

Physical Assaults by Women Partners: A Major Social Problem

MURRAY A. STRAUS

The first purpose of this chapter is to review research that shows that women initiate and carry out physical assaults on their partners as often as men do. A second purpose is to show that, despite the much lower probability of physical injury resulting from attacks by women, assaults by women are a serious social problem, just as it would be if men "only" slapped their wives or "only" slapped female fellow employees and produced no injury. One of the main reasons "minor" assaults by women are such an important problem is that they put women in danger of much more severe retaliation by men. They also help perpetuate the implicit cultural norms that make the marriage license a hitting license. It will be argued that, to end woman beating, it is essential for women also to end the seemingly harmless pattern of slapping, kicking, or throwing things at male partners who persist in some outrageous behavior and "won't listen to reason."

The chapter focuses exclusively on physical assaults, even though they are not necessarily the most damaging type of abuse. One can hurt a partner deeply—even drive the person to suicide—without ever lifting a finger. Verbal aggression may be even more damaging than physical attacks (Vissing, Straus, Gelles, & Harrop, 1991). This chapter is concerned only with physical assaults be-

cause, with rare exception, the controversy has been about "violence"—that is physical assaults—by women partners.

DEFINITION AND MEASUREMENT OF ASSAULT

The National Crime Panel Report defines *assault* as "an unlawful physical attack by one person upon another" (U.S. Department of Justice, 1976). It is important to note that neither this definition nor the one used for reporting assaults to the Federal Bureau of Investigation (1989) requires injury or bodily contact. Thus if one person chases another, attempting to hit or stab the victim with a stick or a knife, and the victim escapes, the attack is still a felony-level crime—an "aggravated assault"—even though the victim was not touched. Nevertheless, in the real world, the occurrence of an injury makes a difference in what the police, prosecutors, and juries do. Consequently, injury will also be considered in this chapter.

GENDER DIFFERENCES IN PARTNER ASSAULT AND HOMICIDE RATES NATIONAL FAMILY VIOLENCE SURVEYS

The National Family Violence Surveys obtained data from nationally representative samples of 2,143 married and cohabiting couples in 1975 and 6,002 couples in 1985 (information on the sample and methodology is given in Gelles & Straus, 1988; Straus & Gelles, 1986, 1990). Previously published findings have shown that, in both surveys, the rate of woman-to-man assault was about the same (actually slightly higher) than the man-to-woman assault rate (Straus & Gelles, 1986, 1990). However, the seeming equality may occur because of a tendency by men to underreport their own assaults (Dutton, 1988; Edleson & Brygger, 1986; Jouriles & O'Leary, 1985; Stets & Straus, 1990; Szinovacz, 1983). To avoid the problem of male underreporting, the assault rates were recomputed for this chapter on the basis of information provided by

the 2,994 women in the 1985 National Family Violence Survey. The resulting overall rate for assaults by women is 124 per 1,000 couples, compared with 122 per 1,000 for assaults by men *as reported by women*. This difference is not great enough to be statistically significant. Separate rates were also computed for minor and severe assaults. The rate of minor assaults by women was 78 per 1,000 couples, and the rate of minor assaults by men was 72 per 1,000. The severe assault rate was 46 per 1,000 couples for assaults by women and 50 per 1,000 for assaults by men. Neither difference is statistically significant. As these rates are based exclusively on information provided by women respondents, the near equality in assault rates cannot be attributed to a gender bias in reporting.

Female assault rates based on the Conflict Tactics Scales (CTS) can be misleading because the CTS does not measure the purpose of the violence, such as whether it is in self-defense, nor does it measure injuries resulting from assaults (Straus, 1977, 1980; Straus, Gelles, & Steinmetz, 1980). That information must be obtained by additional questions, and the 1985 National Family Violence Survey included questions on who initiated violence and questions on injuries.

Injury adjusted rates. Stets and Straus (1990) and Brush (1990) provide data that can be used to adjust the rates to take into account whether the assault resulted in an injury. Stets and Straus found a rate of 3 percent for injury-producing assaults by men and 0.4 percent for injury-producing assaults by women. Somewhat lower injury rates were found by Brush for another large national sample—1.2 percent of injury-producing assaults by men and 0.2 percent for injury-producing assaults by women. An “injury adjusted” rate was computed using the higher of the two injury estimates. The resulting rate of injury-producing assaults by men is 3.7 per 1,000 ($122 \times .03 = 3.66$), and the rate of injury-producing assaults by women is much lower—0.5 per 1,000 ($124 \times .004 = 0.49$). Thus the injury adjusted rate for assaults by men is six times greater than the rate of domestic assaults by women.

Although the injury adjusted rates correspond more closely to police and National Crime Victimi-

zation Survey statistics (see below), there are several disadvantages to rates based on injury (Straus, 1990b, pp. 79–83), two of which will be mentioned. One of the disadvantages is that the criterion of injury contradicts the new domestic assault legislation and new police policies. These statutes and policies premise restraining orders and encourage arrest on the basis of attacks. They do not require observable injury.

Another disadvantage of using injury as a criterion for domestic assault is that injury-based rates omit the 97 percent of assaults by men that do not result in injury but that are nonetheless a serious social problem. Without an adjustment for injury, the National Family Violence Survey produces an estimate of more than 6 million women assaulted by a male partner each year, of which 1.8 million are “severe” assaults (Straus & Gelles, 1990). If the injury-adjusted rate is used, the estimate is reduced to 188,000 assaulted women per year. The figure of 1.8 million seriously assaulted women every year has been used in many legislative hearings and countless feminist publications to indicate the prevalence of the problem. If that estimate had to be replaced by 188,000, it would understate the extent of the problem and could handicap efforts to educate the public and secure funding for shelters and other services. Fortunately, that is not necessary. Both estimates can be used, because they highlight different aspects of the problem.

OTHER SURVEYS

Married and cohabiting couples. Although there may be exceptions that I missed, every study among the more than thirty describing some type of sample that is not self-selective (such as community random samples and samples of college student dating couples) has found a rate of assault by women on male partners that is about the same as the rate of assault by men on female partners. These studies include research by such respected scholars as Scanzoni (1978) and Tyree and Malone (1991) and large-scale studies such as the Los Angeles Epidemiology Catchment Area study (Sorenson & Telles, 1991), the National Survey of Families

and Households (Brush, 1990), and the survey conducted for the Kentucky Commission on Women (Schulman, 1979).

The Kentucky study also brings out a troublesome question of scientific ethics, because it is one of several in which the data on assaults by women were intentionally suppressed. The existence of those data became known only because Hornung, McCullough, and Sugimoto (1981) obtained the computer tape and found that, among the violent couples, 38 percent of the attacks were by women on men who, as reported by the women themselves, had not attacked them. Some of the other studies that found approximately equal rates are cited in Straus and Gelles (1990, pp. 95–105).

Dating couples. Sugarman and Hotaling (1989) summarize the results of twenty-one studies that reported gender differences in assault. They found that the average assault rate was 329 per 1,000 for men and 393 per 1,000 for women. Sugarman and Hotaling comment that a "surprising finding . . . is the higher proportion of females than males who self-report having expressed violence in a dating relationship" (p. 8). Moreover, other studies published since their review further confirm the high rate of assault by women in dating relationships (see, e.g., Pirog-Good & Stets, 1989; Stets & Straus, 1990).

Samples of "battered women." Studies of residents in shelters for battered women are sometimes cited to show that it is only their male partners who are violent. However, these studies rarely obtain or report information on assaults by women, and when they do, they ask only about self-defense. Pagelow's (1981) questionnaire, for example, presents respondents with a list of "factors responsible for causing the battering," but the list does not include an attack by the woman, therefore precluding finding information on female-initiated assaults. One of the few exceptions is in the work of Walker (1984), who found that one out of four women in battering relationships had answered affirmatively that they had "used physical force to get something [they] wanted" (p. 174). Another is the study by Giles-Sims (1983) that found that in the year prior to coming to a shelter, 50 percent of the women reported assaulting their partners, and

in the six months after leaving the shelter, 41.7 percent reported an assault against a partner. These assaults could all have been in self-defense, but Giles-Sims's case study data suggest that this is not likely.

GOVERNMENT CRIME STATISTICS

National Crime Victimization Survey. The National Crime Victimization Survey (NCVS) is an annual study of approximately 60,000 households, conducted for the Department of Justice by the Bureau of the Census. Analysis of the NCVS for the period 1973–1975 by Gaquin (1977–1978) found an extremely low rate of partner violence—2.2 per 1,000 couples. By comparison, the 1985 National Family Violence Survey found a rate of 161 per 1,000, which is 73 times higher. The NCVS rate for assaults by men is 3.9 per 1,000; the rate is 0.3 for assaults by women. Thus, according to the NCVS, the rate of domestic assaults by men is 13 times greater than the rate of assaults by women.

The extremely low rates of assaults found by the NCVS may be accounted for by the fact that NCVS interviews were conducted with both partners present, and victims may have been reluctant to respond out of fear of further violence. Perhaps even more important, the NCVS is presented to respondents as a study of crime. The difficulty with a crime survey as the context for estimating rates of domestic assault is that most people think of being kicked by their partners as wrong, but not a crime in the legal sense. It takes relatively rare circumstances, such as an injury or an attack by a former partner who "has no right to do that," for the attack to be perceived as a crime (Langan & Innes, 1986). This is probably why the NCVS produces such totally implausible statistics as a 75 percent injury rate (compared with an injury rate of less than 3 percent in the two surveys cited earlier) and more assaults by former partners than by current partners. This is because, in the context of a crime survey, people tend to report attacks only when they have been experienced as "real crimes"—because they resulted in injury or were perpetrated by former partners.

Police calls. Data on calls for domestic assaults

to the police are biased in ways that are similar to the bias of the National Crime Victimization Survey. As in the NCVS, at least 93 percent of the cases are missed (Kaufman Kantor & Straus, 1990), probably because there was no injury or threat of serious injury great enough to warrant calling the police. Because the cases for which police are called tend to involve injury or chronic severe assault, and because that tends to be a male pattern, assaults by women are rarely recorded by police. Another reason assaults by women are rare in police statistics is that many men are reluctant to admit that they cannot "handle" their wives. These artifacts produce a rate of assaults by men that is far greater than the rate of assaults by women. Dobash and Dobash (1979), for example, found that only 1 percent of intrafamily assault cases in two Scottish cities were assaults by wives.

PARTNER HOMICIDE RATES

Homicide rates published by the FBI show that only 14 percent of homicide offenders are women (calculated from Federal Bureau of Investigation, 1989, unnumbered table at bottom of p. 9). However, the percentages of female offenders vary tremendously according to the relationships between offenders and victims. Female-perpetrated homicides of strangers occur at a rate that is less than a twentieth the male rate. The female share goes up somewhat for murders of acquaintances. As for murders of family members, women committed them at a rate that was almost half the rate of men in the period 1976–1979 and more than a third of the male rate during the period 1980–1984.

However, family includes all relatives, whereas the main focus of this chapter is couples. Two recent gender-specific estimates of the rates for partner homicide indicate that women murder male partners at a rate that is 56 percent (Straus, 1986) and 62 percent (Browne & Williams, 1989) as great as the rate of partner homicides by men. This is far from equality, but it also indicates that, in partner relationships, even when the assaults are so extreme as to result in death, the rate for women is extremely

high, whereas, as noted above, for murders of strangers the female rate is only a twentieth of the male rate.

SELF-DEFENSE AND ASSAULTS BY WOMEN PARTNERS

In previous work I have explained the high rate of attacks on partners by women as largely a response to or a defense against assault by the partner (Straus, 1977, 1980; Straus et al., 1980). However, new evidence raises questions about that interpretation.

HOMICIDE

For lethal assaults by women, a number of studies suggest that a substantial proportion are self-defense, retaliation, or acts of desperation following years of brutal victimization (Browne, 1987; Browne & Williams, 1989; Jurik, 1989; Jurik & Gregware, 1989). However, Jurik (1989) and Jurik and Gregware's (1989) investigation of twenty-four cases in which women killed partners found that the victim initiated use of physical force in ten (42 percent) of the cases. Jurik and Gregware's table 2 shows that only five out of the twenty-four homicides (21 percent) were in response to "prior abuse" or "threat of abuse/death." Mann's (1990) study of the circumstances surrounding partner homicides by women shows that many women who murder their partners are impulsive and violent and have criminal records. Jurik (1989) and Jurik and Gregware (1989) also report that 60 percent of the women they studied had previous arrests. The widely cited study by Wolfgang (1958) refers to "victim-precipitated" homicides, but the case examples indicate that these homicides include cases of retaliation as well as self-defense.

NATIONAL FAMILY VIOLENCE SURVEY

Woman-only violence. Of the 495 couples in the 1985 National Family Violence Survey for whom one or more assaultive incidents were reported by a woman respondent, the man was the only violent partner in 25.9 percent of the cases, the woman

was the only one to be violent in 25.5 percent of the cases, and both were violent in 48.6 percent of the cases. Thus a minimum estimate of violence by women that is not self-defense because the woman is the only one to have used violence in the past twelve months is 25 percent. Brush (1990) reports similar results for the couples in the National Survey of Families and Households.

Perhaps the real gender difference occurs in assaults that carry a greater risk of causing physical injury, such as punching, kicking, and attacks with weapons. This hypothesis was investigated using the 211 women who reported one or more instances of a "severe" assault. The resulting proportions were still close: 35.2 percent; man only, 35.2 percent; and woman only, 29.6 percent.

These findings show that regardless of whether the analysis is based on all assaults or is focused on dangerous assaults, about as many women as men attacked spouses who had not hit them during the one-year referent period. This is inconsistent with the self-defense explanation for the high rate of domestic assault by women. However, it is possible that, among the couples where both assaulted, all the women were acting in self-defense. Even if that unlikely assumption were correct, it would still be true that 25–30 percent of violent relationships are violent solely because of attacks by the woman.

Initiation of attacks. The 1985 National Family Violence Survey asked respondents, "Let's talk about the last time you and your partner got into a physical fight and [the most severe act previously mentioned] happened. In that particular instance, who started the physical conflict, you or your partner?" According to the 446 women involved in violent relationships, their partners struck the first blows in 42.3 percent of the cases, the women hit first in 53.1 percent of the cases, and the women could not remember or could not disentangle who hit first in the remaining 3.1 percent of the cases.

Similar results were obtained by five other studies. Bland and Orne's (1986) study of marital violence and psychiatric disorder in Canada found that women initiated violence somewhat more often than did men. Gryl and Bird (1989) found that "respondents in violent dating relationships in-

icated that their partners initiated the violence 51% of the time; they initiated it 41% of the time; and both were equally responsible 8% of the time." Saunders (1989) analyzed data on the sequence of events in the 1975 National Family Violence Survey and found that women respondents indicated that they struck the first blow in 40 percent of the cases. Henton, Cate, Koval, Lloyd, and Christopher (1983) found that "in 48.7% . . . of the relationships, the respondent perceived that both partners were responsible for 'starting' the violence" (p. 472). A large-scale Canadian study found that women struck the first blow about as often as men. However, as in the case of the Kentucky survey mentioned earlier, the authors have not published the findings.

IS THE HIGH RATE OF ASSAULT BY WOMEN EXPLAINABLE AS SELF-DEFENSE?

It is remarkable that all six of the studies which investigated who initiates violence found that women initiate violence in a large proportion of cases. However, caution is needed in interpreting these findings, for several reasons.

First, some respondents may have answered the question in terms of who began the argument, not who began hitting. Interviewers were instructed to rephrase the question in such cases. However, there may have been instances in which the misunderstanding of the question went unnoticed.

Second, if the woman hit first, she could still have been defending herself in a situation that she defined as posing a threat of grave harm from which she could not otherwise escape (Browne, 1987; Jurik, 1989; Jurik & Gregware, 1989).

A third reason for caution is the limited data available in the National Family Violence Survey on the context of the assaults. Who initiates an assault and who is injured are important aspects of the contextual information needed for a full understanding of the gendered aspects of intrafamily assault, but they are not sufficient. For example, there may have been an escalation of assaults throughout the relationship, with the original attacks by the man. The fact that the most recent in-

cident happened to be initiated by the female partner ignores the history and the context producing that act, which may be one of utter terror. This scenario is common in cases of women who kill abusive male partners. A battered woman may kill her partner when he is not attacking her, and thus may appear not to be acting in self-defense. As Browne (1987), Jurik (1989), and Jurik and Gregware (1989) show, the traditional criteria for self-defense use assumptions based on male characteristics that ignore physical size and strength differences between men and women and ignore the economic dependency that locks some women into relationships in which they have legitimate grounds for fearing for their lives.

The scenario described above is often recounted by clients of shelters for battered women. However, it is hazardous to extrapolate from the situation of women in those extreme situations to the pattern of assaults that characterizes couples in the general population as represented in the National Family Violence Survey. This issue is discussed more fully later in this chapter. For the moment, let us assume that many of the assaults initiated by women are in response to fear derived from a long prior history of victimization. Even if that is the case, it is a response that tends to elicit further assaults by the male partner (Bowker, 1983; Feld & Straus, 1989; Gelles & Straus, 1988, chap. 7; Straus, 1974).

In the light of these qualifications and cautions, the self-defense explanation of the near equality between men and women in domestic assaults cannot be rejected. However, one can conclude that the research on who hit first does not support the hypothesis that assaults by women are primarily acts of self-defense or retaliation.

GENDER AND CHRONICITY OF ASSAULT

Although the prevalence rate of assaults by women is about the same as that for male partners, men may engage in more repeated attacks. This hypothesis was investigated by computing the mean number of assaults among couples for which at least one assault was reported by a female respondent. According to these 495 women, their part-

ners averaged 7.2 assaults during the year, and they themselves averaged six assaults. Although the frequency of assault by men is greater than the frequency of assault by women, the difference is just short of being statistically significant. If the analysis is restricted to the 165 cases of severe assault, the men averaged 6.1 and the women 4.28 assaults, which is a 42 percent greater frequency of assault by men and is also just short of being statistically significant. If one disregards the tests of statistical significance, these comparisons support the hypothesized greater chronicity of violence by men. At the same time, the fact that the average number of assaults by male partners is higher should not obscure the fact that the violent women carried out an average of six minor and five severe assaults per year, indicating a repetitive pattern by women as well as by men.

THE CLINICAL FALLACY AND THE REPRESENTATIVE SAMPLE FALLACY

The discrepancy between the findings from surveys of family problems and findings based on criminal justice system data or the experiences of women in shelters for battered women does not indicate that one set of statistics is correct and the other not. Both are correct. However, they apply to different groups of people and reflect different aspects of domestic assault. Most of the violence that is revealed by surveys of family problems is relatively minor and relatively infrequent, whereas most of the violence in official statistics is chronic and severe and involves injuries that need medical attention. These two types of violence probably have different etiologies and probably require different types of intervention. It is important not to use findings based on cases known to the police or shelters for battered women as the basis for deciding how to deal with the relatively minor and infrequent violence found in the population in general. That type of unwarranted generalization is often made; it is known as the *clinical fallacy*.

Representative community sample studies have the opposite problem, which can be called the *representative sample fallacy* (Straus, 1990b; see also

Gelles, 1991). Community samples contain very few cases involving injury and severe assaults every week or more often. Men tend to be the predominant aggressors in this type of case, but representative sample studies cannot reveal that, because they include few if any such cases. Ironically, the types of cases that are not covered by community surveys are the most horrible cases and the ones that everyone wants to do something about. However, community surveys can tell us little about what to do about these extreme cases because the samples contain too few to analyze separately.

The controversy over assaults by women largely stems from survey researchers' assumptions that their findings on rates of partner assault by men and women apply to cases known to the police and to shelters, and the similar unwarranted assumption by clinical researchers that the predominance of assaults by men applies to the population at large.

Both community sample data and clinical sample data are needed. Community sample data are essential for informing programs directed at the larger community, especially programs intended to prevent such cases in the first place or to prevent them from developing into clinical cases. Conversely, it is essential to have research on clinical samples, such as those involved with the police or shelters for battered women, in order to have data that do apply to such cases and that therefore provide a realistic basis for programs designed to aid the victims and to end the most serious type of domestic violence.

CONTEXT AND MEANING

The number of assaults by itself, however, ignores the contexts, meanings, and consequences of these assaults. The fact that assaults by women produce far less injury is a critical difference. There are probably other important differences between men and women in assaults on partners. For example, a man may typically hit or threaten to hit to force some specific behavior on pain of injury, whereas a woman may typically slap a partner or pound on his chest as an expression of outrage or in frustra-

tion because of his having turned a deaf ear to repeated attempts to discuss some critical issue (Greenblat, 1983). Despite this presumed difference, both are uses of physical violence for coercion.

A meta-analysis of research on gender differences in aggression by Eagly and Steffen (1986) brings out a related difference in context and meaning. These researchers found no overall difference in aggression by men and women, but less aggression by women if the act would produce harm to the target. These and other differences in context, meaning, and motivation are important for understanding violence by women against partners, but they do not indicate the absence of assault by women. Nor do differences between men and women in the histories, meanings, objectives, and consequences of assaults refute the hypothesis discussed below: that assaults by women help legitimate male violence. Only empirical research can resolve that issue.

VIOLENCE BY WOMEN INCREASES THE PROBABILITY OF WOMAN BEATING

There seems to be an implicit cultural norm permitting or encouraging minor assaults by women in certain circumstances. Stark and McEvoy (1970) found about equal support for a woman hitting a man as for a man hitting a woman. Greenblat (1983) found that both men and women are more accepting of women hitting men than of men hitting women. Data from the National Family Violence Survey also show more public acceptance of a woman slapping a man than of a man slapping a woman. Greenblat suggests that this is because "female aggressors are far less likely to do physical harm" (p. 247). These norms tolerating low-level violence by women are transmitted and learned in many ways. For example, even casual observation of the mass media suggests that just about every day, there are scenes depicting a man who makes an insulting or outrageous statement and an indignant woman who responds by "slapping the cad," thus presenting an implicit model of assault as a morally correct behavior to millions of women.

Let us assume that most of the assaults by women fall into the "slap the cad" genre and are not intended to—and only rarely do—cause physical injury. The danger to women is shown by studies that find that *minor violence by women* increases the probability of severe assaults by men (Bowker, 1983; Feld & Straus, 1989; Gelles & Straus, 1988, pp. 146–156). Sometimes this is immediate and severe retaliation. Regardless of whether that occurs, however, a more indirect and probably more important effect may be that such morally correct slapping acts out and reinforces the traditional tolerance of assault in relationships. The moral justification of assault implicit when a woman slaps or throws something at a partner for doing something outrageous reinforces his moral justification for slapping her when *she* is doing something outrageous—or when she is obstinate, nasty, or "not listening to reason" as he sees it. To the extent that this is correct, one of the many steps needed in primary prevention of assaults on women is for them to forsake even "harmless" physical attacks on male partners and children. Women must insist on nonviolence from their sisters, just as they rightfully insist on it from men.

It is painful to have to recognize the high rate of domestic assaults by women. Moreover, the statistics are likely to be used by misogynists and apologists for male violence. The problem is similar to that noted by Barbara Hart (1986) in the introduction to a book on lesbian battering: "[It] is painful. It challenges our dream of a lesbian utopia. It contradicts our belief in the inherent nonviolence of women. And the disclosure of violence by lesbians . . . may enhance the arsenal of homophobes. . . . Yet, if we are to free ourselves, we must free our sisters" (p. 10). My view of recognizing violence by women is parallel to Hart's view on lesbian battering. It is painful, but to do otherwise obstructs a potentially important means of reducing assaults by men—raising the consciousness of women about the implicit norms that are reinforced by a *ritualized slap* for outrageous behavior on the part of their partners.

It follows from the above that efforts to prevent assaults by men must include attention to assaults by women. Although this may seem like "victim

blaming," there is an important difference. Recognizing that assaults by women are one of the many causes of woman beating does not justify such assaults. It is the responsibility of men as well as women to refrain from physical attacks (including retaliation), at home as elsewhere, no matter what the provocation.

DENYING THE EVIDENCE

The findings showing approximately equal rates of partner assault by men and women have been greeted with disbelief and anger by some feminist scholars. There is a large literature which attempts to repudiate the findings. Most of these efforts fall into three categories: (1) criticism of the Conflict Tactics Scales, (2) criticism of the authors of such studies for ignoring the sexist structure of society, and (3) implicitly excusing violence by women by arguing that it must be understood in the context of male oppression.

VALIDITY OF THE CONFLICT TACTICS SCALES

The fact that so many studies have found equal rates of assault has been blamed on deficiencies in the Conflict Tactics Scales (CTS), the instrument used in most of the studies. These critiques contain so many factual errors that the authors could not have examined the CTS firsthand. Because of space limitations I can give only three of the many alleged deficiencies. One example is the assertion that the CTS measures only violence used to settle a conflict and that it ignores purely malicious violence. On the contrary, the instructions ask respondents to describe what happens "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." A second erroneous criticism is that the findings are questionable because men underreport their own violence. Although men do underreport, this could not have produced the statistics in this chapter because they are based on data provided by women. Another example is the claim that the CTS gives a biased and limited picture of abuse of partners because it ig-

nores verbal abuse. This is perhaps the most posterous criticism because a measure of Verbal Aggression is one of the CTS scales.

In addition to factual errors, there are conceptual errors. For example, it is claimed that the CTS is invalid because the continuum of violence in the scales is so broad that it fails to discriminate among the different kinds of violence. Rather, it is the broad continuum that enables one to differentiate cases of minor and severe violence. Perhaps the most important conceptual error is the belief that the CTS is deficient because it does not measure the consequences of physical assault (such as physical and emotional injury) or the causes (such as desire to dominate). This is akin to thinking that a spelling test is inadequate because it does not measure why a child spells badly, or does not measure possible consequences of poor spelling, such as low self-esteem or low evaluations by employers. The concentration of the CTS on acts of physical assault is deliberate and is one of its strengths. Only by having separate measures of assaults, injuries, and context can one, for example, show that acts of violence by men result in more injury than when the same acts are committed by women (Stets & Straus, 1990; Straus, 1990a, 1990b).

Like all tests and scales, the CTS is not perfect. Nevertheless, numerous reviews by scholars who do not have a vested interest in blaming the messenger for the bad news agree that the CTS is the best available instrument (see, e.g., reviews by Grotevant & Carlson, 1989; Hertzberger, 1991.) Its use in many studies since 1973 has established its validity and reliability. New evidence on validity and reliability is published almost monthly by research scholars who are using the CTS in many countries. No other scale meets this standard. Finally, no matter what one thinks of the CTS, at least four studies that did not use the CTS also found roughly equal rates of violence by women.

FAULTY RESEARCH DESIGN DUE TO IGNORING INSTITUTIONALIZED SEXISM

An indirect approach to discounting the findings on equal rates of assault is the claim that the theo-

retical approach of the studies is invalid because they ignore the sexist structure of society. Since my research has borne the brunt of this criticism, an examination of that research is appropriate. It shows that a paper I presented at a conference in 1973 was the sociological work that introduced most of the feminist explanations of couple violence (Straus, 1976). These feminist approaches include institutionalized male power, cultural norms legitimating male violence against women, and economic inequality between men and women that locks women into violent marriages. These contributions were widely cited until I published "politically incorrect" data on violence by women and was therefore excommunicated from feminist ranks. However, I remain one of the faithful, and have never accepted the excommunication. On the contrary, I have continued to research and write on these issues (see for example Coleman & Straus, 1986, Kolb & Straus, 1974; Straus, 1973, 1976, 1994, Straus et al., 1980; Yllö & Straus, 1990).

EXCUSING ASSAULTS BY WOMEN

The third most popular mode of denying the bad news about assaults by female partners is to explain it away as the result of frustration and anger at being dominated by men. This is parallel to the excuses men give to justify hitting their partners, such as a woman's being unfaithful. In my opinion, parts of some critiques are justifications of violence by women in the guise of feminism. This is a betrayal of the feminist ideal of a nonviolent world. In addition, excusing violence by women and denying overwhelming research evidence may have serious side effects. It may contribute to undermining the credibility of feminist scholarship and contribute to a backlash that can also thwart progress toward the goal of equality between men and women.

CONCLUSIONS

Ending assaults by women needs to be added to efforts to prevent assaults on women for a number of reasons. Perhaps the most fundamental reason is the intrinsic moral wrong of assaulting a partner,

as expressed in the fact that such assaults are criminal acts, even when no injury occurs. A second reason is the unintended validation of the traditional cultural norms tolerating a certain level of violence between partners. A third reason is the danger of escalation when women engage in "harmless" minor violence. Feld and Straus (1989) found that if the woman partner also engaged in an assault, it increased the probability that assaults would persist or escalate in severity over the one-year period of their study, whereas if only one partner engaged in physical attacks, the probability of cessation increased. Finally, assault of a partner "models" violence for children. This effect is as strong for assaults by women as it is for assaults by men (Jaffe, Wolfe, & Wilson, 1990; Straus, 1983, 1992a; Straus et al., 1980).

It should be emphasized that the preventive effect of reducing minor assaults by women has not been proven by the evidence in this chapter. It is a plausible inference and a hypothesis for further research. Especially needed are studies to test the hypothesis that "harmless" assaults by women strengthen the implicit moral justification for assaults by men. If the research confirms that hypothesis, it would indicate the need to add reduction of assaults by women to efforts to end woman beating, including public service announcements, police arrest policy, and treatment programs for batterers. Such changes must be made with extreme care for a number of reasons, not the least of which is to avoid implying that violence by women justifies or excuses violence by their partners. Moreover, although women may assault their partners at approximately the same rate as men assault theirs, because of the greater physical, financial, and emotional injury suffered, women are the predominant victims (Stets & Straus, 1990; Straus et al., 1980). Consequently, first priority in services for victims and in prevention and control must continue to be directed toward assaults by men.

This chapter is based on a paper presented at the 1989 meeting of the American Society of Criminology. It is a pleasure to acknowledge the comments and criticisms of the members of the 1989-1990 Family Research Laboratory Seminar,

and also those of Angela Browne, Glenda Kaufman Kantor, Coramae Mann, Daniel Saunders, Kirk R. Williams, and Kersti A. Yllö. However, this does not imply their agreement with the arguments presented in this chapter. Part of the data presented here are from the National Family Violence Resurvey, funded by National Institute of Mental Health grant R01MH40027 (Richard J. Gelles and Murray A. Straus, coinvestigators) and by a grant for "family violence research training" from the National Institute of Mental Health (grant T32 MH 15161).

REFERENCES

- Bland, R., & Orne, H. (1986). Family violence and psychiatric disorder. *Canadian Journal of Psychiatry*, 31, 129-137.
- Bowker, L. H. (1983). *Beating wife-beating*. Lexington, Mass.: Lexington.
- Browne, A. (1987). *When battered women kill*. New York: Free Press.
- Browne, A., & Williams, K. R. (1989). Exploring the effect of resource availability and the likelihood of female-perpetrated homicides. *Law and Society Review*, 23 (1), 75-94.
- 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, 56-67.
- Coleman, D. H., & Straus, M. A. (1986). Marital power, conflict and violence. *Violence and Victims*, 1, 141-157.
- Dobash, R. E., & Dobash, R. P. (1979). *Violence against wives: A case against the patriarchy*. New York: Free Press.
- Dutton, D. G. (1988). *The domestic assault of women: Psychological and criminal justice perspectives*. Boston: Allyn & Bacon.
- Eagly, A. H., & Steffen, V. I. (1986). Gender and aggressive behavior: A meta-analytic review of the social psychological literature. *Psychological Bulletin*, 100, 309-330.
- Edleson, J. L., & Brygger, M. P. (1986). Gender differences in reporting of battering incidents. *Family Relations*, 35, 377-382.
- Federal Bureau of Investigation. (1989). *Crime in the United States*. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Justice.
- Feld, S. L., & Straus, M. A. (1989). Escalation and desistance of wife assault in marriage. *Criminology*, 27, 141-161.
- Gaquin, D. A. (1977-1978). Spouse abuse: Data from the National Crime Survey. *Victimology* 2, 632-642.
- Gelles, R. J. (1991). Physical violence, child abuse, and child homicide: A continuum of violence or distinct behaviors? *Human Nature*, 2, 59-72.
- Gelles, R. J., & Straus, M. A. (1988). *Intimate violence: The causes and consequences of abuse in the American family*. New York: Simon & Schuster.
- Giles-Sims, J. (1983). *Wife battering: A systems theory approach*. New York: Guilford.
- Greenblat, C. S. (1983). A hit is a hit is a hit . . . or is it? Approval and tolerance of the use of physical force by spouses. In D. Finkelhor, R. J. Gelles, G. T. Hotaling, & M. A. Straus

- (eds.), *The dark side of families: Current family violence research* (pp. 235-260). Beverly Hills, Calif.: Sage.
- Grotevant, H. D., & Carlson, C. I. (1989). *Family assessment: A guide to methods and measures*. New York: Guilford.
- Gryl, F. E., & Bird, G. W. (1989). *Close dating relationships among college students: Differences by gender and by use of violence*. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the National Council on Family Relations, New Orleans.
- Hart, B. (1986). Preface. In K. Lobel (ed.), *Naming the violence: Speaking out about lesbian battering* (pp. 9-16). Seattle: Seal.
- Henton, J., Cate, R., Koval, J., Lloyd, S., & Christopher, S. (1983). Romance and violence in dating relationships. *Journal of Family Issues*, 4, 467-482.
- Hertzberger, S. D. (1991). The Conflict Tactics Scales. In D. J. Keyser & R. C. Sweetland (eds.), *Test critiques*, 8. Kansas City: Test Corporation of America.
- Hornung, C. A., McCullough, B. C., & Sugimoto, T. (1981). Status relationships in marriage: Risk factors in spouse abuse. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, 43, 675-692.
- Jaffe, P. G., Wolfe, D. A., & Wilson, S. K. (1990). *Children of battered women: Issues in child development and intervention planning*. Newbury Park, Calif.: Sage.
- Jouriles, E. N., & O'Leary, K. D. (1985). Interspousal reliability of reports of marital violence. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology*, 53, 419-421.
- Jurik, N. C. (1989). *Women who kill and the reasonable man: The legal issues surrounding female-perpetrated homicide*. Paper presented at the 41st Annual Meeting of the American Society of Criminology, Reno, Nev.
- Jurik, N. C., & Gregware, P. (1989). *A method for murder: An interactionist analysis of homicides by women*. Tempe: Arizona State University, School of Justice Studies.
- Kaufman Kantor, G., & Straus, M. A. (1990). Response of victims and the police to assaults on wives. In M. A. Straus & R. J. Gelles (eds.), *Physical violence in American families: Risk factors and adaptations to violence in 8,145 families* (pp. 473-486). New Brunswick, N.J.: Transaction.
- Kolb, T. M., & Straus, M. A. (1974). Marital power and marital happiness in relation to problem solving ability. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, 36, 756-766.
- Langan, P. A., & Innes, C. A. (1986). Preventing Domestic Violence Against Women. Discussion Paper. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Justice, Bureau of Justice Statistics. Special Report NCJ 102037.
- Mann, C. R. (1990). Black female homicide in the United States. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 5, 176-201.
- Pagelow, M. D. (1981). *Woman-battering: Victims and their experiences*. Beverly Hills, Calif., Sage.
- Pirog-Good, M. A., & Stets, J. E. (eds.). (1989). *Violence in dating relationships: Emerging social issues*. New York: Praeger.
- Saunders, D. G. (1989). *Who hits first and who hurts most? Evidence for the greater victimization of women in intimate relationships*. Paper presented at the 41st Annual Meeting of the American Society of Criminology, Reno, Nev.
- Scanzoni, J. (1978). *Sex roles, women's work, and marital conflict*. Lexington, Mass.: Lexington.
- Schulman, M. (1979). *A survey of spousal violence against women in Kentucky* (Study No. 792701, conducted for Kentucky Commission on Women, sponsored by the U.S. Department of Justice, Law Enforcement Assistance Administration). Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office.
- Sorenson, S. B., & Telles, C. A. (1991). Self-reports of spousal violence in a Mexican-American and non-Hispanic white population. *Violence and Victims*, 6, 3-15.
- Stark, R., & McEvoy, J., III. (1970). Middle class violence. *Psychology Today*, 4, 52-65.
- Stets, J. E., & Straus, M. A. (1990). 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* (pp. 151-166). New Brunswick, N.J.: Transaction.
- Straus, M. A. (1973). A general systems theory approach to theory of violence between family members. *Social Science Information*, 12, 105-125.
- Straus, M. A. (1974). Leveling, civility, and violence in the family. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, 36, 13-29.
- Straus, M. A. (1976). Sexual inequality, cultural norms, and wife-beating. *Victimology*, 1, 54-76.
- Straus, M. A. (1977). Normative and behavioral aspects of violence between spouses: Preliminary data on a nationally representative USA sample. In *Violence in Canadian Society* Symposium sponsored by Simon Fraser University, Department of Criminology, at the University of New Hampshire Family Research Laboratory, Durham.
- Straus, M. A. (1980). Victims and aggressors in marital violence. *American Behavioral Scientist*, 23, 681-704.
- Straus, M. A. (1983). Ordinary violence, child abuse, and wife-beating: What do they have in common? In D. Finkelhor, R. J. Gelles, G. T. Hotaling, & M. A. Straus (eds.), *The dark side of families: Current family violence research* (pp. 213-234). Beverly Hills, Calif.: Sage.
- Straus, M. A. (1986). Domestic violence and homicide antecedents. *Domestic Violence*, 62, 446-465.
- Straus, M. A. (1990a). 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* (pp. 49-73). New Brunswick, N.J.: Transaction.
- Straus, M. A. (1990b). 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* (pp. 75-91). New Brunswick, N.J.: Transaction.
- Straus, M. A. (1992a). Children as witnesses to marital violence: A risk factor for lifelong problems among a nationally representative sample of American men and women. In D.

- F. Schwarz (ed.), *Children and violence: Report of the Twenty-Third Ross Round-table on Critical Approaches to Common Pediatric Problems in collaboration with the Ambulatory Pediatric Association*. Columbus, Ohio: Ross Laboratories.
- Straus, M. A. (1994). State-to-state differences in social inequality and social bonds in relation to assaults on wives in the United States. *Journal of Comparative Family Studies*, 25, 7-24.
- Straus, M. A. (1995). Trends in cultural norms and rates of partner violence: An update to 1992. In Sandra M. Stith & M. A. Straus, *Understanding partner violence: Prevalence, causes, consequences and solutions*. Minneapolis: National Council of Family Relations.
- 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, 465-479.
- Straus, M. A., & Gelles, R. J. (eds.). (1990). *Physical violence in American families: Risk factors and adaptations to violence in 8,145 families*. New Brunswick, N.J.: Transaction.
- Straus, M. A., Gelles, R. J., & Steinmetz, S. K. (1980). *Behind closed doors: Violence in the American family*. Garden City, N.Y.: Anchor/Doubleday.
- Sugarman, D. B., & Hotaling, G. T. (1989). Dating violence: Prevalence, context, and risk markers. In M. A. Pirog-Good & J. E. Stets (eds.), *Violence in dating relationships: Emerging social issues*. New York: Praeger.
- Szinovacz, M. E. (1983). Using couple data as a methodological tool: The case of marital violence. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, 45, 633-644.
- Tyree, A., & Malone, J. (1991). *How can it be that wives hit husbands as much as husbands hit wives and none of us knew it?* Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Sociological Association.
- U.S. Department of Justice. (1976). *Dictionary of criminal justice data terminology*. Washington, D.C.: National Criminal Justice Information Service.
- Vissing, Y. M., Straus, M. A., Gelles, R. J., & Harrop, J. W. (1991). Verbal aggression by parents and psychosocial problems of children. *Child Abuse and Neglect*, 15, 223-238.
- Walker, L. E. A. (1984). *The battered woman syndrome*. New York: Springer.
- Wolfgang, M. E. (1958). *Patterns of criminal homicide*. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.
- Yllö, K. A., & Straus, M. A. (1990). Patriarchy and violence against wives: The impact of structural and normative factors. In M. A. Straus & R. J. Gelles (eds.), *Physical violence in American families: Risk factors and adaptations to violence in 8,145 families*. New Brunswick, N.J.: Transaction.