Chapter 4

Feminist Activism and Scholarship in Resisting and Responding to Gender-based Abuse

Joanne Belknap and Deanne Grant

Abstract

Gender-based abuses (GBAs; more frequently referred to as 'violence against women') have been a concern of current day feminists and their predecessors, dating back centuries, but only came under broader scrutiny in the latter half of the twentieth century. The goal of this chapter is to provide a historical overview of the emergence of feminist concerns and activism that led to a largely global identification and recognition of the prevalence and ramifications of GBA. The chapter includes a range of GBAs, such as sexual harassment, stalking, sex trafficking, and forced marriage, but focusses primarily on intimate partner abuse and rape. It is beyond the scope of one chapter, or even one book, to adequately address the efforts to respond to GBA across the world. Instead, the authors hope to describe the work by feminist activists and scholars to identify GBA as a serious and prevalent social problem, the various and often overlapping types of GBA, and the work to design and implement a range of responses to deter GBA, advocate for GBA survivors, hold gender-based abusers accountable, and provide safer communities. In addition to the early attempts to assess and respond to GBA, this chapter covers some of the most original and innovative documentations and responses to GBA from across the globe.

Keywords: Violence against women; gender-based abuse; feminism; activism; rape; partner abuse; intersectionality

Introduction

Although violence against women (VAW) has been a historical constant, the most successful identification of it as a social problem was with the second wave of the women's/feminist movement in the 1960s and 1970s (e.g., Abrar et al., 2000; Charles, 1995; Nichols, 2014; Pandhe, 1988). Since the 1970s, feminist VAW activists and scholars have documented and expanded the definitions and scope of these victimisations. Initially, the focus was on what is commonly called 'domestic violence' (DV), focussing on (1) husbands' non-sexual physical violence against wives (e.g., hitting, kicking, etc.), and (2) men who raped women they did not know ('stranger rape') (see Russell, 1984). These VAW categories were followed by documenting the prevalence, and in some cases the original labelling, of other types of VAW such as child sexual abuse (including incest), sexual harassment (first labelled in the 1970s), dating and post-break-up abuses ('date rape' was first labelled in the 1980s), stalking (first identified as a social problem in the 1990s), forced marriage, marital rape, and sex trafficking. Richards and Haglund's (2016) assessment of marital rape laws addresses the uneven development of such legislation globally. Over time, the feminist VAW movement and scholarship documented and expanded the definitions and scope to include trans individuals and more regularly include girls and address the ways in which race, class, (dis)ability, and other demographic characteristics were related to victimisation risks.

All along (from naming it VAW to gender-based victimisation) there was a recognition by feminist scholars and activists that although a person of any gender/sex can commit or be victims of these violations, they are most commonly perpetrated by men (or boys) against women (or girls). As the range of identified VAW violations and potential victims expanded, scholars and activists began re-labelling this phenomenon 'gender-based violence' (see Ferrer-Perez and Bosch-Fiol, 2019). The violations/abuses that fall under 'gender-based violence', however, are not always violent, although they are almost always violating and hurtful, and very often experienced as traumatic by the victims (see Belknap, 2015; Belknap and Sharma, 2014; Russell, 1984). Indeed, the non-violent abuses can sometimes be more traumatic than the violent ones. For example, many survivors report that intimate partners' psychological abuses (e.g., threats to kill the victim or her/their children or saying hateful things such as 'you are ugly and stupid') are more upsetting than their physical abuses (i.e., hitting, slapping, and kicking). Given that these gendered-based victimisations are not always violent, and that some non-violent abuses can be very traumatic, degrading, and/or frightening, consistent with some other scholars (e.g., Belknap and Sharma, 2014; Charney and Russell, 1994; Zechenter, 1997) we advocate for using the term 'gender-based abuse' (GBA) in lieu of 'gender-based violence' (and as a more inclusive term than 'violence against women'/VAW).

Notably, many GBAs far surpass what is considered an 'epidemic'. Devries et al. (2013: 1527), drawing on data from 81 countries, reported that although there are regional variations, overall and 'globally, in 2010, 30.0% … of women aged 15 and over have experienced, during their lifetime, physical and or sexual intimate partner violence'. At the same time, analyses of federally collected US data indicate that among violent crimes, serious intimate partner violence and sexual assaults are the most chronically underreported to the police (Clay-Warner and McMahon-Howard,

2009; Rennison, 2010; Truman and Morgan, 2016). Thus, intimate partner abuse (IPA) and sexual assaults are both alarmingly frequent and troublingly invisible in terms of being reported to the police. Appropriately, if belatedly, GBA has been increasingly viewed as an *international human rights violation* (e.g., Vaughan et al., 2019; García-Moreno et al., 2013; Zechenter, 1997) and a significant *public health/ medical issue* (e.g., Abrahams et al., 2017; Checchi et al., 2017; Fedina et al., 2018; Heller et al., 2018; Vaughan et al., 2019; García-Moreno et al., 2013).

This chapter provides a brief history and summary of some of the feminist GBA activism and scholarship which helped (1) define and document the various GBA phenomena as serious, and often frequent (some types of GBA are more common than others), social problems; (2) broaden the violations GBA encompasses; (3) provide a more intersectional approach to identifying GBA victims and perpetrators; (4) challenge the community and legal system responses to GBA; (5) document the remarkable increase in GBA research; and (6) identify some of the exciting and innovative programmes to deter GBA, and more appropriately respond to GBA victims, offenders, and the larger communities. Notably, although feminist GBA activism and scholarship is associated with the global North (e.g., North America and Europe), a vast amount of this feminist activism has been from the global South (e.g., Africa, Southeast Asia, and South America).[1] Unfortunately, although it occurred, less is documented about the beginning stages of feminist activism and resistance to GBA in the global South. Finally, given that most of the GBA research is on IPA and sexual assault/rape, these are the GBAs that are most thoroughly addressed in this chapter.

Identifying and Expanding GBAs

As feminist GBA scholarship and activism has grown, so too has the labelling of behaviours deemed GBAs, including the varied tactics or means of perpetrating GBAs. An example of the latter is cyberstalking used by many abusive intimate partners to keep tabs on and/or harass their victims through text messages, emails, social media, and so on (e.g., see Belknap et al., 2012). An example of the former is what is now labelled 'coercive control', a tactic of IPA that likely always existed but was first documented by the late IPA feminist scholar and activist Ellen Pence with Michael Paymar in 1993, when working with IPA women survivors to develop the now well-known 'Power and Control Wheel'. The wheel included physical and sexual violence but also identified the controlling/coercive behaviours such as intimidation, emotional abuse, isolation, economic abuse, using children, and minimising, denying, and blaming (Pence and Paymar, 1993). In 2007, Evan Stark detailed this IPA tactic more fully in his book *Coercive Control: How Men Entrap Women in Personal Life*.

We will briefly define some of the types of GBAs. It is useful to note the overlapping among the types of GBA, for example, sexual abuse and stalking is often committed by a current or former intimate partner. *IPA* includes any physical

---

[1]A perusal of the references for this chapter highlights feminist GBA activism and scholarship as a global phenomenon.

(e.g., hitting, slapping, punching, stabbing, and shooting), sexual (e.g., oral, vaginal, and anal rape), or emotional/psychological (e.g., threatening and degrading words or behaviours, social media shaming and harassment, etc.) abuses perpetrated by a current or former intimate partner. The relationships between the victim and the current or former partner include spouse, date, lover, girlfriend/boyfriend, or any type of intimate/romantic relationship. At its most extreme, IPA is *intimate partner homicide*, whereby someone purposely kills a current or former intimate partner.

In this chapter, we define *rape* (one type of sexual abuse) as forced or coerced oral, anal, or vaginal penetration, whether the abuser uses a penis, a finger, or a foreign object (e.g., a non-body part) to penetrate. Clearly, what constitutes 'rape' has varied over time and across countries, and even across jurisdictions of the same country. In addition to rape, physical sexual abuses can also include grabbing or touching genitals or breasts without consent. Notably, sexual abuse also includes non-physical abuses such as demeaning sexual comments or threats, posting nude photos, or sexual acts without the victim's consent on social media or in a workplace or other venues. Many of these violations fall into the legal definitions of *sexual harassment* if conducted in a place of employment or education. However, they could clearly occur in non-work or non-educational spaces and places, although laws are less clear on some of these locations, such as *sexual harassment* in a public library, on the street, at a party, while camping/hiking, and so on. *Sexual harassment* legal definitions typically include unwanted non-verbal/physical, verbal, and printed or electronic materials that are sexual in nature and can humiliate, degrade, and frighten the victim (see O'Reilly and Garret, 2019). Now turning to defining *stalking,* Miglietta and Acquadro Maran (2017: 563) draw on a large body of research when stating that most legal definitions of stalking 'agree in describing stalking as behaviors that involve repeated harassment by an individual toward another such that the victim fears for her or his safety'. Importantly, most stalking is committed by a current or former intimate partner (e.g., Cattaneo et al., 2011).

Sex trafficking, a form of human trafficking, was defined by the US Trafficking Victims Protection Act of 2000 as when 'a commercial sex act is induced by force, fraud, or coercion, or in which the person induced to perform sex acts is under the age of 18' (Logan et al., 2009: 4). Importantly, sex trafficking is often portrayed as something that occurs to victims transported across countries, but much of sex trafficking occurs domestically (within a country) where it is often ignored when the victims are marginalised in society (i.e., poor women and girls of colour). Similar to most other GBAs, this has occurred for centuries and is not a new phenomenon, although it is only more recently identified as a serious problem (Logan et al., 2009; Segrave et al., 2009). Another type of GBA, which is less well known, is *forced marriage,* whereby marriage is coerced or forced through such tactics as kidnapping, threatening to kill, and other similar emotional or physical behaviours that force or coerce the victim into marriage (Chantler, 2012). Forced marriage is a form of rape due to victims' inability to consent to sex with their husbands who they have been forced to marry. Often forced marriages are of girls as young as 9 with men old enough to be their fathers and grandfathers (e.g., Roka et al., 2013).

History

Men abusing their wives and men/boys sexually abusing girls/women has been a historical constant (e.g., Brownmiller, 1975; Clark, 1987; Dobash and Dobash, 1979; Gordon, 1988; Pleck, 1983; Schwendinger and Schwendinger, 1983). Certainly, over the centuries, individuals have resisted physically and through legal systems (when they existed), but many of these actions were not even offences (such as marital rape and sexual harassment) until the 1970s and later. Although there are historical instances of feminists attempting to hold gender-based abusers accountable in more organised ways, these were not hugely successful until the second wave of the feminist/women's movement, in the 1970s and since. Thus feminist advocacy and organising on GBA has been vital to the beginning of the activism and scholarship that has drastically changed the visibility of GBA, reduced victim blaming, and motivated criminal legal system changes and responses that are successful in ways that are more community based, and less racist, classist, and homophobic, as well as less sexist and misogynistic (see, e.g., Schechter, 1982; Wagers et al., 2017). Evidence of successful feminist GBA activism includes the extensive changes in awareness about the dynamics and prevalence of GBAs, the implementation of safehouses (also known as 'battered women's shelters' and 'refuges'), and other community advocacy. Changing awareness about and responses to men abusing current and former women partners – and to the women abused by such men – is largely due to feminist activist and scholars, such as Shamita Dasgupta, Anne DePrince, Del Martin, Ellen Pence, Julia Perrilla, Erin Pizzey, Beth E. Richie, Susan Schecter, Cris Sullivan, Roberta Villalón, and many others, who mostly started (and continued) as GBA activists/advocates in their own and other communities before they were GBA scholars. Notably, many of these women were/are women of colour and/or lesbians.[2]

Thus, feminist activism has been essential not only in GBA becoming identified as a social problem, but feminist activism and scholarship have had profound impacts on the implementation of both community and criminal legal system GBA responses. In addition to implementing the first safehouses and rape crisis centres in the 1970s (e.g., Dobash and Dobash, 1979; Donat and D'Emilio, 1992; Nichols, 2014; Pizzey, 1977), feminists were successful in changing laws and police and court responses to the GBA abusers and victims. Similarly, '[l]egal reform has been a priority throughout the history of feminist organizing against rape in the United States' and other countries (Levine, 2018: 323). Some of the primary movements in rape law reform were to change it from a property crime whereby raped women and girls were viewed as damage to men's property – married women were their husbands' property and unmarried women were their fathers' property – and thus the damage was to these *men's property* (see Brownmiller, 1975; Clark, 1987; Levine, 2018). With the second wave of the feminist movement in the 1970s, there were major changes in rape law, more specifically recognising

---

[2]Sadly, some of these women have died: Del Martin (b. 1921– d. 2008), Ellen Pence (1948–2012), and Susan Schecter (1946–2004).

that penile–vaginal rape is not the only type of rape (i.e., oral and anal rapes), rape can be committed by any gender/sex, any gender/sex can be victimised by rape, and that rapes can be coercive in nature even when physical force is not evident (see Belknap, 2015).

Wood's (1973) classic treatise on rape reform emphasises the uniqueness of these cases. First, she reports:

> The most curious thing about forcible rape cases, despite common misconceptions, is the amount of sympathy which is afforded the offender, and the callousness, or even hostility in some cases, which is felt for the victim. Because of the assumption that jurors are likely to feel sympathy for the victim and convict the assailant without adequate evidence, many states have more stringent proof require-ments than would be necessary for other crimes. (Wood, 1973: 335)

Second, she addresses the hypervigilant belief in the myth that women/girls frequently make-up rape victimisations and innocent men are arrested, or even go to jail or prison for rapes they did not commit. Wood (1973: 335) notes: 'The law of rape is such that it is highly unlikely to produce an inordinate number of false convictions'. This has been verified by others, as well (see Belknap, 2010).

GBA is still very prevalent and community and legal system responses still have room for significant improvement. Additionally, these successes did not come without backlash, and nowhere is this more apparent than the implementation of law enforcement pro-arrest 'DV' policies in the 1980s and 1990s. These laws and policies served to hold more abusers accountable and helped many women and their children, resulting in DV cases reaching the courts at unprecedented rates. However, the backlash by some police who begrudged having their discretion in DV arrests removed, was seen in arrests of women for DV, very often when they appeared to be the victims. And this has been an ongoing problem (e.g., DeLeon-Granados et al., 2006; Durfee, 2012; Hirschel et al., 2007; Miller, 2005; Muftić et al., 2015). Perhaps not surprisingly, scholars found that like police who resisted pro-arrest policies, court officials, typically district attorneys and judges, also became reluctant to prosecute and convict DV defendants, with many openly holding victim-blaming attitudes (e.g., Corsilles, 1994; Erez and Belknap, 1998; Hartman and Belknap, 2003; Melton, 2004; Ptacek, 1999).

Walklate et al. (2018) highlight the complex history of feminist scholars and activists advocating for legal reform in responding to GBA. Although, 'recourse to the law remains one of the central planks of policy responses on the highly debated issue of how best to prevent and respond to violence against women', feminists engaging with the historically patriarchal criminal legal system to imple-ment or modify sexist policies and laws is challenging (Walklate et al., 2018: 116). Indeed, their preliminary analysis of The Home Office's addition of Stark's (2007) 'coercive control' as an IPA tactic (in addition to outright IP violence) to laws in England and Wales in 2015, 'concludes that, in the case of coercive control, more law is not the answer to improving responses to intimate partner violence' (Walk-late et al., 2018: 115). They explain how the coercive control tactics, particularly

unending surveillance and isolation, make it difficult for the victims to have the autonomy to seek social and systemic help (i.e., help from friends, family, neighbours, police, courts, etc.), and how difficult such tactics are to explain to the police or prove in court (Walklate et al., 2018: 121–122).

The first shelters/safehouses for IPA survivors were developed with collaborative, non-hierarchical (as opposed to bureaucratic) models in efforts to resist patriarchal approaches (Kubiak et al., 2011; Nichols, 2014; Schechter, 1982). They were also designed to be survivor-centered with social change activism, advocating for women's agency and educating systems and communities (Nichols, 2014: 11). Although the first safehouses/shelters were grassroots and struggling for funding and facilities, they ultimately were more feminist in not having to adapt to funders' requirements (see Nichols, 2014; Sullivan, 2011). More recently, in the last decade, efforts have been to get back to collaboration with what are typically called community-based or community-coordinated responses (Cattaneo and Goodman, 2005; Cattaneo et al., 2009; Koss et al., 2017; Nichols, 2014; Sullivan, 2011).

Intersectionality and GBA

Intersectionality and cumulative disadvantage are key to understanding GBA. That is, the more one is marginalised in society by race, ethnicity, class, disability, immigrant status, and sexual identity, as well as gender, the greater the risk of GBA victimisation (e.g., Cribb and Barnett, 1999; Fedina et al., 2018). Early activism on GBA in the 1970s rarely addressed intersectional risks and has been 'criticized for marginalizing women of color, lesbian women, and lower class women' (Nichols, 2014: 3).

IPA research by and about women of colour has been a key to untangling the varying experiences by and responses to IPA victims and abusers of colour and intersecting marginalisations, such as undocumented survivors. Koyama (2016) stresses the women excluded from safehouses for being substance addicted, homeless, mentally ill, HIV-positive, and so on highlighting the larger institutionalised problem of the DV movement's reliance upon the state which too often results in these women's exclusion from services.

Beth E. Richie's (1996) *Compelled to Crime* and other work, including her 2000 article *Black Feminist Reflection on the Antiviolence Movement,* and her 2012 book *Arrested Justice*, which addresses the complex intersections of sexism, racism, and homophobia/heterosexism, as well as the criminalising of African American women and victims. Roberta Villalón's (2010) book *Violence Against Latina Immigrants: Citizenship, Inequality, and Community* details US Latina immigrant women's challenges to navigate DV services and support under threat from their partners and deportation, manifested in the state rhetoric and action against undocumented immigrants. Despite seemingly helpful laws for undocumented women experiencing DV, many are doubly burdened by the systematic abuse represented in institutionalised responses. Margaret Abraham's (2000) book *Speaking the Unspeakable: Marital Violence among South Asian Immigrants in the United States* similarly addressed the unique challenges of these immigrant women victims of DV, and also grappled with feminist advocacy groups hoping

to assist but facing serious hurdles within their feminist organisations in how best to do so. A 1990s study of IPA among Western Samoan women living in Samoa and as immigrants in New Zealand found 'that women from ethnic minorities and recent immigrant groups tend not to use support services provided by the community' for IPA victims (Cribb and Barnett, 1999: 61).

INCITE! is a US grassroots, national, activist organisation of women, gender non-conforming, and trans people of colour against violence, who promote a far more structural means of addressing 'violence against women of color' which they identify as '"violence directed at communities", such as police violence, war, and colonialism, and "violence within communities", such as sexual and domestic violence' (downloaded from their website 10/20/17 http://www.incite-national.org/page/about-incite). INCITE! leadership and members include prolific scholars such as Beth E. Richie and Angela Y. Davis, and their work through scholarship and organising (e.g., conferences, radio shows, etc.), is directed at the state to address gender-, race-, and colonial-based violence, including how the United States is structured to victimise communities of colour. INCITE began in 2000 by 'a small group of impassioned women of colour activists who were fed up with existing organisations that couldn't (or wouldn't) address violence faced by women of colour' (http://mail.incite-national.org/page/history, downloaded 10/20/17). INCITE! has published two edited books: *Color of Violence: The INCITE! Anthology* (2006, 2016) and *The Revolution Will Not Be Funded: Beyond the Non-Profit Industrial Complex* (2007, 2017). Women of colour feminisms have built a feminist analysis that exposes relative inequitable social structures that significantly contribute to the exposure of intimate violence and coercive state interventions (Roberts, 2016).

The contributions of women of colour feminists through movements such as INCITE! revealed the complexities women of colour face when experiencing both intimate and structural violence, and how these are related. Clearly, with changes in IPA arrest and court policies and the growth of shelters and abuser intervention, huge strides have been made in the visibility and seriousness of IPA as a societal, institutional, structural, and individual problem. But it is also clear that the structural problems of sexism, misogyny, racism, classism, anti-immigrant/nationalism, and so on must be key in fruitful moves forward to deter and better respond to DV structurally, institutionally, through communities, and individually.

Pathways Theory and the Criminalisation of GBA Survivors

Pathways Theory was developed to address how adverse life events such as traumatic victimisation place individuals, including youth, at an increased likelihood of offending (see Belknap, 2015). Research documenting the tenets of pathways theory dates back to the 1970s (although the term 'pathways' was not used until 1992, Daly, 1992), and was conducted primarily on incarcerated girls and women, documenting the high rates of sexual abuse (particularly incest) victimisations that led to them running away from home and engaging in crimes (primarily drug/alcohol use/selling and sex work). Current research continues to find these links (e.g., DeHart et al., 2014; Shdaimah and Leon, 2015). As noted previously, a major backlash

that occurred from the increased criminalising of IPA was the implementation of pro-arrest 'DV' laws and policies in the 1980s and 1990s, whereby women were arrested in unprecedented numbers. Thus, there was the criminalising of these victims as offenders if they resisted in any way or even if their abusers simply reported they resisted. The increased arrest and prosecution of women as IPA *perpetrators* has resulted in an extraordinary number of women in jails and prisons for DV as offenders. Significantly, these changes have affected poor women and women of colour the most (e.g., Kubiak et al., 2011; Miller, 2005; Richie, 2012). Other research notes a pattern whereby if women's onset of offending is not as youth, it is strongly linked to adulthood IPA victimisation (e.g., Simpson et al., 2008). For example, a large study of jailed women in the United States found that violence by a partner (which was typically when the women were adults) increased a woman's likelihood, including onset, of sex work, property crime, and/or drug offending (DeHart et al., 2014).

The 'Explosion' in GBA Research over Time

This section documents the remarkable growth in GBA research over time (see Table 1). To do this, we conducted searches for publications on five specific GBA topics – IPA, sexual assault/rape, stalking, sexual harassment, and sex-trafficking. We used the ISI Web of Science 'Core Collection' ISIWSCC search, using a range of definitions for these seven types of GBAs, while controlling for six time periods: 1900–1969, 1970–1979, 1980–1989, 1990–1999, and 2000–2018.[3] Finally, we report the year of the first publication on the type of GBA found in the ISI Web of Science.

Table 1 summarises the findings (with footnotes that explain the wording we used to conduct the searches) of the GBAs we included. The five GBA types are listed in the columns in order of the most to the least number of publications: there are many obvious themes in Table 1. First, the increase in GBA publications,

---

[3]Given that we conducted this data collection and analysis in February 2019, we stopped with publications in 2018. The numbers can change for years as the Web of Science sometimes adds new journals to its existing database over time, which is why it is necessary to collect the data on one day. (We finalised our methods and collected the final data on 24 February 2019). This is not a fool proof method; there are likely some publications we missed, and others are perhaps in here that are very tangentially related to the specific GBA topics. ISI Web of Science is also biased towards journals published in English, although this appears to have improved as they have added more journals to their base. When they add new journals, they go back and add all the articles, not only the ones published since the journal was added to ISI Web of Science. Clearly, some publications could fall into more than one of the GBA categories in Table 1 (e.g., date rape and marital rape research could fall under both sexual assault/rape and IPA; or a study could potentially be generally on GBA/VAW and include all the six topics). We deleted some articles that our search process identified that were unrelated to GBA, such as the three additional articles on IPA prior to 1970, but the label 'domestic disturbance' in these cases was used for 'civil unrest' and the police and military responding to 'domestic' protests (i.e., political protests in the United States) (see the two articles in the references with 'Anonymous' (1936, 1966) authors and the article by Poe [1968]).

Table 1. GBA Publications 1960–2018 ($N = 41,363$).[a]

Date Published	Types of GBA													Increase from Previous Time Period
	Intimate Partner Abuse[b]		Sexual Assault/Rape[c]		Sexual Harassment[d]		Sex-Trafficking[e]		Stalking[f]		Total by Decade Published		
	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%	
1900–1969	1	0.00	31	0.26	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	32	0.1	
1970–1979	44	0.19	178	1.47	8	0.18	0	0.00	0	0.00	230	0.6	7.2×
1980–1989	320	1.34	433	3.57	238	5.25	0	0.00	0	0.00	991	2.4	4.3×
1990–1999	1,822	8.07	1,715	14.12	1,120	24.70	1	0.14	37	5.95	4,695	11.4	4.8×
2000–2009	6,437	27.65	3,316	27.31	1,189	26.22	68	9.52	215	34.57	11,225	27.1	2.4×
2010–2018[c]	14,725	62.75	6,470	53.28	1,980	43.66	645	90.33	370	59.49	24,190	58.5	2.2×
											41,363	100.1[g]	
Total column N	23,349	100.00	12,143	100.01[g]	4,535	100.01[g]	714	99.99[g]	622	100.01[g]			
Total column %	56.4		29.4		11.0		1.7		1.5				
First publication	1967		1925		1976		1995		1993				

[a]Data source: ISI Web of Science 'Core Collection' accessed on 24 February 2019. Given the date of data collection, we ended with 2018 as this was the last complete year. The specific GBAs included in this table are ordered from most to least publications between 1900 and 2018. $N = 41,363$ but it is important to remember that some publications appeared more than once in the table, that is, they included more than one of the five types of GBA. (Potentially, then, a publication could be included as many as five times in this table if it included all five GBA topics.)

[b]String of words in ISI Web of Science: TOPIC: ('domestic dispute*' OR 'domestic disturbance*' OR 'domestic violence*' OR 'battered women*' OR 'battered woman*' OR 'spouse abuse*' OR 'spousal abuse*' OR 'wife abuse*' OR 'intimate partner violence*' OR 'intimate partner abuse*'.

[c]Given the amount of research on 'rape seed' the second topical row was necessary to delete the rape seed studies. String of words in ISI Web of Science: TOPIC: ('sexual assault* OR 'rape') AND TOPIC: (police OR assault* OR attack* OR consent* OR consensual* OR victim* OR court* OR defendant* OR complainant*).

[d]String of words in ISI Web of Science: TOPIC: ('sexual harass* OR 'sexually harass*').

[e]String of words in ISI Web of Science: TOPIC: ('sex-traffic*' OR 'sexually-traffic*'). *Note:* ISI Web of Science does not note whether there is a hyphen so the same for 'sex-traffic*' and 'sex traffic*'.

[f]In attempts to delete research on animals stalking other animals, the string of words in ISI Web of Science: TOPIC: (stalking*) AND TOPIC: (police OR assault* OR victim* OR court* OR defendant* OR complainant*). (*Attack was deleted in this string as it is often identified as animals stalking other animals.)

[g]Percentages were not 100.0% due to rounding off.

particularly from the onset of the second wave of the feminist/women's movement, is remarkable. Only 32 GBA publications were prior to 1970, while from 2010 to 2018, there were 24,190 GBA publications. Second, almost 3 in 5 (58.5%, $n = 24,190$) of the GBA articles were published in the most recent (and shortest) time period, from 2010 to 2018, and over a quarter (27.1%) of the GBA articles were published in the preceding time period, from 2000 to 2009. Stated alternatively, 85.6% ($n = 35,415$) of all of the GBA publications were since 2000. By GBA type, 90% of the sex-trafficking, 63% of the IPA, 59% of the stalking, 53% of the sexual assault/rape, and 44% of the sexual harassment articles were published from 2010 to 2018 (the most recent time period). For every time period, the overall increase in GBA publications was at least 2.2 times, with the biggest rate increases in the 1970s, 1990s, and 1980s, respectively. Third, from 1900 to 1918, there is a clear order in the number of publications across the five categories of GBA. From most to least publications, over half (56.4%) were on IPA ($n = 23,349$), 29.4% were on sexual assault/rape ($n = 12,143$), 11.0% were on sexual harassment ($n = 4,535$), 1.7% were on sex-trafficking ($n = 714$), and 1.5% were on stalking ($n = 622$).

Fourth, prior to 1970, there were a total of 32 publications across the five types of GBAs, and all but one of these were on rape/sexual assault ($N = 31$) and the remaining one was on IPA ($N = 1$). Interestingly, sexual assault/rape publications remained more frequent than IPA publications, but with a decreasing gap, until the 1990s, and for each of the last three time periods the gap between IPA and sexual assault/rape publications increased culminating in the final period (2010–2018) where the number IPA publications ($N = 14,725$) was 2.3 as many as the sexual assault/rape publications ($N = 6,470$) (see Table 1). In order of their first appearance in the ISI Web of Science among the six GBA types, the earliest was on sexual assault/rape in 1925, followed over four decades later by the first on IPA in 1967, and nine years later the first on sexual harassment in 1976. There was an almost two-decade lag before the next original GBA type, stalking, was published in 1993, followed two years later by the first sex-trafficking article in 1995 (see Table 1). Taken together, the findings summarised in Table 1 indicate that most GBA research is on IPA, followed by sexual assault/rape, but that the sex-trafficking research is the most quickly growing body of GBA research in recent decades.

Overall Table 1 suggest: an extraordinary growth in GBA research, but also suggests the grassroots, community, and feminist origination of identifying GBA as a social problem. This massive increase in publications is in no small part due to passage of the federal Violence Against Women Act in 1994 (and the Act's subsequent re-authorisations) that has included unprecedented funding for research on IPA, rape/sexual abuse, stalking, and sex-trafficking. But this explosion in GBA research is very likely also related to more women and feminists in the academy and the growth of the feminist movement, which has been very key in challenging the invisibility of and responses to GBA.

Innovative Programmes Addressing GBAs

Once again, it is beyond the scope of this chapter to list all of the promising and sometimes proven programming and policies to deter and respond to GBA but is

important to list some of these. Earlier, we reported the increasing and relatively recent global awareness of GBA as international human rights and public health problems. Checchi et al. (2017: 2298) underscore the necessity and challenges that humanitarian and public health responders face in responding to GBA in areas of crisis, often called by wars and disasters, such as unplanned displacement and exposure to armed conflict, yet note some success in these challenges. Devries et al.'s (2013: 1527) global report on IPA stated that although the 'prevention field is still in its nascence, emerging evidence suggests several promising areas of intervention'. They include improved intervention with children who witness IPA, improving women's and girls' educational attainment, and challenging the social norms that identify IPA as a private matter, the condoning of men's/boys' control of women/girls, and engaging men/boys in violence prevention, encouraging bystander (such as neighbours') taking action when IPA occurs, and using media to promote gender equity and non-violent relationships (Devries et al., 2013: 1528). An example of the power of *social* context in deterring IPA are seen in a study of Samoan women IPA survivors, some living in Samoa and some living as immigrants in New Zealand (Cribb and Barnett, 1999). Strong extended family networks aided women's efforts to leave abusive men, while more traditionally 'nuclear households' replacing these extended family arrangements served to isolate the women and keep the IPA a private matter (Cribb and Barnett, 1999).

Given that research indicates the type of GBA that is most prevalent is IPA it is not surprising that it has by far the most research conducted on it (see Table 1), and that the most GBA-related programming and policies address IPA. British feminists Abrar et al. (2000: 246) point out that there have been significant IPA policy changes since the 1970s, and that it is important to remember:

> There is no single public organization with responsibility for domestic violence policy; responsibility spreads across a wide range of agencies spanning central and local tiers of government and public, private and quasi-governmental sectors.

As noted previously, as the original, feminist-based grassroots safehouses became more accepted and funded by governmental bodies and others, the organisations tended to lose their feminist approaches. Nichols (2014: 10) notes that these grassroots advocacy organisations have evolved from feminist 'into professionalized, specialized, and collaborative organizations'.

Encouragingly, research assessing collaborations between the more feminist safehouses and victim-advocates with the more traditional police departments and courts has been effective in bringing about real change (e.g., Cerulli et al., 2015; DePrince et al. 2012). The successful collaborations are typically ones that are survivor centered (e.g., Koss et al., 2017; Nichols, 2014). One example is DePrince et al.'s (2012) work with feminists and criminal legal system key players to implement and study a community which found that IPA survivors who were randomly assigned to the coordinated community responses were more likely to engage with the process, and this was particularly true for poorer women and women of colour. Finally, to address the criminalising of IPA survivors, the Michigan Coalition Against Domestic and Sexual Violence funded a project to

provide such women with resources and tools to assist, and what resulted is a free on-line document, *Best Practice Toolkit for Working with Domestic Violence Survivors with Criminal Histories* (Kubiak et al., 2011).

An ongoing feminist challenge has been raised by some feminists who are concerned with how to promote feminist advocacy for victims of GBA at the same time that many criminal legal systems, in addition to being sexist, are highly and disproportionately punitive to GBA defendants when they are poor, of colour, and otherwise marginalised (Bernstein, 2012; Harris, 2011; Whittier, 2016).

We need an analysis that furthers neither the conservative project of sequestering millions of men of colour in accordance with the contemporary dictates of globalised capital and its prison industrial complex, nor the equally conservative project of abandoning poor women of colour to a continuum of violence that extends from the sweatshops through the prisons, to shelters, and into bedrooms at home. How do we develop analyses and organising strategies against VAW that acknowledge the race of gender and the gender of race? (Harris, 2011: 13).

Conclusions

This chapter reported on the history of identifying and defining different types of, raising awareness about, documenting and researching, and responding to GBA. Although GBA has always existed, feminist activists and scholars, often one-in-the-same, have been highly successful in massive changes in scholarship on and responses to GBA since the 1970s. The data we presented in Table 1 evidence the massive increase in scholarship on GBA since the 1970s: GBA publications increased from 32 between 1900 and 1969 to over 24,000 from 2010 through 2018. As this research and activism evolved and expanded, there has been growing recognition of the need to address GBA responses and scholarship from an intersectional perspective; such as how race/ethnicity and class intersect with gender in understanding the dynamics behind GBA and how to better navigate both the community and legal system responses to it. Feminist activism and scholarship has also recognised how much of GBAs, including very serious forms, are not always violent per se, yet can be very traumatic for the victims. Although the focus of GBA is often on the United States and England, feminist activists and scholars from all over the world have contributed to awareness about and resistance to GBA. What was lost in some of the grassroots feminist organisations responding to GBA (e.g., more patriarchal oversight by governmental, funding, and criminal legal system agencies) in the 1970s has been aided in more recent years by more victim-centered and community-coordinated responses. Although this chapter highlights the power of feminism in advancing the awareness of and responses to GBA, it remains a far to frequent phenomenon that deserves ongoing feminist research and activism and innovative responses.

References

Abraham, M. (2000). *Speaking the unspeakable: Marital violence among South Asian immigrants in the United States,* New Brunswick, NJ, Rutgers University Press.

Abrahams, N., Seedat, S., Lombard, C., Kengne, A.P., Myers, B., Sewnath, A., Mhlongo, S., Ramjee, G., Peer, N. Garcia-Moreno, C. and Jewkes, R. 2017. Study protocol for a longitudinal study evaluating the impact of rape on women's health and their use of health services in South Africa. *BMJ Open*, 7(9), 1–13.

Abrar, S., Lovenduski, J. and Margetts, H. 2000. Feminist ideas and domestic violence policy change, *Political Studies*, 48, 239–262.

Anonymous. 1936. Use of military force in domestic disturbances, *Yale Law Journal*, 45(5), 879–895.

Anonymous. 1966. Federal intervention in the states for the suppression of domestic violence: constitutionality, statutory power, and policy, *Duke Law Journal*, 4, 415–462.

Belknap, J. 2010. Rape: too hard to report and too easy to discredit victims, *Violence Against Women*, 16(12), 1335–1344.

Belknap, J. 2015. *The Invisible Woman: Gender, Crime, and Justice*, 4th ed., Belmont, CA, Cengage Learning.

Belknap, J. and Sharma, N. 2014. The significant frequency and impact of stealth (nonviolent) gender-based abuse among college women, *Trauma, Violence, & Abuse*, 15(3), 181–190.

Belknap, J., Chu, A.T. and DePrince, A.P. 2012. The roles of phones and computers in threatening and abusing women victims of male intimate partner abuse, *Duke Journal of Gender Law & Policy*, 19, 373–406.

Bernstein, E. (2012). Carceral politics as gender justice? The "traffic in women" and neoliberal circuits of crime, sex, and rights, *Theory and Society, 41*(3), 233–259.

Brownmiller, S. 1975. *Against Our Will: Men, Women and Rape*, New York, NY, Simon and Schuster.

Cattaneo, L.B. and Goodman, L.A. 2005. Risk factors for reabuse in intimate partner violence: a cross-disciplinary critical review, *Trauma Violence & Abuse*, 6(2), 141–175.

Cattaneo, L.B., Cho, S. and Botuck, S. 2011. Describing intimate partner stalking over time: An effort to inform victim-centered service provision, *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 26(17), 3428–3454.

Cattaneo, L.B., Goodman, L.A., Epstein, D., Kohn, L.S. and Zanville, H.A. 2009. The victim-informed prosecution project: a quasi-experimental test of a collaborative model for cases of intimate partner violence, *Violence Against Women*, 15(10), 1227–1247.

Cerulli, C., Trabold, N., Kothari, C. L., Dichter, M. E., Raimondi, C., Lucas, J., Cobus, A., & Rhodes, K. V. (2015). In Our Voice: Survivors' Recommendations for Change, *Journal of Family Violence, 30*(1), 75–83.

Chantler, K. (2012). Recognition of and intervention in forced marriage as a form of violence and abuse, *Trauma Violence & Abuse, 13*(3), 176–183.

Charles, N. 1995. Feminist politics, domestic violence and the state, *The Sociological Review*, 43(4), 617–640.

Charney, D.A. and Russell, R.C. 1994. An overview of sexual harassment, *The American Journal of Psychiatry*, 151(1), 10–17.

Checchi, F., Warsame, A., Treacy-Wong, V., Polonsky, J., Van Ommeren, M. and Prudhon, C. 2017. Public health information in crisis-affected populations: a review of methods and their use for advocacy and action, *The Lancet*, 390(10109), 2297–2313.

Clark, A. 1987. *Women's Silence, Men's Violence: Sexual Assault in England, 1770–1845*, London, Pandora Press.

Clay-Warner, J. and McMahon-Howard, J. 2009. Rape reporting: 'classic rape' and the behavior of law, *Violence and Victims*, 24(6), 723–743.

Corsilles, A. 1994. No-drop policies in the prosecution of domestic violence cases: guarantee to action or dangerous solution?, *Fordham Law Review*, 63(3), 853–881.

Cribb, J. and Barnett, R. 1999. Being bashed: Western Samoan women's responses to domestic violence in Western Samoa and New Zealand, *Gender, Place and Culture*, 6(1), 49–65.

Daly, K. 1992. Women's pathways to felony court: feminist theories of lawbreaking and problems of representation, *Southern California Review of Law and Women's Studies*, 2(1), 11–52.

DeHart, D., Lynch, S., Belknap, J., Dass-Brailsford, P. and Green, B. 2014. Life history models of female offending: the roles of serious mental illness and trauma in women's pathways to jail, *Psychology of Women Quarterly*, 38(1), 138–151.

Devries, K. M., Mak, J. Y. T., García-Moreno, C., Petzold, M., Child, J. C., Falder, G., Lim, S., Bacchus, L. J., Engell, R. E., Rosenfeld, L., Pallitto, C., Vos, T., Abrahams, N., & Watts, C. H. 2013. Global health. The global prevalence of intimate partner violence against women, *Science*, 340, 1527–1528.

DeLeon-Granados, W., Wells, W. and Binsbacher, R. 2006. Arresting developments – trends in female arrests for domestic violence and proposed explanations, *Violence Against Women*, 12(4), 355–371.

DePrince, A. P., Belknap, J., Labus, J. S., Buckingham, S. E., & Gover, A. R. (2012). The impact of victim-focused outreach on criminal legal system outcomes following police-reported intimate partner abuse, *Violence Against Women, 18*(8), 861–881.

Dobash, R.E. and Dobash, R. 1979. *Violence Against Wives: A Case Against The Patriarchy*, New York, NY, Free Press.

Donat, P.L.N. and D'Emilio, J. 1992. A feminist redefinition of rape and sexual assault: historical foundations and change, *Journal of Social Issues*, 48(1), 9–22.

Durfee, A. (2012). Situational Ambiguity and Gendered Patterns of Arrest for Intimate Partner Violence, *Violence Against Women, 18*(1), 64–84.

Erez, E. and Belknap, J. 1998. In their own words: battered women's assessment of the criminal processing system's responses, *Violence and Victims*, 13(3), 251–268.

Fedina, L., Backes, B.L., Jun, H.J., Shah, R., Nam, B., Link, B.G. and DeVylder, J.E. 2018. Police violence among women in four US cities, *Preventive Medicine*, 106, 150–156.

Ferrer-Perez, V.A. and Bosch-Fiol, E. 2019. Gender in the analysis of intimate partner violence against women: from gender "blindness" to gender-specific research, *Anuario de Psicologia Juridica* [Annal of Legal Psychology], 29(1), 69–76.

García-Moreno, C., Pallitto, C., Devries, K., Stöckl, H., Watts, C. and Abrahams, N. 2013. *Global and Regional Estimates of Violence Against Women: Prevalence and Health Effects of Intimate Partner Violence and Non-partner Sexual Violence*, Geneva, World Health Organization.

Gordon, L. 1988. *Heroes of Their Own Lives: The Politics and History of Family Violence*. New York, NY, Viking.

Harris, A.P. 2011. Heteropatriarchy kills: challenging gender violence in a prison nation, *Washington University Journal of Law & Policy*, 37, 13–65.

Hartman, J.L. and Belknap, J. 2003. Beyond the gatekeepers: court professionals' self-reported attitudes about and experiences with misdemeanor domestic violence cases, *Criminal Justice and Behavior*, 30(3), 349–373.

Heller, M., Roberts, S.T., Masese, L., Ngina, J., Chohan, N., Chohan, V., Shafi, J., Mcclelland, R.S., Brindle, E. and Graham, S.M. 2018. Gender-based violence, physiological stress, and inflammation: a cross-sectional study, *Journal of Women's Health*, 27(9), 1152–1161.

Hirschel, D., Buzawa, E., Pattavina, A. and Faggiani, D. 2007. Domestic violence and mandatory arrest laws: to what extent do they influence police arrest decisions? *Journal of Criminal Law & Criminology*, 98(1), 255–298.

INCITE! Ed. 2007. *The revolution will not be funded: Beyond the non-profit industrial complex*, Cambridge, MA, South End Press

INCITE! Ed. 2017. *The revolution will not be funded: Beyond the non-profit industrial complex* [Electronic resource], Durham, NC: Duke University Press.

INCITE! Ed. 2006. *Color of Violence: The Incite! Anthology*, Cambridge, MA, South End Press.

INCITE! Women of Color Against Violence Ed. 2016. *Color of Violence: The INCITE! Anthology*. https://doi.org/10.1215/9780822373445, Durham, NC, Duke University Press.

Koss, M.P., White, J.W. and Lopez, E.C. 2017. Victim voice in reenvisioning responses to sexual and physical violence nationally and internationally, *American Psychologist*, 72(9), 1019–1030.

Koyama, E. 2016. Disloyal to feminism: abuse of survivors within the domestic violence shelter system. In *Color of Violence*, Ed. INCITE! Women of Color Against Violence, pp. 208–222, Durham, NC, Duke University Press.

Kubiak, S., Sullivan, C., Nnawulezi, N. and Fedock, G. 2011. *Best Practices Toolkit for Working with Domestic Violence Survivors with Criminal Histories*, East Lansing, MI, Michigan Coalition Against Domestic and Sexual Violence. Available at: vaw.msu.edu/project/best-practices-toolkit-for-working-with-domestic-violencesurvivors-with-criminal-histories/

Levine, E.C. 2018. Sexual scripts and criminal statutes: gender restrictions, spousal allowances, and victim accountability after rape law reform, *Violence Against Women*, 24(3), 322–349.

Logan, T.K., Walker, R. and Hunt, G. 2009. Understanding human trafficking in the United States, *Trauma, Violence, & Abuse*, 10(1), 3–30.

Melton, H.C. 2004. Stalking in the context of domestic violence: findings on the criminal justice system, *Women & Criminal Justice*, 15(3–4), 33–58.

Miglietta, A. and Acquadro Maran, D. 2017. Gender, sexism and the social representation of stalking: what makes the difference? *Psychology of Violence*, 7(4), 563–573.

Miller, S.L. 2005. *Victims as Offenders: The Paradox of Women's Violence in Relationships*, New Brunswick, NJ, Rutgers University Press.

Muftić, L.R., Finn, M.A. and Marsh, E.A. 2015. The victim–offender overlap, intimate partner violence, and sex: assessing differences among victims, offenders, and victim-offenders, *Crime & Delinquency*, 61(7), 899–926.

Nichols, A.J. 2014. *Feminist Advocacy: Gendered Organizations in Community-based Responses to Domestic Violence*, Lanham, MD, Lexington Books.

O'Reilly, A. and Garrett, P.M. 2019. 'Playing the game?': The sexual harassment of female social workers across professional workspaces, *International Social Work*, 62(1), 105–118.

Pandhe, S. 1988. Women's studies and women's movement, *Economic & Political Weekly*, 23(40), 2049–2050.

Pence, E. and Paymar, M. 1993. *Domestic Violence Information Manual. The Duluth Domestic Abuse Intervention Project*, New York, NY, Springer. Available at: http://www.dulutch-model.org [Accessed 26 February 2019].

Pizzey, E. 1977. *Scream Quietly or the Neighbors Will Hear*, Middlesex, Penguin.

Pleck, E. 1983. Feminist responses to crimes against women, 1868–1896, *Signs*, 8(3), 451–470.

Poe, D.A. 1968. The use of federal troops to suppress domestic violence, *American Bar Association Journal*, 54(2), 168–171.

Ptacek, J. 1999. *Battered Women in the Courtroom*, Boston, MA, Northeastern University Press.

Rennison, C.M. 2010. An investigation of reporting violence to the police: a focus on Hispanic victims, *Journal of Criminal Justice*, 38(4), 390–399.

Richards, D.L. and Haglund, J. 2016. *Violence Against Women and the Law*, London, Routledge.

Richie, B.E. 1996. *Compelled to Crime: The Gender Entrapment of Battered Black Women*. New York, Routledge.

Richie, B.E. 2012. *Arrested Justice: Black Women, Violence, and America's Prison Nation*, New York, NY, New York University Press.

Roberts, D. 2016. Feminism, race, and adoption policy. In *The Color of Violence: The INCITE! Anthology*, Ed. The INCITE! Anthology Co-editors, pp. 42–52, Durham, NC, Duke University Press.

Roka, Z.G., Akech, M., Wanzala, P., Omolo, J., Gitta, S. and Waiswa, P. 2013. Factors associated with obstetric fistulae occurrence among patients attending selected hospitals in Kenya, 2010, *BMC Pregnancy and Childbirth*, 13, 56.

Russell, D.E.H. 1984. *Sexual Exploitation: Rape, Child Sexual Abuse, and Workplace Harassment*, Beverly Hills, CA, Sage.

Schechter, S. 1982. *Women and Male Violence: The Visions and Struggles of the Battered Women's Movement*, Boston, MA, South End Press.

Schwendinger, J.F. and Schwendinger, H. 1983. *Rape and Inequality*, Beverly Hills, CA, Sage.

Segrave, M., Milivojevic, S. and Pickering, S. 2009. *Sex Trafficking: International Context and Response*, Cullompton, Willan Pub.

Shdaimah, C. S., & Leon, C. 2015. "First and Foremost They're Survivors": Selective Manipulation, Resilience, and Assertion Among Prostitute Women, *Feminist Criminology, 10*(4), 326–347.

Simpson, S. S., Yahner, J. L., & Dugan, L. (2008). Understanding Women's Pathways to Jail: Analysing the Lives of Incarcerated Women, *Australian and New Zealand Journal of Criminology, 41*(1), 84–108.

Stark, E. 2007. *Coercive Control: How Men Entrap Women in Personal Life*, Oxford, Oxford University Press.

Sullivan, C.M. 2011. Evaluating domestic violence support service programs: waste of time, necessary evil, or opportunity for growth? *Aggression and Violent Behavior*, 16, 354–360.

Truman, J.L. and Morgan, R.E. 2016. *Criminal Victimization, 2015*, NCJ 250180, Bureau of Justice Statistics. Available at: https://www.bjs.gov/content/pub/pdf/cv15.pdf

Vaughan, C., Jarallah, Y., Murdolo, A., Murray, L., Quiazon, R., Block, K. and Zannettino, L. 2019. The MuSeS project: a mixed methods study to increase understanding of the role of settlement and multicultural services in supporting migrant and refugee women experiencing violence in Australia, *BMC International Health & Human Rights*, 19(1), 1–8.

Villalón, R. 2010. *Violence Against Latina Immigrants: Citizenship, Inequality, and Community*, New York, NY, New York University Press.

Wagers, S.M., Pate, M. and Brinkley, A. 2017. Evidence-based best practices for batterer intervention programs: a report from the field on the realities and challenges batterer intervention programs are facing, *Partner Abuse*, 8, 409–428.

Walklate, S., Fitz-Gibbon, K. and McCulloch, J. 2018. Is more law the answer? Seeking justice for victims of intimate partner violence through the reform of legal categories, *Criminology & Criminal Justice*, 18(1), 115–131.

Whittier, N. (2016). Carceral and intersectional feminism in Congress: The Violence Against Women Act, discourse, and policy, *Gender & Society, 30*(5), 791–818.

Wood, P.L. 1973. The victim in a forcible rape case: a feminist view, *The American Criminal Law Review*, 11, 335–354.

Zechenter, E.M. 1997. In the name of culture: cultural relativism and the abuse of the individual, *Journal of Anthropological Research*, 53(3), 319–347.

This page intentionally left blank

Chapter 5

Feminist Criminology in a Time of 'Digital Feminism': Can the #MeToo Movement Create Fundamental Cultural Change?

Annie Cossins

Abstract

One of the key contributions of feminist criminology has been to recognise the cultural significance of the concepts of sex and gender, bodies and social practices in order to conceptualise men's engagement with crime, including the dominance of men as perpetrators of crimes of violence against women.

This chapter focusses on the #MeToo movement which has revealed the stark contrast between women's experiences of sexual assault and sexual harassment, and the extent of men's perceived entitlement to women's bodies. By theorising the regulatory processes by which different bodies are 'moralised', it is possible to see how cultures are created by reference to the values ascribed to different bodies as well as what different bodies do. The author considers the applicability of moral regulation theory to show how processes of sexualisation, including sexual assault and harassment, constitute identity formation and considers whether resistance in the form of the #MeToo movement amounts to a powerful enough challenge to introduce cultural and structural changes.

Keywords: #MeToo movement; sex, race and class; intersectionalities; sexualisation; moral regulation; bodies