates that the percentage of male victims of domestic violence makes up only 5% in the general public. She nevertheless feels that we should help these male victims even if the percentage is small. Apparently she views any discussion which suggests there are far more than 5% male victims of domestic violence in the general population as being "anti-feminist." In this critique of her article, I will address a number of her assertions. In doing so it is not my desire to draw any concern away from the women who have suffered both physical and emotional pain and injury from their male partners every year. Although I did understand a number of Orman's points in her article and agreed with some of them, I also had some questions and comments that warrant a response. My questions and comments are based on the review of the research data on domestic violence that is often ignored or explained away. I sent draft copy of my questions and comments to Kate Orman for her review and comments before presenting this essay.

Orman mentioned that the research of Murray Straus, Richard Gelles, and Suzanne Steinmetz has been used to "attack shelters and services for battered wives as unnecessary or sexist." She references Mildred Pagelow, who indicated that two women's shelters were denied funding because of this information. I am not aware of any shelters that have been closed down or had funds reduced because of the existence of survey data indicating that males and females are assaulting each other at nearly the same rate, or within a range of 35 to 65 percent male victims of domestic violence. The data is used to encourage centers and policy makers to allow existing funding to also be used to help male victims. The language of current legislation that funds shelters only allows the monies to be used for women and children. Pat Overberg, executive director of Valley Oasis Family Violence Shelter in Lancaster, who has the only shelter for heterosexual males in California, shares her frustration that the state funding can only be used to help women and children, not men who are victims and need shelter help. They have to use other funding to help these men.

Comment 1:

As Orman correctly states Straus and his colleagues assert that although the rate of assaultive behavior between husband and wives is nearly the same, wives are 7 to 10 times more likely to report needing to see a doctor as a result of these assaults than men. This ratio comes from the question in the National Family Violence Survey (NFVS) which asks,

“In the last 12 months has either of you been hurt badly enough as a result of a conflict between you to need to see a doctor?” (Stets and Straus, 1990, p.157)

What I found interesting from this study was that the actual percentages of those who reported they needed to see a doctor were very quite small for both wives and husbands who answered “yes” to this question. 3.0% of women who were assaulted reported they needed to see a doctor and 0.4% of men who were assaulted reported they needed to see a doctor. Although these are very small percentages for both women and men, based on *these percentages* the female respondents did show that they were about 7.5 times more likely to report the need to see a doctor than the men.

I recently asked both Straus and Gelles if saying women are 7.5 times more likely to report they “needed to see a doctor” the same as saying women are 7.5 times more likely to be injured than men who are assaulted by their wives? They both indicated no. Gelles wrote to me saying, “...neither Professor Straus nor I can answer this question, since we did not measure injury apart from a need to see a doctor.” They both agreed with me that the research doesn’t tell us if women are seven or ten times more likely to be injured than male victims of domestic violence, only that women were more likely to report a need to see a doctor, based upon the small percentage of women and men who responded affirmatively to this question. They also agreed with me that to determine the level of actual injuries men and women sustain from domestic attacks an “injury index” needs to be developed. Straus told me that there is one in their new Conflict Tactics Scale-2 (CTS-2). So saying women are seven or ten times more likely to be injured than men in domestic violence based on this research is not accurate, but speculative in nature.

There is another question that needs to be answered. If a woman and a man sustain the exact injury, will both be just as likely to report they need to see a doctor? Or will one gender be more likely to seek professional medical attention for injuries? This is why simply looking at hospital reports (archival data) can be misleading. Stets and Straus write that women seek medical attention more often than men in general, “Previous research reveals that, on average, more women than men make visits to physicians and spend time in bed due to illness (Marcus and Siegel, 1982; Verbrugge, 1985). (Stets and Straus, 1990, p. 158)

Stets and Straus also said,

“In general, the differences between women and men victims in terms of the rate of needing to see a doctor, taking time off from work, and being bedridden are not particularly strong or large.” (Stets and Straus, 1990, p.158)

They do suggest there is “some tendency for women to experience more negative effect than men,” and thereby experience more “negative effects on their health,” for severe assaults. (Stets and Straus, 1990, p.158)

Another point that should be made is that, if only 3% of the women reported they needed to see a doctor because of their injuries, shouldn't we still provide domestic violence services for the other 97% of women who might have been assaulted but did not seek medical attention? If we say yes, then might we not also say the same for the 99.6% of men who were assaulted but didn't seek medical attention for their injuries?

It should be noted that hospital records may not be giving an accurate appraisal of actual domestic violence injuries because victims, especially men, may not seek medical attention from hospitals, or may be less inclined to report their injuries as caused by their partners. In a recent article (Sacramento Bee, 1998, August 5) a new study based on the Journal of American Medical Association (JAMA) was featured. It found that 36.9% of all women who reported to the ED for any kind of injury “said they had experienced emotional or physical abuse in their lifetimes by a partner.” Domestic violence workers were quick to state how this report reinforces what they have known from previous studies. Several points need to be made about this JAMA report. First, the report says nothing about the percentage rate of men who have been emotionally or physically abused by their partners in their lifetime? There is no indication that ED workers even asked men the same questions they asked women. Second, the women who answered the survey question may not have come to the ED for a domestic violence injury. The question was not, “are you here today in the ED because of a domestic violence injury?” but “have you experienced emotional or physical abuse from your partner in your lifetime?” Third, the report doesn't tell us what percentage of the domestic violence was between heterosexual or homosexual partners? Finally, doing a survey study in a hospital instead of a representative national survey of the general population has less power to generalize about a phenomenon. Hospital studies can be misleading. For another example, in one of the largest hospital studies, at Henry Ford Hospital in Detroit, Michigan, the questionnaire asked if “at any time” the patient had been a victim of domestic violence. By asking the question in this manner Cook raises the caution that “...the abuse injury was not directly related to the specific hospital emergency visit” (Cook, 1997, p. 4). It appears that a number of studies are more interested in the “emotional and physical” abuse of women than they are of men.

Men do generally have greater muscular strength and therefore are more likely to cause more personal damage to their partners. Yet is this true in all cases, most cases, a few cases, or is it that some husbands are too ashamed to admit that their injuries were caused by their partners, or are they generally less likely to seek medical treatment for themselves when they are injured? The 1985 NFVS data show

that women are 77% more likely to hit with an object when attacking their husbands than husbands are in attacking their wives, and 54% more likely to throw an object at their husbands than husband throw an object at their wives (Straus & Gelles, 1986). The use of an object like a bat, picture frame, metal object, thrown glass at her male partner can equalize the level of injury a husband sustains from his wife even though he might be physically stronger. Cook (1997) warns that the image of a frying pan being hurled at a husband is not “humorous.” He shares a conversation between Erin Pizzey, who started the world’s first women’s shelter, and David Thomas. Pizzey told Thomas that “a significant proportion of the men who are treated for eye injuries received their injuries during domestic violence where glass objects were thrown by their mates” (p. 19).

It can be stated that a man is more likely to have greater ability in restraining the blows of an abusive wife than a woman with her abusive husband, yet a woman may be more likely to assault her husband when he is in a vulnerable position, like sleeping, taking a shower, being attacked from behind (ABC 20/20, 1997, September 19). One man reported to this researcher that his wife crashed a night stand on his face while he was asleep. Pearson (1997) looks at the importance of “will” in partner assault. She writes that at the heart of violence is the human will. In other words, which partner because of disposition, personality, life history, has the will to hurt another person. She believes that what makes domestic violence between partners different than a simple face-to-face boxing match is that there is an intimate relationship between the parties. She writes that “there are relational strategies and psychological issues at work in an intimate relationship that negate the fact of physical strength” (p. 117).

Pearson goes on to say that the most well documented cause of domestic violence for both men and women stems from transfer of learned violence from one generation to the next. She writes that learning violence from parents and siblings has a far stronger influence on a boy or girl than gender conditioning. Pearson (1997) sites two studies (Langhinrich-Rohling, J. et al, 1995 and Malone & Tyree, 1991) which found that boys and girls who were abused by their fathers were more likely to become victims of domestic violence in their adult lives, whereas those who were abused by their mothers were more likely to become perpetrators of domestic violence in their adult lives. Langhinrichsen-Rohling et al., (1995) speculate that this is because “fathers may teach children how to respond to authority,” namely learned helplessness, and “mothers may be more responsible than fathers to teach their children about how to resolve differences and handle conflict,” namely engaging in violence to resolve conflicts (p. 173). Pearson supports this theory by saying that men tend to instill submission in their children, which can contribute to their victimization as adults, while mothers who are abusive toward their children instill aggression as a means of communication with others. This suggests that there is a strong link between child abuse and domestic violence. Other researchers also support the concept that child abuse sets the foundation for future adult violence (Karr-Morse & Wiley, 1997).

Orman mentioned that the National Crime Victimization Survey (NCVS) also states that women are seven times more likely to be injured than male victims. In reading her reference for this from the U.S. Department of Justice, *Violence between Intimates: Domestic Violence, 1994*, I could not find this statement. The article does suggest that women were about twice as likely to receive medical care/hospitalization from injuries sustained from an intimate partner vs. injuries sustained from a stranger. The report did indicate that, in 1992, 70% of murder victims who were killed by intimates were female, 30% were male. The report also states that men received an average prison sentence of 17.5 years for killing their wives, where wives only averaged 6.2 years for killing their husbands.

Comment 2:

Orman writes that Straus, Gelles, and Steinmetz didn't specifically conclude that men and women are equally the victims of domestic violence. I also wouldn't conclude this based on the current data we have, yet Straus' does write,

“ every study among the more than thirty describing some type of sample that is not self-selected (such as community random samples and samples of college student dating couples) has found a rate of assault by women on male partners that is about the same as the rate of assault by men on female partners.”

(Straus, 1997, p. 211)

Steinmetz writes that she

“..found only small differences in the percentage of husband and wives who reported to throwing things, pushing or shoving, hitting with a hand, or hitting with an object. In fact the total violence scores, for these three studies, were very similar. The data from the nationally representative sample (Straus et al., 1977), based on reports of violence that occurred during 1975, found wives to be slightly higher in almost all categories except pushing and shoving. The total violence scores, however, were identical.” (Steinmetz, 1978, pp. 502-503)

Gelles writes,

“...because any discussion of the problem of 'battered men' has been considered 'politically incorrect', there are few, if any, available and effective programs that have been developed for male victims of intimate violence. Thus, even if physicians are successful in identifying male victims, there are few agencies or programs that can be used for referral.” (Gelles, 1996, p. 3)

Although Straus makes it clear that the topic of female assault should not be used to undermine the efforts of feminists who are advocates for battered wives, he also writes in his latest article (1997) “*Physical Assaults by Women Partners: A Major Social Problem*:

“Women must insist on nonviolence from their sisters, just as they rightfully insist on it from men. It is painful to have to recognize the high rate of domestic violence by women... excusing violence by women and denying overwhelming research evidence may have serious side affects. It may contribute to undermining

the credibility of feminist scholarship and contribute to a backlash that can also thwart progress toward the goal of equality between men and women.” (Straus, 1997, pp. 217 & 218)

Comment 3:

In regard to Orman’s comments about the Conflict Tactics Scale (CTS), used in a number of randomized surveys, I have several remarks:

- A. She is correct in saying that the National Family Violence Survey (NFVS), which uses the CTS, does not collect information about the reasons for the assaultive behavior of couples, such as self-defense. In fact, there really hasn’t been much national survey research done in the area of the context of the assaults between partners. Some researchers have indicated that the majority of the assaults by women are for reasons of self-defense (Browne, 1987; Campbell, 1992; Dobash & Dobash, 1979; Pagelow, 1984, Saunders, 1986). Yet many of these studies come from *clinical samples* (archival data) of women who seek services in domestic violence shelters, law enforcement stations and social service agencies. Women may tend to use these services more than men. Yet national surveys do give us some indication of the percentage of those who might be assaulting their partners for reasons other than self-defense.

The 1975 NFVS discovered that 49.5% of the respondents reported the domestic violence was mutual, 27.7% of the violence was by the woman only, and 22.7% was by the man only. This suggests that at least 36% of the assaults that men experience were not from their wives defending themselves. And of the other 64% that is identified as mutual assault, it’s highly unlikely that all of the assaults by the wives were defensive in nature. Langhinrichsen-Rohling et al., (1995) found in their face-to-face couples study that 83% of the domestic violence cases were classified a “bi-directionally or mutually physically aggressive. What may be going on here is more of a dance of violence between couples than only one of the party constantly being the perpetrator and the other solely being the victim. Also in the 1985 study, as reported by women, 52.7% of the women reported they struck the first blow and 42.6% reported that their husbands struck the first blow. Even though this don’t tell us why the women struck the first blow, neither does it tell us the reason the men struck the first blow.

The only national probability survey that specifically asks the question of why the assault took place, comes from the first largest national study of domestic violence in England, 1994. This is what it found:

English Study 1994
Victimization Inflicted

	Women	Men
Total committing assaults:	<u>11%</u>	<u>10%</u>
<u>Reason for Assault</u>		
A. "Get through to..."	53%	64%
B. "Something said or threatened..."	52%	53%
C. "Some physical action..."	21%	27% (Clearly Self-Defense)
D. "Stop doing something..."	33%	43%
E. "Make do something..."	26%	26%
F. "About to use physical action."	17%	21% (Clearly Self-Defense)
G. "Influence of alcohol, etc..."	13%	35%
H. "In character..."	16%	27%
I. "Other"	12%	..7%

(Carrado, et al., 1996)

The first thing to notice about this randomized national study from England is that there really wasn't much difference between men and women in regard to the "reasons" they gave for assaulting their partners. In fact, item "E", which is clearly an assault that would be considered an issue of "power and control", shows 26% of women and 26% of men use violence to make their partner "do something." This surely doesn't support the idea that men are the only ones using power and control over their partners. The authors of the study also identified items "C" and "F" as clearly defensive in nature. This would then suggest that about 80% of assaults by wives on their husbands are for reasons other than self-defense. Those who say that item "B", "Something said or threatened," can be considered a reason for women assaulting their partners in self-defense still have to explain that the same percentage of men said the same thing. Also, most would not excuse a man for hitting his wife because she may threaten to leave him, ruin his career, and take the children never to see them again.

So why do domestic violence workers see something different? Perhaps we need to ask the question: "Which of the following women who assaulted their husbands are more likely to seek help from a domestic violence center, those women who assaulted their husbands "to get through to them" (item A), or those women who had experienced their husbands using "some physical action" against them (item C)? I would suggest that those women who were assaulted by their husbands would seek help from a domestic violence center. Women who assaulted their husbands to make them do something or get through to them are unlikely to seek help from a domestic violence center. One woman told me that, when she did go to a domestic violence center to get help for her anger and assaulting her husband, she had to leave and go elsewhere because she felt they were trying to make her into the victim.

In Canada a social scientist, Reena Sommer, (1994) examined a longitudinal study of Winnipeg residents as part of the Winnipeg Health and Drinking Survey (1989). The survey consisted of "married, cohabiting and remarried males and females between the ages of 18 and 65 years." The data were

collected at two points in time over a two year period. Both phases of the research were each done face-to-face during a “90 minute session which involved a structured interview and a self-administered questionnaire” (Sommer, 1994, p. iv). She found that of the 452 females and 447 males interviewed, 39% of the women and 26% of the men committed acts of violence against their spouses at some time in their relationship, and that 16% of the women and 8% of the men defined those acts as severe in nature. In researching the reasons for the assaults she found that 90% of the women who reported that they were abusive did not strike their male partners in self-defense. Sommer (1992) states on the contrary, they hit, kicked, threw something, and bit their male partners when they were furious, jealous, high on drugs or alcohol, frustrated, in need for control or had impulse problems. She reports that 14% of the men who were attacked needed to go to the hospital. Sommer shares how her study underscores “the need to address the issues of husband battering as a ‘real’ problem and to attempt to rectify the misconception that family violence is a problem of women and children alone” (p. 1321).

Perhaps it would be more accurate for domestic violence centers to say, “Of those women who seek help from our center, most assault their husbands for reasons of self-defense, but this does not include the 80-90% of women who assault their husbands for reasons other than self-defense in the general population, and who never seek our help.”

- B. Orman is correct that the CTS shows that “husbands have a higher rate of the most dangerous and injurious forms of violence (beating up and using a gun)”, at least in the 1975 survey. The question is, by how much more?

NFVS 1975:	Husband as abuser	Wife as abuser
Beat up spouse:	1.1% (517,000)	0.6% (282,000)
Using a knife or gun:	0.3% (141,000)	0.2% (94,000)

About twice as many wives were beaten up by their partners than husbands, but using Straus’ projection formula, there still were approximately 282,000 husbands who were *beaten up* by their wives. This is more than a quarter of a million men. Who is helping these victims of violence? What community services do these men have available to them? And when one looks at the percentage of husbands who have been attacked with a knife or gun (0.2%), it’s not that much different from wives (0.3%) (Straus, 1977, p. 446).

More importantly, what Orman doesn’t say is that the more recent 1985 NFVS shows there has been a change in the percentage of kinds of assaults against men and women. In the study it was found that the percentage differences are nearly the same between men and women:

NFVS 1985	Husband as abuser	Wife as abuser
-----------	-------------------	----------------

Beat up spouse: 0.8% (432,000) 0.6% (324,000)
 Using a knife or gun: 0.2% (108,000) 0.2% (108,000)
 (Straus, 1986, p. 471)

C. Orman writes that violent acts by husbands are repeated more often than violent acts by wives. When one looks at individual types of abuse in the NFVS data this is partially true, but not in all types of assault. In fact, when one looks at the “mean” totals, the wives show a slightly higher repetitive assault rate than husbands, overall violence averaging 10.1 assaults for *female batterers* per year vs. 8.8 assaults for *male batterers* per year. Even for “Severe Violence” the data shows an average of 8.8 assaults by wives per year and 8.0 assaults by husbands per year. The “median” totals show even less of a difference between wives and husbands when it comes to repetitive assaults per year. Straus writes:

“...the mean frequency of occurrence overstates the case because there are a few cases in which violence was almost a daily or weekly event. For this reason, the *median* gives a more *realistic* picture of the typical frequency of violence in violent families.” (Straus, 1977, p. 445)

1975 NFVS Assaults by:	Incidence Rate by Percentage		Frequency			
	Husbands	Wives	Husbands	Wives	Husbands	Wives
Severe Violence Index:	3.8	4.6	8.0	8.9	2.4	3.0
Overall Violence Index:	12.1	11.6	8.8	10.1	2.5	3.0
Minor Assault:						
Threw something at spouse:	2.8	5.2	5.5	4.5	2.2	2.0
Pushed, grabbed, shoved:	10.7	8.3	4.2	3.5	1.6	1.9
Slapped spouse	5.1	4.6	4.2	3.5	1.6	1.9
Severe Assault:						
Kicked, bit, or hit with something:	2.4	3.1	4.8	4.6	1.9	2.3
Hit or tried to hit with something:	2.2	3.0	4.5	7.4	2.0	3.8
Beat up spouse:	1.1	0.6	5.5	3.9	1.7	1.4
Threatened with a knife or gun:	0.4	0.6	4.6	3.1	1.8	2.0
Used a knife or gun:	0.3	0.2	5.3	1.8	1.5	1.5

(Straus, 1977, p.446)

In analyzing the 1985 NFVS as reported by women themselves, Straus writes:

“According to these 495 women, their partners averaged 7.2 assaults during the year, and they themselves averaged 6 assaults. Although the frequency of assault by men is greater than the frequency of assault by women, the difference is just short of being statistically significant....the fact that the average number of assaults by male partners is higher should not obscure the fact that the violent women carried out an average of 6 minor and 5 severe assaults per year, indicating a repetitive pattern by women as well as by men.”

(Straus, 1997, p. 215)

D. It is true that the CTS researchers in general suggest that “women are locked into marriage to a much greater extent than men...and they often have no alternative to putting up with beatings by their husbands.” These are the opinions of a number of researchers, and for a number of women this is tragically true. Yet, because most of our attention has been given to listening to the female victims of domestic violence, this doesn’t mean that men may not also feel “locked” into an abusive marriage. The research does suggest that women are more likely to be assaulted once they leave a relationship, and this is a fearful prospect for a woman to face - either continuing to live in an abusive relationship, or leaving and facing possible greater injury or even death. And for the more severe cases of domestic violence, I would agree that women are at greater risk of retaliation from estranged spouses. Yet the male victims that I have interviewed, as well as those interviewed by Dr. Carole Hammond-Saslow (180 male victims), Phil Cook, Suzanne Steinmetz and others also feel locked into abusive relationships. Their greatest fear is losing an equal portion of time with their children. Men may have this fear more than women who leave abusive relationships, especially given our current family court system. Dr. Hammond-Saslow informed me that the male victims she interviewed gave many of the same reasons for not leaving their abusive wives that wives give for not leaving abusive husbands, including economic and religious reasons. Today’s woman is earning more than her mother or grandmother did years ago. Twenty years ago Steinmetz said that there are some sexist assumptions when it comes to who is more locked into an abusive relationship. She reminds the reader that when a man leaves a relationship he is typically still responsible for a “certain amount of economic support of the family in addition to the cost of a separate residence for himself.” She made the point that the wife typically is given custody of the children, which includes child care support from the father. She writes,

“Interviews with abused men suggest that leaving the family home means leaving many hours of home involvements, family rooms, dens, workshops, in other words the comfortable and familiar, that which is not likely to be reconstructed in a small apartment.” (Steinmetz, 1978, p. 506)

I would emphasize the fact that losing primary custody of their children to the wives who abused them is a tragedy that a number of male victims are still suffering. One man told me that the blows he received from his wife are not nearly as painful as the attacks with which she now assaults him - namely the lack of visitation with his children, which she often controls.

Comment 4.

Orman shared some of the criticism leveled at the Conflict Tactics Scale (CTS) itself. Every research instrument has both strengths and weaknesses, and the CTS is no exception. To the critics of the CTS, Straus writes,

“Like all tests and scales, the CTS is not perfect. Nevertheless, numerous reviews by scholars, who do not have a vested interest in blaming the messenger for the

bad news, agree that the CTS is the best available instrument (Grotevant & Carlson, 1989; Hertzberger, 1991). Its use in many studies since 1973 has established its validity and reliability. New evidence on validity and reliability is published almost monthly by research scholars who are using the CTS in many countries. No other scale meets this standard. Finally, no matter what one thinks of the CTS, at least four studies that did not use the CTS also found roughly equal rates of violence by women.” (Straus, 1997, p. 218)

I don't believe Straus would seriously object to three points of criticism Dobash and Dobash raise about the CTS:

A. The CTS only focuses on verbal, emotional, and physical abuse. It doesn't ask about rape or sexual assault, which is a form of physical abuse. If I might make a comment here, in interviewing the male victims in my study, I was surprised by the number of men who were also sexually assaulted by their wives, including her kicking or hitting his testicles. One man, let's call him Mark, reported what happened shortly after he was engaged to his fiancée; whom I will call Cathy:

“We moved to a duplex in Concord at 2 a.m. The upstairs residents were upset and one of them came down to complain. Cathy's brothers and I tried to calm down the situation, telling them we had no choice. Cathy yelled at the man, calling him a “f...king asshole”, he then called her a “b..ch”. I stepped in between to calm down the situation. The man muttered a couple more words then went back upstairs. Cathy asked if she could see me in the kitchen. She said, “come here I have to tell you something”. She kneed me in the groin as hard as she could. This could have been a disastrous situation, as she knew I had only one testicle due to an earlier injury as a teenager. She yelled, “you f...king asshole, you better stick up for me next time.” (Fontes, 1997)

She could have seriously damaged his “only” testicle, which might have made him incapable of having his own children. Although this story is disturbing, a number of men are beginning to talk about similar attacks. It appears that some women have forgotten that testicles are part of a man's reproductive system and are equivalent to a woman's ovaries. Perhaps the permission women were given in the 50s to “slap a cad” is being replaced in the 90s with “kick a testicle,” which can be seen as a form of sexual assault when done for reasons other than self-defense.

B. It is true that the CTS only counts violent acts and doesn't identify acts that are for reasons of self-defense. Nor does it distinguish between throwing a pillow vs. throwing a lamp. I addressed this in Comment 3 and will in Comment 5.

C. Straus has supported the idea that when it comes to “severe” abuse men do tend to underreport their assaultive behavior against their wives as compared to accounts by wives. What he also found was that men underreport the

“severe” abuse they received by their wives. I will go over this more in Comment 5. Straus is in the process of redesigning the CTS. The CTS 2 will address some of the limitations of the old CTS that others have raised.

What I find interesting about those who criticize the CTS is that, when it comes to estimating the “projected” number of female victims of domestic violence, the critics often use data that comes from the CTS, namely:

- 2 million women are assaulted by their husbands each year. (Straus, 1977)
- The FBI reports that a woman is assaulted every 15 seconds in this country by her husband. (Calif. Dept. of Justice, 1997)
- 4 million women are assaulted by their male partners each year. (Family Violence Prevention Fund, 1997)
- A woman is assaulted every 9 seconds in this country by her male partner. (Family Violence Prevention Fund, 1997)

All of these statements are *based* on the data which comes directly from the CTS. Without the CTS none of these statements could be made. Today data from the 1994 Commonwealth Fund Survey of Women’s Health is often used in domestic violence literature which states that:

“8.4 percent of women between 18 and 65 and living with a man (4.4 million women) were physically abused by their domestic partners in the past year.”

These statistics come from the research of Dr. Stacey Plichta. This is what she says about the CTS:

“Spouse abuse is only measured for those women currently living with or married to a man (both are referred to as her spouse). These questions are from the Conflict Tactics Scale (CTS), a widely used instrument with *good reliability and validity*.”
(Plichta, 1996, p.240)

Comment 5.

In general there are two types of research that are most often used in domestic violence studies. One is Archival Research and the other is Survey Research. Archival data on domestic violence may be found in various places - law enforcement records, hospital records, court records, family service reports, district attorney’s offices, governmental records, and domestic violence centers. Most new research starts with reviewing archival data. It is a quick and easy way to start understanding a phenomenon. It may not give us a complete picture, but it can help us develop future research questions and determine research designs. The advantages of archival research are:

1. It is easy to obtain. The data has already been collected. It only has to be retrieved.
2. It is generally investigated by third parties that may investigate the truth of the reporting.

3. It is low-cost research. Because the data is already collected, the cost of retrieval is usually low.

What does the archival research data tell us about domestic violence?

Some Archival Research Source	Percentage of Male Victims of Domestic Violence
❖ 1981 San Diego Association of Governments	6.0%
❖ 1979 Detroit Police Department	7.0%
❖ 1978 Dobash and Dobash	1.5%
❖ 1978 Byles	5.0%
❖ 1978 Lenore Walker	1.5%
❖ 1976 Monroe County (New York) Police Department (McLeod, 1984, pp. 172-173)	10.0%

This is just a sampling of archival data which suggest that the average for male victims of domestic violence is about 5%. This research is also over 15 years old. What does more recent archival data tell us?

Los Angeles Police Department data on Domestic Violence Arrests:

Year	# of Women	% of Women Arrested	# of Men Assaulted
❖ 1995	1,262	<u>14.3%</u>	7,513
❖ 1994	1,079	12.5%	7,580
❖ 1993	941	10.7%	7,856
❖ 1992	732	9.0%	7,426
❖ 1991	669	8.3%	7,425
❖ 1990	519	6.7%	7,277
❖ 1989	501	7.2%	6,492
❖ 1988	457	7.6%	5,583
❖ 1987	340	<u>7.0%</u>	4,540

(Bennett, 1997, p.5)

There appears to be a steady rise in arrest rates for female perpetrators from 7% in 1987 to 14% in 1995.

California Department of Justice Domestic Violence Arrests:

Year	Total	Male Arrests	%	Arrests Reports	
				Female Arrests	%
❖ 1995	60,279	52,394	87%	7,885	<u>13%</u>
❖ 1994	56,919	50,473	89%	6,446	11%
❖ 1993	50,982	46,063	90%	4,919	10%
❖ 1992	49,547	45,349	92%	4,198	8%
❖ 1991	45,677	42,318	93%	3,359	<u>7%</u>

(California Dept. of Justice, 1997, special run)

Again, there appears to be a steady rise in female arrests for domestic violence from 7% (1991) to 13% (1995).

In a Sacramento Bee article dated December 7, 1997 entitled “Arrests of Women Soar in Domestic Abuse Cases,” author Mareva Brown reported that while the arrest rate for male batterers has *decreased* from 3,147 arrests in 1991 to 2,922 arrests in 1996, it has actually *increased* for female offenders from 245 in 1991 to 469 in 1996. In 1991, 7% of the arrests for domestic violence were of women, and in 1996 this figure rose to 14%. Brown writes that Sacramento’s lead domestic abuse prosecutor, Kate Killeen, says that “few women are arrested in error.” She also is quoted as saying “..that mutual arrests for domestic abuse have been dropping since the new law was enacted in January 1996. Still there is evidence that women are abusing their mates.” In the same article Sgt. Nick Calnon, one of the two domestic violence detectives in the Sacramento County Sheriff’s Department, is quoted as saying, “Just because the kids will be motherless is not enough reason not to arrest her.” (Brown, Dec. 7, 1997)

The Detroit News, April 20, 1997, reported that “...analysis of crime data collected by the Michigan State Police shows that men were victims in nearly 20 percent of all domestic abuse cases reported in 1995 in Michigan.”

There seems to be an increase in male victims of domestic violence, based upon archival data over the past five to eight years, from 5% to 15% or even higher. Even the U.S. Department of Justice suggests that females are expressing offending behavior at a greater rate than five years ago for most types of crimes.

U.S. Department of Justice: The Uniform Crime Reports

The report suggests that males still commit a much greater percentage of aggravated assaults overall - 83% for men and 17% for women. What is interesting is that the percentage increase for women has grown faster than for men.

Offense Charged	Percentage Increase From 1991 to 1995			
	Total		Under 18	
	Male	Female	Male	Female
Arson:	3%	<u>27%</u>	15%	<u>70%</u>
Aggravated Assault:	4%	<u>37%</u>	6%	<u>39%</u>
Weapons, carrying, possessing, etc.:	2%	<u>13%</u>	11%	<u>42%</u>
Offenses against family and children:	35%	<u>62%</u>	54%	<u>77%</u>

(U.S. Dept. of Justice, 1996, Table 35)

Although archival data is a good place to start research, it does have some limitations:

- A. Archival data comes from specialized and clinical sources, such as police, hospital, agency records, DA’s offices, and domestic violence centers. Lenore Walker, who has written extensively about battered women, shares the limitations of her own studies when she writes, “These women were not randomly selected, and they cannot be considered a legitimate data base from which to make specific generalizations.” (Walker, 1979, p. xiii)

- B. Archival data can be compromised by reporting or system biases. In a study by the Kentucky Commission on Women, Straus writes that they “intentionally suppressed” information that “38% of attacks were by women on men who, as reported by women themselves, had not attacked them.” (Straus, 1997, p. 212)
- C. Archival data only records that which has been reported. If a segment of the general population is less likely to report the data to archival centers, the results are likely to be incomplete and even misleading.

This is why researchers use other kind of methodology to study a phenomenon, like Survey Research. One of the earliest surveys is the U.S. Department of Justice’s *National Crime Victimization Survey* (NCVS). As Orman reported in her article, this is the largest and longest ongoing survey done in the U.S. It is interesting that when one compares the articles reporting on the NCVS, one also finds a trend in the steady increase of male victims of domestic violence, as seen in more current archival data.

1973-1975 averages: 3.9 per 1,000 women reported being assaulted by their partners, and 0.3 per 1,000 men reported being assaulted by their partners. This means that 94% of reported victims were female and 6% of reported victims were male. (Gaquin, 1978, p. 636)

1987-1991 averages: 5.4 per 1,000 women reported being assaulted by their partners, and 0.5 per 1,000 men reported being assaulted by their partners. This means that 91% of reported victims were female and 9% of reported victims were male. (Bureau of Justice Statistics, NCJ-154348, 1995)

The NCVS was redesigned in 1992 to better capture more areas of domestic violence data. The 1992-1993 NCVS showed 9.4 per 1,000 (0.94%) of the women reported being assaulted by their partners, and 1.4 per 1,000 (or 0.14%) of the men reported being assaulted by their partners. This means that 87% of reported victims were female and 13% of reported victims were male. The NCVS shows an increase in male victims of domestic violence from 6% in 1987 to 13% in 1993. (Bureau of Justice Statistics, NCJ-154348, 1995)

In the latest NCVS (1996) it indicates that 7.5 per 1,000 (.75%) women were assaulted, still less than 1%, and that 1.4 per 1,000 (.14%) men were assaulted, slightly greater than one tenth of one percent. Although this survey shows an increase in the percentage rates for both women and men, the projected numbers for men triples (from 48,983 to 147,896) while for women the rate less than doubled (from 572,032 to 837,899). These numbers are loaded by formula. To unload these numbers divide by 1,500. This will then give the actual number of survey cases. (Bureau of Justice Statistics, NCJ-167237) This means that 85% of reported victims were female and 15% of reported victims were male. The U.S. Bureau of the Census estimated

that in 1996 there were 54 million married couples in the U.S. By using the percentages in the NCVS for 1996 this would translate into 405,000 wives (84%) and 75,600 husbands (16%) that were abused by their spouse in the U.S.

The National Crime Victimization Survey indicates that there has been as steady rise in the percentage of male victims of domestic violence from 6% in 1975 to 15% in 1996.

There are some weaknesses to the NCVS:

1. The NCVS interviews the couples together, which may make a wife or husband reluctant to respond honestly about their abuse.
2. The NCVS is presented to respondents as a “Crime Survey.” People may only report domestic violence if it is very severe or chronic in nature, and thereby consider it more of a crime to report on the NCVS.

This may be why the percentage of reported domestic violence in the NCVS is so small, 0.75% for women and 0.14% for men who report being victims of domestic violence in the U.S. Based on the “redesigned” figures, these percentages project to about 840,000 women and 150,000 men in the U.S. who were assaulted by their spouses. Although the percentage difference between men and women (85% female victims and 15% male victims) is much like what the archival data show, it also indicates a much smaller number of female victims than most advocates report, less than 1% of women who reported being assaulted by their husbands. This may be why most projected numbers used in domestic violence literature or presentations come from survey data other than the NCVS, such as the CTS.

The Commonwealth Fund: Commission on Women’s Health, 1994, presented a list of survey studies that asked both men and women about their experience with domestic violence. This is what was presented:

<u>National Probability Samples</u>	Male Batterers	Female Batterers
Straus & Gelles (1990)	116 (48%)	124 (52%)
Straus et al. (1980)	121 (51%)	116 (49%)
Straus & Gelles (1986)	110 (48%)	120 (52%)
Elliott et al. (1985)	268 (36%)	471 (64%)
<u>Local/State Probability Samples</u>		
Nisonoff & Bitman	160 (59%)	110 (41%)
<u>Nonprobability Local Samples</u>		
Makepeace (1983)	137 (59%)	93 (41%)
Brutz & Ingoldby (1981)	146 (49%)	152 (51%)

Makepeace (1981)	206 (63%)	120 (37%)
Meredith et al. (1986)	220 (55%)	180 (45%)
O'Leary & Arias (1988)	340 (45%)	420 (55%)
Szinovacz (1987)	260 (46%)	300 (54%)
Barling et al. (1987)	740 (50%)	730 (50%)
Mason & Blankenship (1987)	18 (45%)	22 (55%)
(Commission on Women's Health, 1994, p. 20)		

What this data shows is what Straus and others have been saying for over twenty years. The overall average from these surveys indicates that men and women are physically abusing each other at nearly the same rate, or a range between 35 to 65 percent male victims.

As mentioned earlier, Straus did find that when it comes to reporting severe abuse, men do tend to under report their abusive behavior toward their partners. But they found that men also tend to under report the severe abuse they *sustain by their partners*. Men tend to under report both their severe assaultive behavior and that of their wives against them. One way to address this problem is to collect the survey data only from women in regard to being assaulted by their partners *and* also assaulting their partners. What do women report about the assaultive behavior of their partners and their own assaultive behavior? The percentages are still nearly the same between men and women, even when reported by women themselves.

As Reported by Women:

Percentages of Assaults on Spouse

For overall assaults:

Husband on Wife	12.2%	Wife on Husband	12.4%
-----------------	-------	-----------------	-------

Minor assaults:

Husband on Wife	7.2%	Wife on Husband	7.8%
-----------------	------	-----------------	------

Severe assaults:

Husband on Wife	5.0%	Wife on Husband	4.6%
-----------------	------	-----------------	------

(Straus, 1997, p.211)

The data shows that 5% of the women reported that they were “severely assaulted by their husbands,” but it also shows that 4.6% of the women reported that they severely assaulted their husbands. The NFVS for 1975 and 1985 also shows a change in the types of assaultive behavior used by men and women against their partners.

It is interesting that when one asks the average domestic violence presenter the question, “What is the percentage difference between female and male victims of domestic violence?” she/he typically will go to “archival data” and say that about 85% of victims are women and 15% are men (that is, if updated percentages are used.) Then if one asks, “What is the projected number of female victims of domestic

violence in the U.S.?” the presenter will usually go to “survey data” other than the NCVS. The following matrix illustrates this:

Archival Data and the NCVS		Most Survey Data	
Female Victims	Male Victims	Female Victims	Male Victims
85-87%	13-15%	48%	52%
473,000* 840,000**	71,500* 150,000**	6.1 million	6.5 million

* The U.S. Department of Justice (DOJ) does not collect the actual number of domestic violence arrest cases. The above numbers are calculated based on the California DOJ and the U.S. Census for married couples.

** These numbers comes for the National Crimes Victimization Survey (NCVS) 1996.

Presenting the data in this way is extremely misleading, because it doesn't state that the “archival data” which indicates that 85% of victims of domestic violence are women, also projects that 473,000 women are assaulted by their partners annually, a significant number but far less than the 2 or 4 or 6 million female victims reported by some domestic violence “Fact Sheets.” Nor do the presenters state that the research which suggests that 6.1 million women are assaulted every year also shows that the percentage rate of physical abuse between females and males is nearly the same.

The way survey data and archival data should be analyzed is as follows:

Presenting ALL the Data:

Archival Data		Most Survey Data	
Female Victims	Male Victims	Female Victims	Male Victims
87%	13%	48%	52%

473,000- (8%) 71,500- (1%) ← 6.1 million 6.5 million

While “archival” research only records that which is reported, survey research can capture unreported cases. By comparing both types of data together we see what domestic violence workers have been saying for years, namely that domestic violence is “under reported.” Only between 8% of women who are assaulted report their abuse. It also shows that only 1% of men who are assaulted report their abuse. This is supported by the research. The 1985 NFVS study found that women were 9 times more likely to report their assaults to the police and 5 times more likely to discuss the abuse with a friend or relative:

Type of Response	Women	Men
Hit back	24.4%	15.0%
Cried	54.6%	5.8%
Yelled or cursed him/her	42.6%	28.7%
Ran to another room	8.6%	13.9%
Called a friend/relative	<u>11.4%</u>	<u>2.2%</u>
Called the police	<u>8.5%</u>	<u>0.9%</u>
Run out of the house	14.0%	18.0%
Other	7.3%	32.2%

(Stets & Straus, 1990, p. 155)

The 1994 CBS movie about a man who was physically abused by his wife had the perfect title: “Men Don’t Tell.” The U.S. Department of Justice National Crime Victimization Survey (NCVS), as discussed earlier, has some limitations. The low percentage of response to domestic violence by both women and men supports the idea that the NCVS probably does a better job of capturing the kind of abuse that is more severe and/or chronic in nature. These are the types of abuse that people are more likely to consider a crime. The National Family Violence Survey (NFVS) by Straus and others who use the CTS, or something like it, shows a report rate that is eight to twelve times greater than that found with the NCVS by the U.S. Dept. of Justice. Perhaps what we are seeing from these numbers is that, when it comes to the more “severe” levels of domestic violence, which make up about 10% of all domestic violence, men and women do report their abuse at about the same rate. But when it comes to the other 90% of abuse that isn’t considered as severe by the victims, women are 9 times more likely than men to report their abuse to police and 5 times more likely to tell a friend or relative. Further research needs to be done in this area.

Comment 6:

In comparing the 1975 and 1985 NFVS data one can identify gender differences in the type of assaults men and women use against each other. Some of the types have increased and some have decreased.

Gender Differences in Type of Assault (Straus, 1986, p. 471):

Women were more likely to use the following type of assault:

Throw something:	86% greater in 1975	54% greater in 1985
*Slap:		41% greater in 1985
Kicked/bit/hit with fist:	29% greater in 1975	60% greater in 1985
Hit, tried to hit with something:	36% greater in 1975	77% greater in 1985

Men were more likely to use the following type of assault:

Push, grab, shove:	29% greater in 1975	4% greater in 1985
*Slap:	11% greater in 1975	
Beat up:	83% greater in 1975	33% greater in 1985
Used a gun or knife:	50% greater in 1975	Even in 1985

The data suggest what the U.S. Uniform Crime Reports have said, that women are becoming more aggressive and are using more violence than their mothers or grandmothers did years ago. Although some now suggest that this is a result of women striking out against a patriarchal system, there is no excuse for assaulting one's partner.

Summary:

When I look at the articles on domestic violence, I read those who are passionate on both sides of the issue. I personally believe that these articles, if done professionally, can help each other get closer to the truth about family violence. I echo Straus' warning that presenting the data on male victims should not be used to lessen the concern or interest in helping our sisters escape a violent relationship. But neither should we minimize, ignore, or bury the data that suggest men are victims of domestic violence at a level that is much greater than 5%. I agree wholeheartedly with Orman who writes, "Abused men deserve better than to be used for political points scoring. They should have sympathy, recognition, and help - and they don't need to be 50% of the victims to deserve it." Neither should abused wives be used for political points or strengthening a particular feminist theory. Most survey data over the past twenty years does suggest that men and women are assaulting each other at nearly the same rate, or within a range between 35 to 65 percent male victims. Unfortunately, there are those who minimize the very real problem of male abuse victims, who keep the general population thinking that these men make up a very small percentage and therefore do not warrant a strong outreach program designed for them and their needs. I do believe that male victims are where female victims were twenty years ago. Few want to believe there is a major problem with male abuse victims.

One male victim told me that his wife would attack his groin when she got angry at him. His young son would witness these attacks. Twice the man ended up in the medical clinic for testicle injuries. What was disturbing to me was that today when his five year old son is "visiting" his dad and doesn't get what he wants, like another piece of cake, the boy hits his dad's groin. I shared with this man that his son may be at greater risk of someday becoming a "wife-beater." The question is, where did this child learn his aggressive behavior, from dad or mom?

Pearson (1997) writes that the most well documented cause of domestic violence for both men and women stems from transfer of learned violence from one generation to the next. She writes that learning violence from parents and siblings has a far stronger influence on a boy or girl than gender conditioning. She also cites two studies (Langhinrich-Rohling, J. et al, 1995 and Malone & Tyree, 1991) which found that boys and girls who are abused by their fathers were more likely to become victims of domestic violence in their adult lives, whereas those who are abused by their mothers were more likely to become perpetrators of domestic violence in their adult lives. Langhinrichsen-Rohling et al., (1995) speculate that this is because “fathers may teach children how to respond to authority,” namely learned helplessness and “mothers may be more responsible than fathers to teach their children about how to resolve differences and handle conflict” (p. 173), namely engaging in violence to resolve conflicts. Pearson supports this theory by saying that men may be more likely to instill submission in their children, which can contribute to their victimization as adults, while mothers who are abusive toward their children may be more likely to instill aggression as a means of communication with others. This suggests that there is a strong link between child abuse and domestic violence. Other researchers also support the concept that child abuse sets the foundation for future adult violence (Karr-Morse & Wiley, 1997).

I believe that domestic violence is at the end of the journey which begins in childhood for both male and female perpetrators. In Newsweek, August 29, 1994, there was an article about O.J. Simpson. What was interesting about the article was that O.J.’s mother physically abused him as a boy. He would get “whipped with anything she could find, a belt, a bottle...” Although we are exploring the “shadow” of men’s lives today, some find it uncomfortable to explore the “shadow” of women’s lives. Almost two-thirds of physical child abuse comes at the hands of women and there are some who suggest that 20-30 percent of sexual abuse of children is done by women. The painful truth may be that women are contributing to the learned anger and emotional wounding of thousands of young boys and girls, who later become perpetrators when they grow up. This is why we can no longer ignore the problem.

So how do we balance the truth about domestic violence?

1. Because of a man’s generally greater strength, a slap or a punch will not carry the same force, even though the assault rate may be the same between women and men.
 - Yet, a woman is about *twice* as likely to use an object when she assaults a man. This can equalize the level of injury. (Straus, 1986, p. 471)
2. A man has a greater ability to restrain the blows of his spouse than does a woman.
 - Yet, a woman is more likely to assault the man when he is in a vulnerable position, like sleeping, taking a shower, or being attacked from behind. (Steinmetz, 1997, ABC 20/20)

3. A woman may have greater economic fears about leaving an abusive relationship than a man does.
 - Yet, a man may have greater fears of losing primary custody of his children if he leaves an abusive relationship than a woman does. (Steinmetz, 1978, p. 506)

More research still needs to be done. Yet in all I have said, it is my belief at this time that women may indeed be at greater risk of serious injury and physical abuse than men in general, especially when we consider that they are twice as likely to be murdered by an ex-spouse than a husband (Bureau of Justice Statistics, 1995, NCJ-162602 and 1996, NCJ-154348), and especially when they are ten times more likely to be raped than men. (Bureau of Justice Statistics, 1993, Table 2) The archival data suggests that women are at greater risk of injury in general, but survey data suggest that men are being assaulted at nearly the same rate as women. What concerns me is that although injury is important to consider, it is easy to ignore the fact that whether it is dad who is hitting mom or mom is hitting dad, often their children are watching and learning about violence in the home. This will likely have a major impact on them when they are married and have families of their own. By ignoring domestic violence against men, we risk never seeing an end to domestic violence in the next generation. For all the rhetoric about ending domestic violence in the 21st century, minimizing the seriousness and extent of male victimization will not end the problem of domestic violence. What do children learn by watching either mom or dad hitting each other, especially when so much of the abuse between partners is mutual assault? We need to stop the “gender splitting” that is used to identify the “victim” and the “perpetrator.” These jackets of identification are often difficult to determine.

Other suggested readings and information on male victims of domestic violence:

- ABC 20/20 video: *Battered by Their Wives*. September 19, 1997, \$29.95, call 1-800-913-3434.
- *Abused Men: The Hidden Side of Domestic Violence*. by Philip Cook, publisher: Praeger, 1997.
- *When She Was Bad: Violent Women and the Myth of Innocence*. by Patricia Pearson, publisher: Viking, 1997
- *Who Stole Feminism: How Women Have Betrayed Women*. by Christina Hoff Sommers, publisher: Simon and Schuster, 1996

References:

- Bennett, Richard, January 1997. A New Side to Domestic Violence, The Family Bulletin, Coalition of Parent Support, pp. 4-5.
- Brown, Mareva, 12/7/97. Arrests of Women Soar in Domestic Abuse Cases, Sacramento Bee.
- Bureau of Justice Statistics, 1993. Criminal Victimization in the United States, 1993, U.S. Department of Justice, Table 2.
- Bureau of Justice Statistics, 1994. Violence Between Intimate: Domestic Violence, U.S. Department of Justice, November 1994, NCJ-149259.
- Bureau of Justice Statistics, 1995. Violence Against Women: Estimates from the Redesigned Survey, U.S. Department of Justice, August 1995, NCJ-154348.
- Bureau of Justice Statistics, 1996. Female Victims of Violent Crime, U.S. Department of Justice, December 1996, NCJ-162602.
- California Department of Justice: Criminal Justice Statistics Center. Special run on April 21, 1997.
- Carrado, M.; George, M. J.; Loxam, E.; Jones, L.; and Templar, D.; 1996. Aggression in British Heterosexual Relationships: A Descriptive Analysis, Aggressive Behavior, 22: 401-415.
- Commission on Women's Health, 1994. Violence Against Women in the United States: A Comprehensive Background Paper, Columbia University, p. 20.
- Family Violence Prevention Fund, 1997. Domestic Violence is A Serious, Widespread Social Problem in America: The Facts, (415-252-8900).
- FBI: Uniform Crime Reports, 1996. U.S. Department of Justice, ISBN 0-16-048756-0, Table 35.
- Gaquin, Deirdre A., 1978. Spouse Abuse: Data from the National Crime Survey, Victimology, 2: 632-643.
- Gelles, Richard, September-October 1996. Violence Toward Men: Fact or Fiction, Action Notes: 6-7.
- Hammond-Saslow, Carole, 1997. Domestic Violence and Levels of Depression, Self-Esteem and Assertiveness in Battered Men, Doctoral Dissertation, United States International University, San Diego.
- McLeod, Maureen, 1984. Women Against Men: An Examination of Domestic Violence Based on a Analysis of Official Data and National Victimization Data, Justice Quarterly, 1: 171-193.

- Pearson, P.; (1997). When she was bad: Violent women and the myth of innocence. New York: Viking Penguin.
- Plichta, Stacey B., 1996. Violence and Abuse: Implications for Women's Health, Women's Health: The Commonwealth Fund Survey, pp. 237-270.
- Sommer, R.; Barnes, G., E.; and Murray, R. P. (1992). Alcohol Consumption, Alcohol Abuse, Personality and Female Perpetrated Spouse Abuse. Personality and Individual Difference, 13 (12): 1315-1323.
- Steinmetz, Suzanne K., 1978. The Battered Husband Syndrome, Victimology, 2: 499-509.
- Stets, J. and Straus, M. A., 1990. Gender Differences in Reporting Marital Violence and Its Medical and Psychological Consequences, Physical Violence in American Families: Risk Factors and Adaptations to Violence in 8,145 Families (New Brunswick, N.J.: Transaction Publishers).
- Straus, M. A., 1977. Wife-Beating: How Common and Why? Victimology, 2: 443-458.
- Straus, M. A. & Gelles, R., 1986. Societal Changes and Change in Family Violence from 1975 to 1985 as Revealed by Two National Surveys, Journal of Marriage and the Family, 48: 465-479.
- Straus, M. A., 1997. Yes, Physical Assaults by Women Partners: A Social Problem, Women, Men and Gender: Ongoing Debates, by M.R. Walsh, New Haven: Yale University Press, pp. 210-221.
- Walker, Lenore E., 1979. The Battered Woman. New York, N.Y.: Harper & Row, Publishers.