

## Dear Author

Here are the proofs of your article.

- You can submit your corrections **online** or by **fax**.
- For **online** submission please insert your corrections in the online correction form. Always indicate the line number to which the correction refers.
- Please return your proof together with the permission to publish confirmation.
- For **fax** submission, please ensure that your corrections are clearly legible. Use a fine black pen and write the correction in the margin, not too close to the edge of the page.
- Remember to note the journal title, article number, and your name when sending your response via e-mail, fax or regular mail.
- **Check** the metadata sheet to make sure that the header information, especially author names and the corresponding affiliations are correctly shown.
- **Check** the questions that may have arisen during copy editing and insert your answers/corrections.
- **Check** that the text is complete and that all figures, tables and their legends are included. Also check the accuracy of special characters, equations, and electronic supplementary material if applicable. If necessary refer to the *Edited manuscript*.
- The publication of inaccurate data such as dosages and units can have serious consequences. Please take particular care that all such details are correct.
- Please **do not** make changes that involve only matters of style. We have generally introduced forms that follow the journal's style. Substantial changes in content, e.g., new results, corrected values, title and authorship are not allowed without the approval of the responsible editor. In such a case, please contact the Editorial Office and return his/her consent together with the proof.
- If we do not receive your corrections **within 48 hours**, we will send you a reminder.

### Please note

Your article will be published **Online First** approximately one week after receipt of your corrected proofs. This is the **official first publication** citable with the DOI.

**Further changes are, therefore, not possible.**

After online publication, subscribers (personal/institutional) to this journal will have access to the complete article via the DOI using the URL:

<http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s11199-009-9697-2>

If you would like to know when your article has been published online, take advantage of our free alert service. For registration and further information, go to:

<http://www.springerlink.com>.

Due to the electronic nature of the procedure, the manuscript and the original figures will only be returned to you on special request. When you return your corrections, please inform us, if you would like to have these documents returned.

The **printed version** will follow in a forthcoming issue.

**To: Springer Customer Support 3**  
**E-mail: CorrAdmin3@spi-bpo.com**  
**Fax: +1-202-3304522**  
**SPI SPi Building, Sacsac Bacong Oriental Negros 6216 Philippines**

**Re:**

**Sex Roles DOI 10.1007/s11199-009-9697-2**

Langhinrichsen-Rolling's Confirmation of the Feminist Analysis of Intimate Partner Violence: Comment on  
Controversies Involving Gender and Intimate Partner Violence in the United States?  
**Johnson**

## Permission to publish

I have checked the proofs of my article and

- I have **no corrections**. The article is ready to be published without changes.
- I have **a few corrections**. I am enclosing the following pages:
- I have made **many corrections**. Enclosed is the **complete article**.

**Date / signature:** \_\_\_\_\_

**Metadata of the article that will be visualized in Online**

1	Article Title	<b>Langhinrichsen-Rolling's Confirmation of the Feminist Analysis of Intimate Partner Violence: Comment on "Controversies Involving Gender and Intimate Partner Violence in the United States"</b>	
2	Article Sub- Title		
3	Article Copyright - Year	<b>Springer Science + Business Media, LLC 2009 (This will be the copyright line in the final PDF)</b>	
4	Journal Name	Sex Roles	
5		Family Name	<b>Johnson</b>
6		Particle	
7		Given Name	<b>Michael P.</b>
8	Corresponding Author	Suffix	
9		Organization	Women's Studies, and African and African American Studies, Penn State
10		Division	
11		Address	University Park , PA, USA
12		e-mail	mpj@psu.edu
13		Received	
14	Schedule	Revised	
15		Accepted	
16	Abstract	This article makes four major points in response to Jennifer Langhinrichsen-Rolling's (2010) review of the intimate partner violence literature. First, the evidence is clear that there is more than one type of intimate partner violence. Second, the feminists are right. Gender is central to the analysis of intimate partner violence, and the coercive controlling violence that most people associate with the term "domestic violence" is perpetrated primarily by men against their female partners. Third, different types of intimate partner violence have different causes, different developmental trajectories, and different consequences. They require different models to understand them. Finally, we need more qualitative research focused on the least understood types of intimate partner violence: violent resistance and situational couple violence.	
17	Keywords separated by ' - '	Intimate partner violence - Gender symmetry - Domestic violence - Intimate terrorism - Abuse	
18	Foot note information		

1  
3  
2

4  
5  
6  
7

# Langhinrichsen-Rolling’s Confirmation of the Feminist Analysis of Intimate Partner Violence: Comment on “Controversies Involving Gender and Intimate Partner Violence in the United States”

8

**Michael P. Johnson**

9  
10

© Springer Science + Business Media, LLC 2009

11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26

**Abstract** This article makes four major points in response to Jennifer Langhinrichsen-Rolling’s (2010) review of the intimate partner violence literature. First, the evidence is clear that there is more than one type of intimate partner violence. Second, the feminists are right. Gender is central to the analysis of intimate partner violence, and the coercive controlling violence that most people associate with the term “domestic violence” is perpetrated primarily by men against their female partners. Third, different types of intimate partner violence have different causes, different developmental trajectories, and different consequences. They require different models to understand them. Finally, we need more qualitative research focused on the least understood types of intimate partner violence: violent resistance and situational couple violence.

27  
28

**Keywords** Intimate partner violence · Gender symmetry · Domestic violence · Intimate terrorism · Abuse

29

## Introduction

30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35

My comments are organized around four major topics: (a) the central role of gender in intimate partner violence, (b) the importance of distinctions among types of intimate partner violence, particularly distinctions that focus on the role of coercive control in violent relationships, (c) the need for different models for the different types of intimate

partner violence, and (d) a call for qualitative dyadic analyses of intimate partner violence. Some of my comments are designed to highlight what I think are the most important implications of Jennifer Langhinrichsen-Rohling’s (2010) analysis, some to dispute some of her conclusions, and others to go beyond her analysis to suggest promising paths for future research and policy development.

36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43

## The Central Role of Gender in Intimate Partner Violence

44  
45

It would be hard to tell from the abstract and conclusion of Langhinrichsen-Rohling’s paper that one of the major implications of her analysis is that the coercive, controlling violence that most people associate with the term “domestic violence” is in fact perpetrated primarily by men against their female partners—as feminist theorists and activists have long argued (Dobash and Dobash 1979; Johnson 2008; Stark 2007). This conclusion is less visible than it should be because of the separation of the first two controversies that Langhinrichsen-Rohling addresses: the gender-symmetry debate and the debate about the utility of typologies. In her discussion of the gender symmetry debate she makes an important point that is too easy to miss and whose import is not clear unless it is combined with some of her conclusions in the section on typologies. Studies using agency samples (e.g., law enforcement, courts, hospitals, shelters) indicate that in heterosexual relationships intimate partner violence is largely male-perpetrated; in contrast, studies using general samples indicate that intimate partner violence is roughly gender-symmetric in terms of perpetration. Thus, the two major

46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65  
66

M. P. Johnson (✉)  
Women’s Studies, and African and African American  
Studies at Penn State,  
University Park, PA, USA  
e-mail: mpj@psu.edu  
URL: [www.personal.psu.edu/mpj](http://www.personal.psu.edu/mpj)

Q1

67 sampling methodologies of intimate partner violence  
 68 research lead to dramatically different conclusions about  
 69 gender. In my early review of the domestic violence  
 70 literature (Johnson 1995), this pattern led me to develop  
 71 the typology that has been the heart of my analyses ever  
 72 since.

73 Briefly, my control-based typology distinguishes among  
 74 three major types of intimate partner violence. (There is a  
 75 fourth type of intimate partner violence discussed in my  
 76 work, *mutual violent control*, which involves two partners  
 77 fighting for control of each other. However, it shows up  
 78 only in very small numbers in most samples, and there is  
 79 considerable controversy regarding its very existence.  
 80 Therefore, I have chosen in most of my recent work to  
 81 focus on the three well-established types discussed below.)  
 82 *Intimate terrorism* involves a violence perpetrator who uses  
 83 violence in combination with a variety of other coercive  
 84 control tactics in order to attempt to take general control  
 85 over his partner. In heterosexual relationships intimate  
 86 terrorism is perpetrated primarily (although not exclusively)  
 87 by men. *Violent resistance* is the violence engaged in by  
 88 many of the women (and the few men) who find themselves  
 89 to be entrapped in a relationship with an intimate terrorist.  
 90 These two types of intimate partner violence predominate  
 91 in agency samples—for the obvious reasons. Intimate  
 92 terrorism is an ongoing pattern of violence and coercive  
 93 control that is likely (a) to frighten the victim into seeking  
 94 help from law enforcement, a protection order, a shelter, or  
 95 a divorce court, (b) to produce injuries that require medical  
 96 attention, and (c) to draw the attention of others who report  
 97 incidents to the authorities.

98 The third major type of intimate partner violence,  
 99 *situational couple violence* involves arguments that escalate  
 100 to verbal aggression and ultimately to physical aggression.  
 101 It does not involve a general pattern of coercive control.  
 102 The interpersonal dynamics that produce the escalation can  
 103 differ considerably from couple to couple, variously rooted  
 104 in anger management problems of one or both of the  
 105 partners, couple communication issues, substance abuse  
 106 issues, and so on. This is the violence that dominates  
 107 general survey data, because of the biases of so-called  
 108 representative survey samples. These biases arise from the  
 109 little-noted high rates of refusal in survey samples—40  
 110 percent in the much-cited National Family Violence  
 111 Surveys (Johnson 1995). Because intimate terrorists and  
 112 their partners refuse to participate in such surveys, the  
 113 former because they do not wish to implicate themselves,  
 114 the latter because they fear retribution from their partner,  
 115 general social survey data include almost no intimate  
 116 terrorism or violent resistance (Johnson et al. 2008).

117 Recent analyses by myself and others confirm these  
 118 patterns, indicating that the two major sampling strategies  
 119 (agency samples and general samples) tap two basically

different intimate partner violence dynamics (Graham- 120  
 Kevan and Archer 2003; Johnson 2006a; Johnson et al. 121  
 2008). In the ongoing debate about the gender structure of 122  
 intimate partner violence (Holstein and Sacks 2009; Young 123  
 2009), those who lean toward a gender-symmetric view 124  
 continue to ignore the agency data and other clear evidence 125  
 for the predominant male perpetration of intimate terrorism, 126  
 preferring to cite general survey data as if it referenced the 127  
 pattern of coercive control that the public equates with the 128  
 term “domestic violence,” when in fact those survey data 129  
 tell us only about situational couple violence, which 130  
 happens to be gender-symmetric in terms of perpetration. 131

Note how careful I am to say that situational couple 132  
 violence is gender-symmetric “in terms of perpetration.” 133  
 The on-going social/political construction of gender sym- 134  
 metry in intimate partner violence is accomplished not only 135  
 through ignoring both agency data and the distinction 136  
 between intimate terrorism and situational couple violence, 137  
 but also by focusing on a ridiculously narrow definition of 138  
 symmetry in terms of incidence/prevalence. In the studies 139  
 that find so-called gender symmetry, what “symmetry” 140  
 means is that roughly the same number of men and women 141  
 acknowledge that at least once in some specified time 142  
 period they have engaged in at least one of the violent 143  
 behaviors listed in whatever survey instrument is used. It is 144  
 clear, however, that even in these general sample, so-called 145  
 gender-symmetric studies, men’s violence produces more 146  
 physical injuries, more negative psychological consequen- 147  
 ces, and more fear (Archer 2000; Kimmel 2002). The 148  
 alleged gender symmetry of intimate partner violence, even 149  
 in its situational couple violence form, is a myth created in 150  
 the service of political ends that include attacks on the 151  
 funding of shelters and batterer intervention programs 152  
 (Dragiewicz and Lindgren 2009). 153

Because the role of gender in intimate partner violence is 154  
 pervasive and involves much more than gender differences 155  
 in perpetration or consequences, gender theory is an 156  
 essential theoretical perspective in this area (Johnson 157  
 2007, 2008). Gender theory (most fully elaborated in 158  
 sociology) is a general perspective rooted in the idea that 159  
 gender is a concept that can be applied at many levels of 160  
 analysis, from average gender differences in size and 161  
 strength, physical abilities, personality, attitudes, and values 162  
 to the gender structure of large-scale social institutions 163  
 (Lorber 1994; Risman 2004). Gender theory is thus a 164  
 perspective that meets Lanhinrichsen-Rohling’s call for 165  
 models of intimate partner violence that are couched at 166  
 many levels of analysis. Let me cite just a few examples of 167  
 research that demonstrates the centrality of gender in 168  
 intimate partner violence. Richard Felson (1996) estab- 169  
 lished the importance of gender differences in size and 170  
 strength. Sugarman and Frankel (1996) have shown the 171  
 importance of traditional attitudes toward women. 172

Q2

173 Holtzworth-Munroe and her colleagues (2000) have  
 174 demonstrated the importance of hostile attitudes toward  
 175 women. A number of studies have demonstrated the  
 176 effects of gendered social structures on state and national  
 177 rates of domestic violence (e.g. , Levinson 1989; Yllö  
 178 1983) and on women’s ability to escape from intimate  
 179 terrorism (Anderson 2007). Finally, of course, we must not  
 180 forget all of the evidence cited above that intimate  
 181 terrorism is largely male-perpetrated, that violent resis-  
 182 tance is primarily a woman’s response to intimate  
 183 terrorism, and that all types of intimate partner violence  
 184 involve more injury, fear, and psychological damage when  
 185 perpetrated by men rather than women.

186 **The Importance of Control-based Typologies**

187 Although one of Langhinrichsen-Rohling’s major points is  
 188 that “there are subtypes of IPV,” she nevertheless is critical  
 189 of typologies at a number of points in her paper. I do not  
 190 find her criticisms to be convincing. As I proceed to  
 191 consider Langhinrichsen-Rohling’s interpretation of the  
 192 research on types of intimate partner violence, the distinc-  
 193 tion between typologies of violence and typologies of  
 194 batterers will be important. One class of typologies focuses  
 195 on the nature of the violence itself or on its role in the  
 196 relationship. For example, with respect to the nature of the  
 197 violence itself, distinctions are often made in terms of  
 198 severity or frequency. As an example of a typology that  
 199 focuses on the relationship context of the violence, my  
 200 control typology is based on the way in which the violence  
 201 is or is not embedded in a pattern of coercive control.

202 Another class of typologies focuses on characteristics of  
 203 the perpetrator. For example, Holtzworth-Munroe and her  
 204 colleagues (2000) identify types of batterers by means of a  
 205 cluster analysis of a number of personality traits, violence  
 206 outside the dyad, and level of intimate partner violence.  
 207 They identify three core types of batterers: family-only  
 208 batterers, borderline/dysphoric batterers, and generally  
 209 violent/antisocial batterers. Their finding that only the latter  
 210 two types score high on a measure of coercive control  
 211 strongly suggests that these two types are both engaged in  
 212 intimate terrorism, whereas family-only batterers are en-  
 213 gaged in situational couple violence. Among the intimate  
 214 terrorists, the borderline/dysphoric batterers are evidently  
 215 motivated to exert coercive control by an extreme emotion-  
 216 al dependence on their partner. The generally violent/  
 217 antisocial batterers are motivated by a generally antisocial  
 218 orientation toward having their own way by any means  
 219 necessary—with others as well as with their partner. These  
 220 two types of batterers exhibit different psychological  
 221 profiles, different developmental histories, and different  
 222 behavior outside of the dyad, but both are involved in a

general pattern of coercive control with respect to their  
 partner, i.e., intimate terrorism. 223 224

Now let us turn to Langhinrichsen-Rohling’s critiques  
 of typologies of intimate partner violence: “Unfortunately,  
 despite their intuitive appeal, several studies have been  
 unable to fully replicate these original typologies [mine  
 and Holtzworth-Munroe’s] as proposed or empirically  
 derived...” (Langhinrichsen-Rohling 2010, p. ??). First of  
 all, I have to object to the wording here. Her reference to  
 “intuitive appeal” suggests that there is no empirical basis  
 for these typologies, as does the reference to “as proposed  
 or empirically derived.” In fact, both of these typologies  
*are* empirically derived and both have considerable  
 support across a variety of samples and a variety of  
 measures. 225 226 227 228 229 230 231 232 233 234 235 236 237

More substantively, I must object to Langhinrichsen-  
 Rohling’s interpretation of the three studies that she cites as  
 not supporting Holtzworth-Munroe’s typology. As far as I  
 can tell, the first study actually does support it. Here is the  
 abstract: “This study empirically tests Holtzworth-Munroe  
 and Stuart’s (1994) typology of male batterers in a  
 community sample. Latent class analyses based on severity  
 of physical aggression, generality of violence, and psycho-  
 pathology partially replicated the Holtzworth-Munroe and  
 Stuart typology by identifying 3 types of violent men:  
 family-only, medium-violence, and generally violent/psy-  
 chologically distressed. Separate groupings of borderline/  
 dysphoric and generally violent/antisocial types were not  
 found. In comparisons of batterer types to each other and to  
 nonviolent men, generally violent/psychologically dis-  
 tressed men differed from other groups on psychological  
 abuse, life stress, marital satisfaction, and attitudes about  
 violence. Types also differed on wives’ fearfulness of their  
 husband and injury from marital aggression” (Delsol et al.  
 2003, p. 635). I suppose that Langhinrichsen-Rohling sees  
 this study as not supporting Holtzworth-Munroe’s typology  
 because there is no differentiation of the two types of  
 intimate terrorists, but that is probably because this is a  
 community sample that is dominated by situational couple  
 violence and does not have enough intimate terrorism in it  
 to allow for such fine distinctions. In any case, the study  
 certainly supports a distinction between situational couple  
 violence and intimate terrorism. 238 239 240 241 242 243 244 245 246 247 248 249 250 251 252 253 254 255 256 257 258 259 260 261 262 263 264 265

The second study (Waltz et al. 2000) does find a  
 situational couple violence group and two types of intimate  
 terrorists, but some of the personality patterns that  
 differentiate the latter two are somewhat different from the  
 ones found by Holtzworth-Munroe and her colleagues.  
 Nevertheless, the authors conclude as follows: “In summa-  
 ry, the present study found support for Holtzworth-Munroe  
 and Stuart’s (1994) model, with the exception of personal-  
 ity disorder characteristics not distinguishing between the  
 generally violent and pathological groups in the predicted  
 266 267 268 269 270 271 272 273 274 275

276 fashion. Further clarification of the distinctions between  
 277 these groups is needed, particularly in terms of personality  
 278 patterns and attachment styles. The model shows promise  
 279 as a means of identifying meaningful differences between  
 280 batterers, and the implications for treatment matching  
 281 should be further explored empirically” (Waltz et al. 2000,  
 282 p. 668). The third study (Babcock et al. 2004) actually does  
 283 not even deal with Holtzworth-Munroe’s typology. In sum,  
 284 what I see here are two studies that in fact give considerable  
 285 support to Holtzworth-Munroe’s model, and one that is  
 286 irrelevant.

287 Later in Langhinrichsen-Rohling’s paper, she cites a  
 288 study in which she and her colleagues found that a measure  
 289 of psychopathology was not helpful in predicting batterer  
 290 intervention success—as if that were further evidence of the  
 291 weakness of Holtzworth-Munroe’s typology. Although that  
 292 seems like something of a non sequitur to me, other studies  
 293 in fact show that this typology does meaningfully predict  
 294 batterer intervention success (Clements et al. 2002;  
 295 Eckhardt et al. 2008). Even more impressively, a 1996  
 296 report of a randomized experiment (Saunders 1996)  
 297 demonstrated that the batterer intervention treatments that  
 298 were tailored to each of the two types of intimate terrorists  
 299 identified by Holtzworth-Munroe were more effective than  
 300 those that were not.

301 If one were to consider all of these studies, along with  
 302 (a) the series of studies done by Holtzworth-Munroe with  
 303 various colleagues, and (b) all of the previous studies by  
 304 other researchers that had converged on three types and that  
 305 led Holtzworth-Munroe and Stuart to propose their model  
 306 in the first place (Holtzworth-Munroe and Stuart 1994), it is  
 307 clear that the support for Holtzworth-Munroe’s typology is  
 308 quite compelling.

309 As I have suggested above, much of the research  
 310 concerning the Holtzworth-Munroe typology also sup-  
 311 ports my distinction between situational couple violence  
 312 and intimate terrorism. In addition, my colleagues and I  
 313 have found support for the control-based typology using a  
 314 variety of secondary data sources with different samples  
 315 and different measures (Johnson 2001, 2006a, 2008;  
 316 Johnson and Cares 2004; Johnson et al. 2002; Johnson  
 317 and Leone 2005; Johnson et al. 2008; Leone 2007; Leone  
 318 et al. 2007; Leone et al. 2004). Support has also come  
 319 from other authors, using a variety of measures in  
 320 dramatically different samples (Frye et al. 2006;  
 321 Graham-Kevan and Archer 2003; Laroche 2005; Rosen  
 322 et al. 2005). So, in the final analysis, I see no reason to  
 323 have any serious doubts about the validity of either  
 324 Holtzworth-Munroe’s typology or mine. There are differ-  
 325 ent types of intimate partner violence and different types  
 326 of batterers. We can neither move our analyses forward  
 327 nor develop effective interventions unless we acknowl-  
 328 edge those differences.

**The Need for Multiple Models**

329

In one major section of her paper, Langhinrichsen-Rohling  
 330 proposes a multivariate causal model of intimate partner  
 331 violence. One model will not be enough. Her model may be  
 332 adequate for bi-directional situational couple violence, but  
 333 the evidence is clear that we need different models for  
 334 different types of intimate partner violence. Let me give just  
 335 a few examples of areas in which we already know that  
 336 different types of intimate partner violence have different  
 337 correlates and different dynamics.  
 338

In a fairly early attempt to distinguish empirically  
 339 between intimate terrorism and situational couple violence,  
 340 Macmillan and Gartner (1999) found, among other things,  
 341 that marital status was related in opposite directions to these  
 342 two major types of intimate partner violence: married  
 343 women were more likely than cohabiting women to be the  
 344 target of intimate terrorism, but less likely to experience  
 345 situational couple violence. Alison Cares and I (Johnson  
 346 and Cares 2004) have shown that childhood exposure to  
 347 parents’ violence toward each other is strongly related to  
 348 adult male intimate terrorism, but not to adult male or  
 349 female situational couple violence. A number of studies  
 350 have demonstrated that couples’ communication patterns  
 351 are related in different ways to situational couple violence  
 352 and to intimate terrorism (Johnson 2006b; Olson 2002).  
 353 And most importantly, gender is strongly related to the  
 354 perpetration of intimate terrorism, but not situational couple  
 355 violence (e.g. , Graham-Kevan and Archer 2003; Johnson  
 356 2006a; Johnson et al. 2008).  
 357

A number of studies have shown that the dynamics of  
 358 different types of intimate partner violence are quite  
 359 different. For example, intimate terrorism is more likely to  
 360 escalate than situational couple violence, and it is less likely  
 361 to be bi-directional (e.g. , Graham-Kevan and Archer 2003;  
 362 Johnson 2006a; Johnson et al. 2008). Intimate terrorism has  
 363 been shown to have more serious consequences for the  
 364 victim than situational couple violence (e.g., Graham-  
 365 Kevan and Archer 2003; Johnson et al. 2002; Johnson  
 366 and Leone 2005; Leone 2007; Leone et al. 2004). Women  
 367 experiencing intimate terrorism are more likely to seek help  
 368 than those experiencing situational couple violence (Leone  
 369 et al. 2007).  
 370

Finally, a literature is developing that demonstrates that  
 371 batterer intervention programs have different outcomes for  
 372 different types of intimate partner violence (Clements et al.  
 373 2002; Eckhardt et al. 2008). There is also a literature on  
 374 other criminal justice interventions that could benefit from  
 375 attention to differences among the types of intimate partner  
 376 violence. For example, domestic violence arrest policies are  
 377 only effective for some types of offenders, but no one has  
 378 yet looked at the connections with types of intimate partner  
 379 violence (Buzawa 2003). Linda Mills (2003, 2008) has  
 380

381 received considerable attention for her assertion that a  
382 restorative justice alternative (Strang and Braithwaite 2002)  
383 to conventional batterer intervention is useful for cases of  
384 situational couple violence, but not for intimate terrorism.  
385 Susan Miller (2005) shows how batterer intervention  
386 groups for women often treat women as violent resisters  
387 rather than as batterers. Finally, the rapidly growing  
388 literature on differentiating among types of intimate partner  
389 violence in family court (Jaffe et al. 2008; Kelly and  
390 Johnson 2008) should soon lead to research on the  
391 effectiveness of various interventions for different types of  
392 intimate partner violence. Jennifer Hardesty and her  
393 colleagues have already shown that divorced couples who  
394 have experienced intimate terrorism have great difficulty  
395 working out post-divorce parenting roles, whereas this is  
396 not the case for those who had experienced situational  
397 couple violence (Hardesty and Chung 2006; Hardesty et al.  
398 2006; Hardesty et al. 2008).

### 399 **The Inevitability of Dyadic Analyses and the Need** 400 **for Qualitative Research**

401 Intimate partner violence is inherently about two people  
402 and the relationship between them. Thus, Langhinrichsen-  
403 Rohling is certainly correct that we need some sort of  
404 dyadic analysis. However, she seems to base this conclu-  
405 sion on the fact that there is considerable bi-directional  
406 intimate partner violence. If she is suggesting that dyadic  
407 analyses may not be needed for other types of intimate  
408 partner violence, I would have to disagree. All types of  
409 intimate partner violence require attention to both partners,  
410 to their relationship, and to the broader social context. In  
411 this connection, I want to make a plea for an increased  
412 focus on qualitative research. Langhinrichsen-Rohling's  
413 call for more dyadic analyses can be implemented most  
414 effectively by looking closely at the interpersonal dynamics  
415 that are involved in the various types of intimate partner  
416 violence. Models that look at statistical associations among  
417 variables can give us clues about what is going on in  
418 relationships, but they involve abstractions that are far from  
419 the realities that we must understand in order to be able to  
420 intervene effectively. The major reason why we have such a  
421 complex understanding of intimate terrorism is that the  
422 research literature on intimate terrorism is deeply rooted in  
423 the narratives of women who have survived it. In contrast,  
424 we have very little qualitative research on situational couple  
425 violence or violent resistance.

426 One of the reasons that we have so little qualitative  
427 research on situational couple violence is that the general  
428 survey samples through which it is most accessible have  
429 been devoted to quantitative, variable-oriented analyses.  
430 These quantitative analyses suggest tremendous diversity

431 within this particular type of intimate partner violence. For  
432 example, as many as 40% of the reports of situational  
433 couple violence involve only one incident, while others  
434 involve chronic, frequent violence (Gelles and Straus  
435 1988). Most couples experiencing situational couple vio-  
436 lence desist, but a significant minority escalate their  
437 violence over time (Feld and Straus 1990). About half  
438 involve violence on the part of both partners, one fourth the  
439 female partner only, one fourth the male partner only  
440 (Straus and Gelles 1990). What we need now are narrative  
441 investigations that can help us to understand this great  
442 diversity. This can be done in a mixed-method approach in  
443 which a relatively large sample answers a standard set of  
444 survey questions, while some or all of the violent couples  
445 are recruited for a more intense qualitative inquiry. The  
446 questions to be asked about situational couple violence are  
447 almost endless. How does "once-only" situational couple  
448 violence differ from continuing situational couple violence?  
449 Why doesn't it happen again? How is it that some couples  
450 who experience multiple incidents desist, while others  
451 continue or even escalate? What is the role of alcohol and  
452 other drugs in incidents of situational couple violence?  
453 What are the various dynamics that produce bi-directional  
454 violence? Why is it that some couples' relationship  
455 satisfaction is not severely damaged by situational couple  
456 violence? Why do some seek help, while others do not? To  
457 what extent are the coping strategies that are marshaled in  
458 response to intimate terrorism also relevant for situational  
459 couple violence? How does men's violence differ from  
460 women's? Are there gender differences in intentions, in  
461 interpretation, in consequences? Are the gender patterns  
462 similar for bi-directional and unidirectional violence?

463 The other under-studied major type of intimate partner  
464 violence, violent resistance, is to be found primarily in  
465 agency samples. Remember, violent resistance is not simply  
466 about a situational resistance to incidental violence; it is  
467 about violent reactions to the coercive controlling violence  
468 of an intimate terrorist. Given that our vast knowledge of  
469 intimate terrorism comes primarily from in-depth interview-  
470 ing of survivors, one would think we would know a lot  
471 about violent resistance. Indeed, that research has told us a  
472 good deal about the creative means by which women cope  
473 with intimate terrorism, but most of it has been focused on  
474 non-violent coping (e.g., Campbell et al. 1998; Campbell  
475 and Soeken 1999; Taft et al. 2007), help-seeking (e.g.,  
476 Gondolf and Fisher 1988; Kaukinen 2004; Leone et al.  
477 2007) and the process of leaving (e.g., Choice and Lamke  
478 1999; Kirkwood 1993). There has been little focus on  
479 violent resistance to intimate terrorism, with the exception  
480 of the literature on women who kill their abusive partners  
481 (Browne 1987; Browne et al. 1999). However, recently  
482 increased attention to women's violence in intimate  
483 relationships (provoked in large part by the gender

484 symmetry debate) has begun to turn this tide (Dasgupta  
 485 2002; Miller 2005; Sullivan et al. 2005; Swan and Snow  
 486 2002). A small amount of women’s violence may be  
 487 intimate terrorism (Hines et al. 2007; Renzetti 1992), and  
 488 of course most of it is the situational couple violence  
 489 discussed above. We need detailed investigations of violent  
 490 resistance, exploring the conditions under which women  
 491 will use violence in response to intimate terrorism, when  
 492 and why they desist or continue with their violent  
 493 resistance, what its consequences are for them and for their  
 494 relationship, and what their experiences are with the  
 495 criminal justice system. Miller’s book (2005) on women  
 496 in batterer intervention programs begins to address the latter  
 497 question, and Potter’s recent book (2008) addresses many  
 498 of these questions for African American women. It’s a start.

499 **In Sum**

500 My reading of Jennifer Langhinrichsen-Rolling’s paper  
 501 leads me to the following broad conclusions. First, the  
 502 evidence is clear that there is more than one type of  
 503 intimate partner violence and more than one type of  
 504 violent partner. Second, the feminists are right. Gender is  
 505 central to the analysis of intimate partner violence, and  
 506 the coercive controlling violence that most people  
 507 associate with the term “domestic violence” is indeed  
 508 perpetrated primarily by men against their female part-  
 509 ners. Third, the different types of intimate partner  
 510 violence have different causes, different developmental  
 511 trajectories, and different consequences. They require  
 512 different models to understand them. Finally, we need  
 513 more qualitative research, especially that focused on the  
 514 least understood types of intimate partner violence:  
 515 violent resistance and situational couple violence.

516 **References**

517 Anderson, K. L. (2007). Who gets out?: gender as structure and the  
 518 dissolution of violent heterosexual relationships. *Gender &*  
 519 *Society, 21*, 173–201.  
 520 Archer, J. (2000). Sex differences in aggression between heterosexual  
 521 partners: a meta-analytic review. *Psychological Bulletin, 126*,  
 522 651–680.  
 523 Babcock, J. C. Green, C. E. Webb, S. A. & Graham, K. H. (2004). A  
 524 second failure to replicate the Gottman et al. (1995) typology of  
 525 men who abuse intimate partners...and possible reasons why.  
 526 *Journal of Family Psychology, 18*, 396–400.  
 527 Browne, A. (1987). *When battered women kill*. New York: Free.  
 528 Browne, A. Williams, K. R. & Dutton, D. G. (1999). Homicide  
 529 between intimate partners: a 20-year review. In M. D. Smith &  
 530 M. A. Zahn (Eds.), *Homicide: a sourcebook of social research*  
 531 (pp. 149–164). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.  
 532 Buzawa, E. S. (2003). *Domestic violence: the criminal justice*  
 533 *response*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Campbell, J. C. & Soeken, K. L. (1999). Women’s responses to  
 534 battering over time: an analysis of change. *Journal of Interper-*  
 535 *sonal Violence, 14*, 21–40.  
 536 Campbell, J. C. Rose, L. Kub, J. & Nedd, D. (1998). Voices of  
 537 strength and resistance: a contextual and longitudinal analysis of  
 538 women’s responses to battering. *Journal of Interpersonal*  
 539 *Violence, 13*, 743–762.  
 540 Choice, P. & Lamke, L. K. (1999). Stay/leave decision-making  
 541 processes in abusive dating relationships. *Personal Relationships,*  
 542 *6*, 351–367.  
 543 Clements, K., Holtzworth-Munroe, A., Gondolf, E. W., &  
 544 Meehan, J. C. (2002, November). *Testing the Holtzworth-*  
 545 *Munroe et al. (2000) batterer typology among court-referred*  
 546 *maritally violent men*. Paper presented at the Association for  
 547 the Advancement of Behavior Therapy annual meeting,  
 548 Reno, NV.  
 549 Dasgupta, S. D. (2002). A framework for understanding women’s use  
 550 of nonlethal violence in intimate heterosexual relationships.  
 551 *Violence Against Women. Special Issue: Women’s use of violence*  
 552 *in intimate relationships Part I, 8*, 1364–1389.  
 553 Delsol, C. Margolin, G. & John, R. S. (2003). A typology of maritally  
 554 violent men and correlates of violence in a community sample.  
 555 *Journal of Marriage and Family, 65*, 635–651.  
 556 Dobash, R. E. & Dobash, R. P. (1979). *Violence against wives: a case*  
 557 *against the patriarchy*. New York: Free.  
 558 Dragiewicz, M., & Lindgren, Y. (2009). The gendered nature of  
 559 domestic violence: Statistical data for lawyers considering equal  
 560 protection analysis. *Journal of Gender, Social Policy & the Law,*  
 561 *72*.  
 562 Eckhardt, C. I. Holtzworth-Munroe, A. Norlander, B. Sibley, A. &  
 563 Cahill, M. (2008). Readiness to change, partner violence  
 564 subtypes, and treatment outcomes among men in treatment for  
 565 partner assault. *Violence and Victims, 23*, 446–477.  
 566 Feld, S. L. & Straus, M. A. (1990). Escalation and desistance from  
 567 wife assault in marriage. In M. A. Straus & R. J. Gelles (Eds.),  
 568 *Physical violence in American families* (pp. 489–505). New  
 569 Brunswick, NJ: Transaction.  
 570 Felson, R. B. (1996). Big people hit little people: Sex differences in  
 571 physical power and interpersonal violence. *Criminology, 34*,  
 572 433–452.  
 573 Frye, V. Manganello, J. Campbell, J. C. Walton-Moss, B. & Wilt, S.  
 574 (2006). The distribution of and factors associated with intimate  
 575 terrorism and situational couple violence among a population-  
 576 based sample of urban women in the United States. *Journal of*  
 577 *Interpersonal Violence, 21*, 1286–1313.  
 578 Gelles, R. J. & Straus, M. A. (1988). *Intimate violence: the causes and*  
 579 *consequences of abuse in the American family*. New York: Simon  
 580 & Schuster.  
 581 Gondolf, E. W. & Fisher, E. R. (1988). *Battered women as survivors:*  
 582 *an alternative to treating learned helplessness*. Lexington, MA:  
 583 D.C. Heath.  
 584 Graham-Kevan, N. & Archer, J. (2003). Intimate terrorism and  
 585 common couple violence: a test of Johnson’s predictions in four  
 586 British samples. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 18*, 1247–  
 587 1270.  
 588 Hardesty, J. L. & Chung, G. H. (2006). Intimate partner violence,  
 589 parental divorce, and child custody: directions for intervention  
 590 and future research. *Family Relations, 55*, 200–210.  
 591 Hardesty, J. L. Ganong, L. H. & Lloyd, S. (2006). How women make  
 592 custody decisions and manage co-parenting with abusive former  
 593 husbands. *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships, 23*,  
 594 543–563.  
 595 Hardesty, J. L. Khaw, L. Chung, G. H. & Martin, J. M. (2008).  
 596 Coparenting relationships after divorce: variations by type of  
 597 marital violence and fathers’ role differentiation. *Family Rela-*  
 598 *tions, 57*, 479–491.  
 599

Q3

Sex Roles

600 Hines, D. A. Brown, J. & Dunning, E. (2007). Characteristics of  
601 callers to the domestic abuse hotline for men. *Journal of Family*  
602 *Violence*, 22, 63–72.

603 Holstein, N., & Sacks, G. (2009, July 16). The violence we ignore.  
604 *The Baltimore Sun*.

605 Holtzworth-Munroe, A. & Stuart, G. L. (1994). Typologies of male  
606 batterers: three subtypes and the differences among them.  
607 *Psychological Bulletin*, 116, 476–497.

608 Holtzworth-Munroe, A. Meehan, J. C. Herron, K. Rehman, U. &  
609 Stuart, G. L. (2000). Testing the Holtzworth-Munroe and Stuart  
610 (1994) batterer typology. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical*  
611 *Psychology*, 68, 1000–1019.

612 Jaffe, P. G. Johnston, J. R. Crooks, C. V. & Bala, N. (2008). Custody  
613 disputes involving allegations of domestic violence: toward a  
614 differentiated approach to parenting plans. *Family Court Review*,  
615 46, 500–522.

616 Johnson, M. P. (1995). Patriarchal terrorism and common couple  
617 violence: Two forms of violence against women. *Journal of*  
618 *Marriage and the Family*, 57, 283–294.

619 Johnson, M. P. (2001). Conflict and control: Symmetry and  
620 asymmetry in domestic violence. In A. Booth, A. C. Crouter &  
621 M. Clements (Eds.), *Couples in conflict* (pp. 95–104). Mahwah,  
622 NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

623 Johnson, M. P. (2006a). Conflict and control: gender symmetry and  
624 asymmetry in domestic violence. *Violence Against Women*, 12,  
625 1–16.

626 Johnson, M. P. (2006b). Gendered communication and intimate  
627 partner violence. In B. J. Dow & J. T. Wood (Eds.), *The sage*  
628 *handbook of gender and communication* (pp. 71–87). Thousand  
629 Oaks, CA: Sage.

630 Johnson, M. P. (2007). Domestic violence: the intersection of  
631 gender and control. In L. L. O’Toole, J. R. Schiffman & M.  
632 K. Edwards (Eds.), *Gender violence: interdisciplinary per-*  
633 *spectives* (2nd ed. pp. 257–268). New York: New York  
634 University Press.

635 Johnson, M. P. (2008). *A typology of domestic violence: intimate*  
636 *terrorism, violent resistance, and situational couple violence*.  
637 Boston: Northeastern University Press.

638 Johnson, M. P., & Cares, A. (2004, November). *Effects and non-*  
639 *effects of childhood experiences of family violence on adult*  
640 *partner violence*. Paper presented at the National Council on  
641 Family Relations annual meeting, Orlando, FL.

642 Johnson, M. P. & Leone, J. M. (2005). The differential effects of  
643 intimate terrorism and situational couple violence: findings from  
644 the national violence against women survey. *Journal of Family*  
645 *Issues*, 26, 322–349.

646 Johnson, M. P., Conklin, V., & Menon, N. (2002, November). *The*  
647 *effects of different types of domestic violence on women: Intimate*  
648 *terrorism vs. situational couple violence*. Paper presented at the  
649 National Council on Family Relations annual meeting, Houston,  
650 Texas.

651 Johnson, M. P., Leone, J. M., & Xu, Y. (2008, November). *Gender,*  
652 *intimate terrorism, and situational couple violence in general*  
653 *survey data: The gender debate revisited—again*. Paper presented  
654 at the National Council on Family Relations annual meeting,  
655 Little Rock, AR.

656 Kaukinen, C. (2004). The help-seeking strategies of female violent-  
657 crime victims: the direct and conditional effects of race and the  
658 victim-offender relationship. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*,  
659 19, 967–990.

660 Kelly, J. B. & Johnson, M. P. (2008). Differentiation among types of  
661 intimate partner violence: research update and implications for  
662 interventions. *Family Court Review*, 46, 476–499.

663 Kimmel, M. S. (2002). “Gender symmetry” in domestic violence: a  
664 substantive and methodological research review. *Violence*  
665 *Against Women*, 8, 1332–1363.

Kirkwood, C. (1993). *Leaving abusive partners: from the scars of* 666  
*survival to the wisdom for change*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage. 667

Langhinrichsen-Rohling, J. (2010). Controversies involving gender 668  
and intimate partner violence in the United States. *Sex Roles*. 669

Laroche, D. (2005). Aspects of the context and consequences of 670  
domestic violence: Situational couple violence and intimate 671  
terrorism in Canada in 1999. Retrieved July 22, 2009, from 672  
[http://www.stat.gouv.qc.ca/bul/conditions\\_vie/AspectViolen\\_an.](http://www.stat.gouv.qc.ca/bul/conditions_vie/AspectViolen_an.pdf) 673  
[pdf](http://www.stat.gouv.qc.ca/bul/conditions_vie/AspectViolen_an.pdf). 674

Leone, J. M. (2007, November). *Suicide ideation among African* 675  
*American victims of intimate terrorism and situational couple* 676  
*violence*. Paper presented at the National Council on Family 677  
Relations annual meeting, Pittsburgh. 678

Leone, J. M. Johnson, M. P. Cohan, C. M. & Lloyd, S. (2004). 679  
Consequences of male partner violence for low-income, ethnic 680  
women. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, 66, 471–489. 681

Leone, J. M. Johnson, M. P. & Cohan, C. M. (2007). Victim help- 682  
seeking: differences between intimate terrorism and situational 683  
couple violence. *Family Relations*, 56, 427–439. 684

Levinson, D. (1989). *Family violence in a cross-cultural perspective*. 685  
Newbury Park, CA: Sage. 686

Lorber, J. (1994). *Paradoxes of gender*. New Haven, CT: Yale 687  
University Press. 688

Macmillan, R. & Gartner, R. (1999). When she brings home the 689  
bacon: Labor-force participation and the risk of spousal violence 690  
against women. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, 61, 947– 691  
958. 692

Miller, S. L. (2005). *Victims as offenders: the paradox of women’s* 693  
*violence in relationships*. New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers. 694

Mills, L. G. (2003). *Insult to injury: rethinking our responses to* 695  
*intimate abuse*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press. 696

Mills, L. G. (2008). *Violent partners: a breakthrough plan for ending* 697  
*the cycle of abuse*. New York, NY: Basic Books. 698

Olson, L. N. (2002). Exploring “common couple violence” in 699  
heterosexual romantic relationships. *Western Journal of Commu-* 700  
*nication*, 66, 104–128. 701

Potter, H. (2008). *Battle cries: black women and intimate partner* 702  
*abuse*. New York: New York University Press. 703

Renzetti, C. M. (1992). *Violent betrayal: partner abuse in lesbian* 704  
*relationships*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage. 705

Risman, B. (2004). Gender as a social structure: theory wrestling with 706  
activism. *Gender & Society*, 18, 429–450. 707

Rosen, K. H., Stith, S. M., Few, A. L., Daly, K. L., & Tritt, D. R. 708  
(2005). A qualitative investigation of Johnson’s typology. 709  
*Violence and Victims. Special Issue: Women’s and Men’s Use of* 710  
*Interpersonal Violence*, 20, 319–334. 711

Saunders, D. G. (1996). Feminist-cognitive-behavioral and process- 712  
psychodynamic treatments for men who batter: interactions of 713  
abuser traits and treatment model. *Violence and Victims*, 4, 393– 714  
414. 715

Stark, E. (2007). *Coercive control: the entrapment of women in* 716  
*personal life*. New York: Oxford University Press. 717

Strang, H. & Braithwaite, J. (eds). (2002). *Restorative justice and* 718  
*family violence*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. 719

Straus, M. A. & Gelles, R. J. (1990). How violent are American 720  
families? Estimates from the national family violence resurvey 721  
and other studies. In M. A. Straus & R. J. Gelles (Eds.), *Physical* 722  
*violence in American families: risk factors and adaptations to* 723  
*violence in 8, 145 Families* (pp. 95–112). New Brunswick, NJ: 724  
Transaction. 725

Sugarman, D. B. & Frankel, S. L. (1996). Patriarchal ideology and 726  
wife-assault: a meta-analytic review. *Journal of Family Violence*, 727  
11, 13–40. 728

Sullivan, T. P. Meese, K. J. Swan, S. C. Mazure, C. M. & Snow, D. L. 729  
(2005). Precursors and correlates of women’s violence: child 730  
abuse traumatization, victimization of women, avoidance coping, 731

- 732 and psychological symptoms. *Psychology of Women Quarterly*,  
733 29, 290–301. 740
- 734 Swan, S. C. & Snow, D. L. (2002). A typology of women's use of  
735 violence in intimate relationships. *Violence against Women*, 8,  
736 286–319. 741
- 737 Taft, C. T. Resick, P. A. Panuzio, J. Vogt, D. S. & Mechanic, M. B.  
738 (2007). Coping among victims of relationship abuse: a longitu-  
739 dinal examination. *Violence and Victims*, 22, 408–418. 742
- 748 Waltz, J. Babcock, J. C. Jacobson, N. S. & Gottman, J. M. (2000).  
Testing a typology of batterers. *Journal of Consulting and  
Clinical Psychology*, 68, 658–669. 743
- Yllö, K. (1983). Sexual equality and violence against wives in  
American states. *Journal of Comparative Family Studies*, 14,  
67–86. 744
- Young, C. (2009, July 16). Battered women—and men. *The Boston  
Globe*. 745  
746  
747

UNCORRECTED PROOF

## AUTHOR QUERIES

### **AUTHOR PLEASE ANSWER ALL QUERIES.**

- Q1. Please check affiliation 1 if captured correctly.
- Q2. The citation "Dragiewicz and Lindgren in press" was changed and linked to "Dragiewicz and Lindgren 2009". Please check if appropriate.
- Q3. Reference Dragiewicz & Lindgren (in press) was changed to Dragiewicz & Lindgren (2009). Please check.

UNCORRECTED PROOF