

Transformative Feminist Criminology: A Critical Re-thinking of a Discipline

Meda Chesney-Lind · Merry Morash

Published online: 11 May 2013
© Springer Science+Business Media Dordrecht 2013

Abstract This essay makes the case for a transformative critical feminist criminology, one that explicitly theorizes gender, one that requires a commitment to social justice, and one that must increasingly be global in scope. Key to this re-thinking of a mature field is the need to expand beyond traditional positivist notions of “science,” to embrace core elements of a feminist approach to methodology, notably the epistemological insights gleaned from a new way of thinking about research, methods, and the relationship between the knower and the known. Other key features of contemporary feminist criminology include an explicit commitment to intersectionality, an understanding of the unique positionality of women in the male dominated fields of policing and corrections, a focus on masculinity and the gender gap in serious crime, a critical assessment of corporate media and the demonization of girls and women of color, and a recognition of the importance of girls’ studies as well as women’s studies to the development of a global, critical feminist criminology.

Introduction

Early theories to explain delinquency, crime, and victimization were actually limited to theorizing male deviance, male criminality, and male victimization with a specific focus of showcasing the utility of the positivist paradigm to the study of the distributions and causes of these phenomena. Thus, the founders of criminology almost completely overlooked women’s crime, and they ignored, minimized, and trivialized female victimization (Hughes 2005). When they did consider women, they considered them in relation to men, and discussions of these relations rarely if ever included details of the horrific violence that many women suffered at the hands of those men (or blamed the woman for the assaults).

M. Chesney-Lind (✉)
Department of Women’s Studies, University of Hawaii at Manoa, Honolulu, HI, USA
e-mail: meda@hawaii.edu

M. Morash
School of Criminal Justice, Michigan State University, East Lansing, MI, USA

Based on the assumption that aspects of the social world could be precisely measured and clearly demonstrably linked as causes and effects, positivist methodology came to dominate criminology by the mid-twentieth century (see Deegan 1990). This perspective emphasized the researcher as objective and detached from both the data collection process and the use of the findings. No consideration was given to the effect of field researchers on study participants, or the potential that social phenomenon are given their meaning by individuals, and these meanings are as important as precisely measured “realities.” Even those criminologists that used more qualitative data, like Thrasher (1927) and Cohen (1955), failed to understand how their own gender colored their view of the world, which meant they completely ignored and/or sexualized girls and talked almost exclusively to boys and young men about gangs and delinquency.

Feminist criminology directed attention towards gender as a key force that shapes crime and social control, towards research methods that recognize power differentials between the researcher and the researched, and give relatively powerless people voice to express their standpoints, and towards action-oriented research to reveal and promote justice. We have both written extensively from and on the feminist criminological framework (Chesney-Lind 2006; Brown et al. 2007; Morash 2006, 2010). In this article, we present highlights from and build on our recent collaboration to select articles and write an introduction for the book, *Feminist Theories of Crime* (Chesney-Lind and Morash 2011), which was published as part of Ashgate’s *Library of Essays in Theoretical Criminology*. The book presents key work representing the best of feminist criminology. Notably, the inclusion of *Feminist Theories of Crime* in this series reflects that feminist theory is a major lasting paradigm within criminology. We know that some scholars see feminist criminology as a subfield of critical criminology. In our view, that is not really an accurate depiction, since not all critical criminologists place gender at the center of theory, and not all feminist criminologists see their work as part of the broader struggle for social justice. So what might be an alternative way of thinking about the two fields, and possibly other fields in criminology as well? One might envision overlapping perspectives, where one field does not compete with another, but instead benefits from considering the concerns and interests of the other field.

A virtue of this conceptualization is that it does not force different perspectives into a hierarchy, with one subsuming the other. The non-hierarchical envisioning of alternative perspectives opens dialog, allows for constructive challenges to both perspectives, and promotes non-combative exchange of ideas. We hope in this essay to demonstrate that such a conversation can push both perspectives forward. The authors of this piece are already engaged in such a conversation, since we each come from quite different places within both critical and feminist criminology. Meda is thoroughly comfortable with many of the dominant concerns of critical criminology having had a long history as an activist as well as a scholar. Merry has focused on addressing a broad range of research questions about gender (and other topics); to do this she has explored and melded positivist, feminist, and critical theories and methods with the hope for bringing new insights to criminology. Collaborating on the recent book of essays, we enjoyed the differences between us, and we felt those complemented and strengthened our work. Our differing criteria for selecting articles to include and our differing acquaintance with different publications resulted in a collection more inclusive and varied than either of us could have produced alone.

Despite many prior decades of neglect of the cornerstones of feminist criminology—the pressing need for research to promote social justice and the recognition of gender as an essential component in explaining crime, victimization, and injustice (see Richie 2012)—our greatest challenge in creating the collection was to select between the many examples

of excellent theory-driven feminist research given how much growth the field has experienced. Indeed, we finally had to restrict our choices to relatively recent publications, and to omit the important topical area of gender in the workplaces of justice, that is in law enforcement, court, correctional, and victim services/advocacy organizations.

In this article, we do note a few key works on gendered organizations—the police departments, correctional enterprises, and courts—that address justice issues and the crucial notion that key organizations of social control are clearly implicated in the enforcement of patriarchal privilege. In addition, we explain feminist theory's unique contributions and key concepts, and note some challenges to the perspective and controversies within it. Finally, we make some recommendations for future development of feminist theory.

Feminist Theory's Unique Focus

To recognize the unique contributions of feminist criminological theory, we first consider what is “missing” in other paradigms, and we present key feminist work that has filled these gaps (Sprague 2005). Specifically, inconsistent with the longstanding inattention to girls and women caught up in the justice system, research on the early history of US courts showed that concern for girls' immoral conduct fueled the so-called “child-saving movement” which established a separate system of justice for youth and that ended up incarcerating large numbers of girls for sexual offenses for many decades into the twentieth century (Chesney-Lind 1977; Odem 1995; Schlossman and Wallach 1978). Another historical analysis (Rafter 1990, pp. 149–152) revealed that while reformatories housed white women deemed amenable to being “saved” through grooming for work as domestics, particularly in the South after the Civil War, the criminal justice system treated and punished imprisoned African American women as if they were men, requiring them to work alongside men in chain gangs, even subjected them to whipping, like men.

The recognition of women's and girls' variation in experiences based on race, gender, and other differences has become another cornerstone of feminist criminology. Feminist criminologists were also the first to recognize that many girls moved deep into the justice system after they ran away from a sexually abusive parent, were arrested for running or for “survival crime,” and were then criminalized by the system (Chesney-Lind 1989). This discovery stimulated much research on girls' and women's unique pathways into illegal activity and institutions of control (e.g., Belknap and Holsinger 1998; Davis 2007; Holsinger 2000; Van Voorhis et al. 2010) and on the high prevalence of victimization among women offenders (e.g., Browne et al. 1999; Moe 2004; Richie 1996).

The inclusion of women and girls in criminological research was catalyzed by the second wave of the feminist movement in the late 60s and early 70s.¹ As might be expected, feminist criminologists of this period brought the insights of feminist theories unrelated to crime and social control into their groundbreaking work; indeed, inter-disciplinarity is another earmark of feminist work. Contemporary criminologists who work from a feminist perspective continue to borrow heavily from the disciplines of women's

¹ The women's movement has traditionally been divided into two historic “waves,” despite the fact that work on the status of women can be dated well before the first of these events, and continued in a rather clear form after the first “wave” passed. Generally, however, the first “wave” is recognized as starting with the Seneca Falls Convention in 1848, and the second “wave” is dated to the publication of Betty Friedan's influential book, *The Feminine Mystique* in 1963.

studies, gender studies, and feminist scholarship in other social sciences and fields of study. Often their keenest insights come when they transgress criminology, that is, they focus on concepts apart from crime, victimization, and justice system; these imported concepts shed light on the operation of gender as it pertains to the core interests of criminology (Cain 1990).

All of the disciplines that contain feminist theory have different strands that vary in several ways: degrees of theoretical attention to intersectionality (i.e., combinations of gender with race, class, ethnicity, and other status markers that affect social life and individuals); preference for particular research methods; integration with constructionist, conflict, or other theoretical paradigms. The best known of the early theoretical influences on criminology were the notions of *radical feminist theory*, *liberal feminist theory*, and *socialist feminist theory*. *Radical feminism* stresses that patriarchal gender arrangements lead to men's efforts to control women's sexuality (and their reproductive capacity) often through violence and abuse (e.g., rape and wife battering). Men dominate over women throughout society, and meaningful change requires obliterating gender differences in power and opportunities (Millet 1970; Brownmiller 1975). *Liberal feminism* suggests that gender oppression would be reduced or eliminated by altering the way that girls and boys are socialized and by reforming laws and their implementation, for example by eliminating bias in the sentencing of women and men and between racial groups (Bickle and Peterson 1991). *Socialist feminism* made an important contribution to understanding that not just gender, but also class, results in oppression, so for example, countries where women receive little education and hold low occupational status experience high levels of sexual violence against women and produce women's tremendous fear of crime (Yodanis 2004; also see Martin et al. 2006; Whaley 2001). According to socialist feminists, since gender oppression takes on alternative forms and intensity depending on social class, reforms require change in the economic system (e.g., a shift towards socialism) not just in the sex/gender system.

New schools of thought continue to appear on the feminist theoretical landscape and they, too, are of clear relevance to criminology. Each school has challenged both mainstream criminology and other feminist theory to more fully account for the complexity of how gender is connected to crime and justice. Despite different strands of feminist theory, there are important key concepts and both theoretical and epistemological assumptions that cut across the variants of feminist theory. The centrality of patriarchy and "feminine" and "masculine" identities, intersectionality that recognizes the combined effects of gender and other status markers, agency even of the oppressed, and feminist epistemology and research methods are persistent characteristics of feminist social science, including feminist criminology.

Patriarchy Matters

While the dictionary defines feminism as simply "the theory of the political, economic, and social equality of the sexes" (Merriam Webster 2009), the terrain has been made much more complicated in the years that followed that 1895 definition. The *sex/gender system* (also referred to as the *gender organization* and *gender arrangements*) stands as a central concept in feminist theory. The sex/gender system exists globally and in countries, cultures, regions, communities, organizations, families, and other groups. It affects individuals by impacting their identities, imposing gendered expectations, and prohibiting and sanctioning "gender inappropriate" behavior. Patriarchal sex/gender systems are characterized

by males' exercise of power and control to oppress women (Hondagneu-Sotelo 1994). The degree and the form of patriarchy vary by place and time and even for subgroups (e.g., social class, racial, ethnic, and age groups) sharing the same geography and period (Lerner 1986a, b; Lown 1983; Pateman 1988, 1989). According to the ideology of extreme patriarchy, women's orientation should be totally restricted to the home with no participation in education or the workforce (Stankuniene and Maslauskaitė 2008). Slightly less extreme forms of patriarchy allow women to participate in the workforce, but husbands and, depending on the culture, other relatives control women's earnings.

The sex/gender system typically functions as a system of social stratification, where both men and women and the tasks they perform are valued differently—with men's assumed qualities and the work they do valued more highly (Conway et al. 1996; Fiske et al. 2002; Gerber 2009). To illustrate, many citizens and some police associate effective policing with characteristics assumed to be traits for men, especially traits surrounding "aggression, violence, danger, risk taking, and courageousness" (Franklin 2005, p. 6; also Heidensohn 1992; Hunt 1984; Prokos and Padavic 2002). In highly gendered (Acker 1990) police organizations, women are stereotyped and channeled into restricted types of police work and support networks, are treated with hostility, and are rejected by other officers just on the basis of their gender (Martin and Jurik 2007). Practices of exclusion from informal work cultures, gender segregation, differential assignments, sexual harassment, and marginalization of women with family responsibilities also characterize correctional organizations and the settings where legal professionals work (Martin and Jurik 2007, p. 2).

The feminist conceptualization of the sex-gender system contrasts sharply with representation of a person's biological sex category as an individual-level variable—an approach that is frequently found in traditional criminological discussions of gender. In feminist theory, gender is not a variable nor is it an unchanging personal trait. A person's gender is constructed through actions and interactions to produce a form of "masculinity" or "femininity" that either reproduces or challenges common expectations for gender-appropriate behaviors (West and Zimmerman 1987; also see West and Fenstermaker 1995). The sex/gender system at the macro (structural) level affects individuals by affording them access to influence and resources depending on their sex and gender. Thus, in order to begin to fully explain key phenomenon, such as the gender gap in crime, as well as the seemingly perplexing responses of the criminal justice system to girls and women as both victims and offenders, we must *theorize* gender in terms of individual-level identity and interactions embedded in a broader macro-level system of gender arrangements.

Feminist criminologists (e.g., Hunnicutt 2009; Ogle and Batton 2009) struggle to keep attention focused on how different forms of patriarchy influence crime, victimization, the justice system, and workers in that system. Importantly, they document inequities and suffering introduced by patriarchal arrangements in order to protest and change them.

Masculinities and Femininities

In criminology, one important explanation that has traditionally been "missing" from conversations about crime is that boys and men have always committed the most crime, especially of a violent type or in the "crimes of the powerful" category (Daly 1989; Schwartz et al. 2009; Steffensmeier et al. 2005). For decades criminologists by and large ignored the gender gap (or dropped girls and women from the analysis as many early longitudinal studies did) which had the effect of normalizing high levels of male violence. Although certainly not the only explanation for men's and boys' high levels of illegal

behavior, theories about gender identities are one approach that holds promise in explaining the gender difference. Although feminist theory, by definition, is grounded in women's experience, some critical male scholars (Messerschmidt 1993; Schwartz and DeKeseredy 1997; DeKeseredy 2011; Schwartz and DeKeseredy, this issue) have increasingly adopted feminist perspectives in their own research on men and male behavior as well as women, and they have explored the link of masculinities to crime. Also, feminist criminologists have made major advances by showing the connection of pressure to conform to particular aspects of manhood and male involvements in crime (Anderson and Umberson 2001; Bui and Morash 2008; Bowker 1997).

The feminist perspective calls attention to gender (and thus masculinity) as something that is enacted in the context of patriarchal privilege, class privilege, and racism. The power of this perspective is clearly evident in work by Danner and Carmody (2001) who document how the media accounts of school shootings completely miss the role of gender in these crimes that so horrified the nation. Surveying newspaper coverage of shootings at multiple districts, Danner and Carmody noted that while the media was obsessed with the stories, all the stories "rounded up all the usual suspects"—general culture of violence, violent media, gangs, the access to guns, youth culture, etc.—with virtually no realization that *all* the perpetrators were male and the victims were predominantly female.

What about girls? Here the discussion focuses on how girls, particularly girls involved in crime, negotiate feminine norms that tend to reward obedience to authority, particularly male authority, passivity, and nurturance. Consider girls who are gang members. Despite the stereotype of gangs as hyper masculine, girls are present in gangs, and present in very significant numbers (one estimate is that that girls are roughly a third of gang members) (Snyder and Sickmund 2006). Exactly how do these girls negotiate what some might imagine as a quint-essentially male space? Are they simply embracing a "bad girl femininity" as an "aggressive, tough, crazy and violent" gang member? Laidler and Hunt (2001) do an outstanding job of documenting how African American, Latina, and Asian American girls negotiate not only dangerous neighborhoods and risky peer groups (since most girls are in mixed sex gangs), but also engage in very complicated cultural notions of femininity. Contrary to the construction of gang girls as "a bad ass" (p. 675), they note that girls place a very high value on both "respect" and "respectability." They alternately challenge and embrace notions of traditional femininity through interactions with others in a range of settings, but always returning to behaviors that involve "defending one's reputation as respectable" (p. 676).

Irwin and Chesney-Lind (2008) build on the insight that girls and women's crime, even violent crime, is not well understood or explained by simply assuming that girls are mimicking their male counterparts and taking up a form of dangerous masculinity (the "bad ass" perspective). Long dominant in criminology, these theories of "violence" assume that female violence can be explained by the same factors that have long been studied to explain male violence, since these "bad" women are seeking equality with men in the area of violence (and acting just like men). Irwin and Chesney-Lind also identify other approaches to female violence that stress its roots in female victimization in patriarchal society, and the role of deteriorated neighborhoods in producing a female version of the "code of the streets" tough femininity, particularly for urban girls of color. Building on these more recent constructions, they conclude that one must examine how the multiple systems of oppression (based on class, race, ethnicity, and gender) interact in complex but co-equal ways to produce contexts where girls' violence makes sense (often as a survival mechanism), rather than understanding gender as something one "does" or doesn't do while negotiating more robust systems of race and class oppression (see Chesney-Lind and Jones 2010).

Intersectionality

African American scholar and activist bell hooks's book, *Ain't I a Woman* (1981), highlighted and forever invalidated the sole focus on gender. Hooks argued against white feminists who felt that women were denied access to politics because they were stereotyped as frail and delicate. She pointed out that women like her had a history that fully contradicted this imagery, in part because of the hard labor and the severe living conditions imposed on slaves. The challenges of understanding the realities of the lives of women who differ in their combinations of age, color, class, ethnicity, sexual orientation, and other characteristics pervade feminist criminology, and are addressed in attempts to take these intersections into account in understanding individual identity, group and local context, and social structure.

Black feminist criminology makes its contribution by emphasizing race-related structural oppression, the influence of Black community and culture, intimate and familial relations affected by race, and the nature of women's identities as Black, female, of a particular class, and so on (Potter 2006). In this tradition, Jones (2010) explored and explained the lives of Black girls who confront violence on a daily basis in their communities. Providing an example of feminist theory that attends to identity, context, race, and gender, Jones rejects placing the justice system at the center of the girls' lives and assuming that justice system labeling is a meaningful descriptor for the girls. Instead she builds theory to show how the girls manage expectations for being "good girls" in communities and schools that are marked by conflict and require an offensive posture and even the use of violence for self-protection.

Agency

Theorists and researchers sometimes ignore women's agency and focus only on their compliance with patriarchal constraints (Gallagher 2007; Macleod 1991). Feminist criminologists instead emphasize agency—an assertion of identity and attempts to steer one's life—even under extreme conditions (Lerner 1986a, b, p. 239). Although in a context characterized by a constant threat of male and female violence, the girls that Jones (Jones 2010) studied were active and agentic in navigating between "good" and "ghetto" messages about Black femininity. Similarly, Bosworth and Carrabine (2001) detailed how women in prison, who certainly suffered from a profound loss of freedom, found a variety of ways to resist, to cope with, and to survive the carceral conditions. As a final example, Morash and Haarr (2012) discovered that many women police resisted reproducing traditional female–male stereotypes and hierarchies that devalue traits commonly associated with women. Instead they fashion complex positive occupational identities that in many cases were not tied to their sex category, but when they were, that associated women's positive attributes with excellent job performance.

Feminist Methodology and Epistemology

Although all sorts of research methods have been used to develop and improve feminist theory (Reinharz 1992; Sprague 2005), feminist criminologists have contributed some unique insights on "how we know" about social life and have challenged positivist science norms that render the researcher invisible and study participants powerless. Feminist

approaches to research are suited to revealing human agency and the constructed nature of gender identity and structure. The recognition of these features of social life extends to the research process.

Specifically, feminist researchers believe that the subjects of research can contribute crucial information on their experiences, that their understandings are important, and that these experiences must be considered in the context of patriarchy to be understood. They recognize the need to consider the power differentials between the researched and the researcher, and how these differentials affect the production of knowledge (Ramazanoglu 1989). Burman et al. (2001) put these principles into practice in their study of Scottish teenaged girls' views and experiences of violence. They faced many dilemmas in their ethnographic work that over time involved 800 girls. For instance, sometimes discussions of violence led to girls being violent towards each other, raising ethical issues about the appropriateness of group discussion and how the researcher should intervene. Also, researchers were strongly affected by girls' accounts of being bullied, sexually assaulted, or in other ways victimized, in some cases because the researchers had similar experiences during their own childhoods. Researchers struggled, too, with girls' descriptions of hitting or slapping each other as "fun" and "not violence."

Also creating ambivalent feelings in many researchers, feminist research documents that girls and women involved in crime are anything but "liberated" or emancipated in their view of other girls and women. Indeed, they are often male identified, and view other girls and women as "bitches" and "sluts." These are difficult and troubling issues for feminist researchers to document about girls' and women's lives, but they remind us that we oppose oppression and violence in girls' lives precisely because it does not always enable (see Artz 1998; Kelly and Morgan-Kidd 2001). The feminist solution to these difficulties include reflexive review of how the researcher affects and learns from study participants, the complexities of establishing non-hierarchical relationships with participants, and of how the research process shapes knowledge (see also Flavin 2001). Some feminists also insist that research must be done collaboratively with subjects who can provide insight into the key questions to be asked and a credible interpretation of findings (Campbell et al. 2009; Wahab 2003).

The importance of feminist criminology's contribution to research methodology is striking in the literature on violence against women. Depending on whether they use positivist measurement and sampling approaches, researchers have drawn conflicting conclusions: either that men and women are equivalently violent in intimate partner relationships, or that men are markedly more violent and destructive than women. Feminist criminologists emphasize that adequate measurement requires adequate theoretical conceptualization of violence and its context and it must include aspects of male violence (like stalking and sexual assault that women rarely commit) (Dobash et al. 1992; Melton and Belknap 2003; Miller 2005; DeKeseredy 2011).

A valid measure of abuse must differentiate the types of intimate partner violence identified by Johnson and Ferraro (2000): *intimate terrorism* which is violence used as one of many tactics in a general pattern of extreme effort to control an intimate partner through the combination of physical and emotional abuse; *violent resistance* in self-defense, often just once; *mutual violence* in which domestic partners use controlling and manipulative violence against each other; and *situational couple violence*, which "results from situations or arguments between partners that escalate on occasion into physical violence" (Kelly and Johnson 2008, p. 485). Shelter and domestic violence advocacy program samples consist primarily of victims of intimate terrorism, but random samples drawn for surveys have high representation of situational violence victims. To bring this point home, we point out

that intimate terrorism victims are often prohibited from leaving home, answering the phone, or reading the mail—so they are highly unlikely to take part in any sort of research, unless they are in shelters. By accurately measuring the type of violence and by recognizing the biases introduced by different sampling approaches, research demonstrates that in heterosexual couples, males most often perpetrate the extremely damaging form of abuse, intimate terrorism, and that misogynist attitudes and gender traditionalism contribute to this form of abusive behavior (Johnson 2006, 2011).

A central tenet of feminist methodologies is that research methods must be up to the task of producing knowledge that informs and promotes positive social change. As a case in point, guided by feminist theory and methodological approaches, Dobash and Dobash (2004) collected qualitative and quantitative data from a sample of couples. Their findings justified public policies that emphasize men's violence against women as well as cautions against the practice of dual arrests, in which police take couples into custody together. If they had studied a random sample of couples with methods to "count" incidents, Dobash and Dobash might have made recommendations for family therapy to address situational couple violence, thereby ignoring the imbalance of power and danger to the victim when intimate terrorism or violent resistance occurs. To challenge damaging policies and advance those that protect the less powerful, feminist criminologists often collaborate with and carefully listen to the people they study. Additionally, they collaborate with advocates to ensure that theoretical discoveries are translated into program and policy action (Haviland et al. 2008).

Challenges for Future Theorizing and Research

As feminist criminology enters the new century, it must embrace two important and exciting challenges: First, in an era of unparalleled inequality, we must find new and powerful ways to continue paying attention to the powerful and the oppressors. We must forcefully present the globalization of the world's issues and the increasing need to see violations of girls and women as human rights issues.

Consistent with the overarching critical criminology paradigm, feminist criminologists have directed attention to a serious limitation of much social science theory, which is its failure to explain the privilege and behavior of powerful people and its complementary concentration on understanding people who lack power (Sprague 2005, pp. 11–12). Given the connection of limited power with female status, feminist criminologists in particular need to be quite careful about "studying down," that is focusing exclusively on the powerless, which can result in pathologizing crime victims, or girls and women in conflict with the law, rather than showing how oppressive gender arrangements lead to victimization and harsh punishment. Understanding structures of power and context are crucial. For instance, Chaudhuri et al. (in press) found that when South Asian-origin husbands and their natal families enforced extreme patriarchy through severe physical and emotional abuse. South Asian women who had migrated to the United States for marriage were so constrained by lack of resources and support network, lack of knowledge, low status in the extended family, and the threat of severe harm, that only intervention by an advocacy agency empowered them to leave the abusive relationship. Rather than blaming the victim for staying in an abusive relationship, the emphasis needs to be on empowering women to overcome cultural and structural barriers that place them at risk of victimization.

Globalization brings new challenges to feminist criminologists. Take the attempted assassination of Malala Yousufzai, the 14-year-old Pakistani girl shot in the head by the

Taliban for speaking out about girls' rights to an education in October, 2012. Shortly after—in December, 2012—in India there was the terrible gang rape and resulting murder of a 23-year-old medical student which provoked worldwide outrage, and ultimately a global women's protest that went viral due to the internet (see onebillionrising.org for images). So if we were asked to chart out the pressing issues for feminist criminology, we would point to the following possibilities.

Malala Yousufzai's courage causes us to see the importance of girls' studies, not just women's studies—since, today's girls will be tomorrow's women. The tragic and brutal death in India tells us about tolerance of girls' and women's victimization. As a horrific example, after she was repeatedly raped over a 90-min period on a public bus she rode with a male friend, who also was severely beaten and left suffering, the couple was dumped on the road. The police who finally showed up argued for two hours about which of them would have to take the seriously beaten couple to the hospital (Pokharel and Rana 2013). Both of these incidents blur the boundaries between victimization, crime and profound human rights violations. They also put in stark focus the explicit failure of certain "courts" and "police" to protect women. Indeed, in some parts of Pakistan, the establishment of Sharia courts actually jail girls and women seeking help for abuse (such as the arrest of women for adultery if they report a rape) and often forcibly return them to their abusers from whom they are trying to escape (Hadi and Chesney-Lind 2013; Asian Human Rights Commission 2010).

These incidents are not isolated or unusual in the countries where they occurred or in many countries throughout the world. They are just two examples of a multitude of organized group efforts, in some cases sponsored or tolerated by the State, to enforce extreme patriarchy. The attack on girls' education is not atypical.

Around the world, students, teachers and schools are attacked at an alarming rate. This war against education, in which educating girls is often times a motivating factor, gets very little attention or media coverage. But in at least 31 countries education has been the target of intentional attacks for political, ideological, sectarian, religious, military or other reasons. (Winthrop 2012, p. 2)

In one year, largely motivated by beliefs that girls should not go to school, Pakistan experienced 152 bombings that destroyed schools, and Afghanistan had 35 schools burned; similar patterns occur in parts of Latin America, Europe, Africa, and the Middle East (Winthrop 2012). Lack of education and resulting dependence on others place girls and women at risk for continued exposure to violence. If they leave or are expelled from their natal or marital families—and expulsion is another form of violence—they may turn to prostitution or illegal acts to survive and keep their children alive, and they often must live in dangerous places that expose them to victimization and the need to defend themselves, sometimes violently. The connection of girls and women being victim and being caught up as offenders in the courts and correctional programs and institutions is strong, and it is many times a causal connection.

Just as globalization alerts us to violence against women throughout the world, it directs attention to US policies that bring women into prisons outside of the United States. Not only did the US "war on drugs" develop into a "war against women" who in increasing proportions came to make up non-violent prison populations charged with drug-related offenses (Chesney-Lind 1977; Johnson 2006). Also, businesses that run and supply prisons, US government entities, and US politicians have promoted arrest, prosecution, and incarceration of women worldwide (Sudbury 2002; Richie 2012). US pressure to criminalize people involved in the international drug trade and in prostitution had the unanticipated effect of promoting incarceration of women who's only means of survival,

economically or in face of pressures from criminal men is to carry drugs or prostitute themselves (Kempadoo 2005).

One aspect of globalization is the movement of people across borders. There is an estimated 214 million international migrants worldwide, and 49 percent of them are women (<http://www.iom.int/jahia/Jahia/about-migration/facts-and-figures/lang/en>). Migrant women are at high risk for sexual exploitation and violence by intimate partners (Piper 2003). Hoping to improve their lives, women who join men as “picture brides” may barely know the men they marry, if they know them at all. They often find themselves vulnerable to abuse because they are isolated in a new country, unable to speak the local language, and unfamiliar with the justice system and sources of help. Alternatively, women may be lured to foreign countries to take jobs where they are exploited or forced to work in the sex trades. These and other circumstances create new patterns of girls’ and women’s victimization, and new challenges for justice system response.

Although we advocate theoretical and research attention to conditions for women internationally, it is important to recognize that in the United States, which the Hausmann et al. (2012) scores as providing equivalent education to females and males, inequality in economic participation and opportunity place women at risk for being unable to leave abusive relationships, move out of dangerous neighborhoods, or resist earning money through illegal means. Dramatic cuts in welfare support that began in 1996 leave increasing numbers of women (and their children) either without income or in low-paying jobs that do not provide medical or other benefits (Peterson et al. 2002). The so-called feminization of poverty (formation of female headed households, fathers’ failure to support children, and segregation of women in low-paying traditionally female occupations) leads to women’s increased involvement in consumer-based crimes, like shoplifting and welfare fraud (Steffensmeier and Streifel 1992; Chesney-Lind and Pasko 2011).

Theory as a tool to fuel the disassembly and replacement of destructive processes in the name of crime control and prevention is long over-due both in the United States and in all the countries that are tempted to emulate the tolerance of violence against women and the penal regimes that the United States has become so reliant upon. Does the new century offer any hopeful signs for such a conversion in theory? The very fact that progressive and critical criminology, and particularly feminist criminology, has survived three decades of furious backlash politics gives us reason for hope. Beyond that, there is the vitality of our field. To do feminist criminology, this article has posited, does not necessarily mean that one is restricted to what was once the standard trilogy of our field: women as offender, victims, and workers in the criminal justice system. Instead, the whole of the field of criminology can fruitfully be re-thought from a feminist perspective. Finally, there is a growing body of international research, particularly in the area of the victimization of women that allows us to hope that feminist criminology will become globally relevant in the decades to come. As it does so, the field will do more than simply “document and count” women’s victimizations; instead it will begin to act across “national” boundaries to name the problem and to re-frame it in ways that make clear the centrality of the human rights of girls and women and also to find ways to take action on behalf of victimized and criminalized women.

Future Directions for Theory and Research

Feminist criminologists, along with other critical theorists, must increasingly embrace the insights of critical studies, particularly the role of the media in the construction and framing of the narratives that shape and define the “crime problem” (and the implicit

solutions to same). The corporate media, whether print or television, turn to crime stories, along with celebrity gossip and scandals, as reliable front-page staples for a variety of reasons. This mix provides a sensationalistic and profitable filler for newspapers and television stations with shrinking newsrooms and diminished appetites to engage in serious investigative journalism (Hamilton 1998; McManus 1994).

Post modern feminism directs attention to the “construction of truth” in such cultural outlets as the media, which can play a very critical role in the public’s perception of the crime “problem.” It is this emphasis on culture and the production of knowledge, rather than on structure, that is an earmark of postmodernism (Milovanovic, this issue). Websdale (1996), for example documented how the media portrayal of sexual assault and abuse as perpetrated by strangers supported the passage of a Washington state law permitting “indefinite civil commitment” of sexual predators, but excluded husbands and fathers assaulting wives and children as potential perpetrators. The law, supported by newspaper reports, creates a discourse that sex crimes, rather than routine, are “dreadful but rare” events that require tough sanctions rather than a confrontation with patriarchal families (Websdale and Alvarez 1998: 65). In an earlier piece, Websdale and Alvarez documented how the corporate media traditionally discusses the murder of women by intimate partners by using an approach they call “forensic journalism.” Here, the reader is given vivid and dramatic details of the event and is ultimately told “more and more about less and less.” In essence, the readers are left with salacious details, but little actual information that might prevent future such occurrences (Websdale and Alvarez 1998).

Regarding offenders, we know that media exposure to crime stories does, in fact, have an impact: heavier viewers of local television news are more likely to fear crime and criminal victimization (Romer et al. 2003, p. 101). This is attributed to “pervasive coverage of violent crime stories,” which also tends to increase fear of African Americans and other minorities who are disproportionately featured in crime stories (Romer et al. 1998). Research has shown that ideas about crime and criminals are based, in large part, on the stories that individuals learn about from the media (Antunes and Hurley 1977; Chermak 1994; Chiricos and Eschholz 2002). A broader question, though, is the degree to which crime journalism influences punitive crime policies like “the war on drugs” and “mass incarceration (see Brennan et al. in press)”.

We also know that the race of women offenders dramatically affects the way the media treat them. In a study of drug stories appearing on the front pages of 17 national newspapers, it was found that the stories about minority women who committed street-drug offenses were considerably more negative than the stories about white women who committed such offenses. The chief difference was the emphasis that journalists tended to place on an offender’s degree of guilt, harm to another person, and reform potential. As an example, stories about white women drug offenders often included pictures of their families on a couch and discussions of a new drug program, while women of color were often portrayed as hopelessly drug addicted, and getting re-arrested and re-committed as a result (Brennan et al. in press).

In an era of around the clock news coverage as well as the use of crime as entertainment, the media often misrepresents the majority of women who break the law and hides the circumstances of women who act with violence. Women who act violently are portrayed in the news as “irrational” and even “demonic,” especially if they act against children (Grabe et al. 2006). By paying much more attention to violence by women than by men, the media suggests (incorrectly) that women are well represented among violent offenders (Naylor 2001; Schlesinger et al. 1991). Documentaries, televised news, and talk shows portray imprisoned women as violent and sex-crazed (Cecil 2007), and “crack

moms” are blamed for damage to unborn children (Humphries 1999). Especially racial and ethnic minority women are described as abnormal and individually flawed (Mann and Zatz 1996). Evidence that women are not and never have been as violent or criminal as men contradicts both media images and official punitive responses. The potential for such portrayals to influence responses to women offenders deserves more attention, because arrest statistics but not victim surveys show a narrowing in the gender gap for assaults (Schwartz et al. 2009), and arrests of women for drunk driving are out of proportion to behavioral indicators (Schwartz and Rookey 2008).

Conclusion

Beyond the idea of the increasing role of globalism and of the media—including video footage that we can now carry with us in our pockets—we would contend, there is a continuing need to better theorize feminist notions of patriarchy and systematically explore how patriarchal privilege is enforced through routine criminal justice practices. Borrowing from work of feminist political scientists like Walby (1990) which early on identified that liberal notions of “public” and “private” greatly disadvantaged women, we must expand our thinking about the links between the observed patterns of women’s victimization, women’s offending, and women’s experience with the criminal justice system within the context of patriarchy. The question of how masculinities or some other forces create the gender gap in criminality also begs for an answer.

We must also think about how feminist theorizing assists us in building a less violent and more just world, including systems of crime control that take us out of the penal regimes of the past century. Feminist criminologists have challenged the masculinist bias in their field, and they continue to do so today. As an example, both of us firmly believe that the assumption that fields grow and develop out of male styles of interaction and argument, or what might be called “mental combat,” is a flawed way to think about intellectual work. We instead think that what builds knowledge is open conversation, real respect, and real listening. Given the growing significance of crime policy and the criminal justice system in an era of “governing through crime” (Simon 2007) and mass incarceration of women in many parts of the world (Carlen 2002; Carlen and Toombs 2006; Lee 2007; Mauer 1999), the feminist perspective on crime in modern society remains all the more vital. Feminist criminologists have proposed alternatives to the expensive and damaging status quo. For example, drawing on Gilligan’s (1982) understanding of the importance of care in girls’ and women’s moral thinking, Daly and Stubbs (2006) suggest that restorative justice may track with the feminist values of care and valuation of relationships as an alternative to the current emphasis on justice. Such notions of reconciliation, truth telling and social responses to law violating that heal rather than punish and incapacitate will not only better reduce crime but also humanize the current de-humanizing systems of punitive courts and institutions, jails, and prisons that can oppress and destroy not only those held within them, but those who are employed to serve as guards and wardens.

Theory as a tool to fuel the disassembly and replacement of destructive processes in the name of crime control and prevention is long over-due both in the US and in all the countries that are tempted to emulate the penal regimes the US has become so reliant upon.

Does the new century offer any hopeful signs for such a conversion in theory? One can only hope that the right wing control over the political process, which established crime as a code word for race in national politics is finally winding down (and losing power in the United States). One would wish that this were a product of moral outrage, but it is also explained by

demographics. Simply put, the desire to ever expand the racist, sexist, and homophobic rhetoric has run into a numbers problem. Once you seek to criminalize huge swaths of *all* minority groups in the US while also seeking to dramatically contract on women's access to safe and legal birth control, you have alienated enough large constituencies to no longer hold national public office (Hadi and Chesney-Lind 2013; Livingston 2013).

In considering the future, we are cautiously optimistic that a feminist approach to the crime problem might be heard. Regardless of the odds, though, our work is informed by the expectation that we act as feminists to improve the social world in which we have found ourselves. This means, of course, that we again face the query: what constitutes feminism and being a feminist? Here, we'd like to conclude with first wave author and activist Rebecca West's wry, and as it turns out, timeless observation:

I myself have never been able to find out what feminism is; I only know that people call me a feminist whenever I express sentiments that differentiate me from a doormat or a prostitute (West and Marcus 1982)

In this article, we hope we have established that being called a feminist is not an insult or a signal that one cannot do good, scholarly or scientifically valid work (Faludi 1989; Sprague 2005). Instead, engaging in feminism and feminist theory offers all of criminology incredible intellectual vitality and a recommitment to go beyond the collecting and disseminating of knowledge to seeking a just, equitable, and healthy world for all.

References

- Acker, J. (1990). Hierarchies, jobs, bodies: A theory of gendered organizations. *Gender and Society*, 4(2), 139–158.
- Anderson, K. L., & Umberson, D. (2001). Gendering violence: Masculinity and power in men's accounts of domestic violence. *Gender and Society*, 15(3), 358–380.
- Antunes, G. E., & Hurley, P. A. (1977). The representation of criminal events in Houston's two daily newspapers. *Journalism Quarterly*, 54(4), 756–760.
- Artz, S. (1998). *Sex, power and the violent school*. Toronto: Trifolium Books.
- Asian Human Rights Commission. (2010). *Pakistan: Sharia Court launches major challenge to protection of women*. December 23rd Post. Act <http://www.humanrights.asia/news/ahrc-news/AHRC-STM-268-2010>. Downloaded March 29, 2013.
- Belknap, J., & Holsinger, K. (1998). An overview of delinquent girls: How theory and practice have failed and the need for innovative changes. In R. T. Zaplin (Ed.), *Female crime and delinquency: Critical perspectives and effective interventions*. Gaithersburg, MD: Aspen.
- Bickle, G. S., & Peterson, R. D. (1991). The impact of gender-based family roles on criminal sentencing. *Social Problems*, 38(3), 372.
- Bosworth, M., & Carrabine, E. (2001). Reassessing resistance: Race, gender, and sexuality in prison. *Punishment and Society: The International Journal of Penology*, 3(4), 501–515.
- Bowker, L. (1997). *Masculinity and violence*. Thousand Oaks: Sage.
- Brennan, P., Chesney-Lind, M., Vandenberg, A., & Wulf-Ludden, T. The saved and the damned: Racial and ethnic differences in media constructions of female drug offenders. *Journal of Criminal Justice and Popular Culture* (in press).
- Brownmiller, S. (1975). *Against our will: Men, women, and rape*. New York: Simon and Schuster.
- Brown, L., Chesney-Lind, M., & Stein, N. (2007). Patriarchy matters: Toward a gendered theory of teen violence and victimization. *Violence Against Women*, 13(12), 1249–1273.
- Browne, A., Miller, B., & Maguin, E. (1999). Prevalence and severity of lifetime physical and sexual victimization among incarcerated women. *International Journal of Law and Psychiatry*, 22(3–4), 301–322.
- Bui, H., & Morash, M. (2008). Immigration, masculinity, and intimate partner violence from the standpoint of domestic violence service providers and Vietnamese-origin women. *Feminist Criminology*, 3(3), 191–215.

- Burman, M. J., Batchelor, S. A., & Brown, J. A. (2001). Researching girls and violence: Facing the dilemmas of fieldwork. *British Journal of Criminology*, 41, 443–459.
- Cain, M. (1990). Towards transgression: New directions in feminist criminology. *International Journal of the Sociology of Law*, 18(1), 1–18.
- Campbell, R., Adams, A. E., & Wasco, S. M. (2009). Training interviewers for research on sexual violence: A qualitative study of rape survivors' recommendations for interview practice. *Violence Against Women*, 15(5), 595–617.
- Carlen, P. (2002). Controlling measures: The repackaging of common sense opposition to women's imprisonment in England and Canada. *Criminal Justice*, 2(2), 155–172.
- Carlen, P., & Tombs, J. (2006). Reconfigurations of penalty: The ongoing case of the women's imprisonment and reintegration industries. *Theoretical Criminology*, 10(3), 337–360.
- Cecil, D. K. (2007). Looking beyond the caged heat: Media images of women in prison. *Feminist Criminology*, 2(4), 304–326.
- Chaudhuri, S., Morash, M., & Yingling, J. Marriage migration, patriarchal bargains, and wife abuse: A study of South Asian women. *Violence Against Women* (in press).
- Chermak, S. (1994). Body count news: How crime is presented in the news media. *Justice Quarterly*, 11(4), 561–582.
- Chesney-Lind, M. (1977). Judicial paternalism and the female status offender: Training women to know their place. *Crime and Delinquency*, 23(2), 121–130.
- Chesney-Lind, M. (1989). Girls' crime and woman's place: Toward a feminist model of female delinquency. *Crime and Delinquency*, 35(1), 5.
- Chesney-Lind, M. (2006). Patriarchy, crime and justice: Feminist criminology in an era of backlash. *Feminist Criminology*, 1(1), 6–26.
- Chesney-Lind, M., & Morash, M. (Eds.). (2011). *Feminist theories of crime. Volume in theoretical criminology series*. Surrey, UK: Ashgate Publishing Limited.
- Chesney-Lind, M., & Pasko, L. (2011). *The female offender* (3rd ed.). Thousand Oaks: Sage.
- Chiricos, T., & Eschholz, S. (2002). The racial and ethnic typification of crime and the criminal typification of race and ethnicity in local television news. *Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency*, 39(4), 400–420.
- Cohen, A. K. (1955). *Delinquent boys*. Glencoe, IL: The Free Press.
- Conway, M., Pizzamiglio, M. T., & Mount, L. (1996). Status, communality, and agency: Implications for stereotypes of gender and other groups. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 71(1), 25–38.
- Daly, K. (1989). Gender and varieties of white-collar crime. *Criminology*, 27(4), 769–797.
- Daly, K., & Stubbs, J. (2006). Feminist engagement with restorative justice. *Theoretical Criminology*, 10, 9–28.
- Danner, M. J. E., & CarmodyCyr, D. (2001). Missing gender in cases of infamous school violence: Investigating research and media explanations. *Justice Quarterly*, 18(1), 87–114.
- Davis, C. P. (2007). At-risk girls and delinquency. *Crime and Delinquency*, 53(3), 408–435.
- Deegan, M. J. (1990). *Jane Addams and the men of the Chicago school*. New Brunswick: Transaction Books.
- DeKeseredy, W. (2011). *Violence against women: Myths, facts, and controversies*. Toronto, ON, Canada: University of Toronto Press.
- Dobash, R. P., & Dobash, R. E. (2004). Women's violence to men in intimate relationships: Working on a puzzle. *British Journal of Criminology*, 44, 324–349.
- Dobash, R. P., Dobash, R. E., Wilson, M., & Daly, M. (1992). The myth of sexual symmetry in marital violence. *Social Problems*, 39(1), 71–91.
- Faludi, S. (1989). *Backlash: The undeclared war against American women*. New York: Crown.
- Fiske, S. T., Cuddy, A. J. C., Glick, P., & Xu, J. (2002). A model of (often mixed) stereotype content: Competence and warmth respectively follow from perceived status and competition. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 82(6), 878–902.
- Flavin, J. (2001). Feminism for the mainstream criminologist. *Journal of Criminal*, 29(4), 271–285.
- Franklin, C. A. (2005). Male peer support and the police culture: Understanding the resistance and opposition of women in policing. *Women & Criminal Justice*, 16, 1–25.
- Gallagher, S. K. (2007). Agency, resources, and identity: Lower-income women's experiences in damascus. *Gender and Society*, 21(2), 227–249.
- Gerber, G. L. (2009). Status and the gender stereotyped personality traits: Toward an integration. *Sex Roles*, 61(5/6), 297–316.
- Gilligan, C. (1982). *In a different voice: Psychological theory and women's development*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

- Grabe, M. E., Trager, K. D., Lear, M., & Rauch, J. (2006). Gender and crime news: A case study test of the chivalry hypothesis. *Mass Communication & Society*, 9, 137–163.
- Hadi, S. T., & Chesney-Lind, M. (2013). Silence and the criminalization of victimization: On the need for an international feminist criminology. In B. Heather, & B. Arrigo (Eds.), *Routledge handbook on international crime and justice studies*. New York: Routledge (forthcoming).
- Hamilton, J. T. (1998). *Channeling violence: The economic market for violent television programming*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Hausmann, R., Tyson, L. D., & Zahida, S. (2012). *The global gender gap report 2012*. Geneva, Switzerland.
- Haviland, M., Frye, V., & Rajah, V. (2008). Harnessing the power of advocacy research collaborations: Lessons from the field. *Feminist Criminology*, 3(4), 247–275.
- Heidensohn, F. (1992). *Women in control?: The role of women in law enforcement*. Oxford: Clarendon press.
- Holsinger, K. (2000). Feminist perspectives on female offending: Examining real girls' lives. *Women and Criminal Justice*, 12(1), 23–51.
- Hondagneu-Sotelo, P. (1994). *Gendered transitions: Mexican experiences of immigration*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Hughes, L. A. (2005). The representation of females in criminological research. *Women and Criminal Justice*, 16(1/2), 1–28.
- Humphries, D. (1999). *Crack mothers: Pregnancy, drugs, and the media*. Columbus, OH: Ohio State University Press.
- Hunt, J. (1984). The development of rapport through the negotiation of gender in field work among police. *Human Organization*, 43, 283–296.
- Hunnicut, G. (2009). Varieties of patriarchy and violence against women: Resurrecting 'patriarchy' as a theoretical tool. *Violence Against Women*, 15(5), 553–573.
- Irwin, K., & Chesney-Lind, M. (2008). Girls violence: Beyond dangerous masculinity. *Sociology Compass*, 2/3, 837–855.
- Johnson, M. P. (2006). Apples and oranges in child custody disputes: Intimate terrorism vs. situational couple violence. *Journal of Child Custody*, 2(4), 43–52.
- Johnson, M. P. (2011). Gender and types of intimate partner violence: A response to an anti-feminist literature review. *Aggression and Violent Behavior*, 16, 289–296.
- Johnson, M. P., & Ferraro, K. J. (2000). Research on domestic violence in the 1990s: Making distinctions. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*, 62, 948–963.
- Jones, N. (2010). *Between good and ghetto: African American girls and inner city violence*. New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press.
- Kelly, J. B., & Johnson, M. P. (2008). Differentiation among types of intimate partner violence: Research update and implications for interventions. *Family Court Review*, 46(3), 476–499.
- Kelly, P., & Morgan-Kidd, J. (2001). Social influences on the sexual behaviors of adolescent girls in at-risk circumstances. *Journal of Obstetric, Gynecologic, and Neonatal Nursing*, 30(5), 481–489.
- Kempadoo, K. (ed.). (2005). *Trafficking and Prostitution Reconsidered: New Perspectives on Migration, Sex Work, and Human Rights*. Boulder, CO: Paradigm Publishers.
- Laidler, K.-J., & Hunt, G. (2001). Accomplishing femininity among the girls in the gang. *British Journal of Criminology*, 41, 656–678.
- Lee, M. (2007). Women's imprisonment as a mechanism of migration control in Hong Kong. *British Journal of Criminology*, 47(6), 847–860.
- Lerner, E. (1986a). Immigrant and working class involvement in the New York City woman suffrage movement, 1905–1917. In J. Friedlander (Ed.), *Women in culture and politics: A century of change* (pp. 223–236). Bloomington: Indiana University Press.
- Lerner, G. (1986b). *The creation of patriarchy*. New York: Oxford.
- Livingston, J. (2013). Demographics and the future of the GOP. *Sociological Images*. Posted on March 19, 2013, at 11:30 a.m. <http://thesocietypages.org/socimages/2013/03/19/demographics-and-the-future-of-the-gop/downloaded>. March 27, 2013.
- Lown, J. (1983). Not so much a factory, more a form of patriarchy: Gender and class during industrialization. In E. Gamarnikow, D. Morgan, J. Purvis, & D. Taylorson (Eds.), *Gender, class and work* (pp. 28–35). London: Heinemann.
- MacLeod, A. (1991). *Accommodating protest: Working women, the new veiling, and change in Cairo*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Mann, C. R., & Zatz, M. S. (1996). *Images of color, images of crime*. Los Angeles: Roxbury Press.
- Martin, S. E., & Jurik, N. C. (2007). *Doing justice, doing gender*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Martin, K., Vieraitis, L. M., & Britto, S. (2006). Gender equality and women's absolute status – A test of the feminist models of rape. *Violence Against Women*, 12(4), 321–339.

- Mauer, M. (1999). *Race to incarcerate*. New York: The New Press.
- McManus, J. H. (1994). *Market driven journalism: Let the citizen beware*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, Inc.
- Melton, H. C., & Belknap, J. (2003). He hits, she hits: Assessing gender differences and similarities in officially reported intimate partner violence. *Criminal Justice and Behavior*, 30(3), 328–348.
- Merriam-Webster (2009). Dictionary. <http://www.merriamwebster.com/dictionary/feminist>.
- Messerschmidt, J. W. (1993). *Masculinities and crime: Critique and reconceptualization of theory*. Lanham, MD: Rowman and Littlefield.
- Millet, K. (1970). *Sexual politics*. Garden City, New York: Doubleday.
- Miller, S. (2005). *Victims as offenders: The paradox of women's violence in relationships (critical issues in crime and society)*. New Brunswick: Rutgers University Press.
- Moe, A. M. (2004). Blurring the boundaries: Women's criminality in the context of abuse. *Women's Studies Quarterly*, 32(3–4), 116–138.
- Morash, M. (2006). *Understanding gender, crime, and justice*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Morash, M. (2010). *Women on Probation and Parole: A feminist critique of community programs and services*. Boston, MA: Northeastern University Press.
- Morash, M., & Haarr, R. N. (2012). Doing, redoing, and undoing gender: Variation in gender identities of women working as police officers. *Feminist Criminology*, 7, 3–23.
- Naylor, B. (2001). Reporting violence in the British print media: Gendered stories. *Howard Journal of Criminal Justice*, 40, 180–194.
- Odem, M. E. (1995). *Delinquent daughters: Protecting and policing adolescent female sexuality in the United States, 1885–1920*. Chappell Hill: The University of North Carolina Press.
- Ogle, R. S., & Batton, C. (2009). Revisiting patriarchy: Its conceptualization and operationalization in criminology. *Critical Criminology*, 17(3), 159–182.
- Pateman, C. (1988). *The sexual contract*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.
- Pateman, C. (1989). *The disorder of women: Democracy, feminism, and political theory*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.
- Peterson, J., Zong, X., & Jones-DeWeever, A. (2002). *Life after welfare reform: Low-income single parent families, pre- and post-TANF* (IWPR Publication no. D446). Washington, DC: Institute for Women's Policy Research.
- Piper, N. (2003). Feminization of labor migration as violence against women: International, regional, and local nongovernmental organization responses in Asia. *Violence Against Women*, 9(6), 723–745.
- Pokharel, K., & Rana, P. (2013). Friend of India rape victim criticizes police. *Wall Street Journal*. <http://online.wsj.com/article/SB10001424127887323374504578221381250081390.html>. downloaded. March 29, 2013.
- Potter, H. (2006). An argument for black feminist criminology: Understanding African American women's experiences with intimate partner abuse using an integrated approach. *Feminist Criminology*, 1, 106–124.
- Prokos, A., & Padavic, I. (2002). "There oughtta be a law against bitches": Masculinity lessons in police academy training. *Gender, Work & Organization*, 9, 439–459.
- Rafter, N. H. (1990). *Partial justice: Women, prisons, and social control*. New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction.
- Ramazanoglu, C. (1989). Improving on sociology: The problems of taking a feminist standpoint. *Sociology*, 23, 427–442.
- Reinharz, S. (1992). *Feminist methods in social research*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- 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: New York University Press.
- Romer, D., Jamieson, K. H., & Aday, S. (2003). Television news and the cultivation of fear of crime. *Journal of Communication*, 53(1), 88–104.
- Romer, D., Jamieson, K. H., & DeCoteau, N. (1998). The treatment of persons of color in local television news: Ethnic blame discourse or realistic group conflict. *Communications Research*, 25(3), 286–305.
- Schlesinger, P., Tumber, H., & Murdock, G. (1991). The media politics of crime and criminal justice. *British Journal of Sociology*, 42, 397–420.
- Schlossman, S., & Wallach, S. (1978). The crime of precocious sexuality: Female juvenile delinquency in the progressive era. *Harvard Educational Review*, 48(1), 65–93.
- Schwartz, M. D., & DeKesseredy, W. S. (1997). *Sexual assault on the college campus: The role of male peer support*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Schwartz, J., & Rookey, B. D. (2008). The narrowing gender in arrests: Assessing competing explanations using self-report, traffic fatality, and official data on drunk driving, 1980–2004. *Criminology*, 46, 637–671.

- Schwartz, J., Steffensmeier, D. J., & Feldmeyer, B. (2009). Assessing trends in women's violence via data triangulation: Arrests, convictions, incarcerations, and victim reports. *Social Problems, 56*, 494–525.
- Simon, J. (2007). *Governing through crime*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Snyder, H. N., & Sickmund, M. (2006). *Juvenile offenders and victims: 2006 national report*. Washington, DC: Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention.
- Sprague, J. (2005). *Feminist methods for critical researchers: Bridging differences*. Walnut Creek, CA: Altamira Press.
- Stankuniene, V., & Maslauskaitė, E. (2008). Family transformations in the post-communist countries: Attitudes toward changes and the ideational shift. In C. Höhn, D. Avramov, & I. E. Kotowska (Eds.), *People, population change and policies: Lessons from the population policy acceptance study* (pp. 113–140). The Hague, The Netherlands: Springer.
- Steffensmeier, D., & Streifel, C. (1992). Time series analysis of the female percentage of arrests for property crimes, 1960–1985: A test of alternative explanations. *Justice Quarterly, 9*(1), 77–104.
- Steffensmeier, D., Schwartz, J., Zhong, H., & Ackerman, J. (2005). An assessment of recent trends in girls' violence using diverse longitudinal sources: Is the gender gap closing? *Criminology, 43*(2), 355–405.
- Sudbury, J. (2002). Celling black bodies: Black women in the global prison industrial complex. *Feminist Review, 70*, 57–74.
- Thrasher, F. M. (1927). *The gang: A study of 1,313 gangs in Chicago*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Van Voorhis, P., Wright, E. M., Salisbury, E., & Bauman, A. (2010). Women's risk factors and their contributions to existing risk/needs assessment: The current status of a gender-responsive supplement. *Criminal Justice and Behavior, 37*(3), 261–288.
- Wahab, S. (2003). Creating knowledge collaboratively with female sex workers: Insights from a qualitative, feminist, and participatory study. *Qualitative Inquiry, 9*(4), 625–642.
- Walby, S. (1990). *Theorizing Patriarchy*. Oxford: UK.
- Websdale, N. S. (1996). Predators: The social construction of "strangerdanger" in Washington State as a form of patriarchal ideology. *Women and Criminal Justice, 7*(2), 43–68.
- Websdale, N., & Alvarez, A. (1998). Forensic journalism patriarchal ideology: The newspaper construction of homicide–suicide. *Popular Culture, Crime and Justice, 126*, 128–130.
- West, C., & Fenstermaker, S. (1995). Doing difference. *Gender and Society, 9*(1), 8–37.
- West, R., & Marcus, J. (1982). The Young Rebecca: Writings of Rebecca West, 1911–17. In: J. Marcus (Ed.), London: Macmillan in association with Virago Press.
- West, C., & Zimmerman, D. H. (1987). Doing gender. *Gender and Society, 1*(2), 125–151.
- Whaley, R. B. (2001). The paradoxical relationship between gender inequality and rape. *Gender and Society, 15*(4), 531–555.
- Winthrop, R. (2012). Malala's attack and the fight for girls' education mark international day of the girl child. Brookings Up Front. <http://www.brookings.edu/blogs/upfront/posts/2012/10/12-international-girl-day-winthrop>.
- Yodanis, C. L. (2004). Gender inequality, violence against women, and fear: A cross-national test of the feminist theory of violence against women. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 19*(6), 655–675.