Men and Domestic Violence:

What Research Tells Us

by

Kieran McKeown
&
Philippa Kidd

Kieran McKeown Limited,
Social & Economic Research Consultants,
16 Hollybank Road, Drumcondra, Dublin 9, Ireland.

Report to the **Department of Health & Children**

March 2002

Table of Contents

The Authors

Kieran McKeown, B.Soc.Sc., M.A. (Econ.), Ph.D., has been involved in social and economic research for over 20 years. In 1987 he set up his own research consultancy, prior to which he was a lecturer at universities in Ireland, England and the United States. His work mainly involves evaluating and assessing policies, programmes and projects in various areas of service provision for families, couples, children, elderly, youth, homeless, drug users, unemployed, etc. He has worked for most of the main Government Departments in Ireland, many statutory and voluntary bodies and the EU Commission. His work is widely published in books, reports and articles. He is fifty, married and the father of a son and twin daughters.

Philippa Kidd, B.A. (Psychology), M.Sc., (Applied Social Research) has undertaken research on a range of family issues. She has co-authored a report on the impact of marriage break-up on children. She has contributed to two EU-funded studies on the family: one on social inclusion and family support; the other on perpetrators and victims of child sexual abuse. She has also been part of a research team assessing the effectiveness of marital and couple counselling. She is fifty, married and the mother of a daughter.

Acknowledgements

In preparing this report we wish to acknowledge the contribution of a number of people through meetings, discussions and written submissions. In the North Eastern Health Board, we benefited from the insightful and constructive comments of Nuala Doherty (Director of Child Care Services) and Fiona Ward (Director of Counselling Services for Adult Survivors of Childhood Abuse). Nuala Doherty also acted as our liaison person with the Department of Health and Children. We met Mary Cleary and Frank McGlynn of AMEN as well as Margaret Costello who is the National Co-ordinator of Women's Refuges in Ireland. These meetings gave us invaluable insights into the reality which leads the victims of domestic violence to seek help.

An earlier draft of the report was confidentially circulated for comment by the Department of Health and Children and submissions were received from the following:

Department of Justice, Equality and Law Reform

Department of Education and Science

Chief Executive Officers of Health Boards

An Garda Síochána

Secretariat of National Steering Committee on Violence Against Women

Midland Health Board

Western Health Board.

The final draft of the report has benefited greatly from these submissions.

Dr. Malcolm George of the University of London was very helpful to us in checking our facts and figures and our analysis of them. A previous draft of the report was also read by Catherine Forde (barrister and former Chairperson of the Irish Family Planning Association) and Margaret Burns (Administrator of the Council for Social Welfare) and benefited from their meticulous attention to detail.

In acknowledging our thanks to all of these we also wish to absolve them of any responsibility for the content of the report which rests solely with the authors.

Preface

"Out beyond ideas of wrongdoing and rightdoing, there is a field. I'll meet you there".
Rumi, Sufi poet (1207-1273)

This report was commissioned by the Department of Health and Children. As its title indicates, we were asked to find out what research studies tell us about domestic violence against men. In answering this question we have broadened the context to include women as well as men so that the experience of each can be seen in a comparative context.

Some may find this a challenging report essentially because it questions a long-standing consensus, both in Ireland and elsewhere, that women are the only victims, and men are the only perpetrators, of domestic violence. We are aware that there are no pure facts, either inside or outside research. Data on domestic violence, whether based on self-reports by victims or by perpetrators, by women or by men, need to be treated seriously and sensitively to assess their validity and reliability. We have tried to do this in a balanced way in the report.

It is well known that women are vastly more likely than men to present as victims of domestic violence to services such as the accident and emergency departments of hospitals, to refuges for abused women, to treatment clinics, to police stations and to the law courts. This clearly indicates that domestic violence is a serious problem for women and probably more serious than the numbers using these services fully convey. However it is also well known that people who use services are rarely representative of the population in general whether with respect to domestic violence or indeed any other characteristic. In order to derive more reliable estimates of the prevalence of domestic violence it is necessary to have a sample of men and women which is known to be representative of the general population and to gain their confidential self-reported experiences of domestic violence both as victims and as perpetrators. Of course this procedure is not perfect either – since there is conclusive evidence that both men and women over-report their victimisation and under-report their perpetration and somewhat less conclusive evidence that men do this more than women – but it is superior to any other method of estimating prevalence which has been tried or tested. It is these prevalence studies which form the core of this report.

If invited to summarise our findings in a few sentences we would say that representative gender-neutral studies of men and women in a number of English-speaking developed countries, notably the US, the UK, Canada, Australia and New Zealand, indicate that the prevalence of domestic

violence is somewhere between 5% and 20% of all current heterosexual relationships, but tends to be considerably higher among people who are young, dating, cohabiting, single or separated and considerably lower among people who are married and older; it also tends to be severe in about 40% of cases.

With the exception of sexual violence which is overwhelmingly perpetrated by men against women, the results of these studies are fairly consistent in showing that, in approximately half of all intimate relationships where domestic violence occurred in the last year, both partners were mutually violent, with the remainder divided fairly equally between male-only violence and female-only violence. As a result, the self-reported prevalence of domestic violence among men and women, both as victims and as perpetrators, is broadly similar for physical and psychological violence, both minor and severe. In addition, both men and women are about equally likely to initiate domestic violence and seem to give broadly similar reasons for doing so. However it needs to be emphasised that the outcomes of domestic violence in terms of physical and psychological injuries tend to be considerably more negative for women victims than for men victims.

These findings indicate that the existing consensus on this issue does not fully reflect the reality of violence between men and women in intimate relationships. The converse of these findings also needs to be emphasised: the vast majority of men and women are not violent to each other in intimate relationships. A key implication of these findings is that domestic violence is not a women's issue or a men's issue but a relationships issue.

These findings challenge the existing consensus not by rejecting it but by incorporating it within a more complex understanding of domestic violence as revealed in the studies reviewed here. In reality this simply means that the problem of domestic violence in English-speaking developed countries is larger in scope and complexity than originally envisaged; it in no way detracts from what we already know about the incidence, prevalence and correlates of domestic violence affecting women in either developed or developing countries. Of course this finding, like most research, raises as many questions as it answers since there has been so little research on certain aspects of domestic violence – notably male victims and female perpetrators - and almost none in Ireland. In addition, it raises a host of questions about why domestic violence is socially constructed to the point that male victims and female perpetrators are virtually invisible and this has major implications for society in general and public policy in particular.

Executive Summary

"Things have not only to be seen to be believed, but also have to be believed to be seen".
Stan Gooch, scientist and author, 1990.

This study was commissioned to provide a broad overview of research on domestic violence against men. We begin therefore by defining domestic violence as the term is used in this report. The term 'domestic violence' covers a wide range of abusive behaviours that occur in intimate relationships between adults. These behaviours may be physical, psychological or sexual and may result in injuries to the victim, depending on the severity and frequency of the violence. This is in line with the usual definition of domestic violence in Ireland which states: "domestic violence refers to the use of physical or emotional force or threat of physical force including sexual violence, in close adult relationships"[1]. As with other aspects of intimate relationships, domestic violence is typically "a process rather than a once-off event"[2] and this requires some understanding of how the domestic violence is initiated and why. This report examines each of these dimensions of domestic violence.

Our terms of reference invited us to answer five key questions about domestic violence against men, drawing upon existing research. Here are our answers in summary form.

What is the Context for Reviewing Domestic Violence Against Men?

The context in Ireland, as elsewhere, is defined by the consensus which exists about the nature and prevalence of domestic violence. The consensus is that, in the vast majority of cases, men are the only perpetrators of domestic violence and women are its only victims. This view has deep cultural roots in our understanding of men and women and has shaped the way we think about domestic violence which, in turn, has permeated the field of research, policy analysis and service provision. In Ireland, this consensus has been supported by three core assumptions[3]: (1) that the consensus is unambiguously supported by international research; (2) that research on the prevalence of domestic violence against women can be used to make claims about the prevalence of domestic violence generally; and (3) that valid claims about the prevalence of

[1] Task Force on Violence Against Women, 1997:10.
[2] ibid:28.
[3] See, for example, Kelleher & O'Connor, 1995; Kelly, 1996; O'Connor, 1996; Task Force on Violence Against Women, 1997:28; McKiernan & McWilliams, 1997; Meade, 1997; Ferguson, 1997; O'Loughlin & Duggan, 1998; National Crime Forum, 1998; Community Workers Co-operative, 1999; Clare, 2000; Department of Education and

domestic violence can be gleaned from research based on services used by the victims of domestic violence such as police records, refuges, etc. The evidence presented in this report questions these assumptions and, by implication, the existing consensus on domestic violence.

What Research Exists on Prevalence of Domestic Violence Against Men?

In order to find studies which would yield reliable information on the prevalence of domestic violence, we established two criteria which each study must meet. First, the study must include both men and women and their experiences of domestic violence, either as victims, as perpetrators or both. This immediately excludes a large number of studies which, despite throwing a good deal of light on various dimensions of domestic violence, are of little help in establishing prevalence because they are based solely on the experiences of women and often on women as victims. Second, the study must be based on a representative sample of the population. This too excludes a large number of studies on domestic violence which are based on convenience samples[4] of people using services (such as doctors' surgeries, refuges, plaintiffs in court, etc) or students attending college.

The application of these two criteria yielded 13 studies which offer the most reliable picture available on the prevalence of domestic violence by men and women. These studies, which are listed in Table 1, include some of the largest and most frequently cited in the literature on domestic violence. They focus mainly on domestic violence in heterosexual relationships although some of them contain data on homosexual as well as heterosexual relationships[5].

Table 1 Gender-Neutral Prevalence Studies of Domestic Violence Based on Representative Samples
Name of Study

1. US National Family Violence Survey, 1975/6
2. US National Family Violence Re-Survey, 1985
3. US National Survey of Families & Households, 1987/8
4. US National Youth Survey, 1992
5. US National Violence Against Women Survey, 1995/6
6. British MORI Survey, 1994
7. British Crime Survey, 1996

Science, 2000:252; Irish Commission for Justice and Peace, 2000; O'Doherty & Lynch, 2000; Bradley, 1999; Bradley, Smith, Long & O'Dowd, 2002.

[4] A convenience sample is defined as "a sample of subjects selected for a study not because they are representative but because it is convenient to use them – as when a college professor studies his own students" (Vogt, 1999:57).

[5] The studies which contain data on domestic violence in homosexual relationships are the US National Violence Against Women Survey (Tjaden & Thoennes, 2000 a, b & c); the British Crime Survey (Mirrlees-Black, 1999) and the Canadian General Social Survey on Victimisation (Canadian Centre for Justice Statistics, 2000).

8. Canada, Calgary Survey, 1981
9. Canada, Edmonton Survey 1983/4
10. Canada, Alberta Survey 1987
11. Canada, General Social Survey on Victimisation, 1999
12. Australia, International Social Science Survey 1996/7
13. New Zealand, Dunedin Survey, 1972/3

What is the Prevalence of Domestic Violence Against Men?

The consensus emerging from the studies of domestic violence reviewed here is that, in English-speaking developed countries such as the US, the UK, Canada, Australia and New Zealand, the prevalence of domestic violence is somewhere between 5% and 20% of all current heterosexual relationships. Prevalence rates tend to be considerably higher among people who are young, dating, cohabiting, single or separated and considerably lower among people who are married and older. Domestic violence tends to be severe[6] in about 40% of cases.

Prevalence rates are calculated on the basis of self-reports by men and women on their victimisation and perpetration; this is the only effective way of ascertaining the true prevalence of domestic violence, even though there is conclusive evidence that both men and women over-report their victimisation and under-report their perpetration and somewhat less conclusive evidence that men do this more than women. In addition to these considerations, it is also important to bear in mind that the prevalence of domestic violence among men and women is extremely sensitive to the way in which violence is measured and to the timeframe, such as last year or life time, within which it is measured.

Beginning with domestic violence experienced in the last year, the results of the studies reviewed are quite consistent in showing that women are at least as likely to perpetrate violence as men. This applies to both physical[7] and psychological[8] violence, severe as well as minor. The self-reports of men and women both agree on this. The studies also show that, in up to half of all intimate relationships where domestic violence occurred within the last year, both partners

[6] Severe physical violence refers to acts such as kicking, biting, hitting or beating a person as well as using or threatening to use a knife or gun.

[7] Physical violence may be either severe or minor. Minor physical violence refers to acts such as throwing something at a person, pushing, grabbing, shoving or slapping a person. Severe physical violence refers to acts such as kicking, biting, hitting or beating a person as well as using or threatening to use a knife or gun.

[8] The term psychological violence covers acts such as insulting or swearing at a person or threatening to hurt or kill them.

were mutually violent, with the remainder divided fairly equally between male-only violence and female-only violence.

Over the course of a life-time this pattern is reversed with men being more violent than women. The difference between "last year" prevalence and "life-time" prevalence is not easy to explain but may be part of a trend over time towards gender equality in rates of domestic violence, either because women are becoming more violent, men are becoming less violent or perhaps a combination of both.

The studies also show that men and women are about equally likely to initiate domestic violence and seem to give broadly similar reasons for doing so. However it needs to be emphasised that the outcomes of domestic violence in terms of physical and psychological injuries tend to be considerably more negative for women victims than for men victims. In addition, the studies show that sexual violence is overwhelmingly perpetrated by men against women.

The overall thrust of these findings may be difficult to reconcile with the fact that women are more likely than men to present as victims of domestic violence to the accident and emergency departments of hospitals, to refuges for abused women, to police stations, to treatment clinics and to seek legal remedies. In trying to address the tension between these two findings it is important not to dismiss either of them as insignificant. In order to build a bridge of understanding between the two results, it is important to bear four factors in mind: (1) the most extreme and chronic forms of domestic violence – whether of men against women or vice versa – may not be included in representative surveys of the type reviewed here; (2) men inflict more injuries on women than vice versa and this would account for the greater proportion of women victims in services; (3) male victims of domestic violence may face much greater barriers in accessing services than female victims; and (4) there is a much greater range of services for female victims of domestic violence than for male victims. These considerations are not designed to provide an exhaustive explanation of why the results of statistically reliable surveys of domestic violence are so at variance with the results of samples of service users. However they do suggest that neither of these findings can be ignored and that domestic violence can no longer be treated as an exclusively women's issue; domestic violence is a relationship issue which affects men as well as women, both as victims and as perpetrators.

What are the Factors Associated with Domestic Violence?

It is evident from the literature that power is a common theme in all forms of domestic violence. Relationships in which one partner is dominant – sometimes the man, sometimes the woman – are at higher risk of domestic violence than more democratic, egalitarian relationships. Victims of domestic violence invariably experience powerlessness but perpetrators can also act out of a similar sense of powerlessness. Power can have a personality dimension but it almost invariably has an economic dimension and male and female victims are usually in a weak economic position within the relationship. Power also has a physical dimension in that people with a physical disability are more vulnerable than those without; children and elderly can also be at risk of abuse. The extent of powerlessness experienced through domestic violence can be seen in the fact that female victims typically feel that there is nothing they can do to stop it while male victims often blame themselves for the violence inflicted upon them. Both men and women can be trapped in a violent relationship but men seem more unwilling than women to leave violent relationships, although women place themselves at higher risk of domestic violence by leaving or trying to leave. Abusive family backgrounds are also a contributory factor in the perpetration of domestic violence. Domestic violence is associated with lower socio-economic status but of course it can be found in all social classes and is confined to a minority within every social class. These findings suggest that no one theory or paradigm can properly explain domestic violence. However there is sufficient evidence to suggest that domestic violence is essentially a learned behaviour and therein lies the hope that what is learned can be unlearned.

What Services are Needed to Address Domestic Violence Against Men?

There are virtually no services for male victims of domestic violence even in countries where there is statistical evidence to indicate that domestic violence against men is a substantial reality[9]. The reason for this is not just the existing consensus about domestic violence – and the resistance which this creates to the idea that men could be victimised by women – but the reluctance of male victims themselves to present for services. The reality of domestic violence for men as well as women is that it is a private, hidden and often shameful form of suffering that few ever hear about other than the men, women and children who are immediately involved. The stigma of being in a violent relationship, and the fear of even more negative consequences if others know about it, lead victims and perpetrators to conspire in keeping secret the violence in their relationship so that women as well as men are reluctant to present for services until their situation becomes intolerable. However there is considerable evidence that men are even more reluctant than women to report their own victimisation to the police or medical authorities and

[9] This is underlined by the fact that there are directories of services for women victims of domestic violence, but none for male victims. For example, The Department of Justice Equality and Law Reform have recently published

those that do often have negative experiences from these services and the professionals involved. Even if we allow for the fact that men in general seem to suffer less negative outcomes of domestic violence than women, particularly in terms of physical injuries, these differences are scarcely sufficient to account for the major disparity between the number of men and women who present for services, given what we know about the prevalence of domestic violence between men and women in English-speaking developed countries.

It is well recognised that one of the ways of addressing the problem of domestic violence against women is to raise public awareness. However a major difficulty facing the male victims of domestic violence is that public awareness and professional perceptions are often very heavily influenced by the existing consensus on this issue; this can exacerbate the problems of male victims because it effectively denies the reality of their experience and contributes to the mutually reinforcing process that men do not present for services while services, in turn, do not develop to respond to men's needs.

Help lines, support groups and counselling have a role in supporting male victims as they do for female victims. However these services are typically under-funded and sometimes run by untrained volunteers. Also, there seems to be no good reason why information about male and female help lines could not be published on the same leaflets and disseminated widely through health centres, Garda stations, doctor's surgeries, etc.

In Ireland as elsewhere there is a perception that, in matters of family law, it is harder for men than women to get justice in the family courts. Whether or not this is true, it is still difficult to explain why there have been virtually no cases in Ireland taken by male victims against their female perpetrators in view of the fact that the letter of Irish law on domestic violence is gender neutral and the fact that the prevalence of domestic violence against men is probably similar in Ireland to that which we have found in other English-speaking developed countries. There seems to be a good deal of dissatisfaction with the way in which the legal system handles the issue of domestic violence, particularly by men but also by women, and it is probably no exaggeration to say that, in some cases at least, the trauma of domestic violence may be exacerbated rather than ameliorated by the legal system as it presently operates.

What is the Way Forward from Here?

a National Directory of Services for Women who have Experienced Violence or the Threat of Violence (National Steering Committee on Violence Against Women, 2000).

The findings in this report point to the need for a larger and more inclusive paradigm of domestic violence than is currently allowable within the existing consensus. By the same reasoning, these findings also make it extremely difficult to sustain credibly a perspective on domestic violence which assumes that, in the vast majority of cases, men are its only perpetrators and women its only victims. The broader and more inclusive paradigm of domestic violence which is suggested by the findings of this report in no way diminish what we already know about the suffering caused to women at the hands of men; nor should it be used in any way as an excuse to reduce services for women victims of domestic violence. A more inclusive approach to domestic violence should not create competition between victims by minimising the experiences of men at the expense of women or vice versa. Although we have no firm evidence on the true prevalence of domestic violence in Ireland, at least not with respect to male victims and female perpetrators, it seems unlikely that it should be significantly different to other English-speaking developed countries such as the US, the UK, Canada, Australia or New Zealand. For this reason, it would be reasonable to proceed on the assumption that domestic violence against men is a significant problem and mutual violence is the main form in which domestic violence tends to occur. That is the basis for a more inclusive paradigm of domestic violence and the starting point for a more comprehensive approach to both prevention and the development of services for the victims and perpetrators of domestic violence.

Chapter One

What is the Context for Reviewing Domestic Violence Against Men?

"When paradigms change, the world itself changes with them. Led by a new paradigm, scientists ... see new and different things when looking with familiar instruments in places they have looked before. It is rather as if the professional community has been suddenly transported to another planet where familiar objects are seen in a different light and are joined by unfamiliar ones as well".

Thomas S. Kuhn, 1970:111.

1.1 Introduction

This chapter describes the context which gave rise to this review of domestic violence against men. In broad outline, the context has two main features. First, there is the existing consensus which has shaped research and policy on domestic violence in Ireland and elsewhere and is based on the premise that, in the vast majority of cases, men are the only perpetrators and women are the only victims of domestic violence. In section 1.2 we briefly review the documentation and assumptions which support this position. Second, there is the emergence of AMEN whose work has highlighted the reality of domestic violence against men in Ireland. In section 1.3 we briefly review its contribution to raising questions about the nature of domestic violence and casting some doubt on the existing consensus. This context prompted the need for the present study whose terms of reference are summarised in section 1.4. Finally we make a few concluding remarks in section 1.5.

1.2 The Existing Consensus

The existing consensus on domestic violence - that women are its only victims and men its only perpetrators – has deep-seated roots in our culture where there seems to be a widespread assumption that 'no man would ever allow himself to be abused by a women' and conversely, 'no woman would ever perpetrate abuse on a man'. Although a number of studies indicate that physical aggression by men against women is generally seen as socially unacceptable - and is less likely to occur where attitudes do not support it[1] - physical aggression by men is

[1] O'Leary, 1993:24; Dibble & Straus, 1980.

nevertheless seen much more negatively than physical aggression by women[2]. One US study found that "battered husbands" were viewed much less sympathetically than "battered wives", while heterosexual battered males were rated more negatively than homosexual battered males[3]. In Britain, some research has documented a perception among social workers, police and women's refuge workers that domestic violence against men does not exist to any great extent and, where it does, it is assumed that women perpetrators must have had a good reason for being violent[4]. In Australia, research on domestic violence has found that both men and women were significantly more negative in their evaluation of the husband than the wife, were more sympathetic to the wife and believed that the husband deserved a harsher penalty for his violence[5]. In Ireland, a small scale study found that the majority of respondents believed that women were the principal victims of domestic violence and that women assaulting men is not nearly as serious as men assaulting women[6]. It is perhaps worth noting in this context that men are the main victims of violent crime generally[7].

Beyond this cultural context, the existing consensus about domestic violence seems to be supported by three additional assumptions, particularly in Ireland. The first assumption is that this consensus is unambiguously supported by international research. For example, one Irish review of the evidence states that "in the vast majority of cases where violence occurs, men are the perpetrators and women the victims (Byles, 1978; Dobash and Dobash, 1979; 1992; Martin, 1976; Watkins, 1982; Kelly, 1999)"[8]. Some of the references cited here are quite old; none refer to the major gender-neutral surveys of domestic violence which are reviewed in Chapters Two and Three below and which show that the evidence does not in fact support the existing consensus. Another Irish review also reached the conclusion that "study after study has documented the persistent, systematic, severe and intimidating force which men inflict on women (Dobash and Dobash, 1979; Martin, 1976; Pagelow, 1981)"[9]. This conclusion is valid as far as it goes but the prevalence of men's violence against women cannot be used to make generalised inferences about domestic violence as a whole; "study after study" has often tended to focus exclusively on women's victimisation and men's perpetration without including the

[2] See for example Arias & Johnson, 1989; Riggs, Murphy & O'Leary, 1989.
[3] Harris & Cooke, 1994.
[4] Stitt & Macklin, 1995.
[5] See Feather, 1996: cited by Fiebert, 1998.
[6] Anderson, 1999.
[7] Mirlees-Black, Budd, Partridge & Mayhew, 1998:7; Watson, 2000:13.
[8] Kelleher & O'Connor, 1999:1.
[9] Kelleher & O'Connor, 1995:2.

reverse side of this coin – women's perpetration and men's victimisation[10]. This leads us to reflect on the second assumption in the existing consensus.

The second assumption is that research on the prevalence of domestic violence against women can be used to make claims about the prevalence of domestic violence generally. This is clearly erroneous. Given that domestic violence occurs in the context of a close relationship between men and women (although it also occurs and with similar prevalence in same sex relationships)[11], any study which focuses only on women to the exclusion of men and on victimisation to the exclusion of perpetration cannot hope to reach a full picture of domestic violence. A substantial amount of research on domestic violence is based on victim studies of women only and, although extremely valuable in themselves, these studies do not reflect the whole picture with regard to prevalence of domestic violence in society. The only major national survey of domestic violence in Ireland[12] was based on a random sample of approximately 1,500 women over the age of 18 years which was carried out in 1994. This postal survey achieved a response rate of 46% which, though possibly adequate, is considerably lower than the lowest response rate (56%)[13] in any of the national random surveys reviewed in Chapters Two and Three below. The results of this survey showed that the prevalence of domestic violence against women was around 18% which is not hugely dissimilar to the prevalence reported in two British surveys carried out in 1994 and 1996 and reviewed in Chapters Two and Three. The earlier of these studies[14] found that 13.4% of women had been physically victimised in one or more of their intimate relationships but the same study also found that 17.3% of men had also been physically victimised; the other study[15] found that 22.7% of women had experienced some sort of physical violence in intimate relationships over their lifetime but the same study found that 14.9% of the men had been victimised in intimate relationships over their lifetime. Thus when gender-neutral research is carried out on domestic violence it tends to confirm the prevalence rates found in 'women only' studies but also finds, depending on the study, high levels of domestic violence against men. In Ireland we know virtually nothing about the prevalence of domestic violence against men in intimate relationships because the question has never been asked.

[10] See for example Statistics Canada, 1993; Australian Bureau of Statistics, 1996; New Zealand Ministry of Justice, 1996; Romkens, 1997; Kelleher & O'Connor, 1995.
[11] Tjaden & Thoennes, 2000c:30; Waldner-Haugrud, Gratch & Magruder, 1987.
[12] Kelleher & O'Connor, 1995.
[13] Tjaden & Thoennes, 2000a.
[14] Carrado, George, Loxam, Jones & Templar, 1996.
[15] Mirrlees-Black, 1999.

The third assumption is that valid claims about the prevalence of domestic violence can be gleaned from research based on services used by the victims of domestic violence such as police records, refuges, etc. Again, this research can be useful in terms of clarifying key aspects of domestic violence but it is not a valid basis for estimating prevalence. Nevertheless the most frequently cited authority in Ireland on the prevalence of domestic violence[16] is based on the analysis of police records of domestic violence in Scotland[17]. This study has also been replicated in Ireland through analysis of Garda records in order "to generate baseline quantitative and qualitative data on the way domestic violence cases are processed in the Irish civil and criminal justice systems"[18]. A key, if expected, finding of this research is that the vast majority of the accused are men. This is in line with national statistics on domestic violence which have been published by An Garda Síochána since 1996; as Table 1.1 shows, nearly nine out of ten complainants in 1998 and 1999 were women falling to just over eight out of ten in 2000.

Table 1.1 Crime Statistics on Domestic Violence in Ireland, 1996-2002

Year	Incidents	% Change	% Male Complainants	% Female Complainants
1996	4,645	+17	N.A.	N.A.
1997	4,184	-10	N.A.	N.A.
1998	8,448	+102	11	89
1999	10,110	+20	11	89
2000	10,877	+8	16	84

Source: Annual Reports of An Garda Síochána, 1996-2002. N.A. = Not Available.

Internationally, crime statistics on domestic violence show a similar pattern but this begs the question as to whether police records accurately reflect the underlying reality of domestic violence. The 1996 British Crime Survey on domestic violence[19] threw some light on this question when it pointed out that only 17% of the victims of domestic violence had informed the police. However it is the findings on the differences between men and women that is particularly relevant in this context: "Only 7% of chronic and intermittent male victims said the police had been alerted, compared to 16% of intermittent female victims, and 36% of chronic female victims"[20]. This report also found that as many men as women were victimised by their intimate partners in the past year although women were more intensively victimised. These findings suggest that neither women nor men are keen to report their victimisation to the police, but men are far less keen than women. From the perspective of prevalence these findings

[16] Dobash & Dobash, 1979.
[17] Cited in Kelleher & O'Connor, 1995; 1999; Task Force on Violence Against Women, 1997.
[18] Kelleher & O'Connor, 1999.
[19] Mirrlees-Black, 1999.
[20] ibid:54.

confirm that police statistics do not reflect the true reality of domestic violence as experienced by either women or men, but especially by men[21].

The consequences of the existing consensus on domestic violence in Ireland are to be found throughout public policy and are reflected most fully in the work of a Task Force on Violence Against Women set up in October 1996. Indeed this Task Force took the findings of the Irish survey cited above[22] as a key benchmark in its work, claiming that "the findings of this research are very much in line with international trends"[23]. Similar assumptions are made in a programme for secondary school boys entitled Exploring Masculinities[24]. Irish law on domestic violence is gender neutral but it is remarkable that much of the publicity material on domestic violence which has been disseminated by agencies such as the Garda Síochána and the Irish Congress of Trade Unions has tended to treat domestic violence as synonymous with violence against women. Similarly in the field of academic research and commentary, the existing consensus has resulted in domestic violence being used interchangeably with violence against women[25]. Outside of Ireland there is a similar tendency to treat domestic violence as synonymous with violence against women[26]. In some studies, this definition leads logically, if somewhat dangerously, to the inclusion of girls and the exclusion of boys, from the paradigm of domestic violence[27].

It is appropriate to ask in this context why the phenomenon of domestic violence has been so formulated as to virtually exclude the possibility of male victims or female perpetrators or indeed the more complex reality of mutual abuse despite the emergence of data which, as we shall see in Chapters Two, Three and Four, point to these realities. There is no easy answer to this question. One of the first researchers to carry out gender-neutral research on violence in American families, Suzanne Steinmetz, also reflected on the broader question of why so much attention is given to domestic violence against women and so little to domestic violence against men. She suggested the following explanation: "the relative lack of empirical data on the topic, the selective inattention both by the media and researchers, the greater severity of physical damage to women making their victimisation more visible, and the reluctance of men to

[21] See also Buzawa & Austin, 1993; Henman, 1996.
[22] Kelleher & O'Connor, 1995.
[23] Task Force on Violence Against Women, 1997:28.
[24] Department of Education and Science, 2000:252.
[25] See for example Kelly, 1996; O'Connor, 1996; McKiernan & McWilliams, 1997; Meade, 1997; Ferguson, 1997; O'Loughlin & Duggan, 1998; National Crime Forum, 1998; Community Workers Co-operative, 1999; Clare, 2000; Irish Commission for Justice and Peace, 2000; O'Doherty and Lynch, 2000; Bradley, 1999; Bradley et al., 2002.
[26] See for example UNICEF, 2000; European Women's Lobby, 1999.
[27] ibid.

acknowledge abuse at the hands of women"[28]. This explanation, which is consistent with the findings of gender-neutral research on domestic violence, also helps to throw light on why domestic violence can be such a divisive issue – as much in Ireland as elsewhere – to such an extent that even raising the issue of domestic violence against men can be perceived as minimising the reality of domestic violence against women. Such a view was explicitly articulated by an American sociologist, Clifton Flynn who wrote that "drawing attention to battered husbands will impede attempts to battle the more serious problem of wife abuse"[29]. Another American sociologist, Mildred Pagelow, adopted a similar stance: "the divisive question of male versus female victims hampered efforts to increase the funding and provision of other resources to female victims of family violence"[30]. Views such as these effectively perpetuate a divisive approach to domestic violence by discounting the possibility that men could ever be its victims, notwithstanding the findings of a number of gender-neutral studies. There can be few other areas of epidemiological research where studies on the prevalence of a source of harm - such as domestic violence - can be seen as divisive when that research is carried out on both genders.

1.3 AMEN

AMEN was founded in December 1997 and provides a confidential helpline as well as an information and support service for male victims of domestic abuse; in 2000 it established a refuge for male victims. In its first three years, AMEN has heard from over 6,000 men and concerned members of their families. These men come from all walks of life and range in age from seventeen to ninety.

The aims, objectives and activities of AMEN are summarised in Table 1.2.

Table 1.2 Aims, Objectives and Activities of AMEN, 2002

Provide a support service for male victims of domestic abuse.
Provide information on legal and other remedies available to men who are being abused in their own homes.
Offer practical advice to abused men on what to do and where to go.
Hold regular mutual support group meetings.
Help abused men to regain self-confidence, self-esteem and become empowered to make informed decisions.
Provide court accompaniment and other supports for abused men.
Help abused men to acquire accommodation for themselves and their children in one of AMEN's two emergency accommodation centres or elsewhere.

[28] Steinmetz, 1977-78:504.
[29] Flynn, 1990:194.
[30] Pagelow, 1985:172.

Increase public awareness of the issue for female domestic violence against men through publicity and disseminating information.
Redress the imbalance in current policies regarding domestic violence.
Commission and conduct research on domestic violence.

In order to gain greater insight into the dimensions of domestic violence against men, AMEN commissioned a small survey of 40 men in the Monaghan area who volunteered to be interviewed on their experiences of victimisation by their women partners. The majority of these men (72%) had suffered some form of physical abuse and an even higher proportion (82%) had unsubstantiated allegations made against them, while all had suffered mental abuse such as threats to report the male victim as perpetrator. However only 45% contacted the Garda Síochána and, of those, 97% claimed that they had not been taken seriously or were treated as if they were the perpetrator. Seventy percent said they had found it difficult to leave their home because of concern for their children's safety.

AMEN has been active in raising the profile of domestic violence against men, particularly through holding two international conferences. The first of these conferences, entitled 'The Silence is Over', was held in Dublin on 10th December, 1998 and the second, entitled 'It is Also a Crime to Beat a Man', was held in Navan on 30th March, 2000. The speakers at these conferences included Erin Pizzey, founder of the first ever women's refuge in Chiswick, London in 1971; Dr. Malcolm George, a senior lecturer at London University, who has specialised in research on domestic violence; Marie Murray, clinical psychologist and author; Dr. Warren Farrell, an American author whose recent book[31] contains an extensive review of the literature on domestic violence; three barristers practising in Ireland, and two members of Dáil Éireann, Roisín Shortall TD and Jim Higgins TD.

The AMEN conference in Navan in 2000 was opened by the Minister of State at the Department of Justice, Equality and Law Reform, Mary Wallace TD. The tone and content of her speech signalled an end to the divisiveness that, as discussed in the previous section, has been a debilitating feature of the discourse on domestic violence. She stated: "I appreciate that there can be particular difficulties for men in reporting incidents of domestic violence and in the way that elements of society deals with such reports. ... There should be no competition between organisations working to support victims. .... I would put it to you that arguments between organisations representing victims are, in fact, counterproductive and do not serve victims in any

[31] Farrell, 1999.

way. They may, in fact, be assisting in the perpetration of such violence by dissuading victims from coming forward and seeking help"[32].

1.4 Terms of Reference for Study

The terms of reference for this study are summarised in Table 1.3.

Table 1.3 Terms of Reference for Review of Domestic Violence Against Men

The review will address the following questions:

1. What work has been carried out in relation to prevalence of domestic violence against men and what are the findings?
2. What paradigms are used to understand the phenomenon?
3. What measures have been useful?
4. What service needs have men who have been victims of violence identified?
5. What services have been developed in other countries and what trends are known in relation to their effectiveness?

In addressing these terms of reference we devote a separate chapter to each of the key questions as follows:

Chapter One:	What is the context for reviewing domestic violence against men?
Chapter Two:	What research exists on prevalence of domestic violence against men?
Chapter Three:	What is the prevalence of domestic violence against men?
Chapter Four:	What are the factors associated with domestic violence against men?
Chapter Five:	What services are needed to address domestic violence against men?

Within the resources available to this study, it has not been possible - nor even necessary - to review every study which has ever been undertaken on domestic violence, essentially because only a relatively small proportion of these studies throw any light on the prevalence of domestic violence against men. Most studies of domestic violence are in fact studies of women's victimisation and, while valuable from that perspective, throw no light on men's experience of domestic violence. Accordingly, as explained in more detail in the next chapter, we focus only on those studies which include men as well as women, are based on representative samples of the population and offer the most reliable estimates available of the prevalence of domestic violence by men and women both as victims and as perpetrators.

1.5 Conclusion

This chapter has shown that the existing consensus about domestic violence in Ireland – as elsewhere – is that, in the vast majority of cases, men are its only perpetrators and women are its only victims. This view has deep cultural roots in our understanding of men and women and has

[32] Wallace, 2000.

shaped the way we think about domestic violence which, in turn, has permeated the field of research, policy analysis and service provision. In Ireland, this consensus has been supported by three core assumptions which, as we have seen, are open to serious question. These three assumptions are: (1) that the consensus is unambiguously supported by international research; (2) that research on the prevalence of domestic violence against women can be used to make claims about the prevalence of domestic violence generally; and (3) that valid claims about the prevalence of domestic violence can be gleaned from research based on services used by the victims of domestic violence such as police records, refuges, etc.

In recent years, largely as a result of the work of AMEN and their holding of two international conferences in Ireland on domestic violence against men in 1998 and 2000, there has been some questioning of this consensus which in turn has prompted the review of research documented in this report. Despite the extensive literature on domestic violence, the amount of research on the specific issue of its prevalence - particularly against men - is quite limited. In the main we have confined ourselves to this literature not only because it is the most relevant but also because it meets all the normal standards of good scientific research. With that in mind, we now address the first major question of the report: What research exists on the prevalence of domestic violence against men?

Chapter Two

What Research Exists On Prevalence Of Domestic Violence Against Men?

"There are things that are not yet true today, perhaps we dare not to find them true, but tomorrow they may be".
Carl Gustav Jung, (1875-1961), 1912:201.

2.1 Introduction and Methodology

In this chapter we identify the research studies which are relevant to assessing the prevalence of domestic violence against men and women, either in the total population or in identified sub-populations of people such as those who are married, cohabiting, dating, separated, divorced, widowed or remarried. In line with conventional usage, we use the term 'prevalence' to refer to the percentage of the total population of men and women who are victims or perpetrators of physical and/or psychological violence within an intimate relationship, either in the past year or in a lifetime.

In order to find studies which would yield reliable information on the prevalence of domestic violence, we established two criteria which each study must meet. First, the study must include both men and women and their experiences of domestic violence, either as victims or perpetrators or both. This immediately excludes a vast number of studies which, despite throwing a good deal of light on various dimensions of domestic violence, are of little help in establishing prevalence because they are based solely on the experiences of women and often on women's experience of victimisation only. Second, the study must be based on a representative sample of the population and adhere to acceptable random sampling procedures. This too excludes a large number of studies on domestic violence which are based on convenience samples[1] of people using services (such as doctors' surgeries, refuges, plaintiffs in court, etc) or students attending college.

The application of these two criteria yielded 13 studies which offer a reliable picture of the prevalence of domestic violence by men and women. These studies, which are listed in Table

[1] A convenience sample is defined as "a sample of subjects selected for a study not because they are representative but because it is convenient to use them – as when a college professor studies his own students" (Vogt, 1999:57).

2.1, are among the largest and most frequently cited in the literature on domestic violence. These studies focus mainly on domestic violence in heterosexual relationships although some of them contain data on homosexual as well as heterosexual relationships[2].

Table 2.1 Gender-Neutral Prevalence Studies of Domestic Violence Based on Representative Samples

Name of Study

1. US National Family Violence Survey, 1975/6
2. US National Family Violence Re-Survey, 1985
3. US National Survey of Families & Households, 1987/8
4. US National Youth Survey, 1992
5. US National Violence Against Women Survey, 1995/6
6. British MORI Survey, 1994
7. British Crime Survey, 1996
8. Canada Calgary Survey, 1981
9. Canada, Edmonton Survey 1983/4
10. Canada, Alberta Survey 1987
11. Canada, General Social Survey on Victimisation, 1999
12. Australia, International Social Science Survey 1996/7
13. New Zealand, Dunedin Survey, 1972/3

For a detailed listing of the authors and sources of these studies, see Table A2.1 in the Appendix to Chapter Two.

In the remainder of this chapter we describe the definition and measurement of domestic violence used in these studies (section 2.3) and the different types of samples on which those studies are based (section 2.4).

2.2 Definition and Measurement of Domestic Violence

The term 'domestic violence' covers a wide range of abusive behaviours that occur in intimate relationships between adults. These behaviours may be physical, psychological or sexual and may result in injuries to the victim, depending on the severity and frequency of the violence. This is in line with the usual definition of domestic violence in Ireland which states: "domestic violence refers to the use of physical or emotional force or threat of physical force including sexual violence, in close adult relationships"[3]. As with other aspects of intimate relationships, domestic violence is typically "a process rather than a once-off event"[4] and this requires some understanding of how the domestic violence was initiated and why.

[2] The studies which contain data on domestic violence in homosexual relationships are the US National Violence Against Women Survey (Tjaden and Thoennes, 2000 a, b & c); the British Crime Survey (Mirrlees-Black, 1999) and the Canadian General Social Survey on Victimisation (Canadian Centre for Justice Statistics, 2000).

[3] Task Force on Violence Against Women, 1997:10.

[4] ibid:28.

These different dimensions of domestic violence are covered in the 13 studies, as Table 2.2 reveals, although some dimensions, particularly physical violence, its frequency and outcomes, are more likely to be covered than others. It is appropriate therefore to examine how these different dimensions of domestic violence are measured in the 13 studies. Before doing so however, it is important to draw attention to two broadly different perspectives on the measurement of domestic violence.

Table 2.2 Dimensions of Violence Used on Prevalence Studies of Domestic Violence

Name of Study	Physical	Psycho-logical	Sexual	Freq-uency	Outcome *	Context **
1. US National Family Violence Survey, 1975/6	✔			✔		
2. US National Family Violence Re-Survey, 1985	✔	✔		✔	✔	✔
3. US National Survey of Families & Households, 1987/8	✔				✔	
4. US National Youth Survey, 1992	✔	✔		✔	✔	✔
5. US National Violence Against Women Survey, 1995/6	✔	✔	✔	✔	✔	
6. British MORI Survey, 1994	✔			✔		✔
7. British Crime Survey, 1996	✔	✔	✔	✔	✔	✔
8. Canada Calgary Survey, 1981	✔	✔		✔		
9. Canada, Edmonton Survey 1983/4	✔			✔	✔	✔
10. Canada, Alberta Survey 1987	✔			✔	✔	✔
11. Canada, General Social Survey on Victimisation, 1999	✔	✔	✔	✔	✔	
12. Australia, International Social Science Survey 1996/7	✔				✔	
13. New Zealand, Dunedin Survey, 1972/3	✔	✔				
Total	**13**	**7**	**3**	**10**	**9**	**6**

*Outcome is typically measured by reference to the injuries sustained and medical services used as a result of domestic violence.

**Context is typically measured by reference to the person who initiated domestic violence and the reasons why.

The first might be referred to as the "relationship or family perspective" and invites respondents to speak of their experience of domestic violence – either as victims or perpetrators – in the context of other conflicts and rows which couples may have. Within this perspective, the topic of domestic violence is typically introduced in the following terms: "No matter how well a couple get along, there are times when they disagree, get annoyed with the other person, or just have spats or fights because they're in a bad mood or tired or for some other reason. They also use many different ways of trying to settle their differences. I'm going to read some things that you and your (spouse/partner) might do when you have an

argument. I would like you to tell me how many times in the past 12 months you ..."[5]. Most of the studies reviewed here adopt this perspective. The second perspective might be referred to as the "crime or assault perspective" and invites respondents to disclose if they have been a victim or perpetrator of an assault or other abuse in a current or previous relationship. In general, this perspective makes no attempt to frame the issue of domestic violence in relational terms and typically focuses on behaviours such as physical or sexual assault as these terms are understood in the criminal law. The two studies which adopt this perspective are The US National Violence Against Women Survey[6] and the Canadian General Social Survey on Victimisation[7]. The significance of these different perspectives, as we shall see more clearly in Chapter Three, lies primarily in the fact that the 'relationship or family perspective' typically yields a much higher prevalence rate than the 'crime or assault perspective'. This is mainly because the former is more conducive to disclosure since it reduces some of the stigma normally associated with domestic violence for perpetrators and victims alike. Other studies also suggest that the 'relationship or family perspective' yields higher prevalence rates than the 'crime or assault perspective'[8]. For this reason, the relationship perspective seems likely to yield a more accurate picture of the true prevalence of domestic violence in society.

2.2.1 Measuring Physical Violence

All but two of the studies in this review measure physical violence using the Conflict Tactics Scale (CTS) or some variant of it; the two exceptions are the British Crime Survey[9] and the Edmonton Survey in Canada[10]. The most common form of the CTS is called CTS R*[11], as summarised in Table 2.3, but there is an earlier version (CTS N)[12] as well as a later version (CTS 2)[13]. The scale has three dimensions covering physical violence, both minor and severe, psychological violence and a reasoning index. In this section we are concerned only with the physical violence dimension.

[5] Straus, 1979 & 1990b.
[6] Tjaden & Thoennes, 2000a, b & c.
[7] Canadian Centre for Justice Statistics, 2000.
[8] Mihalic & Elliot, 1997.
[9] Mirrlees-Black, 1999.
[10] Bland & Orn, 1986.
[11] Straus & Gelles, 1988.
[12] Straus, Gelles & Steinmetz, 1980.
[13] Straus, Hamby, Boney-McCoy & Sugarman, 1996.

Table 2.3 The Conflict Tactics Scales: Couple Form R*

No matter how well a couple get along, there are times when they disagree, get annoyed with the other person, or just have spats or fights because they're in a bad mood or tired or for some other reason. They also use many different ways of trying to settle their differences. I'm going to read some things that you and your (spouse/partner) might do when you have an argument. I would like you to tell me how many times in the past 12 months you:

Thinking back over the last 12 months you've been together, was there ever an occasion when (your spouse/partner)..... Tell me how often (he/she) did...

REASONING INDEX

A. Discussed an issue calmly
B. Got information to back up your/his/her side of things
C. Brought in, or tried to bring in, someone to help settle things

PSYCHOLOGICAL VIOLENCE INDEX

D. Insulted or swore at him/her/you
E. Sulked or refused to talk about an issue
F. Stomped out of the room or house or yard
G. Cried
H. Did or said something to spite him/her/you
I. Threatened to hit or throw something at him/her/you
J. Threw or smashed or hit or kicked something

PHYSICAL VIOLENCE INDEX

Minor Violence

K. Threw something at him/her/you
L. Pushed, grabbed or shoved him/her/you
M. Slapped him/her/you

Severe Violence

N. Kicked, bit or hit him/her/you
O. Hit or tried to hit him/her/you with something
P. Beat him/her/you
Q. Choked him/her/you *
R. Threatened him/her/you with a knife or gun
S. Used knife or fired a gun

* The Item 'Choked him/her/you' was an addition made to the CTS N Aggression Index.

Source: Gelles and Straus, 1988.

The CTS was developed and subsequently refined in the US during the 1970s and 1980s by Murray Straus, Richard Gelles and colleagues at the Family Research Laboratory in the University of New Hampshire[14]. Research by Straus found that the CTS has "construct validity" in that it "produces findings that are consistent with theoretical or empirical propositions about the variable that the instrument purports to measure"[15]. In his testing of the CTS, Straus[16] found that its reliability was highest for the Physical Violence Index, lowest for the Reasoning Index, with Psychological Aggression Index holding an intermediate position. He also found that differences in reliability between these three elements of the CTS "are largely a function of the number of items in each scale"[17]. It has been difficult to measure "concurrent validity" of the CTS – that is the degree to which the new instrument is related to other presumably valid

[14] See Straus, Gelles & Steinmetz, 1980; Straus & Gelles, 1986; Straus, Hamby, Boney-McCoy & Sugarman, 1996.

[15] Straus, 1990a:69-70.

[16] Straus, 1990c:63.

[17] ibid.

instruments - since few other instruments have been designed to measure domestic violence. Interestingly, it has also been found that "social desirability" presents little threat to the validity of the CTS[18] despite discrepancies between the reports of violence given by husbands and by wives with men reporting less violence than women[19]; we return to this issue in Chapter Three by separately estimating the rates of domestic violence based on women's self-report and men's self-report. According to Straus, the CTS is "the best available instrument to measure intrafamily violence" because of the supportive research evidence on "stable factor structure, moderate reliability and concurrent validity and the strong evidence of construct validity"[20].

One group of researchers who used the CTS to measure family violence among Swedish psychiatric in-patients concluded that "the CTS is a reliable and valid instrument for measuring domestic violence"[21]. Another researcher who developed an alternative scale to measure domestic violence – with separate listings for men and women - has also acknowledged that the CTS is "relatively sound" even though "several shortcomings remain"[22]. A more recent review of over 50 studies which have used the CTS found evidence which points to the overall reliability of the CTS[23]. The balance of evidence therefore suggests that the CTS is an adequate measure of domestic violence and certainly as good if not better than any of its alternatives; at the same time, like all research instruments, the results which it produces need to be interpreted with care.

In addition to measuring the type of violence, CTS also measures its intensity in terms of the frequency of violent behaviour. Although critics have observed that the CTS does not measure the outcome or context of violence[24], in reality many of the studies which use the CTS include separate measurements of this. For example, nine of the 13 studies in this review measure the outcome of domestic violence in terms of injuries sustained and the need for treatment while the context is measured in terms of who initiates the violence and why. Thus the criticism that CTS does not measure outcome or context does not apply in practice to many of the studies which use the scale. Similarly, although earlier versions of the CTS (notably CTS N and CTS R*), do not measure sexual violence, three of the studies reviewed here include a measure of sexual violence.

[18] ibid:69; see also Arias & Beach, 1987:147; Resick & Reese, 1986.
[19] See Stets & Straus, 1990a:162; Szinovacz, 1983; Jouriles & O'Leary, 1985; Edleson & Brygger, 1986.
[20] Straus, 1990c:71-2.
[21] Bergman and Ericsson, 1996:169.
[22] Marshall, 1992b:190.
[23] Archer, 1999; 2000.
[24] See, for example, Dobash, Dobash, Cavanagh & Lewis, 1998; Dobash, Dobash, Daly & Wilson, 1992.

The CTS is a self-report instrument and has been found to be acceptable with respondents. Although prevalence rates tend to vary directly with the number of items on the list – such that longer lists produce higher prevalence rates - there are certain items in the CTS which invariably happen if more severe acts have been committed. An inspection of the items comprising physical violence indicates that these can vary in severity from pushing and slapping to beating, choking and the use of a knife or gun. In the US, the distinction between minor and severe physical violence "is roughly parallel to the legal distinction between 'simple assault' and 'aggravated assault'. An aggravated assault is an attack that is likely to cause grave bodily harm, such as an attack with a knife or gun, regardless of whether the object of the attack was actually injured"[25]. In the measurement of domestic violence, it is not difficult to see why it is necessary to measure both violent behaviour and the outcome of that behaviour, and that is what most of the studies reviewed here have done.

Leaving aside studies which use the CTS, the British Crime Survey asked respondents about the most recent occasion when force was used against them and invited them to state if any of the following had happened to them: (1) property deliberately damaged; (2) pushed, shoved or grabbed; (3) kicked, slapped or hit with a fist; (4) anything thrown at you; (5) threatened with anything such as a stick or knife; (6) choked, strangled or suffocated; (7) hit with anything such as a stick[26]. In the Edmonton survey in Canada, respondents were simply asked: "did you ever hit or throw things at your partner?"[27].

2.2.2 *Measuring Psychological Violence*

Psychological violence is a way of hurting the other through behaviours such as insulting, threatening or frightening. As with physical violence, respondents were asked to indicate the frequency with which these behaviours occurred.

In this review, seven of the 13 studies measure psychological violence. Three of these studies – the US National Family Violence Re-Survey, the Calgary Survey in Canada and the Dunedin Survey in New Zealand - use the seven items from the CTS, as indicated in Table 2.3. Most of the CTS items in the psychological scale have an intuitive face validity (such as insulting, threatening or throwing things) but others seem to be more heavily dependent on context and interpretation for their effect (such as crying, sulking and stomping out of the room).

[25] Straus, 1990c:58.
[26] Mirrlees-Black, 1999:105-6.
[27] Bland & Orn, 1986:131.

Four of the studies in this review focus primarily on fear as a form of psychological violence. In the US National Youth Survey, for example, respondents were asked to report on "the number of fights in which they felt in danger of being physically hurt"[28]. Similarly the US National Violence Against Women Survey asked respondents if their perpetrator "threatened to harm or kill them"[29] or if "they feared they or someone close to them would be seriously harmed or killed"[30]. The British Crime Survey also used fear as an aspect of psychological violence in addition to being insulted and asked respondents if their partner had ever: (1) sworn at or insulted you and (2) ever said things that frightened you such as threatening to harm you or someone close to you[31]. The Canadian General Social Survey on Victimisation asked respondents if they did or did not fear for their lives.

2.2.3 Measuring Sexual Violence

Sexual violence is normally understood as forcing a person to engage in some form of sexual activity without their consent. Three of the studies in our review – US National Violence Against Women Survey, British Crime Survey and Canadian General Social Survey on Victimisation - measure sexual violence.

The US National Violence Against Women Survey defines sexual violence as rape which they defined as "an event which occurred without the victim's consent, that involved the use or threat of force to penetrate the victim's vagina or anus by penis, tongue, fingers, or object, or the victim's mouth by penis"[32]. The British Crime Survey asked each respondent if "you were forced to have sex when you didn't want to"[33] while the Canadian Social Survey on Victimisation asked if "your partner forced you into any unwanted sexual activity by threatening you, holding you down, or hurting you in some way"[34].

2.2.4 Measuring Frequency of Violence

All but four of the studies reviewed measure the frequency of violence. The usual method for measuring frequency is by counting the number of times each violent act occurs. The standard categories are: once, twice, 3-5 times, 6-10 times, 11-20 times and 20+ times. From this, a mean or median frequency is calculated, usually drawing upon both victim and perpetrator

[28] Morse, 1995:267-268.
[29] Tjaden & Thoennes, 2000a:153.
[30] ibid.
[31] Mirrlees-Black, 1999:101-102.
[32] Tjaden & Thoennes, 2000:147.
[33] Mirrlees-Black, 1999:106.
[34] Canadian Centre for Justice Statistics, 2000:13.

responses[35]. In the British Crime Survey, the frequency of domestic violence is further analysed to distinguish between "intermittent victims" (those who have been victims of any type of force on 1-2 occasions in the past year) and "chronic victims" (those who have been victims of any type of force on 3+ occasions in the past year)[36]. In the Alberta survey in Canada, frequency levels are differentiated according to whether they are "low" (1-4 incidents in the past year), "moderate" (5-20 incidents in the past year) or "high" (20+ incidents in the past year)[37]. Other studies, notably the British MORI Survey and the Edmonton Survey in Canada, use simpler methods of measuring frequency such as the number reporting "more than one category of assault"[38] in the former or whether the act occurred "on more than one occasion"[39] in the latter.

2.2.5 Measuring Outcome

The outcomes of domestic violence are typically measured in two ways. The first is by asking respondents if they experienced physical injury as a result of a violent act, while the second asks if respondents received medical treatment following the injuries sustained; other less used indicators of outcome include "time off work"[40] and "days in bed"[41] as a result of domestic violence. These measures are useful indicators of outcome although they probably constitute only a small sub-set of all the likely outcomes of domestic violence, both for victims and perpetrators, particularly where children are involved and where the violence is both frequent and severe.

Some studies in this review simply asked if the respondent had sustained "physical injury" or "received medical attention"[42] but most used questionnaires which offered respondents a list of various types of both physical injury and medical attention. In the case of injury, respondents were variously asked if they have "ever been cut, bruised or seriously injured"[43] or been "physically injured, e.g. knocked down, bruised, scratched, cut, choked, bones broken or teeth injured"[44]. The items constituting injury in the US National Violence Against Women Survey include: "scratch, bruise or welt; laceration or knife wound; broken bone or dislocated bone; head and spinal cord injury; sore muscle, sprain or strain; internal injury; broken tooth; burn,

[35] See, for example, Morse, 1995:262.
[36] Mirrlees-Black, 1999:71
[37] Kwong, Bartholomew & Dutton, 1999:8.
[38] Carrado et al, 1996:403
[39] Bland & Orn, 1986:131.
[40] Kwong, Bartholomew & Dutton, 1999:10.
[41] Stets & Straus, 1990s:157-8.
[42] Canadian Centre for Justice Statistics, 2000: Table 2.5.
[43] Brush, 1990:60.
[44] Morse, 1995:254.

knocked unconscious"[45]. The British Crime Survey defined injury as involving either bruise, scratch, cut, broken bone or other injury[46].

As regards the usage of medical services, most refer to doctors and hospitals but other questionnaires offer a more extensive list of options including hospital care, physician care, dental care, ambulance / paramedic care and physical therapy[47]. In the Australian International Social Science Survey, the dimensions of injury and medical care are intermingled as follows: (1) injured, needed first aid; (2) needed treatment by a doctor or nurse; (3)pain as bad as hitting thumb with a hammer, or worse; (4) called the police or other government authority[48].

2.2.6 Measuring Context

The context of domestic violence is measured in five of the studies reviewed here by asking about which partner initiated the violence, while one of these studies – the British MORI Survey – also asked about the reasons why, in the opinion of both perpetrator and victim, the violent behaviour occurred. These questions throw useful light on the context of domestic violence although it is also worth bearing in mind that a full understanding of context would require a broader understanding of the behaviours, attitudes and emotions that make up the relationship between the couple.

The typical question used to measure initiation is "who was responsible or to blame for starting the fight"[49]. In the British Crime Survey, respondents were given a choice of three options to describe initiation: (1) you used force first; (2) they used force first; (3) can't remember[50]. In the Edmonton survey in Canada, each respondent was given the option of answering yes or no to the question: "were you ever the one who hit or threw things first, regardless of who started the argument?"[51]. Similar 'forced choice response options' were offered in the Alberta survey in Canada[52].

Another aspect of context is the reasons which people give for using force against their partner. This was explored in one study by asking respondents why they and their partners used force[53]. The response options in this study included: it was the only way to get through to him / her; I

[45] Tjaden & Thoennes, 2000c:Exhibit 13.
[46] Mirrlees-Black, 1999:107.
[47] Tjaden & Thoennes, 2000c: Exhibit 15.
[48] Headey, Scott & de Vaus, 1999:15.
[49] Morse, 1995:255.
[50] Mirrlees-Black, 1999:106.
[51] Bland & Orn, 1986:131.
[52] Kwong, Bartholomew & Dutton, 1999:11.

was getting back at him / her for something nasty (s)he said or threatened to do to me; I wanted to make him / her do what I wanted; I was under the influence of alcohol at the time.

2.3 Sample Characteristics

In this section we describe the samples used in the different studies. This includes a description of sample characteristics such as definition, size, response rate, method of data collection and unit of analysis. Our purpose in drawing attention to sample characteristics is to create awareness of the limitations of survey data and the dangers of over-extrapolating from the results of one survey alone. A key implication of this for the present report is that conclusions about the prevalence and correlates of domestic violence can only be drawn where these are strongly corroborated across the different surveys.

2.3.1 Definition of Sample

The populations in these studies are defined in terms of either current relationships, previous relationships or both. As summarised in Table 2.4, the population in 10 of the studies may be described as adult men and women who are "ever married or cohabiting" which includes those who are currently married and cohabiting as well as those who are separated, divorced, widowed or remarried. In practice, some studies select their sample on the basis of persons who are "currently married or cohabiting" but then ask questions about relationships in either the past year or in their life time which means that the scope of these studies is not just the current relationship but previous relationships as well. In this sense, the studies which we review examine domestic violence in all forms of heterosexual relationships[54] and some, particularly the US National Family Violence Re-Survey, separately estimate the prevalence of domestic violence in each relationship form (see Chapter Three below).

2.3.2 Sample Size and Response Rate

A summary of sample size in the studies under review is presented in Table 2.5. This shows that eight of the studies have achieved sample sizes of 1,000 to 2,000 but four have samples of over 10,000 while one has a sample of over 6,000. In general, the larger a randomly selected sample, the more reliable the statistics, particularly when it comes to the analysis of sub-samples such as cohabiting couples, separated couples, dating couples, etc.

[53] Carrado et al, 1996:409.

[54] As indicated above, three studies also collected data on domestic violence in homosexual relationships. These are: the US National Violence Against Women Survey (Tjaden & Thoennes, 2000 a, b & c); the British Crime Survey (Mirrlees-Black, 1999) and the Canadian General Social Survey on Victimisation (Canadian Centre for Justice Statistics, 2000).

Table 2.4 Relationship Status of Respondents in Studies of Domestic Violence

Name of Study	Current Relationship Status	Last Year*	Life-Time*
1. US National Family Violence Survey, 1975/6	Currently married / cohabiting	✔	✔
2. US National Family Violence Re-Survey, 1985	Currently married / cohabiting	✔	✔
3. US National Survey of Families & Households, 1987/8	Currently married	✔	
4. US National Youth Survey, 1992	Ever married / cohabiting	✔	
5. US National Violence Against Women Survey, 1995/6	Ever married / cohabiting	✔	✔
6. British MORI Survey, 1994	Ever married / cohabiting	✔	✔
7. British Crime Survey, 1996	Ever married / cohabiting	✔	✔
8. Canada, Calgary Survey, 1981	Currently married / cohabiting	✔	
9. Canada, Edmonton Survey 1983/4	Ever married / cohabiting	✔	✔
10. Canada, Alberta Survey 1987	Ever married / cohabiting	✔	
11. Canada, General Social Survey on Victimisation, 1999	Ever married / cohabiting	✔	✔
12. Australia, International Social Science Survey 1996/7	Ever married / cohabiting	✔	
13. New Zealand, Dunedin Survey, 1972/3	Ever married / cohabiting	✔	

*These refer to all relationships in that period. For more details, see Table A2.2 in the Appendix to Chapter Two.

An important influence on the reliability of statistics in sample surveys is the response rate and is "one of the more frequent sources of bias in social science research"[55]. Table 2.5 shows that all but one of the studies in this review had response rates of over 60% but one had a response rate of 56%. One textbook on social research offers the following as a rough guide to the impact of response rates: "50 percent is adequate for analysis and reporting. A response of 60 percent is good. And a response rate of 70 percent is very good"[56]. It is significant that the one study in our review - the US National Violence Against Women Survey – which had the lowest response rate (56%) and which had a decisively higher refusal rate from men (48%) than from women (36%), produced the only set of results which are significantly at variance with all the other studies under review.

The issues of sample size and response rate are particularly important in studies of domestic violence, since these surveys run the risk that significant sub-groups of men or women may be missed simply because, as a consequence of their involvement in domestic violence, they refuse to participate for reasons of guilt or fear. However it is normally very difficult to estimate the direction of bias when potential respondents refuse to participate.

[55] Vogt, 1999:248.
[56] Babbie, 1998:22.

Table 2.5 Sample Size and Response Rate in Studies of Domestic Violence

Name of Study	Achieved Sample Size	Response Rate (%)
1. US National Family Violence Survey, 1975/6	2,143	64
2. US National Family Violence Re-Survey, 1985	6,002	84
3. US National Survey of Families & Households, 1987/8	13,017	NA*
4. US National Youth Survey, 1992	1,340	78
5. US National Violence Against Women Survey, 1995/6	16,000	56
6. British MORI Survey, 1994	1,978	75
7. British Crime Survey, 1996	10,844	97
8. Canada Calgary Survey, 1981	1,124	72
9. Canada, Edmonton Survey 1983/4	1,200	80
10. Canada, Alberta Survey 1987	1,045	90
11. Canada, General Social Survey on Victimisation, 1999	15,743	94
12. Australia, International Social Science Survey 1996/7	1,643	65
13. New Zealand, Dunedin Survey, 1972/3	1,037	83

*N.A. = Not Available. For more details, see Table A2.2 in the Appendix to Chapter Two.

2.3.3 Method of Data Collection

The reliability of survey statistics may also be influenced by the method of data collection. In the studies under review, three methods of data collection were used with equal frequency: face-to-face interviews, self-completion of questionnaire and telephone interview (see Table A2.3 in the Appendix to Chapter Two for more details). Each method can influence the response rate as well as the reliability of responses although the precise influence can be difficult to detect. It is known that anonymity is an important influence on whether or not questions are answered truthfully. If, for example, a spouse who has perpetrated violence against the respondent is likely to overhear responses in a face-to-face interview, then fear will undoubtedly inhibit truthfulness and may even put the respondent in danger of further violence. Some of the problems which arise with self-completion questionnaires concern eye-sight, literacy and comprehension; at the same time, giving help to the respondent can interfere with anonymity. For example, in the British Crime Survey it was estimated that "those who....completed the questionnaire with someone else's assistance had lower rates of domestic victimisation"[57]. Telephone interviews are less costly than face-to-face interviews and, because of its perceived anonymity, "the telephone leads to more truthfulness and, therefore, increased reporting of violence"[58]. However the disadvantage is that "telephone

[57] Mirrlees-Black, 1999:97.
[58] Straus & Gelles, 1990:123.

interviews cannot reasonably expect to keep subjects on the telephone for much more than 35 minutes"[59].

With one exception, all of the surveys in this review are based on cross-sectional data, that is data collected at one point in time; the exception is the US National Youth Survey[60], for which data was collected over four years. It is possible that, in longitudinal studies, respondents become accustomed to answering intimate questions and may be more forthcoming over time and this would improve the reliability of the data. The respondents in the Dunedin Survey[61] in New Zealand were also interviewed on several occasions prior to being questioned about domestic violence and, according to the authors of this study, "had, in the past, repeatedly reported ... on sensitive topics such as sexual behaviour. Because there has never been a violation of confidentiality, they were willing to provide frank reports"[62]. In view of these considerations, it is significant that these two studies - US National Youth Survey and the Dunedin Survey in New Zealand - yielded the highest prevalence rates of domestic violence for both men and women. However, it also needs to be acknowledged that the focus of both these studies was on youth which, as we shall see in Chapter Three, have higher rates of domestic violence than older age groups.

2.3.4 Unit of Analysis

The unit of analysis in all but one of the studies is adult men and women who are not related to each other; one study, the Calgary Survey[63] in Canada, collected data from both members of each couple. The unit of analysis is important because research on domestic violence, and on marital and couple relationships generally, has yielded "ample evidence that spouses differ substantially in their answers to seemingly objective questions"[64], (i.e. responses from each partner may be discrepant[65]). This problem is further obscured by the use of aggregate data (i.e. combining data from unrelated men and women). Whilst data using either unit of analysis can be analysed for gender bias in self-reporting, data from couples give a more reliable picture of interspousal agreement, as well as gender bias in self-reporting. Couple data also provide valuable information about the unidirectionality or reciprocity of intimate violence and this can be useful in estimating, for example, the extent of mutual violence.

[59] ibid:23.
[60] Morse 1995.
[61] Magdol et al., 1997.
[62] ibid:70
[63] Brinkerhoff & Lupri, 1988.
[64] See for example Marsiglio, 1995; Hawkins, Christiansen, Pond Sargent & Hill, 1995; Rosenbaum & O'Leary, 1981; O'Leary and Arias, 1988; Geffner et al., 1988.
[65] Klein, 1982; see also Geffner et al., 1988:467.

Whether data on domestic violence is collected from respondents concerning their victimisation or their perpetration, or indeed both, is also relevant given the tendency for perpetrators to under-estimate their violence (see Chapter Three below). More than half the studies under review ask respondents about both victimisation and perpetration while the others focus exclusively on either one, mainly victimisation (see Table A2.3 in the Appendix to Chapter Two for more details). Clearly studies which focus on both victimisation and perpetration provide a more robust basis for testing the reliability of self-reports.

2.4 Conclusion

Our purpose in this chapter was to identify research studies which are relevant to assessing the prevalence of domestic violence against men and women. We did this by selecting studies which met two criteria: (1) the study must include both men and women and their experiences of domestic violence, either as victims or perpetrators or both, and (2) the study must be based on a representative sample of the population and adhere to acceptable random sampling procedures. The application of these two criteria yielded 13 studies which offer a reliable picture of the prevalence of domestic violence by men and women. In geographical terms, our search yielded five studies from the US, four from Canada, two from Britain and one each from Australia and New Zealand.

These studies throw valuable light on the key dimensions of domestic violence including physical, psychological and sexual abuse, its severity and frequency, its outcome in terms of injuries and the need for medical care, and the overall context of domestic violence in terms of who initiated it and why. Most of the studies in the review adopt a "relationship or family perspective" to the measurement of domestic violence and invite respondents to speak of their experience – either as victims or perpetrators – in the context of general conflicts and rows which couples may have. However some of the studies adopt a "crime or assault perspective" by inviting respondents to disclose if they have been a victim of an assault or other abuse in a current or previous relationship. There is some overlap between the two perspectives and some of the studies seem to combine elements of both. The significance of the distinction, as we shall see more clearly in Chapter Three, lies primarily in the fact that the "relationship or family perspective" typically yields a much higher prevalence rate than the "crime or assault perspective". This is mainly because the former is more conducive to disclosure by virtue of reducing some of the stigma normally associated with domestic violence for perpetrators and victims alike. For this reason, the "relationship or family perspective" seems likely to yield a more accurate picture of the true prevalence of domestic violence in society.

The chapter explained in some detail the various instruments used to measure domestic violence, including the Conflict Tactics Scale (CTS) which is used by many studies to measure physical and psychological violence. The CTS is used in conjunction with other measures to capture the multi-dimensional nature of domestic violence, particularly its outcome and context.

The chapter also described the samples used in the different studies. In 10 of the 13 studies the sample comprised adult men and women who are "ever married or cohabiting" which includes those who are currently married and cohabiting as well as those who are separated, divorced, widowed or remarried. As regards sample size we found that eight of the studies have achieved sample sizes of 1,000 to 2,000 but four have samples of over 10,000 and one had over 6,000. All but one of the studies had response rates of over 60% but one had a response rate of 56%, this being the study - the US National Violence Against Women Survey – which produced the only set of results which are significantly at variance with the other studies under review, possibly due to the high refusal rate, particularly among men.

In the studies under review, three methods of data collection were used with equal frequency: face-to-face interviews, self-completion of questionnaire and telephone interviews. Each method can influence the response rate as well as the reliability of responses although the precise influence is hard to judge. All but two of the surveys are based on cross-sectional data but two were part of longitudinal studies and this may have improved their reliability as respondents became accustomed to answering intimate questions, including questions about domestic violence. Whether or not this is the case, it is significant that the two studies which were part of longitudinal surveys yielded higher prevalence rates of domestic violence for both men and women than any other study in the review.

Overall, the analysis in this chapter indicates that the studies reviewed are statistically robust in terms of their overall methodology including measurement instruments, achieved sample size and response rate and can be taken as a good representation of their respective populations. At the same time, all survey data has limitations which need to be borne in mind when making extrapolations from samples to populations. One way of minimising these limitations is by comparing results from different surveys in different countries and drawing conclusions only where these are strongly corroborated across those surveys; that is a particular strength of the work and results presented in this report.

Chapter Three

What is the Prevalence of Domestic Violence Against Men?

"Conflict can be creative. I do not imagine a world without conflict. I do have a vision of a world without violence"

Center for NonViolent Communication, Texas, USA (www.cnvc.org)

3.1 Introduction

In this chapter we report on the prevalence of domestic violence as revealed in thirteen major studies. These studies, as described in the previous chapter, meet the two key criteria necessary for yielding reliable information on the prevalence of domestic violence: (1) the studies include both men and women and their experiences of domestic violence, either as victims, perpetrators or both; and (2) the studies are based on representative samples of the population and adhere to random sampling procedures.

Before discussing the detailed results of these studies, it is necessary to consider an issue affecting all of the data on which they are based, namely the truthfulness of self-reports by men and women on their victimisation and perpetration (section 3.2). In the light of these considerations, we summarise key findings on the different dimensions of domestic violence as follows: total physical violence (section 3.3), both severe (section 3.4) and minor (section 3.5), psychological violence (section 3.6), sexual violence (section 3.7), frequency of violence (section 3.8), outcome of violence (section 3.9) and context of violence (section 3.10). The chapter concludes with a synopsis of the key findings and reflections on their implications (section 3.11). Throughout the chapter we use tables to present key findings on each dimension of domestic violence in order to facilitate cross-study and cross-country comparisons, while more detailed findings from the studies are presented in the Appendix to Chapter Three.

3.2 Reliability of Self-Reports on Victimisation and Perpetration

It is generally agreed that self-reports on victimisation and perpetration by both partners in a relationship offer the ideal way of determining the true prevalence of domestic violence. This however is rarely available and all of the studies reviewed here, with the exception of the Calgary Survey in Canada, are based on the self-reports of men and women who are unrelated to each other; that is the norm in studies of domestic violence. In all studies, however, the

difficulty still arises that both men and women may under-report their perpetration and over-report their victimisation. This is part of a more general issue involving research on intimate relationships, namely that men and women sometimes perceive their own and their partner's behaviour quite differently[1].

Studies which have examined this issue of under- and over-reporting tend to the view that, although it occurs, it is not on such a scale nor so different between men and women as to seriously question the validity and reliability of self-report data. The issue was examined in a meta-analytic study of over 80 domestic violence surveys which concluded that "data from perpetrator ratings and victim ratings indicate that there is a greater measure of agreement than past critics have suggested"[2]. One study compared reports by each member of a couple and found that couples were more likely to agree upon the non-occurrence of physical violence and whether the female partner used violence than whether the male partner did[3]. Similarly, another study found that "though victims (both men and women) reported somewhat more abuse than did their perpetrators, this was not statistically significant"[4].

Of the thirteen studies in this review, six of them allow us to examine what has been termed the "offender effect" and the "gender effect" in self-reports of domestic violence. The results are summarised in Table 3.1.

Table 3.1 Studies Which Show Offender Effects and Gender Effects in Self-Reports of Domestic Violence

Name of Study	Offender Effect		Gender Effect	
	Yes	No	Yes	No
US National Family Violence Re-Survey, 1985	✔		✔	
US National Youth Survey, 1992	✔		✔	
British MORI Survey, 1994	✔			✔
Canada, Alberta Survey 1987	✔		✔	
Australia, International Social Science Survey 1996/97	✔		✔	
New Zealand, Dunedin Survey, 1972/73	✔		✔	
Total	**6**	**0**	**5**	**1**

For details on the authors and sources of these studies, see Table A3.1 in the Appendix to Chapter Three.

The tendency of both men and women to under-report their own perpetration and over-report their own victimisation is known as the "offender effect" and is found in all six studies listed in Table 3.1. In aggregate terms, the offender effect creates the anomalous situation where fewer acts of violence are perpetrated than are sustained. For example, the US National Youth Survey

[1] See for example Marsiglio, 1995; Hawkins, Christiansen, Pond Sargent & Hill, 1995; Rosenbaum & O'Leary, 1981; O'Leary & Arias, 1988; Geffner et al., 1988.
[2] Archer, 1999:1284.
[3] Szinovacz, 1983.

found that "the rate of minor male-to-female violence reported by men is generally higher than that reported by women and the rate of severe male-to-female violence reported by men is generally lower than that reported by women. However, the same pattern holds true for the women respondents reporting on their own minor and severe violence toward men. Thus there appears to be an 'offender effect' rather than a 'gender effect' in reporting violence, with each sex generally overstating their own minor aggressive behaviour toward their partner (compared to that reported by the opposite sex) and understating their own severe violence"[5].

The gender effect, as the term suggests, refers to the tendency for either men or women to systematically over-report or under-report their own or their partner's victimisation or perpetration. This can be difficult to quantify unless one is using couple data where both partners are invited to report on both perpetration and victimisation. Since this type of data is rarely available, the usual practice is to compare the difference between: (1) self-reported male perpetration and self-reported female victimisation on the one hand and (2) self-reported female perpetration and self-reported male victimisation on the other hand. The results from the five studies in this review which allow the issue to be examined show that men under-report perpetration relative to women in three of these studies (US National Family Violence Re-Survey, US National Youth Survey and the Dunedin Survey in New Zealand), men over-report perpetration relative to women in one study (Alberta Survey in Canada) while the other study (Australian International Social Science Survey) shows than women under-report perpetration relative to men. The finding that men tend to under-report perpetration relative to women has also been found in other studies, both community-based[6] and clinic-based[7] as well as by a meta-analysis of over 80 studies which "indicated systematic under-reporting by perpetrators of both sexes, which is greater for men than for women"[8].

These different studies point to two conclusions. First, there is conclusive evidence of offender bias in reporting domestic violence such that both men and women under-report their own perpetration and over-report their own victimisation. The implication of this, according to one team of researchers, is that "...under research conditions that guarantee confidentiality, either abuser reports or victim reports are suitable methods for use in research on partner abuse"[9]. Second, there is less conclusive evidence of gender bias in reporting domestic violence, although some studies do show that men tend to under-report their own perpetration. The implication of

[4] Moffitt et al., 1997:55.
[5] Morse 1995:259; see also Riggs et al., 1989; Browning & Dutton, 1986.
[6] Szinovacz, 1983.
[7] Jouriles & O'Leary, 1985.
[8] Archer, 2000:665.

this, according to the same team of researchers, is that "either the man or the woman may serve equally well as the source of data for research"[10]. Typically it is not possible to do anything about offender bias or gender bias in data that has already been collected except to be aware of its implications in the analysis and to test for its impact by separately calculating prevalence rates based on the self-reports of both men and women. That is what we have done in all of the tables in this chapter.

3.3 Total Physical Violence

Total physical violence in a relationship is calculated by summing the total number of acts, both serious and minor, which are sustained or inflicted by the respondent in a current or previous relationship. The usual timeframe for calculating domestic violence is the last year or the life-time or both. As indicated in Table 3.2, most of the studies in this review (12 out of 13) measure the prevalence of domestic violence in all relationships within the last year but some (4 out of 13) measure it over the course of a life-time as well; one study measured it over the past five years.

Beginning with the last year, the results in Table 3.2 show that women are either more likely than men to inflict physical violence (as shown by 8 out of 12 studies) or equally likely (as shown by 3 of the 12 studies). This finding is based on self-reports from men and women; even when the offender effect and the gender effect associated with self-reports are taken into account, the result still stands that "within the family, women are about as violent as men"[11].

[9] Moffitt et al., 1997:47.
[10] ibid:54
[11] Stets & Straus, 1990a:157.

Table 3.2 Prevalence of Total Physical Violence in Representative Samples of Men and Women

Name of Study	Total Physical Violence					
	Last Year			Life-Time		
	F to M	M to F	Both*	F to M	M to F	Both*
US National Family Violence Survey, 1975/6	11.6	12.1				
US National Family Violence Re-Survey, 1985	12.4	11.6				
Re-Survey, 1985 (Co-habiting Only) §	9.3 (26.9)	7.2 (20.7)	18.1 (52.4)			
Re-Survey, 1985 (Married Only) §	4.2 (28.6)	3.4 (23.2)	7.1 (48.2)			
US National Survey of Families & Households, 1987/8	3.4	2.9				
US National Youth Survey, 1992	27.9	20.2				
	37.7p	13.9p	48.5p			
US National Violence Against Women Survey, 1995/6	0.6v	1.1v		7.0v	20.4v	
British MORI Survey, 1994	11.2v[a]	4.5v[a]		17.3v	13.4v	
				10.9p	9.5p	6.8
British Crime Survey, 1996	4.2v	4.2v		14.9v	22.7v	
Canada Calgary Survey, 1981 §	13.2p (35.2p)	10.3p (27.3p)	14.3p (37.5p)			
Canada, Edmonton Survey 1983/4				22.6p	14.6p	
Canada, Alberta Survey 1987	12.3v	9.6v				
	12.5p	12.9p				
Canada, General Social Survey on Victimisation, 1999	2.0v	2.0v		7.0v[b]	8.0v[b]	
	4.0v[c]	4.0v[c]		22.0v[d]	28.0v[d]	
Australia, International Social Science Survey 1996/7	5.7v	3.7v				
	3.6p	3.4p				
New Zealand, Dunedin Survey, 1972/3	34.1v	27.1v				
	37.2p	21.8p				

Definitions: F to M = Female to Male physical violence : M to F = Male to Female physical violence : p = respondent is perpetrator : v = respondent is victim : numbers which do not have "v" or "p" attached to them are based on responses from both victims and perpetrators combined.

* The term "both" refers to those respondents who reported being both victim and perpetrator of domestic violence in all relationships, although not necessarily in the same relationship.

§ The numbers in brackets are based on the sub-sample of respondents who have been either victims or perpetrators of domestic violence and sum to 100%. The numbers in the same cells without brackets are based on the total sample of male and female respondents in order to derive a true prevalence rate.

[a] Data under heading 'Last Year' relates to any time in current relationship.

[b] Data under heading 'Life-Time' relates to any partner in last five years.

[c] Data under heading 'Last Year' relates to current partner in last five years.

[d] Date under heading 'Life-Time' relates to past partners in last five years.

For further details, see Table A3.1 in the Appendix to Chapter Three.

Only one study – the US National Violence Against Women Survey - shows the reverse of this trend and the reason for this, as suggested in the previous chapter, may be due to the fact that it adopted a "crime or assault perspective", while all but one of the others adopted a "relationship or family perspective". The authors of the US National Violence Against Women Survey reported that their survey first asked respondents "whether they had ever sustained violent acts … and, if so, whether their perpetrator was a current or past intimate partner"[12]; reflecting on

[12] Tjaden & Thoennes, 2000c:23

this, the authors comment that "this approach may be considered less accepting of partner violence and therefore less likely to result in disclosure of intimate perpetrated violence"[13].

Turning to life-time prevalence, two of the four studies which have data on this show a reverse pattern with men being more likely than women to inflict physical violence (see Table 3.2). The reasons for this are not obvious but one contributory factor is likely to be that separated men tend to be more violent to their ex-partners[14] which, over the course of a life-time, would contribute to the higher life-time prevalence of domestic violence against women. However this is unlikely to be the entire explanation and the difference between last year and life-time prevalence may be part of a trend over time towards gender equality in rates of domestic violence either because women are becoming more violent, men are becoming less violent or perhaps a combination of both. Whatever the explanation, the finding that women are at least as likely as men to inflict physical violence in the past year is strongly corroborated by the different studies using random and representative samples reviewed here.

Two further features of domestic violence are noteworthy from Table 3.2. The first concerns the overall prevalence of domestic violence in countries such as the US, UK[15], Canada, Australia and New Zealand. A striking feature of the results in Table 3.2 is that the prevalence rate varies from less than 1% to nearly 50%. This partly reflects methodological differences in the studies as well as differences in sample characteristics. Methodologically, studies which estimate the prevalence of domestic violence using data on victimisation – such as the US National Violence Against Women Survey, the British Crime Survey and the Canadian General Social Survey on Victimisation - tend to derive lower rates than studies which combine data on both victimisation and perpetration. In addition, there are differences between the studies in their sample characteristics which also contribute to differences in prevalence rates. It is clear, for example, that younger people are a good deal more violent than older people as indicated by the fact that the two studies which have the highest prevalence rates – US National Youth Survey and the Dunedin Survey in New Zealand - were based on populations of young people. According to the author of one of these studies, "sample age appears to be a major factor contributing to observed prevalence rate differences"[16]. The youth dimension may also be reflected in the fact, as shown in the National Family Violence Re-Survey, that cohabiting couples are twice as

[13] ibid, 2000a:158-9.

[14] See, for example, Mirrlees-Black, 1999:Table A6.1, p78; Canadian Centre for Justice Statistics, 2000:Tables A5 and A6, pp.51-2; as one review (Archer, 2000:665) has observed, "there is a much higher female victimisation rate following separation and divorce (Gaquin, 1977-78; Wilson & Daly, 1993)".

[15] Unlike other studies, the British Crime Survey included sexual violence in calculating total physical violence over a life-time and this may by part of the reason why its prevalence rates differ significantly from the British MORI Survey.

violent to each other as married couples. However youth is not the only factor and one study has shown that, even when age is controlled for, "the greater risk of assault typically occurs when individuals live together but are not married"[17]. One study has also shown that dating relationships have higher rates of domestic violence than married or cohabiting relationships[18].

Bearing these considerations in mind, and leaving aside the extremes of high and low prevalence rates which arise because of the influence of methodology and sample characteristics, one is then led to the conclusion that the overall prevalence of domestic violence in the countries studied ranges from 5% to 20% of all intimate relationships. This range constitutes the likely upper and lower limits of the problem in these countries and may be a good indication of the likely extent of domestic violence in Ireland.

A second feature concerns the composition of domestic violence between male-only, female-only and mutual. Three studies throw light on this issue – US National Family Violence Re-Survey, US National Youth Survey and the Calgary Survey in Canada - and are fairly consistent in showing that up to half of all domestic violence is mutual; as regards the other half, the studies show that female-only violence tends to be greater than male-only violence (Table 3.2). The fact that up to half of all domestic violence is mutual is not surprising, according to one team of researchers, since "conjugal violence is multifaceted and is a result of conflict exchanges between couples. It takes place in an interactive context that is governed by mutual dependence and reciprocity; thus we would expect mutual violence to be more prevalent than violence committed by only one partner"[19].

3.4 Severe Physical Violence[20]

Severe physical violence, as we have seen in Chapter Two, involves acts such as kicking, biting, hitting or beating a person as well as using or threatening to use a knife or gun. Nine of the 13 studies estimate the prevalence of severe physical violence in the past year (Table 3.3). These studies suggest that severe violence constitutes around 40% of total physical violence. All of the results in Table 3.3 show that, within the past year, women used more severe acts of violence against men than men did against women.

[16] Morse, 1995:256.
[17] Stets & Straus, 1990b:241.
[18] Carrado et al., 1996:409.
[19] Brinkerhoff & Lupri, 1988:421.
[20] In some of the studies, the term 'assault' is used synonymously with severe physical violence; in this report we use only the latter term in order to maintain consistency.

Table 3.3 Prevalence of Severe Physical Violence In Representative Samples of Men and Women

Name of Study	Severe Physical Violence				
	Last Year			Life-Time	
	F to M	M to F	Both*	F to M	M to F
US National Family Violence Survey, 1975/6	4.6	3.8			
US National Family Violence Re-Survey, 1985	4.8	3.4			
Re-Survey, 1985 (Co-habiting)	4.6	2.5	7.6		
	(13.4)	(7.3)	(22.0)		
Re-Survey, 1985 (Married)	1.4	0.8	1.5		
	(9.6)	(5.7)	(10.5)		
US National Youth Survey, 1992	13.8	5.7			
	16.3v	6.7v			
	11.4p	4.7p			
US National Violence Against Women Survey, 1995/6				2.6v[1]	5.3v[1]
				0.5v[2]	8.4v[2]
British MORI Survey, 1994✣	4.0v[a]	2.0v[a]		7.0v	6.0v
				3.0p	2.0p
				9.0sv[3]	10.0sv[3]
				5.0mv[3]	3.0mv[3]
Canada Calgary Survey, 1981	10.7p	4.8p	6.0p		
	(49.6p)	(22.3p)	(28.1p)		
Canada, Alberta Survey 1987	4.8v	2.8v	5.5		
	4.5p	2.2p			
Canada, General Social Survey on Victimisation, 1999	1.7v[6c]	0.7v[6c]		3.0v[4b]	1.0v[4b]
	(41.0v[6c])	(19.0v[6c])		(42.0v[4b])	(11.0v[4b])
	0.2v[2c]	0.5v[2c]		3.5v[2d]	9.0v[2d]
	(4.0v[2c])	(13.0v[2c])		(16.0v[2d])	(32.0v[2d])
Australia, International Social Science Survey 1996/7	4.1v[5]	2.5v[5]			
	2.8p[5]	2.2p[5]			
New Zealand, Dunedin Survey, 1972/3	21.2v	12.7v			
	18.6p	5.7p			

Definitions: F to M = Female to Male physical violence : M to F = Male to Female physical violence: p = respondent is perpetrator : v = respondent is victim : numbers which do not have "v" or "p" attached to them are based on responses from both victims and perpetrators combined.

* The term "both" refers to those respondents who reported being both victim and perpetrator of domestic violence in all relationships, although not necessarily in the same relationship.

§ The numbers in brackets are based on the sub-sample of respondents who have been either victims or perpetrators of "severe" domestic violence. The numbers in the same cells without brackets are based on the total sample of male and female respondents in order to derive a true prevalence rate.

✣ sv = single and dating victims: mv = married or cohabiting victims.

[1] Kicked, bit. [2] Beat up. [3] Punched/kicked. [4] Kicked, bit, hit, hit with something.

[5] Hit with fist, or with something held in hand, or thrown. [6] Kicked, bit or hit.

[a] Data under heading 'Last Year' relates to any time in current relationship.

[b] Data under heading 'Life-Time' relates to any partner in last five years.

[c] Data under heading 'Last Year' relates to current partner in last five years.

[d] Date under heading 'Life-Time' relates to past partners in last five years.

For further details, see Table A3.2 in the Appendix to Chapter Three.

This is a surprising result given the greater strength of men and, as with the measurement of all forms of domestic violence, is influenced by the wording of different types of abuse and the responses of men and women to that wording. The Canadian Social Survey on Victimisation gives a detailed breakdown on men's and women's responses to different types of severe violence and this reveals that while women are nearly three times more likely than men to report being "beat up" by their partners, men are three times more likely to report being "kicked, bit,

hit, or hit with something" by their partners. A remarkable variability in responses to these items is also to be found in the US National Violence Against Women Survey. Both forms of abuse - "beat up" and "kicked, bit, hit, or hit with something" - are deemed to constitute severe violence and could even be regarded as synonyms for each other but each seem to have quite different connotations for both men and women. This is in line with other research which has found that violent behaviours are "likely to differ in meanings and implications depending upon the gender of the perpetrator and gender of recipient (Arias and Johnson, 1986; Makepeace, 1986; Pirog-Good and Stets, 1989)"[21].

Two studies estimate the life-time prevalence of severe domestic violence and one of them shows that men use more severe physical violence than women (the US National Violence Against Women Survey) while the other shows that women use more severe physical violence than men (British MORI Survey).

The findings on severe physical violence mirror the findings on total physical violence, particularly with respect to the prevalence of domestic violence among different sub-groups of the population. In practice this means that relationships are at their most severely violent when the respondents are young, dating, cohabiting, single or separated and are least violent when couples are married and older. We return to a discussion of these variables in Chapter Four.

3.5 Minor Physical Violence

Five studies in this review estimate the prevalence of minor physical violence in the past year. As discussed in Chapter Two, these studies measure minor physical violence using three items from CTS namely: (1) threw something at partner; (2) pushed, grabbed or shoved partner; (3) slapped partner. All five studies are consistent in showing that women are either equally likely or more likely than men to perpetrate minor acts of domestic violence. These studies also show, as might be expected, that the prevalence of minor violent acts is greater than the prevalence of severe violent acts (see Tables A3.2 and A3.3 in the Appendix to Chapter Three).

3.6 Psychological Violence

As with other forms of domestic violence, the prevalence of psychological violence is heavily dependent on how it is defined and measured. Seven of the studies in this review measure

[21] Marshall, 1992b:190.

psychological violence (see Table 3.4). Three of these – the US National Family Violence Re-Survey, the Calgary Survey in Canada and the Dunedin Survey in New Zealand - measure psychological violence using the CTS definition (see Table 2.2 in Chapter Two above) and all of them show that women are more likely to perpetrate psychological violence than men. By contrast, four studies - the US National Youth Survey, the US National Violence Against Women, the British Crime Survey and the Canadian General Social Survey on Victimisation – define psychological violence in terms of feeling in fear or in physical danger and these find that men are more likely to perpetrate psychological violence than women.

Table 3.4 Prevalence of Psychological Violence in Representative Samples of Men and Women

Name of Study	Psychological Violence[1]					
	Last Year			Last Year		
	F to M	M to F	Both*	F to M	M to F	Both*
US National Family Violence Re-Survey, 1985	75.0	74.0				
US National Youth Survey, 1992	13.5[22]	29.0[2]				
US National Violence Against Women Survey, 1995/6	19.6v[3]	44.7v[3]				
British Crime Survey, 1996	1.2v[2]	3.8v[2]	2.6v[2]	5.1v[2] 56.1v[4]	15.9v[2] 49.3v[4]	10.8v[2] 52.5v[4]
Canada Calgary Survey, 1981	23.5	13.2	36.7			
Canada, General Social Survey on Victimisation, 1999				0.5v[5] (7.0v[5])	3.2v[5] (38.0v[5])	
New Zealand, Dunedin Survey, 1972/3	89.7v 94.6p	83.8v 85.8p				

Definitions: F to M = Female to Male psychological violence : M to F = Male to Female psychological violence : p = respondent is perpetrator : v = respondent is victim : numbers which do not have "v' or "p" attached to them are based on responses from both victims and perpetrators combined.

* The term "both" refers to those respondents who reported being both victim and perpetrator of domestic violence in all relationships, although not necessarily in the same relationship.

§ The numbers in brackets are based on the sub-sample of respondents who have been either victims or perpetrators of domestic violence. The numbers in the same cells without brackets are based on the total sample of male and female respondents in order to derive a true prevalence rate.

1 Unless otherwise stated 'Psychological Violence' is measured using CTS R* Items D to J.

2 Where respondents felt in physical danger.

3 Where respondents feared bodily injury or death at most recent physical assault.

4 Where respondents were sworn at/insulted.

5 Where respondents feared for life in past 5 years.

For further details, see Table A.3.4 in the Appendix to Chapter Three.

The different ways in which men and women experience psychological violence is neatly illustrated in the British Crime Survey which shows that men are more likely to be "sworn at or insulted"[22] whereas women are more likely to have had things said to them that "frightened you such as threatening to harm you or someone close to you"[23]. It could be argued that being frightened is more distressing than being insulted – although none of the studies examine the

[22] Mirrlees-Black, 1999:68.

[23] ibid.

psychological distress associated with either fear or insult – and for this reason it is impossible to weigh the relative impact of these different forms of psychological violence. More generally, it is difficult to make any inferences from these studies about the prevalence of psychological violence as experienced by men and women given the systematically different ways in which each responds to the measurement items. From the perspective of this review, it would be safe to conclude that men are just as likely as women to be victims of psychological violence but each experiences it quite differently.

3.7 Sexual Violence

Sexual violence is normally understood as forcing a person to engage in some form of sexual activity without their consent and that is how it is defined in the three studies which measure it. Table 3.5 shows that women are the main victims of sexual violence; men are rarely its victims. The US and Canadian studies show similar rates of sexual violence against women in the past year (0.2% and 0.3% respectively) but the British Crime Survey reports a much higher rate (4% for "intermittent victims" and 12% for "chronic victims"[24]). As with other aspects of domestic violence, differences in the prevalence of sexual violence may reflect differences in methodology as much as differences in reality.

Although men are much less likely to be victims of sexual violence than women, the British Crime Survey found that 2% of men classified as "chronic victims" were also sexually assaulted in the past year. Over a life-time, the US National Violence Against Women found that 0.2% of men were victims of sexual violence compared to 4.5% of women. For women as well as men, sexual violence is much less prevalent than either physical or psychological violence.

[24] The British Crime Survey defines "intermittent victims" as those who have been victims of any type of force on 1-2 occasions in the past year while "chronic victims" are defined as those who have been victims of any type of force on 3+ occasions in the past year (Mirrlees-Black, 1999:71).

Table 3.5 Prevalence of Sexual Violence in Representative Samples of Men and Women

Name of Study	Sexual Violence			
	Last Year		Life-Time	
	F to M	M to F	F to M	M to F
US National Violence Against Women Survey, 1995/6	0.0v [a]	0.2v [a]	0.2v [b]	4.5v [b]
British Crime Survey, 1996	2.0v(c) [c]	12.0v(c) [c]		
	0.0v(i) [c]	4.0v(i) [c]		
Canada, General Social Survey on Victimisation, 1999	0.0v [d]	0.3v [d]		
	(0.0v [d])	(8.0v [d])		

Definitions: F to M = Female to Male sexual violence : M to F = Male to Female sexual violence : p = respondent is perpetrator : v = respondent is victim : numbers which do not have "v" or "p" attached to them are based on responses from both victims and perpetrators combined.

§ The numbers in brackets are based on the sub-sample of respondents who have been either victims or perpetrators of domestic violence. The numbers in the same cells without brackets are based on the total sample of male and female respondents in order to derive a true prevalence rate.

[a] Data under heading 'Last Year' relates to current or former partner in the previous twelve months

[b] Data under heading 'Life Time' relates to current or former partner in the victim's life time.

[c] Data under heading 'Last Year' relates to current or former partner in the last domestic assault

[d] Data under heading 'Last Year' relates to current partner in last five years.

For further details, see Table A3.5 in the Appendix to Chapter Three.

3.8 Frequency of Violence

Frequency is an important dimension of domestic violence given that, other things being equal, the greater the frequency, the greater the potential harm to the victim. The usual method for measuring frequency is by counting the number of times each violent act occurs from which a mean or median frequency is calculated, usually drawing upon both victim and perpetrator responses (see Chapter Two). Seven of the thirteen studies in this review measure the mean frequency of domestic violence (see Table 3.6).

The consensus from most of the studies is that, within the last year, domestic violence occurred between five and ten times with women tending to perpetrate at least as frequently as men. This is similar to findings on the prevalence of total physical violence and may be part of a trend towards gender equality in rates of domestic violence either because women are becoming more frequently violent, men are becoming less frequently violent or perhaps a combination of both. Whatever the explanation, the finding that women perpetrated physical violence at least as frequently as men in the past year is strongly corroborated by the different studies reviewed here and applies to both severe (see Table A3.7) and minor acts of violence (see Table A3.8). However, over a life time, the pattern is reversed with men tending to perpetrate more frequently than women and this may help to explain the higher proportion of women in clinical samples.

Table 3.6 Mean Frequency of Total Physical Violence in Representative Samples of Men and Women

Name of Study	Number of	Total Physical Violence	
		Last Year	Life-Time

		F to M	M to F	F to M	M to F
US National Family Violence Survey, 1975/6	Mean	10.1	8.8		
	Median	3.0	2.5		
US National Family Violence Re-Survey, 1985	Mean	6.1	5.4		
	Median	2.5	1.5		
US National Youth Survey, 1992	Mean	6.3	3.6		
US National Violence Against Women Survey, 1995/6	Mean			4.7v	7.1v
British MORI Survey, 1994	Mean	1.7v[a]	1.9v[a]	1.9v[b]	2.1v[b]
British Crime Survey, 1996	Mean	5.0v	5.2v		
Canada, General Social Survey on Victimisation, 1999	Mean			4.3v[c]	6.2v[c]

Definitions: F to M = Female to Male physical violence : M to F = Male to Female physical violence : p = respondent is perpetrator : v = respondent is victim : numbers which do not have "v" or "p" attached to them are based on responses from both victims and perpetrators combined.

[a] Data under heading 'Last Year' relates to any time in current relationship.

[b] Data under heading 'Life-Time' relates to current and previous relationships.

[c] Data under heading 'Life-Time' relates to any partner in last five years.

For further details, see Table A3.6 in the Appendix to Chapter Three.

3.9 Outcomes of Violence

The outcomes of domestic violence are normally measured by asking respondents about the physical injuries they have sustained and medical treatment they have received for those injuries. As indicated in Chapter Two, these are useful indicators of outcome although they probably constitute only a small sub-set of all the likely outcomes of domestic violence, both for victims and perpetrators, particularly where children are involved and where the violence is both frequent and severe.

We have seen that about 40% of all domestic violence is severe and one would therefore expect to find a relatively high level of injuries among victims. This however is not always the case as the data in Table 3.7 indicates. Six of the studies in our review measured injuries resulting from domestic violence. Three of these – the US National Family Violence Re-Survey, the US National Survey of Families and Households and the Australian General Social Survey on Victimisation - found that the proportion of victims with injuries was no higher than 4%; by contrast, two studies – the US National Violence Against Women Survey and the Canadian General Social Survey on Victimisation - found that the proportion of victims with injuries could be as high as 40%, while one study – the US National Youth Survey - found that up to 20% of victims were injured. The substantial disparities among these different studies – four of them based on representative samples of the US population - makes it difficult to form a coherent picture as to the scale of injuries resulting from domestic violence.

Table 3.7 Outcome of Physical Violence in Representative Samples of Men and Women

Name of Study	Injuries Last Year		Treatment Last Year	
	F to M	M to F	F to M	M to F
US National Family Violence Re-Survey, 1985	0.6	3.7	0.4	3.0
US National Survey of Families & Households, 1987/8	0.2v[a]	1.1v[a]		
	0.4p[a]	0.2p[a]		
US National Youth Survey, 1992	13.5v	20.1v	14.3v	11.8v
	10.7p	13.0p	11.1p	15.0p
US National Violence Against Women Survey, 1995/6	18.8v[b]	41.6v[b]	3.8v[b]	11.3v[b]
British Crime Survey, 1996			2.0(i)	3.0(i)
			4.0(c)	10.0(c)
Canada, Alberta Survey 1987			0.0v	0.6v
Canada, General Social Survey on Victimisation, 1999	13.0v[c]	40.0v[c]	3.0v[c]	15.0v[c]
Australia, International Social Science Survey 1996/7	1.8	1.2	1.5	1.1

Definitions: F to M = Female to Male physical injuries/treatment : M to F = Male to Female physical injuries/treatment : p = respondent is perpetrator : v = respondent is victim : i = intermittent victim : c = chronic victim : numbers which do not have "v" or "p" attached to them are based on responses from both victims and perpetrators combined.

[a] Data under heading 'Last Year' relates to any time in current relationship

[b] Data under heading 'Last Year' relates to most recent physical assault

[c] Data under heading 'Last Year' relates to any partner in last five years.

For further details, see Tables A3.9 and A3.10 in the Appendix to Chapter Three.

Results on the usage of medical services arising from domestic violence are also somewhat inconclusive with four studies - the US National Youth Survey, the US National Violence Against Women Survey, the British Crime Survey and the Canadian General Social Survey on Victimisation - suggesting that 10% to 15% of victims go for medical treatment while three studies – the US National Family Violence Re-Survey, the Alberta Survey in Canada and the Australian International Social Science Survey - suggest that the proportion is 3% or less. As with other aspects of domestic violence, the prevalence of injuries and the uptake of medical services seem to be heavily influenced by the methods of measurement.

Turning to the differences between men and women, the results from five of the six studies in Table 3.7 reveal that, when the data is based on the self-reports of victims, women are more likely than men to report being injured as a result of domestic violence (see Table 3.7). In these five studies, women's likelihood of being injured is between two and six times higher than men's. The exception to this is the Australian International Social Science Survey which found that men were more likely to be injured than women. Overall, it is fair to conclude that women are more likely than men to be injured as a result of domestic violence. This is consistent with the results of clinic-based studies which also indicate that, even in cases of mutual violence, women are more likely to suffer severe physical and psychological injuries than men[25].

[25] See for example Nazroo, 1995.

In the case of treatment, six of the seven studies in Table 3.7 indicate that women are more likely than men to receive treatment for injuries sustained as a result of domestic violence. In four of these studies, women's likelihood of receiving treatment is between two and six times higher than men's. This is consistent with the greater level of injuries sustained by women, even taking into account the generally lower uptake of medical treatment by men[26]. Once again, the Australian International Social Science Survey produced the surprising result that men were more likely than women to receive treatment as a result of domestic violence.

Overall, our analysis of the outcomes of domestic violence suggests that women are more likely than men to sustain injuries and to receive treatment for those injuries. However the various studies provide little consensus as to the proportion of men or women who are regularly injured or receive treatment. Estimates of the proportion of men and women victims who are injured can vary from less than 1% to around 40% while the proportion seeking medical help for those injuries also varies from less than 1% to around 15%. As with other dimensions of domestic violence, the study of outcomes is particularly sensitive to the different measurement techniques used and requires considerable caution in their interpretation.

3.10 Context of Violence

Domestic violence is sometimes conceptualised as the problem of men assaulting women in the interest of maintaining a culturally prescribed position of dominance within the family[27]. In this perspective it is assumed that female violence in intimate relationships is predominantly defensive or retaliatory, rather than offensive. If women do initiate violence in a relationship, then this is regarded as atypical female behaviour[28] and is likely to be seen as "expressive" rather than "instrumental".

In order to explore this issue, a number of studies have tried to measure the context of domestic violence by asking "which partner initiated the violence?". Five studies have collected data on this question (see Table 3.8); another study has also collected data on the reasons given by men and women for perpetrating violence against their partners (see Table 3.9). These questions are clearly part of the context for understanding domestic violence. However it is worth bearing in mind that the context of domestic violence – as with other aspects of intimate relationships – is much more complex than this and involves not just the relationship itself and the behaviours, attitudes and emotions that have evolved within it over time but also the larger familial, social,

[26] McNeely and Robinson-Simpson, 1987.
[27] See for example Pagelow, 1985.

economic and cultural context in which the relationship is situated. Nevertheless the question of who initiates domestic violence and why can throw valuable light on the process.

Table 3.8 Initiation of Physical Violence in Representative Samples of Men and Women

Name of Study	Initiators of Violence			
	Last Year			
	F to M	M to F	Cannot Remember	
			F to M	M to F
US National Family Violence Re-Survey, 1985	44.1v	43.7v	4.7F	
	52.7p	42.6p	12.0M	
US National Youth Survey, 1992	61.3v	45.8v		
	54.2p	38.7p		
British Crime Survey, 1996	8.0(i)	2.0(i)	15.0(i)	9.0(i)
	2.0(c)	2.0(c)	11.0(c)	12.0(c)
Canada, Edmonton Survey, 1983/84	42.3v[a]	26.6v[a]		
	73.4p[a]	57.7p[a]		
Canada, Alberta Survey 1987	51.0v	33.0v		
	67.0p	49.0p		

Definitions: F to M = Female to Male initiation of physical violence : M to F = Male to Female initiation of physical violence : p = respondent is perpetrator : v = respondent is victim : i = intermittent victim : c = chronic victim : numbers which do not have "v" and "p" attached to them are based on responses from both victims and perpetrators combined.

[a] Data under heading 'Last Year' relates to any time in current relationship

For further details, see Table A3.11 in the Appendix to Chapter Three.

The results in Table 3.8 shows that women are consistently more likely than men to initiate domestic violence; the only exception is "chronic victims" in the British Crime Survey where men and women are equally likely to initiate violence[29]. This result holds true whether the data is based on the self-reports of victims or perpetrators and is in line with other surveys[30]. This clearly questions the notion that women's violence is largely retaliatory or defensive. Further insight into the context of domestic violence is provided by the one study – the British MORI Survey – which examined the reasons given by men and women for being violent to their partners. As summarised in Table 3.9, the three main reasons for perpetrating domestic violence are frustration, control, and retaliation.

Table 3.9 Reasons For Perpetrating Violence in Current Relationships, UK MORI Survey

Reasons For Perpetrating Violence	Males (n=895) %	Females (n=970) %
Frustration	64	53
"I thought it was the only way to get through to him / her"	*64*	*53*
Controlling their Partner	36	30
"To stop him / her doing something"	*43*	*33*
"To make him / her do what I wanted"	*26*	*26*

[28] Straus & Gelles, 1986; Pleck, Pleck, Grossman and Bart, 1978; Saunders, 1986.

[29] The British Crime Survey defines "chronic victims" as those who have been victims of any type of force on 3+ occasions in the past year (Mirrlees-Black, 1999:71).

[30] DeMaris, 1992:118.

Retaliation	34	30
"I was getting back for something nasty he / she said or threatened to do to me"	*53*	*52*
"I was getting back at some physical action he / she had used against me"	*27*	*21*
"I thought he / she was about to use physical action against me"	*21*	*17*
Alcohol	35	13
"I was under the influence of, for instance, alcohol at the time"	*35*	*13*
Character	6	12
"It is or was in my character / that's the way I am or was"	*6*	*12*

Source: Derived from Carrado et al, 1996: Table V, p.409.

Both men and women cite frustration as their main reason for being violent, although men (64%) are more likely than women (53%) to give this as a reason. Controlling their partner is also an important reason for domestic violence, with men (36%) somewhat more likely than women (30%) to give this as a reason. Similar proportions of men (34%) and women (30%) also give retaliation as a reason for domestic violence. These reasons are not mutually exclusive and it is possible that specific acts of violence may be prompted by all three reasons[31]. Finally, men are much more likely than women (35% compared to 13%) to cite the "influence of alcohol" as a reason for being violent. This pattern of findings shows that men and women engage in violence for broadly similar reasons – frustration, control and retaliation - with men more likely than women to cite all of these reasons. Men's violence, according to these findings, seems to be no more "instrumental" than women's just as women's is no more "expressive" than men's.

[31] Felson and Messner, 2000.

3.11 Summary and Conclusion

This chapter reported on the prevalence of domestic violence as revealed in thirteen major studies. These studies were selected because they meet the two key criteria necessary for yielding reliable information on the prevalence of domestic violence: (1) the studies include both men and women and their experiences of domestic violence, either as victims, perpetrators or both; and (2) the studies are based on representative samples of the population and adhere to random sampling procedures.

Prevalence rates are typically measured with reference to relationships in both the last year and over a life-time. The results of the studies show that, over the last year, women are either more likely than men to inflict physical violence (as shown by 8 out of 12 studies) or equally likely (as shown by 3 of the 12 studies); only one study showed a different pattern to this. Four studies contain data on life-time prevalence and these show a reverse pattern with men being more likely than women to inflict physical violence. The reasons for the contrast between last year and life-time prevalence are not obvious but may be part of a trend over time towards gender equality in rates of domestic violence either because women are becoming more violent, men are becoming less violence or perhaps a combination of both. Whatever the explanation, the finding that women are at least as likely as men to inflict physical violence in the past year is strongly corroborated by the different studies reviewed here.

The overall prevalence of domestic violence in the different societies – US, UK, Canada, Australia and New Zealand - ranges from 5% to 20% of all intimate relationships with much higher rates among people who are young, single, dating, cohabiting or separated and correspondingly lower rates among people who are married and older. Three studies throw light on the composition of domestic violence and are fairly consistent in showing that about half of all domestic violence is mutual; as regards the other half, the studies show that female-only violence is either equal to or greater than male-only violence.

Severe physical violence involves acts such as kicking, biting, beating, choking, etc. and constitutes around 40% of total physical violence. The studies consistently show that, within the past year, women used more severe acts of violence against men than men did against women although, as with all measurements of domestic violence, this is heavily influenced by the wording of different types of abuse and the responses of men and women to that wording.

Nine studies measured psychological violence and seven of these show that women are more likely to perpetrate psychological violence than men. The different ways in which men and women experience psychologic al violence is neatly illustrated in the British Crime survey which shows that men are more likely to be "sworn at or insulted"[32] whereas women are more likely to have had things said to them that "frightened you such as threatening to harm you or someone close to you"[33].

Sexual violence is normally understood as forcing a person to have sex without their consent and the three studies which measure this show consistently that women are its main victims. Six studies measure the frequency of violence and found that, within the last year, domestic violence occurred between five and ten times with women tending to perpetrate at least as frequently as men. Over a life time, the pattern is reversed with men tending to perpetrate more frequently than women. This is similar to findings on the prevalence of total physical violence and, as already suggested, may be part of a trend towards gender equality in domestic violence.

The outcomes of domestic violence were measured in eight studies by asking respondents about physical injuries sustained and medical treatment received. The results show that women are more likely than men to sustain injuries and to receive treatment as a result of domestic violence. However the various studies provide little consensus as to the proportion of men or women who are regularly injured or receive treatment for those injuries. The proportion of men and women victims who are injured can, depending on the study, vary from less than 1% to around 40% while the proportion seeking medical help for those injuries can also vary from less than 1% to around 15%.

Five studies examined the question "which partner initiated the violence?" and show, with one exception, that women are consistently more likely than men to initiate domestic violence. One study also examined the reasons for being violent and this shows that men and women are violent to their partners for broadly similar reasons – frustration, control and retaliation - with men more likely than women to cite all of these reasons.

These findings are difficult to reconcile with the fact that women are far more likely than men to present as victims of domestic violence to the accident and emergency departments of hospitals, to refuges for abused women, to police stations, and treatment clinics. Other

[32] Mirrlees-Black, 1999:68.
[33] ibid.

researchers have noted this tension between community-based surveys using representative samples of the population (such as those which form the basis of this chapter) and clinic-based surveys using self-selected populations: "Community studies have consistently reported that more women than men are physically violent toward a partner. Clinical studies have consistently implied that more men than women are physically violent towards a partner"[34].

In trying to address the tension between these two findings it is important not to dismiss either of them as insignificant. In order to build a bridge of understanding between the two results, it is important to bear four factors in mind. First, the most extreme forms of domestic violence – whether of men against women or vice versa – may not be included in representative surveys of the type reviewed here. In other words, there may be chronic forms of domestic violence against women which cannot be captured in these surveys and which would account for their higher representation in clinic-based studies. Second, notwithstanding the higher level of physical and psychological violence of women against men, the surveys reviewed here also show that physically violent men inflict more injuries on women than vice versa. That would help to explain the greater use of services by women victims of domestic violence. Third, male victims of domestic violence may face much greater barriers to services than female victims because of a widespread cultural belief that 'no man would ever allow himself to be abused by a women' and conversely, 'no woman would ever perpetrate abuse on a man'. Fourth, there is a much greater range of services for female victims of domestic violence than for male victims and, from a statistical point of view, this allows domestic violence against women to become more visible. By contrast, there are virtually no services for male victims of domestic violence and this may be conducive to drawing the erroneous conclusion that there are no male victims either.

These considerations are not designed to provide an exhaustive explanation of why the results of statistically reliable surveys of domestic violence are so at variance with the results of self-selected samples of people who use services for the victims of domestic violence or who report domestic violence to the police. However they do suggest that these findings can no longer be ignored and that domestic violence is a issue which affects men as much as women, both as victims and as perpetrators. In this sense, domestic violence is not a women's issue or a men's issue but a relationships issue.

[34] Magdol et al., 1997:76.

Chapter Four

What Are The Factors Associated With Domestic Violence?

"*When resentment goads you to anger, remember that anger is a false imitation of fortitude, and fortitude is the antithesis of anger*".
Desiderius Erasmus (1466-1536)

4.1 Introduction

This chapter examines some of the factors which research has found to be associated with domestic violence and draws upon some of the prevailing paradigms that have been used to explain it. In order to make the research findings as accessible and useful as possible we have organised the chapter into five main sections covering the factors associated with mutual violence between men and women (section 4.2), as well as the individual characteristics of male perpetrators (section 4.3), female perpetrators (section 4.4), male victims (section 4.5) and female victims (section 4.6). In order to capture the scope of research in this field we present the findings in each section under the following headings: age, marital and parenting status, socio-economic status, family of origin, and psychological / pathological correlates. As we shall see, not all of the research findings are in agreement with each other although some common factors emerge consistently and it is these which are most useful in helping to clarify the known factors associated with domestic violence.

4.2 Mutual Abuse

We know from our review in Chapter Three that much domestic violence is mutual. With few exceptions, mutual violence is significantly more likely than either domestic violence by men only against women or by women only against men. The research findings indicate that between a third and a half of all domestic violence involves mutual abuse. For example data from the 1985 US National Family Violence Re-survey show that "of the 825 respondents who experienced one or more assaults, both parties engaged in violence in 49% of the cases. … These results are similar to those found in the first National Family Violence Survey (Straus, 1980)"[1]. Similar results were found in the 1981 study in Calgary, Canada[2]; the 1987 study in Alberta, Canada[3]; and the 1996/7 survey in Australia[4]. According to the Australian team of

[1] Stets & Straus, 1990a:154.
[2] Brinkerhoff & Lupri, 1988:426.
[3] Kwong, Bartholomew & Dutton, 1999.

researchers: "Violence runs in couples. In over 50% of partnerships in which violence occurred both partners struck each other"[5]. Other surveys report similar or higher findings; for example a survey of couples seeking marital therapy found that "86% of aggression reported by the couples in this sample was reciprocal"[6]. Indeed one study based on a sample of dating students found that victimisation was the largest predictor of perpetration for both men and women[7].

The reality of mutual domestic violence is itself likely to be highly diverse and three variants may be noted. First, it is highly likely that there are cases whereby the mutual violence is almost exclusively male with the woman retaliating in self-defence on an infrequent basis; in these instances, the woman's assaults are likely to be more minor and justifiably self-defensive in the context of the violence being inflicted upon her. Second, there are couples where the violence is more akin to 'mutual combat' with both partners using similar acts and initiating as much as responding, and usually using only minor assaults. Third, in still other couples there is likely to be much greater use of assaults by women with the male partner responding infrequently and perhaps less severely. It is clear therefore that mutual domestic violence is a rather heterogeneous category and this needs to be borne in mind in this section.

4.2.1 Age

One of the more robust findings to emerge from a number of different research studies is that mutual violence is considerably higher among younger couples than older couples. For example, the MORI study in the UK found that "the reported incidence of either sustained or inflicted victimisation was highest for the youngest age group and decreased with age"[8]. In the first US National Family Violence Survey (1975-76) which used marital or cohabiting couples as its sample, it was found that violence was most prevalent in younger families, particularly those under 30[9]. The Calgary Survey found that mutual violence "is pronounced particularly among younger couples and among those married less than eight years"[10]. These findings have led one group of researchers to suggest that "the origin of spouse abuse and a concomitant weakening of marital bonds appear to be rooted in the formative stages of marriage"[11]. Straus and his colleagues (1980) give four possible explanations for the higher level of abuse among young couples: (1) that younger people are more violence prone; (2) that younger marriages

[4] Heady, Scott & deVaus, 1999.
[5] ibid:9.
[6] Cascardi, Langhinrichsen & Vivian, 1992:1183.
[7] Bookwala, Frieze, Smith & Ryan, 1992.
[8] Carrado et al., 1996:408.
[9] Straus et al., 1980:143; see also Stets & Henderson, 1991; Cascardi, Langhinrichsen & Vivian, 1992.
[10] Brinkerhoff & Lupri, 1988:429.

involve two people learning to live with one another, going through frequent and often drastic changes; (3) that younger marriages are more likely to break up; and (4) that violence in the family is increasing[12]. As it turns out, the latter cause appears to have been disproven by the second US National Family Violence Resurvey (1985) which showed that prevalence rates were remarkably similar to the first US National Family Violence Survey (1975-76). However other researchers have analysed data from the two American National Family Violence Surveys and were unable to explain the association between age and marital violence[13]. The only qualification to the strong association between youth and mutual domestic violence is that couples in retirement also show relatively high rates of aggression towards each other. For example, the Calgary Survey did a separate analysis of older couples and found that couples in the retirement stage had a considerably higher incidence rate than couples in the pre-retirement stage. Thus "there is some evidence that age and interspousal violence are curvilinear"[14]. Similarly results from the British Crime Survey found that, "although risks of partner assault decrease with age for both men and women, they do not disappear - around 1% of the over 45s had been assaulted by a partner in the last year"[15]. However the overall weight of evidence suggests that mutual violence is much more likely among younger men and women.

4.2.2 Marital and Parenting Status

As the term is normally used, the marital status of a person may be single, married, cohabiting, separated, divorced or widowed. One of the consistently robust findings about mutual domestic violence is that it tends to be highest among cohabiting couples and lowest among married couples with dating and divorced couples holding an intermediate position between these two extremes. In the Calgary study, it was found that cohabiting couples had double the violence rate of those who were married[16], while in the General Social Survey on Victimisation in Canada "four percent of those living in common-law unions reported spousal violence compared to only 1% of those who were married. This was the case regardless of whether the victim was male or female"[17]. Similarly the 1985 US National Family Violence Resurvey found that cohabiting couples had the highest assault rate overall and well ahead of married and dating couples[18]. This study also found that the severity of violence was greatest among cohabiting couples: "Not only are cohabiting couples at greatest risk for violence, but in addition the most dangerous forms of

[11] O'Leary, Barling, Arias, Rosenbaum, Malone & Tyree, 1989.
[12] Straus, Gelles & Steinmetz, 1980:143.
[13] Suitor, Pillemer & Straus, 1990:316.
[14] Brinkerhoff & Lupri, 1988:429.
[15] Mirrlees-Black, 1999:28.
[16] Brinkerhoff & Lupri, 1988; see also Lane & Gwartney-Gibbs, 1985.
[17] Canadian Centre for Justice Statistics, 2000:15

violence occur when individuals cohabit. This is true because severe violence that is carried out by both partners is most common in cohabiting relationships"[19]. Although few of the surveys under review included data on divorced and separated persons, other research has found that this group has a relatively high rate of mutual domestic violence[20]. One explanation offered for the high risk of domestic violence among cohabitees is that "cohabiting couples may be more likely to be isolated from their network of kin than dating and married couples ... which might help to monitor violent behaviour"[21]. The same authors suggested that the issue of control may be particularly important for cohabiting couples: "The issue of control may not be as problematic among dating and married couples as it is among cohabiting couples ... but as dating relationships become more serious, control may take more precedence and violence may become more frequent"[22]. Yet others have suggested the constraining influence of marriage itself as an explanatory factor: "cohabiting couples may be more violent than married couples because they tend to share certain features that give rise to conflict, but they may lack some features of marriage that serve to constrain the conflict from escalating into physical assaults"[23].

Unlike marital status, the association between parenting status and domestic violence is much less straightforward and the results of research are somewhat inconsistent. In the Calgary study for example, childless couples had a higher incidence of domestic violence than couples with children although the authors suggest that this may be "more a function of age and length of marriage than of being a parent"[24]. By contrast, the first US National Family Violence Survey (1975-76) found that "spouse abuse was low for men and women with no children, increased with each additional child up to six and was non-existent in homes with six or more children"[25]. The British Crime Survey came up with a similar result "perhaps suggesting children sometimes increase pressures in relationships"[26].

One review of the literature proposed the following synthesis of the link between marital and parenting status: "The myth that 'all married couples are at equal risk for violence' has been replaced by data showing that partner violence is concentrated among unmarried young men and women who cohabit and bear children at a young age, especially young men and women who have a developmental history of conduct problems .... Rates of partner violence double among

[18] Stets & Straus, 1990b:241; see also Yllo & Straus, 1981.
[19] Stets & Straus 1990b:235.
[20] Nisonoff & Bitman, 1979.
[21] Stets & Straus, 1990b:241-2.
[22] ibid:242; see also Hotaling & Straus, 1980; Arias et al., 1987; Stets & Pirog-Good, 1987.
[23] Moffitt & Caspi, 1998:142.
[24] Brinkerhoff & Lupri, 1988:426.
[25] Straus et al., 1980:179.

young couples who move from dating into cohabiting and who bear children at a young age. And so aggressive behaviour becomes highly stable across the life course of individuals and is transmitted from generation to generation within families"[27].

4.2.3 Socio-economic Status

The main research findings suggest that mutual domestic violence is more prevalent among lower socio-economic groups. Both of the US National Family Violence Surveys came up with this result[28]. The British Crime Survey also found a strong association between mutual domestic violence and households experiencing financial difficulties: 10% of women and 12% of men living in these households had been assaulted in the previous year[29]. The British MORI survey also found that perpetration was higher (though only slightly) in lower socio-economic groups[30]. Other studies report similar results[31]. These results do not imply that mutual domestic violence is confined to lower socio-economic groups; only that the prevalence rates tend to be higher. As the Calgary survey suggested "domestic violence is not limited to the lower classes"[32]; indeed the results of a US student survey found that students from high-income families reported experiencing more violence than others but this was not a random sample[33]. It seems safe to conclude therefore that domestic violence is more prevalent in lower socio-economic groups.

4.2.4 Family of Origin

The association between mutual domestic violence and family of origin characteristics was explored in the Australian International Social Science Survey. According to its authors: "People who had violent parents were significantly more likely than others to be violent to their own partners and to be victims of violence themselves. On the other hand, a huge majority of people whose parents were violent do not assault their own partners"[34].

4.2.5 Psychological/Pathological Correlates

Power: Domestic violence is seen by many researchers as an expression of power. According to the authors of the first US National Family Violence Survey in 1975-76: "violence is used by the

[26] Mirrlees-Black, 1999:32.
[27] Moffitt & Caspi, 1998:142.
[28] Straus et al., 1980:Chart 10; Stets & Straus, 1990:232.
[29] Mirrless-Black, 1999.
[30] Carrado et al., 1996:408.
[31] Cascardi et al., 1992; Stets & Henderson, 1991; Canada Centre for Justice Statistics, 2000.
[32] Brinkerhoff & Lupri, 1988:426.
[33] Lane & Gwartney-Gibbs, 1985.
[34] Headey, Scott & deVaus, 2001:9.

most powerful family member as a means of legitimising his or her dominant position ... less powerful members of the family tend to rely on violence as a reaction to their own lack of participation in the family decision making process"[35]. In a study by Colman and Straus (1986), it was suggested that those couples who are egalitarian (29%) and make decisions together had the lowest rates of conflict and violence, whilst male-dominant (9.4%) and female-dominant (7.5%) couples had the highest rates. When couples agreed that one or other should make the decisions in the family, conflict and violence were reduced; however when conflict did occur in such families, it was associated with a much higher risk of violence than a similar level of conflict in egalitarian families[36]. Power can be expressed through controlling behaviours such as jealousy or demanding to know the whereabouts of the person at all times and, according to one study, "Both women and men were equally likely to report experiencing these two forms of controlling behaviour"[37]. Other studies have also suggested that "Use of controlling behaviours and verbal abuse appears to be bi-directional in intimate relationships (Kasian and Painter, 1992)"[38].

Alcohol: Alcohol intoxication has been linked to spouse battering although the precise causal nature of the link is unclear[39]. For example, the British Crime Survey found that a third of assaults took place while the assailant was under the influence of alcohol. However the author of this study pointed out that "it is not possible to say whether alcohol caused the violence, whether it contributed to it happening, or simply reflects a correlational effect (alcohol use may be higher amongst the group most likely to commit assaults)"[40]. Other researchers have also been at a loss to explain the causal connection between alcohol use and domestic violence and suggest that alcohol is better viewed as a means of gaining courage to carry out the act and /or as a convenient excuse once it has occurred[41]. It is also worth pointing out that while alcohol plays a role in many domestic assaults, the majority take place without its 'assistance'. In the British MORI Survey, men were much more likely than women to cite the influence of alcohol as one of their reasons for perpetrating violence against their partners[42].

[35] Straus et al., 1980:193.
[36] Colman & Straus, 1986; see also O'Leary & Curley, 1986; Dutton, 1994:173.
[37] Canadian Centre for Justice Statistics, 2000:18.
[38] Dutton, 1994:173.
[39] Nisonoff & Bitman, 1979; Stets & Henderson, 1991; Ernst, Nick, Weiss, Houry & Mills, 1997.
[40] Mirrlees-Black, 1999:46.
[41] See Morley & Mulender, 1994.
[42] Carrado et al., 1996:Table 5.

Psychopathology: The Edmonton survey in Canada found a strong connection between the perpetration of domestic violence and the presence of psychopathological characteristics[43]. Their results, which support a pathological rather than a sociological explanation of domestic violence, revealed that "higher than expected proportions of those exhibiting violent behaviour had a psychiatric diagnosis and the rate of violent behaviours in those with diagnoses (54.4%) significantly exceeds the rate in the remainder of the sample (15.5%). Particularly high rates of violence are found in those whose alcoholism is combined with antisocial personality disorder and/or recurrent depression (80-93%). Also at high risk for violence are those who have made suicide attempts (over 50%) and those who have been arrested for non-traffic offences (65.9%)"[44]. Another study suggested that domestic violence was related to patients with personality disorder and schizophrenia but not to depression[45].

4.2.6 Summary

This review suggests that mutual domestic violence is found mainly among younger couples and is strongly associated with cohabitation; relative to other relationships, marriage seems to be a protection against mutual domestic violence although this may be a residual effect created by the dissolution of violent marriages. Most of the evidence suggests that mutual domestic violence is associated with lower socio-economic status; however there seems to be no clear association between parenting status and mutual domestic violence. Mutual violence is more likely to occur in relationships which are either male-dominant or female-dominant and is least likely in egalitarian relationships. Mutual domestic violence is also associated with alcohol use and psychological disturbance. These findings provide support for a sociological understanding of mutual domestic violence (given its association with the distribution of power in relationships) as well as a pathological model of domestic violence (given its association with certain psychopathological characteristics).

4.3 Male Perpetrators

There is a substantial amount of research on male perpetrators. This is due in part to the existing consensus of domestic violence which assumes that, in the vast majority of cases, perpetrators are male. However it may also be due to the fact that the most serious physical and psychological injuries arising through domestic violence are perpetrated by men.

[43] Bland & Orn, 1986.
[44] ibid:129.
[45] Bergman & Ericsson, 1996.

4.3.1 Age

Although youth seemed to predict domestic violence in the area of mutual abuse, a number of studies suggest that male perpetrators tend to be older men. For example, the Calgary survey found that men who were between 30 and 45 years old were significantly more likely to be violent than either younger or older men[46]. This study also found perpetration among older retired men where "husband-to-wife violence exceeded wife-to-husband violence by a two-to-one margin"[47]. The British Crime Survey also found that, "over half of domestic violence assaults against women are committed by a male aged between 30 and 59. Attackers of chronic victims had a slightly older age profile than those of intermittent victims"[48].

4.3.2 Marital and Parenting Status

The British Crime Survey found that male perpetration was highest among men who were separating or separated from their partners; this contrasts with female perpetration which is highest among women who are cohabiting with their partners[49]. This seems to suggest that male perpetration is more likely to occur when a relationship is breaking down (hence the higher rate of separation among female victims) whereas female perpetration is more likely in an ongoing relationship (hence the higher rate of cohabitation among male victims). The same inference can be drawn from the results of the MORI Survey in the UK[50]. The different profile of male and female perpetrators may also reflect the "differential emotional reactions to separation on the part of men and women, with women less likely to use violence than men to express their feelings in this context"[51]. Given that female perpetration is more likely in cohabitating relationships, the same author concludes that "women's violence against men is, therefore, more likely to be within the context of an ongoing relationship"[52]. It is worth emphasising that male perpetration does not occur only in the context of separation; it occurs in all marital statuses but is more likely in the context of separation.

4.3.3 Socio-economic Status

One indicator of socio-economic status is employment and the research evidence suggests a strong association between men who are unemployed or employed part-time and the perpetration

[46] Brinkerhoff & Lupri, 1988:426.
[47] ibid:424.
[48] Mirrlees-Black, 1999:43.
[49] Mirrlees-Black, 1999.
[50] Carrado et al., 1996.
[51] Mirrlees-Black, 1999:30.
[52] ibid.

of domestic violence. The 1975-6 US National Family Violence Survey found that unemployed men were twice as likely to use severe violence on their wives as men employed full-time, and men employed part-time had a rate of wife-beating three times the rate for full-time employed men[53]. The most violent husbands were those who had graduated from high school whereas the least violent were either grammar school dropouts or men with some college education[54]. In some respects this finding is similar to the socio-economic profile of male perpetrators in the New Zealand study which found that severely violent men were more likely than their female counterparts to be poorly educated, chronically unemployed and to lack social network support. "On average, men who were perpetrators had three fewer social support resources than the sample as a whole"[55].

4.3.4 Family of Origin

The research evidence suggests that male perpetrators are more likely to have been abused as children and are more likely to have witnessed parental spouse abuse in their families of origin[56]. "According to the Violence Against Women Survey (1993), men who witnessed violence by their fathers were three times more likely than men without these childhood experiences to be violent toward their wives (Rodgers, 1994)"[57].

4.3.5 Psychological/Pathological Correlates

Attitudes: It has been found that male perpetrators have more tolerant attitudes towards violence and verbal aggression than the population in general[58] as well as more tolerant attitudes to spouse abuse in particular[59].

Power: We have already seen that inequalities in power are associated with mutual domestic violence. This is also true of male perpetrators. The results of the first US National Family Violence Survey (1975-76) found that male perpetration tends to occur in households where "the husband is dominant in family decisions, the wife is a full-time housewife and the wife is very worried about economic security"[60]. However, the reverse can also be the case in that husbands who do not control decision-making, are stressed and are lacking in self-esteem, are also

[53] Straus et al., 1980:150.
[54] ibid:146.
[55] Magdol et al., 1997:76.
[56] Rosenbaum & O'Leary, 1981; see also O'Leary & Curley, 1986.
[57] Canada Centre for Justice Statistics, 2000:16.
[58] Bookwala, Frieze, Smith & Ryan, 1992.
[59] Russell & Hulson, 1992; Rosenbaum & O'Leary, 1981.
[60] Straus et al., 1980:204.

inclined to be abusive[61]. "Powerlessness rather than power seems to be implicated in male use of intimate violence, and intimacy itself rather than gender politics seems to be the most crucial factor in such violence"[62]; as a consequence, "assaultive males report feeling powerless in respect to their intimate partners (Dutton & Strachan, 1987)"[63]. The common thread in these findings seems to be that inegalitarian relationships tend to be more abusive than egalitarian relationships.

Alcohol & Drug-Abuse: Many researchers regard alcohol as a significant contributory factor in male perpetration[64], particularly with heavy drinking bouts[65]. The British Crime Survey also found that drugs were a factor in a minority of cases: "8% of female victims of chronic domestic violence said their assailant was under the influence of drugs at the time of the last assault, compared to 5% of the intermittent victims"[66].

Psychopathology: The research evidence suggests that male perpetrators are more likely to have some psychopathology compared to the average population of men. "There is strong evidence that the majority of men who are either court-referred or self-referred for wife assault do have diagnosable psychological pathology. In studies of assaultive males, about 80%-90% of both court-referred and self-referred men exhibited diagnosable psychopathology, typically personality disorders (Dutton, 1994; Dutton & Starzomski, 1994; Hamberger & Hastings, 1986,1989; Hart, Dutton & Newlove, 1993; Hastings & Hamberber, 1988; Saunders, 1992). Estimates of personality disorder in the general population would be more in the 15%-20% range (Kernberg, 1977; Zimmerman & Coryell, 1989)"[67]. The same author adds: "Patriarchy does not elicit violence against women in any direct fashion. Rather, it may provide the values and attitudes that personality-disordered men can exploit to justify their abuse of women"[68].

The Dunedin study in New Zealand found that "although women report more perpetration of physical violence than men, the personal characteristics of male perpetrators are the most deviant and are consistent with the profile that has emerged from clinical research on male perpetrators (Dinwiddie, 1992; Roberts, 1987)"[69]. This study also found that, among

[61] Russell & Hulson, 1992; Rosenbaum & O'Leary, 1981.
[62] Dutton, 1994:177.
[63] ibid:174.
[64] Russell & Hulson, 1992; Rosenbaum & O'Leary, 1981; Kaufman Kantor & Straus, 1987.
[65] Canada Centre for Justice Statistics, 2000:16.
[66] Mirrlees-Black, 1999:46.
[67] Dutton, 1994:176.
[68] ibid.
[69] Magdol et al., 1997:76.

perpetrators of severe physical violence, men had more extreme levels than women of clinically relevant characteristics such as polydrug abuse, antisocial personality disorder and depression[70].

4.3.6 Summary

Our review of the evidence suggests that male perpetrators tend to be in the age range of 30 to 50 years, to be separated or separating from their partners, to come from lower socio-economic backgrounds and to be have a relatively poor employment record. They are also likely to come from abusive family backgrounds and, perhaps related to this, to have more tolerant attitudes towards violence and aggression. Male perpetrators also tend to be either dominant or dominated in their current relationships and are much more likely than other men – or indeed female perpetrators - to show symptoms of psychopathology such as personality disorder or depression. These characteristics suggest that male perpetrators are strongly influenced by a disruptive family background, have a poor relationship with their current partner and are relatively disadvantaged vis à vis other men.

4.4 Female Perpetrators

Unlike male perpetrators, there is relatively little research on female perpetrators. Again this is due, at least in part, to the existing consensus on domestic violence which assumes that, in the vast majority of cases, women only use domestic violence in self-defence which is not "perpetration" in its pure sense. However, as we have seen in Chapter Three, there is a good deal of research evidence to suggest that women perpetrate violence against men in situations that cannot be characterised as self-defence[71]. "It seems likely that a strong norm of men not hitting women enables women to engage in physical aggression that might not otherwise have occurred..... women's aggression can be explained in terms of two sets of beliefs about how men should treat their wives or partners. In western nations, there will be a greater impact of the norm of disapproval of men's physical aggression toward women and a lesser impact of patriarchal values.... Female aggression increases...where there are modern secular liberal values together with economic and familial emancipation of women. Most of the studies finding frequent female physical aggression were located in such conditions"[72].

[70] ibid.

[71] For example Straus et al., 1980; Stets & Straus, 1990a; Morse, 1995; Brinkerhoff & Lupri, 1988; DeMaris, 1992.

[72] Archer, 2000:668.

There is also research evidence that women in lesbian relationships perpetrate violence against other women[73], more so than gay men do against their partners[74]. "Lesbians were more likely to be classified as victims and perpetrators of violence than gay men;...when items were weighted to create an indicator of severity, no significant differences between lesbians and gay men were found"[75]. However, the US National Violence Against Women Survey found that 11.4% of same-sex cohabiting women reported being victimized (at some time in their life) by a female partner, while 15.4% of same-sex cohabiting men reported being victimized (at some time in their life) by a male partner[76].

4.4.1 Age

A number of studies show that female perpetrators tend to be younger women, usually under 30 years old. This is the clear finding of the Calgary survey in Canada which showed that women under 30 were likely to be more violent than older women, and were nearly twice as likely to perpetrate violence against their partners than their partners were against them, (18.0% vs 9.9%)[77]. Similar results have emerged from other studies[78]. An important exception to these findings emerged from the British Crime Survey which found that about half of the physical assaults committed by women against male partners were committed by those aged between 16 and 29 while the other half were committed by women aged 30 to 59, with no difference between chronic and intermittent victims[79].

4.4.2 Marital and Parenting Status

Cohabitation is a factor associated with female perpetration and has a stronger influence than it has on male perpetration. According to the Calgary study in Canada[80], cohabiting female respondents were significantly more likely to perpetrate violent acts than were married females (20.9% vs 12.7%). They were also more likely to perpetrate violent acts than cohabiting male perpetrators (20.9% vs 11.6%). The same results were reported by the British Crime Survey which found that cohabiting men (8%) were at much greater risk of victimisation by their female partners than married men (3%)[81].

[73] Dutton, 1994; Lie & Gentlewarrior, 1991; Bologna, Waterman & Dawson, 1987.
[74] Waldner-Haugrud, Gratch & Magruder, 1987:173.
[75] ibid.
[76] Tjaden & Thoennes, 2000c:30.
[77] Brinkerhoff & Lupri, 1988:426.
[78] See for example Sommer, Barnes & Murray, 1992; Malone, Tyree & O'Leary, 1989; O'Leary et al., 1989; Stets, 1990.
[79] Mirrlees-Black, 1999:43.
[80] Brinkerhoff & Lupri, 1988:426.
[81] Mirrlees-Black, 1999:72 &74.

4.4.3 Socio-economic Status

The research evidence, particularly from the two US National Family Violence Surveys, suggests that there are two main types of female perpetrator. The first is women who are blue collar and married. This is clear from the 1975 US National Family Violence Survey which found that "the most violent wives are those who did not complete high school"[82]. This study also found that the characteristics which are important for husband beating included the wife being a manual worker[83]. However more detailed analysis of the 1985 US National Family Violence Resurvey – which focused on the interaction between socio-economic status and marital status - found a second type of female perpetrator, namely women who are white collar and either dating or cohabiting[84]. However, the latter type may have resulted from the growth in cohabitation in the ten years after the first type was identified. The Calgary study in Canada also found a sub-group of female perpetrators among higher earning educated couples and also found that "women who were employed full-time were somewhat more likely to report violence against their husbands than women who worked for pay part-time and those who were homemakers"[85]. Thus female perpetration seems to be influenced by the interaction of both socio-economic status and marital status. Other studies typically offer scant information on the socio-economic characteristics of female perpetrators.

4.4.4 Family of Origin

There are relatively few studies which seem to have investigated this dimension but the first US National Family Violence Survey (1975-75) offered the following profile of the female abuser: "the abusive wife was physically punished at age thirteen specifically by her father; and she also grew up in family in which mother hit father"[86]. Other researchers have found that female perpetration is associated with the following variables: being a victim of physical assault in an adolescent romantic relationship; weak emotional ties; low levels of alcohol/drug use; and opportunity to aggress[87]. A variety of non-random samples have found that family of origin was not a critical factor of women in abusive relationships[88] but it is doubtful if these should be given the same weight as the random sample of the US National Family Violence Survey.

[82] Straus et al., 1980:146.
[83] ibid:204.
[84] Stets & Straus 1990:232.
[85] Brinkerhoff & Lupri, 1988:424.
[86] Straus et al., 1980:204.
[87] White & Humphrey, 1994.
[88] O'Leary & Curley, 1986.

4.4.5 Psychological/Pathological Correlates

Power: There is an extensive amount of research and commentary on the link between power and domestic violence. Our review of the research evidence in the previous sections suggests that domestic violence is more likely to occur in male-dominated and female-dominated relationships and is least likely to occur in egalitarian relationships. As such, domestic violence can be just as much an expression of women's power as of men's power. It is sometimes assumed that most female perpetration is a response to powerlessness and occurs only in the context of self-defence. However the evidence does not support this view. We have already seen in Chapter Three that women are just as likely, on their own admission, to initiate violence in the relationship as their male partner. The British MORI study found that male and female perpetrators gave broadly similar reasons for inflicting violence on their partner[89]. In fact the most frequently cited reason for perpetration was that this was the "only way to get through to" their partners (53% of women gave this as the reason compared to 64% of men). According to the authors: "Even at the potentially most serious level of assault only one woman in three identified self-defence or retaliation as a reason for their assault"[90]. Similarly Gonzalez (1997) asked women students why they assaulted their male partners and the most common reason given was a spontaneous reaction to frustration. In a dating sample, male victims thought female aggressors wanted to show how angry they were and wanted to retaliate for feeling emotionally hurt or mistreated; female perpetrators agreed but said they wanted to get control too. Male perpetrators cited jealousy more often than female perpetrators[91].

Psychopathology: The research reviewed earlier in this chapter suggests that male perpetrators may have more pronounced pathological characteristics than female perpetrators. However, the results of a Canadian survey found that female perpetrators tend to be young women who are "highly anxious, emotional, worrisome, prone to drug and/or alcohol dependence"[92]. The Edmonton survey, also in Canada, came up with a similar profile[93]. These Canadian studies also found that female perpetrators can be tough-minded, uncaring, insensitive, and antisocial[94]. Some studies also suggest that female perpetrators are more likely than men to use weapons in domestic violence[95].

[89] Carrado et al., 1996, Table 5.
[90] ibid:410.
[91] Follingstad, Wright, Lloyd, & Sebastian, 1991.
[92] Sommer, Barnes & Murray, 1992:1321.
[93] Bland and Orn, 1986.
[94] Sommer, Barnes & Murray, 1992; Bland & Orn, 1986; see also Riggs, O'Leary & Breslin, 1990.
[95] for example, Roberts, O'Toole, Raphael, Lawrence & Ashby, 1996.

4.4.6 Summary

The research evidence suggests that female perpetrators tend to be younger women, usually under 30. The research also suggests that there may be two different types of female perpetrator: one is a blue collar women who is married and the other is a white collar women who is cohabiting or dating. However, the latter type may have resulted from the growth in cohabitation in the ten years after the first type was identified. There is limited evidence on the family of origin of female perpetrators but one study found that they had personal experience of victimisation as young girls and may also have seen their mother hitting their father. Female perpetrators seem to have a less psychopathological profile than male perpetrators but their reasons for inflicting violence on their partner tend to be similar and are not primarily self-defence. These findings draw attention to the importance of power in the perpetration of domestic violence and suggest that social rather than pathological factors may be the main influences on female perpetrators.

4.5 Male Victims

Male victims refer essentially to those men who suffer violence from their female partners without retaliating. Even though the evidence of research shows that there are male victims in a substantial proportion of violent relationships, there has been relatively little research on these men.

4.5.1 Age

The main source of data on the age of male victims comes from the 1996 British Crime Survey. Most male victims, like their female counterparts, are in the 20-40 age bracket. Within that bracket, in the British Crime Survey, "the peak age for male-victims was 20 to 24: 9.2% said they had been assaulted in the previous year"[96]. Similarly, the Canada General Social Science Survey on Victimisation indicated that most male victims were between 25 and 35[97].

4.5.2 Marital and Parenting Status

Male victims, like their female counterparts, are least likely to be married, and are most likely to be separated, divorced or cohabiting. That is the clear finding of both the British Crime Survey and the UK MORI Survey[98]. However there is one significant difference in the marital status of

[96] Mirrlees-Black, 1999:28.
[97] Canadian Centre for Justice Statistics, 2000:15.
[98] Mirrlees-Black, 1999; Carrado et al., 1996.

male and female victims. In the British Crime Survey the highest risk category for male victims is cohabitation (7.7%) whereas the highest risk category for female victims is separation (21.6%). This seems to suggest that women remain married or cohabiting with a male that does not assault them, but who they can assault without fear that he will break up the relationship because of her assaultiveness. Male victims are more likely to stay in a violent relationship than female victims possibly because, as suggested by one group of researchers, of the "social unacceptability of males being victims of domestic assault"[99]; however it may also be due to a desire to protect children from a violent mother.

4.5.3 Socio-economic Status

The results of the different studies produce a somewhat inconsistent profile of the socio-economic status of male victims. On the one hand there are studies which show that male victimisation is more likely among lower socio-economic men. For example the 1975 US National Family Violence Survey found that "men who have not completed high school are the most likely to be victims of their wives' violence"[100]. Similarly the 1994 MORI Survey in the UK found that victimisation of men in lower socio-economic groups was more likely both in all relationships and current relationships than those in the higher socio-economic groups[101]. By contrast, the findings of the 1996 British Crime Survey indicate that professional and skilled non-manual men were more likely than any other category of men to be victimised[102]. However it is the employment status of these men which points to their vulnerability since, according to the British Crime Survey, male victims are more likely to be working part-time, unemployed or in education. The same survey also found that disability was a factor in male victimisation: "disability and long standing illness are related to risks of victimisation, particularly for young men. Over one in ten young men with a long standing illness or disability said they had been assaulted by a partner in the previous year"[103]. Thus a synthesis of these different studies might suggest that men are more likely to be victimised by their female partners when they have little economic power and bring few economic resources to the relationship.

4.5.4 Family of Origin

"Women and men who were physically assaulted as children by adult caretakers were significantly more likely to report being victimised by their current partner, even when the

[99] Carrado et al., 1996:412; see also George, 1994; Harris & Cook, 1994.
[100] Straus et al., 1980:146.
[101] Carrado et al., 1996:408-9.
[102] Mirrlees-Black, 1999:31.
[103] ibid:32.

effects of other independent variables were controlled....It is possible however, that respondents who reported one type of victimisation (eg child maltreatment) were simply more willing to report other types of victimisation (eg intimate partner violence)"[104].

4.5.5 Psychological/Pathological Correlates

Power: The unequal distribution of power in relationships between men and women is apparent in much domestic violence. The first US National Family Violence Survey 1975-76 found that husbands are more likely to be beaten by their wives in households where one or other partner was dominant while husbands in democratic homes are the least likely to be abused[105]. This is also consistent with the weak economic position of male victims and a failure to fill traditional male roles leading, according to the British Crime Survey, to a higher level of "self-blame" among male victims[106].

Psychopathology: Male victims suffer from psychological distress though, according to one study, they suffer to a lesser extent than female victims[107].

4.5.6 Summary

Male victims are more likely to be younger men who are cohabiting with their partners and, relative to other men, they have little economic power and bring few economic resources to the relationship. These men, perhaps because they do not fulfil their own or their partners expectations of the traditional male role, are likely to blame themselves for the violence that is inflicted on them.

4.6 Female Victims

Female victims are probably the main victims of domestic violence in that they sustain the most severe physical and psychological injuries. Although much of the pain and suffering of domestic violence is invisible and unheard, the harshest realities of domestic violence are undoubtedly evident in the injuries sustained by female victims. Understandably therefore a good deal of research attention has been given to the characteristics of female victims.

[104] Tjaden & Thoennes, 2000c: 34.
[105] Straus et al., 1980:193.
[106] Mirrlees-Black, 1999:40.
[107] Grandin, Lupri & Brinkerhoff, 1998.

4.6.1 Age

Most female victims, like their male counterparts, are in the 16-40 age bracket. According to the British Crime Survey and the Canada General Social Science Survey on Victimisation, the strongest concentration of victims is in the 16-24 age bracket[108]. Older women can also be victims but this is less likely[109].

4.6.2 Marital and Parenting Status

There is a good deal of evidence that single and separated women are at the highest risk of victimisation by their male partners; married women are at the least risk of victimisation. This is the clear finding from the two British studies in our review but has also been found in the US National Violence Against Women Survey and the Edmonton survey in Canada. According to the UK MORI survey "higher percentages of single dating women reported sustaining victimisation across all relationships than married/cohabiting women"[110]. It should be noted that "single" women in this context includes both those who are never married as well as those who are divorced. The British Crime Survey also found that these women are at risk although it is separated women who were at highest risk: "women who described themselves as currently separated from a partner with whom they had previously been living were by far the most likely to have been victims of domestic assault in the previous year: 22% had been assaulted at least once that year. While for some of this group separation may have followed the assault, the weight of evidence suggests many assaults occur immediately following separation"[111]. These findings are in line with the Edmonton survey in Canada which found that there was a relationship between women who walked out of relationships and spousal violence[112]. Thus women who leave or have left relationships are more at risk of victimisation from partners of those relationships. Although the majority of male and female victims live with their perpetrators, female victims are less likely to be living with their perpetrators than male victims[113]. Married women are at least risk of domestic violence.

[108] Mirrlees-Black, 1999:28; Canada Centre for Justice Statistics, 2000:15.
[109] See Roberts, O'Toole, Raphael, Lawrence & Ashby, 1996.
[110] Carrado et al., 1996:407.
[111] Mirrless-Black, 1999:29.
[112] Bland & Orn, 1986:135.
[113] Mirrlees-Black, 1999:30; Stets & Straus 1990:232.

4.6.3 Socio-economic Status

There is a high degree of consensus that female victims are drawn predominantly from lower socio-economic groups. For example, the 1975 National Family Violence Survey in the US found that "women who have not completed high school are the most likely to be physically abused ... and college-educated women are the least likely to be abused by their husbands"[114]. Similarly, the 1996 British Crime Survey found that "women living in households whose head of household's occupation fell into the two least skilled categories reported the highest rates of assault in the previous year"[115]. This study also found that female victims, like their male counterparts, were more likely to be outside the labour force (i.e., in education or on home duties); women with a disability were also at a greater risk of violence. The same pattern emerged from the Calgary study in Canada which found that "women working full-time were less likely to be victimised by their husbands than were wives who worked part-time or did not work for pay outside the home"[116]. The authors of this study go on to offer the following explanation for this pattern: "Being employed full-time makes women less dependent economically, and renders wives less vulnerable to being abused physically by their male partners. These findings are consistent with exchange theory, which holds that a redistribution of resources lessens the traditional imbalance between the sexes and thus affects the rate of victimisation"[117]. We have already seen that the same reasoning can be applied to explain the experiences of male victims. However, the US Violence Against Women Survey showed somewhat different results, in that "Women were significantly more likely to report violence by a current partner if their education level was greater than their partner's"[118].

4.6.4 Family of Origin

We have come across relatively few studies which examine this dimension but two studies found a definite correlation between an abusive family history and female victimisation[119].

4.6.5 Psychological/Pathological Correlates

Power: Female victims, like their male counterparts, tend to feel powerless. In the British Crime Survey chronic female victims were less likely to blame themselves than male victims but

[114] Straus et al., 1980:146.
[115] Mirrlees-Black, 1999:30-1.
[116] Brinkerhoff & Lupri, 1988:426.
[117] ibid.
[118] Tadjen & Thoennes, 2000c:34.
[119] Ernst, Nick, Weiss, Houry & Mills, 1997; Tadjen & Thoennes, 2000c:34.

most of them felt powerless to prevent their most recent attack with 75% saying that "there was nothing they could have done"[120]. This finding is consistent with the loss of self-esteem that is known to accompany repeated verbal and physical abuse[121].

Alcohol & Drug-Abuse: The British Crime Survey found that female victims (15%) were more likely than male victims (11%) to have used at least one illegal drug in the last year[122]. Moreover women who used at least one illegal drug in the last year were also much more likely to have been victimised than non-drug using women (3%).

Psychopathology: Not surprisingly, female victims show signs of serious psychological distress and one study found that female victims report "higher mean rates of psychological distress than male victims"[123].

4.6.6 Summary

Female victims, like their male counterparts, tend to be under 40 years old with the strongest concentration in the 16-24 age bracket. Women who are single, divorced, separating or separated are at the highest risk of victimisation and there is evidence to suggest that leaving a relationship places women at risk of violence from the male partner of that relationship. The majority of victims live with their perpetrators but women victims are less likely to be living with their perpetrators than men. Married women are at least risk of domestic violence although this may be the outcome of women leaving violent marriages. Female victims tend to be drawn from lower socio-economic groups and, like male victims, they tend to be outside the labour market or occupy a weak position within it. They typically feel powerless to do anything to stop the violence which is inflicted upon them.

4.7 Conclusion

This chapter has reviewed a fairly extensive literature to find out what is known about the correlates of domestic violence. Although not exhaustive, our review covers some of the main studies in this area and is broadly indicative of what is known about the factors associated with domestic violence. We now summarise our findings by presenting a brief profile of the five aspects of domestic violence which we have identified, namely mutual violence (where men and

[120] Mirrlees-Black, 1999:41.
[121] Jasinksi & Williams, 1997.
[122] Mirrlees-Black, 1999:32.
[123] Grandin, Lupri & Brinkerhoff, 1998:43.

women are violent to each other), male perpetrators, female perpetrators, male victims and female victims.

Mutual domestic violence is found mainly among younger couples and is strongly associated with cohabitation; relative to other relationships, marriage seems to offer a protection against domestic violence. Most of the evidence suggests that mutual domestic violence is associated with lower socio-economic status; however there seems to be no clear association between parenting status and mutual domestic violence. Mutual violence is more likely to occur in relationships which are either male-dominant or female-dominant and is least likely in egalitarian relationships. Mutual domestic violence is also associated with alcohol use and psychological disturbance. These findings provide support for a sociological understanding of mutual domestic violence (given its association with the distribution of power in relationships) as well as a pathological model of domestic violence (given its association with certain psychopathological characteristics).

Male perpetrators tend to be in the age range of 30 to 50 years, to be separated or separating from their partners, to come from lower socio-economic backgrounds and to have a relatively poor employment record. They are also likely to come from abusive family backgrounds and, perhaps related to this, tend to have more tolerant attitudes towards violence and aggression. Male perpetrators also tend to be either dominant or dominated in their current relationships and, in the light of research to date, seem more likely than other men – or indeed female perpetrators - to show symptoms of psychopathology such as personality disorder or depression. These characteristics suggest that male perpetrators are strongly influenced by a disruptive family background and a poor relationship with their current partner and are relatively disadvantaged vis à vis other men.

Female perpetrators tend to be younger women, usually under 30. The research also suggests that there may be two different types of female perpetrator: one is a blue collar women who is married and the other is a white collar women who is cohabiting or dating. There is limited evidence on the family of origin of female perpetrators but one study found that they had personal experience of victimisation as young girls and may also have seen their mother hitting their father. Female perpetrators tend to have a less psychopathological profile than male perpetrators but their reasons for inflicting violence on their partner tend to be similar and are not primarily aimed at self-defence. These findings draw attention to the importance of power in the perpetration of domestic violence and suggest that social rather than pathological factors are the main influences on female perpetrators.

Male victims are more likely to be younger men who are cohabiting with their partners and, relative to other men, they have little economic power and bring few economic resources to the relationship. These men, perhaps because they do not fulfil their own or their partners' expectations of the traditional male role, are likely to blame themselves for the violence that is inflicted on them.

Female victims, like their male counterparts, tend to be under 40 years old with the strongest concentration in the 16-24 age bracket. Women who are single, divorced or separated are at the highest risk of victimisation and there is evidence to suggest that leaving a relationship places women at risk of violence from their male partner. Married women are at least risk of domestic violence although this may be the residual effect of female victims leaving violent marriages. Female victims tend to be drawn from lower socio-economic groups and, like male victims, they tend to be outside the labour market or occupy a weak position within it. They typically feel powerless to do anything to stop the violence which is inflicted upon them.

It will be clear from the different profiles of domestic violence presented in this chapter that power is a common thread in all of them. Relationships in which one partner is dominant – sometimes the man, sometimes the woman – are at higher risk of domestic violence than more democratic, egalitarian relationships. Power can have a personality dimension but it almost invariably has an economic dimension and male and female victims are usually in a weak economic position within that relationship. The extent of powerlessness experienced through domestic violence can be seen in the fact that female victims typically feel that there is nothing they can do to stop it while male victims often blame themselves for the violence inflicted upon them. Both men and women can be trapped in a violent relationship but men seem more unwilling than women to leave violent relationships although women place themselves at higher risk of domestic violence by leaving or by trying to leave. Abusive family backgrounds are a factor in the perpetration of domestic violence, particularly in the case of male perpetrators who also seem to exhibit more psychopathological characteristics than their female counterparts. Domestic violence is associated with lower socio-economic status but of course it can be found in all social classes and tends to be confined to a minority within every social class. These findings suggest that no one theory or paradigm can properly explain domestic violence. However there is sufficient evidence to suggest that domestic violence is essentially a learned behaviour and therein lies the hope that what is learned can be unlearned. In that context we now turn to the issue of services.

Chapter Five

What Services are Needed to Address Domestic Violence Against Men?

"*Hatred never ceases by hatred but by love alone is healed. This is an ancient and eternal law*".
Bhudda (563-483 BC)

5.1 Introduction

This chapter examines the services that are needed to address the problem of domestic violence against men. This was not an easy chapter to write because there is very little literature on the topic of services for men – at least men as victims rather than men as perpetrators. This reflects the fact that there are almost no services for the male victims of domestic violence, even in countries where the statistical evidence provides prime facie evidence that there is considerable domestic violence against men[1]. The lack of services for the male victims of domestic violence is reinforced by the reluctance of male victims to present themselves as needing services which, in turn, is often used to suggest that there is no demand for such services. It is necessary therefore to begin by reflecting on the mutually reinforcing process by which lack of services and reluctance to seek services make it difficult to find evidence of demand for services and we discuss this in section 5.2. These reflections lead us to the view that services for men can only be developed if there is a much greater public awareness among the population generally, as well as among professional service providers in particular, that domestic violence against men is a reality just like domestic violence against women (section 5.3). Some of the services that have been developed for men, albeit in a rather piecemeal and under-funded manner, include help-lines, group supports, refuges, counselling and we briefly examine these in sections 5.4, 5.5, 5.6, and 5.7 respectively. We also review how domestic violence is treated in the legal system, particularly from the perspective of men (section 5.8). The logic of acknowledging that there are male victims of domestic violence is that there are also female perpetrators and we briefly comment on their service needs (section 5.9).

[1] This is underlined by the fact that there are directories of services for women victims of domestic violence, but none for male victims. For example, The Department of Justice Equality and Law Reform have recently published a National Directory of Services for Women who have Experienced Violence or the Threat of Violence (National Steering Committee on Violence Against Women, 2000).

5.2 Demand for Services

The reality of domestic violence is that it is a private, hidden and often shameful form of suffering that few ever hear about other than the men, women and children who are immediately involved. The stigma of being involved in a violent relationship and the fear of even more negative consequences if others knew about it, lead victims and perpetrators to conspire in keeping a lid of secrecy on the violence in their relationship, so that women as well as men are reluctant to present for services until their situation becomes intolerable.

The 1996 British Crime Survey found that most victims of domestic violence did not report the matter to the authorities, whether to the police or to medical practitioners[2]. However men are significantly less likely to report than women. The British Crime Survey found that, among chronic victims of domestic violence, 60% of women told a friend or relative (compared to only 29% of men), 22% of women informed the police (compared to only 8% of men) and 20% of women saw a doctor or went to hospital (compared to only 3% of men). Other research in the UK has suggested that while male and female victims experience their plight as shameful and humiliating, men face the additional fear of being ridiculed as 'wimps' for being victimised by a woman[3]. This is also the experience in the US where, according to one observer, "men have a more difficult time not only admitting they are victims and seeking help, but they also have a more difficult time leaving the abusive relations: "Because if you leave, you are abdicating your responsibility, and you are less than a man" (Cook, 1997:60)"[4].

These realities help to explain the anomaly that so few men report themselves as victims to services even though they are willing to report similar levels of victimisation as women in the confidential gender-neutral surveys that we reviewed in Chapter Three. Even allowing for the fact that men seem to suffer less negative outcomes of domestic violence than women, particularly in terms of physical injuries, these differences are scarcely sufficient to account for the major disparity between the number of men and women who present for services. However this should also be seen in the context that men systematically under-report their health needs by comparison with women[5] and are much less likely to use medical services such as GPs than women[6].

[2] Mirrlees-Black, 1999:80.
[3] Stitt & Macklin, 1995.
[4] McNeely, Cook and Torres, 2001:239.
[5] Armstrong, 1999.

It is helpful to recall the difficulties which women victims experience when presenting for services since these probably apply equally to men. "When women seek help they often do so in a tentative and ambivalent manner, filtered through shame, self-blame, a sense of failure, concerns about exposing the private problems of their families, fear associated with men's threats if contact is made and concern about the nature of the response they might receive"[7]. Likewise the experiences of Irish women in accessing services seem remarkably similar to that which we know about the problems being encountered by male victims. According to the Task Force on Violence Against Women: "women face a variety of psychological and physical barriers to deal with violence in relationships. Many women also feel that existing services are incapable of responding to their needs"[8].

It is doubtful if most male victims would prefer to 'suffer in silence' but it is possible that many are afraid to bring their victimisation to anyone's attention for fear of not being believed, the matter going to court and their children being taken away or left with the 'abusive' wife[9]. Whatever the reasons, the findings of the British Crime Survey indicate that "male victims are less likely to admit, for reasons of shame, embarrassment, or machismo, the true seriousness of outcomes of assaults by women"[10]. Thus the lack of demand for services by the male victims of domestic violence is less a reflection of the real needs of these victims and more a reflection on the difficulty of expressing those needs in a way which does not risk making the matter worse.

There is some evidence that the difficulties which male victims of domestic violence encounter in presenting for services are now being recognised. In March 2000 the Minister of State at the Department of Justice, Equality and Law Reform, Mary Wallace TD, observed that "there can be particular difficulties for men in reporting incidents of domestic violence and in the way that elements of society deals with such reports"[11].

5.3 Raising Public Awareness

It is well recognised that one of the ways of addressing the problem of domestic violence against women is to raise public awareness that the problem exists. This makes it easier for victims to acknowledge that they have a problem which needs help and creates greater awareness among service providers and society in general about domestic violence. In addition, as leading

[6] Office for National Statistics, 1998.
[7] Dobash & Dobash, 1979 cited in Dobash & Dobash, 1992:232.
[8] Task Force on Violence Against Women, 1997:11.
[9] Steinmetz, 1977-78.
[10] Mirrlees-Black, 1999:62.
[11] Wallace, 2000.

researchers on marital therapy in the US have pointed out, "reductions in the incidence of marital violence will occur only as we are able to raise generations of non-violent people through education and social change"[12]. The experience of Sweden suggests that this is indeed possible[13].

In Ireland the importance of public awareness is generally appreciated. For example, the Task Force on Violence Against Women (1997) gave great importance to public awareness in its strategy and recommended "a publicly funded public awareness campaign, including TV/radio/poster ... and information leaflets"[14]. A similar emphasis has been placed on public awareness in Northern Ireland[15].

A major problem facing the male victims of domestic violence is that public awareness is very heavily influenced by the existing consensus on this issue – that women are the only victims and men are the only perpetrators. Public awareness campaigns which focus only on women as victims may exacerbate the problems of male victims because it effectively denies the reality of their experience and contributes to the mutually reinforcing process that men do not present for services while services, in turn, do not develop to respond to men's needs. One group of commentators has described this situation as the "unintended negative consequences to well-intended social policies"[16]. There can be no denying or minimising the appalling reality of domestic violence against women but presenting this as the only reality – as for example in UNICEF's report on "Domestic Violence against Women and Girls"[17] or an EU-based report entitled "Unveiling the Hidden Data on Domestic Violence in the European Union"[18] – is not helpful to the plight of male victims and is not consistent with the reality of domestic violence, at least in English-speaking developed countries. As the Canadian research team, who carried out the Calgary study which we discussed in Chapter Three, wrote: "It appears that a significant amount of education is needed to dispel the myth that males cannot be seriously abused by females. Work on this myth would help couples more effectively deal with the destructive patterns in their relationship, help prevent violence in the first place, and reduce the tendency of helping professionals to deny this problem. Moral consistency, in this case a willingness to

[12] Margolin & Burman, 1993:70.
[13] Durrant, 1999.
[14] Task Force on Violence Against Women, 1997:11-19.
[15] Cited in Adams, C, 1999.
[16] Gelles & Loseke, 1993:xiv.
[17] UNICEF, 2000.
[18] European Women's Lobby, 1999.

confront couple violence with its negative psychological consequences, would seem to speak most powerfully to the needs of both female and male victims"[19].

Public awareness can also help to change professional attitudes to domestic violence against men. Like the general public, professional attitudes can vary enormously on this issue: some professionals "know" the problem does not exist because they have never encountered it while others "know" it does exist because they have. Thus perceptions shape the way in which professionals engage with the problem. As one researcher has observed: "The fact is that a larger proportion of the social agencies that deal with family violence target only female victims. Thus we should not be surprised if these groups do not find evidence of male victims of domestic violence"[20].

The reality as experienced by male victims of domestic violence is that professionals tend to be generally unhelpful. This finding emerged from the 1996 British Crime Survey which discovered that male victims were "particularly unhappy about the level of support offered by agencies, especially by the police"[21]. In explanation, the author of this survey suggested that "support agencies have a particular problem in recognising that male victims can be just as in need of support and advice as female victims"[22]. Other researchers and commentators have found that professional people who come into contact with male victims of domestic violence either refuse to believe them or are ill-prepared to offer advice[23]. Again this needs to be seen in the context that a large range of social services tend to "filter out" men and fathers[24].

These considerations suggest that raising awareness of the true scope and reality of domestic violence would be an important part of any strategy in addressing domestic violence against men. Of course we have no hard data about the situation in Ireland but, if it is similar to the other English-speaking developed countries reviewed here, then it is likely that domestic violence against men is a significant if unacknowledged reality. Again, it is noteworthy that this possibility has been officially acknowledged by the Minister of State at the Department of Justice, Equality and Law Reform who has stated that the National Steering Committee on Violence against Women, which was established in 1997, is not "blind to, or in any way against

[19] Grandin, Lupri & Brinkerhoff, 1998.
[20] George, 1994:150.
[21] Mirrlees-Black, 1999:63.
[22] ibid.
[23] Adams, 1999; Farrell, 1993; McHugh, Walsh & McCafferky, 1999; Stitt & Macklin, 1995; Macchietto, 1992; Harris & Cook, 1994.
[24] See Buckley, 1998; McKeown,2001.

the plight of male victims of domestic violence ... or against progress in relation to the provision of services for male victims"[25].

5.4 Help Lines

Help lines have become an enormously popular aspect of all services, not only in social services but in the commercial world as well. For the victims of domestic violence they offer immediacy, confidentiality and information which are particularly crucial when situations reach a point of crisis. For service providers they can be a source of referral and a gateway to their services. For policy makers, they can give an indication of the level of need which exists for that service.

As in other areas of domestic violence, help line services are much more developed for women than men. In Ireland, a help line service for male victims is run by AMEN, a voluntary organisation established in 1997. In the three years to 2000, AMEN was contacted by over 6,000 men and concerned members of their families. In the UK, there is a modest help line service based in London, called MALE, and staffed by one person. It was established in 1994 as an adjunct to Merton Refuge which provides shelter for the female victims of domestic abuse. In 1998/99 the MALE help line received 8,200 calls: 47% from male victims, 25% from male perpetrators, 5% from female perpetrators, and 10% from men who had been abused physically or sexually as children[26]. Similar help lines have been set up in other countries such as the US and Canada but they are typically under-funded and run by untrained volunteers[27].

To be genuinely helpful to callers, all help lines need to be properly funded and staffed by competent people with the appropriate skills and information. In the area of domestic violence, there are the additional complexities of separate help lines for male and female victims. This may not be essential in the long-term but the highly charged nature of the issues may make it sensible for the foreseeable future. There is also the perception that staff trained to take calls from female victims may not be equally disposed to take calls from male victims, and vice versa. One observer of the situation in the US suggested that staff working with female victims may view male callers in a negative light: "domestic violence shelter workers are trained to take calls from men as crank calls. From their perspective, if a man calls claiming to be a victim, it's actually a perpetrator trying to get information on how to beat the system"[28].

[25] Wallace, 2000.
[26] MALE Merton Refuge, 1999.
[27] Cook, 1997.
[28] ibid:64.

As regards the dissemination of information about help lines, there would seem to be no reason why information about male and female help lines could not be published on the same leaflets and distributed widely through health centres, Garda stations, doctor's surgeries, etc. Gender equality would be preferable with regard to these publications so that men and women suffering from domestic violence could receive relevant information from the same leaflet.

5.5 Group Support

Despite the limited research in this area there is some evidence to suggest that, apart from help lines, the most important source of help for male victims is a support group. One US study of abused husbands found that their primary service needs were met through support groups[29]. Other commentators suggest likewise: "Every community should provide support groups for all victims of domestic violence. Sharing common experiences truly works wonders towards helping individuals rebuild shattered lives"[30]. In Britain, two researchers interviewed 20 male victims of domestic violence in the north-western region of England and asked each of them if they saw a need for a help-line or refuge centre for men. Twelve of the men felt they badly needed somebody sympathetic to talk to, and that a help-line would go some way to help, but they also needed "somewhere to go and chat so we realise that it's OK to ask for help and support, and that we are not to blame". However, they were extremely concerned about anonymity: "I don't know how many men would openly admit that their wife beats them up"[31]. In Ireland AMEN has found that support groups are enormously helpful to male victims but their work is limited by lack of funding for trained facilitators and for renting regular meeting places.

As with help lines, running support groups is a skilled undertaking particularly when the issue is as sensitive as domestic violence. Victims can be a great source of support to each other but the efficacy of these groups can be greatly enhanced by a skilled facilitator and this should be borne in mind in setting up these groups.

5.6 Refuges

It is generally accepted that, where domestic violence cannot be stopped while a couple continue to live together, then it should be the perpetrator rather than the victim who is obliged to leave the family home. In practice it is not always possible to achieve this ideal and refuges are

[29] Minnesota Department of Corrections, cited by Pagelow, 1985:187.
[30] Cook, 1997:154; see also Farrell, 1990:58.
[31] Stitt & Macklin, 1995.

necessary for the shelter and protection of victims and their children. A further complicating factor is that half of all domestic violence is mutual.

The experience of AMEN in Ireland and MALE in the UK suggests that refuges are not a priority for the male victims of domestic violence unless they have had to leave home with dependent children. Male victims who are forced to leave home may need immediate accommodation but this could be provided through bed-and-breakfast rather than refuges. Both organisations already work in partnership with the local health services to find this type of accommodation for male victims who have had to leave home.

One of the urban myths that has arisen about refuges for male victims is that many of them have had to close because of lack of clients. We have not been able to find evidence to confirm this. However one of the "refuges" in London which we examined turned out to be a house which was open to male victims for a week as part of a campaign to raise awareness about domestic violence against men; it was never intended as a refuge, never funded as a refuge and never run as a refuge in the normal sense. In any case, as already suggested, there are some doubts as to whether refuges are required for the male victims of domestic violence, unless there are young dependent children involved.

5.7 Counselling

The rationale for counselling was clearly outlined by the Task Force on Violence Against Women and probably applies equally to male victims even though it was specifically formulated in terms of the needs of female victims: "Living with abuse can lead to depression, low self-esteem, and other psychological effects for both women and their children. It is important that women have access to counselling and personal support to help rebuild their confidence in themselves, to heal the hurt, and to give them the strength to make a new life. Participation in general self-development programmes and survivors' support groups can be of great benefit to women. In addition, access to individual counselling is often required"[32].

One of the leading US researchers in marital therapy has suggested that individual counselling may be required in cases of severe domestic violence but couple counselling may be appropriate in treating "lower levels of verbal and physical aggression that are commonly self-reported by both men and women that are not in self-defence. ... Preventive efforts are sorely needed to stop

[32] Task Force on Violence Against Women, 1997:78.

the escalation of physical aggression from mild to severe levels of physical aggression"[34]. Other research on married couples in counselling where mutual violence was one of the presenting problems found that these couples did not spontaneously identify their physical aggression as a marital problem[35]. Generally speaking, the small amount of research that is available about the needs of male victims suggests that they would avail of counselling services[36].

Our observations above about how professionals perceive domestic violence generally and male and female victims in particular apply equally to counsellors. One US counsellor has suggested that the existing consensus about domestic violence which is held by most counsellors has the effect of making it "less likely for victimised men to receive the same recognition from us as mental health counsellors.... (thus) we can unintentionally add to the denial problem we recognise men exhibiting in therapy. ... When I was unaware of the research regarding battered men, I never saw battered men or physically abusive women in my counselling. Subsequent to my own learning of the prevalence of physically abused men, I began (as well as continue) to see proportionately equal numbers of battered men and women as well as abusive men and women"[37]. Other commentators have suggested that "many, many therapists show an anti-male bias when it comes to domestic violence"[38].

5.8 Legal Issues

In Ireland as elsewhere there is a perception that, in matters of family law, it is harder for men than women to get justice in the courts. In the US, one commentator has observed: "The idea that a man will not be given a fair and equal opportunity in the field of domestic relations law is a pervasive belief. This belief directly affects the ability of the abused man to seek relief under the law"[39]. In Ireland groups such as Parental Equality and AMEN have also spoken of what they see as bias in the family courts against men and the two AMEN conferences in 1998 and 2000 heard evidence from victims about how difficult it can be to get justice in the courts. Some Irish barristers have also suggested that a higher standard of proof may be needed for male than female complainants of domestic violence[40]. It is difficult to assess these observations independently because family court hearings are not heard in public and no record is kept of the proceedings, but they are matters which merit further investigation. At the same time, and this is

[34] O'Leary,1993:20.
[35] Vivian & Langhinrichsen-Rohling, 1994; see also O'Leary & Vivian, 1990.
[36] See for example Stitt & Macklin, 1995.
[37] Macchietto, 1992:375-385; see also Krug, 1989:112; Cook, 1997:106.
[38] Cook, 1997:95.
[39] ibid:78.
[40] Wood, 1998; Corrigan, 1998.

surely symptomatic of just how fraught the issue of domestic violence can be, women victims also have reservations about the court system as the Task Force on Violence Against Women pointed out: "Many women ... feel that the legal and court systems minimise the seriousness of crimes committed against women, fail to dispense justice and make women feel at fault for what has happened"[41].

The two main functions of the family law system in Ireland is protection from domestic violence and separation from one's partner. One study has suggested that the number of cases coming before the courts under each of these functions is approximately equal[42]. The same study also found that 85% of all family law cases – and virtually 100% of all domestic violence cases - are initiated by women, leading the authors to conclude that, in Ireland, family law is "a woman's resource rather than a man's resource"[43]. This clearly calls for some explanation in view of the evidence reviewed in Chapters Three and Four above and the fact that the letter of Irish law on domestic violence is gender neutral. However we are not in a position to offer any definitive explanation since no research has been carried out on why male victims do not seek legal redress. Moreover we know virtually nothing about those female victims who seek legal redress since statistics on barring and protection orders alone "tell us nothing about the nature of the violence (how often it is psychological rather than physical, how repetitive it is, how severe it is), about the victims and perpetrators (we do not know, for example, how often children as well as women are victims), about the kind of responses the courts give (we do not know, for example, why more than half the barring applications made in 1993-94 were not granted), and the pattern of enforcement of orders issued, about rates of recidivism, or about any other practical outcome as far as families are concerned"[44]. It is worth noting however that legal cases have been taken by male victims of domestic violence in the US, the UK, Canada and Australia[45].

In 1998 the Law Reform Committee of the Law Society of Ireland carried out a survey of 100 family law solicitors to examine the operation and effectiveness of the provisions of the Domestic Violence Act, 1996[46]. This survey, which yielded a response rate of 83%, found that there are large variations in the way the legislation is implemented particularly on matters such as the standard of proof necessary to establish abuse and the setting of dates for a full court hearing in cases where men have had ex parte interim barring orders issued against them in their

[41] Task Force on Violence Against Women. 1997:11.
[42] Fahey & Lyons, 1995:22.
[43] ibid:136
[44] ibid:2.
[45] See Bates, 1981.

absence and have not been informed by the court of the allegations made against them. These findings are a cause for concern – to women as well as men – and indicate that the trauma of domestic violence may be exacerbated rather than ameliorated by the legal system as it operates at present. For that reason, many of the recommendations made by the Law Reform Committee of the Law Society of Ireland offer hope that the situation can be improved.

5.9 Counselling for Female Perpetrators

As required by our brief, this chapter has focussed on the service needs of male victims of domestic violence. However it is appropriate to consider briefly the needs of female perpetrators since these too have been largely ignored in the literature on domestic violence. This approach is in line with the overall findings and theme of the report which suggests that our understanding of the field of domestic violence needs to be broadened to include female perpetrators as well as male victims. Our review does not resolve the healthy dispute in the literature over the relative size of the different categories of domestic violence (male and female victims, male and female perpetrators) but there is sufficient research evidence to suggest that all of these categories are substantial enough to be included within any framework which purports to deal with domestic violence in a comprehensive way.

As with services for male victims, there is very little research on services for female perpetrators. As one US counsellor and psychotherapist has observed: "Presently, services for abusive women dealing with their abusive behaviour are as limited as services for victimised men"[47]. In London the co-ordinator of MALE has written: "There is a distinct lack of services available to people who are taking responsibility for their abusive behaviour and are looking for behaviour modification programmes"[48].

As we have seen in Chapter Four, relatively little is known about female perpetrators essentially because most research has assumed that they act in self-defence. While it is certainly true that some female perpetration in heterosexual relationships is self-defence, the evidence reviewed in Chapter Four suggested that this is not the only or even the main motivation. In the New Zealand study, the authors found some evidence for self-defence but they also found that female perpetrators seem to make a rational choice to be violent because "they may understand that the likelihood is very low that they will injure their partner or be prosecuted ... and given social norms constraining men's behaviour toward women, women may also anticipate that few men

[46] Law Society of Ireland, 1999; MacIntyre, 2000.
[47] Macchietto, 1992:376.

will hit back"[49]. Whatever the reason, the possibility cannot be ignored that women perpetrators may also need services to help address their violent behaviour and this is currently denied them[50]. From the perspective of prevention, these services should also include educational interventions in order to raise awareness among girls as well as boys of the reality of aggression and violence and the need to develop communication and conflict resolution skills as part of healthy intimate relationships[51].

5.10 The Needs of Children

The impact of domestic violence on children is outside the strict scope of this study but no review of the topic would be complete without adverting to the fact that children are invariably victimised when there is domestic violence between their parents. There is widespread agreement among researchers that children are more adversely affected by conflict between their parents than by either marital distress or divorce and this adversity increases with the severity and frequency of the conflict[52]. Children who witness domestic violence run a significant risk of themselves becoming anti-social, violent and sexually abusive both in childhood and in adult life[53]. In addition, children who live in homes where there is domestic violence between their parents are also more likely to become victims of physical abuse themselves[54]. These considerations serve to further broaden our understanding of domestic violence and the scope of interventions required to address it. In particular they highlight the need for professionals to be aware that child abuse may itself be an indicator of domestic violence and vice versa and the need to understand the family dynamic at work in these cases – as seen from the perspective of all family members – before interventions are made.

5.11 Conclusion

We have seen in this chapter that there are virtually no services for male victims of domestic violence even in countries where there is statistical evidence to indicate that domestic violence against men is a substantial reality. The reason for this is not just the existing consensus about domestic violence – and the resistance which this creates to the idea that men could be victimised by women – but the reluctance of male victims themselves to present for services. The reality of domestic violence for men as well as for women is that it is a private, hidden and

[48] Les Davidson in MALE Merton Refuge, 1999.
[49] Magdol et al., 1997:76.
[50] See Steinmetz cited in Cook:1997:113.
[51] See Straus & Gelles, 1990:105.
[52] Holtzworth-Munroe et al, 1997:148-149; Najman et al, 1997.
[53] Haapalo & Pokela, 1999:111.
[54] Moffitt & Caspi, 1998.

often shameful form of suffering that few ever hear about other than the men, women and children who are immediately involved. The stigma of being involved in a violent relationship and the fear of even more negative consequences if others know about it, lead victims and perpetrators to conspire in keeping a lid of secrecy on the violence in their relationship, so that women as well as men are reluctant to present for services until their situation becomes intolerable. However there is considerable evidence that men are even more reluctant than women to report their own victimisation to the police or medical authorities and those that do often have negative experiences from these services and the professionals involved. Even if we allow for the fact that men seem to suffer less negative outcomes of domestic violence than women, particularly in terms of physical injuries, these differences are scarcely sufficient to account for the major disparity between the number of men and women who present for services.

It is well recognised that one of the ways of addressing the problem of domestic violence against women is to raise public awareness that the problem exists. However a major problem facing the male victims of domestic violence is that public awareness and professional perceptions are often very heavily influenced by the existing consensus on this issue. This can exacerbate the problems of male victims because it effectively denies the reality of their experience and contributes to the mutually reinforcing process that men do not present for services while services, in turn, do not develop to respond to men's needs.

Help lines, support groups and counselling have a role in supporting male victims as they do for female victims. However male help lines are typically under-funded and sometimes run by untrained volunteers. Also, there seems to be no good reason why information about male and female help lines could not be published on the same leaflets and disseminated widely through health centres, Garda stations, doctor's surgeries, etc.

As might be expected, much of the divisiveness associated with domestic violence is also mirrored in relatively high levels of dissatisfaction by men as well as women with the way in which the legal system handles this issue and it is probably no exaggeration to say that, in some cases at least, the trauma of domestic violence may be exacerbated rather than ameliorated by the legal system as it operates at present. In Ireland as elsewhere there is a perception that, in matters of family law, it is harder for men than women to get justice in the courts. Whether or not this is true, it is still difficult to explain why there have been very few cases in Ireland taken by male victims against their female perpetrators in view of the evidence reviewed in Chapters Three and Four above and the fact that the letter of Irish law on domestic violence is gender

neutral. We are not in a position to offer any definitive explanation of this until more thorough research has been carried out on the way in which the cases are processed through the courts. However we do know from a study by the Law Reform Committee of the Law Society of Ireland that there are serious inadequacies in the present system – which adversely affect men as well as women – and these need to be addressed.

The findings in this chapter – and in the report generally – point to the need for a larger and more inclusive paradigm of domestic violence than is currently allowable within the existing consensus. By the same reasoning, these findings also make it extremely difficult to credibly sustain a perspective on domestic violence which assumes that, in the vast majority of cases, men are its only perpetrators and women its only victims. The broader and more inclusive paradigm of domestic violence which is suggested by the findings of this report in no way diminish what we already know about the suffering caused to women at the hands of men; nor should it be used in any way as an excuse to reduce services for women victims of domestic violence. A more inclusive approach to domestic violence should not create competition between victims by minimising the experiences of men at the expense of women or vice versa. Although we have no firm evidence on the true prevalence of domestic violence in Ireland, at least not with respect to male victims and female perpetrators, it seems unlikely that it should be significantly different to other English-speaking developed countries such as the US, the UK, Canada or New Zealand. For this reason, it would be reasonable to proceed on the assumption that domestic violence against men is a significant problem and mutual violence is the main form in which domestic violence tends to occur. That is the basis for a more inclusive paradigm of domestic violence and the starting point for a more comprehensive approach to both prevention and the development of services for the victims and perpetrators of domestic violence.

Appendix to Chapter Two

Table A2.1 References for Surveys

Name of Study	Authors & Source
1. US National Family Violence Survey, 1975/76	Gelles, 1987. Straus, 1979 Straus, 1990d Straus, Gelles and Steinmetz, 1980. Straus and Gelles, 1986, 1990. Steinmetz, 1977-78.
2.1 US National Family Violence Re-Survey, 1985	Colman and Straus, 1986. Gelles, 1987, 1990, 1997. Gelles and Straus, 1979. Hotaling and Straus, 1980. Stets and Pirog-Good, 1987. Stets and Henderson, 1991. Straus, 1979, 1981, 1990a, 1990c, 1990d. Straus and Gelles, 1986, 1988, 1990. Straus, Hamby, Boney-McCoy and Sugerman, 1996 Straus and Sweet, 1992. Suitor, Pillemer and Straus, 1990. Yello and Straus, 1981.
2.2 US National Family Violence Re-Survey, 1985	Stets and Straus, 1990a.
2.3 US National Family Violence Re-Survey, 1985	Straus, 1993.
2.4 US National Family Violence Re-Survey, 1985	Stets and Straus, 1989, 1990b.
2.5 US National Family Violence Re-Survey, 1985	Stets and Straus, 1989, 1990b.
3. US National Survey of Families & Households, 1987-88	Brush, 1990. Sweet, Bumpass and Call, 1988.
4.1 US National Youth Survey, 1983	Morse, 1995.
4.2 US National Youth Survey, 1986	ditto
4.3 US National Youth Survey, 1989	ditto
4.4 US National Youth Survey, 1992	ditto
5. US National Violence Against Women Survey, 1995/96	Tjaden and Thoennes, 2000a, 2000b and 2000c.
6. British MORI Survey, 1994	Carrado, George, Loxam, Jones and Templar, 1996.
7. British Crime Survey, 1996	Mirrlees-Black, 1999.
8.1 Canada, Calgary Survey, 1981	Brinkerhoff and Lupri, 1988. Grandin, Lupri and Brinkerhoff, 1998.
9. Canada, Edmonton Survey, 1983/84	Bland and Orn, 1986.
10. Canada, Alberta Survey 1987	Kennedy and Dutton, 1989. Kwong, Bartholomew and Dutton, 1999.
11. Canada, General Social Survey on Victimisation, 1999	Canadian Centre for Justice Statistics, 2000. Rogers, 1994.
12. Australia International Social Science Survey 1996/97	Headey, Scott and de Vaus, 1999. Heady, Funder, Scott, Kelley and Evans, 1996.
13. New Zealand, Dunedin Survey, 1972/73	Magdol, Moffitt, Caspi, Newman, Fagan and Silva, 1997.

Table A2.2 Sample Characteristics of Surveys Used in Studies of Domestic Violence

Data Source Country Year	Authors & Year	Sample Population		Achieved Sample Size	Sample Composition		Response Rate	Refusal Rate	
		Age	Marital Status		Female	Male	Total	Female	Male
1. US National Family Violence Survey, 1975/6	Straus, Gelles & Steinmetz, 1980; Straus & Gelles 1986/1990	18-65	Currently married/ cohabiting	2,143	55%	45%	64%		
2.1 US National Family Violence Re-Survey, 1985	Straus & Gelles 1988/1990	18+	Currently married/ cohabiting, recently separated, divorced or single parents	6,002	59%	41%	84%		
2.2 US National Family Violence Re-Survey, 1985	Stets & Straus 1990a	18+	Currently married/ cohabiting	n=5,248	56%	44%	73%		
2.3 US National Family Violence Re-Survey, 1985	Straus, 1993	18+	Currently married/ cohabiting women	n=2,994					
2.4 US National Family Violence Re-Survey, 1985	Stets & Straus 1989/1990b	18+	Currently cohabiting	n=237					
2.5 US National Family Violence Re-Survey, 1985	Stets & Straus 1989/1990b	18+	Currently married	n=5,005					
3. US National Survey of Families & Households, 1987/8	Brush, 1990	19+	Total	13,017					
			Currently married	n=5,474					
4.1 US National Youth Survey, 1983-92	Morse, 1995	18-24	Wave 6 - 1983 Ever married/ cohabiting	1,496 n=477	63%	37%	87%		
4.2 US National Youth Survey, 1983-92	Morse, 1995	21-27	Wave 7 - 1986 Ever married/ cohabiting	1,384 n=723	56%	44%	80%		
4.3 US National Youth Survey, 1983-92	Morse, 1995	24-30	Wave 8 - 1989 Ever married/ cohabiting	1,436 n=959	53%	47%	83%		
4.4 US National Youth Survey, 1983-92	Morse, 1995	27-33	Wave 9 - 1992 Ever married/ cohabiting	1,340 n=1,001	51%	49%	78%		
5. US National Violence Against Women Survey, 1995/6	Tjaden & Thoennes, 2000a	18+	Total	16,000	50%	50%	56%	36%	48%
			Ever married/ cohabiting	n=14,212	51%	49%			
			Currently married/ cohabiting	n=11,637	49%	51%			

Table A2.2 Sample Characteristics of Surveys Used in Studies of Domestic Violence (Continued)

Data Source Country Year	Authors & Year	Sample Population		Achieved Sample Size	Sample Composition		Response Rate	Refusal Rate	
		Age	Marital Status		Female	Male	Total	Female	Male
6. British MORI Survey, 1994	Carrado et al, 1996	15+	Total	1,978			85%	15%	14%
			Ever married/ cohabiting/ dating	n=1,865	52%	48%			
			Currently married/ cohabiting	n=1,481	52%	48%			
7. British Crime Survey, 1996	Mirrlees-Black, 1999	16-59	Ever married/ cohabiting/ dating/ same sex	10,844	54%	46%	97%	3%	2.3%
8.1 Canada, Calgary Survey, 1981	Brinkerhoff & Lupri, 1988		Currently married/ cohabiting	1,124	50%	50%	72%		
9. Canada, Edmonton Survey, 1983/4	Bland & Orn, 1986	18+	Total	1,200	59%	41%	80%		
			Ever married/ cohabiting	n=971	63%	37%			
10. Canada, Alberta Survey 1987	Kwong, Bartholomew & Dutton, 1999	18+	Ever married/ cohabiting	1,045	49%	51%	90%		
			Ever married/ cohabiting last year	n=707	50%	50%			
11. Canada, General Social Survey on Victimisation, 1999	Canadian Centre for Justice Statistics, 2000	15+	Total	25,876	55%	45%	81.3%	5%	6%
			Ever married/ cohabiting/ same sex	n=15,743	50%	50%	94%		
			Currently married/ cohabiting/ same sex	n=14,068	49%	51%	95%		
12. Australia International Social Science Survey 1996/97	Headey, Scott & de Vaus, 1999	18+	Total	2,151					
			Ever married/ cohabiting last year	n=1,643	51%	49%	60-65%		
13. New Zealand, Dunedin Survey, 1972/73	Magdol, et al., 1997	21	Birth cohort	1,037	48%	52%	91%		
			Ever married/ cohabiting/ dating last year	n=861	49%	51%	83%		

Table A2.3 Measurements and Methods Used in Studies of Domestic Violence

Data Source Country Year	Measurement Instrument	Method of Data Collection and Analysis			
		Individuals			Couples
		Victims	Perpetrators	Victims & Perpetrators	Perpetrators
1. US National Family Violence Survey, 1975/6	CTS (N) (Straus 1979)			Face-to-face interviews	
2.1 US National Family Violence Re-Survey, 1985 **2.2** US National Family Violence Re-Survey, 1985 **2.3** US National Family Violence Re-Survey, 1985 **2.4** US National Family Violence Re-Survey, 1985 **2.5** US National Family Violence Re-Survey, 1985	CTS (R*) (Straus 1979 & 1981)			Telephone Interviews	
3. US National Survey of Families & Households, 1987/88	Derived from the CTS (N) Straus, 1979 (Brush, 1990)			Self-completion questionnaire	
4.1 US National Youth Survey, 1983 **4.2** US National Youth Survey, 1986 **4.3** US National Youth Survey, 1989 **4.4** US National Youth Survey, 1992	CTS (N) (Straus, 1979 & Straus, 1990c)			Face-to-face interviews	
5. US National Violence Against Women Survey, 1995/6	Derived from CTS (N) Straus, 1979 (Tjaden & Thoennes, 2000a)	Telephone Interviews			
6. British MORI Survey, 1994	Derived from CTS (N) (Straus 1979)	Self-completion questionnaire – currently coupled only		Self-completion questionnaire – all partners	
7. British Crime Survey, 1996	BCS measure	Computer Assisted Self-Interviewing			
8. Canada, Calgary Survey, 1981	CTS (N) (Straus 1979) and various				Self-completing questionnaire
9. Canada, Edmonton Survey, 1983/4	Diagnostic Interview Schedule (DIS)		Structural Interviews with questionnaire		

Table A2.3 Measurements and Methods Used in Studies of Domestic Violence (Continued)

Data Source Country Year	Measurement Instrument	Method of Data Collection and Analysis			
		Individuals			Couples
		Victims	Perpetrators	Victims & Perpetrators	Perpetrators
10. Canada, Alberta Survey 1987	Derived from CTS (R*) (Straus, 1979 & 1981)			57% telephone interviews + 43% face-to-face interviews	
11. Canada, General Social Survey on Victimisation, 1999	Derived from CTS (R*) Straus 1979 & 1981 (Rogers, 1994)	Telephone Interviews			
12. Australia International Social Science Survey 1996/7	Derived from CTS (R*) Straus 1979 & 1981 (Headey et al., 1996)			Self-completed mail-shot questionnaire	
13. New Zealand, Dunedin Survey, 1972/3	CTS (R*) (Straus, 1990b; & Hornung et al., 1981)	Face-to-face Interviews	Face-to-face Interviews		

Appendix to Chapter Three

Table A3.1 Prevalence of Total Physical Violence In Representative Samples of Men and Women

Data Source Country Year	Authors & Year	Total Physical Violence					
		Last Year			Life-Time		
		F to M	M to F	Both	F to M	M to F	Both
1. US National Family Violence Survey, 1975/6	Straus, Gelles & Steinmetz 1980; Straus & Gelles 1986: Table 2 1990: Table7.2 'Both': Gelles 1987:37	11.6	12.1	16.0*			28.0*
2.1 US National Family Violence Re-Survey, 1985	Straus & Gelles 1988;Table 1.1 1990:Table 6.1 'Both': Gelles 1997:75	12.4	11.6	16.1*			28.0*
2.2 US National Family Violence Re-Survey, 1985	Stets & Straus 1990a						
2.3 US National Family Violence Re-Survey, 1985	Straus, 1993:68-9 (Women)	12.4p	12.2v				
2.4 US National Family Violence Re-Survey, 1985	Stets & Straus 1989/1990b: Table 1 § (Cohabiting)	9.3 (26.9)	7.2 (20.7)	18.1ϕ (52.4)ϕ			
2.5 US National Family Violence Re-Survey, 1985	Stets & Straus 1989/1990b: Table 1 § (Married)	4.2 (28.6)	3.4 (23.2)	7.1ϕ (48.2)ϕ			
3. US National Survey of Families & Households, 1987-88	Brush, 1990:61	3.4	2.9				
4.1 US National Youth Survey, 1983	Morse, 1995 Table 1 & Table 4	48.0 32.6p	36.7 11.9p	54.5* 54.8pϕ			
4.2 US National Youth Survey, 1986	Morse, 1995 Table 1 & Table 4	41.4 31.6p	31.4 9.9p	45.9* 58.4pϕ			
4.3 US National Youth Survey, 1989	Morse, 1995 Table 1 & Table 4	35.0 29.7p	27.9 11.8p	39.8* 58.5pϕ			
4.4 US National Youth Survey, 1992	Morse, 1995 Table 1 & Table 4	27.9 37.7p	20.2 13.9p	32.4* 48.5pϕ			
5. US Nat. Violence Against Women Survey, 1995/96	Tjaden & Thoennes, 2000a: Tables 1 & 2	0.6v	1.1v		7.0v	20.4v	
6. British MORI Survey, 1994	Carrado et al, 1996:Table I	11.2v[a]	4.5v[a]		17.3v 10.9p	13.4v 9.5p	6.8ϕ
7. British Crime Survey, 1996	Mirrlees-Black, 1999: T. A.3.1	4.2v	4.2v	4.2v*	14.9v	22.7v	19.0v*
8.1 Canada Calgary Survey, 1981	Brinkerhoff & Lupri, 1988:Table 2 §	13.2p (35.2p)	10.3p (27.3p)	14.3pϕ (37.5p)ϕ			
9. Canada, Edmonton Survey, 1983/4	Bland & Orn, 1986:Table II				22.6p	14.6p	19.7p*

Table A3.1 Prevalence of Total Physical Violence In Representative Samples of Men and Women (continued)

Data Source Country Year	Authors & Year	Total Physical Violence					
		Last Year			Life-Time		
		F to M	M to F	Both	F to M	M to F	Both
10. Canada, Alberta Survey 1987	Kwong, Bartholomew & Dutton, 1999: Fig. 2 Kennedy & Dutton, 1989: Table 3	12.3v 12.5p	9.6v 12.9p	15.5*			
11. Canada, General Social Survey on Victimisation, 1999	Canadian Centre for Justice Statistics, 2000: Fig.2.1/App.A2	2.0v 4.0v[c]	2.0v 4.0v[c]	2.0v* 4.0v[c]*	7.0v[b] 22.0v[d]	8.0v[b] 28.0v[d]	7.0v* 25.0v[d]*
12. Australia, Int. Social Science Survey 1996/97	Headey, Scott & de Vaus, 1999: Table 3	5.7v 3.6p	3.7v 3.4p				
13. New Zealand, Dunedin Survey, 1972/73	Magdol et al., 1997: T 1&2	34.1v 37.2p	27.1v 21.8p				

Definitions: F to M = Female to Male physical violence : M to F = Male to Female physical violence :
p = respondent is perpetrator : v = respondent is victim : numbers which do not have "v" and "p" attached to them are based on responses from both victims and perpetrators combined.

* The term "both" refers to those respondents who reported experiencing domestic violence in all relationships.

ϕ The term "both" refers to those respondents who reported being both victim and perpetrator of domestic violence in all relationships, although not necessarily in the same relationship.

§ The numbers in brackets are based on the sub-sample of respondents who have been either victims or perpetrators of domestic violence and sum to 100%. The numbers in the same cells without brackets are based on the total sample of respondents in order to derive a true prevalence rate.

[a] Data under heading 'Last Year' relates to any time in current relationship.

[b] Data under heading 'Life-Time' relates to any partner in last five years.

[c] Data under heading 'Last Year' relates to current partner in last five years.

[d] Date under heading 'Life-Time' relates to past partners in last five years.

Table A3.2 Prevalence of Severe Physical Violence In Representative Samples of Men and Women

Data Source Country Year	Authors & Year	Severe Physical Violence Last Year F to M	Last Year M to F	Last Year Both	Life-Time F to M	Life-Time M to F	Life-Time Both
1. US National Family Violence Survey, 1975/6	Straus, Gelles & Steinmetz 1980; Straus & Gelles 1986: Table 2 1990: Table 7.2 'Both': Gelles 1987:37	4.6	3.8	6.1*			
2.1 US National Family Violence Re-Survey, 1985	Straus & Gelles 1988;Table 1.1 1990:Table 6.1	4.8	3.4	6.3*			
2.2 US National Family Violence Re-Survey, 1985	Stets & Straus 1990a:Table 9.2	4.7v 4.4p	4.9v 1.3p				
2.3 US National Family Violence Re-Survey, 1985	Straus, 1993:68-9 (Women)	4.6p	5.0v				
2.4 US National Family Violence Re-Survey, 1985	Stets & Straus 1989/1990b: Table II § (Cohabiting)	4.6 (13.4)	2.5 (7.3)	7.6ϕ (22.0) ϕ			
2.5 US National Family Violence Re-Survey, 1985	Stets & Straus 1989/1990b: Table II § (Married)	1.4 (9.6)	0.8 (5.7)	1.5 (10.5) ϕ			
3. US National Survey of Families & Households, 1987-88	Brush, 1990						
4.1 US National Youth Survey, 1983	Morse, 1995 Table 2	22.4 22.0v 22.7p	10.1 11.4v 7.4p	25.5*			
4.2 US National Youth Survey, 1986	Morse, 1995 Table 2	22.8 27.7v 18.9p	9.5 10.0v 9.0p	24.9*			
4.3 US National Youth Survey, 1989	Morse, 1995 Table 2	17.7 20.8v 15.1p	7.6 8.9v 6.2p	20.0*			
4.4 US National Youth Survey, 1992	Morse, 1995 Table 2	13.8 16.3v 11.4p	5.7 6.7v 4.7p	15.8*			
5. US National Violence Against Women Survey, 1995/96	Tjaden & Thoennes, 2000a: Table 1				2.6v[1] 0.5v[2]	5.3v[1] 8.4v[2]	
6. British MORI Survey, 1994	Carrado et al, 1996 Table II & Fig. 1. d✣	4.0v[a]	2.0v[a]		7.0v 3.0p 9.0sv[3] 5.0mv[3]	6.0v 2.0p 10.0sv[3] 3.0mv[3]	
7. British Crime Survey, 1996	Mirrlees-Black, 1999						
8.1 Canada, Calgary Survey, 1981	Brinkerhoff & Lupri, 1988:Table 2 §	10.7p (49.6p)	4.8p (22.3p)	6.0pϕ (28.1p) ϕ			
9. Canada, Edmonton Survey, 1983/84	Bland & Orn, 1986						
10. Canada, Alberta Survey 1987	Kwong, Bartholomew & Dutton, 1999: 7 of 18, Fig.1&2, Table 3	4.8v 4.5p	2.8v 2.2p	5.5ϕ			

Table A3.2 Prevalence of Severe Physical Violence In Representative Samples of Men and Women (Continued)

Data Source Country Year	Authors & Year	Severe Physical Violence					
		Last Year			Life-Time		
		F to M	M to F	Both	F to M	M to F	Both
11. Canada. General Social Survey on Victimisation, 1999	Canadian Centre for Justice Statistics, 2000: App. A3, Table 2.2& Table 2.3§	1.7v[6c] (41.0v[6c]) 0.2v[2c] (4.0v[2c])	0.7v[6c] (19.0v[6c]) 0.5v[2c] (13.0v[2c])	1.2v[6c]* (31.0v[6c])* 0.3v[2c]* (8.0v[2c])*	3.0v[4b] (42.0v[4b]) 3.5v[2d] (16.0v[2d])	1.0v[4b] (11.0v[4b]) 9.0v[2d] (32.0v[2d])	2.0v[4b,] (25.0v[4b] 6.6v[2d,] (26.0v[2d]
12. Australia International Social Science Survey 1996/97	Headey, Scott & de Vaus, 1999: Table 3	4.1v[5] 2.8p[5]	2.5v[5] 2.2p[5]				
13. New Zealand, Dunedin Survey, 1972/73	Magdol et al., 1997: T 1&2	21.2v 18.6p	12.7v 5.7p				

Definitions: F to M = Female to Male physical violence : M to F = Male to Female physical violence:
p = respondent is perpetrator : v = respondent is victim : numbers which do not have "v" and "p" attached to them are based on responses from both victims and perpetrators combined.

* The term "both" refers to those respondents who reported experiencing domestic violence in all relationships.

ϕ The term "both" refers to those respondents who reported being both victim and perpetrator of domestic violence in all relationships, but not necessarily in the same relationship.

§ The numbers in brackets are based on the sub-sample of respondents who have been either victims or perpetrators of domestic violence. The numbers in the same cells without brackets are based on the total sample of respondents in order to derive a true prevalence rate.

✣ sv = single and dating victims: mv = married or cohabiting victims.

1 Kicked, bit. 2 Beat up. 3 Punched/kicked. 4 Kicked, bit, hit, hit with something.

5 Hit with fist, or with something held in hand, or thrown. 6 Kicked, bit or hit.

a Data under heading 'Last Year' relates to any time in current relationship.

b Data under heading 'Life-Time' relates to any partner in last five years.

c Data under heading 'Last Year' relates to current partner in last five years.

d Date under heading 'Life-Time' relates to past partners in last five years.

Table A3.3 Prevalence of Minor Physical Violence In Representative Samples of Men and Women

Data Source Country Year	Authors & Year	Minor Physical Violence Last Year F to M	M to F	Both
1. US National Family Violence Survey, 1975/76	Straus, Gelles & Steinmetz, 1980; 1990.			
2.1 US National Family Violence Re-Survey, 1985	Straus & Gelles 1988; 1990.			
2.2 US National Family Violence Re-Survey, 1985	Stets & Straus 1990a:Table 9.2	7.5v 7.7p	6.9v 9.2p	
2.3 US National Family Violence Re-Survey, 1985	Straus, 1993:69 (Women)	7.8p	7.2v	
2.4 US National Family Violence Re-Survey, 1985	Stets & Straus 1989/1990b: Table 2 § (Cohabiting)	4.6 (13.4)	1.3 (3.5)	8.0ϕ (23.2)ϕ
2.5 US National Family Violence Re-Survey, 1985	Stets & Straus 1989/1990b: Table 2 § (Married)	2.8 (18.9)	1.1 (7.5)	4.1ϕ (28.3)ϕ
3. US National Survey of Families & Households, 1987-88	Brush, 1990			
4.1 US National Youth Survey, 1983	Morse, 1995 Table 2	46.4 20.9v 28.4p	36.4 24.7v 30.1p	
4.2 US National Youth Survey, 1986	Morse, 1995 Table 2	40.5 14.6v 21.6p	36.4 21.4v 22.4p	
4.3 US National Youth Survey, 1989	Morse, 1995 Table 2	33.4 16.3v 18.1p	27.0 18.6v 21.9p	
4.4 US National Youth Survey, 1992	Morse, 1995 Table 2	26.5 11.6v 16.4p	19.9 15.3v 13.7p	
5. US National Violence Against Women Survey, 1995/96	Tjaden & Thoennes, 2000a			
6. British MORI Survey, 1994	Carrado et al, 1996			
7. British Crime Survey, 1996	Mirrlees-Black, 1999			
8.1 Canada, Calgary Survey, 1981	Brinkerhoff & Lupri, 1988			
9. Canada, Edmonton Survey, 1983/84	Bland & Orn, 1986			
10. Canada, Alberta Survey 1987	Kwong, Bartholomew & Dutton, 1999: Fig. 2	12.1v 11.9p	9.6v 12.1p	
11. Canada, General Social Survey on Victimisation, 1999	Canadian Centre for Justice Statistics, 2000			
12. Australia International Social Science Survey 1996/97	Headey, Scott & de Vaus, 1999: Table 3	5.1v[11] 2.7p[11]	3.2v[11] 3.1p[11]	
13. New Zealand, Dunedin Survey, 1972/73	Magdol et al., 1997: Table 1 & 2	31.8v 35.8p	26.1v 21.8p	

Definitions: F to M = Female to Male physical violence : M to F = Male to Female physical violence:
p = respondent is perpetrator : v = respondent is victim : numbers which do not have "v" and "p" attached to them are based on responses fromboth victims and perpetrators combined.

* The term "both" refers to those respondents who reported experiencing domestic violence in all relationships.

ϕ The term "both" refers to those respondents who reported being both victim and perpetrator of domestic violence in all relationships, but not necessarily in the same relationship.

§ The numbers in brackets are based on the sub-sample of respondents who have been either victims or perpetrators of domestic violence. The numbers in the same cells without brackets are based on the total sample of respondents in order to derive a true prevalence rate. [1] Slap, shake or scratch.

Table A3.4 Prevalence of Psychological Violence In Representative Samples of Men and Women

Data Source Country Year	Authors & Year	Psychological Violence[1] Last Year F to M	Last Year M to F	Last Year Both	Life-Time F to M	Life-Time M to F	Life-Time Both
1. US National Family Violence Survey, 1975/76	Straus, Gelles & Steinmetz, 1980; 1990.						
2.1 US National Family Violence Re-Survey, 1985	Straus & Sweet, 1992: Fig. 1	75.0	74.0				
2.2 US National Family Violence Re-Survey, 1985	Stets & Straus, 1990a						
2.3 US National Family Violence Re-Survey, 1985	Straus, 1993 (Women)						
2.4 US National Family Violence Re-Survey, 1985	Stets & Straus 1989/1990b (Cohabiting)						
2.5 US National Family Violence Re-Survey, 1985	Stets & Straus 1989/1990b (Married)						
3. US National Survey of Families & Households, 1987-88	Brush, 1990						
4.1 US National Youth Survey, 1983	Morse, 1995						
4.2 US National Youth Survey, 1986	Morse, 1995						
4.3 US National Youth Survey, 1989	Morse, 1995: Table 9	9.5[22]	30.1[22]				
4.4 US National Youth Survey, 1992	Morse, 1995: Table 9	13.5[22]	29.0[22]				
5. US National Violence Against Women Survey, 1995/96	Tjaden & Thoennes, 2000a: Table 4	19.6v[3]	44.7v[3]				
6. British MORI Survey, 1994	Carrado et al, 1996						
7. British Crime Survey, 1996	Mirrlees-Black, 1999:TA.3.1	1.2v[22]	3.8v[22]	2.6v[22]	5.1v[22] 56.1v[4]	15.9v[22] 49.3v[4]	10.8v[2] [2]52.5v[4]
8.2 Canada, Calgary Survey, 1981	Grandin et al, 1998: Table IV	23.5	13.2	36.7			
9. Canada, Edmonton Survey, 1983/84	Bland & Orn, 1986						
10. Canada, Alberta Survey 1987	Kwong, Bartholomew & Dutton, 1999						
11. Canada, General Social Survey on Victimisation, 1999	Canadian Centre for Justice Statistics, 2000: Table 2.5 §				0.5v[5] (7.0v[5])	3.2v[5] (38.0v[5])	
12. Australia International Social Science Survey 1996/97	Headey, Scott & de Vaus, 1999						
13. New Zealand, Dunedin Survey, 1972/73	Magdol et al., 1997:71	89.7v 94.6p	83.8v 85.8p				

Definitions: F to M = Female to Male physical violence : M to F = Male to Female physical violence : p = respondent is perpetrator : v = respondent is victim : numbers which do not have "v' or "p" attached to them are based on responses from both victims and perpetrators combined.

* The term "both" refers to those respondents who reported being both victim and perpetrator of domestic violence in all relationships, but not necessarily in the same relationship.

§ The numbers in brackets are based on the sub-sample of respondents who have been either victims or perpetrators of domestic violence. The numbers in the same cells without brackets are based on the total sample of male and female respondents in order to derive a true prevalence rate.

[1] Unless otherwise stated 'Psychological Violence' is measured using CTS R* Items D to J.

Table A3.4 Prevalence of Psychological Violence In Representative Samples of Men and Women (Continued)

[2] Where respondents felt in physical danger. [3] Where respondents feared bodily injury or death at most recent physical assault. [4] Where respondents were sworn at/insulted. [5] Where respondents feared for life in past 5 years.

Table A3.5 Prevelance of Sexual Violence In Representative Samples of Men and Women

Data Source Country Year	Authors & Year	Sexual Violence			
		Last Year		Life-Time	
		F to M	M to F	F to M	M to F
1. US National Family Violence Survey, 1975/76	Straus , Gelles & Steinmetz, 1980				
2.1 US National Family Violence Re-Survey, 1985	Straus & Gelles 1988				
2.3 US National Family Violence Re-Survey, 1985	Straus, 1993 (Women)				
2.4 US National Family Violence Re-Survey, 1985	Stets & Straus, 1989/1990b (Cohabiting)				
2.5 US National Family Violence Re-Survey, 1985	Stets & Straus, 1989/1990b (Married)				
3. US National Survey of Families & Households,1987/88	Brush, 1990				
4.1 US National Youth Survey, 1983	Morse, 1995				
4.2 US National Youth Survey, 1986	Morse, 1995				
4.3 US National Youth Survey, 1989	Morse, 1995				
4.4 US National Youth Survey, 1992	Morse, 1995				
4. US National Survey of Families & Households, 1987/88	Brush, 1990				
5. US National Violence Against Women Survey, 1995/96	Tjaden & Thoennes, 2000a: Table 1 & 2	0.0v [a]	0.2v [a]	0.2v [b]	4.5v [b]
6. British MORI Survey, 1994	Carrado et al, 1996				
7. British Crime Survey, 1996	Mirrlees-Black, 1999:T. A.5.2	2.0v(c) [c] 0.0v(i) [c]	12.0v(c) [c] 4.0v(i) [c]		
8.1 Canada, Calgary Survey, 1981	Brinkerhoff & Lupri, 1988				
9. Canada, Edmonton Survey, 1983/84	Bland & Orn, 1986				
10. Canada, Alberta Survey 1987	Kwong, Bartholomew & Dutton, 1999				
11. Canada, General Social Survey on Victimisation, 1999	Canadian Centre for Justice Statistics, 2000: Table 2.2§	0.0v [d] (0.0v [d])	0.3v [d] (8.0v [d])		
12. Australia International Social Science Survey 1996/97	Headey, Scott & de Vaus, 1999				
13. New Zealand, Dunedin Survey, 1972/73	Magdol et al., 1997				

Definitions: F to M = Female to Male sexual violence : M to F = Male to Female sexual violence : p = respondent is perpetrator : v = respondent is victim : numbers which do not have "v" or "p" attached to them are based on responses from both victims and perpetrators combined.

§ The numbers in brackets are based on the sub-sample of respondents who have been either victims or perpetrators of domestic violence. The numbers in the same cells without brackets are based on the total sample of male and female respondents in order to derive a true prevalence rate.

[a] Data under heading 'Last Year' relates to current or former partner in the previous twelve months.

[b] Data under heading 'Life Time' relates to current or former partner in the victim's life time.

[c] Data under heading 'Last Year' relates to current or former partner in the last domestic assault.

[d] Data under heading 'Last Year' relates to current partner in last five years.

Table A3.6 Frequency of Total Physical Violence In Representative Samples of Men and Women

Data Source Country Year	Authors & Year	Number of Assaults	Total Physical Violence			
			Last Year		Life-Time	
			F to M	M to F	F to M	M to F
1. US National Family Violence Survey, 1975/76	Straus, Gelles & Steinmetz, 1980; Gelles, 1987:T2:39	Mean	10.1	8.8		
		Median	3.0	2.5		
2.1 US National Family Violence Re-Survey, 1985	Straus & Gelles 1988; Gelles, 1997:T4.1:76	Mean	6.1	5.4		
		Median	2.5	1.5		
2.3 US National Family Violence Re-Survey, 1985	Straus, 1993:76 (Women)	Mean	6.0p	7.2v		
2.4 US National Family Violence Re-Survey, 1985	Stets & Straus, 1989/1990b (Cohabiting)					
2.5 US National Family Violence Re-Survey, 1985	Stets & Straus, 1989/1990b (Married)					
3. US National Survey of Families & Households, 1987/88	Brush, 1990					
4.1 US National Youth Survey, 1983	Morse, 1995	Mean	6.1	4.8		
4.2 US National Youth Survey, 1986	Morse, 1995	Mean	7.9	5.1		
4.3 US National Youth Survey, 1989	Morse, 1995	Mean	6.4	3.7		
4.4 US National Youth Survey, 1992	Morse, 1995	Mean	6.3	3.6		
4. US National Survey of Families & Households, 1987/88	Brush, 1990					
5. US National Violence Against Women Survey, 1995/96	Tjaden & Thoennes, 2000a: Table 3	Mean			4.7v	7.1v
6. British MORI Survey, 1994	Carrado et al, 1996: Table III	Mean	1.7v[a]	1.9v[a]	1.9v[b]	2.1v[b]
7. British Crime Survey, 1996	Mirrlees-Black, 1999:T. A.3.6 & p21	% pop. chronic assaults	1.5(c)	2.0(c)	5.0(c)	12.1(c)
		Mean	5.0v	5.2v		
8.1 Canada, Calgary Survey, 1981	Brinkerhoff & Lupri, 1988					
9. Canada, Edmonton Survey, 1983/84	Bland & Orn, 1986	% pop. chronic assaults[1]			37.4p (51.0p)	42.3p (73.3p)
10. Canada, Alberta Survey 1987	Kwong, Bartholomew & Dutton, 1999	% pop. chronic assaults	9.0p 5.0v	4.0p 12.0v		
11. Canada, General Social Survey on Victimisation, 1999	Canadian Centre for Justice Statistics, 2000: Table 2.4§	% pop. chronic assaults			0.9v[b] (13.0v[b])	2,2v[b] (26.0v[b])
12. Australia International Social Science Survey 1996/97	Headey, Scott & de Vaus, 1999					
13. New Zealand, Dunedin Survey, 1972/73	Magdol et al., 1997					

Table A3.6 Frequency of Total Physical Violence In Representative Samples of Men and Women (Continued)

Definitions: F to M = Female to Male physical violence : M to F = Male to Female physical violence : p = respondent is perpetrator : v = respondent is victim : numbers which do not have "v" or "p" attached to them are based on responses from both victims and perpetrators combined.

[1] Hit or threw things first on more than one occasion

[a] Data under heading 'Last Year' relates to any time in current relationship.

[b] Data under heading 'Life-Time' relates to current and previous relationships.

[c] Data under heading 'Life-Time' relates to any partner in last five years.

Table A3.7 Frequency of Severe Physical Violence In Representative Samples of Men and Women

Data Source Country Year	Authors & Year	Number of Assaults	Severe Physical Violence Last Year F to M	M to F
1. US National Family Violence Survey, 1975/76	Straus , Gelles & Steinmetz, 1980; Gelles, 1987:T2:39	Mean	8.9	8.0
		Median	3.0	2.4
2.1 US National Family Violence Re-Survey, 1985	Straus & Gelles 1988;Gelles, 1997:T4.1:76	Mean	5.4	5.2
		Median	1.5	1.5
2.3 US National Family Violence Re-Survey, 1985	Straus, 1993:76 (Women)	Mean	4.3p	6.1v
2.4 US National Family Violence Re-Survey, 1985	Stets & Straus, 1989,1990b (Cohabiting)			
2.5 US National Family Violence Re-Survey, 1985	Stets & Straus, 1989, 1990b (Married)			
3. US National Survey of Families & Households, 1987/8	Brush, 1990			
4.1 US National Youth Survey, 1983	Morse, 1995	Mean	3.8	2.5
4.2 US National Youth Survey, 1986	Morse, 1995	Mean	4.9	2.9
4.3 US National Youth Survey, 1989	Morse, 1995	Mean	3.6	1.7
4.4 US National Youth Survey, 1992	Morse, 1995	Mean	4.5	2.1
5. US National Violence Against Women Survey, 1995/96	Tjaden & Thoennes, 2000a			
6. British MORI Survey, 1994	Carrado et al, 1996			
7. British Crime Survey, 1996	Mirrlees-Black, 1999			
8.1 Canada, Calgary Survey, 1981	Brinkerhoff & Lupri, 1988			
9. Canada, Edmonton Survey, 1983/4	Bland & Orn, 1986			
10. Canada, Alberta Survey 1987	Kwong, Bartholomew & Dutton, 1999			
11. Canada, General Social Survey on Victimisation, 1999	Canadian Centre for Justice Statistics, 2000			
12. Australia International Social Science Survey, 1996/7	Headey, Scott & de Vaus, 1999			
13. New Zealand, Dunedin Survey, 1972/3	Magdol et al., 1997			

Definitions: F to M = Female to Male physical violence : M to F = Male to Female physical violence : p = respondent is perpetrator : v = respondent is victim : numbers which do not have "v" or "p" attached to them are based on responses from both victims and perpetrators combined.

Table A3.8 Frequency of Minor Physical Violence In Representative Samples of Men and Women

Data Source Country Year	Authors & Year	Number of Assaults	Minor Physical Violence Last Year F to M	M to F
1. US National Family Violence Survey, 1975/76	Straus , Gelles & Steinmetz, 1980; Gelles, 1987			
2.1 US National Family Violence Re-Survey, 1985	Straus & Gelles 1988;Gelles, 1997			
2.3 US National Family Violence Re-Survey, 1985	Straus, 1993 (Women)			
2.4 US National Family Violence Re-Survey, 1985	Stets & Straus 1989 (Cohabiting)			
2.5 US National Family Violence Re-Survey, 1985	Stets & Straus 1989 (Married)			
3. US National Survey of Families & Households, 1987-88	Brush, 1990			
4.1 US National Youth Survey, 1983	Morse, 1995	Mean	4.4	3.7
4.2 US National Youth Survey, 1986	Morse, 1995	Mean	5.3	3.6
4.3 US National Youth Survey, 1989	Morse, 1995	Mean	4.7	2.9
4.4 US National Youth Survey, 1992	Morse, 1995	Mean	4.3	2.6
5. US National Violence Against Women Survey, 1995/96	Tjaden & Thoennes, 2000a			
6. British MORI Survey, 1994	Carrado et al, 1996			
7. British Crime Survey, 1996	Mirrlees-Black, 1999			
8.1 Canada, Calgary Survey, 1981	Brinkerhoff & Lupri, 1988			
9. Canada, Edmonton Survey, 1983/84	Bland & Orn, 1986			
10. Canada, Alberta Survey 1987	Kwong, Bartholomew & Dutton, 1999			
11. Canada, General Social Survey on Victimisation, 1999	Canadian Centre for Justice Statistics, 2000			
12. Australia International Social Survey, 1996/97	Headey, Scott & de Vaus, 1999			
13. New Zealand, Dunedin Survey, 1972/73	Magdol et al., 1997			

Definitions: F to M = Female to Male physical violence : M to F = Male to Female physical violence : p = respondent is perpetrator : v = respondent is victim : numbers which do not have "v" or "p" attached to them are based on responses from both victims and perpetrators combined.

Table A3.9 Injuries Sustained through Physical Violence in Representative Samples of Men and Women

Data Source Country Year	Authors & Year	Physical Injuries Last Year F to M	Physical Injuries Last Year M to F
1. US National Family Violence Survey, 1975/76	Straus, Gelles & Steinmetz, 1980; 1990.		
2.1 US National Family Violence Re-Survey, 1985	Straus & Gelles, 1988; 1990		
2.2 US National Family Violence Re-Survey, 1985	Stets & Straus 1990a		
2.3 US National Family Violence Re-Survey, 1985	Straus, 1993:69 (Women)	0.6p	3.7v
2.4 US National Family Violence Re-Survey, 1985	Stets & Straus 1989 (Cohabiting)		
2.5 US National Family Violence Re-Survey, 1985	Stets & Straus 1989 (Married)		
3. US National Survey of Families & Households, 1987-88	Brush, 1990:61:61	0.2v[a] 0.4p[a]	1.1v[a] 0.2p[a]
4.1 US National Youth Survey, 1983	Morse, 1995		
4.2 US National Youth Survey, 1986	Morse, 1995: Table 8	19.6v 9.3p	21.2v 21.3p
4.3 US National Youth Survey, 1989	Morse, 1995: Table 8	10.4v 11.7p	19.5v 14.3p
4.4 US National Youth Survey, 1992	Morse, 1995: Table 8	13.5v 10.7p	20.1v 13.0p
5. US National Violence Against Women Survey, 1995/96	Tjaden & Thoennes, 2000a: Table 5§	1.0v[b] (18.8v[b])	6.9v[b] (41.6v[b])
6. British MORI Survey, 1994	Carrado et al., 1996		
7. British Crime Survey, 1996	Mirrlees-Black, 1999:22	1.1v	2.2v
8.1 Canada, Calgary Survey, 1981	Brinkerhoff & Lupri, 1988		
9. Canada, Edmonton Survey, 1983/84	Bland & Orn, 1986		
10. Canada, Alberta Survey 1987	Kwong, Bartholomew & Dutton, 1999:		
11. Canada, General Social Survey on Victimisation, 1999	Canadian Centre for Justice Statistics, 2000: Table 2.5§	0.9v[c] (13.0v[c])	3.5v[c] (40.0v[c])
12. Australia International Social Science Survey 1996/97	Headey, Scott & de Vaus, 1999: Table 4	1.8	1.2
13. New Zealand, Dunedin Survey, 1972/73	Magdol et al., 1997		

Definitions: F to M = Female to Male physical injuries : M to F = Male to Female physical injuries : p = respondent is perpetrator : v = respondent is victim : numbers which do not have "v" or "p" attached to them are based on responses from both victims and perpetrators combined.

§ The numbers in brackets are based on the subsample of respondents who have either been victims or perpetrators of domestic violence. The numbers in the same cells without brackets are based on the total sample of male and female respondents in order to derive a true prevalence rate.

[a] Data under heading 'Last Year' relates to any time in current relationship.

[b] Data under heading 'Last Year' relates to most recent physical assault.

[c] Data under heading 'Last Year' relates to any partner in last five years.

Table A3.10 Medical Treatment Received as Result of Physical Violence

Data Source Country Year	Author & Year	Treatment Last Year F to M	Treatment Last Year M to F
1. US National Family Violence Survey, 1975/76	Straus, Gelles & Steinmetz, 1980; 1990.		
2.1 US National Family Violence Re-Survey, 1985	Straus & Gelles 1988; 1990:		
2.2 US National Family Violence Re-Survey, 1985	Stets & Straus 1990a:157	0.4	3.0
2.3 US National Family Violence Re-Survey, 1985	Straus, 1993 (Women)		
2.4 US National Family Violence Re-Survey, 1985	Stets & Straus, 1989/1990b (Cohabiting)		
2.5 US National Family Violence Re-Survey, 1985	Stets & Straus, 1989/1990b (Married)		
3. US National Survey of Families & Households, 1987-88	Brush, 1990		
4.1 US National Youth Survey, 1983	Morse, 1995		
4.2 US National Youth Survey, 1986	Morse, 1995:Table 8*	3.6v 11.8p	13.2v 25.0p
4.3 US National Youth Survey, 1989	Morse, 1995:Table 8*	10.5v 14.3p	13.2v 20.0p
4.4 US National Youth Survey, 1992	Morse, 1995:Table 8*	14.3v 11.1p	11.8v 15.0p
5. US National Violence Against Women Survey, 1995/96	Tjaden & Thoennes, 2000a: Table 5§	0.2v[a] (3.8v[a])	1.9v[a] (11.3v[a])
6. British MORI Survey, 1994	Carrado et al. 1996		
7. British Crime Survey, 1996	Mirrlees-Black, 1999:TA.5.4	2.0(i) 4.0(c)	3.0(i) 10.0(c)
8.1 Canada, Calgary Survey, 1981	Brinkerhoff & Lupri, 1988		
9. Canada, Edmonton Survey, 1983/84	Bland & Orn, 1986		
10. Canada, Alberta Survey 1987	Kwong, Bartholomew & Dutton, 1999: 10 of 18	0.0v	0.6v
11. Canada, General Social Survey on Victimisation, 1999	Canadian Centre for Justice Statistics, 2000: Table 2.5§	0.2v[b] (3.0v[b])	1.9v[b] (15.0v[b])
12. Australia International Social Science Survey 1996/97	Headey, Scott & de Vaus, 1999: Table 4	1.5	1.1
13. New Zealand, Dunedin Survey, 1972/73	Magdol et al., 1997		

Definitions: F to M = Female to Male physical injuries/treatment : M to F = Male to Female physical injuries/treatment : p = respondent is perpetrator : v = respondent is victim : i = intermittent victim : c = chronic victim : numbers which do not have "v" or "p" attached to them are based on responses from both victims and perpetrators combined.

§ The numbers in brackets are based on the subsample of respondents who have either been victims or perpetrators of domestic violence. The numbers in the same cells without brackets are based on the total sample of male and female respondents in order to derive a true prevalence rate.

* Percentage of those injured who sought or were reported to have sought medical treatment.

a Data under heading 'Last Year' relates to most recent physical assault.

b Data under heading 'Last Year' relates to any partner in last five years.

Table A3.11 Initiators of Physical Violence In Representative Samples of Men and Women

Data Source Country Year	Authors & Year	Initiators of Violence Last Year			
		F to M	M to F	Cannot Remember F to M	Cannot Remember M to F
1. US National Family Violence Survey, 1975/76	Straus, Gelles & Steinmetz, 1980; 1990.				
2.1 US National Family Violence Re-Survey, 1985	Straus & Gelles 1988; 1990.				
2.2 US National Family Violence Re-Survey, 1985	Stets & Straus, 1990a:154-5	44.1v 52.7p	43.7v 42.6p	4.7F 12.0M	
2.3 US National Family Violence Re-Survey, 1985	Straus, 1993 (Women)				
2.4 US National Family Violence Re-Survey, 1985	Stets & Straus 1989/1990b (Cohabiting)				
2.5 US National Family Violence Re-Survey, 1985	Stets & Straus 1989/1990b (Married)				
3. US National Survey of Families & Households, 1987-88	Brush, 1990				
4.1 US National Youth Survey, 1983	Morse, 1995				
4.2 US National Youth Survey, 1986	Morse, 1995				
4.3 US National Youth Survey, 1989	Morse, 1995				
4.4 US National Youth Survey, 1992	Morse, 1995: Table 5	61.3v 54.2p	45.8v 38.7p		
5. US National Violence Against Women Survey, 1995/96	Tjaden & Thoennes, 2000a				
6. British MORI Survey, 1994	Carrado et al, 1996				
7. British Crime Survey, 1996	Mirrlees-Black, 1999: Table 5.1	8.0(i) 2.0(c)	2.0(i) 2.0(c)	15.0(i) 11.0(c)	9.0(i) 12.0(c)
8.1 Canada, Calgary Survey, 1981	Brinkerhoff & Lupri, 1988				
9. Canada, Edmonton Survey, 1983/84	Bland & Orn, 1986: Table II	42.3v[a] 73.4p[a]	26.6v[a] 57.7p[a]		
10. Canada, Alberta Survey 1987	Kwong, Bartholomew & Dutton, 1999: 11 of 18	51.0v 67.0p	33.0v 49.0p		
11. Canada, General Social Survey on Victimisation, 1999	Canadian Centre for Justice Statistics, 2000				
12. Australia International Social Science Survey 1996/97	Headey, Scott & de Vaus, 1999				
13. New Zealand, Dunedin Survey, 1972/73	Magdol et al., 1997				

Definitions: F to M = Female to Male initiation of physical violence : M to F = Male to Female initiation of physical violence: p = respondent is perpetrator : v = respondent is victim : i = intermittent victim : c = chronic victim.

[a] Data under heading 'Last Year' relates to any time in current relationship.

Bibliography

ADAMS, C. (1999) An Investigation into the Resources Available in Northern Ireland to Male Victims of Domestic Violence, Master of Science in Criminology and Criminal Justice submitted to Queen's University, Belfast.

ANDERSON, L.C. (1999) An Investigation into Male Victimisation from Domestic Violence in Heterosexual Relationships, post-graduate thesis submitted to University of Wales, Cardiff.

ARCHER, J. (1999) "Assessment of the Reliability of the Conflict Tactics Scales: A Meta-Analytic Review", Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 14(12) (December):1263-1289.

ARCHER, J. (2000) "Sex Differences in Aggression Between Heterosexual Partners: A Meta-Analytic Review", Psychological Bulletin, 126(5):651-680.

ARCHER, J. & RAY, N. (1989) "Dating Violence in the United Kingdom: A Preliminary Study", Aggressive Behaviour, 15:337-343.

ARIAS, I. & BEACH, S.R.H. (1987) "Validity of Self-Reports of Marital Violence", Journal of Family Violence, 2(2):139-149.

ARIAS, I. & JOHNSON, P. (1989) "Evaluation of Physical Aggression among Intimate Dyads", Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 4:298-307.

ARIAS, I., SAMIOS, M. & O'LEARY, K.D. (1987) "Prevalence and Correlates of Physical Aggression During Courtship", Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 2(1) (March):82-90.

ARMSTRONG, J. (1999) Men's Health: The Common Sense Approach, Dublin: Gill and Macmillan.

AUSTRALIAN BUREAU OF STATISTICS (1996) Women's Safety - Australia 1996, Canberra: Australian Bureau of Statistics.

BABBIE, E. (1998) (8th ed.) The Practice of Social Research. London: Wadsworth Publishing Company.

BACHMAN, R. & TAYLOR, B. (1994) "The Measurement of Family Violence and Rape by the Redesigned National Crime Victimisation Survey", Justice Quarterly, 11(3)(Sept.):499-512.

BATES, F. (1981) "A Plea for the Battered Husband", Family Law, 11:92-94.

BERGMAN, B. & ERICSSON, E. (1996) "Family Violence among Psychiatric In-patients as Measured by the Conflict Tactics Scale (CTS)", Acta Psychiatrica Scandinavica, 94:168-174.

BERK, R.A., FENSTERMAKER BERK, S., LOSEKE, D.R. & RAUMA, D. (1983) "Mutual Combat and Other Family Violence Myths" in D. Finkelhor, R.J. Gelles, G.T. Hotaling & M.A. Straus (eds.) The Dark Side of Families: Current Family Violence Research, London: Sage Publications, 197-212.

BERSANI, C.A. & CHEN, H-T. (1988) "Sociological Perspectives in Family Violence" in V.B. Van Hasselt, R.L. Morrison, A.S. Bellack & M. Hersen (eds.), Handbook of Family Violence, London: Plenum Press, 1988:57-84.

BILLINGHAM, R.E. & SACK, A.R. (1986) "Courtship Violence and the Interactive Status of the Relationship", Journal of Adolescent Research, 1:315-325.

BLAND, R. & ORN, H. (1986) "Family Violence and Psychiatric Disorder", Canadian Journal of Psychiatry, 31(March):129-137.

BOGRAD, M. (1990) "Why We Need Gender to Understand Human Violence", Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 5 (March):132-135.

BOLOGNA, M.J., WATERMAN, C.K. & DAWSON, L.J. (1987) Violence in Gay Male and Lesbian Relationships: Implications for Practitioners and Policy Makers. Paper presented at the Third National Conference of Family Violence Researchers, Durham, N.H.

BOOKWALA, J., FRIEZE, I.H, SMITH, C. & RYAN, K. (1992) "Predictors of Dating Violence: A Multivariate Analysis", Violence and Victims, 7:297-311.

BOROWSKI, M., MURCH, M. & WALKER, V. (1983) Domestic Violence: The Community Response. London: Tavistock.

BRADLEY, F. (1999) General Practice and Domestic Violence Against Women, (M.D. thesis), Dublin: University of Dublin.

BRADLEY, F., SMITH, M., LONG, J., & O'DOWD, T., (2002) "Reported Frequency of Domestic Violence: Cross Sectional Survey of Women Attending General Practice, British Medical Journal, 2 February, 324:271-274.

BREINES, W. & GORDON, L. (1983) "Review Essay: The New Scholarship on Family Violence", Signs: Journal of Women in Culture and Society, 8:490-531.

BRINKERHOFF, M.B. & LUPRI, E. (1988) "Interspousal Violence", Canadian Journal of Sociology, 12(4):407-434.

BRITISH MEDICAL ASSOCIATION (1998) Domestic Violence: A Health Care Issue?, London: BMA.

BROWNE, A. (1988) "Family Homicide: When Victimised Women Kill" in V.B. Van Hasselt, R.L. Morrison, A.S. Bellack & M. Hersen (eds.), Handbook of Family Violence, London: Plenum Press, 1988:233-246.

BROWNE, A. (1993) "Violence Against Women by Male Partners: Prevalence, Outcomes and Policy Implications", American Psychologist, 48(10):1077-1087.

BROWNE, A. & WILLIAMS, K.R. (1989) "Exploring the Effect of Resource Availability and the Likelihood of Female-Perpetrated Homicides", Law & Society Review, 23(1):75-94.

BROWNE, K., & HERBERT, M.(1997) Preventing Family Violence. Chichester, England: John Wiley & Sons Ltd.

BROWNING, J. & DUTTON, D. (1986) "Assessment of Wife Assault with the Conflict Tactics Scale: Using Couple Data to Quantify the Differential Reporting Effect", Journal of Marriage and the Family, 48:375-379.

BRUSH, L.D. (1990) "Violent Acts and Injurious Outcomes in Married Couples: Methodological Issues in the National Survey of Families and Households", Gender & Society, 4(1)(March):56-67.

BRUTZ J.L. & INGOLDSBY, B.B. (1984) "Conflict Resolution in Quaker Families", Journal of Marriage and the Family, 46:21-26.

BUCKLEY, H. (1998) "Filtering Out Fathers: The Gendered Nature of Social Work in Child Protection", Irish Social Worker, Autumn, 16 (3):7-11.

BUZAWA, E.S. & AUSTIN, T. (1993) "Determining Police Response to Domestic Violence Victims: The Role of Victim Preference", American Behavioral Scientist, 36(5)(May):610-623.

BYLES, J.A. (1978) "Violence, Alcohol Problems and other Problems in Disintegrating Families", Journal of Studies in Alcohol. 39:551-53.

CAMPBELL, A., MUNCER, S., GUY, A. & BANIM, M. (1996) "Social Representations of Aggression: Crossing the Sex Barrier", European Journal of Social Psychology, 26:135-147.

CANADIAN CENTRE FOR JUSTICE STATISTICS (2000) Family Violence in Canada: A Statistical Profile 2000, The Daily: Statistics Canada

CARRADO, M., GEORGE, M.J., LOXAM, E., JONES, L. & TEMPLAR, D. (1996) "Aggression in British Heterosexual Relationships: A Descriptive Analysis", Aggressive Behavior, 22:401-415.

CASCARDI, M., LANGHINRICHSEN, J. & VIVIAN, D. (1992) "Marital Aggression: Impact, Injury and Health Correlates for Husbands and Wives", Archives of Internal Medicine, 152:1178-1184.

CLARE, A., (2000), On Men: Masculinity in Crisis, London: Chatto & Windus.

COLEMAN, D.H. & STRAUS, M.A. (1986) "Marital Power, Conflict and Violence in a Nationally Representative Sample of American Couples", Violence and Victims, 1(2):141-157.

COMMISSION ON THE FAMILY (1996) Strengthening Families for Life, Interim Report, November, Dublin: Stationery Office.

COMMUNITY WORKERS CO-OP (1999) Violence Against Women: An Issue for Community Work, Galway: Community Workers Co-operative.

COOK, P.W. (1997) Abused Men: The Hidden Side of Domestic Violence, Westport, CT, USA: Praeger Publishing.

CORRIGAN, C. (1998) A Barrister's view given at the First AMEN International Conference on Male Victims of Domestic Abuse, Navan: AMEN.

DALY, M. & WILSON, M. (1988). Homicide. New York: Aldine de Gruyter.

DAVIS, R.C., LURIGIO, A.J. & SKOGAN, W.G. (1997) Victims of Crime (2nd ed.), London: Sage Publications.

DEAL, J.E. & WAMPLER, K.S. (1986) "Dating Violence: The Primacy of Previous Experience", Journal of Social and Personal Relationships, 3:457-471.

DEMARIS, A. (1992) "Male Versus Female Initiation of Aggression: The Case of Courtship Violence" in E.C. Viano (ed.), Intimate Violence: Interdisciplinary Perspectives, Bristol, PAA:Taylor & Francis.

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION AND SCIENCE. (2000) Exploring Masculinities, Dublin: Department of Education and Science.

DIBBLE, U.G. & STRAUS, M.A. (1980) "Some Social Determinants of Inconsistency Between Attitudes and Behaviour; The Case of Family Violence", Journal of Marriage and the Family 42(February):71-80.

DINWIDDIE, S.H. (1992) "Psychiatric Disorders among Wife Batterers", Comprehensive Psychiatry, 33:411-416.

DOBASH, R.P., DOBASH, R.E. (1979) Violence against wives: A case against the patriarchy, New York: The Free Press.

DOBASH, R.P., DOBASH, R.E. (1992) Women, Violence and Social Change, London: Routledge.

DOBASH, R.P., DOBASH, R.E., CAVANAGH, K. & LEWIS, R. (1994) "Separate and Interacting Realities: A Comparison of Men's and Women's Accounts of Violence Against Women", Violence Against Women, 4:382-414.

DOBASH, R.P., DOBASH, R.E., WILSON, M. & DALY, M. (1992) "The Myth of Sexual Symmetry in Marital Violence", Social Problems, 39(1):71-91.

DUNFORD, F.W., HUIZINGA, D. & ELLIOTT, D.S. (1990) "The Role of Arrest in Domestic Assault: The Omaha Police Experiment", Criminology, 28(2):183-206.

DURRANT, J. (1999) A Generation Without Smacking: The Impact of Sweden's Ban on Physical Punishment, London: Save the Children.

DUTTON, D.G. (1994) "Patriarchy and Wife Assault: The Ecological Fallacy", Violence and Victims, 9(2):167-182.

DUTTON, D.G. (1995) "Intimate Abusiveness", Clinical Psychology: Science and Practice, 2(3)(Fall):207-224.

DUTTON, D.G. & STARZOMSKI, A. (1994) "Psychological Differences between Court-Referred and Self-Referred Wife Assaulters", Criminal Justice and Behaviour, 21(2):203-222.

DUTTON, D.G. & STRACHAN, C.E. (1987). "Movitational Needs for Power and Dominance as Differentiating Variables of Assaultive and Non-Assaultive Male Populations", Violence and Victims, 2:145-156.

DWYER, D.C. (1995) "Response to the Victims of Domestic Violence: Analysis and Implications of the British Experience", Crime & Delinquency, 41(4):527-540.

EAGLY, A.H. & STEFFEN, V.J. (1986) "Gender and Aggressive Behaviour: A Meta-Analytic Review of the Social Psychological Literature", Psychological Bulletin, 100(3):309-330.

EDLESON, J.L. & BRYGGER, M.P. (1986) "Gender Differences in Reporting of Battering Incidences", Family Relations, 35:377-382.

EDWARDS, S.S. (1989) Policing 'Domestic' Violence: Women, the Law and the State. London: Sage.

ELLIOTT, F.A. (1988) "Neurological Factors" in V.B. Van Hasselt, R.L. Morrison, A.S. Bellack & M. Hersen (eds.), Handbook of Family Violence, London: Plenum Press, 1988:359-378.

ERNST, A., NICK, T., WEISS, S., HOURY, D. & MILLS, T. (1997) "Domestic Violence in an Inner-City Emergency Department", Annals of Emergency Medicine, 30:190-197.

EUROPEAN WOMEN'S LOBBY (1999) "Unveiling the Hidden Data on Domestic Violence in the European Union", A Report Presented to the German Presidency of the EU, European Commission Conference on Domestic Violence, Cologne, 28-30 March, Brussels: European Women's Lobby.

FAHEY, T.& LYONS, M. (1995) Marital Breakdown and Family Law in Ireland, Dublin: Oak Tree Press in association with the Economic and Social Research Institute.

FARRELL, W. (1993) The Myth of Male Power, New York: Simon & Schuster.

FARRELL, W. (1999) Women Can't Hear What Men Don't Say: Destroying Myths, Creating Love, New York: Penguin/Putnam

FELSON, F.B. & MESSNER, S.F. (2000) "The Control Motive in Intimate partner Violence", Social Psychology Quarterly, 63(1):86-94.

FERGUSON, H. (1997) "Vicious Circle: Domestic Violence and the Law", Gazetteer: Law Society of Ireland, April, p.7.

FIEBERT, M.S. (1998) "References Examining Assaults by Women on Their Spouses/ Partners", Sexuality & Culture, Vol. 1, New Brunswick, N.J.: Transaction Publishers:273-86.

FINCHAM, F. & BRADBURY, T.N. (eds.) (1990) The Psychology of Marriage: Basic Issues and Applications, London: The Guilford Press.

FLYNN, C.P. (1990) "Relationship Violence by Women: Issues and Implications", Family Relations, 39:194-198.

FOLLINGSTAD, D., WRIGHT, S., LLOYD, S. & SEBASTIAN, J. (1991) "Sex Differences in Motivations and Effects in Dating Violence", Family Relations, 40:51-57.

FRIEDMAN, L.N. & TUCKER, S.B. (1997) "Violence Prevention through Victim Assistance: Helping People Escape the Web of Violence" in R. Davis, A. Lurigio & W. Skogan (eds.) Victims of Crime (2nd ed.) London: Sage Publications.

FRODI, A., ROPERT-THOME, P. & MACAULEY, J. (1977) "Are Women Less Aggressive than Men? A Review of the Literature", Psychological Bulletin, 84:634-660.

GAQUIN, D.A. (1977-8) "Spouse Abuse: Data from theNational Crime Survey", Victimology, 2:632-643.

GARDA SÍOCHÁNA (1998) Annual Report 1997, Dublin: Government Stationary Office.

GARDA SÍOCHÁNA (1999) Annual Report 1998, Dublin: Government Stationary Office.

GARNER, J. & FAGAN, J. (1997) "Victims of Domestic Violence", in R.C. Davis, A.J. Lurigio & W.G. Skogan (eds.), Victims of Crime, (2nd. ed.), London: Sage Publications

GEFFNER, R., ROSENBAUM, A. & HUGHES, H. (1988) "Research Issues Concerning Family Violence", in V.B. Van Hasselt, R.L. Morrison, A.S. Bellack & M. Hersen (eds.), Handbook of Family Violence, London: Plenum Press, 457-478.

GELLES, R.J. (1987) Family Violence, (2nd Ed.) London: Sage Publications.

GELLES, R.J. (1990) "Methodological Issues in the Study of Family Violence", in M.A. Straus and R.J. Gelles (eds.) Physical Violence in American Families: Risk Factors and Adaptations to Violence in 8,145 Families, London: Transaction Publishers.

GELLES, R.J. (1997) Intimate Violence in Families, (3rd edition) London: Sage Publications.

GELLES, R.J. & LOSEKE, D.R. (eds.) (1993) Current Controversies on Family Violence, London: Sage Publications.

GELLES, R.J. & STRAUS, M.A. (1988) Intimate Violence, London: Simon & Schuster.

GELLES, R.J. & STRAUS, M.A. (1990) "The Medical and Psychological Costs of Family Violence" in M.A. Straus and R.J. Gelles (eds.), Physical Violence in American Families: Risk Factors and Adaptations to Violence in 8,145 Families, London: Transaction Publishers

GEORGE, M.J. (1994) "Riding the Donkey Backwards: Men as the Unacceptable Victims of Marital Violence", Journal of Men's Studies, 3(2):137-159

GEORGE, M.J. (1997) "Into the Eye of the Medusa: Beyond Testosterone, Men and Violence", The Journal of Men's Studies, 5(4):295-313.

GEORGE, M.J. (1998a) Beyond all Help?: Comments upon 'Commonly held Unhelpful Beliefs' in 'Domestic violence: a Health Care Issue' by L. Davis, L. Radford & J. Richardson, BMA (1998), London: Dewar Research/MSRG.

GEORGE, M.J. (1998b) The Great Taboo, Paper given at the First AMEN International Conference on Male Victims of Domestic Abuse, Navan: AMEN.

GERARD, A.B. (1994) Parent-Child Relationship Inventory (PCRI) Manual, Los Angeles: Western Psychological Services.

GONZALEZ, D.M. (1997) "Why Females Initiate Violence: A Study Examining the Reasons Behind Assaults on Men". Unpublished Master's Thesis, California State University, Long Beach.

GRANDIN, E. & LUPRI, E. (1997) "Intimate Violence in Canada and the United States: A Cross-National Comparison", Journal of Family Violence, 12(4):417-443.

GRANDIN, E., LUPRI, E. & BRINKERHOFF, M.B. (1998) "Couple Violence and Psychological Distress", Canadian Journal of Public Health, 89(1):43-47.

HAAPASALO, J. & POKELA, E. (1999) "Child Rearing and Child Abuse Antecedents of Criminality", Aggression and Violent Behaviour, 4(1):107-127.

HAMBERGER, L.K. & HASTINGS, J.E. (1989) "Counselling Male Spouse Abusers: Characteristics of Treatment Completers and Dropouts", Violence and Victims, 4:275-286.

HAMBY, S.L. (1998) "Partner Violence: Prevention and Intervention" in J.L. Jasinski and L.M. Williams (eds.) Partner Violence: A Comprehensive Review of 20 Years of Research, London: Sage Publications, 210-258.

HANKS, S.E. (1992) "Translating Theory into Practice; A Conceptual Framework for Clinical Assessment, Differential Diagnosis, and Multi-Modal Treatment of Maritally Violent Individuals, Couples and Families", in E.C. Viano (ed.), Intimate Violence: Interdisciplinary Perspectives, Bristol, PAA:Taylor & Francis.

HARRIS, M.B. (1996) "Aggression, Gender and Ethnicity", Aggression and Violent Behavior, 1(2):123-146.

HARRIS, R.J. & COOK, C.A. (1994) "Attributions about Spouse Abuse: It Matters Who the Batterers and Victims Are", Sex Roles, 30(7/8):553-565.

HART, B., STUEHLING, J., REESE, M. & STUBBING, E. (1990) Confronting Domestic Violence: Effective Police Responses. Reading, Pennsylvania: Pennsylvania Coalition Against Domestic Violence.

HART, S.D., DUTTON D.G., & NEWLOVE, T. (1993) "The Prevalence of Personality Disorder among Wife Assaulters", Journal of Personality Disorders, 7(4): 1721-1740.

HASTINGS, J.E. & HAMBERGER, L.K. (1988) "Personality Characteristics of Spouse Abusers: A Controlled Comparison", Violence and Victims, 3:31-48.

HAWKINS, A., CHRISTIANSEN, S.L., POND SARGENT, K. & HILL, E.J., (1995) "Rethinking Fathers Involvement in Child Care: A Developmental Perspective", in W. Marsiglio, (ed.), Fatherhood: Contemporary Theory, Research, and Social Policy, London: Sage.

HEADEY, B., FUNDER, K., SCOTT, D., KELLEY, J. & EVANS, M.D.R. (1996) "Family Interaction Module" in J. Kelley and M.D.R. Evans (eds.) IssA: International Social Science Survey/Australia 1996/97: Questionnaire. Canberra and Melbourne: Australian National University and University of Melbourne.

HEADEY, B., SCOTT, D. & deVAUS, D. (1999) "Domestic Violence in Australia: Are Women and Men Equally Violent?" Australian Monitor, 2(3(, July.

HENMAN, M. (1996) "Domestic Violence: Do Men Under Report?", Forensic Update, 47:3-8.

HOLTZWORTH-MUNROE, A., BEATTY, S.B. & ANGLIN, K. (1995) "The Assessment and Treatment of Marital Violence: An Introduction for the Marital Therapist" in N.S. Jacobson & A.S. Gurman (eds) Clinical Handbook of Couple Therapy, New York: The Guildford Press, 317-339.

HOLTZWORTH-MUNROE, A. & STUART, G.L. (1994) "Typologies of Male Batterers: Three Subtypes and the Differences Among Them", Psychological Bulletin, 116(3):476-497.

HOLTZWORTH-MUNROE, A., SMUTZLER, N., BATES, L. & SANDIN, E. (1997) "Husband Violence: Basic Facts and Clinical Implications", in W. K. Halford & H.J. Markman (eds.), Clinical Handbook of Marriage and Couples Interventions, Chichester: John Wiley & Sons Ltd.

HORNUNG, C., MCCULLOUGH, B.C. & SUGIMOTO, T. (1981) "Status Relationships in Marriage: Risk Factors in Spouse Abuse", Journal of Marriage and the Family, 43:675-692.

HOTALING, G.T., FINKELHOR, D., KIRKPATRICK, J.T. & STRAUS, M. (eds.) (1988) Coping with Family Violence: Research and Policy Perspectives, London: Sage Publications.

HOTALING, G.T., FINKELHOR, D., KIRKPATRICK, J.T. & STRAUS, M. (eds.) (1988) Family Abuse and its Consequences: New Directions in Research, London: Sage Publications.

HOTALING, G.T. & STRAUS, M. (1980) "Culture, Social Organisation, and Irony in the Study of Family Violence", in M.A. Straus and G.T. Hotaling, (eds.), The Social Causes of Husband-Wife Violence, Minneapolis MN: University of Minnesota Press.

HUDSON, W.W. & MCINTOSH, S.R. (1981) "The Assessment of Spouse Abuse: Two Quantifiable Dimensions", Journal of Marriage and the Family, 43:873-888.

IRISH COMMISSION FOR JUSTICE AND PEACE (2000) Domestic Violence. Dublin: The Irish Commission for Justice and Peace and the Pastoral Commission of the Irish Bishops' Conference.

JACOBSON, N. & GOTTMAN, J. (1998) Breaking the Cycle: New Insights into Violent Relationships, London: Bloomsbury.

JACOBSON, N.S. & GURMAN, A.S. (eds.) (1995) Clinical Handbook of Couple Therapy, London: The Guildford Press

JASINSKI, J.L. & WILLIAMS, L.M. (eds.) (1998) Partner Violence: A Comprehensive Review of 20 Years of Research, London: Sage Publications.

JOHNSON, M.P. (1995) "Patriarchal Terrorism and Common Couple Violence: Two Forms of Violence Against Women", Journal of Marriage and the Family, 57(May):283-294.

JOURILES, E.N. & O'LEARY, K.D. (1985) "Interspousal Reliability of Reports of Marital Violence", Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 53(3):419-421.

JUNG, C.G. (1912) "On the Psychology of the Unconscious", in Two Essays on Analytical Psychology, Collected Works, Volume 7, London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.

JURIK, N. & GREGWARE, P. (1989). A Method of Murder: An Interactionist Analysis of Homicides by Women. Tempe: Arizona State University, School of Justice Studies.

KALMUSS, D.S. & STRAUS, M.A. (1990) "Wife's Marital Dependency and Wife Abuse", in M.A. Straus & R.J. Gelles (eds.) Physical Violence in American Families: Risk Factors and Adaptations to Violence in 8,145 Families, London: Transaction Publishers.

KASIAN, M. & PAINTER, S. (1992). "Frequency and Severity of Psychological Abuse in a Dating Population", Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 7:350-364.

KASLOW, F.W. (1987) "Marital and Family Therapy", in M.B. Sussman & S.K. Steinmetz (eds.) Handbook of Marriage and the Family, London: Plenum Press, 835-860.

KAUFMAN KANTOR, G. & JASINSKI, J.L. (1998) "Dynamics and Risk Factors in Partner Violence", in J.L. Jasinski and L.M. Williams (eds.) Partner Violence: A Comprehensive Review of 20 Years of Research, London: Sage Publications,1-43.

KAUFMAN KANTOR, G. & STRAUS, M.A. (1987) "The 'Drunken Bum' Theory of Wife Beating", Social Problems, 34(3):213-230.

KELLEHER, M. (1998) Youth Suicide Trends in the Republic of Ireland, British Journal of Psychiatry, 173, 196-197.

KELLEHER, P. & O'CONNOR, M. (1995) Making the Links: Towards an Integrated Strategy for the Elimination of Violence Against Women in Intimate Relationships with Men, Dublin: Women's Aid.

KELLEHER, P. & O'CONNOR, M. (1999) Safety and Sanctions: Domestic Violence and the Enforcement of Law in Ireland, Dublin: Women's Aid.

KELLEY, J. & EVANS, M.D.R. (1999) "Australian and International Survey Data for Multivariate Analysis: The IssA." Australian Economic Review 32 (September): In press.

KELLY, L. (1996) "When Women Protection is the Best Kind of Child Protection: Children, Domestic Violence and Child Abuse", Administration: Journal of the Institute of Public Administration of Ireland, 44 (2):118-135.

KELLY, L. (1999) Domestic Violence Matters: An Evaluation of a Development Project, London: British Home Office.

KERLINGER, F.N. (1986) Foundations of Behavioural Research, (3rd Edition) London: Holt, Rinehart and Winston Inc.

KERNBERG, O. (1977) "The Structural Diagnosis of Borderline Personality Organisation. In P. Hartocollis (Ed.), Borderline Personality Disorders: The Concept, The Syndrome, The Patient (pp.87-121). New York: International Universities Press.

KIM, K. & CHO, Y. (1992) "Epidemiological Survey of Spousal Abuse in Korea", in E.C. Viano (ed.), Intimate Violence: Interdisciplinary Perspectives, Bristol, PAA:Taylor & Francis.

KLEIN, P. (1982) "The Problem of Multiple Perception in Families". Unpublished manuscript, University of Notre Dame.

KRUG, R.S. (1989) "Adult Male Report of Childhood Sexual Abuse by Mothers. Case Descriptions, Motivations and Long-term Consequences", Child Abuse and Neglect, 13:111-119.

KUHN, T.S. (1970) The Structure of Scientific Revolutions (2nd ed. Enlarged), London and Chicago: The Chicago University Press.

KWONG, M.I., BARTHOLOMEW, K. & DUTTON, D.G. (1999) "Gender Differences in Patterns of Relationship Violence in Alberta", Canadian Journal of Behavioural Science 31(3):150-160.

LANE, K.E. & GWARTNEY-GIBBS, P.A. (1985) "Violence in the Context of Dating and Sex", Journal of Family Issues, 6(1):45-59.

LANGLEY MILLER, JA. & KNUDSEN (1999) "Family Abuse and Violence" in MB. Sussman, SK. Steinmetz & G.W. Peterson (eds.). Handbook of Marriage and the Family (2nd Ed.) New York: Plenum Press.

LAW REFORM COMMITTEE OF THE LAW SOCIETY OF IRELAND (1999) Domestic Violence: The Case for Reform, Dublin: The Law Society of Ireland.

LEIBRICH, J., PAULIN, J. & RANSOM, R. (1995) Hitting Home: Men Speak about Abuse of Women Partners, Welling, New Zealand: New Zealand Department of Justice.

LEVINSON, D. (1988) "Family Violence in Cross Cultural Perspective" in V.B. Van Hasselt, R.L. Morrison, A.S. Bellack & M. Hersen (eds.), Handbook of Family Violence. New York: Plenum.

LIE, G. & GENTLEWARRIOR, S. (1991) "Intimate Violence in Lesbian Relationships: Discussion of Survey Findings and Practice Implications. Journal of Social Service Research, 15:41-59.

LUCAL, B. (1995) "The Problem with 'Battered Husbands'", Deviant Behaviour: An Interdisciplinary Journal, 16:95-112.

MACCHIETTO, J.G. (1992) "Aspects of Male Victimisation and Female Aggression: Implications for Counselling Men", Journal of Mental Health Counselling, 14(3)(July):375-392.

MCHUGH, S., WALSH, N. & CAFFERKEY, A. (1999) Domestic Violence, A Societal Issue - A Focus on Male Victims, Diploma in Social Studies, Dublin: Dublin Institute of Technology.

MCINTYRE, O. (2000) Paper given on "Domestic Violence: A Case for Reform", AMEN Conference, Navan, Ireland.

MACKAY, I. (1992) "Educating the Professional to Aid Abuse Victims in Achieving Human Rights", in E.C. Viano (ed.), Intimate Violence: Interdisciplinary Perspectives, Bristol, PAA:Taylor & Francis.

MCKEOWN, K. (2001) Fathers and Families: Research and Reflection on Key Questions, A Report to the Department of Health and Children, November, Dublin: Stationery Office.

MCKEOWN, K., HAASE, T., PRATSCHKE, J., ROCK, R., AND KIDD, P. (2001) Unhappy Marriages: Does Counselling Help? A Report to ACCORD, March, Dublin: ACCORD.

MCKEOWN, K., HAASE, T., AND PRATSCHKE, J. (2001) Distressed Relationships: Does Counselling Help? A Report to MRCS – Marriage and Relationship Counselling Services, April, Dublin: MRCS.

MCKIERNAN, J. & MCWILLIAMS, M. (1997) "Women, Religion and Violence in the Family", in A. Byrne & M. Leonard (eds.), Women and Irish Society: A Sociological Reader, Belfast: Beyond the Pale Publications, 1997:327-341.

MCLEER, S.V. (1988) "Psychoanalytic Perspectives on Family Violence" in V.B. Van Hasselt, R.L. Morrison, A.S. Bellack & M. Hersen (eds.), Handbook of Family Violence, London: Plenum Press, 1988:11-25.

MCLEOD, M. (1984) "Women Against Men: An Examination of Domestic Violence Based on an Analysis of Official Data and National Victimisation Data", Justice Quarterly, 1:171-193.

MCNEELY, R.L., COOK, P.W. & TORRES, J.B. (2001) "Is Domestic Violence a Gender Issue or a Human Issue", Journal of Human Behaviour in the Social Environment, 4(4):227-251.

MCNEELY, R.L. & ROBINSON-SIMPSON, G. (1987) "The Truth About Domestic Violence: A Falsely Framed Issue", Social Worker, (Nov-Dec.):485-490.

MAGDOL, L, MOFFITT, T.E., CASPI, A., NEWMAN, D.L., FAGAN, J. & SILVA, P.A. (1997) "Gender Differences in Partner Violence in a Birth Cohort of 21-year-olds: Bridging the Gap between Clinical and Epidemiological Approaches", Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 65(1):68-78.

MAKEPEACE, J.M. (1986) "Gender Differences in Courtship Violence Victimisation", Family Relations, 35:383-388.

MALE & MERTON REFUGE (1999) 1998/9 Annual Report and Accounts, UK: Merton Refuge Ltd.

MALONE, J., TYREE, A. & O'LEARY, K.D. (1989) "Generalisation and Containment: Different Effects of Past Aggression for Wives and Husbands", Journal of Marriage and the Family, 51(Aug.):687-697.

MARGOLIN, G. (1988) "Interpersonal and Intrapersonal Factors Associated with Marital Violence", in G.T Hotaling, D. Finkelhor, J.T. Kirkpatrick and M.A. Straus (eds.), Family Abuse and Its Consequences, London: Sage Publications, 203-227.

MARGOLIN, G. & BURMAN, B. (1993) "Wife Abuse Versus Marital Violence: Different Terminologies, Explanations and Solutions", Clinical Psychology Review, 13:59-73.

MARGOLIN, G. & FERNANDEZ, V. (1994) "Other Marriage and Family Questionnaires" in E.E. Filsinger, (ed.), Marriage and Family Assessment: A Sourcebook for Family Therapy, London: Sage Publications: 328-330.

MARSHALL, L.L. (1992a) "Development of Severity of Violence Against Women Scales", Journal of Family Violence, 7(2):103-121.

MARSHALL, L.L. (1992b) "Severity of Violence Against Men Scales", Journal of Family Violence, 7(3):189-203.

MARSIGLIO, W. (1995) "Fathers' Diverse Life Course Patterns and Roles" in W. Marsiglio (ed.), Fatherhood: Contemporary Theory, Research, and Social Policy, London: Sage.

MARTIN, D. (1976) Battered Wives, San Francisco: Glide.

MEADE, R.R. (1997) "Domestic Violence: An Analysis and Response from Community Activists", in A. Byrne & M. Leonard (eds.), Women and Irish Society: A Sociological Reader, Belfast: Beyond the Pale Publications, 1997:342-356.

MEREDITH, W.H., ABBOTT, D.A. & ADAMS, S.L. (1986) "Family Violence: Its Relation to Marital and Parental Satisfaction and Family Strengths", Journal of Family Violence, 1(4):299-305.

MERRILL, L.L., HERVIG, L.K., MILNER, J.S., NEWELL, C.E. & KOSS, M.P. (1998) "Premilitary Intimate Partner Conflict in a Navy Basic Trainee Sample", Military Psychology, 10:1-15.

MIHALIC, S.W. & ELLIOTT, D. (1977) "If Violence is Domestic, Does it Really Count?", Journal of Family Violence, 12(3):293-311.

MILLER, J.L. & KNUDSEN, D.D. (1999, 1987) "Family Abuse and Violence", in M. Sussman, S. Steinmetz & G. Peterson (eds.), Handbook of Marriage and the Family, (2nd ed.). New York: Plenum Press.

MINNESOTA DEPARTMENT OF CORRECTIONS, (1979) Report to the Legislature, St. Paul: Minnesota, USA.

MIRRLEES-BLACK, C. (1995) Estimating the Extent of Domestic Violence: Findings from the 1992 BCS in Research Bulletin 37, London: Home Office Research and Statistics Department, 37: 1-11.

MIRRLEES-BLACK, C. (1999) Domestic Violence: Findings from a new British Crime Survey Self-completion Questionnaire, London: Home Office Research Study 191.

MIRRLEES-BLACK, C., BUDD, T., PARTRIDGE, S. & MAYHEW, P. (1998) The 1998 British Crime Survey: England & Wales, Home Office Statistical Bulletin, 21.

MOFFITT, T.E. & CASPI, A. (1998) "Annotation: Implications of Violence between Intimate Partners for Child Psychologists and Psychiatrists", Journal of Child Psychology and Psychiatry, 39:137-144.

MOONEY, J. (1993) The Hidden Figure: Domestic Violence in North London, London: Islington Council.

MORLEY, R. & MULLENDER, A. (1994) Preventing Domestic Violence to Women. Police Research Group Crime Prevention Unit Series Paper 48, London: Home Office Police Research Group.

MORSE, B.J. (1995) "Beyond the Conflict Tactics Scale: Assessing Gender Differences in Partner Violence", Violence and Victims, 10(4)251-272.

MUEHLENHARD, C.L. & COOK, S.W. (1988) "Men's Self-Reports of Unwanted Sexual Activity", Journal of Sex Research, 24,1988:25-72.

NAJMAN, J.M., BEHRENS, B.C., ANDERSEN, M., BOR, W., O'CALLAGHAN, M. & WILLIAMS, G. M. (1997) "Impact of Family Type and Family Quality on Child Behaviour Problems: A Longitudinal Study", Journal of the American Academy of Child and Adolescent Psychiatry, 36:10, October.

NATIONAL CRIME FORUM (1998) Report of the National Crime Forum, Dublin: Institute of Public Administration.

NATIONAL STEERING COMMITTEE ON VIOLENCE AGAINST WOMEN AND THE DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE, EQUALITY AND LAW REFORM (2000) National Directory of Services for Women who have Experienced Violence or the Threat of Violence, Dublin: Department of Justice, Equality and Law Reform.

NAZROO, J. (1995) "Uncovering Gender Differences in the Use of Marital Violence: The Effect of Methodology", Sociology, 29(3):475-494.

NEW ZEALAND MINISTRY OF JUSTICE (1996) New Zealand Women's Safety Survey, http://www.justice.govt.nz/pubs/reports/1996/victims.

NEY, P.G. (1992) "Transgenerational Triangles of Abuse: A Model of Family Violence", in E.C. Viano (ed.), Intimate Violence: Interdisciplinary Perspectives, Bristol, PAA:Taylor & Francis.

NISONOFF, L. & BITMAN, I. (1979) "Spouse Abuse: Incidence and Relationship to Selected Demographic Variables", Victimology, 4:131-40.

O'CONNOR, M. (1996) "Protecting Abused Women and Their Children: The Irish Context", Administration: Journal of the Institute of Public Administration of Ireland, 44 (2):114-117.

O'DOHERTY, C. & LYNCH, C., (2000) "Working with Violent Men: The Irish Expereince", Social Work in Europe, 7(1):12-21.

OFFICE FOR NATIONAL STATISTICS, 1998, Living in Britain: Results from the 1996 General Household Survey, London: The Stationery Office.

O'LEARY, K.D. (1988) "Physical Aggression between Spouses: A Social Learning Theory Perspective" in V.B. Van Hasselt, R.L. Morrison, A.S. Bellack & M. Hersen (eds.), Handbook of Family Violence, London: Plenum Press, 1988:31-53.

O'LEARY, K.D. (1993) "Through a Psychological Lens: Personality Traits, Personality Disorders and Levels of Violence", in R.J. Gelles & D.R. Loseke, Current Controversies on Family Violence, Newbury Park: Sage.

O'LEARY, K.D. & ARIAS, I. (1988) "Assessing Agreement of Reports of Spouse Abuse", in G.T Hotaling, D. Finkelhor, J.T. Kirkpatrick and M.A. Straus (eds.), Family Abuse and Its Consequences, London: Sage Publications.

O'LEARY, K.D., BARLING, J., ARIAS, I, ROSENBAUM, A., USED, T., MALONE, J. & TYREE, A. (1989) "Prevalence and Stability of Physical Aggression Between Spouses: A Longitudinal Analysis", Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 57(2):263-268.

O'LEARY, K.D. & CURLEY, A.D. (1986) "Assertion and Family Violence: Correlates of Spouse Abuse", Journal of Marital and Family Therapy, 12(3):281-289.

O'LEARY, K.D. & VIVIAN, D. (1990) "Physical Aggression in Marriage", in F.D. Fincham and T.N. Bradbury (eds.), The Psychology of Marriage: Basic Issues and Applications, London: The Guilford Press, 323-348.

O'LOUGHLIN, A. & DUGGAN, J. (1998) Abuse, Neglect and Mistreatment of Older People: An Exploratory Study, Dublin: National Council on Ageing and Older People.

OXFORD DICTIONARY OF SOCIOLOGY (1998) Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.

PAGELOW, M.D. (1981) Woman-Battering: Victims and Their Experiences, Beverly Hills: Sage.

PAGELOW, M.D. (1984) Family Violence, New York: Praeger.

PAGELOW, M.D. (1985) "The 'Battered Husband Syndrome': Social Problem or Much Ado about Little", Sociological Review, 31:172-195.

PAINTER, K. & FARRINGTON, D.P. (1998) "Marital Violence in Great Britain and its Relationship to Marital and Non-Marital Rape", International Review of Victimology, 5:257-276.

PHILLIPS, M. (1999) The Sex-Change Society: Feminised Britain and the Neutered Male, London: The Social Market Foundation.

PIROG-GOOD, M.A. & STETS, J.E. (1989) "The Help-seeking Behaviour of Physically Abused College Students", in Pirog-Good, MA., & Stets, JE. (eds.), Violence in Dating Relationships: Emerging Social Issues, New York: Praeger.

PIZZEY, E. (1998) Paper given at the First AMEN International Conference on Male Victims of Domestic Abuse, University College, Dublin, 10th December 1998.

PLASS, M.S. & GESSNER, J.C. (1983) "Violence in Courtship Relations: A Southern Sample", Free Inquiry in Creative Sociology, 11(2):198-202.

PLECK, E., PLECK, J., GROSSMAN, M. & BART, P. (1977-78) "Comment & Reply - The Battered Data Syndrome: A Comment on Steinmetz' Article", Victimology, 2 (3-4):680-684.
RESICK, P.A. & REESE, D. (1986) "Perception of Family Social Climate and Physical Aggression in the Home", Journal of Family Violence 1:71-83.

RIGGS, D.S., MURPHY, C.M. & O'LEARY, K.D. (1989) "Intentional Falsification in Reports of Interpartner Aggression", Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 4:220-232.

RIGGS, D.S. & O'LEARY, K.D. (1992) Violence between Dating Partners: Background and Situational Correlates of Courtship Aggression. Manuscript submitted for publication & cited by K.D. O'Leary (1993).

RIGGS, D.S., O'LEARY, K.D. & BRESLIN, F.C. (1990) "Multiple Correlates of Physical Aggression in Dating Couples", Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 5(1) (March):61-73.

ROBERTS, A.R. (1987) "Psychosocial Characteristics of Batterers: A Study of 234 Men Charged with Domestic Violence Offences", Journal of Family Violence, 2:81-93.

ROBERTS, G.L., O'TOOLE, B., RAPHAEL, B., LAWRENCE, J.M. & ASHBY, R. (1996) "Prevalence Study of Domestic Violence Victims in an Emergency Department", Annals of Emergency Medicine, 27(6):747-753.

RODGERS, K. (1994). "Wife Assault: The Findings of a National Survey. Juristat. Catalogue 85-002-XPE 14(9). Canadian Centre for Justice Statistics. Ottawa: Minister of Industry.

ROLLINS, B.C. & OHENEBA-SAKYI, Y. (1990) "Physical Violence in Utah Households", Journal of Family Violence, 5(4):301-309.

ROMKENS, R. (1997) "Prevalence of Wife Abuse in the Netherlands: Combining Quantitative and Qualitative Methods in Survey Research", Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 12(1).

ROSENBAUM, A. & O'LEARY, K.D. (1981) "Marital Violence: Characteristics of Abusive Couples", Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 49(1):63-71.

RUSSELL, R.J.H. & HULSON, B. (1992) "Physical and Psychological Abuse of Heterosexual Partners", Personality and Individual Differences, 13:457-473.

SAUNDERS, D.G. (1986) "When Battered Women Use Violence: Husband Abuse or Self-Defence?", Victims and Violence, 1(1):47-60.

SAUNDERS, D.G. (1992) "A Typology of Men Who Batter: Three Types Derived from Cluster Analysis", American Journal of Orthopsychiatry, 62:624-275.

SCHWARTZ, M.D. (1987) "Gender and Injury in Spousal Assault", Sociological Focus, 20(1):61-75.

SCHWARTZ, M.D. & DEKERESEDY, W.S. (1993) "The Return of the 'Battered Husband Syndrome' through the Typification of Women as Violent", Crime, Law and Social Change, 20:249-265.

SIMONELLI, C.J. & INGRAM, K.M. (1998) "Psychological Distress Among Men Experiencing Physical and Emotional Abuse in Heterosexual Dating Relationships", Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 13(6):667-681.

SOMMER, R. (1984) Male and Female Perpetrated Partner Abuse: Testing a Diathesis-stress Model. Doctoral Thesis. University of Manitoba, Winnipeg, Canada.

SOMMER, R., BARNES, G.E. & MURRAY, R.P. (1992) "Alcohol Consumption, Alcohol Abuse, Personality and Female Perpetrated Spouse Abuse", Personality and Individual Differences, 13:1315-1323.

STARK, E. & FLITCRAFT, A. (1988) "Violence amongst Intimates: An Epidemiological Review" in V.B. Van Hasselt, R.L. Morrison, A.S. Bellack & M. Hersen (eds.), Handbook of Family Violence, London: Plenum Press, 1988:293-317.

STATISTICS CANADA (1993) Violence against Women Survey: Survey Highlights 1992. The Daily, Canada: Statistics Canada..

STEINMETZ, S.K (1977-78) "The Battered Husband Syndrome", Victimology, 2:499-509.

STEINMETZ, S.K. (1981) "A Cross-Cultural Comparison of Marital Abuse", Journal of Sociology & Social Welfare, 8:404-414.

STEINMETZ, S.K. (1987) "Family Violence: Past, Present and Future", in M.B. Sussman, & S.K. Steinmetz (eds.) Handbook of Marriage and the Family, London: Plenum Press, 725-760.

STEINMETZ, S.K. & LUCCA, J.S. (1988) "Husband Battering" in V.B. Van Hasselt, R.L. Morrison, A.S. Bellack & M. Hersen (eds.), Handbook of Family Violence, London: Plenum Press, 1988:233-246.

STETS, J.E. (1990) "Verbal and Physical Aggression in Marriage", Journal of Marriage and the Family, 52 (May):501-514.

STETS, J.E. & HENDERSEN, D.A. (1991) "Contextual Factors Surrounding Conflict Resolution while Dating: Results from a National Study", Family Relations, 40:29-36.

STETS, J.E. & PIROG-GOOD, M.A. (1989) "Patterns of Physical and Sexual Abuse for Men and Women in Dating Relationships: A Descriptive Analysis", Journal of Family Violence, 4(1):63-76.

STETS, J.E. & STRAUS, M.A. (1989) "The Marriage License as a Hitting License: A Comparison of Assaults in Dating, Cohabiting, and Married Couples", Journal of Family Violence, 4(2):161-180 (For a revised and expanded version of this paper, see Stets & Straus, 1990b).

STETS, J.E. & STRAUS, M.A. (1990a) "Gender Differences in Reporting Marital Violence and Its Medical and Psychological Consequences", in M.A. Straus & R.J. Gelles (eds.) Physical Violence in American Families: Risk Factors and Adaptations to Violence in 8,145 Families, London: Transaction Publishers.

STETS, J.E. & STRAUS, M.A. (1990b) "The Marriage License as a Hitting License: A Comparison of Assaults in Dating, Cohabiting, and Married Couples", in M.A. Straus & R.J. Gelles (eds.) Physical Violence in American Families: Risk Factors and Adaptations to Violence in 8,145 Families, London: Transaction Publishers.

STITT, S. & MACKLIN, A. (1995) 'Battered Husbands': The Hidden Victims of Domestic Violence, Research Monograph, Liverpool: John Moores University Consumer Research.

STRAUS, M.A. (1979) "Measuring Intrafamily Conflict and Violence: The Conflict Tactics (CT) Scales", Journal of Marriage and Family, 41:75-88. For a revised and expanded version of this paper, see Straus 1990b.

STRAUS, M.A. (1980) "Victims and Aggressors in Marital Violence", American Behavioural Scientist 23:681-704.

STRAUS, M.A. (1981) "Re-Evaluation of the Conflict Tactics Scale", Paper presented at the Second National Conference for Family Violence Researchers, Durham, NH, July. (For a revised and expanded version of this paper, see Straus 1990c).

STRAUS, M.A. (1990a) "The National Family Violence Survey", in M.A. Straus & R.J. Gelles (eds.) Physical Violence in American Families: Risk Factors and Adaptations to Violence in 8,145 Families, London: Transaction Publishers.

STRAUS, M.A. (1990b) "Measuring Intrafamily Conflict and Violence: The Conflict Tactics (CT) Scales", in M.A. Straus & R.J. Gelles (eds.) Physical Violence in American Families: Risk Factors and Adaptations to Violence in 8,145 Families, London: Transaction Publishers.

STRAUS, M.A. (1990c) "The Conflict Tactics Scales and Its Critics: An Evaluation and New Data on Validity and Reliability" in M.A. Straus & R.J. Gelles (eds.) Physical Violence in American Families: Risk Factors and Adaptations to Violence in 8,145 Families, London: Transaction Publishers.

STRAUS, M.A. (1990d) "Injury and Frequency of Assault and the 'Representative Sample Fallacy' in Measuring Wife Beating and Child Abuse", in M.A. Straus & R.J. Gelles (eds.) Physical Violence in American Families: Risk Factors and Adaptations to Violence in 8,145 Families, London: Transaction Publishers.

STRAUS, M.A. (1990e) "Ordinary Violence, Child Abuse, and Wife Beating: What do they have in Common?", in M.A. Straus & R.J. Gelles (eds.) Physical Violence in American Families: Risk Factors and Adaptations to Violence in 8,145 Families, London: Transaction Publishers.

STRAUS, M.A. (1993) "Physical Assaults by Wives: A Major Social Problem" in R.J. Gelles & D. R. Loseke (eds.) Current Controversies on Family Violence, London: Sage Publications, 67-87.

STRAUS, M.A. & GELLES, R.J. (1986) "Societal Change and Change in Family Violence from 1975 to 1985 as Revealed by Two National Surveys", Journal of Marriage and the Family, 48 (Aug.):465-479.

STRAUS, M.A. & GELLES, R.J. (1988) "How Violent Are American Families? Estimates from the National Family Violence Resurvey and Other Studies", in G.T Hotaling, D. Finkelhor, J.T. Kirkpatrick & M.A. Straus (eds.), Family Abuse and Its Consequences, London: Sage Publications

STRAUS, M.A. & GELLES, R.J. (eds.) (1990) Physical Violence in American Families: Risk Factors and Adaptations to Violence in 8,145 Families, London: Transaction Publishers.

STRAUS, M.A. & GELLES, R.J. (1990) "How Violent Are American Families? Estimates from the National Family Violence Resurvey and Other Studies", in M.A. Straus & R.J. Gelles (eds.) Physical Violence in American Families: Risk Factors and Adaptations to Violence in 8,145 Families, London: Transaction Publishers.

STRAUS, M.A., GELLES, R.J. & STEINMETZ, S.K. (1980) Behind Closed Doors, New York: Anchor Press/Doubleday.

STRAUS, M.A., HAMBY, S.L., BONEY-MCCOY, S. & SUGARMAN, D.B. (1996), "The Revised Conflict Tactics Scales (CTS2): Development and Preliminary Psychometric Data", Journal of Family Issues, 17(3)(May):283-316.

STRAUS, M.A. & SMITH, C. (1990) "Family Patterns and Primary Prevention of Family Violence", in M.A. Straus & R.J. Gelles (eds.) Physical Violence in American Families: Risk Factors and Adaptations to Violence in 8,145 Families, London: Transaction Publishers.

STRAUS, M.A. & SWEET, S. (1992) "Verbal/Symbolic Aggression in Couples: Incidence Rates and Relationships to Personal Characteristics", Journal of Marriage and the Family, 54(May):346-357.

STRUCKMAN-JOHNSON, C. (1988) "Forced Sex on Dates: It Happens to Men, Too", Journal of Sex Research, 24:234-241.

SUITOR, J.J., PILLEMER, K. & STRAUS, M.A. (1990) "Marital Violence in a Life Course Perspective", in M.A. Straus & R.J. Gelles (eds.) Physical Violence in American Families: Risk Factors and Adaptations to Violence in 8,145 Families, London: Transaction Publishers.

SUSSMAN, M.B. & STEINMETZ. S.K. (eds.) (1987) Handbook of Marriage and the Family, London: Plenum Press.

SWEET, J., BUMPASS, L. & CALL, V. (1988) The Design and Content of the National Survey of Families and Households. Madison: University of Wisconsin, Center for Demography and Ecology.

SWIFT, C.F. (1988) "Stopping the Violence: Preventional Strategies for Families", in L.A. Bond & B.M. Wagner, (eds.), Families in Transition: Primary Prevention Programs that Work, London: Sage Publications.

SZABO, P. (1998) "The Silence is Over" from The First AMEN Conference on Male Victims of Domestic Abuse, Navan: AMEN.

SZINOVACZ, M.E. (1987) "Family Power", in M.B. Sussman & S.K. Steinmetz (eds.) Handbook of Marriage and the Family, London: Plenum Press, 652-683.

TASK FORCE ON VIOLENCE AGAINST WOMEN (1997) Report of the Task Force on Violence Against Women, Dublin: Stationery Office.

THOMPSON, E.H. (1991) "The Maleness of Violence in Dating Relationships: An Appraisal of Stereotypes", Sex Roles, 24 (5/6):261-278.

TJADEN, P. & THOENNES, N. (1997) "The Prevalence and Consequences of Intimate Partner Violence: Findings from the National violence Against Women Survey", Paper presented at the 49th Annual Meeting of the American Society of Criminology, San Diego, CA.

TJADEN, P. & THOENNES, N. (1998) "Prevalence, Incidence, and Consequences of Violence Against Women: Findings from the National Violence Against Women Survey", (Research in Brief), (pp. 1-16). Washington, DC: National Institute of Justice Centers for Disease Control and Prevention.

TJADEN, P. & THOENNES, N. (2000a) "Prevalence and Consequences of Male-to-Female and Female-to-Male Intimate Partner Violence as Measured by the National Violence Against Women Survey", Violence Against Women, 6(2):142-161.

TJADEN, P. & THOENNES, N. (2000b) "Full Report of the Prevalence and Consequences of Violence Against Women: Findings from the National Violence Against Women Survey", US Dept. of Justice, Office of Justice Programmes: http://www.ojp.usdoj.gov

TJADEN, P. & THOENNES, N. (2000c) Extent, Nature and Consequences of Intimate Partner Violence: Findings from the National Violence Against Women Survey. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Justice, National Institute of Justice, 2000, NCJ 18867.

UNICEF (2000) "Domestic Violence against Women and Girls", Innocenti Digest 6 (May). Florence: United National Children's Fund, Innocenti Research Centre.

VAN HASSELT, V.B., MORRISON, R.L., BELLACK, A.S. & HERSEN, M. (eds.) (1988) Handbook of Family Violence, London: Plenum Press, 1988.

VIANO, E.C. (1992) "Violence among Intimates: Major issues and approaches", in E.C. Viano (ed.) Intimate Violence: Interdisciplinary Perspectives, Bristol, PA: Taylor & Francis

VIVIAN, D. & LANGHINRICHSEN-ROHLING, J. (1994) "Are Bi-Directionally Violent Couples Mutually Victimized?: A Gender-Sensitive Comparison", Violence and Victims, 9(2)107-124.

VOGT, W.P. (1999) Dictionary of Statistics and Methodology: A Non-Technical Guide for the Social Sciences, Second Edition, London: Sage Publications.

WALDNER-HAUGRUD, L.K., GRATCH, L.V. & MAGRUDER, B. (1997). "Victimisation and Perpetration Rates of Violence in Gay and Lesbian Relationships: Gender Issues Explored", Violence and Victims, 12(2):173-184.

WALLACE, M. (2000) Opening Speech given by the Minister of State at the Department of Justice, Equality and Law Reform at the Second AMEN Conference on Male Victims of Domestic Abuse. Navan: AMEN.

WATKINS, C.R. (1982) Victims, Aggressors and the Family Secret: An Exploration into Family Violence, St. Paul: Minnesota Department of Public Welfare.

WATSON, D. (2000) Victims of Recorded Crime in Ireland: Results from the 1996 Survey. Dublin: Oak Tree Press (in association with the Economic and Social Research Institute).

WHITE, J.W. & HUMPHREY, J.A. (1994) "Women's Aggression in Heterosexual Conflicts", Aggressive Behaviour, 20:195-202.

WHITE, J.W. & KOSS, M.P. (1991) "Courtship Violence: Incidence in a National Sample of Higher Education Students", Violence and Victims, 6(4):247-256.

WHITE, J.W. & KOWALSKI, R.M. (1994) "Deconstructing the Myth of the Nonaggressive Woman: A Feminist Analysis", Psychology of Women Quarterly,18:487-508.

WILSON, M. & DALY, M. (1992b) "Who Kills Whom in Spouse Killings? On the Exceptional Sex Ratio of Spousal Homicides in the Unites States", Criminology, 30:189-215.

WOOD, K. (1998) A Barrister's View given at the First AMEN International Conference on Male Victims of Domestic Abuse, Navan: AMEN.

YLLO, K.A. & STRAUS, M.A. (1990) "Patriarchy and Violence against Wives: The Impact of Structural and Normative Factors", in M.A. Straus and R.J. Gelles (eds.) Physical Violence in American Families: Risk Factors and Adaptations to Violence in 8,145 Families, London: Transaction Publishers.

YOUNG, P., O'DONNELL, I. & CLARE, E. (2001) Crime in Ireland: Trends and Patterns, 1950 to 1998, A Report by the Institute of Criminology, Faculty of Law, University College Dublin, for The National Crime Council. Dublin: Stationery Office.

ZIMMERMAN, M. & CORYELL, W. (1989) "DSM-III Personality Disorder Diagnoses in a Non-Patient Sample", Archives of General Psychiatry, 46:682-689.

ZINGRAFF, M.T., LEITER, J., MYERS, K.A. & JOHNSEN, M.C. (1993) "Child Maltreatment and Youthful Problem Behaviour", Criminology, 31, 173-202.