

UC Riverside

UC Riverside Electronic Theses and Dissertations

Title

Gendering Intimate Partner Violence: an Analysis of the National Longitudinal Study of Adolescent Health

Permalink

<https://escholarship.org/uc/item/75s38638>

Author

Messinger, Adam

Publication Date

2010

Peer reviewed|Thesis/dissertation

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

RIVERSIDE

Gendering Intimate Partner Violence:
an Analysis of the National Longitudinal Study of Adolescent Health

A Dissertation submitted in partial satisfaction

of the requirements for the degree of

Doctor of Philosophy

in

Sociology

by

Adam Messinger

June 2010

Dissertation Committee:

Dr. Kirk R. Williams, Chairperson

Dr. Bob Hanneman

Dr. Scott Coltrane

Copyright by
Adam Messinger
2010

Signature Approval Page

The Dissertation of Adam Messinger is approved:

Committee Chairperson

University of California, Riverside

Acknowledgements

Many thanks to Dr. Bob Hanneman, Dr. Kirk Williams, and Dr. Scott Coltrane for your countless hours of advice, guidance, and mentorship.

Dedication

For my wife, Marina, whose patience, humor, and love helped me through this difficult and rewarding project.

ABSTRACT OF THE DISSERTATION

Gendering Intimate Partner Violence:
an Analysis of the National Longitudinal Study of Adolescent Health

by

Adam Messinger

Doctor of Philosophy, Graduate Program in Sociology

University of California, Riverside, June 2010

Dr. Kirk R. Williams, Chairperson

Scholars have long posited that intimate partner violence (IPV) – physical violence, sexual violence, verbal abuse, and controlling behaviors between intimate partners – is impacted by masculinity norms of aggression and dominance (for example, see Haraway and O’Neil 1999; Moore and Stuart 2005). Despite this topic’s immense potential for prevention and treatment policies, quantitative IPV research tends to eschew empirically informed measures of masculinities and femininities in favor of a simplistically binary male-female variable, likely in part because of methodological concerns over how to adequately measure the complexities of gender. This is unfortunate given that the representative nature of large-scale, quantitatively-analyzed research is of great value to policymakers. The present dissertation provides a thorough background on the gender

and IPV literatures with a particular focus on the history and benefits of quantifying gender. Additionally, the Bem Sex-Role Inventory, the most widely used measure of gendered psychological traits in the literature, is used to predict IPV in an analysis of 4,027 nationally-representative adolescents in a relationship, data drawn from the National Longitudinal Study of Adolescent Health. This represents the first study using a gender trait measure to predict IPV utilizing a nationally-representative sample. Findings from negative binomial regression and multinomial logistic regression analyses reveal that a lack of femininity – rather than simply the presence of masculinity – predicts an increased risk of IPV perpetration and victimization for both men and women. Methodological and policy implications as well as future directions are discussed.

Table of Contents

Introduction	 p. 1
Chapter 1: The Nature of IPV	 p. 8
Chapter 2: IPV Prevalence by Binary Gender	 p. 24
Chapter 3: Finding Gender	 p. 49
Chapter 4: The Bem Sex-Role Inventory	 p. 76
Chapter 5: Gendered IPV Theories	 p. 106
Chapter 6: Qualitative & Quantitative Insights	 p. 127
Chapter 7: Gendered IPV in AddHealth	 p. 159
Chapter 8: Gendered Underreporting in AddHealth	 p. 198
Chapter 9: Conclusions	 p. 217
Bibliography	 p. 233

List of Figures

Figure 1: Original BSRI Items p. 85

Figure 2: BSRI-S Items p. 88

List of Tables

Table 1.1 Descriptive Statistics	 p. 176
Table 1.2 Percentage of Men and Women Endorsing Each BSRI Category	 p. 178
Table 1.3 Percentage of Respondents Experiencing Exclusively Male-to-Female, Exclusively Female-to-Male, Bidirectional, and No Physical and Sexual IPV	 p. 178
Table 1.4 Frequency of IPV within Exclusively Male-to-Female, Exclusively Female-to-Male, and Bidirectional Physical and Sexual IPV	 p. 179
Table 1.5 Percentage of Male and Female Respondents Within BSRI Categories Currently Experiencing Use and Receipt of Physical and Sexual IPV	 p. 180
Table 1.6 Means of IPV Measures by Binary Gender and BSRI Categories Among Respondents in an IPV Relationship	 p. 182
Table 1.7 Correlation Matrix for Primary Study Variables (<i>N</i> = 4,027)	 p. 183
Table 2.1 Summary of Multinomial Logistic Regressions with BSRI Predicting Direction of Physical IPV	 p. 187
Table 2.2 Summary of Multinomial Logistic Regressions with	

BSRI Predicting Direction of Sexual IPV	 p. 189
Table 3.1 Summary of Negative Binomial Regressions with BSRI Predicting IPV Among Male Respondents	 p. 192
Table 3.2 Summary of Negative Binomial Regressions with BSRI Predicting IPV Among Female Respondents	 p. 194
Table 4.1 IPV Prevalence Agreement Based on Average Male and Female Responses	 p. 211
Table 4.2 IPV Occurrence Agreement Based on Average Male and Female Responses	 p. 212
Table 4.3 IPV Prevalence Agreement Based on Average Male and Female Responses by BSRI Categorization	 p. 214

Introduction

What is missing, oddly, from these claims of gender symmetry is an analysis of gender. By this, I mean more than simply a tallying up of which biological sex is more likely to be perpetrator or victim. I mean an analysis that explicitly underscores the ways in which gender identities and gender ideologies are embodied and enacted by women and men. Examining domestic violence through a gender lens helps clarify several issues (Kimmel 2002, 1344).

The modern gender literature suggests gender norms for a given culture intersect with other sets of norms on race, ethnicity, class, sexual orientation, and age to form multiple versions of masculinities and femininities (King 1988; West and Fenstermaker 1995). What is more, although cultural expectations often encourage biologically male individuals to abide by norms of masculinities and biologically female individuals to follow norms of femininities, in this literature gender is perceived to be a performance in which people do not always rigidly follow the norms they have been taught, even to the extent that some men may perform aspects of femininities while some women can perform aspects of masculinities (Butler 1990, 1997; Halberstam 1998; West and Zimmerman 1987). Gender norms govern every imaginable type of behavior, including intimate partner violence, or IPV (Anderson 2005; White 2009), a crime of sexual violence, physical violence, verbal abuse, or controlling behaviors perpetrated between two partners currently or formerly in a romantic or sexual relationship. The question, of course, is how exactly does gender impact IPV? The purpose of this dissertation is to begin to find an answer.

IPV scholars have long contended that the key may lie with culturally mainstream “hegemonic” masculinity (Connell 1987), which encourages men to be emotionally distant as well as aggressive in the quest for dominance (Crowell and Burgess 1996; Haraway and O’Neil 1999; Moore and Stuart 2005; Thorne-Finch 1992). Unfortunately, as many IPV researchers are not familiar with today’s gender literature, often it is assumed there is only one type of masculinity – hegemonic – and that only men can embody it. Thus, the binary gender variable – are you male or are you female, check the box that applies – has become a way for IPV researchers to test if gender, specifically hegemonic masculinity, predicts IPV perpetration. According to this logic, if more males perpetrate IPV, then this must be because they perform hegemonic masculinity while women do not. Conversely, if men and women are equally likely to perpetrate IPV, then some researchers have argued that hegemonic masculinity and, indeed, gender in general are entirely unrelated to IPV. Upon discovering in recent nationally representative studies that physical IPV is equally likely to be perpetrated by men and women, many researchers termed this phenomenon “gender symmetry” or “sex symmetry” and claimed it as proof that gender is unrelated to IPV (Dutton 1994; Dutton and Nicholls 2005; Felson 2002; Hamel 2007; McNeely, Cook, and Torres 2001; Straus 1979, 1993, 2006). A debate has ensued over the past two decades as to whether other aspects of IPV – such as initiation of violence, sexual violence, stalking, partner homicide, and physical and mental health outcomes – show that men and women are equally likely to be “abusers” or if, contrary to physical IPV perpetration data, men are more often the abusers (for

reviews of the debate, see Anderson 2005; DeKeseredy 2006; Dutton and Nicholls 2005; Kimmel 2002; Saunders 2002; Straus 1999, 2006, 2008).

Certainly, if men are more often IPV abusers, this would lend credence to theories predicting that gender impacts IPV. However, even if men and women are equally likely to be abusers, the gender literature would suggest that gender may still play a role. Specifically, it is conceivable that one of the versions of gender, likely hegemonic masculinity, predicts IPV perpetration, and both men and women could potentially be performing aspects of hegemonic masculinity. How can this be tested?

Many have offered that gender has so many versions and impacts so many aspects of life that it is too detailed to boil down into closed-ended questions in quantitative data (for example, see Canaan and Griffin 1990). When a researcher does not know all the right questions and all the possible answer choices, as might be the case with gender's relation to IPV, qualitative research may be a strong option. At the same time, IPV researchers and government grant agencies quite often prefer the more generalizeable quantitative approach because the end-goal in the IPV literature is to construct policies that are applicable at the national level. With scholars rarely becoming intimately familiar with both quantitative and qualitative analysis, the quantitative IPV literature can often become insulated from the qualitative IPV literature. This is to say that it may prove simpler to bring easily utilized quantitative measures of gender to quantitative researchers than expect quantitative researchers to learn an entirely new methodological and analytic language by reading and taking part in the qualitative literature.

With this in mind, this dissertation has several interrelated purposes. In Chapter One, research on the nature of IPV is reviewed to highlight the dangers IPV poses and the importance of finding solutions. Chapter Two explores the prevalence of IPV by binary gender. While this provides some insight on the ways gender might impact IPV, a binary gender variable does not reflect modern conceptions of gender as taking multiple forms. Chapter Three reviews the literatures on gender theory and quantitative gender measures. Too often in the past, discussions of gender measures have been devoid of a full appreciation for modern gender theory. Connecting the two literatures will enable a discussion of the utility of gender measures and how, in the future, such measurements might come to more closely reflect modern conceptualizations of gender. Chapter Four focuses on one specific gender measure, the Bem Sex-Role Inventory, which is utilized in analyses for the dissertation. Chapter Five delves into theories of IPV perpetration, with a focus on gendered IPV theories and how typically non-gendered IPV theories may be viewed through a gendered standpoint. Chapter Six explores both qualitative and quantitative research that has explicitly looked for ways gender impacts IPV perpetration. Chapter Seven is an original analysis of how a gender measure, the Bem Sex-Role Inventory, relates to IPV perpetration in the National Longitudinal Study of Adolescent Health (AddHealth). Although not the first to use a gender trait measure to predict IPV perpetration, this paper represents the first to do so with a nationally representative sample. Among the results are findings that suggest, independent of binary gender, a lack of femininity helps explain IPV. Being nationally representative, it is hoped that this analysis will spark renewed interest in gender measures and, in turn, the gender literature

among quantitative IPV researchers. Chapter Eight reviews research finding men and women do not always agree who perpetrated what in a relationship, and an AddHealth analysis of IPV underreporting is conducted. This research suggests that binary gender and gender measures may provide quantitative researchers with a fuller understanding of underreporting. Lastly, Chapter Nine provides conclusions on the current state of the literature on gender and IPV particularly with regard to the “directionality” debate, how the analyses of the dissertation have helped to move this literature forward, and future roads to be traveled.

Regarding Research Terminology in This Dissertation

In the interest of both brevity and clarity, the terms “measure,” “qualitative,” and “quantitative” will hold particular meanings throughout the course of this dissertation. Regarding measures, while both a scale and an index use a series of questions to measure an abstract variable (i.e. gender), where they differ is in their scoring. Scale scoring is based on expected answer patterns, and index scoring requires summing the number of answers in a given direction, i.e. all “yes” answers or perhaps all “strongly agree” answers (Babbie 2010). Despite this key difference in scoring, it has become common practice to label both indices and scales as “scales.” Part of this confusion may stem from the common practice of terming a Likert item – a single statement on a questionnaire where the respondents numerically rate the degree to which they agree with the statement – as a Likert scale. From there, some authors of indices comprised of Likert items – items which the authors incorrectly term Likert scales – assume that their

index must therefore be a scale. Again, what differentiates a scale from an index is not the format of the answer choices (i.e. Likert-style) but the way the questions are scored; that is, a series of Likert items could be either an index or scale, depending on the scoring technique used. Confusing matters further is that some index authors incorrectly label their index as a scale (i.e. Conflict Tactics Scale), furthering the trend in the literature to blur the definitional line between index and scale. As such, in this dissertation, “measure” is used as an umbrella term for both scales and indices. However, out of respect to measure authors, wherever a measure title misleadingly includes “Scale” in it, the original title is used. Similarly, in her seminal book on gender measures, Beere (1990) at times titles gender measures herself when the authors had not yet done so, and, again, if she also misleadingly includes “Scale” in a measure title, Beere’s original measure title is referenced in the dissertation.

Additionally, qualitative and quantitative are terms that tend to refer to the analytic technique employed: “qualitative analysis” involves mining for broad themes, and “quantitative analysis” involves statistically comparing data on clearly defined variables. Qualitative analysis is most useful with high detail, somewhat unstructured data: as such, gathering richly detailed data tends to be easiest either with observations or interviews involving open-ended questions where the respondent can speak at length, and small sample sizes are most practical because gathering so much detail on each individual can become financially and temporally prohibitive if the sample is too large. Likewise, quantitative analysis is most feasible with low detail, highly structured data: gathering such data is often simplest with respondent-administered questionnaires involving closed-

ended questions with a small number of predetermined answer choices, and large sample sizes are not only possible – because this type of data is gathered quickly and cheaply for any given individual, enabling more individuals to be surveyed – but also preferable to allow for the sample to more strongly represent the population. Thus, although all sampling and data gathering methods can potentially result in data that can be both qualitatively and quantitatively analyzed, qualitative and quantitative analysis are strongly associated with particular sampling and data gathering methods. This dissertation at numerous points refers to these two common research paths. As short hand, for a researcher or research process associated with these paths, the adjectives “qualitative” and “quantitative” are applied. For example, a “quantitative approach” refers to the complete research path from sampling and data gathering method through data analysis resulting in quantitative data analysis, a “quantitative study” is a study employing a quantitative approach, the “quantitative literature” is the literature of research using the quantitative approach, a “quantitative researcher” is a researcher who is most familiar with and prefers utilizing the quantitative approach, “quantitative data” is data amenable to quantitative analysis, and a “quantitative measure” refers to a composite measure (index or scale) for an abstract variable that will result in data analyzed quantitatively. Again, qualitative and quantitative are terms most typically reserved for the description of an analytic technique, but, in the interest of brevity, these adjectives are being utilized in this dissertation to more broadly refer to the common research paths resulting in qualitative and quantitative analysis.

Chapter 1: The Nature of IPV

Intimate Partner Violence (IPV) is a dangerous, prevalent crime that is deserving of policy interventions to hinder its spread. IPV comes in many forms, including sexual violence, physical violence, verbal abuse, and controlling behaviors. Sexual violence typically involves non-consensual sexual acts, humiliating sexual acts, sex after physical violence, and threats of sexual violence. Physical violence, more common than sexual violence, frequently includes striking, choking, repeated beatings using objects, throwing or destroying property, physical violence involving humiliation, and threats of physical violence. Verbal abuse and controlling behaviors are the most common forms of IPV. Verbal abuse involves verbally humiliating victims in private or in public, often involving name-calling and belittling their intelligence, abilities, and appearance. This of course helps induce self-blame by the victim, which shifts fault away from the abuser and therein legitimizes the violence in the eyes of the abuser and often the victim as well. Controlling behaviors are efforts by the abuser to control the victim's whereabouts. This often is mistaken for commonplace jealousy because, in essence, it is jealousy pushed to an encroaching extreme. For instance, it can be as seemingly mundane as resorting to guilt whenever the victim attempts to spend time with others (i.e. "You are always going out with your friends," "But I was planning on making dinner for the two of us"), accusing the victim of flirting with anyone of the binary gender normally attracted to as defined by the victim's sexual orientation (i.e. "I do not want you hanging out with your ex," "I saw the way you looked at my friend," "Don't you think that outfit is a little too

sexy”), or texting and calling the victim whenever the victim is with other people instead of allowing the victim to freely enjoy time with others. Used repeatedly, these controlling efforts can effectively cut short the victim’s social support network, isolating the victim away from friends and family who now might not be emotionally and physically close enough to recognize the abuse. This network might also feel slighted by what appears from the outside to be the victim’s stronger interest in the romantic partner than them, leading the victim’s friends and even family to reciprocate the distancing actions. Controlling behaviors can also take on a more obvious tone, such as controlling the victim’s financial resources, forbidding the victim from taking a paid job, or threatening violence against the victim or their children if the victim leaves (Wallace 2005). This chapter will detail what is known about the nature of IPV, in particular (1) quantitative IPV measures, (2) IPV prevalence, (3) dynamics within abusive relationships, (4) escaping abuse, and (5) costs of abuse.

1.1 IPV Measures

Efforts to quantify IPV have ranged in their goals, between assessing attitudes, predictors, triggers, and malleability. Several IPV measures have focused on attitudes which may encourage IPV, all of which sum across self-report items, typically employing Likert scaling. The Relationship Expectations Scale is really a measure of attitudes about gender roles in relationships, although the intention of the authors is to use the measure to predict IPV (Foran and Slep 2007). The Relational Entitlement and Proprietariness Scale assesses the degree to which a partner is controlling, although it does not measure the

frequency with which the partner uses controlling tactics (Hannawa, Spitzberg, Wiering, Teranishi 2006). Most IPV attitudinal measures, though, address what IPV behaviors are appropriate responses in particular scenarios, such as the Prescribed Norms Scale (Foshee et al. 1996) – i.e. “Boys sometimes deserve to be hit by the girls they date” – and the retaliation NOBAGS measure (Huesmann and Guerra 1997) – i.e. “Suppose a girl says something bad to a boy, do you think it’s wrong for the boy to scream at her?” Other examples include the Acceptance of Interpersonal Violence Scale (Burt 1980), the Intimate Partner Violence Attitude Scales (Smith, Thompson, Tomaka, and Buchanan 2005), and the Attitudes Towards Dating Violence measures (Price, Byers, and the Dating Violence Research Team 1999), which include three Attitudes Towards Male Dating Violence Scales and three Attitudes Towards Female Dating Violence Scales. A few measures look at general predictors of IPV, such as the Domestic Violence–Related Financial Issues Scale (Weaver, Sanders, Campbell, and Schnabel 2009), which looks at how financial insecurity promote IPV, and the Prognostic Indicator Scale for the Treatment of Partner Abuse Perpetrators (Murphy, Morrel, Elliott, and Neavins 2003), which is a composite measure of an IPV prevalence measure along with several other measures regarding common predictors of IPV like alcohol use and aggression. A small number of measures look at triggers to IPV, including the additive, self-report Proximal Antecedents to Violent Episodes Scale (Babcock, Costa, Green, and Eckhardt 2004) – which asks respondents “How likely are you to be physically aggressive in each of the following situations?” – and measures involving the respondent keeping a daily diary of IPV and the preceding events (i.e. Fals-Stewart 2003). Malleability or changeability of a

respondent's propensity to violence is the focus of some self-report measures, like the University of Rhode Island Change Assessment for Domestic Violence measure (Levesque, Gelles, and Velicer 2000), the Accountability Scale (Costa, Candy, and Babcock 2007), and the Safe at Home Inventory (Begun et al. 2003).

Going beyond attitudes, predictors, triggers, and malleability, by far the most prominent IPV measurements are those that estimate prevalence. Such measurements are critical to estimating the size of the problem within a given population, and this can assist in determining the appropriate policy intervention. Some of these measures look to explore a specific type of IPV, such as the focus on verbal abuse in the Partner-Directed Insults Scale (Goetz, Shackelford, Schipper, and Stewart-Williams 2006), the focus on controlling behaviors in the Brief Coercion and Conflict Scales (Cook and Goodman 2006), and the focus on both verbal abuse and controlling behaviors in the popular Psychological Maltreatment of Women Inventory (Tolman 1989, 1999). The most widely used measures of IPV prevalence, quite logically, explore all types of IPV. Less popular among this group is the relatively new Abuse Within Intimate Relationships Scale (Borjesson, Aarons, and Dunn 2003), and a measure used with some frequency in the adolescent IPV literature is the Conflict in Adolescent Dating Relationships Inventory (Wolfe et al. 2001).

The Conflict Tactics Scale (CTS; Straus 1979) and the Conflict Tactics Scale Revised (CTS2; Straus, Hamby, Boney-McCoy, and Sugarman 1996), however, are easily the most cited measures of IPV prevalence (DeKeseredy and Schwartz 1998). Both the CTS and CTS2 introduce their measures to the respondents with a preamble

paragraph utilizing almost the exact same wording. They both state that even the best couples can get “annoyed” with one another and have “disagreements,” “spats,” or “fights” because of being “in a bad mood” or “tired”; and couples “have different ways of trying to settle their differences (Straus 1979; Straus, Hamby, Boney-McCoy, and Sugarman 1996).” The preamble then asks the respondent to explain how often the respondent and the respondent’s partner perpetrated within the past year the items listed on the measure. The original CTS by Straus (1979) was 19 questions which ranged from non-violent conflict resolution tactics (i.e. discussed the issue calmly), to so-called minor physical abuse (i.e. threatened or actually threw something, hit, kicked, or pushed), to so-called extreme physical abuse (i.e. threatening or using a knife or gun) (Straus 1979). Straus, Hamby, Boney-McCoy, and Sugarman’s (1996) revised version, the CTS2, has 39 questions and adds in items on injury (i.e. physical pain, sprain, cut, bruise, broken bone, burned, needed to and/or did see a doctor) and sexual abuse (i.e. used physical force to, threatened force to, or insisted to have oral, anal, or vaginal sex), in addition to more specific items on physical abuse (Straus, Hamby, Boney-McCoy, and Sugarman 1996).

1.2 IPV Prevalence

To date, most IPV research has been conducted on marital, adult, and college relationships (O’Keefe 2005). Adolescent relationships deserve increased attention not only because they can present early warning signs for adult IPV (Magdol, Moffitt, Caspi, and Silva 1998; O’Leary et al. 1989) but because they are at higher risk of IPV than any other age group (Rennison 2001; Morse 1995; O’Leary 1999; Rennison and Welchans

2000; Sorenson, Upchurch, and Shen 1996; Wolfe et al. 2003). The first episode generally occurs by the age of 15 (Henton, Cate, Koval, Lloyd, and Christopher 1983), a sobering reality considering that 25% of 12 year olds (Carver, Joyner, and Udry 2003) and 50 to 75% of 15 year olds (Feiring 1996; Foshee et al. 1996) are in dating relationships. One in four high school boys and girls report some form of IPV in the past year (Avery-Leaf, Cascardi, O'Leary, and Cano 1997; Foshee et al. 1996; Silverman, Raj, Mucci, and Hathaway 2001), and one in three high school students has experienced it at some point in life (Arias, Samios, and O'Leary 1987; Bergman 1992; Bookwala, Frieze, Smith, and Ryan 1992; Foo and Margolin 1995; Jezl, Molidor, and Wright 1996; White and Koss 1991). Verbally abusive or controlling tactics are present in anywhere from 20 to 96% of dating relationships (James, West, Deters, and Armijo 2000; Jezl, Molidor, and Wright 1996; Molidor 1995). One study of adolescents found boys and girls to be equally likely to utilize these strategies with the exception of females being more likely to use emotional manipulation – for instance, said things to hurt the other's feelings (Foshee 1996). Estimates of physical IPV among high school students range from 10% (Centers for Disease Control and Prevention 2008) to 25% (Foshee 1996; O'Keefe 1997). By college, about one-third of students report physical IPV in the past year, both in the U.S. (Straus and Ramirez 2007) and in an international study of 31 universities representing 16 nations (Straus 2004). IPV resulted in 1510 deaths in 2005, with 78% of IPV murder victims being female (Centers for Disease Control and Prevention 2009). 3 to 6% of male homicide victims and 30 to 55% of female homicide victims are murdered by an intimate partner, which is to say relationships are among the most lethal locations for

women; among women murdered by a partner, 65 to 80% were previously abused by their killer (Campbell 2004). Thus, intimate partner femicide is quite common.

Estimates of IPV, of course, must be viewed through the prism of the measure used for quantification.

1.3 IPV Dynamics

In the literature, many researchers have explored the dynamics within these relationships like types of, sequence of, and triggers for abuse. There has been a growing interest in relationships in which both partners use IPV against each other. With little research conducted on dynamics within such relationships, one arguably undertheorized description prevails among scholars: stress can result in both lashing out and retaliation, typically with low-level physical violence and an absence of controlling behaviors and sexual violence (for a review, see Anderson 2005; Kimmel 2002; Straus 1979). The most detailed and extensive research on IPV dynamics has been conducted on relationships where men perpetrate IPV against a female partner. This portion of the literature is focused predominantly on two topics, the cycle of abuse and why abuse occurs in certain moments.

The first of these two topics is dominated by Walker's (1979) Cycle Theory of Violence, which is generally accepted in academia and the legal system as the best theory explaining the dynamics of unidirectional, male-against-female IPV relationships. In the first phase, tension builds for any number of reasons, although often it results from the abuser perceiving the victim has failed him in some way. This gives rise to the second

phase in which the abuser physically attacks the victim, either as a premeditated punishment or an uncontrollable representation of rage. By the third phase, both partners are invested in reconciliation. They have each placed a great deal of time, effort, and love into their relationship. This means that they are not quick to end the relationship and, furthermore, may see the violent outburst as rare and unlikely to reoccur. After experiencing shock, disbelief, and denial, the abuser begs for forgiveness and assures it will never happen again. The victim is likely to attempt reconciliation by soothing the abuser, avoiding the abuser, and self-blaming. The cycle between abuse and reconciliation continues throughout the duration of the relationship. With each cycle, the violence becomes more intense (Walker 1979). Also, ironically, each successive cycle can strengthen the relationship and decrease chances of it dissolving. This is for at least four reasons. First, the male-to-female abuser comes to feel he can get away with it and so may be more likely to resort to physical violence when angered. Second, the abuser typically blames the victim for enraging the abuser and indirectly “causing” the abuse; this helps an abuser displace guilt onto the victim, increasing an abuser’s comfort with violence as well as decreasing a victim’s anger towards the abuser. Third, abusers often verbally belittle victims, decreasing a victim’s sense of self-worth and desirability while increasing the value of the abuser as a rare romantic partner actually in love with the “worthless” victim. Fourth and finally, the victim may come to feel escape is too dangerous to risk, both for her own personal safety and that of any children she may have (Walker 1979; Wallace 2005).

The literature includes two competing explanations as to why abuse occurs in certain moments: uncontrolled emotion and rational calculation. Many theories posit that abuse is the result of an uncontrollable burst of emotion. Walker's (1979) Cycle Theory of Violence falls in this category, and, as it is the most widely accepted theory of IPV in academia and the justice system, it therefore would appear that the concept of an out-of-control abuser is very popular. Several theories suggest sources for these emotional outbursts resulting in abuse, including goal blockage, unaddressed anger and shame, and alcohol. Frustration-Aggression Theory contends that IPV would occur when aggression mounts due to goal blockage by the victim (Dollard, Doob, Miller, Mowrer, and Sears 1939). Social Conflict Theory explains that the uncontrolled assaults emerge from unaddressed anger and shame within the relationship (Retzinger 1991). Some suggest that these uncontrolled assaults are rooted either in drugs or, more typically, alcohol (Gelles 1974). Alcohol use is a characteristic highly correlated in the literature with IPV perpetration (Rosenbaum and Maiuro 1990). There is some disagreement in the field over whether substance abuse facilitates the abuse (Sher 1985) or helps the abuser self-justify the acts (Coleman and Straus 1983; McClelland, Davis, Kalin, and Wanner 1972).

There is, however, another school of thought that would contend that instances of abuse are not completely out of the control of abusers but rather are rationally calculated actions. Such theories include Exchange/Social Control Theory, Traumatic Bonding Theory, and the theoretical concept of Psychological Entrapment. According to Exchange/Social Control Theory, abusers are rational, and, if they determine that the benefits (i.e. power and control) outweigh the potential costs (i.e. being caught and

punished), they will assault their victims (Gelles 1983). Traumatic Bonding Theory also suggests that abusers are rational and calculating, consciously using the cycle of abuse-reconciliation to reinforce the bond with their victims (Dutton 1995; Dutton and Painter 1981). Also favoring the vision of a rational abuser is the theoretical concept of Psychological Entrapment, which posits that abusers seek out partners who will sweat to make a relationship work when violence becomes present (Anderson, Boulette, and Schwartz 1991). Without a doubt, the idea of IPV abusers being “rational” is controversial. To a degree, this stems from a fear that calling abusers rational would be the same as labeling their behavior as legitimate. This is not necessarily true. According to the concept of “bounded rationality” in the criminology literature’s Rational Choice Perspective, since people are not all-knowing and cannot fully comprehend all options and consequences, every action we take is rational to us only based on the limited information we have (Clarke and Cornish 1985; Cornish and Clarke 1986). The same could apply to abusers. Even if their logic does not appear rational to others, it likely is rational to the abuser – i.e., the victim is provoking the attack, IPV is an acceptable response, the victim deserves this, and chances of discovery and punishment are low. Even if this is fleeting and subconscious, it appears highly plausible that the abuser engages in a cost-benefit analysis before committing an abusive act.

1.4 Escaping Abuse

Much of the literature is dedicated to explaining how an IPV relationship ends and, conversely, why in other circumstances it does not end. There are generally four

reasons for an IPV relationship to end: the abuser kills the victim, the victim kills the abuser, the victim decides to leave, or the abuser decides to stop abusing. The reasons mediating the decision to kill the victim are not clearly delineated in the literature. Some suggest that the victim leaving the relationship may result in the abuser trying to regain control over the victim through murder (Campbell 1995; Campbell et al. 2003; McFarlane et al. 1999).

As far as the victim killing the abuser, one suggestion comes from the theoretical concept of “battered women’s syndrome,” which posits that the well-documented feelings of intense fear and isolation among victim’s may escalate to the point that victims may believe murdering their abusers is the only escape (Walker 1984). While compelling, this is only saying that the same feelings from the relationship motivate the murder. Why the feelings escalate and what triggers that escalation are unclear.

Another manner in which an IPV relationship can end is through the decision of the victim to leave the relationship. It should be noted that leaving an abuser does not guarantee the abuse will end. For instance, Hotton (2001) found that, even after separation, 95% of female victims continue experiencing verbal abuse and controlling behaviors and 39% continue experiencing physical violence (Hotton 2001). That said, the decision of the victim to leave (and possibly press charges) is mediated by at least five factors: guilt, fear of retaliation, perception of help, economic dependency, and emotional attachment.

One of the factors affecting the victim’s decision to leave is guilt. A common characteristic associated with victims in IPV research is self-blaming, possibly in part due

to related characteristics like abuser-induced low self-esteem and genuinely caring for their partners (Anderson, Boulette, and Schwartz 1991). Fear of retaliation is another factor mediating the victim's decision to leave. This fear is a well-documented characteristic of IPV victims (Anderson, Boulette, and Schwartz 1991). Retaliation can come in all of the forms of IPV. According to the concept of battered women's syndrome, through repeated physical abuse in particular, the victim will ultimately become immobilized by feelings of fear and being trapped, feelings that will literally destroy the victim's hope of escape (Walker 1984). The victim's perception of help also mediates the victim's decision to leave. IPV relationships which include a controlling abuser typically also involve the victim becoming isolated from friends and family (Anderson, Boulette, and Schwartz 1991). Economic dependency is considered by many scholars to be a factor that plays a strong role in many IPV victims' decisions to leave. In relationships in which one partner is the "breadwinner," economic dependency may prevent the victim from leaving because doing so could literally jeopardize the victim's ability to survive, i.e. afford housing, utility bills, food, child-related costs (Anderson, Boulette, and Schwartz 1991). This may be more often the case for women in opposite-sex relationships because, in America and similar to many other parts of the industrialized world, women on average earn only 77 cents for every dollar men earn (DeNavas-Walt, Proctor, and Mills 2004).

Lastly, emotional attachment to the abuser can also affect the victim's decision to leave. The most serious abuse, according to the Cycle Theory of Violence, tends to arrive later on in a relationship. By this point, the victim may have developed genuine

feelings of affection for the abuser. On top of this, because victims are typically isolated, they may feel that their only emotional support comes from the abuser (Anderson, Boulette, and Schwartz 1991). Additionally, as mentioned earlier, IPV frequently includes physical, sexual, and psychological acts of humiliation (Wallace 2005). These acts, verbal humiliation in particular, may help explain why IPV research indicates that victims typically have very low self-esteem (Anderson, Boulette, and Schwartz 1991). Low self-esteem in turn suggests that these victims may feel worthless and yet fortunate, in spite of the abuse, to have this one person in their life actually care about them. According to Traumatic Bonding Theory, it is possible that the abuser may utilize the abuse-reconciliation cycle to reinforce the emotional bond with the victim (Dutton and Painter 1981). It could also be that some victims accept IPV as a legitimate course of action for the abusers and so can still perceive the abusers to love them. Violence may be viewed as legitimate if the victim had previous experiences where violence was a common interpersonal conflict tactic. For instance, violence in the family of origin is a well-known risk-factor for IPV victimization (Anderson, Boulette, and Schwartz 1991).

The final way an IPV relationship can end is through the abuser's decision to stop abusing. Although this occurrence might be rare, some abusers voluntarily discontinue abuse, in some cases after only one act of abuse and in other cases after repeatedly abusing. Reasons for this are not, as of yet, discussed in the literature. Other reasons that an abuser decides to stop abusing are less voluntary. While protection orders are frequently violated, often with few repercussions for the abuser, they are legal documents stating that, on punishment of fine and/or imprisonment, the abuser shall not come near

the victim. This can also include not contacting the victim in any way. Admittedly, even so-called permanent protection orders are temporary, only lasting on average of one to three years; others are far more temporary, lasting a few weeks. But this obviously can play a role in the abuser's decision to stop abusing. As will incarceration or rehabilitation programs. However, it is worth noting that there is some doubt about the effectiveness of these factors on recidivism. The Indianapolis Domestic Violence Prosecution Experiment, one of the most comprehensive studies of its kind, suggested no significant effects on recidivism regardless of which sentencing a judge gives, be it "diversion to counseling, probation with counseling, and other sentencing such as fines, probation, jail time (Chalk and King 1998, 181)." Penal deterrence plays a role in stopping abuse. In the criminology literature, there is some debate as to whether it is in fact the certainty rather than severity of punishment that deters criminals (Paternoster and Bachman 2001). As most abusers are never punished, penal deterrence may not impact many abusers.

In situations where the victim decides to leave or the abuser decides to stop abusing, the decisions can be and are frequently retracted after a brief period. For instance, it has been suggested that some victims leave relationships in part to "induce changes in the conduct of the batterer (Chamallas 2003, 260)." The feelings for the abuser may still be present, and the victim may simply be leaving in order to take away the bad parts of the relationship (i.e., the abuse) and save the good parts (i.e., mutual affection). Abusers may similarly stop abusing briefly but then reengage in IPV soon after. The Cycle Theory of Violence suggests that not only do victims but abusers as well experience shock after the initial abuse and the second heightened act of abuse. This

shock – and possibly the fear of being caught and punished – leads abusers to reconcile with the victim. But, as the word “cycle” in the title of the theory might suggest, the stoppage of abuse is only temporary. Similarly, even if an abuser is forced to stop abusing, either by a protection order or incarceration, recidivism is likely for many IPV abusers.

1.5 IPV Costs

Society suffers not only the emotional costs of terror and pain experienced by loved ones but also financial costs: estimates of annual societal financial costs associated with IPV range from \$1.7 to \$140 billion (Chalk and King 1998; National Center for Injury Prevention and Control 2003). Costs for victims can include loss of income-accruing time and ability, low grade point average, low self-esteem, depression, post-traumatic stress disorder, substance use, poor current health, developing a chronic disease, developing a chronic mental illness, reproductive health problems, fear for current safety, sustaining physical injuries, and death, either by suicide or homicide at the hands of one’s partner (Bergman 1992; Chamallas 2003; Coker et al. 2002; Demaris 2005; Wallace 2005). IPV is clearly a prevalent, harrowing crime that demands research be conducted to find any and all predictors – including gender – so as to better inform policy responses.

1.6 Summary

Attempts to quantify intimate partner violence (IPV) – sexual violence, physical violence, verbal abuse, and controlling behaviors – have addressed attitudes, predictors, triggers, and malleability, but the most prominent measures have measured prevalence, with the most popular being the the Conflict Tactics Scale (Straus 1979) and the Conflict Tactics Scale Revised (Straus, Hamby, Boney-McCoy, and Sugarman 1996). It has been found that IPV prevails more on adolescents than any other age group (Rennison 2001; Morse 1995; O’Leary 1999; Rennison and Welchans 2000; Sorenson, Upchurch, and Shen 1996; Wolfe et al. 2003). This is troubling in part because so little research has been done to date on adolescent IPV (O’Keefe 2005). IPV is a painful and costly crime, though much of the literature has focused on extreme male-to-female IPV relationships largely to the exclusion of other types of abusive relationships. This literature has shown abuse is often cyclical, with lulls in violence and apologies before stress, emotional overload, and at times possibly rational calculation result in further violence. IPV prevalence differences are addressed in the next chapter.

Chapter 2: IPV Prevalence by Binary Gender

With a wealth of studies on IPV prevalence, which is most “accurate”? Though very useful for understanding the context of violence, small scale qualitative studies are not generalizeable nationally. Further, specific sampling locations like shelters, emergency rooms, batterer treatment programs, and couples therapy provide important insights into IPV at these locations, but, again, studies of such subpopulations cannot be generalized nationally (Anderson 2005; Kimmel 2002). Most useful for estimating the number of men and women using and being affected by IPV in a relationship – devoid of any understanding of why or under what circumstance – is quantitative analysis on large scale, nationally representative samples. (Though, just as more severe forms of IPV might be overrepresented in shelters, emergency rooms, and batterer treatment programs, some have contended that severe IPV is underrepresented in these nationally representative surveys because of reluctance to share such sensitive information or difficulty in being located (Johnson 1995; Saunders 2002).) This chapter details the quantitatively-measured prevalence of male and female perpetration of (1) verbal, controlling, (2) sexual, and (3) physical IPV, (4) initiation of IPV, (5) stalking, (6) partner homicide, (7) outcomes of fear, psychological repercussions, and physical injury, and (8) motivations for IPV perpetration.

2.1 Verbal and Controlling IPV by Binary Gender

Though they are distinct strategies with unique outcomes, verbal abuse and controlling behaviors often are studied together as a single construct labeled “psychological” (or “emotional”) aggression. There may be good reason to view these strategies as linked. As Jacobson and Gottman (1998) note, verbal aggression may not be inherently bad for a relationship if it results in resolving rather than avoiding problems, but verbal sparring can turn abusive in the forms of belligerence and contempt. Further, in their study of abusive males, they found that non-abusive verbal aggression raised the heart rates of the men, whereas abusive verbal aggression coincided with a decrease in the men’s heart rates, signaling to the researchers that abusive verbal aggression is more often showing a desire for control rather than an involuntary response to rage. This same group of calm, verbally abusive “cobras” were found to also be more physically violent (Jacobsen and Gottman 1998).

The literature suggests psychological aggression is quite prevalent in relationships and that men and women are just as likely to employ it, with perhaps women slightly more likely. With a non-probability sample of 1,157 college students, Straus and Douglas (2004) found that in the past year 93% of relationships that had at least one partner using psychological aggression involved both partners employing it, and whether men or women use the tactics more frequently within a given relationship depended on which measure is used, the CTS2 or CTS2 Short Form. Similarly, a study of 232 students from a religiously-affiliated high school found 97% of boys and 95% of girls who had dating experience had been victims of psychological aggression (Jezl, Molitor, and Wright 1996). Sears, Byers, and Price (2007) found that, among 633 Canadians ages

12-18, 47% of girls and 35% of boys had used psychological aggression in a relationship at some point in life. One study of North Carolina adolescents found that, up until that point in life, boys used and girls received significantly more personal insults, and, suggesting underreporting problems for boys, girls both used and received significantly more emotional manipulation (Foshee 1996). Analyzing this dissertation's nationally-representative data of 12-21 year olds' experiences, the National Longitudinal Study of Adolescent Health, Halpern, Oslak, Young, Martin, and Kupper (2001) found not only similar psychological victimization rates in the past 18 months for boys (28%) and girls (29%) but only slight gender differences in types of psychological victimization. 23% of both boys and girls had been sworn at by their partners, 14% of boys and 19% of girls had been insulted by their partners, and 3% of boys and 5% of girls had been threatened by their partners.

Measuring control is difficult for at least two reasons. First, as just mentioned above, often control is measured along with verbal aggression as a single construct. For instance, controlling behaviors are often believed to include monitoring and threats. Looking at just the last two studies mentioned above, Halpern, Oslak, Young, Martin, and Kupper (2001) include threats alongside verbal aggression in their measure for psychological aggression, and Foshee (1996) includes both monitoring and threats next to verbal aggression in the psychological aggression measure. Second, control in a relationship has been measured in the literature in two very distinct ways, as *tactics* – a specific set of behaviors that, taken cumulatively, restrict the ability of a partner to make decisions and act freely – and as a *strategy* – a motivation to achieve this same goal of

restriction through not only specifically controlling tactics but any type of IPV tactic including physical, sexual, and verbal IPV. The former involves questions of “what” while the latter involves questions of “why.”

Motives like the desire to control are reviewed later in this chapter. For now, it is worth noting that specific tactics are labeled by some scholars as inherently controlling, though not all researchers agree which tactics are controlling. In a secondary data analysis of 274 married and formerly married women from shelters, courts, and a matched neighborhood sample, Johnson (2006) found women from these locations – which probably over-represent victims of extreme male-to-female IPV (Kimmel 2002) – were less likely than their male partners to use all types of controlling tactics measured, including threats, controlling finances, “use of privilege and punishment” (telling the partner what to do and either threatening or actually removing themselves emotionally or sexually), using children to influence the partner, “isolation” (monitoring and deterring from visiting certain people and locations), “emotional abuse” (sexually compares the partner unfavorably and does not offer signs of love and kindness), and rape. In a study of staff and students at a British university, a location less likely to exhibit unidirectional IPV though no more nationally representative than Johnson’s (2006) study population, Graham-Kevan and Archer (2009) found most controlling tactics to be equally used by men and women, though women were significantly more likely to use isolation and men significantly more likely to use economic abuse. Foshee (1996) found among North Carolina adolescents that the girls were significantly more likely than boys to receive monitoring behaviors, but there was no significant gender difference in use of monitoring

behaviors. Taken together, verbal and controlling IPV tactics appear to be employed at relatively equal rates by men and women, though as to whether there are gender differences in controlling motivation is reviewed later in this chapter.

The idea that certain tactics are inherently controlling has at times, it seems, been taken to an extreme. Some researchers (i.e. Felson and Messner 2000; Johnson 2000; Lenton 1995; Smith 1990) have constructed measures of controlling tactics and labeled them “patriarchal ideology” measures. This label has three effects: first, as just alluded to, it narrowly implies that these tactics can never be motivated anything but a desire for control, second, it also narrowly implies that these tactics are used only by men against women, and, third and perhaps most importantly, it may mislead readers into presuming actual ideology was measured as with other patriarchal-egalitarian ideology measures like the Attitudes Toward Women Scale (Spence and Helmreich 1972), the Ambivalent Sexism Inventory (Glick and Fiske 1996), or the Traditional/Egalitarian Sex Role Inventory (Larsen and Long 1988). Readers need to move beyond the authors’ abstracts which speak only of ideology to realize that the authors have not measured attitudes but only renamed IPV as ideology. For example, in a secondary data analysis of Statistics Canada’s Violence Against Women Survey, Lenton (1995) calls controlling tactics and verbal IPV “patriarchal ideology.” The findings conclude that a husband’s patriarchal ideology predicts wife abuse, yet, again, the author chose to not use any of the available measures which actually measure ideology. Felson and Messner (2000) more explicitly claim that threats of violence, again measured as tactics rather than beliefs, are the same as “the control motive.” Although Smith’s (1990) measure of patriarchal ideology does

indeed measure beliefs rather than behaviors, all of the items ask about whether the male respondents believe it is acceptable to use controlling tactics and sexual IPV in relationships. Again, this is not a measure assessing relationship dynamics but, rather, the use or, in this case, the desire to use IPV. Lastly, H. Johnson (2000) concludes in her study that alcohol use and IPV by men may have a spurious relationship explained by attitudes towards women. However, what Johnson (2000) terms “proxy measures of negative attitudes toward female partners” are in fact a series of variables measuring if the husband or wife witnessed IPV in childhood and if the husband perpetrated against his wife verbal IPV and controlling tactics. It is unfortunate when some authors choose to mislabel their measures – in this case calling IPV measures “patriarchal ideology” measures – as this only makes it more difficult to understand their studies and differentiate measures of controlling tactics, controlling motives, and ideology promoting particular hierarchies in relationships.

2.2 Sexual IPV

The literature shows quite clearly that, in intimate relationships, women are far more likely than men to be victims of sexual IPV. In a review of the literature, Saunders (2002) notes that women were five times as likely as men to be sexually victimized in an intimate relationship in a large-scale study of college students (Makepeace 1986), two to sixty times more likely in studies of high school students (Molidor and Tolman 1998; O’Keefe and Treister 1998), and twenty times more likely in the nationally representative National Violence Against Women Survey (Tjaden and Thoennes 2000).

2.3 *Physical IPV*

Unlike most forms of IPV, physical IPV has been thoroughly studied, so much so that it is unfortunately often treated as the only form of IPV worth analyzing (DeKeseredy and Dragiewicz 2007; Saunders 2002). To this end, there are two opposing sets of quantitative findings that could be explained by methodological differences. One set of “Family Violence” studies – including the National Family Violence Survey, the National Survey of Families and Households, and the National Comorbidity Study – find “gender symmetry,” with approximately 50% of opposite-sex IPV relationships exhibiting violence by both partners, 25% by just women, and 25% by just men (Straus 2005). Anywhere from 10 to 35% of respondents in these samples experience physical IPV (Straus 1999). Conversely, another set of “Feminist” studies – including the National Violence Against Women Survey, the National Crime Victimization Survey (NCVS), and the NCVS’s predecessor the National Crime Survey – suggest the vast majority of physical IPV is committed by men against women (Kimmel 2002; Straus 1999). Anywhere from 0.2 to 1.1% of respondents in these samples experience IPV annually (Straus 1999).

Clearly the first set of Family Violence studies is finding many more respondents experiencing physical IPV than the second set of Feminist studies, anywhere from 10 to 175 times more. One generally accepted explanation for this is the context of the study. Family Violence studies finding “gender symmetry” in physical IPV rates are typically introduced to respondents as focusing on family or health issues, and the preamble to the violence questionnaire frames physical violence as a common response to routine family

conflicts (Kimmel 2002). This open-tent approach encourages respondents to report any and all experiences of relationship violence, even violence that might have been considered non-violent or even playful by the respondent. Conversely, Feminist studies finding most physical IPV to be by men against women are introduced to respondents as focusing on serious violence and crime, and often removed from the violence questionnaire is the preamble implying that violence commonly emerges from everyday conflicts (Kimmel 2002). This narrower approach may discourage reports of violence not considered “violent” or “criminal” by the respondent, including violence that is in fact less serious or playful. It is also possible that respondents in relationships with two violent partners are underreporting if they feel their violence perpetration makes them culpable for their own victimization.

Following this contention that Family Violence and Feminist studies are methodologically tapping into different types of IPV relationships (i.e. Anderson 2005; Kimmel 2002), some researchers have put forth typologies that illustrate these different forms of abusive relationships. The most popular of such typologies was designed by Michael Johnson (Johnson 1995, 2005, 2006, 2008; Johnson and Ferraro 2000; Johnson and Leone 2005; Leone, Johnson, Cohan, and Lloyd 2004). Relationships in which both partners or one partner is abusive count as “situational couple violence” so long as low levels of violence and control are used; often, situational couple violence is bidirectional, or perpetrated by both partners. What Johnson once named and the literature still refers to as “intimate terrorism” was recently relabeled by Kelly and Johnson (2008) as “coercive intimate terrorism.” This is where one partner exclusively uses both violence

and controlling behaviors. According to Johnson's (2006) study, in opposite-sex intimate terrorism relationships, men are almost always the abusers and women the victims.

Leone, Johnson, Cohan, and Lloyd's (2004) study of 563 randomly-selected low income women found that outcomes of violence are most negative in this type of relationship, although Anderson's (2008) analysis of the National Violence Against Women Survey disagrees. Two variations on coercive intimate terrorism exist, beginning with "violent resistance," where the victim, again almost always a woman, uses violence in self-defense. "Mutual violent control" is a very rare response to victimization which includes not only violence but also controlling behavior in self-defense. Lastly, Kelly and Johnson (2008) added to this typology "separation-instigated violence" which is violence that occurs for the first time in the relationship upon separation. It is posited that Family Violence studies draw heavily on bidirectional, situational couple violence relationships. Feminist IPV studies draw more on intimate terrorism and one of its variants, violent resistance, in essence unidirectionality. Johnson's typology is based on the combinations of a high-low controlling variable and a high-low violence variable, with directionality of abuse mixed in. The placement of control as the centerpiece to his typology is mirrored by Stark's (2006, 2007) research on coercive control. Stark suggests that a "minor" act of violence in the context of multiple acts of violence can result in greater control over a partner and is therefore more negatively impacting than the perpetration of a single "severe" act of violence. He agrees with Johnson that control is the one element that differentiates less damaging from more terrorizing IPV relationships.

Faced with the possibility of two very different types of IPV relationships existing, McHugh, Livingston, and Ford (2005) urges that researchers stop attempting to determine if most IPV is male-to-female coercive intimate terrorism or bidirectional situational couple violence: “Rather than distinguishing which patterns are most correct or more common, the postmodern perspective encourages us to accept various conceptions of intimate violence (McHugh, Livingston, and Ford 2005, 332).” While it may be useful to prepare policy responses for both types of IPV, it would be a waste of resources to assume both types of relationships are equally prevalent and present in the same portions of society.

Ultimately, these findings taken collectively suggest that physical IPV is perpetrated half of the time by both partners, one-fourth of the time by just men, and one-fourth by just women. That is to say, physical IPV perpetration rates appear “gender symmetrical,” though with one rather large caveat: gender symmetry in violence rates in no way implies that women and men are just as likely to be “abusive.” Violence can be perpetrated by an “abuser” acting in aggression or a “victim” fighting back in self-defense, and violence rates do not provide information on context to determine whether men or women are more likely to be abusers and victims. The fact that the set of Feminist studies encouraging only reports of self-labeled “violence” and “crime” revealed predominantly male against female IPV suggests, though clearly does not establish in and of itself, that the most disturbingly extreme forms of IPV are perpetrated mainly by men against women. At the same time, there is no reason to assume the

additional violence being reported in the gender symmetrical Family Violence studies is not serious enough to warrant studying and preventing it.

2.4 Initiation

Studies suggest that relatively equal numbers of men and women have initiated physical violence in an intimate relationship (Hamberger 2005; Straus 1999). For instance, in a study of women in court-mandated batterer treatment, Hamberger (1997) found 73% of women and 77% of their male partners had initiated violence at some point. Similarly, Hamberger and Guse (2002) found that 91% of men in court-mandated batterer treatment, 87% of women in court-mandated batter treatment, and 91% of women in shelters had initiated violence at some point in their relationships. It is important to note that these percentages explain how many men and women have *ever* initiated violence in a given relationship, not how often. This may have been a point of confusion for Holtzworth-Monroe (2005), who appeared to conclude from Hamberger's (2005) review that both men and women believe their partners initiate more often than them, logically impossible: "such retrospective biases should not be surprising" with "the answer...in the eye of the beholder...each gender tending to claim that their partner 'started it (Holtzworth-Monroe 2005, 254).'" Instead, it simply seems that both partners tend to feel they have both "started it" at least once, not necessarily that they have initiated equally as often within the relationship.

To that point, Hamberger's (2005) review goes on to importantly note that men initiate more often than women within a given relationship. In Hamberger's (1997) study

of women in a court-mandated batterer treatment program, though approximately the same number of men and women had initiated violence at least once, men initiated more often. 25% of the women and 37% of the men initiated violence every single time in a given relationship, 35% of the women and 55% of the men initiated violence more than half the time in a given relationship, and only 12.5% of the respondents indicated that both partners initiated equally as often in a relationship. Further, 51% of men and 27.4% of women had initiated violence for the first time in their relationship, with 21.5% of cases undetermined. Similarly, in Hamberger and Guse's (2002) study of men in a batterer treatment program and women in a shelter and a batterer treatment program, though the number of men and women who had initiated violence at least once was nearly identical, men initiated violence more often within a given relationship. According to the two samples of women, they reported their male partners initiated violence 90 to 100% of the time, yet, according to the male sample, their female partners initiated only 50% of the violence. In a study of men and women at a trauma center for emergency medical services, Phelan, Hamberger, Hare, and Edwards (2002) found 100% of the men reported initiating violence 50% to 100% of the time, while 91% of women reported initiating violence 0% to 20% of the time. Though the sampling locations for the studies above are by no means nationally representative, it seems telling that the results remain consistent for both men and women in court-mandated batterer treatment programs.

These findings suggest that, while relatively equal numbers of men and women have initiated violence at least once in a relationship, men do so far more frequently

within a given relationship. Like with physical IPV, contextual questions remain unanswered by these quantitative measurements. For instance, initiation does not necessarily imply motivation. It is possible that, at least in some cases, a victim initiates violence as a pre-emptive strike based on an expectation of ensuing violence by an abusive partner. In addition, the act of initiation may be interpreted differently by men and women. Though initiation of violence might logically imply being the first to physically attack, one study suggests that some women believe initiation can also be getting angry, raising an issue that leads to the conflict, and persistently requesting the partner open up verbally (Olson and Lloyd 2005). Stets and Straus (1990) have made the same point, that some women may view initiation in terms of initiating an argument rather than initiating the physical violence. Given this, it is feasible that initiation in and of itself does not automatically mean that a partner was the first to physically strike, nor does it necessarily mean that any such strikes must be motivated by aggression rather than self-preservation. Taken together with data on physical IPV prevalence, the literature would suggest that men most often bring violence into conflicts, women are highly likely to reciprocate this violence, and nowhere in this data on physical relationship violence is there a clear picture of motivations, context, or who is best labeled “abuser” and “victim.”

2.5 Stalking

Often separation is a catalyst for IPV. One nationally representative study in Canada found that, of those who experienced violence after divorce or separation, for

only 37% the violence levels did not change after breaking up, whereas 24% said the violence worsened, and 39% said the violence happened for the first time (Statistics Canada 2001). Stalking is a crime largely perpetrated by men, and this is also true for stalking among ex-intimate partners. The National Violence Against Women Survey revealed that 14.2% of women and 4.3% of men had been victims of stalking in their lifetimes, and, of these stalking victims, 41% of the women and 28% of the men had been stalked by an intimate partner (Davis, Coker, and Sanderson 2002). Stalking of both male and female intimate partners was reported in this study to be mostly perpetrated by men (Tjaden and Thoennes 2000). As a measure of the gendered impact of stalking, Davis, Coker, and Sanderson (2002) also found in this data that women are 13 times more likely than men to report being in fear of their stalker.

2.6 Partner Homicide

Partner homicide today is largely perpetrated by men against women, though it was not always this way. As Saunders (2002) noted in his review of the literature, prior to the mid-1980s, only slightly more women than men were victims of partner homicide, and in the 1990s the ratio of female victims to male victims jumped to approximately 3 to 1. In the past few years, roughly 70% of partner homicide victims were women murdered by a male intimate, and 30% were men murdered by a female intimate. Though partner homicide has decreased for both male and female victims in the past several decades, the annual number of male victims has decreased much faster and farther than the number of female victims, generating this gender gap in partner homicide

(Browne, Williams, and Dutton 1999; Dugan, Nagin, and Rosenfeld 1999; Greenfeld et al. 1998; Saunders 2002; Saunders and Browne 2000). Saunders (2002) points out that it is misleading to draw conclusions of gender symmetry by ignoring partner homicide rates after 1985, when the gender gap started to widen. Further, Saunders' (2002) review of the literature shows female perpetrators of partner homicide are typically motivated by a desire to prevent future harm to themselves and their children (Browne 1986, 1987; Dugan, Nagin, and Rosenfeld 1999; Grant 1995; Jurik and Winn 1990; Leonard 2002; Maguigan 1991). This pre-emptive self-defense motivation has been posited by some scholars to actually be a justification given to cover up a more insidious motivation, though no study with an adequate sample size has shown this to be true (Jurik and Gregware 1989; Saunders 2002). Conversely, male partner homicide perpetrators are 7 to 10 times less likely than female perpetrators to be motivated by self-defense. Instead, men who kill their female partners are typically motivated by jealousy and a desire for control (Barnard, Vera, Vera, and Newman 1982; Block 2000; Block and Christakos 1995; Cazenave and Zahn 1992; Goetting 1995; Stout 1993; Wilson, Daly, and Daniele 1995), with separation or potential for separation often being the catalyst (Campbell 1981; Wilson and Daly 1992, 1993). These findings provide context to research showing that, among perpetrators of partner homicide, women experience much higher levels of fear than men (Stout and Brown 1995). All told, not only are men much more likely to kill their female partners than the reverse, but, if motivations during partner homicide are any guide to motivations of IPV during relationships, it seems likely that male

perpetrators of partner homicide typically fit the role of “abuser” in the relationship while female partner homicide perpetrators typically fit the role of “victim” in the relationship.

2.7 Outcomes

Among quantitative measures of IPV outcomes, three are key indicators of how violence impacts intimate partners: fear, psychological repercussions, and physical injury. The literature suggests, unlike physical IPV by women, violence by men more often strikes fear in their partners (Jacobsen et al. 1994; Langhinrichesen-Rohling, Neidig, and Thorn 1995; Saunders 2002), fear that is more likely to be prolonged throughout the relationship (Dasgupta 2002). With an admittedly non-representative sample of women in a shelter and men in a batterer treatment program, Barnett, Lee, and Thelen (1997) found men were significantly more likely to report that their violence frightened their partner. Similarly, in their analysis of the National Violence Against Women Survey, Tjaden and Thoennes (2000) noted 45% of women as compared to 20% of men who had experienced physical IPV “feared bodily injury or death” during the recent-most physical attack.

Psychological damage appears to also be more prevalent for women than men in abusive relationships. In a study of the National Comorbidity Survey, female victims of physical violence or threats of violence were more strongly associated than male victims with negative psychosocial outcomes (Williams and Frieze 2005). With much of IPV involving two physically violent partners, Anderson (2002) in part set out to understand whether men or women are more negatively impacted psychologically in such “mutually” abusive relationships. Using the National Survey of Families and Households, she found

depression and substance abuse to be more prevalent for women than men in relationships with two violent partners (Anderson 2002). Regarding sexual IPV, Cortina and Kubiak (2006) analyzed the National Violence Against Women Survey. Female victims of sexual IPV experienced more severe posttraumatic stress disorder than male victims, though the significant correlation turned out to be explained by the greater history of sexual victimization for women (Cortina and Kubiak 2006). Controlling tactics seem to be associated with the same gender gap in psychological outcomes. Próspero (2009) found among 573 college students that receiving controlling behaviors more strongly predicted negative the mental health outcomes like anxiety, depression, somatic symptoms, and hostility. In particular, this association between being with a controlling partner and experience negative psychological effects was stronger for women than men (Próspero 2009).

Lastly, as with fear and psychological repercussions, physical injury is more likely to be experienced by women than men in abusive relationships (Anderson 2005; Archer 2000; Arias and Johnson 1989; Brush 1993; Browne 1987; Foshee 1996; Shorey, Cornelius, and Bell 2008; Stets and Straus 1990). Analysis of the National Violence Against Women Survey revealed that women physically attacked by a male partner were twice as likely to become injured than men physically attacked by a female partner (Tjaden and Thoennes 2000). In a massive meta-analysis of the empirical literature, Archer (2000) found 62% of those injured in abusive relationships and 83% receiving medical attention for such an injury were women.

2.8 Motivations for IPV Perpetration

With nearly every other type of crime perpetrated largely by men (Hamby 2005), many researchers have questioned whether it is logical to presume that relationships involving two violent partners are in fact cases of “mutual battering” or if, instead, these are largely relationships with women using self-defense against abusive males. To help determine context and in turn culpability for IPV perpetration, many researchers have attempted to determine what violence motivations are most common for women and men. Excluding studies of partner homicide, IPV motivations research has tended to show that women are more likely to be motivated by self-defense than men, but most of women’s violence cannot be explained by just self-defense. Other common motivations for women are to express anger and retaliation, often the most popular motivations for men. Two types of studies have been most frequently conducted to measure motivations: studies of both men and women and studies of just women.

Studies that have included both men and women in their samples have tended to show either that women use violence in self-defense more than or just as much as men. Many studies have found that women use violence in self-defense more often than men (Barnett, Lee, and Thelen 1997; Cascardi and Vivian 1995; Hamberger, Lohr, and Bonge 1994; Makepeace 1986). Barnett, Lee, and Thelen (1997) compared males in court-mandated batterer treatment to women in shelters, which is somewhat akin to comparing apples to oranges in that the average male and average female were not compared. Further, the most popular motivation for both men and women was the somewhat nebulous “let out violence” followed by “get other’s attention.” Cascardi and Vivian

(1995) did indeed find that, among couples in marital treatment, women used violence in self-defense more often than men, but only for “severe” rather than “minor” IPV. Again, this was not the main motivation, with “anger/coercion” being the most popular motivation for men and “anger only” for women. Hamberger, Lohr, and Bonge (1994) found using factor analysis that women and men arrested for partner violence hold similar motivations for violence, though women were slightly more likely to use violence in self-defense and retaliation while men were more likely to be motivated to dominate and control. The strongest evidence was put forth by Makepeace (1986), whose study of a seven college sample of students showed not only that self-defense was more frequently a motivation for female violence than male violence (approximately twice as frequent) but also that self-defense was the number one motivation for women and only number three for men. For men, the most popular motivation was “uncontrollable anger” followed by “intimidate.” Some studies revealed different findings on the relative motivations of males and females, including negligent differences. Foshee, Bauman, Linder, Rice, and Wilcher (2007) found the most common type of violence motivation for adolescent girls was “patriarchal terrorism response” which consisted of responding to predominantly male-against-female IPV with self-defense or by sending a message physically that she will not take his abuse anymore. At the same time, the most common response for the adolescent boys was “escalation prevention,” which was essentially self-defense against a girl attempting to attack her boyfriend. Similarly, Follingstad, Wright, Lloyd, and Sebastian’s (1991) study of 495 college students revealed that women used violence in self-defense only slightly more than men, and there was no significant

difference between their rates of self-defense. Further, women most commonly were motivated to use violence “in retaliation for emotional hurt” and “to show anger,” and, not morally much better, men were most often motivated to perpetrate violence “because of jealousy” followed by “to show anger.” In Carrado, George, Loxam, Jones, and Templar’s (1996) study of a nationally-representative British sample, self-defense was never explicitly included on their questionnaire’s list of motivations. However, those items that might imply self-defense (i.e. “I thought he/she was about to use a physical action against me”) were either just as likely or more likely to be a violence motivation for men as compared to women.

When only women are included in a sample, self-defense again is typically high on the list of motivations for violence but does explain not all of their IPV. Swan and Snow’s (2003) study of 95 women, recruited largely from an inner-city health clinic as well as from a family violence intervention program and family court waiting room, showed 75% of the women used self-defense at least some of the time. Although, no other motivation was used by more women or more frequently within a relationship, the authors imply that, among those who used violence in self-defense at least once, all of their violence was not in self-defense. Among the battered women seeking services at a shelter or agency, Saunders (1986) asked the majority of the sample that had used violence (83%) which motivations were more frequent for them, including self-defense, fighting back, and first strike. Although self-defense was most popular, 31% of those using “minor” violence and 39% using “severe” violence were always motivated by self-defense. Fighting back was a close second, and first strike was a distant third, again

suggesting that self-defense is a prominent motivation for women's violence but not the only one. Results are similar for women who were either mandated by a court or volunteered for batterer treatment. Hamberger (1997) found among 52 women in court-mandated batterer treatment that self-defense was the most common violence motivation, accounting for just over one-third of their violence. Retaliation was the next most prominent motivation. Babcock, Millard, and Siard's (2003) study of 52 women in batterer treatment showed that, although self-defense was the most common motivation when asked in an open-ended format, only 28% of the sample offered this motivation. Stuart et al. (2006) studied 87 women in court-mandated batterer treatment, and, although self-defense was the motivation that explained the highest mean amount of violence within relationships (38.7%), to show anger (39%) and a response to being provoked (38.9%) were more prominent. Like most of these studies, respondents could select multiple choices, but they were choosing between 29 motivations. While this type of detailed data is no doubt informative, it may make the percentage of respondents using self-defense appear smaller than in reality. For instance, Stuart et al. (2006) also found that "to get away from your partner" explained an average of 25.8% of violent episodes in relationships, answers that would likely have gone to the self-defense choice had their been fewer options to select from. Weston, Marshall, and Coker (2007) factor analyzed 125 motivations among 356 female perpetrators as compared to 243 non-violent women. They found self-defense to be the most common motivation for "severe" violence, but this was second to stress and frustration for "minor" violence. In one of the more generalizeable studies, DeKeseredy, Saunders, Schwartz, and Alvi (1997) analyzed data

from 1,835 nationally-representative female college students in Canada. Asked how much of their violence was in self-defense, women were less likely to report none than some to all. Self-defense was more likely to be reported as the motivation 100% of the time for women who perpetrated “severe” violence as compared to “minor” violence. Straus (2006) rightfully points out that these studies on IPV motivations that exclude men from their samples do not provide conclusions on how motives differ between men and women, as it is conceivably possible that the inclusion of men in these studies would reveal that men claim to use self-defense just as often (Straus 2006, 1089). However, studies of just women and studies including both men and women reveal very similar findings. Therefore, these studies with all-female samples, while certainly not methodologically ideal in sampling, serve to bolster the findings from male-female samples.

Overall, self-defense appears to be more often a motivation for female violence than male violence, but this does not account for much of female relationship violence. Anger and retaliation are often popular motivations for both men and women. In light of data showing men initiate conflicts and violence more often within relationships, it is possible that retaliation is more commonly an issue for women. Indeed, retaliation is one of the most common motivations for female violence (Carrado, George, Loxam, Jones, and Templar 1996; Follingstad, Wright, Lloyd, and Sebastian 1991; Hamberger 1997; Hamberger, Lohr, and Bonge 1994; Makepeace 1986; Saunders 1986). The qualitative distinction between self-defense and retaliation may be blurrier than at first glance. If both motivations are provided as options on a questionnaire, respondents may determine

that the researcher defines self-defense as blocking attacks only and retaliation is defined as hitting back. Legally, however, self-defense does include hitting back, and so perhaps self-defense and retaliation are more similar than different. If this is the case, unlike with men's violence, self-defense/retaliation may explain the majority of women's violence in relationships. Clearly, motivations research leans towards the notion that men are more often the "abusers" and women the "victims" in relationships, but the operationalization of self-defense and retaliation in questionnaires leaves room for speculation.

2.9 Summary

That women and men are equally likely to use verbal aggression appears to be less significant than other indicators of IPV. Verbal sparring among partners appears so commonplace in the modern relationship that one study of high school adolescents with any dating experience found 97% of boys and 95% of girls had experienced psychological IPV (Jezl, Molidor, and Wright 1996). This is not to say that verbal aggression cannot have powerful, negative effects for partners; to the contrary, all signs suggest that verbal aggression is an integral part of abusive patterns. Yet, clearly, current measures of verbal IPV are not sensitive enough to separate everyday verbal aggression from more severe, detrimental verbal behaviors.

That said, there appear to be two distinct groupings of prevalence findings: those that can be clearly interpreted and those that cannot be. Clear findings include that the vast majority of sexual IPV, partner homicide, and stalking are perpetrated by men against women. A qualitative understanding of context and motives would help better

clarify under what conditions such crimes occur, but quantitative data on these issues seem clear in distinguishing “abusers” from “victim.” Another set of findings are less clear, however, including those on controlling tactics and physical violence. That men and women are equally likely to perpetrate controlling tactics does strongly suggest that both men and women can at times desire control over their partners. At the same time, most scholars agree that controlling motives are not limited to these pre-designated controlling tactics (i.e. controlling finances, limiting a partner’s social circle, etc.) but can provide the impetus for all forms of IPV, including verbal, sexual, and physical IPV. Prevalence findings on physical IPV are also difficult to interpret. That men and women are equally likely to perpetrate physical violence in intimate relationships would appear difficult to reconcile with data suggesting that men initiate violence far more frequently within relationships, that women fear their violent partners far more often than men, and that women are more likely to experience negative outcomes like psychological trauma and physical injury. Such contextual quantitative data hints that the motives for violence may be different for men and women. Indeed, research on motives suggests that women are more likely to use violence in self-defense, although this does not explain the majority of their violent acts. Combined with data on initiation frequency and common female violence motive of retaliation, the implication from the motives literature is that men are more often the aggressors in IPV relationships, but women also use violence for a variety of reasons that are not entirely morally beyond reproach such as in anger.

What should be obvious to any social scientist is that any “average” implies exceptions. These IPV prevalence findings verify this hunch. Women appear equally as

likely as men to employ a set of conflict tactics that most scholars agree are controlling by the very nature of the tactics. Many women are killing their partners or using physical violence, with approximately one-fourth of physical IPV relationships involving only female-to-male physical violence (Straus 2005). Even though it is possible that much of the “mutual” violence and female-perpetrated partner homicide can be explained by less insidious motives like self-defense/retaliation, at least some women deserve the label “abuser.” Female abuser treatment programs and male victim counseling and shelters are worthy of funding and consideration by researchers. With this as a given, social scientists, criminologists, and IPV scholars are most interested in the “average” because it helps explain the largest portion of IPV relationships. Quantitative, IPV prevalence data seems to indicate that IPV is likely most often perpetrated by men against women, with women using violence more often in self-defense. Of course, importantly, such a binary conception of gender does not entirely explain how gender relates to IPV. What version of masculinity – or femininity for that matter – are male abusers performing? Data on IPV disaggregated by a male-female variable fails to answer this question.

Chapter 3: Finding Gender

For researchers, “finding” gender has proven challenging. From discovering gender, to determining what causes it and how it is expressed, understandings of this complex construct have continually shifted in the past thirty years. With a different definition for each generation, empirical measures of gender have also changed. Today, to a certain degree, it appears our theoretical understanding of gender has outpaced our ability to fully measure it. This chapter will explore key steps in the research community’s journey to find gender: (1) defining gender; (2) the quantitative-qualitative dilemma in measuring gender; and attempts to quantitatively measure gender as defined by several feminist gender theories of the past three decades including (3) social exchange theory, (4) sex/gender roles theory, and (5) interactionist and intersectionist theory.

3.1 *Defining Gender*

Scholars have come to view *sex* as the biological distinctions which separate men from women, generally a binary construct with the exception of the much smaller intersex population. Conversely, *gender* is the non-biological self-identity, “personality traits, activities, interests, and behavior” culturally associated with either men – referred to as *masculinity* – or with women – referred to as *femininity* (Beere 1990, 21). That is, barring a chromosomal test, viewing a history of surgeries and hormone treatments, and

seeing an individual in the nude, the instant cognitive recognition of a person's sex is entirely based on gender (Lorber 2003).

Until recently, gender and sex were believed to have the same underlying cause. Initially, gender and sex were often thought to be preordained by god and religion (Bem 1993). In the last 150 years, as science gained greater influence, *biological essentialism* took the place of religion in explaining gender. Under this theory, sex causes gender – or, put another way, all thoughts and actions internally emerge from our biology, unwaveringly leading men and women down separate paths. An important implication of this theory is that men and women are biologically predetermined to be best suited for different roles in society. In the patriarchal societies which dominate the globe, men on average have greater income, status, and political power. This theory would view inequality between men and women as inevitable, unchangeable, and perhaps even preferred (Bem 1993).

In the 19th and early 20th centuries, sociology's founding fathers adopted this gender theory of their day. For instance, Herbert Spencer (founder of British sociology), Auguste Comte (founder of French sociology), Ferdinand Toennies (founder of German sociology), and Vilfredo Pareto (founder of Italian sociology) each argued that biological deficiencies in women justifies their subjugation and relegation to the household. Emile Durkheim, the most famous early French sociologist, contended in *Suicide* that marriage lowers the suicide rate for men and raises it for women because women are simple people that are easily satisfied, and men are more complex and need constraining through

marriage. Durkheim also believed that division of labor is good for marriage, with equality leading to instability (Chafetz 2006).

Beginning in the 20th century and picking up steam by the 1980s, theorists started agreeing that gender is more likely socially constructed than biologically determined. *Social construction* involves a cycle of positively and negatively reinforced learning from and then practicing in one's social environment, including but not limited to with family, peers, school, employment, law, and the media (Coltrane 1998). Being non-biological and culturally dependent, gender has the potential to be less rigidly binary than sex. Different types of masculinities and femininities are now believed to exist, as are culturally unexpected combinations of gender and sex like masculine women and feminine men (West and Fenstermaker 1995).

3.2 *The Quantitative-Qualitative Dilemma*

As a major organizing force in the world, gender has long been of interest to researchers. Measuring it is problematic, though, because it is multi-dimensional, each dimension has numerous possible indicators, and there is no universally agreed upon list of gender dimensions and indicators. A possible starting point is determining whether a qualitative or quantitative approach is most beneficial.

Often this debate is pre-empted, perhaps unfairly, by many gender theorists who have argued that quantitative approaches should not even be considered in a study of gender (for example, see Canaan and Griffin 1990). It is believed that feminist interviewers can utilize their own personal experiences and views to better see data

patterns and to gain a rapport with interviewees (Collins 1989; Haraway 2004; Harding 2004; Smith 2004; Wylie 2004). Coltrane (1994) agrees that researcher bias can be a benefit, but it is not necessarily better than the distant researcher who avoids reactivity issues through quantitative approaches:

One should guard against the tendency in some scholarly writing to accept one's felt emotions or bodily sensations as somehow superior or more authentic than other ways of knowing, because emotions and bodily experiences are also socially constructed... (Coltrane 1994, 56).

He feels that quantitative approaches have unjustly been stigmatized as unable to produce feminist-friendly results. While quantitative approaches have often been used in studies finding that inequality is biologically inevitable, "this tendency is not inherent to the method" but rather to the researcher using the method (Coltrane 1994, 51). If, as Coltrane concludes, both qualitative and quantitative approaches can be considered in studies of gender, we can return to our original question of which is preferable.

With such an abstract, poorly understood construct as gender, a strong argument can be made that gender is best measured through qualitative research. To come even close to grasping its full complexity, it would be wise to use a method which enables detailed, in-depth data gathering. At the same time, with such immense detail comes a barrier to large samples. Quantitative approaches, on the other hand, are limited in exploring the nature of gender, but the low level of detail brings the advantage of quantification and thus both causality testing and high generalizeability to the population. Put more simply, is it better to know a lot about a few people or know very little about a lot of people?

Any answer to this question must be informed by the goal of the research study. If the aim is to understand gender in all of its complexities, obviously a qualitative approach is most logical. Gender theorists tend to use qualitative methods for this reason. But for a study like this one which requires accurately estimating the prevalence of intimate partner violence in a population, quantitative approaches may be necessary. The most popular measure conducive to quantitative analysis (hereafter “quantitative measure”) of gender in the past and still today is the binary male-female variable. Since it is typically self-reported, it likely draws on a combination of sex and gender. This is a point of confusion for scholars, with most referring to a binary male-female variable as “gender” but some referring to it as “sex” (i.e. Anderson 2005; Aylor and Dainton 2004). For those interested in quantitatively exploring the diversity of gender, however, composite measures like indices and scales (hereafter “measures”) are most often used.

In a recent attempt to count the number of gender measures in circulation, Beere (1990) contacted 464 measure authors. Of course, as she points out, most gender measures are not reliable, valid, or present in more than one publication. For those that do meet the criteria, she finds there are at least 211 distinct gender measures. Many of these are rarely used, but, those that are viewed as gold standards are present in countless publications. What is made abundantly clear by her project – and by the noticeable absence in the literature of other types of quantitative measures – is that measures have become the preeminent strategy for quantitatively assessing gender.

As Beere (1990) notes, gender measures have several flaws. They are often designed with one type of population – typically college students, such as with the Bem

Sex-Role Inventory – and then used on different populations. Self-reporting can lead to a number of issues like problems with recall and social desirability. Of note, arguably the largest drawback is that not all possible dimensions and indicators of gender are used (Beere 1990). As mentioned at the beginning of this chapter, gender has at least five dimensions, including self-identities, personality traits, activities, interests, and behaviors (Beere 1990). As it is typically better for measures to have a single strong factor, each measure usually focuses on only one dimension. Whether for economy of time or cost, studies of gender rarely incorporate more than one measure. When they do, they tend to compare measures measuring the same dimension rather than attempt to account for multiple gender dimensions in the same study. Complicating matters further is that each dimension has a number of sub-dimensions, each with a seemingly unlimited combination of indicators. For instance, “gendered personality” or “gendered behavior” is nearly as complex and impossible to completely measure as gender itself.

Despite its limits, a (composite) measure has the potential to capture a slice of gender. Gender measures tap into one or more dimensions of gender – generally either attitudes or self-identified personality traits pertaining to gender – and it is easy to test for correlations across measures to see if dimensions correlate. Thus, if gendered personalities are shown to predict gendered behaviors, a researcher who includes a measure on only one dimension can tentatively draw conclusions about the larger construct of gender. By using self-reported closed-ended questions, ease of quantification allows for larger, generalizeable samples. The lessened role of the researcher with such quantitative approaches also avoids problems with respondent

reactivity and researcher misinterpretations. If any research method has its flaws, gender measures have too many strengths to be ignored. This is particularly true in studies not solely about gender but rather about how gender relates to another variable in the population, such as intimate partner violence. Gender measures are employed methodologically in a variety of ways, for example as a mediator, as a moderator, or to divide the sample for subgroup comparisons.

In their efforts to illicit data on one dimension or another, measure designers have created a number of distinct types of gender measures. Whether intentional or not, these measures tend to fit best with different gender theories. In the *Handbook of the Sociology of Gender*, Chafetz (2006) outlines many of the feminist gender theories since the 1970s that have been featured prominently in sociology and also often integrated into other social science disciplines such as psychology, anthropology, racial and ethnic studies, and queer studies. Of the theories she describes, many of them are not amenable to being measured by gender measures. For example, macrostructural theories such as world systems theory and Marxist-inspired theory address gender inequality on historical, societal, and global levels, aspects of the gender system that are not easily quantified at the individual level. Likewise, childhood engenderment theories like socialization theory and neo-Freudian theory deal with the process of learning gender norms, particularly early in life, and this process is often too subconscious and multifaceted to lend itself to quantification. Other feminist gender theories she describes (i.e. rational choice theory, status expectations theory, etc.) similarly involve complex processes that are often situationally-specific and therefore more easily measured qualitatively. The theoretical

areas that Chafetz (2006) describes which have most frequently been aligned with gender measures –social exchange theory, sex/gender role theory, interactionist theory, and intersectionist theory – focus less on the process of learning gender and the structural limitations placed on gender norms and, instead, more on individual-level gender characteristics like personality traits, behaviors, attitudes. Below we explore the connections between these four sets of theories and measures. Popularity of measures listed in this section is largely assessed by Beere’s (1990) listing of referencing frequency for gender measures in the literature up until 1990 as well as an online search of the literature since 1990 by the present author.

3.3 Social Exchange Theory

Like with many feminist gender theories, social exchange theory was not constructed but, rather, edited by feminist scholars. According to the feminist version of this theory, male-female intimate relationships are team-like dyads, with each partner providing equal amounts of benefits to the team. As men in patriarchal societies often have broader access to resources outside the family like superior income and prestige, women may be expected to uphold their end of the exchange by tapping into other resources more easily accessible to them like deference and household labor. When the man’s ability to offer benefits to the dyad outpace the woman’s ability, the unstated assumption may be that the woman is now indebted to the man to a vague and therefore potentially infinite degree (Chafetz 1980, 1990; Curtis 1986).

A number of measures explore the gendered division of labor in relationship dyads. These measures look at attitudes towards just men, just women, or both men and women. They are typically additive measures using anywhere from 6 to 120 Likert items (Beere 1990). Items have addressed such topics as breadwinning (i.e. Iazzo 1983), sexual expectations (i.e. Iazzo 1983; Snell, Belk, and Hawkins 1986), household division of labor (i.e. Baber and Tucker 2006; Blood and Wolfe 1960), gendered jobs (i.e. Doyle and Moore 1978; Fine-Davis 1976; Schau and Kahn 1980), patriarchal chivalry (i.e. Burt 1980; Doyle and Moore 1978), parenting (i.e. Fine-Davis 1976; Slade and Jenner 1978), and feminism (i.e. Elmore, Brodsky, and Naffziger 1975; Gibb and Bailey 1983; Kirkpatrick 1936; Kroska 2000a, 2000b).

Based on Beere's (1990) records of gender measure usage, by far the most widely circulated measure to explore the gendered division of labor is the Attitudes Toward Women Scale, or AWS (Spence and Helmreich 1972, 1978; Spence, Helmreich, and Stapp 1973), which by 1990 was cited over four hundred times (Beere 1990). The AWS has three versions of different lengths, 55 items, 25 items, and 15 items. The smaller measures are subsets of the largest, and they are each highly correlated (Beere 1990). The measure provides Likert item statements regarding academics and jobs; autonomy; sexual, pre-marital, and marital roles; and drinking, cursing, and sexual joking. As some have noted, the AWS does not correlate with measures of negative affect towards all women but, rather, it focuses on attitudes towards particular women, such as homemakers and feminists (Eagly and Mladinic 1989; Glick and Fiske 1997; McHugh and Frieze 1997). It has been found that patriarchal attitudes measured with the AWS do predict

self-reported patriarchal household division of labor (McGovern and Meyers 2002). The AWS has been used to study numerous topics, including intimate partner violence. One study for instance found wives in healthy relationships and husbands in abuser therapy were most likely to hold conservative patriarchal attitudes (Rosenbaum and O'Leary 1981).

3.4 Sex/Gender Roles Theory

Because the distinction between sex and gender came gradually to the literature, what was initially referred to as sex roles theory as early as the 1960s was later renamed as gender roles theory. As such, though for the sake of simplicity Chafetz (2006) labels this “role theory,” hereafter this is referred to as sex/gender roles theory. According to sex/gender roles theory, gender is a temporary role one employs in appropriate contexts. It portrays gender as inherent to the individual but never entirely stagnant, shifting and adapting to new situations (West and Zimmerman 1987).

Gender measures inspired by sex/gender roles theory are by far the most numerous, diverse, and amply cited (Beere 1990). The widespread use of measures associated with this theory may in part be due to the reality that personality traits are very easy to measure with self-reported measure items. Given its age and cross-disciplinary appeal, it is also possible that sex/gender roles is known to a wider audience of scholars than other theories.

A somewhat uncommon form of sex/gender roles measures involves a list of personality traits for which the respondent must indicate if it applies best to men or

women (for example, see Belk and Snell 1986). Some measures, like the amply cited Sex Role Stereotype Questionnaire which uses semantic differential questions, ask respondents to rate the applicability of personality traits not only to themselves, but also to their ideal self, all men, and all women (Rosenkrantz, Vogel, Bee, Broverman, and Broverman 1968). Most frequently, sex/gender roles measures are comprised of a series of self-reported Likert items asking respondents to indicate the degree to which a personality trait describes them. The measures tend to be geared towards both men and women, and usually they are designed for either a high-school-or-older population or a college-or-older population (Beere 1990).

Although some measures have included negative traits (i.e. Antill, Cunningham, Russell, and Thompson 1981), generally these measures include only traits with culturally positive connotations, such as with the Bem Sex-Role Inventory. As might be expected, the types of personality traits chosen for these measures are limited, as modern measure designers recycle themes from older measures. Masculinity is often measured by “instrumental” traits (i.e. independence, confidence, assertiveness, leadership, desire for power), and femininity is typically measured by “expressive” traits (i.e. cooperation, compassion, tenderness) (Gill, Stockard, Johnson, and Williams 1987; Woo and Oei 2008). These traits have been the focus of many gender theorists, whether using the terms instrumental and expressive (Parsons, Bales, and Shils 1954) or roughly synonymous terms like autocentric and allocentric (Gutmann 1970), agency and communion (Bakan 1966), less relational and more relational positions on parenting (Chodorow 1978), and non-interference and interdependency relative to helping others

(Gilligan 1982). These gender stereotypes are among the most widely known and used in gender socialization in cultures throughout the world, including the United States (Barry, Bacon, and Child 1957).

As late as the 1960s, gender was generally viewed as a bipolar spectrum with masculinity at one end and femininity at the other. Feminine traits might be weighted negative one, and masculine traits could be weighted as positive one, with the summed total describing not only if one was more masculine or feminine but also the degree to which they were gender-typed. The implication of this bipolar conceptualization is that androgynous respondents falling on the middle of the spectrum can only possess medium levels of masculinity and femininity – rather than distinguishing between those with high levels of both or low levels of both. Further, androgyny was considered abnormal, with healthy men only embodying masculinity and healthy women only femininity.

In the 1970s, an article was published which had a dramatic impact on the ways sex/gender roles measures measured gender from then on. Constantinople (1973) argued that it is not only possible but healthy for people to possess both masculine and feminine traits. As Gill, Stockard, Johnson, and Williams (1987) put it with regards to instrumentality and expressiveness:

... expressiveness is not the opposite of instrumentality; instead the concepts constitute two separate dimensions, each with a positive and a negative pole. Specifically, this means that expressiveness does not imply a lack of instrumental competence, nor does competence in instrumental activities preclude the ability to relate expressively (Gill, Stockard, Johnson, and Williams 1987, 380).

As such, masculinity and femininity should have separate orthogonal measures (Constantinople 1973). Since then, measures like the Bem Sex-Role Inventory

popularized a particular way of dealing with these separate measures, a technique now quite common to see in sex/gender roles measures. A median split method is used to find the average masculinity score and femininity score for a study's sample. Respondents scoring above the median on masculinity and below on femininity are labeled "masculine," respondents scoring low on masculinity and high on femininity are labeled "feminine," high scorers on both masculinity and femininity are labeled "androgynous," and the label of "undifferentiated" is assigned to those scoring low on both (Beere 1990).

Although gender personality trait measures in the tradition of sex/gender roles have been numerous and well cited, certain measures have been given much more attention in the literature than others. To help place the dissertation's measure, the Bem Sex-Role Inventory, in the context of related sex/gender roles measures, several of the more prominent measures in this area are reviewed here, with prominence defined by the frequency with which the measures are referenced in the literature up until 1990 (see Beere 1990). A brief look is taken at three measures which have garnered a reasonably large amount of attention over the years although are less frequently used in articles between 1990 and 2010 based on a recent online search of the sociology and psychology literatures by the present author. We then turn to the second-most popular sex/gender roles measure, the Personal Attributes Questionnaire (Spence, Helmreich, and Holahan 1979; Spence, Helmreich, and Stapp 1974), which is similar in many key ways to the Bem Sex-Role Inventory. The most widely cited in the literature – both up until 1990, according to Beere (1990), and since 1990, based on a recent online search by the present author – the Bem Sex-Role Inventory (Bem 1974) is used in the dissertation's analysis

and is reviewed in Chapter Four in considerably more detail. Each of these measures attempt to quantify self-labeled, stereotypically gendered, personality traits.

3.4a Sex/Gender Roles: ACL, PRF ANDRO, & MMPI

Three sex/gender roles measures are well-cited (see Beere 1990), although, based on the present author's recent online search of the literature, they were more utilized prior to 1990 than since: the Adjective Check List or ACL (Gough 1952; Gough and Heilbrun 1965), the Personality Research Form's androgyny submeasure or PRF ANDRO (Berzins, Welling, and Wetter 1978), and the Minnesota Multiphasic Personality Inventory or MMPI (Hathaway and McKinley 1943). The ACL is a list of 300 traits, and respondents check those which apply to them (Gough 1952). 53 of the items help predict binary gender, with 28 items labeled masculine and 25 labeled feminine (Gough and Heilbrun 1965; Heilbrun 1976). With few exceptions (i.e. handsome, frank, etc.), masculine items tap into instrumentality (i.e. aggressive, assertive, autocratic, confident, dominant, etc.), and, with few exceptions (i.e. jolly, talkative, etc.), feminine items tap into expressiveness (i.e. cooperative, dependent, submissive, sympathetic, timid, etc.). Like the measures that came into favor after the publication of Constantinople's (1973) landmark article mentioned earlier, the ACL treats masculinity and femininity as orthogonally distinct measures which can be scored with the median split method so as create the masculinity-femininity typology of high-high (androgynous), low-low (undifferentiated), high-low (masculine), and low-high (feminine).

Within the Personality Research Form is the PRF ANDRO, 56 true-false items divided into two measures (Berzins, Welling, and Wetter 1978). The PRF ANDRO also appears alongside several self-esteem, careless response, and filler items in the Interpersonal Disposition Inventory. The 29 item masculine submeasure of the PRF ANDRO measures not only instrumentality but also risk-taking orientation, social ascendancy, and intellectual ascendancy. The 27 item feminine submeasure taps entirely into expressiveness, measuring concern about others, nurturing, and self-subordinating. Like the ACL, the PRF ANDRO submeasures are combined through a median split which is then used to create masculinity-femininity typology scores for each respondent.

The MMPI is designed to measure personality traits inherent to the respondent, used mainly by clinical psychologists diagnosing mental disorders (Hathaway and McKinley 1943). Though not designed exclusively to assess gender, it does have gender submeasures utilized in gender analysis. The Mf submeasure is 60 items addressing interests, jobs, aesthetic preferences, and activity-passivity. The revised version, the MMPI-2, has a fairly similar Mf submeasure, comprised of 57 items (Butcher, Dahlstrom, Graham, Tellegen, and Kaemmer 1989). But instead of a single Mf measure, the items here are divided into the masculinity GM measure and the femininity GF measure. In studies of gender, although only these submeasures are usually employed, the MMPI / MMPI-2 are sometimes administered in their entirety which includes a number of the other submeasures measuring such traits of clinical concern as depression, hysteria, and paranoia.

It is difficult to determine exactly why certain measures gain favor while others lose it. The movement towards Likert items might help to illuminate the difficulties the ACL has had in the past decade. The PRF ANDRO might be less appealing than other measures because of its size and also the original intent to deal more with clinical psychology than healthy gender personalities. The MMPI may have been viewed less favorably in the 1970s when single, bipolar gender measures were deemed problematic, although the MMPI-2 remedies this problem. A simpler answer may lie with the widespread usage of two measures, the Personal Attributes Questionnaire and the Bem Sex-Role Inventory. A popular measure draws attention because it is more likely to have had numerous diagnostics run on it to ensure validity, reliability, and dimensionality. Using a popular measure also means an ease with which the study results can be compared to other studies using the same measure, a benefit enabled by the social scientific method which encourages the accumulation of evidence rather than monolithic studies never replicated. In spite of its weaknesses (to be discussed in Chapter 4), a measure like the Bem Sex-Role Inventory is of great value in large part because conclusions can be drawn from it across studies. At the same time, measures like the ACL, PRF ANDRO, and MMPI may be less frequently used in part, ironically, because there are fewer studies employing these measures with which to form comparisons of findings.

3.4b Sex/Gender Roles: PAQ / EPAQ

The 55-item Personal Attributes Questionnaire, or PAQ, uses self-reported 5-point semantic differential items to measure gender personality traits (Spence, Helmreich, and Stapp 1974, 1975). To design the PAQ, first a list of traits were built on top of the Sex Role Stereotype Questionnaire authored by Rosenkrantz, Vogel, Bee, Broverman, and Broverman (1968). A college student sample was divided, with some subsamples asked to rate items on the list that are more typically masculine and other subsamples rating items that are more typically feminine. Confirmation from multiple subsamples found 54 items to have significantly different mean scores for masculinity and femininity (one item did not reach statistical significance and so is not accounted for in scoring the PAQ). These items were divided into three submeasures. The “female-valued” submeasure is 18 items designated by their subsamples as positive traits for both the ideal man and ideal woman. With few exceptions (i.e. creative, enjoys art and music, neat), this measure largely represents expressiveness (i.e. considerate, devotes self to others, emotional, etc.). The “male-valued” submeasure is comprised of 23 items identified by their subsamples as positive traits for both the ideal man and ideal women. Other than a few items (i.e. good at sports, interested in sex, intellectual, etc.), this measure presents mainly instrumental traits (i.e. not easily influenced, acts as leader, self confident, etc.). The third submeasure is 13 items labeled by the subsamples as ideal only for men or for women. With a few exceptions (i.e. mechanical aptitude, religious), this measure is a mixture of expressive items (i.e. cries easily, needs approval, etc.) and instrumental items (i.e. aggressive, loud, etc.). Although this third submeasure again was designed with the

“ideal” man and woman in mind, unintentionally the items for the submeasure have a noticeably greater negative connotation than the other two submeasures (Spence, Helmreich, and Stapp 1974, 1975).

A very popular short version of the PAQ includes only eight items from each of the three submeasures, items which were selected by item-total correlations. Each submeasure highly correlates with the corresponding submeasure from the original PAQ, .82 for female-valued, .85 for male-valued, and .78 for the gender-typed submeasures (Spence and Helmreich 1978). The Extended Personal Attributes Questionnaire, or EPAQ, has the same 24 items as the short version plus 16 items which are negative for both men and women though more strongly associated with either men or women (Spence, Helmreich, and Holahan 1979). The new negative masculinity submeasure has 8 items which are all negatively instrumental, such as arrogant, greedy, and dictatorial. The new negative femininity submeasure has 4 items which are negatively expressive (servile, spineless, gullible, subordinates self to others) and 4 items which tap into verbal aggression (whiny, complaining, nagging, fussy). Although designed and predominantly used with college-aged samples, the PAQ / EPAQ have been applied to all types of populations of varying ages, nationalities, sexual orientations, medical and psychological conditions, and employment types. It has been adapted by Hall and Halberstadt (1980) and Spence, Helmreich, and Holahan (1979) to younger populations. Toller, Suter, and Trautman (2004) find that the PAQ helps predict attitudes towards feminism (Toller, Suter, and Trautman 2004).

Some attention has been given in the literature to whether the PAQ measures simply instrumentality and expressiveness. Gill, Stockard, Johnson, and Williams (1987) believe that Parsons (1951) intended for instrumentality to be defined as “concern with the attainment of goals external to the interactional process” and expressiveness to be defined as concern with “facilitating the interaction process itself” (Gill, Stockard, Johnson, and Williams 1987, 379-380). Expressiveness, they feel, implies working with others towards goals, and this is not necessarily the same as being emotional – they point out that helping someone work through a difficult problem may require suppressing your own emotions to create calm and sympathy. Expressiveness also does not mean dependence or passivity because helping to address a situation more often requires interdependence and action. The PAQ, as they note, does mix what they would refer to as expressive items with emotional items (i.e. emotional, not hide emotions, expresses tender feelings, cries easily, feelings hurt) and dependence items (i.e. needs approval, needs for security). Passivity items are not clearly in the female-valued items of the PAQ, and they do not delve into the concepts behind the instrumental items as they do with expressiveness (Gill, Stockard, Johnson, and Williams 1987). Helmreich, Spence, and Wilhelm (1981) counter that most studies exploring the dimensionality of the PAQ have been very small, and their own factor analysis found the submeasures of the PAQ to be unidimensional (Helmreich, Spence, and Wilhelm 1981). Even if instrumentality and expressiveness as they are measured in the PAQ do mask multiple concepts, if the concepts are so highly correlated that they may be derived from a common underlying

factor, the measure will likely highlight the same types of respondents whether all subconcepts are included or not.

The PAQ and the Bem Sex-Role Inventory (BSRI) are very similar in that they both measure expressiveness and instrumentality through self-reported submeasures, and both were developed with a college student sample asked to rate which traits from a list were more aligned with men or women. Unlike the BSRI, the PAQ and its authors do not claim to be measuring global self-images of gender. In fact, they suggest that their measure be viewed more as a measure of instrumentality and expressiveness rather than masculinity and femininity (Helmreich, Spence, and Holahan 1979; Hiller and Philliber 1985; Spence and Helmreich 1979). As mentioned above, the EPAQ adds in negative gender items, which no version of the BSRI does. In most comparison studies, the all-positive itemed PAQ correlates highly with the BSRI (Hiller and Philliber 1985). Although the BSRI is the most widely cited gender measure – based on Beere’s (1990) assessment of the literature and an online literature search by the present author – to build upon sex/gender roles theory, it will not be reviewed here but rather explored in great detail in Chapter Four.

3.5 Interactionist and Intersectional Theory

Unlike sex/gender roles theory, interactionist theories contend that gender both changes over time and is not inherent to the individual. They assert that gender is created and recreated through every interaction. Thus, one must continually prove to others and themselves that they abide by culturally-accepted gender standards. Two main

interactionist theories are West and Zimmerman's (1987) doing gender theory and Butler's (1990, 1997) performative gender theory (Butler 1990, 1997; West and Zimmerman 1987). While doing gender theory is rooted in the language of symbolic interactionism and ethnomethodology (gender as a mutually agreed upon and fluctuating symbol) and performative gender in poststructuralism (gender as a non-concrete experience unique to each individual), these theories agree that gender is accomplished during interactions. Where they differ slightly is how frequently gender is "done" or "performed." Doing gender theory purports that gender is done in all interactions, while performative gender theory suggests, like sex/gender roles theory, that gender can at times be a temporary role.

West and Zimmerman's doing gender theory finds that being identified by others as biologically male or female – a process resulting in being assigned a "sex category" – requires minimal effort during interactions, particularly because people are socialized to categorize others even with the tiniest cues as evidence. As a result, sex categories are "master identities," present in all contexts. The main question becomes how gendered a person would like to appear. Using Garfinkle's (1967) ethnography of the young male-to-female transsexual "Agnes," West and Zimmerman (1987) explain that Agnes can often achieve sex categorization during interactions because her biological sex is not visible, but she does gender more fervently because she wishes to not only be identified by others as a woman but as a very feminine woman (West and Zimmerman 1987).

Butler's performative gender theory suggests that gender is less omnipresent than doing gender theory argues. Thorne (1995) critiques this stance: "The dramaturgical

approach that feminist sociologists left behind when we discarded the conception of ‘sex roles’ has reappeared in Butler’s writings... (Thorne 1995, 498-499).” Butler does leave hints that she believes gender is to at least some degree omnipresent, but she never states it plainly. She comes close in some moments though: performative gender, she writes, “consists of a reiteration of norms which precede, constrain, and exceed the performer and in that sense cannot be taken as the fabrication of the performer’s ‘will’ or choice (Butler 1993, 234).” In a later statement specifically on drag, she reiterates this message: “I do not mean to suggest that drag is a ‘role’ that can be taken on or taken off at will. There is no volitional subject behind the mime who decides, as it were, which gender it will be today (Butler 1997, 308).” Clearly performative gender theory does not go as far as sex/gender roles theory to state that gender is not present at all in certain situations, but yet it does not appear to go as far as doing gender theory in claiming that gender is omnipresent. Ultimately, interactionist theories like doing gender and performative gender make important leaps in gender theorizing, allowing researchers to study the process through which gender is created and changes from moment to moment.

Intersectionality – referred to by Chafetz (2006) as multiple jeopardy theory – builds upon interactionism, adding that in reality gender always affects and is affected by other demographics like class, race, ethnicity, and sexual orientation. In the past, these various social locations were viewed and measured exclusively through a slew of mathematical metaphors – additive, multiplicative, planes, and axes – which were later seen as problematic, in large part because they implied that each type of difference is separate from the others (Glenn 1999; Takagi 1995; West and Fenstermaker 1995). For

instance, even though King's (1988) concept of "multiple jeopardy" emphasizes simultaneity, her use of a multiplicative metaphor implies separate rather than a unified system governing interaction (King 1988).

Nearly a decade after the publication of West and Zimmerman's article "Doing Gender," West and Fenstermaker (1995) published "Doing Difference." According to the theory presented in the paper, in interactions, we do not just "do gender" in isolation; simultaneously, we also will "do" class, race, ethnicity, and other parts of our social location. The collective action of doing all our social locations together is termed "doing difference (West and Fenstermaker 1995, 8-9)." West and Fenstermaker write that various social locations "are potentially omnirelevant to social life" and yet can be "stressed or muted, depending on the situation (West and Fenstermaker 1995, 30)." That is, while no type of social location will ever be completely absent during interactions, it is possible that some become more salient at times.

Both interactionist and intersectional theorists view gender as a complex, non-fixed, interpersonal experience, and, as such, they tend to favor qualitative research methods such as ethnography, in-depth interviews, and observations. That said, because these theories add to our understanding of gender, it may be worthwhile for quantitatively-oriented researchers (hereafter "quantitative researchers") to develop quantitative measures informed by these theories. Taking her cue from Anderson's review of the literature (2005), Brush (2005) understates the massive dilemma of how to quantitatify an interactionist conceptualization of gender that seems to demand limitless data on every moment and aspect of life: "there is little consensus on how to measure

gender as an emergent property of interaction in a couple (Brush 2005, 870).” Some measures have attempted to capture – albeit to a limited degree – the types of everyday behaviors most likely to be engaged in by mainly men and mainly women. Doubtless there are also countless measures which measure all sorts of behaviors which can then be correlated with a binary gender variable, but few of these measures were intended to operationalize gender. One exception is the Sex Role Behavior Scale (SRBS), which measures male and female preferences with regards to recreational activities, jobs, social and dating behavior, and marital behavior. It has come in several versions over the years, including the 160 item SRBS-1 (Orlofsky 1981), the 240 item SRBS-2 (Orlofsky, Ramsden, and Cohen 1982), and the 96 item SRBS short form (Orlofsky and O’Heron 1987). Another prominent gender behavior measure, Gender Diagnosticity (GD), has mainly been cited in articles by the measure’s author (for one exception on bullying, see Young and Sweeting 2004). GD measures preferences for occupations, hobbies, and activities, and discriminant analysis is used to find the combination of weighted items which best identify males and females in a given sample (Lippa 1991, 1995a, 1995b, 1997, 1998, 2001; Lippa and Connelly 1990). The Gender-Stereotyped Attitude Scale for Children shows children pictures of everyday activities and asks the children to state if mainly men, women, or both can do the activity (Signorella and Liben 1985). Shepard and Hess’ (1975) Stereotypes of Occupations and Activities measure ask similar questions but use interviews instead of images (Shepard and Hess 1975). As previously mentioned, there are several measures exclusively tackling more stereotypically “gendered” arenas such as parenting (i.e. Fine-Davis 1976; Slade and Jenner 1978),

sexual behaviors (i.e. Iazzo 1983; Snell, Belk, and Hawkins 1986), household division of labor (Baber and Tucker 2006; Blood and Wolfe 1960; Jacobson 1950), and patriarchal chivalry (Burt 1980; Doyle and Moore 1978). A number of measures, sometimes referred to as gender stereotypes measures, ask respondents whether men or women are more likely to engage in the sort of behaviors listed in a set of statements.

As with interactionist theories, intersectional theories like West and Fenstermaker's (1995) *Doing Difference* were created and embraced by scholars tending to favor qualitative methods. Still, if such intersectional theories were to be of interest to quantitative researchers, it would be desirable to construct a single measure that would somehow combine demographic variables. Typically quantitative researchers prefer to separate constructs into separate variables and measures so as to look for correlations across them. Thus, intersectionality is often explored in gender research, but gender is treated as a distinct construction. A few scholars, however, have attempted to merge gender and other demographics into a single measure. One obvious solution is to form interaction terms, a tactic Dillaway and Broman (2001) take. A related option, utilized by Steinbugler, Press, and Dias (2006), is to divide the sample by the attributes of an intersectional typology, for instance by conducting the same analyses on a black-male subsample, black-female subsample, white-male subsample, and white-female subsample. The limitation for both interaction terms and intersectional subsamples is that neither approach attempts to discover the ways in which demographics intersect. Rather, these two approaches assume only that there is an intersection, and the goal of the study is then shifted to correlating the intersections with a different variable of greater interest.

Settles (2006) has a unique and potentially promising strategy for investigating intersectionality. In her study, gender and race are merged into a measure measuring how important to the respondent gender and race are relative to one another, and they are merged yet again into another measure measuring how gender and race interfere with one another (Settles 2006). Understandably, if gender is too complex to fully capture quantitatively, adequately capturing the infinitely more complex intersections between gender and other demographics into a quantitative measure may not be possible.

3.7 Summary

In the past thirty years, though generally coming to agree that gender interacts with other demographic variables, gender scholars have struggled over whether gender is static and inherent or dynamic and existing only through interactions. Out of this debate, sex/gender roles measures like the Bem Sex-Role Inventory have come under fire of late for treating gender as traits inherent to the individual rather than an interactional process (for example, see Anderson 2005). This at the same time is both accurate and not as problematic as made out to be. It is possible that a respondent may identify with a set of socially desirable gender norms that do not entirely reflect the version of gender that is interactionally performed, thus resulting in problems with reliability. However, there is no reason to presume that most respondents inaccurately assess the gender traits embodied by their behaviors. The slightly more complex conceptualization of gender, as an interactional and intersectional achievement, may simply not be quantitatively measurable in all its detail. In sum, though perhaps not nearly as informative as

qualitative research on IPV and gender, gender measures can provide generalizeable and easily measurable data on particular dimensions of gender, especially attitudes (i.e. Attitudes Toward Women Scale; Spence and Helmreich 1972) and self-reported personality traits (i.e. Personal Attributes Questionnaire; Spence, Helmreich, and Stapp 1974) and, more rarely, activities and behaviors (i.e. Games Inventory; Bates and Bentler 1973). These measures are largely utilized in survey research, whether in the form of interviews or self-administered questionnaires, by mail, over the phone, or in person. On occasion they are included in experiments (i.e. Bem 1975; Bem, Martyna, and Watson 1976). To date, gender measures have been mostly of interest within psychology and sociology, though they remain underutilized in certain disciplines like criminology.

Chapter 4: The Bem Sex-Role Inventory

The Bem Sex-Role Inventory should perhaps more accurately be renamed the Bem *Gender*-Role Inventory because it certainly is a measure of socially constructed gender and not biological sex. In measuring gender personality traits inherent to the individual, the Bem Sex-Role Inventory (BSRI) and its short version (BSRI-S) emerge from within the gender school of thought entitled sex/gender roles discussed in Chapter Three. Although scholars subscribing to this theory eventually shifted the name “sex roles” to “gender roles” when the literature came to acknowledge a distinction between sex and gender, Bem chose not change the name of her measure. Although one can only speculate, in part this may be due to a desire to maintain the name recognition the measure had built up prior to the shift in sex-gender terminology. In addition, outside of the gender scholar community, “sex roles” remains a widely recognized – if outdated – synonym for gender.

The 60 item BSRI (Bem 1974) and 30 item BSRI-S (Bem 1979) emerge from the sex/gender roles tradition in that they add up Likert item scores on stereotypically gendered personality traits to create a separate masculinity score and femininity score for each respondent. She creates a typology from high/low masculinity and high/low femininity scores where respondents are categorized as either mainly masculine, mainly feminine, mainly both (androgynous), or mainly neither (undifferentiated).

What exactly “masculinity” and “femininity” mean is explored more fully later in this section when turning to factor analyses. As for Bem’s stated definitions, these have changed over the years. In her initial article introducing the original BSRI, Bem (1974)

implies that the masculinity submeasure measures instrumentality – a take-charge approach towards task-based goals – and the femininity submeasure measures expressiveness – an interdependent approach towards goals, both task-based and emotional support-based goals:

Both historically and cross-culturally, masculinity and femininity seem to have represented two complementary domains of positive traits and behaviors (Barry, Bacon, & Child, 1957; Erikson, 1964; Parsons & Bales, 1955). In general, masculinity has been associated with an instrumental orientation, a cognitive focus on “getting the job done”; and femininity has been associated with an expressive orientation, an affective concern for the welfare of others (Bem 1974, 156).

This is Bem’s only description of the BSRI’s purpose in this earliest article. By the introduction of the BSRI-S, Bem (1979) has pulled back slightly from her statement that the BSRI exclusively measures instrumentality and expressiveness. Instead, the BSRI measures “a *heterogeneous* collection of attributes” grouped together, at times seemingly arbitrarily, by societal norms (Bem 1979, 1048, emphasis added). Further, Bem taps into her gender schema theory by arguing that the underlying factors for each submeasure will likely be more unidimensional for gender-typed respondents (those scoring as either “masculine” or “feminine”) because they recognize and tend to abide by culturally accepted gender stereotypes. Conversely, the dimensionality is more unpredictable for non-gender-typed respondents (“androgynous” and “undifferentiated” respondents) because they do not subscribe as strongly to cultural gender expectations:

The very concept of androgyny is a positive assertion that these arbitrary clusters of apples and oranges need not—and for some individuals do not—“hang together.” If the culture groups a hodgepodge of attributes into a category it calls “femininity” or “masculinity,” then that hodgepodge is what sex-typed individuals will take as the standard for their behavior. The purpose of the BSRI is to discriminate between those

individuals for whom this hodgepodge does form a unitary cluster and those individuals for whom it does not (Bem 1979, 1049).

Thus, one might infer from this statement that the dimensionality of a full sample may be more multidimensional than if respondents are first divided into her typology of masculine, feminine, androgynous, and undifferentiated.

Ultimately, though, the masculinity submeasure is a list of items meant to evoke “instrumentality,” and the femininity submeasure taps into “expressiveness.” This was the originally provided intention of the measure, and she restates these origins of the BSRI in her 1981 manual for the BSRI and BSRI-S (Bem 1974, 1981). Bem expects that not all people – most notably androgynous and undifferentiated individuals – will abide by the socially desirable traits associated with their sex. Put another way, Bem is attempting to take commonly held gender stereotypes – at least commonly held by her 1972 college student sample helping her devise the original BSRI – and show that they are only stereotypes, that, in reality, many people do not live up to them. She uses experiments as well as theoretical models, described later, to also show that those who do not live up to these stereotypes are perhaps healthier. So, despite the appearance of the BSRI and BSRI-S as measures which reaffirm gender stereotypes, quite to the contrary, we can infer that Bem views her measures as starting points for a gender revolution which moves culturally-accepted masculinity and femininity away from their associations with instrumentality and expressiveness.

In this dissertation, the BSRI-S is employed. As such, the remainder of this chapter is dedicated to the BSRI-S and its precursor, the original BSRI. Specifically, this chapter will explore: (1) their immense popularity, (2) their theoretical underpinnings, (3)

the composition of the BSRI, (4) the composition of the BSRI-S, (5) scoring, and the value of these measures insofar as (6) the degree they measure expressiveness and instrumentality and (7) how much can be inferred from them regarding other dimensions of gender.

4.1 Popularity

Although the popularity of a measure by no means ensures its validity and reliability, widespread use does imply that a large portion of the research community has faith in the measure. With this in mind, Bem's (1974) Bem Sex-Role Inventory (BSRI) and Bem's (1979) Bem Sex-Role Inventory Short Version (BSRI-S) are not only the most popular sex/gender roles measures but the most popular gender measures overall. A Summer 2009 search through the University of California's ERIC database, sociology databases (Sociological Abstracts and Sage's Sociology Full-Text Collection), and psychology databases (PsychINFO, PsychARTICLES, and Sage's Psychology Full-Text Collection) by the present author reveals that Bem's measures have been cited in 2630 peer-reviewed journal articles and referred to in 1690 abstracts. This of course excludes duplicates produced by a multiple database search, but it also excludes books as well as peer-reviewed journal databases from any number of disciplines such as health, social work, and political science. Although these massive numbers are certainly impacted by the fact that the BSRI has been available for 35 years, not even older measures have come close. The second-most popular measures are Spence, Helmreich, and Stapp (1974)'s PAQ – also developed in 1974 like the BSRI – and Spence, Helmreich, and

Holahan (1979)'s EPAQ – similarly authored in 1979 like the BSRI-S. Collectively, the PAQ and EPAQ come in a distant second in both citations (1500) and abstract references (560). After the third-most popular – Spence and Helmreich's (1972) Attitudes Toward Women Scale or AWS, with 1148 citations and 464 abstract references – there is a precipitous drop in popularity for other gender measures.

The BSRI and BSRI-S have been used with many types of populations. About two-thirds of studies using these measures have been with college student samples (Beere 1990). Of the remaining studies, an astonishing diversity of populations has been measured with the BSRI or BSRI-S:

Homosexuals and transsexuals are frequently tested with the BSRI. The BSRI has also been given to athletes, physicians, attorneys, hotel employees, married couples, adolescents, infertile couples, parents-to-be, parents, senior citizens, college faculty, women awaiting trial, counselors in training, public school administrators and educators, medical, dental, and dental hygiene students, incarcerated criminals, women with gynecological problems, anorexics and bulimics, middle managers, ministerial students and ministers, nursing students, psychiatric inpatients, mediators, teachers, psychotherapists, high school and college athletes, homosexual fathers, patients, physicians, career counseling clients, juvenile delinquents, physical educators, clinical psychologists, university faculty, police cadets, athletic administrators, health professionals, accountants, museum visitors, women receiving abortions, social workers, prostitutes, alcoholics, and schizophrenics. The BSRI has been used with Asian-Americans and Hispanic-Americans. It has been used in numerous foreign countries, sometimes in English and sometimes after translation into the native language. The countries have included Germany, New Zealand, Australia, Israel, India, West Indies, Ireland, Sweden, South Africa, Canada, Mexico, Saudi Arabia, Malaysia, and Finland (Beere 1990, 74-75).

As Beere (1990) notes, to facilitate reaching new populations, some scholars also have modified the measures in minor ways, including by asking respondents to rate items for someone other than themselves (i.e. Antill and Russell 1980; Lorr and Diorio 1978;

Wheeless and Dierks-Stewart 1981). More major changes have been made to form new measures: for instance, Mirandé's (1997) Mirandé Sex-Role Inventory designed for a Latino population; Kurdek and Siesky's (1980) Children's Sex-Role Self-Concept Inventory, Thomas and Robinson's (1981) Adolescent Sex Role Inventory, and Boldizar's (1991) Children's Sex Role Inventory for a child-aged population; Drinkwater's (1979) Australian Sex Role Inventory and Antill, Cunningham, Russell, and Thompson's (1981) Australian Sex Role Scale for an Australian population; and Tzuriel (1984) Bar-Ilan Sex Role Inventory for an Israeli population.

4.2 Theoretical Background

As noted earlier, the 1970s saw a major shift in how gender is quantitatively measured. Up until then, gender measures typically treated masculinity and femininity as bipolar opposites of a single dimension and thus a single measure. With this approach came "congruence models," theories that maintained that psychologically healthy individuals score towards one of the two poles but not in the middle. Healthy men should score as highly masculine and – by default of the measure's bipolar nature – not very feminine, and healthy women should score as highly feminine and not very masculine (Ballard-Reisch and Elton 1992). Constantinople's (1973) famous article decried unidimensional bipolar male-female measures and argued in favor of treating masculinity and femininity as distinct gender dimensions often both present in each person (Constantinople 1973). Her article had a profound impact on measures that were to

come, including the BSRI and BSRI-S, by encouraging the treatment of masculinity and femininity as separate, orthogonal measures.

Bem initially joins with other researchers in a school of thought called androgyny theory, which argues that healthy individuals in fact embody a relatively even mixture of masculinity and femininity (Ballard-Reisch and Elton 1992; Bem 1974 , 1975, 1979; Constantinople 1973; Helgeson 1994; Kaplan and Bean 1976; Whitley 1984). Bem makes her case for androgyny theory through a series of experiments testing conformity under pressure (Bem 1975) and interactions with kittens (Bem 1975), babies (Bem, Martyna, and Watson 1976), and lonely students (Bem, Martyna, and Watson 1976). The studies tap into aspects of instrumentality and expressiveness. She finds that those who are best equipped to handle multiple types of situations are those that score relatively equal amounts of masculinity and femininity on the BSRI / BSRI-S. Conversely, those who are gender-typed – or what she misleadingly refers to as “sex-typed” – are limited in the types of tasks they can succeed in (Bem and Lewis 1975; Bem, Martyna, and Watson 1976; Bem 1977). Bem and Lenney (1976) find performance-hurting anxiety can result from performing actions culturally associated with the opposite sex, but this anxiety is far more likely to inhibit gender-typed individuals than those with relatively equal masculinity and femininity scores. Bem’s solution to the social ineptness of gender-typed individuals is to encourage them to embody both masculinity and femininity.

By the 1980s, Bem comes to believe that gender stereotypes play a major role in reinforcing inequality between men and women. As such, she shifts away from androgyny theory because she feels it is problematic to praise and encourage traditional

masculinity and femininity, albeit simultaneously. Her new strategy, embodied in her gender schema theory, is to encourage people to stop using gender as an organizing principle of society. Gender schema theory argues that most people use a “gender polarization lens” to see everything in society as either masculine or feminine, and they also use an “androcentrism lens” to view the masculine as normal and the feminine as deviant, therein encouraging inequality. A “biological essentialism lens” plays a vital role in reinforcing this inequality. It encourages people to view these unequal divisions in society as biologically inevitable rather than socially constructed. She hopes that people will use an “encultured lens” to resist viewing society in this way (Bem 1981b, 1983, 1984). Bem assumes that gender is entirely socially constructed, and, in this sense, it is all in our heads. Although the components of gender may continue to exist, if we no longer label those components as gender, gender as a culturally understood construct will cease to exist. Potentially, inequality between men and women should also begin to dissipate.

In the 1990s, Bem determines that gender schema theory is unrealistic. She writes, “I have begun to worry that there may be no possible path for getting us from where we are now to where I would like us to be (Bem 1995, 330).” Bem contends that a slightly more feasible solution to ending inequality between men and women is to proliferate gender and sexuality categories. Doing so might limit societal privilege disproportionately awarded to masculine men, feminine women, and heterosexuals (Bem 1995). Despite these shifts in theoretical perspectives, Bem’s measures were unaffected.

4.3 *BSRI*

Construction of the original Bem Sex-Role Inventory (BSRI; Bem 1974) began in 1972, when Bem and several students selected 200 personality traits they agreed were “both positive in value and either masculine or feminine in tone (Bem 1974, 156).” They selected an additional 200 gender-neutral traits, half being positive and half being negative, which were intended to test for social desirability effects. Using an unstated sampling technique – most likely convenience sampling of her psychology students like she did the following year to test the psychometric properties of the completed measure – Bem sampled 100 Stanford University undergraduate students, half of them women and half men. 40 of the students participated during the winter and 60 during summer. They were asked to indicate on a 7-point Likert item, “In American society, how desirable is it for a [woman / man] to be [personality trait] (Bem 1974, 157)?” The sample was divided into two groups both with men and women, and one group was asked only how desirable the given trait was for a woman, and the other group was only asked how desirable the trait was for a man. Traits were then labeled “masculine” if both male and female respondents were significantly more likely to rate the trait as desirable for men, and conversely traits were labeled “feminine” if both male and female respondents were significantly more likely to rate the trait as desirable for women (Bem 1974).

Among traits passing this test of significance, 20 were chosen for the femininity submeasure and 20 for the masculinity submeasure. Although these 40 items are all positive traits, a social desirability submeasure was designed using an additional 20 gender-neutral items – 10 positive and 10 negative – which were included if they were

not rated by her sample as significantly more masculine or feminine and also did not get significantly different scores from the male and female respondents. The 20 item masculinity submeasure, 20 item femininity submeasure, and 20 filler items comprise the BSRI's 60 items (see Figure 1).

Because several years later Walkup and Abbott (1978) found that roughly half of the supposedly gender-neutral items were in fact not neutral, Bem would eventually suggest to those using the BSRI to include these final 20 items as “filler” but to not score them or use them to measure social desirability (Bem 1981; Walkup and Abbott 1978). However, Bem notes that a respondent's definition of social desirability is itself a product

Figure 1: Original BSRI Items

Masculine Items	Feminine Items	Filler Items
Acts as a leader	Affectionate	Adaptable
Aggressive	Cheerful	Conceited
Ambitious	Childlike	Conscientious
Analytical	Compassionate	Conventional
Assertive	Does not use harsh language	Friendly
Athletic	Eager to soothe hurt feelings	Happy
Competitive	Feminine	Helpful
Defends own beliefs	Flatterable	Inefficient
Dominant	Gentle	Jealous
Forceful	Gullible	Likable
Has leadership abilities	Loves children	Moody
Independent	Loyal	Reliable
Individualistic	Sensitive to the needs of others	Secretive
Makes decisions easily	Shy	Sincere
Masculine	Soft spoken	Solemn
Self-reliant	Sympathetic	Tactful
Self-sufficient	Tender	Theatrical
Strong personality	Understanding	Truthful
Willing to take a stand	Warm	Unpredictable
Willing to take risks	Yielding	Unsystematic

of her or his gender personality. Although by no means a perfect relation, those respondents who perceive gender-typing (masculine men and feminine women) to be culturally required are also the most likely themselves to be gender-typed. Similarly, those who perceive gender-typing to not be as stigmatized by society are the most likely to not be gender-typed themselves (Bem 1981, 31-32). In addition, in her 1973 test-retest sample of 28 males and 28 females, Bem used the Marlowe Crowne Social Desirability measure in conjunction with the BSRI. She found low correlations between this social desirability measure and the BSRI's femininity submeasure, masculinity submeasure, the femininity-minus-masculinity difference, and the absolute value of the femininity-minus-masculinity difference.

When administered, the items from each measure are interspersed with one another. The first item and every third item after are masculine, the second item and every third item after are feminine, and the third item and every third item after is neutral. The BSRI instructions to respondents read, "On the next page, you will find listed a number of personality characteristics. We would like you to use those characteristics to describe yourself, that is, we would like you to indicate, on a Likert item from 1 to 7, how true of you each of these characteristics is. Please do not leave any characteristic unmarked (Bem 1981, 78)." The following Likert item answer choices are provided for each item: 1 ("never or almost never true"), 2 ("usually not true"), 3 ("sometimes but infrequently true"), 4 ("occasionally true"), 5 ("often true"), 6 ("usually true"), and 7 ("always or almost always true") (Bem 1981, 78).

4.4 BSRI-S

The birth of the Bem Sex-Role Inventory Short Version (BSRI-S) comes in the context of attacks on the dimensionality of the original BSRI. Specifically, Pedhazur and Tetenbaum (1979) find that 83% of the BSRI's variance for females can be accounted for by four factors: one expressive feminine factor (highest loadings were for compassionate, tender, understanding, sympathetic, sensitive to the needs of others, gentle), an assertiveness masculine factor (highest loadings were for assertive, forceful, acts as a leader, has leadership abilities, strong personality, dominant, and aggressive), a self-sufficiency factor (loading positively were self-reliant, independent, and self-sufficient, and loading negatively were gullible and childlike), and a sex factor (the item "masculine" tends to indicate male sex, and the item "feminine" tends to indicate female sex). Males in their study revealed similar items for the factors (Pedhazur and Tetenbaum 1979). Bem's article introducing the BSRI-S is in fact almost entirely dedicated to directly challenging Pedhazur and Tetenbaum's (1979) critique.

Curiously, Bem replies to this critique by stating that it is not problematic to have more than two factors in the BSRI: "the theory underlying the BSRI does not require that the domains of femininity and masculinity be unidimensional (Bem 1979, 1051)." Yet she ultimately heeds Pedhazur and Tetenbaum's (1979) warnings. Bem runs a factor analysis on the 40 BSRI masculinity and femininity items and restricts the extracted factors to two. Additionally, excludes the sex-measuring items "masculine" and "feminine." She also excludes a number of feminine items with low social desirability and that did not consistently load on the femininity factor. The resulting BSRI-S is a

shrunk version of the original measure, now with two factors and greater internal consistency, with alphas ranging from .84 to .90 for the BSRI-S as compared to the original BSRI's alphas ranging from .75 to .87. The social desirability of each measure is comparable (Bem 1981). The BSRI-S is a 30-item measure with a 10-item masculinity submeasure, a 10-item femininity submeasure, and 10 filler items (see Figure 2). It is highly correlated with the BSRI, with a coefficient of .90 for both the masculinity and femininity submeasures (Bem 1981; Hoffman and Borders 2001). Just like with the BSRI, the BSRI-S instructs respondents to indicate how well each item describes them. Again, the same answer choices are provided: 1 ("never or almost never true"), 2 ("usually not true"), 3 ("sometimes but infrequently true"), 4 ("occasionally true"), 5 ("often true"), 6 ("usually true"), and 7 ("always or almost always true") (Bem 1981, 78).

4.5 Scoring

Originally, Bem (1974) suggested scoring the BSRI with three measures. The

Figure 2: BSRI-S Items

Masculine Items	Feminine Items	Filler Items
Aggressive	Affectionate	Adaptable
Assertive	Compassionate	Conceited
Defends own beliefs	Eager to soothe hurt feelings	Conscientious
Dominant	Gentle	Conventional
Forceful	Loves children	Jealous
Has leadership abilities	Sensitive to the needs of others	Moody
Independent	Sympathetic	Reliable
Strong personality	Tender	Secretive
Willing to take a stand	Understanding	Tactful
Willing to take risks	Warm	Truthful

first measure is a masculinity “raw score.” This is arrived at by first totaling the Likert scores for a given respondent and then dividing that total by the number of items answered on the masculinity measure. In essence, this is the mean score for items on a submeasure, and she refers to this as the “raw score.” As her Likert items each have 7 points, the masculinity raw score can range from 1 to 7. The femininity raw score is identical to this except that of course the femininity submeasure items are used to compute it. The third “difference” score is a measure of the degree to which a respondent is gender-typed (either more masculine or more feminine) versus not gender-typed. This involves changing the raw scores of the two submeasures to T-scores, and the masculinity score is then subtracted from the femininity score (Bem 1974).

Authors of the PAQ, Spence and Helmreich (1975) critiqued this approach by noting that the difference score places all respondents with relatively equal masculinity and femininity scores into one group which Bem entitles “androgynous.” (Note that Bem also uses this broad definition of androgyny when referring to “androgyny theory.”) They suggest instead reserving the label “androgynous” for respondents with equally high masculinity and femininity scores, and this group should be distinguished from “undifferentiated” respondents with equally low masculinity and femininity scores. To confirm the usefulness of this distinction, Bem, Martyna, and Watson (1976) and Bem (1977) conduct a new study and rescore some of her older experiments. They find evidence that suggests undifferentiated respondents have significantly lower self-esteem and are less responsive to kittens than androgynous respondents, and, among men, those who were undifferentiated reported significantly less self-disclosure than androgynous

respondents (Bem 1977; Bem, Martyna, and Watson 1976). In light of these results, Bem (1977) comes to agree with Spence and Helmreich (1975) that androgynous respondents should be analyzed separately from undifferentiated respondents.

Similar to the PAQ, the BSRI and BSRI-S now are scored in order to sort respondents into a masculinity-femininity typology. Today, Bem (1981) suggests in her manual for the BSRI and BSRI-S that there are two equally useful ways of scoring these measures to create this typology: a median-split and a hybrid technique (Bem 1981). The median-split technique involves finding a median raw score, either by using a pre-existing score she provides based on her previous studies or by finding the median in a researcher's own sample. She recommends the latter when using a large sample with relatively equal numbers of men and women. As this certainly applies to this dissertation's data set, her recommendation is taken for this paper, and the raw median score is estimated from the study's sample. Respondents scoring above the median on the masculinity submeasure are considered to have high masculinity scores, whereas below the median they would be deemed to have low masculinity scores. The same is done with the femininity submeasure. Respondents scoring both high-masculinity and low-femininity are labeled "masculine," low-masculinity and high-femininity respondents are labeled "feminine," high-masculinity and high-femininity respondents are labeled "androgynous," and low-masculinity and low-femininity respondents are labeled "undifferentiated (Bem 1981)."

The hybrid technique involves using both the difference score and the median-split. Similar to the difference score she describes in her 1974 article introducing the

BSRI, the difference score Bem describes in her 1981 manual involves changing the raw scores of the masculinity and femininity submeasures to T-scores, and the masculinity score is subtracted from the femininity score. She adds to this in her manual that the subtracted score should also be changed to a T-score, and both this T-score and the submeasure T-scores are standardized using her 1978 college sample. Bem recommends a cutoff point of plus or minus 10, roughly one standard deviation, to distinguish between three groups: masculine, androgynous-or-undifferentiated, and feminine respondents. Then the androgynous-or-undifferentiated group is divided into androgynous and undifferentiated respondents using the median-split method. The hybrid technique, she notes, designates more respondents as undifferentiated and fewer as androgynous as compared to when using just the median-split technique (Bem 1981).

In evaluating these two scoring techniques, Bem cannot say which is preferable. She writes, “At the present time, it is not known if one of the classification methods has greater predictive utility than the other. Both appear to be perfectly adequate for research (Bem 1981, 68).” Despite some variability in the results from the two scoring techniques (see Bem 1981 and Hoffman and Borders 2001 for analyses of these differences), she only notes that, because the median-split technique is simpler to understand and execute, it is more popular (Bem 1981). Although both scoring techniques are understandable and useable for this dissertation, because there is no clear empirical benefit for one technique, the popularity of the median-split technique was the main criteria to choose this scoring technique for analyses of this paper. Results are more readily comparable to past and future studies if the same scoring technique is used.

4.6 Expressiveness and Instrumentality

Of great importance is determining exactly what the BSRI and BSRI-S measure. As noted earlier, Bem (1974, 1981) believes they measure a slice of the culturally-accepted expectations for men – instrumentality – and for women – expressiveness (Bem 1974, 1981). She further believes that this factor structure will be most associated with respondents who are gender-typed (mainly masculine or feminine) because they acknowledge and are more likely to abide by cultural definitions. Bem also feels that there will be a large chunk of society whose measure answers will not follow the culturally prescribed factor structure – non-gender-typed respondents (androgynous and undifferentiated) – because they are less likely to acknowledge and abide by cultural definitions. If this is true, the masculinity and femininity submeasures might not each be strictly unidimensional for androgynous and undifferentiated respondents, but they may indeed be generally unidimensional for masculine and feminine respondents (Bem 1974, 1979, 1981). Two first-order confirmatory factor analyses on the original BSRI have tested this prediction by splitting their samples into two groups, one of masculine and feminine respondents and one of androgynous and undifferentiated respondents. Larson and Seidman (1986) excluded the 20 filler items from their factor analysis. They found four bipolar primary factors for the gender-typed group; for the non-gender-typed group, one of the factors was bipolar, but the other three were unipolar (Larson and Seidman 1986). Schmitt and Millard (1988) attempted to confirm these findings with the same techniques and factor structure but included the 20 filler items. They found for each group two factors explained approximately 75% of the variance, but the factors were

bipolar for the gender-typed group and unipolar for the non-gender-typed group (Schmitt and Millard 1988). In both studies, the factors chosen for testing were based on previous factor analyses (i.e. Gaudreau 1977), but the factors themselves do not appear to stem from any common patterns derived from the literature. In spite of the low face validity of their results, these two studies do suggest that Bem (1974, 1979, 1981) is correct to suspect different factorial structures for gender-typed and non-gender-typed individuals. It would seem less useful then to study the factor structure of the measures for the entire sample (Helmreich, Spence, and Wilhelm 1981) or even males and female separately, although this appears to be the usual strategy for researchers, including for all of the remaining studies described below.

The majority of factor analyses on these two measures to date have been conducted largely on the original BSRI, perhaps due to it having been published earlier than the BSRI-S and also a tendency today for researchers to use the full BSRI over the BSRI-S. Some factor analytic techniques are rarely used, such as a multitrait-multimethod technique (i.e. Wong, McCreary, and Duffy 1990) or a combination of confirmatory factor analysis with structural equation modeling (i.e. Blanchard-Fields, Suhrer-Roussel, and Hertzog 1994). First-order exploratory factor analysis has been by far the most common choice for researchers looking to discover the underlying factors behind the original BSRI (Choi and Fuqua 2003). Items from the BSRI are pooled together – either all 60 items, the 40 gender items, or some variation on the 40 items such as including a sex variable or excluding the items “masculine” and “feminine (Choi and Fuqua 2003).” A sample is given the BSRI, and males and females are analyzed either

separately or together, although this sample decision has shown to have little impact on the results (Choi and Fuqua 2003). Principle component analysis reveals which items tend to correlate in large clusters. Generally orthogonal rotation is used rather than oblique rotation, likely due to Bem's assertion that masculinity and femininity are independent constructs; however, oblique rotation when used instead of orthogonal rotation (i.e. Gaa, Liberman, and Edwards 1979) or in addition to it (i.e. Ballard-Reisch and Elton 1992; Windle and Sinnot 1985) has provided similar results to orthogonal rotation (Choi and Fuqua 2003). The researcher gives the cluster a name based on the researcher's intuition on what all the cluster's items have in common. This named cluster is viewed as an underlying abstract construct being measured by several indicators, the items in the cluster.

In their review of 23 first-order exploratory factor analyses, Choi and Fuqua (2003) found that the number of factors revealed has ranged from two to eleven. Some studies (i.e. Ratliff and Conley 1980), though, have found a large number of factors because the researcher fails to question the validity of factors with very few items (i.e. 2 to 3) and a very low subject-to-variable ratio (i.e. 1 to 3), in essence factors created by chance rather than a real pattern (Choi and Fuqua 2003). Focusing their factor analysis review on the most commonly found factors with loadings of at least .40, Choi and Fuqua (2003) find that the original BSRI most likely has four factors: one femininity factor, two masculinity factors, and one sex factor (Choi and Fuqua 2003).

As Choi and Fuqua (2003) note, most first-order exploratory factor analyses, including Bem's (1981), have found only one femininity factor for the original BSRI,

although only seven to ten of the twenty femininity submeasure items load onto the factor (i.e. Bem 1981; Bledsoe 1983; Gaudreau 1977; Maznah and Choo 1986; Thompson and Melancon 1986; Windle and Sinnot 1985). Only 10% of the total variance is usually explained by this factor, a relatively low number (Choi and Fuqua 2003). Bem (1981) and several others have reported that there is one masculinity factor in the original BSRI, with roughly 17 of the 20 items loading onto it (Ballard-Reisch and Elton 1992; Bem 1981; Bledsoe 1983; Bohannon and Mills 1979; Gaudreau 1977; Moreland, Gulanick, Montague, and Harren 1978; Windle and Sinnot 1985). A number of studies, however, suggest that there are two masculine factors, an instrumental factor (for example, has leadership abilities, willing to take a stand, assertive, etc.) and an autonomous (or “agentic”) factor (for example, individualistic, self-reliant, self-sufficient, etc.) (Pedhazur and Tetenbaum 1979; Ruch 1984; Whetton and Swindells 1977). The instrumental factor in these studies is often comprised of two factors (i.e. Gaa, Liberman, and Edwards 1979) or even more (i.e. Sassenrath and Yonge 1979). Only 5 to 20% of the total variance is generally explained by these masculinity factors (Choi and Fuqua 2003). Choi and Fuqua (2003) and others (i.e. Collins, Waters, and Waters 1979; Messick 1989) suggest that these factor distinctions on the masculinity submeasure are real, that within there are likely two unique concepts of instrumentality and autonomy (Choi and Fuqua 2003; Collins, Waters, and Waters 1979; Messick 1989). The bipolar sex factor – sometimes referred to as the M-F factor – was found in most studies. Some studies found only the items “masculine” and “feminine” loaded onto it, while other studies arrived at the factor

by incorporating a self-reported bipolar sex variable or the submeasure scores. This factor explained 3 to 15% of the total variance (Choi and Fuqua 2003).

Next to first-order exploratory factor analysis (EFA), the other factor analysis technique most commonly used is first-order confirmatory factor analysis (CFA), if to a slightly lesser degree (Choi, Fuqua, and Newman 2007). CFA involves a slightly different statistical technique than EFA, typically principle factor analysis as opposed to principle component analysis. Conceptually they differ in that CFA is used when a researcher has predetermined – presumably based on a literature of prior EFAs – the appropriate factor structure for the BSRI, and the goal is thus to see (or confirm) if the factor structure fits with the researcher's sample. First-order CFAs testing a two-factor model – whether on a sample of senior citizens (Windle and Sinnot 1985), American adults (Blanchard-Fields, Suhrer-Roussel, and Hertzog 1994; Martin and Ramanaiah 1988), American adolescents (Campbell, Gillaspay, and Thompson 1997), Japanese college students (Sugihara and Katsurada 1999), or Japanese adolescents (Marsh and Myers 1986) – are statistically significantly different from the null model but also tend to have a poor fit for the samples (Choi, Fuqua, and Newman 2007). Four factor models (Blanchard-Fields, Suhrer-Roussel, and Hertzog 1994; Martin and Ramanaiah 1988) have similarly not been strong fits (Choi, Fuqua, and Newman 2007).

Unlike first-order factor analyses which look to see if certain items correlate together into a factor, second-order and other higher order factor analyses involve looking at how these factors correlate together into fewer, larger factors. Higher-order exploratory factor analyses have often found two higher-order factors, masculinity and

femininity. For instance, Thompson and Melancon (1986) found four primary factors (which they left unnamed) and from them two second-order factors (Thompson and Melancon 1986). Higher-order confirmatory factor analyses have revealed similar factor structures with two higher-order factors (Blanchard-Fields, Suhrer-Roussel, and Hertzog 1994; Choi, Fuqua, and Newman 2007; Marsh and Myers 1986). Aiming to confirm the results of Blanchard-Fields, Suhrer-Roussel, and Hertzog (1994), Choi, Fuqua, and Newman (2007) conducted the most recent and intricate higher-order CFA. They generally found that two primary factors – compassionate and interpersonal affect – loaded onto a second-order femininity factor, four first-order factors – athletic, decisive, self-sufficient, and shy – loaded onto a masculinity second-order factor, and one primary factor – dominant – loaded onto both the masculinity and femininity second-order factors. They did find, as expected, that adding a path from shy to the femininity second-order factor improved the model's fit. The athletic and shy factors explained only about 20% of the variance for their items, as compared to closer to 50% explained variance for the other factors. Only 10% of the variance for these two factors was explained by the second-order masculinity and femininity factors, suggesting that athleticism and shyness could be removed from the factorial model to create a better fit. The shy factor in their study as well as in the original Blanchard-Fields, Suhrer-Roussel, and Hertzog (1994) study is negatively correlated with the second-order masculinity factor. This is perhaps not surprising if shyness is considered the opposite of assertiveness, which is positively correlated with the second-order masculinity factor (Choi, Fuqua, and Newman 2007).

In sum, the original BSRI appears to hold numerous first-order factors – two to four, although potentially as many as seven or eleven – but these do cluster into a single second-order masculinity factor and a single second-order femininity factor. One would expect the BSRI-S to be less factorally complex than the BSRI because Bem (1979) designed the BSRI-S specifically by factor analyzing the BSRI and retaining only two factors (Bem 1979). Choi and Fuqua (2003) note that the BSRI items most likely to load onto a first-order femininity or masculinity factor in prior factor analyses were the same items retained for the BSRI-S. Indeed, in a CFA using two samples, each roughly 250 female college students, Martin and Ramanaiah (1988) confirms this point. Whether using a two or four factor model, they found the BSRI-S was more homogenous and provided a better fit for the data than the BSRI (Martin and Ramanaiah 1988). The question is exactly how homogeneous it is. Does the BSRI-S contain only two factors, as Bem (1979) was led to believe, or is it more complex?

One approach to answering this question is looking at the remaining items in the BSRI-S. Turning to the still famous first-order and second-order CFA of the original BSRI by Blanchard-Fields, Suhrer-Roussel, and Hertzog (1994), we do indeed see that certain BSRI factors that they found are all but erased in the BSRI-S because those particular items never made it into the BSRI-S. A seven-factor solution for the original BSRI – shy, interpersonal affect, compassionate, decisive, dominant, self-sufficient, athletic – fit their data (723-person non-probability purposive sample with a broad age range) better than Bem's (1974) two-factor solution, and these factors clustered for the most part into a single second-order masculinity factor – decisive, dominant, self-

sufficient, athletic, and, negatively correlated, shy – and a single second-order femininity factor – interpersonal affect and compassionate. On the BSRI-S, two of the seven factors – athletic and self-sufficient – have had their items completely removed from the BSRI. In addition, shy has had three of the four items removed, with the one remaining item, gentle, also an item for the interpersonal affect factor. Remaining in the BSRI-S are items for two masculinity submeasure factors – dominant (aggressive, assertive, dominant, forceful) and decisive (aggressive and assertive, both also on the dominant factor, as well as defends own beliefs, has leadership abilities, strong personality, willing to take risks, willing to take a stand) – and two femininity submeasure factors – compassionate (compassionate, eager to soothe, sympathetic, sensitive to the needs of others, understanding) and interpersonal affect (affectionate, gentle, loves children, tender, warm).

Factor analyses to date have largely focused on the BSRI, although a few studies have looked at the factorial structure of the BSRI-S. Most first-order factor analyses find the BSRI-S to have two factors (Campbell, Gillaspy, and Thompson 1997; Ozkan and Lajunen 2005; Peng 2006). Campbell, Gillaspy, and Thompson (1997) conducted a first-order CFA on the 20 items of the BSRI-S masculinity and femininity submeasures. With 791 college and graduate students gathered from a single university using an unstated sampling method, they found a structure of two uncorrelated factors fit better than a model of two correlated factors, one bipolar factor, and no factors (Campbell, Gillaspy, and Thompson 1997). Ozkan and Lajunen (2005) used CFA with data from 536 Turkish college students given a Turkish-translated BSRI-S. After dividing the sample into men

and women, they found a two-factor solution fit the data well, with each submeasure forming a single factor. Somewhat surprisingly, though, for both men and women, one item from the femininity submeasure, eager to soothe hurt feelings, loaded positively onto the masculinity factor, and one item from the masculinity submeasure, aggressive, loaded negatively onto the femininity factor. In addition, for just the women, willing to take a stand was still positively loading onto the masculinity factor but also negatively loaded onto the femininity factor (Ozkan and Lajunen 2005). In an 838-person Taiwanese sample of undergraduate students, graduate students, police, nurses, and managers given a Chinese-translated BSRI-S, Peng (2006) found a two-factor solution with CFA was a better fit for the data than the EFAs solution of one masculinity factor, two femininity factors, and one factor with a hodge-podge of leftover items (Peng 2006).

There are reasons to suspect, however, that the BSRI-S has more than two factors. Of the first-order factor analyses, one points to this conclusion. Colley, Mulhern, Maltby, and Wood (2008) used first-order EFA and CFA with a sample pooled from two separate studies and then divided into two college-aged samples, each comprised of just under 400 students from the U.K. A three-factor solution was a better fit for the samples than a two-factor solution. The first “interpersonal sensitivity / dominance” factor included three items with negative loadings – aggressive, forceful, and willing to take risks – and three with positive loadings – sensitive to the needs of others, sympathetic, and understanding. The second “personal agency” factor was unipolar, including assertive, defends own beliefs, dominant, independent, leadership ability, and strong personality. The third “interpersonal expressiveness” factor was also unipolar, including affectionate,

eager to soothe hurt feelings, gentle, loves children, and willing to take a stand (Colley, Mulhern, Maltby, and Wood 2009). In addition, to date, only one second-order factor analysis on the BSRI-S has been conducted, and it also points to more than just two first-order factors. Choi and Jenkins (2000) conducted a first-order and second-order CFA on all of the items from the PAQ short version (Spence and Helmreich 1978) pooled together with the BSRI-S items. With a convenience sample of 651 undergraduate psychology students, they found six first-order factors fit the data well, with three of them loading onto a second-order masculinity factor – aggressive, confident, and independent – and three loading onto a second-order femininity factor – emotional, expressive, and relational (Choi and Jenkins 2000).

Ultimately, there are points of discontinuity and similarity for the BSRI and BSRI-S. They differ in the potential number of first-order factors, with the BSRI having anywhere from two to eleven factors and the BSRI-S having a lower range of two to six factors. The most popular factor solutions are three to four first-order factors for the BSRI and only two first-order factors for the BSRI-S. At the same time, most factor analyses suggest these two measures have no more than four first-order factors, including up to two masculinity submeasure factors – autonomy and dominance – and up to two femininity submeasure factors – compassion and interpersonal sensitivity. Factor analyses also suggest that each set of submeasure factors forms a larger second-order factor, implying that the measures do tap into masculinity and femininity constructs.

4.7 Going Beyond Gender Traits

An important question is whether the BSRI-S measures other dimensions of gender beyond gender traits. While little research has been conducted on this question with the BSRI-S, a fair deal of work has been done with the BSRI. The BSRI has been shown to correlate with cross-sex behavior (Bem 1975, 1977; Bem and Lenney 1976; Bem and Lewis 1975; Bem, Martyna, and Watson 1976) and identifying gender in others (Frable and Bem 1985); friendship needs (Reeder 2003; Zarbatany, Conley, and Pepper 2004), sexual attraction (Andersen and Bem 1981; Cunningham and Russel 2004; Fernandez, Quiroga, and Del Olmo 2006; Field, Crothers, and Kolbert 2007; Fink, Brewer, Fehl, and Neave 2007), attitudes about marriage and household division of labor (Koopman-Boyden and Abbott 1985; Dasgupta and Basu 2001; Hiller and Philliber 1985; Katsurada and Sugihara 2002; Pursell, Banikiotes, and Sebastian 1981), and parenting (Allgeier 1975; Baumrind 1982; Lavine and Lombardo 1984; Orlofsky 1979; Repetti 1984; Russell 1978); well-being (Johnson, McNair, Vojick, Congdon, Monacelli, and Lamont 2006), self-esteem (Bem 1977), anxiety coping strategies (Brewer, Mitchell, and Weber 2002; Lombardo, Cretser, and Roesch 2001; Millar and Houska 2007; Singh and Agrawal 2007; Versalle and McDowell 2004-2005; Washburn-Ormachea, Hillman, and Sawilowsky 2004), depression (Li, DiGiuseppe, and Froh 2006; Marcotte, Fortin, Potvin, and Papillon 2002), eating disorders (Hepp, Spindler, and Milos 2005; Klingenspor 2002; Meyer, Blissett, and Oldfield 2001; Ravaldi, Vannacci, Bolognesi, Mancini, Faravelli, and Ricca 2006) and schizophrenia (Sajatovic, Jenkins, Strauss, Butt, and Carpenter 2005); spatial ability (Massa, Mayer, and Bohon 2005), creativity (Hittner and Daniels

2002; Keller, Lavish, and Brown 2007), occupations (Koca, AscI, and KirazcI 2005; Sevim 2006; Snyder and Skrypnek 1981; Yanico 1981) and leadership (Grinnell 2002; Powell, Butterfield, and Parent 2002); giving behavior (Karniol, Grosz, and Schorr 2003) and religious beliefs (Sevim 2006); and risk-taking behaviors (Cazenave, Le Scanff, and Woodman 2007; Ozkan and Lajunen 2005), aggression (Crothers, Field, and Kolbert 2005), and criminal thinking (Walters 2001). At the same time, without the availability of an article exploring every study ever undertaken comparing the BSRI with another variable, it is impossible to ascertain the ratio of significant-to-non-significant findings.

Gender trait measures are of course not necessarily the only or even the best approaches to quantifying gender. However, while the BSRI itself only measures two to four factors of one gender dimension – personality traits – clearly the studies listed above show that it is related to other gender dimensions, including gendered self-identities, activities, interests, and behaviors. It is distinctly possible that the BSRI-S, being considerably shorter than the BSRI, fails to address as many aspects of gender as the BSRI. All the same, these studies do suggest that the BSRI-S, at least indirectly, is much more than just a measure of gender personality traits.

4.8 Summary

Sex/gender roles theory, described in Chapter Three, suggests that gender norms help construct personality traits which in turn will inform behavior. The Bem Sex-Role Inventory is not only the most popular gender trait measure but the most popular gender measure of any kind. Both the original 60 item BSRI (Bem 1974) and, being used in this

dissertation, the short version 30 item BSRI-S (Bem 1979) have a masculinity and femininity submeasure, and each submeasure is comprised of numerous, seven-point Likert items asking respondents to indicate how closely a particular personality trait describes them. Because both men and women fill out the masculinity and femininity submeasures, they can then be given, based on the median submeasure scores for the sample, a label of “masculine” (the combination of high-masculinity and low-femininity), “feminine” (low-masculinity and high-femininity), “androgynous” (high scores on both submeasures), or “undifferentiated” (low scores on both submeasures). Bem’s goal was thus not to reify gender stereotypes but rather to prove that not all men are masculine and not all women are feminine. This point is in direct contrast to earlier beliefs in the literature that gender is bipolar and that one can only be masculine or feminine, not both or neither.

Of great import is what aspects of gender these measures actually measure. Bem offers that the one aspect of masculinity being measured is “instrumentality,” and the one aspect of femininity being measured is “expressiveness (Bem 1974, 1981).” She contends that these represent the most fundamental stereotypes of masculinity and femininity in the United States, a conclusion that was similarly arrived at by the undergraduate sample that helped her determine in the first place the traits that best measure masculinity and femininity. Exploratory factor analyses on the original BSRI have tended to show that the femininity submeasure is indeed unidimensional, but there are at least two masculinity factors: an instrumental factor (i.e. has leadership abilities, willing to take a stand, assertive, etc.) and an autonomous or agentic factor (i.e.

individualistic, self-reliant, self-sufficient, etc.) (for example, see Pedhazur and Tetenbaum 1979; Ruch 1984; Whetton and Swindells 1977). Second order factor analyses revealed that, if there are multiple factors in these submeasures, these factors cluster together to form one femininity factor on the femininity submeasure and one masculinity factor on the masculinity submeasure. The BSRI-S was constructed by running a factor analysis and constricting the number of factors to two, and the little research that has been done with the BSRI-S does suggest that it is factorally less complex than the original BSRI. Importantly, the BSRI has been shown to correlate with measures covering an enormous variety of concepts, including but certainly not limited to identifying gender in others (Frable and Bem 1985), sexual attraction (Andersen and Bem 1981; Cunningham and Russel 2004; Fernandez, Quiroga, and Del Olmo 2006; Field, Crothers, and Kolbert 2007; Fink, Brewer, Fehl, and Neave 2007), attitudes about marriage and household division of labor (Koopman-Boyden and Abbott 1985; Dasgupta and Basu 2001; Hiller and Philliber 1985; Katsurada and Sugihara 2002; Pursell, Banikiotes, and Sebastian 1981), and occupations (Koca, Asci, and Kirazci 2005; Sevim 2006; Snyder and Skrypnek 1981; Yanico 1981). That is to say, the Bem-Sex Role Inventory may only measure the core aspects of masculinity and femininity personality stereotypes, but the BSRI appears to tap into the axle around which a good deal of gendered identity, behavior, and attitudes revolves.

Chapter 5: Gendered IPV Theories

Several theories of why people become IPV abusers have been developed without gender specifically in mind. At the same time, each of these typically non-gendered theories may provide insights into gender differences in IPV perpetration. These theories can be broadly grouped into several large topics: (1) the cost-benefit analysis, (2) biology, (3) violence in the family of origin, and (4) stress. Two theories represent the core presence of feminist theory in the IPV literature and shed more direct light on the gendered nature of IPV, including (5) gendered-structural IPV theory and (6) gendered socialization / interactionist IPV theory.

5.1 The Cost-Benefit Analysis

Some theories of IPV causation begin with the core assumption of criminology's control theory: everyone is a potential criminal. The question, therefore, is not "why do certain people abuse" but, rather, "why do most people not abuse"? These behavioral / rational choice theories of IPV suggest the answer lies with the typical rationality of humans – if the benefits outweigh the costs, abuse will occur (Shorey, Cornelius, and Bell 2008; Williams and Hawkins 1989). As Gelles (1983) phrased it in his exchange / social control theory, people "abuse other family members because they can (Gelles 1983, 157)." Gelles posits certain costs might include fear of physical retaliation from the victim, fear of arrest and incarceration, and fear of a loss of status (Gelles 1983). Myers (1995) suggests abusers might perceive a benefit of perpetrating IPV to be the ability to successfully get a victim to comply with demands. To date, research has yet to

explore if men and women interpret costs and benefits differently or if they have a different benefits-to-costs ratio for the tipping point necessary to engage in abuse.

5.2 Biology

Some have attempted to explain male violence in general and male violence against women through research on evolution (i.e. Ellis 1989a, 1989b; Rowe 2002; Smuts 1992), genes (i.e. Caspi, Moffitt, Silva, Stouthamer-Loeber, Krueger, and Schmutte 1994), nervous systems (i.e. Mednick 1977), personality disorders (Holtzworth-Munroe and Stuart 1994), and, as a biological-impairment agent, alcohol, although some scholars contend that alcohol is more likely imbibed after the decision to abuse as a way to help justify their upcoming violence to themselves and others (Gelles 1993; Stets 1991). Faith in biological explanations of IPV beyond psychopathology seems low in the literature, in part because the evidence is weak and perhaps also in part because most IPV scholars are social scientists with little interest in biology. Not only are social explanations given more weight in the literature, but it is possible that biological differences can at times be caused by social forces. For instance, noting brain differences in MRI brain scans of abusive and non-abusive individuals prior to the age of two, Dutton (2007) suggests that year-one infancy experiences like attachment to parents can shape the brain and abusive personalities. While biological research has the potential to help explain differences between male and female perpetrated IPV, that potential has yet to be fully realized.

5.3 Violence in the Family of Origin

Among the more prominent explanations of IPV perpetration, most scholars believe that IPV is in part a learned behavior. It is possible that abusive behavior is learned from peers (Reitzel-Jaffe and Wolfe 2001; Schwartz, DeKeseredy, Tait, and Alvi 2001), though very little research has been done on this subject. Abusers might also be learning from larger cultural norms. This is a theory of IPV perpetration that has been infused with a gender discourse, and it is discussed later in this chapter. Beyond such learning from cultural norms, social learning theory has largely been applied in this literature to the family of origin. Three subtopics are popular choices for research on this intergenerational transmission of violence: witnessing parental IPV, experiencing child abuse, and childhood attachment with one's parents.

Among the most studied predictors of IPV perpetration are witnessing IPV between your parents during childhood (O'Leary 1988) and experiencing child abuse (Shorey, Cornelius, and Bell 2008). Children with violence in the family of origin may be learning that violence allows people to successfully vent frustration, resolve conflicts, and manipulate and control one's partner (Shorey, Cornelius, and Bell 2008). Further, some abusers are believed to have a deficit in relationship communication skills that may make it more difficult to resolve relationship conflicts through non-violent strategies (Holtzworth-Munroe 1992; Holtzworth-Munroe and Anglin 1991; Morrison, Van Hasselt, and Bellack 1987; Ronan, Dreer, Dollard, and Ronan 2004). Such communication skills deficits are often socially learned within the family at an early age, and they are then used both in future relationships and in identifying potential mates with

similar skill deficits (Alexander, Moore, and Alexander, 1991; Foshee, Bauman, and Linder, 1999; Wekerle and Wolfe, 1999; Wolfe, Wekerle, Reitzel-Jaffe, Lefebvre, 1998). Despite the intergenerational transmission of violence being among the key predictors of future IPV perpetration, like all IPV theories, it does not come close enough to a perfect correlation. Luthra and Gidycz (2006) tested a model of physical IPV perpetration by Riggs and O’Leary (1989) that included “background” variables like violence in the family of origin as well as situational variables like communication skills and substance abuse. The model correctly classified female violence perpetrators in 83.3% of cases but did so for male perpetrators in only 30% of cases (Luthra and Gidycz 2006). Citing Follette and Alexander’s (1992) assessment of the literature, Shorey, Cornelius, and Bell (2008) conclude that violence in the family of origin is clearly a necessary but not sufficient predictor of IPV perpetration. In addition, witnessing physical IPV among parents might not predict non-physical forms of IPV like sexual violence in relationships (Carr and VanDeusen 2002), further limiting the scope of this theory.

Witnessing parental IPV and experiencing child abuse may have distinct outcomes for men and women. Gwartney-Gibbs, Stockard, and Bohmer (1987) posit that differences in gender socialization for boys and girls may result in gender differences in internalization of violence in the family of origin. In their review of the literature, Foshee, Bauman, and Linder (1999) comment that studies have indeed found gender differences in the association between violence in the family of origin and future IPV perpetration, but the findings are not consistent. Witnessing parental IPV as a child has been shown to predict future IPV perpetration more for females (Sigelman, Berry, and

Wiles 1984), more for males (Gwartney-Gibbs, Stockard, and Bohmer 1987), and about the same for females and male (Kalmuss 1984; Tontodonato and Crew 1992; White 2009). Similarly, experiencing child abuse has been shown to predict future IPV perpetration more for females (Tontodonato and Crew 1992), more for males (Burke, Stets, and Pirog-Good 1988; Marshall and Rose 1988), and about the same for females and males (Kalmuss 1984; Laner and Thompson 1982; Sieglman, Berry, and Wiles 1984; Smith and Williams 1992).

Some studies appear to not have adequately distinguished between child physical abuse and child sexual abuse. This is a key distinction given that boys are at a slightly higher risk of child physical abuse, particularly more extreme versions, while girls are at a far greater risk of child sexual abuse (Barnett, Miller-Perrin, and Perrin 2005). In a recent secondary data analysis of a longitudinal study on students from age 14 through year four of college, White (2009) notes that experiencing physical punishment by a parent during childhood only predicted future male victimization and perpetration of physical IPV, and experiencing child sexual abuse predicted female victimization and male perpetration of physical IPV (White 2009).

A further distinction that might be made is which parent engages in violence. If boys are more likely to look to other men as models of masculinity and girls more likely to look at women for norms of femininity, it is conceivable that witnessing parental IPV and experiencing child abuse when perpetrated by a father is most likely to lead a son perpetrate IPV in the future and, likewise, with violence in the family of origin by mothers and future IPV perpetration by daughters. Jankowski, Leitenberg, Henning, and

Coffey (1999) indeed found among 1,576 college students that witnessing physical violence by a married parent of the same binary gender as the child witness predicts the witness becoming a perpetrator of physical dating violence. For physical child abuse, evidence is mixed. Foshee, Bauman, and Linder (1999) found in their study of 1,965 eighth and ninth grade students that experiencing physical child abuse by one's mother significantly predicts dating violence perpetration for only males, and being hit by a father did not significantly predict perpetration for males or females. Conversely, in a study of 648 college students, Kaura and Allen (2004) found that dating violence perpetration for females was predicted by a father hitting them as a child and for males was predicted by a mother hitting them as a child.

Beyond witnessing parental IPV and experiencing child abuse, the concept of social learning has been applied to understanding IPV with regard to parenting styles of those raising a future abuser. As discussed in a review by Shorey, Cornelius, and Bell (2008), attachment theory purports that the quality of childhood relations with your caregivers leads people as they grow up to find partners that mimic these childhood relations. Relation styles are either "secure," which involves a loving, close bond, or "insecure," that is, distant or even abusive (Bowlby 1969, 1972, 1980; Hazan and Shaver 1987; Waters, Posada, Crowell, and Keng-ling 1993). Applying attachment theory to IPV, those with insecure childhood relations with caregivers are more likely to be jealous or abusive in adult relationships (Cicchetti and Howes 1991; Crittenden and Ainsworth 1989). Evidence is mixed on the significance of child-parent attachment as a predictor of future IPV (Loh and Gidycz 2006). The literature suggests that there are no differences

between prevalence of attachment styles for men and women, with about half of both adult men and women having insecure attachment orientations (Brennan, Clark, and Shaver 1998; Gormely 2005; Kiselica 2001). At the same time, men who attempt to strictly adhere to masculinity norms and feel they are failing to live up to these expectations tend to experience insecure attachment with their parents (Blazina and Watkins 2000; DeFranc and Mahalik 2002; Fischer and Good 1998). Thus, it may be that the literature's focus on whether masculinity or femininity is the stronger predictor of IPV fails to account for the reality that many individuals fail to achieve their culturally expected gender. Such situations may result in a strained and dysfunctional parent-child relationship which for the child, in turn, serves as model for intimate relationships.

The specific roles played by mothers and fathers in parenting have been shown to also be related to future IPV of the children. The use of the term "parents" in attachment research obscures the fact that most of the parenting is done in these families by the mothers and that it is the relationship with mothers more so than with fathers that tends to help determine whether children will grow up to be IPV perpetrators (Lapierre 2008). For instance, some have found that the agency of mothers in egalitarian homes can lead to less delinquency in sons (McCarthy, Hagan, and Woodward 1999). A father's violence may inhibit the mother's daily routines, self-esteem, parental authority, and ability to successfully communicate with children their understanding of why violence is occurring (Bancroft and Silverman 2002; Holden, Stein, Ritichie, Harris, and Jouriles 1998; Levendosky and Graham-Bermann 1998; Mullender et al. 2002). Further making the mother-child bond more tenuous, as Kelly (1994) notes, is the "double level of

intentionality” or interconnectedness of violence by the father against the mother and against the child. At times, abuse of one might be done in front of the other to establish control, and mother or child might be forced into assisting in the father’s abuse of the other. Children can be born out of rape, repeated pregnancies are used as a way to control mothers, and children often side with or are coerced into siding with the violent father (Kelly 1994). Lapierre (2008) calls for a feminist perspective on mothering in abusive relationships which does not blame mothers for failing to adequately attach to their children but rather blames abusive fathers for inhibiting the ability of mothers to bond with and protect their children (Lapierre 2008).

Though some abusive fathers experience shame and guilt (Fox, Sayers, and Bruce 2001; Perel and Peled 2008), many are unprepared to acknowledge the effects of their violence on their children (Perel and Peled 2008). As Perel and Peled (2008) discuss in their review, research on abusive men has often revealed fathering styles that are authoritative (Bancroft and Silverman 2002), distant and uninvolved (Holden and Ritchie 1991; Sterenberg et al. 1994), self-interested and possessive of the children (Ayoub, Grace, Paradise, and Newberger 1991), manipulative (Bancroft and Silverman 2002; Vock, Elliot, and Spironello 1997), and physically punishing though not physically affectionate (Holden and Ritchie 1991). While most of these characteristics distinguish abusive fathers from non-abusive fathers, Fox and Benson (2004) find that the amount of time spent with children is relatively the same for abusive and non-abusive fathers. Some have posited that the absence of fathers from active parenting, even those who are not abusive, may lead their sons to one day become abusers because the sons lack a positive

masculinity role model (Brooks and Silverstein 1995). In their interviews with 14 abusive Israeli fathers, Perel and Peled (2008) found abusive fathers often view their embodiment of the traditional breadwinner father image as a way to express love for their children (Perel and Peled 2008), likely a similar method of affection for non-abusive fathers who also often spend little time with children. The fathers believed their emotional and temporal distance from the children to be problematic, just as they felt it was problematic when their own fathers treated them this same way, but they felt this was outweighed by the financial benefit their long working hours would one day bring their children. As one father concluded, “Maybe they feel that something is lacking when I don’t spend much time with them. But look, I prefer that they feel a bit short now rather than afterwards they don’t have anywhere to live (Perel and Peled 2008, 467).” At the same time, many fathers felt not only envious of their wives closer bond with the children but in fact partially blamed the mothers for keeping them out of their children’s hearts (Perel and Peled 2008).

Social learning as a concept offers insight into why people become IPV perpetrators, although the implications of gender for it are somewhat unclear. Witnessing parental IPV and experiencing physical or sexual abuse as a child do seem to increase the likelihood that such children will grow up to become IPV perpetrators, but evidence on gender differences is mixed and inconsistent. Insecure attachment to parents predicts insecure attachment and IPV perpetration with adult relationships. The ratio of people with insecure to people with secure attachment orientations is the same for men and women, though some evidence suggests that different types of masculinities and

femininities reveal differences in attachment styles. Female partners of abusive fathers find their ability to bond with and protect their children are stymied by the father's abusive tactics, which often involve pitting mother against child or child against mother in an attempt to control both of them. Abusive fathers appear to be more controlling, physically punitive, and temporally distant than non-abusive mothers and fathers, but, somewhat contrary to the purely manipulative and masochistic image of abusive fatherhood portrayed in interviews with their female partners, interviews with abusive fathers also reveal a yearning to be emotionally closer with their children and hints of remorse over repeating a version of parenting from their own fathers that they deemed problematic. This assessment of course addresses abusive relationships in which men are the predominant violence perpetrators. It is possible that the same understanding of parenting styles in violent families could be applied to those in which mothers are the primary violence users or even relationships with two parental "abusers," but a paucity of research on parenting in these other types of violent families makes such conclusions difficult to draw. What emerges from this literature is a complex picture of social learning in the family. Children learn not only about the use of violence but also gender norms in general, gendered parenting norms, and gendered relationship norms. Which parent perpetrates violence, how child abuse and parent abuse are interwoven, the use of physical versus sexual child abuse, and the degree to which parent-child bonds are hampered for victimized and abusive parents alike all play a role in determining the likeliness that violence in the family of origin results in future IPV perpetration.

5.4 Stress

Abuse can certainly occur outside of conflicts as an ongoing attempt to control a partner. Most of the literature, however, is focused on IPV that emerges within the context of a conflict (i.e. research using the Conflict Tactics Scale). The presumption typically made about conflict-based IPV is that the attacker's stress reaches critical levels, and, lacking stress management skills, the attacker explodes into violence (DeKeseredy and Schwartz 1998). Walker's (1979) famous cycle theory of violence purports that tension builds slowly in abusive relationships, at a critically high level the tension results in violence, and then the tension is subsequently diffused until the next cycle of tension-building.

Some evidence concurs that only high levels of stress in conflicts will result in IPV. While people in abusive relationships may deal well with low-conflict situations, their communication skills have been shown to break down in high-conflict situations (Ronan, Dreer, Dollard, and Ronan 2004), a considerable problem as abusive relationships encounter more high-conflict situations than non-abusive relationships (Arias, Samios, and O'Leary 1987; Billingham 1987; Gryl, Stith, and Bird 1991; Stets and Pirog-Good 1987; Straus 1991; Straus, Gelles, and Steinmetz 1980). Men and women may have different levels of communication and interpersonal skills, which could affect how stress is dealt with. In non-abusive relationships, girls are more interdependent (Citrin, Roberts, and Fredrickson 2004; Furman and Simon 2006; Lloyd 1991; White 2009), engaging in relationship maintenance activities more frequently and subconsciously (Aylor and Dainton 2004). In abusive relationships, women are more

committed to the relationship (Hanley and O'Neill 1997) and withdraw from interactions with demanding male partners (Babcock, Waltz, Jacobson, and Gottman 1993).

Stress can build from anywhere in life, although employment and relationships have been given the most attention. For instance, Cano and Vivian (2003) found that occupational stress for men and occupational and interpersonal stress for women predicted IPV perpetration. Retzinger (1991) theorized that fear of intimacy leads to shame, then to stress, and finally to aggression. Further research is needed on how men and women differ in developing and responding to stress.

The most well-known literature on stress has been called the "Family Violence Perspective." The core belief is that the family is the greatest source of stress as well as the location in which stress is most often vented (Dutton 1994; Dutton and Nicholls 2005; Felson 2002; Hamel 2007; Straus 1979, 1993, 2006). Witt (1987) puts it succinctly: "family violence researchers assert that the family is the most *violent* social grouping in the country, with individuals being more likely to be harmed by an *angry* family member than anyone else (Witt 1987, 291; emphasis added)." In merging together findings on child abuse prevalence, the intergenerational transmission of violence, and physical IPV "gender symmetry," the Family Violence perspective treats the family as a breeding ground for violence, with mothers and fathers equally likely to be violent to each other and children and, in turn, with children likely to adopt these violent dispositions in their families when they reach adulthood. That is to say, as McNeely, Cook, and Torres (2001) put it, IPV may not be a problem that female victims mainly face but rather a "human issue" that victimizes men and women equally. Some have suggested that

researchers stop using the labels “abuser” and “victim” because they fail to reflect that most abusive relationships include two violent partners (Flemons 1989). In the effort to prove men and women are equally violent in relationships, Family Violence scholars often overlook evidence showing IPV is perpetrated more often by men against women, such as findings on motivations, initiation frequency within relationships, sexual IPV, stalking, and partner homicide. All the same, the Family Violence perspective correctly illustrates that the family can be both a source of stress and a location for venting stress, and norms revolving around intimate and parent-child relationships can be passed down to the next generation via social learning.

5.5 Gendered-Structural IPV Theory

Though offering a few insights on how gender and IPV interact, the theories just described were not specifically designed to do so. Two theoretical frameworks remain which shed more direct light on the gendered nature of IPV: gendered-structural IPV theory and gendered socialization / interactionist IPV theory. Combined, these form the core presence of feminist theory in the IPV literature. These theories are by no means meant to replace others but, rather, should be viewed as important additional pieces to the larger puzzle of IPV.

Gendered-structural IPV theory draws upon Brownmiller’s (1975) concept of “patriarchy,” a society in which men on average have greater power in core institutions like the workforce, family, government, law, military, and science. Patriarchy – literally meaning “rule by the father” – is in essence domination of a society’s resources by men

and, as a result, the privileging of male over female gender identities (Blumberg 1984; Coltrane 1992; Connell 2005; Gutmann 1997). Gendered-structural IPV theory contends that patriarchy indirectly causes IPV by encouraging men to maintain control in all aspects of society including relationships and, further, by providing men with greater tangible resources to achieve this control, like higher average wages and the cultural tradition of fathers as rulers of the family (Dobash and Dobash 1992; Kurz 1993, 1997; Lloyd 1991).

Though with merit, this theory has two main problems. Chief among these, as Hunnicutt (2009) points out, is that the pathways between patriarchy and IPV are undefined or, as Kandiyoti (1988) puts it, “undertheorized.” As a result, almost immediately after the term patriarchy was introduced to the feminist lexicon, it was backed away from by researchers who chose instead to use less critiqued synonyms like “*male-dominated society, sexual inequality theory, and the nebulous feminist perspectives* (Hunnicutt 2009, 553; italics in original text).” For instance, working within this theory, why do some men not perpetrate IPV? As Coston (2009) puts it, “Ultimately, it cannot be patriarchy that makes men who abuse and men who do not different, because an overwhelming majority of men have patriarchy in common (Coston 2009, 582).” Of course, Coston’s response to this hole in the theory – the theory must be completely incorrect – is too simplistic. Each known predictor of IPV only explains a small percentage of IPV, but, when combined with other explanations, we can hope to come closer to a more complete picture. Not all men have equal power in a patriarchy, as gender inequality can never entirely operate outside of racial, ethnic, class, and sexual

orientation structural inequalities. That is, in patriarchies, men *on average* have greater power than women, but some men are far below this average relative to women in their lives. Further, men in some relationships already have greater power relative to their female partners, and potentially this may make it seem unnecessary to acquire control through violence. Hunnicutt (2009) also suggests that patriarchal privileges can lessen for certain groups of men as a society tackles sexism, racism, classism, or homophobia; however, a residue of patriarchal ideology may remain that leads some of these men to believe they are still entitled to interpersonal power.

Following from this primary issue with the theory that it is undertheorized, the second problem is that it is difficult to measure. While it is possible to measure the cause in this theory – i.e. wage gap, political seat gap, etc. – and to measure the outcome – i.e. male and female IPV perpetration and victimization rates – the pathways between the two are difficult to define let alone empirically detect. White (2009) succinctly describes the problem: “the structuralist assumptions are oftentimes difficult to translate into empirically testable hypotheses. It is difficult to define a phenomenon that captures the various ways that gender can organize social relationships and it is difficult to find measures that assess the impact of gender on the organization of social relationships (White 2009, 7).” One solution may be to treat patriarchal relationship ideology – beliefs that men deserve to have more power and control than women in relationships – as a proxy for the pathway between patriarchy and IPV. Indeed, many feminist scholars contend that gender norms are constructed by and reinforce patriarchy (White and Kowalski 1998). However, it is difficult to empirically establish that patriarchal

relationship ideology is directly created by patriarchy, as it is feasible that ideology and structural inequality might not always perfectly align in all time periods and cultures.

Gendered-structural IPV theory is often mistaken by IPV researchers to be the only feminist theory in the literature (DeKeseredy and Dragiewicz 2007). Notably omitted in many discussions of feminist contributions to IPV scholarship is gendered socialization / interactionist IPV theory, to be discussed in the next section. For example, Dutton (2006) writes, “The claim from a feminist analytical perspective, therefore is twofold: that society is patriarchal and that the use of violence to maintain male patriarchy is accepted (Dutton 2006, 97).” This boils feminist theory’s contributions in the IPV literature down to gendered-structural IPV theory. Similarly, Shorey, Cornelius, and Bell (2008) narrowly contend that, “A feminist analysis of violent behavior maintains that abuse is the result of an underlying patriarchal societal system that encourages power and control struggles between men and women (Dobash & Dobash, 1992). Feminist theory views interpersonal violence as a manifestation of prevailing structures of male dominance and female subservience, and it is believed that power inequality leads to violent behaviors in dating relationships (Shorey, Cornelius, and Bell 2008, 189).” Felson (2002) treats gendered-structural IPV theory (renamed the “violence against women perspective”) as the only feminist theory contribution to the literature, and he attempts to lay claim to feminism’s gendered socialization / interactionist IPV theory (renamed his “violence perspective”) as his own invention. As Felson and Cares (2005) describe this view,

...many of them feminist activists, take what has been called a *violence against women* perspective. They believe that men’s violence against

their female partners is particularly widespread based on sexism and patriarchy (Kurz)... According to a *violence perspective*...[g]ender differences in intimate partner violence reflect gender differences in offending and victimization in general, in other words, main effects of gender. Gender differences in intimate partner violence reflect that men tend to be physically stronger and more prone to use violence against anyone (Felson and Cares 2005, 1182-1183).”

This belief that gender socialization into aggression can result in doing gender through IPV is one of the core tenets of feminism’s gendered socialization / interactionist IPV theory, a fact overlooked by Felson and Cares (2005) as they co-opt the theory as their own. It seems quite common in the literature for researchers to ignore certain pertinent details – particularly gendered socialization / interactionist IPV theory – as they claim to describe a monolithic feminist perspective on IPV. Why this might be is unclear. Possibly, certain theories are omitted from an article if an author believes them to not directly relate, or, in some cases, criminologists might not have time to adequately familiarize themselves with feminist contributions.

5.6 Gendered Socialization / Interactionist IPV Theory

Drawing on social construction and interactionist theories of gender reviewed in Chapter 3, Gendered Socialization / Interactionist IPV Theory begins with the premise that gender is a socially learned set of norms that is only achieved in any given moment when it is performed. As gender never entirely disappears, it follows that all behaviors and beliefs are in part an attempt to “do gender.” IPV is a way for some individuals to do gender (Anderson 2005; White 2009).

Most often, the aspects of Connell's (1987) culturally mainstream "hegemonic" masculinity that promote dominance, the use of aggression, and independence coupled with a lack of interpersonal communication are linked with IPV perpetration (Crowell and Burgess 1996; Haraway and O'Neil 1999; Moore and Stuart 2005; Thorne-Finch 1992). Conversely, mainstream versions of femininity tend to play the yang to hegemonic masculinity's yin, encouraging interdependence, docility, and stronger interpersonal skills (Brush 2005; Connell 1987). However, if norms of hegemonic masculinity are indeed more strongly associated with IPV than norms of femininities, it does not automatically follow that all men will attempt to embody hegemonic masculinity as there are multiple types of masculinities (West and Fenstermaker 1995). Further, it is also possible that women will follow norms of hegemonic masculinity (Anderson 2005; Próspero 2008; White 2009). As Próspero (2008) notes, "there is an assumption in the masculinity/IPV literature [sic] is that masculinity is learned only by males and not by females. If masculine gender is not what *one is* but what *one does*, then females may also 'do gender' by performing masculine characteristics, especially if these acts are portrayed in a patriarchal society as positive and bestow power, such as being courageous and displaying proof of achievement (Próspero 2008, 640-641)." Próspero (2008) points out here that women may in fact desire to achieve aspects of hegemonic masculinity because society values these traits highly and rewards those with them with greater access to resources. The issue, Brush (2005) concludes, is conformity to gender norms: "What matters, fundamentally, is the combination (in a given couple) of men's and women's conformity or nonconformity to their respective gender norms, including expecting or

enforcing conformity from each other (Brush 2005, 870).” Thus, this suggests that it is not necessarily being male but adherence to hegemonic masculinity for men and women that likely predicts IPV.

However, doing your culturally prescribed gender is not an entirely free choice. In a patriarchy where men on average hold positions of greater power, men will likely be given more opportunities to practice dominating and violent aspects of hegemonic masculinity. This may be true in many nations across the globe that share colonialist roots in patriarchy (Coltrane 1992; Connell 2005; Gutmann 1997). Men are also more likely to be accepted for these gender performances as masculinity norms are culturally prescribed to men. Positive reinforcement of acceptance and negative reinforcement of ridicule and ostracization by society and intimate partners eventually result in self-policing of gender conformity (Brush 2005). Perhaps, then, it would be expected that men would more likely embody versions of masculinity and women versions of femininity, though the boundaries are fluid enough to allow crossover.

5.7 Summary

Each of the typically non-gendered theory sets reviewed above – the cost-benefit analysis, biology, violence in the family of origin, and stress – have often not been used to understand how gender impacts IPV. Rather, they are typically treated as broad explanations of IPV causation that could equally apply to anyone. At the same time, some researchers have made efforts to search for gender differences within these theoretical frameworks. One perspective that is becoming rare in the literature is that

everyone is a potential abuser, and a cost-benefit analysis determines whether or not abuse will occur. The literature has yet to address whether this analytic process differs for men and women. It is possible that the cost-to-benefit ratio that will deter IPV, the interpretation of costs and benefits, and the role of gender socialization vary for men and women. Though biological theories have often treated men as more inherently violent or evolutionarily driven to violently secure mates, evidence is weak. The greatest promise in explaining IPV perpetration, other than through gendered IPV theories, is with theories involving violence in the family of origin and stress. Much of the literature on violence in the family of origin does not distinguish between which parent is abusing, nor does it typically explore the complex relationship abusive parents and their non-abusive partners have with their children. Research searching for gendered implications finds children are socially learning gender norms, gendered parenting norms, and gendered relationship norms that may help determine if attitudes about violence, IPV, and child abuse are handed down to the next generation. Methods of coping with employment and interpersonal stressors may differ for men and women, although more research is needed in this area. Each theory offers a piece to the larger puzzle of how gender impacts how IPV is experienced, with integrative theories attempting to draw on elements of each (i.e. Bell and Naugle 2008).

Feminist theory's largest contributions to the IPV literature have been Gendered-Structural IPV Theory and Gendered Socialization / Interactionist IPV Theory. Gendered-Structural Theory, while no doubt accurate in many respects, is too difficult to measure. As researchers often treat this theory as feminist theory's only contribution to

the literature, feminist theory is at times dismissed by IPV researchers as unhelpful in predicting IPV (DeKeseredy and Dragiewicz 2007). Gendered Socialization / Interactionist IPV Theory, however, suggests that certain forms of socially learned and interactionally performed gender may encourage IPV, and these forms may be embodied by both men and women. Indeed, it would seem likely that different genders have different impacts on the cost-benefit analysis, how violence in the family of origin is experienced, and how stress is coped with.

Chapter Six: Qualitative & Quantitative Insights

Although limited, gender has been employed to some degree in the empirical gender literature. This chapter reviews findings from (1) qualitative studies, as well as studies employing (2) gender strain measures, (3) gender ideology measures, (4) gendered relationship measures, and (5) gender trait measures.

6.1 Qualitative Studies

Qualitative studies employing in-depth interviews and focus groups have shed additional light on the association between gender and IPV in male-female dating relationships. Five findings are frequently found in such studies: (1) dating generates status, (2) jealousy and violence are at times viewed as reflections and sources of love, (3) girls' violence is treated as unserious, (4) boys are not allowed to hit girls with certain special exceptions, and (5) some violence may be perceived as playfulness.

One common finding in the qualitative literature is that dating generates status for adolescents, particularly girls (Chung 2005, 2007). Chung (2007) conducted a study on 25 young women in Australia recruited from public schools and youth services. The girls felt pressure both from within and without to gain dating experience. Fiona, a 17 year old, reflects on the negative impact not having a boyfriend can have on self-image:

But if you don't have anyone you do feel bad about yourself. You question things. I've got a lot of friends but no boyfriend. You think, "What's wrong with me if you're my friend in general, why can't you be something more than that?" (Chung 2007, 1277)

Pressure to date, of course, also emerges from peers. Lee, an 18 year old girl, found it more difficult to maintain friendships as many girls started to date:

It's horrible because all my friends—there's not one now that hasn't got a boyfriend at the moment or a girlfriend, not one. It's hard going to parties and that. I don't have as much fun anymore. The girls stick to their boyfriends and I'm like "come and drink with me," they just don't (Chung 2007, 1278).

In her study of 40 Australian youths ages 15 to 19, Chung (2005) similarly found that dating for girls generates status. For boys, however, experience with sexual intercourse was more desirable. So important is sexual experience for boys that Mark, 17, used his friend's lack of experience as justification to repeatedly tease him: "like I say Nathan have you done it yet? I always give him shit, cause he hasn'tAm [sic] I allowed to talk like that? Cause he hasn't done nothing with another girl. Yeah, and so I give him shit (Chung 2005, 448)." In relationships, this translates into boys showing love by not pressing for sex too early and, for girls, offering sex earlier – the very body of the girlfriend becomes a battleground, with both partners jockeying for control over it. The drive for sexual conquest among young men creates both an opportunity for female partners to attract the interests of a boy and fear that the boy may cheat. If teen dating is more critical to performing femininity, this may create an imbalance of power early in an adolescent relationship in which girls need commitment more than do boys (Chung 2005).

In this relationship context of infidelity fears and girls needing the status of a relationship more than boys, some researchers have found that displays of commitment and love are in such demand that jealousy and violence are often viewed as acceptable

proxies (Chung 2005, 2007; Johnson et al. 2005; Miller and White 2003). In her study of 40 Australian teenagers, Chung (2005) noted that the girls believed they had a monopoly on emotional communication skills. This simultaneously empowered them with a sense of uniqueness and, unfortunately, also led them to presume their boyfriends' controlling tactics were their conversationally inept method of displaying affection and commitment. Thus, girls often interpret their boyfriends' policing of their clothing styles and jealousy over interactions with other boys as signs of love. Complicating matters is the culturally popular love narrative of a chivalrous male protecting the sexual reputation of a female. So powerful is this imagery that many girls view controlling tactics as a necessary piece to fairytale romance (Chung 2005). As Chung (2007) noted in her study of 25 Australian women, "From his perspective, the young women suggested, she must present as monogamous and sexually attractive to men, 'but not slutty,' to tarnish her boyfriend's identity and reputation." After Vicki, 17, was hit on by another man while wearing tight clothing, her boyfriend began to repeatedly yell at her for wearing sexually provocative clothing. When Vicki chose to throw out some of this clothing, she viewed it in part as a way to show her boyfriend love and commitment:

Um, three days ago he was going away and um, three days ago I went and got a box and I put every single one of my tight tops in it and I gave it to him as a present. And I said, "Here you go. Are you happy?" And he just went, "All right, thanks." ...So, I mean I respect him in that point of view because I think, well you know, if that's really not what he wants me to do, it's not gonna bother me whether I wear a tight top (Chung 2007, 1280).

Johnson et al. (2005) similarly found the love narrative to mask the insidious nature of violence. In their study of 120 urban, predominantly African American adolescents ages

14-22, one respondent reflected that “Some girls think that when a boy hits them or gives them a bruise...they think it’s cute...they think that the boy really loves them (Johnson et al. 2005, 176).” If jealousy or abuse is viewed by some as an indicator of love, it is conceivable that a partner might attempt to generate jealousy to test commitment. This was indeed the case in Miller and White’s (2003) study of 70 African-American youths from organizations for at-risk and delinquent youths. They found that boys often intentionally created jealousy for the girls by pretending to cheat or pretending to flirt with others. Although both boys and girls were frequently jealous in relationships and this jealousy was often unfounded, boys not only were more likely to cheat but also more likely to be successful in their attempts to control their partners. They disengaged from conversations when girls tried to be controlling, often portraying the girlfriend as emotionally unstable and irrational. Male controlling tactics tended to emerge in long-term relationships whereas female controlling tactics were more often used early in relationships when it was less clear if the boy was just “playing” her (Miller and White 2003).

Violence by girls and women and in relationships tends to not be taken seriously, simultaneously weakening their power in relationships and silencing male receivers of this violence (Anderson and Umberson 2001; Miller and White 2003; Sears, Byers, Whelan, and Saint-Pierre 2006). In Anderson and Umberson’s (2001) study of 33 men with a mean age of 32 in batterer treatment, time and time again the male abusers referred to their female partners’ violence and attempts at self-defense as inconsequential, as Adam exemplifies: “I came out of the kitchen, and then I got in her face, and I shoved

her. She shoved, she tried to push me a little bit, but it didn't matter much (Anderson and Umberson 2001, 363)." Miller and White's (2003) study of African-American youths revealed that the boys found girls to be physically weaker and, therein, found women's violence to be ineffective:

Describing what happened when a girl called him in his girlfriend's presence, Andrew explained, "she got mad or whatever and she got to going off and she slapped me or whatever. It wasn't really nothing, really." Marvin said his girlfriend once got mad and threw a baseball at him, but "it missed [and] I laughed at her. It made her madder but you know she just got frustrated and just sat there." Likewise, Ricky said, "if we have an argument or something, she'll just like hit me, punch me in my chest or something or like slap me on my back or push me in my head or something. It ain't, I mean...it's not too much (Miller and White 2003, 1232)."

Girls often engaged in violence to elicit faithfulness or, quite frequently, greater emotion from their boyfriends, but these goals rarely came to fruition because their violence could be ignored as non-threatening. The boys also found girls' violence to be the result of an explosion of emotion, which they contrasted with what they perceived as their own calm rationality. This had the effect of both justifying female violence and allowing it to be taken less seriously (Miller and White 2003). Sears, Byers, Whelan, and Saint-Pierre (2006) asked 26 focus groups of 8 to 13 Canadian high school students about what they believe occurs in an abusive relationship. Many agreed that girls' violence is taken less seriously. One result, one respondent suggested, is that "girls are more likely to get away with abuse," with male partners, police, and society in general less likely to label female violence as deviant as compared to male violence (Sears, Byers, Whelan, and Saint-Pierre 2006, 1198). This guess about IPV from a sample largely without personal experience with IPV stands in stark contrast to the picture presented by boys who had

been in abusive relationships and were quick to dismiss female violence as insignificant. It is not entirely clear whether boys label female violence as insignificant because they actually perceive it to be so or because it may not seem “manly” to admit to feeling like a victim. However, the consistency of their self-reports suggests that, for the most part, boys do not feel as threatened by female violence as girls are by male violence. Fiebert and Gonzalez’s (1997) quantitative study of 978 female college students confirms these findings. Among female respondents that had initiated aggression, the top two reasons checked on a questionnaire for their initiation were “I have found that most men have been trained not to hit a woman, and therefore I am not fearful of retaliation from my partner” and “I believe that men can readily protect themselves so I don’t worry when I become physically aggressive.”

An accompanying theme in this qualitative literature is that boys are generally not allowed to hit girls (Anderson and Umberson 2001; Johnson et al. 2005; Miller and White 2003; Mullaney 2007; Sears, Byers, Whelan, and Saint-Pierre 2006; Wood 2004). In Miller and White’s (2003) study of 70 African-American youths recruited from organizations for at-risk and delinquent youths, both boys and girls typically felt it was not manly to hit a girl:

Rennesha said, “I feel a man has too much strength to hit a female, it is just not a man to hit a female....Some girls think they tough, want to keep walking up. But still, you walk away. You a man.” Cooper explained, “we have more strength than them. Why hit a female, when they hit you back it won’t hurt for real. No competition in that (Miller and White 2003, 1236).”

Unlike female violence, male violence is often viewed by both partners as incredibly injurious and potentially lethal (Anderson and Umberson 2001; Miller and White 2003).

This partially explains why male violence specifically against women is typically viewed as inappropriate. In addition, the love narrative in popular culture directs men to be chivalrous by protecting female partners (Miller and White 2003). Thus, while female violence is often viewed as ineffective and therein legitimate, male violence is largely viewed as deviant, a lesson often passed down by parents to both boys and girls (Anderson and Umberson 2001; Johnson et al. 2005; Miller and White 2003; Mullaney 2007; Sears, Byers, Whelan, and Saint-Pierre 2006; Wood 2004).

Respondents in these studies, however, also felt that there may be exceptions to this rule. Specifically, boys may feel justified in hitting their girlfriends when the female partner fails to respectfully treat her boyfriend as the leader of the relationship (Anderson and Umberson 2001; Boonzaier 2008; Johnson et al. 2005; Miller and White 2003; Mullaney 2007; Sears, Byers, Whelan, and Saint-Pierre 2006; Totten 2003; Wood 2004). Reminiscent of gender role strain theory (O'Neil 1982; Pleck 1981, 1985), men expecting to acquire hegemonic dominance and respect in a relationship may feel strain from being treated as an equal by a female partner, and violence may be one strategy such men use to acquire the status they feel is rightfully theirs as men. Studies with adolescents suggest that sometimes this disrespect comes in the form of teasing, yelling, or even wearing provocative clothing in front of other males, particularly in relationships with severe levels of male-to-female abuse (Johnson et al. 2005; Miller and White 2003). Other times, female violence that is typically viewed as unserious can reach such heights that the he feels his dominance in the relationship is threatened, and a superior show of violence is required to regain control of his hegemonic status. In Miller and White's

(2003) study, for instance, Cleshay felt that “‘when the woman step up to her husband like she a man and try to go head up with him, I think he should let her know, “you can’t whoop me.” Because some girls be needin’ it....Sometimes you need to put people in they place (Miller and White 2003, 1237).’” Put more mildly, Christal suggests that “‘if a girl hit a dude, they deserve to be hit back (Miller and White 2003, 1238).’” Interviews with adult men in batterer treatment programs reveal a similar picture of men using violence to reacquire what they perceive to be a lack of hegemonic status that should be rightfully theirs as men. In Wood’s (2004) study of 22 incarcerated men who had participated in a batterer treatment program, by far the most popular justification for their violence was “she disrespected me as a man.” Feelings of emasculation were strong in a study of 15 South African men (Boonzaier 2008) and a study of 30 marginalized adolescents in a violent peer group such as a gang (Totten 2003). Anderson and Umberson’s (2001) study of 33 adult men in batterer treatment noted that the most common justification for abusing their female partners was that the women were “controlling...demanding, or dominating,” which often had the effect of leading the men to feel “emasculated (Anderson and Umberson 2001, 367).” When pressed, the men were unable to provide specifics regarding what controlling tactics their female partners used, which suggested to the authors that “these claims may be indicative of these men’s fears about being controlled by a woman rather than the actual practices of their partners (Anderson and Umberson 2001, 368).” This argument has important implications for gender role strain theory, as it seems possible that men may feel strain not just from failing to acquire dominance in the relationship but also from acquiring dominance and failing to feel

dominant – or, as Anderson and Umberson (2001) put it, fear of being inadequate may be the driving force rather than actual inadequacy. This position seems to fit well with Mullaney's (2007) interviews with 14 adult men in batterer treatment, which found that the men often felt they deserved but never received sufficient gratitude for their successful performance of the breadwinner role (Mullaney 2007).

The qualitative literature also suggests that some violence may be perceived as playfulness (Foshee, Bauman, Linder, Rice, and Wilcher 2007; Johnson et al. 2005). Part of the difficulty in assessing the context of violence in a relationship is that not all men and women define violence in the same manner. Some believe there is a difference between serious and less serious violence, and that less serious violence is by default not a big deal. For instance, during interviews in which a myriad of justifications for abuse were given, Wood (2004) found that incarcerated male batterers attempted to “disassociate” or distance themselves from the label of abuser by noting that the violence was limited (Wood 2004). Certain violence tactics in relationships are believed by some to not be considered IPV. Many adolescent respondents in Miller and White's (2003) study felt that, unlike slapping and punching, grabbing and pushing are not violence (Miller and White 2003). Complicating matters is that some violence may not only be considered “less serious” or non-violent but in fact socially accepted playfulness (Foshee, Bauman, Linder, Rice, and Wilcher 2007; Johnson et al. 2005). One male respondent in Johnson et al. (2005)'s study describes how boys might “smack her ass” when trying to flirt with a girl, a tactic that appears to be intended to seduce rather than punish (Johnson et al. 2005, 176). Foshee, Bauman, Linder, Rice, and Wilcher's (2007) studied 116

adolescents who had indicated on a screening questionnaire that they had perpetrated at least one physical or sexual IPV tactic. Following these questionnaires, in-depth interviews revealed that that 29% of the female and 38% of the male perpetrators had only used these tactics in the context of play. Some of the boys use violence to seduce, just as Johnson et al. (2005) found. As one boy describes it, “I believe it [playing] is a major thing in flirting, you know, like I said, you get the physical contact and stuff like that (Foshee, Bauman, Linder, Rice, and Wilcher 2007, 511).” The boys also physically flirted with their girlfriends once involved in a relationship. States one boy, “I mean playing around, I know me and my girlfriend wrestle a lot or horse around (Foshee, Bauman, Linder, Rice, and Wilcher 2007, 511).” Some of the girls also described physical play in this manner, as a matter of fun and flirting:

...while looking at the acts scale, one girl stated, “I play a lot with all that. I only scratch him, and slapping, yeah. Twisting their arm, we play, I play like that. Kick, slam them against the wall, choke them, I’d be playing doing stuff like that.” Another stated, “Not ever . . . in anger. I mean we play and we, we play fight and we play wrestle and stuff like that. But we, I’m not a violent kind of person (Foshee, Bauman, Linder, Rice, and Wilcher 2007, 504).”

The questionnaire preamble told respondents, “During the last year, how many times have you done the following things to a person that you had a date with? Only include when you did it to him or her first. In other words, don’t count it if you did it in self-defense (Foshee, Bauman, Linder, Rice, and Wilcher 2007, 501).” This wording is key because, unlike other popular IPV acts measures (i.e. Conflict Tactics Scale), this questionnaire did not require the violence to occur within the context of a conflict and, therefore, could conceivably have occurred during play. Foshee, Bauman, Linder, Rice,

and Wilcher (2007) rightfully question whether these respondents might have not wished to share socially undesirable IPV incidents with researchers and so either omitted them during interviews or reinterpreted them as play (Foshee, Bauman, Linder, Rice, and Wilcher 2007). All the same, the large percentage of the sample and the clarity of their descriptions of play suggest that, to adolescents, violent acts are labeled as violence or play depending largely on the context of the acts.

6.2 Gender Strain Measures

In part because gender norms are often contradictory and historically in flux, Pleck's (1981) gender role strain theory and O'Neil's (1982) gender role conflict theory suggest that attempts to do gender commonly result in negative consequences and negative psychological symptoms, particularly for men. Pleck (1981, 1995) describes three types of gender role strain. "Discrepancy strain" occurs when a man does not live up to his internalized expectations of masculinity, "dysfunction strain" occurs when a man does live up to expectations of masculinity which in turn results in negative consequences for himself or others (i.e. violence, low level of family participation), and, lastly "trauma strain" occurs when the fulfillment of masculinity expectations is such a harsh process that it results in trauma, examples of which might be found among male soldiers, male athletes, and male racial and sexual minorities. All of the measures in this vein deal with men and masculinity.

Further, most of the measures derived from this theory focus on dysfunction strain, which emerges, in essence, from a set of features within mainstream, hegemonic

masculinity that might seem problematic from a feminist perspective. In this sense, these measures are closely related to gender trait measures, as they ask respondents how closely they identify with popular norms of masculinity. For example, the Gender Role Conflict Scale (O'Neil, Helms, Gable, David, and Wrightsman 1986) assesses masculinity norms regarding “success, power, competition,” “restrictive emotionality,” “restrictive affectionate behavior between men,” and “conflicts between work and family relations,” which is how work gets in the way of family relations, not the other way around. Very few studies have used this measure in analyzing IPV (Moore and Stuart 2005). Schwartz, Waldo, and Daniel (2005) found among 74 male abusers in IPV treatment that the “success, power, competition” submeasure predicted physical IPV, the “restrictive affectionate behavior between men” submeasure predicted using isolation, and the “restrictive emotionality” submeasure negatively correlated with the use of intimidation and threats. The “conflicts between work and family relations” submeasure did not significantly predict IPV perpetration. The Hypermasculinity Inventory (Mosher and Sirkin 1984) measures three negative aspects of masculinity which may cause strain, including sexist attitudes towards women, violence as manly, and danger as exciting. While Ray and Gold (1996) found this measure did not correlate with men’s verbal or physical IPV perpetration, Suarez-Al-Adam, Raffaelli, and O’Leary (2000) found women’s perceptions of their male partner’s hypermasculinity to strongly predict male perpetration of verbal and physical IPV. Parrott and Zeichner (2003) similarly found more men with high Hypermasculinity Inventory scores perpetrated IPV (83%) than men with low scores (46%). Further, men with high scores on the measure were more likely

than those with low scores to be highly aggressive in the intensity and duration of shocks given when provoked by a female confederate (Parrott and Zeichner 2003).

Another measure, the Masculine Gender Role Stress Scale (Eisler and Skidmore 1987), assesses discrepancy strain, stress that emerges from failing to live up to aspects of hegemonic masculinity. Unlike the Gender Role Conflict Scale which asks how much certain masculinity norms apply to them, the Masculine Gender Role Stress Scale asks respondents how much stress they receive from certain situations governed by masculinity norms. The five submeasures measure stress from physical inadequacy (which asks about such topics as physical ability, drinking ability, sexual desirability, and being labeled as gay), emotional inexpressiveness (i.e. admitting love, fear, or hurt, crying in front of others, etc.), subordination to women (having less power at work and at home relative to women), intellectual inferiority (such topics as being accused of being too emotional or indecisive, working with harder working or smarter people, and, seemingly unrelated, talking with a feminist, asking for directions, staying at home with a sick child), and performance failure (not performing well at work or sexually). Eisler, Franchina, Moore, Honeycutt, and Rhatigan (2000) found that college men scoring high on the Masculine Gender Role Stress Scale were more likely to report it was acceptable to use IPV against women in vignette scenarios where masculinity was relevant as well as scenarios where masculinity was irrelevant. Franchina, Eisler, and Moore (2001) found college men who score high on this measure were more likely to report it was acceptable to use IPV against women in situations threatening to masculinity but not in situations where masculinity was not threatened. Copenhaver, Lash, and Eisler (2000) studied

substance-abusing male veterans, and they found the measure predicted IPV in Bivariate analysis but not when controlling for trait anger. Jakupcak, Lisak, and Roemer (2002) found the measure to predict dating IPV after controlling for family income and masculine ideology, and an interaction between the measure and masculine ideology, and they showed high Masculine Gender Role Stress scores and masculine ideology in combination predicted higher levels of IPV.

Although not necessarily formal measures, some measures of discrepancy strain have focused on men's stress emerging from not living up to hegemonic masculinity norms more specifically relative to their female partners, what has often been called "relative resources theory." Macmillan and Gartner (1999) found "severe" husband-to-wife physical IPV was more likely to occur for employed wives if the husband was unemployed rather than if the husband was employed. The authors contend that the wife's employment represents symbolic power, and it becomes threatening to men if men have less of such power by being unemployed. Similarly, Babcock, Waltz, Jacobson, and Gottman (1993) found among husband-to-wife physical IPV couples recruited through ads and public service announcements that physical IPV was more severe in couples where the husband had less power than the wife. Three types of power were measured, including wife-husband differentials in economic status, decision-making power, communication patterns, and communication skills. Using waves one and two of the National Survey of Families and Households, a nationally representative sample of 4,095 couples, Demaris, Benson, Fox, Hill, and Wyk (2003) found that IPV is more likely when a relationship has a more egalitarian woman and a more traditional man, perhaps an

indirect reflection of relationships in which men might be stressed by a female partner having nearly as much power as the man. Based on a subsample of 4,948 men and women from this same dataset, Anderson (1997) found that, as compared to women who earned less than 31% of the family income, women who contributed 55 to 69% of the family income were three and half times as likely to be victimized by their male partners, and women whose incomes comprised 70% or beyond of the family's net were five and half times more likely to become IPV victims.

6.3 Gender Ideology Measures

While both gender trait measures and gender strain measures address how closely the respondent abides by gender norms, gender ideology measures determines what gender norms the respondent believes men and women in general should abide by. Gender ideology measures tend to group scores into one of two types of male-female power relations, either traditional (male-dominated) or egalitarian, with a female-dominated orientation noticeably absent from these measures. As Moore and Stuart (2005) note, "men who hold traditional values and expectations regarding appropriate gendered behavior may engage in partner violence when expectations regarding partner behavior are violated or the man perceives violence as justifiable to maintain the expectations of male behavior (e.g., Eisler, 1995; Marshall, 1993) (Moore and Stuart 2005, 49)." Interestingly, gender ideology and gender trait measures are not highly correlated (Archer 1989; Fitzpatrick, Salgado, Suvak, King, and King 2004; King, King, Carter, Surface, and Stepanski 1994; Spence 1993), suggesting that people do not always

abide by the gender norms they believe men and women are meant to follow. It is conceivable that this means that the various dimensions of gender are entirely unrelated, although, more likely, it could mean that the dimensions of gender cluster into a wide variety of patterns not viewable in studies only exploring two dimensions of gender at a time.

Traditional gender ideology on the Male Role Norms Scale (Thompson and Pleck 1986), which has separate submeasures for attitudes on masculinity and femininity, generally predicts perpetration of psychological IPV if not physical IPV. Good, Hepper, Hillenbrand-Gunn, and Wang (1995) found that holding traditional masculinity norms predicted psychological IPV. Physical IPV was not measured. Using this same measure, Jenkins and Aube (2002) found traditional masculinity also predicted psychological IPV, and, though physical IPV was measured, its relationship with the measure was not significant. Jakupca, Lisak, and Roemer's (2002) study is among the only to find this measure does not predict IPV. However, the authors merged verbal and physical IPV into a single measure, and Jenkins and Aube's (2002) study suggests that a possible lack of significance between the measure and physical IPV may have pushed an otherwise significant relation between the measure and verbal IPV into non-significance.

The Sex Role Egalitarianism Scale (Beere, King, Beere, and King 1984) is a single measure merging attitudes on masculinity and femininity, which may complicate interpretation. In general, studies have suggested that traditional gender ideology predicts only more "severe" IPV. This was the case in a study of men in violence or alcoholism treatment programs (Crossman, Stith, and Bender 1990; Stith and Farley

1993). If injury is as indication of “severe” IPV, Schubert, Protinsky, and Viers (2002) found a similar pattern. Among men in anger management groups, church groups, counseling centers, and so on, traditional men were more likely to injure their partners, although the measure did not predict prevalence or frequency of physical violence (Schubert, Protinsky, and Viers 2002). In an interesting twist on causality, Stith and Farley’s (1993) study of 68 men in batterer treatment and 107 in alcoholism treatment showed that observation of IPV as a child decreases likeliness of sex-role egalitarianism, which in turn increases likeliness of severe male-to-female marital IPV. Two studies had different findings from the above set of studies. Specifically, Stith (1990) found the measure did not predict IPV among police officers, obviously a very different sample from these other studies. Fitzpatrick, Salgado, Suvak, King, and King’s (2004) of 250 undergraduate students showed that traditional attitudes did predict more psychological perpetration and victimization for women, but the measure also predicted less psychological and physical perpetration and victimization for men.

The very popular Attitudes Toward Women Scale (Spence and Helmreich 1972; Spence, Helmreich, and Stapp 1973) generally also shows that traditional gender ideology predicts IPV. Hurlbert, Whittaker, and Munoz (1991) found abusive husbands are more traditional than non-abusive husbands among a sample of military personnel. Ryan (1995) conducted two studies. The first found the measure did not predict aggression among college men, although the author posited that the respondents made their answers more liberal when they were told upon recruitment that it was a study about attitudes towards women. The second study avoided using this wording in recruitment,

and this time being traditional on the ATW predicted being aggressive. Haj-Yahia and Edelson (1994) found traditional attitudes among engaged men in Israel predicted perpetrating verbal IPV but not physical IPV. Haj-Yahia's (2003) study of 362 husbands in Israel showed traditional attitudes about marriage and women predicted acceptance of physical husband-to-wife IPV in some situations.

Some studies, however, have found the Attitudes Towards Women Scale is unrelated to IPV. Sigelman, Berry, and Wiles (1984) found more traditional attitudes about women predicted physical IPV perpetration but not after including control variables. Alexander, Moore, and Alexander (1991) showed holding more traditional attitudes toward women correlated with perpetrating physical dating violence, but this relationship similarly disappeared in regression analysis. Neidig, Friedman, and Collins (1986), using only the Empathy submeasure, found that the measure did not predict spousal violence among male military service members. Johnston (1988) showed that the measure did not predict whether male respondents were non-abusers or abusers in clinics or court-mandated treatment. Hastings (2000) found the measure did not predict verbal or physical IPV. Rosenbaum and O'Leary (1981) compared non-abused wives to abused wives in treatment either with or without their husbands. The abused women in individual treatment reported that their husbands held more traditional beliefs about women than the women in the two other groups, including the abused wives in treatment with their abusive husbands. That is, the measure only predicted if male abusers were included or not in female victim treatment, but it did not predict whether the men perpetrated IPV (Rosenbaum and O'Leary 1981).

Several studies of IPV have included gender ideology measures that are rarely employed, and results have been mixed. Using a series of rare gender ideology measures, Lichter and McCloskey (2004) conducted a longitudinal study of 208 mother-child dyads from violent and nonviolent homes. The authors found that traditional gender ideology predicted higher levels of dating IPV perpetration after controlling for marital violence exposure. Somewhat similarly, Willis, Hallinan, and Melby (1996) used the Traditional/Egalitarian Sex Role Inventory (Larsen and Long 1988) with male and female European American students. Perhaps reflecting an indirect measure of IPV acceptance, they found that those who endorsed traditional gender ideology were more likely than those with egalitarian ideology to be biased towards defending a male abuser in a vignette study of European American male students. Conversely, utilizing the Macho Scale (Villemez and Touhey 1977) in a study of correlates with physical IPV and threats of physical IPV among 305 undergraduate students, Bookwala, Frieze, Smith, and Ryan (1992) found traditional attitudes predicted IPV perpetration for women while more egalitarian attitudes predicted IPV perpetration for men.

Several related constructs like acculturation, culture, religion, and sexist humor have also been explored in the literature. Not using any formal gender ideology measure but rather a set of items from Foshee et al.'s (1996, 2000) Safe Dates Project, Ulloa, Jaycox, Marshall, and Collins (2004) found Latino youth were more likely to hold proviolent attitudes about IPV if they were male or endorsed traditional gender ideology. Ulloa, Jaycox, Marshall, and Collins posited that egalitarianism is the status quo in the United States, traditional gender ideology is the status quo in Latin American cultures,

and so Latino youth in America who are more traditional must therefore not be as acculturated to American culture as egalitarian Latino youth in America. Lending some support to this theory, Vandello and Cohen (2008) suggest that attitudes about gender roles in relationships that contribute to IPV may vary culturally. They cite an unpublished study of theirs (Vandello and Cohen forthcoming) which found female IPV victimization rates were higher in cultures also rating high on a composite measure measuring the importance of female purity. Levitt and Ware (2006) suggest that religion is often viewed as telling men to be dominant and women submissive, therein leading some to view it as promoting IPV. They question the evidence for this belief though. Finally, Ryan and Kanjorski (1998) find male college students who like sexist humor are more likely to perpetrate psychological, physical, and sexual IPV, and for women sexist humor enjoyment did not predict IPV perpetration.

Some research suggests that traditional gender ideology can actually be divided into positive and negative items. Herzog (2007) posits that the literature has provided two arguments for expanding the ideological continuum in such a way to include positive and negative traditional gender ideology. First, blatant sexist attitudes are rarer today and also less socially desirable to report in studies, so it is necessary to have measures more sensitive to sexist attitudes existing just beneath the surface (Campbell, Schellenberg, and Senn 1997; Glick and Fiske 1997; McHugh and Frieze 1997; Swim and Cohen 1997; Tougas, Brown, Beaton, and Joly 1997). Examples of such measures include the Neosexism measure (Tougas, Brown, Beaton, and Joly 1995), the Modern Sexism measure (Swim, Aikin, Hall, and Hunter 1995), and the Benevolent Sexism submeasure

of the Ambivalent Sexism Inventory (Glick and Fiske 1996). The Neosexism measure was not tested here, and, though the Modern Sexism measure was, it was not significantly predictive of IPV. Second, as Glick and Fiske (1997) have argued, sexism can involve not only hostile attitudes towards women but also protective and benevolent attitudes. To this end, Glick and Fiske (1996, 1997) developed the 22-item Ambivalent Sexism Inventory which has two submeasures, one for hostile sexism (i.e. “Women are too easily offended”) and another for benevolent sexism or, put another way, chivalry (i.e. “Women should be cherished and protected by men”). “Benevolent sexism” is defined by Glick and Fiske (1996) as, “a set of interrelated attitudes toward women that are sexist in terms of viewing women stereotypically and in restricted roles but that are subjectively positive in feeling (for the perceivers) and also tend to elicit behaviors that are typically categorized as prosocial (Glick and Fiske 1996, 491).”

As expected, using the Ambivalent Sexism Inventory, Allen, Swan, and Raghavan (2009) found benevolent sexism to be negatively related to male perpetration of IPV. In Forbes, Adams-Curtis, and White’s (2004) study of 264 college students, men with higher scores on hostile sexism were more likely to have perpetrated verbal IPV and sexual coercion. Benevolent sexism was unrelated to IPV for men, and, for that matter, both submeasures were unrelated to female-perpetrated IPV. Forbes, Jobe, White, Bloesch, and Adams-Curtis (2005) and Sakalli (2001) similarly found hostile sexism predicts positive attitudes about male-to-female IPV. Herzog (2007) found in a nationally representative sample of 1,650 Israeli male and female adults that benevolent sexism predicts wanting to punish a criminal in provided scenarios. These findings were

to a degree mirrored by Jenkins and Aube's (2002) study of EPAQ gender traits among 85 undergraduate couples, with only negative aspects of masculinity for men and negative aspects of femininity for women predicting IPV perpetration.

6.4 Gendered Relationship Measures

While some gender ideology measures look at beliefs about how men and women should behave in relationships, gendered relationship measures ask specifically about gendered issues in the respondent's relationship. To be clear, these are not measures of gender. However, they do explore ways in which gender might color interpretations and actions in relationships. There are at least three types of such measurements, including those that assess relationship power differentials, IPV seriousness attributions, and IPV acceptance.

Some studies have used measures to look at how relationship power differentials impact IPV. The Marital Power and Decision Making Scale (Blood and Wolfe 1960) was used by Coleman and Straus (1986, 1990) to construct a typology of relationship power differentials: male-dominant, female-dominant, equalitarian (partners jointly decide), and divided power (decision-making responsibilities divided between partners). In a nationally represented sample, as compared to the other relationship types, male-dominant relationships had the highest level of conflict as measured by the amount of spousal disagreement on relationship items. Equalitarian couples had the least amount of "minor" violence. Using the same dataset, Straus (1990) found physical IPV in 16.1% of male-dominant relationships as compared to 5.2% of couples who share decisions.

Similarly, Yllo (1984) found a “severe” violent incident was experienced by less than 3% of equalitarian couples, 7.1% of wife-dominant couples, and 10.7% of husband-dominant couples. Newark, Harrell, and Salem (1995) noted that, among 210 women in family court cases, abused women were more likely than non-abused women to report being in a male-dominant relationship. Tang (1999) found in a national sample that husband-dominant predicted women reporting male verbal IPV. One of the only studies to show this, Tang also showed that minor physical IPV was highest among wife-dominant couples and then husband-dominant couples. Kim and Sung (2000) found male-dominant predicts male-to-female violence, and Kim and Emery (2003) found male-dominant predicts male-to-female violence, followed by divided-power, then female-dominant, and lastly equalitarian. With rare exception (i.e. minor physical IPV in Tang’s (1999) study), research suggests that male-dominant relationships are more likely to exhibit IPV, in particular male-to-female IPV.

Cultural expectations of men as violent, women as weak and in need of protection, and the “typical” domestic violence image in the media of a male batterer and a female victim, may color how violence is perceived depending on whether the perpetrator is male or female. In particular, women’s physical IPV is often perceived as less serious than men’s physical IPV. In Fiebert and Gonzalez’s (1997) study of college, some women believed their violence towards men was not as deviant, dangerous, or serious as violence by men to women. 285 of 978 had initiated physical violence against their male partners (they were not asked if their male partners had used violence against them). From among a list of 10 deeper reasons for the violence provided to the

respondents, by far the two most popular reasons were “I have found that most men have been trained not to hit a woman, and therefore I am not fearful of retaliation from my partner” and “I believe that men can readily protect themselves so I don’t worry when I become physically aggressive.” Other possible answer choices included that women have the right to hit male partners, they learned this behavior from the media or parents, and that using violence is empowering, sexually stimulating, or healthy. While obviously this finding is limited by the fact that it was a closed-ended set of questions where other reasons not provided might have been endorsed more (and it is further limited in that we do not know the context of their violence, if perhaps it might be initiated because of a threat of violence by the male partner for instance), it does point to a gendered expectation among some women that their violence towards men is not as deviant, dangerous, or serious as violence by men to women. Similarly, Taylor and Sorenson (2005) showed approximately 26,000 IPV vignettes to a community-residing sample of 3,679 adults who tended to view women’s violence as less serious than men’s. Further, although blame for IPV was most often placed on the abuser, responsibility for a solution was more often placed on both partners (52%) or just the victim (31%).

Lastly, some studies have explored whether IPV abusers may hold beliefs that IPV is an acceptable way to enforce gender norms in their relationships. Although undoubtedly influenced by gender, this concept is arguably too far removed from gender to be considered a measurement of gender. Certain types of gender may lead to acceptance of IPV, but these measures neither measure the originating gender source nor the process through which this source results in IPV acceptance. As such, they are

beyond the purview of this literature review. However, it may be worth noting that, in the United States, men tend to hold IPV acceptance beliefs more often than women. Nayak, Byrne, Martin, and Abraham (2003) studied college students in India, Japan, Kuwait, and the United States, and there were some national gender differences in self-reported attitudes about the acceptance of IPV as normative behavior. In the United States, item loadings were higher for men than women on all of the measure's items, but this was not the case in the other nations. In India, all of the items but one loaded far higher for women, and in Japan and Kuwait it was mixed. For instance, in Japan, unlike in Kuwait or the United States, women were more likely to indicate "a man is justified in beating his wife if she is unfaithful to him," and, in Kuwait, unlike in Japan or the United States, women were far more likely than men to indicate that "Some women deserve to be beaten."

6.5 Gender Trait Measures

Largely, attempts to compare gender trait measures to IPV have utilized a version of the Bem Sex-Role Inventory – the BSRI (Bem 1974) and BSRI-S (Bem 1979) – or a version of the Personal Attributes Questionnaire – the PAQ (Spence, Helmreich, and Stapp 1974) and EPAQ (Spence, Helmreich, and Holahan 1979). Beginning with the BSRI, of the very few studies that have been conducted testing the relationship between the BSRI and IPV, findings lean slightly towards suggesting masculinity predicts IPV perpetration although evidence is generally mixed.

Some studies find IPV perpetration is predicted by masculinity (Bernard, Bernard, and Bernard 1985; Próspero 2008; Thompson 1991). Bernard, Bernard, and Bernard (1985) studied 157 college students and compared a control group of students with no IPV history with men who had been abusive and women who had been abused. Verbal, physical, and sexual IPV were merged into a single dichotomous variable. The vast majority of men and women with any IPV experience had been both abusive and abused at some point in life (Bernard, Bernard, and Bernard 1985). This is obviously problematic given the research design. As individual relationships were never analyzed, it is impossible to know if this means that the respondents were typically abused and abuser in the same relationship (i.e. “mutual” IPV) or in separate relationships (i.e. abused in one relationship, abuser in the next). It was found that, among males, being categorized as masculine on the BSRI predicted perpetrating any kind of IPV in their lifetimes, and, for females, being categorized as feminine predicted less IPV victimization. In their discussion, the authors posit that masculine men may feel threatened by women who did not similarly follow their gender norms of femininity. Implicit in their discussion is that these gender “traits” reflect actual power hierarchies in relationships (i.e. dominance, leadership), and a woman who identifies herself with such traits is not only encroaching upon masculine men’s sense of having unique identities from women but also masculine men’s actual power. As they note in their conclusion, this is of course impossible to test with their data because they never compare the genders of partners in the same relationship. Further, at least one other study, using a sample of 33 women self-described as battered and who came from a shelter or mental health

facility, found the reverse, that women were not less likely but more likely to be victimized if they were feminine (Warren and Lanning 1992). Bernard, Bernard, and Bernard's (1985) second explanation was that these non-feminine women may be more aggressive than feminine women, and so these women may be "victims" because they are also likely to be abusive. As they put it, "abuse begets abuse (Bernard, Bernard, and Bernard 1985, 575)." So their non-feminine gender is likely predicting their also being abusers rather than victims. However, as noted earlier, these authors never made this distinction in their sample, so it is impossible to tell. The authors very accurately conclude that, "This data is thought provoking, but clearly raises more questions than it answers (Bernard, Bernard, and Bernard 1985, 576)."

Designed somewhat more convincingly, Thompson (1991) found in a study of 336 undergraduate students that masculinity predicts physical IPV for both men and women, and femininity is unrelated. Once controlling for the BSRI, binary gender did not predict physical IPV. The interaction term for the BSRI and binary gender did not significantly predict physical IPV (Thompson 1991). Similarly, Próspero (2008) found among 167 college students that masculinity increased and femininity decreased perpetration of psychological IPV, although the BSRI was unrelated to physical or sexual IPV. Although not speaking to masculinity, Worth, Matthews, and Coleman (1990) found in their study of 109 college students that low femininity predicted IPV for men (Worth, Matthews, and Coleman 1990).

A few studies, however, have come to different conclusions. In a study of 505 college students at one university, Burke, Stets, and Pirog-Good (1988) found femininity

predicted physical IPV for both men and women (Burke, Stets, and Pirog-Good 1988). Thompson (1991) suggests that the reason their own study found the exact opposite results, with masculinity predicting IPV for both men and women, may be due to methodology, as Burke, Stets, and Pirog-Good (1988) ran separate analyses for men and women and used the outdated, bipolar version of the BSRI. Conversely, LaViolette, Barnett, and Miller (1984) found male marital abusers were most likely to be undifferentiated. A few studies have also found that the BSRI does not predict IPV. Among 30 IPV and 60 non-violent couples seeking psychiatric treatment for marital conflict, Coleman, Weinman, and Hsi (1980) found the BSRI did not predict IPV perpetration among the men. Haj-Yahia and Edelson (1994) found among 434 Palestinian men in Israel that the BSRI did not predict verbal or physical IPV by the men against their fiancées. As mentioned previously, Próspero (2008) found the BSRI to only predict psychological IPV and not physical or sexual IPV among 167 undergraduate students. Lastly, in a study of 161 undergraduate students at a southern university, androgyny was not significantly different from all other BSRI-S gender categories in predicting attitudes condoning violence in general (Smith, Ellis, and Benson 2001).

Research on how the PAQ predicts IPV is similarly mixed. Some studies indicate masculinity predicts IPV perpetration. For instance, Boye-Beamon, Leonard, and Senchak (1993) compared black and white premarital, male-to-female, physical IPV among 535 newlywed couples. Although the PAQ did not predict IPV perpetration for Black husbands, among the White husbands, those with low femininity scores (first those categorized as Masculine followed by Undifferentiated) were more likely than those

categorized as Feminine or Androgynous to perpetrate physical IPV. Although the PAQ did not predict IPV victimization for White wives, among Black wives, those who were scoring low on masculinity (first Undifferentiated followed by Feminine) were most likely to be physically victimized, as compared to Androgynous and Masculine. Combinations of genders within a couple did not predict IPV. The implication is that masculinity predicts perpetration for men while femininity predicts victimization for women. Using the EPAQ with 85 undergraduate couples, Jenkins and Aube (2002) found that negative masculinity traits predicted frequency increases and positive masculinity traits predicted frequency decreases for psychological and physical IPV. Positive masculinity also predicted lower severity for all forms of IPV other than physical violence. Femininity scores did not correlate with IPV for men. For women, negative masculinity also predicted frequency increases for symbolic aggression (emotional manipulation) and severity increases in psychological IPV, and negative femininity increased and positive femininity decreased physical IPV frequency. That is to say, depending on the form of IPV in question, negative aspects of masculinity for men and negative aspects of femininity for women predicted IPV perpetration (Jenkins and Aube 2002). Mosher and Danoff-Burg (2005) found among undergraduates that acceptance of IPV, for both males and females, as well as willingness to be in uncommitted sexual relationships, for just males, are related to masculine “unmitigated agency” on the EPAQ.

At the same time, a few studies suggest the opposite, that low masculinity and high femininity predict IPV perpetration. Rosenbaum (1986) found that, as compared to happy and unhappy non-abusive husbands, physically abusive husbands tended to be low

on masculinity, less androgynous, and more undifferentiated. In their study of 505 college students, Stets and Pirog-Good (1987) found femininity to be unrelated to physical IPV for women but predicted both physical IPV perpetration and victimization for men. Low masculinity scores predicted receipt of IPV for both men and women but were unrelated to perpetration for either. Using this same dataset, Burke, Stets, and Pirog-Good (1988) transformed the PAQ through discriminant function analysis into a unidimensional, bipolar construct. It was found that being more feminine than masculine predicted sexual IPV perpetration for men and physical IPV perpetration for women. Perhaps reflecting this mixed nature of the evidence on the PAQ and BSRI's connection with IPV rather than any unanimously supported conclusion, Sugarman and Frankel's (1996) meta-analytic review using some data with the BSRI and some with the PAQ found that, among husbands, IPV perpetration was predicted by low masculinity and femininity scores, and, among wives, IPV perpetration was predicted by femininity. Similarly, compared to other types of gender measures, reviews of the literature have found gender traits measures to have an unclear connection with both sexual violence (Murnen, Wright, and Kaluzny 2002) and IPV (Moore and Stuart 2005).

6.6 Summary

Empirical research has shed some light on the ways in which gender and IPV intersect. Qualitative studies have found that men's and women's violence are governed by different rules and have different outcomes due to gender norms. Often motivated by jealousy and a desire for a more emotionally communicative male partner, women's

violence is viewed as not serious both by women and men because of femininity stereotypes of weakness. That is to say, women's violence may be viewed as a culturally accepted response to conflict, a point reiterated by some research using gendered relationship measures regarding IPV seriousness attributions. However, because women's violence is viewed as unserious and because of femininity stereotypes of emotional irrationality, men were often able to ignore not only women's violence but the goals behind the violence. Conversely, in part because of masculinity stereotypes of overpowering strength and chivalrous protection of women, both men and women generally believed a man should neither hit a woman nor hit back in response to women's violence. At the same time, some men and women agreed that men were justified in hitting their female partners when the women challenged the man's "rightful" authority in the relationship. Unlike with women's violence, men's violence was typically perceived by both parties to be overpowering. This in combination with the common strategy of men to ignore women's goals for violence often led to men getting their way more often. However, men's violence and, for that matter, men's and women's jealousy and controlling tactics were often viewed in the relationship as signs of love, thereby increasing the chances that IPV will reoccur in the future. Confusing matters somewhat was disagreement over what constituted violence, including whether "minor" violence like pushing or grabbing or violence in the context of flirtation are in fact really acts of violence. Implications for misinterpretation of IPV quantitative measures seem clear.

Quantitative studies employing gender measures have also provided some important insights. As it is often measured, dysfunction strain from gender strain theory

is nearly identical to masculinity as measured by gender trait measures like the BSRI. Taken collectively, masculinity is shown to predict IPV, but the findings are mixed and emerge from studies not utilizing probability sampling or nationally representative samples. Two other key findings in the quantitative literature address power in relationships. First, studies with gender ideology measures and gendered relationship measures have generally shown that men who believe they should have or actually do have more power in relationships relative to women are more likely to perpetrate IPV. Second, according to measures of gender strain theory's component of discrepancy strain, men who have less power in relationships than women, particularly men who experience stress as a result, are more likely to perpetrate IPV. These final two points regarding power differentials in relationships suggest that perhaps the safest relationships are those that are egalitarian (decision-making is traded on and off between partners) and equalitarian (decision-making is always jointly shared), as it would appear that IPV is more likely to occur both in relationships where men have more power than women and in relationships where men have less power than women. However, there is a literature that suggests that actual power is less important than perceived power for men in feeling their authority threatened (see Mankowski, Haaken, and Silvergleid 2002).

Chapter Seven: Gendered IPV in AddHealth

This literature is largely silent on the question of whether certain versions of gender impact IPV differently in male-to-female, female-to-male, and bidirectional IPV relationships. One clue regarding perpetration in these relationship types might be drawn from Johnson (Johnson 1995, 2005, 2006, 2008; Johnson and Ferraro 2000), who contends that coercive intimate terrorism – relationships in which most of the violence and controlling tactics are perpetrated by one partner, typically the man – has the most negative impact on victims. It seems that higher degrees of aggression and lower amounts of empathy would make it easier to perpetrate such a crime where responsibility for these high levels of abuse is easily assigned. In other words, (Hypothesis 1) *in male-to-female IPV relationships, high masculinity, low femininity, and being categorized as masculine for men would seem the logical culprits for IPV perpetration*. Johnson also posits that bidirectional IPV relationships are typically less violent and controlling, though, as reviewed in Chapter Six, the picture seems much more complex than Johnson indicates. All the same, if high masculinity and low femininity are likely the best gender predictors of IPV in general, it is hypothesized that (Hypothesis 2) *high masculinity, low femininity, and being categorized as masculine predict IPV perpetration in bidirectional and female-to-male IPV relationships, but the strength of the correlation is largest for male-to-female IPV relationships*.

Victimization may also be predicted by the BSRI in different ways for male-to-female, female-to-male, and bidirectional IPV. Based on the gender strain literature

(O'Neil 1982; Pleck 1981), particularly Pleck's (1981, 1995) concept of "discrepancy strain" described in Chapter Six, men may sometimes experience strain from not living up to internalized expectations of masculinity and, in response to this strain, may lash out with IPV (for example, see applications of the Masculine Gender Role Stress Scale: Copenhaver, Lash, and Eisler 2000; Eisler, Franchina, Moore, Honeycutt, and Rhatigan 2000; Franchina, Eisler, and Moore 2001; Jakupcak, Lisak, and Roemer 2002). The source of such feelings of masculinity inadequacy at times can be derived from a man comparing himself to a female partner who is outperforming him in the traditionally masculine "public sphere" or workforce. As mentioned in Chapter Six, evidence abounds for this explanation of IPV, what has often been termed "relative resources theory" (for example, see Anderson 1997; Babcock, Waltz, Jacobson, and Gottman 1993; Demaris, Benson, Fox, Hill, and Wyk 2003; Macmillan and Gartner 1999). It is likely that women who are high wage earners are more egalitarian in gender ideology, as gender ideology measures typically tap into expectations regarding what financial roles women should play in relationships. Evidence suggests, of course, that gender ideology and gender traits are not highly correlated (Archer 1989; Fitzpatrick, Salgado, Suvak, King, and King 2004; King, King, Carter, Surface, and Stepanski 1994; Spence 1993). However, if more egalitarian women are also less feminine and more masculine, then perhaps (Hypothesis 3) *being high on masculinity, low on femininity, and categorized as masculine should predict victimization for women in male-to-female IPV relationships*. Additionally, (Hypothesis 4) *regarding male victimization in female-to-male IPV, the literature*

provides no firm reason to suspect the male's gender categorization will predict his female partner becoming the sole abuser.

In the empirical literature, IPV perpetration has been predicted by being feminine (Burke, Stets, and Pirog-Good 1988; Stets and Pirog-Good 1987) and undifferentiated (LaViolette, Barnett, and Miller 1984; Rosenbaum 1986), and gender trait measures have also been found to be unrelated to IPV perpetration (Coleman, Weinman, and Hsi 1980; Haj-Yahia and Edelson 1994). However, the greatest number of studies has supported the contention that, *(Hypothesis 5) in a full sample of unidirectional and bidirectional IPV relationships, being high on masculinity, low on femininity, and categorized as masculine predicts IPV perpetration, irrespective of binary gender* (Bernard, Bernard, and Bernard 1985; Boye-Beamon, Leonard, and Senchak 1993; Jenkins and Aube 2002; Próspero 2008; Thompson 1991).

Findings have been mixed regarding IPV victimization and gender trait measures – with femininity for women (Warren and Lanning 1992) and men (Stets and Pirog-Good 1987) predicting victimization, less femininity predicting victimization for women (Bernard, Bernard, and Bernard 1985), and less masculinity predicting victimization for women (Boye-Beamon, Leonard, and Senchak 1993). Based on Hypotheses 3 and 4, there is reason to suspect that male and female victims tend to be different gender categories in unidirectional and bidirectional IPV relationships. This is to say that, *(Hypothesis 6) in a full sample of unidirectional and bidirectional IPV relationships, a gender trait measure like the BSRI should not be significantly correlated with IPV*

victimization. Distinct sexual and physical IPV predictions would be difficult to construct based on the paucity of research on these narrower topics.

Up until the analyses of this dissertation, neither the BSRI nor the PAQ has been used to predict IPV in a study with a nationally representative sample. With rare exception, study populations have overwhelmingly been undergraduate students at a single college. As this paper represents the first to use a gender trait measure, the BSRI, to predict IPV perpetration with a nationally representative sample, and considering the mixed nature of the empirical literature, this research is to a degree exploratory in nature.

Below are results of an analysis of the National Longitudinal Study of Adolescent Health, testing if and in what way the Bem Sex-Role Inventory predicts IPV perpetration for men and women. The following items are described here: (1) research design, (2) Univariate analyses, (3) Bivariate analyses, (4) multinomial logistic regression to test the effects of the BSRI on male-to-female, female-to-male, and bidirectional physical and sexual IPV, and (5) negative binomial regression to measure the prediction of physical and sexual IPV perpetration frequency by the BSRI. Lastly, (6) the findings are briefly summarized prior to a fuller discussion in Chapter 9.

7.1 Research Design

The study reported in this chapter is a secondary data analysis of Wave III from the *National Longitudinal Study of Adolescent Health* (Add Health; Harris 2009), the largest study of adolescents ever undertaken. As described on the Add Health website, (Harris et al. 2009), in 1994, under a grant from the National Institute of Child Health and

Human Development and 17 other federal agencies, a stratified multistage cluster sample was gathered that is nationally-representative of U.S. high schools. All 26,666 U.S. high schools with an 11th grade and at least 30 students were stratified into 80 clusters based on region of country, “urbanicity” (urban, suburban, or rural), school size, school type, percent white, percent black, grade span, and curriculum type. One school from each of the 80 clusters was selected for the sample; 65% (52) of the schools agreed to participate, and those that did not were replaced by another school within the cluster. Each participating school identified “feeder schools” with a 7th grade which was expected to send at least five graduates onto that high school’s incoming class; one feeder school was selected based on the probability proportionate to the number of students it would send on to the high school, and, again, those that declined to participate were replaced with another feeder school. A feeder school was not recruited for four high schools lacking feeder schools contributing the minimum number of five students, nor were feeder schools recruited for the twenty high schools which were their own feeders in that that they spanned 7th through 12th grade. 132 schools participated in this core sample (Harris et al. 2009).

Parents were notified in advance that a questionnaire would be given to students on a certain date. Some schools required active consent, in that a parent had to sign a form agreeing for the student to participate. Most schools allowed passive consent, assuming consent was given when parents did not return a form indicating their lack of consent. Of those students that did attend school on the date indicated to parents, 90,118 7th-12th graders filled out an in-school questionnaire. These students as well as any other

students in attendance that day who did not fill out the questionnaire were stratified by grade and binary gender. With six grades and two genders (male and female), there were 12 stratum, and from each stratum for a given school about 17 students were drawn, resulting in about 200 students being selected from each of the 80 school pairs. To help with studying social networks, all enrolled students in 2 large schools and 14 small schools of varying school types and regions were purposively selected for Wave I in-home interviews; in addition to the 200 students already selected from these schools for the core sample, including all of the remaining students at these schools added 2,559 completed in-home interviews. In total, a core sample of 12,105 students agreed to participate in Wave I in-home interviews (Harris et al. 2009).

In addition to this core sample, special oversamples were drawn to aid in studying smaller populations. From those who filled out in-school questionnaires, four “ethnic” supplementary samples participated in Wave I in-home interviews, including 1,038 blacks with at least one parent with a college degree, 334 Chinese, 450 Cubans, and 437 Puerto Ricans. 589 physically disabled students were also oversampled using the in-school questionnaires. Additionally oversampled from those participating in Wave I in-home interviews were adolescent dyads living in the same house, including identical twins, fraternal twins, half siblings, full siblings, and non-related pairs like step-siblings, foster children, and non-related adopted siblings. This “genetic” supplementary sample includes 6,196 students, although, unlike with the ethnic samples, the study designers do not report the proportion of this sample drawn as a supplement and the proportion already drawn in the core sample. Add Health designers supply data users with weights specially

calculated to account for oversampling and to restore the national representativeness of the data (Harris et al. 2009).

All told, 27,000 were selected for and 20,745 participated in Wave I in-home interviews, and interviews were also conducted with 17,670 parents and 144 school administrators. After Wave I was conducted from 1994 to 1995, Wave II in-home interviews commenced in 1996 with 14,738 of these same students, ranging from 8th to 12th grade, in addition to interviews with 128 school administrators. From 2001 to 2002, Wave III in-home interviews were conducted with 15,170 Wave I students now ages 18 to 26, 27 Wave II special genetic respondents, and 1,507 partners at least 18 years of age in opposite-sex romantic relationships of at least three months with selected Wave I students. From 2007 to 2008, over 20,000 of the Wave I students, now ages 24 to 32, were interviewed again for Wave IV, though this wave of Add Health has yet to be released to the public (Harris et al. 2009).

To avoid confidentiality issues with paper questionnaires, in-home student interviews during all waves of Add Health were conducted by inputting responses on a laptop. Generally laptop questions were administered by an interviewer, a process referred to as CAPI, or computer-assisted personal interview. To limit social desirability effects, for more sensitive questions, respondents used headphones to listen and respond to questions on the laptop while in private; this process is also known as ACASI, or audio computer-assisted self-interview. Interviews lasted approximately 90 minutes, and this was followed by taking biological specimens of participants for, on average, an additional 44 minutes (Harris et al. 2009).

As per the Add Health study design, the BSRI was only filled out by Wave III respondents indicating being in a current, opposite-sex relationship of at least three months where both partners are 18 years of age or older (Harris et al. 2009). Although fitting this description based on earlier screening questions, later survey questions revealed some of these respondents to be in same-sex relationships or not currently in a relationship; these respondents were removed from analysis. Similarly, while indicating on a screening question that the current relationship was at least three months long, later questions about the specific month the relationship began revealed that 157 respondents were in relationships less than three months long. As this was more likely due to accident than intentional lying with such an innocuous question, there is no reason to suspect these respondents differ greatly from other respondents initially screened out due to having short relationships. To enhance subgroup comparisons, these respondents were included in the subsample studied, with the understanding that short relationships are likely to be heavily underrepresented in this subsample. This dissertation focuses on a subset of Wave III which is currently in a sexual, romantic, or marital relationship with a partner of the opposite-sex ($N = 4,027$). Further, only the current relationships were analyzed. Though Add Health has hierarchical data on all relationships for each respondent, only a select group was allowed to fill out detailed questions on IPV. This group included respondents flagged with a current, opposite-sex relationship, but it also included all sexual relationships listed by all respondents as well as the two most important relationships for each of a randomly selected group of respondents. To focus on all of these relationships would have been to decrease generalizeability. By studying

only current relationships – be they sexual, romantic, or marital – a subsample emerges which takes a nationally-representative, cross-sectional snap shot of adolescent relationships beginning at different ages, extending for different periods of time, and existing in different temporal locations relative to previous and future relationships.

The studies conducted for this dissertation draw from a wide range of variable clusters, including (A) gender, (B) IPV, (C) relationship context, (D) criminal history, and (E) demographics. Multiple imputation was used to address any issues with missing data. Below, the manner through which these variables are operationalized within Add Health is discussed.

7.1a Variables: Gender

Gender is measured in two ways by Add Health, first as a binary male-female variable, and second with the BSRI-S. The Add Health codebook does not specify how binary gender is operationalized, other than the answer choices being “male” and “female” with no option for declining to answer. It appears in a long list of questions that would likely be filled out by the interviewer without asking the respondent for information (i.e. date of interview, version of the survey, etc.), so it is possible this particular question was done by listening to tone of voice, the interviewer asking an unstandardized question, or touch-tone dialing. For the purposes of this paper, female was coded as 1, and male was coded as 0. There were no missing cases. That 41% of the sample was male may impact Bivariate analysis slightly, but in multiple variable regression analysis it should be of less concern given the large size of the sample.

The second way gender is measured is with the BSRI-S. The BSRI-S is prompted by a question, “How often is each of the following statements true of you?” Masculine items include these ten statements: I defend my own beliefs, I am independent, I am assertive, I have a strong personality, I am forceful, I have leadership abilities, I am willing to take risks, I am dominant, I am willing to take a stand, I am aggressive. Feminine items include these ten statements: I am affectionate, I am sympathetic, I am sensitive to the needs of others, I am understanding, I am compassionate, I am eager to soothe hurt feelings, I am warm, I am tender, I love children, I am gentle. Ten additional “filler” statements were mixed in, but, as per Bem’s instructions, they are not included in the BSRI scoring. Although the thirty items of the BSRI-S are all in the same spot within the survey, the masculine, feminine, and filler items are scattered within the BSRI-S measure. Beyond voiced out loud answers of “refused,” “don’t know,” and “not applicable,” Likert items allowed for seven possible answer choices regarding the statement provided: 1 (“never or almost never true”), 2 (“usually not true”), 3 (“sometimes but infrequently true”), 4 (“occasionally true”), 5 (“often true”), 6 (“usually true”), and 7 (“almost or almost always true”).

Following one of Bem’s suggested scoring techniques, a “median-split” is used to create a typology. For a given respondent, all masculine item scores are summed and then divided by the number of masculine items answered, and then the same is done for all the feminine items. This results in the mean “raw score” for the masculine submeasure and the feminine submeasure for an individual respondent, each raw score with a possible range of one to seven. The mean of raw scores for the entire sample is

then calculated for each of the two submeasures. A typology is arrived at by labeling respondents as having a femininity raw score above or below the sample median for femininity raw scores and, similarly, with a masculinity raw score above or below the sample median for masculinity raw scores. High masculinity and low femininity is labeled as “masculine,” low masculinity and high femininity is labeled as “feminine,” high masculinity and high femininity is labeled as “androgynous,” and low masculinity and low femininity is labeled as “undifferentiated.”

Two versions of the BSRI-S were constructed for this paper. First, three dummy variables were created for masculine, feminine, and androgynous, each coded as one for being labeled as this and zero for not being labeled this way. Undifferentiated was not included in analysis because it was used as the reference group. A second version of the BSRI-S consisted of a measure which summed all of the masculine item scores, a measure which summed all of the feminine item scores, and an interaction term for these masculinity and femininity measures. This was an attempt to address the possibility that some respondents were close to the median and as a result were somewhat arbitrarily forced into one of the four gender types. There were 522 missing cases for the BSRI masculinity submeasure and 391 missing cases for the BSRI femininity submeasure. Chronbach’s alpha for the masculinity submeasure is .80 and, for the femininity submeasure, .91. The masculinity submeasure in this sample appears to have two factors, one for violent and another for instrumental-autonomous. Using principal components analysis, the eigen value for the first component (3.87) is only just over twice as large as for the second component (1.51), though all other components have eigen values below 1.

The literature has generally found the same and suggests the factors measure instrumentality and autonomy (for example, see Pedhazur and Tetenbaum 1979; Ruch 1984; Whetton and Swindells 1977). The factor analysis on the present sample found all items loaded positively and with relatively equal strength for the first factor. For the second factor, several arguably violent items loaded negatively (“I am forceful,” “I am dominant,” “I am aggressive,” and, “I am willing to take risks”) while the rest, a combination of instrumentality and autonomy, loaded positively (“I defend my own beliefs,” “I am independent,” “I am assertive,” and “I have a strong personality,” “I have leadership abilities,” and “I am willing to take a stand”). Conversely, the literature also predicts that the femininity submeasure is unidimensional (for example, see Bem 1981; Bledsoe 1983; Gaudreau 1977; Maznah and Choo 1986; Thompson and Melancon 1986; Windle and Sinnot 1985). This was also the case in this sample, with eigen values approximately seven times greater for the first component (5.73) than for the second component (.83).

Two other versions of the BSRI-S were tested though not reported in this paper. Principal cluster analysis revealed a binary gender factor and an intensity factor, but results using this version of the BSRI-S are not published here as findings were nearly identical to those found with using the other operationalizations of the BSRI-S. Also, inspired by the IPV literature, the items from the BSRI-S were divided into four factors – Autonomous, Dominant, Compassionate, Helpful to Others – but, with mixed results, these analyses are also not reported here. Ultimately, the two versions of the BSRI-S used in this study are the closest to Bem’s original intentions.

7.1b Variables: IPV

Four types of IPV were operationalized, use of physical IPV, receipt of physical IPV, use of sexual IPV and receipt of sexual IPV. This section of Add Health was prefaced by the following statement: “No matter how well a couple gets along, there are times when they disagree or fight. Couples have many ways of settling their differences. Please indicate how often each of the following things has occurred during the past year in your relationship with <PARTNER>.” This is consistent with the spirit of incident-based IPV measures like the Conflict Tactics Scale (Straus 1979; Straus, Hamby, Boney-McCoy, and Sugarman 1996), which attempt to downplay the potential seriousness of IPV so as to encourage reporting of even minor incidents.

Physical IPV use was measured by two questions: “How often in the past year have you threatened <PARTNER> with violence, pushed or shoved partner, or thrown something at partner that could hurt?” and “How often in the past year have you slapped, hit, or kicked <PARTNER>?” Nearly identical questions asked about the receipt of physical IPV. The use of violence and threats are highly correlated ($r = .59$), as are the receipt of violence and threats ($r = .68$), and both pairs have strong Chronbach’s alphas (.73 and .80 respectively), indicating the viability of merging threats and actual violence into a single physical IPV use measure and a single physical IPV receive measure. The physical IPV use measure has 246 missing cases, and the physical IPV receive measure has 237 missing cases.

Sexual IPV use was measured by one question: “How often in the past year have you insisted on or made <PARTNER> have sexual relations with you when {HE/ SHE}

didn't want to?" A nearly identical question inquired about sexual IPV receipt. 234 cases are missing for the sexual IPV use measure, and 230 cases are missing for the sexual IPV receive measure.

Physical and sexual IPV use and receipt measures have similar scoring. Besides voiced out loud answers of "refused," "don't know," and "not applicable," each question had the same answer choices, recoded slightly for this paper: 0 ("never" or "This hasn't happened in the past year, but did happen before then"), 1 ("once"), 2 ("twice"), 4 ("3-5 times"), 8 ("6-10 times"), 15 ("11-20 times"), and 22 ("more than 20 times"). Because physical IPV is comprised of two questions each with a range of 0 to 22, physical IPV use ranges from 0 to 44, and physical IPV receipt also ranges from 0 to 44. As sexual IPV is measured by one question, sexual IPV use ranges from 0 to 22, as does sexual IPV receipt. The benefit of additive measures over binary variables is that analysis can move beyond simply the presence of IPV to frequency within a given relationship. In addition, a physical IPV typology variable was created, where neither partner using physical IPV is coded as 1, both partners using IPV is coded as 2, only the respondent using is coded as 3, and only the respondent receiving is coded as 4. An identical variable was created to measure a sexual IPV typology.

7.1c Variables: Relationship Context

Relationship context is measured by three variables. "Months at risk" is the number of months the relationship existed during the time frame referred to by the IPV questions, the past twelve months. As such, the range of possible attributes is from 1 to

12, with any relationship excess of 12 months being coded as 12. This variable helps take into account that some respondents had greater temporal opportunity to experience IPV. There were 295 missing cases for this variable. “Length” is the number of months the relationship existed. Unlike months at risk, length can help account for the seriousness of the relationship as well as at what point in the relationship the survey is measuring. Respondents with a relationship length of negative months ($n = 9$) were presumed to result from interviewer error and were recoded as missing. All told, there were 295 missing cases for the relationship length variable. Lastly, “relationship number” is the number of relationships the respondent has had including the current one. It is highly likely that having prior relationships has an impact on the likelihood of IPV separate from the age of the respondent, as two respondents of identical age may have very different relationship histories. There were zero missing cases on the relationship number variable.

7.1d Variables: Criminal History

Three variables help measure criminal history, each a binary variable coded 1 if any of the listed items were in the affirmative and 0 if all the items did not occur. The detail of additive measures is not necessary as these variables are not at the heart of this research, and, further, the percentage of respondents answering in the affirmative for these variables was low enough that binary scoring is preferable. “Child abuse” is a binary variable measuring experiencing child abuse (as child ever experiencing neglect, physical abuse, or sexual abuse by a parent or adult care-giver). There are 2,876 missing

cases for this variable. Though this missing data is imputed and though this an important variable to include in analysis, it is conceivable that the amount of missing data may bias results because those not answering this question may have wanted to give socially undesirable and sensitive answers, i.e. experienced child abuse. On the perpetration end of the criminal spectrum, “violent crime committed” is a binary variable measuring using or threatening to use a weapon to get something from someone, or physically fighting with or without a weapon. This variable has 240 missing cases. “Non-violent crime committed” is a binary variable indicating if a respondent deliberately damages someone else’s property, steals something in or not in a house, buys, sells, or holds stolen property, uses someone else’s credit cards without their permission, deliberately writes a bad check, or sells drugs. This variable has 218 missing cases.

7.1e Variables: Demographics

Demographic variables include age, education, income, and race-ethnicity. “Age” is measured in the units of years old, and there are no missing cases on this variable.

“Education” is coded 0 for no degrees, 1 for high school diploma, high school equivalency, or GED, 2 for associate or junior college degree, 3 for college degree, and 4 for any graduate degree, including master’s degree, doctoral degree, or professional degree. This coding was selected to account for the basic differences in levels of education. More specific distinctions may have blurred the reality that different people take different routes to graduating high school (i.e. high school diploma, high school equivalency, GED) or a short-term college (i.e. associate vs. junior college), and different

careers have different end points in graduate degrees wherein a degree higher than a master's might not be preferable (i.e. high school teacher vs. college teacher). There are three missing cases for the education variable. Total personal "income" before taxes is coded as 5,000 (for those answering 10,000 – 14,999), 12,500 (for those answering 10,000 – 14,999), 17,500 (for those answering 15,000 – 19,999), 25,000 (for those answering 20,000 – 29,999), 35,000 (for those answering 30,000 – 39,999), 45,000 (for those answering 40,000 – 49,999), 62,500 (for those answering 50,000 – 74,999), and 100,000 (for those answering 75,000 or more). Respondents were asked to include in this total any income originating from employment, financial assets, government aid, and transfers from friends and biological family. There are 392 missing cases for the income variable. "Race-ethnicity" is measured by a series of dummy variables, coded 1 for belonging to this demographic and 0 for not belonging to it. Such variables included "Latino" (just Hispanic or Latino; 5 missing cases), "Black" (just black or African American; 279 missing cases), "Native" (just American Indian or Native American; 371 missing cases), "Asian" (just Asian or Pacific Islander; 257 missing cases), and "Mixed" (any combination of two or more of these groups; 189 missing cases). "White" (812 missing cases) was not included in analysis as it was the reference group.

7.2 Univariate Analyses

Means and standard deviations for study variables are provided in Table 1.1. Among 4,027 respondents in the sample, 59% were female ($n = 2,375$), and 41% were male ($n = 1,652$). 28% of the sample were undifferentiated on the BSRI ($n = 1,110$), 18%

Table 1.1 Descriptive Statistics

Variable	Mean	SD
Physical IPV Use (range: 1-44) [excluding respondents scoring zero]	4.73	6.46
Physical IPV Receive (range: 1-44) [excluding respondents scoring zero]	5.45	7.87
Sexual IPV Use (range: 1-22) [excluding respondents scoring zero]	3.71	5.24
Sexual IPV Receive (range: 1-22) [excluding respondents scoring zero]	3.47	4.14
BSRI Typology – N (%)	Masc.: n = 742 (18 %) Fem.: n = 730 (18%) Undiff.: n = 1,110 (28%) Andr.: n = 1,445 (36%)	
BSRI Masculinity Submeasure (range: 10-70)	49.08	9.33
BSRI Femininity Submeasure (range: 10-70)	57.24	10.04
Binary Gender – N (%)	Female: n = 2,375 (59%) Male: n = 1,652 (41%)	
Months at Risk (range: 1-12)	10.67	2.94
Relationship Length (range: <1 – 298 months)	37.10	28.66
Relationship Number (range: 1-41) [# of prior relationships plus 1 for current one]	2.53	2.29
Experienced Child Abuse – N (%)	Yes: n = 1,114 (28%)	
Committed Violent Crime – N (%)	Yes: n = 464 (12%)	
Committed Non-Violent Crime – N (%)	Yes: n = 735 (18%)	
Age (range 18-27)	22.08	1.74
Education (0 = no degree; 1 = high school degree; 2 = associate or jr. college degree; 3 = college degree; 4 = graduate degree)	1.22	.79
Income (range: \$0-100,000) [from job, assets, aid, family/friends transfers]	14,536	15,257
Race-Ethnicity – N (%)	Latino: n = 650 (15%) Black: n = 750 (18%) White: n = 2,202 (52%) Asian: n = 249 (6%) Native: n = 27 (1%) Mixed: n = 163 (4%)	

were masculine (n = 742), 18% were feminine (n = 730), and 36% were androgynous (n = 1,445). This BSRI categorical breakdown is similar to Bem's 1978 study of Stanford undergraduates also utilizing the median split scoring method with the short version of the BSRI (see Bem 1981). With regard to intimate partner violence (IPV), 22% of the sample used (n = 886) and 19% received physical IPV (n = 743), with nearly all respondents in violent relationships using or receiving 1 to 8 violent acts. Approximately 5% used and 7% received sexual IPV, with most of these respondents experiencing 1 to 4 acts. Respondents on average were 22 years of age, high school graduates, and drawing in a personal income – including income originating from employment, financial assets, government aid, and transfers from friends and biological family – of \$14,536. The sample was predominantly White (n = 2,202), and the largest minorities were Black (n = 750) and Latino (n = 650). About one quarter (28%) of respondents had experienced child abuse. 18% of the sample had committed a non-violent crime and 12% a violent crime unrelated to IPV, with 23% committing either a non-violent or violent crime. The current relationship reported on in this study was on average the second or third intimate relationship for respondents. Although ranging widely, the current relationship had averaged approximately three years in length and had been continuing 11 of the possible 12 months prior to the interview representing the time frame the IPV items inquired about.

Table 1.2 Percentage of Men and Women Endorsing Each BSRI Category

Binary Gender	BSRI Category			
	Undifferentiated	Masculine	Feminine	Androgynous
Men (n = 1,652)	33.05%	23.67%	11.14%	32.14%
Women (n = 2,375)	23.75%	14.78%	22.99%	38.48%

7.3 Bivariate Analyses

Men were more likely than women to be categorized as masculine and undifferentiated while women were more likely than men to be categorized as feminine and androgynous, which may suggest men prefer to avoid categories involving femininity. Interestingly, androgyny and undifferentiated categories were more popular for both men and women as compared to feminine and masculine categories (see Table

Table 1.3 Percentage of Respondents Experiencing Exclusively Male-to-Female, Exclusively Female-to-Male, Bidirectional, and No Physical and Sexual IPV

IPV Present (Yes / No)	Direction of IPV			
	None	Male-to-Female	Female-to-Male	Bidirectional
Physical IPV (n = 3598)	73.27%	2.40%	10.01%	14.33%
Sexual IPV (n = 3970)	90.81%	3.88%	2.34%	2.97%

1.2). 14% of respondents were involved in a bidirectional physical IPV relationship, 2% in relationships with exclusively male-to-female physical IPV, and a surprising 10% in relationships with exclusively female-to-male physical IPV; also, 3% were in a bidirectional sexual IPV relationship, 4% were in a relationship which involved unidirectional male-to-female sexual IPV, and 2% were in relationships with unidirectional female-to-male sexual IPV (see Table 1.3). The frequency of IPV incidents was highest in bidirectional relationships, with women in such relationships using physical IPV significantly more frequently and men using sexual IPV significantly more frequently ($p < .05$; see Table 1.4).

Among those experiencing child abuse, 57% were female, with women

Table 1.4 Frequency of IPV within Exclusively Male-to-Female, Exclusively Female-to-Male, and Bidirectional Physical and Sexual IPV

		Direction of IPV			
		Male-to-Female	Female-to-Male	Bidirectional by Men	Bidirectional by Women
Physical IPV Measure					
	Mean	3.16	3.38	4.58†	6.33†
	SD	5.10	4.81	6.45	7.92
Sexual IPV Measure					
	Mean	3.49	3.18	5.13†	2.53†
	SD	4.37	4.38	6.11	3.65

Notes: Physical IPV Measure scores range is 1-44; Sexual IPV scores range is 1-22.

† Significantly different means in a t-Test ($p < .05$)

representing 56% of child physical abuse victims and 65% of child sexual abuse victims. The highest number of child abuse incidents available as an answer choice was “more than ten times.” This answer choice represented a similar percentage of female (20%) and male (22%) physical child abuse victims, but it was selected by a far greater percentage of female (27%) than male (13%) child sexual abuse victims. Regarding crimes perpetrated outside of relationships, 12% of women and 27% of men perpetrated a non-violent crime, 6% of women and 20% of men perpetrated a violent crime, and 76% of respondents who committed both types of crimes were male.

Described in Table 1.5 are the percentage of men and women of the varying BSRI

Table 1.5 Percentage of Male and Female Respondents Within BSRI Categories
Currently Experiencing Use and Receipt of Physical and Sexual IPV

Sample	BSRI Category	Currently Experiencing Physical IPV		Currently Experiencing Sexual IPV	
		Use	Receipt	Use	Receipt
Men	Undifferentiated	16%	19%	7%	8%
	Masculine	18%	23%	5%	8%
	Feminine	5%	12%	3%	2%
	Androgynous	11%	17%	4%	7%
Women	Undifferentiated	31%	21%	5%	10%
	Masculine	37%	24%	6%	11%
	Feminine	23%	13%	4%	7%
	Androgynous	26%	18%	3%	6%

categories using and receiving physical and sexual IPV in a current relationship. Among women, those who were masculine were most likely to use and receive physical and sexual IPV, those who were undifferentiated were second most likely to use and receive physical and sexual IPV, and those who were feminine were least likely use and receive physical IPV and second to least likely to use and receive sexual IPV. Meanwhile, the pattern for men was similar. Men who were masculine were most likely to be involved in an abusive relationship, followed by those who were undifferentiated, then androgynous, and, for both physical and sexual IPV unlike with women, feminine men least likely. That is to say, being masculine greatly increases the risk of IPV, and being feminine greatly reduces the risk. That undifferentiated men and women are second most likely suggests that what connects undifferentiated and masculine men and women – that they are the least feminine in the sample – may help explain why these respondents are most likely to be involved in abusive relationships. Conversely, those who are least likely to be currently experiencing IPV – those who are androgynous and particular those who are feminine – are bound by their similarity of being the most feminine in the sample. Thus, this may imply that it is not the presence of masculinity but, rather, the lack of femininity that is the key to understanding IPV perpetration. The implications of this important finding are discussed at the conclusion of this chapter.

Table 1.6 illustrates how many violent acts occur on average within the current abusive relationship of men and women identifying with the various BSRI categories. Among men in an abusive relationship, those who were undifferentiated used and received physical IPV most often and used and received sexual IPV second most often.

Table 1.6 Means of IPV Measures by Binary Gender and BSRI Categories

Among Respondents in an IPV Relationship

Sample	BSRI Category	Physical IPV Measure Mean (range: 1-44)		Sexual IPV Measure Mean (range: 1-22)	
		Use	Receipt	Use	Receipt
Men	Undifferentiated	4.86	8.12	6.70	4.15
	Masculine	3.56	6.10	4.95	2.55
	Feminine	2.70	3.38	6.80	3.25
	Androgynous	3.84	6.22	3.00	4.78
Women	Undifferentiated	5.33	4.83	1.82	2.78
	Masculine	5.79	4.40	1.95	3.11
	Feminine	3.12	5.31	3.00	3.64
	Androgynous	5.14	4.25	2.38	3.40

Those abusive men who were feminine were generally experiencing the fewest violent incidents, with the exception that, among abusive men, feminine men were perpetrating the most number of sexually violent acts in their relationships. Conversely, among abusive women, although those who were undifferentiated perpetrated and received the fewest acts of sexual violence, they perpetrated and received the second most number of physically violent acts. Further, out of the abusive women, while being feminine did indeed predict using the fewest acts of physical IPV, being feminine also predicted the greatest amount of physical IPV received and sexual IPV used and received. In other words, while the picture of who perpetrates abuse appears somewhat clear with regard to

Table 1.7 Correlation Matrix for Primary Study Variables ($N = 4,027$)

Variables	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	21	22	23	24	25	26		
* = $p < .05$.																											
1. Phys Use	.50*	.18*	.24*	.04*	-.06*	-.01	.03*	.01	-.07*	.11*	.08*	.10*	-.02	-.00	.07*	.10*	-.04*	-.07*	-.04*	-.00	.07*	.01	.01	.03	-.08*		
2. Phys Rec		.22*	.27*	.03	-.05*	-.02	.05*	-.01	-.07*	-.05*	.06*	.07*	-.02	-.05	.09*	.12*	-.01	-.06*	-.02	-.02	.00	.00	.01	.03*	-.03		
3. Sexual Use			.39*	.01	-.01	-.04*	.05*	-.03*	-.06*	-.07*	.03	.04*	-.03*	.02	.06*	.07*	.03	-.03*	.04*	.01	.01	.01	.02	.00	-.03		
4. Sexual Rec				.00	-.02	.00	.01	-.01	-.05*	-.00	.03*	.03	-.01	-.01	.09*	.09*	.00	-.05*	.00	.03*	.05*	-.00	.01	.02	-.08*		
5. Masculine					-.22*	-.36*	-.29*	.32*	-.27*	-.11*	.01	-.02	.06*	-.00	.07*	.10*	.03	.02	.08*	-.02	.02	-.02	-.02	.00	.00		
6. Feminine						-.35*	-.29*	-.31*	.32*	.14*	.01	.01	.01	.04	-.09*	-.08*	-.00	.07*	-.04*	-.04*	-.09*	-.02	.01	.01	.11*		
7. Androgynous							-.46*	.57*	.55*	.07*	-.03*	-.03*	.01	-.00	.01	-.04*	-.02	-.00	-.03	-.00	.05*	.02	-.02	.01	-.04*		
8. Undifferentiated								-.58*	-.61*	-.10*	.02	.04*	-.07*	-.03	.01	.03*	.00	-.07*	-.00	.06*	.01	.02	.02	-.02	-.05*		
9. Masculinity Scale								.48*	-.02	-.02	-.06*	.10*	.01	.04*	.04*	-.02	.07*	.06*	-.04*	.01	-.02	-.02	.01	.01	.01		
10. Femininity Scale									.23*	-.03	-.05*	.06*	.00	-.15*	-.11*	-.04*	.09*	-.03	-.08*	-.06*	-.03	.01	.02	.09*	.09*		
11. Female										.01	.05*	.04*	.01	-.22*	-.19*	-.10*	.06*	-.16*	-.03*	.04*	.01	-.01	.00	.00	-.01		
12. Risk											.52*	-.21*	-.02	-.08*	-.12*	.14*	.01	.07*	.05*	-.02	-.02	.01	.01	.01	-.01		
13. Length													-.32*	-.01	-.07*	-.12*	.30*	-.00	.08*	.08*	-.01	-.02	-.01	.00	-.02		
14. Relationship No.														.03	.06*	.10*	-.06*	.04*	.01	-.09*	-.04*	-.01	-.04*	.03	.10*		
15. Child Abuse															.05	.09*	.07*	.11*	.07*	.06*	-.01	.02	.06	-.02	-.05		
16. Violent Crime																.26*	-.06*	-.12*	.01	.03	.07*	.05*	-.00	.00	-.09*		
17. Non-Violent Crime																	-.09*	-.06*	-.01	-.01	-.03*	-.08	.01	.04*	.02		
18. Age																			.26*	.25*	.09*	-.04*	-.01	.05*	-.00		
19. Education																				.11*	-.08*	-.05*	-.01	.09*	-.03*		
20. Income																				.03	-.08*	-.01	-.00	-.02	.07*		
21. Latino																					N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A		
22. Black																						N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A		
23. Native																							N/A	N/A	N/A		
24. Asian																								N/A	N/A		
25. Mixed																									N/A		
26. White																									N/A		

the BSRI categories, the relationship of the BSRI to the amount of violence experienced with abusive relationships is more complex.

The correlation matrix is provided in Table 1.7. As expected, the BSRI's masculinity and femininity submeasures are negatively correlated ($r = -.22$). Unrelated to sexual IPV receipt and physical IPV use and receipt, the BSRI masculinity submeasure was only correlated with sexual IPV use ($r = -.03$), with less masculine respondents more likely to perpetrate sexual IPV. Conversely, the BSRI femininity submeasure was negatively correlated with the use and receipt of both physical and sexual IPV ($r = -.05$ to $-.07$), suggesting that less feminine respondents are slightly less likely to be involved in an abusive relationship. In this sample, more feminine respondents on the BSRI femininity submeasure were slightly younger and better educated, while more masculine respondents on the BSRI masculinity submeasure were also better educated and had higher incomes.

Women in this sample were more likely to use and less likely to receive physical IPV, and they were less likely to use sexual IPV. Binary gender was unrelated to the BSRI's masculinity submeasure, but it was correlated with the BSRI's femininity submeasure ($r = .23$), with women more likely than men to be feminine. Women in the sample were younger, slightly more educated, and drawing in less income than men.

As expected from the commonness of bidirectionality in nationally representative health studies, use and receipt of physical IPV are strongly correlated ($r = .50$), as are use and receipt of sexual IPV ($r = .39$). Experiencing child abuse was unrelated to either type of IPV, though histories of both non-violent and violent crime perpetration positively

correlates with both physical and sexual IPV, suggesting perhaps that a generally criminal personality might be more likely to perpetrate a relationship-based crime like IPV. Though age was significantly correlated only with physical IPV use ($r = -.04$), the use and receipt of both physical and sexual IPV were negatively correlated, if weakly, with education, hinting that IPV is slightly more prevalent in youth.

Other control variables related as expected for the most part. Older respondents were also more educated ($r = .26$) and drew a larger income ($r = .25$), and, similarly, those who were better educated had higher incomes ($r = .11$). Older respondents also had longer relationships ($r = .30$). Somewhat surprisingly, those with fewer previous relationships were currently involved in longer relationships ($r = -.32$), implying that the first relationships for adolescents can be quite serious.

7.4 Multinomial Logistic Regression Analyses

As previously mentioned, categorical IPV variables were constructed. For the physical IPV typology variable, not being currently involved in an IPV relationship is coded 1, being involved in a bidirectional physical IPV relationship is coded as 2, being the only partner to use physical IPV in the current relationship is coded 3, and being the only partner to receive physical IPV in this relationship is coded 4. An identical coding scheme was used to construct a sexual IPV typology variable. With categorical variables, multinomial logistic regression allows the effects of the BSRI to be shown within each type of IPV relationship. Those respondents coded as 1 for not being currently involved in an IPV relationship were the base category for analyses, so results are from models 2-

4, with all findings being in comparison to respondents not involved in an abusive relationship.

In total, eight multinomial logistic regression analyses were run, with four run for the physical IPV typology and four for the sexual IPV typology. Among the four models using the physical IPV typology as the dependent variable, two used the BSRI masculinity submeasure, femininity submeasure, and an interaction term as the main control variables, the first model run with all female respondents and the second model run with all male respondents. The third and fourth models with the physical IPV typology as the dependent variable used as the main control variables the other version of the BSRI, derived from Bem's median split method, that includes a binary masculine variable, a binary feminine variable, and a binary androgynous variable, with the binary undifferentiated variable excluded as the reference group; this arrangement of variables was utilized in the third model with all female respondents and the fourth model with all male respondents. All other control variables described in the research design section were run with all four models, including months at risk, relationship length, relationship number, experienced child abuse, committed a violent crime, committed a non-violent crime, age, education, personal income, Latino, Black, Native, Asian, and mixed race, with White excluded as the racial reference group and binary gender also excluded from analyses because separate models were run for men and women. The four models using the physical IPV typology as the dependent variable are identical to the other set of four models run with the exception being that the dependent variable was instead the sexual IPV typology.

Table 2.1 Summary of Multinomial Logistic Regressions

With BSRI Predicting Direction of Physical IPV

Predictor	Sample	Direction of Physical IPV (Dependent Variable)					
		Male-to-Female vs. None		Bidirectional vs. None		Female-to-Male vs. None	
		<i>RRR</i>	<i>SE</i>	<i>RRR</i>	<i>SE</i>	<i>RRR</i>	<i>SE</i>
Masculinity Submeasure	Men	1.03	.05	1.07	.04	.97	.04
	Women	.93	.06	1.08*	.04	1.05	.04
Femininity Submeasure	Men	1.00	.04	1.03	.05	.99	.04
	Women	.94	.04	.99	.03	1.00	.03
Interaction Term	Men	1.00	.00	1.00	.00	1.00	.00
	Women	1.00	.00	1.00	.00	1.00	.00
Masculine	Men	1.22	.72	1.69	.49	.97	.35
	Women	.29	.22	1.32	.36	.89	.28
Feminine	Men	.01***	.01	.34	.19	1.54	.72
	Women	.47	.28	.59*	.15	.74	.20
Androg.	Men	.48	.32	.95	.26	1.17	.40
	Women	.85	.36	.77	.17	.62*	.13

RRR = relative risk ratios. *SE* = standard error. * $p < .05$ ** $p < .01$ *** $p < .001$

Note: Months at risk, relationship length, relationship number, experienced child abuse, committed a violent crime, committed a non-violent crime, age, education, personal income, Latino, Black, Native, Asian, and mixed race were controlled for. Findings based on 5 imputed versions of the data.

Findings regarding relationships involving physical IPV are reported in Table 2.1. Taken collectively, these analyses reveal that among women, a one unit increase on the masculinity submeasure is associated with an 8% increased risk ($rrr = 1.08$) of being in a bidirectional physical IPV relationship, and, similarly, being categorized as feminine on the BSRI is associated with a 41% decreased risk ($rrr = .59$) of being in a bidirectional physical IPV relationship. Also, for women, being categorized as androgynous is associated with a 38% decreased risk ($rrr = .62$) of being the sole user of violence in a relationship. Likewise, for relationships involving sexual IPV (see Table 2.2), categorization as feminine for men is associated with an 89% decreased risk ($rrr = .11$) of being in a bidirectional sexual IPV relationship, and categorization as androgenous is associated with a decreased risk of male-to-female sexual IPV for both men ($rrr = .25$) and women ($rrr = .46$). For male-to-female IPV relationships, being masculine for men would seem the logical culprit for IPV perpetration. This was incorrect although close to what was found: not being feminine predicted perpetration by men in male-to-female IPV relationships. Hypotheses 2 and 3 predicted a relationship between being masculine and perpetration in all relationship types and a relationship between being masculine and victimization for women in male-to-female IPV relationships – both hypotheses were incorrect, with both sets of variables not being correlated. Hypothesis 4 was proven correct in that male victimization in female-to-male IPV was not correlated with the BSRI.

Despite a great number of the BSRI variables not being significant, three key patterns stood out. First, for women only, higher scores on the masculinity submeasure

Table 2.2 Summary of Multinomial Logistic Regressions

With BSRI Predicting Direction of Sexual IPV

Predictor	Sample	Direction of Sexual IPV (Dependent Variable)					
		Male-to-Female vs. None		Bidirectional vs. None		Female-to-Male vs. None	
		<i>RRR</i>	<i>SE</i>	<i>RRR</i>	<i>SE</i>	<i>RRR</i>	<i>SE</i>
Masculinity Submeasure	Men	.98	.09	1.07	.07	1.18	.11
	Women	1.14	.10	1.09	.10	1.05	.08
Femininity Submeasure	Men	1.08	.06	1.04	.06	1.19	.13
	Women	1.10	.08	1.04	.08	1.01	.07
Interaction Term	Men	1.00	.00	1.00	.00	1.00	.00
	Women	1.00	.00	1.00	.00	1.00	.07
Masculine	Men	.56	.37	.44	.26	2.53	1.36
	Women	.92	.38	1.66	1.03	.56	.36
Feminine	Men	.98	.60	.11*	.12	.59	.59
	Women	.81	.32	1.82	1.06	.74	.50
Androg.	Men	.25*	.17	.80	.38	1.22	.70
	Women	.46*	.17	1.48	.69	.35	.22

RRR = relative risk ratios. *SE* = standard error. * $p < .05$ ** $p < .01$ *** $p < .001$

Note: Months at risk, relationship length, relationship number, experienced child abuse, committed a violent crime, committed a non-violent crime, age, education, personal income, Latino, Black, Native, Asian, and mixed race were controlled for. Findings based on 5 imputed versions of the data.

increased the risk of being in a bidirectional IPV relationship. Second, being categorized as feminine on the BSRI appears to greatly decrease the risk of physical IPV, for women with regard to being in a bidirectional physical IPV relationship and for men being in a male-to-female physical IPV and bidirectional sexual IPV. Third, androgyny seems to also greatly decrease the risk of IPV, with female-to-male physical IPV for women and male-to-female sexual IPV for both men and women. That is to say, being feminine for men or androgynous for men and women seems to decrease the likelihood of being involved in an abusive relationship, while more masculine women are more likely to be in a bidirectional IPV relationship. Generally, the BSRI binary category variables correlated more often than the BSRI submeasures with the dependent variables.

7.5 Negative Binomial Regression Analyses

The main analysis is an attempt to determine if the BSRI, the main set of independent variables, helps predict the dependent variables of physical and sexual IPV use and receipt. Negative binomial regression was utilized because the IPV dependent variables are event counts for which, as established by the likelihood-ratio chi-square test of the over-dispersion alpha parameter, the event probability shifts over time during the course of a relationship. All told, 16 models were tested, 4 with the physical IPV used measure as the dependent variable, 4 with the physical IPV received measure as the dependent variable, 4 with the sexual IPV used measure as the dependent variable, and 4 with the sexual IPV received measure as the dependent variable. For each cluster of four models, two are run with only male respondents, and two are run with only female

respondents. Of the two regression models for men, the first has as the main independent variables the BSRI's masculinity submeasure, femininity submeasure, and their interaction term, and the second has as the key independent variables the BSRI's binary category variables of masculine, feminine, and androgynous, with undifferentiated as the reference group excluded from the regressions. The same two types of models are run for women as well. In all models, months at risk was included as an "exposure" variable to account for how many months the respondent's current relationship existed within the prior 12 month time frame that the IPV dependent variables refer to. Also, all models controlled for relationship length, relationship number, experienced child abuse, committed a violent crime, committed a non-violent crime, age, education, personal income, Latino, Black, Native, Asian, and mixed race. White was the racial reference group and therefore excluded from the models, and binary gender was also excluded because separate models were run for men and women.

Results from the eight analyses conducted with male respondents are summarized in Table 3.1. The picture for sexual IPV use and gender is somewhat mixed for men. Both the masculinity submeasure ($irr = 1.12$) and the femininity submeasure ($irr = 1.13$) predicted sexual IPV use for men. The interaction between the two submeasures also predicted sexual IPV use ($irr = 1.00$), suggesting that an increase in masculinity and a decrease in femininity may result in a 12% increased risk of using more sexual IPV, an increase in femininity and decrease in masculinity may result in a 13% increased risk of using more sexual IPV, and a simultaneous increase in masculinity and femininity may increase the risk of using more sexual IPV by 25%. To a certain degree these findings

Table 3.1 Summary of Negative Binomial Regressions
With BSRI Predicting IPV Among Male Respondents

Predictor	IPV Measure (Dependent Variable)							
	Physical IPV Use Measure		Physical IPV Receive Measure		Sexual IPV Use Measure		Sexual IPV Receive Measure	
	<i>IRR</i>	<i>SE</i>	<i>IRR</i>	<i>SE</i>	<i>IRR</i>	<i>SE</i>	<i>IRR</i>	<i>SE</i>
Masculinity Submeasure	1.00	.06	1.01	.04	1.12*	.06	1.00	.06
Femininity Submeasure	.94	.06	.96	.04	1.13*	.07	.96	.06
Interaction Term	1.00	.00	1.00	.00	1.00**	.00	1.00	.00
<i>n (df)</i>	1391 (25.7)		1390 (13.1)		1390 (5.3)		1391 (45.9)	
Masculine	.66	.22	.71	.20	.22*	.13	.61	.25
Feminine	.14***	.08	.27**	.11	.27	.19	.18*	.12
Androg.	.41**	.13	.73	.22	.11***	.05	1.11	.47
<i>n (df)</i>	1541 (19.0)		1540 (9.4)		1543 (4.9)		1544 (113.2)	

IRR = incidence-rate ratios. *SE* = standard error. *df* = minimum degrees of freedom
n = minimum observations **p* < .05 ***p* < .01 ****p* < .001

Note: Months at risk (exposure variable), relationship length, relationship number, experienced child abuse, committed a violent crime, committed a non-violent crime, age, education, personal income, Latino, Black, Native, Asian, and mixed race were controlled for. Findings based on 5 imputed versions of the data (chi-square tests are not provided in outputs because multiple imputation enables inferences on coefficients separately but not collectively).

seem to be at odds with the analyses including the BSRI binary category variables, where not only is being categorized as masculine as compared to undifferentiated (*irr* = .22) predictive of a 78% decreased risk in using more sexual IPV, but being androgynous as

compared to undifferentiated ($irr = .11$) decreases the risk of using more sexual IPV by 89%. At the same time, although the interaction term's coefficient appears to be implying that androgyny increases the risk of using sexual IPV, it is possible that increases in the masculinity and femininity submeasure scores do not always pass the median threshold necessary to be categorized as androgynous. As such, although these conflicting findings must give some pause, the BSRI's binary category variables appear to give the clearest message on sexual IPV use, finding that men who are masculine or androgynous are at a greatly reduced risk of perpetrating sexual IPV.

Other findings for men were less contradictory. Relative to undifferentiated respondents, being categorized as feminine decreased the risk for men of being a physical IPV perpetrator by 86% ($irr = .14$) and victim by 73% ($irr = .27$), potentially a result of the often bidirectional nature of IPV in this sample. Being categorized as feminine also decreased the risk of receiving sexual IPV by 82% ($irr = .18$). In general for men, it seems that, relative to undifferentiated respondents, being categorized as either feminine or androgynous greatly reduced the risk of being involved in an abusive relationship, both as a physical IPV perpetrator and a physical and sexual IPV victim. Though being masculine also greatly decreased the risk of IPV for men, it did so only with regard to sexual IPV use. Looking at these results from another angle, men who are undifferentiated appear to be at the greatest risk of being involved in abusive relationships.

Turning to Table 3.2, what becomes immediately clear is that the BSRI is not as predictive of IPV for women. A one unit increase on the BSRI masculinity submeasure

Table 3.2 Summary of Negative Binomial Regressions
With BSRI Predicting IPV Among Female Respondents

Predictor	IPV Measure (Dependent Variable)							
	Physical IPV Use Measure		Physical IPV Receive Measure		Sexual IPV Use Measure		Sexual IPV Receive Measure	
	<i>IRR</i>	<i>SE</i>	<i>IRR</i>	<i>SE</i>	<i>IRR</i>	<i>SE</i>	<i>IRR</i>	<i>SE</i>
Masculinity Submeasure	1.05	.05	1.04	.06	1.05	.09	1.13*	.07
Femininity Submeasure	.97	.04	1.02	.05	.97	.07	1.03	.05
Interaction Term	1.00	.00	1.00	.00	1.00	.00	1.00	.00
<i>n (df)</i>	2009 (13.4)		2015 (22.8)		2012 (0.6)		2015 (7.4)	
Masculine	1.17	.29	1.13	.36	2.17	1.10	1.54	.64
Feminine	.41**	.12	.79	.28	1.56	.74	1.00	.34
Androg.	.77	.18	.77	.19	1.97	1.03	1.00	.34
<i>n (df)</i>	2209 (22.3)		2218 (41.7)		2218 (6.1)		2221 (45)	

IRR = incidence-rate ratios. *SE* = standard error. *df* = minimum degrees of freedom
n = minimum observations **p* < .05 ***p* < .01 ****p* < .001

Note: Months at risk (exposure variable), relationship length, relationship number, experienced child abuse, committed a violent crime, committed a non-violent crime, age, education, personal income, Latino, Black, Native, Asian, and mixed race were controlled for. Findings based on 5 imputed versions of the data (chi-square tests are not provided in outputs because multiple imputation enables inferences on coefficients separately but not collectively).

(*irr* = 1.13) increases the risk of receiving more sexual IPV by 13%. Meanwhile, being categorized as feminine (*irr* = .41) decreases the risk of using more physical IPV by 59%.

It is interesting to note that the masculinity submeasure predicts relatively the same

amount of increased risk of sexual IPV use for men as it does sexual IPV receipt for women. Other than this, women and men who are categorized as feminine are similar in that they are at a decreased risk of using more physical IPV. However, being feminine does not have the same degree of protective quality for women as it does for men with regard to the range of IPV measures the binary feminine variable significantly predicts. Also unlike with men, being categorized as androgynous is not significantly related to IPV for women.

Hypotheses 5 and 6 were partially or not supported. Hypothesis 5 predicted that high masculinity, low femininity, and masculine categorization would correlate with IPV perpetration among men and women. While masculinity did predict sexual IPV use for men, femininity did as well. Unexpectedly, being feminine for women and men and androgynous for men decreased IPV use. Hypothesis 6 predicted that the BSRI variables would not be significantly correlated with IPV victimization, but this was also not the case, as being feminine predicted less of both physical and sexual IPV receipt for men.

Taken collectively, findings from the main analysis indicate that being androgynous for men and feminine for men and women generally decrease the risk of IPV, being feminine has a strong impact on IPV and on more types of IPV than being androgynous, masculinity projects a more mixed impact on IPV in predicting sexual IPV receipt for women and both more and less sexual IPV use for men, and gender as measured by the BSRI is more closely related to IPV for men than women.

7.6 Summary

Contrary to expectations derived from the literature that hegemonic masculinity would be the key BSRI predictor of IPV, instead, a lack of femininity seems to be the key. Analyses tended to link undifferentiated with masculine – the two BSRI categories with the lowest femininity submeasure scores – and androgynous with feminine – the two gender categories with the highest femininity submeasure scores. Specifically, femininity seems to act as a protective factor against IPV, whereas lack of femininity may enable people to be less interpersonally sensitive and thus more callous and abusive. Lack of femininity appears to have slightly different effects depending on the type of IPV and the direction of abuse. For instance, feminine or androgynous men and women are less likely to be involved in male-to-female and bidirectional IPV relationships, but the effect with regard to female-to-male IPV involvement is more mixed, particularly for men. In general, this finding may be reflecting the particular version of feminine personality traits described by the BSRI, emphasized femininity (Connell 1987). The absence of interpersonal sensitivity is a prerequisite for antisocial personality disorder, often the beginnings of callousness, violence, and a criminal mind.

As approximately 56% of men and 53% of women are either masculine or undifferentiated, there is ample potential for violence emerging from a lack of femininity. Indeed, IPV is quite common, with 27% of respondents currently in a relationship involving physical IPV and 9% involving sexual IPV. At the same time, although an R^2 statistic is not available with analyses using multiple imputation, in the correlation matrix the strength of significant BSRI effects on the IPV variables ranged only from -.07 to .05.

This indicates that, like with most variables in the correlation matrix, gender as measured by the BSRI is only one piece to the puzzle of IPV.

Chapter Eight: Gendered Underreporting in AddHealth

An IPV measurement issue of concern is whether prevalence is accurately reported in surveys like AddHealth by men, women, perpetrators, and victims. This chapter explores the literatures on (1) IPV underreporting prevalence, (2) underreporting solutions, and (3) underreporting causes. Additionally discussed is the (4) research design of original analyses using AddHealth which entail (5) average male and female IPV prevalence mean comparisons as well as (6) average IPV prevalence mean comparisons for men and women categorized on the BSRI as masculine, feminine, androgynous, and undifferentiated. Finally, (7) the results are briefly summarized prior to a more in-depth discussion in Chapter 9.

8.1 Underreporting Prevalence

The easiest way to test accuracy is to ask known criminals and crime victims whether they have been involved in crime. Such studies of known crime victims have shown a great deal of underreporting (Hamby 2005). For example, in one study, only 29% of assaults (not necessarily IPV) previously reported to police were reported to the interviewers (Czaja, Blair, Bickart, and Eastman 1994). Similar disclosure rates were found in studies of known child sexual abuse victims (Widom and Morris 1997; Williams 1994). With regard to IPV, one study found 57% of males arrested for IPV perpetration failed to report this to interviewers (Babinski, Hartsough, and Lambert 2001). All of this is to suggest that underreporting is a major concern with any crime study. At the same

time, IPV studies often use anonymous sampling, and many respondents have never been arrested for abuse. Considering that verification with official records is therefore typically not an option, one prominent method used to test the validity of IPV measures is inter-partner agreement. That is, when studies recruit both partners within relationships and ask both partners to report perpetration and victimization, it is possible to determine if men agree they perpetrate as much IPV as their female partners report being victimized, and it similarly is possible to find out if women agree they perpetrate as much IPV as their male partners are victimized.

When compared to what their partners report about them, both men and women underreport perpetration (Archer 1999; O’Leary and Williams 2006; Simpson and Christensen 2005). The correlation coefficient between partners’ reports of IPV tends to be statistically significant but small in magnitude (Archer 1999; Arias and Beach 1987; Armstrong, Wernke, Medina, and Schafer 2002; Bohannon, Dosser, and Lindley 1995; Browning and Dutton 1986; Edelson and Brygger 1986; Heyman and Schlee 1997; Jouriles and O’Leary 1985; Moffitt et al. 1997; O’Leary and Arias 1988; Schafer, Caetanon, and Clark 2002; Szinovacz 1983; Szinovacz and Egley 1995). While most studies on this topic employ nonprobability sampling with a small sampling frame, one study using multistage probability sampling and interviews with both partners of 1,635 couples in the 48 states of the continental U.S also found mixed agreement on violence between partners (Schafer, Caetano, and Clark 2002). Based on this information, it would appear that men and women underreport at only marginally different rates

However, these correlations analyze agreement on all types of incidents, including both the occurrence of violence and the nonoccurrence of violence. As most relationships are nonviolent, agreement on nonviolence by male and female partners has the potential to mask high disagreement on violence within these overall agreement correlations. This is exactly what has been found according to a review of fifteen agreement studies (Armstrong, Wernke, Medina, and Schafer 2002). Again, while most studies do not use nationally representative probability samples, Szinovacz and Egley (1995) analyzed 4,088 married couples from the first wave of the National Survey of Families and Households (Sweet, Bumpass, and Call 1988) and indeed found high agreement on nonviolence and low agreement on violence. In a study of 453 heterosexual married or cohabitating couples with children living in Suffolk County, New York, O’Leary and Williams (2006) found that disagreement was not high on the occurrence of necessarily all types of IPV. As expected, for sexual IPV, physical IPV, and especially injury, agreement is higher for nonoccurrence and lower for occurrence. Conversely, though, for negotiation (non-abusive verbal conflict resolution) and psychological IPV (verbal abuse and/or controlling behaviors), agreement was very high on occurrence and low on nonoccurrence (O’Leary and Williams 2006). So, at least for sexual IPV, physical IPV, and injury, it is clear that men and women underreport at vastly different rates.

With one exception that focused on blue collar workers in northern California (Cunradi, Bersamin, and Ames 2009), most studies find that women report more perpetration and victimization than men (Armstrong, Wernke, Medina, and Schafer 2002;

Simpson and Christensen 2005). For example, in their nationally representative study of 1,635 couples, looking at male-to-female physical IPV, Schafer, Caetano, and Clark (2002) found in 5.42% of relationships there was agreement that the man used physical IPV, in 4.40% of relationships only women said men used physical IPV while the men denied it, and in 3.79% of relationships only men said they, the men, used physical IPV while women did not. That is to say, when there was disagreement about whether male-to-female physical IPV occurred at all, women were more likely than men to say it happened. Similarly, women also were more likely to report female-to-male physical IPV, with 6.99% of relationships having partners agreeing that the women perpetrated physical IPV against the man, in 7.64% of relationships only women said they, the women, used physical IPV while men did not, and in 3.59% of relationships only men said women used physical IPV while women denied it (Schafer, Caetano, and Clark 2002). Thus, women were more likely than men to report physical IPV occurred at all in a relationship, whether that meant admitting they were the users or receivers of violence. Just as they found agreement level differences for the various forms of IPV, O'Leary and Williams (2006) also found in their study of 453 married or cohabitating couples with children that there were gender differences in who underreported each IPV type more. Specifically, in line with the rest of the empirical literature, they found women more likely than men to report victimization and perpetration of psychological IPV and physical IPV. Somewhat unexpectedly, though, as compared to men, women were slightly less likely to report male perpetration and far less (roughly 10% less) likely to report female perpetration of sexual IPV (O'Leary and Williams 2006).

8.2 Underreporting Solutions

As underreporting is a considerable issue for IPV scholars, methodological and statistical corrective solutions are important to develop. These solutions will vary depending on whether a study has one or both partners for each relationship. If both partners are present in a sample, some believe the higher report of violence should be used (Straus, Hamby, Honey-McCoy, and Sugarman 1996). For example, O’Leary and Williams (2006) find 10 to 20% more perpetrators and victims of IPV if one were to add together IPV incidents mutually agreed upon with incidents only one partner reported. As the authors put it, though there are many motivations to underreport, many feel that “outside of legal proceedings (e.g., child custody cases, divorce, and orders of protection), there is little incentive for partners to report aggression when it does not exist (O’Leary and Williams 2006, 657).” While overestimation is possible, logic would suggest the highest rates of IPV reported by a partner in a given relationship are the most accurate, with social desirability bias more likely to deter admitting to the presence rather than absence of IPV in a relationship. If the higher IPV rates reported within a dyad are taken as more accurate, then we are led back to the point that men and women are equally likely to perpetrate physical IPV.

Schafer, Caetano, and Clark (2002) warn against using the “proxy method” – relying on one half of a relationship to accurately report on the other half’s IPV – yet for most studies it is not financially and logistically possible to recruit both partners. When only one partner from each relationship is available, some suggest what have been called “correction factors” (O’Leary and Williams 2006). This requires first conducting a study

with both partners present to establish the maximum dyadic rate, the number of perpetrators and victims in a sample based on combining agreed upon perpetrators or victims with perpetrators or victims only reported by one partner; one maximum dyadic rate is for male-to-female IPV, and the other is for female-to-male IPV. Then the female rate is established by determining the number of perpetrators and victims as reported by just females; one female rate is again for male-to-female IPV, and another is for female-to-male IPV. The same is then done to find the male rate. A male-to-female correction factor for female respondents is found by dividing the maximum dyadic male-to-female rate by the female's male-to-female rate; the same can then be done to find a male-to-female correction factor for male respondents, and, eventually one could replicate the process to determine a female-to-male correction factor for female respondents and another for male respondents. Generally these correction factors are above one and below two. Once such correction factors have been established in prior studies with both partners present, these correction factors can then be applied to prevalence rates in future studies with only one partner per relationship present. Specifically, multiplying the victim or abuser prevalence rates for an all-male or all-female sample by a correction factor could account for underreporting and reveal a slightly higher "real" prevalence rate.

8.3 Underreporting Causes

Explanations tend to address underreporting in general rather than why men underreport more than women. For example, aggression is socially undesirable (Hamby

2005; O’Leary and Williams 2006; Szinovacz and Egley 1995), staying in an abusive relationship often results in cognitive dissonance that can be dampened by underreporting (Armstrong, Wernke, Medina, and Schafer 2002; Szinovacz and Egley 1995), and cultural legitimizing of IPV may lead partners to not report IPV if they self-label the violence as not criminal and therefore of little interest to the researchers (Campbell 2000; Hamby 2005). Some suggest that partners happy in their relationships have much to lose, and so they may either subconsciously shoulder more of the blame for IPV or consciously paint their abuser in a kinder light so as to avoid legal repercussions (Fincham, Bradbury, Arias, Byrne, and Karney 1997; Simpson and Christensen 2005). Some respondents may remain mute on IPV out of fear of reprisal by their partner in the form of IPV (Schafer, Caetano, and Clark 2002) or use of a power differential like control of financial resources (O’Leary, Vivian, and Malone 1992). Although this is perhaps more of a concern with in-person interviewing, anonymous random digit dialing can also inspire fear of reprisal if the abuser is in the home at the time of the interview.

Researchers suggest methodological issues may also lead to underreporting for both men and women. For instance, memory bias can occur either because old events fade in memory or because of telescoping, where the date of events are misremembered. Forward telescoping is when events occurring before the time frame asked about are remembered to have occurred during the study’s time frame and so are incorrectly included in the data; backward telescoping is when events occurring during the study’s time frame are remembered to occur outside the time frame and so are incorrectly excluded from the data (Hamby 2005).

With regard to memory bias, most IPV studies require respondents to remember approximately how often certain types of events occurred within a specific time span. This is a difficult feat for anyone regardless of whether the topic for recall is IPV or how often one ate a hamburger in the past month let alone in the past year, the duration of your most recent relationship, or your entire lifetime. In one study of the National Crime Survey, which would later become the National Crime Victimization Survey, Turner (1972) asked respondents about crimes already known to him based on police records; it was found that 69% of incidents from the previous 90 days were reported as compared to 30% of incidents from the previous 10-12 months (Turner 1972). Recall thus seems stronger if the time span asked about is shorter (Hamby 2005). It is likely far harder to recall IPV frequency if the respondent experienced these events multiple times rather than a handful of times or not at all (Armstrong, Wernke, Medina, and Schafer 2002). A related issue is whether respondents are asked to recall if a type of IPV occurred at all or the frequency with which it occurred. In one study by Hamby, Sugarman, and Boney-McCoy (2006), using binary questions versus frequency questions did not impact findings for men or women on psychological or physical IPV, but they found a big gender difference in the percentage of respondents admitting to sexual violence if the questions were binary (47% male and 3% female) as compared to the traditional CTS2 (Revised Conflict Tactics Scale) frequency questions (26% male and 22% female).

In addition to memory bias, another set of methodological issues which may result in underreporting are survey length and question wording. Sometimes respondents experience fatigue from lengthy surveys and attempt to shorten their time in the study by

purposely not reporting certain incidents (Czaja, Blair, Bickart, and Eastman 1994). A large number of questions on a measure can have a similar effect, as can having too few items (Hamby 2005). It is possible that inter-partner agreement is higher if there are fewer measure items (Johnson and O’Leary 1996). Word choice is also important. Behavioral wording tends to result in higher report rates than criminal labels like “rape” or “violence” as not all respondents are prepared to identify their experiences as criminal (Hamby 2005; Hamby and Koss 2003). Related to this, Simpson and Christensen (2005) found greater agreement on items rated as more objective and specific. Sometimes word choice can be problematic if closed-ended IPV checklists fail to include all possible forms of IPV, thereby likely overlooking certain respondents (Hamby, Poindexter, and Gray-Little 1996). Despite having more items, the CTS2 is not inherently better than the original CTS at discouraging underreporting or inaccurate reporting, pointing to the inherent limitation of any IPV measure (Simpson and Christensen 2005).

Researchers have also found that underreporting is associated with certain respondent characteristics. For instance, Caetano, Schafer, Field, and Nelson (2002) found in their nationally representative analysis of 1,635 couples that agreement is low independent of race and ethnicity, but it seems to be lower in particular for Hispanics. Anderson (1997) found evidence of disagreement being associated with ethnicity, marital status, education, and income. Mental abilities associated with substance use are also associated with IPV reporting disagreement (Medina, Schafer, Shear, and Armstrong 2004). One study of male batterers in a treatment program and their female partners attempted to compare a wide variety of causal explanations for underreporting. In it,

Heckert and Gondolf (2000) posited personality traits and social desirability to be less related to underreporting than rational, situational factors like fear of ruining their relationship, economic dependency, and not currently feeling their safety threatened.

Although it is clear from this literature that both men and women underreport relative to their partner's claims, it is also quite clear that men underreport to a greater degree. It is surprising that scholars have focused on explaining the former point and yet largely left the latter point unexplored. Without empirical studies on this question, only speculation is possible. Two explanations of greater male underreporting seem feasible: the nature of violence used by men and women could be different, and suspected causes of underreporting may impact men and women differently.

First, it may be that the nature of violence is different for men and women. As mentioned in Chapter Two, women may be more often than men motivated to use violence in self-defense (Barnett, Lee, and Thelen 1997; DeKeseredy et al. 1997; Melton and Belknap 2003). If these findings are indeed accurate, it implies that male users of violence are more often the "abusers," and female users of violence are more likely to be "victims" fighting off their male abusers. In this case, causes of underreporting may differentially impact abusers and victims, which would explain gender differences. For example, among violence users, if males are more likely to be abusers, it is conceivable that they view their violence motivated by aggression as less socially desirable than female violence used in self-defense. Further, criminals are more likely to fear legal repercussions, which would predict greater underreporting for men if indeed their

violence is more criminally motivated. It may also be that male abusers are more likely to legitimize IPV and therefore not label their violence as abusive.

Second, it is also possible that male underreporting is explained by gender differences rather than abuser-victim differences. It may be, for instance, that the cultural stigma of a man slapping a woman is greater than for a woman slapping a man, so social desirability effects could lead more men to underreport their violence perpetration than women. Similarly, based on toughness norms of hegemonic masculinity and greater underreporting of rape by male victims than female victims, male victimization may be more strongly stigmatized than female victimization (Allen-Collinson 2009; White 2009). However, Kimmel (2002) posits men actually would be more likely to report their own victimization than women. Because of cultural expectations that male IPV is justified in certain situations and because of femininity norms of passivity and non-violence, female violence perpetration may be more salient to the couple than male violence perpetration. In fact, Kimmel goes on to point out, men are more likely than women to respond to receiving violence by calling the police, pressing charges, and not dropping the charges (Ferrante, Morgan, Indermaur, and Harding 1996; Rouse, Breen, and Howell 1988; Schwartz 1987). Implicit in Kimmel's discussion is that femininity norms have a more powerful sway over women while masculinity norms have a greater impact on men. As a result, if perhaps both partners underreport female victimization and male perpetration, women may be even more likely to underreport female victimization and men more likely to underreport male perpetration.

Rather than either-or, of course, both abuser-victim and gender dynamics theories may both be important in explaining differences in male and female underreporting. Regardless of the reason, the underreporting literature seems clear on who is most likely to underreport IPV. Specifically, this literature supports the hypothesis that (Hypothesis 7) *women are more likely than men to report physical and sexual IPV perpetration and victimization*. It is largely untested and thus unclear, though, as to whether masculinity and femininity interact with binary gender to impact underreporting.

8.4 Research Design

As is made clear by the underreporting literature, it is not preferable to only sample one person per relationship. The “proxy method” of relying on one half of a relationship to accurately report what the other half of the relationship would have said about IPV is problematic, considering that studies including both partners in a relationship frequently show disagreement on IPV prevalence (Schafer, Caetano, and Clark 2002). At the same time, recruiting both partners in a relationship is not always possible. While Wave III of Add Health actually does have a subset of data with partner dyads, this data is not always made available for analysis out of concern that such information in the hands of too many researchers may potentially result in the confidentiality of respondent identities being compromised. For the present analysis, only one person per relationship is provided in the sample. This means that a perfect test of partner dyadic agreement is not possible with the available data. However, it stands to reason that, with such a large and representative sample, the average IPV prevalence

reported by female respondents would mirror IPV prevalence that male respondents' female partners would have reported had they been included in the study. Similarly, the average IPV prevalence reported by male respondents should mirror the IPV prevalence that female respondents' male partners would have reported had they also been included in this study. Thus, partner agreement and, indirectly, underreporting can be assessed by comparing the average prevalence of IPV perpetration by female respondents with the average IPV victimization for male respondents and, similarly, by comparing the average prevalence of IPV victimization of female respondents with the average IPV perpetration by male respondents. These comparisons with Wave III of Add Health utilize the operationalizations of physical and sexual IPV use and receipt described in Chapter Seven. Comparisons are made via mean scores on the IPV measures and through t-Tests to test the statistical significance of these male-female mean differences. Although a potentially unfounded assumption is required that masculine, feminine, androgynous, and undifferentiated genders are randomly distributed throughout male-female partner dyads, exploratory analyses comparing mean scores on IPV measures were also conducted to see if, on average, men and women who are more feminine or masculine are more likely to agree on IPV prevalence. For this final analysis, a bipolar measure of the BSRI was constructed by subtracting the femininity submeasure from the masculinity submeasure. Scores on the bipolar measure above zero, being more masculine than feminine, were coded into a new BSRI variable as one, and scores below zero on the bipolar measure, being more feminine than masculine, were coded as zero. This binary bipolar BSRI

variable was used along with a binary male-female gender variable to compare mean IPV measure scores.

8.5 Mean Comparisons of Average IPV Prevalence for Men and Women

Table 4.1 compares physical and sexual IPV use and receipt measure means for men and women in the full sample (including those reporting no IPV), and the table also displays the significance of male and female IPV prevalence means via two-tailed t-Tests. Findings suggest that, in the average relationship, the amount of male-perpetrated physical IPV is significantly reported to be greater by female respondents than male respondents. Additionally, in the average relationship, the amount of female-perpetrated

Table 4.1 IPV Prevalence Agreement Based on Average Male and Female Responses

IPV Type and Direction	Subsample	Mean IPV Measure Scores
Male-perpetrated Physical IPV	Male respondents	.57**
	Female respondents	.86**
Female-perpetrated Physical IPV	Male respondents	1.25
	Female respondents	1.39
Male-perpetrated Sexual IPV	Male respondents	.29
	Female respondents	.25
Female-perpetrated Sexual IPV	Male respondents	.27***
	Female respondents	.10***
Significantly different means on a two-tailed t-Test: * $p < .05$ ** $p < .01$ *** $p < .001$		

sexual IPV is significantly reported to be greater by male respondents than female respondents. This trend extends to non-significantly different means for other combinations of IPV type and binary gender of the perpetrator. In particular, for physical IPV, women report more violent acts to occur in the average relationship than men report, regardless of whether male or female perpetration is the issue. Conversely, for sexual IPV, women report fewer violent acts to occur in the average relationship than men report, regardless of whether male or female perpetration is the issue.

As it is possible that merging respondents not reporting abuse with those who did may blur agreement data (Armstrong, Wernke, Medina, and Schafer 2002), an additional analysis was conducted comparing the percentage of men and women to agree on the occurrence (any vs. none) of male-perpetrated and female-perpetrated physical and

Table 4.2 IPV Occurrence Agreement Based on Average Male and Female Responses

IPV Type and Direction	Subsample	Percent Scoring Over Zero on IPV Measure
Male-perpetrated Physical IPV	Male respondents	14%
	Female respondents	19%
Female-perpetrated Physical IPV	Male respondents	19%
	Female respondents	28%
Male-perpetrated Sexual IPV	Male respondents	5%
	Female respondents	8%
Female-perpetrated Sexual IPV	Male respondents	7%
	Female respondents	4%

sexual IPV (see Table 4.2). The pattern in the previous table regarding physical IPV holds for occurrence agreement in that women were more likely than men to report that IPV occurs in the average relationship. For sexual IPV, however, the previous table analyzing mean IPV measure scores found, as compared to female respondents, men reported more sexually violent acts to occur in the average relationship regardless of whether it was male-perpetrated or female-perpetrated. While the findings in the two tables are similar for female-perpetrated sexual IPV, this was not the case with male-perpetrated sexual IPV, for which women were much more likely than men to report that sexual IPV occurred at all in the average relationship.

8.5 Mean Comparisons of Average IPV Prevalence for Men and Women by BSRI Gender

Table 4.3 details differences in the average IPV measure scores for men and women who are “more masculine” – more masculine than feminine – or “more feminine” – more feminine than masculine – on a binary, bipolar BSRI variable. The amount of physical and sexual IPV used and received in the average relationship was highest for both men and women who were more masculine. Masculine women report more use and receipt of both types of IPV in the average relationship than men with the exception of female-perpetrated sexual IPV where masculine men report more than women. Interestingly, feminine women reported more physical IPV occurring in the average relationship than men, but feminine women also reported less sexual IPV occurring in the average relationship than men.

Table 4.3 IPV Prevalence Agreement Based on Average Male
and Female Responses by BSRI Categorization

IPV Type and Direction	Subsample	Mean IPV Measure Scores
Male-perpetrated Physical IPV	Male – masculine	.86
	Male – feminine	.47
	Female – masculine	1.40
	Female – feminine	.78
Female-perpetrated Physical IPV	Male – masculine	1.69
	Male – feminine	1.16
	Female – masculine	2.43
	Female – feminine	1.22
Male-perpetrated Sexual IPV	Male – masculine	.39
	Male – feminine	.30
	Female – masculine	.42
	Female – feminine	.22
Female-perpetrated Sexual IPV	Male – masculine	.28
	Male – feminine	.24
	Female – masculine	.14
	Female – feminine	.09

8.6 Summary

It was hypothesized that women are more likely than men to report IPV incidents irrespective of whether it is physical or sexual IPV and whether it is male or female perpetrated. Results confirmed that men appeared to underreport physical IPV, but the hypothesis was incorrect regarding sexual IPV, where it seems to be women who are more often underreporting. Sexual IPV reporting is more complex when it comes to admitting any violence occurred. Women are more likely than men to report any sexual IPV in a relationship if it is male-perpetrated, and men are more likely than women to report any sexual IPV in a relationship if it is female-perpetrated. As might be expected, both men and women who were more masculine than feminine reported the greatest number of IPV incidents in the average relationship of the sample, both for physical and sexual IPV use and receipt. Being more feminine than masculine, interestingly, had different impacts on physical and sexual IPV. As compared to feminine men, feminine women reported more physical IPV use and receipt but also less sexual IPV use and receipt. This reflects binary gender findings. It is possible that this difference between physical and sexual IPV underreporting in part reflects that physical IPV is far more likely than sexual IPV in this sample to be bidirectional. Masculine women generally reported both more physical and sexual IPV than masculine men, so, at least with regard to masculinity, it appears that gender personality traits may override binary gender with regard to underreporting. This analysis would imply that interpretation of past and future IPV data should be wary of underreporting being affected by gender personality traits,

but, at the same time, additional research is needed that includes BSRI results for partner dyads.

Chapter 9: Conclusions

Intimate partner violence (IPV) – sexual violence, physical violence, verbal abuse, or controlling behaviors perpetrated against a current or former romantic or sexual partner – is a painful crime that is most prevalent among adolescents (Rennison 2001; Morse 1995; O’Leary 1999; Rennison and Welchans 2000; Sorenson, Upchurch, and Shen 1996; Wolfe et al. 2003), with 10 to 25% of high school students alone experiencing physical IPV (Centers for Disease Control and Prevention 2008; Foshee 1996; O’Keefe 1997). Every possible explanation of IPV perpetration must be explored to help better tailor policy interventions, and gender has often been theorized to be one of the many contributing factors. This dissertation both reviews and expands upon the literature’s efforts to detail the relations between gender and IPV. In this final chapter, conclusions are drawn from the dissertation regarding (1) the current state of the literature on gender and IPV, (2) how the present analyses have helped moved this literature forward, and (3) recommendations for future research.

9.1 Current State of the Literature

Over the past three decades, a directionality debate has formed in the IPV literature over the direction of abuse, whether it is largely male-to-female or bidirectional “mutual battering” (Kimmel 2002). On one side is what has been labeled the “Feminist Perspective” which views IPV as largely perpetrated by men against women, a result of gender socialization and patriarchal privileges that lead some men to feel they deserve

power in relationships and life in general. On the other side of the debate is what has been termed the “Family Violence Perspective” which contends IPV is typically bidirectional, resulting from stress being often vented by men and women against family members including partners and children (for reviews of the directionality debate, see Anderson 2005; DeKeseredy 2006; Dutton and Nicholls 2005; Kimmel 2002; Saunders 2002; Straus 1999, 2006, 2008).

To say that researchers are invested in the outcome of this debate is to put it mildly. Accusations of one’s opponents being ideologically blinded to the data have been thrown by both Feminist IPV researchers (i.e. Dasgupta 2002; DeKeseredy 2006; Dobash, Dobash, Wilson, and Daly 1992; Saunders 2002) and Family Violence researchers (i.e. Dutton 2006; Dutton and Nicholls 2005; Hamel 2007; Straus 2006). Similarly, both Feminist IPV researchers (i.e. Anderson 2005; Dasgupta 2001; DeKeseredy and Schwartz 2003; Girard 2009; Saunders 2002) and Family Violence researchers (i.e. Holtzworth-Munroe 2005; Lupri 2004; McNeely, Cook, and Torres 2001; Straus 2006) have accused their opponents of, either directly or indirectly through advocacy groups, shifting government policies and funding away from the form of IPV (male-to-female or bidirectional IPV) they believe to be most prevalent.

Based on this paper’s thorough review of the gender and IPV literature, what can be taken away with regard to the directionality debate? Generally, it would appear that (A) the feminist perspective is correct insofar as IPV is more often perpetrated by men against women, (B) women’s IPV may represent a large minority of cases although it has

different connotations and consequences than male-perpetrated IPV, and (C) gender plays a much more complex role when it is not measured as a binary variable.

9.1A Current State of the Literature – Male-Perpetrated IPV is Most Prevalent

Firstly, the Feminist perspective does appear to be accurate in contending that IPV is more often perpetrated by men against women. One of the more clear signs of “gender symmetry” that favors the Family Violence perspective seems to be with psychological IPV. However, with some studies finding that over 95% of adolescents utilize psychological IPV in relationships (i.e. Jezl, Molitor, and Wright 1996), this may be less of a sign of gender symmetrical abuse and more an indication of mainstream relationship behavior. The most contentious point in the directionality debate revolves around physical IPV, with nationally representative studies finding physical IPV to be just as often perpetrated by men and women (for a review of many of these studies, see Straus 1999). However, not only do men initiate violent conflicts more often within a given relationship (for a review, see Hamberger 2005), but women are more likely to be motivated to use violence in self-defense (Barnett, Lee, and Thelen 1997; Cascardi and Vivian 1995; Hamberger, Lohr, and Bonge 1994; Makepeace 1986). Retaliation is also among the more popular violence motivations for women (Carrado, George, Loxam, Jones, and Templar 1996; Follingstad, Wright, Lloyd, and Sebastian 1991; Hamberger 1997; Hamberger, Lohr, and Bonge 1994; Makepeace 1986; Saunders 1986), and it is conceivable that, given both the options of self-defense and retaliation on a closed-ended questionnaire, respondents may perceive “self-defense” to only include blocking attacks

and retaliation to include striking back in self-defense. Regardless, if physical IPV rates are nearly identical for men and women, motivations and initiation research suggests that men are at least slightly more likely than women to be “abusers,” and women are more likely to be “victims.”

The picture becomes even clearer, however, when other forms of IPV are taken into account. Men perpetrate the vast majority of sexual IPV (see Saunders 2002), partner homicide (see Saunders 2002), and stalking (Tjaden and Thoennes 2000), and women in abusive relationships are far more likely to experience fear (Dasgupta 2002; Jacobsen et al. 1994; Langhinrichesen-Rohling, Neidig, and Thorn 1995; Saunders 2002), psychological trauma (Anderson 2002; Próspero 2009; Williams and Frieze 2005), and physical injury (Anderson 2005; Archer 2000; Arias and Johnson 1989; Brush 1993; Browne 1987; Foshee 1996; Shorey, Cornelius, and Bell 2008; Stets and Straus 1990).

9.1B Current State of the Literature – Women’s IPV is Still a Problem

Second, while female-perpetrated IPV may be less prevalent than male-perpetrated IPV, there are reasons to suspect that this represents a large minority of IPV cases, though female-perpetrated IPV would seem to play by a unique set of rules. While men seem to be more often the “abusers” in relationships, female-perpetrated abuse is still quite common. Considering the nationally representative studies showing that women perpetrate physical IPV just as often as men (Straus 1999), women’s violence must be assumed to be abusive in nature if their self-reported motivations are not self-defense and, if one considers it an extension of self-defense, not retaliation. Indeed, these

motives only explain a fraction of the physical violence perpetrated by women in relationships (Babcock, Millard, and Siard 2003; Barnett, Lee, and Thelen 1997; Cascardi and Vivian 1995; Follingstad, Wright, Lloyd, and Sebastian 1991; Hamberger 1997; Hamberger, Lohr, and Bonge 1994; Saunders 1986; Stuart et al. 2006; Swan and Snow 2003). Adolescent girls are also just as likely if not more likely than boys to use verbally abusive or controlling tactics (Halpern, Oslak, Young, Martin, and Kupper 2001; Jezl, Molitor, and Wright 1996; Sears, Byers, and Price 2007). This is to say that women may be less likely to be abusive, but female-perpetrated IPV is present enough – at least with regard to verbal and non-self-defensive physical IPV – that research and policy should not ignore female perpetrators and male victims.

At the same time, female-perpetrated IPV appears to have different consequences than male-perpetrated IPV. As mentioned above, women are far more likely to experience negative outcomes from IPV, including fear, psychological trauma, and physical injury (with some exceptions of course – for example, see Migliaccio 2002). Qualitative studies have similarly found that women's IPV has less of an impact than men's IPV. Female-perpetrated verbal abuse, controlling behaviors, and physical IPV are often ignored by male partners, and so women's goals behind using IPV – i.e. desiring more sexual faithfulness or a deeper emotional connection – can be easily ignored by the men. Meanwhile, when men employ IPV, they tend to “win” conflicts and get their way (i.e. Anderson and Umberson 2001; Miller and White 2003; Sears, Byers, Whelan, and Saint-Pierre 2006). Perhaps most importantly, qualitative studies reveal that women's violence is perceived differently in relationships than men's violence. Specifically,

women's violence tends to be viewed by both partners as not intimidating, without potential for serious damage, and, ultimately, not violence. Conversely, the mere potential for men's violence is generally viewed by both partners as very intimidating, having immense potential for physical damage, and, in turn, "real" violence that must only be used when absolutely necessary, often deemed to be the case when women disrespect their partners or challenge their authority (Anderson and Umberson 2001; Boonzaier 2008; Johnson et al. 2005; Miller and White 2003; Mullaney 2007; Sears, Byers, Whelan, and Saint-Pierre 2006; Totten 2003; Wood 2004). Although it is possible that men downplay the seriousness of women's violence in an attempt to perform hegemonic masculinity, the similarity of women's and men's reports and the consistency across studies does suggest that gender norms lead women's violence to seem inferior to men's violence by both male and female partners. On the one hand, a disturbing implication of this is that gender norms may have normalized female-perpetrated IPV to the point that such behaviors often do not appear abusive to men and women. On the other hand, however, if female-perpetrated IPV is not perceived to hurt or be abusive, it likely will induce less fear and negative consequences than male-perpetrated IPV. Thus, female-perpetrated IPV is quite common – if less common than male-perpetrated IPV – but it has less of an impact than male-perpetrated IPV with regard to "winning" conflicts, fear, psychological trauma, and physical injury.

Overall, the gender and IPV literature suggests that men are more often than women the "abusers" in relationships, that women do perpetrate IPV quite often, and that the consequences of IPV tend to be worst for women even when they employ IPV. Whether

this implies that the Feminist IPV perspective is entirely correct depends on how the Feminist perspective is defined. If this perspective contends that most female-perpetrated IPV is in self-defense, then the Feminist perspective may be inaccurate. If the perspective instead purports that IPV is more often perpetrated by men against women, then the Feminist perspective would appear to be correct. Similarly, the Family Violence perspective may be correct or incorrect depending on how it is defined. If this perspective contends that IPV is perpetrated exactly equally by men and women, then the Family Violence perspective seems to be inaccurate. If the perspective assumes that IPV perpetration is a problem for both men and women, if more so for men, then the Family Violence perspective is also accurate. Too often, discussion of the directionality debate polarizes the two sides to highlight their differences – in reality, however, many feminist researchers acknowledge and in fact study female-perpetrated IPV (see DeKeseredy and Dragiewicz 2007), and many family violence researchers believe that women are more often in the role of “victim” in abusive relationships (i.e. Gelles 2000; Gelles and Straus 1999).

9.1C Current State of the Literature – Gender Beyond a Binary Variable

Gendered-Structural IPV Theory and Gendered Socialization / Interactionist IPV Theory suggest that gender may help predict IPV. The question is how to measure gender. According to modern-day gender theories, gender comes in multiple versions of masculinities and femininities (King 1988; West and Fenstermaker 1995). While the level of detail captured by this notion of gender may be more conducive to qualitative

research, many IPV scholars and policy developers today speak predominantly a quantitative language. In the quantitative IPV literature, contrary to modern gender theory, gender is most often operationalized as a binary, male-female variable. This may be because of the ease with which it can be quantified and, potentially, because IPV scholars may not be fully familiar with the gender literature. Several measures of gender-related strain, ideology, relationships, and traits are available in the literature and, to a limited degree, have been used to test their predictive power of IPV. It has been generally found that men with ideology favoring or relationships embodying male control of women predicts IPV, and, conversely, when men have less power – or, just as importantly, *perceive* themselves to have less power (see Mankowski, Haaken, and Silvergleid 2002) – than female partners, this can result in strain and an effort to symbolically demonstrate power and control, such as through IPV. It would seem that relationships in which men and women share power and decision-making are the safest. Further, masculinity as measured by gender trait measures like the Bem Sex-Role Inventory tend to predict IPV – generally for men but in some studies for women as well – although the evidence is mixed, and non-representative sampling in these gender trait and IPV studies to date leaves room for doubt.

Clearly, though, the gender literature is far from irrelevant in our understanding of IPV. A common Family Violence claim of “gender symmetry” in the IPV literature’s directionality debate confuses a very outdated binary version of gender with the far more complex version of gender widely agreed upon by gender scholars. Even if men and women were equally likely to be “abusers” – which the literature would appear to not

support – this in no way establishes that gender and gender theories are unrelated to IPV. Indeed, both qualitative research and quantitative gender measures research suggests gender plays a complex role in predicting IPV beyond binary gender.

9.2 The Place of the Present Analyses in the Literature

There has been little research to date using a gender trait measure to predict IPV. Further, all prior studies have not used nationally-representative samples, and samples from these studies have overwhelmingly been undergraduate students at a single college. It would be problematic to develop national solutions to IPV based on studies that most accurately address the concerns of a single educational institution. In a secondary data analysis of the National Longitudinal Study of Adolescent Health, more commonly referred to as Add Health, this dissertation represents the first attempt to predict IPV in a nationally-representative sample with a gender trait measure, in this case the short version of the Bem Sex-Role Inventory (BSRI-S; Bem 1979). The adolescent and young adult age range in this sample represent a portion of Americans at a heightened risk for IPV (Rennison 2001; Morse 1995; O’Leary 1999; Rennison and Welchans 2000; Sorenson, Upchurch, and Shen 1996; Wolfe et al. 2003), a group that has only recently in their lives begun to date (Feiring 1996; Foshee et al. 1996) and thus still honing their gender performances within intimate relationships. Particularly given the current trend in the IPV literature to measure gender as an oversimplified binary variable, generalizable findings such as the ones presented in this paper may be the key to drawing renewed interest in gender measures from IPV scholars.

Contrary to expectations that high masculinity would be the key BSRI submeasure in analyses, findings suggest that low femininity predicts IPV. Being androgynous or, to a greater degree, feminine decreased the risk of perpetrating IPV and decreased the risk of being involved in male-to-female and bidirectional IPV relationships. These are the two BSRI categories that are high on the femininity submeasure. Likewise, being masculine or undifferentiated – the two BSRI categories that are low on the femininity submeasure – predicted an increased risk of perpetrating IPV. With certain exceptions, these findings held for both men and women, suggesting that gender traits as measured by the BSRI-S have an impact on IPV unique from binary gender. Although hegemonic masculinity (Connell 2009) tends to be treated as the main gender culprit for violence perpetration in the literature, as researchers it is possible that we focus too much on what is present in a particular version of gender and not enough on what is absent. Specifically, a lack of interpersonal sensitivity may make someone inherently more callous and abusive. Why might this be? With regard to men, David and Brannon (1976) suggest that the rejection of femininity norms is an inherent part of performing American hegemonic masculinity. Several scholars have suggested that this pattern begins with childhood socialization. For instance, Chodorow (1997, 1999) contends that boys are pushed away from mothers and taught to embrace emotional isolationism. Dinnerstein (1976) argues that children will resent the inevitable imperfections of their parents, and, as mothers tend to be the primary caretakers, the child's resentment will be predominantly focused on the femininity of women. From a criminological perspective, however, if one were to add a "not" into enough of the items

on the BSRI-S femininity submeasure for a given respondent's personality – i.e. “I am [NOT] sympathetic,” “I am [NOT] sensitive to the needs,” “I am [NOT] understanding,” “I am [NOT] gentle” – the respondent may have antisocial personality disorder, a common beginning to a criminal career for many other types of violent offenders in society. Considering that roughly 56% of men and 53% of women are either masculine or undifferentiated in this nationally-representative sample of adolescents, it would appear that half of the national adolescent population is slightly more at risk of perpetrating IPV. Finding this half in future studies, of course, will require moving beyond a binary gender variable to identifying these gender trait differences among men and women.

A related question to be raised is whether men and women of various genders are not only more likely to perpetrate IPV but also more likely to underreport IPV. Underreporting is often measured by agreement. That is, it is presumed that, within a given relationship, what one partner claims to have received in IPV, the other partner should report to have perpetrated. The literature finds women tend to report both receiving and using IPV more than the men in their relationships – which is to suggest that men are underreporting (see Armstrong, Wernke, Medina, and Schafer 2002). With the present Add Health sample, relationship dyads were not available. Instead, it is presumed that, as the sample is both large and nationally-representative, the average amount of IPV used by men should be the same as the average amount of IPV received by women; similarly, the average amount of IPV used by women should be the same as the average amount of IPV received by men. It is further presumed that social

desirability effects are more likely to discourage respondents from report than hiding abuse, such that the higher reports of IPV are presumed to be more accurate. In this way, indirectly, agreement and underreporting can be tested. As expected, men on average reported using and receiving less physical IPV than women. However, with sexual IPV, it appears that women are the ones underreporting. The possibility remains that different genders on the a gender trait measure like the BSRI-S may help shed light on which men and women are most likely to underreport. The present sample is ill-equipped to answer such a question without not only partner dyads but also knowledge of the BSRI scores for the other partner not currently in the sample. All the same, a comparison of mean IPV use and receipt across gender categories with this sample found masculine men and women reported the greatest number of IPV incidents. As compared to feminine men, feminine women reported more physical IPV use and receipt but also less sexual IPV use and receipt.

9.3 Recommendations for Future Research

Several recommendations for future research can be drawn from this dissertation. That the gender trait measure literature is so mixed and, furthermore, that this study shows slightly different findings from the literature regarding femininity and IPV suggests that this dissertation, as compared to prior efforts, may be distinct with its adolescent-based sample and that the Add Health sample is far more heterogeneous being nationally-representative. Indeed, contrary to the often exclusive focus in the gendered IPV literature on the role of aggressive and dominant hegemonic masculinity, this

dissertation suggests that less feminine men and women are at an increased risk of both victimization and perpetration of IPV as compared to more feminine men and women. Being the first study to analyze IPV and a gender measure with a nationally-representative sample, it is imperative that future replication determine the accuracy of the finding that a lack of femininity predicts IPV. Doing so may not only encourage more widespread use of gender measures but also more precise IPV prediction and batterer treatment. Based on the findings from this study, however, it seems warranted that future studies of IPV consider operationalizing gender beyond a binary variable.

Additionally, as underreporting is a considerable problem in IPV research, it is worth investigating if gender measures help predict which men and women are more likely to underreport. The present analyses were able to begin this exploration, but relationship dyads are required for a study to fully establish what connection if any gender measures may have to IPV dyadic agreement and underreporting.

Finally, although the Bem Sex-Role Inventory is among the best available gender measures in the literature, it does not fully incorporate modern gender theories that define gender as a performance intersecting with other demographic-based norms. Although admittedly a tall task to miniaturize such a diverse conceptualization of gender into a brief, closed-ended questionnaire measure, it may be possible to develop several submeasures, each addressing a different dimension of gender. Brush (2005) makes a similar suggestion:

“One methodological strategy to get at the interactive and institutional organization of violence and aggression might be to study constellations of gendered attributes and actions within couples to determine necessary and

sufficient combinations associated with aggression by one, the other, or both members of a couple (Brush 2005, 872).”

This may involve merging and editing several pre-existing measures. One question to be answered by researchers tackling this future task is whether a comprehensive gender measure is best constructed as a general measure of gender – as the Bem Sex-Role Inventory is intended to be – or as a measure specifically of gender performances in relationships. The former is appealing in that it may provide assistance to literatures beyond criminology, yet the latter may not only be more feasible in that it narrows the range of behaviors to address but it may also correlate more strongly with and better predict IPV.

Based on the currently available gender measures, several aspects of gender may be easier to include in a multi-submeasure measure, broadly tapping into gendered identity, behaviors, and ideology. Regarding identity, two types of measures may be of use. First, as personality traits are at the core of culturally acknowledged gender identities, it seems valuable to include a measure of instrumental and expressive personality traits. To keep the total item count down, the short version of either with the Bem Sex-Role Inventory (Bem 1979) or Personal Attributes Questionnaire (Spence and Helmreich 1978) would be preferable, possibly the all-positive itemed BSRI-S for ease of scoring rather than the PAQ which includes both positive and negative items. Second, it may be valuable to include a measure of discrepancy strain because struggles with performing gender, independent of the gender outcome, can determine if a desire to abide by gender norms consciously motivate other behaviors such as IPV. The Masculine Gender Role Stress Scale (Eisler and Skidmore 1987) is an excellent measure of

discrepancy strain for masculinity performance, but a currently non-existent mirror measure will need to be constructed for femininity.

In addition to exploring gendered identity, a broader gender measure could also include measures of gendered behaviors via attitudes about behaviors. The benefit of inquiring about attitudes of behaviors rather than behaviors themselves is that the measure could be applied a wider age range, including adolescents who may have attitudes about employment or marriage but do not yet partake in them. Attitudes about stereotypically gendered behaviors may include items from multiple pre-existing measures assessing attitudes about jobs (AWS short version, Spence and Helmreich 1978; MMPI-2, Butcher, Dahlstrom, Graham, Tellegen, and Kaemmer 1989; SRBS short form, Orlofsky and O'Heron 1987), recreational attitudes (SRBS short form; GD, Lippa 1991), recreational activities (SRBS; GD), and parenting and household division of labor (AWS; SRBS; GD; Social Roles Questionnaire, Baber and Tucker 2006).

Lastly, this broader gender measure might also do well to account for ideology pertaining to how strongly an individual accepts culturally dominant gender arrangements. Non-acceptance could be measured by hostile sexist attitudes while acceptance, somewhat narrowly, could be measured by "benevolent" or chivalrous attitudes as measured by the Ambivalent Sexism Inventory (Glick and Fiske 1996, 1997).

Along the way, items may need to be removed from analysis if they overlap with other measures being utilized in the questionnaire, and combining portions of measures, as suggested above, may also be done in analysis. Beyond tweaking how the measures are treated in analysis, it may be unwise to make changes to the measures in the

questionnaire itself such as reordering or removing items because this will limit the reliability and validity pre-established for these measures in prior papers. Ultimately, the gendering of intimate partner violence analysis has already been shown to aid in IPV prediction, and the literature and future policy could greatly benefit from an enriched understanding of the issues at hand, perhaps by route of gender measures.

Bibliography

- Alexander, P. C., Moore, S., & Alexander, E. R., III (1991). What is transmitted in the intergenerational transmission of violence? *Journal of Marriage & the Family*, 53, 657-668.
- Allen, C. T., Swan, S. C., & Raghavan, C. (2009). Gender Symmetry, Sexism, and Intimate Partner Violence. *Journal of interpersonal violence*, 24(11), 1816-1834.
- Allen-Collinson, J. (2009). A marked man: Female-perpetrated intimate partner abuse. *International journal of men's health*, 8(1), 22-40.
- Allgeier, E. R. (1975). Beyond sowing and growing: The relationship of sex typing to socialization, family plans, and future orientation. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 5, 217-226.
- Andersen, S. M., & Bem, S. L. (1981). Sex typing and androgyny in dyadic interaction: Individual differences in responsiveness to physical attractiveness. *Journal of personality and social psychology*, 41(1), 74-86.
- Andersen, S. M., Boulette, T. R., & Schwartz, A. H. (1991). Psychological maltreatment of spouses. In R. T. Ammerman & M. Hersen (Eds.), *Case studies in family violence* (pp. 293-328). New York: Plenum Press.
- Anderson, K. L. (1997). Gender, status, and domestic violence: An integration of feminist and family violence approaches. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, 59, 655-669.
- Anderson, K. L. (2002). Perpetrator or victim?: Relationships between intimate partner violence and well-being. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, 64, 851-863.
- Anderson, K. L. (2005). Theorizing gender in intimate partner violence research. *Sex Roles*, 52, 853-865.
- Anderson, K. L. (2008). Is Partner Violence Worse in the Context of Control? *Journal of Marriage and Family*, 70(5), 1157-1168.
- Anderson, K. L., & Umberson, D. (2001). Gendering violence: Masculinity and power in men's accounts of domestic violence. *Gender and Society*, 15, 358-380.
- Antill, J. K., Cunningham, J. D., Russell, G., & Thompson, N. L. (1981). An Australian sex-role scale. *Australian Journal of Psychology*, 33(2), 169-183.

- Antill, J. K., & Russell, G. (1980). A preliminary comparison between two forms of the Bem sex-role inventory. *Australian Psychologist*, 15(3), 427-435.
- Archer, J. (1989). From the laboratory to the community: Studying the natural history of human aggression. In J. Archer & K. Browne (Eds.), *Human aggression: Naturalistic approaches* (pp. 25-41). London: Routledge.
- Archer, J. (1999). An assessment of the reliability of the Conflict Tactics Scales: A meta-analytic review. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 14, 1263-1289.
- Archer, J. (2000). Sex differences in aggression between heterosexual partners: A meta-analytic review. *Psychological Bulletin*, 126, 651-680.
- Arias, L., & Beach, S. R. H. (1987). Validity of self-reports of marital violence. *Journal of Family Violence*, 2, 139-149.
- Arias, I., & Johnson, P. (1989). Evaluations of physical aggression among intimate dyads. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 4, 298-307.
- Arias, I., Samios, M., & O'Leary, K. D. (1987). Prevalence and correlates of physical aggression during courtship. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 2, 82-90.
- Armstrong, T. G., Wernke, J. Y., Medina, K. L., & Schafer, J. (2002). Do partners agree about the occurrence of intimate partner violence? A review of the current literature. *Trauma, violence & abuse*, 3(3), 181-193.
- Avery-Leaf, S., Cascardi, M., O'Leary, K. D., & Cano, A. (1997). Efficacy of a dating violence prevention program on attitudes justifying aggression. *Journal of adolescent health*, 21(1), 11-17.
- Aylor, B., & Dainton, M. (2004). Biological Sex and Psychological Gender as Predictors of Routine and Strategic Relational Maintenance. *Sex Roles*, 50(9-10), 689-697.
- Ayoub, C. C., Grace, P. F., Paradise, J. E., & Newberger, E. H. (1991). Alleging Psychological Impairment of the Accuser to Defend Oneself Against a Child Abuse Allegation: A Manifestation of Wife Battering and False Accusation. *Child & Youth Services*, 15(2), 191-208.
- Babcock, J. C., Costa, D. M., Green, C. E., & Eckhardt, C. I. (2004). What Situations Induce Intimate Partner Violence? A Reliability and Validity Study of the Proximal Antecedents to Violent Episodes (PAVE) Scale. *Journal of Family Psychology*, 18(3), 433-442.

- Babcock, J. C., Miller, S. A., & Siard, C. (2003). Toward a typology of abusive women: Differences between partner-only and generally violent women in the use of violence. *Psychology of Women Quarterly*, 27, 153–162.
- Babcock, J. C., Waltz, J., Jacobson, N. S., & Gottman, J. M. (1993). Power and violence: The relation between communication patterns, power discrepancies, and domestic violence. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology*, 61, 40-50.
- Baber, K. M., & Tucker, C. J. (2006). The Social Roles Questionnaire: A new approach to measuring attitudes toward gender. *Sex Roles*, 54(7-8), 459-467.
- Babinski, L. M., Hartsough, C. S., & Lambert, N. M. (2001). A comparison of self-report of criminal involvement and official arrest records. *Aggressive behavior*, 27(1), 44-54.
- Bakan, D. (1966). *The Duality of Human Existence: An Essay on Psychology and Religion*. Oxford, England: Rand McNally.
- Ballard-Reisch, D., & Elton, M. (1992). Gender orientation and the Bem Sex Role Inventory: A psychological construct revisited. *Sex Roles*, 27(5-6), 291-306.
- Bancroft, L., & Silverman, J. G. (2002). *The Batterer as Parent: Addressing the Impact of Domestic Violence on Family Dynamics (Sage Series in Violence Against Women)*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Barnard, G. W., Vera, H., Vera, M. I., & Newman, G. (1982). Till death do us part: A study of spouse murder. *Bulletin of the American Academy of Psychiatry and the Law*, 10(4), 271-280.
- Barnett, O., Lee, C., & Thelen, R. (1997). Gender differences in attribution of self-defense and control of interpartner aggression. *Violence Against Women*, 3(5), 462-481.
- Barnett, O., Miller-Perrin, C. J., & Perrin, R. D. (2005). *Family violence across the lifespan: An Introduction (2nd Edition)*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Barry, H., Bacon, M. K., & Child, I. L. (1957). A cross-cultural survey of some sex differences in socialization. *The Journal of abnormal and social psychology*, 55(3), 327-332.
- Baumrind, D. (1982). Are androgynous individuals more effective persons and parents? *Child development*, 53(1), 44-75.

- Beere, C. A. (1990). *Gender Roles: A Handbook of Tests and Measures*. New York, NY: Greenwood Press.
- Beere, C. A., King, D. W., Beere, D. B., & King, L. A. (1984). The Sex-Role Egalitarianism Scale: A measure of attitudes toward equality between the sexes. *Sex Roles, 10*(7-8), 563-576.
- Begun, A. L., Murphy, C. M., Bolt, D., Weinstein, B., Strodthoff, T., Short, L., & Shelley, G. (2003). Characteristics of the Safe at Home instrument for assessing readiness to change intimate partner violence. *Research on Social Work Practice, 13*, 80-107.
- Belk, S., & Snell, W. E. (1986). Beliefs about women: Components and correlates. *Personality & social psychology bulletin, 12*(4), 403-413.
- Bell, K. M., & Naugle, A. E. (2008). Intimate partner violence theoretical considerations: Moving towards a contextual framework. *Clinical Psychology Review, 28*(7), 1096-1107.
- Bem, S. L. (1974). The measurement of psychological androgyny. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 42*, 155-162.
- Bem, S. L. (1975). Sex role adaptability: One consequence of psychological androgyny. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 31*, 634-643.
- Bem, S. L. (1977). On the utility of alternative procedures for assessing psychological androgyny. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 45*, 196-205.
- Bem, S. L. (1979). Theory and measurement of androgyny: A reply to the Pedhazur-Tetenbaum and Locksley-Colten critiques. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 37*, 1047-1054.
- Bem, S. L. (1981). Gender schema theory: A cognitive account of sex typing. *Psychological Review, 88*, 354-364
- Bem, S. L. (1981b). The BSRI and gender schema theory: A reply to Spence and Helmreich. *Psychological review, 88*(4), 369-371.
- Bem, S. L. (1983). Gender Schema Theory and Its Implications for Child Development: Raising Gender-Aschematic Children in a Gender-Schematic Society. *Signs, 8*(4), 598-616.
- Bem, S. L. (1993). *The Lenses of Gender*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.

- Bem, S. L. (1995). Dismantling Gender Polarization and Compulsory Heterosexuality: Should We Turn the Volume Down or Up? *The Journal of Sex Research*, 32(4), 329-334.
- Bem, S. L., & Lenney, E. (1976). Sex-typing and the avoidance of cross-sex behavior. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 33, 48-54.
- Bem, S. L., & Lewis, S. A. (1975). Sex role adaptability: One consequence of psychological androgyny. *Journal of personality and social psychology*, 31(4), 634-643.
- Bem, S. L., Martyna, W., & Watson, C. (1976). Sex-typing and androgyny: Further explorations of the expressive domain. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 34, 1016-1023.
- Bergman, L. (1992). Dating violence among high school students. *Social Work*, 37, 21-27.
- Bernard, J. L., Bernard, S. L., & Bernard, M. L. (1985). Courtship violence and sex-typing. *Family Relations*, 34, 573-576.
- Berzins, J. I., Welling, M. A., & Wetter, R. E. (1978). A new measure of psychological androgyny based on the Personality Research Form. *Journal of consulting and clinical psychology*, 46(1), 126-138.
- Billingham, R. E. (1987). Courtship violence: The patterns of conflict resolution strategies across seven levels of emotional commitment. *Family Relations*, 36, 283-289.
- Blanchard-Fields, F., Suhrer-Roussel, L., & Hertzog, C. (1994). A confirmatory factor analysis of the Bem Sex Role Inventory: Old questions, new answers. *Sex Roles*, 30(5-6), 423-457.
- Blazina, C., & Watkins, Jr., C. E. (2000). Separation/individuation, parental attachment, and male gender role conflict: Attitudes toward the feminine and the fragile masculine self. *Psychology of men & masculinity*, 1(2), 126-132.
- Bledsoe, J. C. (1983). Factorial validity of the Bern Sex-Role Inventory. *Perceptual and Motor Skills*, 56, 55-58.
- Block, C. R. (2000). Chicago Women's Health Risk Study: Risk of Serious Injury or Death in Intimate Violence: A Collaborative Research Project. *Illinois Criminal Justice Information Authority, National Institute of Justice, US Dept of Justice*.

- Block, C. R., & Christakos, A. (1995). Intimate Partner Homicide in Chicago over 29 Years. *Crime & delinquency*, 41(4), 496-526.
- Blood, R., & Wolfe, D. (1960). *Husbands and Wives*. New York: Free Press.
- Blumberg, R. L. (1984). A General Theory of Gender Stratification. In R. Collins (Ed.) *Sociological Theory* (pp. 23-101). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Bohannon, J. R., Dosser, D. A., Jr., & Lindley, S. E. (1995). Using Couple Data to Determine Domestic Violence Rates: An Attempt to Replicate Previous Work. *Violence and Victims*, 10(2), 133-141.
- Bohannon, W. E., & Mills, C. J. (1979). Psychometric properties and underlying assumptions of two measures of masculinity/femininity. *Psychological reports*, 44(2), 431-450.
- Boldizar, J. P. (1991). Assessing sex typing and androgyny in children: the Children's Sex Role Inventory. *Developmental Psychology*, 27, 505-515.
- Bookwala, J., Frieze, I. H., Smith, C., & Ryan, K. (1992). Predictors of dating violence: A multivariate analysis. *Violence and Victims*, 7, 297-311.
- Boonzaier, F. (2008). 'If the Man Says you Must Sit, Then you Must Sit': The Relational Construction of Woman Abuse: Gender, Subjectivity and Violence. *Feminism & psychology*, 18(2), 183-206.
- Borjesson, W. I., Aarons, G. A., & Dunn, M. E. (2003). Development and confirmatory factor analysis of the Abuse within Intimate Relationships Scale. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 18, 295-309.
- Bowlby, J. (1969). *Attachment and loss: Vol. 1. Attachment*. New York: Basic Books.
- Bowlby, J. (1972). *Attachment and loss, Vol. II, Separation: Anxiety and anger*. New York: Basic Books.
- Bowlby, J. (1980). *Attachment and loss, Vol. III, Loss: Sadness and depression*. New York: Basic Books.
- Boye-Beaman, J., Leonard, K. E., & Senchak, M. (1993). Male premarital aggression and gender identity among black and white newlywed couples. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, 55, 303-313.

- Brennan, K. A., Clark, C. L., & Shaver, P. R. (1998). Self-report measurement of adult attachment: An integrative overview. In J. A. Simpson & W. S. Rholes (Eds.), *Attachment theory and close relationships* (pp. 46-76). New York: Guilford Press.
- Brewer, N., Mitchell, P., & Weber, N. (2002). Gender role, organizational status, and conflict management styles. *The International Journal of Conflict Management*, 13(1), 78-94.
- Brooks, G. R., & Silverstein, L. S. (1995). Understanding the dark side of masculinity: An interactive systems model. In R. F. Levant & W. S. Pollack (Eds.), *A new psychology of men* (pp. 280-333). New York: Basic Books.
- Browne, A. (1986). Assault and homicide at home: When battered women kill. In M. J. Saks & L. Saxe (Eds.), *Advances in applied social psychology* (pp. 57-79). Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Browne, A. (1987). *When battered women kill*. New York: Free Press.
- Browne, A., Williams, K., & Dutton, D. (1999). Homicide between intimate partners: A 20-year review. In M. D. Smith & M. A. Zahn (Eds.), *Homicide: A sourcebook of social research* (pp. 149-164). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Browning, J., & Dutton, D. (1986). Assessment of wife assault with the Conflict Tactics Scale: Using couple data to quantify the differential reporting effect. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, 48, 375-379.
- Brownmiller, S. (1975). *Against our will: Men, women and rape*. New York: Bantam Books.
- Brush, L. D. (1993). Violent acts and injurious out-comes in married couples: Methodological issues in the National Survey of Families and Households. In P. B. Bart & E. G. Moran (Eds.), *Violence against women: The bloody footprints* (pp. 240-251). Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Brush, L. D. (2005). Philosophical and Political Issues in Research on Women's Violence and Aggression. *Sex Roles*, 52(11-12), 867-873.
- 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(3), 272-285.
- Burt, M. R. (1980). Cultural myths and supports for rape. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 38, 217-230.

- Butcher, J. N., Dahlstrom, W. G., Graham, J. R., Tellegen, A., & Kaemmer, B. (1989). *Minnesota Multiphasic Personality Inventory-2: Manual for administration and scoring*. Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press.
- Butler, J. (1990). *Gender trouble: Feminism and the subversion of identity*. New York: Routledge.
- Butler, J. (1993). *Bodies that matter: On the discursive limits of sex*. New York: Routledge.
- Butler, J. (1997). Imitation and Gender Insubordination. In L. Nicholson (Ed.), *The Second Wave: A Reader in Feminist Theory* (pp. 300-315). New York: Routledge.
- Campbell, J. C. (1981). Misogyny and homicide of women. *Advances in Nursing Science/Women's Health*, 3, 67-85.
- Campbell, J. C. (1995). *Assessing dangerousness: Violence by sexual offenders, batterers, and child abusers*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Campbell, J. C. (2000). Promise and perils of surveillance in addressing violence against women. *Violence Against Women*, 6(7), 705-727.
- Campbell, J. C. (2004). Helping women understand their risk in situations of intimate partner violence. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 19, 1464-1477.
- Campbell, T., Gillaspy, J. A., & Thompson, B. (1997). The factor structure of the Bem sex-role inventory (BSRI): Confirmatory analysis of long and short forms. *Educational and Psychological Measurement*, 57, 118-124.
- Campbell, B., Schellenberg, E. G., & Senn, C. Y. (1997). Evaluating measures of contemporary sexism. *Psychology of Women Quarterly*, 21, 89-102.
- Campbell, J. C., Webster, D.W., Koziol-McLain, J., Block, C. R., Campbell, D.W., Curry, M. A., et al. (2003). Risk factors for femicide in abusive relationships: Results from a multisite case control study. *American Journal of Public Health*, 93, 1089-1097.
- Canaan, J. E., & Griffin, C. (1990). The New Men's Studies: Part of the Problem or Part of the Solution? In J. Hearn & D. Morgan (Eds.), *Men, Masculinities and Social Theory* (pp. 206-214). London: Unwin Hyman.
- Cano, A., & Vivian, D. (2003). Are life stressors associated with marital violence? *Journal of Family Psychology* 17, 302-314.

- Carr, J. L., & VanDeusen, K. M. (2002). The relationship between family of origin violence and dating violence in college men. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 17, 630–646.
- Carrado, M., George, M. J., Loxam, E., Jones, L., & Templar, D. (1996). Aggression in British heterosexual relationships: A descriptive analysis. *Aggressive Behavior*, 22, 401-415.
- Carver K., Joyner K., & Udry J. R. (2003). National estimates of adolescent romantic relationships. In P. Florsheim (Ed.), *Adolescent romantic relations and sexual behavior: Theory, research, and practical implications* (pp. 23–56). Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Capsi, A., Moffitt, T., Silva, P., Stouthamer-Loeber, M., Krueger, R., & Schmutte, P. (1994). Are some people crime-prone? Replications of the Personality-crime relationship across countries, genders, races and methods. *Criminology*, 32, 163-195.
- Cazenave, N. A., & Zahn, M. A. (1992). Women, murder, and male domination: Police reports of domestic violence in Chicago and Philadelphia. In E. C. Viano (Ed.), *Intimate violence: Interdisciplinary perspectives* (pp. 83-97). Washington, DC: Hemisphere.
- Cazenave, N. A., Le Scanff, C., & Woodman, T. (2007). The personality and psychological profiles of women engaged in risk taking sports. *Anxiety Stress Coping*, 20, 421–435.
- Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. (2008). Youth Risk Behavior Surveillance – United States, 2007. *Morbidity and Mortality Weekly Report*, 57(SS-4). Retrieved February 10, 2010 (<http://www.cdc.gov/mmwr/PDF/ss/ss5704.pdf>).
- Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. (2009). Understanding Teen Dating Violence: Fact Sheet 2009. Retrieved February 10, 2010 (<http://www.cdc.gov/violenceprevention/pdf/TeenDatingViolence2009-a.pdf>).
- Chafetz, J. S. (Ed.). (2006). *Handbook of the Sociology of Gender*. New York: Springer.
- Chalk, R., & King, P. A. (1998). *Violence in Families: Assessing Prevention and Treatment Programs*. Washington, D.C.: National Academy Press.
- Chamallas, M. (2003). *Introduction to Feminist Legal Theory*. 2nd ed. New York: Aspen Publishers.

- Chodorow, N. (1978). *The reproduction of mothering*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.
- Chodorow, N. (1997). The Psychodynamics of the Family. In L. Nicholson (Ed.), *The Second Wave: A Reader in Feminist Theory* (pp. 181-197). New York: Routledge.
- Chodorow, N. (1999). *The Reproduction of Mothering: Psychoanalysis and the Sociology of Gender*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.
- Choi, N., & Fuqua, D. R. (2003). The structure of the Bem Sex Role Inventory: A summary report of 23 validation studies. *Educational and Psychological Measurement*, 63, 872–887.
- Choi, N., & Fuqua, D. R. & Newman, J. (2007). Hierarchical confirmatory factor analysis of the Bem Sex Role Inventory. *Educational and Psychological Measurement*, 67, 818-832.
- Choi, N., & Jenkins, S. (2000, April). A factor analysis of the Bem Sex Role Inventory and the Personal Attributes Questionnaire. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, New Orleans, LA.
- Chung, D. (2005). Violence, control, romance and gender equality: Young women and heterosexual relationships. *Women's Studies International Forum*, 28, 445–55
- Chung, D. (2007) Making Meaning of Relationships: Young Women's Experiences and Understandings of Dating Violence. *Violence Against Women*, 13(12), 1274-1295.
- Cicchetti, D., & Howes, P.W. (1991). Developmental psychopathology in the context of the family: Illustrations from the study of child maltreatment. *Canadian Journal of Behavioural Science*, 23, 257–281.
- Citrin, L., Roberts, T., & Fredrickson, B. (2004). Objectification theory and emotions: A feminist psychological perspective on gendered affect. In L. Tiedens, & C. Leach (Eds.), *The social life of emotions* (pp. 203-223). New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Clarke, R.V., & Cornish, D.B. (1985). Modeling Offenders' Decisions: A Framework for Research and Policy. In M. Tonry & N. Morris (Eds.), *Crime and Justice: An Annual Review of Research, Volume 6* (pp. 147-185). Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Coker, A. L., Davis, K. E., Arias, I., Desai, S., Sanderson, M., Brandt, H. M., & Smith P. H. (2002). Physical and mental health effects of intimate partner violence for men and women. *American Journal of Preventive Medicine*, 23, 260-268.

- Coleman, D. H., & Straus, M. A. (1983). Alcohol abuse and family violence. In E. Gottheil, K. A. Druley, T. E. Skoloda, & H. M. Waxman (Eds.), *Alcohol, Drug Abuse and Aggression* (pp. 104-24). Springfield, IL: Charles C. Thomas.
- Coleman, D. H., & Straus, M. A. (1986). Marital power, conflict, and violence in a nationally representative sample of American couples. *Violence & 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 (Eds.), *Physical violence in American families: Risk factors and adaptations to violence in 8,145 families* (pp. 287-300). New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction Publishers.
- Coleman, K. H., Weinman, M. L., & Hsi, B. P. (1980). Factors affecting conjugal violence. *Journal of Psychology, 105*, 197-202.
- Colley, A., Mulhern, G., Maltby, J., & Wood, A. M. (2009). The short form BSRI: Instrumentality, expressiveness and gender associations among a United Kingdom sample. *Personality and Individual Differences, 46*, 384-387.
- Collins, P. H. (1989). Social Construction of Black Feminist Thought. *Signs, 14*(4), 745-773.
- Collins, M., Waters, C. W., & Waters, L. K. (1979). Factor analysis of sex-typed items from the Bem Sex Role Inventory: A replication. *Psychological Reports, 44*, 517-518.
- Coltrane, S. (1992). The Micropolitics of Gender in Nonindustrial Societies. *Gender and Society, 6*(1), 86-107.
- Coltrane, S. (1994). Theorizing Masculinities in contemporary social science. In H. Brod & M. Kaufman (Eds.), *Theorizing masculinities* (pp. 39-60). Thousand Oaks, CA : Sage.
- Coltrane, S. (1998). *Gender and Families*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Pine Forge Press.
- Connell, R. W. (1987). *Gender and power*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.
- Connell, R. W. (2005). Globalization, Imperialism, and Masculinities. In M. Kimmel, J. Hearn, & R. W. Connell (Eds.), *Handbook of Studies on Men and Masculinities* (pp. 71-89). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

- Constantinople, A. (1973). Masculinity–femininity: An exception to a famous dictum? *Psychological Bulletin*, 80, 389–407.
- Cook, S.L., & Goodman, L.A. (2006). Beyond Frequency and Severity: Development and Validation of the Brief Coercion and Conflict Scales. *Violence Against Women*, 12(11): 1050-1072.
- Copenhaver, M. M., Lash, S. J., & Eisler, R. M. (2000). Masculine gender role stress, anger, and male intimate abusiveness: Implications for men’s relationships. *Sex Roles*, 42, 405–414.
- Cornish, D.B., & Clarke, R.V. (1986). *The Reasoning Criminal*. New York: Springer-Verlag.
- Cortina, L. M., & Kubiak, S. P. (2006). Gender and Posttraumatic Stress: Sexual Violence as an Explanation for Women's Increased Risk. *Journal of Abnormal Psychology*, 115(4), 753-759.
- Costa, D. M., Candy, B., & Babcock, J. C. (2007). Preliminary Report on the Accountability Scale: A Change and Outcome Measure for Intimate Partner Violence Research. *Violence and Victims*, 22(5), 515-531.
- Coston, B. (2009). Book Review: Intimate Partner Violence. By Angela J. Hattery. New York: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, Inc., 2008, 222 pp., \$75.00 (cloth); \$28.95 (paper). *Gender and Society*, 23, 581-583.
- Crittenden, P. M., & Ainsworth, M. D. S. (1989). Child maltreatment and attachment theory. In D. Cicchetti & V. Carlson (Eds.), *Child maltreatment: Theory and research on the causes and consequences of child abuse and neglect* (pp. 432–463). Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Crossman, R. K., Stith, S. M., & Bender, M. M. (1990). Sex-role egalitarianism and marital violence. *Sex Roles*, 22, 293–304.
- Crothers, L. M., Field, J. E., & Kolbert, J. B. (2005). Navigating power, control, and being nice: Aggression in adolescent girls’ friendships. *Journal of Counseling and Development*, 83(2), 349-354.
- Crowell, N. A., & Burgess, A. W. (1996). *Understanding violence against women*. Washington, DC: National Academies Press.
- Cunningham, S.J., & Russell, P.A. (2004). The influence of gender roles on evolved partner preferences. *Sexualities, Evolution and Gender*, 6, 131–150.

- Cunradi, C. B., Bersamin, M., & Ames, G. (2009). Agreement on Intimate Partner Violence Among a Sample of Blue-Collar Couples. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 24(4), 551-568.
- Czaja, R., Blair, J., Bickart, B., & Eastman, E. (1994). Respondent strategies for recall of crime victimization incidents. *Journal of Official Statistics*, 10(3), 257-276.
- Dasgupta, S. D. (2001). Towards an understanding of women's use of non-lethal violence in intimate heterosexual relationships. *VAWNet Applied Research Forum*. Retrieved February 10, 2010 (http://new.vawnet.org/Assoc_Files_VAWnet/AR_womviol.pdf).
- Dasgupta, S. D. (2002). A framework for understanding women's use of nonlethal violence in intimate heterosexual relationships. *Violence Against Women*, 8, 1364-1389.
- Dasgupta, S., & Basu, J. (2001). Effects of gender role identity of couples and earning status of the wife on marital quality. *Social Science International*, 17, 16-30.
- David, D. S., & Brannon, R. (Eds.). (1976). *The Forty-Nine Percent Majority: The Male Sex Role*. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley Publishing Company, Inc.
- Davis, K. E., Coker, A. L., & Sanderson, M. (2002). Physical and mental health effects of being stalked for men and women. *Violence and Victims*, 17 (4), 429-443.
- DeFranc, W., & Mahalik, J. R. (2002). Masculine gender role conflict and stress in relation to parental attachment and separation. *Psychology of Men and Masculinity*, 3, 51-60.
- DeKeseredy, W. S. (2006). Future directions. *Violence Against Women*, 12, 1078-1085.
- DeKeseredy, W. S., & Dragiewicz, M. (2007). Understanding the Complexities of Feminist Perspectives on Woman Abuse: A Commentary on Donald G. Dutton's *Rethinking Domestic Violence*. *Violence Against Women*, 13, 874-84.
- DeKeseredy, W. S., Saunders, D., Schwartz, M. D., & Alvi, S. (1997). 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. D. (1998). Measuring the extent of woman abuse in intimate heterosexual relationships: A critique of the Conflict Tactics Scales. *VAWNet Applied Research Forum*. Retrieved January 1, 2010 (http://www.vawnet.org/vn1/library/general/AR_ctscrit/html).

- DeKeseredy, W. S., & Schwartz, M. D. (2003). Backlash and whiplash: A critique of Statistics Canada's 1999 General Social Survey on victimization. *Online Journal of Justice Studies*, 1(1). Retrieved February 10, 2010 (<http://ojjs.uoit.ca/JOURNAL/backissues/ojjs/html/issues/1.1/dekeseredy-schwartz.html>).
- DeMaris, A. (2005). Violent Victimization and Women's Mental and Physical Health: Evidence from a National Sample. *The Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency*, 42(4), 384-411.
- DeMaris, A., Benson, M. L., Fox, G. L., & Van Wyk, J. (2003). Distal and proximal factors in domestic violence: A test of an integrated model. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, 65, 652-667.
- DeNavas-Walt, C., Proctor, B. D., & Mills, R.J. (2004). U.S. Census Bureau, Current Population Reports, P60-226: Income, Poverty, and Health Insurance Coverage in the United States: 2003. U.S. Government Printing Office: Washington, DC.
- Dillaway, H., & Broman, C. (2001). Race, Class, and Gender Differences in Marital Satisfaction and Divisions of Household Labor among Dual-Earner Couples: A Case for Intersectional Analysis. *Journal of Family Issues*, 22, 309-327.
- Dinnerstein, D. (1976). *The mermaid and the minotaur*. New York: Harper & Row.
- Dobash, R. E., & Dobash, R. P. (1992). *Women, violence, and social change*. Boston: Routledge Kegan Paul.
- Dobash, R. P., Dobash, R. E., Wilson, M., & Daly, M. (1992). The myth of sexual symmetry in marital violence. *Social Problems*, 39, 71-91.
- Dollard, J., Doob, L. W., Miller, N. E., Mowrer, O. H., & Sears, R.R. (1939). *Frustration and Aggression*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.
- Doyle, J. A., & Moore, R. J. (1978). Attitudes Toward the Male's Role Scale (AMR): An objective instrument to measure attitudes toward the male's sex role in contemporary society. *JSAS Catalog of Selected Documents in Psychology*, 8 (Ms. No. 1678), 33-35.
- Drinkwater, B. A. (1979). Social desirability of characteristics of the bem sex-role inventory. *Australian Psychologist*, 14(3), 311-317.
- Dugan, L., Nagin, D., & Rosenfeld, R. (1999). Explaining the decline in intimate partner homicide: The effects of changing domesticity, women's status, and domestic violence resources. *Homicide Studies*, 3, 187-214.

- Dutton, D. G. (1994). Patriarchy and wife assault: The ecological fallacy. *Violence and Victims*, 9, 167–182.
- Dutton, D. G. (1995). Male abusiveness in intimate relationships. *Clinical Psychology Review*, 15, 567-581.
- Dutton, D. G. (2006). *Rethinking domestic violence*. Vancouver, Canada: University of British Columbia Press.
- Dutton, D. G. (2007). *The abusive personality: Violence and control in intimate relationships* (2nd ed.). New York: Guilford.
- Dutton, D. G., & Nicholls, T. L. (2005). The gender paradigm in domestic violence research and theory: Part 1- The conflict of theory and data. *Aggression and Violent Behavior*, 10(6), 680–714.
- Dutton, D. G., & Painter, S. L. (1981). Traumatic Bonding: The Development of Emotional Attachments in Battered Women and Other Relationships of Intermittent Abuse. *Victimology*, 6, 139-155.
- Eagly, A. H., & Mladinic, A. (1989). Gender stereotypes and attitudes toward women and men. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 15, 543-558.
- Edelson, J. L., & Brygger, M. P. (1986). Gender differences in reporting of battering incidences. *Family Relations*, 35, 377-382.
- Eisler, R. M., Franchina, J. J., Moore, T. M., Honeycutt, H., & Rhatigan, D. L. (2000). Masculine gender role stress and intimate abuse: Effects of gender relevance of conflict situations on men's attributions and affective responses. *Psychology of Men and Masculinity*, 1, 30–36.
- Eisler, R. M., & Skidmore, J. R. (1987). Masculine gender role stress: Scale development and component factors in the appraisal of stressful situations. *Behavior Modification*, 11, 123–136.
- Ellis, L. (1989a). Evolutionary and Neurochemical Causes of Sex Differences in Victimizing Behavior: Toward a Unified Theory of Criminal Behavior and Social Stratification. *Social science information*, 28(3), 605-636.
- Ellis, L. (1989b). Sex Differences in Criminality: An Explanation Based on the Concept of r/K Selection. *The mankind quarterly*, 30(1-2), 17-37.

- Elmore, P. B., Brodsky, A. M., & Naffziger, N. (1975). The attitudes toward feminist issues scale: A validation study. Paper presented at the 31st meeting of the American Personnel and Guidance Association, New York.
- Fals-Stewart, W. (2003). The occurrence of partner physical aggression on days of alcohol consumption: A longitudinal diary study. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 71*, 41–52.
- Feiring, C. (1996). Concepts of romance in 15-year-old adolescents. *Journal of Research on Adolescence, 7*, 214-224.
- Felson, R. B. (2002). *Violence and gender reexamined*. Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.
- Felson, R. B., & Cares, A. C. (2005). Gender and the seriousness of assaults on intimate partners and other victims. *Journal of Marriage and Family, 67*(5), 182–195.
- Felson, R. B., & Messner, S. F. (2000). The control motive in intimate partner violence. *Social Psychology Quarterly, 63*, 86-94.
- Fernández, J., Quiroga, M.A., & Del Olmo, I. (2006). Is sexual attraction independent of the instrumental and expressive traits? *Spanish Journal of Psychology, 9*, 162-170.
- Ferrante, A., Morgan, F., Indermaur, D. & Harding, R. (1996). *Measuring the extent of domestic violence*. Annandale, Australia: Hawkins Press.
- Fiebert, M. S., & 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.
- Field, J. E., Crothers, L. M. & Kolbert, J. B. (2007). Adolescent Female Gender Identity and Attraction to Male Bullies and Victims. *Journal of Emotional Abuse, 7*(1), 1-15.
- Fincham, F. D., Bradbury, T. N., Arias, I., Byrne, C. A., & Karney, B. R. (1997). Marital violence, marital distress, and attributions. *Journal of Family Psychology, 11*, 367–372.
- Fine-Davis, M. (1976). Structure, determinants and correlates of attitudes toward the role and status of women in Ireland, with particular reference to employment status of married women. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Department of Psychology, Trinity College, University of Dublin.

- Fink, B., Brewer, G., Fehl, K., & Neave, N. (2007). Instrumentality and lifetime number of sexual partners. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 43, 747-756.
- Fischer, A. R., & Good, G. E. (1998). Perceptions of parent-child relationships and masculine role conflicts of college men. *Journal of Counseling Psychology*, 45, 346-352.
- Fitzpatrick, M. K., Salgado, D. M., Suvak, M. K., King, L. A., & King, D. W. (2004). Associations of gender and gender-role ideology with behavioral and attitudinal features of intimate partner aggression. *Psychology of Men & Masculinity*, 5, 91-102.
- Flemons D. (1989). An ecosystemic view of family violence. *Family Therapy*, 16(1), 1-10.
- Follette, V. M., & Alexander, P. C. (1992). Dating violence: Current and historical debates. *Behavioral Assessment*, 14, 39-52.
- Follingstad, D. R., Wright, S., Lloyd, S., & Sebastian, J. A. (1991). Sex differences in motivations and effects in dating violence. *Family Relations*, 40, 51-57.
- Foo, L., & Margolin, G. (1995). A multivariate investigation of dating aggression. *Journal of Family Violence*, 10, 351-377.
- Foran, H. M., & Slep, A. M. S. (2007). Validation of a Self-Report Measure of Unrealistic Relationship Expectations. *Psychological Assessment*, 19(4), 382.-396.
- Forbes, G. B., Adams-Curtis, L. E., & White, K. B. (2004). Firstand second-generation measures of sexism, rape myths and related beliefs, and hostility toward women. *Violence Against Women*, 10, 236-261.
- Forbes, G. B., Jobe, R. L., White, K. B., Bloesch, E., & Adams-Curtis, L. E. (2005). Perceptions of dating violence following a sexual or nonsexual betrayal of trust: Effects of gender, sexism, acceptance of rape myths, and vengeance motivation. *Sex Roles*(3/4), 165-173.
- Foshee, V. A. (1996). Gender differences in adolescent dating prevalence, types and injuries. *Health Education Research*, 11(3), 275-286.
- Foshee, V. A., Bauman, K. E., Greene, W. F., Koch, G. G., Linder, G. F., & MacDougall, J. E. (2000). The safe dates program: 1-year follow-up results. *American Journal of Public Health*, 90(10), 1619-1622.

- Foshee, V. A., Linder, G. F., Bauman, K. E., Langwick, S. A., Arriaga, X. B., Heath, J. L., et al. (1996). The safe dates project: Theoretical basis, evaluation design, and selected baseline findings. *American Journal of Preventive Medicine*, 12(5 Suppl.), 39-47.
- Foshee, V. A., Bauman, K. E., & Linder, G. F. (1999). Family Violence and the Perpetration of Adolescent Dating Violence: Examining Social Learning and Social Control Processes. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, 61, 331-342.
- Foshee, V. A., Bauman, K. E., Linder, F., Rice, J., & Wilcher, R. (2007). Typologies of Adolescent Dating Violence: Identifying Typologies of Adolescent Dating Violence Perpetration. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 22(5), 498-519.
- Fox, G. L., & Benson, M. L. (2004). Violent men, bad dads? Fathering profiles of men involved in intimate partner violence. In R. D. Day & M. E. Lamb (Eds.), *Conceptualizing and measuring father involvement* (pp. 359-384). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Fox, G. L., Sayers, J., & Bruce, C. (2001). Beyond bravado: Fatherhood as a resource for rehabilitation of men who batter. *Marriage and Family Review*, 30, 137-163.
- Frable, D. E., & Bem, S. L. (1985). If you are gender schematic, all members of the opposite sex look alike. *Journal of Personality & Social Psychology*, 49, 459-468.
- Franchina, J. J., Eisler, R. M., & Moore, T. M. (2001). Masculine gender role stress and intimate abuse: Effects of masculine gender relevance of dating situations and female threat on men's attributions and affective responses. *Psychology of Men and Masculinity*, 2, 34-41.
- Furman W., & Simon, V. A. (2006). Actor and partner effects of adolescents' romantic working models and styles of interactions with romantic partners. *Child Development*, 77, 588-604.
- Gaa, J. P., Liberman, D., & Edwards, T. A. (1979). A comparative factor analysis of the Bem Sex Role Inventory and the Personal Attribute Questionnaire. *Journal of Clinical Psychology*, 35, 592-598.
- Garfinkel, H. (1967). *Studies in Ethnomethodology*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- Gaudreau, P. (1977). Factor analysis of the Bem Sex Role Inventory. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology*, 45, 299-302.
- Gelles, R. J. (1974). *The Violent Home*. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.

- Gelles, R. J. (1983). An Exchange / Social Control Theory. In D. Finkelhor, R. J. Gelles, G. T. Hotaling, & M. A. Straus (Eds.), *The Dark Side of Families: Current Family Violence Research* (pp. 151-165). Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.
- Gelles, R. J. (1993). *The Violent Home*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Gelles, R. J. (2000). Estimating the incidence and prevalence of violence against women. *Violence Against Women*, 6, 784-804.
- Gelles, R. J., & Straus, M. A. (1999). Profiling violent families. In A. Skolnick & J. Skolnick (Eds.), *The Family in Transition* (pp. 414-431). White Plains, NY: Longman.
- Gibb, G. D., & Bailey, J. R. (1983). Attitude toward Equal Rights Amendment Scale: An objective measurement tool of attitudes toward equal rights legislation. *Psychological reports*, 53(3), 804-806.
- Gill, S., Stockard, J., Johnson, M., & Williams, S. (1987). Measuring gender differences: The expressive dimension and critique of androgyny scales. *Sex Roles*, 17, 375-400.
- Gilligan, C. (1982). *In a different voice: Psychological theory and women's development*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Girard, A. (2009). Backlash or equality? The influence of men's and women's rights discourses on domestic violence legislation in Ontario. *Violence Against Women*, 15, 5-23.
- Glenn, E. (1999). The Social Construction and Institutionalization of Gender and Race. In M. M. Ferree, J. Lorber, & B. B. Hess (Eds.), *Revisioning Gender* (pp. 3-43). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Glick, P., & Fiske, S. T. (1996). The Ambivalent Sexism Inventory: Differentiating hostile and benevolent sexism. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 70, 491-512.
- Glick, P., & Fiske, S. T. (1997). Hostile and benevolent sexism: Measuring ambivalent sexist attitudes toward women. *Psychology of Women Quarterly*, 21, 119-135.
- Goetting, A. (1995). *Homicide in families and other special populations*. New York: Springer.

- Goetz, A. T., Shackelford, T. K., Schipper, L. D., & Stewart-Williams, S. (2006). Adding Insult to Injury: Development and Initial Validation of the Partner-Directed Insults Scale. *Violence and Victims*, 21(6), 691-706.
- Good, G. E., Hepper, M. J., Hillenbrand-Gunn, T., & Wang, L. (1995). Sexual and psychological violence: An exploratory study of predictors in college men. *Journal of Men's Studies*, 4, 59-71.
- Gormley, B. (2005). An adult attachment theoretical perspective of gender symmetry in intimate partner violence. *Sex Roles*, 52, 785-795.
- Gough, H. G. (1952). Identifying psychological femininity. *Educational and Psychological Measurement*, 12, 427-439.
- Gough, H. G., & Heilbrun, A. B. (1965). *Manual for the Adjective Check List and the Need scales for the ACL*. Palo Alto, CA: Consulting Psychologists Press.
- Graham-Kevan, N., & Archer, J. (2009). Control tactics and partner violence in heterosexual relationships. *Evolution and human behavior*, 30(6), 445-452.
- Grant, C. A. (1995). Women who kill: The impact of abuse. *Issues in Mental Health Nursing*, 16, 315-326.
- Greenfeld, L. A., Rand, M. R., Craven, D., Klaus, P. A., Perkins, C. A., Ringel, C., et al. (1998). *Violence by intimates: Analysis of data on crimes by current or former spouses, boyfriends, and girlfriends*. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Justice, Bureau of Justice Statistics.
- Grinnell, J. P. (2002). Effects of leaders' and evaluators' sex on sex-role stereotyping of charismatic leaders. *Psychological Reports*, 91, 1247-1252.
- Gryl, F. E., Stith, S. M., & Bird, G. W. (1991). Close dating relationships among college students: Differences by use of violence and by gender. *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships*, 8, 243-264.
- Gutmann, D. (1970). Female ego styles and generational conflict. In J. Bardwick et al. (Eds.), *Feminine personality and conflict* (pp. 77-96). Belmont, CA: Brooks/Cole.
- Guttman, M. C. (1997). Trafficking in Men: The Anthropology of Masculinity. *Annual Review of Anthropology*, 26, 385-409.
- 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.

- Haj-Yahia, M. M. (2003). Beliefs about wife beating among Arab men from Israel: The influence of their patriarchal ideology. *Journal of Family Violence, 18*(4), 193–206.
- Haj-Yahia, M. M., & Edleson, J. L. (1994). Predicting the use of conflict resolution tactics among engaged Arab–Palestinian men in Israel. *Journal of Family Violence, 9*, 47–62.
- Halberstam, J. (1998). *Female Masculinity*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.
- Halpern, C. T., Oslak, S. G., Young, M. L., Martin, S. L., & Kupper, L. L. (2001). Partner violence among adolescents in opposite-sex romantic relationships: Findings from the National Longitudinal Study of Adolescent Health. *American Journal of Public Health, 91*(10), 1679–1685.
- Hamberger, L. K. (1997). Female offenders in domestic violence: A look at actions in their context. *Journal of Aggression, Maltreatment and Trauma, 1*, 117–129.
- Hamberger, L. K. (2005). Men’s and women’s use of intimate partner violence in clinical samples: Toward a gender-sensitive analysis. *Violence and Victims, 20*(2), 131–151.
- Hamberger, L. K., & Guse, C. E. (2002). Men’s and women’s use of intimate partner violence in clinical samples. *Violence Against Women, 8*, 1305–1335.
- Hamberger, L. K., Lohr, J., & Bonge, D. (1994). Intended function of domestic violence is different for arrested male and female perpetrators. *Family Violence and Sexual Assault Bulletin, 10*, 40–44.
- Hamby, S. L. (2005). Measuring Gender Differences in Partner Violence: Implications from Research on Other Forms of Violent and Socially Undesirable Behavior. *Sex Roles, 52*(11/12), 725–742.
- Hamby, S. L., & Koss, M. P. (2003). Shades of gray: A qualitative study of terms used in the measurement of sexual victimization. *Psychology of Women Quarterly, 27*, 243–255.
- Hamby, S. L., Poindexter, V. P., & Gray-Little, B. (1996). Four measures of partner violence: Construct similarity and classification differences. *Journal of Marriage and the Family, 58*, 127–139.

- Hamby, S. L., Sugarman, D. B., & Boney-McCoy, S. (2006). Does Questionnaire Format Impact Reported Partner Violence Rates? An Experimental Study. *Violence and Victims*, 21(4), 507-518.
- Hamel, J. (2007). Toward a gender-inclusive conception of intimate partner violence research and theory: Part 1 – Traditional perspectives. *International Journal of Men's Health*, 6(1), 36-53.
- Hanley, M. J., & O'Neill, P. (1997). Violence and commitment: a study of dating couples. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 12, 685–703.
- Hannawa, A. F., Spitzberg, B. H., Wiering, L., & Teranishi, C. (2006). “If I can’t Have You, No One Can”: Development of a Relational Entitlement and Proprietariness Scale (REPS). *Violence and Victims*, 21(5), 539-560.
- Haraway, D. (2004). *The Haraway Reader*. New York: Routledge.
- Harway, M., & O’Neil, J. M. (Eds.). (1999). *What causes men’s violence against women?* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Harding, S. (2004). *The Feminist Standpoint Theory Reader: Intellectual & Political Controversies*. New York: Routledge.
- Harris, K. M. (2009). The National Longitudinal Study of Adolescent Health (Add Health), Waves I & II, 1994–1996; Wave III, 2001–2002; Wave IV, 2007-2009 [machine-readable data file and documentation]. Chapel Hill, NC: Carolina Population Center, University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill.
- Harris, K. M., Halpern, C. T., Whitsel, E., Hussey, J., Tabor, J., Entzel, P., & Udry, J. R. (2009). The National Longitudinal Study of Adolescent Health: Research Design. Chapel Hill, NC: Carolina Population Center, University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill. Retrieved February 10, 2010 (<http://www.cpc.unc.edu/projects/addhealth/design>).
- Hastings, B. M. (2000). Social information processing and the verbal and physical abuse of women. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 15, 651–664.
- Hathaway, S. R., & McKinley, J. C. (1943). *The Minnesota Multiphasic Personality Inventory*. Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press.
- Hazan, C., & Shaver, P. R. (1987). Romantic love conceptualized as an attachment process. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 5(2), 511-524

- Heckert, D. A., & Gondolf, E. W. (2000). Predictors of Underreporting of Male Violence by Batterer Program Participants and Their Partners. *Journal of Family Violence*, 15(4), 423-443.
- Heilbrun, A. B., Jr. (1976). Measurement of masculine and feminine sex role identities as independent dimensions. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology*, 44, 183-190.
- Helgeson, V. S. (1994). Prototypes and dimensions of masculinity and femininity. *Sex Roles*, 31, 653-682.
- Helmreich, R. L., Spence, J. T., & Holahan, C. K. (1979). Psychological androgyny and sex role flexibility: A test of two hypotheses. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 37, 1631-1644.
- Helmrich, R. L., Spence, J. T., & Wilhelm, J. A. (1981). A psychometric analysis of the Personal Attributes Questionnaire. *Sex Roles*, 7(11), 1097-1108.
- Henton, J., Gate, R., Koval, J., Lloyd, S., & Christopher, S. (1983). Romance and violence in dating relationships. *Journal of Family Issues*, 4, 467-482.
- Hepp, U., Spindler, A., & Milos, G. (2005). Eating disorder symptomatology and gender role orientation. *International Journal of Eating Disorders*, 37, 227-233.
- Herzog, S. (2007). An empirical test of feminist theory and research: The effect of heterogeneous gender-role attitudes on perceptions of intimate partner violence. *Feminist Criminology*, 2(3), 223-244.
- Heyman, R. E., & Schlee, K. A. (1997). Toward a better estimate of the prevalence of partner abuse: Adjusting rates based on the sensitivity of the Conflict Tactics Scale. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 11(3), 332-338.
- Hiller, D. V., & Philliber, W. W. (1985). Internal consistency and correlates of the Bem Sex-Role Inventory. *Social Psychology Quarterly*, 48, 373-380.
- Hittner, J. B., & Daniels, J. R. (2002). Gender-role orientation, creative accomplishments and cognitive styles. *Journal of Creative Behaviour*, 36, 62-75.
- Hoffman, R. M., & Borders, L. D. (2001). Twenty-five years after the Bem sex-role inventory: A reassessment and new issues regarding classification variability. *Measurement and Evaluation in Counseling and Development*, 34, 39-55.

- Holden, G. W., & Ritchie, K. L. (1991). Linking extreme marital discord, child rearing, and child behavior problems: Evidence from battered women. *Child Development, 62*, 311-327.
- Holden, G. W., Stein, J., Ritchie, K., Harris, S., & Jouriles, E. N. (1998). The parenting behaviors and beliefs of battered women. In G. W. Holden, R. Geffner, & E. N. Jouriles (Eds.), *Children exposed to marital violence: Theory, research, and applied issues* (pp. 289-334). Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.
- Holtzworth-Munroe, A. (1992). Social skill deficits in maritally violent men: Interpreting the data using a social information processing model. *Clinical Psychology Review, 12*, 605-617.
- Holtzworth-Munroe, A. (2005). Female perpetration of physical aggression against an intimate partner: A controversial new topic of study. *Violence and Victims, 20*, 251-259.
- Holtzworth-Munroe, A., & Anglin, K. (1991). The competency of responses given by maritally violent versus nonviolent men to problematic marital situations. *Violence and Victims, 6*, 257-269.
- Holtzworth-Munroe, A., & Stuart, G. (1994). Typologies of male batterers: Three subtypes and the differences among them. *Psychological Bulletin, 116*, 476-497.
- Hotton, T. (2001). Spousal violence after marital separation. *Juristat, 21*, 1-19.
- Huesmann, L. R., & Guerra, N. G. (1997). Children's normative beliefs about aggression and aggressive behavior. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 72*, 408-419.
- Hunnicutt, G. (2009). Varieties of Patriarchy and Violence Against Women: Resurrecting "Patriarchy" as a Theoretical Tool. *Violence Against Women, 15*(5), 553-573.
- Hurlbert, C. D., Whittaker, K. E., & Munoz, C. J. (1991). Etiological characteristics of abusive husbands. *Military Medicine, 156*, 670-675.
- Iazzo, A. N. (1983). The construction and validation of Attitudes Toward Men Scale. *Psychological Record, 33*, 371-378.
- Jacobson, N. S., Gottman, J. M., Waltz, J., Rushe, R., Babcock, J., & Holtzworth-Munroe, A. (1994). Affect, verbal content, and psychophysiology in arguments of couples with a violent husband. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 62*, 982-988.

- Jacobson, N., & Gottman, J. (1998). *When men batter women: New insights into ending abusive relationships*. New York: Simon & Schuster.
- Jakupcak, M., Lisak, D., & Roemer, L. (2002). The role of masculine ideology and masculine gender role stress in men's perpetration of relationship violence. *Psychology of Men and Masculinity*, 3, 97–106.
- James, W., West, C., Deters, K., & Armijo, E. (2000). Youth dating violence. *Adolescence*, 35(139), 455-465.
- Jankowski, M. K., Leitenberg, H., Henning, K., & Coffey, P. (1999). Intergenerational transmission of dating aggression as a function of witnessing only same sex parents vs. opposite sex parents vs. both parents as perpetrators of domestic violence. *Journal of Family Violence*, 14(3), 267-279.
- Jenkins, S. S., & Aubé, J. (2002). Gender differences and gender-related constructs in dating aggression. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 28(8), 1,106–1,118.
- Jezl, D. R., Molitor, C. E., and Wright, T. L. (1996). Physical, sexual and psychological abuse in high school dating relationships: Prevalence rates and self-esteem issues. *Child and Adolescent Social Work Journal*, 13(1), 69-87.
- Johnson, H. (2000). The role of alcohol in male partners' assaults on wives. *Journal of Drug Issues*, 30, 725–740.
- Johnson, M. P. (1995). Patriarchal terrorism and common couple violence: Two forms of violence against women. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, 57, 283–295.
- Johnson, M. P. (2005). Domestic Violence: It's Not About Gender--Or Is It? *Journal of Marriage and Family*, 67, 1126-1130.
- Johnson, M. P. (2006). Conflict and control: Gender symmetry and asymmetry in domestic violence. *Violence Against Women*, 12, 1003–1018.
- Johnson, M. P. (2008). *A typology of domestic violence: Intimate terrorism, violent resistance, and situational couple violence*. Boston: Northeastern University Press.
- Johnson, M. P., & Ferraro, K. J. (2000). Research on domestic violence in the 1990s: Making distinctions. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, 62, 948–963.

- Johnson, M. P., & Leone, J. M. (2005). The differential effects of intimate terrorism and common couple violence: Findings from the National Violence Against Women Survey. *Journal of Family Issues*, 26, 322–349.
- Johnson, H. D., McNair, R., Vojick, A., Congdon, D., Monacelli, J., and J Lamont. (2006). Categorical and continuous measurement of sex-role orientation: differences in associations with young adults' reports of well-being. *Social Behavior & Personality: An International Journal*, 34, 59-75.
- Johnson, P. L., & O'Leary, K. D. (1996). Behavioral components of marital satisfaction: An individualized assessment approach. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology*, 64, 417–423.
- Johnson, S. B., Frattaroli, S., Campbell, J., Wright, J., Pearson-Fields, A. S., & Cheng, T. L. (2005). *Journal of Women's Health*, 14(2), 172-179.
- Johnston, M. E. (1988). Correlates of early violence experience among men who are abusive toward female mates. In G. T. Hotaling & D. Finkelhor (Eds.), *Family abuse and its consequences: New directions in research* (pp. 192–202). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Jouriles, E. N., & O'Leary, K. D. (1985). Interspousal reliability of reports of marital violence. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology*, 53, 419–421.
- Jurik, N. C., & Gregware, P. (1989). *A method for murder: An interactionist analysis of homicides by women*. Unpublished manuscript, Arizona State University, Tempe, AZ.
- Jurik, N. C., & Winn, R. (1990). Gender and homicide: A comparison of men and women who kill. *Violence and Victims*, 5, 227-242.
- Kalmuss, D. (1984). The intergenerational transmission of marital aggression. *Journal of Marriage & the Family*, 46, 11–19.
- Kandiyoti, D. (1988). Bargaining with patriarchy. *Gender & Society*, 2, 274-290.
- Kaplan, A. G., & Bean, J. P. (Eds.). (1976). *Beyond sex-role stereotypes: Readings toward a psychology of androgyny*. Boston: Little, Brown.
- Karniol, R., Grosz, E., & Schorr, I. (2003). Caring, gender role orientation, and volunteering. *Sex Roles: A Journal of Research*, 49(1/2), 11-19.
- Katsurada, E. & Sugihara, Y. (2002). Gender- role identity, attitudes towards marriage and gender segregated backgrounds. *Sex Roles*, 47, 249-258.

- Kaura, S. A., & Allen, C. M. (2004). Dissatisfaction with relationship power and dating violence perpetration by men and women. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 19, 576–588.
- Keller, C. J., Lavish, L. A., & Brown, C. (2007). Creative styles and gender roles in undergraduate students. *Creativity Research Journal*, 19, 273–280.
- Kelly, L. (1994) The interconnectedness of domestic violence and child abuse: challenges for research, policy and practice. In A. Mullender & R. Morley (Eds.), *Children Living with Domestic Violence* (pp. 43–56). London: Whiting and Birch Ltd.
- Kelly, J. B., & Johnson, M. P. (2008). Differentiation among types of intimate partner violence: Research update and implications for interventions. *Family Court Review*, 46, 476–499.
- Kim, J.-Y., & Emery, C. (2003). Marital power, conflict, norm consensus, and marital violence in a nationally representative sample of Korean couples. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 18, 197–219.
- Kim, J.-Y., & Sung, K. (2000). Conjugal violence in Korean American families: A residue of the cultural tradition. *Journal of Family Violence*, 15, 331–345.
- Kimmel, M. S. (2002). “Gender symmetry” in domestic violence: A substantive and methodological research review. *Violence Against Women*, 8, 1332–1363.
- King, D. (1988). Multiple Jeopardy, Multiple Consciousness: The Context of a Black Feminist Ideology. *Signs*, 14(1), 42-72.
- King, L. A., King, D. W., Carter, D. B., Surface, C. R., & Stepanski, K. (1994). Validity of the Sex-Role Egalitarianism Scale: Two replication studies. *Sex Roles*, 31, 339–348.
- Kirkpatrick, C. (1936). The construction of a belief-pattern scale for measuring attitudes toward feminism. *Journal of Social Psychology*, 7, 421-437.
- Kiselica, M. (2001, August). Are males really emotional mummies? What do the data indicate? Symposium conducted at the 109th annual meeting of the American Psychological Association, San Francisco.
- Klingenspor, B. (2002). Gender-related self-discrepancies and bulimic eating behavior. *Sex Roles*, 47(1/2), 51–65.

- Koca, C., Aşçı, F.H. & Kirazcı, S. (2005). Gender role orientation in athletes and non-athletes in patriarchal societies: a case of Turkey. *Sex Roles*, 52(3-4), 217-225.
- Koopman-Boyden, P. G., & Abbott, M. (1985). Expectations for household task allocation and actual task allocation: A New Zealand study. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, 6(1), 211-219.
- Kroska, A. 2000a. Conceptualizing and measuring gender ideology as an identity. *Gender & Society*, 14, 368-394.
- Kroska, A. 2000b. Time for Theoretical Housekeeping: Reexamining Theories of the Division of Household Labor. Presented at the annual meetings of the American Sociological Association, 2000 Washington, DC.
- 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.
- Kurz, D. (1997). Physical assaults by male partners: A major social problem. In M. R. Walsh (Ed), *Women, Men, and Gender: Ongoing Debates* (pp. 222 - 231). New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.
- Laner, M. R., & Thompson, J. (1982). Abuse and aggression in courting couples. *Deviant Behavior: An International Journal*, 3, 229-244,
- Langhinrichsen-Rohling, J., Neidig, P., & Thorn, G. (1995). Violent marriages: Gender differences in levels of current violence and past abuse. *Journal of Family Violence*, 10, 159-176.
- Lapierre, S. (2008) Mothering in the context of domestic violence: the pervasiveness of a deficit model of mothering. *Child & Family SocialWork*, 13, 454-463.
- Larsen, K. S., & Long, E. (1988). Attitudes toward sex roles: Traditional or egalitarian? *Sex Roles*, 19, 1-11.
- Larson, R. J., & Seidman, E. (1986). Gender schema theory and sex role inventories: Some conceptual and psychometric considerations. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 50, 205-211.
- Lavine, L., & Lombardo, J. P. (1984). Self-disclosure: Intimate and nonintimate disclosures to parents and best friends as a function of Bem Sex Role category. *Sex Roles*, 11, 735-744.

- Lenton, R. L. (1995). Power versus feminist theories of wife abuse. *Canadian Journal of Criminology Special Issue: Focus on the Violence Against Women Survey*, 37, 305–330.
- Leonard, E. (2002). *Convicted Survivors: The Imprisonment of Battered Women Who Kill*. Albany, New York: State University of New York Press.
- Leone, J. M., Johnson, M. P., Cohan, C. L., & Lloyd, S. E. (2004). Consequences of male partner violence for low-income minority women. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, 66, 472 – 490.
- Levendosky, A.A., & Graham-Bermann, S. A. (1998). The moderating effects of parenting stress on children's adjustment in woman-abusing families. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 13, 383–397.
- Levesque, D. A., Gelles, R. J., & Velicer, W. F. (2000). Development and validation of a stages of change measure for men in batterer treatment. *Cognitive Therapy and Research*, 24(2), 175–199.
- LaViolette, A. D., Barnett, O. W., & Miller, C. L. (1984). A classification of wife abusers on the Bem sex-role inventory. Presented at the Second Annual Conference on Research and Domestic Violence, Durham, NH.
- Levitt, H. M., & Ware, K. (2006) "Anything with Two Heads is a Monster": Religious Leaders' Perspectives on Marital Equality and Domestic Violence. *Violence Against Women*, 12, 1169-1190.
- Li, C., DiGiuseppe, R. & Froh, J. (2006) The roles of sex, gender, and coping in adolescent depression. *Adolescence*, 41, 409–415.
- Lichter, E. L., & McCloskey, L. A. (2004). The effects of childhood exposure to marital violence on adolescent gender-role beliefs and dating violence. *Psychology of Women Quarterly*, 28, 344–357.
- Lippa, R. (1991). Some psychometric characteristics of gender diagnosticity measures: Reliability, validity, consistency across domains and relationship to the Big Five. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 61, 1000-1011.
- Lippa, R. (1995a). Do sex differences define gender-related individual differences within the sexes? Evidence from three studies. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 21, 349-355.

- Lippa, R. (1995b). Gender-related individual differences and psychological adjustment in terms of the Big Five and circumplex models. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 69, 1184–1202.
- Lippa, R. (1997). The display of masculinity, femininity, and gender diagnosticity in self-descriptive photo essays. *Journal of Personality*, 65, 139-169.
- Lippa, R. (1998). The nonverbal judgment and display of extraversion, masculinity, femininity, and gender diagnosticity: A lens model analysis. *Journal of Research in Personality*, 32, 80-107.
- Lippa, R. (2001). On deconstructing and reconstructing masculinity-femininity. *Journal of Research on Personality*, 35, 168–207.
- Lippa, R., & Connelly, S. C. (1990). Gender diagnosticity: A new Bayesian approach to gender-related individual differences. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 59, 1051-1065.
- Lloyd, S. A. (1991). The darkside of courtship: Violence and sexual exploitation. *Family Relations*, 40, 14–20.
- Loh, C., & Gidycz, C. A. (2006). A prospective analysis of the relationship between childhood sexual victimization and perpetration of dating violence and sexual assault in adulthood. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 21(6), 732-749.
- Lombardo, W. K., Cretser, G. A. & Roesch, S. C. (2001) For crying out loud: The differences persist in the '90s. *Sex Roles*, 45, 529–47.
- Lorber, J. (2003). The Social Construction of Gender. In E. Disch (Ed.), *Reconstructing Gender: A Multicultural Anthology*. San Francisco, CA: McGraw-Hill.
- Lorr, M. & Diorio, M. (1978). Analysis and abbreviation of Bem's Sex-Role Inventory. *Psychological Reports*, 43, 879-882.
- Lupri, E. (2004, May). Institutional resistance to acknowledging intimate male abuse. Paper presented at the Counter-Roundtable Conference on Domestic Violence. Calgary, Canada.
- Luthra, R., & Gidycz, C. A. (2006). Dating violence among college men and women: Evaluation of a theoretical model. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 21, 717–731.

- Macmillan, R., & Gartner, R. (1999). When she brings home the bacon: Labor-force participation and the risk of spousal violence against women. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, 61, 947-958.
- Magdol, L., Moffitt, T. E., Caspi, A., & Silva, P. (1998). Developmental antecedents of partner abuse: A prospective-longitudinal study. *Journal of Abnormal Psychology*, 107, 375-389.
- Maguigan, H. (1991). Battered women and self-defense: Myths and misconceptions in current reform proposals. *University of Pennsylvania Law Review*, 140, 379-486.
- Makepeace, J. M. (1986). Gender differences in courtship violence victimization. *Family Relations*, 35, 383-388.
- Mankowski, E., Haaken, J., & Silvergleid, C. (2002). Collateral damage: an analysis of the achievements and unintended consequences of batterer intervention programs and discourse. *Journal of Family Violence*, 17, 167-184.
- Marcotte, D., Fortin, L., Potvin, P., & Papillon, M. (2002). Gender differences in depressive symptoms during adolescence: Role of gender-typed characteristics, self-esteem, body-image, stressful life events, and pubertal status. *Journal of Emotional and Behavioral Disorders*, 10, 29-42.
- Marsh, H. W., & Myers, M. (1986). Masculinity, femininity, and androgyny: A methodological and theoretical critique. *Sex Roles*, 14, 397-430.
- Marshall, L. L., & Rose, P. (1988). Family of origin violence and courtship abuse. *Journal of Counseling & Development*, 66, 414-418.
- Martin, H. J., & Ramanaiah, N. V. (1988). Confirmatory factor analysis of the Bem Sex-Role Inventory. *Psychological Reports*, 62, 343-350.
- Massa, L. J., Mayer, R. E., & Bohon, L. M. (2005). Individual differences in gender role beliefs influence spatial ability test performance. *Learning and Individual Differences*, 15, 99-111.
- Maznah, I., & Choo, P. F. (1986). The factor structure of the Bem Sex Role Inventory (BSRI). *International Journal of Psychology*, 21, 31-41.
- McCarthy, B., Hagan, J., & Woodward, T. S. (1999). In the Company of Women: Structure and Agency in a Revised Power-Control Theory of Gender and Delinquency. *Criminology* 37(4), 761-88.

- McClelland, D. C., Davis, W. N., Kalin, R., & Wanner, E. (1972). *The Drinking Man*. New York: Free Press.
- McFarlane, J., Campbell, J., Wilt, S., Sachs, C., Ulrich, Y., & Xu, X. (1999). Stalking and intimate partner femicide. *Homicide Studies*, 3(4), 300-316.
- McGovern, J. M., & Meyers, S. A. (2002). Relationships between sex-role attitudes, division of household tasks, and marital adjustment. *Contemporary Family Therapy*, 24(4), 601-618.
- McHugh, M. C., & Frieze, I. H. (1997). The measurement of gender-role attitudes. *Psychology of Women Quarterly*, 21, 1-16.
- McHugh, M. C., Livingston, N. A. & Ford, A. (2005). A postmodern approach to women's use of violence: developing multiple and complex conceptualizations. *Psychology of Women Quarterly*, 29(3), 323-336.
- McNeely, R. L., Cook, P. W., & Torres, J. B. (2001). Is domestic violence a gender issue, or a human issue? *Journal of Human Behavior in the Social Environment*, 4(4), 227-251.
- Medina, K. L., Schafer, J., Shear, P. K., & Armstrong, T. G. (2004). Memory ability is associated with disagreement about the most recent conflict in polysubstance abusing couples. *Journal of Family Violence*, 19(6), 387-398.
- Mednick, S. A. (1977). A biosocial theory of the learning of law-abiding behavior. In S. A. Mednick & K. O. Christiansen (Eds.), *Biosocial bases of criminal behavior* (pp. 1-8). New York: Gardner.
- Messick, S. (1989). Validity. In R. L. Linn (Ed.), *Educational measurement* (3rd ed.). New York: Macmillan.
- Meyer C., Blissett J., & Oldfield, C. (2001). Sexual orientation and eating psychopathology: the role of masculinity and femininity. *International Journal of Eating Disorders*, 29(3), 314-318.
- Migliaccio, T. (2002). Abused Husbands: A Narrative Analysis. *Journal of Family Issues*, 23(1), 26-52.
- Millar, M. G., & Houska, J. A. (2007). Masculinity and Intentions to Perform Health Behaviors: The Effectiveness of Fear Control Arguments. *Journal of behavioral medicine*, 30(5): 403-409.

- Miller, J., & White, N. A. (2003). Gender and Adolescent Relationship Violence: A Contextual Examination. *Criminology*, 41, 1207-1248.
- Mirandé, A. 1997. *Hombres Y Machos: Masculinity and Latino Culture*. Boulder, CO: Westview Press.
- Moffitt, T. E., Caspi, A., Krueger, R., Magdol, L., Margolin, G., Silva, P. A., & Sydney, R. (1997). Do partners agree about abuse in their relationship? A psychometric evaluation of interpartner agreement. *Psychological Assessment*, 9, 47-56.
- Molidor, C. E. (1995). Gender differences of psychological abuse in high school dating relationships. *Child and Adolescent Social Work Journal*, 12, 119-134.
- Molidor, C. E., & Tolman, R. M. (1998). Gender and contextual factors in adolescent dating violence. *Violence Against Women*, 4, 180-194.
- Moore, T. M., & Stuart, G. L. (2005). A review of the literature on masculinity and partner violence. *Psychology of Men & Masculinity*, 6, 46-61.
- Moreland, J. R., Gulanick, N., Montague, E. K., & Harren, V. A. (1978). Some psychometric properties of the Bem Sex-Role Inventory. *Applied Psychological Measurement*, 2, 249-256.
- Morrison, R. L., Van Hassell, V. B., & Bellack, A. S. (1987). Assessment of assertion and problem-solving skills in wife abusers and their spouses. *Journal of Family Violence*, 2, 227-238.
- Morse, B. J. (1995). Beyond the Conflict Tactics Scale: Assessing gender differences in partner violence. *Violence and Victims*, 10, 251-272.
- Mosher, C. E., & Danoff-Burg, S. (2005). Agentic and communal personality traits: Relations to attitudes towards sex and sexual experiences. *Sex Roles*, 52, 121-129.
- Mosher, D. L., & Sirkin, M. (1984). Measuring a macho personality constellation. *Journal of Research in Personality*, 18, 150-163.
- Mullaney, J. (2007). Telling it like a man: masculinities and battering men's accounts of their violence. *Men and Masculinities*, 10, 222-247.
- Mullender, A., Hague, G., Imam, U., Kelly, L., Malos, E., & Regan, L. (2002). *Children's Perspectives on Domestic Violence*. London: Sage.

- Murphy, C. M., Morrel, T. M., Elliott, J. D., & Neavins, T. M. (2003). A prognostic indicator scale for the treatment of partner abuse perpetrators. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 18*, 1087-1105.
- Myers, D. L. (1995). Eliminating the battering of women by men: Some considerations for behavior analysis. *Journal of Applied Behavior Analysis, 28*, 493-507.
- National Center for Injury Prevention and Control. (2003). Costs of Intimate Partner Violence Against Women in the United States. Atlanta, GA: Centers for Disease Control and Prevention.
- Nayak, M., Byrne, C., Martin, M., & Abraham, A. (2003). Attitudes toward violence against women: A cross-nation study. *Sex Roles, 49*, 333-342.
- Neidig, P. H., Friedman, D. H., & Collins, B. S. (1986). Attitudinal characteristics of males who have engaged in spouse abuse. *Journal of Family Violence, 1*, 223-233.
- Newark, L., Harrell, A., & Salem, P. (1995). Domestic violence and empowerment in custody and visitation cases. *Family and Conciliation Courts Review, 33*, 30-62.
- O'Keefe, M. (1997). Predictors of dating violence among high school students. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 12*, 546-569.
- O'Keefe, M. (2005). Teen dating violence: A review of risk factors and prevention efforts. *VAWNet Applied Research Forum*. Retrieved February 1, 2010 (http://new.vawnet.org/Assoc_Files_VAWnet/AR_TeenDatingViolence.pdf).
- O'Keefe, M., & Treister, L. (1998). 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. (1988). Physical aggression between spouses: A social learning theory perspective. In V. B. Van Hasselt & R. L. Morrison (Eds.), *Handbook of Family Violence* (pp. 31-55). New York: Plenum Publishing.
- O'Leary, K. D. (1999). Psychological abuse: A variable deserving critical attention in domestic violence. *Violence and Victims, 14*, 3-23.
- O'Leary, K. D., & Arias, I. (1988). Prevalence, correlates, and development of spouse abuse. In R. DeV. Peters, and R. J. McMahon (Eds.), *Social Learning and Systems Approach to Marriage and the Family*. New York: Brunner/Mazel.

- O'Leary, K. D., Barling, J., Arias, L., Rosenbaum, A., Malone, J., & Tyree, A. (1989). Prevalence and stability of physical aggression between spouses: A longitudinal analysis. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology*, 57, 263-268.
- O'Leary, K. D., Vivian, D., & Malone, J. (1992). Assessment of physical aggression against women in marriage: The need for multimodal assessment. *Behavioral Assessment*, 14, 5-14.
- O'Leary, K. D., & Williams, M.C. (2006). Agreement about acts of aggression in marriage. *Journal of Family Psychology*, 20(4), 656-662.
- O'Neil, J. M. (1982). Gender role conflict and strain in men's lives: Implications for psychiatrists, psychologists, and other human service providers. In K. Solomon & N. Levy (Eds.), *Men in transition: Theory and therapy*. New York: Plenum Press.
- O'Neil, J. M., Helms, B., Gable, R., David, L., & Wrightsman, L. (1986). Gender Role Conflict Scale: College men's fear of femininity. *Sex Roles*, 14, 335-350.
- Olson, L. N., & Lloyd, S. A. (2005). "It depends on what you mean by starting": An exploration of how women define initiation of aggression and their motives for behaving aggressively. *Sex Roles*, 53, 603-617.
- Orlofsky, J. L. (1979). Parental antecedents of sex-role orientation in college men and women. *Sex Roles*, 5, 495-512.
- Orlofsky, J. L. (1918). Relationship between sex role attitudes and personality traits and the Sex Role Behavior Scale-1: A new measure of masculine and feminine role behaviors and interests. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 40, 927-940.
- Orlofsky, J. L., & O'Heron, C. A. (1987). Stereotypic and nonstereotypic sex role trait and behavior orientations: Implications for personal adjustment. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 52, 1034-1042.
- Orlofsky, J. L., Ramsden, M. W., & Cohen, R. S. (1982). Development of the revised sex role behavior scale. *Journal of Personality Assessment*, 46, 632-638.
- Özkan, T., & Lajunen, T. (2005). Masculinity, femininity, and the Bem Sex Role Inventory in Turkey. *Sex Roles*, 52, 103-110.
- Parrott, D. J., & Zeichner, A. (2003). Effects of hypermasculinity on physical aggression against women. *Psychology of Men and Masculinity*, 4, 70-78.
- Parsons, T. (1951). *The social system*. Glencoe, IL: Free Press.

- Parsons, T., Bales, R. F., & Shills, E. (1954). *Working papers in the theory of action*. Glencoe, IL: Free Press.
- Paternoster, R., & Bachman, R. (2001). *Explaining Criminals and Crime: Essays in Contemporary Criminological Theory*. Los Angeles, CA: Roxbury Publishing Co.
- Pedhazur, E. J., & Tetenbaum, T. J. (1979). Bem Sex Role Inventory: A theoretical and methodological critique. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 37, 996-1016.
- Peng, T. K. (2006). Construct validation of the Bem Sex Role Inventory in Taiwan. *Sex Roles*, 55, 843-851.
- Perel, G., & Peled, E. (2008). The fathering of violent men: Constriction and yearning. *Violence Against Women*, 14(4), 457-482.
- Phelan, M. B., Hamberger, L. K., Hare, S., & Edwards, S. (2002, August). Impact of partner violence on male and female emergency department patients. Paper presented at the meeting of the American Psychological Association, Chicago, IL.
- Pleck, J. H. (1981). *The myth of masculinity*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Pleck, J. H. (1985). *Working Wives/Working Husbands*. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.
- Price, L. E., Bryers, S. E., & the Dating Violence Research Team. (1999). The Attitudes towards Dating Violence Scales: Development and Initial Validation. *Journal of Family Violence*, 14(4), 351-375.
- Powell, G. N., Butterfield, D. A., & Parent, J. D. (2002). Gender and managerial stereotypes: Have the times changed? *Journal of Management*, 28, 177-193.
- Próspero, M. (2008). Effects of masculinity, sex, and control on different types of intimate partner violence perpetration. *Journal of family violence*, 23(7), 639-645.
- Próspero, M. (2009). Sex symmetric effects of coercive behaviors on mental health? Not exactly. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 24(1), 128-146.
- Pursell, S., Banikiotes, P., & Sebastian, R. (1981). Androgyny and the perception of marital roles. *Sex Roles*, 7, 201-215.
- Ratliff, E. S., & Conley, J. (1981). The structure of masculinity-femininity multidimensionality and gender differences. *Social Behavior and Personality*, 9, 41-47.

- Ravaldi, C., Vannacci, A., Bolognesi, E., Mancini, S., Faravelli, C., & Ricca, V. (2006). Gender role, eating disorder symptoms, and body image concern in ballet dancers. *Journal of Psychosomatic Research*, 61, 529-535.
- Ray, A. L., & Gold, S. R. (1996). Gender roles, aggression, and alcohol use in dating relationships. *Journal of Sex Research*, 33, 47-55.
- Reeder, H. M. (2003). The effect of gender role orientation on same- and cross-sex friendship formation. *Sex Roles*, 49, 143-152.
- Reitzel-Jaffe, D., & Wolfe, D. A. (2001). Predictors of relationship abuse among young men. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 16, 99-115.
- Rennison, C. M. (2001). Special Report: Intimate Partner Violence and Age of Victim, 1993-99. *U.S. Department of Justice, Bureau of Justice Statistics*.
- Rennison, C. M., & Welchans, S. (2000). *Intimate partner violence*. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Justice.
- Repetti, R. L. (1984). Determinants of children's sex stereotyping: Parental sex-role traits and television viewing. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 3, 457-468.
- Retzinger, S. M. (1991). *Violent Emotions: Shame and Rage in Marital Quarrels*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Riggs, D. S., & O'Leary, K. D. (1989). A theoretical model of courtship aggression. In M. A. Pirog-Good & J. E. Stets (Eds.), *Violence in dating relationships: Emerging social issues* (pp. 53-71). New York: Praeger Publishers.
- Ronan, G. F., Dreer, L. E., Dollard, K. M., & Ronan, D. W. (2004). Violent Couples: Coping and Communication Skills. *Journal of Family Violence*, 19(2), 131-137.
- Rosenbaum, A. (1986). Of men, macho, and marital violence. *Journal of Family Violence*, 1, 121-129.
- Rosenbaum, A., & Maiuro, R. (1990). Perpetrators of Spouse Abuse. In R. T. Ammerman & M. Hersen (Eds.), *Treatment of Family Violence* (pp. 280-309). New York: Wiley.
- Rosenbaum, A., & O'Leary, K. D. (1981). Marital violence: Characteristics of abusive couples. *Journal of Consulting & Clinical Psychology*, 49, 63-71.

- Rosenkrantz, P., Vogel, S., Bee, H., Broverman, I., & Broverman, D. M. (1968). Sex-role stereotypes and self-concepts in college students. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 32*, 287–295.
- Rouse, L. P., Breen, R., & Howell, M. (1988). Abuse in relationships: A comparison of married and dating college students. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 3*, 414–429.
- Rowe, D. C. (2002). *Biology and Crime*. Los Angeles, CA: Roxbury.
- Ruch, L. O. (1984). Dimensionality of the Bem Sex Role Inventory: A multidimensional analysis. *Sex Roles, 10*, 99–117.
- Russell, G. (1978). The father role and its relation to masculinity, femininity, and androgyny. *Child Development, 49*, 1174–1181.
- Ryan, K. M. (1995). Do courtship-violent men have characteristics associated with a “battering personality”? *Journal of Family Violence, 10*, 99–120.
- Ryan, K. M., & Kanjorski, J. (1998). The enjoyment of sexist humor, rape attitudes, and relationship aggression in college students. *Sex Roles, 38*, 743–756.
- Sajatovic, M., Jenkins, J. H., Strauss, M. E., Butt, Z. A., & Carpenter, E. (2005) Gender identity and implications for recovery among men and women with schizophrenia. *Psychiatric Services, 56*, 96–98.
- Sakalli, N. (2001). Beliefs about wife beating among Turkish college students: The effects of patriarchy, sexism, and sex differences. *Sex Roles, 44*(9–10), 599–610.
- Sassenrath, J. M., & Yonge, G. D. (1979). The Bem Sex-Role Inventory reexamined. *Psychological Reports, 45*, 935–941.
- Saunders, D. G. (1986). When battered women use violence: Husband-abuse or self-defense? *Violence and Victims, 1*, 47–60.
- Saunders, D. G. (2002). Are physical assaults by wives and girlfriends a major social problem? A review of the literature. *Violence Against Women, 8*, 1424–1448.
- Saunders, D. G., & Browne, A. (2000). Intimate partner homicide. In R. T. Ammerman & M. Hersen (Eds.), *Case studies in family violence* (2nd ed., pp. 415–449). New York: Plenum.
- Schafer, J., Caetano, R., & Clark, C.L. (2002). Agreement about violence in U.S. Couples. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 17*(4), 457–470.

- Schau, C., & Kahn, L. (1980). Children's sex stereotypes of adult occupations. In C. H. Beere (Ed.), *Women and women's issues: A handbook of tests and measures*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Schmitt, B. H., & Millard, R. T. (1988). Construct validity of the Bem Sex Role Inventory (BSRI): Does the BSRI distinguish between gender-schematic and gender-aschematic individuals? *Sex Roles*, 19, 581-588.
- Schubert, E. E., Protinsky, H. O., & Viers, D. (2002). Levels of differentiation and marital egalitarianism in men who batter. *Journal of Feminist Family Therapy*, 14, 1-19.
- Schwartz, J. P., Waldo, M., & Daniel, D. (2005). Gender-role conflict and self-esteem: Factors associated with partner abuse in court-referred men. *Psychology of Men and Masculinity*, 6, 109-113.
- Schwartz, M. D. (1987). Gender and injury in spousal assault. *Social Focus*, 20, 61-74.
- Schwartz, M. D., DeKeseredy, W., Tait, D., & Alvi, S. (2001). Male peer support and a feminist routine activities theory: Understanding sexual assault on the college campus. *Justice Quarterly*, 18, 701-727.
- Sears, H. A., Byers, E. S., & Price, E. L. (2007). The co-occurrence of adolescent boys' and girls' use of psychologically, physically, and sexually abusive behavior in their dating relationships. *Journal of Adolescence*, 30, 487-504.
- Sears, H. A., Byers, E.S., Whelan, J.J., & Saint-Pierre, M. (2006). "If it hurts you, then it is not a joke": adolescents' ideas about girls' and boys' use and experience of abusive behavior in dating relationships. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 21, 1191-207.
- Settles, I. (2006). Use of an intersectional framework to understand Black women's racial and gender identities. *Sex Roles*, 54, 589-601.
- Sevim, S.A. (2006). Religious tendency and gender roles: predictors of the attitudes toward women's work roles? *Social Behaviour and Personality*, 34(1), 77-86.
- Shepard, W. O., & Hess, D. T. (1975). Attitudes in four age groups toward sex role division in adult occupations and activities. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 6, 27-39.
- Sher, K. J. (1985). Subjective Effects of Alcohol: The Influence of Setting and Individual Differences in Alcohol Expectancies. *Journal of Studies on Alcohol*, 46, 137-146.

- Shorey, R. C., Cornelius, T. L., & Bell, K. M. (2008). A critical review of theoretical frameworks for dating violence: Comparing the dating and marital fields. *Aggression and Violent Behavior, 13*, 185-194.
- Sigelman, C. K., Berry, C. J., & Wiles, K. A. (1984). Violence in college students' dating relationships. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology, 5*, 530-548.
- Signorella, M. L., & Liben, L. S. (1985). Assessing children's gender-stereotyped attitudes. *Psychological Documents, 15*, 7.
- Silverman, J. G., Raj, A., Mucci, L. A., & Hathaway, J. E. (2001). Dating violence against adolescent girls and associated substance use, unhealthy weight control, sexual risk behavior, pregnancy, and suicidality. *JAMA, 286*, 572-579.
- Simpson, L. E., & Christensen, A. (2005). Spousal Agreement Regarding Relationship Aggression on the Conflict Tactics Scale-2. *Psychological Assessment, 17*(4), 423-432.
- Singh, K., & Agrawal, P. (2007). Perceived Sex Role and Fear of Success: A Study on Urban Working Women. *Journal of Social Sciences, 15*(1), 65-69.
- Slade, P., & Jenner, F. A. (1978). Questionnaire measuring attitudes to females' social roles. *Psychological Reports, 43*, 351-354.
- Smith, B.A., Thompson, S., Tomaka, J., Buchanan, A. C. (2005). Development of the Intimate Partner Violence Attitude Scales (IPVAS) with a Predominantly Mexican American College Sample. *Hispanic Journal of Behavioral Sciences, 27*(4), 442-454.
- Smith, D. E. (2004). Women's Perspective as a Radical Critique of Sociology. In S. Harding (Ed.), *The Feminist Standpoint Theory Reader: Intellectual and Political Controversies* (pp. 21-34). New York: Routledge.
- Smith, J. P., & Williams, J. G. (1992). From abusive household to dating violence. *Journal of Family Violence, 7*, 153-165.
- Smith, M. D. (1990). Patriarchal ideology and wife beating: A test of a feminist hypothesis. *Violence & Victims, 5*, 257-273.
- Smith, S. C., Ellis, J. B., & Benson, T. A. (2001). Gender, gender roles, and attitudes toward violence: Are viewpoints changing? *Social Behavior and Personality, 29*, 43-47.

- Smuts, B. (1992). Male aggression against women: An evolutionary perspective. *Human Nature* 3, 1-44.
- Snell, W. E., Jr., Belk, S. S., & Hawkins, R. C. (1986). The masculine role as a moderator of stress-distress relationships. *Sex Roles*, 15, 359–366.
- Snyder, M., & Skrypnik, B. J. (1981). Testing hypotheses about the self: Assessments of job suitability. *Journal of Personality*, 49, 193–211.
- Sorenson, S. B., Upchurch, D. M., & Shen, H. (1996). Violence and injury in marital arguments: Risk patterns and gender differences. *American Journal of Public Health*, 86, 35-40.
- Spence, J. T. (1993). Gender-related traits and gender ideology: Evidence for a multifactorial theory. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 64, 624–635.
- Spence, J. T., & Helmreich, R. L. (1972). The Attitudes Toward Women Scale: An objective instrument to measure attitudes toward the rights and roles of women in contemporary society. *JSAS Catalog of Selected Documents in Psychology*, 2, 66–67.
- Spence, J. T., & Helmreich, R. L. (1975). Ratings of self and peers on sex-role attributes and their relation to self-esteem and conceptions of masculinity and femininity. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 32, 29-39.
- Spence, J. T., & Helmreich, R. L. (1978). *Masculinity and femininity: Their psychological dimensions, correlates and antecedents*. Austin, TX: University of Texas Press.
- Spence, J. T., & Helmreich, R. L. (1979). The many faces of androgyny: A reply to Locksley and Colten. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 37, 1032-1046.
- Spence, J. T., Helmreich, R. L., & Holahan, C. (1979). Negative and positive components of psychological masculinity and femininity and their relationship to self-reports of neurotic and acting out behaviors. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 37, 1673–1682.
- Spence, J. T., Helmreich, R. L., & Stapp, J. (1973). A short version of the Attitudes Toward Women Scale (AWS). *Bulletin of the Psychonomic Society*, 2, 219–220.
- Spence, J. T., Helmreich, R. L., & Stapp, J. (1974). The Personal Attributes Questionnaire: A measure of sex role stereotypes and masculinity-femininity. *JSAS Catalogue of Selected Documents in Psychology*, 4, 43–44.

- Stark, E. (2006). Reply to Michael P. Johnson's conflict and control: Gender symmetry and asymmetry in domestic violence. *Violence Against Women*, 12, 1019–1025.
- Stark, E. (2007). *Coercive control: How men entrap women in personal life*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Statistics Canada. (2001). *Family violence in Canada: A statistical profile*. Ottawa, Canada: National Clearinghouse on Family Violence.
- Steinbugler, A., Press, J., & Dias, J. (2006). Gender, race, and affirmative action: Operationalizing intersectionality in survey research. *Gender & Society*, 20, 805–825.
- Sterenberg, K. J., Lamb, M. E., Greenbaum, C., Dawud, S., Cortes, R. M., & Lorey, F. (1994). The effects of domestic violence on children's perceptions of their perpetrating and nonperpetrating parents. *International Journal of Behavioral Development*, 17, 779–795.
- Stets, J. E. (1991). Cohabiting and marital aggression: The role of social isolation. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, 53, 669–680.
- Stets, J. E., & Pirog-Good, M. A. (1987). Violence in dating relationships. *Social Psychology Quarterly*, 50, 237–246.
- Stets, J. E., & Straus, M. A. (1990). Gender differences in reporting marital violence and its medical and psychological consequences. In M. A. Straus & R. J. Gelles (Eds.), *Physical violence in American families: Risk factors and adaptations to violence in 8,145 families* (pp. 151–165). New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction.
- Stith, S. M. (1990). Police response to domestic violence: The influence of individual and familial factors. *Violence and Victims*, 5, 37–49.
- Stith, S. M., & Farley, S. C. (1993). A predictive model of male spousal violence. *Journal of Family Violence*, 8, 183–201.
- Stout, K. D. (1993). Intimate femicide: A study of men who have killed their mates. *Journal of Offender Rehabilitation*, 19, 81–94.
- Stout, K. D., & Brown, P. (1995). Legal and social differences between men and women who kill intimate partners. *Affilia*, 10, 194–205.
- Straus, M. A. (1979). Measuring intrafamily conflict and violence: The Conflict Tactics (CT) Scales. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, 41, 75–88.

- Straus, M. A. (1990). The Conflict Tactics Scales and its critics: An evaluation and new data on validity and reliability. In M. A. Straus & R. J. Gelles (Eds.), *Physical violence in American societies: Risk factor and adaptations to violence in 8,145 families* (pp. 49-73). New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction Publications.
- Straus, M. A. (1991). Conceptualization and measurement of battering: Implications for public policy. In M. Steinman (Ed.), *Woman battering: Policy responses* (pp. 19-47). Cincinnati, OH: Anderson.
- Straus, M. A. (1993). Physical assaults by wives: A major social problem. In R. J. Gelles & D. R. Loseke (Eds.), *Current controversies on family violence* (pp. 67-87). Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Straus, M. A. (1999). The controversy over domestic violence by women: A methodological, theoretical, and sociology of science analysis. In X. B. Arriaga & S. Oskamp (Eds.), *Violence in intimate relationships* (pp. 17-44). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Straus, M. A. (2004). Prevalence of violence against dating partners by male and female university students worldwide. *Violence Against Women*, 10, 790-811.
- Straus, M. A. (2005). Women's violence toward men is a serious social problem. In D. R. Loseke, R. J. Gelles, & M. M. Cavanaugh (Eds.), *Current controversies on family violence* (pp. 55-77). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Straus, M. A. (2006). Future research on gender symmetry in physical assaults on partners. *Violence Against Women*, 12, 1086-1097.
- Straus, M. A. (2008). Dominance and symmetry in partner violence by male and female university students in 32 nations. *Children and Youth Services Review*, 30(3): 252-275.
- Straus, M. A., & Douglas, E. M. (2004). A short form of the Revised Conflict Tactics Scales, and typologies for severity and mutuality. *Violence and Victims*, 19, 507-520.
- Straus, M. A., Gelles, R. J., & Steinmetz, S. K. (1980). *Behind closed doors: Violence in the American family*. Garden City, NJ: Doubleday, Anchor Press.
- Straus, M. A., Hamby, S. L., Honey-McCoy, S., & Sugarman, D. B. (1996). The revised Conflict Tactics Scales (CTS2): Development and preliminary psychometric data. *Journal of Family Issues*, 17, 283-316.

- Straus, M. A., & Ramirez, I. L. (2007). Gender symmetry in prevalence, severity, and chronicity of physical aggression against dating partners by university students in Mexico and USA. *Aggressive Behavior*, 33, 281-290.
- Stuart, G. L., Moore, T. M., Gordon, K. C., Hellmuth, J. C., Ramsey, S. E., & Kahler, C. W. (2006). Reasons for intimate partner violence perpetration among arrested women. *Violence Against Women*, 12, 609-621.
- Suarez-Al-Adam, M., Raffaelli, M., & O'Leary, A. (2000). Influence of abuse and partner hypermasculinity on the sexual behavior of Latinas. *AIDS Education and Prevention*, 12, 263-274.
- Sugerman, D. B., & Frankel, S. L. (1996). Patriarchal ideology and wife-assault: A meta-analytic review. *Journal of Family Violence*, 11, 13-40.
- Sugihara, Y., & Katsurada, E. (1999). Masculinity and femininity in Japanese culture: A pilot study. *Sex Roles*, 40, 635-646.
- 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.
- Sweet, J., Bumpass, L., & Call, V. (1988). The design and content of the National Survey of Families and Households (Working paper NSFH-1). Madison, WI: Center for Demography and Ecology, University of Wisconsin.
- Swim, J. K., Aikin, K. J., Hall, W. S., & Hunter, B. A. (1995). Sexism and racism: Old-fashioned and modern prejudices. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 68, 199-214.
- Swim, J. K., & Cohen, L. L. (1997). Overt, covert, and subtle sexism: A comparison between the Attitudes Toward Women and Modern Sexism scales. *Psychology of Women Quarterly*, 21, 103-118.
- Szinovacz, M. E. (1983). Using couple data as a methodological tool: The case of marital violence. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, 45(3), 633-644.
- Szinovacz, M. E., & Egley, L. C. (1995). Comparing one-partner and couple data on sensitive marital behaviors: The case of marital violence. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, 57, 995-1010.
- Takagi, D. (1995). Symposium: On West and Fenstermaker's "Doing Difference." *Gender and Society*, 9(4), 491-513.

- Tang, C. S.-K. (1999). Marital power and aggression in a community sample of Hong Kong Chinese families. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 14*, 586–602.
- Taylor, C. A., & Sorenson, S. B. (2005). Community-based norms about intimate partner violence: Putting attributions of fault and responsibility into context. *Sex Roles, 53*, 573–589.
- Thompson, B., & Melancon, J. G. (1986). Factor structure of the Bem Sex Role Inventory. *Measurement and Evaluation in Counseling and Development, 19*, 77–83.
- Thompson, E. H. (1991). The maleness of violence in dating relationships: An appraisal of stereotypes. *Sex Roles, 24*, 261–278.
- Thompson, E. H., & Pleck, J. H. (1986). The structure of male role norms. *American Behavioral Scientist, 29*, 531–543.
- Thorne, B. (1995). Symposium: On West and Fenstermaker's "Doing Difference." *Gender and Society, 9*(4), 491–513.
- Thorne-Finch, R. (1992). *Ending the silence: The origins and treatment of male violence against women*. Toronto, Ontario, Canada: University of Toronto Press.
- Tjaden, P., & Thoennes, N. (2000). *Extent, nature, and consequences of intimate partner violence: Findings from the National Violence Against Women Survey*. Washington, DC: National Institute of Justice/Centers for Disease Control and Prevention.
- Toller, P. W., Suter, E. A., & Trautman, T. C. (2004). Gender role identity and attitudes toward feminism. *Sex Roles, 51*, 85–90.
- Tolman, R. M. (1989). The development of a measure of psychological maltreatment of women by their male partners. *Violence and Victims, 4*(3), 159–177.
- Tolman, R. M. (1999). The validation of the psychological maltreatment of women inventory. *Violence and Victims, 14*, 25–37.
- Tontodonato, P., & Crew, B. K. (1992). Dating violence, social learning theory, and gender: A multivariate analysis. *Violence and Victims, 7*, 3–14.
- Tougas, F., Brown, R., Beaton, A. M., & Joly, S. (1995). Neosexism: Plus ça change, plus c'est pareil. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 21*, 842–849.

- Totten, M. (2003). Girlfriend abuse as a form of masculinity construction among violent, marginal male youth. *Men and Masculinities*, 6, 70–92.
- Turner, A. G. (1972). *The San Jose methods test of known crime victims*. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office. U.S. Census Bureau. Current Population Reports, Series P-60.
- Tzuriel, D. (1984). Sex role typing and ego identity in Israeli, Oriental, and Western adolescents. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 46, 440-457.
- Ulloa, E., Jaycox, L., Marshall, G., & Collins, R. (2004). Acculturation, gender stereotypes, and attitudes about dating violence among Latino youth. *Violence and Victims*, 19(3), 273-287.
- Vandello, J. A., & Cohen, D. (2008). Gender, culture, and men's intimate partner violence. *Social and Personality Psychology Compass*, 2, 1–16.
- Vandello, J. A., & Cohen, D. (forthcoming). *Cultural themes Associated with Violence against Women: A Cross-cultural Analysis*. University of South Florida: Unpublished manuscript.
- Versalle, A., & McDowell, E. (2004–2005). The attitudes of men and women concerning gender differences in grief. *Omega*, 50(1), 53–67.
- Villemez, W. J., & Touhey, J. C. (1977). A measure of individual differences in sex-typing and sex-discrimination: The "macho" scale. *Psychological Reports*, 41, 411-415.
- Vock, J., Elliot, P., & Spironello, V. (1997). From child witnesses to pawns: Post-separation tactics of abusive ex-partners Paper presented at the Conference on Children Exposed to Family Violence, London, Ontario.
- Walkup, H., & Abbott, R. D. (1978). Cross-validation of item selection on the Bem Sex Role Inventory. *Applied Psychological Measurement*, 2, 63-71.
- Wallace, H. (2005). *Family Violence: Legal, Medical, and Social Perspectives* (4th ed.). Boston: Pearson Education, Inc.
- Walker, L. E. (1979). *The Battered Women*. New York: Harper and Row.
- Walker, L. E. (1984). *The Battered Woman Syndrome*. New York: Springer.
- Walters, G. D. (2001). The relationship between masculinity, femininity, and criminal thinking in male and female offenders. *Sex Roles*, 45, 677-689.

- Warren, J., & Lanning, W. (1992). Sex role beliefs, control, and social isolation of battered women. *Journal of Family Violence*, 7(1), 1-8.
- Washburn-Ormachea, J. M., Hillman, S. B., & Sawilowsky, S. S. (2004). Gender and gender-role orientation differences on adolescents' coping with peer stressors. *Journal of Youth and Adolescence*, 33, 31-40.
- Waters, E., Posada, G., Crowell, J., & Keng-ling, L. (1993). Is attachment theory ready to contribute to our understanding of disruptive behavior problems? *Development and Psychopathology*, 5, 215-224.
- Weaver, T. L., Sanders, C. K., Campbell, C. L., & Schnabel, M. (2009). Development and Preliminary Psychometric Evaluation of the Domestic Violence--Related Financial Issues Scale (DV-FI). *Journal of interpersonal violence*, 24(4), 569-585.
- Wekerle, C., & Wolfe, D. A. (1999). Dating violence in mid-adolescence: Theory, significance, and emerging prevention initiatives. *Clinical Psychology Review*, 19, 435-456.
- West, C., & Fenstermaker, S. (1995). Doing Difference. *Gender and Society*, 9(1), 8-37.
- West, C., & Zimmerman, D. (1987). Doing Gender. *Gender and Society*, 1(2), 125-151.
- Weston, R., Marshall, L. L., & Coker, A. L. (2007). Women's Motives for Violent and Nonviolent Behaviors in Conflicts. *Journal of interpersonal violence*, 22(8), 1043-1065.
- Wheless, V. E., & Dierks-Stewart, K. (1981). The psychometric properties of the Bem sex-role inventory: Questions concerning reliability and validity. *Communication Quarterly*, 29, 173-186.
- Whetton, C., & Swindells, T. (1977). A factor analysis of the Bem Sex Role Inventory. *Journal of Clinical Psychology*, 33, 150-153.
- White, J. W. (2009). A gendered approach to adolescent dating violence: Conceptual and methodological issues. *Psychology of Women Quarterly* 33(1), 1-15.
- 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., & Kowalski, R. M. (1998). Male violence toward women: An integrated perspective. In R. G. Geen & E. Donnerstein (Eds.), *Human aggression: Theories*,

- research and implications for social policy* (pp. 203–228). San Diego, CA: Academic Press.
- Whitley, B. E., Jr. (1984). Sex-role and psychological well-being: Two meta-analyses. *Journal of Sex Roles*, 12, 207–221.
- Widom, C. S., & Morris, S. (1997). Accuracy of adult recollections of childhood victimization: Part 2. Childhood sexual abuse. *Psychological Assessment*, 9(1), 34–46.
- Williams, K. R., & Hawkins, R. (1989). Controlling Male Aggression in Intimate Relationships. *Law and Society Review*, 23, 591-612.
- Williams, L. M. (1994). Recall of childhood trauma: A prospective study of women's memories of child sexual abuse. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology*, 62(6), 1167– 1176.
- Williams, S. L., & Frieze, I. H. (2005). Patterns of violent relationships, psychological distress, and marital satisfaction in a national sample of men and women. *Sex Roles*, 52, 771–784.
- Willis, C. E., Hallinan, M. N., & Melby, J. (1996). Effects of sex role stereotyping among European American students on domestic violence culpability attributions. *Sex Roles*, 34(7-8), 475-491.
- Wilson, M., & Daly, M. (1992). Who kills whom in spouse killings? On the exceptional sex ratio of spousal homicides in the United States. *Criminology*, 30, 189-215.
- Wilson, M., & Daly, M. (1993). Spousal homicide risk and estrangement. *Violence and Victims*, 8, 3-16.
- Wilson, M., Daly, M., & Daniele, A. (1995). Familicide: The killing of spouse and children. *Aggressive Behavior*, 21, 275-291.
- Windle, M., & Sinnott, J. D. (1985). A psychometric study of the Bem Sex Role Inventory with an old sample. *Journal of Gerontology*, 40, 336-343.
- Witt, D. D. (1987). A conflict theory of family violence. *Journal of Family Violence*, 2, 291–301.
- Wolfe, D. A., Scott, K., Reitzel-Jaffe, D., Wekerle, C., Grasley, C., & Straatman, A. L. (2001). Development and validation of the Conflict in Adolescent Dating Relationships Inventory. *Psychological Assessment*, 13(2), 277-293.

- Wolfe, D. A., Wekerle, C., Reitzel-Jaffe, D., & Lefebvre, L. (1998). Factors associated with abusive relationships among maltreated and non-maltreated youth. *Development and Psychopathology*, 10, 61-85.
- Wolfe, D. A., Wekerle, C., Scott, K., Straatman, A., Grasley, C., & Reitzel-Jaffe, D. (2003). Dating violence prevention with at-risk youth: A controlled outcome evaluation. *Journal of Consulting & Clinical Psychology*, 71(2), 279-291.
- Wong, F. Y., McCreary, D. R., & Duffy, K. G. (1990). A further validation of the Bern sex role inventory: A multitrait-multimethod study. *Sex Roles*, 22, 249-259.
- Woo, M., & Oei, P. S. T. (2008). Empirical investigation of the MMPI-2 Gender-Masculine and Gender-Feminine scales. *Journal of Individual Differences*, 29(1), 1-10.
- Wood, J. T. (2004). Monsters and victims: Male felons' accounts of intimate partner violence. *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships*, 21(5), 555-576.
- Worth, D. M., Matthews, P. A., & Coleman, W. R. (1990). Sex role, group affiliation, family background, and courtship violence in college students. *Journal of College Student Development*, 31, 250-254.
- Wylie, A. (2004). Why Standpoint Matters. In S. Harding (Ed.), *The Feminist Standpoint Theory Reader: Intellectual and Political Controversies* (pp. 339-352). New York: Routledge.
- Yanico, B. J. (1981). Sex-role self-concept and attitudes to occupational daydreams and future fantasies of college women. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 19, 290-301.
- Yllo, K. (1984). The status of women, marital equality, and violence against wives: A contextual analysis. *Journal of Family Issues*, 5, 307-320.
- Young, R. & Sweeting, H. (2004). Adolescent bullying, relationships, psychological well-being, and gender-atypical behavior: A gender diagnosticity approach. *Sex Roles*, 50, 525-537.
- Zarbatany, L., Conley, R., & Pepper, S. (2004). Personality and gender differences in friendship needs and experiences in preadolescence and young adulthood. *International Journal of Behavioral Development*, 28, 299-310.