CHAPTER 11

Masculinities, Femininities, and Homicide: Competing Explanations for Male Violence

Kenneth Polk

Despite the fact that, virtually since the first empirical studies of crime, it was clear that one of the major factors in crime was sex, it is only in recent years that criminologists have begun to take the data seriously and treat sex or gender as central theoretical issues in accounting for crime. Put simply, across many different countries and in many research studies, official crime, especially violent crime, involves mostly male offenders. In the case of homicide, for example, typically males make up between 85 and 95 percent of the known offenders (Wallace, 1986; Polk, 1994). In fact, closer examination will reveal that in over half the cases of homicide, males are involved as both offender and victim. While early studies of homicide might note such distributions, they would give little attention to the obviously important question of why it is that these crimes are committed by males, and the equally important theoretical issue of why females are much less likely to be involved.

In the last decade or so, this situation has altered dramatically. Social analysts have moved the factor of sex onto the center of the stage. In the case of homicide they have specifically addressed the question of why it is that males feature so predominantly in the offense. Two somewhat different pathways have been followed, one seeking to understand better the data of male offending, the other elaborating theoretical frameworks which address issues of masculinity, or more properly masculinities, and crime.

The Multiple Scenarios of Male Violence

Regarding the first of these, important research work has been done which examines the multiplicity of ways that masculinity plays out in the data of violence. There is, in other words, no single pattern of male violence. Looking specifically at the issue of homicide, for example, there are quite a number of different patterns, or scenarios of masculine violence that can be identified (Polk, 1994).

One that will come to the minds of many quite quickly is that where a male directs the violence toward a female, most often a sexual partner (Dobash & Dobash, 1992). Even here, however, it is significant that there are distinct patterns. A common form of male violence toward women is that which has its source in the readiness of males to use violence toward women sexual partners when the male feels that his control over the woman is slipping away. There is a pattern whereby males come to view their female partner as a form of sexual property, and the use of violence, including lethal violence, is a way that the male expresses his control over the woman. Often jealousy is an explicit part of this violence, and time and again the phrase "if I can't have you, no one will" echoes through the data of male violence toward women. This pattern can be described as distinctively male since it is empirically the case that women rarely kill their male partners out of jealousy.

As important as this theme of jealousy and sexual control is, there are others that involve male violence toward females. One that is common in homicide files is that where the male becomes extremely depressed and overwhelmed as he comes to feel the meaning of life creeping away, and he then decides to commit suicide. Such depressive males, if they have a wife, often will include the wife in the suicide plan, so that they wife is killed just before the male takes his own life. As in the previous scenario, the issue of violence is distinctively male, because very rarely are examples found where it is the wife who decides to commit suicide, and then dictates that the husband must also die. The common theme in both of these scenarios is that the male is likely to view the woman as a form of "property" over which the male exerts rights, including the right to terminate the life of the woman.

There are other patterns that, while rare, stir up considerable public controversy and concern. There are those occasional and isolated cases where males, out of a poorly understood personal history that leads to a deep antagonism toward women, become involved in a pattern of "serial killing." While it may be difficult to provide adequate theoretical explanations for why offenders engage in such extreme violence, it is clear that most such violence, consistent with the general pattern, is committed by males (while exceptions have been noted, few serial or other mass killers are female).

Most violence involving male offenders has as its victim other males. Even here, however, there are a number of important sub-themes that need to be distinguished (Polk, 1994). One of the commonest of the male-on-male

patterns involves the typical pub fight, or what might better be termed "honor contests." These are events, which often escalate rapidly in such leisure scenes as pubs, parties, beach outings, or other public settings, frequently involving a combination of the use of alcohol in a setting of primarily young males. What sparks the violence often appears to the outsider to be "trivial" (while it is obviously not so to those involved), including a minor jostle, an insult, a comment to a woman companion, or in some cases simply challenging eye contact. The participants are often provoked by what is seen as a challenge to their standing as males, in a word, to their honor. The initial intent of those involved is to argue and to fight, and the lethal consequences, when they occur, are not what was initially intended. In addition to being male, the participants in such disputes over honor are likely to come from the lower rungs of the economic ladder, they are young, and there is some evidence that they have histories of trouble and violence. This latter fact suggests that for some young males, violence has become a way of responding to social situations that allows them to control and direct social encounters. Others have pointed out that the honor contest functions within a clear set of social rules, involving an "opening move" on the part of one of the participants which sets up the initial challenge, which is then responded to by a "counter-move" by another which sets the encounter off in the direction of escalating violence.

Another rather different pattern involves the planned use of violence as a device for resolving a dispute that has extended over time. In this pattern, those involved have known each other for some time; in many cases they have even been close friends and shared resources. Something happens and the relationship unravels. Lethal violence becomes possible when the social circumstances of the males closes off legitimate forms of dispute resolution, as is the case of those deeply enmeshed in criminal ways of life and thus are unable to call upon the police or courts as a way of resolving their differences. Persons involved in dealing of drugs, for example, may be partners in crime for a period of time, and then one might lend money to the other for a drug deal. If the second person refuses to pay back the debt, the offended partner may feel he has little option but to use violence as a way to resolve the matter. This pattern, of course, can take other forms when the criminal activities are more tightly organized, and lead to a whole range of behaviors under the rubric of "offers that can not be refused."

A final male pattern involves the use of violence during the course of another crime, such as armed robbery or burglary. Here, as is the case with the dispute resolution scenario, at issue is the offender's willingness to engage in the very risky behavior of taking weapons into the scene of a crime (because, as a matter of fact, it is the offender who often ends up being the victim of the lethal violence).

Feminine Violence?

But what of violence involving women? Women, certainly, can be violent, and at times their violence takes lethal form. Feminine violence, however, is much less frequent (especially serious violence), it has different targets, and it is generally based in very different motivations than male lethal violence. Women are rarely involved in the above male scenarios of violence. Women rarely kill their male partners out of jealousy, despite the imagery encountered in detective fiction. Women almost never feel that they must use exceptional violence to defend their sense of honor. And, while women may have disputes with close associates, they rarely employ lethal violence as a way of resolving such personal conflicts, and they rarely are involved in deaths which occur in the course of such crimes as armed robbery or burglary (although occasionally a woman may be a co-defendant in such circumstances).

Women do engage in lethal violence, but that violence has a whole different feel to it than masculine violence. This difference is seen perhaps most clearly in homicides where the woman kills her male sexual partner. In a great majority of such cases, the woman is reacting to the precipitating violence of the male. In some of these cases, there is a physical confrontation between the man and the woman. The man employs some violence toward the woman, and the woman retaliates immediately with some form of defensive violence. In such cases, the woman may be able to plead successfully that either her acts constituted legitimate self-defense, or that because of the precipitating violence of the male, she experienced some form of diminished responsibility that lowers the level of criminal culpability for the violence. There are many other circumstances, however, where the capacity of the male for violence is large, and the resources available to the woman are slight. Here the woman may bide her time and concoct some form of plot to pull off the killing successfully, such as waiting until the male is drunk to the point of incapacitation, and then taking advantage of that moment to carry out the killing. While it may be the violence of the male that is the provoking feature of both of these forms of killing, in the second scenario the woman may find herself facing a charge of murder in its most serious form, since she used "malice aforethought" as part of the killing.

A second major overarching scenario of feminine violence is directed at children, nearly always the natural children of the women involved (Alder & Polk, 2001). Proportionally, women are much more likely to kill children than are men, and in fact this is the one form of violence where some investigations will report that there are as many female as male offenders. Care must be taken with this assertion, however, because women and men tend to have very different patterns involving lethal violence toward children. When women kill children they are the natural mothers of their victims. The most common patterns involve neonaticide (where the child dies in the first 24 hours after birth), homicide involving children as part of a suicide of the mother (often where the mother's motives appear to be "altru-

istic": because she expresses the view that they children are better off not being left behind without their mother's care), or situations where the mother suffers from some exceptional psychiatric disorder (for example, where her "voices" tell her that she must kill her child). The situations where children are victims of lethal violence makes a strong contribution to the need to differentiate gender in the analysis of violence, because while mothers are likely to feature in homicides of younger children (under the age of 6), when the victims are older, especially over the age of ten, the killer is virtually always a male.

In short, while women can be violent, and in fact women occasionally kill, most serious violence is emphatically male behavior. Women rarely are involved in honor contest violence, or feel the need to take up violence as a way of resolving a long-standing dispute, and they (despite what might be encountered in detective fiction) almost never kill their husband or sexual partner out of jealousy. The empirical data lead us, in other words, to the conclusion that not only are males more likely to engage in serious violence, but that there are systematic themes or "scenarios" within which the violence occurs.

It needs to be noted that there are some situations where both men and women exhibit some amount of violence. Family violence surveys have found persistently that when it comes to low levels of violence, such as pushing, shoving, slapping or verbal abuse, women may be as violent at men (Straus & Gelles, 1990). While such findings have provoked considerable controversy, it is important to be clear about at two components of features of this research. First, the findings often refer to levels of violence that are well below the point of producing serious physical injury, and there is little doubt that the systematic use of extreme levels of violence is distinctively masculine in character. As discussed above, homicide as an example is a crime that rarely involves female offenders being violent toward their male partner, and even where this is the case, in most instances that female violence is a reaction to prior violence of the male. Second, one should not be surprised if one finds violent males and then observes as well that there are violent family environments (where women, too, are part of the violent pattern). If one assumes that violence, like other social behavior is learned, then it makes sense that some boys and girls learn from an early age that violence is an accepted device for coping with stressful situations (by observing, for example, their mother striking them or their siblings). For the males, this learning can become more focused as the child moves into adolescence, and some may learn that for them violence "works" as a device for negotiating their social world. That violence may become progressively more directed to issues of control and competition, and more extreme as early adulthood is reached. Further, this learning of violence may evolve most readily in family environments where both mothers and fathers engage in some level of violence (recognizing that life-threatening violence is likely to be male initiated), because such settings clearly convey the message that violence is acceptable as a process for coping with situations of stress and conflict.

Controversies Regarding the Social Origins of Violence: A Biological/Evolutionary Perspective?

What is it about masculinity that provokes such violence? Here there are profound disagreements regarding where the answer might be found. One vector of disagreement concerns the social origins of violence. One current view, derived from evolutionary psychology, argues that men are violent because of evolutionary processes that select for violence (Daly & Wilson, 1988). In the human ancestral environment, according to this position, male aggressiveness and violence contributed to the successful emergence of the species, and can be found today in the tendencies for males to employ violence both to control the reproductive capacities of their sexual partners (hence the violence of males toward women as an expression of the "proprietariness" over them), and the violence between males, especially younger males, is a continuation of violence as a way of addressing the ever present problem of competition between males. This view, especially as expressed by Daly and Wilson (1988), is logically well crafted, and is immediately appealing in the way it recognizes the distinct patterns of violence, for example, the sexual proprietariness that is an essential feature of jealousy violence, and the centrality of honor and competition in many of the male-on-male scenes of violence.

Countering such assertions, sociologists are likely to point out that whatever may have held for early human environments, certainly over recent decades the nature of human competition and cooperation has changed profoundly. The humans currently who are the most successfully in the competition for resources in fact are the least likely to employ serious forms of violence as a tactic in their interpersonal negotiations, including dealing with competitors either for economic resources or in terms of the reproductive capacities of women. As such, the sociologists observe that it is those with the least amount of economic resources (that is, those less successful in the competition for these goods) who are the most violent, and they then turn to the task of assessing why this should be so. Put another way, the sharp differentials in the level of violence among and between cultural groups raises questions about any simple assertion that masculine violence across the board is to be accounted for with some form of genetic reasoning (Polk, 1994).

For those inclined toward sociological reasoning, a counter argument is that while there is a persistent problem of competition between males that each male must address, how that competition is negotiated is in large part shaped by the resources that are available. Some from an early age have access to a number of economic and social supports that help assure an easy movement through the important scenes of competition that males (or females) face as they age. Resources such as wealth, class and status position, and power assure that some from an early age negotiate their way through highly competitive school and professional training settings, which lead to

successful entry into adulthood. The more empowerment that one has from such resources, the less likely that risky strategies of competition need to be considered, including the use of violence. Complex male and female successful identities can be shaped and forged for such individuals, without needing to back up their sense of self through the use of violence. For those less empowered, however, there is the constant struggle with the problem of status failure in school and the onset of adulthood with looming unemployment that may trigger for the extremely marginalized virtually a life on the edges of the society. Unsuccessful in other ways, one method of asserting one's manliness is through violence, by letting people know that you are not a wimp, nor a person that others can push around.

One recent line of thinking has argued that in some respects violence among young, lower-class males is one of the ways that such individuals are able to engage successfully in the business of "doing gender," that is, making a clear and public statement that they are emphatically males, and stand ready to respond, with violence if necessary, to any person who attempts the challenge their manhood. Some such challenges, of course, might come from other males, and here we see the playing out of the male-on-male pattern of violence that makes up the honor contest. Another form of competition concerns the male's relationship with a female partner, and here the actions may take the form of violence toward the woman as a device for exerting control over her, or perhaps violence directed at the sexual rival. Violence, in short, for some becomes a device for assertion of manhood, for sending the message that they are not persons to be trifled with (Messerschmidt, 1993). In this view it is the social context, not biology, which is responsible for shaping the violence.

Gender and the Instrumental Character of Violence

There is considerable controversy currently about how such patterns of violence fit into general notions of "masculinity" and "femininity." One line of research has argued that masculine violence and criminality tends to be viewed as rational and purposive, with the violence then serving "instrumental" ends, while in contrast feminine violence is more likely to be perceived as spontaneous, emotive and reactive in character (Campbell, 1993). In addition to fitting well with common public views of gender, it is possible to enter the data of violence and find verification for such arguments. Certainly those in the area of domestic violence have underscored the idea that much of male violence toward women, in contrast to a perception of such actions as being immediate outgrowths of arguments that escalate suddenly, is in fact a deep, purpose pattern of behavior that the male evolves as a persistent and willful mechanism of control. Put another way, the male uses violence deliberately to achieve his end of exerting successful control over his female partner. Similarly, much of domestic homicides where men

kill their wives or sexual partners are far from being arguments which go out of control. Instead they show such elements as careful tracing of the woman's routine movements (so that she can be overtaken in a moment of maximum vulnerability), and planning which might include obtaining a lethal weapon. In contrast, much of women's violence toward men is highly reactive, with the woman striking back during the course of a violent episode that in fact has been initiated by the male.

While there are numerous cases of violence that demonstrate the apparent instrumental character of male violence, and the emotive and spontaneous character of female violence, there are important exceptions that raise questions about this hypothesis of gender difference. It is precisely this planned character that in some cases has created the need for the "battered woman syndrome" as a legal defense against a charge of criminal homicide. This issue arises in cases where the woman has planned the homicide, often because of her fear of the male capacity for violence, and her planning contains elements of intentional behavior that are central material elements in charge of murder. The battered woman syndrome defense has been introduced as a way of bringing into consideration the long pattern of physical abuse in these cases (which is argued to be the actual precipitating cause of the lethal violence), either as a way of lowering the level of culpability (to a charge of manslaughter, for example), or even in some cases to a plea of self-defense which, if successful, would mean that violence would be determined to be justifiable. Whatever the turmoil that lies behind the violence, the particular act is in the eyes of the law clearly "instrumental" and as such has the potential to attract maximum criminal sanctions.

A close inspection of a complete file of homicides is likely to show that, in addition to these cases, there are those where for a number of reasons the woman has decided that she wishes to terminate the relationship with her male partner, and she then enlists the help of either female or male associates (or both) to use homicide as the device for achieving the separation. While far from the most common cases of female spousal killing, the presence of some such violence, as well as the cases of battered women who kill their husbands, demonstrate that in some circumstances women, too, are capable of instrumental violence.

Further, sexual partners are not the only victims of the lethal violence of women. In fact, women in general are as likely to kill their natural child as they are their spouse. In some forms of child killing, the woman carefully plans her actions. This is particularly the case when a central goal of the violence is the suicide of the woman. Having made the decision to take her own life, it is common for the woman to kill the children so that they will not have to suffer being left in a world without their mother. The woman often leaves tragic suicide notes behind, providing detailed instructions for the funerals, including how the children should be dressed (Wallace, 1986; Alder & Polk, 2001).

These exceptions require that we refine Campbell's hypothesis to recognize that at least some of the violence of women can be highly intentional, rational, and instrumental. In addition, consideration of the themes which run through the distinctive scenarios of male violence require further refinement because the nature of the elements of intentionality, that is the component elements of instrumentality, are quite different across the different forms of male homicide. When violence is chosen as a mechanism for resolving a long simmering dispute, its "instrumental" feature is manifest. In the situation of honor contests, the situation is more complicated, since the violence may be quite spontaneous, and the death far from what was intended by either party at the beginning of the interaction. There is a further problem, of course, because in the Campbell formulation, it is hard to see a place for the obvious emotional and expressive actions that are present in the accounts of at least some masculine violence. While Campbell's formulation provides the valuable contribution of a language within which male and female violence might be described, ultimately it may be important to go beyond the terms "instrumental" and "expressive" to account for gender differences in violence, especially in terms of addressing the theoretical forces at work which lead to such differences by sex in the meanings attached to violence.

The Utility of the Concept of "Masculinity"

There is, in fact, considerable turmoil in the current discussions regarding masculinity and crime. The more crafted analyses have pointed out that there are not patterns of "masculinity," but "masculinities" that must be considered (Messerschmidt, 1993). There is no single cluster of ideas that defines a masculine ideal of violence; rather, as the above patterns show, there are a number of patterned ways, much like scripts, that men become involved in violence. One can argue, of course, that there are dominant patterns that hold out principles of "manhood" which are understood as being general scenarios that guide male behavior. It is only relatively recently that there has been a challenge to the idea of the sexual attractiveness of the dark powerful barbarian, whom we are told to expect that quivering females hope will choose them for sexual coupling. Such stories run so deep in the culture, as illustrated by legends, drama, fiction and films, that one can see the ready appeal of the psychological evolutionists and their reference to masculine patterns of dominance and aggression emerging out of ancestral environments.

What is also clear, however, is that there are many such patterns of idealized manhood that are available is guides to behavior, and often the directions taken in one direction (for example, avoidance of violence) will be in conflict with another (where violence in a particular scene, as in the honor contest, may be seen as an imperative). Given this complexity, it should come as no surprise that there are those who argue that, in fact, the concept

of "masculinity" as currently understood contributes little but confusion to an understanding of the behavior of males (Collier, 1998). If it is understood that what at least some of these arguments are addressing is the multitude of choices that confront a young male as he moves from childhood through adolescence into adulthood, then there may be some merit in what is being suggested. That is, young males as they move through these very complicated years will be confronted with a wide-ranging set of expectations, and these expectations often will be in conflict. There is no simple or single ideal of "each on of us as a real man" which operates to define and guide youthful male behavior, including violence. If the theoretical issue being addressed is how does a diverse group of individual young males move through these important years, the very diversity of their behavior indicates that there is no single standard of "masculinity" by which the behavior of emergent adults is being shaped.

Nonetheless, when it comes to violence, it is emphatically male conduct that we are addressing, both in terms of its character and it numbers. Furthermore, there are persistent patterns to the violence that can be identified. While much more empirical work needs to be done, these patterns often take the form of "scripts" or scenarios of behavior. The steps of the honor contest, from the opening move, counter-move, and then the mutual agreement to engage in violence, serve as culturally defined patterns which individuals know about, and draw upon, as they become swept up in such violence. What is important here is that the young males who engage in these exchanges do not themselves "invent" the steps involved in the honor contest. They, and the friends that make up the social audience in such encounters, "know the moves" that are expected as the violence unfolds. There certainly may be unique and innovative features to any honor contest, but what the general notions of maleness and masculinity provide are the basic scripts which establish for the participants the expected social rules by which the participants know and understand what each step means, what choices are available, which choices are those that "real men" might follow, and where the interaction is headed.

Within contemporary cultures, in other words, there are available as masculine ideals a variety of these scenarios that are understood as constituting the "rules of the game." Clearly, we may understand these rules even if we do not engage in an honor contest. In fact, both men and women are likely to have very clear ideas about such social scenes, and one of the pressures that may operate on some males is that the encounter evolves in front of potential or actual sexual partners, who will then "judge" the "manliness" of the male by virtue of how he negotiates his way through the interactions.

In a similar way, there are some clear expectations held by some males about what they should do in situations of jealousy. While some males, in fact hopefully a very large proportion, respond to the loss of the affections of a woman partner they value highly by some form of hurt withdrawal, others are provoked into a pattern of attempts at obsessive control which will in

extreme forms lead to lethal violence. Here, again, however, the pattern seems to function much like a "script" which guides the male behavior. One indication of this can be found in the language so common in jealousy homicides. In Australia, Canada, Great Britain, and the United States over and over one hears the phrase: "if I can't have you, no one will.": chilling, deadly, but repetitive. As with the honor contest, the males are drawing upon a scripted vocabulary that guides their actions, and, find expression in their very words.

There are, in other words, persistent and repeated patterns of masculine violence that are played out in ways that indicate that the males are drawing upon their understandings of these as they proceed into the violence encounters. It follows that one reasonable line for research is to understand the nature of the scripts, their elements, and how the fit into wider understanding of masculinity (or masculinities), and different males negotiate their way through the complicated expectations represented by these scenarios.

But such scripted patterns are not exclusively male. While much less common, there are distinctive feminine patterns of violence, including lethal violence. The battered woman syndrome is obviously one such pattern, but there are others, especially in terms of women's violence toward children. One important fact here is that overwhelmingly violence toward children is a result of actions by the natural mother of the child. One especially disturbing patterns involves mothers (mostly young) whose actions (or inactions) result in the death of their baby within a few minutes of its birth. This pattern, known as "neonaticide" again has been observed in Australia, Canada, Great Britain, and the United States, and involves most frequently women who simply cannot and will not face the reality of their impending birth. Their denial is so strong that it even persists when the infant is born (not infrequently in a bathroom of a household that does not suspect either the pregnancy, or the birth when it occurs). When confronted afterward, the young woman is likely to say "I just hoped it would go away" or something like "I just could not face what people would say."

The position taken here is that while it is important to recognize that there are problems in conceptions and definitions of masculinity and femininity, these difficulties should not lead to the abandonment of these terms as guides either to understanding violence, or to carrying out future research. It is certainly the case that young men and women as they move through adolescence and into adulthood will be presented with myriad and at times conflicting definitions of idealized masculine or feminine behavior. There are, however, clearly patterned expectations about the way males, and females, ought to position themselves with respect to violence and the social scenes that produce it. Some of the most important questions, in fact, involve the issue of how and why most young people avoid violence, especially violence that might take lethal form. This avoidance is not because males are unaware of the expectations held out in the various scripts of violence, such as the honor contest. One does not have to be Conan the Bar-

barian to know what is expected of a "real man" when confronted with a challenge to masculine honor. Most males, however they might know the script, chose to conduct their existence such that they are not placed in situations where they are expected to be violent, or they find ways of withdrawing should they somehow find themselves in such scenes. One important line for future research, it could be argued, is precisely how these protective and restraining behaviors are deemed the desirable choice in encounters with a potential for violence. Included in such research would be a focus on the social audience, including the role of women, who often are critical in directing the flow of the behavior either away from, or toward, escalating violence.

Summary

In summary, the data of crime indicate that overwhelming serious risk taking, as reflected in violence, is the behavior of males. This raises important questions about what it is about males, and masculinity, that triggers these higher levels of violence. While some have suggested, perhaps correctly, that there is considerable confusion in current discussions of both masculinity and femininity as these relate to the question of violence, nonetheless there appear to be important and repeated patterns of both masculine and feminine violence (although of course feminine violence is much less common). Understanding both the elements of these patterns, as reflected in what appear to be the highly scripted scenarios within which these encounters evolve, and their social origins, is an important and continuing task for contemporary criminology.

Discussion Questions

1. What do we mean by the terms "masculinities" and "femininities"? How do these terms relate to the concept of crime? What are the differences between "masculine" and "feminine" violence? Give examples in your answer.

2. Explain why "masculinities" have been overlooked by criminologists until recently. In other words, why has analysis of crime (and offenders) neglected "masculinities" as an explanatory construct?

3. What difference does it make—to both the analysis and response to crime—if we place gender (especially "masculinities") at the forefront of our theorizing? Explain how our thinking about crime and offenders might be transformed.

4. Identify the two theoretical pathways, or explanations, that have been suggested to account for the predominance of males in homicide offending.

5. Describe some of the scenarios of masculine violence. What are some of the major motivational themes that accompany these scenarios, or patterns, of homicide?

6. How are youth, and social class, implicated in patterns of masculine violence? How would you explain this phenomenon?

7. What is the relationship between masculinity/femininity and the function or purpose of the violence? Relate you answer to the character of the violence: instrumental versus expressive. Give examples of specific scenarios in which this dichotomy might play out.

8. In what ways might it be necessary to modify Campbell's hypothesis regarding the link between gender and the function or purpose of violence? Provide a rationale for your answer.

9. What are "cultures of masculinity"? How might these cultures be embedded in the organizational practices and behaviors of police and other agents of the criminal justice system?

10. How do men and women come to acquire the "rules of the game" concerning appropriate gender behavior? How might we begin to change or at least modify these rules so as to reduce the level of violence in society?