Methodological Issues in Studying IPV

Resources for studying IPV methods

• At the VAWnet site you'll find an excellent overview of the criticisms of the CTS/CTS-2 that Walter DeKeseredy and Martin Schwartz wrote. Also, there is a discussion of measures in a chapter in the 2nd edition of the Sourcebook on Violence Against Women (Renzetti, Edleson, and Bergen).

• The work by Becky Block and Jackie Campbell and the Chicago Women's Health Study are a pretty good place to start.

• Feminist Fieldwork Analysis, by Sherryl Kleinman (2007, Los Angeles: SAGE Publications), could be a useful reference in regards to research methodology. The text presents a lot of useful questions to get researchers thinking. Also contains some references to other studies that might be useful.

• Refer to the Sourcebook on Violence Against Women (Sage) and also check out MINCAVA's applied research documents. There are a few on this topic. Comprehensive measures ask about marital status and include separation assault, sexual assault, measures of context and outcomes and controlling behavior in addition to physical behaviors. Dobash and Dobash are a great source of info regarding your question. The following article from 2004 has a great overview of 'violence against women' vs. 'domestic and family violence' debates and a critique of the Conflict Tactics Scale methodology used by many researchers. I found it to be a good overall starting point. http://www.brown.uk.com/domesticviolence/dobash.pdf BRIT. J. CRIMINOL. (2004) 44, 324–349 WOMEN'S VIOLENCE TO MEN IN INTIMATE RELATIONSHIPS: Working on a Puzzle RUSSELL P. DOBASH* and R. EMERSON DOBASH*

• I would strongly recommend Michael Johnson's work on typologies of IPV. He contrasts methods used by feminist scholars with those used by Straus et al. and talks about why they result in different findings.

• Helen Eigenberg is a good source.

• One type of methodological issue (dealing with definition, measurement and sampling issues) is discussed in depth in Michael P Johnson's "A Typology of Domestic Violence: Intimate Terrorism, Violent Resistance, and Situational Couple Violence" and he's got some other publications regarding the same thing.

Molly Dragiewicz added that:

“Just a note that many scholars have concerns about using typologies when there have not been studies designed to understand these descriptive types. In particular, there has never been any study designed to understand "common" or "situational couple violence". The typologies are based on reanalysis of data collected for other purposes.

Also typologies have been inappropriately treated in practice as predicting behavior when there is no screening tool that can discern types.”
Megan Haselschwerdt commented that:

“I understand that there are some researchers and practitioners who have concerns about Johnson’s typology or the use of a typological approach in general, but nevertheless, there are several publications that have empirically supported the importance of making distinctions between intimate terrorism and situational couple violence in research (I do think this is trickier for practice at the current time). I’m not sure why the use of secondary data is problematic in differentiating between types of IPV (SCV in particular), but here are some additional citations from a variety of methods for anyone who is interested.”

She also suggested the following citations: