Understanding Female-to-Male Violence
in Canadian University and College
Dating Relationships:
A Test of the Rebellion Thesis

by

Lisa R. Leduc, B.Soc.Sc., M.A.

A dissertation submitted to
the Faculty of Graduate Studies and Research
in partial fulfillment of the requirements for
the degree of

Doctor of Philosophy

Department of Sociology and Anthropology

Carleton University

Ottawa, Ontario.

January 6th, 2004

©2004, Lisa R. Leduc

National Library
of Canada

Bibliothèque nationale
du Canada

Acquisitions and
Bibliographic Services

Acquisitions et
services bibliographiques

395 Wellington Street
Ottawa ON K1A 0N4
Canada

395, rue Wellington
Ottawa ON K1A 0N4
Canada

Your file Votre référence

ISBN: 0-612-94205-8

Our file Notre référence

ISBN: 0-612-94205-8

The author has granted a non-exclusive licence allowing the National Library of Canada to reproduce, loan, distribute or sell copies of this thesis in microform, paper or electronic formats.

L'auteur a accordé une licence non exclusive permettant à la Bibliothèque nationale du Canada de reproduire, prêter, distribuer ou vendre des copies de cette thèse sous la forme de microfiche/film, de reproduction sur papier ou sur format électronique.

The author retains ownership of the copyright in this thesis. Neither the thesis nor substantial extracts from it may be printed or otherwise reproduced without the author's permission.

L'auteur conserve la propriété du droit d'auteur qui protège cette thèse. Ni la thèse ni des extraits substantiels de celle-ci ne doivent être imprimés ou autrement reproduits sans son autorisation.

In compliance with the Canadian Privacy Act some supporting forms may have been removed from this dissertation.

Conformément à la loi canadienne sur la protection de la vie privée, quelques formulaires secondaires ont été enlevés de ce manuscrit.

While these forms may be included in the document page count, their removal does not represent any loss of content from the dissertation.

Bien que ces formulaires aient inclus dans la pagination, il n'y aura aucun contenu manquant.

Canada

PAGINATION ERROR.

TEXT COMPLETE.

ERREUR DE PAGINATION.

LE TEXTE EST COMPLET.

ABSTRACT

This dissertation tests a theory of women's use of violence in dating that places that violence in the context of patriarchy. It is hypothesized that women engage in violence against their dating partners as a form of gender deviance. Their actions are a style of rebellion against patriarchal oppression. Through secondary analysis of data from a Canadian National Survey, attempts are made to connect respondents' self-reports of violence behavior and their rejection of familial patriarchal values and beliefs. This "Rebellion Thesis" offers an alternative lens for investigating women's violence to that offered by some family violence researchers who continue to tender the "mutual combat" explanation.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Thank you to Walter DeKeseredy and Katherine Kelly, the original researchers on the Canadian National Survey, as well as all of the participants in the study.

Of course Walter has provided me with so much more than a data set. His faith in my abilities and his patience with my slow progress went way beyond the job description of a doctoral supervisor. From the first time he advised me in my Master's research, his unwavering support has continued to counteract my own insecurities. Thanks for sticking with me Walter.

Much gratitude as well to Terry Nosanchuk and Shahid Alvi who also never lost faith in my ability to get it done and offered invaluable input and suggestions at very key moments in the process. Shahid was especially instrumental in guiding me through the final stretch.

The encouragement of my colleagues was integral throughout the completion of all of my doctoral requirements. Thank you to: Suzanne Hill; Christine Gervais; Colleen Dell; Roberta Lynn Sinclair; Ginni Dilworth and Mathew Johnson. So many times you seemed to be the only ones who understood what I was going through and that sense of connection really helped.

No dissertation is ever completed without the external support of family and friends. My heartfelt thanks to my Mom and Dad as well as my 'non academic' friends who allowed me to be someone other than a PhD student once in a while; thank you Trish, Jeanette and Yvonne.

And to Kevin, I do not believe words could express what your emotional, physical and financial support has meant to me. I would have never even begun this undertaking without your encouragement, and I certainly could not have finished it without you behind me. I am eternally grateful.

This work is dedicated to my **other** two major projects, Jesse and Sedona.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
ABSTRACT.....	iii
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS	iv
TABLE OF CONTENTS.....	v
LIST OF TABLES	vii
LIST OF FIGURES	ix
LIST OF APPENDICES.....	x
 CHAPTER	
I	
INTRODUCTION	1
Historical, Political, and Social Context.....	1
Liberation Into a Life of Crime.....	2
The Battered Husband Syndrome	4
Us Versus Them.....	5
Taking It To The Streets	10
A Proposed Cease-fire	11
Call for a Feminist Reclamation	13
Goals of This Study	14
II	
LITERATURE REVIEW	16
Incidence and Prevalence.....	16
An Emphasis on Risk Markers	22
Women’s Use of Violence In Dating.....	25
(Over)Reliance on the Conflict Tactics Scale.....	32
Gender Sensitive Research	39
Supplementing the CTS	40
Declarations of Gender Symmetry and the Absence of Theory	46
Contributions of the Current Research	54
III	
THEORETICAL FOUNDATIONS.....	56
Patriarchy	56
Courtship.....	59
Gender Roles and Gender Deviance	64
Power and Control	71
Theoretical Synthesis.....	76
Theoretical Framework – Rebellion Theory.....	78
Hypotheses.....	81

IV	METHODOLOGY	83
	The Original Study.....	84
	Purposes of the Study.....	84
	The Sample	84
	Operational Definitions.....	87
	Secondary Analysis.....	90
	Recoding the Data.....	90
V	FINDINGS.....	109
	Testing the Hypotheses	109
	Crosstabular Analysis	109
	Regression Analysis.....	119
VI	DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSIONS	126
	Rebellion Theory	126
	Implications for Policy.....	131
	Directions for Future Research	132
	REFERENCES	133

LIST OF TABLES

TABLE		Page
1.1	Summary of Studies Examining Gender Symmetry of Violence in Intimate Relationships.....	6
2.1	Dating Violence Surveys	18
2.2	Percentage of Women Using Different Motives For Violence in Dating.....	52
4.1	Demographic and Educational Characteristics Of the Sample	86
4.2	Frequency Scale of Rejection of Patriarchy1 (beliefs).....	93
4.3	Frequency Scale of Rejection of Patriarchy2 (attitudes).....	94
4.4	Variable Recodes and Transformations – Patriarchy.....	96
4.5	Frequency Scale of Use of Violence.....	97
4.6	Variable Recodes and Transformations – Violence	100
4.7	Variable Recodes and Transformations – Motives	102
4.8	Variable Recodes and Transformation – Victimization.....	106
4.9	Variable Recodes and Transformation – Alcohol.....	107
5.1	Chi Square Analysis of Use of Violence By Rejection of Patriarchy2 (attitudes).....	110
5.2	Chi Square Analysis of Use of Minor Violence By Rejection of Patriarchy2 (attitudes).....	111

5.3	Chi Square Analysis of Use of Severe Violence By Rejection of Patriarchy2 (attitudes).....	111
5.4	Chi Square Analysis of Use of Violence by Rejection of Patriarchy2 (attitudes) controlling For Victimization Since High School	113
5.5	Chi Square Analysis of Use of Minor Violence By Rejection of Patriarchy2 (attitudes) controlling For Victimization Since High School	114
5.6	Chi Square Analysis of Use of Severe Violence By Rejection of Patriarchy2 (attitudes) controlling For Victimization Since High School	115
5.7	Chi Square Analysis of Use of Violence by Previous Victimization Since High School.....	116
5.8	Chi Square Analysis of Use of Minor Violence Initiative Motive by Rejection of Patriarchy1 (beliefs)	117
5.9	Chi Square Analysis of Use of Severe Violence Initiative Motive by Rejection of Patriarchy1 (beliefs).....	118
5.10	Chi Square Analysis of Use of Severe Violence Initiative Motive by Rejection Of Patriarchy2 (attitudes).....	118
5.11	Pearson Correlation Matrix of Independent/Predictor Variables.....	121
5.12	Regression Analyses - R^2 Changes of Independent Variable Blocks.....	124

LIST OF FIGURES

FIGURE		Page
3.1	Model of Rebellion Theory.....	80

LIST OF APPENDICES

APPENDIX

A	Canadian National Survey Female Questionnaire	167
B	Variable Transformation.....	186
C	Chi Square Analysis with NON-Significant Results	193

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Historical, Political and Social Context

Women's use of violence is an area of study that has a history rife with discord. Conflicts over theoretical foundations; research instruments; media misrepresentations; policy influences; and even personal aspersions continue to this day. The current research project is an attempt to understand the context, meanings and motives of female-to-male dating violence. To that end, a theoretical model placing women's use of violence within the context of patriarchy will be empirically tested. Although there are many other empirically based studies on this issue, most of them are theoretically barren. Conversely, much of the theory constructed around the issue has not been empirically tested; and therein lies the conflict. As the research in this study wades directly into this conflict, it is important to have an in-depth cognizance of both the antagonistic history of the issue, as well as the friction in the present context. This review will serve to situate the current study within the field and illuminate the motives for this research that are in many ways grounded in that ongoing conflict.

What follows is a review of the historical, political and social context of the issue of women's use of violence in intimate relationships and the differing perspectives attempting to explain it. The place of the current research within this context is discussed and a brief statement of the research agenda as well as the outline of the forthcoming chapters is also presented.

Liberation Into a Life of Crime

With the women's liberation movement in the 1970's came a disturbing trend of theoretical explanations predicting an impending explosion in female criminal behaviour. Adler (1975) and Simon (1975) both published books that argued women were becoming more involved in criminal behaviour as the women's liberation movement opened up more opportunities for them outside of the home. Adler (1975) and Simon (1975) were pioneers in criminological research in that they were the first to focus research on female crime. Adler (1975) analyzed FBI arrest statistics and found increases in female arrest rates between 1960 and 1972. Explaining this increase as a function of women's emancipation from the narrow role of housewife into previously male dominated spheres (including criminal enterprise); Adler (1975:16) labeled this phenomenon as the "shady aspect of liberation". Although contemporary feminist criminologists concede that Adler (1975) and Simon (1975) should be commended for forcing "a contemporary reassessment of the relationship between sex and participation in criminal activity" (Curran & Renzetti, 1994:166), it is also important to point out the major problems with the liberation/emancipation perspective.

Adler's (1975) research was conducted with police statistics which are infamous for what they do not measure, the dark figure of crime. Adler (1975) also failed to control for the small base numbers from which she calculated the percentage increases in criminal arrest rates. This failure translated into a deceptive inflation of rates. The number of women arrested was so low to begin with that any small increase would appear as a major change in percentage terms (Chesney-Lind & Sheldon, 1992).

Another problem with the liberation/emancipation theory is that no empirical research has been able to discover a positive relationship between the women's movement and female crime. Indeed some studies have found the opposite, that women and girls involved in crime are less liberated (Cernkovich & Giordano, 1979; James & Thornton, 1980).

Belknap (1996) states that the only effect feminism and the women's liberation movement has had on female crime is that women are more likely to be arrested, prosecuted and convicted. This contention has been echoed by other contemporary feminist criminologists (Curran, 1994; Faith, 1993; Messerschmidt, 1986; Chesney-Lind, 1997). As Morris (1987:69) stated "Social changes in the 1960's led not to changes in criminality among women but to changes in perceptions of women and criminality among women." Although women were not committing crime because they were liberated, the criminal justice system was reacting to them based on the perception that their liberation was driving their behaviour.

Although the liberation/emancipation theories have received no empirical support they continue to be influential in the minds of the general public, conservative politicians, and many journalists (DeKeseredy, 2000). Indeed the over policing, prosecution and incarceration of female offenders can be framed as what Chesney-Lind (1997) calls "equality with a vengeance". This perspective that women are acting more 'like men' and therefore need to be controlled is having very real policy repercussions.

The Battered Husband Syndrome

One area where women are often constructed as ‘acting like men’ is within the field of domestic violence. The term ‘battered husband syndrome’ was coined by Steinmetz (1977) in a study based on secondary analysis of research conducted by Straus and Gelles. Steinmetz (1977) found that there were more reported blows struck by women than there were reported blows struck by men. Straus, Gelles and Steinmetz (1980) stated that although men are more likely to hurt women than vice versa because they are stronger, this is unimportant. They contended instead that the number of women who beat their husbands means that we need “some revision of the traditional view about female violence” (Straus, Gelles & Steinmetz, 1980:41). They argued that; “It is important that we should not be misdirected by the politics of social problems which focus attention on issues such as wife abuse....the problem is one of *family violence* “ (emphasis in the original) (ibid:12). Although both Straus and Gelles later softened their stance on the mutuality of domestic violence¹; the driving perspective of their work remains that we will not solve the problem of violence within families until we stop blaming men for all of the violence and look at women’s participation in violent behaviours as well. Straus and Gelles eventually re-focussed their discussion on women’s use of violence into an emphasis on victim precipitation. They claimed that; “the danger to a woman of such behavior [use of minor physical violence against her

¹ Gelles (1985) later conceded that the problem is more one of battered wives than family violence. Gelles & Straus (1988) reanalyzed their original work and highlighted the use of self defensive violence by women. But the focus on self defensive violence by women eventually shifted to ‘self defense or retaliation’ (Straus, 1988; Stets & Straus, 1990), and even those context/meanings/motives were dismissed as less important than the larger problem of women’s use of violence “(even though) a great deal of violence by women against their husbands is retaliation or self defense....violence by women against their husbands is not something to be dismissed because of the even greater violence by husbands” (Straus & Gelles, 1990:120). Even more recently, Gelles (2000) has lamented the disingenuous political use of his

husband] is that it sets the stage for the husband to assault her.....Unless women also forsake violence in their relationships with male partners and children, they cannot expect to be free from assault” (Straus & Gelles, 1990:105).

More recently, Straus has concentrated his research on violence in dating relationships; or what he refers to as “Intimate Partner Violence” (IPV) (Straus & Yodanis, 1996; Straus & Ramirez, 1999; Straus & Medeiros, 2002; Straus & Ramirez, 2003). His research continues however to focus on gender symmetry in IPV as well as renewing the issue of female victim precipitation;

These results are consistent with the gender symmetry in IPV found by more than 100 previous studies....The presence of gender symmetry in these different cultural contexts, combined with studies showing that women are injured more often and more seriously by partner-assaults, and studies showing that women initiate IPV as often as men, suggests that programs and policies aimed at primary prevention of IPV *by women* are crucial to ending IPV and for reducing the victimization of women. (emphasis in the original)
Straus & Ramirez, 2003:15

Us Versus Them

There are two dominant discourses regarding women's violent behaviour toward their partners, the family violence perspective, as presented in the previous section, and feminist perspectives. Researchers who adhere to these perspectives typically use different samples and measures. Given the varied approach, the findings from the two ‘camps’, not surprisingly, often come to very different conclusions regarding gender symmetry or asymmetry in intimate violence offending and victimization. The

work by stating that “It is categorically false to imply that there are the same number of ‘battered’ men as

characteristics of the various family violence and feminist perspective studies are summarized in the following Table.

TABLE 1.1: Summary of Studies Examining Gender Symmetry of Violence in Intimate Relationships

in Intimate Relationships				
STUDY	PERSPECTIVE	SAMPLE/SETTTING MEASUREMENT		FINDINGS
Straus, Gelles & Steinmetz (1980)	Family Violence	National/US CTS	Mail Survey	More self reports of use of violence by women than men
O’Leary et al (1989)	Family Violence	New York CTS	Survey (in office)	Women were more likely than men to be aggressive
Brush (1990)	Family Violence	National/US CTS	Interview	Confirms evidence of women acting violently. Most common Response was both partners violent
Straus & Gelles (1990)	Family Violence	National/US CTS	Phone Interview (wife or husband not both)	Gender symmetry in offending and victimization
Morse (1995)	Family Violence	National/US Modified CTS	Interview	Higher female-to-male violence for minor to severe violence Women more likely to have Injuries
Madgol et al (1997) Moffit & Caspi (1999)	Family Violence	National/New Zealand CTS	Interview	Women were more often perpetrators
Straus & Ramirez (2003)	Family Violence	International US & Mexico CTS2	Questionnaire (in university classrooms)	Gender symmetry in physical aggression and severe attacks
Dobash & Dobash (1984)	Feminist	Police/Court Records	N/A	Women constitute 90%-95% of victims of assaults in the home

battered women” (even putting the word battered into quotations when describing men).

<u>STUDY</u>	<u>PERSPECTIVE</u>	<u>SAMPLE/SETTING</u> <u>MEASUREMENT</u>	<u>FINDINGS</u>	
Saunders (1986)	Feminist	Clinical Modified CTS	Questionnaire	Majority of women engaged in in some form of nonsevere violence. Self –Defense and fighting back was most common motives reported
Smith (1991)	Feminist	Toronto Modified CTS	Phone Survey	Women-centered approach with broad definition of violence and Use of multiple measures produced higher rates of victimization
DeKeseredy & Kelly (1993)	Feminist	National/ Canada Modified CTS	Questionnaire (in University classrooms)	Replicated results of Saunders (1986) with non clinical sample Women use non severe violence With self defense motives
Vivian & Langhinrichsen-Rohling (1994)	Feminist	Clinical New York modified CTS	Interviews in Therapy setting	Wives were more likely than husbands to be victimized and to be more negatively effected
Tjaden & Thoennes (2000)	Feminist	National/US modified CTS	Phone Survey	Women more likely to be victims of intimate violence, to experience it more frequently for a longer duration and to suffer more negative consequences

NOTE: CTS = Conflict Tactics Scale

As discussed in the previous section, the family violence researchers² maintain that women and men are mutually violent in intimate relationships. Table 1.1 illustrates how this view is supported by much quantitative research based almost exclusively on the Conflict Tactics Scale. This genre of investigation, which consists mainly of ‘counting blows’ consistently reveals that female-to-male violence in dating, co-habitation, and marriage is just as, if not more, prevalent than male-to-female violence.

² This is a label Kurz (1993:89) gives to researchers who follow the conceptual, theoretical, and methodological approaches used by University of New Hampshire sociologist Murray Straus.

The opposing discourse, grounded in feminism, discounts these types of findings as flawed and distorted. Feminists researchers³ argue that the 'battered husband syndrome' is a disingenuous construct created as fodder for the backlash against women's rights. More specifically 'family violence' research is often critiqued for its over-reliance on the Conflict Tactics Scale as a tool to elucidate details within intimate relationships. This instrument, although widely used, is rife with problems⁴. As indicated in Table 1.1, feminist researchers use a modified Conflict Tactics Scale that includes questions dealing with context, meanings and motives.

Feminists suggest that women and men may have different motivations for using violence. Whereas men are viewed as more likely to use violence to control and exercise power (Hamberger et al, 1997), women are viewed as more likely to use violence to express emotion, escape violence, or to defend themselves (Saunders, 1986; Hamberger & Potente, 1994; Cascardi & Vivian, 1995; DeKeseredy et al, 1997; Melton & Belknap, 2003). In addition, men and women may give different meanings to the violence they perpetuate and/or receive. Thus, even when men and women in a relationship are equally likely to employ force, women may experience more fear or intimidation (Cantos et al, 1994; Morse, 1995; Barnett et al, 1997). Feminist researchers also critique family violence researchers as participating in victim blaming with their focus on women's use of violence as precipitation of their own victimization (Schwartz & DeKeseredy, 1993).

The polarization between these two perspectives is vast and includes claims of misrepresentations on both sides. Straus (1998:17) has stated that he was "excommunicated as a feminist" when he and his colleagues Gelles and Steinmetz first

³ Some researchers who have denounced the work of Straus and his colleagues include: DeKeseredy, Schwartz, Renzetti, Chesney-Lind, Koss, Saunders, and Dobash & Dobash

reported on high rates of female-to-male violence in 1980. Although Straus (1998:18) reports that the “vitriolic 20 year controversy” subsided by 1997 in the face “overwhelming accumulation of evidence from more than a hundred studies showing approximately equal assault rates”, feminist scholars continue to discount the work of Straus and other family violence researchers as a mere counting of blows without any examination of context meanings and motives (Renzetti, 1994; DeKeseredy et al, 1997; DeKeseredy & Schwartz, 1998; Melton & Belknap 2003; DeKeseredy & Schwartz, 2003).

Feminist scholars in turn are critiqued by their family violence counterparts as being unitary and invariable in their examinations of intimate family violence, they are accused of promoting “victim feminism” where men are always at fault and women are always defending themselves (Wolf, 1993; Dutton, 1994). Feminists are accused of having an “unstated agenda to create a perception violence by men as wrong and malicious, and violence by women as morally courageous defense [sic]” (Straus & Medeiros, 2002). The rejoinder to this critique is that it fails to conceptualize the diversity of feminisms, but rather remains stuck in the view of feminist theory as a monolithic, unified, unchanging paradigm (Renzetti, 1994). Certainly feminist researchers share the assumption of the centrality of gender as a variable for understanding human behaviour, but calls to “move beyond” feminism (Dutton, 1994: 176) are doomed to construct the issue of intimate violence within a vacuum. Intimate violence is gendered, as are individual and institutionalized responses to that violence. To ignore the contribution of a feminist perspective is a failure to recognize both the variety

⁴ For a more complete critique of the CTS see page 32.

within feminist thought as well as the role of feminists as critics of one-dimensional models of human behaviour (Messerschmidt, 1993; Miller, 1994).

Taking it To The Streets

The battle between feminist and family violence researchers has not remained within academia but has been played out in the media⁵ and political⁶ arenas.

Unfortunately, in the conflict in these arenas (which can so often effect policy decisions), the feminists are losing the battle. The family violence contention of gender symmetry has been co-opted into a popularized version of the “women do it too” proclamation that is being disseminated in various forums. DeKeseredy (1999) relates how in the Canadian context there are a series of “people without data” who feed the antifeminist backlash. Work by Pearson (1997), Fekete (1994) and Sommer (1998) is largely responsible for redirecting the focus of domestic violence research, clinical initiatives and public discussion into a debate over the problem of violent women⁷. These antifeminists use anecdotal evidence; data from family violence driven research; and misrepresentations of the purposes and findings of feminist research to propel an agenda that discredits feminist interpretations of the problem of intimate violence as well discrediting individual feminist scholars⁸. Discussions and proclamations found within the antifeminist backlash

⁵ For example: “Women Emerge as Aggressors in Alberta Survey” front page The National Post July 10, 1999; “Research Points to Abuse Gender Balance” The National Post July 10, 1999; “Things ‘Not Expected to Be True’ Ignored in Domestic Violence” The National Post July 14, 1999; “Brochure Spread Anti-Male Bias: Panel” The Calgary Herald June 19 2000; “Men as Likely to Face Abuse From Partner, Statscan Says” The Globe and Mail June 27, 2002

⁶ See DeKeseredy & Schwartz (2003) for a discussion of the political ramifications of the backlash in Canada and it’s effect on federally funded research initiatives through Statistics Canada

⁷ For a more complete discussion of the contribution of these authors to the backlash see DeKeseredy (1999)

⁸ DeKeseredy (1999) discusses the impact on his personal life and career of “well placed lies” (Stark-Adamec, 1996) in the work of antifeminist scholars as well as the backlash from the general public influenced by those same scholars.

have also been used in other venues to discredit female victims, support men's rights, and keep family violence law gender neutral⁹. So the repercussions of a family violence perspective controlling popular discourse are very real for feminist scholars working in this area as well as women who are victims. Through their utilization of quantitative evidence, family violence researchers have gained the power to influence dialogues that make important policy decisions about the problem of woman abuse.

A Proposed Cease-fire

At a recent workshop on gender symmetry in intimate violence sponsored by the U. S. Department of Justice, scholars from both family violence and feminist perspectives were invited to participate in discussions about the development of clear definitions of intimate partner violence; connections of specific instruments to particular sub-populations; and validation of violence against women measures (US DOJ, 2000). A theme that emerged from these discussions was the importance of a cognizance of the ramifications of discord between researchers for services to victims. The group spoke about keeping the significant political issues in mind when choosing research terminology. The 'battleground' may have serious implications for the services delivered to both women and children. Disparities in definitions, research instruments and interpretations of results should be clearly explained to keep political support behind all research efforts. Although civil conflict on broad issues may continue, the public should

⁹ The work of these antifeminists has been used by men in court mandated batterer programs in attempts to block the work of profeminist facilitators. As well, father's rights activists have used the gender symmetry thesis as a basis for official complaints about discrimination against men in custody hearings as well as in federally funded research. (DeKeseredy & Schwartz, 2003). Because of testimony by antifeminist researchers and advocates before the Canadian Senate-Commons Committee on Child Custody and Access (1998), the committee refused to recommend that family law or divorce legislation employ a gender-specific definition of family violence

be made more fully aware of the value of differing research work. Participant Walter DeKeseredy highlighted these concerns in his discussion of future directions for research and advocacy;

There is a sense that the research community has been divided into two camps....However, academic work has moved beyond the conflict and, as reflected in today's conversation, can support new theoretical and empirical approaches. Integration of feminist concerns with main stream survey research was also addressed in a recent CDC conference....We must be careful however about how we disseminate our research....Government agencies are often pushed by conservative lobby groups, and independent academic work needs to be strengthened. The complex nature of the work has to be communicated clearly to the media and the public in order to avoid distortion.
US DOJ, 2000:16

In his substantive and methodological research review of gender symmetry in domestic violence, Kimmel (2002) also called for efforts to reconcile the disparate data and encouraged feminist researchers and practitioners to acknowledge women's use of violence while focussing research into why it tends to be very different from violence by men toward their female partners. Kimmel (2002:1333) also worries that family violence researchers focussing on gender symmetry are "often motivated by a desire to undermine or dismantle those initiatives that administer to female victims". He argues that it is possible, and even politically necessary, to acknowledge that some women use violence as a conflict tactic while understanding that men may be more likely to use violence instrumentally to control their partners. Furthermore, Kimmel (2002:1355) argues that examinations into both women's and men's aggression must be "embedded with the larger framework of gender inequality".

Call for a Feminist Reclamation

It is extremely important for the feminist perspective to 'take back' this issue. We can continue to ignore the rhetoric of a 'battered husband syndrome'; but the numbers cannot be ignored. Women are hitting their boyfriends and husbands, and a feminist lens needs to be turned onto that. The refusal to acknowledge these behaviours, or the discounting of them as always being perpetrated in self-defense, has only served to feed the conservative agenda and strengthen the backlash rooted in the work of the family violence researchers. The backlash needs to be answered. The best way to answer it is to address the issue head on; acknowledge the rates of female violence and then look past the numbers to elucidate the reality of women's experiences in intimate relationships, and how the use of violence becomes part of that experience. In her critique of the work Pearson (1997), Chesney-Lind (1999:118) calls for “a nuanced, sophisticated, and data driven treatment [of women’s violence] – and most importantly – one that begins by placing women’s aggression and violence in it’s social context of patriarchy”. Feminist researchers examining women’s violence and criminal behaviour have long advocated for non-androcentric theory driven research that places those behaviours within the context of the women’s experiences of victimization both interpersonally and on a larger institutional level. (Chesney-Lind, 1989, 1997; Faith, 1993; Baskin & Sommers, 1998; Renzetti, 1999; Katz, 2000; Dasgupta, 2001; Kimmel, 2002; Perilla et al, 2003). Renzetti (1999:14) calls for research that pays “careful attention to those situations in which women use violence in intimate relationships as perpetrators, not in self-defense or even in retaliation. It is feminists who must undertake this work.”

Physical aggression by women in premarital romantic relationships is among the best documented. Most of this documentation however, only relates a one-dimensional picture; a shopping list of numbers of violent behaviours reported. What is needed is a more in-depth investigation into the context of those behaviours, a look behind the numbers. This research attempts to provide that look, to contextualize women's use of violence in dating within the structure of patriarchy.

Goals of this Study

The goal of this research is to examine the complex *nature* of female courtship violence by delving past the basic numbers of prevalence and incidence rates, and focusing instead, on the context, meaning and motives of the behaviours. Specifically, this study is an attempt to empirically connect women's use of violence in dating to their experiences with, and personal views of, familial patriarchal ideology. As a feminist informed inquiry, this study will test a theory of female-to-male dating violence that is developed through a review of relevant literature and an exploration of various related theoretical concepts, all examined within a feminist perspective.

There is a dearth of Canadian research into courtship violence, and specifically female-to-male courtship violence. Most studies to date (Canadian and otherwise) have presented data indicating high rates of female violence in dating with little extensive inquiry into the nature of that violence. Certainly, a feminist informed theory driven analysis of a large data set has not yet surfaced. This research proposes to begin to fill in that gap.

This research explores female-to-male violence in dating relationships. Specifically a secondary analysis of female dating violence self-reports found in the Canadian National Survey conducted by DeKeseredy and Kelly (1992). What follows is an overview of the process of theory selection and development through the literature review and discussion of theoretical concepts. Once the ideational framework is set out, a description of how it was applied and tested with the current data set is presented.

In Chapter 2 a review of the relevant literature further reveals the tension and controversies between the family violence and feminist perspectives as well as the problematic focus on risk markers by researchers from both camps. How these issues relate specifically to the study of women's use of violence is discussed. In Chapter 3, a review of relevant theoretical concepts and their limited application within the genre to date is reviewed and synthesized in the development of 'Rebellion Theory'. Relevant hypotheses designed to test the theory are also revealed. Both the methodology of the Canadian National Survey on Dating Violence and pertinent methodological processes of the current research are presented in Chapter 4. The results of the data analysis testing the hypotheses are briefly presented in Chapter 5 with discussion of those findings being proffered in the following chapter. Also in Chapter 6, various conclusions based on the findings are discussed along with suggestions for future research.

CHAPTER II

LITERATURE REVIEW

When addressing the issue of female-to-male violence in dating relationships there are several areas of literature that need to be reviewed in order to provide a relevant base of knowledge from which to proceed and to explicate the importance and contribution of the research at hand. Of course a review of research into dating violence is required as well as specific focus on the extant work examining women's use of violence in dating relationships. What little theoretical work has been accomplished in the area of female-to-male violence in dating must also be perused. Within this entire body of literature there emerges two interrelated controversies that speak to the present study; problems with reliance on the Conflict Tactics Scale and declarations of gender symmetry in the use of violence in intimate relationships. What follows is an overview of all of these relevant issues and how they pertain to the current research project, as well as a discussion of how this study contributes to the field.

Incidence and Prevalence

There has been an explosion of research focusing on dating violence since the early 1980's.¹⁰ Just like the exploration into marital violence that started a decade earlier,

¹⁰ Cate et al, 1980; Laner & Thompson, 1982; Henton et al, 1983; Makepeace, 1983; Sigelman, Berry & Wiles, 1984; Lane & Gwartney-Gibbs, 1985; McKinney, 1986; Stets & Pirog-Good, 1987; Arias, Samios & O'Leary, 1987; DeKeseredy, 1988; Riggs et al, 1990; Stets & Henderson, 1991; Follingstad et al, 1991; Barnes et al, 1991; Pedersen & Thomas, 1992; Bookwala et al, 1992; DeKeseredy & Kelly, 1993; Lejeune & Follette, 1994; Cascardi & Vivian, 1995; Riggs & O'Leary, 1996; Hanley & O'Neill, 1997; Molitor &

much of the early inquiries into dating violence served to expose the incidence and prevalence rates of violence in courtship. Sugarman and Hotaling (1989) identified over 20 data sets estimating the amount of dating violence among young people. However, conceptual and procedural variations make comparisons across these data sets problematic. Table 2.1 on the following pages summarizes some of the more recent studies and their findings (with specific attention to Canadian based research). This sampling of research (along with the studies summarized in Table 1.1 in the preceding chapter) highlights several key problematics of comparisons across studies. There is an over-reliance on the Conflict Tactics Scale as well as deep divisions within the literature between family violence and feminist scholars over differing measures; focus; and interpretations of results. In the sections that follow a more detailed discussion of these problematics is presented with references to specific studies and disparities.

Tolman, 1998; O'Keefe, 1998; Crawford, 1998; Neufeld et al, 1999; Price & Byers, 1999; Jackson et al, 2000; Spencer & Bryant, 2000; Shook et al, 2000; Harned, 2001; Straus & Medeiros, 2002; Straus & Ramirez, 2003

TABLE 2.1: Dating Violence Surveys

SURVEY	SURVEY LOCATION	SAMPLE DESCRIPTION	INTERVIEW MODE	MEASURE(S) OF ABUSE	INCIDENCE RATES	PREVALENCE RATES
DeKeseredy (1988)	Southern Ontario	308 male university students	Self administered questionnaires	CTS ^a and two modified SES ^b items	70% physical and/or psychological abuse, 69% psychological abuse, 12% physical abuse; 2.6% sexually aggressive	Not examined
White & Koss (1991)	U.S. National	4707 students from 32 university and colleges (2602 women and 2105 men)	Self administered questionnaires	CTS and SES	Psychological violence (inflicted and received) men=81%, women=88% Physical violence (inflicted) men=37%, women=35%, (received)men=39%, women=32%	Not examined
DeKeseredy Kelly & Baklid (1992)	Eastern Ontario	179 female and 106 male university and college students	Self administered questionnaires	CTS and SES	MEN – 13% physical violence, 68% psychological abuse, 8% sexually aggressive WOMEN – 26% physically abused, 69% psychologically abused, 28% sexually victimized	MEN – 18% physical violence, 75% psychological abuse, 12% sexual aggression WOMEN – 32% physical victimization, 78% psychologically abused, 40% sexually attacked

SURVEY	SURVEY LOCATION	SAMPLE DESCRIPTION	INTERVIEW MODE	MEASURE(S) OF ABUSE	INCIDENCE RATES	PREVALENCE RATES
Elliot, Odynak, & Krahn (1992)	University of Alberta	1016 undergraduate students (male and female)	Self administered questionnaires	Modified SES	Not examined	44% of students reporting unwanted sexual experience stated that offender was a romantic acquaintance, 18% said perpetrator was casual or first date
Finkelman (1992)	University of New Brunswick & St. Thomas University	447 undergraduate students (male and female)	Self administered questionnaires	SES	34.4% reported unwanted sexual experiences (N=127) were victimized by boyfriend/girl-friend or date ^e	Not examined
Shook et. al.(2000)	U.S. Midwest	572 university students (177 male and 395 female)	Mailed questionnaires	CTS2 ^f	Not examined	Verbal Abuse – men=80%; women=83%; Physical Abuse – men=23%, women 13%

SURVEY	SURVEY LOCATION	SAMPLE DESCRIPTION	INTERVIEW MODE	MEASURE(S) OF ABUSE	INCIDENCE RATES	PREVALENCE RATES
Harned (2001)		874 undergraduate and graduate students (385 male and 489 female)	Internet survey	ABI ^g , SES and CTS2	Psychological abuse (inflicted)-men=84%, women=85%; (received)men=87%, women=82%; Physical Abuse: (inflicted)-men=11%, women=18%; (received)-men=20% women=22% Sexual Abuse: (inflicted)-men=26%, women=8% (received)men=25%, women=39%	Not examined
Straus & Medeiros (2002)		566 undergraduate students sociology or introduction to psychology courses (232 men and 334 women)	Self administered questionnaires	CTS2	Not examined	22% reported use of minor violence (same for men and women), 11% severe violence (men-10%, women-11%)
Katz, WashingtonKuffel & Coblenz (2002)	Washington State University	283 undergraduate students (male and female)	Self administered questionnaires	CTS2	Not examined	47% reported acts of physical aggression against a dating partner (men and women)

SURVEY	SURVEY LOCATION	SAMPLE DESCRIPTION	INTERVIEW MODE	MEASURE(S) OF ABUSE	INCIDENCE RATES	PREVALENCE RATES
Straus & Ramirez (2003)	Mexico, Texas and New Hampshire	Undergraduate students (447 male and 957 female)	Self administered questionnaire	CTS2	Not examined	33.7% respondents reported some act of physical aggression (similar rates for men and women), 11.4% severely attacked partner (men and women)

a. Conflict Tactics Scale (Straus, 1979); b. Sexual Experience Survey (Koss & Oros, 1982); c. Violent Behavior Inventory (Domestic Abuse Project, cited in Gondolf, 1985); d. CRA Abuse Index (Stacy & Shupe, 1983); e. Gender Variations in victimization are not reported in this study; f. Conflict Tactics Scale 2 (Straus, 1995); g. Abusive Behavior Inventory (Shepard & Campbell, 1992)

An Emphasis on Risk Markers

Much of the extant literature on dating violence is atheoretical and is characterized by attempts to identify incidence and prevalence rates as well as 'risk markers'. While this critique is especially true for family violence researchers, feminist based work has also been guilty of focussing on the identification of risk markers.

This emphasis on risk markers is problematic because it fails to contextualize or explain the behaviour *theoretically*. For example; if it was found through empirical analysis that men or women who have been abused as children also use violence in their relationships, what does that risk marker explain about the violence? Why does experience of childhood abuse lead to use of violence in intimate relationships? Just listing childhood abuse as a risk marker will not answer that question. Certainly risk markers can play a valuable role in testing theories but too often they are simply analyzed as associations within a theoretical vacuum. In the absence of theoretical models, risk markers are in danger of becoming shopping lists of factors associated with use of violence but with a conspicuous lack of explanation for the associations.

Some of the risk factors that have been investigated in the area of intimate partner violence include:

- (a) Interparental Aggression (Stets & Pirog-Good, 1990; Riggs et al, 1990; Marshall and Rose, 1990; White et al, 1999)
- (b) Intraparental Aggression (Straus et al, 1980; Straus & Yolandis, 1996 Avakame, 1998)
- (c) Corporal Punishment/Physical Abuse as a Child (Kalmuss, 1984; Malone et al, 1989; Stets & Pirog-Good, 1990; Ryan, 1998; White et al, 1999, Moffitt & Caspi, 1999; Straus & Ramirez, 2003)

- (d) Aggression as a Child/Adolescent (Malone et al, 1989; Riggs et al, 1990; Moffitt & Caspi, 1999; Giordano et al, 1999; Swan & Snow, 2003)
- (e) Verbal Aggression from Partner (Straus et al, 1980; Bookwala et al, 1992; Ryan, 1998; Cano et al, 1998; Swan & Snow, 2003)
- (f) Physical Aggression from Partner (Marshall & Rose, 1990; Sets & Pirog-Good, 1990; Bookwala et al, 1992; Straus & Yolandis, 1996; Cano et. al.1998; Swan & Snow, 2003)
- (g) Controlling/Jealous Behaviour toward Partner and from Partner (Stets & Pirog-Good, 1990; Cano et al, 1998; Ryan, 1999; Straus & Ramirez, 2003; Swan & Snow, 2003)
- (h) Dominant Personalities (either partner) (Straus et al, 1980; Riggs et al, 1990; Ryan, 1998)
- (i) Age (Straus et al, 1980; Giordano et al, 1999; White et al, 1999)
- (j) Race/Ethnicity (Straus et al, 1980; Straus & Yolandis, 1996; Felson, 1997; Anderson, 1997; Giordano et al, 1999; West & Rose, 2000)
- (k) Commitment/Involvement (Stets & Pirog-Good, 1990; Felson, 1997; Byrne & Arias, 1997; Ryan, 1998; O'Keefe & Treister, 1998)
- (l) Relationship Problems/Conflict (Strause et al, 1980; Riggs et al, 1990; Straus & Yolandis, 1996; Ellis, 1996; Straus & Ramirez, 2003)
- (m) Sex Role Beliefs (Bookwala et al, 1992; DeKeseredy et al, 1997; Ryan, 1998)
- (n) Income (Straus et al, 1980; Ellis, 1996; Straus & Yolandis, 1996; Anderson, 1997; Straus & Ramirez, 2003)
- (o) Education (Ellis, 1996; Anderson, 1997; Moffitt & Caspi, 1999)

- (p) Alcohol Use (Straus et al. 1980; Felson, 1997; DeKeseredy & Schwartz, 1998; Ryan, 1998; Shook et al, 2000; Swan & Snow, 2003)
- (q) Self Control (Riggs et al, 1990; Bookwala et al, 1992; Avakame, 1998; Giordano et al, 1999; Straus & Ramirez, 2003)
- (r) Depression (Straus & Yolandis, 1996; Straus & Ramirez, 2003)
- (s) Stress (Straus et al, 1980; Riggs et al, 1990; Marshall & Rose, 1990; Felson, 1997; Swan & Snow, 2003)
- (t) Criminal History (Buzawa et al, 1999; Straus & Ramirez, 1999, 2003)

A cursory examination of these risk markers illuminates an overriding theme of struggle for power and control. Factors (a) through (h) all deal with this issue. These women have experienced some form of behavioral control in their lives, and have shown previous attempts to (re)gain that control. Unfortunately, the researchers discovering these risk markers have made no attempts at synthesizing the findings into some theoretical explanation.

Fortunately there are some distinct exceptions to this wasteland of athereotical scholarship. For example, DeKeseredy (1988) explored the role of male peer support in violence against women in dating. DeKeseredy and Kelly (1993) examined violence in dating from a feminist perspective by evaluating the contribution of familial patriarchal ideology to men's use of violence. This research was influenced by earlier feminist work looking at marital violence (Saunders, 1986; Smith, 1990). Alvi and Selbee's (1998) work testing DeKeseredy and Ellis' (1995) DAD model (Dependency, Availability and Deterrence) is another example of theoretically based empirical

scholarship looking at dating violence. The current research initiative will also ground empirical research within a theoretical foundation.¹¹

Women's Use of Violence in Dating

There has been no original research conducted with a specific view to primarily address female-to-male violence within dating relationships. Even the research at hand represents a secondary analysis of data obtained in a broader focused study on dating violence in general. Much of the data reported on women's use of violence has similarly been by-products of broader based violence research.¹² Some researchers discovering high rates of female-to-male violence are surprised at the apparent symmetry in violence between men and women in intimate relationships. As a result of both this surprise and the broader based goals decreed by the original research, little investigation into the context of women's violence is performed. The result of all of these factors is that we find many dating and marital violence studies describing symmetrical rates of violence for men and women without any discussion of the differing context, meanings and motives of the violence. There is also a set of family violence research that focuses explicitly on the issue of gender symmetry (Straus, 1995; Straus & Yolandis, 1996; Straus & Ramirez, 2003)¹³.

Saunders (1986) was the first researcher to focus on the motives of violent women. Although his research focused on women's use of violence in marriage; the

¹¹ The theoretical base for this study is explicated in the following chapter.

¹² Makepeace, 1986; Arias et al, 1987; Gwartney-Gibbs et al, 1987; Brinkerhoff & Lupri, 1988; Stets & Pirog-Good, 1989, 1990; Gryl et al, 1991; Bergman, 1992; Tontodonato & Crew, 1992

¹³ A more in-depth discussion of the gender symmetry debate follows later in this chapter

issues raised are noteworthy in any discussion of female-to-male violence in intimate relationships. As we will see, Saunders context, meanings and motives focus has been replicated by other feminist researchers looking at dating violence (DeKeseredy et al, 1997). Saunders wanted to include explanatory variables and apply a feminist perspective in order to reduce the bias evident in relying solely on violence rates procured from employing the Conflict Tactics Scale (CTS) (a more focussed discussion of the problems with the CTS will follow). To supplement the CTS measure, Saunders asked respondents whether their aggressive behaviours could be categorized as self defense (protecting self from immediate harm), retaliatory (fighting back in situation where they were not first to use these tactics), or first strike (using action before being attacked or threatened)(1986:49). This attempt to understand the women's frame of reference and contextualize her violent behaviour within the situation, as well as understand her own motivation, led Saunders to discover that most of women's violence is perpetrated in self defense (1986, 1988).

Saunders (1988) also addressed some of the conceptual issues regarding the definition of self-defense. He found that self defense and retaliation or fighting back were not mutually exclusive, especially in the minds of the female perpetrators, and concluded that self defense should not be ruled out simply because the woman feels anger (Saunders, 1988). The results indicated that reports of self defensive and retaliatory violence were strongly associated (Saunders, 1986). Violence used in self defense may very well be more serious than the original attack because the women come to know their partners' behaviour patterns and are aware of the level of violence

required to protect themselves. One major shortcoming in Saunders research was his reliance on a clinical sample.

Other research using non-clinical samples have however upheld Saunders' self defense thesis in both marital and dating violence (White & Koss, 1991; Vivian & Langhinrichsen-Rohling, 1994; Hamberger et al, 1994; Cascardi & Vivian, 1995; DeKeseredy et al, 1997; Dasgupta, 1999; Swan & Snow, 2003). Some of this research has also investigated other contextual features of female-to-male violence that is disregarded by CTS based research. Cascardi and Vivian (1995) procured information regarding severity; psychological impact; injury; function; consequences; and precipitating events. They found that women's and men's violence in marital relationships differ greatly in their context. Men's violence tends to be more severe (behaviours and injury); more coercive in nature (assessed by setting events, outcomes and function), and more often associated with the consumption of alcohol. Women's violence was found to be more expressive in nature and more likely to be associated with self-defence (Cascardi & Vivian, 1995).

Follingstad et. al.(1991) were also informed by Saunders (1986) earlier work on motivational differences between men and women using violence in marriage. They looked into the sex differences in motivations and effects in *dating* violence. Follingstad et. al.(1991) measured gender differences in; motivations; effects; social desirability responses (Marlowe-Crowne); justification for relationship violence; and violent behaviours (CTS). Their measurement of motives for dating violence is the

most comprehensive to date including:

- anger;
- inability to verbally express self;
- feel more powerful;
- get control over other person;
- retaliation for being hit;
- self defense;
- retaliation for emotional hurt;
- anger displaced onto partner;
- punish person for wrong behaviour;
- prove love;
- it was sexually arousing;
- to get attention;
- jealousy.

Follingstad et al, 1991:54

Women's use of violence in courtship was found to be most often motivated by attempts to show anger and in retaliation for emotional hurt and the need to protect themselves (Follingstad et al, 1991).

Swan & Snow (2003) examined three different possible motivations for women's use of violence in intimate relationships; self defense ("How often do you use violence to defend yourself from your partner?"; "How often do you use violence to get him to stop hitting or otherwise hurting you?"); retaliation ("How often do you use violence to get even with your partner for something he has done?"); and control ("How often do you threaten to use violence to make your partner do the things you want him to do?") (Swan & Snow, 2003:90). While 75% of their sample reported using self-defense; women who reported being victimized by their partners more than they themselves used violence claimed self-defense significantly more than women who reported using violence more often than their partners. The more aggressive women self-reported significantly more control instigated violence than their the more victimized respondents (Swan & Snow, 2003). The reactive motivation of self-defense

was predicted by the extent of the women's victimization whereas the proactive motivations of retribution and control were not (Swan & Snow, 2003).

Through in-depth interviews with women who were in court mandated counseling for their use of violence, Dasgupta (1999:217) found that "the most pervasive and persistent motivation for women's use of violence is ending abuse in their own lives....when viewed in terms of motives, intentions, and consequences, these women's use of violence emerges as instrumental; that is, the incidents are directed toward the resolution of conflicts, or control of immediate surroundings."

The self-defense thesis has, however, been challenged by other studies. DeMaris (1992) asked college students reporting violence in their dating relationships who was the 'initiator' of the violence. Both male and female respondents indicated that it was the female partner that usually initiated the violence. This initiation variable was obtained through specific questioning with a scale of responses consisting of always; usually; and mutual initiation:

If you and your partner have *both* been violent in your current or most recent relationship, which of the following statements best describes who usually threatened to hit *first*, *started* pushing or shoving, or threw the *first* slap or punch?
DeMaris, 1992:114

Respondents in this survey were not asked any further contextual questions and self-reports of initiation were not linked to previous victimization. It is also important to note that DeMaris (1992) did not have couples in his sample, rather he relied on the reports of individual victims (male and female) to designate the initiator of the violence.

Harned (2001) also did not find empirical support for the self-defense thesis. In her study of undergraduate and graduate students, Harned (2001) used Follingstad et

al's (1991) Motivations and Effects Questionnaire to examine motives for dating violence in a large sample of university students¹⁴. Although this scale focuses more on risk factors for use of violence (ie. anger and jealousy), it also includes the motive of self-defense. Harned (2001) found that women were not more likely to use violence in self defense than men.

Bookwala et. al.(1992) examined multiple variables to discern possible predictors of violence in dating. These predictors included; attitudes to violence in relationships; sex role attitudes; romantic jealousy; general level of interpersonal aggression; verbal aggression; verbal and physical aggression from partner. Previous victimization was found to be the most reliable predictor for violence by both men and women. Women were also found to use violence most likely when they had a history of verbal aggression; were violent in other contexts; and experiencing romantic jealousy (Bookwala et al, 1992:302). Bookwala et. al. (1992) also found that violent women were more likely to hold traditional attitudes regarding sex roles. None of the predictors were specifically linked or conceptualized to motives for violent behaviour.

In their study of gender and contextual factors in adolescent dating violence, Molitor and Tolman (1998) found that male and female teenagers did not differ in overall frequency of violence. However, adolescent girls experienced significantly higher levels of severe violence and reported more severe physical and emotional reactions to that violence. Focusing on violence in high school relationships, O'Keefe and Treister (1998) also replicated these results, finding that the most significant predictor for female use of violence was previous victimization.

¹⁴ See Table 2.1 for Harned's (2001) results

In their study of courtship violence among college students, Shook et. al. (2000) found that male and female students who used verbal aggression are characteristically similar. Both experienced aggression from a parent as children and drank alcohol within three hours (before or after) an argument with a dating partner. Male and female students who admitted using physical aggression were dissimilar except that both experienced parent-child aggression. For male respondents, witnessing conjugal violence and their general drinking patterns were also significantly related to their use of physical force. For females, use of physical force was most clearly associated with drinking alcohol within three hours of an argument with a dating partner.

But once again we see these studies as moving away from an examination context meanings and motives, into a listing of risk markers. This diverted focus consistently fails to explicate the *nature* of the violent behaviour. We are presented with items that are statistically associated with use of violence (or even predictive of it) but without any corresponding theoretical discussion of the meaning of those relationships. For an examination of risk markers to be useful, it needs to have some theoretical engine driving the explanation of the association between risk marker and behaviour. This theoretical base can provide more insightful examination into the subtleties of the relationships observed. In the study at hand, significant associations will be examined within a theoretical model which will take into account self-defensive, retaliatory and initiative female-to-male violence in dating.

DeKeseredy et. al. (1997) is the only study to examine female-to-male dating violence exclusively (although the research was a secondary phase of a larger study investigating all violence in university/college dating relationships). Informed by

Saunders (1986), this study attempted to explore the contexts, meanings and motives of women's use of violence. The researchers were able to replicate some of Saunders (1986) findings as well as the previous findings of Makepeace (1986), Follingstad et. al.(1991), and Bookwala et. al.(1992)¹⁵. DeKeseredy et. al.(1997) found support for the hypotheses that women's violence is often self-defensive in motivation and also often reported as fighting back. The nature of female-to-male violence was found however to be more complex with many variations. There was some evidence of 'first strike' violence by women. As well, alcohol use and a history of victimization (notably sexual assault) was found to be related to all types of women's violence (self defensive, retaliatory, first strike). However, women's dating violence was not related to a greater adherence to traditional sex role beliefs, as found by Bookwala et. al.(1992).

(Over)Reliance on the Conflict Tactics Scale

The Conflict Tactics Scale (CTS) is a measure of violence in intimate relationships. Primarily used in survey research, this scale was developed by Straus (1979). It is an eighteen item list, which attempts to measure different ways respondents deal with interpersonal conflict in family or intimate relationships on a continuum of least, to most severe forms of aggression. The continuum found in the scale is traditionally broken down into three distinct conflict resolution tactics; reasoning, verbal/psychological aggression, and physical violence. Some researchers have divided the items on the scale further in an attempt to discover a wider array of tactics/aggression used by respondents (Labne & Gwartney-Gibbs, 1985).

¹⁵ More findings by DeKeseredy et. al.(1997) are presented later in this chapter

The first implementation of the CTS was with the U.S. National Family Violence Survey in 1975. This research discovered high rates of violence by wives; results that have been replicated by many studies and refuted by some (Stets & Straus, 1990). Usually clinical samples furnish gender differences in rates of violence, while non-clinical samples indicate gender-symmetry in intimate violence (Stets & Straus, 1990:151)

The CTS is widely used in the area of dating violence.¹⁶ In their review of the research Sugarman and Hotaling found what they referred to as “methodological parochialness” (1989:27) in the literature. Survey research using the CTS seems to rule the milieu. One of the problems is that these studies often employ some *variation* of the CTS thereby possibly altering the measures used across research sites. Simple reliance on the CTS may allow for ease of comparison of study results (depending on variations employed), but it also leaves the entire body of literature open to the criticisms of the CTS. Those criticisms are great, in both number and seriousness.

First and foremost the CTS has been critiqued for what it ignores. The scale overlooks many forms of abuse including; scratching, burning, suffocating and most obviously, sexual assault. As well, more indirect or subtle types of abuse like;

¹⁶ Cate et al, 1980; Laner & Thompson, 1982; Henton et al; 1983; Makepeace, 1983; Sigelman, Berry & Wiles, 1984; Lane & Gwartney-Gibbs, 1985; McKinney, 1986; Deal & Wampler, 1986; Stets & Pirog-Good, 1987; Arias, Samios & O'Leary, 1987; DeKeseredy, 1988; Riggs et. al.1990; Stets & Henderson, 1991; Follingstad et al, 1991; Barnes et al, 1991; Pedersen & Thomas, 1992; Bookwala et al, 1992; DeKeseredy & Kelly, 1993; Lejeune & Follette, 1994; Cascardi & Vivian, 1995; Riggs & O'Leary, 1996; O'Keefe, 1997; Molitor & Tolman, 1998; Crawford, 1998; Jackson et al, 2000; Spenser & Bryant, 2000; Shook et al, 2000

economic deprivation, intimidation, isolation, and stalking are also absent despite the fact they are all common elements of battering (Yllo, 1993; Dagsputa, 2001; Kimmel, 2002). Like most quantitative measures the CTS overlooks the wider social and ideological forces effecting the actors/actresses in any dating relationship (DeKeseredy & Hinch, 1991).

There is also a great deal of controversy regarding the nature of the CTS as a continuum. This form appears to assume that some 'lessor' forms of abuse are not as serious as others. Research using variations of the CTS that include supplementary open and closed ended questions (victims' in-depth account of incident; degree of injury; requirement of medical assistance) has revealed that some CTS-defined 'minor' incidents are in reality 'severe' (Smith, 1987; Dagsputa, 1999; Kimmel, 2002). An alternative technique that could be employed to rate the seriousness of the acts reported would be to have the respondents rate the seriousness of the behaviours. This subjective insight would provide some valuable information regarding how victims perceive and attach importance to abuse. This may be especially salient in the case of female to male violence, when some forms of minor physical abuse (shoving, slapping) may be viewed less seriously by the male victim than some verbal abuse, just because of the physical size differential. Other types of information that may be useful in measuring violence are; force with which an action is carried out; relative size and strength of the perpetrator and the victim; initiation and escalation of violence; clustering of events together; and types and changes of threats.

The most telling absence in the CTS is its failure to account for the motives, context or consequences of dating violence. This deficiency has been noted by many

researchers.¹⁷ The CTS has been accused of simply ‘counting blows’ because of its failure to contextualize any of the behaviours it is measuring. It remains topographical in nature as it provides a description of the form of the behaviour(s) without considering the motives behind the behaviours or their context and impact. Dasgupta (2001) critiques the CTS for its’ failure to account for contexts and motives as well as its’ style of framing abuse within an artificial hierarchy of seriousness;

In particular, the CTS tends to ignore the influence of cultural and ethnic backgrounds. Although there is some recognition of emotional violence in the instrument, the focus is mainly on physical aggression. This linearity of CTS results in a counting of ‘blows’ and assessing the ‘severity’ of violence according to a set rank order. For instance, consider a situation where an immigrant woman has thrown a pot at her husband who has just destroyed her passport and conditional residency status card. On the CTS the magnitude of the woman’s violence would be considered much greater than that of her husband. Dasgupta, 2001:16

The CTS situates abusive behaviours within the context of ‘settling disputes’; this is evident in the traditional introduction given to respondents when administering the measure.

No matter how well a couple gets 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 may use many different ways to settle their differences. Below is a list

¹⁷ Saunders, 1986; Brinkerhoff & Lupri, 1988; DeKeseredy & MacLean, 1990; Stets & Henderson, 1991; White & Koss, 1991; DeKeseredy & Hinch, 1991; Rhodes, 1992; Schwartz & DeKeseredy, 1992; Yllo, 1993; Vivian & Langhinrichsen-Rohling, 1994; Cascardi & Vivian, 1995; Morse, 1995; DeKeseredy et al, 1997; Barnett et al, 1997; Dasgupta, 2001; Kimmel, 2002.

of some things that might have been done to you by your partner in these circumstances. Please circle the number which best represents your answer in each of the following situations.
Straus et al, 1981:256

By referring to the incidents as disputes or conflicts (or even 'spats') there is a tendency to deprecate the seriousness of the actions. It is important to avoid value-laden terminology when developing any survey instrument, yet this introduction clearly minimizes the gravity of some (if not all) of the behaviours described in the proceeding scale.

Feminist scholars also argue that it should not be presumed (as it is with the CTS) that violence is a 'conflict tactic'; rather it should be seen as a tactic of coercion and control (Yllo, 1993; Renzetti, 1994, 1999; Dagsputa, 2001; Kimmel, 2002; Worcester, 2002; Perilla et al, 2003). This is a major schism between the 'family violence' researchers headed by Straus, and feminist scholars such as Yllo and others (Ellis & Stuckless, 1996; DeKeseredy, 1999). As well, many violent episodes in marital and dating relationships occur 'out of the blue', not preceded by any disputes. The CTS may be missing these incidents. This is important when investigating gender differences in use of violence. If the CTS can only measure *conflict* instigated violence, then it is excluding *control* instigated violence which is more likely to depict male-to-female violence (Ellis & Stuckless, 1996; DeKeseredy et al, 1997; DeKeseredy & Schwartz, 1998, Kimmel, 2002; Worcester, 2002).

Kimmel (2002) highlights the public-private paradox than cannot be sufficiently explained by family violence researchers using CTS rates to promote the concept of gender symmetry. In every sphere except intimate relationships men have

overwhelmingly higher rates of use of violence than their female counterparts.

Atheoretical counting of blows with the CTS does not serve to elucidate this disparity.

Despite all these criticisms, the CTS continues to be the most widely used measure of intimate violence in North America. Straus continues to claim that conflict resolution needs to be measured separately from context. He asserts that the large number of context variables that could be included would make the instrument too cumbersome. Combining the CTS with contextual variables assumes that the two are related and Straus is not convinced that they are (Straus, 1993). Instead, he views the CTS as an instrument to be used as a framework for obtaining further information on context rather than obtaining that information by itself. He has however collaborated on the development of CTS2 which does address the impact of the behaviours as well as including sexual assault (Straus et al, 1995). The CTS2 was designed to measure psychological and physical attacks on a partner in a marital, cohabitating, or dating relationship, and also the use of negotiation in such relationships. This revised instrument has;

- (1) additional items to enhance content validity and reliability;
- (2) revised working to increase clarity and specificity;
- (3) better differentiation between minor and severe levels on each scale;
- (4) new scales to measure sexual coercion and physical injury; and
- (5) a new format to simplify administration and reduce response sets.

Straus et al, 1996:287

It is difficult to comprehend that a sociologist would claim that the *context* of any situation is not relevant or related to the incidents occurring within that situation.

Most researchers who have used the CTS themselves critique its lack of context.¹⁸

Straus however remains steadfast in his refusal to recommend altering the CTS2 to overtly include context. He has published research focusing on gender symmetry of violence in intimate partner relationships, claiming that it is being excused/ignored by feminists scholars (Straus, 1993; Straus & Yolandis, 1996; Straus & Ramirez, 2003). This ‘typification’ of women as violent is a serious shift in ideology for Straus who originally viewed family violence as indicative of female subordination (Schwartz & DeKeseredy, 1993). So the CTS(2) remains, a monolithic, topographical, incredibly popular measure that is supplemented by context, meanings and motives questions as well as sexual experiences survey (SES) (Koss, Gidycz & Wisniewski, 1987) and other supplemental instruments¹⁹. All of the blame should not be placed however solely on the instrument itself. Rather it is the researchers who rely solely on the CTS(2) as a measure of violence who are failing to recognize and address the multidimensionality of the behaviours (DeKeseredy & Schwartz, 1998).

Morse (1995) sees the controversy regarding the appropriate focus of inquiry and utility of the CTS as an ideological dispute. Feminist scholars come at this issue with different values, philosophies and goals than most family violence researchers. For feminists a gender sensitive inquiry is not merely reporting sex differences in use of violence. That is not to say that feminist research should abandon all use of the CTS, it is a useful tool to procure incidence and prevalence rates, but attempts to explain the

¹⁸ Saunders, 1986; Brinkerhoff & Lupri, 1988; DeKeseredy, 1988; Stets & Henderson, 1991; White & Koss, 1991; DeKeseredy & Kelly, 1993; Vivian & Langhinrichsen-Rohling, 1994; Cascardi & Vivian, 1995; Barnett et al; 1997

¹⁹ Research using measures to supplement the CTS is discussed later in this chapter.

meaning of the those rates must be grounded in more sensitive measures. This research uses the motives indices first used by Sanders (1986) to supplement the CTS scores and help give more insight into the meanings of the aggression it counts.

Gender Sensitive Research

The increased focus on gender differences (or lack thereof) in dating violence requires a closer inspection of what a gender sensitive measure really is. Simply counting the number of blows struck by women and men is not a representation of the gendered nature of dating violence. Rather it represents gendered patterning of violence; “the relative frequency with which male and female partners hit or abuse their partners and the comparative seriousness of the injuries they inflict on each other.” (Ellis & Stuckless, 1996:39).

Gender can be defined as the sociocultural and psychological shaping, patterning and evaluating of female and male behaviour (Lipman-Blumen, 1984). There is a great difference between sex (biological determination of male/female) and gender (ascribed set of norms within normative system of gender standards). Gender roles provide the blueprint for all other power relations²⁰. It is imperative therefore to view women’s use of violence with an appreciation of its gendered meaning both within the relationship and within society as a whole. An elementary list of CTS scores divided by sex does not provide any insight into how gender influences violence in dating relationships. To view that list with an awareness and appreciation of the gendered nature of courtship is a first step toward understanding the issue. But further

²⁰ A more thorough discussion of the concept of gender is presented in the next chapter

measures are required to elucidate the *gender* differences, not just the *sex* differences in use of violence. That women are sometimes violent in intimate relationships does not diminish the role gender plays in the etiology of couple violence. Many family violence researchers claim to produce results based on gender, but they are only viewing the sex differences and claiming that women are as violent as men. Rather than exploring the complexities of the nature of women's violence itself, they see women as simply becoming more like men. By holding male behaviour as normative and evaluating female behaviour in terms of that male standard, the research is doomed to be gender blind and fail to address the specific nature of female violence (Yllo, 1993; Renzetti, 1994; Worcester, 2002; Kimmel, 2002).

Supplementing the CTS

The best defense against the narrowness of the CTS is to use multiple measures. Some researchers are following this path and supplement CTS and SES applications with context, meaning and motive questions (Saunders, 1986; DeKeseredy & Kelly, 1993; Swan & Snow, 2002). While others abandon the quantitative measures like the CTS completely and employ qualitative in-depth interview techniques instead (Mayer & Johnson, 1988; Dagsputa, 2001; Perilla et al, 2003).

Rhodes (1992) developed an alternative survey instrument intended to procure more detailed information about intimate violence. The Assessment of Spousal Abuse

survey asked questions regarding:

- identity of perpetrator;
- identity of victim;
- descriptive data (physical size, fitness, age etc.) of both perpetrator and victim;
- antecedents of violent episode;
- time of attack;
- nature of violent action(s);
- victims' actions in response to violence;
- weapons used;
- intensity and duration of attack; and
- consequences of attack

Rhodes, 1992:32

This instrument was only tested however on a small clinical population of female victims.

Harned (2001) supplemented the CTS2 with a 12-item version of the Abusive Behaviour Inventory – Psychological Abuse Subscale (Shepard & Campbell, 1992).

This instrument measures psychological abuse on four subscales:

- Emotional Abuse (insults, humiliation, degradation);
- Isolation (restriction of social contact);
- Intimidation/Threats (attempts to frighten, threats of harm to self or others);
- Economic Abuse (restriction of financial resources).

Harned, 2001:274

Barnett et. al.(1997) completed a major rehaul of the CTS to develop the Relationship Abuse Questionnaire (RAQ). The RAQ has many more items, whereas the CTS has two major subscales (nonviolent and violent), The RAQ has four subscales:

- Verbal (4 items)
- Psychological (7 items)
- Threat (6 items)
- Physical (10 items)

Barnett et al, 1997:465

Although there is some overlap of items between the CTS and RAQ, the RAQ Psychological subscale has all new items and the RAQ also includes additional items to help account for contextual factors of abuse like outcomes and attributions (Barnett et al, 1997). Barnett et al's (1997) findings with this instrument indicated that underlying the similar gender frequencies of abuse are statistically significant contextual gender disparities in outcomes and attributions.

Swan and Snow (2003) supplemented the CTS2 along with the Psychological Maltreatment of Women Inventory (PMWI) in an attempt to measure coercive and controlling behaviours outside of the conflict framework of the CTS2. Items of dominating and isolating behaviours included in this inventory are:

- (1) Not wanting partner to see friends;
- (2) Restrict use of car/telephone;
- (3) Jealous or suspicious of partner's friends;
- (4) Monitor partner's time, make him/her account for whereabouts;
- (5) Keep partner from school or other self-improvement;
- (6) Keep partner from family;
- (7) Not allow partner to leave the house;
- (8) Keep partner from medical care;
- (9) Follow partner to check on what he/she is doing;
- (10) Demand partner stay home and take care of children;
- (11) Treat partner like an inferior;
- (12) Act like partner was your personal servant;
- (13) Get upset if housework was not done when you wanted;
- (14) Keep partner from doing things to help him/herself.

Swan & Snow, 2003:84.

Some researchers have attempted to use a broad theoretical perspective that considers the interactions of social, historical, institutional, as well as individual variables in women's violence (Miller, 1994; Hamberger et al, 1997; Heise, 1998;

Dasgupta, 1999). This 'ecological nesting' framework looks at five interactive levels:

- (1) Individual level – childhood socialization; past experiences
- (2) Microsystem level – immediate situation (family, workplace, relationships)
- (3) Mesosystem level – interactions between microsystems
- (4) Exosystem level – structures within society
- (5) Macrosystem level – historical, cultural and ethnic background

Dasgupta, 1999:198

These ecological nesting studies have found a myriad of motivations and contextual variables related to women's use of violence against their partners. At the individual level, along with self-defense and retaliation, researchers have also discovered demanding attention, expressing anger, low self-respect escape, saving loved ones, establishing self identity, and punishment as motives that compel women to engage in violent behaviour (Hamberger et al, 1997; Dasgupta, 1999). At the microsystem level, not surprisingly the most consistent contextual factor associated with women's use of intimate violence is their own victimization at the hands of their partners (Hamberger et al, 1997; Heise, 1998; Dasgupta, 1999). Edleson & Tolman (1992) found that direct and indirect communications between different entities in the women's lives (ie: church, family, workplace) at the mesosystem level will effect intervention strategies as well as use of violence.

Examination into the effects of mandatory arrest policies on women who use violence provides a look at the influence of exosystem level structures, specifically the criminal justice system. Researchers highlight that many women charged under mandatory arrest policies are not identified as victims of abuse, therefore the context of their violence remains invisible (Hamberger et al, 1997; Dasgupta, 1999; Miller, 2001).

Cultures as well as patriarchal parameters that determine gender roles are examined at the macrosystem level. Studies founded on feminist-structural theories have expressly scrutinized cultural prescriptions of gender roles and their bearing on intimate violence. (Smith, 1990; Yllo, 1993; DeKeseredy & Schwartz, 1998c). These studies propose that violence against one's female partner is an offshoot of male gender role socialization, which is based on establishing power and control. Studies do indicate that men who engage in repeated acts of violence against their female partners do so to assert authority in their intimate relationships (Smith, 1990; Follingstad et al, 1991; Barnett et al, 1997; Hamberger et al, 1997). The cultural norms around women's use of violence are in opposition to those for men. Cultural prescriptions for gender roles prohibit women from engaging in aggressive actions targeting their male partners (Renzetti, 1994; Miller, 1994; Dasgupta & Warrier, 1996; Dasgupta, 1999).²¹

The ecologically nested framework provides a valid and complex understanding of violence by women as it takes into account the interactions of antecedents (historical context, social prescriptions of gender roles, social and legal reactions; early socialization) as well as immediate conditions and consequences of the actions (individual experiences, intentions, partner's responses, repercussions for work, family and social network). Unfortunately even those studies using this framework tend to focus on two or three different system levels as it is logistically difficult to examine all five in one study.

The majority of researchers examining intimate partner violence remain implanted within the genre of 'family violence', headed by Straus, relying heavily on

²¹ A more in-depth discussion of normative gender role prescription is presented in the next chapter.

the CTS. These family violence scholars continue to purport that intimate violence is symmetrical, but their research is generally gender blind.

Saunders (1988) recommends maintaining a feminist perspective to ensure the research remains gender sensitive. Within a feminist perspective the researcher should ask about power differences within the relationship and examine the different consequences of male and female violence based on physical and social differences in power. The feminist researcher does not just count, but asks questions about motives and consequences. Quantitative measures should not be taboo to those wishing to perform feminist informed research; rather their feminist foundations allows them to produce new questions and interpretations of the findings, and look at the data in a different light, with the assumption of women's oppression. Smith (1994) makes several recommendations to enhance woman abuse survey research. These include; broad definitions; lifetime prevalence; multiple measures; multidimensional measures; open-ended questions; and effective interviewers. DeKeseredy and Kelly employed most of these techniques in the Canadian National Survey of dating violence which is the data set being examined in the current study. Ellis & Stuckless' (1996) review of marital violence research revealed that when both the CTS and feminist measures are used, the CTS reveals gender symmetry in spousal violence, whereas feminist measures uncover gender asymmetry.

The issue of definitional disparities highlights the tension between feminists and family violence researchers. Feminist scholars maintain that battering is a pattern of intimidation, coercive control and oppression in which the batterer utilizes physical assaults to maintain a pattern of domination (Dasgupta, 2001). Family violence

researchers however suggest that the broad definition of battering that includes patterns of behaviour aimed at establishing and maintaining power and control has a moral agenda to end oppression of women; whereas a more narrow definition included physical assaults only proposes to “end all physical assaults, regardless of the gender of perpetrator or victim” (Straus, 1999:38)

The CTS is a good starting point for inquiry into female-to-male violence in university/college dating relationships. Surely it can supply information regarding the *extent* of the phenomenon, but beyond counting blows, the CTS offers little in the way of explaining the *nature* of women’s use of violence. It seems that there has already been enough CTS based research aimed at procuring prevalence and incidence rates of female-to-male violence. We need to move beyond the numbers and rates and attempt to understand what they mean. The CTS will prove of little use in that endeavor, and even as a quantitative measure of women’s violence it needs to be viewed skeptically, perhaps through a feminist lens. To understand the nature of female-to-male courtship violence, further measures need to be employed. The context, meanings and motives of the violence within the gendered arena of courtship should be examined in an attempt develop an inclusive theory of women’s use of violence. This research attempts to provide that examination.

Declarations of Sexual Symmetry and the Absence of Theory

Although there are few studies dealing with female-to-male violence in dating relationships exclusively, a review of the literature does reveal a great deal of empirical declarations of sexual symmetry in dating violence (Sugarman & Hotaling, 1989;

Harned, 2001; Straus & Ramirez, 2003). This body of research tends to rely on comparisons of male and female CTS rates alone, and therefore fails to capture any contextual issues or the gendered nature of courtship violence (Schwartz & DeKeseredy, 1993; Renzetti, 1994; DeKeseredy et al, 1997; Kimmel, 2002).

This critiques of the CTS become most salient when CTS measured aggression rates for males and females are compared. Research using the CTS alone to measure violence in dating relationships has found symmetrical rates for both sexes; some even report higher female-to-male violence (Sugarman & Hotaling, 1989; Stets & Straus, 1990; Morse, 1995; Straus & Ramirez, 2003). These results have led many scholars to claim that couples in violent dating relationships are mutually combative; and has also given rise to the edification of the 'battered husband' (Stienmetz, 1980; Straus, 1990; Fekete, 1994, Straus & Yolandis 1996; Pearson, 1997; Sommer, 1998; Straus & Ramirez, 2003). But the CTS's failure to contextualize the violence within issues both internal and external to the relationship paralyzes its ability to truly reflect the reality of women's' use of violence; and dating violence as a whole;

Without the context of the woman's assaultive behaviour, the argument that women are just as violent as men, assumes that women and men assault each other for the same reasons and creates the impression that the violence is gender-neutral.

DeKeseredy & MacLean, 1990:2

An incongruity in self-reporting and attributing blame also occurs between the sexes. It has been found that men are less likely to report their own violence and take responsibility for their behaviours than the women victimized by those behaviours (Edelson & Brygger, 1986; Stets & Straus, 1990; DeKeseredy & MacLean, 1990; DeKeseredy & Hinch, 1991; Lejeune & Follette, 1994; Morse, 1995; DeKeseredy et al,

1997; Crawford, 1998). This may account for the higher proportion of female-to-male violence discovered in the research. Much of this research focuses on the differing responses as they relate to social desirability. Dutton and Hemphill (1992) found that reduced self reports of physical abuse by men were related to impression management, while discrepancies in self reports of psychological abuse were related to self deception as well as impression management. This discrepancy in self-reporting further negates the usefulness of the CTS in producing accurate accounts of women's and men's use of violence. More progressive researchers supplement the CTS with social desirability measures (Marlowe-Crowne)(Saunders, 1988). The retrospective nature of the CTS as a research instrument may also increase the likelihood of skewed self-reports across genders. Dobash et al (1998) found that women viewed their own use of violence as gender nonconforming and therefore were more likely to remember and report it;

Women may be more likely to remember their own aggression because it is deemed less appropriate and less acceptable for women than for men and thus takes on the more memorable quality of a forbidden act or one that is out of character.

Dobash et al, 1998:405

In addition to overestimating their own violence, women may also tend to underestimate their partners' violence given the norms of domestic life, which frequently find women discounting, downplaying, normalizing, or even excusing their partners' behaviour. Men on the other hand may underestimate their own use of violence but overestimate their partners' aggression for the same normative behavioural expectations of masculinity and femininity. (Ferraro, 1983; Bograd, 1990; Bowker, 1998; Archer, 2000).

Research using a dyadic form of inquiry would serve to address the problems with discrepancies in self-reporting as well as give more in-depth data regarding the context of violence from both sides of the couple. Previous research using this form have yielded a wealth of information about the context, meanings and motives of violence of both the female and male victims and perpetrators (Laner & Thompson, 1982; Rouse et al, 1988; Bergman, 1992; Johnson, 1995; Molidor, 1995; West, 1995; Hanley & O'Neil, 1997).

The simple abundance of empirical findings however has led to the typification of women as being equally as violent as men (Schwartz & DeKeseredy, 1993; Dasgupta, 2001). In turn, this has been co-opted into an argument of the gender neutrality of dating violence and the embodiment of dating violence as mutually combative behaviours. This is a reflection of the wave of backlash making its way through family violence research and literature (discussed in the introduction). Backlash scholars and popular media writers (those who DeKeseredy (1999) refers to as 'people without data') continue to accuse feminist scholars of constructing a false and anti-male agenda driven framework of female victimization in intimate partner violence (Straus, 1990, 1993; Fekete, 1994; Pearson, 1997; Sommer, 1998; Straus & Ramirez, 2003).

What began as a nuanced discussion of one of the most volatile arenas of human relating had been reduced to a bigoted creed. Men are evil. Women are good. Domestic violence is wife-beating, and any man who finds himself at receiving end of a woman's fist is a liar or a freak.
Pearson, 1997:127

Feminist scholars have also been critiqued from within for simply ignoring the empirical evidence thereby contributing to the backlash (Renzetti, 1994, 1999; Chesney-Lind, 1999; Dagsputa, 2001; Kimmel, 2002; Worcester, 2002). Indeed there is a need to reclaim the female-to-male violence issue into a feminist informed perspective to answer critics like Straus. We need to turn our focus to the empirical evidence of female-to-male violence and attempt to comprehend the underlying reality, by examining the contexts, meanings and motives.

The first step is the application of a theory explaining the unique nature of women's use of violence. Much of the modest theory employment to date has simply applied male theories of violence to female violence (DeMaris, 1987; Tontodonato & Crew, 1992; Riggs & O'Leary, 1996). There is a need to move beyond not only topography (CTS reliance), but androcentric theory application as well. Women's violence means different things, we need to examine it through a feminist lens in order to develop a gender sensitive analysis. This does not mean that there must be some feminist declaration that all women are victims and all female violence is self defense. Rather an exploration into the specific complex *nature* of women's violence is required.

That women are sometimes violent in their intimate relationships should not diminish the importance of discerning the role of gender in domestic violence. Women who use violence against their partners are often typified as acting "like men". This practice of holding male behaviour as the norm and evaluating female behaviour in terms of the male standard is a problem located throughout the family violence literature. Feminist based scholars argue that the violent behaviour of women is qualitatively different from that of men (Hamberger and Potente, 1994; Vivian and

Langhinrichsen-Rohling, 1994; DeKeseredy et al, 1997; Chesney-Lind 1997; Renzetti, 1999; Worcester, 2002). Unfortunately, it is not these voices that are dominating the discourse;

....it must be also be noted that despite the preponderance of evidence documenting significant gender differences in intimate violence, it is the "women are as violent as men" perspective that appears to be garnering the most support, at least in the public consciousness if not in academic and clinical circles. As Schwartz and DeKeseredy (1993,p.249) maintain, "Right now there is an important battle being waged over the nature of women's behavior and its role in woman abuse." This is a battle whose outcome has serious consequences for battered women, especially in terms of our society's institutionalized responses to their behavior. Battered women's survival strategies increasingly are being stigmatized and , worse, criminalized.
Renzetti, 1994:197

The importance of a feminist based investigation into female intimate violence is clear then. To ignore or discount the empirical evidence only serves to push feminist inquiry into irrelevance at the expense of women in need.

The work of DeKeseredy et. al.(1997) on women's use of violence in dating is the one example of a thoughtful exploration of context, meanings and motives behind the violence. Analyzing the same data set that is used for the present research, DeKeseredy et. al.(1997) found that almost one-half (46.1%) of the female respondents reported physically assaulting their male dating partners or boyfriends since leaving high school, while 17.8 percent of the men reported using physical violence against their partners in the same time period. Although this finding on the surface appears to indicate that there is a 'battered boyfriend syndrome', feminist scholars DeKeseredy et.

al.(1997) chose to look behind the numbers to examine the women's motives in using violence. Table 2.2 summarizes their findings.

TABLE 2.2: Percentage of Women Using Different Motives for Violence in Dating

MOTIVE	NUMBER	FREQUENCY OF USE OF MOTIVE			
		0%	1-49%	50%	100%
Minor Violence					
Self Defense	678	62.3	20.1	10.7	6.9
Fighting Back	677	53.6	23.2	16.1	7.1
Initiate Attack	663	63.3	19.7	9.7	7.3
Severe Violence					
Self Defense	367	56.5	21.6	13.4	8.5
Fighting Back	359	48.9	26.7	15.2	9.2
Initiate Attack	359	56.8	20.9	12.4	9.9

Source: Adapted from DeKeseredy & Schwartz, 1993

These results indicate that a substantial amount of violence reported by women was self-defensive or retaliatory. DeKeseredy et. al.(1997) found that the motives of self-defense and fighting back were positively and significantly correlated with each other. This supports the findings of Saunders (1986).

DeKeseredy et. al.(1997) also found that women who report higher levels of self-defensive violence also report higher levels of both physical and sexual victimization.

Studies like DeKeseredy et al's (1997) demonstrate the importance of moving beyond counting acts of violence with the CTS and using reliable measures of motives. The current research is an attempt to further that endeavor.

In their reviews of the extant research looking at women's use of violence and the gender symmetry debate, Dasgupta (2001) and Kimmel (2002) found similar themes running through feminist informed studies that did more than count blows with the CTS;

- The majority of women who use violence against their male partners are battered themselves;
- The assessment of men's and women's violence towards their intimate partners as fundamentally similar arises from conflation of the terms 'battering' and 'violence' as well as the decontextualization of violent actions;
- Women's violent behaviour towards their heterosexual partners is substantially different from men's on historical, cultural, systemic, situational, and individual grounds;
- Women's abusive behaviours towards their heterosexual partners emerge from various motivations including self-defense, retaliation, reclaiming self respect, and controlling of abusers' violence;
- Gender symmetry in intimate violence tends to be clustered entirely at the lower end of violence;
- Women from different cultural backgrounds may view violence differently so it is important to take cross-cultural perspectives in the development of both research and policy;

- Claims of gender symmetry exclude a thorough analysis of gender and how gender identity and ideology (cultural definitions of masculinity and femininity)
- Women's aggression against their male partners needs to be recognized by their contexts that include socio-cultural backgrounds, family and community networks, systems and institutions of intervention, motivations and intentions, immediate sanctions, as well as consequences;
- There is a dramatic disproportion of women in shelters and hospital emergency rooms;

By equating women's violence to men's, the criminal justice and other intervening systems evaluate women's behaviour by androcentric standards. This evaluation is invalid and may lead to inappropriate and unjust responses

Contributions of the Current Research

As explicated through this review of the literature, there is a dearth of theoretically driven empirical research into women's use of violence in dating. While many studies develop incidence and prevalence rates by counting blows, others focus on developing risk markers as predictors of intimate violence with an absence of concrete theoretical frameworks to explain them. To answer the antifeminist backlash, empirical research testing a feminist informed theoretical model needs to be completed.

In response to the call for a "nuanced, sophisticated, and data driven treatment [of women's violence] – and most importantly – one that begins by placing women's aggression and violence in it's social context of patriarchy" (Chesney-Lind, 1999:118); this study is an attempt to empirically connect women's use of violence in dating to

their experiences with, and personal views of, familial patriarchal ideology. The work of DeKeseredy et. al.(1997) provides insightful elucidation of the motives for female-to-male violence but fails to connect those motives substantively to patriarchal ideology.²² This research will test for a relationship between women's self reports of use of violence in dating and their views on patriarchy. A theoretical model explaining the prediction of this relationship is developed through a review and integration of relevant theoretical concepts in the following chapter.

²² DeKeseredy et. al.(1997) in an attempt to replicate the findings of Bookwala et. al.(1992) investigated the relationship between women's use of violence and traditional sex role attitudes but their findings did not support an association

CHAPTER III

THEORETICAL FOUNDATIONS

In an attempt to go beyond the mere ‘counting blows’ analysis produced by examining female and male CTS rates, there is a need to set up a theoretical foundation from which to proceed. The CTS rates of female-to-male violence are important in that they elucidate the subject and force some sort of focus onto the issue. But this research is an attempt to go beyond elucidation and use a theory driven analysis to delve into the nature of female-to-male courtship violence. From the review of the relevant literature there emerges several concepts that need to be further explored and defined in an attempt to develop a theoretical engine to drive the study. These include: patriarchy; courtship; gender roles and deviance; power and control. What follows is an examination of these concepts both generally and within the literature of domestic violence. Additionally, a brief discussion of how these concepts have been synthesized into the Rebellion Theory driving the current research is introduced. The presentation of this theoretical model is followed by specific hypotheses developed to test the theory with the current data set.

Patriarchy

Patriarchy has two components; the structure in which men in our society have more power and privilege than women; and the ideology which legitimizes that structural arrangement. Millet (1969) sees the ideology as the ‘energy source’ of patriarchal domination. Within familial patriarchy (male domination within the home or family), the ideology consists of a set of beliefs that legitimizes male power and authority over

women in a marriage (or a marriage-like arrangement), as well as a set of attitudes or norms supportive of violence against wives who violate or are perceived as violating the ideals of familial patriarchy. Those ideals include obedience, respect, loyalty, dependence, sexual access, and sexual fidelity. These ideals directly mirror the gender norms outlined by Schur (1983) (discussed later in this chapter). So it is these ideals or norms that provide the blueprint for familial patriarchal ideology.

Although social and familial patriarchy are inherently intertwined; “within itself to a greater or lesser extent, the family reflects, reproduces and recreates the hierarchical gender system of society as a whole.” (Kaufman, 1987:10), they do not always have similar support/power at different historical moments and locations. While the structures of familial patriarchy may have eroded over the past two decades (due in large part to the women’s movement), the ideological basis of the patriarchal family has not eroded at the same pace. There appears to be a contrast between the public and private strength of patriarchy. Women have gained more power in public life so that it may appear that patriarchal ideology is on the wane. But that ideology is alive and well in the private sphere where it remains a dominate force within most intimate relationships between men and women.

Walby (1992) makes a useful distinction between what she calls private (familial) patriarchy and public (structural) patriarchy;

In private patriarchy the dominant structure is household production while in the public form it is employment and the state, though in each case the remainder of the six structures²³ is significant. In the private form the dominant mode of expropriation is individual, by the husband or father; in the public it is collective, by men. In the private form the strategy is exclusionary; in the public it is segregationist.

Walby 1992:36

Walby (1992) notes that the disadvantaged position of women vis-à-vis men is particularly evidenced through the marriage contract. The key social locus of women's oppression and exploitation under private patriarchy is the household. This control is perpetuated with support from various socio-cultural structures from both within and external to the family.

The concept of patriarchy has forever been tied to the issue of intimate violence. Traditionally, the inequitable positions of men and women, both in society in general and within the family, have been used to explain male violence against their partners. The 'patriarchal subculture' of wife beaters (Bowker, 1983). Smith (1990) found evidence to support the feminist thesis suggesting husbands who adhere to an ideology of familial patriarchy are more likely to beat their wives than husbands who do not adhere to such an ideology. These findings were replicated by DeKeseredy & Kelly (1993).

Patriarchy has a long history within familial subordination. hooks (2000:61) defines "patriarchal violence in the home as a reflection of the sexism and male domination present in our society and acceptance of the use of coercive force by a more powerful individual to control others." This definition includes male violence against

²³ The six structures are: Paid Employment; Household Production; Culture; Sexuality; Violence; and the State

female partners, same-gender violence, female violence against male partners (except in the case of self-defense, as that would not constitute the use of coercion), and adult violence against children.

Just because the focus here is on female-to-male dating violence, the importance of patriarchy does not diminish. Indeed, much of the courtship literature points to the influence of patriarchy in dating customs. Cate and Lloyd (1992) specifically addressed the way in which the historical and social networks and context effect interaction during courtship. To attempt to understand the gendered nature of violence, patriarchy (the number one blueprint for gender relations) needs to be taken into account. How patriarchy is inextricably linked to other important theoretical concepts will now be discussed.

Courtship

As with the feminist theoretical examinations of marital violence, the foundation for feminist-informed studies of violence in dating is rooted in the concept of familial patriarchy and how it is reproduced within the ritual of courtship. For the purpose of sociological inquiry, the term 'courtship' can be defined rather broadly to include relationships that move to marriage, as well as those that end before marriage (traditionally labelled 'dating' relationships). This definition acknowledges that most dating relationships have commitment as an underlying theme (Lloyd & Cate, 1985; Lloyd, 1991). The study of courtship recognizes that close relationships evolve through the interaction of the participants as well as being embedded in, and reciprocally tied to, various contexts (historical, social network, physical environment, etc.) (Cate & Lloyd,

1992). The body of research on courtship therefore is varied within the social sciences to include historical descriptions; models of courtship across cultures; predictive nature of courtship to marriage; and other factors salient to the relationships themselves.

One of these factors is commonly referred to as the ‘dark side’ of courtship (Lloyd, 1991; Cate & Lloyd, 1992). This embodies research regarding violence within courting/dating couples. As previously discussed this area of research exploded during the 1980’s after Makepeace’s (1981) breakthrough study illustrating the prevalence of violence in dating relationships. Most of the ensuing research however did not examine the nature of courtship and how the courtship system itself could be a contributory factor to the violence. The one exception to this trend is DeKeseredy & Schwartz’s (1993) work on the role of courtship patriarchy in dating violence

Lloyd (1991) hypothesizes that there are two features inherent in the dating/courtship ritual that both encourage the use of violence, and allow it to continue over time without the termination of the relationship. The first is the difference in contextual factors of courtship between men and women. The North American courtship system remains largely patriarchal in nature (patriarchy being defined by Lloyd (1991:15) as “financial and emotional dependence of women on men”²⁴). Courtship then has different meanings or themes for men and women. The male theme is one of maintaining control, whereas the female theme centers around dependence on her partner and/or the relationship itself (Lloyd, 1991). We can see these themes reflected in our culture by the

²⁴ It is important to note that this is a very simplistic definition. Other feminist scholars prefer Smith’s (1990) or Walby’s (1992) definitions of familial patriarchal ideology explained in the previous section; it is those definitions that drive the current research.

stereotypes still often held about men and women in relationships; unmarried men are 'eligible bachelors' while unmarried women are 'old maids'.

.... the themes represent threads of socialization, media portrayals, and stereotypes that influence particular individuals to varying degrees. The hypothesis here is that the greater the emphasis on these themes as 'the way courtship should be', the greater the potential for aggressive and exploitative behavior.
Lloyd, 1991:15

These themes can foster and maintain dating violence as the males' requirement for control justifies his use of violence to gain compliance from his partner; and the females' dependence on her partner and the relationship itself constrains her to remain in a violent situation because 'any man is better than no man'. Other researchers have also hypothesized that control is the underlying mechanism contributing to dating violence (Laner, 1989; Stets & Pirog-Good, 1990; Stets & Henderson, 1991; White & Koss, 1991; Vivian & Langhinrichsen-Rohling, 1994).

These themes also echo the norms of familial patriarchy highlighted by other authors who characterize familial patriarchy as male control in intimate settings (Barrett, 1980; Eisenstein, 1980; Ursel, 1986; Smith, 1990; DeKeseredy & Schwartz, 1998). Imbedded in familial patriarchy are the ideals that form the blue print for gender relations within intimate relationships:: obedience, respect, loyalty, dependence, sexual access, and sexual fidelity (Smith, 1990)

The very nature of the ritual of courtship may also contribute to conflicts in control issues between the couple. As a relationship develops, individual autonomy is often abandoned in favour of becoming the 'couple'. If this evolution into couple affiliation does not occur concurrently for both members then some conflict over control

of actions, thoughts and desires is inevitable. If one partner is spending more time with friends external to the relationship, then the remaining partner may resent this perceived neglect of the relationship and attempt to gain more control over their partners actions. This potential conflict over control of actions is reflected in the questions examining adherence to patriarchal ideology; "Does a man have the right to decide whether or not his wife/partner should go out in the evening with her friends?" (Smith, 1990, DeKeseredy & Kelly, 1992). The importance of control and domination within marriage is highlighted in the discussion of patriarchy in the previous section.

Lloyd points to romance as the second feature inherent to courtship and connected to violence. The romanticized nature of courtship further contributes to the acceptability of violence within the relationship. A great deal of dating violence research, specifically those that are dyadic, have found that both members of the couple tend to downplay the negative aspects of violent episodes in favour of a romanticized view of the relationship (Cate et al, 1982; Laner & Thompson, 1982; Henton et al, 1983; Billingham, 1987; Rouse et al, 1988; Bergman, 1992; Molidor, 1995; Katz et al, 1997; Price & Bryers; 1999; James, et. al., 2000). The retention of the romantic ideal of courtship was found to be more important than any threat of psychological or physical injury. Henton et. al.(1983) uncovered that romance and violence coexist. One-third of the respondents in that study interpreted violent behaviour as love. Both members of the couples tended to take joint responsibility for the initiation of violence and report sympathetic interpretations of the violent episodes.

Although Lloyds' discussion of themes indirectly touches upon the gendered nature of courtship, much of the research in this milieu is conspicuously gender blind²⁵. This is a major failing of this body of literature. The scholars purport to analyze the nature of courtship, yet ignore how it is fundamentally gendered. Lloyd (1991) dances around the concept of gender by labelling the cultural products of socialization as different 'themes' in dating for men and women. But more direct investigation into gender roles in courtship is required if we are to attempt a real understanding of what the behaviours (violent and nonviolent) within the relationship mean or represent. Gender roles are inherently embedded in any relationship between men and women. If women fulfill a dependent role in courtship as asserted by Lloyd, why is that so? Are they dependent not just on their partner, but on the relationship itself? The answer lies in the ascribed normative gender roles for women. Women's socialization emphasizes both the importance of having a relationship, and their own responsibility to maintain it.

The literature centered on how the nature of courtship contributes to dating violence is valuable to this research. By opening up the concept of differing patriarchal themes in courtship for men and women it calls for a clearer gendered focus on dating violence. If we are to look at the gendered nature of violence; we need to understand the gendered nature of courtship as well. This line of inquiry leads into literature addressing prescribed gender roles and how they are lived through social customs such as courtship. This body of literature will be examined in the theoretical sections that follow.

²⁵ One exception to this is DeKeseredy and Schwartz's (1993) work on courtship patriarchy

Gender Roles and Gender Deviance

By surveying gender, power and deviance literature (Beechey, 1979; McCormick & Jessor, 1983; Schur, 1983; Lipman-Blumen, 1984; Messerschmidt, 1986 and 1993; Walby, 1990) a more informed picture of women's roles in courtship develops. The normative system of gender standards is shaped and constituted by patriarchy. Social stigmatization is the key mechanism to enforce gender norms, but most of these norms are unwritten, they are imposed in the course of interaction. So it is through social interaction that the battle between the sexes is fought. In regard to courtship, the norm for women is to secure and maintain a relationship in view of eventual marriage. One of the most important prescribed roles for women is marriage.

Schur (1983) cites three main gender norms prescribed for women; appearance norms, marital/maternity norms, and sexuality norms. The influence of patriarchy is evident here; "control over women's appearance, autonomy, and sexuality can serve as a statement of what male domination entails." (Schur, 1983:53). Women therefore are labelled deviant when they diverge from these norms by being overweight or unkempt; single or childless; or lesbian (Schur, 1983). Deviance through rejection of gender norms is one of the most stigmatized and policed behaviours of women.

What is female gender deviance? To better understand this term we need to look at what is culturally considered 'female' or 'feminine' and this impacts "beliefs about what women need and deserve and how they should be treated" (Pollock, 1995:3). The feminine woman is associated with being virtuous, maternal, pleasant, submissive, compliant, sexy and existing as helpmates to men. Deviance then is anything "different from normal, and normal is defined by stereotypes" (Pollock, 1995:4). Terms used to

describe the deviant/unfeminine woman are uncooperative, dominant, aggressive, independent, manipulative, moody, overly physical, and unemotional (Gratch, 1995).

The deviant woman does not conform to feminine stereotypes.

The unruly woman is the undisciplined woman. She is a renegade from the disciplinary practices which would mold her as a gendered being. She is the defiant woman who rejects authority which would subjugate her and render her docile. She is the offensive woman who acts in her own interests.

Faith, 1993:1

Feminine stereotypes are taught and enforced through formal and informal social control mechanisms. Girls and women are "rewarded for conforming attitudes, femininity and socially conservative behaviours" (Faith, 1993:60). The 'bad girl' cultural stereotype is a product of the politics of patriarchal relations; "...her appearance, actions and attitudes have been offensive to the dominant discourses which define, classify, regulate and set penalties for deviance." (Faith, 1993:1)

Schur (1983:72) hypothesizes that women use deviance within gender norms as a way to challenge the system that prescribed those norms in the first place. Using appearance norms as an example a woman could be overeating as a way of dealing with the pressures and limits of the gender system; "Fat is a response to the many oppressive manifestations of a sexist culture. Fat is a way of saying 'no' to powerlessness and self denial." (Schur, 1983:73). A parallel example may be made of women's use of violence in dating relationships. Although she accepts the prescribed marital gender norm by participating in courtship, she rebels against male control by violating female gender norms through the use of violence within courtship. The continued popularity of weight loss programs illustrates the conflict faced by many women as they rebel against the

gender norms while also embracing them. The same illustration can be seen in how women remain in, and continue to develop, intimate courting relationships founded in patriarchal norms. This hypothesis of women using violence in intimate relationships as rebellion against traditional gender norms goes against the findings of Bookwala et al (1992) who found a correlation between women's self reports of violence behavior and their traditional sex role beliefs. That finding could not however be upheld by the research done by DeKeseredy et al (1997).

Hirschi's control theory lists four factors contributing to conformity and the spurning of deviant behaviour:

- (1) attachment - to parents, school, peers
 - (2) commitment - to conventional lines of action
 - (3) involvement - in conventional activities
 - (4) belief - in conventional values
- Hirschi, 1969

Through resistance or rejection of "conventional" (i.e. patriarchal) norms/values, violent women do not conform to their prescribed gender roles. Their deviance (violence) may be seen then as a failure within one of Hirschi's control mechanisms, belief in conventional values; the values proscribed within familial patriarchy.

Hagan (1990) points to familial patriarchal controls as a cause for reduction in behavioural choices for mothers and daughters. Domestic controls used to reduce female vulnerability to crime and to reproduce patriarchal family structures also restrain deviant role exits (Hagan, 1990). Hagan was specifically looking at female gender deviant exits/acts such as leaving home and committing suicide, however, the influence of domestic patriarchal controls on behavioural choices speaks to the strength of the perceived deviance of role rejections/reversals.

Men can be seen as adhering to gender norms by attempting to maintain control and domination within courtship, possibly using violence to do so. Women however, may use violence in resistance to that control and domination. Other dating and marital violence research supports the theory that men use violence as a means of control (Laner, 1989; Stets & Henderson, 1991; White & Koss, 1991; Vivian & Langhinrichsen-Rohling, 1994; West, 1995; Johnson, 1995; Cascardi & Vivian, 1995).

Gerber (1991) also looked at how gender stereotypes influence perceptions of violence in intimate relationships (in this case, marital relationships). She tested the hypothesis that differing gender roles can explain why men are believed to be high in 'agency' (self-assertiveness, desire to subjugate others), and women high in 'communion' (accommodation, selflessness, and vulnerability). Violent behaviour was found to be a predictive factor of perception of gender stereotypes. Violent men and *women* were perceived as high in agency and low in communion; whereas victimized women and *men* were seen to be high in communion and low in agency (Gerber, 1991:450). This research deals with *perceptions* of gender, power and intimate violence, but that makes it even more salient to the discussion of the hegemony of prescribed gender roles. The respondents dissented from the traditional sex typing of gender roles (male agency; female communion) in the face of violent behaviours. This strongly suggests that these conventional gender norms, and their inherent relationship to violence, are embedded in the general psyche.

As discussed in the previous section, within courtship literature these gender norms/expectations are often referred to as 'themes'. The male theme is one of maintaining control, whereas the female theme centers around dependence on her partner

and/or the relationship itself (Lloyd, 1991). Other research examining intimate violence also speaks to differential attributions of behaviour across gender lines.

Crawford (1998) found that women's involvement in courtship violence was related to her partner's characteristics, while men's involvement appeared to be almost unrelated to, or independent of, his partner. Women's violence was related to the partners' struggle for control or dyadic power, while their victimization was predicted by the difference in partners' perceptions of alternatives and the difference in their levels of dependence.

Giordano et. al.(1999) focused on women's self identity and their use of relationship violence in both adolescence and adulthood. This longitudinal study found that delinquency in adolescence (within and outside of intimate relationships) was a significant predictor of those same delinquent behaviours in adulthood. Use of violence by respondents was significantly related to their 'identities'; women who were viewed as 'troublemakers' had higher CTS scores. Giordano et. al.(1999) found that situational variables as well as broader societal forces effected the life course pattern of deviant behaviour. These forces would include of course gender role socialization and social control.

.....the individual involved in an intimate adult romantic or marital relationship will bring to their relationship not only a particular repertoire of past behaviour, but a sense of self that may either be consistent or entirely inconsistent with the overt expression of anger/violence.

Giordano et al, 1999:22

That sense of self is formed through gender specific socialization and social control that dictates women be passive and submissive. The self concept of 'troublemaker' then is

parallel with the concept of gender deviance. Johnson and Kaplan (1989) also found that early deviance and self-rejection as well as deviant peer associations were more significantly related to later deviance for women than for men.

Pagelow (1978) speaks to the strength of traditional gender roles and their importance in the context of intimate violence. Women are socially conditioned into the victim role and men into the aggressor role; sex role socialization and patriarchal social structure combine to maintain the status quo. When there is a role reversal, with the male assuming the victim status and the female becoming the aggressor, there must be strong positive and negative reinforcers present to extinguish previously learned sex-typed gender appropriate behaviour and to introduce 'inappropriate' contrary behaviour.

McDonough (1988) hypothesizes that both gender and deviance are cultural constructs that shape the behavioural options and the self-concepts of those who are categorized as male or female, deviant or normal. Norms defining deviance, especially when actively enforced by control mechanisms, set the boundaries of acceptable gender behaviour more sharply than do broad definitions of gender roles. Analyzing the differential attributions of deviance to men and women should therefore enhance understanding the position of women in society. Definitions of deviance and women's inferior status are inextricably linked;

- (1) definitions of deviance impose restrictions on the rights of those labeled deviants and have historically been used to control minorities;
- (2) women are often defined as 'all-purpose' deviants;
- (3) the deviant status of women is functional to the present socioeconomic order; and
- (4) contradictory normative demands effectively keep women trapped in deviant (and therefore inferior) positions.

McDonough, 1988:13

The hegemony of patriarchal gender role expectations may also contribute to research findings of high violence rates among women;

Reports of female assaults may be subject to systematic gender relation biases in both the definition of violence as well as the recall of such actions by each partner. As such, women's aggressive behaviour is seen as a violation of expectations for prosocial behaviour by women will more likely be characterized as "violent" and consequently more likely be recalled and reported.
Morse, 1995:269

Other feminists have also pointed to the criminal justice system as a tool that serves to reinforce hegemonic gender role expectations in the patterns of it's treatment of female offenders (Faith, 1993; Chesney-Lind, 1997). Women who participate in 'unfeminine' behaviours are often targeted by formal social control agencies.

The concept of traditional (patriarchal) gender roles and deviance from those roles contributes significantly to the theory driving this research. Women using violence against their dating partners may be viewed as rejecting/deviating from their prescribed gender role as a form of rebellion against patriarchy (the very ideology that prescribes the role). This 'rebellion theory'²⁶ then is founded in the notion that female-to-male violence is a form of gender deviance.

Previous research linking traditional gender role beliefs and violent behaviour has dispensed contradictory findings. McKinney (1986) reported that women who held more liberal attitudes exhibited a greater likelihood of reporting that they sustained and/or perpetuated violence in a dating relationship. Burke et. al.(1989) indicated that both men and women who perceived themselves as more feminine on semantic differential scales

²⁶ A fuller discussion of this theory is presented later in this chapter.

were more likely to express violence; while Deal and Wampler (1986) revealed that scores on the Osmond-Martin Sex-Role Attitude Scale (1975) did not correlate with frequency of violent acts. Thompson (1990) found that gender-role orientation helped explain variations in courtship aggression; a more masculine and/or less feminine gender orientation and variations in relationship seriousness proved to be the two strongest predictors of both men's and women's involvement in courtship violence. Bookwala et. al. (1992) found that violent women were more likely to hold traditional attitudes regarding gender roles, but that finding could not be supported by DeKeseredy et. al. (1997) using the same data set being employed in the present research. The issue of gender role orientation needs to be further analyzed to address these contradictions.

As previously discussed, a great deal of research has been focussed on different motivations for use of violence across genders; men using violence to control their partners and women using violence within conflicts. If traditional gender roles support the patriarchal template for intimate gender relations within which men have power and control over women; then violence within those relationships must be related not just to the roles but to that struggle for power as well. A discussion of the concepts of power and control then will prove useful in the development of the current theory.

Power and Control

When addressing the notion of gender roles within relationships, the supplemental concept of power, and its distribution within the relationship based on those roles, is intrinsically connected. Gender roles provide the blueprint for all other power relationships.

The concept of power must be unambiguous when discussing its' control and use within courtship. Sociologically, a Weberian definition may be most germane;

The process whereby individuals or groups gain or maintain the capacity to impose their will upon others, to have their way recurrently, despite implicit or explicit opposition through invoking and/or threatening punishment, and offering and/or withholding rewards.....Power over others fosters the illusion of controlling ones' own destiny as well. By convincing the controlled, the controllers also convince themselves.
(Lipman-Blumen, 1984:6-8)

Foucault sees power as a dynamic entity that is evident at every level of societal relations. This relational view of power gives way to an ascending analysis of how power relationships at the micro level of society make possible larger dominations like class power and patriarchy. So the power distribution within a dating relationship may reflect, support and recreate patriarchy on the macro level.

....power is something that circulates, that is produced from one moment to the next.....Power is dispersed across complicated and heterogeneous social networks marked by ongoing struggle. Power is not something present at specific locations within those networks but instead is always at issue in ongoing attempts to (re)produce effective social alignments.
Rouse, 1994:109

This view supports the ideas discussed earlier in this chapter about private (familial) versus public (structural) patriarchy. Private patriarchy serves to reproduce and legitimize it's public counterpart.

This conceptualization of power as being fluid seems particularly germane when referring to the close connection of power and resistance. Resistance is not external to

power because power is not a system of domination with an inside and outside. Rather the dichotomy of power~resistance is continually being negotiated.

Within the dating relationship, normative gender roles within familial patriarchal ideology prescribe that the power lies with the man. To maintain that power and control the man may feel justified in using any means necessary, including violence. The woman may remain within an abusive relationship because of her adherence to gender norms; or, she may rebel against the power differential and use violence or other forms of gender deviance to resist the system of control and coercion and (re)gain some power of her own. The importance of this concept of power when examining intimate violence has been highlighted by other scholars.

West (1995) points out that relationships are not *overtly* concerned with the issue of power, but they are enacted within the relations of power. By incorporating the concept of ideology with power, West calls for qualitative research that attempts to understand hegemonic social forces by analyzing the central, effective, and dominant system of meanings and values; not in abstract form, but how they are organized and lived in intimate relationships (1995:135). Ideologies like patriarchy; colonialism; nationalism; and capitalism have inherent power that contextualizes all forms of violence.

Worcester (2002) argues that cores issues of power and control as well as the context of violence need to be central to discussions and policies regarding domestic violence and women's use of force. Violence by men or women occurs within a social, historical, and economic context in which most men and women have differing roles, opportunities and social power.

Coleman & Straus (1986) explored the relationship between family power structure; power norm consensus; and marital conflict. Couples with an egalitarian power structure had the least conflict. Although consensus about the legitimacy of either male-dominant or female-dominant power structures reduced the level of conflict; these skewed power relationships (where one partner held more power/control), were still much more likely to experience violence in conflicts than their egalitarian counterparts.

Control may be viewed as the behavioural dimension of power.

.....managing/regulating another's thoughts, feelings, actions. Getting another to do what you want them to do but they would otherwise not do. This is similar to the concept 'power'. However 'interpersonal control' is preferred over the term 'power' because it focuses on action and the active exercise of power. If successful, interpersonal control maintains power or dominance over another.

Stets & Pirog-Good, 1990:372

Some violence in intimate relationships then may be motivated not by the desire to express anger, frustration, or some other immediate emotion during a conflict, but more instrumentally motivated by the desire to control. The use of violence however may not indicate the experience of control, but rather the experience of loss of control. "Violence is a part of a system of domination, but it is at the same time a measure of its imperfection" (Connell, 1995:84). This conceptualization would help explain why battered women are most at risk when they are in the process of leaving an abusive relationship; their abusers turn to violence in an attempt to regain control.

As discussed previously, other dating and marital violence research supports the theory that men use violence as a means of control. Often 'control motivated' violence is distinguished from 'conflict instigated' violence as more accurately characterizing male-

to-female violence (while women's violence is often categorized as more likely to be a result of conflict) (Laner, 1989; Vivian & Langhinrichsen-Rohling, 1994; Cascardi & Vivian, 1995).

Johnson (1995) distinguishes between two forms of couple violence; common couple violence and patriarchal terrorism. Common couple violence is gender balanced and seen as a product of a violent prone culture. It is an intermittent response to occasional conflicts and is motivated by the need to control a specific situation. Patriarchal terrorism is characterized by more extreme and patterned forms of violence that is motivated by the need to be in control of the relationship. Patriarchal terrorism is based in the gendered nature of intimate relationships and is more often perpetrated by men. Johnson's conceptualization of common couple violence can be seen as *conflict* instigated violence; whereas his interpretation of patriarchal terrorism parallels the conceptualization of *control* instigated violence (albeit in an extreme and patterned form). The key to Johnson's hypotheses is the difference in the *motivation* of the aggressor. This supports once again the necessity to examine the context of the violence. It must be noted however that Johnson based his theory on behavioural outcomes rather than data on self reported motivations, so his typology lacks empirical support.

Stets and Pirog-Good (1990) found that women were just as likely to use control as men. By focusing on the interpersonal process in courtship aggression, Stets and Pirog-Good found that interpersonal control (the active exercise of power) was an important motivator of violence by both men and women (1990). Their focus on the behavioural dimension of power, rather than the need or desire to control, may also support the rebellion theory of women's use of violence. Female-to-male violence in

dating may represent an attempt to both reject the control of their partners, and regain some degree of control of their own. There has been no research directly testing whether women's use of violence is an act of mutiny against male control/domination both within the relationship, and in society as a whole. The closest to date was the work of Emery, Lloyd and Castleton (1989) who attempted to highlight the role of control in courtship violence. Specifically interested in why some women hit back, they concluded that the label of self defense was too simplistic as it failed to capture the context of the relationship within which the violence occurred.

The women identified control and domination as the reasons for their partners' use of violence. Their own use of violence was seen as containing components of resistance to his attempted domination, as well as frustration and anger.
Emery et al, 1989:15

This echoes Saunders (1988) assertions regarding the complexity of self-defense, as well as touching on the tenets of the 'rebellion theory' of the present research.

Each of the concepts discussed in the previous sections contribute to the development of a theoretical model for the present study. A synthesis of these concepts with a cognizance of the relevant literature provides a base from which to proceed.

Theoretical Synthesis

Women are subordinated by patriarchy at both the micro (private; familial) and macro (public; social) levels. At the micro level, patriarchy prescribes roles for women and men in individual relationships. Those roles are reinforced and legitimated at the macro level by other social and cultural institutions such as the capitalist economic

system; criminal justice system; religious traditions; educational institutions; birth family socialization; and popular culture. But it is in the arena of private patriarchy in intimate relationships where this domination is most vividly lived and reproduced.

Although traditionally familial patriarchy is often associated with family and/or marital relationships, courtship literature reveals that the same themes are played out in heterosexual dating rituals. These themes revolve around different sets of norms and expectations for men and women both within the relationship itself and within society and general. The prescribed roles for women specifically serve to support, reproduce, and legitimate patriarchal ideology; allowing it to remain hegemonic in nature. Challenges to those norms, or refusals to act out those roles, represent therefore, rebellion against that ideology.

The influence of patriarchal ideology within intimate relationships is visible through the disparate and gendered allocation of power and control. The importance of power and control within a relationship is integral to understanding not only familial patriarchy, but also the potential for use of physical aggression (by either partner) within the struggle for, and maintenance of, control.

The ritual of courtship is played out within the framework of patriarchy which dictates gender roles and provides the template for power and control within the relationship. Invariably then, women are thrust into the subordinate position within this ritual; a position that is legitimized not only within the individual relationship, but by structures found in wider society. The scripted behaviours/roles for the female dating partner are predetermined, with pressure for conformity coming from both her boyfriend

and other socio-cultural forces in her life, both of which play roles in the reenactment of patriarchal conventions.

Theoretical Framework – Rebellion Theory

Although women have the pressure of patriarchal domination pushing on them in many arenas, it is lived most explicitly at the site of marriage/courtship where normative behavioural expectations are transferred at an intimate interpersonal level. So it is in this arena that women may be most likely to push back against that domination. Perhaps she cannot change her subordinate position within other social or economic structures, but she can attempt to achieve agency within her intimate relationships by using aggression. This grasp for agency can be framed as rebellion against patriarchal domination; physical action on a interpersonal (micro) level that symbolically represents a broader (macro) rejection of patriarchal norms and expectations.

'Rebellion theory' asserts that women who are aggressive and/or violent towards their dating partners are participating in a form of gender deviance, a way of rebelling against the patriarchal norms imbedded in the dating relationship itself; in the entire ritual of heterosexual courtship; as well as in other socio-cultural institutions. Female-to-male violence is a behavioural rejection of hegemonic patriarchal ideology. The violence represents not only the rebellion against the prescribed norms but an attempt to resist the male control inherent in those norms, and (re)gain some power/control of her own.

Through a review of the relevant literature and an exploration of specific theoretical terms, an appropriate theoretical foundation for this research has been developed. The 'rebellion theory' proposed here attempts to explain women's use of

violence in dating by combining and applying a feminist informed evaluation of the research and discussion into the concepts of patriarchy, courtship, gender deviance, and power/control with a cognizance of previous research and theory testing.

The model on the following page (Figure 3.1) provides a visual representation of Rebellion Theory. Hegemonic patriarchal ideology is supported and reproduced through various socio-cultural structures. The institutions within these structures continually place expectations on the woman to fulfill the roles prescribed by the patriarchal ideology. The woman is continually interacting with these forces, she pushes back against this pressure and rebels from the expectations at the site of the hyper-patriarchal structure of dating/marital rituals (one of the main locations for the reproduction of familial patriarchal ideology). This rebellion takes the form of violence within dating or marriage.

FIGURE 3.1: Model of Rebellion Theory

Hypotheses

The expressed goal of this research is to empirically test a theory of women's use of violence that is grounded in feminist informed theory specifically tied to the concept of patriarchy. To that end, the following hypotheses have been developed in an attempt to find empirical support for the Rebellion Theory:

(1) Women who engage in violence are more likely to reject the ideology of familial patriarchy.

This hypothesis is the crux of 'rebellion theory'. A test of the relationship between rejection of patriarchal ideology and use of violence to allow an inference that the violence is a form of rebellion against patriarchy. This expected relationship is a disposition-response association.

A disposition is not a state or condition, rather a tendency to respond in a certain way under designated circumstance; it is types of attitudes; beliefs; reflexes; habits; values; tendencies or powers that may give rise to behaviour but are dependent on circumstances for its' activation.
Rosenberg, 1968

This hypothesis contends that women who use violence have a set of attitudes/beliefs that do not support familial patriarchy and therefore they may use violence within a structure that reinforces the norms of that ideology (ie dating).

(2) Women who have been previously victimized will be more likely to both engage in violent behaviours and reject familial patriarchal ideology.

This hypothesis is generated from both the results of previous studies and the theory driving this research. Previous victimization has been found to be a strong predictor of women's use of violence in dating and marital relationships. It is hypothesized that the

introduction of previous victimization will strengthen the relationship between use of violence and rejection of patriarchy because victimization effects each of the variables on their own. Further, previous victimization represents an explicit interpersonal experience with familial patriarchal domination and may be viewed therefore as a contributing factor in a woman's rebellion.

(3) Women who self-report 'initiative' violence will be more likely to reject familial patriarchal ideology than those who report 'self-defense' and 'retaliatory' violence.

'Initiative' or 'first strike' violence is the most under examined form of female-to-male violence. It also lends itself most readily to the conservative backlash theories of 'mutual combat' and the 'battered husband syndrome'. One of the stated goals of this research is to reclaim this kind of data into a feminist informed examination. It is important therefore to test the rebellion theory specifically with the most controversial variable; women's initiative violence. It is also important to look specifically at initiative violence with this theoretical model because these are the behaviours that cannot be explained away by immediate conflicts within the current dating relationship. The violence may have emerged therefore from something else. From the perspective of the rebellion theory, the violence was a response to a ritual imbedded in familial patriarchy (dating) and emerged from a disposition that rejects the very tenets of that ideology.

In what follows, I utilize data from the Canadian National Survey on violence in college and university dating relationships to test the veracity of these hypotheses.

CHAPTER IV

METHODOLOGY

With a view to testing the Rebellion Theory with a relevant data set, various data sources were considered (General Social Survey, National Victimization Survey) as well as the possibility of an original research project. Because one of the stated goals of the study was to answer the family violence claims of gender symmetry that were based on large scale quantitative surveys, it seemed wise to use similar data (in substance and size) to test the current theory. Original research, in the absence of large scale funding, therefore became logistically impossible.

With the decision to move forward with secondary analysis, an exploration for data with relevant information was performed. What was needed was a data set that had information about women's self reported use of violence in dating as well as their disclosures regarding adherence to familial patriarchal norms. The only existing data set fulfilling these requirements was the Canadian National Survey of dating violence in university and college. This survey had already been culled for information on men's use of violence (See Table 2.1) as well as some exploratory examination of predictors of women's use of violence (DeKeseredy et al, 1997). This analysis would be the first however to use the data to test Rebellion Theory. To achieve that end, some altering of the data set was required. What follows is a cursory description of the original study and a presentation of the operational definitions used, followed by an in-depth explanation of the data manipulation performed in preparation for the current study.

The Original Study

Purposes of the Study

DeKeseredy and Kelly's (1992) study is the first of its kind in Canada to provide reliable national survey data and accurate information regarding the extent of violence and victimization dating relationships. The Canadian National Survey (CNS) was explicitly designed to:

- Overcome or minimize the limitations of previous North American surveys on woman abuse in dating;
 - Provide accurate estimates of the extent of male-to-female victimization in Canadian elementary school, high school, and university/college dating;
 - Compare Canadian national survey data with those generated by U.S. surveys;
 - Determine the key risk factors associated with woman abuse in Canadian dating;
 - Identify the contexts, meanings, and motives of female-to-male violence in Canadian postsecondary school courtship; and
 - Test several theories of woman abuse in dating.
- DeKeseredy & Schwartz, 1998:15

The Sample

A total of 1835 women and 1307 men from 48 post-secondary institutions across Canada participated in the study.²⁷ In the autumn of 1992 a research team administered questionnaires in 95 undergraduate classes in schools from the Maritime Provinces to British Columbia. Both French and English versions were administered. Response rates were very high, with less than 1% of prospective participants refusing to take part. The

²⁷ For a more detailed discussion of the sample distribution and sampling techniques employed see DeKeseredy & Kelly, 1992.

research was sponsored by a grant from Health and Welfare Canada's Family Violence Prevention Division.

The sample being used for this project consists of 1854 women who have a median age of 20 years. Most are 1st or 2nd year students who identified themselves as either English-Canadian or French-Canadian. The majority (78%) have never been married. All respondents were carefully and repeatedly warned that all questions in the survey referred only to events that took place in heterosexual dating (nonmarital) relationships. A sizable portion of the sample (42.2%) are enrolled in arts programs. The table on the following page (4.1) highlights several demographic and educational characteristics of the sample.

Under the research protocol, students in the selected classes were asked by a research team member to participate in a study on problems in male-female dating relationships. They were also told that participation was completely voluntary and anonymous and that all information they provided would be kept strictly confidential. Students were also told that they did not have to answer any question they did not want to and that they could stop filling out the questionnaire at any time.

Debriefing discussed the objectives of the survey, existing information on the frequency and severity of woman abuse in dating, and the role peers play in perpetuating this type of intimate female victimization. Lists of local (on and off campus) support services for survivors and offenders were distributed. Participants were encouraged to ask the research team questions and to discuss the survey.

TABLE 4.1: Demographic and Educational Characteristics of the Sample

DEMOGRAPHIC	
Age (median)	20
Ethnicity:	Percent
- Central American	.1
- Scandinavian	1.0
- French Canadian	22.4
- English Canadian	47.9
- British ^a	5.5
- West European ^b	3.2
- East European ^c	3.2
- South European ^d	5.5
- Far Eastern ^e	5.3
- African ^f	1.6
- Caribbean	1.6
- Middle Eastern ^g	1.4
- Latin American	.3
- Aboriginal	1.8
- Black	.1
- Jewish	.1
- Other	.7
Refugee	.7
Marital Status:	
- Never Married	77.9
- Married	7.6
- Living with an Intimate Heterosexual partner	10.5
- Separated	1.8
- Divorced	1.9
- Widowed	.3
EDUCATIONAL	
Year of Study:	
- First	42.4
- Second	23.8
- Third	19.6
- Fourth	10.2
- Other	4.0
Major:	
- Arts	42.2
- Education	11.2
- Fine Arts	2.0
- Agriculture	2.9
- Engineering	.7

- Health	2.8
- Sciences	9.0
- Business	12.5
- Law	3.0
- Trades	5.8
- Service Occupation	
- Technology Program	
- Don't Know	1.7

a. Wales, Scotland, N. Ireland, England; b. France Germany, Holland etc.; c. Russia, Poland Hungary, Baltic States, etc.; d. Italy, Spain, Portugal, Greece, etc.; e. Japan, China, India, Hong Kong, etc.; f. North, Central or South; g. Israel, Lebanon, Iraq, etc.

Operational Definitions

The key concepts in this research are operationally defined through the survey instrument as follows:

(1) Dating

Dating was formulated by the researchers only as far as to limit it to heterosexual encounters. Since some relationships are more casual and others more serious, dating was operationalized to include all of those situations, in addition to engagement and cohabitation. Casual dating was operationalized as “a good time with no future commitment or obligation on the part of you and your dating partner”; serious dating as “involving a great deal of commitment and intimacy”; cohabitation as whether one had “moved in with or lived regularly with a boyfriend”; and finally, engagement was operationalized as whether one had “been engaged to a boyfriend”.²⁸ None of these categories are mutually exclusive since the respondents were asked about their dating activities as a whole over the 12 month period before the study. It is possible that one respondent could have in fact engaged in all four forms of dating in that period.

²⁸ See questions 2, 3, 4, and 5 in the female questionnaire (Appendix A)

(2) Violence/Abuse

As previously mentioned, two different questionnaires were presented to the participants, one for women, and one for men. The abuse questions were not the same for both. Female respondents were asked about details of intentional physical, sexual and/or psychological assaults experienced. They were asked to self-report their own physical assaultive behaviours only. The measures employed in these questions included modified versions of the CTS (Straus, 1979) and the Sexual Experiences Survey (SES) (Koss et al, 1987).²⁹

(3) Context, Meaning and Motives

Also discussed previously this research identifies closely with other feminist informed studies attempting to comprehend the *nature* of female to male violence. Therefore the context, meanings and motives data will be assessed through the responses to questions regarding how the female perpetrator viewed the motivation behind her behaviour (self-defense, retaliatory, initiative). Each respondent who self-reported use of violence was asked to estimate the percentage of times they were;

....primarily motivated by acting in self-defense,
that is protecting yourself from immediate physical harm

....trying to fight back in a situation where you
were not the first to use these or similar tactics

²⁹ See questions 16, 17, and 19 in the female questionnaire (Appendix A)

....used these actions on your boyfriends or dates
before they actually attacked you or threatened
to attack you³⁰

(4) Familial Patriarchal Ideology

In the original study, patriarchal ideology was defined as;

....a discourse which supports the abuse of women
who violate the ideals of male power and control
over women in intimate relationships.... key
elements of this ideology are obedience, respect,
loyalty, dependence, sexual access, and sexual
fidelity.

DeKeseredy & Kelly, 1993:12-13

This ideology was operationalized by respondents' degree of agreement or disagreement with a number of statements. These statements were described as beliefs and attitudes that addressed the key elements of the ideology in everyday situational terms.

There were two survey questions addressing respondents degree of adherence to or rejection of patriarchal ideology (both developed by Smith, 1990). One of these questions dealt with the women's *beliefs* and asked them their degree of agreement with statements like:

A man has the right to decide whether or not his
wife/partner should go out in the evening with her friends.

A man has the right to have sex with his
wife/partner when he wants, even though she
may not want to.³¹

³⁰ See question 19 in the female questionnaire (Appendix A)

³¹ See question 25 in the female questionnaire (Appendix A - page 16)

These questions are attempting to measure the respondents' beliefs in an ideology that legitimizes male power and authority over women in a marriage (or marriage-like arrangement).

The second question dealing with patriarchal ideology assesses the women's attitudes or norms supportive of violence against wives who violate or are perceived as violating the ideals of familial patriarchy (obedience, respect, loyalty, dependence, sexual access, sexual fidelity). This question asks respondents if they would approve of a man slapping his dating partner or girlfriend for a variety of different transgressions;

....she won't do what he tells her to do
she insults him in public
she comes home drunk
she won't have sex with him ³²

Secondary Analysis

Recoding the Data

Obviously the goals of the original research are not totally analogous with this research project. As a result the data set is not functional as is. Although it is 'clean', there remains some work (computing and recoding of variables) to be completed for the purposes of obtaining data for testing the hypotheses at hand.³³

(1) Patriarchy

The first step is to look at the data investigating the respondent's views on

³² See question 26 in the female questionnaire (Appendix A)

³³ See Appendix B for a chart outlining descriptions of all variables and how they were transformed

patriarchal ideology. As discussed in the previous section, this is found in questions 25 (beliefs) and 26 (attitudes). The answers to these questions were appropriately recoded to produce summative scaled variables (see Table 4.4), and all 'don't know' answers were recoded as missing. Traditionally, 'don't knows' are placed in the middle of a summative scale with the assumption that they represent a similar response to 'No Opinion'.

However that assumption may be difficult to defend given the nature of the questions at hand. With issues as sensitive as the ones being addressed here, dealing with personal ideology and beliefs, an answer of 'don't know' does not necessarily mean the respondent has no opinion. Perhaps she is not sure of her opinion, or unwilling to reveal it in this arena. The presumption that she has no opinion requires a conjecture that does not align itself with the goals of this research. Therefore a more formal statistical guideline was followed and the 'don't knows' were excluded from the inquiry (for both questions 25 and 26). Similar decisions have been made within public opinion survey research (Gilljam and Granberg, 1993).

In order to assess the stability of the items, a factor analysis with a varimax rotation was performed on both questions 25 and 26. This analysis recommended that questions 25(f) and (h) not be included in the research. A reliability analysis supported this decision as well. The alpha of the data proved to be higher when questions (f) and (h) were deleted. Similar examination of question 26 suggested the deletion of 26(g) to better serve the inquiry.

Summative scales were developed for both questions 25 and 26, with higher scores indicating a greater rejection of patriarchy. Both the results of the factor analyses,

and the theoretical engines of the original research³⁴ indicated that the two questions dealt with different factors/streams within the issue of patriarchy. As previously discussed, question 25 represents an inquiry into the respondent's *beliefs* regarding familial patriarchal ideology (these were labelled 'Rejection of Patriarchy1'), while question 26 measures the respondent's *attitudes* regarding approval of the use of dating violence by men as a response to a contravention of patriarchal norms ('Reject of Patriarchy2'). Specifically the approval of a "man slapping his dating partner or girlfriend".

The factor analysis of question 26 further indicated that some of the statements were related to each other³⁵. These relations divided the questions within 26 into two distinct streams. These two factors emerged:

- (i) 'refusal' - she won't do what he tells her to,
 - she won't have sex with him, and
- (ii) 'transgression' - she insults him when they are home alone,
 - she insults him in public,
 - she comes home drunk, and
 - he learns she is dating another man.

These two factors may become relevant later in the data analysis, after an initial look at generalities may lead to a re-examination and dissection of these original variables. In anticipation of that future relevance, sub-variables of Rejection of Patriarchy2 were created ('Rejection of Patriarchy2 Refusal' and 'Rejection of Patriarchy2 Transgression').

³⁴ see Smith, 1990 and DeKeseredy & Kelly 1993

³⁵ The factor analysis was completed with Kaiser's varimax rotation with the eigenvalues being greater than one. The 'refusal' factor explained 24.2% of the variance and the 'transgression' factor explained 11.7

An examination of the results of the summative frequency scales of Rejection of Patriarchy1 and Rejection of Patriarchy2 reveals that the data is heavily skewed towards rejection of patriarchal ideology. As indicated in Table 4.2, within the Reject1 variable less than one quarter of the respondent's received a score between 8 and 21, with the remaining seventy-five percent scoring in the higher range of 22 to 24.

TABLE 4.2: Frequency Scale of Rejection of Patriarchy1 (beliefs)

SCORE	FREQUENCY	PERCENT
10	1	.0
14	3	.2
15	3	.2
16	7	.4
17	11	.6
18	36	1.9
19	41	2.2
20	67	3.6
21	106	5.7
22	194	10.4
23	315	17.0
24	987	53.2
Total	1771	95.5
Missing	50	4.5
	1854	100.0

Mean = 22.92; Std. Deviation = 1.700

The summative frequency results obtained in Rejection of Patriarchy2 (attitudes) were even more distinct, with over 70% of the responses landing in the highest score of 18. This scale is presented in Table 4.3.

TABLE 4.3: Frequency Scale of Rejection of Patriarchy2 (attitudes)

SCORE	FREQUENCY	PERCENT
6	2	.1
7	2	.1
8	2	.1
9	2	.1
10	5	.3
11	8	.4
12	8	.5
13	23	1.2
14	21	1.1
15	42	2.3
16	74	4.0
17	244	13.2
18	1333	71.9
Total	1766	95.2
Missing	89	4.8
	1854	100.0

Mean = 17.47; Std. Deviation = 1.326

These results indicate that there is no scale or continuum of 'adherence to rejection of' patriarchal ideology. Rather, there is a dichotomous split between those who reject patriarchy and those who do not.

This one-sided weighting of the data is of some concern. It serves to bring into question the ability of this data set to address the hypotheses set forward in the current research project. If such a large majority of the respondents clearly reject patriarchy; then how can any association found between rejection and use of violence be valid?

Without a corresponding inverse association between adherence to patriarchy and use of violence, it may prove difficult to defend the validity of the original association. It can be argued that with such a large proportion of the sample rejecting the ideology, then any relationship between that rejection and use of violence is a function of the proportion rather than any causal connection.

This dilemma has been faced by researchers before. Malamuth and Check (1980) attempted to develop a 'propensity to rape' scale. Instead, they found that their

respondents fit into two categories, those who might conceivably rape; and those who would not. What we are left with is essentially, like Malamuth and Check, two categories of respondents; those who reject patriarchy and those who do not. Because the proposed data analysis for the research included crosstabular analysis³⁶, further recoding of the rejection of patriarchy variables was required. Two or three set ordinal data is necessary for crosstabular analysis. It was decided that those respondents scoring highest on either summative scale (Rejection of Patriarchy1 or Rejection of Patriarchy2) could be categorized as rejecting patriarchy, while responses with any other lower value could be put into an adherence category. These new two set variables were labelled 'Rejection of Patriarchy1 Grouped' and 'Rejection of Patriarchy2 Grouped'. Table 4.4 on the following page displays all of the patriarchy recoding/transforming procedures.

³⁶ These analyses are presented in the next chapter

TABLE 4.4: Variable Recodes and Transformations - Patriarchy

ORIGINAL VARIABLE(S)	METHOD OF TRANSFORMATION	NEW VARIABLE	DESCRIPTION
Q25a-e and g	Addition of q25a-e and g after recode (a and b: 1=4; 2=3; 3=2; 4=1) (all: 5=missing)	Rejection of Patriarchy1	Scale of rejection of/adherence to familial patriarchal beliefs [↓#’s=adherence; ↑#’s=rejection]
Q26a-f	Addition of q26a-f after recode (4=missing)	Rejection of Patriarchy2	Scale of attitudes supporting/denouncing use of violence to uphold tenets of familial patriarchy [↓#’s=support; ↑#’s=denounce]
Q26a and f	Addition of q26a+f after recode (4=missing)	Rejection of Patriarchy2 Refusal	Refusal subgroup of rejection of patriarchy2 indicated from factor analysis [↓#’s=adherence; ↑#’s=rejection]
Q26b-e	Addition of q26b-e after recode (4=missing)	Rejection of Patriarchy2 Transgression	Transgression subgroup of rejection of patriarchy2 indicated from factor analysis [same as above]
Rejection of Patriarchy1	Recode reject1 (0-23=1; 24=2)	Rejection of Patriarchy1 Grouped	Ordinal 2 set grouping of adherence [1] and rejection [2] of familial patriarchal beliefs
Rejection of Patriarchy2	Recode reject2 (8-20=1; 21=2)	Rejection of Patriarchy2 Grouped	Ordinal 2 set grouping [Adherence=1; Rejection=2]
Rejection of Patriarchy2 Refusal	Recode of rej2ref (2-5=1; 6=2)	Rejection of Patriarchy2 Refusal Grouped	Ordinal 2 set grouping of reject2 subgroup refusal [adherence=1; rejection=2]

(2) Violence

Female-to male violence was calculated in the original study by the responses to question 19. This question represents a condensed version of the Conflict Tactics Scale, addressing physical conflict only (as discussed previously, female respondents were not asked about their commission of psychological abuse). Some recoding of these variables was completed to obtain scores more representative of the

groupings. A summative variable computed from the addition of these recoded groups was then created and named 'Violence' (See Table 4.6 for descriptions of these recoding procedures).

An examination of the distribution of the violence scale (displayed in Table 4.5) presents a heavily weighted division, with over half of the responses representing no violence. The remainder of the dispersion is also weighted at the low end, with another 30% scoring between 1 and 6. Moving up from there, the distribution is stretched very thin along the remaining scale. These results echo those found by other researchers (Sanders, 1986; Straus, 1990; Follingstad et al, 1991; Bookwala et al, 1992; Shook et al, 2000).

TABLE 4.5: Frequency Scale – Use of Violence

Score	Frequency	Percent
Valid 0	932	50.3
1	143	7.7
2	118	6.4
3	55	3.0
4	46	2.5
5	17	.9
6	16	.8
7	6	.3
8	43	2.3
9	25	1.4
10	33	1.8
11	24	1.3
12	7	.4
13	5	.3
14	7	.4
15	1	.1
16	24	1.3
17	9	.5
18	13	.7
19	9	.5
20	7	.4
21	4	.2
22	2	.1
24	9	.5

25	5	.3
26	9	.5
27	9	.5
28	2	.1
29	4	.2
31	2	.1
32	15	.8
33	6	.3
34	9	.5
35	2	.1
37	0	.0
40	8	.4
41	2	.1
42	2	.1
44	2	.1
48	3	.1
56	5	.3
58	2	.1
60	1	.1
64	2	.1
65	3	.2
66	3	.2
72	0	.0
76	1	.0
80	1	.0
81	1	.0
88	1	.0
104	2	.1
Total	1655	89.2
Missing	200	10.8
Total	1854	100.0

In this case there are two ways to divide up the data for ease of use. Similar to the rejection of patriarchy data, these responses could be simply split along numerical score lines. That is, there would be the one group who did not use violence at all, and the other group who did. This is a good starting point and is a technique used by most researchers (DeKeseredy et al, 1997; Straus & Ramirez, 2003). This new grouped use of violence variable was labelled ‘Use of Violence Grouped’,

Further analysis relevant to the goals of this research will require specific division of the violence variable. The Conflict Tactics Scale (Straus, 1979) which provided the design for question 19, divides the violent behaviours along severity lines. The first, least severe group is psychological conflict (i.e.: insulting or swearing at him; did or said something to spite him; threatened to hit or throw something at him. The female questionnaire does not ask the respondents about personal commission of this group of behaviours. Rather, it starts with the second, mid-range, type of behaviours.

These include:

- threw something at him;
- pushed, grabbed or shoved him;
- slapped him.

After quizzing respondents regarding their motivations behind these behaviours (self-defense; retaliatory; initiative), the survey then asks about more severe violence. These include:

- kicked, bit or hit him with your fist;
- hit or tried to hit him with something;
- beat him up;
- choked him;
- threatened him with a knife or gun;
- used a knife or gun on him.

Once again, respondents are then asked about their motivation for these assaults.

For the purpose of further division of the violence data, a theoretical case can be made for dividing those who self reported violent behaviours into two sub-groups; those who used only less severe violence and those who used more severe. Division of the behaviours along these lines is supported not only by the design of the original Conflict Tactics Scale (Straus, 1979), but also the framework set-up of the survey instrument.

Both summative scale and ordinal grouped variables were created for these two sub-groups. Table 4.6 presents a summary of all of the violence variable recodes and transformations.

TABLE 4.6: Variable Recodes and Transformations - Violence

ORIGINAL VARIABLE(S)	METHOD OF TRANSFORMATION	NEW VARIABLE	DESCRIPTION
Q19a-l	Addition of q19a-l after recode (1=1; 2=2; 3=4; 4=8; 5=16; 6=0)	Use of Violence	Scale of self reported use of violence [↑#’s=↑violence]
Use of Violence	Recode violence (0=1; 1-104=2)	Use of Violence Grouped	Ordinal 2 set grouping [No violence=1; Violence=2]
Q19a-c	Addition of q19a-c after recode (1=1; 2=2; 3=4; 4=8; 5=16; 6=0)	Use of Minor Violence	Scale of self reported use of minor violence [↑#’s=↑minor violence]
Q19d-l	Addition of q19d-l after recode (same as above)	Use of Severe Violence	Scale of self reported use of severe violence [↑#’s=↑severe violence]
Use of Minor Violence	Recode minor violence (0=1; 1-48=2)	Use of Minor Violence Grouped	Ordinal 2 set grouping [No minor violence=1; Minor violence=2]
Use of Severe Violence	Recode severe violence (0=1; 1-56=2)	Use of Severe Violence Grouped	Ordinal 2 set grouping [No severe violence=1; Severe violence=2]

(3) Motive

Along with the self-reports of use of violence, female respondents were asked questions about the motives behind that violent behaviour. They were given three specific contextual possibilities for their use of violence:

(a) Self-Defense

"....in doing these actions you were primarily motivated by acting in self defence, that is protecting yourself from immediate physical harm"

(b) Retaliatory

"....in doing these actions you were trying to fight back in a situation where you were not the first to use these or similar tactics"

(c) Initiative

"....you used these actions on your boyfriends or dates before they actually attacked you or threatened to attack you"

Respondents were asked to estimate the frequency in which each (if any) of these descriptions described the motive of their violent behaviour. They were permitted to choose the frequency from a scale of 0-100%. Obviously, those respondents who did not self report any violence were directed to skip the contextual questions altogether. The motive questions were asked twice, once for each type of violence (minor and severe). As well as the 100 point scale of frequency of motive, these responses were recoded into four categories: 0%=never; 1-35%=sometimes; 36-75%=often; 76-100%=regularly. This revised scale was used for each motive question as well as for each type of violence, resulting in six new 4-group variables:

Minor violence – self-defense motive
 Minor violence - retaliatory motive
 Minor violence - initiative motive

Severe violence - self defence motive
 Severe violence - retaliatory motive
 Severe violence - initiative motive

The details of all the transformations for motive variables is presented in Table 4.7.

TABLE 4.7 Variable Recodes and Transformation - Motives

ORIGINAL VARIABLE(S)	METHOD OF TRANSFORMATION	NEW VARIABLE	DESCRIPTION
Q19_abc1	Relabel q19_abc1	Minor Violence Self-Defense Motive Scale	Scale of frequency of self defense motive for use of minor violence (%'s) [↑#'s=↑ self defense motive]
Minor Violence Self-Defense Motive Scale	Recode q19_abc1 (0=1; 1-35=2; 36-75=3; 76-100=4)	Minor Violence Self-Defense Motive Grouped	Ordinal 4 set grouping for frequency of self defense motive for use of minor violence [Never=1; sometimes=2; often=3; regularly=4]
Q19_abc2	Relabel q19_abc2	Minor Violence Retaliatory Motive Scale	Scale of frequency of retaliatory motive for use of minor violence (%'s) [↑#'s=↑ retaliatory motive]
Minor Violence Retaliatory Motive Scale	Recode q19_abc2 (0=1; 1-35=2; 36-75=3; 76-100=4)	Minor Violence Retaliatory Motive Grouped	Ordinal 4 set grouping for frequency of retaliatory motive for use of minor violence [Never=1; sometimes=2; often=3; regularly=4]
Q19_abc3	Relabel q19_abc3	Minor Violence Initiative Motive Scale	Frequency scale of initiative motive for use of minor violence (%'s) [↑#'s=↑ initiative motive]
Minor Violence Initiative Motive Scale	Recode q19_abc3 (0=1; 1-35=2; 36-75=3; 76-100=4)	Minor Violence Initiative Motive Grouped	Ordinal 4 set grouping for frequency of initiative motive for use of minor violence [Never=1; sometimes=2; often=3; regularly=4]

ORIGINAL VARIABLE(S)	METHOD OF TRANSFORMATION	NEW VARIABLE	DESCRIPTION
Q19_di1	Relabel q19_di1	Severe Violence Self-Defense Motive Scale	Frequency scale of self defense motive for use of severe violence (%'s) [↑#'s=↑ self defense motive]
Severe Violence Self-Defense Motive Scale	Recode q19_di1 (0=1; 1-35=2; 36-75=3; 76-100=4)	Severe Violence Self-Defense Motive Grouped	Ordinal 4 set grouping for frequency of self defense motive for use of severe violence [Never=1; sometimes=2; often=3; regularly=4]
Q19_di2	Relabel q19d-i2	Severe Violence Retaliatory Motive Scale	Frequency scale of retaliatory motive for use of severe violence (%'s) [↑#'s=↑ self defense motive]
Severe Violence Retaliatory Motive Scale	Recode q19_di2 (0=1; 1-35=2; 36-75=3; 76-100=4)	Severe Violence Retaliatory Motive Grouped	Ordinal 4 set grouping for frequency of retaliatory motive for use of severe violence [Never=1; sometimes=2; often=3; regularly=4]
Q19_di3	Relabel q19_di3	Severe Violence Initiative Motive Scale	Frequency scale of initiative motive for use of severe violence (%'s) [↑#'s=↑ self defense motive]
Severe Violence Initiative Motive Scale	Recode q19_di3 (0=1; 1-35=2; 36-75=3; 76-100=4)	Severe Violence Initiative Motive Grouped	Ordinal 4 set grouping for frequency of initiative motive for use of severe violence [Never=1; sometimes=2; often=3; regularly=4]

(4) Victimization

Also included in the survey were a series of questions regarding previous victimization. Respondents were asked about their experiences as victims of violence in their previous dating relationships, in the last 12 months and since leaving high school. Once again the Conflict Tactics Scale was used as a template for possible victimization. In this case however all three types of violence were included; minor; severe; and

psychological. Respondents were asked whether their dating partner and/or boyfriend had ever:

- (a) insulted or swore at you;
- (b) put you down in front of friends or family;
- (c) accused you of having affairs or flirting with other men;
- (d) did or said something to spite you;
- (e) threatened to hit or throw something at you;
- (f) threw, smashed or kicked something;
- (g) threw something at you;
- (h) pushed, grabbed or shoved you;
- (i) slapped you;
- (j) kicked, bit, or hit you with his fist;
- (k) hit or tried to hit you with something;
- (l) beat you up;
- (m) choked you;
- (n) threatened you with a knife or a gun;
- (o) used a knife or gun on you.

Modified from Straus (1979)

Here we see the items that were omitted from the questions regarding women's own use of violence (a)-(f). These behaviours are often referred to as psychological violence.

Some recoding of the variables was performed to create appropriate grouping representations and values for the summative scales (See Table 4.8). Summative variables computed from the addition of these recoded groups were then created and named 'Victimization since High School' and 'Victimization in the last 12 months'. Those variables were then further grouped into ordinal two set variables representing victimization/no victimization ('Victimization since High School Grouped' and 'Victimization in last 12 Months Grouped').

Respondents were also questioned more specifically about sexual abuse at the hands of their boyfriends and/or dating partners. Question 16 in the original survey is adapted from the Sexual Experiences Survey (Koss, 1987) and deals with victims

submitting to sex play, attempted intercourse and sexual intercourse as a result of:

- continual arguments and pressure;
- a man's position of authority;
- threats and/or use of physical force;
- use of alcohol and/or drugs.

The responses to these questions were recoded to create summative scales ('Sexual Victimization Since High School' and 'Sexual Victimization in the Last 12 Months'), and as with the psychological/physical victimization variables (procured through the Conflict Tactics Scale), these summative scales were grouped into ordinal two set variables representing sexual abuse/no sexual abuse ('Sexual Victimization Since High School Grouped' and 'Sexual Victimization in Last 12 Months Grouped').

The original survey also questioned respondents about physical and sexual victimization they may have experienced in high school and elementary school dating relationships. The full Conflict Tactics Scale and Sexual Experiences Survey were not employed in this instance. Rather the women were asked whether dating partners in these time periods had ever;

- threatened to use physical force to make you engage in sexual activities;
- used physical force to make you engage in sexual activities;
- intentionally emotionally hurt you (ie, insult, say something to spite you);
- intentionally physically hurt you.

These responses were also recoded to produce summative scales.

A summary of the victimization variables created is presented in Table 4.8 on the following page.

TABLE 4.8: Variable Recodes and Transformation - Victimization

ORIGINAL VARIABLE(S)	METHOD OF TRANSFORMATION	NEW VARIABLE	DESCRIPTION
Q17a-o2	Addition of q17a-o2 after recode (1=1; 2=2; 3=4; 4=8; 5=16; 6=0)	Victimization Since High School	Scale of victimization in dating relationships since high school [↑#’s=↑victimization]
Victimization Since High School	Recode victimhs (0=1; 1-240=2)	Victimization Since High School Grouped	Ordinal 2 set grouping of victimization since high school [no abuse=1; abuse=2]
Q17a-o1	Addition of q17a-o1 after recode (1=1; 2=2; 3=4; 4=8; 5=16; 6=0)	Victimization in Last 12 Months	Scale of victimization in dating relationships in last 12 months [↑#’s=↑victimization]
Victimization in Last 12 Months	Recode victim12 (0=1; 1-210=2)	Victimization in Last 12 Months Grouped	Ordinal 2 set grouping of victimization in last 12 months [no abuse=1; abuse=2]
Q16a-j2	Addition of q16a-j2 after recode (1=1; 2=0)	Sexual Victimization Since High School	Scale of sexual victimization since high school [↑#’s=↑sexual victimization]
Sexual Victimization Since High School	Recode sexvichs (0=1; 1-10=2)	Sexual Victimization Since High School Grouped	Ordinal 2 set grouping of sexual victimization since high school [no sexual abuse=1; sexual abuse=2]
Q16a-j1	Addition of q16a-j1 after recode (1=1; 2=0)	Sexual Victimization in Last 12 Months	Scale of sexual victimization in dating relationships in last 12 months [↑#’s=↑sexual victimization]
Sexual Victimization in Last 12 Months	Recode sexvic12 (0=1; 1-10=2)	Sexual Victimization in Last 12 Months Grouped	Ordinal 2 set grouping of sexual victimization in last 12 months [no sexual abuse=1; sexual abuse=2]
Q20b-e	Addition of q20b-e after recode (1=1; 2=0)	Victimization during High School	Scale of victimization during high school [↑#’s=↑victimization]
Q21b-e	Addition of q21b-e after recode (1=1; 2=0)	Victimization during Elementary School	Scale of victimization during elementary school [↑#’s=↑victimization]

(5) Use of Alcohol

A review of the literature highlights the recurrent employment of a use of alcohol variable in research regarding violence in dating relationships³⁷. In anticipation of using alcohol use as a controlling variable, question 22c (in which respondents were asked about how often they drank with their boyfriends and/or dating partners) was transformed to produce a summative scale of alcohol consumption with a dating partner ('Alcohol Use With Partner'). Table 4.9 displays the process of creating new variables from these responses.

TABLE 4.9: Variable Recodes and Transformation – Alcohol

ORIGINAL VARIABLE(S)	METHOD OF TRANSFORMATION	NEW VARIABLE	DESCRIPTION
Q22c	Addition of q22c after recode (1=0; 2=2; 3=4; 4=6; 5=8)	Alcohol Use With Partner	Scale of consumption of alcohol with dating partner [↑#’s=↑use of alcohol]
Alcohol Use With Partner	Recode alcwpart (0=1; >0=2)	Alcohol Use With Partner Grouped	Ordinal 2 set grouping of alcohol use with dating partner (no alcohol use=1; alcohol use=2)

³⁷ Labne & Gwartney-Gibbs, 1985; Makepeace, 1986; Billingham & Sack, 1986; Deal & Wampler, 1986; Gwartney-Gibbs et al, 1987; Arias et al, 1987; Rouse et al, 1988; Flynn, 1990; Follingstad et al, 1991; Barnes et al, 1991; Bird et al, 1991; Gryl et al, 1991; Bergman, 1992; Bookwala et al, 1992; DeMaris, 1992; Bethke et al, 1993; DeWeerth & Kalma, 1995; DeKeseredy et al, 1997; Molitor & Tolman, 1998; Follingstad et al, 1999; Giordano et al, 1999; Jackson, 1999; James et al, 2000; Shook et al, 2000.

(6) Education Level

As previously stated, the original survey was administered to students in university and college classes producing little diversity within the sample. It can be hypothesized however that respondents further along in their post-secondary career may have been exposed to a wider range of different ideologies. This exposure may effect their beliefs and values, including their adherence to or rejection of familial patriarchy. This variable may indeed become germane to the research at hand.

(7) Age

The range of age of respondents (17-69) was fairly wide considering the population being sampled. The mean age was 22.11, but the standard deviation was 5.561 which indicates the clustering around the median is not that concentrated. It was decided therefore that the sample represented enough of a span of ages to use this variable in the analysis. As with the education level variable it could be hypothesized that the older a woman gets the more educated and perhaps liberated she becomes and therefore may be more likely to reject patriarchal norms. Unfortunately another support for this argument is that the older a woman gets the more likely she will have been victimized by an intimate partner, which may also contribute to a rejection of patriarchy. No transformation of this variable was required.

With the variable transformation complete we now have various relevant data in both scaled and categorical form that will enable both crosstabular and regression analysis. The results of these analyses are presented in the following chapter.

CHAPTER V

FINDINGS

Testing the Hypotheses

The three theoretical hypotheses that were formulated to test the Rebellion Theory³⁸ all deal with expected relationships between variables. Specifically, these hypotheses predicted the following relationships:

- (1) Rejection of patriarchy and use of violence would be related;
- (2) The relationship between rejection of patriarchy and use of violence to be strengthened by previous victimization;
- (3) Rejection and Patriarchy would be more strongly related to initiative motives for use of violence to self-defensive or retaliatory motives.

The testing of these hypotheses with the data set occurs in two stages: first crosstabular analyses will search for significant levels of association between categorical variables; and then more sophisticated regression analysis will examine the predictive value of the independent variables.

Crosstabular Analysis

As presented in the previous chapter, various categorical variables were created to represent the factors in the hypotheses.³⁹ The first step in the crosstabular analysis is to test the rejection of patriarchy variables (reject1-group1; reject1-group2; reject2-group)

³⁸ See page 76.

³⁹ Rejection of Patriarchy; Use of Violence; Use of Minor Violence; Use of Severe Violence; Previous Victimization; Use of Minor Violence Self-Defense Motive; Use of Minor Violence Retaliatory Motive; Use of Minor Violence Initiative Motive; Use of Severe Violence Self Defense Motive; Use of Severe Violence Retaliatory Motive; Use of Severe Violence Initiative Motive

against the various use of violence variables (use of violence; use of minor violence; use of severe violence). These analyses only furnished three significant results.⁴⁰ The first significant result was in the relationship between Use of Violence and Rejection of Patriarchy2 (attitudes). This analysis is summarized in the following table.

TABLE 5.1: Chi Square Analysis of Use of Violence by Rejection of Patriarchy2 (attitudes)

		REJECTION OF PATRIARCHY2		
USE OF VIOLENCE		Adherence	Rejection	TOTAL
Did not use violence	Count	367	514	881
	% within Reject	52.7	60.4	56.9
	% of Total	23.7	33.2	56.9
Used violence	Count	329	337	666
	% within Reject	47.3	39.6	43.1
	% of Total	21.3	21.8	43.1
TOTAL	Count	696	851	1547
	% within			
	Violence	45.0	55.0	100.0
	% of Total	45.0	55.0	100.0

Chi Square = 9.186, df = 1, Sig. = .002

Phi = -.077 (sig. = .002)

Cramer's V = .077 (sig. .002)

Although there is a significant chi square value at 9.186 (so we can reject the null hypothesis), the Phi and Cramer's V values (.077) indicate that the strength of the relationship between these two variables is not very strong. According to Guilford's Guide to Interpreting Coefficients of Associations, a measure of significance below .20 is considered "slight, almost negligible". These statistical interpretations are upheld of course by a cursory perusal of the crosstabs. There are only small changes across rows and columns, indicating that the cases are almost randomly spread over the cells.

⁴⁰ For a review of the NON-significant Chi Square results see Appendix C

Not surprising, Rejection of Patriarchy2 (attitudes) was also found to be significantly associated with the subgroups of Use of Violence; Use of Minor Violence and Use of Severe Violence. These analyses are presented in the subsequent tables (5.2 and 5.3).

TABLE 5.2: Chi Square Analysis of Use of Minor Violence by Rejection of Patriarchy2 (attitudes)

		REJECTION OF PATRIARCHY2		
		Adherence	Rejection	TOTAL
MINOR VIOLENCE Did not use minor violence	Count	386	544	930
	% within Reject	54.8	62.3	58.9
	% of Total	24.5	29.5	58.9
Used minor violence	Count	319	329	648
	% within Reject	45.2	37.7	41.1
	% of Total	20.2	20.8	41.1
TOTAL	Count	705	873	1578
	% within Violence	44.7	53.3	100.0
	% of Total	44.7	53.3	100.0

Chi Square = 9.216, df = 1, Sig. = .002

Phi = -.076 (sig. = .002)

Cramer's V = .076 (sig. .002)

TABLE 5.3: Chi Square Analysis of Use of Severe Violence by Rejection of Patriarchy2 (attitudes)

		REJECTION OF PATRIARCHY2		
		Adherence	Rejection	TOTAL
SEVERE VIOLENCE Did not use severe violence	Count	532	686	1218
	% within Reject	74.5	79.8	77.4
	% of Total	33.8	43.6	77.4
Used severe violence	Count	182	174	356
	% within Reject	25.5	20.2	22.6
	% of Total	11.6	11.1	22.6
TOTAL	Count	714	860	1574
	% within Violence	45.4	54.6	100.0
	% of Total	45.4	54.6	100.0

Chi Square = 6.161, df = 1, Sig. = .013, Phi = -.063 (sig. = .013), Cramer's V = .063 (sig. .013)

Although these results are not surprising (as both use of minor violence and use of severe violence are colinear with use of violence), it is important to highlight the fact that Rejection of Patriarchy2 (attitudes) has a similar relationship with both of the subgroups. Notwithstanding the fact that both of these associations are once again slight (Phi's and Cramer's V's .076 and .063); this analysis does tell us that the relationship between Rejection of Patriarchy2 (attitudes) and Use of Violence is not predicated on a strong relationship with either use of minor or use of severe violence.

The second hypothesis contends that the relationship between Rejection of Patriarchy and Use of Violence will be stronger for those women who have been previously victimized. To test this assumption, the same three sets of variables that have already been detected as having some level of association are retested, controlling for previous victimization. The results of this process are illustrated in the series of tables (5.4; 5.5; and 5.6) on the following pages.

This series of tables provides some interesting observations. In Table 5.4, the association between Rejection of Patriarchy2 (attitudes) and Use of Violence is only significant for those women who had not been previously victimized. Even though the strength of this association is higher here (Phi and Cramer's V = .168) than the original association not controlling for previous victimization (Phi and Cramer's V = .077), the potency of the relationship remains negligible. This finding does not however support the hypothesis that the association between rejection of patriarchy and use of violence will be stronger for women who have been previously victimized.

TABLE 5.4: Chi Square Analysis of Use of Violence by Rejection of Patriarchy2 (attitudes) Controlling for Victimization Since High School

VICTIMIZATION SINCE HIGH SCHOOL	USE OF VIOLENCE	REJECTION OF PATRIARCHY2			TOTAL
			Adherence	Rejection	
Not Victimized	Did not use Violence	Count	62	123	185
		% within Reject	89.9	97.6	94.9
		% of Total	31.8	63.1	94.9
	Used Violence	Count	7	3	10
		% within Reject	10.1	2.4	5.1
		% of Total	3.6	1.5	5.1
	TOTAL	Count	69	126	195
		% within violence	35.4	64.6	100.0
		% of Total	35.4	64.6	100.0
Victimized	Did Not use Violence	Count	295	370	665
		% within Reject	48.6	53.5	51.2
		% of Total	22.7	28.5	51.2
	Used Violence	Count	312	321	633
		% within Reject	51.4	46.5	48.8
		% of Total	24.0	24.7	48.8
	TOTAL	Count	607	691	1298
		% within violence	46.8	53.2	100.0
		% of Total	46.8	53.2	100.0

NO VICTIMIZATION: Chi Square = 5.524; df = 1; Sig. = .019

Phi = -.168 (sig. = .019)

Cramer's V = .168 (sig. .019)

VICTIMIZATION: Chi Square = 3.164 df = 1; Sig. = .075

Phi = -.049 (sig. = .075)

Cramer's V = .049 (sig. = .075)

That same finding is supported in the results presented in Table 5.5 where once again the women who were not victimized exhibit a significant relationship between their rejection of patriarchy and their use of violence.

TABLE 5.5: Chi Square Analysis of Use of Minor Violence by Rejection of Patriarchy2 (attitudes) controlling for Victimization since High School

VICTIMIZATION SINCE HIGH SCHOOL	USE OF MINOR VIOLENCE	REJECTION OF PATRIARCHY2			TOTAL
			Adherence	Rejection	
Not Victimized	Did not use Minor Violence	Count	64	127	191
		% within Reject	90.1	97.7	95.0
		% of Total	31.8	63.2	95.0
	Used Minor Violence	Count	7	3	10
		% within Reject	9.9	2.3	5.0
		% of Total	3.5	1.5	5.0
	TOTAL	Count	71	130	201
		% within violence	35.3	64.7	100.0
		% of Total	35.3	64.7	100.0
Victimized	Did Not use Minor Violence	Count	312	394	706
		% within Reject	50.8	55.6	53.4
		% of Total	23.6	29.8	53.4
	Used Minor Violence	Count	302	315	617
		% within Reject	49.2	44.4	46.6
		% of Total	22.8	23.8	46.6
	TOTAL	Count	614	709	1323
		% within violence	46.4	53.6	100.0
		% of Total	46.4	53.6	100.0

NO VICTIMIZATION: Chi Square = 5.539; df = 1; Sig. = .019

Phi = -.166; sig. = .019

Cramer's V = .166 (sig. .019)

VICTIMIZATION: Chi Square = 2.992; df = 1; Sig. = .084

Phi = -.048 (sig. = .084)

Cramer's V = .048 (sig. = .084)

An exception however is found in Table 5.6 where the relationship between rejection of patriarchy and use of violence is only held up for women who have been previously victimized. But the strength of the association, is even weaker (Phi = .056) than the original comparison (Phi = .077). Although it does not relate to the original hypotheses, one of the most telling findings illustrated in this table series is the heavy weighting of the data on the bottom cells (victimization) of the crosstabs. This is representative of

TABLE 5.6: Chi Square Analysis of Use of Severe Violence by Rejection of Patriarchy2 (attitudes) controlling for Victimization since High School

VICTIMIZATION SINCE HIGH SCHOOL	USE OF SEVERE VIOLENCE	REJECTION OF PATRIARCHY2			TOTAL
			Adherence	Rejection	
Not Victimized	Did not use Severe Violence	Count	71	128	199
		% within Reject	98.6	99.2	99.0
		% of Total	35.3	63.7	99.0
	Used Severe Violence	Count	1	1	2
		% within Reject	1.4	.8	1.0
		% of Total	.5	.5	1.0
	TOTAL	Count	72	129	201
		% within violence	35.8	64.2	100.0
		% of Total	35.8	64.2	100.0
Victimized	Did Not use Severe Violence	Count	447	534	981
		% within Reject	72.0	76.8	74.5
		% of Total	34.0	40.6	74.5
	Used Severe Violence	Count	174	161	335
		% within Reject	28.0	23.2	25.5
		% of Total	13.2	12.2	25.5
	TOTAL	Count	621	695	1316
		% within violence	47.2	52.8	100.0
		% of Total	47.2	52.8	100.0

NO VICTIMIZATION: Chi Square = .177; df = 1; Sig. = .674

Phi = -.030 (sig. = .674)

Cramer's V = .030 (sig. .674)

VICTIMIZATION: Chi Square = 4.072; df = 1; Sig. = .044

Phi = -.056 (sig. = .044)

Cramer's V = .056 (sig. = .044)

course of the prevalence rate of victimization for the respondents; but another important comparison is between the second and fifth rows in the tables (Not Victimized-Used Violence; Victimized-Used Violence). Here we see a huge weighting in the victimization row, a preponderance of women who are using violence have been previously victimized. The strength of that relationship (previous victimization and use of violence) is reiterated in Table 5.7 on the following page

TABLE 5.7: Chi Square Analysis of Use of Violence by Previous Victimization Since High School

USE OF VIOLENCE		PREVIOUS VICTIMIZATION SINCE HIGH SCHOOL		
		Not Victimized	Victimized	TOTAL
Did not use violence	Count	198	703	901
	% within Victim	95.2	50.6	56.4
	% of Total	12.4	44.0	56.4
Used violence	Count	10	687	697
	% within Victim	4.8	49.4	43.6
	% of Total	.6	43.0	43.6
TOTAL	Count	208	1390	1598
	% within Violence	13.0	87.0	100.0
	% of Total	13.0	87.0	100.0

Chi Square = 146.451, df = 1, Sig. = .000

Phi = .303 (sig. = .000)

Cramer's V = .303 (sig. .000)

Not only does an examination of the weighting of the cells across the columns (and the bottom row totals) indicate that a preponderance of the sample has suffered victimization; a strong relationship between that victimization and use of violence is confirmed by the extremely high Chi Square value with a significance of .000. Of course this strong association has been discovered by other researchers (DeKeseredy et al, 1997). It is important to note the small n's in many of the cells in this series of tables. This weighted distribution restricts the value of any associations discovered.

The final hypothesis deals specifically with motives for use of violence. It is predicted that rejection of patriarchy will be more strongly associated with violence reported to be perpetuated with an initiative motive than with that reporting a self-defense of retaliatory motive.

This hypothesis was supported somewhat by chi square analysis. It was found that the rejection patriarchy variables only had significant associations with initiative

motive violence.⁴¹ Specifically, significant relationships were found between Rejection of Patriarchy1 (beliefs) and Minor Violence Initiative Motive; Rejection of Patriarchy1 (beliefs) and Severe Violence Initiative motive; as well as Rejection of Patriarchy2 (attitudes) and Severe Violence Initiative Motive. The results of the crosstabular tests of these relationships are presented in the following table series (5.8; 5.9; and 5.10):

TABLE 5.8: Chi Square Analysis of Minor Violence Initiative Motive by Rejection of Patriarchy1 (beliefs)

MINOR VIOLENCE INITIATIVE MOTIVE		REJECTION OF PATRIARCHY1		TOTAL
		Adherence	Rejection	
Did not report Initiative Motive	Count	191	233	424
	% within Reject	68.7	60.4	63.9
	% of Total	28.8	35.1	63.9
Reported Initiative Motive	Count	87	153	240
	% within Reject	31.3	39.6	36.1
	% of Total	13.1	23.0	36.1
TOTAL	Count	278	386	664
	% within Motive			
	% of Total	41.9	58.1	100.0
		41.9	58.1	100.0

Chi Square = 4.873, df = 1, Sig. = .027

Phi = .086 (sig. = .027)

Cramer's V = .086 (sig. .027)

The associations found in all three of these tables is similar in strength (none are overly potent); but the more interesting feature of these analyses emerges from a comparison between the second rows (reported initiative motive) in all three tables. Table 5.10 (Severe Violence Initiative Motive by Rejection of Patriarchy2 (attitudes)) shows a decreasing rate of initiative motive moving from adherence of patriarchy to rejection. This is the opposite of the associations summarized in the other two tables with Rejection of Patriarchy1 (beliefs).

⁴¹ See Appendix C for a list of all NON-significant chi square analyses

TABLE 5.9: Chi Square Analysis of Severe Violence Initiative Motive by Rejection of Patriarchy1 (beliefs)

SEVERE VIOLENCE INITIATIVE MOTIVE		REJECTION OF PATRIARCHY1		TOTAL
		Adherence	Rejection	
Did not report Initiative Motive	Count	97	102	199
	% within Reject	63.8	52.0	57.2
	% of Total	27.9	29.3	57.2
Reported Initiative Motive	Count	55	94	149
	% within Reject	36.2	48.0	42.8
	% of Total	15.8	27.0	42.8
TOTAL	Count	152	196	348
	% within			
	Motive	43.7	43.7	100.0
	% of Total	43.7	56.3	100.0

Chi Square = 4.848. df = 1, Sig. = .028

Phi = .118 (sig. = .028)

Cramer's V = .118 (sig. = .028)

TABLE 5.10: Chi Square Analysis of Use of Severe Violence Initiative Motive by Rejection of Patriarchy2 (attitudes)

SEVERE VIOLENCE INITIATIVE MOTIVE		REJECTION OF PATRIARCHY2		TOTAL
		Adherence	Rejection	
Did not report Initiative Motive	Count	84	103	187
	% within Reject	50.0	63.2	56.5
	% of Total	25.4	31.1	56.5
Reported Initiative Motive	Count	84	60	144
	% within Reject	50.0	36.8	43.5
	% of Total	25.4	18.1	43.5
TOTAL	Count	168	163	331
	% within Motive			
	% of Total	50.8	49.2	100.0
		50.8	49.2	100.0

Chi Square = 5.856, df = 1, Sig. = .016

Phi = -.133 (sig. = .016)

Cramer's V = .133 (sig. = .016)

It appears then that the direction of the association between Use of Severe Violence Initiative Motive and Rejection of Patriarchy2 (attitudes) may be inverse, which is the opposite of the argument in the hypothesis. Cross Tabular analysis was originally chosen because it was hoped that categorical variables of used/did not use violence and reject/adhere to patriarchal values would be more evenly weighted. With the skewed data present however, cross tabular examination offers limited results. By placing results into yes/no dichotomous categories we lose the richness of the scaled data. This is not therefore the best tool to measure directional relationships or even test for predictive value, to examine those issues the more sophisticated regression analysis is required.

Regression Analysis

Because there is room for multiple independent variables in regression, other variables are added to the ones directly related to the hypotheses. The following independent variables will be regressed into each dependent variable:

- Rejection of Patriarchy1 (beliefs)
- Rejection of Patriarchy2 (attitudes) Transgression
- Rejection of Patriarchy2 (attitudes) Refusal
- Victimization Since High School
- Victimization in Last 12 Months
- Sexual Victimization Since High School
- Sexual Victimization in Last 12 Months
- Alcohol Use With Partner⁴²
- Victimization During High School
- Victimization During Elementary School
- Year of Study⁶
- Age⁴³

⁴² Alcohol use with partner was included because of the previous research identifying alcohol use as a risk marker for dating violence (Shook et al 2003)

⁴³ Demographic variables were included to test for a maturity factor in use of violence

The following dependent variables will be utilized to test the predictive value of the independent variables for specific types of violence and specific motives for violence:

- Use of Violence
- Use of Minor Violence
- Use of Severe Violence
- Minor Violence Self Defense Motive
- Minor Violence Retaliatory Motive
- Minor Violence Initiative Motive
- Severe Violence Self Defense Motive
- Severe Violence Retaliatory Motive
- Severe Violence Initiative Motive

In building a regression model care must be taken to avoid multicollinearity between predicting (independent) values. Multicollinearity can limit the size of the R value because the predictors are going after much of the same variance on y and it can also create difficulty in determining the importance of any given predictor because the effects of the predictors are confounded by the correlations between them. A Pearson Correlation Bivariate Matrix can highlight any inter-correlations between the independent variables. Table 5.11 on the following pages is a presentation of this matrix for all of the included independent variables. At first glance it appears that there is a great deal of multicollinearity between these independent variables. This is not an unexpected result as so many of the variables address some type of victimization. It is not necessary however to block all of the victimization variables together. A suggested guideline for dealing with correlated predictors is to combine variables which have intercorrelations of .80 or higher (Stevens, 1996). None of these variables have Pearson values that high; the highest correlation discovered is .715 between Victimization since High School and Victimization in Last 12 Months.

TABLE 5.11: Pearson Correlation Matrix of Independent/Predictor Variables

VARIABLES		VARIABLES										
		Rejection of Patriarchy1	Rejection of Patriarchy2	Victim since High School	Victim last 12 months	Sex Victim since High School	Sex Victim last 12 months	Alcohol Use with Partner	Victim during High School	Victim during Elementary School	Year of Study	Age
Rejection of Patriarchy1	Pearson Sig.	1	.139** .000	.032 .206	-.017 .509	.033 .184	.016 .519	.096** .000	.047 .070	.063 .073	.106** .000	-.004 .860
Rejection of Patriarchy2	Pearson Sig.	.139** .000	1	-.018 .479	-.051* .044	.019 .455	-.020 .439	-.001 .959	-.025 .324	-.098** .005	.007 .771	.032 .179
Victim since High School	Pearson Sig.	.032 .206	-.018 .479	1	.715** .000	.448** .000	.274** .000	.084** .001	.294** .000	.224** .000	.043 .085	.194** .000
Victim last 12 months	Pearson Sig.	-.017 .509	-.051* .044	.715** .000	1	.293** .000	.354** .000	.070** .007	.253** .000	.146** .000	-.041 .102	.034 .173
Sex Victim since High School	Pearson Sig.	.033 .184	.019 .455	.448** .000	.293** .000	1	.661** .000	.074** .004	.321** .000	.112** .002	.047 .060	.197** .000
Sex Victim last 12 months	Pearson Sig.	.016 .519	-.020 .439	.274** .000	.354** .000	.661** .000	1	.112** .000	.220** .000	-.006 .862	-.069** .006	-.032 .197
Alcohol Use with Partner	Pearson Sig.	.096** .000	1	.084** .001	.070** .007	.074** .004	.112** .000	1	.082** .002	.010 .777	-.033 .198	-.080** .002
Victim during High School	Pearson Sig.	.047 .070	-.025 .324	.294** .000	.253** .000	.321** .000	.220** .000	.082** .002	1	.209** .000	-.025 .331	-.037 .144

		Rejection of Patriarchy1	Rejection of Patriarchy2	Victim since High School	Victim last 12 months	Sex Victim since High School	Sex Victim last 12 months	Alcohol Use with Partner	Victim during High School	Victim during Elementary School	Year of Study	Age
Victim during Elementary School	Pearson Sig.	.063 .073	-.098** .005	.224** .000	.146** .000	.112** .002	-.006 .862	.010 .777	.209** .000	1 .000	.107** .002	.083** .017
Year of Study	Pearson Sig.	.106** .000	.007 .771	.043 .085	-.041 .102	.041 .060	-.069** .006	-.033 .198	-.025 .331	.107** .002	1 .000	.216** .000
Age	Pearson Sig.	-.004 .860	.032 .179	.194** .000	.034 .173	.197** .000	-.032 .197	-.080** .002	-.037 .144	.083* .017	.216** .000	1 .000
** = Correlation is significant at the .01 level (2-tailed)												
* = Correlation is significant at the .05 level (2-tailed)												

It was decided therefore to group the independent variables in the following thematic blocks based on collinearity:

INDEPENDENT VARIABLES	BLOCK GROUPING
Rejection of Patriarchy1 (beliefs)	
Rejection of Patriarchy2 (attitudes) -Transgression -Refusal	Rejection of Patriarchy2
Victimization Since High School Victimization in last 12 Months	Victimization
Sexual Victimization Since High School Sexual Victimization in Last 12 Months	Sexual Victimization
Alcohol Use With Partner	
Victimization During High School Victimization During Elementary School	Previous Victimization
Year of Study Age	Demographics

The results of each regression analysis⁴⁴ are presented in Table 5.12 on the following page.

⁴⁴ Scatterplots of the variables indicated that the assumptions underlying multiple regression were met. Although there is some skewness in the variables, this was managed by the size of the sample and there were no significant outliers. Transformation was not considered in an attempt to remain true to the original responses.

TABLE 5.12: Regression Analyses – R² Changes of Independent Variable Blocks

DEPENDENT VARIABLE	INDEPENDENT VARIABLE BLOCKS R ² CHANGE							
	Rejection of Patriarchy ¹	Rejection of Patriarchy ²	Victimization	Sexual Victimization	Alcohol Use	Previous Victimization	Age & Education	TOTAL R ²
Use of Violence	.001	.003	.288***	.001	.000	.000	.002	.295***
Use of Minor Violence	.002	.003	.304***	.002	.000	.004	.000	.317***
Use of Severe Violence	.000	.005	.223***	.006	.001	.001	.001	.237***
Minor Violence Self Defense Motive	.003	.023*	.165***	.036***	.006	.006	.010	.247***
Minor Violence Retaliatory Motive	.000	.018*	.193***	.016*	.004	.004	.005	.220***
Minor Violence Initiative Motive	.005	.004	.017*	.002	.002	.002	.008	.005
Severe Violence Self Defense Motive	.013	.004	.289***	.043**	.000	.000	.020	.337***
Severe Violence Retaliatory Motive	.003	.007	.262***	.029*	.003	.003	.008	.268***
Severe Violence Initiative Motive	.015	.017	.008	.004	.004	.011	.016	.014

*p<.05; **p<.01; ***p<.001

Once again, it is the victimization variables that have the most predictive value for almost all types of violence (with the exception of Minor Violence Initiative Motive⁴⁵ and Severe Violence Initiative Motive). Rejection of Patriarchy2 is also significant in predicting Minor Violence Self Defense Motive and Minor Violence Retaliatory Motive. The relationships that were discovered in the chi square analysis between the rejection of patriarchy variables and use of violence and motive variables are conspicuous in their absence. This apparent contradictory finding speaks to the limited value of looking for relationships with categorical variables. There is a loss of richness in the data when it is transformed into a two set grouping (reject/adhere; violence/no violence). Instead the scaled data used in a regression analysis is multidimensional and therefore and provide results indicating not just the predictive significance of the independent variables, but also the amount of variance in the dependent variable they can predict.

It is interesting to note that none of the independent variables were significantly predictive of initiative violence. This specific finding and a general discussion of the usefulness of the data analysis in supporting the model of Rebellion Theory is presented in the next Chapter.

⁴⁵ Although the Change in R^2 of Victimization (.017) is significant (at a $p < .05$) in predicting changes in minor violence initiative motive; because the total R^2 of the regression (.005) is not significant this result is negated

CHAPTER VI

DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSIONS

The following discussion will expand on the various findings presented in the previous chapter; both those that relate directly to the constructed hypotheses as well as some of the extraneous findings that seemed contradictory. All of the discoveries will be connected to the extant literature reviewed earlier. Suggestions for directions in future research will also be presented in association with the findings of the current work.

Rebellion Theory

The analysis of this data set did not support the theoretical model constructed to drive this research. Women's rejection of patriarchal ideology could not be significantly associated with their self-reports of use of violence. Although the chi square analysis originally indicated a slight level of association with some relevant variables, the more sophisticated multiple regression (using richer scaled variables rather than categorical sets), did not support that finding. The crosstabular presentations suggested that the cell values were not randomly distributed but any association between variables could not be supported as predictive by multiple regression. The hypothesis looking for support of the Rebellion theory predicted that we would find results opposite to those found by other researchers who discovered an association between traditional sex role beliefs (which could be defined as adherence to patriarchy) and women's use of violence (Bookwala et al, 1992; Ryan, 1998). Those findings however were also not supported by the current

analysis. Although rejection of patriarchy could not be significantly associated with use of violence, neither could adherence to patriarchy.

There are many possible reasons for why this model was not upheld by the analysis. Survey data is not the most effective way to garner information about the issues involved in this theory. Quantitatively measuring beliefs and attitudes about familial patriarchy is difficult at best. It is also difficult to measure motives. This difficulty is exemplified by the ongoing process of developing of different instruments attempting to procure reliable information on these issues. More in-depth qualitative research is better suited to measure the subtleties of motives and beliefs. What we are really trying to discover is the story behind the numbers; and relying on numbers to elucidate that story is naïve at best.

Unfortunately this data set is also problematic for what it does not measure; women's use of psychological violence. As mentioned in Chapter IV, although women were asked about all types of victimization within the Conflict Tactics Scale (psychological, minor physical, and severe physical), they were not asked to self report their own use of psychological violence (just minor and severe physical). The following items represent what was omitted from the women's self reports:

- (a) insulted or swore at him;
- (b) put him down in front of friends or family;
- (c) accused him of having affairs or flirting with other women;
- (d) did or said something to spite him;
- (e) threatened to hit or throw something at him;
- (f) threw, smashed or kicked something.

Looking at what was excluded from the women's self reports it becomes evident that this data set does not provide a complete picture of their use of violence. Other research has

suggested that women tend to use words as their weapons and are more likely to engage in psychological violence. So it is possible that women may be expressing their rebellion against patriarchal ideology in more verbal, non-physical ways that are not measured with this instrument and therefore not available for the current analysis.

One of the tenets of the mutual combat theory in the gender symmetry debate is that women often participate in psychological and minor physical violence which precipitates (sometimes severe) retaliation from their partners (Straus & Gelles, 1990; Straus & Ramirez, 2003). One of the stated purposes of this research project was to answer the declarations of gender symmetry with a more nuanced, feminist driven examination of the meanings of women's behaviours. By ignoring one of the major facets of the mutual combat thesis, any rebuttal to those family violence researchers is handicapped.

Even though the rebellion thesis of the current study was not empirically supported, it is important that feminist scholars continue to resist the mutual combat default explanation proffered by family violence researchers. What this project did discover was a very strong relationship between previous victimization and use of violence. There is something going on in the process from victimization to use of violence and further research needs to be conducted to explicate that process. Qualitative ethnography may be better suited to this kind of interpretive research agenda.

It is vital to illuminate this process between victimization and use of violence and even more specifically, differing motives for use of violence. The failure of previous victimization to predict initiative motivated violence is important for two reasons. Firstly, it speaks to the weakness of the question to really measure a *motive*. Rather this

question (“what percentage of these times overall do you estimate that you used these actions on your boyfriends or dates before they actually attacked you or threatened to attack you?”) is measuring context. The respondent could indicate that she was first to participate in the aggressive behaviour, but that does not tell us *why* she did. Once again we are not getting the ‘story’ behind the numbers.

Regardless of the weakness of the question format, the lack of association between previous victimization and initiative violence, in the face of high correlation between previous victimization and self defensive and retaliatory violence, points to differing explanations for use of violence by women based on their framing of their relationship. With more victimization, they are explaining their own use of violence as self defensive or fighting back. Perhaps the lack of predictive value of the victimization variables for initiative violence is a reflection of the women’s refusal to frame their relationships as abusive.

The research within courtship literature discussed in the third chapter highlights the apparent importance of the maintenance of a ‘romantic ideal’ for partners when they are describing intimate violence. Dyadic research has found that both members of a couple tend to downplay the negative aspects of violent episodes in favour of a romanticized view of the relationship (Cate et al, 1982; Laner & Thompson, 1982; Henton et al, 1983; Billingham, 1987; Rouse et al, 1988; Bergman, 1992; Molidor, 1995; Katz et al, 1997; Price & Bryers; 1999; James, et. al., 2000). Henton et. al.(1983) discovered that one-third of the respondents interpreted violent behaviour as love. Both members of the couples tended to take joint responsibility for the initiation of violence and report sympathetic interpretations of the violent episodes (Henton et al, 1983).

We know that women are beaten many times before they make the decision to leave, it is a process. It follows then that it is also a process to (re)define motives for use of violence as self-defensive or retaliatory in the face of abuse. If a woman is not in a place where she is willing to explain her victimization as abusive, then it may be unlikely that she would explain the motives for her own use of violence as self-defensive or retaliatory, it would be easier to frame the situation as 'mutual combat', or even deny or downplay her partners violence.

Sociologist C. Wright Mills (1963) discussed the important influences of process, situation, and expectations on the formulation of vocabularies of motive;

....both motives and actions very often originate not from within [the actors/actresses] but from the situation in which individuals find themselves. It translates the question of 'why' into a 'how' that is answerable in terms of situation and it's typical vocabulary of motives, ie., those which conventionally accompany that type of situation and function as cues and justification for normative actions in it.

Mills, 1963:442

A woman who has experienced victimization at the hands of her boyfriend then, will develop vocabularies of motive for her own use of violence based on how she defines the situation and what she views as expected justifications based on that definition. If she defines the situation as mutual combat, the justification of self-defense is not prescribed. She may not even define the partner's behaviour as victimizing at all. The conceptualization of vocabularies of motive is constructed after actions, in anticipation of questions requiring explanation for those actions (Mills, 1963). If a woman does not define her relationship as abusive, she will not define her own use of violence as self defensive or retaliatory.

Other circumstances both internal and external to the relationship may influence the development of these explanations for both the women's and her partner's use of violence. One possible factor that is supported by the current analysis is whether or not the woman was consuming alcohol with her partner.

The regression analysis found that use of alcohol had an inverse predictive relationship with reports of self-defense motive for minor violence. So women who were less likely to drink with their partners were more likely to report self-defense as a motive for their own use of violence. It could be argued then that those women who were drinking with their partners may have been less likely to frame their own use of violence as self-defensive because they felt somewhat responsible for their own victimization and therefore adopted the mutual combat explanation. This would be similar to rape victims feeling self-blame because they had drunk with their victimizers previous to the rape. This self-blame occurs because of the dominance of rape myths that perpetuate victim blaming (Pitts & Schwartz; 1997).

Implications for Policy

At the start of this research project it was hoped that the findings would resoundingly refute the mutual combat thesis and therefore support the retention and return of funding to agencies helping battered women. Although that goal was not realized, there are some important lessons to be taken away from this work.

Advocates who work with and for survivors of abuse must start talking about women's own use of violence. They must develop sophisticated and consumable answers to the question "Don't women do it too?". By dismissing these statements with a simple

“It’s different”, we risk further alienation from the mainstream and open up the discourse for more control by family violence researchers. Yes, women’s use of violence is different, and that difference needs to be interrogated and explained to those who ask that question. The contribution of previous victimization to female-to-male violence should be highlighted in an attempt to move past the numbers of blows struck and develop an understanding of the story.

In the face of mandatory arrest policies and their sometimes devastating repercussions for women, programming for survivors must deal with the issue of women’s use of intimate violence. This focus should take the form of education of law enforcement and other criminal justice and human services personnel. Education about the context of women’s violence as well as differing types of violence precipitated by men.

Directions for Future Research

As mentioned earlier, the failure of this research to support the theoretical model may be more indicative of the inadequacy of the current measures/data for procuring information relevant to the theory than of flaws in the model itself. Future research should not therefore abandon the adoption of conceptual frameworks relating rejection of patriarchy to women’s use of violence; rather more appropriate research methods should be employed to further test that relationship. Specifically it is recommended that an ethnographic study be conducted examining women’s vocabularies of motive for their use of violence and situating those vocabularies within experiences of previous victimization and rejection of patriarchal norms. This research should also focus on women’s

processes of developing explanatory frameworks around their victimization, their use of violence, and definitions of the relationship. A dissection of the interrelationships between those frameworks would help to elucidate the development of the vocabularies of motive as well.

This call for richer data to examine motivations echoes other scholars; “Longitudinal, qualitative research, with rich detailed interview data on context meaning and motive would be desirable.” (DOJ, 2000). It is hoped that feminist based investigations into the meanings behind women’s use of violence will continue in an attempt to push back the wave of gender symmetry discourse. It is important for us to understand how intimate violence is gendered, that is not to look at who hits who how many times; rather what is the specific nature of women’s use of violence; where does it come from and where does it go?

REFERENCES

- Adler, E. S. (1981). The underside of married life: Power, influence and violence. In L. H. Bowker (Ed.), *Women and Crime in America* (pp. 300-320). New York: Macmillan.
- Adler, F. (1975). *Sisters in crime*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Alberta Human Rights and Citizenship Commission. (2000). *Movement for the establishment of real gender equality V*. Edmonton, Alberta, Canada: The Family Centre.
- Alsdurf, J. , & Alsdurf, P. (1989). *Battered into submission: The tragedy of wife abuse in the Christian home*. Illinois: InterVarsity Press.
- Alvi, S., DeKeseredy, W., & Ellis, D. (2000). Contemporary social problems in North American society. Toronto, Ontario, Canada: Addison Wesley Longman.
- Alvi, S., & Selbee, K. (1997, December). Dating status variations and woman abuse. *Violence Against Women*, 3, 705-732.
- Andrews, B., & Brewin, C. R. (1990). Attributions of blame for marital violence. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, 31, 757-776.
- Anselmi, D. L., & Law, A. L. (1998). *Questions of gender: Perspectives and paradoxes*. Boston: McGraw-Hill.
- Archer, D., & McDaniel, P. (1995). Violence and gender. In Ruback, J. (Ed.), *Interpersonal Violent Behavior: Social and Cultural Aspects* (pp. 63-87). New York: Springer.
- Archer, J. (2000). Sex differences in aggression between heterosexual partners: A meta-analytic review. *Psychological Bulletin*, 126, 651-680.

- Arias, I., Samios, M., & O'Leary, K. D. (1987). Prevalence and correlates of physical aggression during courtship. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 2, 82-90.
- Babcock, J. C., Waltz, J., Jacobson, N. S., & Gottman, J. M. (1993). Power and violence: The relationship between communication and patterns, power discrepancies and domestic violence. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology*, 61, 40-50.
- Barling, A., et al. (1987). Factor similarity of the conflict tactics scales across samples, spouses, and sites: Issues and implications. *Journal of Family Violence*, 2, 37-54.
- Barnes, G. E., Greenwood, L., & Sommer, R. (1991). Courtship violence in a Canadian sample of male college students. *Family Relations*, 40, 37-44.
- Barnett, O. W., & LaViolette, A. D. (1993). *It could happen to anyone*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications.
- Becker, H. S., & Geer, B. (1957). Participant observation and interviewing: A comparison. *Human Organization*, 16, 28-32.
- Beechey, V. (1979). On patriarchy. *Feminist Review*, 3, 66-82.
- Benson, T. C., & Benson, K. (1984). Premarital violence on campus. *Society for the Study of Social Problems*.
- Bergman, L. (1992). Dating violence among high school students. *Social Work*, 37, 21-27.
- Bernard, J. L., Bernard, S. L., & Bernard, M. L. (1985, October). Courtship violence and sex-typing. *Family Relations*, 34, 573-576.
- Berry, W. D. (1993). *Understanding regression assumptions*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications.

- Bethke, T. M., & DeJoy, D. M. (1993). An experimental study of factors influencing the acceptability of dating violence. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 8, 36-51.
- Billingham, R. E. (1987a). Conflict tactics and the level of emotional commitment among unmarrieds. *Human Relations*, 40, 59-74.
- Billingham, R. E. (1987b). Courtship violence: The patterns of conflict resolution strategies across seven levels of emotional commitment. *Family Relations*, 36, 283-289.
- Billingham, R. E., & Sack, A. R. (1986). Courtship violence and the interactive status of the relationship. *Journal of Adolescent Research*, 1, 315-325.
- Bird, G. W., Stich, S., & Schlada, J. (1991). Psychological resources, coping strategies, and negotiation styles as discriminators of violence in dating relationships. *Family Relations*, 26, 289-296.
- Bjorkqvist, K., & Niemela, P. (Eds.). (1992). *Of mice and women: Aspects of female aggression*. San Diego, CA: Academic Press.
- Bogal-Allbritten, R. B., & Allbritten, W. L. (1985). The hidden victims: Courtship violence among college students. *Journal of College Student Personnel*, 26, 201-204.
- Bograd, M. (1988). How battered women and abusive men account for domestic violence: Excuses, justifications, or explanations? In D. Finkelhor, G. T. Hotaling, J. T. Kirkpatrick, & M. A. Straus (Eds.), *Coping With Family Violence* (pp. 60-77). Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications.
- Bograd, M. (1998). Why we need gender to understand human violence. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 5, 132-135.

- Bookwala, J., Frieze, I. H., Smith, C., & Ryan, K. (1992). Predictors of dating violence: A multivariate analysis. *Violence and Victims*, 7, 297-311.
- Bowker, L. H. (1983). *Beating wife beating*. Washington, DC: Lexington Books.
- Brinkerhoff, L. (1988). Interspousal violence. *The Canadian Journal of Sociology*, 13, 407-434.
- Browne, A. (1987). *When battered women kill*. New York: Free Press.
- 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 Family*, 48, 375-379.
- Bunge, V. P. (2000). Spousal violence. In V. P. Bunge & D. Locke (Eds.), *Family violence in Canada: A statistical profile 2000* (pp. 11-19). Ottawa, Ontario, Canada: Statistics Canada.
- Burke, P. J., Stets, J. E., & Pirog-Good, M. A. (1988). Gender identity, self-esteem, and physical and sexual abuse in dating relationships. *Social Psychology Quarterly*, 51, 272-285.
- Campbell, A., Muneer, S., & Coyle, E. (1992). Social representation of aggression as an explanation of gender differences. *Aggressive Behavior*, 18, 95-108.
- Carlson, B. E. (1996, March). Dating violence. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 11, 3-19.
- Cascardi, M., & Vivian, D. (1995). Contexts for specific episodes of marital violence. *Journal of Family Violence*, 10, 265-293.
- Cate, R., Henton, J., Koval, J., Christopher, S., & Lloyd, S. (1982). Premarital abuse: A social psychological perspective. *Journal of Family Issues*, 3, 79-91.

- Cate, R. M., & Lloyd, S. A. (1992). *Courtship*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications.
- Cauffman, E., Feldman, S. S., Jensen, L. A., & Arnett, J. J. (2000, November). The (un)acceptability of violence against peers and dates. *Journal of Adolescent Research, 15*, 652-673.
- Caufield, M. B., & Riggs, D. S. (1992, December). The assessment of dating aggression: Empirical evaluation of the conflict tactics scale. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 7*, 549-558.
- Cernokovich, S. A., & Giodano, P. C. (1979). A comparative analysis of women's and men's delinquency. *Sociology Quarterly, 20*, 131-145.
- Chang, D. H. (1987). Violence against women in the family: A national and international perspective. *International Journal of Comparative and Applied Criminal Justice, 11*, 153-157.
- Charles, R. (1997, February). Thoughts stimulated by Braithwaite's analysis of control balance theory. *Theoretical Criminology, 1*, 99-110.
- Charon, J. M. (1979). *Symbolic interactionism*. New Jersey: Prentice-Hall.
- Chase, K. A., Treboux, D., & O'Leary, K. D. (2002, January). Characteristics of high-risk adolescents' dating violence. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 17*, 33-50.
- Chesney-Lind, M. (1986, Autumn). Women and crime: The female offender. *Signs, 12*, 78-96.
- Chesney-Lind, M. (1989, January). Girls' crime and women's place: Toward a feminist model of female delinquency. *Crime and Delinquency, 35*, 5-29.
- Chesney-Lind, M. (1993, August). Girls, gangs and violence: Anatomy of a backlash. *Humanity and Society, 17*, 321-344.

- Chesney-Lind, M., & Sheldon, R. G. (1998). *Girls, delinquency, and juvenile justice*. Belmont, CA: Wadsworth.
- Christensen, F. (1998, June 30). *Prostituted science and scholarship: A submission to the special senate-commons committee on custody and access* (rev. ed.). Retrieved July 19, 2003 from http://www.fathers.bc.ca/prostituted_science.htm
- Claerhout, S., Elder, J., & Janes, C. (1982). Problem-solving skills of rural, battered women. *American Journal of Community Psychology*, 10, 605-612.
- Cohen, S. (Ed.). (1988). *Life events and psychological functioning*. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage Publications.
- Cohen, S., & Hoberman, H. M. (1983). Positive life events and social support as buffers of life change stress. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 13, 99-125.
- Cohen, S., & Syme, S. L. (Eds.). (1985). *Social support and health*. Florida: Academic Press, Inc.
- Coleman, D. H., & Straus, M. A. (1986). Marital power, conflict, and violence in a nationally representative sample of American couples. *Violence and Victims*, 1, 141-157.
- Coleman, D. H., & Straus, M. A. (1990). Marital power, conflict, and violence in a nationally representative sample of American couples. In M. A. Straus, R. J. Gelles, and C. Smith (Eds.), *Physical Violence in American Families* (pp. 287-304). New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction Publishers.
- Connell, R. W. (1995) *Masculinities*. Berkley: University of California Press.
- Cornell, C. P., & Gelles, R. J. (1985). *Intimate violence in families*. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage Publications.

- Craib, I. (1992). *Modern social theory* (2nd ed.). New York: St. Martin's Press.
- Crawford, C. C. (1998). Is dating violence really mutual? An examination of the occurrence and severity of dating violence and the injuries sustained from a resource theory perspective. (Doctoral dissertation, Rutgers University, 1998). *Dissertation Abstracts International*.
- Curran, D. J., & Renzetti, C. (Eds.). (1986). *Women, men and society: The sociology of gender*. Boston: Allyn & Bacon.
- Dasgupta, S. (1999) Just like men? A critical view of violence by women. In M. F. Shepard & E. L. Pence (Eds.) *Coordinating community responses to domestic violence: Lessons from Duluth and beyond*, (p.195-222). Thousand Oaks: Sage.
- Dasgupta, S. (2001). *Towards an understanding of women's use of non-lethal violence in intimate heterosexual relationships*. USDOJ, Violence Against Women Online Resources, Applied Research Forum.
- Deal, J. E., & Wampler, K. S. (1986). Dating violence: The primacy of previous experience. *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships*, 3, 457-471.
- Dean, J. D. (1995). Dating violence: The hidden secret. *Journal of Sex Education and Therapy*, 21, 151-152.
- Dobash, R. E., & Dobash, R. P. (1979). *Violence against wives*. New York: Free Press.
- DeKeseredy, W. S. (1988). *Woman abuse in dating relationships*. Toronto, Ontario, Canada: Canadian Scholars Press.
- DeKeseredy, W. S. (1992). In defense of self-defense: Demystifying female violence against male intimates. In R. Hinch (Ed.), *Crosscurrents: Debates in Canadian Society*. Toronto, Ontario, Canada: Nelson.

DeKeseredy, W. S. (1993). Woman abuse in university and college dating relationships:

The contribution of familial patriarchy. *The Journal of Human Justice*, 4, 25-52.

DeKeseredy, W. S. (1995). Enhancing the quality of survey data on woman abuse.

Violence Against Women, 1, 158-173.

DeKeseredy, W. S. (Ed.). (1997). Intimate relationship status variations in woman abuse

[Special Issue]. *Violence Against Women*, 3(6).

DeKeseredy, W. S. (1999, November). Tactics of the antifeminist backlash. *Violence*

Against Women, 5, 1258-1276.

DeKeseredy, W. S. (2000a). Current controversies on defining non-lethal violence

against women in intimate heterosexual relationships: Empirical implications.

Violence Against Women, 6, 728-746.

DeKeseredy, W. S. (2000b). Women, crime and the Canadian criminal justice system.

Cincinnati, OH: Anderson Publishing.

DeKeseredy, W. S., & Hinch, R. (1991). *Woman abuse: Sociological perspectives*.

Toronto, Ontario, Canada: Thompson Educational Publishing.

DeKeseredy, W. S., & Kelley, K. (1993). The incidence and prevalence of woman abuse

in Canadian university and college dating relationships. *The Canadian Journal of Sociology*, 18, 57-159.

DeKeseredy, W. S., & MacLean, B. D. (1990). Researching woman abuse in Canada: A

left realist critique of the conflict tactics scale. *Canadian Review of Social Policy*, 25, 19-27.

DeKeseredy, W. S. and Macleod, L. (1997). *Woman abuse: A sociological story*.

Toronto, Ontario, Canada: Harcourt Brace.

- DeKeseredy, W. S., Saunders, D. G., Schwartz, M. D., & Alvi, S. (1997, April-June). The meanings and motives for women's use of violence in Canadian college dating relationships: Results from a national survey. *Sociological Spectrum*, 17, 199-222.
- DeKeseredy, W. S., & Schwartz, M. (1998a). Measuring the extent of woman abuse in intimate heterosexual relationships: A critique of the Conflict Tactics Scales. *Violence Against Women Online Resources*. Retrieved July 19, 2003 from <http://www.vaw.umn.edu/documents/vawnet/ctscritique/ctscritique.html>
- DeKeseredy, W. S. & Schwartz, M. (Eds.). (1998b). *Rethinking violence against women*. Thousand Oaks, CA:Sage.
- DeKeseredy, W. S. & Schwartz, M. (1998c). *Woman abuse on campus: Results from the Canadian National Survey*. Thousand Oaks, CA:Sage.
- DeKeseredy, W. S., & Schwartz, M. D. (2002). Backlash and whiplash: A critique of Statistics Canada's 1999 general social survey on victimization. Forthcoming in *Online Justice Studies*.
- DeMaris, S. A. (1987). The efficacy of a spouse abuse model in accounting for courtship violence. *Journal of Family Issues*, 8, 291-305.
- DeMaris, S. A. (1992). Male vs female initiation of aggression: The case of courtship violence. In E. C. Viano (Ed.), *Intimate Violence: Interdisciplinary Perspectives* (pp. 111-120). New York: Hemisphere Publishing.
- Denham, D., & Gillespie, J. (1998). *Two steps forward... One step back*. Ottawa, Ontario, Canada: Health Canada.
- Denzin, N. K. (1978). *The research act: A theoretical introduction to sociological methods* (2nd ed.). New York: McGraw-Hill.

- DeWeerth, C., & Kalma, A. (1995). Gender differences in awareness of courtship initiation tactics. *Sex Roles*, 32, 717-734.
- Dobash, R. E., & Dobash, R. P. (1978). Wives: The appropriate victims of marital violence. *Victimology*, 2, 426-442.
- Dobash, R. P., Dobash, R. E., Wilson, M., & Daly, M. (1992). The myth of sexual symmetry in marital violence. *Social Problems*, 39, 71-91.
- Doyle, J. S., Malouff, J. M., & Schutte, N. S. (1988). The relationship between characteristics of the victim, persuasive techniques of the batterer, and returning to a battering relationship. *Journal of Social Psychology*, 128, 605-610.
- Dutton, D. G. (1988). *Domestic assault of women: Psychological and criminal justice perspectives*. Newton, MA: Allyn and Bacon, Inc.
- Dutton, D. G., & Hemphill, K. J. (1992). Patterns of socially desirable responding among perpetrators and victims of wife assault. *Violence and Victims*, 7, 29-39.
- Eber, L. P. (1981). Battered wife's dilemma. *Hasting Law Journal*, 32, 895-931.
- Edelson, J. L., & Bryger, M. P. (1986). Gender differences in reporting battering incidents. *Family Relations*, 35, 377-389.
- Eisenstein, Z. (1980). *Capitalist patriarchy and the case for a socialist feminism*. New York: Monthly Review Press.
- Ellis, D. (1995). *Spousal violence: Who hurts whom, how often and how seriously*. North York, Ontario, Canada: LaMarsh Research Centre on Violence and Conflict Resolution.

- Ellis, D. (1992). Woman abuse among separated and divorced women: The relevance of social support. In E.C. Viano (ed.) *Intimate violence: Interdisciplinary perspectives*, pp. 177-188. Bristol, PA: Taylor and Francis.
- Ellis, D., & Stuckless, N. (1996). *Mediating and negotiating marital conflicts*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Faith, K. (1995). *Unruly women: The politics of confinement and resistance*. Vancouver, BC, Canada: Press Gang.
- Faludi, S. (1991). *Backlash: The undeclared war against American women*. New York: Crown.
- Faludi, S. (1996, April). Statistically challenged. *The Nation*, 15, 10.
- Farrell, J. (2000, June 19). Brochure spread anti-male bias: Panel. *Calgary Herald*. Retrieved Sept. 25, 2000 from <http://www.mesacanada.com/brochure.htm>
- Fekete, J. (1994). *Moral panic: Biopolitics rising*. Montreal, Ontario, Canada: Robert Davies.
- Feld, S. L., & Straus, M. A. (1989). Escalation and desistance of wife assault in marriage. *Criminology*, 27, 141-161.
- Ferraro, K. J. (1979a). Hard love: Letting go of an abusive husband. *Frontiers*, 4, 16-18.
- Ferraro, K. J. (1979b). Physical and emotional battering: Aspects of managing hurt. *California Sociologist*, 2, 134-149.
- Ferraro, K. J. (1983). Rationalizing violence: How battered women stay. *Victimology*, 8, 203-212.
- Ferraro, K. J., & Johnson, J. M. (1989). How women experience battering: The process of victimization. *Social Problems*, 30, 325-339.

- Fiebert, M. (1997). Annotated bibliography: References examining assaults by women on their spouses/partners. *Sexuality and Culture*, 1, 273-286.
- Fiebert, M. & Gonzalez, D. M. (1997). College women who initiate assaults on their male partners and the reasons offered for such behavior. *Psychological Reports*, 80, 583-590.
- Fine, M. (1981). An injustice by any other name. *Victimology*, 6, 48-58.
- Finn, J. (1985). The stresses and coping behavior of battered women. *Social Casework*, 66, 341-349.
- Flynn, C. P. (1990). Sex roles and women's response to courtship violence. *Journal of Family Violence*, 5, 83-94.
- Follingstad, D. R., Bradley, R. G., Laughlin, J. E., & Burke, L. (1999, Winter). Risk factors and correlates of dating violence: The relevance of examining frequency and severity levels in a college sample. *Violence and Victims*, 14, 365-380.
- Foshee, V. A., Bauman, K. E., & Fletcher, L. G. (1999). Family violence and the perpetration of adolescent dating violence: examining social learning and social control processes. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, 61, 331-343.
- Foss, K. (2002, June 27). Men as likely to face abuse from partner, Statscan says. *The Globe and Mail*, p. A8.
- Gelles, R. (1976). Abused wives: Why do they stay? *Journal of Marriage and Family*, 38, 659-668.
- Gelles, R. J. (2000, July). Estimating the incidence and prevalence of violence against women. *Violence Against Women*, 6, 784-804.

- Gelles, R., & Loseke, D. (Eds.). (1993). *Current controversies on family violence*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications.
- Gentleman, K. M. (1984). Wife beating: Attitudes of a non-clinical population. *Victimology*, 9, 109-119.
- Gerber, G. L. (1991). Gender stereotypes and power: Perceptions of the roles in violent marriages. *Sex Roles*, 24, 439-458.
- Gilljam, M., & Granberg, D. (1993). Should we take don't know for an answer? *Public Opinion Quarterly*, 57, 348-357.
- Giordano, P. C., & Cernkovich, S. A. (1997). Gender and antisocial behavior. In D. M. Stoff, J. Breiling & J. D. Maser (Eds.), *Handbook of Antisocial Behavior* (pp. 255-273). New York: John Wiley and Sons.
- Giordano, P. C., Milhollin, T. J., Cernkovich, S. A., Pugh, M. D., & Rudolph, J. L. (1999). Delinquency, identity, and women's involvement in relationship violence. *Criminology*, 37, 17-37.
- Glaser, B. G., & Strauss, A. L. (1967). *The discovery of grounded theory: Strategies for qualitative research*. Hawthorne, NY: Aldine.
- Goffman, E. (1961). *Encounters*. New York: Bobbs-Merrill Co.
- Gordon, M. (2000). Definitional issues in violence against women: Surveillance and research from a violence research perspective. *Violence Against Women*, 6, 747-783.
- Gray, H. M., & Foshee, V. (1997). Adolescent dating violence. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 12, 126-142.

- Gryl, F. E., Stith, S. M., & Bird, G. W. (1991). Close dating relationships among college students: Differences by use of violence and gender. *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships*, 8, 243-264.
- Gwartney-Gibbs, P. A., Stockard, J., & Bohmer, S. (1987). Learning courtship aggression: The influence of parents, peers, and personal experiences. *Family Relations*, 36, 276-282.
- Hadley, K. (2001). *"And we still ain't satisfied": Gender inequality in Canada: A status report for 2001*. Ottawa, Ontario, Canada: CSJ Foundation for Research and Education and National Action Committee on the Status of Women.
- Hagan, J. (1990). The structuration of gender and deviance: A power-control theory of vulnerability to crime and the search for deviant role exits. *The Canadian Review of Sociology and Anthropology*, 27, 137-156.
- Hamberger, L. K., & Potente, T. (1994). Counseling heterosexual women arrested for domestic violence: Implications for theory and practice. *Violence and Victims*, 9, 125-137.
- Hamby, S. L., & Gray-Little, B. (2000). Labeling partner violence: When do victims differentiate among acts? *Violence and Victims*, 15, 173-186.
- Hammer, R. (2002). *Antifeminism and family terrorism: A critical feminist perspective*. Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield.
- Hanley, M. J., & O'Neill, P. (1997, October). Violence and commitment. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 12, 685-704.
- Hanmer, J., & Maynard, M. (Eds.). (1987). *Women, violence and social control*. Atlantic Highlands, NJ: Humanities Press International.

- Hannah-Moffat, K. (Ed.). (2000). *An ideal prison*. Halifax, NS, Canada: Fernwood Publishing.
- Hardy, M. A. (1993). *Regression with dummy variables*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications.
- Harned, M. S. (2001). Abused women or abused men? An examination of the context and outcomes of dating violence. *Violence and Victims, 16*, 269-285.
- Harris, A. R. (1977). Sex theories of deviance: Toward a functional theory of deviant type scripts. *American Sociological Review, 42*, 3-16.
- Harry, J. E. (1987). Gender schemas and gender deviance. Society for the Study of Social Problems – Association Paper.
- Hartwig, F., & Dearing, B. E. (1979). *Exploratory data analysis*. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage Publications.
- Hastings, B. M. (2000, June). Social information processing and the verbal and physical abuse of women. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 15*, 651-664.
- Heimer, K., & De Coster, S. (1999). The gendering of violent delinquency. *Criminology, 37*, 277-317.
- Henton, J., Cate, R. M., Koval, J., & Lloyd, S. (1983). Romance and violence in dating relationships. *Journal of Family Issues, 4*, 467-482.
- Heyman, R. E., & Schlee, K. A. (1997, September). Toward a better estimate of the prevalence of partner abuse: Adjusting rates based on the sensitivity of the conflict tactics scale. *Journal of Family Psychology, 11*, 332-338.
- Hilberman, E., & Munson, K. (1978). Sixty battered women. *Victimology, 2*, 460-470.

- Hilton, N. Z. (1989). When is an assault not an assault? The Canadian public's attitude towards wife and stranger assault. *Journal of Family Violence*, 4, 323-337.
- Hilton, N. Z., & Harris, G. T. (1998, February). On the validity of self-reported rates of interpersonal violence. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 13, 58-73.
- Hirschi, T. (1969). *Causes of delinquency*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Hirschi, T., & Selvin, H. C. (1973). *Principles of survey analysis*. New York: The Free Press.
- Hoff, L. A. (1990). *Battered women as survivors*. London: Routledge.
- hooks, B. (2000). *Feminism is for everybody: Passionate politics*. Cambridge, MA:South End.
- Hortin, J. (1966). Order and conflict theories of social problems as competing ideologies. *American Journal of Sociology*, 71, 6-24.
- Hubbard, E. A. (1993). Of course I fight back: An ethnography of women's use of violence in intimate relationships. (Doctoral dissertation, University of Colorado, Boulder, 1993). *Dissertation Abstracts International*.
- Jackson, S. (1999). Issues in dating violence literature: A review. *Aggressive and Violent Behavior*, 4, 233-247.
- Jackson, S. M., Cram, F., & Seymour, F. W. (2000, March). Violence and sexual coercion in high school students' dating relationships. *Journal of Family Violence*, 15, 23-36.
- Jacobson, D. (1986). Types and timing of social support. *Journal of Health and Social Behavior*, 27, 250-264.

- James, W. H., West, C., Deters, K. E., & Armijo, E. (2000). Youth dating violence. *Adolescence*, 35, 455-465.
- Jiwani, Y. (2000, August). *The 1999 General Social Survey on spousal violence: An analysis*. Retrieved July 19, 2003 from <http://www.casac.ca/issues/survey99.htm>
- Johnson, H. (1996). *Dangerous domains: Violence against women in Canada*. Toronto, Ontario, Canada: Nelson.
- Johnson, J. M., & Ferraro, K. J. (1988). Courtship violence: Survey vs. empathic understandings of abusive conduct. *Studies in Symbolic Interaction*, 9, 175-186.
- Johnson, M. P. (1995). Patriarchal terrorism and common couple violence. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, 57, 283-294.
- Johnson, M. P. (2000). Conflict and control: Images of symmetry and asymmetry in domestic violence. In A. Booth, A. Crouter, & M. Clements (Eds.), *Couples in conflict* (p. 178-204). Hillsdale, NJ:Lawrence Erlbaum
- Johnson, R. J., & Kaplan, H. B. (1989). Gender and deviance. American Sociological Association.
- Joint Committee on Child Custody and Access. (1998). *For the sake of the children*.
- Jouriles, E. N., & O'Leary, K. N. (1985). Interspousal reliability of reports of marital violence. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology*, 53, 419-491.
- Kalmuss, D. (1979). The attribution of responsibility in the wife-abuse context. *Victimology*, 4, 284-291.
- Kaplan, A. (1964). *The conduct of inquiry*. San Francisco: Chandler.
- Katz, J., Street, A., & Arias, I. (1997, Fall). Individual differences in self-appraisals and responses to dating violence scenarios. *Violence and Victims*, 12, 265-276.

- Katz, R. S. (2000). Explaining girls' and women's crime and desistance in the context of their victimization experiences: A developmental test of revised strain theory and the life course perspectives. *Violence Against Women*, 6, 633-661.
- Kennedy, L.W., & Dutton, D.G. (1989). The incidence of wife assault in Alberta. *Canadian Journal of Behavioural Science*, 21, 40-54.
- Kimmel, M. S. (2000). *The gendered society*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Kimmel, M. S. (2002). "Gender Symmetry" in domestic violence. *Violence Against Women*, 8, 1332-1363.
- Koss, M. P., Gidycz, C. A., & Wisniewski, N. (1987). The scope of rape: Incidence and prevalence in a national sample of higher education students. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology*, 55, 162-170.
- Kruttschnitt, C. (1996). Contributions of quantitative methods to the study of gender and crime, or bootstrapping our way into the theoretical thicket. *Journal of Quantitative Criminology*, 12, 135-161.
- Kurz,D. (1993). Physical assaults by husbands: A major social problem. In R.J. Gelles & D.R. Loseke (Eds.), *Current controversies on family violence* (pp. 88-103). Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications.
- Labell, L. S. (1979). Wife abuse: A sociological study of battered women and their mates. *Victimology*, 4, 258-267.
- Labne, K. E., & Gwartney-Gibbs, P. A. (1985). Violence in the context of dating and sex. *Journal of Family Issues*, 6, 45-59.
- Laner, M. R. (1989). Competition and combativeness in courtship: Reports from men. *Journal of Family Violence*, 4, 47-62.

- Laner, M. R. (1990). Violence or its precipitators: Which is more likely to be identified as a dating problem. *Deviant Behavior*, 11, 319-329.
- Laner, M. R., & Thompson, J. (1982). Abuse and aggression in courting couples. *Deviant Behavior*, 3, 229-244.
- Launius, M. H., & Jenson, B. L. (1987). Interpersonal problem-solving skills in battered, counseling and control women. *Journal of Family Violence*, 2, 151-162.
- Lawlor, A. (2002, June 26). Men as likely to suffer spousal abuse, Statscan says. *The Globe and Mail*. Retrieved July 2, 2002 from <http://www.globeandmail.com/servlet/RTGAMArticleHTMLTemplate/C/>
- Lejeune, C., & Follette, V. (1994). Taking responsibility: Sex differences in reporting dating violence. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 9, 133-140.
- Levy, B. (1990). Abusive teen dating relationships: An emerging issue for the '90s. *Response to the Victimization of Women and Children*, 13, 5-15.
- Levy, B. (Ed.). (1990). *Dating violence: Young women in danger*. Seattle, WA: Seal.
- Lipman-Blumen, J. (1984). *Gender Roles and Power*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Lloyd, S. A. (1987). Conflict in premarital relationships: Differential perceptions of males and females. *Family Relations*, 36, 290-294.
- Lloyd, S. A. (1991). The darkside of courtship: Violence and sexual exploitation. *Family Relations*, 40, 14-20.
- Lloyd, S. A., & Emery, B. C. (1994). Physically aggressive conflict in romantic relationships. In D. Cahn (Ed.), *Conflict in Intimate Relationships*. Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

- Long, J. S. (1983). *Confirmatory factor analysis*. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage Publications.
- Lucal, B. (1995). The problem with “battered husbands.” *Deviant Behavior*, 16, 95-112.
- Macklin, E. D. (1983). Effect of changing sex roles on the intimate relationships of men and women. *Marriage and Family Review*, 6, 97-113.
- Macleod, L. (1980). *Wife battering in Canada: The vicious circle*. Ottawa, Ontario, Canada: Canadian Advisory Council on the Status of Women.
- Macleod, L. (1987). *Battered but not beaten...preventing wife battering in Canada*. Ottawa, Ontario, Canada: Canadian Advisory Council on the Status of Women.
- Makepeace, J. M. (1986). Gender differences in courtship violence. *Family Relations*, 35, 383-388.
- Matsueda, R. L. (1992). Reflected appraisals, parental labeling and delinquency: Specifying a symbolic interactionist theory. *American Journal of Sociology*, 97, 1577-1611.
- Mayer, L. J., & Johnson, J. M. (1988). Courtship violence and the emotional career of betrayal. *Studies in Symbolic Interactionism*, 9, 187-199.
- McCormick, N. B., & Jesser, C. J. (1983). The courtship game. In E. R. Allgeier & N. B. McCormick (Eds.), *Changing Boundaries* (pp. 65-86). Palo Alto, CA: Mayfield.
- McDonough, J. F. (1988). Catch 22 controls as barriers to women’s rights. Society for the Study of Social Problems.
- McKinney, K. (1986a, May). Measures of verbal, physical and sexual dating violence by gender. *Free Inquiry in Creative Sociology*, 14, 55-60.
- McKinney, K. (1986b, May). Perceptions of courtship violence: Gender difference and involvement. *Free Inquiry in Creative Sociology*, 14, 61-66.

- McNeely, R. L., & Robinson-Simpson, G. (1987). The truth about domestic violence: A falsely framed issue. *Social Work, 32*, 485-490.
- Melton, H. C., & Belknap, J. (2003). He hits, she hits: Assessing gender difference and similarities in officially reported intimate partner violence *Criminal Justice and Behavior, 30*, 328-348.
- Merlo, A., & Pollock, M. (Eds.). (1995). *Women, law and social control*. Toronto, Ontario, Canada: Allyn & Bacon.
- Messerschmidt, J. W. (1986). *Capitalism, patriarchy, and crime*. Totowa, NJ: Rowman & Littlefield.
- Messerschmidt, J. W. (1993). *Masculinities and crime*. Lanham, MD: Rowman & Littlefield.
- Miles, M. B., & Huberman, A. M. (1984). *Qualitative data analysis: A sourcebook for new methods*. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage Publications.
- Miller, S. (Ed.). (1998). *Crime, control and women*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Miller, S. L., & Simpson, S. S. (1991). Courtship violence and social control: Does gender matter? *Law and Society Review, 25*, 335-365.
- Miller, S. L. (2001). The paradox of women arrested for domestic violence criminal justice professionals and service providers respond. *Violence Against Women, 7*, 1339-1376.
- Millet, K. (1969). *Sexual politics*. New York: Avon.
- Mills, C. W. (1963). *Power, politics and people*. London: Oxford University Press.

- Mills, R. B., & Malley-Morrison, K. (1998, December). Emotional commitment, normative acceptability, and attributions for abusive partner behaviors. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 13*, 682-700.
- Molidor, C. (1995). Gender differences of psychological abuse in high school dating relationships. *Child and Adolescent Social Work, 12*, 119-134.
- Molidor, C., & Tolman, R. M. (1998, April). Gender and contextual factors in adolescent dating violence. *Violence Against Women, 4*, 180-194.
- Morris, M. (2002, March). Violence against women and girls: A fact sheet for the Canadian Research Institute for the Advancement of Women. Retrieved Oct. 10 2002 from http://www.criaw-icref.ca/violence_fact_sheet_a.htm
- Nelson, E. D., & Robinson, B. W. (1994, April). "Reality talk" or "telling tales?" The social construction of sexual and gender deviance on a television talk show. *Journal of Contemporary Ethnography, 23*, 51-78.
- Neufeld, J., McNamara, J. R., & Ertl, M. (1999, February). Incidence and prevalence of dating partner abuse and its relationship to dating practices. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 14*, 125-138.
- O'Keefe, M. (1997, August). Predictors of dating violence among high school students. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 12*, 546-568.
- O'Keefe, M. (1998, March). Factors mediating the link between witnessing interparental violence and dating violence. *Journal of Family Violence, 13*, 39-57.
- O'Keefe, M., & Treister, L. (1998, April). Victims of dating violence among high school students: Are the predictors different for males and females? *Violence Against Women, 4*, 195-223.

- O'Leary, K. D. (2000). Are women really more aggressive than men in intimate relationships? *Psychological Bulletin*, 126, 685-689.
- Okun, L. (1986). *Woman abuse: Facts replacing myths*. New York: State University of New York Press.
- Pagelow, M. D. (1981a). *Women battering*. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage Publications.
- Pagelow, M. D. (1981b). Factors affecting women's decisions to leave violent relationships. *Journal of Family Issues*, 4, 391-415.
- Pagelow, M. D. (1984). The question of a "battered husband syndrome." In M. Pagelow & L. W. Pagelow (Eds.), *Family Violence* (pp. 267-277). New York: Praeger Scientific.
- Pearson, L., & Gallaway, R. (1998). *For the sake of the children: Report of the Special Joint Committee on Child Custody and Access*. Ottawa, Ontario, Canada: Public Works and Government Services Canada.
- Pearson, P. (1997). *When she was bad*. Toronto, Ontario, Canada: Random House.
- Pedersen, P., & Thomas, C. D. (1992). Prevalence and correlates of dating violence in a Canadian university sample. *Canadian Journal of Behavioral Science*, 24, 490-501.
- Perilla, J. L., Frndak, K., Lillard, D., & East, C. (2003) A working analysis of women's use of violence in the context of learning, opportunity, and choice. *Violence Against Women*, 9, 10-46.
- Pirog-Good, M. A., & Stets, J. E. (Eds.). (1989). *Violence in dating relationships: Emerging social issues*. New York: Praeger.
- Pleck, E. (1987). *Domestic Tyranny*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Pleck, E., Pleck, J.H., Grossman, M., & Bart, P. (1977-78). The battered data syndrome:

A comment on Steinmetz's article. *Victimology*, 2, 680-684.

Price, E. L., & Byers, E. S. (1999). The attitude towards dating violence scales:

Development and initial validation. *Journal of Family Violence*, 14, 351-375.

Radford, J. (1987). Policing male violence – Policing women. In J. Hanmer & M.

Maynard (Eds.), *Women, violence and social control* (pp. 30-45). Atlantic

Highlands, NJ: Humanities Press International.

Renzetti, C. (1994). On dancing with a bear: Reflections on some of the current debates

among domestic violence theorists. *Violence and Victims*, 9, 195-200.

Renzetti, C. (1999). The challenge to feminism posed by women's use of violence in

intimate relationships. In S. Lamb (Ed.), *New versions of victims: Feminists*

struggle with the concept. (p.42-56). New York: New York University Press.

Renzetti, C., & Curran, D. (1995). *Women, men and society*. Boston: Allyn & Bacon.

Renzetti, C., & Lee, R. M. (Eds.). (1993). *Researching sensitive topics*. Newbury Park,

CA: Sage Publications.

Rhodes, N. R. (1992). The assessment of spousal abuse: An alternative to the conflict

tactics scale. In E. C. Viano (Ed.), *Intimate Violence: Interdisciplinary*

Perspectives (pp. 27-36). New York: Hemisphere Publishing.

Riggs, D. S., & O'Leary, K. D. (1996). Aggression between heterosexual dating partners.

Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 11, 519-540.

Ronfeldt, H. M., Kimerling, R., et al. (1998, February). Satisfaction with relationship

power and the perpetration of dating violence. *Journal of Marriage and Family*,

60, 70-79.

- Rosenberg, M. (1968). *The logic of survey analysis*. New York: Basic Books.
- Rouse, J. (1994). Power/knowledge. In G. Gutting (Ed.), *The Cambridge Companion to Foucault* (pp. 92-114). New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Rouse, L. P., Breen, R., & Howell, M. (1988). Abuse in intimate relationships: A comparison of married and dating college students. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 3, 415-429.
- Ryan, K. M. (1998, December). The relationship between courtship violence and sexual aggression in college students. *Journal of Family Violence*, 13, 377-394.
- Sadri, M. (1992). Durkheim's division of labor and selective saliency of ascriptive and achieved status. American Sociological Association.
- Saunders, D. (1986). When battered women use violence: Husband abuse or self-defense? *Violence and Victims*, 1, 47-60.
- Saunders, D. (1988). Wife abuse, husband abuse, or mutual combat? A feminist perspective on the empirical findings. In K. Yllo, & M. Bograd (Eds.), *Feminist Perspectives on Wife Abuse* (pp. 90-113). Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications.
- Saunders, D. G., Lynch, A. B., Grayson, M., & Linz, D. (1987). The inventory of beliefs about wife beating: The construction and initial validation of a measure of beliefs and attitudes. *Violence and Victims*, 2, 39-57.
- Sawicki, J. (1991). *Disciplining Foucault*. New York: Routledge.
- Schneider, B. E. (1987). Feminist disclaimers, stigma and the contemporary women's movement. American Sociological Association.
- Schur, E. (1983). *Labeling women deviant*. Philadelphia: McGraw-Hill.

- Schwartz, M. (2000). Methodological issues in the use of survey data for measuring and characterizing violence against women. *Violence Against Women*, 6, 815-838.
- Schwartz, M. A., & DeKeseredy, W. S. (1993). The return of the “battered husband syndrome” through typifications of women and violence. *Crime, Law, and Social Change*, 20, 249-265.
- Schritchfield, S. A., & Masker, J. (1989). Gender traditionality and perceptions of date rape.
- Shook, N., Gerrity, D. A., Jurick, J., & Segrist, A. E. (2000, March). Courtship violence among college students: A comparison of verbally and physically aggressive couples. *Journal of Family Violence*, 15, 1-22.
- Shotland, R. L. (1992). A theory of the causes of courtship rape. *Journal of Social Issues*, 48, 127-143.
- Shupe, A. L., Hazelwood, L., & Stacey, W. (1994). *The violent couple*. Westport, CT: Praeger.
- Simon, T. R., Anderson, M., Thompson, M. P., Crosby, A. E., Shelley, G., & Sacks, J. J. (2001). Attitudinal acceptance of intimate partner violence among U.S. adults. *Violence and Victims*, 16, 115-126.
- Simonelli, C. J., & Ingram, K. M. (1998, December). Psychological distress among men experiencing physical and emotional abuse in heterosexual dating relationships. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 13, 667-682.
- Sinclair, D. (1985). *Understanding wife assault: A training manual for counselors and advocates*. Toronto, Ontario, Canada: Ministry of Community and Social Services.

- Smith, J. P., & Williams, J. G. (1992). From abusive household to dating violence. *Journal of Family Violence*, 7, 153-165.
- Smith, M. (1987). The incidence and prevalence of woman abuse in Toronto. *Violence and Victims*, 2, 173-187.
- Smith, M. D. (1990). Patriarchal ideology and wife beating: a test of a feminist hypothesis. *Violence and Victims*, 5, 257-273.
- Smith, M. D. (1994). Enhancing the quality of survey data on violence against women. *Gender and Society*, 18, 109-127.
- Spencer, G. A., & Bryant, S. A. (2000, November). Dating violence: a comparison of rural, suburban, and urban teens. *Journal of Adolescent Health*, 27, 302-305.
- Stacy, C. L., Shandel, L. M., Flannery, W. S., Conlon, M., & Milardo, R. M. (1994). Its not all moonlight and roses: Dating violence at the University of Maine. *College Student Journal*, 28, 2-9.
- Stanko, E. (1985). *Intimate intrusions: Women's experiences of male violence*. London: Routledge.
- Stanko, E. A. (1990). *Everyday violence: How women and men experience sexual and physical danger*. London: Pandora.
- Statistics Canada. (1993). *Violence Against Women Survey*. Ottawa: Author.
- Statistics Canada. (2002, June 26). Family violence: Impacts and consequences of spousal violence. *The Daily*. Retrieved July 2, 2002 from <http://www.statcan.ca/Daily/English/020626/d020626a.htm>
- Steinmetz, S. (1977-78). The battered husband syndrome. *Victimology*, 3-4, 499-509.

- Steinmetz, S. K. (1980). Women and violence: Victims and perpetrators. *American Journal of Psychotherapy*, 34, 334-350.
- Stets, J. E., & Henderson, D. A. (1991). Contextual factors surrounding conflict resolution while dating: Results from a national survey. *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, 63-76.
- Stets, J. E., & Pirog-Good, M. A. (1990). Interpersonal control and courtship aggression. *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships*, 7, 371-394.
- 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, & C. Smith (Eds.), *Physical Violence in American Families* (pp. 151-180). New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction Publishers.
- Stets, J. E., & Straus, M. A. (1990b). The marriage license as a hitting license: A comparison of assaults in dating, cohabitating and married couples. In M. A. Straus, R. J. Gelles, & C. Smith (Eds.), *Physical Violence in American Families* (pp. 227-244). New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction Publishers.
- Stevens, J. (1996). *Applied Multivariate Statistics for the Social Sciences 3rd Edition*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Straus, M. A. (1980, May/June). Victims and aggressors in marital violence. *American Behavioral Scientist*, 23, 681-704.

- Straus, M. A. (1990a). Measuring intrafamily conflict and violence: The conflict tactics scale. In M. A. Straus, R. J. Gelles, & C. Smith (Eds.), *Physical Violence in American Families* (pp. 29-48). New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction Publishers.
- Straus, M. A. (1990b). The conflict tactics scale and its critics: An evaluation and new data on validity and reliability. In M. A. Straus, R. J. Gelles, & C. Smith (Eds.), *Physical Violence in American Families* (pp. 49-74). New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction Publishers.
- Straus, M. A. (1990c). New scoring methods for violence and new norms for the conflict tactics scale. In M. A. Straus, R. J. Gelles, & C. Smith (Eds.), *Physical Violence in American Families* (pp. 535-560). New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction Publishers.
- Straus, M. A. (1993). Physical assault by wives: A major social problem. In R. J. Gelles & D. R. Loseke (Eds.), *Current Controversies on Family Violence* (pp. 67-87). Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications.
- Straus, M. A. (1998, November). *The controversy over domestic violence by women: A methodological, theoretical, and sociology of science analysis*. Paper presented at the Cleremont Symposium on Applied Social Psychology on Violence in Intimate Relationships.
- Straus, M. A., & Gelles, R. (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. (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* (pp. 95-132). New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction.
- Straus, M. A., Gelles, R., & Steinmetz, S. (1981). *Behind closed doors: Violence in the American family*. New York: Anchor.
- Straus, M. A., Hamby, S. L., Boney-McCoy, S., & Sugarman, D. B. (1995). *The revised conflict tactics scale (CTS2)*. Durham, NH: Family Research Laboratory.
- Straus, M. A., Hamby, S. L., Boney-McCoy, S., & Sugarman, D. B. (1996, May). The revised conflict tactics scale (CTS2): Development and preliminary psychometric data. *Journal of Family Issues*, 17, 283-316.
- Straus, M. A., & Medeiros, R. A. (2002). Gender differences in risk factors for physical violence between dating partners by university students.
- Straus, M. A., & Ramirez, I. L. (1999, November). *Criminal history and assault of dating partners: The role of gender, age of onset, and type of crime*. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Society of Criminology, Toronto, Canada.
- Straus, M. A., & Ramirez, I. L. (n.d.). Grant application for International Dating Violence Study.
- Straus, M. A., & Yodanis, C. L. (1996, August). *Gender hostility and violence against dating partners*. Paper presented at the 12th World Meeting of the International Society for Research on Aggression, Strasbourg, France.

- Strube, M. J. (1988). The decision to leave an abusive relationship. In D. Finkelhor, G. T. Hotaling, J. T. Kirkpatrick, & M. A. Straus (Eds.), *Coping with Family Violence* (pp. 93-106). Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications.
- Sugarman, D. B., & Hotaling, G. T. (1997, April). Intimate violence and social desirability: A meta-analytic review. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 12*, 275-290.
- Swan, S. C., & Snow, D. L. (2002). A typology of women's use of violence in intimate relationships. *Violence Against Women, 8*, 286-319.
- Swan, S. C., & Snow, D. L. (2003). Behavioral and psychological differences among abused women who use violence in intimate relationships. *Violence Against Women, 9*, 75-109.
- Thoits, P. (1982). Conceptual, methodological and theoretical problems in studying social support as a buffer against life stress. *Journal of Health and Social Behavior, 23*, 145-159.
- Thompson, E. H., Jr. (1991, March). The maleness of violence in dating relationships: An appraisal of stereotypes. *Sex Roles, 24*, 261-278.
- Thompson, W. E. (1986). Courtship violence: Toward a conceptual understanding. *Youth and Society, 18*, 162-176.
- Tontodonato, P., & Crew, B. (1992). Dating violence, social learning theory, and gender: A multivariate analysis. *Violence and Victims, 7*, 3-14.
- Touliatos, J., Perlmutter, B. F., & Straus, M. A. (Eds.). (1990). *Handbook of family measurement techniques*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications.

- Trainor, C. (Ed.). (2002a). *Family violence in Canada: A statistical profile 2002*. Ottawa, Ontario, Canada: Statistics Canada.
- Trainor, C. (2002b). Highlights. In C. Trainor (Ed.), *Family violence in Canada: A statistical profile 2002* (p. 1). Ottawa, Ontario, Canada: Statistics Canada.
- Trainor, C. (2002c). Measuring family violence. In C. Trainor (Ed.), *Family violence in Canada: A statistical profile 2002*. Ottawa, Ontario, Canada: Statistics Canada.
- Trainor, C., Lambert, M., & Dauvergne, M. (2002). Spousal violence. In C. Trainor (Ed.), *Family violence in Canada: A statistical profile 2002* (pp. 6-9). Ottawa, Ontario, Canada: Statistics Canada.
- Turner, H. A. (1994). Gender and social support. *Sex Roles*, 30, 521-541.
- Ursel, E. J. (1984). Toward a theory of reproduction. *Contemporary Crises*, 8, 265-292.
- U.S. Department of Justice. (2000) Workshop on gender symmetry: Summary of workshop discussion. *Violence Against Women Programs*.
- Vivian, D., & Langhinrichsen-Rohling, J. (1994). Are bi-directionally violent couples mutually victimized? A gender sensitive comparison. *Violence and Victims*, 9, 107-124.
- Walby, S. (1990). *Theorizing patriarchy*. Oxford, England: Basil Blackwell.
- Walker, L. E. (1979). Battered women and learned helplessness. *Victimology*, 2, 525-534.
- Walker, L. E. (1983). The battered women syndrome study. In D. Finkelhor, R. J. Gelles, G. T. Hotaling, & M. A. Straus (Eds.), *The Dark Side of Families: Current Family Violence Research* (pp. 42-43). Beverly Hills, CA: Sage Publications.
- Walker, L. E. (1984). *The battered woman syndrome*. New York: Springer Publishing Co.

- Walker, L. E. (1989). *Terrifying Love*. New York: Harper Collins.
- West, C. M., & Rose, S. (2000, May). Dating aggression among low income African American youth: An examination of gender differences and antagonistic beliefs. *Violence Against Women*, 6, 470-495.
- West, J. T. (1995). Understanding how the dynamics of ideology influence violence between intimates. In S. Duck & J. T. Wood (Eds.), *Confronting Relationship Challenges* (pp. 129-149). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- White, J. W., & Koss, M. P. (1991). Courtship violence: Incidence in a national sample of higher education students. *Violence and Victims*, 6, 247-256.
- White, J. W., Merrill, L. L., & Koss, M. P. (2001, September). Predictors of premilitary courtship violence in a navy recruit sample. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 16, 910-927.
- Worcester, N. (2002). Women's use of force. *Violence Against Women*, 8, 1390-1415.
- Yllo, 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, & C. Smith (Eds.), *Physical Violence in American Families* (pp. 383-402). New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction Publishers.
- Young, M. (1991). Victims of partner abuse: Laws and policies change but myths continue. *Nova Newsletter*, 15(2), 4-11.

APPENDIX A**Canadian National Survey
Female Questionnaire**

MALE-FEMALE DATING

RELATIONSHIPS

QUESTIONNAIRE

This is the first national Canadian survey on problems in male-female dating relationships. It is sponsored by Health and Welfare Canada, and is being conducted by Carleton University Professors Walter DeKeseredy and Katharine Kelly. Please read the instructions for each section carefully and answer each question as honestly as you can. Please note that any information you provide will be kept *completely confidential*. Participation in this study is *strictly voluntary*. We think that you will find this questionnaire interesting.

It will take different people different lengths of time to fill in the survey. Some will not take too long to complete it; others will take longer. But all of your answers are important to us, so take your time and be as honest as possible. When you have completed the questionnaire, a researcher will pick it up from you.

The results of this survey will be made widely available and hopefully used to improve relations between male and female dating partners. If you have any questions, please contact Walter DeKeseredy or Katharine Kelly at (613) 788-2582.

Thank you for taking the time to complete this questionnaire.

IF YOU HAVE FILLED OUT THIS QUESTIONNAIRE IN ANOTHER CLASS, DO NOT COMPLETE THIS ONE. PLEASE RETURN IT IMMEDIATELY TO THE RESEARCHER.

First we would like to ask some general questions about your dating patterns. Please circle the number which best represents your answer.

1. Have you been involved in a dating relationship with a male at any point in your life, no matter how short-term or casual, or long-term and serious?

Yes 1
No 2

IF NO, PLEASE GO TO QUESTION 11. IF YOU ARE CURRENTLY MARRIED AND HAVE NOT DATED IN THE LAST 12 MONTHS, PLEASE GO TO QUESTION 10.

2. Just in the past 12 months alone, have you engaged in casual dating with men (i.e., a good time with no future commitment or obligation on the part of you and your dating partner)?

Yes 1
No 2

- (i) If yes, please estimate how many different persons you have had such casual (not serious) dates with in the last 12 months?

3. Just in the past 12 months alone, have you had any serious dating relationships with men (i.e., involving a great deal of commitment and intimacy)?

Yes 1
No 2

- (i) If yes, please estimate how many different persons you have had such serious (not casual) dates with in the last 12 months?

4. Just in the past 12 months alone, have you ever moved in with or lived regularly with a boyfriend?

Yes 1
No 2

5. Just in the past 12 months alone, have you ever been engaged to a boyfriend?

Yes 1
No 2

6. Just in the past 12 months alone, have you engaged in casual dating with men who do not share your ethnic background?

Yes 1
No 2

7. Just in the past 12 months alone, have you had any serious dating relationships with men who do not share your ethnic background?

Yes 1

No 2

8. Just in the past 12 months alone, have you ever moved in with or lived regularly with a boyfriend who does not share your ethnic background?

Yes 1

No 2

9. Just in the past 12 months alone, have you ever been engaged to a boyfriend who does not share your ethnic background?

Yes 1

No 2

10. We have been asking about the past 12 months only. Since leaving or graduating from high school, however, have you had dating partners or boyfriends?

Yes 1

No 2

11. What does the term dating mean to you? Please answer in the space below.

12. Now, we would like to ask you some general background questions. This information will allow us to compare your responses to other Canadian students. Please circle **only one** number which best represents your answer. Where there are blanks, please write out the answer. Please note your responses will be kept completely confidential.

a. How old are you? _____

b. What year did you leave or graduate from high school? _____

c. Please list the courses (e.g., history, sociology) and course level (e.g., first year) you are taking this term.

d. What is your year of study?

- First year 1
 Second year 2
 Third year 3
 Fourth year 4
 Other (i.e., special student) 5

e. What year did you begin college/university? _____

f. What subject or program are you majoring in, or do you expect to major in? _____

g. Do you identify yourself as an Aboriginal (e.g., Metis, status/nonstatus Indian) person?

- Yes 1
 No 2

h. Which ethnic or cultural group do you identify with? Please circle the number which best represents your answer.

1 Central American (El Salvador, Honduras etc.)	8 S. European (Italy, Spain, Portugal, Greece, etc.)
2 Scandinavian (Denmark, Sweden, Norway)	9 Far Eastern (Japan, China, India, Hong Kong, etc.)
3 French Canadian	10 African (specify if North Central, or South) _____
4 English Canadian	11 Caribbean
5 British (Scotland, Wales, England, N. Ireland)	12 Middle Eastern (Israel, Lebanon, Iran, Iraq, etc)
6 W. European (France, Germany, Holland etc.)	13 Latin American
7 E. European (Russia, Poland, Baltic States, Hungary, etc.)	14 Other (please specify) _____

i. What is your marital status?

- Never married and not living with a male partner 1
 Married and living with your spouse 2
 Living with a male partner 3
 Separated and not living with a male partner 4
 Divorced and not living with a male partner 5
 Widowed and not living with a male partner 6

j. What country were you born in? _____

k. Are you a recent (i.e., within the last five years) immigrant to Canada?

- Yes 1
 No 2

l. Are you a refugee from another country?

- Yes 1
 No 2

m. Are you a foreign student?

Yes 1

No 2

13. Do you currently belong to a sorority?

Yes 1

IF YES PLEASE GO TO QUESTION 15.

No 2

14. Have you ever belonged to a university or college sorority?

Yes 1

No 2

15. The next questions are about how safe you generally feel in public places these days. For each of the following situations please tell us if you would feel: very safe, reasonably safe, neither safe nor unsafe, somewhat unsafe, or very unsafe. Please circle the **NUMBER** which best represents your answer. How safe do you feel or would you feel?

	Very Safe	Reasonably Safe	Neither Safe nor Unsafe	Somewhat Unsafe	Very Unsafe
a. walking alone after dark	1	2	3	4	5
b. riding a bus or streetcar alone after dark	1	2	3	4	5
c. riding a subway alone after dark	1	2	3	4	5
d. walking alone to your car in a parking lot after dark	1	2	3	4	5
e. waiting for public transportation alone after dark	1	2	3	4	5
f. walking past men you don't know, while alone after dark	1	2	3	4	5
g. being alone in your own home after dark	1	2	3	4	5

IF YOU HAVE NEVER BEEN INVOLVED IN A DATING RELATIONSHIP, PLEASE GO TO QUESTION 24.

16. Sexual relations are common in dating relationships. The next questions are about your sexual experiences with dating partners and/or boyfriends. Below is a list of things that might have happened to you in the last 12 months and/or since you left high school. Please answer either YES or NO to both sections of each question. **IF YOU ARE OR HAVE BEEN MARRIED, PLEASE NOTE THESE QUESTIONS REFER ONLY TO DATING RELATIONSHIPS.**

	IN THE LAST 12 MONTHS		SINCE LEAVING HIGH SCHOOL (including the last 12 months)	
	YES	NO	YES	NO
a. Have you given in to sex play (fondling, kissing, or petting, but not intercourse) when you didn't want to because you were overwhelmed by a man's continual arguments and pressure?	1	2	1	2
b. Have you engaged in sex play (fondling, kissing, or petting, but not intercourse) when you didn't want to because a man used his position of authority (boss, professor, supervisor, etc.) to make you?	1	2	1	2
c. Have you had sex play (fondling, kissing, or petting, but not intercourse) when you didn't want to because a man threatened or used some degree of physical force (twisting your arm, holding you down, etc.) to make you?	1	2	1	2
d. Has a man attempted sexual intercourse (getting on top of you, attempting to insert his penis) when you didn't want to by threatening or using some degree of physical force (twisting your arm, holding you down, etc.), but intercourse did not occur?	1	2	1	2
e. Has a man attempted sexual intercourse (getting on top of you, attempting to insert his penis) when you didn't want to because you were drunk or high, but intercourse did not occur?	1	2	1	2
f. Have you given in to sexual intercourse when you didn't want to because you were overwhelmed by a man's continual arguments and pressure?	1	2	1	2

		IN THE LAST 12 MONTHS		SINCE LEAVING HIGH SCHOOL (including the last 12 months)	
		YES	NO	YES	NO
g.	Have you had sexual intercourse when you didn't want to because a man used his position of authority (boss, professor, supervisor) to make you?	1	2	1	2
h.	Have you had sexual intercourse when you didn't want to because you were drunk or high?	1	2	1	2
i.	Have you had sexual intercourse when you didn't want to because a man threatened or used some degree of physical force (twisting your arm, holding you down, etc.) to make you?	1	2	1	2
j.	Have you engaged in sex acts (anal or oral intercourse or penetration by objects other than the penis) when you didn't want to because a man threatened or used some degree of physical force (twisting your arm, holding you down, etc.) to make you?	1	2	1	2

17. We are particularly interested in learning more about your dating relationships. No matter how well a dating couple gets 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 to settle their differences. Below is a list of some things that you might have been done to you by your boyfriends and/or dating partners in these circumstances. Please circle the number which best represents your answer in each of the following situations. Please note the items are repeated twice. The first set is for the past twelve months, the second set covers all of your experiences since you left high school. **IF YOU ARE OR HAVE BEEN MARRIED, PLEASE NOTE THESE QUESTIONS REFER ONLY TO DATING RELATIONSHIPS.**

		IN THE LAST 12 MONTHS					
		Once	Twice	3-5 Times	6-10 Times	More than 10 Times	Never
a.	Insulted or swore at you	1	2	3	4	5	6
b.	Put you down in front of friends or family ..	1	2	3	4	5	6
c.	Accused you of having affairs or flirting with other men	1	2	3	4	5	6
d.	Did or said something to spite you	1	2	3	4	5	6

SINCE LEAVING HIGH SCHOOL
(including the last 12 months)

	Once	Twice	3-5 Times	6-10 Times	More than 10 Times	Never
l. Beat you up	1	2	3	4	5	6
m. Choked you	1	2	3	4	5	6
n. Threatened you with a knife or a gun	1	2	3	4	5	6
o. Used a knife or gun on you	1	2	3	4	5	6

18. We realize that it may be difficult to discuss some of your dating experiences, but if we may, we would like to ask you a few questions about the **most recent** incident in which you were physically, sexually or emotionally hurt by a boyfriend or dating partner. Please circle the letter or number which best represents your answer. **IF YOU HAVE NOT BEEN HURT BY A BOYFRIEND OR MALE DATING PARTNER, PLEASE GO TO QUESTION 19.**

- a. Please indicate whether the last incident was:

a) physical abuse	d) both a and b
b) sexual abuse	e) both a and c
c) emotional abuse	f) both b and c
	g) a, b and c

- b. Did you ever turn to anyone for help?

Yes 1
No 2

(IF NO, PLEASE GO TO QUESTION 19)

- c. Did you turn to at least one friend for help?

Yes 1
No 2

(IF NO, PLEASE GO TO ITEM d)

- (1) How satisfied were you with the help you received from this/these friend(s)?

Very satisfied 1
Satisfied 2
Not satisfied 3

- d. Did you turn to the police (not campus security) for help?

Yes 1
No 2

(IF NO, PLEASE GO TO ITEM e)

IN THE LAST 12 MONTHS

	Once	Twice	3-5 Times	6-10 Times	More than 10 Times	Never
e. Threatened to hit or or throw something at you	1	2	3	4	5	6
f. Threw, smashed or kicked something	1	2	3	4	5	6
g. Threw something at you	1	2	3	4	5	6
h. Pushed, grabbed or shoved you	1	2	3	4	5	6
i. Slapped you	1	2	3	4	5	6
j. Kicked, bit, or hit you with his fist	1	2	3	4	5	6
k. Hit or tried to hit you with something	1	2	3	4	5	6
l. Beat you up	1	2	3	4	5	6
m. Choked you	1	2	3	4	5	6
n. Threatened you with a knife or a gun	1	2	3	4	5	6
o. Used a knife or gun on you	1	2	3	4	5	6

SINCE LEAVING HIGH SCHOOL
(including the last 12 months)

	Once	Twice	3-5 Times	6-10 Times	More than 10 Times	Never
a. Insulted or swore at you	1	2	3	4	5	6
b. Put you down in front of friends or family ..	1	2	3	4	5	6
c. Accused you of having affairs or flirting with other men	1	2	3	4	5	6
d. Did or said something to spite you	1	2	3	4	5	6
e. Threatened to hit or or throw something at you	1	2	3	4	5	6
f. Threw, smashed or kicked something	1	2	3	4	5	6
g. Threw something at you	1	2	3	4	5	6
h. Pushed, grabbed or shoved you	1	2	3	4	5	6
i. Slapped you	1	2	3	4	5	6
j. Kicked, bit, or hit you with his fist	1	2	3	4	5	6
k. Hit or tried to hit you with something	1	2	3	4	5	6

(1) How satisfied were you with the help you received from the police?

Very satisfied 1
 Satisfied 2
 Not satisfied 3

e. Did you turn to at least one family member for help?

Yes 1
 No 2

(IF NO, PLEASE GO TO ITEM f)

(1) How satisfied were you with the help you received from this/these family member(s)?

Very satisfied 1
 Satisfied 2
 Not satisfied 3

f. Did you turn to a religious leader for help?

Yes 1
 No 2

(IF NO, PLEASE GO TO ITEM g)

(1) How satisfied were you with the help you received from this person?

Very satisfied 1
 Satisfied 2
 Not satisfied 3

g. Did you turn to a medical professional for help (e.g., doctor, nurse, etc.) for help?

Yes 1
 No 2

(IF NO, PLEASE GO TO ITEM h)

(1) How satisfied were you with the help you received from the medical professional?

Very satisfied 1
 Satisfied 2
 Not satisfied 3

h. Did you turn to a campus counselling service for help?

Yes 1

No 2

(IF NO, PLEASE GO TO ITEM i)

(1) How satisfied were you with the help you received from the counselling service?

Very satisfied 1

Satisfied 2

Not satisfied 3

i. Did you turn to a women's group or women's centre for help?

Yes 1

No 2

(IF NO, PLEASE GO TO ITEM j)

(1) How satisfied were you with the help you received from the women's group or women's centre?

Very Satisfied 1

Satisfied 2

Not satisfied 3

j. Did you turn to campus security for help?

Yes 1

No 2

(IF NO, PLEASE GO TO ITEM k)

(1) How satisfied were you with the help you received from campus security?

Very satisfied 1

Satisfied 2

Not satisfied 3

k. Did you turn to a crisis centre or crisis hot-line for help?

Yes 1

No 2

(IF NO, PLEASE GO TO ITEM l)

(1) How satisfied were you with the help you received from the crisis centre or crisis hot-line?

Very satisfied 1

Satisfied 2

Not satisfied 3

- l. Did you turn to the campus administration for help?

Yes 1

No 2

(IF NO, PLEASE GO TO ITEM m)

- (1) How satisfied were you with the help you received from the campus administration?

Very satisfied 1

Satisfied 2

Not satisfied 3

- m. Did you turn to anyone else for help? If so, please indicate below who you turned to.
IF NOT, PLEASE GO TO QUESTION 19.

19. Now, we would like to ask you some more questions about your dating relationships. Please indicate if **YOU HAVE EVER** used the following methods to settle disputes with your boyfriends and/or dates **SINCE LEAVING HIGH SCHOOL** (including the last 12 months). Please circle the number which best represents your answer. **IF YOU ARE OR HAVE BEEN MARRIED, PLEASE NOTE THESE QUESTIONS REFER ONLY TO DATING RELATIONSHIPS.**

	Once	Twice	3-5 Times	6-10 Times	More than 10 Times	Never
a. Threw something at him	1	2	3	4	5	6
b. Pushed, grabbed or shoved him	1	2	3	4	5	6
c. Slapped him	1	2	3	4	5	6

IF YOU ANSWERED NEVER TO ALL OF THE ABOVE THREE ITEMS, DO NOT ANSWER THE NEXT THREE QUESTIONS (i.e., On items a, b, and c). PLEASE GO TO THE SECTION THAT IMMEDIATELY FOLLOWS THESE QUESTIONS. IT IS MARKED WITH AN ASTERIX (*).

On items a, b, and c, what percentage of these times overall do you estimate that in doing these actions you were primarily motivated by acting in self-defence, that is protecting yourself from immediate physical harm? Circle the number which best represents your answer.

0% 10% 20% 30% 40% 50% 60% 70% 80% 90% 100%

On items a, b, and c, what percentage of these times overall do you estimate that in doing these actions you were trying to fight back in a situation where you were not the first to use these or similar tactics? Circle the number which best represents your answer.

0% 10% 20% 30% 40% 50% 60% 70% 80% 90% 100%

On items a, b, and c, what percentage of these times overall do you estimate that you used these actions on your boyfriends or dates before they actually attacked you or threatened to attack you? Circle the number which best represents your answer.

0% 10% 20% 30% 40% 50% 60% 70% 80% 90% 100%

***Again, please indicate if YOU HAVE EVER used any of the following methods to settle disputes with your boyfriends or dates since you left high school. Please circle the number which best represents your answer.**

	Once	Twice	3-5 Times	6-10 Times	More than 10 Times	Never
d. Kicked, bit, or hit him with your fist	1	2	3	4	5	6
e. Hit or tried to hit him with something	1	2	3	4	5	6
f. Beat him up	1	2	3	4	5	6
g. Choked him	1	2	3	4	5	6
h. Threatened him with a knife or a gun	1	2	3	4	5	6
i. Used a knife or gun on him	1	2	3	4	5	6

IF YOU ANSWERED NEVER TO ALL OF ITEMS d to i, GO TO QUESTION 20.

On items d to i, what percentage of these times overall do you estimate that in doing these actions you were primarily motivated by acting in self-defence, that is protecting yourself from immediate physical harm? Circle the number which best represents your answer.

0% 10% 20% 30% 40% 50% 60% 70% 80% 90% 100%

On items d to i what percentage of these times overall do you estimate that in doing these actions you were trying to fight back in a situation where you were not the first to use these or similar tactics? Circle the number which best represents your answer.

0% 10% 20% 30% 40% 50% 60% 70% 80% 90% 100%

On items d to i, what percentage of these times overall do you estimate that you used these actions on your boyfriends or dates **before** they actually attacked you or threatened to attack you? Circle the number which best represents your answer.

0% 10% 20% 30% 40% 50% 60% 70% 80% 90% 100%

20. NOW WE WOULD LIKE TO ASK YOU A FEW QUESTIONS ABOUT YOUR HIGH SCHOOL (I.E., GRADES 9-13) DATING RELATIONSHIPS. PLEASE CIRCLE THE NUMBER WHICH BEST REPRESENTS YOUR ANSWER.

- a. Did you date boys when you were in high school?

Yes 1

No 2

(IF NO, PLEASE GO TO QUESTION 21)

- b. In high school, did a male dating partner and/or boyfriend ever threaten to use physical force to make you engage in sexual activities?

Yes 1

No 2

- c. In high school, did a male dating partner and/or boyfriend ever use physical force in an attempt to make you engage in sexual activities, whether this attempt was successful or not?

Yes 1

No 2

- d. In high school, did a male dating partner and/or boyfriend ever intentionally emotionally hurt (i.e., insult, say something to spite you) you?

Yes 1

No 2

- e. In high school, did a male dating partner and/or boyfriend ever intentionally physically hurt you?

Yes 1

No 2

21. THE NEXT QUESTIONS ARE ABOUT YOUR ELEMENTARY SCHOOL (I.E., GRADES 1-8) DATING RELATIONSHIPS. PLEASE CIRCLE THE NUMBER WHICH BEST REPRESENTS YOUR ANSWER.

- a. Did you date boys when you were in elementary school?

Yes 1

No 2

(IF NO, PLEASE GO TO QUESTION 22)

- b. In elementary school, did a male dating partner and/or boyfriend ever threaten to use physical force to make you engage in sexual activities?

Yes 1

No 2

- c. In elementary school, did a male dating partner and/or boyfriend ever use physical force in an attempt to make you engage in sexual activities, whether this attempt was successful or not?

Yes 1
No 2

- d. In elementary school, did a male dating partner and/or boyfriend ever intentionally emotionally hurt (i.e. insult, say something to spite you) you?

Yes 1
No 2

- e. In elementary school, did a male dating partner and/or boyfriend ever intentionally physically hurt you?

Yes 1
No 2

22. The next questions are about your use of alcohol and drugs in the last 12 months. Please circle the number which best represents your answer.

- a. Did you drink alcoholic beverages in the last 12 months?

Yes 1
No 2

(IF NO, PLEASE GO TO ITEM D)

- b. If yes, how often on average did you drink alcoholic beverages in the last 12 months?

Once a week 1
2-3 times a week 2
4-6 times a week 3
Every day 4
Once or twice a month 5
Don't know 6

- c. How often did you drink with your boyfriends and/or dating partners in the last 12 months?

Never 1
Very seldom 2
Occasionally 3
Often 4
Very often 5

- d. In the last 12 months, did you use recreational drugs (e.g., hash, marijuana, cocaine, speed, LSD, heroin)?

Never 1
 Very seldom 2
 Occasionally 3
 Often 4
 Very often 5

- e. How often have you used recreational drugs (e.g., hash, marijuana, cocaine, speed, LSD, heroin) with your boyfriends and/or dating partners in the last 12 months?

Never 1
 Very Seldom 2
 Occasionally 3
 Often 4
 Very often 5

23. Thinking about your entire university and/or college career, have you ever been upset by dating partners and/or boyfriends trying to get you to do what they had seen in pornographic pictures, movies, or books? Please circle the number which best represents your answer.

Yes 1
 No 2

(IF NO, PLEASE GO TO QUESTION 24)

- (i) If you were upset, can you tell us what happened? Please provide this information in the space below.

24. Have you EVER BEEN:

- a) Raped and/or sexually assaulted by someone **OTHER THAN A DATING PARTNER.**

Yes 1
 No 2

- i) If yes, was this person a stranger?

Yes 1
 No 2

b) Physically assaulted by someone **OTHER THAN A DATING PARTNER.**

Yes 1
 No 2

i) If yes, was this person a stranger?

Yes 1
 No 2

c) Sexually harassed by someone **OTHER THAN A DATING PARTNER.**

Yes 1
 No 2

i) If yes, was this person a stranger?

Yes 1
 No 2

25. The next questions are about *your beliefs*. For each of the following statements, please tell us if you strongly agree, agree, disagree, or strongly disagree. Circle the number which best represents your answer.

- | | Strongly
Agree | Agree | Disagree | Strongly
Disagree | Don't
Know |
|--|-------------------|-------|----------|----------------------|---------------|
| a. A man and his wife/partner should have equal say in deciding how to spend the family income | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| b. A man and his wife/partner should share the household chores if they are both working outside the home | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| c. A man has the right to decide whether or not his wife/partner should go out in the evening with her friends | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| d. A man has the right to decide whether or not his wife/partner should work outside the home | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| e. Sometimes it is important for a man to show his wife/partner that he is the head of the house | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| f. Any woman who is raped is at least partly to blame | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| g. A man has the right to have sex with his wife/partner when he wants, even though she may not want to | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| h. If a man hits his wife/partner, its because he's lost his temper and gone out of control | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |

26. Now we would like to ask you a few questions about your attitudes for each of the following situations, please tell us if you would approve of a man slapping his dating partner or girlfriend. Would you approve if (circle the number which best represents your answers) . . .

	Yes	Depends	No	Don't Know
a. ...she won't do what he tells her to do	1	2	3	4
b. ...she insults him when they are home alone	1	2	3	4
c. ...she insults him in public	1	2	3	4
d. ...she comes home drunk	1	2	3	4
e. ...she is sobbing hysterically	1	2	3	4
f. ...she won't have sex with him	1	2	3	4
g. ...he learns that she is dating another man	1	2	3	4
h. ...she hits him first when they are having an argument	1	2	3	4

27. We really appreciate the time you have taken to complete this survey. And we'd like to assure you that everything you have told us will remain strictly confidential.

We realize that the topics covered in this survey are sensitive and that many women are reluctant to talk about their dating experiences. But we're also a bit worried that we haven't asked the right questions

So now that you have had a chance to think about the topics, have you had any (any other) experiences in which you were physically and/or sexually harmed by your dating partners and/or boyfriends while you attended college or university? Please provide this information in the space below.

APPENDIX B
VARIABLE TRANSFORMATION

<u>VARIABLE LABEL</u>	<u>VARIABLE NAME</u>	<u>DESCRIPTION</u>	<u>METHOD OF TRANSFORMATION COMPUTE/RECODE</u>
Violence	Use of violence	Scale of self reported use of violence [↑#'s=↑violence]	Addition of q19a-I after recode (1=1; 2=2; 3=4; 4=8; 5=16; 6=0)
Reject1	Rejection of patriarchy 1	Scale of rejection of/adherence to familial patriarchal beliefs [↓#'s=adherence; ↑#'s=rejection]	Addition of q25a-e and g after recode (a and b:1=4; 2=3; 3=2; 4=1) (all: 5=missing)
Reject2	Rejection of patriarchy2	Scale of attitudes supporting/denouncing use of violence to uphold tenets of familial patriarchy [same as above]	Addition of q26a-f after recode (4=missing)
Rej1grp1	Rejection of patriarchy1 grouped	Ordinal 2 set grouping of adherence [1] and rejection [2] of familial patriarchal beliefs	Recode reject1 (0-23=1; 24=2)
Rej1grp2	Rejection of patriarchy1 grouped2	Ordinal 3 set grouping [adherence=1; moderate rejection=2; rejection=3]	Recode reject1 (0-21=1; 22-23=2; 24=3)
Rej2grp	Rejection of patriarchy2 grouped	Ordinal 2 set grouping [Adherence=1; Rejection=2]	Recode reject2 (8-20=1; 21=2)
Violgrp	Use of violence grouped	Ordinal 2 set grouping [No violence=1; Violence=2]	Recode violence (0=1; 1-104=2)
Minor	Use of minor violence	Scale of self reported use of minor violence [↑#'s=↑minor violence]	Addition of q19a-c after recode (1=1; 2=2; 3=4; 4=8; 5=16; 6=0)

<u>VARIABLE LABEL</u>	<u>VARIABLE NAME</u>	<u>DESCRIPTION</u>	<u>METHOD OF TRANSFORMATION</u>
Severev	Use of severe violence	Scale of self reported use of severe violence [↑#’s=↑severe violence]	Addition of q19d-I after recode (same as above)
Mingrp	Use of minor violence grouped	Ordinal 2 set grouping [No minor violence=1; Minor violence=2]	Recode minor (0=1; 1-48=2)
Sevgrp	Use of severe violence grouped	Ordinal 2 set grouping [No severe violence=1; Severe violence=2]	Recode severely (0=1; 1-56=2)
Minsd	Minor violence self defense motive scale	Scale of frequency of self defense motive for use of minor violence (%’s) [↑#’s=↑ self defense motive]	Relabel q19_abc1
Minsdgrp	Minor violence self defense motive	Ordinal 4 set grouping for frequency of self defense motive for use of minor violence [Never=1; sometimes=2; often=3; regularly=4]	Recode q19_abc1 (0=1; 1-35=2; 36-75=3; 76-100=4)
Minret	Minor violence retaliatory motive scale	Scale of frequency of retaliatory motive for use of minor violence (%’s) [↑#’s=↑ retaliatory motive]	Relabel q19_abc2
Minretgp	Minor violence retaliatory motive	Ordinal 4 set grouping for frequency of retaliatory motive for use of minor violence [Never=1; sometimes=2; often=3; regularly=4]	Recode q19_abc2 (0=1; 1-35=2; 36-75=3; 76-100=4)
Mininit	Minor violence initiative motive scale	Frequency scale of initiative motive for use of minor violence (%’s) [↑#’s=↑ initiative motive]	Relabel q19_abc3

<u>VARIABLE LABEL</u>	<u>VARIABLE NAME</u>	<u>DESCRIPTION</u>	<u>METHOD OF TRANSFORMATION</u>
Miningrp	Minor violence initiative motive	Ordinal 4 set grouping for frequency of initiative motive for use of minor violence [Never=1; sometimes=2; often=3; regularly=4]	Recode q19_abc3 (0=1; 1-35=2; 36-75=3; 76- 100=4)
Sevsd	Severe violence self defense motive scale	Frequency scale of self defense motive for use of severe violence (%'s) [↑#'s=↑ self defense motive]	Relabel q19_di1
Sevsdgrp	Severe violence self defense motive	Ordinal 4 set grouping for frequency of self defense motive for use of severe violence [Never=1; sometimes=2; often=3; regularly=4]	Recode q19_di1 (0=1; 1-35=2; 36-75=3; 76- 100=4)
Sevret	Severe violence retaliatory motive scale	Frequency scale of retaliatory motive for use of severe violence (%'s) [↑#'s=↑ self defense motive]	Relabel q19d-i2
Sevretgp	Sever violence retaliatory motive	Ordinal 4 set grouping for frequency of retaliatory motive for use of severe violence [Never=1; sometimes=2; often=3; regularly=4]	Recode q19_di2 (0=1; 1-35=2; 36-75=3; 76- 100=4)
Sevinit	Severe violence initiative motive scale	Frequency scale of initiative motive for use of severe violence (%'s) [↑#'s=↑ self defense motive]	Relabel q19_di3

<u>VARIABLE LABEL</u>	<u>VARIABLE NAME</u>	<u>DESCRIPTION</u>	<u>METHOD OF TRANSFORMATION</u>
Sevingrp	Severe violence initiative motive	Ordinal 4 set grouping for frequency of initiative motive for use of severe violence [Never=1; sometimes=2; often=3; regularly=4]	Recode q19_di3 (0=1; 1-35=2; 36-75=3; 76- 100=4)
Victimhs	Victimization since high school	Scale of victimization in dating relationships since high school [↑#’s=↑victimization]	Addition of q17a-o2 after recode (1=1; 2=2; 3=4; 4=8; 5=16; 6=0)
Victim12	Victimization in last 12 months	Scale of victimization in dating relationships in last 12 months [same as above]	Addition of q17a-o1 after recode (same as above)
Victhsgp	Victimization since high school grouped	Ordinal 2 set grouping of victimization since high school [no abuse=1; abuse=2]	Recode victimhs (0=1; 1-240=2)
Vic12grp	Victimization in last 12 months grouped	Ordinal 2 set grouping of victimization in last 12 months [no abuse=1; abuse=2]	Recode victim12 (0=1; 1-210=2)
Sexvic12	Sexual victimization in last 12 months	Scale of sexual victimization in dating relationships in last 12 months [↑#’s=↑sexual victimization]	Addition of q16a-j1 after recode (1=1; 2=0)
Sexvichs	Sexual victimization since high school	Scale of sexual victimization since high school [same as above]	Addition of q16a-j2 after recode (same as above)

<u>VARIABLE LABEL</u>	<u>VARIABLE NAME</u>	<u>DESCRIPTION</u>	<u>METHOD OF TRANSFORMATION</u>
Sxvchsgp	Sexual victimization since high school grouped	Ordinal 2 set grouping of sexual victimization since high school [no sexual abuse=1; sexual abuse=2]	Recode sexvichs (0=1; 1-10=2)
Sxvc12gp	Sexual victimization in last 12 months grouped	Ordinal 2 set grouping of sexual victimization in last 12 months [same as above]	Recode sexvic12 (same as above)
Alcwpart	Alcohol use with partner	Scale of consumption of alcohol with dating partner [↑#’s=↑use of alcohol]	recode q22c (1=0; 2=2; 3=4; 4=6; 5=8)
Alcgrp	Alcohol use with partner grouped	Ordinal 2 set grouping of alcohol use with dating partner (no alcohol use=1; alcohol use=2)	Recode alcwpart (0=1; >0=2)
Educlv	Education level	Ordinal grouping of education level (1 st year=1; 2 nd year=2; 3 rd year=3; 4 th year=4)	Recode q12d (1=1; 2=2; 3=3; 4=4; 5=missing)
Vicths	Victimization during high school	Scale of victimization during high school [↑#’s=↑victimization]	Addition of q20b-e after recode (1=1; 2=0)
Victel	Victimization during elementary school	Scale of victimization during elementary school [↑#’s=↑victimization]	Addition of q21b-e after recode (1=1; 2=0)
Rej2ref	Rejection of patriarchy2 subgroup refusal	Refusal subgroup of rejection of patriarchy2 indicated from factor analysis [↓#’s=adherence; ↑#’s= rejection]	Addition of q26a+f after recode (4=missing)

<u>VARIABLE LABEL</u>	<u>VARIABLE NAME</u>	<u>DESCRIPTION</u>	<u>METHOD OF TRANSFORMATION</u>
Rej2tran	Rejection of patriarchy2 transgression	Transgression subgroup of rejection of patriarchy2 indicated from factor analysis [same as above]	Addition of q26b-e after recode (4=missing)
R2refgrp	Rejection of patriarchy2 subgroup refusal grouped	Ordinal 2 set grouping of reject2 subgroup refusal [adherence=1; rejection=2]	Recode of rej2ref (2-5=1; 6=2)
R2trangp	Rejection of patriarchy2 subgroup transgression grouped	Ordinal 2 set grouping of reject2 subgroup transgression [same as above]	Recode rej2tran (4-11=1; 12=2)
Minsdgp2	Minor violence self defense motive 2 category group	Ordinal 2 set grouping of frequency of use of self defense motive in minor violence [1=never used sd motive; 2=used sd motive]	Recode minsd (0=1; 1-100=2)
Minrtgp2	Minor violence retaliatory motive 2 category group	Ordinal 2 set group of frequency of use of retaliatory motive in minor violence [1=never used ret motive; 2=used ret motive]	Recode minret (0=1; 1-100=2)
Minigp2	Minor violence initiative motive 2 category group	Ordinal 2 set group of frequency of use of initiative motive in minor violence [1=never used initiative motive; 2=used initiative motive]	Recode mininit (same as above)

<u>VARIABLE LABEL</u>	<u>VARIABLE NAME</u>	<u>DESCRIPTION</u>	<u>METHOD OF TRANSFORMATION</u>
Sevsdgp2	Severe violence self defense motive 2 category group	Ordinal 2 set group of frequency of use of self defense motive in severe violence [1=never used sd motive; 2=used sd motive]	Recode sevsd (same as above)
Sevrtgp2	Severe violence retaliatory motive 2 group category	Ordinal 2 set group of frequency of use of retaliatory motive in severe violence [1=never used ret motive; 2=used ret motive]	Recode sevret (same as above)
Sevingp2	Severe violence initiative motive 2 category group	Ordinal 2 set group of frequency of use of initiative motive in severe violence [1=never used initiative motive; 2=used initiative motive]	Recode sevinit (same as above)

APPENDIX C

CHI SQUARE ANALYSES WITH NON-SIGNIFICANT RESULTS

VARIABLES	CHI SQUARE (df = 1)	SIGNIFICANCE (2-sided)
Use of Violence by Rejection of Patriarchy1	1.511	.219
Use of Violence by Rejection of Patriarchy1 (three set grouping)	2.949 (df = 2)	.229
Use of Minor Violence by Rejection of Patriarchy1	2.705	.100
Use of Minor Violence by Rejection of Patriarchy1 (three set grouping)	3.158 (df = 2)	.206
Use of Severe Violence by Rejection of Patriarchy1	.875	.350
Use of Severe Violence by Rejection of Patriarchy1 (three set grouping)	2.738 (df = 2)	.254
Minor Violence Self Defense Motive by Rejection of Patriarchy1	.501	.479
Minor Violence Self Defense Motive by Rejection of Patriarchy1 (three set grouping)	.534 (df = 2)	.766
Minor Violence Retaliatory Motive by Rejection of Patriarchy1	.108	.742
Minor Violence Retaliatory Motive by Rejection of Patriarchy1 (three set grouping)	.839 (df = 2)	.657
Minor Violence Initiative Motive by Rejection of Patriarchy1 (three set grouping)	4.948 (df = 2)	.084
Severe Violence Self Defense Motive by Rejection of Patriarchy1	.515	.473
Severe Violence Self Defense Motive by Rejection of Patriarchy1 (three set grouping)	1.024 (df = 2)	.599
Severe Violence Retaliatory Motive by Rejection of Patriarchy1	1.938	.164
Severe Violence Retaliatory Motive by Rejection of Patriarchy1 (three set grouping)	3.298 (df = 2)	.192
Severe Violence Initiative Motive by Rejection of Patriarchy1 (three set grouping)	5.113 (df = 2)	.078
Minor Violence Self Defense Motive by Rejection of Patriarchy2	.834	.361
Minor Violence Retaliatory Motive by Rejection of Patriarchy2	2.791	.095
Minor Violence Initiative Motive by Rejection of Patriarchy2	.980	.322
Severe Violence Self Defense Motive by Rejection of Patriarchy2	.499	.480
Severe Violence Retaliatory Motive by Rejection of Patriarchy2	2.511	.113