

RELATIONAL NETWORKS OF WOMEN IN VICTORIA AND THE ISSUE  
OF WOMEN ABUSE IN INTIMATE BONDS

by

Elise Jonina Wickson  
University of Victoria, B.A., 1981

A THESIS SUBMITTED IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT

ACCEPTED  
OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DEGREE OF  
OF GRADUATE STUDIES


MASTER OF ARTS

in the Department


of


Sociology


We accept this thesis as conforming  
to the required standard

  
Professor Mary J. Gallant

  
Professor Roy Watson

  
Professor Christine St. Peter

  
Professor Margie Mayfield

  
Professor Gordana Lazarevich

Ⓢ

ELISE JONINA WICKSON, 1988

University of Victoria

All rights reserved. This thesis may not be reproduced  
in whole or in part, by mimeograph or other means,  
without the permission of the author.

## ABSTRACT

This study examines and compares the role of women's network structure in marriages. Particular emphasis is placed on relationships where the traumatic bond of wife abuse is present. Women in normal couple bonds are compared with those where abuse has occurred in order to describe the possible impact of the structure of the interpersonal networks of these women with regards to the factor of isolation.

The data were based on results of a mailed questionnaire sent to a random sample of 112 married women over 18 years of age who resided in Greater Victoria in 1987.

Results show that in fact abused women do have isolating structures in the way they interact with friends and family as well as the kind of communication involved in the bond with their husband. There is a tendency to sporadic bursts of conflict, more extreme and intense in abused women's couple-interaction than in non-abused women's bonds. Also, abused women's networks were focused on interaction with specific family members than were non-abused women's networks.

The associations in the results gave a qualified support to the hypotheses. However, new indications of network structure to show long-term interaction patterns with friends, family and in the couples' interaction is needed in future research in order to

broaden the comparison so that conditions prompting continuation of abusive behaviour may be more clearly specified and their actual effects determined.


Examiners:

  
Professor Mary J. Gallant

  
Professor Roy Watson

  
Professor Christine St. Peter

  
Professor Margie Mayfield

  
Professor Gordana Lazarevich

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

|   |    |
|---|----|
| Abstract                                      | ii |
| Table of Contents                             | iv |
| List of Tables                                | vi |
| Acknowledgements                              | ix |
| Glossary                                      | x  |
| Introduction                                  | 1  |
| Chapter 1                                     | 3  |
| 1.1 Historical Overview                       | 3  |
| 1.2 Current Sociological Work                 | 8  |
| 1.2.1 Theoretical Work                        | 10 |
| 1.2.2 Empirical Results                       | 18 |
| 1.3 Approach Used in the Present Study        | 23 |
| Chapter 2                                     | 31 |
| 2.1 Overview                                  | 31 |
| 2.2 Research Design                           | 33 |
| 2.2.1 The Sample Methods                      | 33 |
| 2.2.2 Data Collection                         | 36 |
| 2.3 Measurement                               | 38 |
| 2.3.1 Dependent Variable--Violence            | 38 |
| 2.3.2 Independent Variable--Network Structure | 39 |
| 2.3.3. Data Analysis                          | 40 |
| Chapter 3                                     | 42 |
| 3.1 Examination of the Tables                 | 42 |
| 3.1.1. Size of the Network                    | 42 |
| 3.1.2 Frequency of Contact Within Network     | 47 |
| 3.1.3 Content of the Shared Interaction       | 59 |
| 3.1.4 Access to Economic Resources            | 71 |

|  |     |
|--|-----|
| Chapter 4                              | 94  |
| 4.1 Conclusions                        | 94  |
| 4.2.1 Encouraging results              | 102 |
| 4.2.2 Implications for Future Research | 105 |
| References                             | 110 |
| Appendices                             | 116 |
| A. Tables                              | 116 |
| B. Questionnaire                       | 165 |
| C. Telephone Contact Sheet             | 190 |

## LIST OF TABLES

|          |   | Page No. |
|----------|---|----------|
| Table 1  | Cross Tabulation of Number of Close Friends                                   | 116      |
| Table 2  | Cross Tabulation of Number of Family Members who are Considered Close Friends | 117      |
| Table 3  | Cross Tabulation of Relationship of Family Member to Respondents              | 118      |
| Table 4  | Cross Tabulation of "Do Close Friends Know Your Family?"                      | 119      |
| Table 5  | Cross Tabulation of Number of Visits Made to Friends                          | 120      |
| Table 6  | Cross Tabulation of Phone Calls to Friends                                    | 121      |
| Table 7  | Cross Tabulation of Shared Leisure Activities with Spouse                     | 122      |
| Table 8  | Cross Tabulation of Leisure Activities Without Spouse                         | 123      |
| Table 9  | Cross Tabulation of Types of Leisure Activities                               | 124      |
| Table 10 | Cross Tabulation of "Who Do You Participate With?"                            | 125      |
| Table 11 | Cross Tabulation of "How Often Do you do These Things with Others?"           | 126      |
| Table 12 | Cross Tabulation of How Often Spouse Participates in Leisure Activities       | 127      |
| Table 13 | Cross Tabulation of "Do You Ever Confide in Your Friends?"                    | 128      |
| Table 14 | Cross Tabulation of "How Frequently Do You Confide in Your Friends?"          | 129      |

|          |   |     |
|----------|---|-----|
| Table 15 | "What Do You Confide in Friends?"   | 130 |
| Table 16 | "What Do You Not Confide in Friends?"   | 131 |
| Table 17 | Cross Tabulation of Level of Agreement<br>Between Spouses                           | 132 |
| Table 18 | Cross Tabulation of "Do Any Items Lead<br>to Arguments?"                            | 133 |
| Table 19 | Cross Tabulation of "How Often Do You<br>Argue?"                                    | 134 |
| Table 20 | Cross Tabulation of "What Do You Argue<br>Over Most?"                               | 135 |
| Table 21 | Cross Tabulation of Sharing Ideas   | 136 |
| Table 22 | Cross Tabulation of Discussions   | 137 |
| Table 23 | Cross Tabulation of Lack of<br>Communication  | 138 |
| Table 24 | Cross Tabulation of "How Often Do You<br>Bicker?"                                   | 139 |
| Table 25 | Cross Tabulation of Loud Arguments  | 140 |
| Table 26 | Cross Tabulation of Physical Violence   | 141 |
| Table 27 | Cross Tabulation of "Do You Depend on<br>Your Husband's Choices for Friends?"       | 142 |
| Table 28 | Cross Tabulation of "Does Husband Object<br>to Time Spent with Friends?"            | 143 |
| Table 29 | Cross Tabulation of "Do You Give Up<br>Activities to Keep Your Husband Happy?"      | 144 |
| Table 30 | Cross Tabulation of "Does Your Husband<br>Check Up on You?"                         | 145 |
| Table 31 | Cross Tabulation of "Do You Feel Unable<br>to Make Decisions Without Your Husband?" | 146 |
| Table 32 | Cross Tabulation of "Does Your Husband<br>Generally Tell You What to Do?"           | 147 |
| Table 33 | Cross Tabulation of "Does Your Husband<br>Get Angry if You Ignore His Advice?"      | 148 |

|          |   |     |
|----------|---|-----|
| Table 34 | Cross Tabulation of "Do You Show Fear When Husband's Impatience Worsens?" | 149 |
| Table 35 | Cross Tabulation of "Does Your Husband Have Excessive Temper Outbursts?"  | 150 |
| Table 36 | Cross Tabulation of "Do You Question his Judgement?"                      | 151 |
| Table 37 | Cross Tabulation of "Has Your Husband Destroyed/Broken Your Possessions?" | 152 |
| Table 38 | Cross Tabulation of "Do You Only Have Things Your Husband Chooses?"       | 153 |
| Table 39 | Cross Tabulation of "Is Your Husband Overly Cruel or Overly Kind?"        | 154 |
| Table 40 | Cross Tabulation of "Does Your Husband Question Your faithfulness?"       | 155 |
| Table 41 | Cross Tabulation of Respondents' Employment Status                        | 156 |
| Table 42 | Cross Tabulation of Spouses' Employment Status                            | 157 |
| Table 43 | Cross Tabulation of Combined Family Income                                | 158 |
| Table 44 | Cross Tabulation of Who Earns More  | 159 |
| Table 45 | Cross Tabulation of Access to Finances                                    | 160 |
| Table 46 | Cross Tabulation of Alternative Capital                                   | 161 |
| Table 47 | Cross Tabulation of Allowance From Husband                                | 162 |
| Table 48 | Cross Tabulation of "Who Handles the Family Budget?"                      | 163 |
| Table 49 | Cross Tabulation of "Who Calculates the Income Tax?"                      | 164 |

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to acknowledge the financial assistance provided by the Sara Spencer Graduate Research Award and the BC Public Interest Research Group; and thank Dr. R. Watson and Dr. J. Payne O'Connor for suggesting I apply for these monies which enabled the research to be conducted.

I also wish to thank Dr. Mary Gallant, my supervisor, for her expertise, time, and encouragement during all phases of this project.

GLOSSARYAbuse

Refers to repeated, deliberate violence, both physical and emotional by a husband towards his wife without her consent, and which may or may not result in injuries. This term is used interchangeably with "battering" or "violence."

Verbal Abuse

Refers to name calling, threats, harassment or any other belittling or demeaning comments by a husband to his wife.

Abused

Refers to respondents who were currently, or had experienced abuse by their spouses. This term is used interchangeably with "battered."

Non/not abused

Refers to respondents who had not experienced abuse. It is used interchangeably with "not battered."

Friend

Refers to persons (male or female) cited by the respondents as someone they chose to be close to through physical and/or verbal communication. Excluding family or relatives.

Family as Friend

A family member or relative of the respondent (male or female) who fits the "friend" definition.

Immediate Family Member

This constitutes the spouse children, parents and siblings of the respondents in the study-- family of procreation.

Marriage

For the purposes of this research, marriage refers both to legally married couples, and couples cohabiting "living together" common-law.

Network

A collective representation of persons held together in some configuration by virtue of sharing some basis for interaction. They are individuals in friendship or familial relations or both, and "belong" to the network by virtue of their participation with the women respondents under study in some kind of relation. Networks include all the persons in given set of relations chosen by the researcher as representing the "population" she is interested in. It is quite possible that the analytical conception of network may not completely overlap with a given individual's conception of the social units to which she believes she "belongs." In short, the notion of group is not a direct equivalent for network, though both are arrangements of persons. They differ in terms of the awareness of them by the members. The individuals may be unable to guess the extent or the constitution of the network into which she is cast by the researcher. Network is a structural, analytical concept representing an observed concatenation of relations or bonds between persons.

Integrated

Networks are integrated when the bonds between the women under study and the other persons in the network are:

- dense as indicated by many ties and interactions
- deep marked by both a connectedness among the persons and intimacy to the interactions.
- cooperation oriented and constructive in interactions with spouse, and in access to financial resources.

Isolated

Networks are isolated when the bonds between the women under study and the other persons in the network are:

- sparse as indicated by few ties and interactions
- shallow marked by both a lack of connectedness among the persons and intimacy to the interactions,
- conflict oriented and restrictive in interactions with spouse, and in access to financial resources

Ramified

Networks are ramified when the bonds between the women under study and the other persons in the network are:

- neither sparse or dense
- neither shallow or deep
- neither conflict oriented or cooperation oriented

In short, a type of "middle" ground between isolated and integrated network structure.

Relative

This constitutes the grandparents, aunts, uncles or cousins of the respondents. Refers generally to one related in some degree of kinship.

In the questionnaire, the two categories of family were treated distinctly; however, in the data tabulation they were combined under "family/relative."

Respondent

Refers to the women participating in the research. These women were at least 18 years old, residing in Greater Victoria and were currently, or had been married or "living common-law" with a man.

Spouse

For the purposes of this research, spouse, husband or partner are used interchangeably, and are intended to refer both to legal spouses and common-law partners.

## INTRODUCTION

This study examines some of the variables impinging upon the traumatic bond--wife battering--between cohabiting or married couples living in Victoria in 1987. The purpose overall is to understand the relational arrangements in which wife battering occurs and is tolerated for varying lengths of time.

Most literature on the subject of wife battering considers it an extremely unpleasant problem affecting the quality of life, with heavy ramifications for immediate family members and for the community. Yet little research has been focussed on the structure of the interpersonal networks of the women involved, particularly ties to family and friends.

It is expected that a network structure in which integrated ties among family and friends are common will create a situation in which battering is less likely to occur than in networks where a preponderance of ties are isolated. In networks where the ties are isolated, the likelihood of normal stress leading to violent interaction is expected to be high.

While the structure of the network in which the couple's relationship is situated is important, the actual content of the couple bond will also be examined, comparing cases where battering was experienced with others where it never occurred. The variables expected to be associated with both types are: (1) size of the networks, (2) frequency of contact within network, (3) content of

interaction shared in the network, (4) access to the economic resources.

Despite the surge of research that has been done on the topic of wife battering recently, there are still great gaps in the knowledge of this issue. The bulk of the research has studied only known and readily available populations of women--those women who have sought outside intervention from "official" helping agencies such as the shelters, police, or psychologists, and have temporarily or permanently ended the abusive relationship. As a result, little information is known about the women who do not come into contact with outside agencies, and almost nothing is known about the dynamics of the abusive relationship such as effect of the traumatic bond on a woman's interpersonal network.

## CHAPTER 1

### A REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

#### 1.1 HISTORICAL OVERVIEW

To have and to hold from this day forward . . .  
to love and to cherish, till death us do part.  
(Solemnization of Matrimony, Church of England,  
p. 4)

In reality, the long established tradition in Western society has been the acceptance of the abuse of women, especially wives, and a "woman's place in history, when properly recorded, has too often been on the receiving end of the fist" (Freeman, 1976:42).

Until recently, the abusive treatment of women and most particularly wives, was developed, justified, maintained, and reinforced by the social, legal, and moral institutions in Western society. Consequently, to facilitate a greater understanding of the multifaceted nature of wife battering, it is necessary to place it in a wider context through the examination of the historical framework within which the abusive actions arose (Dobash and Dobash, 1979). Once placed in this wider framework, the most important insight gained is that this behaviour is not "deviant" or pathological in the truest sense, nor was it considered criminal or reprehensible, but a behaviour with a long standing history as an established, acceptable prerogative of a husband, to be exercised

in the privacy of his home without interference from outside forces.

Wife abuse has been documented for at least 2,700 years, as far back as the first marriage laws of the Roman Empire (753 B.C.), which gave the husband upon marriage the absolute ownership and control over all property and people including his wife, who was considered a necessary and inseparable possession (Freeman, 1976; Dobash and Dobash, 1979; O'Faolain and Martines, 1974).

Justification for the ownership of a wife was based on establishing the pedigree of any children born to the marriage, especially sons who would eventually inherit the family name and possessions.

Integral to the marriage laws was the explicit legal right to physically chastise a wife for transgressions (known as the Law of Chastisement), such as drinking wine, adultery, or any behaviour which might indicate that the husband did not exercise complete control over his wife (Dobash and Dobash, 1979).

Gradually Roman women sought and won some freedoms mainly as the result of the Punic Wars (ending in 202 B.C.), which through the prolonged absences of or the death of many Roman men enabled women to take on more responsibilities. Women were allowed to inherit property and receive an education, and this helped to relax somewhat the severe double standard of behaviour as well as physical beatings as punishment for transgressions (Okun, 1986; Dobash and Dobash, 1979). These small gains were reversed with the advent of Christianity which firmly re-established the early Roman

views on women, marriage, and the family, including those of chastisement (Freeman, 1976).

Christianity had a tremendous impact on the status of women and the institution of marriage. Not only were women required legally to be subject to their husbands as before, but Christian teachings now explicitly made this a sacred duty (Freeman, 1976; Davidson, 1977). Powerful justification for this was provided: "then God said, let us make man in our image, after our likeness" while women were created so ". . . that man should not be alone; I will make a helper fit for him . . ." (Genesis 2:18), thus firmly establishing a naturally subordinate place for women vis-a-vis men. The teachings were also explicit about the role of a wife:

Wives be subject to your husbands, for the husband is the head of the wife . . . so let wives also be subject in everything to their husbands." (Ephesians 5:22, 23, 24)

and her duties:

I permit no women to . . . have authority over men; she is to keep silent . . ." and "will be saved through bearing children, if she continues in faith and love and holiness, with modesty." (Timothy 2:11, 12, 15)

Legitimation of this view of women was Eve's behaviour in the Garden of Eden which resulted in man's expulsion thus indicating an inherently evil nature in all women as her descendants. This blame, coupled with the other Christian teachings, supplied powerful encouragement for wife abuse when combined with the

authority of the state. For it was now not only a husband's legal right but his moral duty as well to control his wife's behaviour to ensure that the "Fall from Grace" did not recur in the context of his family and home (Okun, 1986).

The Middle Ages in Europe ushered in an era in which the State and the Church exhorted husbands to flog, exile, or kill their wives with impunity, chivalry notwithstanding (Dobash and Dobash, 1979). It was firmly believed that "a woman good or bad needs the stick," fostering at times such widespread abuse of women that priests had to plead with their male parishioners to use the same restraint in beating their wives they would show to their livestock (MacLeod, 1980:27; Martin, 1976).

The Law provided little protection for women from this abuse. In England, Common Law, which was based on cases brought before the court by members of the community who felt wronged, offered little help as women were denied the right to speak and thus present a case. Women were still considered the chattel of their husbands upon marriage (having been previously the chattel of their father), with no separate legal status and no civil rights. It was argued that a husband must have the right to punish his wife because he was considered legally responsible for her behaviour and liable for punishment for her crimes. As long as the husband used a "reasonable" instrument (a rod no larger than his thumb) and did not spill her blood in public, he was free from any legal or moral censure (Martin, 1976).

By the nineteenth century in Europe, some norms had evolved concerning what was considered appropriate chastisement. Beatings while the woman was pregnant or involving "unreasonable" instruments were frowned upon in England, but not open to legal sanction (Okun, 1986; Martin, 1976). In France, the husband had to follow the "legitimate" rules of punishment, that is "blows, thumps, kicks or punches . . . which did not leave any marks" (Dobash and Dobash, 1979; Carlson, 1977:9). As long as the husband did not exceed the customary limits of chastisement in his community, he was unlikely to face either moral or legal action--a situation which did not change greatly until well into the next century (Dobash and Dobash, 1979).

Due to the unique nature of wife abuse in which the violence occurs in the privacy of the home and society has both implicitly and explicitly legitimated its use for centuries, it has remained "invisible" and avoidable as an area for concern. Sporadic attempts to curb the abuse of wives did crop up in the intervening years from the nineteenth century until its "discovery" as an issue in the 1970s. Groups such as the Suffragettes in Britain and the Women's Christian Temperance Union in North America did attempt to focus attention on the plight of the abused wife; however, this issue was never the main thrust of either movement, and their attempts lost impetus when women were granted the vote and Prohibition was declared in the U.S. in the 1920s (Cramer, 1980).

Battered wives thus remained an issue to be ignored, or joked about, but not to be taken seriously.<sup>1</sup>

It was not until the activities of the Women's Movement and its emergent feminist perspective that attention was centered on battering, opening the public's eyes to the violence and abuse that existed in families, demanding that this behaviour be stopped.

## 1.2 CURRENT SOCIOLOGICAL WORK

The issue of battered wives as an area for scholarly inquiry in sociology may be described at best as a situation of selective inattention. This lack of research can be attributed to two interrelated factors: (1) a dearth of sociological research into violence in general, and (2) the impact of the consensus equilibrium model for studying family relationships within sociology.

Until recently, sociologists tended to ignore violence as an issue for research despite evidence indicating that confrontation was a basic feature of social order (Domenach, 1981; Prus, 1978; Simmel, 1955). If violence was studied, it was visible, instrumental, intentional, and group based, such as race riots and rarely at the interpersonal level (Prus, 1978; Chandler, 1973). The theoretical work done was based on theories borrowed from the Sociology of Deviance and attempted to utilize and integrate such diverse sources as Parson's and Merton's Structural Functionalism,

Lemert's Labelling Theory (1972); Becker (1966), Sutherland and Cressey's differential association work (1970); Cohen's Cultural Transmission Theory (1971); Wolfgang and Ferracuti's and Dietz's Subculture of Violence (1967; 1978); and Garfinkel (1967) and Douglas (1973), writings in phenomenology (Beyer-Gammon, 1978). These works served to focus attention only on the consequences of violence at the broadest level. There was little knowledge of violence as an ongoing interpersonal process within the family, responsive to group and community level constraints (Horowitz and Schwartz, 1974; Gelles, 1983; Prus, 1978). At best, wife battering was either indirectly referred to under other topics such as jealousy, homicide, and sadomasochism or simply ignored as an issue with little value in its own right.

The consensus equilibrium model, which dominated sociological research for decades in North America, had tremendous consequences for the study of violence within the family (Straus and Gelles, 1979). The main focus of this model were the procreative and regulatory functions of the family, such as sexual behaviour, which promoted a view of the home as a haven of harmony and tranquility where violence was a rare and abnormal occurrence. As a result, violent behaviour within the family, including wife battering, was infrequently studied (Okun, 1986; Gelles, 1983).

This view of the family was paralleled by a North American cultural myth of the "happy family" and the almost sacred right to privacy in the home, which allowed the physical abuse of wives and

other forms of intra-familial violence to operate under a "conspiracy of silence," invisible and unchallenged (Straus and Gelles, 1979). This conspiracy depicted outside intervention into the abusive relationship as a betrayal, violating the sanctity of privacy between husbands and wives (Steinmetz and Straus, 1974). Consequently, there was scant sympathy or support for a wife who openly admitted she was abused and sought help. The prevailing attitude was to blame the woman for the violence (Okun, 1986; Barnsley, 1985). This blame stemmed from two prevalent stereotypes held about battered women: (1) victim precipitation--"she asked for it" or deserved it, (2) masochism--"she likes it" because she stays<sup>2</sup> (Barnsley, 1985).

The result of the above mentioned factors was that very little substantive research on battered wives appeared in sociology prior to the middle 1970s, when partly in response to the emergence of the feminist perspective and a shift away from the consensus model for family study in Sociology, scholarly attention became focussed on the role of conflict and violent behaviour between intimates.

### 1.2.1 THEORETICAL WORK

At present, theoretical work on battered wives in Sociology can be divided roughly into two main approaches: (1) a "mainstream" or family violence approach, and (2) a feminist approach. Since

this research's theoretical underpinnings do not fit neatly into either approach but integrate components of each, it is therefore useful to briefly discuss each position as background information to the main focus of this paper--the role that the traumatic bond plays in a woman's interpersonal network.

#### Family Sociology and Violence Mainstream Approach

The main focus of this approach is that wife abuse is a subset of acts within the larger framework of family violence, which includes sibling violence, spousal rape, and child abuse. This makes all humans potential targets of abuse (Okun, 1986; Straus and Gelles, 1979).

The most important factor emphasized by this "mainstream" perspective is the role played by cultural norms in family violence. Murray Straus (1976), one of the most prominent theorists within this approach, suggests that norms are the most critical factor in the creation and sustenance of wife abuse. For Straus "the marriage license is a hitting license," due in large part to the lack of societal institutions trained to identify the problem and intervene. Beyond this, there is an overall reluctance in society in general to interfere in the sanctity of the home. Instead the police, courts, and bystanders through inaction, accept and tacitly encourage violent behaviour between husbands and wives (see also Stark et al., 1979; Straus, 1976).

The twin pillars of reinforcement of domestic violence are: (1) privacy of the family, and (2) a simplistic stereotype of the happy family. These two factors operate to allow society to turn a blind eye, "it's nobody else's business," keeping the severity and extent of the violence unrevealed, thus protecting the batterer (Straus and Flynn, 1980). The violence that is addressed by social agencies is relegated to the streets between strangers, despite overwhelming evidence that women and children are at greater risk of assault, homicide, and rape in their own homes than any other place; and violence becomes perceived as atypical or abnormal, while the victims are unwilling or unable to seek outside help (Okun, 1986; Dobash and Dobash, 1979; Straus, 1980).

This approach also examines the encouragement of violence as it occurs at the government level through war, police tactics, capital punishment, corporal punishment, or the use of violence as a problem-solving strategy (Straus, 1976). The print and video media are criticized for encouraging a high level of violence in the population with their open endorsement of violence in all areas of life. Rarely are non-violent solutions offered to the conflicts shown. Most often wife abuse is portrayed as humorous and easily resolvable (e.g. "The Honeymooner's," or "Ruthless People") or conducted only by a psychopath ("My Life with Billy"), neither of which accurately depicts the true nature of intra-familial violence (Straus, 1978).<sup>3</sup>

Straus and Gelles (1979) utilizing this perspective attempt to explain the nature of family violence through a typology developed to account for its sources. Six items are identified: (1) the amount of time family members spend together; (2) the divergent range of activities and interests among family members which may overlap and compete, creating conflict; (3) the intensity and high level of emotional involvement required of members which magnifies any frustrations experienced; (4) total acceptance of traditional gender roles; (5) a "might is right" attitude which fosters the use of physical violence as an appropriate discipline tool for both children and women as a prerogative of the authority of the father; and (6) unassuaged resentment arising from the obligations and duties thrust upon family members by the involuntary or semi-voluntary nature of family membership. Straus notes that the above factors operate to produce conflict which can lead to violence within families.

#### Feminism in the Family Approach to Violence

Some of the mainstream sociologists "cross-over" to a feminist approach by acknowledging the role that the family plays in society that aids and abets wife abuse. By recognizing the male as the "head" of the family and his use of force, as both protecting and justifying this position, family sociologists imply that to question this arrangement is to "threaten" the social order.

Acceptance of the male authority model in the family legitimates any violence that occurs (Straus, 1980). These sociologists also note that society keeps women in battering relationships through: (1) an economic structure which allocates child-rearing solely to the female, without providing adequate day care, trapping her at home powerless, dependent, and unequipped in terms of seniority and occupational skills to enter the marketplace. This effectively leaves the woman to choose between poverty or battering as a lifestyle (Straus, 1980). And (2) the "myth" of child-rearing in which tremendous importance is placed on the complementary roles of mother and father. "Staying together for the children's sake," encourages a wife to adapt, accepting the violence in order to "save" the marriage, entailing attempts to placate the aggressive husband or to keeping things quiet when the violence does erupt (Straus, 1980).

Straus (1980) also notes that women are socialized to be victims. Society views women as childlike, unreasonable, emotional, and more likely to exaggerate. They are considered a highly unreliable source of information in terms of this stereotype. Battered wives seeking outside help are defeated before they begin. Most women have been socialized not to defend themselves physically or emotionally when questions concerning family matters arise. Instead, women are valued when they exhibit their "traditional" gender traits of passivity, self-sacrifice, and

cooperation.<sup>4</sup> In an abusive relationship, this amounts to placing "saving the marriage" over saving oneself.

Three criticisms have been leveled at the mainstream approach:

(1) Feminist scholars criticize the mainstream approach precisely because they study domestic or family violence, arguing that this obfuscates the fact that overwhelmingly the violence is directed at women by men, and this creates a piecemeal approach which ignores the insidious nature of the violence and minimizes its extent (Gruberman and Wolfe, 1985). (2) The lack of explanation of the existence of contradictory norms concerning woman abuse and why one set took precedence over the other. There are and always have been norms concerning aggression towards women--boys are taught not to hit girls and gentlemen do not hit a lady, yet there is no explanation offered as to why these norms co-exist with the tremendous violence perpetrated upon wives (Okun, 1986). (3) The emphasis placed on internal conflict leading to family violence ignores the role outside events may play in the development of violence. Often events beyond the control of the family members (e.g. unemployment) act as catalysts for violence; yet these are barely acknowledged in this perspective which holds that all family members are exposed to equal levels of conflict, and yet cannot adequately explain why disproportionately men resort to violence and why women are the targets.

### Feminist Approach

The second approach in sociological literature is a feminist perspective, which views wife battering as one element in the larger framework of violence against women in society--including rape, pornography, media exploitation, child abuse, and sexual harassment (Schechter, 1982; Boulding, 1981; Gruberman and Wolfe, 1985). In this analysis, emphasis is placed on the historical roots of the treatment of women and the institutions which perpetuate violence against women asking, "what social conditions produce the same target (women) generation after generation?" (Schechter, 1982:215-216).

Overwhelmingly, it is the wife who is abused physically and emotionally by her husband. In well over ninety percent (90%) of reported cases of conjugal violence, it is the woman that is abused (Okun, 1986). For the feminist scholars, the source of this abuse lies in the patriarchal structure of society (Okun, 1986). Although authors within this approach differ on whether patriarchy is a primary or sole cause of the abuse, it is viewed as the umbrella of understanding in which women become acceptable victims in Western society. Women, especially wives, have always been culturally legitimate targets for abuse (Schechter, 1982). As history documents, the mistreatment of wives is a long standing, time honoured tradition, developed, maintained, and reinforced by all the social, legal, and moral institutions. The twin

manifestations of the patriarchal system--the denigration of female victims by men and the simultaneous exoneration of the assailant, perpetuates male domination and the oppression of women (Eisenberg and Micklow, 1977; Barry 1981; Martin, 1976).

Feminist scholars reject the use of gender neutral terms--"domestic violence" in reference to wife battering, arguing that wife battering is a separate entity and must be studied in its own right, not hidden within family violence as the unique characteristics and high incidence of it justify an independent status (Dobash and Dobash, 1984).

Feminist sociological theory has had a great impact on the field. It permeates nearly all the literature on battered wives to some extent, and nearly every scholar writing about wife abuse professes to hold at least some feminist tenets, most notably the impact of the patriarchal structure on society to explain the lack of response of social institutions (Okun, 1986). This impact can perhaps be attributed to the fact that it was the Women's Movement which first demanded that this issue be examined in its own right and not under such euphemisms as "marital discord," "police work," "homicide," or "alcoholism." Yet, despite the tremendous influence of this perspective, it is not without its critics.

Mainstream scholars argue that focussing exclusively on women as victims allows (1) the simplistic stereotype of the happy family and the resulting "conspiracy of silence" to continue and (2) this focus ignores the relationship between the various forms of family

violence--wife battering, child abuse, and sibling violence--which share not only the same contributing causes, but have been found to be statistically interrelated within a family (Martin, 1976).

Quite commonly a family which is experiencing one form of abuse is suffering from another type as well, either as the result of the first type developing into another (the child steps in to protect the mother from violence and is struck) or by directly causing another form (the abused child grows up to be an abuser or become an abused adult) (Straus and Gelles, 1979; Steinmetz and Straus, 1974; Hilberman and Munson, 1978; Steinmetz, 1977; Gayford, 1975).

#### 1.2.2 EMPIRICAL RESULTS

It is useful at this point to examine the current empirical findings on battered women to provide an outline of what the current state of knowledge is.

##### Incidence and Prevalence

In Canada, twenty-three percent (23%) of all the assaults reported to the police occur in the home. Of these reported assaults, seventy-seven percent (77%) involved a female as a victim. Her husband or ex-husband was the perpetrator ninety percent (90%) and eighty percent (80%) of the time respectively (Statistics Canada, C.U.V.S., 1985). In the U.S. up to fifty-two percent (52%) of the assaults reported to the police occurred

between family members, with five (5%) to eleven percent (11%) listed specifically as husband-wife assaults (Okun, 1986). In both countries, the "standard" estimate used is one in ten women will report being seriously assaulted (resulting in injuries) each year by their husbands (MacLeod, 1987; 1980; Gruberman and Wolfe, 1985).

### Age

There are contradictory findings concerning age and the battering of women. In Canada, the average battered woman tends to be young; fourteen percent (14%) were under twenty-one, and fifty-six percent (56%) were between the ages of twenty-one and thirty-four years of age, with the average age at twenty-eight (MacLeod, 1987, 1980). In the U.S., the majority of studies have found that women forty-one to fifty years of age experienced the most violence (Martin, 1976; Walker, 1979; Dobash and Dobash, 1979; O'Brian and Gelles, 1983). One interesting finding that has yet to be explained is the higher levels of violence found in couples where the husband is older and the least amount of abuse in couples where the wife is older (Gelles, 1983).

### Marital Status

In Canada, fifty percent (50%) of the women are legally married; twenty-eight percent (28%) were living common-law, and ten percent were single; seven percent (7%) were separated, and five

percent (5%) were divorced (MacLeod, 1987). One interesting fact about these statistics is that the number of battered wives that are separated, or divorced from their spouses has increased from thirteen percent (13%) in 1980 to twenty-two percent (22%) in 1987, indicating that physical distance, separate residences, or restraining orders did not protect the women from further violence (MacLeod, 1987; 1980; Ellis, 1982; Gelles, 1983). Similarly in the U.S. twenty-six (26%) of the women battered were assaulted by their former husbands (Okun, 1986).

#### Length of Relationship

In both Canada and the U.S. the average length of relationship between the battered wife and her husband was between seven (7) and eight (8) years (Eisenberg and Micklow, 1977; MacLeod, 1987; 1980). For Canadian women, less than eight percent (8%) had lived with their spouses for under a year, thirty-four percent (34%) for one to five years, thirty-three percent (33%) six to ten years and twenty-three percent (23%) over ten years (MacLeod, 1987).

#### Race

In the U.S., Straus (1980) found that wife abuse is more common among American minority groups, almost triple the rate for whites, while MacLeod (1980) found in Canada that Native women are disproportionately represented in shelters. However, sociologists in both countries are extremely cautious not to generalize from

these findings, acknowledging instead that many other factors could influence the higher rates exhibited by minority groups.

### Religion

Straus and Gelles (1979) reported that couples of differing religious backgrounds or where one partner professes to no religion at all exhibited a slightly higher rate of reported abuse. The lowest rates of abuse were reported by Jews. There are no available statistics on battering by religion for Canada as of 1987.

### Social Class

In the American studies of battered wives, sharply differing accounts emerge when taking social class into consideration. Flynn (1980), Straus (1980), reported no class effect at all. Davidson (1977) and Walker (1979) found that abuse was most common among women in the middle class, while Steinmetz and Straus (1974) Whitehurst (1974) and Goode (1971) found that battering was more prevalent in the lower or working class. MacLeod (1980; 1987) reported that in Canada the typical woman in the shelter was from a working class background, her husband was a blue collar worker and usually only seasonally employed.

### Income

Gelles (1983) found that a drop in abuse levels was positively associated with a rise in income level. There is certainly support for this in Canadian statistics. MacLeod (1987) found that fully seventy-five percent (75%) of the battered women studied were living in poverty with their husbands, forty-three (43%) of which had a family income of less than \$10,000 a year, and thirty-two percent (32%) earned between \$10,000 and \$20,000 a year.

### Occupation

American data (Straus, 1980; Gelles, 1983) suggests that rates of violence were nearly twice as much among women whose husbands had blue collar jobs, with the rates peaking in the middle of the occupational spectrum. This figure rose to nearly three times if the husband was unemployed. In Canada, women from working class backgrounds are disproportionately represented in shelter data; only thirty-eight percent (38%) of the women had spouses who were regularly employed; thirty-three percent (33%) were unemployed and twenty-nine percent (29%) worked either irregularly or seasonally (Chan, 1977; MacLeod, 1987).

In Canada, of the battered women who were employed (twenty percent [20%] of the sample), fifty-nine percent (59%) held either skilled or unskilled blue collar positions, with twenty-five

percent (25%) holding white collar clerical/secretarial, and eight percent (8%) as professionals (MacLeod, 1987).

### Education

In both Canadian and American data, men without high school graduation made up the largest category of batterers, and women who did not finish high school were the most likely to be abused (Gelles, 1983; Straus, 1980; MacLeod, 1980). In a 1987 study, MacLeod found that fully seventy percent (70%) of the women had not finished high school; twenty-two percent (22%) had graduated from high school, only six percent (6%) had completed technical or college training, and less than two percent (2%) held a university degree. One interesting finding reported was that violence was greatest where the wife had more education than her husband and lowest where the husband had more education (O'Brien, 1971; Gelles, 1983; Carlson, 1980).

### 1.3 APPROACH USED IN THE PRESENT STUDY

As previously mentioned, the theoretical perspective of this paper is neither strictly feminist nor mainstream in its approach. Acknowledged in this framework are elements from the mainstream approach, most notably the role that cultural norms play in the perpetuation of wife abuse as well as the feminist emphasis on the importance of examining the socio-historical background to

understand the "normalcy" of the behaviour and the impact of a patriarchal structure on this issue. However, what neither position can offer is the main focus of this research, that is, knowledge of the dynamics of a violent relationship.

While this gap is partly due to the previously mentioned factors, such as lack of research into violence generally in Sociology, it is also the result of the thrust of the early studies. Early research was aimed at crisis solving, documenting incidence and prevalence to establish the nature of the "crisis" for the community and to get the women out of the life-threatening situation (MacLeod, 1987). Now, since the "crisis" has been acknowledged, the focus has shifted to the prevention of battering--an important aspect of which is the structure of the abusive relationship. This paper examines how the traumatic bond, which arises between a couple out of a normal intimate one, under conditions of increased isolation and dependency can result in violence and at times maintaining life-threatening abuse.

#### The Development of a Traumatic Bond and its Relationship to Violence

Normally, intimate bonds develop between a couple upon entering a relationship (either cohabiting or marriage) as they attempt to construct a shared world, which is segregated with its

own controls and closed conversations (Berger and Kellner, 1974). Society provides some guidance and instruction on how to go about this "world making" task, but for the most part the couple must attempt this important construction on their own (Berger and Kellner, 1974). This is a precarious undertaking as success depends on the particular meshing of the idiosyncrasies which each member brings, the future development of these idiosyncrasies and their role in the couple's life together, creating a highly unstable situation--at least at the outset (Berger and Kellner, 1974; Simmel, 1955).

A certain level of conflict is, then, to be expected during the first years of the couple's life together, as tensions and problems are bound to arise due to the wide range of activities, interests, and outlooks, often competing and overlapping, that are part of the everyday life of the couple (Straus and Gelles, 1979; Simmel, 1955). Conflict is a normal way to manage the resulting discord and divergence between the partners as it is bound up with the elements that produce unity, and this might allow for the resolution of conflict generated (Gaipa, 1986; Simmel, 1955).

The very nature of intimacy demands a high level of emotional involvement, and this can elevate the intensity and meaning of the frustrations, tensions, and conflict experienced by the couple (Straus and Gelles, 1979). How this conflict is managed is crucial. When precipitating factors such as alcohol, drug use, pregnancy, and job stress are also present, a very real potential

for violence as a means of conflict management between the couple has been introduced (Straus and Gelles, 1979; Walker, 1979).

Violence can quickly become established as the typical, habitual, and predictable form of interaction between the couple, forging a traumatic bond. Once established this bond plays an important part in the couple's relationship. It not only dominates their daily lives and the continuing development of their relationship, but it affects their interaction with those in their wider interpersonal network.

Since few couples are totally isolated, part of the construction of their shared world often includes the re-perceiving and regrouping of past relationships to accommodate the partner (Berger and Kellner, 1974; Bott, 1957). These relationships include formal ties with external people and institutions (e.g. doctor or formal social agencies), as well as informal ties with colleagues, friends, and relatives, and form multiple social networks (Wellman, 1979; Bott, 1957). The diversity of these relationships enmeshing the couple provides the potential of access to a broad range of resources and choices for each partner, even though they are constrained by situational factors (Blumstein and Schwartz, 1985; Wellman, 1979; Bott, 1957). The traumatic bond is one such factor for once it emerges it dramatically affects the interpersonal network, especially for the wife who is often more housebound than the traditional husband.

Studies of abused wives have found that while the husband may maintain his interpersonal network, the wife is usually isolated from hers (Pagelow, 1981; Dobash and Dobash, 1979). Battered women report that they have had no close personal friends for years and little contact with family members (Pagelow, 1981). It is unclear which occurs first; in some cases the isolation occurred before the physical abuse began, while in others it was ongoing with the violence. But what is clear is that the isolation of the women both socially and economically is a common factor (Pagelow, 1981).

It is well documented that abusive husbands deliberately isolate their wives by severing their interpersonal ties. The wife is forbidden to use the phone, leave the house without her husband, or use the car; her friends and relatives are driven away, and new friendships are discouraged or prohibited (Martin, 1976; Ganley and Harris, 1978; Walker, 1979). Usually accompanying this "social" isolation is an "economic" isolation, where a wife is never given money for personal use or access to bank accounts or credit cards, and she is deliberately kept uninformed about family finances (Okun, 1986).

The destruction of the battered wife's interpersonal network suggests an attempt by the husband to ensure his wife is totally reliant on the single bond to him, forcing her to depend entirely on him for resources which might otherwise have come from her interpersonal network. She then becomes more willing to tolerate

excesses such as violence, which normally would have kept the traumatic bond from continuing.

Initially too, an abused wife contributes to her own isolation by consciously avoiding those who might negatively assess her or her marriage (Okun, 1986; Walker, 1979). Shame and guilt are all too often pinned on the wife when an abusive relationship is publicly disclosed (Okun, 1986; Dobash, Dobash, and Cavanaugh, 1984; Dobash and Dobash, 1979; Walker, 1979; Serum, 1979). Battered women tend to internalize this blame, taking responsibility for the violence and this prevents many from seeking help (Pagelow, 1984; Pressman, 1984).

Dealing with the violence will eventually outweigh the fear of disclosure, and the wife will attempt to seek help through what remains of her interpersonal network (Dobash and Dobash, 1984). In some cases she will turn first to her informal ties, friends, and relatives, while others turn to "official" agencies. In any event, the responses she receives are crucial to the continued interaction between the couple (Dobash and Dobash, 1984; 1979; Pahl, 1979; Stark, Flitcraft and Frazier, 1979). If support appears to be with the wife, then the chances of future violence and the continuance of the traumatic bond are decreased as the legitimacy of this behaviour is challenged and possible means of escape from the violence are offered to the wife. If, however, the wife is blamed or refused help by others, the traumatic bond is legitimized, reinforced, and the status quo remains (Dobash and Dobash, 1984).

Therefore, in light of the previously discussed literature on violence and network structure, the following hypotheses are put forward:

- H1 When the network structure is isolated, the level of violence will be high.
- H2 When the network structure is ramified, there may be some violence.
- H3 When the network is integrated, there will be no violence.

## CHAPTER 1 ENDNOTES

<sup>1</sup>As late as 1982, in the Canadian House of Commons, a call for aid for abused wives was met with laughter and hoots of derision from both sides of the house (MacLeod, 1980; 1987).

<sup>2</sup>It is interesting to note that these two explanations are commonly used against female sexual assault victims too.

<sup>3</sup>Cinematic art, however, is one of the few areas of cultural expression in which the horror that can become part of everyday life, are vividly depicted. Examples of this are Fatal Attraction, The Burning Bed, Mother Dearest.

<sup>4</sup>Talcott Parsons' (1970) concept of "compulsive masculinity" ironically represents this. While representing mainstream structural functional accounts of the family (see Parsons and Bales, 1955), it points out the unintended anachronisms in some of our values. "Compulsive masculinity" implicitly devalues women, giving rise to a negative self-image associated with being female. This situation in values encourages the expression of male aggression as a sign of masculinity and a tolerance of violence by the criminal justice system dominated by this conception of the "male animal."

<sup>5</sup>Somers' D is a PRE-measure (proportion of predicting reduction error) which gives the proportion reduced in error by using the variables compared to prediction by chance.

## CHAPTER 2

## METHODOLOGY

2.1 OVERVIEW

This research is not a replication of any previous work, nor is it entirely unique. There have been other random sample studies conducted on this topic such as Gauguin, 1977. However, what makes this research novel is (1) the focus on the structure on the interpersonal network of the respondents, and (2) the hypothesis testing of and not strictly the documenting of incidence and prevalence.

A lack of hypothesis testing has plagued most of the empirical research into wife battering since it began in the 1970s (Okun, 1986). Two factors are cited for this: (1) underreporting of incidents and the resulting unreliability of statistics, (2) difficulties in obtaining subjects (Okun, 1986).

Incidents of wife battering are greatly underreported due to the shame and embarrassment attached to being a victim. Dobash and Dobash (1979) found in their study that only 1.6% of the actual assaults were reported to the police, while MacLeod (1987) estimated in Canada that 62% of the assaults will not be reported to anyone including the police. If the victim does not report the incident, then chances are that no one else will either as less

than 9% of all domestic assaults in Canada were reported by witnesses (Statistics Canada, C.U.V.S. Bulletin 4, 1985).

Other factors contributing to the underreporting of assaults are the medical and police categorizations which obscure the source of the complaint (Okun, 1986). Doctors treat wife-battering injuries as "accidental" or "unspecified" in origin, the police often do not list the victim-perpetrator relationship, therapists treat "anxiety neuroses" and "paranoia." As a result, it is practically impossible to describe the nature and the extent of wife battering in a population accurately (Okun, 1986).

The difficulty in obtaining subjects for research, especially for controlled or random studies, is another problem hampering empirical research. The bulk of the research has had to rely on clinical or quasi-clinical samples--women seeking refuge, divorce applications/restraining orders, police calls, volunteers, psychotherapy patients, and students (Okun, 1986). The resulting information then is based on a subsection of battered women, those who have sought some type of intervention. Consequently, generalizing from the results is highly problematic at best.

To date, what has emerged from the studies is a snapshot of the "average" battered women in Canada. She is twenty-eight years old, married for at least seven years, has two children, has not finished high school, and does not work outside the home. Her husband holds a blue collar occupation and the family income is usually low and/or unstable. The problem with this profile and the

research done to date is that it is representative of only a small proportion of battered women. In Canada, only eleven percent (11%) of all battered women fit this profile (MacLeod, 1987). There are then great gaps in the knowledge concerning this issue which this research design in part attempts to fill.

## 2.2. RESEARCH DESIGN

### 2.2.1 THE SAMPLE METHODS

The unit of analysis for this study was composed of females over 18 years of age, who have been or are currently married or cohabiting with a man and residing in Greater Victoria in 1987.

The sampling framework was the 1987 Greater Victoria phone book which includes residences in Brentwood Bay, Central Saanich, Esquimalt, North Saanich, Oak Bay, Saanich, Saanichton, Sidney, Sooke, and Victoria. Jordan River residences were excluded (as this is a long distance call), as well as all businesses and multiple listings for one address, unlisted phone numbers, and those not having a telephone (less than 1/2 of 1% of the population do not have a phone). Each residence was numbered for a total of 111,118 possible units. This number is lower than the figure given by the British Columbia Telephone Company (B.C. Tel) Public Affairs of 188,000, but theirs included Jordan River numbers, unlisted numbers, and multiple listings for a single residence (Public Information Officer, B.C. Tel, 1987).

In all, 507 names were drawn from the phone book using a random number table, and called to obtain the 200 women deemed appropriate for a good sample (Sudman, 1976; Rosenberg, 1968). An arbitrary limit of six attempts for each subject was set to ensure all had a fair chance to be included in the sample. If after six attempts the researcher had failed to contact the subject, the name was struck off the list and a new one was drawn. Names were also withdrawn if a woman did not live at the residence, if the number had been disconnected or changed and no new number supplied, if the researcher knew the participant, if the subject did not fit the requirements (i.e. never married or cohabited, was under legal age); if the subject refused to participate; if the subject was to be out of town for an extended period of time, or if the subject did not understand or write English.

Phoning began in the middle of May 1987 and continued through to the end of July 1987. Calling occurred Monday to Friday (initial attempts at contact on the weekend proved fruitless--no doubt due to the season) in the following time slots: morning 9:00 a.m. - 12:00; afternoon 12:00 - 4:00 p.m.; late afternoon 4:00 p.m. - 6:00 p.m.; and evening 6:00 p.m. - 9:00 p.m. Each subject was phoned once during each of the time slots until contacted or until six attempts had been made. The bulk of the subjects were reached during the afternoon and evening; so, the final two attempts were generally repeated during this time period. A log was kept of each contact noting the times called, the result

of the contact, if a questionnaire was sent, the date sent and returned, and any comments made by the subject.

The same introduction to the study was read to each subject to ensure uniformity and to inform the respondent of the sensitive material contained in the questionnaire (see Appendix C).

Overall, most persons contacted were friendly and interested in participating in the project. Many women, 19.3% (N=98) refused outright to participate for reasons ranging from "not interested," "don't have the time," illness or infirmities, or they would be out of town all summer, and in a few instances because the subject matter upset them. In some cases, initial hesitancy to participate was due to the respondent feeling she was not "smart enough" or lacked anything interesting to report; some wanted reassurance that the project involved only one questionnaire, and their name would not be sold or used for further research (perhaps an indication that Victoria is saturated with research projects). In the majority of the contacts, the first hurdle to overcome was to assure the subject that this was not a telephone sales solicitation, especially with the elderly women. In many instances, the elderly women hung up before the researcher could identify the project or were extremely rude until the affiliation with the University was mentioned. An interesting phenomenon were the husbands who carefully screened their wives' phone calls, demanding to know who the researcher was, why the researcher wished to talk to their wives, and what the project was about. Several

times husbands openly listened on a phone extension, and in two cases the husbands intervened to tell their wives that they could not participate. In one instance, where the husband was listening on the extension, the woman seemed quite interested until the section on battering was mentioned, and then she appeared to become quite frightened and hung up.

### 2.2.2 DATA COLLECTION

Initially, this research was to be conducted by interview schedule over the telephone; however, this was changed to a mailed self-administered questionnaire (Appendix B) owing to the sensitive nature of the content and the resulting concerns about confidentiality and anonymity.<sup>1</sup>

The questionnaire consisted of four sections: I. Personal Bonds and their Content; II. The Traumatic Bond; III. Experienced Assaults; and IV. Background Information.

Part I was designed to ascertain the content and structure of the subject's interpersonal network through an examination of the leisure activity patterns of the subject, the extent and depth of friendships with kin and non-kin, and the amount of agreement between the subject and her spouse on various items. It was expected that the degree of isolation present in the subject's interpersonal network would be revealed here.

Part II dealt with the subject's general knowledge of the issue of wife battering and opinions on the topic. It did not require firsthand knowledge and was intended to reveal whether standard stereotypes and prejudices were still prevalent concerning this issue.

Part III was designed to gain more specific knowledge about assaults experienced first hand and any attempts to deal with the situation. It was expected that this section would reveal the degree of isolation present as well as the responses (if any) from the interpersonal network which have encouraged or discouraged the level of violence.

Part IV asked standard background information as well as questions to indicate any economic isolation. It was expected that these questions would show the universal nature of wife battering (that it occurs in all classes, races, and religions), along with the subject's isolation from economic resources.

The questionnaires were mailed out weekly in batches of 30 during the phoning, beginning the end of May 1987 and finishing in early August 1987. Each questionnaire was identified by a number corresponding to the name from the master phoning list in case a follow-up call would be necessary. Included with the questionnaire was a consent form and during the July mail strike a notice that told the respondent to continue to mail the completed questionnaire until further notice. The mail strike no doubt contributed to lowering the response rate (56% N=112). The return rate of 56% is

just below what is considered a good response rate for this type of research (60%) and above what is considered adequate (50%) (Baily, 1978; Babbie, 1979).

The respondents were given from ten days to two weeks to complete and return the questionnaires (except in a few cases where the subject was going to be away but was still interested in participating--the length of time was increased slightly). As the questionnaires were returned, they were marked as to the date of return, given a new identifying number corresponding to the date returned, and marked as to whether or not the woman had experienced battering. Of the one hundred and twelve questionnaires (112) returned, ninety-one personally (91) (81.2%) had not experienced abuse in their relationship while twenty-one (21) (18.8%) indicated that they had.

## 2.3 MEASUREMENT

### 2.3.1 DEPENDENT VARIABLE--VIOLENCE (BATTERED OR NOT)

The respondents when answering the questionnaire identified themselves as battered or not (see Questionnaire, question 19, Appendix B). An explanation of their answer was requested and this aided the researcher in determining that the respondent had indeed experienced the type of violence under study. Of the 112 respondents, ninety-one (81.2%) were not battered, while twenty-one (18.8%) were considered battered for the purposes of this research.

This figure was much higher than expected for abused women, nearly double the rate used as a "best estimate" of battered women in the Canadian population of one in ten (10%) (McLeod, 1987; 1980).

### 2.3.2 INDEPENDENT VARIABLE--NETWORK STRUCTURE

The respondents' network patterns, whether isolated or integrated, were measured by: (1) size of the network, by the number of close friends and family, and number of friends knowing family members; (2) frequency of contact with them; (3) content of the interaction shared, involving shared leisure activities and confidences as well as respondent's level of agreement with her spouse; (4) access to the economic resources of the household as indicated by employment status of the respondent and her spouse, combined family income, who earns more, access to own bank accounts or credit cards, whether either spouse receives an allowance, who handles the family budget, and who calculates the income tax return.

It is expected that these variables will allow a clear basis for comparing the battered and non-battered women, and that the battered women will exhibit the isolated or focused pattern while the non-battered women will have an integrated or diversified pattern. The isolated pattern is typified by a low number of friends, little and superficial contact with them, low involvement with family or kin members, leisure activity pattern that relies

heavily on spouse, yet a low level of agreement with spouse in day-to-day living and limited access or control over economic resources such as bank accounts or family budget. This is in direct contrast with the integrated pattern which is indicated by a broad network of friends and family members, a high level of intimacy and leisure involvement with these friends and the spouse, as well as much greater access and control over family finances.

### 2.3.3 DATA ANALYSIS

Due to the nature of the sample and the level of the data obtained, descriptive rather than inferential statistics were used. This does limit the generalizability of the results (Loether and McTavish, 1974; 1976) but allows a clear basis for interpretation of the comparative situations: abused versus non-abused.

The bulk of the raw data was computed and cross-tabulated (except for two sets of tables which were simply percentaged). Somers' D was discerned to be the most appropriate measure of association to use in the interpretation of the results; however, the bulk of the interpretation relied on describing the nature of the relationships observed in the cross-tabulated sample data.<sup>2</sup>

Because the tables displaying the results referred to in Chapter 3 are so voluminous, it was decided for the sake of convenience to place them all together in Appendix A.

## CHAPTER 2 ENDNOTES

<sup>1</sup>The British Columbia Medical Association does not require doctors to report suspected wife battering injuries while it does now require doctors to report child abuse.

<sup>2</sup>The change of research design was required by the Committee on Research or Other Studies Involving Human Subjects in order to get permission to conduct the study.

## CHAPTER 3

RESULTS3.1 EXAMINATION OF THE TABLES3.1.1 SIZE OF THE NETWORK(i) Friends

Question 4 in the questionnaire asked:

"Among the people you think of as friends, please list the first names of those you feel closest to. Stop when you feel you have named your closest ties."

Cross tabulation analysis of the results of this question revealed that the respondents (N=99) reported having between three and five close friends most frequently (48.5%) (see Table 1). Only 7.1% had two or fewer friends, while 44.4% stated they had six or more close friends.

Of those with a small network (one to two people) 42.9% were battered. Among those with a medium network (two to five persons) 27.1% were battered, where respondents claimed six or more persons as close friends, only 11.4% were battered.

Somers' D (Somers' D = 0.174) indicates a slightly negative association with 17.4% of the variation explained, indicating a tendency for network size among close friends to be under six people and for battered women to have proportionately few close friends in their networks compared to non-battered women.

(ii) Family

The respondents were asked in question 10:

"Is anyone in your immediate family or relatives among your closest friends? (If the answer was yes) What is their relation to you?"

Cross tabulation of all the subjects' answers (N=99) showed that only "a few" (one to two) family members were considered by the respondents to be like close friends (61.6%) (see Table 2). Less than one-quarter of all respondents did not count a family member as a close friend (21.2), a few (10.1%) had "many" family as close friends (3-5 family members), while only 7.1% reported "a lot" of relatives (five or more) as friends.

More of the time non-abused women did not define family members like close friends (81.0%), while abused women were more predominately those who defined "a few," "many" or "a lot" of family members like close friends, overlapping the two types in meaning much more frequently (80.9%) than the non-abused respondents.

Somers' D indicates a slightly positive association with explained variation of only 2.6%, meaning battered women were more likely than non-battered women to see family in terms of close friendship.

### Description of Close Family

The respondents were asked to provide details of close family relationships to supply deeper information concerning those family members included in their network and to allow a comparison between the respondents. When asked to provide these details, a total of twenty-five (25) different relatives were listed (see Table 3), and a variety of relationships ranging from "son" or "daughter" to "niece-in-law" were mentioned. The relatives most frequently mentioned by the women were female; 67.7% of the respondents listed at least one female relative as a close friend. Male relatives accounted for 29.4%. Approximately seven percent (6.9%) of the relatives listed could not be identified by gender, for example, "cousin." The three most frequently mentioned relatives overall were: (1) "sister," 23.3% (2) "mother," 13.2%, and (3) "daughter," 10.8%. The most often mentioned male relatives were "husband" and "brother" at 7.8% each.

Three differences were noted in the structures of close family membership in the respondents' networks: (1) fewer numbers of relatives overall were listed by the abused respondents; (2) different rankings of relatives were cited as the 3 most frequently mentioned relatives by each group; and (3) male relatives (brother) was listed as close more often among the abused respondents, while female relatives were more frequently mentioned by the non-abused women.

From these results it appears that an isolating aspect occurs in the abused women network as evidenced by the smaller numbers of family members considered as close in comparison with the non-abused women. But perhaps more interesting is the gender difference. Non-abused women ranked sister (24.6%), mother (13.2%) and daughter (9.2%) (exclusively female) as the 3 closest relatives, while abused women ranked sister (19.4%), daughter (16.6%), and brother (13.8%) (mixed gender ranking). This is an unexplained finding as there appears to be no information on gender composition of close family or friends and battered women. However, from the questionnaire's 7 answers and "Sylvie's Story", a NFB film,<sup>1</sup> it was suggested that a brother due to his gender and its accompanying physical traits (e.g. size, age), he is perceived more often as a source of help for the abused women than women are.

(iii) Interrelatedness of Network

Question 6(a) and (b) asked respondents:

- (a) "Do any of your closest friends know other members of your immediate family?"
- (b) "Do your closest friends know any other of your relatives?"

The results were combined into one table (see Table 4), and cross-tabulation analysis of all respondents (N=97) revealed that among respondents having no family as close friends, abused and

non-abused were equally represented. Those listing "a few" (1-2) family as close friends were much less likely to be among the battered (15.5%) than the not-battered (84.2%). This was also true for those claiming "many" (3-4) family as close friends with battered women (10.3%) being less represented relative to not battered (89.3%) than in any other category of the independent variable. Of respondents claiming "a lot" of family as close friends, proportionately fewer not battered women (72.9%) and more battered women (27.1%) were in this category than others whose family as close friends were claimed. This suggests that battered women are more likely than non-battered women to integrate family as friends.

Somers' D indicates a slight positive association with an explained variation of eight percent (8%).

What is suggested by the data on network size is that the women who have experienced abuse do exhibit an isolated network in terms of size (see Tables 1 and 2). They have fewer close friends (one or two), than non-abused respondents (six or more), and they appear to find closeness mainly with their families (see Table 4. Abused respondents often cited five or six relatives as close friends, while the non-abused typically had as many friends as family in their list of close ties.

It was expected that the abused woman would have both fewer friends and fewer relatives as friends, indicative of the isolated network pattern. Instead what was found was that abused women

cited more relatives as close friends, but a relatively smaller proportion of friends, in comparison with the non-abused respondents, providing less variety in close ties.

Table 4 indicates the lack of interrelatedness or density across the abused respondents' network, keeping separate both family and friends in comparison with the non-abused women. This pattern of relatively self-contained clusters of friends and family suggests not only a lack of variety of kinds of interpersonal relationships from which the abused women can gain support but a diminished likelihood of confidence sharing or disclosure concerning the violence (see also Chapter 4).

### 3.1.2 FREQUENCY OF CONTACT WITHIN NETWORK

#### (i) Visits to Friends

Question 7(a) of the questionnaire asked the women:

"Last week, how often did you get together with your closest friends, by phone or in person?"

The results were compiled into two tables, the first reporting the number of visits by the respondents to friends (Table 5) and the second which reports the number of phone calls from the respondent to close friends (Table 6).

Cross tabulation of the number of visits made by all respondents (N=91) revealed that 31.9% made between one or two

visits to friends in a week (see Table 5), while 18.7% stated they had not made any visits to their friends. Non-abused respondents reported between three and five visits most often (84.6%), while abused women stated they had made six or more visits during the week (31.6%) indicating that higher levels of frequency of face to face interaction were reported by abused women, although they were only slightly more likely than the non-abused respondents to participate in this kind of interaction. A slightly positive relationship was indicated by the Somers' D explaining 3.9% of the variation.

(ii) Phone Calls to Friends

The cross tabulation of the number of phone calls (Table 6) revealed that all the respondents (N=91) made between one to two phone calls to their close friends in a week (31.9%). Just over one-quarter (26.4%) of the women reported six or more calls, while 19.8% of the women made no phone calls at all to their closest friends.

Proportionately "no phone calls" (88.9%) were reported more by the non-abused women while making one to two calls to their friends in a week (31%), typified the abused women.

Somers' D indicates only a very small positive association with .1% of the variation explained.

The results of Tables 5 and 6 were contrary to what was expected, that the abused women would exhibit less frequent contact with their friends indicating an isolating pattern by lack of contact, "being shut off" from their friends when compared with the non-abused women.

Instead, the abused respondents exhibited a pattern of more contact by phone and face-to-face interaction. However, this contrary finding may be due to the content of the question itself which asked the respondents to list the phone calls and visits to close friends for just the week prior to answering the questionnaire, and not a "typical" week; therefore, unaccounted for factors such as friends being on holiday or a heavy workload may have biased the results (see Chapter 4 for further discussion).

### 3.1.3 CONTENT OF THE SHARED INTERACTION

#### (i) Leisure Patterns

##### (i) (a) Shared Leisure Activities With Spouse

Question 1(a) of the questionnaire asked the respondents:

"Do you and your spouse share many leisure time activities?"

Cross tabulation of the results (see Table 7) revealed that of all respondents (N=94), 86.2% shared leisure activities with their spouses. A comparison of the abused women and non-abused women

reveals that not participating with their spouses in leisure activities was reported more by abused women (23.1%). A slightly positive association indicated by the Somers' D confirmed the greater likelihood of non-abused women to share leisure pursuits with their spouses, and for the proportionately decreased joint participation among the abused respondents explaining 4.5% of the variation between these variables ( $D=0.045$ ).

(i) (b) Leisure Participation Without Spouse

Question 1(b) asked respondents:

"Do you participate in any leisure activities without your spouse?"

Cross tabulation revealed that of all respondents ( $N=97$ ), 89.7% stated that they did participate in leisure activities without their spouses, while only 10.3% did not (see Table 8). A participation rate of slightly more (20.7%) was exhibited by the abused women, while not to participate without their spouses (80%) was more typical of the non-abused women. A slightly negative association is indicated by the Somers' D, explaining (.6%) of the variation.

When the respondents were asked to provide details concerning these leisure activities: "Typically, what sorts of things to you do?" The ninety-five (95) women who participated in leisure

activities without their spouses mentioned a rich variety of seventy-five (75) separate activities (at least two per person). For research purposes, these activities were sorted into four main categories: (1) sports, (2) hobbies/games, (3) social activities/outings, (4) volunteer work/clubs/school.

Cross tabulation (see Table 9) revealed that the category in which the largest number of all women participated was "sports" (37.5%), followed by "hobbies/games" (31.3%), "social activities/outings" (23.3%) and "volunteer work/clubs/school" (7.9%).

The most and least popular leisure activities for abused and non-abused women differed. The most frequently mentioned leisure activities for battered women were "social activities and outings" (32.1%), while "sports" were the least mentioned (17.7%). The non-abused respondents reported participation in "sports" most frequently (82.2%) and "social activities" were the least mentioned (67.9%). Perhaps this difference can be attributed to the nature of "social activities," which requires very little planning, expense or organization of schedules. The other categories of activities especially "sports" demands more control over finances, time, and people in comparison with social activities or outings. Somers' D indicates a positive association with 7.3% of the variation explained.

(i) (c) Leisure Companions Other than Spouses

The respondents were asked who they participated with:

"Who with? friend, immediate family member,  
relative, alone, or other."

either singly or in some combination of (see Table 10). Cross tabulation revealed that respondents (N=88) most often participated with a combination of "friend," or "family," or "alone," or "other" (65.9%). Of those participating with a friend, 84.6% were not battered and 15.4% were battered. Those participating with family were entirely non-abused women as well as those who engaged in solitary leisure habits (92.3%).

A slightly positive association is indicated by the Somers' D with 6.5% of the variation explained.

(i) (d) Frequency of Participation at Leisure with Someone  
Other than Spouse

The respondents were also asked:

"How often? rarely, occasionally, or regularly."

In other words, who did respondents join at leisure when not with their spouse.

Cross tabulation of the results (see Table 11) revealed that the respondents (N=86) "regularly" participated (68.6%), with less than five percent (4.7%) "rarely" participating in leisure

activities without their spouses. More "occasional" participation was reported by the abused women (87%) as well as "rarely" participating with those in their leisure networks (25%). Those who reported "occasional" participation, 13.0% were battered, while of those who "regularly" participated, 23.7% were battered compared to 76.3% who were not. This indicates that battered respondents were more likely than non-battered to be involved at leisure with a wide variety of people other than their spouse. A slightly positive association was indicated by the Somers' D for this variable explaining (7.7%) of the variation.

(i) (e) Frequency of Spouse's Leisure Participation Without Respondent

The final question concerning the leisure network asked:

"How often did the respondents' spouses participate in leisure activities without your spouse? rarely, occasionally, or regularly."

Eighty (N=80) respondents (see Table 12) stated that their spouses participated in leisure without them. Non-abused women reported that their spouses were slightly more likely to state that husbands participated without them "rarely" (84.6%) than "occasionally" or "regularly" (81.3%). By contrast, abused women were slightly more likely to state their husbands participated in

leisure without them "regularly" (18.8), rather than "occasionally" (17.6%) or "rarely" (15.4%).

Somers' D indicates a small positive association explaining 4.9% of the variation. This indicates that there is a tendency among both spouses of a non-violent couple to rely on other partners than the spouse for some of their leisure needs.

What the preceding results suggest concerning leisure patterns overall is that the non-abused respondents exhibit a rich and varied network of leisure pursuits both independently from and with their spouses, as well as with friends and family.

The battered women, however, exhibited a more individualized self-focused pattern to their leisure activities. They spent less time with their spouses in shared pursuits, had fewer persons in their network (especially family or relatives), and their husbands spent more time participating without them in comparison to the non-abused women--in short a pattern more indicative of an isolating network than of an integrating one.

These findings may partially explain the greater frequency of contact by abused women with their friends as well. The abused women ranked "social activities/outings" as their most frequently pursued leisure activity; and this necessarily requires contact with other persons, while "sports," the most frequently mentioned activity for non-abused women does not always involve others (e.g. aerobics), and this may account for the higher rates of contact for the abused respondents (see Chapter 4 for further discussion).

### 3.1.3 Sharing Confidences

#### (ii) (a) Propensity to Confide

The respondents (N=98) were asked in question 8:

"Do you ever confide in any of your friends?"

Cross tabulation of the answers revealed that fully 93.9% stated that they did confide in their friends, with only 6.1% claiming they did not (see Table 13). Of those women who confided 22.8% were abused and 77.2% were not, while those respondents who reported not confiding were entirely non-battered women.

Somers' D indicates a negative association with 22.8% of the variation explained.

#### (ii) (b) Frequency of Confidences

The respondents were then asked:

"How often?           regularly, occasionally, or rarely."

they confided in their friends. The results were compiled in Table 13. The cross tabulation showed most of the respondents were more likely to confide "occasionally" (47.3%) in their friends and only 2.2% responded that they "never" confided in their friends.

Of those women not confiding at all in friends, all of them (100%) were not battered. Among those who rarely confided in

friends, again, not battered women were more numerous (80%) than battered (20%). The tendency is, as we move toward "regularly" from "rarely" or "occasionally" confiding in friends is to find that battered women are more likely to increase, not-battered to decrease. This is consistent with the pattern of findings in the previous table (see Table 12).

Somers' D indicates a positive association with 10.3% of the variation explained by this arrangement of the variables.

(ii) (c) Topics Confided

Further details about the nature of the confidences to close friends were supplied by the women in response to "What kinds of things do you feel comfortable in confiding?" The answers were compiled in Table 14.

The respondents mentioned discussing topics that covered a wide array of subjects from the very general, "almost anything," to the specific, "politics" or "work/school" (see Table 15). The three most frequently mentioned topics overall were:

(1) "children"/"grandchildren" (16.0%), (2) "family concerns/ accomplishments" (13.1%), and (3) "beliefs/dreams/feelings" (12.0%).

When the abused women were analyzed separately, a different pattern emerged concerning their confidences to friends. Not only did this group of women mention overall fewer topics for discussion

(42 topics as compared to 133 for non-abused women) (see Table 15), but the three most frequently mentioned subjects differed as well.

Abused women did not report discussing with their friends "leisure/sports/travel," "future plans," "other friends," or "humorous incidents/anecdotes," unlike the non-abused women. The three most frequently mentioned subjects for battered women were: (1) "beliefs/dreams/feelings" (19.0%), (2) "children/grandchildren" (14.3%), and (3) "money" (11.9%). While for the non-abused women "children/grandchildren" (16.5%), "Family concerns and accomplishments" (14.3%) and "work/school (10.5%) were the three most frequently discussed topics.

(ii) (d) Topics not Confided

The respondents were further asked:

"What sorts of things are you not likely to confide?"

The results were compiled into Table 16.

Once more the topics discussed by the respondents covered a broad array, though not quite as broad as the confidences. Again, the subject matter ranged from the very general "family problems" to the specific such as "age." The three most frequently mentioned topics not confided to friends were: (1) "sexual matters/problems" (27.5%), (2) "money concerns" (18.3%), and (3) "innermost desires" (15.8%).

When taken into consideration separately, the abused women exhibited a slightly different pattern concerning what they would not confide in their friends. The subjects not discussed varied in number, with the abused women not mentioning "secrets," "gossip/complaints," "age," "unresolved disputes" and "religion." It is interesting to note that this group of women specifically stated that they did not mention "problems with their children" or "violence" to their friends, two topics not even mentioned by the non-abused women.

What is revealed in the preceding set of tables is that unlike the leisure network, the abused women do not appear to have a clear-cut, isolated pattern concerning confidences to friends in comparison with the non-abused women. In fact, this group of respondents were more likely to confide in their friends and to do so more often than the non-abused women. However, it was evident that a type of "screening" went on between the respondents and their friends concerning the nature of these confidences. As one of the abused women remarked ". . . in general, I will confide only what is flattering to me or my family, and not anything that is not." So despite an increased propensity to confidence, this "openness" may in reality be only at a superficial level and thus still present an isolating pattern in comparison with the non-abused women (see also Chapter 4).

### 3.1.3 CONTENT OF SHARED INTERACTION

#### (iii) Level of Agreement Between Spouses

##### (iii) (a) Index of Agreement for Everyday Issues

Respondents were asked in question 2(a):

"Please indicate the level of agreement between you and your spouse on the following items:

- (1) housework
- (2) family budget
- (3) children
- (4) pets
- (5) leisure time
- (6) family care
- (7) friendships with the opposite sex
- (8) church attendance
- (9) gifts
- (10) vacations
- (11) unfaithfulness
- (12) major holidays (e.g. Christmas)
- (13) in-laws
- (14) working wives
- (15) working mothers
- (16) sexual relations"

The respondents (N=92) indicated whether they and their spouses "strongly agreed" (5), "agreed" (4), "disagreed" (3), "strongly disagreed" (2), or were "undecided" (1) on each issue. A score was calculated by adding the respondents' answers and the results are reported in Table 17.

Cross tabulation reveals that the largest groups of all women exhibited neither a high level of agreement with their spouses (a score of 65 or more; 41.3%) nor a high level of disagreement (a

score below 33; 2.2%) but a moderate level of agreement (a score between 49-64; 52.2%).

Most of the respondents, both battered and non-battered tended toward agreement or strong agreement on a wide variety of the items which may from time to time cause some frustration. It is clear that some of the things which make a normal relation work (that is, similarity or harmony on a variety of issues) also are necessary in relation with violent interaction. Very few respondents fell into "disagree" or "strongly disagree" levels of interaction. The Somers' D was low ( $D=0.025$ ) showing little of the variation in responses explained by the variables.

(iii) (b) Presence of Arguing--Everyday Issues

The respondents (N=94) were asked in question 2(b) to provide details concerning any disagreements over the everyday issues listed in question 2(a):

"Do any of the above items lead to arguments between you and your spouse?"

Cross tabulation of the results reveals that 76.6% of the women stated that the items led to arguments and less than one-quarter reported that they did not (23.4%) (see Table 18). Of those respondents who reported that the items led to arguments 25% were abused, while only 4.5% of those responding that they did not lead to arguments were abused, compared with 95.5% of the

non-abused respondents. This illustrates a slightly higher likelihood for arguments between battered women and their spouses than among the non-abused respondents and their spouses.

Somers' D indicates a negative association between battering and arguments with 20.4% of the variation explained.

(iii) (c) Frequency of Arguing--Everyday Issues

Respondents were further asked:

"How often? rarely, occasionally, or regularly."

Frequency that the listed items provoked arguments with their spouses is provided in Table 19. Cross tabulation of the results showed that the women reported that "rarely" (43.7%) and "occasionally" (43.7%) and "regularly" (12.7%), did the everyday issues led to arguments. Of those who reported arguing "regularly," 22.2% were battered, and 77.8% were not. Proportionately more of the non-abused women claim to argue "regularly" than either "occasionally" or "rarely." Abused women were more likely to state they argued "occasionally" (29.0%) than either "rarely" or "regularly." A slightly positive association was indicated by the Somers' D, explaining just under three percent (2.7%) of the variation.

(iii) (d) Most Frequently Argued Everyday Issue

The final question concerning the everyday issues asked was open ended: "Which items lead to most arguments?" The results are shown in Table 20. The top three items provoking arguments were:

- "(1) housework and children (43.5%)
- (2) finances (20.3%)
- (3) leisure/pets; and in-laws at 13.0% each."

Of those women who reported arguing over "sexual behavior"; "finances" 33.3% and 28.6%, respectively were abused, and composed the two most frequently argued over issues for this group of respondents. By contrast, those who reported arguing about "leisure activities, pets and in-laws" were non-abused women (88.9% and 77.8% respectively) comprising the two most commonly argued over issues for this group of women. "Housework and kids" category accounted for 23.3% of the battered women and 76.7% of the non-battered making it the third most frequently argued issue for both groups of women. Somers' D indicates a very small positive association with .8% of the variation explained with this larger number of categories.

(iii) (e) Communication Pattern Between Spouses

Question 3, asked the respondents:

"For each of the statements below, please indicate the frequency (regularly, occasionally, rarely, or never) with which they occur in your relationship with your spouse?"

- (1) sharing of ideas
- (2) lots of discussion
- (3) lack of communication
- (4) bickering
- (5) loud arguing
- (6) physical violence"

to further indicate the level of agreement through an examination of the pattern of communication between the spouses. The results are compiled into Tables 21, 22, 23, 24, 25, and 26.

Cross tabulations of the results for all the respondents indicates that they "regularly" shared ideas (Table 21, 80.6%) and held discussions (22, 59.6%); there was "occasionally" a lack of communication (23, 54.3%) and bickering (24, 50%); there were "rarely" loud arguments (25, 53.2%), and for the most part there was "never" physical violence (26, 89.4%) between the couples.

Comparison between the two groups of women reveals a strikingly different pattern. Of those respondents who reported "occasionally sharing ideas," 80.0% were non-abused comprising the greatest proportion for this group, while those reporting "rarely" sharing ideas 66.7% of which were battered and accounted for the majority of abused women (Table 21). Occasional discussions were reported by 82.8% of the non-abused women, and only 17.2% of the battered respondents who most often reported "never" holding discussions with their spouses (see Table 22). "Rarely" experiencing a lack of communication accounted for 90.3% of the non-abused women and only 9.7% of the abused who more often

reported "regularly" (66.7%) not communicating (see Table 23). Of those reporting "rarely" bickering 80.0% were non-abused, comprising the largest proportion for this group while "regularly" bickering accounted for the majority of abused women (25%, see Table 24). Those who reported "never" arguing loudly with their spouses of whom 90.0% were not-battered women and only 10% were battered who reported "regularly" arguing loudly (40.0%, see Table 25). Finally, "never" experiencing physical violence accounted for 85.7% of the non-abused women, while "rarely" was more often reported by the battered women (85.7%, see Table 26).

Looking at patterns in the data across these six tables, battered women are most likely to "rarely" share ideas with their spouses while not-battered women are most likely to regularly share ideas with their spouses (see Table 21). Battered women are most likely to "never" or "rarely" have discussions with their spouses while not-battered women are most likely to "occasionally" or "regularly" have discussions with their spouses (see Table 22). Battered women are most likely to report experiencing lack of communication "regularly" and "occasionally" while not-battered women are most likely to report "rarely" or "never" experiencing lack of communication with their spouses (see Table 23). The tendency is for battered women to indicate a much greater communication problem in relating to their spouses than for not-battered women. Where communication is lacking or problematic

the chances for bickering or violent explosive speech to occur are higher.

Tables 24 and 25 indicate that battered women were careful about reporting bickering or loud arguments. However, no battered women reported "never" bickering while non-battered women did. The likelihood for battered women to report "regularly" or "occasionally" loud arguments is higher than "rarely" or "never." While not-battered women show the reverse tendency.

Somers' D indicated a positive association for sharing ideas and discussions, explaining 3.8% and 3.1% of the variation respectively (see Tables 21, 22); and a negative association for lack of communication (17.3% variation explained) (see Table 23); bickering (5.4% variation explained) (see Table 24); loud arguments (11.3% variation explained) and physical violence (53% of the variation explained) (see Tables 25-26).

(iii) (f) Index of Dependency

The final question used to determine level of agreement between spouses was question 11, which asked respondents:

"For each of the statements below, please indicate the frequency (regularly, occasionally, rarely, or never) with which they occur in your relationship with your spouse?

- (1) You depend on his choices for friends.
- (2) He objects to your time spent with friends.
- (3) You give up important activities to keep him happy.
- (4) He frequently checks up on you when you are away from the house.

- (5) You feel unable to make decisions unless he guides you.
- (6) He generally tells you what to do.
- (7) He gets angry if you ignore his advice.
- (8) You show fear when his impatience worsens.
- (9) He has excessive temper outbursts.
- (10) You question his judgement.
- (11) He has destroyed or injured many of your personal possessions.
- (12) You only keep things around that he chooses for you.
- (13) He is overly cruel or overly kind.
- (14) He questions your faithfulness to him."

The results were compiled into Tables 26 to 39. Overall, the respondents reported that "occasionally" they depended on their husbands' choices for friends (Table 26, 35.9%); "never" did the husbands object to time spent with friends (Table 27, 53.8%); they "rarely" gave up activities to keep their husbands happy (Table 28, 48.4%); the husbands "never" checked up on them (Table 29, 73.1%); "rarely" did they feel unable to make decisions without their husbands (Table 30, 46.2%) nor did the husbands tell them what to do (Table 31, 37.6%), nor did the husbands get angry if they ignored his advice (Table 32, 39.1%). The respondents "never" showed fear if the husbands' impatience worsened (Table 33, 77.4%), nor did the husbands have excessive temper outbursts (Table 34, 55.9%). "Rarely" did the women question their husbands' judgement (Table 35, 51.1%), and "never" had the husbands destroyed their personal possessions (Table 36, 94.6%), nor did the women keep only those things the husbands chose (Table 37, 79.6%), nor were the husbands overly cruel or kind (Table 38, 76.3%), nor did they question the respondents' faithfulness (Table 39, 90.3%).

Very different patterns emerged for the non-abused and abused women when they were analyzed separately. Of those women who "never" depended on their husbands' choices for friends 30.4% were battered, while those who "occasionally" did, 84.8% were not battered (see Table 26). Those women whose husbands "regularly" objected to their time spent with friends were comprised of 66.7% of abused women, while husbands who "never" objected were spouses predominately of non-abused women (84.0%, see Table 27). Women who "regularly gave up activities to please their spouses accounted for the largest proportion of battered women (50.0%) while those who "never" did this consisted mainly of non-abused respondents (86.4%, see Table 28). Those respondents who were "regularly" checked upon constituted the greatest proportion of battered women 66.7%, while women "never" checked up on comprised mainly of not battered (85.3%, see Table 29). Of those who reported "regularly" feeling unable to make decisions without their spouse 50% were battered, while those who "occasionally" felt this way 94.4% were not abused (see Table 30). Respondents who were "regularly" told what to do comprised the largest proportion of abused women, 66.7%, and those who "occasionally" experienced this were predominately non-abused (90.5%, see Table 31). Of those women whose spouses "regularly" got angry if they ignored advice given 66.7% were battered, and those whose husbands "rarely" behaved this way constituted the majority of not-abused (88.9%, see Table 32).

Respondents who reported "regularly" showing fear if their husbands' impatience worsened accounted for 50% of the abused women, while "never" feeling this consisted of 83.3% of not-abused women (see Table 33). Those whose husbands "regularly" had excessive temper outbursts were 66.7% battered, while those whose spouses "never" did this were overwhelmingly not-abused (90.4%, see Table 34). Of those who reported "regularly" questioning spouses' judgement, 40% were battered, while those who "never" questioned were 83.3% not-abused (see Table 35). Those women whose spouses had "regularly" destroyed their personal possessions, 100% were battered while those who had "never" experienced this 83.0% were not abused (see Table 36). Respondents who "occasionally" only kept things husbands chose were 100% not battered, while those who "rarely" did this 28.6% were abused (see Table 37). Of those respondents whose husbands were "regularly" overly cruel or kind 50% were abused while those whose spouses were "never" this way 87.3% were not abused (see Table 38). Those women who reported "regularly" being questioned concerning their faithfulness 100% were abused, while those only "occasionally" questioned 100% were not abused (see Table 39).

Somers' D indicated positive associations for--giving up activities to please the husband (see Table 28, 8.3% of variation explained):

- husband objecting to time spent with friends (see Table 27, 12.1% explained variation);

- husband checking up on the wife (see Table 29, 20.6% variation explained);
- husband telling the wife what to do (see Table 31, 1.6% explained variation);
- husband getting angry if his wife ignores his advice (see Table 32, 1.9% explained variation);
- wife's fear of husband if impatience worsens (see Table 39, 15.3% variation explained);
- husband having excessive temper outbursts (see Table 34, 25% variation explained);
- husband destroying wife's personal possessions (see Table 36, 62.5% variation explained); and
- husband overly cruel or kind (see Table 38, 30.5% variation explained).

Negative associations were indicated by the Somers' D between depending on husbands choice for:

- friends (see Table 26, 10.7% variation explained);
- feeling unable to make decisions without husband (see Table 30, 11.6% variation explained); and
- only having things around that husband chooses (see Table 37, .6% of the variation explained).

What emerges from this set of data is a striking contrast concerning level of agreement with spouses between the two groups of respondents. It was expected that the abused women would show an isolating pattern of a lower level of agreement with their spouses on everyday issues leading to greater conflict and arguments, and an increased pattern of destructive communication marked by a lack of shared ideas, discussions, communication, and

an increased presence of bickering, loud arguing and physical violence, while also exhibiting a pattern of high dependency on their husbands resulting in a subsequent loss of control over their own lives. This is to a great degree what the results bore out.

The abused women indicated that overall they tended to disagree with their spouses more on everyday issues. While this led to less arguments in comparison with the non-abused women, the pattern of communication between the abused respondent and her husband was clearly a destructive one marked by: a lack of idea sharing, discussion, and communication; and the occurrence of regular bickering, loud arguments, and some physical violence. This stands in contrast to the non-abused women who shared a higher level of agreement on everyday issues, and exhibited a constructive pattern of communication with their spouses.

Finally, the abused women also exhibited a pattern indicative of an unhealthy dependence on their husbands. Question 11 was designed to identify relationships in which there is either the potential for a traumatic bond to develop, or where it already exists. A pattern of answers which displays a majority of "regularly" answers indicates that a wife is experiencing an increased dependency on her spouse to the detriment of control over many facets of her own life and introducing a very real potential for abuse in the relationship. Conversely, a pattern of answers marked by a majority of "never" or "rarely" indicates a healthy

interdependence between husband and wife with little chance of violence to occur.

The abused respondents did display a pattern marked by a preponderance of "regularly" answers in sharp contrast to the non-abused women who displayed a pattern consisting mainly of "never" and clearly indicating that the abused women are experiencing a traumatic bond.

These data also suggest that the abused woman's relationship with her spouse is an uniquely isolating one--that is, there is a lack of constructive interaction between them, emotionally isolating them from each other while at the same time fostering a high state of dependency on the husband, and reinforcing the woman's isolation from friends and family (see also Chapter 4).

#### 3.1.4 ACCESS TO ECONOMIC RESOURCES

The following were used to measure the respondents' access to the household economic resources:

- " (i) employment of wife and husband
- (ii) combined family income
- (iii) who earns more
- (iv) who handles the family budget
- (v) who receives an allowance
- (vi) who calculates the income tax return"

(i) Employment Status

(i) (a) Respondents' Employment

Question 38(a) asked the respondents:

"Are you currently employed outside the home?

(if yes),

What is your occupation?"

Cross tabulation of the results (see Table 40) revealed that 52.5% of the respondents (N=99) were employed outside the home; 41.4% of the women were homemakers and 6.1% were either retired or students. Of those employed outside the home, 25.0% were abused, while those listing "homemaker" as a profession 17.1% were abused. A slightly negative association is indicated between battering and employment status, explaining only 1.8% of the variation.

(i) (b) Spouses' Employment

The respondents were asked to provide information about their spouses' employment status in question 38(b):

"Is your spouse currently employed?

(if yes)

What is his occupation?"

Cross tabulation of the results (see Table 41) indicated that the majority of all respondents' husbands (N=91) were currently

employed (73.6%), 7.7% were unemployed and 18.7% were either retired or students.

Of those whose husbands were students/retired, 94.1% were not abusers, only one (5.9%) was abusive. Most women's spouses (73.6%) were employed and of these 23.9% were abusers. Among the 7.7% who had unemployed husbands, a little over a quarter (28.6%) were abused. This is consistent with the literature associating increased likelihood of violence in situations of unemployment (see MacLeod, 1987, 1980).

A small positive association between battering and spouse's employment was indicated by the Somers' D explaining 14.7% of the variation.

(ii) Combined Family Income:

Question 39 asked respondents:

"What is your combined family income?"

Under \$10,000  
 \$11,000 - \$19,999  
 \$20,000 - \$29,999  
 \$30,000 - \$39,999  
 \$40,000 - \$49,999  
 \$50,000 - \$59,999  
 \$60,000 - \$69,999  
 \$70,000 - or over  
 Don't know"

Cross tabulation of the answers (see Table 42) reveals that of all the respondents (N=97), forty percent (40.2%), have a combined

family income of \$40,000 or more; 35.1% report an income of between \$20,000 and \$39,999, and less than one-quarter (20.6%) have an income of under \$20,000.

Those reporting an income in the highest bracket (\$40,000 +) were mostly not-battered (82.1%) but (17.9%) were. Households with a middle income (\$20,000 - \$39,999) had slightly over one-quarter of the wives abused (26.5%). Twenty percent (20.0%) of the lower income category (\$19,999 or less) were battered women. Generally income levels did not clearly differentiate the presence or absence of battering in this sample.

A negative association was indicated by the Somers' D explaining 5.2% of the variation.

(iii) Who Earns More

The respondents (N=90) were asked in question 40:

"Who earns more? You, Spouse, About equal, or Don't know."

to add a further dimension to the combined family income data. The results were cross tabulated and are reported in Table 43.

For all the women, 66.7% reported that their spouses earned more; 15.6% of the respondents earned more than their husbands; 14.4% claimed that the two incomes were "about equal," and only 2.2% of the women were not sure who earned more.

Of those whose spouse earned more than they did, eighteen percent (18.3%) were battered. This compares with twenty-one

percent (21.4%) who stated they earned more than their spouse. The highest likelihood of battering in the sample came for couples whose incomes were about equal (30.8%). Somers' D indicates a positive association between with 9.6% of the variation explained. This indicates the comparable size of incomes of spouses may be a more meaningful indicator of battering than the combined household income itself.

(iv) Access to Money

Question 41 asked the respondents:

"Do you have your own: --Checking account? Savings account?  
Credit cards?"

If you answer 'No' to any of the above, are they: --In both names? All in husband's name?"

The answers were compiled into two tables, 44 and 45.

Cross tabulation of all respondents (N=97) revealed that just under one-half (49.5%) had direct access to bank accounts (checking and savings) and credit cards in their own names (see Table 44). The next largest category of all women had their own bank accounts (28.9%), followed by 7.2% who had access only to credit cards in their own names. Of both groups of respondents, 14.4% of the women had neither their own bank accounts nor credit cards.

Those who reported having their own credit and bank accounts were more likely to be battered (29.2%), while those who had no

independent access to money were predominately not-abused (92.9%).

Somers' D indicates a positive association with 14.2% of the variation explained.

Table 45 shows that the most common source of alternative capital for the respondents (N=57) other than their own accounts is a joint bank account/credit card with their spouses (89.5%).

Those who reported either having no alternative capital or all in spouse's name tended to be non-abused women (100%), while those having alternative credit in husband's name were likely to be battered (33.3%). Somers' D indicates a slightly negative association with 1.8% of the variation explained.

(v) Allowance

The respondents (N=92) were asked in question 41:

"Do you receive an allowance from your husband for your personal expenses?"

The results were cross tabulated and are shown in Table 46.

Fully 82.6% of all the women did not receive an allowance from their husbands, while 15.2% stated they did.

Of those women who received an allowance, 78.6% were not-abused. This is very nearly the size of not-battered women not receiving an allowance. The likelihood of being battered and on an allowance was higher (21.4%) than being battered and not having an allowance (22.4%).

A slightly negative association is indicated for this variable by the Somers' D explaining four percent (4%) of the variation.

(vi) Family Budget

Question 42(b) asked the respondents:

"Who handles the family budget? You, Spouse, or Both."

The women (N=96) responded that either they (the respondents) did or they both shared handling of the family budget (44.8%, 44.8% respectively) (see Table 47). Less than ten percent (9.4%) reported that only the husband handled the family budget.

Of those who reported sharing the family budget, 83.7% were not-abused, 16.3% were abused. Those answering "she does" to the question had the highest likelihood of being battered over those who said "husband does" (22.2%) or "both do" (16.3%).

Somers' D indicates that the association is slightly negative with 8.7% of the variation explained.

(vii) Income Tax Calculation

The respondents were asked in question 42(c):

"Who calculates the income tax return? You, Spouse, or Both."

and the results are reported in Table 48.

Overall, the women (N=95) reported that they calculated the income tax return (31.6%) or their husbands did (28.4%).

Of those whose husbands calculated the tax return, 88.9% were not abused, 11.1% were. This traditional approach was not typical of those who answered "she does." These women were however more likely (30.0%) to be traditional (11.1%) to be battered, while in households where both spouses prepared the income tax or someone was paid to do it there was a lower but equal likelihood (20.0%) of being battered.

Somers' D indicates a slightly negative association with 4.1% of the variation explained.

It was expected that the abused women would exhibit an isolated pattern by a lack of access and control of the household finances and display the economic characteristics typical of the "average" battered women in Canada--an unemployed husband, low and/or unstable family income, who stays at home and has little knowledge or control over the finances (McLeod, 1987). A situation which acts as an effective mechanism to keep her in the abusive marriage.

Instead, the data suggest a different picture.

The abused women were more likely to be employed outside the home than non-abused, a surprising finding which may be at least partially explained by the larger number of abused women who are divorced in this sample (23.8%) and therefore do not have the option of choosing to stay at home, unlike the non-abused (1.3% are

divorced). However, working outside the home did not give the abused women a higher family income when compared with the non-abused women--(no doubt due to the higher rate of unemployed spouses of battered women), but it was not as low as generally given either, falling in a moderate range of \$20,000-\$39,999 per year.

A further unexpected finding was that having a separate bank account and credit cards far more often than not typified the abused women, as did not receiving an allowance from their husbands. Three factors may account for the contrary findings concerning access to economic resources: (1) earning a pay cheque gives the woman a "right" to manage at least some of the financial resources of the household, as evidenced by the larger numbers of abused women who work outside the home and handled the family budget and completed their tax return; (2) the larger numbers of divorced abused women compared with the non-abused women which leaves the battered women with no option but to do all their own financial management; and (3) the result of the abused women in the sample being younger (40-49, 33.3%) than the non-abused (60 or older, 31.3%) and thus they would also be less likely to be locked into a "traditional" style of money management in marriage--where the woman has limited access to the money.

So clearly, these data do not support an isolating economic pattern for the abused respondents as expected. It is instead surprisingly the non-abused women who exhibited the lack of access to the financial resources in this sample.

### 3.2 DISCUSSION OF THE TABLES

H1 When the network structure is isolated, the level of violence will be high.

It was expected that abused women would exhibit an isolated network in terms of (i) network size, (ii) frequency of contact, (iii) content of shared interaction, and (iv) access to economic resources. Instead, the support for hypothesis 1 was qualified, that is, the data neither fully supported nor totally rejected this hypothesis.

The results upheld the hypothesis in terms of: (i) network size (number of close friends, number of family members known by close friends); (ii) content of shared interaction (leisure patterns, level of agreement with spouse, nature of confidences to friends); (iv) access to economic resources (employment of spouse, combined family income), but did not support the hypothesis in terms of: (i) network size (number of relatives as close friends); (ii) frequency of contact within the network; (iii) content of shared interaction (number of confidences to friends and frequency of arguments); (iv) access to economic resources (employment of respondent, access to capital, handling of family budget, completion of tax return).

(i) Network Size

An isolating pattern in the interpersonal network of the abused women was indicated by the fewer number of close friends and the segregated structure of the network in terms of the lack of interrelatedness between family and friends which was not exhibited by the non-abused respondents. Although the abused women reported a larger number of relatives as friends, and this did not support the hypothesis, in fact, it still presented a more isolated content to the network for the abused women, precisely because family and friends were segregated. The two sets of friends, family members and close friends, were less likely to know each other, unlike in the non-abused woman's network and this isolates the woman by restricting the density of ties within the interpersonal network.

(ii) Frequency of Contact Within the Network

The data did not support the hypothesis in terms of either number of phone calls to friends or number of visits with friends. Contrary to what was expected, the abused respondents were in more frequent contact by both phone and face to face with their friends than the non-abused women. Two factors may account for this lack of support: (1) a bias introduced by the question wording, or (2) the failure of the variable to accurately reflect network structure.

As previously mentioned, a bias may have been introduced into the results by the question wording, which does not ask the respondent to record a typical week of contact with friends, but the week preceding the arrival of the questionnaire. The findings may have been influenced by an "atypical" week of contact for either or both groups of women, in which calls and visits were unusually high or low.

More importantly however, is that frequency of contact as measured strictly by the number of calls and visits to friends may not be an accurate indicator of an isolating pattern within the network. Frequent visits and phone calls to friends may not necessarily mean the abused women have a diversified interpersonal network of human resources to draw upon. As was shown by the data on the nature of confidences, the battered women were not discussing issues of major importance in their lives with these friends such as marital problems or more specifically violence at home. Contact in absolute numbers does not reveal the lack of intimacy and depth to these friendships reflected by the content of the confidences made by the abused women. Perhaps this shallowness in the level of the friendships requires more frequent contact to keep the relationships viable. Further, the generally poor level of communication and agreement between the abused woman and her husband may drive her to seek more frequent contact with those in her network who do not make conversation so painful.

(iii) Content of Shared Interaction Within the Network

(a) Leisure Patterns

The results did support hypothesis 1 in respect to leisure patterns. The abused respondents presented an isolated pattern to their leisure activities in comparison with the non-abused respondents. This group of women spent less time sharing leisure pursuits with their spouses, as well as with friends or family members; and their husbands more frequently participated without them. This directly contrasted with the non-abused respondents who had a more diverse friendship base to their leisure activities as well as increased shared leisure pursuits with their spouses and others on a more regular basis.

(b) Shared Confidences with Friends

Concerning shared confidences, the data did not support the expected findings for hypothesis 1. Instead, abused women were more, not less likely to share confidences with friends and to do so more often than non-abused women, rejecting an isolating pattern. However, a deeper examination of the content of these confidences presents a different picture, and sheds light on the contradictory findings.

Differences among the two groups of women indicated that not only did the abused women report discussing fewer topics with their

friends overall, but the content differed for the two groups as well. Missing from the abused women's conversations interestingly enough were confidences concerning long-range commitment and planning of one's life such as "travel/vacation plans" or "future plans" unlike the non-abused respondents, as well as any references to trouble in the marriage such as sexual problems or violence. The abused respondents appeared to erect a screen limiting the level of intimacy, sharing only what was not different about their lives.

When the segregated nature of the abused woman's network is kept in mind, that is, the lack of integration of family and close friends, clearly the woman is isolated from those who might offer a cohesive and unified base of support, by feeling unable to discuss her more serious problems with the small range of contacts within her network.

(iii) Level of Agreement with Spouse

The results on level of agreement with spouse supported hypothesis 1 in all but frequency of arguing.

The abused respondents indicated that they and their spouses disagreed much more over everyday issues than the non-abused women, and there was a destructive element to the pattern of communication between the respondent and her spouse. Yet, the abused respondents reported arguing less than the non-abused women, which suggests

that the frequency of arguments may be lower due to the generally lower level of communication between the spouses overall, whether arguments or discussions. Tied to this was a high level of dependence by the abused wife on her husband to the point of a loss of control over many simple decisions concerning her life, such as choosing possessions or spending time with friends, all indicative of the presence of a traumatic bond and an isolated pattern, and in direct contrast with the non-abused respondents.

(iv) Access to Economic Resources

Overall, the results from access to economic resources did not support the hypothesis for the most part and were instead contrary to the expected results, except for two findings--the slightly higher rate of unemployment for spouses of abused women and the slightly lower family income in comparison with the non-abused women. What the data indicated was that the abused respondents indicated a better level of access to, and knowledge of the family finances than did the non-abused women. It is likely that three interrelated demographic factors operated to influence these results: (1) the difference in age between the two groups of respondents; (2) the greater number of abused women employed outside the home compared with the non-abused women; and (3) the higher rate of divorce among the abused women when compared to non-abused respondents.

As previously mentioned, the non-abused women were on an average twenty years older than the abused respondents in this sample. This age gap undoubtedly accounts not only for the larger numbers of non-abused women not employed outside the home due strictly to retirement, but may also operate to maintain a more "traditional" approach to marriage and money management by the non-abused women where they stay at home and their husbands earn, control, and manage the finances. Intertwined with this is the greater number of abused women who were employed outside the home compared to the non-abused respondents who were more likely to be homemakers. Women who do work outside the home earn not only their own source of money, but also a greater say in the managing of the joint finances and this may partially explain the greater access and knowledge of the resources that the abused women reported. As mentioned, the higher divorce rate among abused women in the sample operated to increase access and knowledge of the economic resources simply because without a spouse there is no one else to share financial management with.

H2 When the network structure is ramified, there may be some violence.

In terms of this hypothesis, the interesting finding was that there seemed to be little support for it. Evidence of a ramified network was not really apparent for either group of respondents. Respondents displayed either characteristics indicative of an

integrated network or an isolated one and rarely anything in between. Even when displaying results contrary to the expected findings for H1 and H3, the respondents did not exhibit a ramified pattern but reported those traits typical of each other, suggesting that there is no such thing as "some violence" where violence and network structure are concerned. Violence either appears to be an absolute state; it is either present in the relationship or not, and this lack of middle ground precludes a ramified pattern to the women's network.

H3 When the network structure is integrated (closely knit), there will be no violence.

It was expected that the women who had not experienced violence would exhibit an integrated or diversified network in terms of (1) size, (2) frequency of contact, (3) content of the shared interaction, and (4) access to economic resources.

As in hypothesis 1, support was qualified, warranting neither total acceptance or rejection of this hypothesis. Support for the hypothesis was found in terms of (i) network size (number of close friends, number of family members as friends); (ii) content of shared interaction (leisure patterns, level of agreement with spouse [except frequency of arguments], nature of confidences); (iv) access to economic resources (employment of spouse, combined family income). A lack of support was indicated by the results from (i) network size (number of family members as friends;

- (ii) frequency of contact; (iii) content of shared interaction (number of confidences to friends, frequency of arguments);
- (iv) access to economic resources (employment of respondent, access to capital, handling of family budget, completion of tax return).

(i) Network Size

The data did support hypothesis 2 in terms of number of friends; the non-abused respondents had more close friends than the abused women, and these friends knew many of the women's family members, indicating a much higher degree of connectedness between friends and family, providing a more dense and diversified network of persons, despite the lower number of family members within it. This stands in direct contrast to the abused women's segregated and isolated network.

One possible explanation for the lower numbers of family as friends for the non-abused women may be the previously mentioned age gap between the respondents. Due to the twenty year age difference the non-abused women may have fewer family members still living, especially parents or older siblings in comparison with the younger battered women.

(ii) Frequency of Contact

Here as in hypothesis 1, the data did not support the expected findings. Instead, despite the more diversified and integrated

network, the non-abused women reported less contact by phone or face to face with their friends than the abused respondents. As mentioned in the discussion of hypothesis 1, the same two factors may have influenced the results: (1) the bias in the question wording eliciting responses not typical of the average week of contact, and (2) failure of the variable to accurately measure network structure because it does not take into account the deeper basis of the friendships, as witnessed by the more intimate confidences within it, and the better level of agreement and communication with their spouses exhibited by these respondents. Both of which may operate to reduce the necessity of frequent contact with the members in the network to keep the friendships viable.

(iii) Content of Shared Interaction

(a) Leisure Patterns

The data did support the hypothesis in terms of leisure patterns. The non-abused women exhibited both an integrated and diversified pattern to their leisure activities through more shared pursuits with their spouses and others in the network, and their spouses were less likely to participate without them which stands in direct contrast to the leisure patterns of the non-abused respondents.

(b) Shared Confidences with Friends

Concerning shared confidences, the data did not support hypothesis 3. Instead, the non-abused respondents were less likely to confide and to do so less often than the abused respondents. However, as discussed in hypothesis 1, this does not totally reject the hypothesis because of the content of the confidences shared with friends. The much broader array of topics discussed by the non-abused respondents revealed a greater depth of intimacy to their friendships in comparison with the non-abused respondents; and this, coupled with the much better level of agreement and communication generally with their spouses, provides a more "private" forum to discuss their concerns and worries and may account for the lower propensity to confide in friends.

(c) Level of Agreement with Spouse

The data on level of agreement with spouse support hypothesis 3 by indicating an integrated pattern for the non-abused women.

The non-abused respondents clearly had a much higher level of agreement on everyday issues. The pattern of communication between the spouses was indicative of constructive, cooperative communication, and not the destructive one of the abused women. The greater frequency of arguments reported by the non-abused respondents does not reject the hypothesis either, as they may be

simply the outcome of more communication between the spouses generally, increasing the chances of arguing. Further, as expected, the non-abused women showed a "normal" level of involvement emotionally and socially, and an interdependence with the spouses more typical of the integrated network, rather than extreme dependence exhibited by the abused respondents.

(iv) Access to Economic Resources

Overall, the findings in relation to access to economic resources did not support the hypothesis. Only the higher family income of the respondents when compared to the abused women was as expected.

This group of respondents instead displayed the characteristics expected to identify the abused women--lack of access to and knowledge of the family finances. The non-abused women were more likely to be employed outside the home and tended not to have access to their own sources of capital, such as bank accounts or credit cards. They were more likely to receive an allowance from their husbands and while the responsibility for the family budget was usually shared, the husband was more often in charge of the income tax return--a pattern indicative of a restricted access and control over the household finances and considered typical of the abused wife. Three factors previously mentioned in hypothesis 1: the age difference between the two

groups of respondents resulting in more non-abused women being retired and increasing the likelihood of the respondents displaying the "traditional" marriage roles, and the greater number of respondents who were still married and thus having the option of sharing the financial management in comparison with the abused respondents.

In summation, there was neither unqualified support for hypotheses 1 and 3 nor a total lack of it. Instead, the data seem to suggest a form of qualified support--abused women did indeed exhibit more of an isolated network as measured by network size, frequency of contact, content of shared interaction and economic access, than the non-abused respondents. However, overall it was not as clear-cut as expected for either group of women. Yet, there was little support for hypothesis 2, a ramified network either. When the respondents did not exhibit the expected findings, they did not display the ramified pattern either, but swung instead to the other end of the spectrum displaying the characteristics identified with the opposite group, and reflecting the absolute nature of violence in the network structure.

What is suggested by the results then is a modification of both the indices used to measure the network structure and of the hypotheses. Rather than rejecting the hypotheses outright, they should be modified and used as guiding orientations for further research.

## CHAPTER 3 ENDNOTES

<sup>1</sup>In several instances respondents remarked that a brother had helped them by taking them for medical help or in physically packing and leaving the house.

<sup>2</sup>"Sylvie's Story" produced in 1986 by the National Film Board on battering mentioned that the abused women either took a police escort or a brother back to collect their belongings from their house suggesting that the brother could be perceived as a source of protection for the women as well.

<sup>3</sup>The score was computed by adding the number of answers, for example:

|                |                        |
|----------------|------------------------|
| strongly agree | 6 x 5 = 30             |
| agree          | 4 x 4 = 16             |
| undecided      | 6 x 1 = 6              |
|                | <hr/>                  |
|                | 16            52 score |

## CHAPTER 4

## CONCLUSIONS AND DISCUSSION

4.1 CONCLUSIONS

The main conclusion to be drawn from this research is that comparison of a women's network structure to a large degree does indicate whether or not violence is present.

Those women who were abused in this study did exhibit a more attenuated pattern in their interpersonal network, in comparison with the non-abused respondents, who displayed a network structure comprised of diverse clusters of friends and family, which included their spouses. The contrast between the two groups of women's network structures was most evident in terms of network size (number of close friends and family considered close), content of shared interaction between friends and family (leisure patterns, nature of confidences, and level of agreement with spouse). In these areas, the findings were as expected--abused women by their fewer close friends and a lack of interrelatedness between family and friends did exhibit a smaller network than did the non-abused respondents. The restricted leisure pattern reported by the abused women, that is, fewer people in the network and less participation with them, the greater tendency not to participate without their husbands while the husbands participated without their spouses, was found to be typical of the abused respondents and not the

non-abused woman. The most clear-cut differences between the two groups of women appeared in the level of agreement with their spouses, where the abused women reported higher rates of disagreement over everyday issues, poor levels of communication, and a much greater dependency emotionally on their spouses, suggesting an isolated rather than integrated network, unlike the non-abused respondents who reported a good level of everyday agreement and communication and an interdependence with their spouse.

Interestingly, the non-abused women's better relationships with their spouses were paralleled by the comments they made in the questionnaire. This group remarked positively more often about their marriages. "I have been blessed with one of the most loving, respectful and caring men . . . "; "We have a very compatible, loving relationship," were comments typical of these women, while abused women tended to make remarks of a disparaging nature: "I'm all for a happy divorce . . ."; "He leads his life the way he wants . . . we are not compatible at all," were more typical in reference to their marriages.

The unexpected results obtained in network size (family as close friend), frequency of contact, content of shared interaction (number of confidences), level of agreement (frequency of arguments), and access to economic resources, should not be interpreted to mean that network structure was a poor indicator of conditions sponsoring the traumatic bond. For on closer

examination, we still see that the abused women displayed overall a foreshortened, isolating network, while the non-abused women did not.

A secondary conclusion may also be drawn about the results. It appeared that the level of violence, in the woman's marriage as posited in the hypotheses seemed to be less important. The presence or absence of violence determined whether or not a woman considered herself battered and not the degree of it. This was made clear by all the respondents who indicated that violence was an absolute state, perhaps only marginally dependent on the severity or frequency of the assaults. Non-abused respondents typically reported, "I told my husband very early in our relationship that I would leave him immediately if he ever struck me," illustrating that one occurrence of abuse would justify labelling oneself as abused and require taking appropriate actions to address this. Abused women all considered themselves a battered wife despite the range of severity of abuse reported, from strictly verbal abuse (taunts, name calling, belittling remarks but no physical assault)<sup>1</sup> to attacks resulting in major injuries (broken bones, cuts requiring stitches), and the frequency reported from a one-time occurrence to regular weekly assaults. To all the respondents, the presence of violence, even though only once, irrevocably changed their status from non-abused wife to abused wife, suggesting that at least for the woman, considering yourself abused does not require regular repeated physical assaults.

What may be concluded then on the basis of the results obtained in this study is that the structure of a married woman's network will provide fertile conditions for harbouring a traumatic bond if other things are present; for example, the tendency to conflict in daily living and not to communicate, "proneness" to possessiveness and dependency in the couple bond, and that once the traumatic bond is established between the spouses and violence occurs this permanently alters not only the marital relationship and the wife's perception of herself within it, but her ties to her friends and family as well.

## 4.2 DISCUSSION

The results from this study raised some interesting points worth discussing, aside from the hypotheses, most notably: (i) the unexpected results, (ii) the encouraging results--life after battering and general level of knowledge, and (iii) the implications of the results for future research.

### 4.2.1 CONTRARY FINDINGS

As previously mentioned, contrary findings concerning this network structure and violence appeared with regard to network size (number of family as close friends), frequency of contact, content of shared interaction (number of confidences), level of agreement (frequency of arguments), and access to economic resources. These

results were not only unexpected but seemed to contradict the current state of knowledge of wife battering and are, therefore, worth discussing.

The first set of contrary results concerning network size, contact, content, and frequency of arguing seemed to be interrelated. The larger number of abused women reporting family members as close friends compared to the non-abused respondents was surprising in light of the literature which states that this group regularly reports having little or no contact with family members for years (see Pagelow, 1984). Closer examination of the data revealed, however, that despite the larger number of family as friends, there was a disjunction between the battered women's friends and family. Moreover, despite professing more willingness to confide, the confidences were of a less intimate nature, creating a further isolating aspect to the social interplay.

The larger number of family members in the abused woman's network, seemed to tie her into a status quo in which tolerance of the husband's violence was given credit by her family viewing it as an idiosyncrasy. The husband was given idiosyncrasy credit when, in a different context he might have been abjured by caring friends, close to both members of the couple as individuals. The heavily family laden nature of the abused women's network is more likely to focus values on keeping the family whole than keeping the union "healthy." As witnessed by respondents' comments concerning advice from family members to her: "Keep your mouth shut and do as

your husband says." "Work harder at making the relationship work" (parents of respondents).

It is posited that the abused woman consciously adds to her own isolation, at least at first, in order to keep the violence hidden (Okun, 1986; Walker, 1979). In this study, the results suggest that the women did deliberately avoid the issue of abuse when confiding in friends; specifically stating that "violence in my home," "family problems" or "personal business between me and my spouse," were not discussed and family members and friends were kept segregated from each other perhaps to keep the violence undisclosed. However, by this the women have also aided in increasing the isolation already present in their network structure. Since neither family nor friends are told outright, at least at first, by the woman that she is being abused, they cannot help until much later. Even if they suspect, the two groups are not likely to be in contact with each other to confirm these suspicions.<sup>2</sup> Thus the woman and her spouse remain the only source of information concerning the state of the marriage, neither of which are likely to publicly disclose the existence of the violence. They remain instead co-conspirators, albeit for different reasons, bound together by their attempts to hide the existence of the traumatic bond.<sup>3</sup>

In this network situation, the abused women experience a double isolation while hiding it from friends and family. The women are also increasingly separating both physically and

emotionally from their spouses too. This group of women reported that not only were their spouses involved in leisure activities without them and therefore physically absent from the home in their free time, but emotionally the couple were absent from each other due to a poor level of agreement and communication, despite the greater day to day disagreements they argued less frequently simply because there was little direct communication left between them. When coupled with the isolation from friends, the wife both needs and yet has no others close enough to replace the "missing" spouse. This conduct appears to foster the increased emotional dependency on the spouse exhibited by the abused women.

The increased dependency may also arise from the husband deliberately attempting to sever the interpersonal ties within his wife's network (see Martin, 1983; Ganley and Harris, 1983; Walker, 1979).

It was certainly clear from what the abused women reported as provoking arguments that their spouses did not make it easy for them to maintain a viable integrated and independent network of friendships. Issues such as time spent with friends or in leisure pursuits led to more disagreement with their spouses than among the non-abused women. As well, the abused women reported that their spouses regularly checked up on them when they left the house, told them what to do, and were angry if their advice was ignored. None of which is conducive to maintaining a diversified or integrated network independent from the spouse so typical of the non-abused

respondents. Instead, the women were cut off from the resources which friends could have provided to help her, such as knowledge, or shelter. The abused respondent thereby experienced increasing dependency on her spouse in compensation for this lack, forcing a reliance on the single bond to her husband, and perhaps making her more willing to tolerate the abusive relationship.

The second major set of contrary findings which dealt with access to economic resources were startling. They contradicted the current knowledge concerning battered wives and economic isolation, stating that there is (1) a lack of money for her personal use, (2) a lack of access to joint resources, and (3) a lack of knowledge of the financial affairs of the household which severely curtails any attempts on the woman's part to leave the abusive relationship (Okun, 1986). In fact, it would be hard to overestimate the importance that the literature has placed on economic factors in explaining battering and why women stay in violent marriages. The literature points out that most battered women are so economically isolated they have no choice but to stay. However, in the present research, the abused women indicated exactly the opposite. They had access to financial resources through (1) their own paycheck, (2) their own bank accounts and credit cards, (3) knowledge--they handled the family budget and did the income tax return. So in fact, the majority of the women in this sample had the economic option to leave the relationship. Comments such as, "There is always money for whatever I want or need"; "I am the

breadwinner . . . he doesn't have any money"; "I control all the money for home and business," were indicative of the abused women's access to the monetary resources, rather than a lack of it.

Perhaps the best explanation for these findings is not that they invalidate the current knowledge, or that they result from errors in this study, but that they (1) demonstrate the great gaps in knowledge about this issue--the lack of information concerning those women who have not come in contact with shelters or social agencies and do not fit the stereotypical economic profile currently given; and (2) undoubtedly economic isolation plays an important role in keeping women in battering relationships, but the emphasis placed may not be warranted to the extent that it currently receives, that it excludes other factors, such as the isolation in the structure and content of the women's interpersonal network indicated in this research in explaining why women endure violent relationships.

#### 4.2.2 Encouraging Results

##### (i) Life After Battering

The first encouraging aspect about this research was the number of women who had ended the abuse and had either gone on to happier second marriages or relationships, or sought help for the violence and ended the abuse. Comments such as "I'm doing fine now. Not all men are rotten"; ". . . in a very happy second

marriage," and "It paid to stick it out . . . had I left him during the rough times, I would have given up a great husband," indicated that there was hope for these women whether they chose to end the relationship or stay, as long as the issue of the abuse was disclosed and dealt with.

Whether the abused women sought professional help (e.g. psychologists, doctors, or lawyers) or non-professional help (family/friends) in response to the abuse, the main hurdle to overcome appeared to be her perception of herself. Comments such as "self-acceptance must be learned"; "I stood up for myself;" ". . . must develop high self-esteem," typically reflected the self-exploration commented on by these women. Nearly all respondents echoed the sentiments of this woman: "If someone was ever to abuse me again in any way . . . I would not give it a second thought to leave him," suggesting that these women had won a hard fought battle for control over their lives and improving the relationship and making them no longer willing to tolerate the abusive behaviour.

The women who sought help for the marriage reported that they received a bewildering array of advice to deal with the violence, ranging from the "professionals" who advised anything from "get rid of your rage towards your parents" (psychiatrist), or "be more humble and accept your lot in life" (family doctor), to "divorce him immediately or separate and seek counselling" (lawyer). Family comments ranged from a "disinterested," "you'll be all right," to

"leave him immediately." It is encouraging that despite the broad range of advice and their isolated network, the abused women were able to take charge and terminate the violent bond, and begin constructing new ones not part of the earlier patterns, and forging a life after battering.

The second encouraging aspect of the research was the high overall knowledge concerning wife abuse among the respondents. No doubt this was due in part to the large numbers of respondents who indicated knowing an abused wife personally, most often as a friend. Overwhelmingly, the respondents knew that wife abuse was no longer legal; that it was not a rare or unusual occurrence; and that the common stereotypes no longer applied, that is, that battering was not the act of a mentally ill husband or that women like the abuse. Instead, the respondents indicated a good level of knowledge--answering that battered women stayed because they often lacked both the emotional and economic resources to do otherwise, and recommended that the women seek professional help first to stop the violence and if this doesn't improve the situation, then to leave the relationship rather than accept the abuse.

The respondents also called for more research in this area and increased help for the battered wife. "Through studies like these, more and more people will come to realize the seriousness and frequency of wife abuse . . . our lawmakers and our judges must get off their [behinds] and deal with this matter seriously," and "push the government into setting up more facilities to help women

in these situations by letting the statistics be known." These sentiments were echoed by both the abused and the non-abused respondents. All of this, coupled with the generally good level of knowledge of the issue, indicates an encouraging trend away from ignorance of the issue or blaming the women for the abuse towards understanding why it occurs and how to prevent it.

#### 4.2.3 IMPLICATIONS FOR FUTURE RESEARCH

What is clearly suggested by the findings from this research is the great need for further research into the area of battered wives, specifically, and the role of isolation and the interpersonal network, particularly. Although the focus of research has begun to shift away from strictly documenting incidence and prevalence of abuse, and as a result, more attention is being paid to other factors in an attempt to understand the problem. However, more emphasis should also be placed on research using "non-traditional" variables which examine the process and dynamics of the violent relationship itself, such as the factors brought forth in this study, concerning not only the structure of the woman's network but the content as well.

This need for further research becomes obvious when the unexpected results from this study are analyzed, especially those concerning economic access. The results of this study suggest that the abused respondents did have the economic flexibility to leave

the marriage and end the abuse but many did not, choosing to stay and enduring years of violence instead. What this indicates is that other factors also operate in conjunction with the strictly economic one to keep women in these violent marriages for so long. Factors such as the ones examined in this research--the isolation from spouse and all but a handful of family and friends, which results in cutting the woman off from interpersonal resources which might have been mobilized to come to her aid.

Future research should then be addressed to studying the patterns of interaction which facilitate this tolerance of the traumatic bond and its accompanying violence rather than reconstructive social activity within the spousal bond.

### Methodological Problems

The first problem faced in this study was the difficulty of locating support. The research milieu of known groups, such as women in shelters or counselling groups, preferred to closet the women rather than expose them to social research, stating that the women needed more government aid and not more "university students peering at them through a microscope"; therefore, this avenue of research offered very little help beyond allowing the researcher to keep copies of the pamphlets they distribute to the general public on wife battering.

Secondly, scholarly information on the topic was hard to find, requiring initially "detective" skills to even locate where to begin to look. Sociological data were found under a variety of headings, ranging from victims, criminology, deviance, women's studies, marriage, mental illness, Canadian law, medicine, and violence. This fragmentation began to change over the course of this research as new data falling under the topic heading "wife abuse" gradually came together. Yet, opinions remain divided over where exactly wife battering fits in the literature and this no doubt seriously hampers both theoretical and empirical research.

The third problem faced was the overall lack of both theoretical and empirical work, especially on isolation and the interpersonal network, which ruled out replicating a study. Although many authors mentioned isolation as a common thread uniting battered women, little attention had been focussed on it outside of the transition houses' records, which were not open to the public scrutiny.

A fourth problem involved the research design. As mentioned, a replication of previous work was not possible so a random sample design was chosen because: (1) it was felt that a random sample might provide some knowledge on the women in general rather than on those who become a "statistic" in government reports. At first, a telephone interview was proposed but was not approved by the University Ethics Committee as too many specious callers had made that kind of research taboo in 1986-87. The study was then

redesigned to accommodate a self-administered questionnaire. As a result of the new research design, certain biases may have been introduced by the initial telephone contact with each person selected as ethics procedures necessitated warning the potential respondent of the sensitive nature of the material contained in the questionnaire. This contact may have introduced some bias by selecting out those serious about the topic and motivating them to do the questionnaire. As well, an unanticipated effect of history was introduced near the beginning of the mailing of the questionnaire when the federal government released its latest report on wife battering which received considerable media attention.

The most serious tactical problem faced in the research was the mail strike in the summer of 1987. This occurred in the middle of the mailing out of the questionnaires, and due to time and money constraints, and concerns about anonymity and confidentiality, the respondents were urged to still return their questionnaires by mail. No doubt the mail strike influenced the return rate and lowered the sample size; nevertheless, the return was still good, with nearly double the rate of abused women in the sample than the expected norm.

CHAPTER 4 ENDNOTES

<sup>1</sup>The one woman reporting only verbal abuse clearly illustrated the damaging aspect of it despite its lack of physical "scars." As she stated, the constant abuse reduced her almost to a state of speechlessness "when trying to say a sentence of any kind I felt so pressured that I would forget words."

<sup>2</sup>Even when it would seem to be obvious, as in seeking medical attention for injuries sustained, some women reported continuing to deny the existence of the violence: "I tripped over a speed bump" one respondent told her father to explain a broken collar bone.

<sup>3</sup>The wife in order to avoid the shame and guilt too often leveled at those who admit to being battered, and the husband to avoid the negative assessment of his behaviour which may result in his wife ending the relationship (see Dobash, Dobash and Cavanaugh, 1984; Dobash and Dobash, 1979; Walker, 1979; Serum, 1979).

REFERENCES

- Babbie, E. R.  
1979           The Practise of Social Research. California:  
Wadsworth.
- Barnsley, J.  
1980           Battered and Blamed. Vancouver: Women's Research  
Centre and Transition House.
- 1985           Feminist Action, Institutional Reaction: Responses  
to Wife Assault. Vancouver: Women's Research  
Centre.
- Bailey, K. D.  
1978           Methods of Social Research. New York: The Free  
Press
- Barry, K.  
1981           Female Sexual Slavery. New York: Avon Books.
- Becker, H.  
1966           Outsiders: Studies in the Sociology of Deviance.  
Toronto: Free Press.
- Berger, P. and H. Kellner  
1974           "Marriage and the Construction of Reality."  
Readings in Sociology. New York: Basic Books.
- Beyer-Gammon, M.  
1978           Violence in Canada. Agincourt: Methuen Press.
- Blumstein, P. and P. Schwartz  
1985           American Couples. New York: Simon and Schuster.
- Book of Common Prayer.  
1955           The Church of England. Toronto: Oxford University  
Press.
- Bott, E.  
1957           Family and Social Network. London: Tavistock.
- Boulding, E.  
1981           The Place of the Family in Times of Social  
Transition: Imaging a Familial Future. Vancouver:  
University of British Columbia.
- Carlson, B.  
1980           "Battered Women and Their Assailants." Violence  
Against Wives. New York: Free Press.

- Carlson, B. E.  
1977 "Battered Women and their Assailants." *Social Work* 22(6), 445-460.
- Chan, K. B.  
1977 "Intra-familial Violence: Myth-making versus Theory Building. Paper presented at C.S.A.A. meeting June in New Brunswick.
- Chandler, D. B.  
1973 "Towards a Classification of Violence." *Social Symposium No. 9*, pp. 69-83.
- Cohen, A. K. "Crime and Juvenile Delinquency." *Contemporary Social Problems*. 3rd Edition. New York: Harcourt Brace Jovanich.
- Cramer, M. H.  
1980 "Public and Political: Documents of the Women's Suffrage Campaign in B.C." *In Her Own Right*. Victoria: Camosun College Press.
- Davidson, T.  
1977 *Conjugal Crime*. New York: Hawthorne Books.
- Dietz, M. L.  
1978 "The Violent Subculture: The Genesis of Violence." *Violence in Canada*. Methuen: Toronto.
- Dobash, E. and R. E. Dobash  
1979 "Wives the Appropriate Victims of Marital Violence." *Victimology* 2(3,4).
- 1984 "The Contact Between Battered Women and the Social and Medical Agencies." *Private Violence and Public Policy*. London: Routledge & Kegan.  
  
*Violence Against Wives*. New York: Free Press.
- Dobash, E., E. Dobash and J. Cavanaugh  
1984 "The Nature and Antecedents of Violent Events." *British Journal of Criminology* 3:July.
- Domenach, J.  
1981 *Violence and its Causes*. Paris: UNESCO
- Douglas, J. D.  
1973 *The Social Meanings of Suicide*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

- Eisenberg, S. and J. Micklow  
1977 "The Assaulted Wife: Catch 22 Revisited." Women's Law Reporter 3, 3-4. pp. 38-61.
- Ellis D.  
1982 Panel Presentation to Conference on Men who Batter. Vancouver: Women's Research Centre.
- Flynn, J. P.  
1980 "Recent Findings Related to Wife Abuse." Social Casework, 58:1.
- Freeman, J. ed.  
1976 Women: A Feminist Perspective. Palo Alto, California: Mayfield.
- Garfinkel, H.  
1967 Studies in Ethnomethodology. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- Gaipa, J.  
1986 "Developing, Maintaining and Severing Relationships: A Processual Perspective." Paper presented at Qualitative Research Conference: Ethnographic Research. Waterloo: University of Waterloo May 13-16.
- Ganley, A. and L. Harris  
1978 "Domestic Violence: Issues in Designing and Implementing Programs for Batterers." Paper presented to the American Psychiatric Association.
- Gauquin, D.  
1977 "Spouse Abuse: Data from the U.S. National Crime Survey." Victimology 2(3,4):632-643.
- Gayford, J.  
1975 "Wife Battering: A Preliminary Survey of 100 Cases." British Medical Journal 1:194-197.
- Gelles, R. J. (ed.)  
1983 The Dark Side of Families: Current Family violence Research. Beverly Hills: Sage.
- Goode, W. J.  
1971 "Force and Violence in the Family." Journal of Marriage and the Family, 33, Nov. 624-636.
- Gruberman, B. and C. Wolfe  
1985 No Safe Place. Toronto: Women's Press.

- Hilberman, E., and Munson, L.  
1978 "60 Battered Women" prepared for American  
Psychiatric Association meetings. Toronto,  
Ontario, May 1977.
- Hofellor, K. H.  
1982 Social Psychological and Situational Factors in Wife  
Abuse. Palo Alto: R & E Research Associates.
- Holy Bible  
1952 Revised Standard Edition. New York: Nelson & Sons.
- Horowitz, R. and G. Schwartz  
1974 Honor, Normative Ambiguity and Violence.  
American Sociological Review 39:238-251.
- Loether, H. and H. McTavish  
1974 Inferential Statistics for Sociologists. Boston:  
Allyn Bacon.
- 1976 Descriptive and Inferential Statistics for  
Sociologists. Boston: Allyn Bacon.
- McLeod, L.  
1980 Wife Battering in Canada: The Vicious Circle.  
Ottawa: Social Services.
- 1987 Battered But Not Beaten. Ottawa: The Canadian  
Advisory Council Status of Women.
- Martin, D.  
1976 Battered Wives. San Francisco: Glide Publishers.
- O'Brien, J.  
1971 "Violence in Divorce-prone Families." Journal of  
Marriage and the Family 33:692-698.
- O'Faolain, J. and Martines, L. (eds.)  
1974 Not in God's Image. New York: Harper & Row.
- Okun, L.  
1986 Women Abuse: Facts Replacing Myths. Albany: State  
University of New York Press.
- Pagelow, M. D.  
1981 Women-Battering. Beverly Hills: Sage.
- Pahl, J.  
1979 "The General Practitioner and the Problems of  
Battered Women." Journal of Medical Ethics, 5.

- Parsons, T. and R. F. Bales  
1955 Family, Socialization and Interaction Process. Illinois: The Free Press.
- Pressman, B.  
1984 Family Violence: Origins and Treatment. Guelph: Office of Educational Practices.
- Prus, R. C.  
1978 "Barrooms to Bedrooms: Towards a Theory of Interpersonal Violence." Violence in Canada. Agincourt: Methuen.
- Rosenburg, M.  
1968 The Logic of Survey Analysis. New York: Basic Books.
- Roy, M.  
1982 The Abusive Partner: An Analysis of Domestic Battering. New York: Van Nostrand Reinhold.
- Schechter, S.  
1982 Women and Male Violence: The Visions and Struggles of the Women's Movement. Boston: South End Press.
- Serum, C.  
1979 "Battered Women and Batterers." Paper presented at Eastern Michigan University.
- Simmel, G.  
1955 Conflict. Illinois: Free Press.  
  
The Web of Group Affiliations. Illinois: The Free Press.
- Stark, E., A. Flitcraft and W. Frazier  
1979 "Medicine and Patriarchal Violence: The Social Construction of a Private Event." International Journal of Health Sciences 9.
- Statistics Canada  
1985 Female Victims of Crime. Canadian Urban Victimization Survey. Ottawa: Ministry of Solicitor General.
- Steinmetz, S.  
1977 "The Use of Force for Resolving Family Conflict." The Family Coordinator 26(1).

- 1977 "The Battered Husband Syndrome." *Victimology* 2(3,4).
- Steinmetz, S. and M. Straus  
1974 *Violence in the Family*. New York: Dodd Mead.
- Straus, M. (ed.)  
1976 "Sexual Inequality, Cultural Norms, and Wife Beating." *Victimology* 2(1):54-70.
- 1980 *The Social Causes of Husband and Wife Violence*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota.
- Straus, M. and J. Flynn  
1980 "Social Structure of Violence in Childhood and Approval of Violence as an Adult." *Aggressive Behavior* 1(3):193-211.
- Straus, M. and R. J. Gelles  
1979 *Behind Closed Doors: Violence in the American Family*. New York: Doubleday/Anchor.
- Sudman, S.  
1976 *Applied Sampling*. New York: Academic Press.
- Sutherland, E., Cressey, D. R.  
1970 *Criminology*, 3th Edition. Philadelphia: J. B. Lippincott.
- Task Force on Violence  
1979 *Family Violence*. Vancouver: United Way.
- Walker, L. E.  
1979 *The Battered Woman*. New York: Harper & Row.
- 1984 *The Battered Woman Syndrome*. New York: Springer.
- Wellman, B.  
1979 "The Community Question: The Intimate Networks of East Yorkers." *American Journal of Sociology* 84(5).
- Whitehurst, R.  
1974 *Violence in Husband-Wife Interaction*. New York: Harper & Row.
- Wolfgang, M. E., & Ferracuti F.  
1967 *The Subculture of Violence*. New York: Barnes & Noble.

Table 1

## CROSS TABULATION OF NUMBER OF CLOSE FRIENDS

| <u>Violence</u> | <u>Number of Close Friends</u> |            |                  | <u>Total</u> |
|-----------------|--------------------------------|------------|------------------|--------------|
|                 | <u>1-2</u>                     | <u>3-5</u> | <u>6 or more</u> |              |
| Not Battered    | 4<br>57.1%                     | 35<br>72.9 | 39<br>88.6       | 78           |
| Yes Battered    | 3<br>42.9%                     | 13<br>27.1 | 5<br>11.4        | 21           |
| Total           | 7<br>7.1%                      | 48<br>48.5 | 44<br>44.4       | 99<br>100.0  |

|           | <u>Symmetric</u> | <u>With Battered<br/>Dependent</u> | <u>With Close<br/>Friends<br/>Dependent</u> |
|-----------|------------------|------------------------------------|---|
| Somers' D | -0.219           | -0.174                             | -0.294                                      |

Number of missing observations = 12

---

Table 2

CROSS TABULATION OF FAMILY MEMBERS  
WHO ARE CONSIDERED CLOSE FRIENDS

| <u>Violence</u> | <u>Number of Family Members</u> |                                    |  |                    | <u>Total</u> |
|-----------------|---------------------------------|------------------------------------|--|--------------------|--------------|
|                 | <u>None</u><br>0                | <u>A Few</u><br>1-2                | <u>Many</u><br>3-5                             | <u>A Lot</u><br>6+ |              |
| Not<br>Battered | 17<br>81.0%                     | 48<br>78.7                         | 8<br>80.0                                      | 5<br>71.4          | 78           |
| Yes<br>Battered | 4<br>19.0%                      | 13<br>21.3                         | 2<br>20.0                                      | 2<br>28.6          | 21           |
| <hr/>           |                                 |                                    |  |                    |              |
| Total           | 21<br>21.2%                     | 61<br>61.6                         | 10<br>10.1                                     | 7<br>7.1           | 99<br>100.0  |
| <hr/>           |                                 |                                    |  |                    |              |
|                 | <u>Symmetric</u>                | <u>With Battered<br/>Dependent</u> | <u>With Relative/<br/>Friend<br/>Dependent</u> |                    |              |
| Somers' D       | 0.033                           | 0.026                              | 0.045  |                    |              |

Number of missing observations = 12

---

Table 3

## CROSS TABULATION OF RELATIONSHIP OF FAMILY MEMBER TO RESPONDENTS

| Relation to Respondent     | All Respondents |       | Abused Respondents |       | Non-Abused Respondents |       |
|----------------------------|-----------------|-------|--------------------|-------|------------------------|-------|
|                            | Mentions        | %     | Mentions           | %     | Mentions               | %     |
| <u>Females</u>             |                 |       |                    |       |                        |       |
| Aunt                       | 1               | .6    | --                 | --    | 1                      | .8    |
| Daughter                   | 18              | 10.8  | 6                  | 16.6  | 12                     | 9.2   |
| Daughter-in-law            | 3               | 1.8   | --                 | --    | 3                      | 2.3   |
| Daughter-in-law's mother   | 1               | .6    | --                 | --    | 1                      | .8    |
| Grandmother                | 2               | 1.2   | --                 | --    | 2                      | 1.5   |
| Mother                     | 22              | 13.2  | 4                  | 11.1  | 18                     | 13.8  |
| Niece                      | 3               | 1.8   | 1                  | 2.8   | 2                      | 1.5   |
| Niece-in-law               | 1               | .6    | --                 | --    | 1                      | .8    |
| Sister                     | 39              | 23.3  | 7                  | 19.4  | 32                     | 24.6  |
| Sister-in-law              | 14              | 8.4   | 2                  | 5.5   | 12                     | 9.2   |
| Mother-in-law              | 3               | 1.8   | 1                  | 2.8   | 2                      | 1.5   |
| Step daughter              | 1               | .6    | --                 | --    | 1                      | .8    |
| Subtotal                   | 108             | 67.7  | 21                 | 58.3  | 86                     | 66.1  |
| <u>Males</u>               |                 |       |                    |       |                        |       |
| Brother                    | 13              | 7.8   | 5                  | 13.8  | 8                      | 6.2   |
| Brother-in-law             | 3               | 1.8   | --                 | --    | 3                      | 2.3   |
| Father                     | 4               | 2.4   | 1                  | 2.8   | 3                      | 2.3   |
| Father-in-law              | 1               | .6    | --                 | --    | 1                      | .8    |
| Husband                    | 13              | 7.8   | 2                  | 5.5   | 11                     | 8.5   |
| Nephew                     | 3               | 1.8   | 1                  | 2.8   | 2                      | 1.5   |
| Son                        | 10              | 6.0   | 3                  | 8.3   | 7                      | 5.4   |
| Son-in-law                 | 1               | .6    | 1                  | 2.8   | --                     | --    |
| Uncle                      | 1               | .6    | --                 | --    | 1                      | .8    |
| Subtotal                   | 49              | 29.4  | 13                 | 36.1  | 36                     | 27.7  |
| <u>Unidentified Gender</u> |                 |       |                    |       |                        |       |
| Children                   | 1               | .6    | --                 | --    | 1                      | .8    |
| Grandchildren              | 1               | .6    | --                 | --    | 1                      | .8    |
| Cousin                     | 7               | 4.2   | 2                  | 5.5   | 5                      | 3.8   |
| Lover                      | 1               | .6    | --                 | --    | 1                      | .7    |
| Subtotal                   | 10              | 6.0   | 2                  | 5.5   | 8                      | 5.9   |
| TOTAL                      | 167             | 100.0 | 36                 | 100.0 | 130                    | 100.0 |

Table 4

## CROSS TABULATION OF FAMILY CLAIMED AS CLOSE FRIENDS

| <u>Violence</u> | <u>Number of Family Cited as Close Friends</u> |                          |                      |                    | <u>Total</u> |
|-----------------|--|--------------------------|----------------------|--------------------|--------------|
|                 | <u>None</u><br>(0)                             | <u>Very Few</u><br>(1-2) | <u>Many</u><br>(3-4) | <u>A Lot</u><br>5+ |              |
| Not Battered    | 1<br>50.0%                                     | 16<br>84.2               | 25<br>89.3           | 35<br>72.9         | 77           |
| Yes Battered    | 1<br>50.0%                                     | 3<br>15.8                | 3<br>10.7            | 13<br>27.1         | 20           |
| Total           | 2<br>2.1%                                      | 19<br>19.6               | 28<br>28.9           | 48<br>49.5         | 97<br>100.0  |

|           | <u>Symmetric</u> | <u>With Battered</u><br><u>Dependent</u> | <u>With Number of</u><br><u>Close Friends</u><br><u>Dependent</u> |
|-----------|------------------|--|---|
| Somers' D | 0.105            | 0.080                                    | 0.155   |

Number of missing observations = 14

---

Table 5

CROSS TABULATION OF NUMBER OF VISITS  
RESPONDENTS MADE TO FRIENDS

| <u>Violence</u> | <u>Number of Visits</u> |            |            |                  | <u>Total</u> |
|-----------------|-------------------------|------------|------------|------------------|--------------|
|                 | <u>0</u>                | <u>1-2</u> | <u>3-5</u> | <u>6 or more</u> |              |
| Not Battered    | 14<br>82.4%             | 22<br>75.9 | 22<br>84.6 | 13<br>68.4       | 71           |
| Yes Battered    | 3<br>17.6%              | 7<br>24.1  | 4<br>15.4  | 6<br>31.6        | 20           |
| <hr/>           |                         |            |            |                  |              |
| Total           | 17<br>18.7%             | 29<br>31.9 | 26<br>28.6 | 19<br>20.9       | 91<br>100.0  |

|           | <u>Symmetric</u> | <u>With Battered<br/>Dependent</u> | <u>With Number of<br/>Visits Dependent</u> |
|-----------|------------------|------------------------------------|--|
| Somers' D | 0.054            | 0.039                              | 0.085                                      |

Number of missing observations = 20

---

Table 6

## CROSS TABULATION OF NUMBER OF PHONE CALLS TO FRIENDS

Number of Phone Calls

| <u>Violence</u> | <u>0</u>    | <u>1-2</u> | <u>3-5</u> | <u>6+</u>  | <u>Total</u> |
|-----------------|-------------|------------|------------|------------|--------------|
| Not Battered    | 16<br>88.9% | 20<br>69.0 | 15<br>75.0 | 20<br>83.3 | 71           |
| Yes Battered    | 2<br>11.1%  | 9<br>31.0  | 5<br>25.0  | 4<br>16.7  | 20           |
| <hr/>           |             |            |            |            |              |
| Total           | 18<br>19.8% | 29<br>31.9 | 20<br>22.0 | 24<br>26.4 | 91<br>100.0  |

|           | <u>Symmetric</u> | <u>With Battered<br/>Dependent</u> | <u>Number of<br/>Phone Calls</u> |
|-----------|------------------|------------------------------------|----------------------------------|
| Somers' D | 0.001            | 0.001                              | 0.002                            |

Number of missing observations = 20

Table 7

## CROSS TABULATION OF SHARED LEISURE ACTIVITIES WITH SPOUSE

| <u>Violence</u> | <u>Participation</u> |            | <u>Total</u> |
|-----------------|----------------------|------------|--------------|
|                 | <u>Yes</u>           | <u>No</u>  |              |
| Not Battered    | 66<br>81.5%          | 10<br>76.9 | 76           |
| Yes Battered    | 15<br>18.5%          | 3<br>23.1  | 18           |
| <hr/>           |                      |            |              |
| Total           | 81<br>86.2%          | 13<br>13.8 | 94<br>100.0  |

|           | <u>Symmetric</u> | <u>With Battered<br/>Dependent</u> | <u>With Participation<br/>Dependent</u> |
|-----------|------------------|------------------------------------|---|
| Somers' D | 0.039            | 0.045                              | 0.035                                   |

Number of missing observations = 17

Table 8

## CROSS TABULATION OF LEISURE ACTIVITIES WITHOUT SPOUSE

| <u>Violence</u> | <u>Participation</u> |            | <u>Total</u> |
|-----------------|----------------------|------------|--------------|
|                 | <u>Yes</u>           | <u>No</u>  |              |
| Not Battered    | 69<br>79.3%          | 8<br>80.0  | 77           |
| Yes Battered    | 18<br>20.7%          | 2<br>20.0  | 20           |
| <hr/>           |                      |            |              |
| Total           | 87<br>89.7%          | 10<br>10.3 | 97<br>100.0  |

|           | <u>Symmetric</u> | <u>With Battered<br/>Dependent</u> | <u>With Participation<br/>Dependent</u> |
|-----------|------------------|------------------------------------|---|
| Somers' D | 0.004            | -0.006                             | -0.003                                  |

Number of missing observations = 14

---

Table 9

## CROSS TABULATION OF TYPES OF LEISURE ACTIVITIES

| <u>Violence</u> | <u>Activities</u>                     |                                    |                                    |  | <u>Total</u> |
|-----------------|---------------------------------------|------------------------------------|------------------------------------|--|--------------|
|                 | <u>Volunteer<br/>Clubs<br/>School</u> | <u>Sports</u>                      | <u>Hobbies-<br/>Games</u>          | <u>Social<br/>Activities<br/>Outings</u> |              |
| Not<br>Battered | 15<br>78.9%                           | 74<br>82.2                         | 59<br>78.7                         | 38<br>67.9                               | 186          |
| Yes<br>Battered | 4<br>21.1%                            | 16<br>17.8                         | 16<br>21.3                         | 18<br>32.1                               | 54           |
| <b>Total</b>    | 19<br>7.9%                            | 90<br>37.5                         | 75<br>31.3                         | 56<br>23.3                               | 240<br>100.0 |
|                 | <u>Symmetric</u>                      | <u>With Battered<br/>Dependent</u> | <u>With Leisure<br/>Activities</u> |  |              |
| Somers' D       | 0.098                                 | 0.073                              | 0.147                              |  |              |

Number of missing observations = 0

---

Table 10

CROSS TABULATION OF LEISURE COMPANION  
OTHER THAN SPOUSE

| <u>Violence</u> | <u>Participate With</u> |               |              |                          | <u>Total</u> |
|-----------------|-------------------------|---------------|--------------|--------------------------|--------------|
|                 | <u>Friend</u>           | <u>Family</u> | <u>Alone</u> | <u>Combina-<br/>tion</u> |              |
| Not Battered    | 11<br>84.6%             | 4<br>100.00   | 12<br>92.3   | 43<br>74.1               | 70           |
| Yes Battered    | 2<br>15.4%              | --<br>--      | 1<br>7.7     | 15<br>25.9               | 18           |
| <b>Total</b>    | 13<br>14.8%             | 4<br>4.5      | 13<br>14.8   | 58<br>65.9               | 88<br>100.0  |

|           | <u>Symmetric</u> | <u>With Battered<br/>Dependent</u> | <u>Participants<br/>With Dependent</u> |
|-----------|------------------|------------------------------------|--|
| Somers' D | 0.080            | 0.065                              | 0.103                                  |

Number of missing observations = 23

---

Table 11

CROSS TABULATION OF  
FREQUENCY OF LEISURE WITH SOMEONE OTHER THAN SPOUSE

| <u>Violence</u> | <u>Frequency of Participation</u> |                           |                  | <u>Total</u> |
|-----------------|-----------------------------------|---------------------------|------------------|--------------|
|                 | <u>Rarely</u>                     | <u>Occasion-<br/>ally</u> | <u>Regularly</u> |              |
| Not Battered    | 3<br>75.0%                        | 20<br>87.0                | 45<br>76.3       | 68           |
| Yes Battered    | 1<br>25.0%                        | 3<br>13.0                 | 14<br>23.7       | 18           |
| <hr/>           |                                   |                           |                  |              |
| Total           | 4<br>4.7%                         | 23<br>26.7                | 59<br>68.6       | 86<br>100.0  |

|           | <u>Symmetric</u> | <u>With Battered<br/>Dependent</u> | <u>With Frequency<br/>of Participation<br/>Dependent</u> |
|-----------|------------------|------------------------------------|--|
| Somers' D | 0.090            | 0.077                              | 0.107  |

Number of missing observations = 25

---

Table 12

CROSS TABULATION OF  
HOW OFTEN SPOUSE PARTICIPATES IN LEISURE ACTIVITIES  
WITHOUT RESPONDENT

Frequency of Participation

| <u>Violence</u> | <u>Rarely</u> | <u>Occasion-<br/>ally</u> | <u>Regu-<br/>larly</u> | <u>Never</u> | <u>Total</u> |
|-----------------|---------------|---------------------------|------------------------|--------------|--------------|
| Not<br>Battered | 11<br>84.6%   | 28<br>82.4                | 26<br>81.3             | --<br>--     | 65           |
| Yes<br>Battered | 2<br>15.4%    | 6<br>17.6                 | 6<br>18.8              | 1<br>100.0   | 15           |
| <b>Total</b>    | 13<br>16.3%   | 34<br>42.5                | 32<br>40.0             | 1<br>1.3     | 80<br>100.0  |

|           | <u>Symmetric</u> | <u>With Battered<br/>Dependent</u> | <u>Frequency of<br/>Participation<br/>With Dependent</u> |
|-----------|------------------|------------------------------------|--|
| Somers' D | 0.067            | 0.049                              | 0.103  |

Number of missing observations = 31

---

Table 13

CROSS TABULATION OF  
 "DO YOU EVER CONFIDE IN YOUR FRIENDS?"

| <u>Violence</u> | <u>Confide</u> |            | <u>Total</u> |
|-----------------|----------------|------------|--------------|
|                 | <u>Yes</u>     | <u>No</u>  |              |
| Not Battered    | 71<br>77.2%    | 6<br>100.0 | 77           |
| Yes Battered    | 21<br>22.8%    | --<br>--   | 21           |
|                 |                |            |              |
| Total           | 92<br>93.9%    | 6<br>6.1   | 98<br>100.0  |

|           | <u>Symmetric</u> | <u>With Battered<br/>Dependent</u> | <u>With Confide<br/>Dependent</u> |
|-----------|------------------|------------------------------------|-----------------------------------|
| Somers' D | -0.116           | -0.228                             | -0.077                            |

Number of missing observations = 13

---

Table 14

CROSS TABULATION OF  
 "HOW FREQUENTLY DO YOU CONFIDE IN YOUR FRIENDS?"

Frequency of Confidences

| <u>Violence</u> | <u>Does Not<br/>Confide</u> | <u>Rarely</u> | <u>Occasion-<br/>ally</u> | <u>Regu--<br/>larly</u> | <u>Total</u> |
|-----------------|-----------------------------|---------------|---------------------------|-------------------------|--------------|
| Not<br>Battered | 2<br>100.0%                 | 12<br>80.0    | 37<br>84.1                | 22<br>68.8              | 73           |
| Yes<br>Battered | --<br>-- %                  | 3<br>20.0     | 7<br>15.9                 | 10<br>31.3              | 20           |
| Total           | 2<br>2.2%                   | 15<br>16.1    | 44<br>47.3                | 32<br>34.4              | 93<br>100.0  |

|           | <u>Symmetric</u> | <u>With Battered<br/>Dependent</u> | <u>With Frequency<br/>of Confidence<br/>Dependent</u> |
|-----------|------------------|------------------------------------|---|
| Somers' D | 0.135            | 0.103                              | 0.193   |

Number of missing observations = 18

---

Table 15

## "WHAT DO YOU CONFIDE IN FRIENDS?"

| Topic                                | All Respondents*   |      | Abused Women**    |      | Non-Abused Women*** |      |
|--------------------------------------|--------------------|------|-------------------|------|---------------------|------|
|                                      | # of Mentions      | %    | # of Mentions     | %    | # of Mentions       | %    |
| Almost anything                      | 10                 | 5.7  | 4                 | 9.5  | 6                   | 4.5  |
| Anything                             | 11                 | 6.3  | 1                 | 2.4  | 10                  | 7.5  |
| Beliefs/dreams/<br>feelings          | 21                 | 12.0 | 8                 | 19.0 | 13                  | 9.8  |
| Family concerns<br>accomplishments   | 23                 | 13.1 | 4                 | 9.5  | 19                  | 14.3 |
| Children/<br>grandchildren           | 28                 | 16.0 | 6                 | 14.3 | 22                  | 16.5 |
| Friends                              | 2                  | 1.2  | --                | --   | 2                   | 1.5  |
| Future Plans                         | 3                  | 1.7  | --                | --   | 3                   | 2.3  |
| Health                               | 13                 | 7.4  | 2                 | 4.8  | 11                  | 8.3  |
| Humorous incidents/<br>gossip        | 3                  | 1.7  | --                | --   | 3                   | 2.3  |
| Marital relationship                 | 10                 | 5.7  | 3                 | 7.1  | 7                   | 5.3  |
| Money matters                        | 14                 | 8.0  | 5                 | 11.9 | 9                   | 6.7  |
| Nothing                              | 1                  | .6   | 1                 | 2.4  | --                  | --   |
| Politics                             | 1                  | .6   | 1                 | 2.4  | --                  | --   |
| Leisure activities/<br>sports/travel | 6                  | 3.4  | --                | --   | 6                   | 4.5  |
| Sexual matters/<br>concerns          | 4                  | 2.3  | 2                 | 4.8  | 2                   | 1.5  |
| Unspecified/everyday<br>concerns     | 8                  | 4.6  | 2                 | 4.8  | 6                   | 4.5  |
| Work/school                          | 17                 | 9.7  | 3                 | 7.1  | 14                  | 10.5 |
| Totals                               | 175 mentions, 100% |      | 42 mentions, 100% |      | 133 mentions, 100%  |      |
| * NB (N=102)                         | ** NB (N=21)       |      | *** NB (N=81)     |      |                     |      |

Table 16

## "WHAT DO YOU NOT CONFIDE IN FRIENDS?"

| Topic                         | All Respondents*   |      | Abused Women**    |      | Non-Abused Women*** |      |
|-------------------------------|--------------------|------|-------------------|------|---------------------|------|
|                               | # of Mentions      | %    | # of Mentions     | %    | # of Mentions       | %    |
| Age                           | 1                  | .8   | --                | --   | 1                   | 1.1  |
| Family matters                | 8                  | 6.7  | 2                 | 7.7  | 6                   | 6.4  |
| Gossip/complaints             | 4                  | 3.3  | --                | --   | 4                   | 4.3  |
| Health                        | 3                  | 2.5  | --                | --   | 3                   | 3.2  |
| Children's problems           | 2                  | 1.7  | 2                 | 7.7  | --                  | --   |
| Marital relationship problems | 17                 | 14.2 | 4                 | 15.4 | 13                  | 13.8 |
| Innermost desires             | 19                 | 15.8 | 4                 | 15.4 | 15                  | 16.0 |
| Money concerns                | 22                 | 28.3 | 4                 | 15.4 | 18                  | 19.1 |
| Nothing                       | 6                  | 5.0  | 3                 | 11.5 | 3                   | 3.2  |
| Religion                      | 1                  | .8   | --                | --   | 1                   | 1.1  |
| Secrets                       | 2                  | 1.7  | --                | --   | 2                   | 2.1  |
| Sexual matters/problems       | 33                 | 27.5 | 6                 | 23.1 | 27                  | 28.7 |
| Unresolved disputes           | 1                  | .8   | --                | --   | 1                   | 1.1  |
| Violence at home              | 1                  | .8   | 1                 | 3.8  | --                  | --   |
| Totals                        | 120 mentions, 100% |      | 26 mentions, 100% |      | 94 mentions, 100%   |      |

Table 17

## CROSS TABULATION OF LEVEL OF AGREEMENT BETWEEN SPOUSES

| <u>Violence</u> | <u>Level of Agreement</u>      |                         |                      |                               | <u>Total</u> |
|-----------------|--------------------------------|-------------------------|----------------------|-------------------------------|--------------|
|                 | <u>Strongly Disagree (-17)</u> | <u>Disagree (33-48)</u> | <u>Agree (49-64)</u> | <u>Strongly Agree (65-80)</u> |              |
| Not Battered    | 2<br>100.0%                    | 3<br>75.0               | 39<br>81.3           | 30<br>78.9                    | 74           |
| Yes Battered    | --<br>-- %                     | 1<br>25.0               | 9<br>18.8            | 8<br>21.1                     | 18           |
| Total           | 2<br>2.2%                      | 4<br>4.3                | 48<br>52.2           | 38<br>41.3                    | 92<br>100.0  |

|           | <u>Symmetric</u> | <u>With Battered Dependent</u> | <u>With Level of Agreement Dependent</u> |
|-----------|------------------|--------------------------------|--|
| Somers' D | 0.032            | 0.025                          | 0.045                                    |

Number of missing observations = 19

Table 18

CROSS TABULATION OF "DO ANY ITEMS LEAD TO ARGUMENTS?"

| <u>Violence</u> | <u>Argue</u> |            | <u>Total</u> |
|-----------------|--------------|------------|--------------|
|                 | <u>Yes</u>   | <u>No</u>  |              |
| Not Battered    | 54<br>75.0%  | 21<br>95.5 | 75           |
| Yes Battered    | 18<br>25.0%  | 1<br>4.5   | 19           |
| <hr/>           |              |            |              |
| Total           | 72<br>76.6%  | 22<br>23.4 | 94<br>100.0  |

|           | <u>Symmetric</u> | <u>With Battered<br/>Dependent</u> | <u>With Argue<br/>Dependent</u> |
|-----------|------------------|------------------------------------|---------------------------------|
| Somers' D | -0.215           | -0.204                             | -0.227                          |

Number of missing observations = 17

Table 19

## CROSS TABULATION OF "HOW OFTEN DO YOU ARGUE?"

| <u>Violence</u> | <u>Frequency of Arguments</u> |                           |                  | <u>Total</u> |
|-----------------|-------------------------------|---------------------------|------------------|--------------|
|                 | <u>Rarely</u>                 | <u>Occasion-<br/>ally</u> | <u>Regularly</u> |              |
| Not Battered    | 24<br>77.4%                   | 22<br>71.0                | 7<br>77.8        | 53           |
| Yes Battered    | 7<br>22.6%                    | 9<br>29.0                 | 2<br>22.2        | 18           |
| Total           | 31<br>43.7%                   | 31<br>43.7                | 9<br>12.7        | 71<br>100.0  |

|           | <u>Symmetric</u> | <u>With Battered<br/>Dependent</u> | <u>With Frequency<br/>of Arguments<br/>Dependent</u> |
|-----------|------------------|------------------------------------|--|
| Somers' D | 0.033            | 0.027                              | 0.044  |

Number of missing observations = 40

---

Table 20

CROSS TABULATION OF "WHAT DO YOU ARGUE OVER MOST?"

| <u>Violence</u> | <u>Item</u>                 |                 |                            |                                 |            |                          |                |                     | <u>Total</u> |
|-----------------|-----------------------------|-----------------|----------------------------|---------------------------------|------------|--------------------------|----------------|---------------------|--------------|
|                 | <u>Unfaith-<br/>fulness</u> | <u>Finances</u> | <u>Sexual<br/>Behavior</u> | <u>House<br/>Work-<br/>Kids</u> | <u>Car</u> | <u>Leisure-<br/>Pets</u> | <u>Friends</u> | <u>In-<br/>Laws</u> |              |
| Not<br>Battered | 1<br>100.0%                 | 10<br>71.4      | 2<br>66.7                  | 23<br>76.7                      | --<br>--   | 8<br>88.9                | --<br>--       | 7<br>77.8           | 51           |
| Yes<br>Battered | --<br>-- %                  | 4<br>28.6       | 1<br>33.3                  | 7<br>23.3                       | 1<br>100.0 | 1<br>11.1                | 2<br>100.0     | 2<br>22.2           | 18           |
| Total           | 1<br>1.4%                   | 14<br>20.3      | 3<br>4.3                   | 30<br>43.5                      | 1<br>1.4   | 9<br>13.0                | 2<br>2.9       | 9<br>13.0           | 69<br>100.0  |

|           | <u>Symmetric</u> | <u>With Battered<br/>Dependent</u> | <u>With Item<br/>Dependent</u> |
|-----------|------------------|------------------------------------|--------------------------------|
| Somers' D | 0.011            | 0.008                              | 0.016                          |

Number of missing observations = 42

Table 21

## CROSS TABULATION OF SHARING IDEAS

Frequency of Sharing Ideas

| <u>Violence</u> | <u>Regularly</u> | <u>Occasion-<br/>ally</u> | <u>Rarely</u> | <u>Total</u> |
|-----------------|------------------|---------------------------|---------------|--------------|
| Not<br>Battered | 60<br>80.0%      | 13<br>86.7                | 1<br>33.3     | 74           |
| Yes<br>Battered | 15<br>20.0%      | 2<br>13.3                 | 2<br>66.7     | 19           |
| Total           | 75<br>80.6%      | 15<br>16.1                | 3<br>3.2      | 93<br>100.0  |

|           | <u>Symmetric</u> | <u>With Battered<br/>Dependent</u> | <u>With Frequency<br/>of Sharing<br/>Dependent</u> |
|-----------|------------------|------------------------------------|--|
| Somers' D | 0.038            | 0.038                              | 0.038  |

Number of missing observations = 18

---

Table 22

## CROSS TABULATION OF DISCUSSIONS

Frequency of Discussions

| <u>Violence</u> | <u>Regularly</u> | <u>Occasion-<br/>ally</u> | <u>Rarely</u> | <u>Never</u> | <u>Total</u> |
|-----------------|------------------|---------------------------|---------------|--------------|--------------|
| Not Battered    | 45<br>80.4%      | 24<br>82.8                | 5<br>71.4     | 1<br>50.0    | 75           |
| Yes Battered    | 11<br>19.6%      | 5<br>17.2                 | 2<br>28.6     | 1<br>50.0    | 19           |
| Total           | 56<br>59.6%      | 29<br>30.9                | 7<br>7.4      | 2<br>2.1     | 94<br>100.0  |

|           | <u>Symmetric</u> | <u>With Battered<br/>Dependent</u> | <u>With Frequency<br/>of Discussions<br/>Dependent</u> |
|-----------|------------------|------------------------------------|--|
| Somers' D | 0.039            | 0.031                              | 0.052  |

Number of missing observations = 17

---

Table 23

## CROSS TABULATION OF LACK OF COMMUNICATION

Frequency of Lack of Communication

| <u>Violence</u> | <u>Regu-<br/>larly</u> | <u>Occasion-<br/>ally</u> | <u>Rarely</u> | <u>Never</u> | <u>Total</u> |
|-----------------|------------------------|---------------------------|---------------|--------------|--------------|
| Not<br>Battered | 2<br>33.3%             | 40<br>78.4                | 28<br>90.3    | 5<br>83.3    | 75           |
| Yes<br>Battered | 4<br>66.7%             | 11<br>21.6                | 3<br>9.7      | 1<br>16.7    | 19           |
| Total           | 6<br>6.4%              | 51<br>54.3                | 31<br>33.0    | 6<br>6.4     | 94<br>100.0  |

|           | <u>Symmetric</u> | <u>With Battered<br/>Dependent</u> | <u>With Frequency<br/>of Communication<br/>Dependent</u> |
|-----------|------------------|------------------------------------|--|
| Somers' D | -0.224           | -0.173                             | -0.317   |

Number of missing observations = 17

---

Table 24

CROSS TABULATION OF "HOW OFTEN DO YOU BICKER?"

| <u>Violence</u> | <u>Frequency of Bickering</u> |                           |               |              | <u>Total</u> |
|-----------------|-------------------------------|---------------------------|---------------|--------------|--------------|
|                 | <u>Regu-<br/>larly</u>        | <u>Occasion-<br/>ally</u> | <u>Rarely</u> | <u>Never</u> |              |
| Not<br>Battered | 9<br>75.0%                    | 37<br>78.7                | 24<br>80.0    | 5<br>100.0   | 75           |
| Yes<br>Battered | 3<br>25.0%                    | 10<br>21.3                | 6<br>20.0     | --<br>--     | 19           |
| <hr/> Total     | 12<br>12.8%                   | 47<br>50.0                | 30<br>31.9    | 5<br>5.3     | 94<br>100.0  |

|           | <u>Symmetric</u> | <u>With Battered<br/>Dependent</u> | <u>With Frequency<br/>of Bickering<br/>Dependent</u> |
|-----------|------------------|------------------------------------|--|
| Somers' D | -0.072           | -0.054                             | -0.106   |

Number of missing observations = 17

Table 25

## CROSS TABULATION OF LOUD ARGUMENTS

Frequency of Loud Arguments

| <u>Violence</u> | <u>Regu-<br/>larly</u> | <u>Occasion-<br/>ally</u> | <u>Rarely</u> | <u>Never</u> | <u>Total</u> |
|-----------------|------------------------|---------------------------|---------------|--------------|--------------|
| Not<br>Battered | 3<br>60.0%             | 14<br>73.7                | 40<br>80.0    | 18<br>90.0   | 75           |
| Yes<br>Battered | 2<br>40.0%             | 5<br>26.3                 | 10<br>20.0    | 2<br>10.0    | 19           |
| Total           | 5<br>5.3%              | 19<br>20.2                | 50<br>53.2    | 20<br>21.3   | 94<br>100.0  |

|           | <u>Symmetric</u> | <u>With Battered<br/>Dependent</u> | <u>With Frequency<br/>of Loud Arguments<br/>Dependent</u> |
|-----------|------------------|------------------------------------|---|
| Somers' D | -0.150           | -0.113                             | -0.221  |

Number of missing observations = 17

---

Table 26

## CROSS TABULATION OF PHYSICAL VIOLENCE

| <u>Violence</u> | <u>Frequency of Physical Violence</u> |               |              | <u>Total</u> |
|-----------------|---------------------------------------|---------------|--------------|--------------|
|                 | <u>Regu-<br/>larly</u>                | <u>Rarely</u> | <u>Never</u> |              |
| Not<br>Battered | 2<br>66.7%                            | 1<br>14.3     | 72<br>85.7   | 75           |
| Yes<br>Battered | 1<br>33.3%                            | 6<br>85.7     | 12<br>14.3   | 19           |
| Total           | 3<br>3.2%                             | 7<br>7.4      | 84<br>89.4   | 94<br>100.0  |

|           | <u>Symmetric</u> | <u>With Battered<br/>Dependent</u> | <u>With Frequency<br/>of Physical Vio-<br/>lence Dependent</u> |
|-----------|------------------|------------------------------------|--|
| Somers' D | -0.399           | -0.530                             | -0.320   |

Number of missing observations = 17

---

Table 27

CROSS TABULATION OF  
 "DO YOU DEPEND ON YOUR HUSBAND'S CHOICES FOR FRIENDS?"

Frequency of Dependence

| <u>Violence</u> | <u>Never</u> | <u>Rarely</u> | <u>Occasion-<br/>ally</u> | <u>Regu-<br/>larly</u> | <u>Total</u> |
|-----------------|--------------|---------------|---------------------------|------------------------|--------------|
| Not<br>Battered | 16<br>69.6%  | 26<br>81.3    | 28<br>84.8                | 4<br>100.0             | 74           |
| Yes<br>Battered | 7<br>30.4%   | 6<br>18.8     | 5<br>15.2                 | --<br>--               | 18           |
| <hr/> Total     | 23<br>25.0%  | 32<br>34.8    | 33<br>35.9                | 4<br>4.3               | 92<br>100.0  |

|           | <u>Symmetric</u> | <u>With Battered<br/>Dependent</u> | <u>With Frequency<br/>of Dependence<br/>Dependent</u> |
|-----------|------------------|------------------------------------|---|
| Somers' D | -0.147           | -0.107                             | -0.234  |

Number of missing observations = 19

---

Table 28

CROSS TABULATION OF "DOES HUSBAND  
OBJECT TO TIME SPENT WITH FRIENDS?"

Frequency of Husband Objecting

| <u>Violence</u> | <u>Never</u> | <u>Rarely</u> | <u>Occasion-<br/>ally</u> | <u>Regu-<br/>larly</u> | <u>Total</u> |
|-----------------|--------------|---------------|---------------------------|------------------------|--------------|
| Not<br>Battered | 42<br>84.0%  | 26<br>81.3    | 5<br>62.5                 | 1<br>33.3              | 74           |
| Yes<br>Battered | 8<br>16.0%   | 6<br>18.8     | 3<br>37.5                 | 2<br>66.7              | 19           |
| <hr/> Total     | 50<br>53.8%  | 32<br>34.4    | 8<br>8.6                  | 3<br>3.2               | 93<br>100.0  |

|           | <u>Symmetric</u> | <u>With Battered<br/>Dependent</u> | <u>With Frequency of<br/>Husband Objecting<br/>Dependent</u> |
|-----------|------------------|------------------------------------|--|
| Somers' D | 0.156            | 0.121                              | 0.218  |

Number of missing observations = 18

---

Table 29

CROSS TABULATION OF "DO YOU GIVE UP  
ACTIVITIES TO KEEP YOUR HUSBAND HAPPY?"

Frequency of Activities Given Up

| <u>Violence</u> | <u>Never</u> | <u>Rarely</u> | <u>Occasion-<br/>ally</u> | <u>Regu-<br/>larly</u> | <u>Total</u> |
|-----------------|--------------|---------------|---------------------------|------------------------|--------------|
| Not<br>Battered | 19<br>86.4%  | 36<br>80.0    | 18<br>75.0                | 1<br>50.0              | 74           |
| Yes<br>Battered | 3<br>13.6%   | 9<br>20.0     | 6<br>25.0                 | 1<br>50.0              | 19           |
| <hr/> Total     | 22<br>23.7%  | 45<br>48.4    | 24<br>25.8                | 2<br>2.2               | 93<br>100.0  |

|           | <u>Symmetric</u> | <u>With Battered<br/>Dependent</u> | <u>With Frequency of<br/>Activities Given<br/>Up Dependent</u> |
|-----------|------------------|------------------------------------|--|
| Somers' D | 0.110            | 0.083                              | 0.165  |

Number of missing observations = 18

---

Table 30

CROSS TABULATION OF "DOES YOUR HUSBAND  
CHECK UP ON YOU FREQUENTLY?"

Frequency of Husband Checking

| <u>Violence</u> | <u>Never</u> | <u>Rarely</u> | <u>Occasion-<br/>ally</u> | <u>Regu-<br/>larly</u> | <u>Total</u> |
|-----------------|--------------|---------------|---------------------------|------------------------|--------------|
| Not<br>Battered | 58<br>85.3%  | 12<br>66.7    | 3<br>75.0                 | 1<br>33.3              | 74           |
| Yes<br>Battered | 10<br>14.7%  | 6<br>33.3     | 1<br>25.0                 | 2<br>66.7              | 19           |
| <hr/> Total     | 68<br>73.1%  | 18<br>19.4    | 4<br>4.3                  | 3<br>3.2               | 93<br>100.0  |

|           | <u>Symmetric</u> | <u>With Battered<br/>Dependent</u> | <u>With Frequency of<br/>Husband Checking<br/>Dependent</u> |
|-----------|------------------|------------------------------------|---|
| Somers' D | 0.233            | 0.206                              | 0.269   |

Number of missing observations = 18

---

Table 31

CROSS TABULATION OF "DO YOU FEEL UNABLE TO  
MAKE DECISIONS WITHOUT YOUR HUSBAND?"

| <u>Violence</u> | <u>Frequency of</u> |                                    |  |                        | <u>Total</u> |
|-----------------|---------------------|------------------------------------|--|------------------------|--------------|
|                 | <u>Never</u>        | <u>Rarely</u>                      | <u>Occasion-<br/>ally</u>              | <u>Regu-<br/>larly</u> |              |
| Not<br>Battered | 21<br>70.0%         | 35<br>81.4                         | 17<br>94.4                             | 1<br>50.0              | 74           |
| Yes<br>Battered | 9<br>30.0%          | 8<br>18.6                          | 1<br>5.6                               | 1<br>50.0              | 19           |
| <hr/> Total     | 30<br>32.3%         | 43<br>46.2                         | 18<br>19.4                             | 2<br>2.2               | 93<br>100.0  |
|                 | <u>Symmetric</u>    | <u>With Battered<br/>Dependent</u> | <u>With Frequency of<br/>Dependent</u> |                        |              |
| Somers' D       | - 0.155             | -0.116                             | -0.231                                 |                        |              |

Number of missing observations = 18

---

Table 32

CROSS TABULATION OF "DOES YOUR HUSBAND  
GENERALLY TELL YOU WANT TO DO?"

Frequency of Husband Telling What to Do

| <u>Violence</u> | <u>Never</u> | <u>Rarely</u> | <u>Occasion-<br/>ally</u> | <u>Regu-<br/>larly</u> | <u>Total</u> |
|-----------------|--------------|---------------|---------------------------|------------------------|--------------|
| Not<br>Battered | 28<br>82.4%  | 26<br>74.3    | 19<br>90.5                | 1<br>33.3              | 74           |
| Yes<br>Battered | 6<br>17.6%   | 9<br>25.7     | 2<br>9.5                  | 2<br>66.7              | 19           |
| <hr/> Total     | 34<br>36.6%  | 35<br>37.6    | 21<br>22.6                | 3<br>3.2               | 93<br>100.0  |

|           | <u>Symmetric</u> | <u>With Battered<br/>Dependent</u> | <u>With Frequency of<br/>Husband Telling<br/>What to do<br/>Dependent</u> |
|-----------|------------------|------------------------------------|---|
| Somers' D | 0.022            | 0.165                              | 0.034   |

Number of missing observations = 18

---

Table 33

CROSS TABULATION OF "DOES YOUR HUSBAND  
GET ANGRY IF YOU IGNORE HIS ADVICE?"

Frequency of Husband's Anger

| <u>Violence</u> | <u>Never</u> | <u>Rarely</u> | <u>Occasion-<br/>ally</u> | <u>Regu-<br/>larly</u> | <u>Total</u> |
|-----------------|--------------|---------------|---------------------------|------------------------|--------------|
| Not<br>Battered | 24<br>75.0%  | 32<br>88.9    | 16<br>76.2                | 1<br>33.3              | 73           |
| Yes<br>Battered | 8<br>25.0%   | 4<br>11.1     | 5<br>23.8                 | 2<br>66.7              | 19           |
| <hr/>           |              |               |                           |                        |              |
| Total           | 32<br>34.8%  | 36<br>39.1    | 21<br>22.8                | 3<br>3.3               | 92<br>100.0  |

|           | <u>Symmetric</u> | <u>With Battered<br/>Dependent</u> | <u>With Frequency of<br/>Husband's Anger<br/>Dependent</u> |
|-----------|------------------|------------------------------------|--|
| Somers' D | 0.025            | 0.019                              | 0.039  |

Number of missing observations = 19

---

Table 34

CROSS TABULATION OF "DO YOU SHOW FEAR  
WHEN HUSBAND'S IMPATIENCE WORSENS?"

Frequency of Fear

| <u>Violence</u> | <u>Never</u> | <u>Rarely</u> | <u>Occasion-<br/>ally</u> | <u>Regu-<br/>larly</u> | <u>Total</u> |
|-----------------|--------------|---------------|---------------------------|------------------------|--------------|
| Not<br>Battered | 60<br>83.3%  | 9<br>64.3     | 4<br>80.0                 | 1<br>50.0              | 74           |
| Yes<br>Battered | 12<br>16.7%  | 5<br>35.7     | 1<br>20.0                 | 1<br>50.0              | 19           |
| <hr/>           |              |               |                           |                        |              |
| Total           | 72<br>77.4%  | 14<br>15.1    | 5<br>5.4                  | 2<br>2.2               | 93<br>100.0  |

|           | <u>Symmetric</u> | <u>With Battered<br/>Dependent</u> | <u>With Frequency<br/>of Fear<br/>Dependent</u> |
|-----------|------------------|------------------------------------|---|
| Somers' D | 0.163            | 0.153                              | 0.176   |

Number of missing observations = 18

---

Table 35

CROSS TABULATION OF "DOES YOUR HUSBAND  
HAVE EXCESSIVE TEMPER OUTBURSTS?"

Frequency of Temper Outbursts

| <u>Violence</u> | <u>Never</u> | <u>Rarely</u> | <u>Occasion-<br/>ally</u> | <u>Regu-<br/>larly</u> | <u>Total</u> |
|-----------------|--------------|---------------|---------------------------|------------------------|--------------|
| Not<br>Battered | 47<br>90.4%  | 21<br>75.0    | 5<br>50.0                 | 1<br>33.3              | 74           |
| Yes<br>Battered | 5<br>9.6%    | 7<br>25.0     | 5<br>50.0                 | 2<br>66.7              | 19           |
| Total           | 52<br>55.9%  | 28<br>30.1    | 10<br>10.8                | 3<br>3.2               | 93<br>100.0  |

|           | <u>Symmetric</u> | <u>With Battered<br/>Dependent</u> | <u>With Frequency of<br/>Temper Tantrums<br/>Dependent</u> |
|-----------|------------------|------------------------------------|--|
| Somers' D | 0.321            | 0.250                              | 0.450  |

Number of missing observations = 18

---

Table 36

## CROSS TABULATION OF "DO YOU QUESTION HIS JUDGEMENT?"

Frequency of Questioning Judgement

| <u>Violence</u> | <u>Never</u> | <u>Rarely</u> | <u>Occasion-<br/>ally</u> | <u>Regu-<br/>larly</u> | <u>Total</u> |
|-----------------|--------------|---------------|---------------------------|------------------------|--------------|
| Not<br>Battered | 10<br>83.3%  | 39<br>83.0    | 21<br>75.0                | 3<br>60.0              | 73           |
| Yes<br>Battered | 2<br>16.7%   | 8<br>17.0     | 7<br>25.0                 | 2<br>40.0              | 19           |
| <hr/> Total     | 12<br>13.0%  | 47<br>51.1    | 28<br>30.4                | 5<br>5.4               | 92<br>100.0  |

|           | <u>Symmetric</u> | <u>With Battered<br/>Dependent</u> | <u>With Frequency of<br/>Questioning His<br/>Judgement<br/>Dependent</u> |
|-----------|------------------|------------------------------------|--|
| Somers' D | 0.110            | 0.084                              | 0.161  |

Number of missing observations = 19

---

Table 37CROSS TABULATION OF "HAS YOUR HUSBAND  
DESTROYED/BROKEN YOUR POSSESSIONS?"Frequency of Destroyed/Broken Possessions

| <u>Violence</u> | <u>Never</u> | <u>Rarely</u> | <u>Regularly</u> | <u>Total</u> |
|-----------------|--------------|---------------|------------------|--------------|
| Not Battered    | 73<br>83.0%  | 1<br>33.3     | --<br>--         | 74           |
| Yes Battered    | 15<br>17.0%  | 2<br>16.7     | 2<br>100.0       | 19           |
| Total           | 88<br>94.6%  | 3<br>3.2      | 2<br>2.2         | 93<br>100.0  |

|           | <u>Symmetric</u> | <u>With Battered<br/>Dependent</u> | <u>With Frequency<br/>of Destroyed<br/>Possessions<br/>Dependent</u> |
|-----------|------------------|------------------------------------|--|
| Somers' D | 0.301            | 0.625                              | 0.198  |

Number of missing observations = 18

---

Table 38

CROSS TABULATION OF "DO YOU ONLY HAVE  
THINGS YOUR HUSBAND CHOOSES?"

Frequency of only Husband's Choices

| <u>Violence</u> | <u>Never</u> | <u>Rarely</u> | <u>Occasion-<br/>ally</u> | <u>Total</u> |
|-----------------|--------------|---------------|---------------------------|--------------|
| Not<br>Battered | 59<br>79.7%  | 10<br>71.4    | 5<br>100.0                | 74           |
| Yes<br>Battered | 15<br>20.3%  | 4<br>28.6     | --<br>--                  | 19           |
| <hr/> Total     | 74<br>79.6%  | 14<br>15.1    | 5<br>5.4                  | 93<br>100.0  |

|           | <u>Symmetric</u> | <u>With Battered<br/>Dependent</u> | <u>With Frequency<br/>of only Hus-<br/>band's Choices<br/>Dependent</u> |
|-----------|------------------|------------------------------------|---|
| Somers' D | -0.006           | -0.006                             | -0.006  |

Number of missing observations = 18

---

Table 39CROSS TABULATION OF "IS YOUR HUSBAND  
OVERLY CRUEL OR OVERLY KIND?"Frequency of Overly Cruel/Kind

| <u>Violence</u> | <u>Never</u> | <u>Rarely</u> | <u>Occasion-<br/>ally</u> | <u>Regu-<br/>larly</u> | <u>Total</u> |
|-----------------|--------------|---------------|---------------------------|------------------------|--------------|
| Not<br>Battered | 62<br>87.3%  | 7<br>58.3     | 3<br>50.0                 | 2<br>50.0              | 74           |
| Yes<br>Battered | 9<br>12.7%   | 5<br>41.7     | 3<br>50.0                 | 2<br>50.0              | 19           |
| <hr/> Total     | 71<br>76.3%  | 12<br>12.9    | 6<br>6.5                  | 4<br>4.3               | 93<br>100.0  |

|           | <u>Symmetric</u> | <u>With Battered<br/>Dependent</u> | <u>With Frequency of<br/>Husband Overly<br/>Cruel/Kind<br/>Dependent</u> |
|-----------|------------------|------------------------------------|--|
| Somers' D | 0.335            | 0.305                              | 0.371  |

Number of missing observations = 18

---

Table 40

CROSS TABULATION OF "DOES YOUR HUSBAND  
QUESTION YOUR FAITHFULNESS?"

Frequency of Questioning

| <u>Violence</u> | <u>Never</u> | <u>Rarely</u> | <u>Occasion-<br/>ally</u> | <u>Regu-<br/>larly</u> | <u>Total</u> |
|-----------------|--------------|---------------|---------------------------|------------------------|--------------|
| Not<br>Battered | 69<br>82.1%  | 4<br>66.7     | 1<br>100.0                | --<br>--               | 74           |
| Yes<br>Battered | 15<br>17.9%  | 2<br>33.3     | --<br>--                  | 2<br>100.0             | 19           |
| <hr/> Total     | 84<br>90.3%  | 6<br>6.5      | 1<br>1.1                  | 2<br>2.2               | 93<br>100.0  |

|           | <u>Symmetric</u> | <u>With Battered<br/>Dependent</u> | <u>With Frequency of<br/>Questioning<br/>Dependent</u> |
|-----------|------------------|------------------------------------|--|
| Somers' D | 0.191            | 0.269                              | 0.148  |

Number of missing observations = 18

---

Table 41

## CROSS TABULATION OF RESPONDENTS' EMPLOYMENT STATUS

| <u>Violence</u> | <u>Employment</u>           |                 |                        | <u>Total</u> |
|-----------------|-----------------------------|-----------------|------------------------|--------------|
|                 | <u>Student,<br/>Retired</u> | <u>Employed</u> | <u>Home-<br/>Maker</u> |              |
| Not<br>Battered | 6<br>100.0%                 | 39<br>75.0      | 34<br>82.9             | 79           |
| Yes<br>Battered | --<br>-- %                  | 13<br>25.0      | 7<br>17.1              | 20           |
| <u>Total</u>    | 6<br>6.1%                   | 52<br>52.5      | 41<br>41.4             | 99<br>100.0  |

|           | <u>Symmetric</u> | <u>With Battered<br/>Dependent</u> | <u>With Frequency<br/>of Participation<br/>Dependent</u> |
|-----------|------------------|------------------------------------|--|
| Somers' D | -0.022           | -0.018                             | -0.031   |

Number of missing observations = 12

---

Table 42

## CROSS TABULATION OF SPOUSES' EMPLOYMENT STATUS

Employment

| <u>Violence</u> | <u>Student,<br/>Retired</u> | <u>Employed</u> | <u>Unemployed</u> | <u>Total</u> |
|-----------------|-----------------------------|-----------------|-------------------|--------------|
| Not<br>Battered | 16<br>94.1%                 | 51<br>76.1      | 5<br>71.4         | 72           |
| Yes<br>Battered | 1<br>5.9%                   | 16<br>23.9      | 2<br>28.6         | 19           |
| <hr/> Total     | 17<br>18.7%                 | 67<br>73.6      | 7<br>7.7          | 91<br>100.0  |

|           | <u>Symmetric</u> | <u>With Battered<br/>Dependent</u> | <u>With Employment<br/>Dependent</u> |
|-----------|------------------|------------------------------------|--------------------------------------|
| Somers' D | 0.164            | 0.147                              | 0.185                                |

Number of missing observations = 20

---

Table 43

## CROSS TABULATION OF COMBINED FAMILY INCOME

Income

| <u>Violence</u> | <u>19,999<br/>or Less</u> | <u>20,000-<br/>39,999</u> | <u>40,000<br/>or over</u> | <u>Do Not<br/>Know</u> | <u>Total</u> |
|-----------------|---------------------------|---------------------------|---------------------------|------------------------|--------------|
| Not<br>Battered | 16<br>80.0%               | 25<br>73.5                | 32<br>82.1                | 4<br>100.0             | 77           |
| Yes<br>Battered | 4<br>20.0%                | 9<br>26.5                 | 7<br>17.9                 | --<br>--               | 20           |
| <hr/> Total     | 20<br>20.6%               | 34<br>35.1                | 39<br>40.2                | 4<br>4.1               | 97<br>100.0  |

|           | <u>Symmetric</u> | <u>With Battered<br/>Dependent</u> | <u>With Income<br/>Dependent</u> |
|-----------|------------------|------------------------------------|----------------------------------|
| Somers' D | 0.070            | -0.052                             | -0.107                           |

Number of missing observations = 14

---

Table 44

CROSS TABULATION OF WHO EARNS MORE

Wage Earner

| <u>Violence</u> | <u>Unemployed</u> | <u>Spouse</u> | <u>You</u> | <u>About Equal</u> | <u>Do Not Know</u> | <u>Total</u> |
|-----------------|-------------------|---------------|------------|--------------------|--------------------|--------------|
| Not Battered    | 1<br>100.0%       | 49<br>81.7    | 11<br>78.6 | 9<br>69.2          | 1<br>50.0          | 71           |
| Yes Battered    | --<br>-- %        | 11<br>18.3    | 3<br>21.4  | 4<br>30.8          | 1<br>50.0          | 19           |
| Total           | 1<br>1.1 %        | 60<br>66.7    | 14<br>15.6 | 13<br>14.2         | 2<br>2.2           | 90<br>100.0  |

|           | <u>Symmetric</u> | <u>With Battered Dependent</u> | <u>With Wage Earner Dependent</u> |
|-----------|------------------|--------------------------------|-----------------------------------|
| Somers' D | 0.117            | 0.096                          | 0.148                             |

Number of missing observations = 21

Table 45

## CROSS TABULATION OF ACCESS TO FINANCES

Access to Finances

| <u>Violence</u> | <u>No Money<br/>Access</u> | <u>Own<br/>Credit</u> | <u>Own Bank<br/>Accounts</u> | <u>Own Cred-<br/>it &amp; Bank</u> | <u>Total</u> |
|-----------------|----------------------------|-----------------------|------------------------------|------------------------------------|--------------|
| Not<br>Battered | 13<br>92.9%                | 6<br>85.7             | 24<br>85.7                   | 34<br>70.8                         | 77           |
| Yes<br>Battered | 1<br>7.1%                  | 1<br>14.3             | 4<br>14.3                    | 14<br>29.2                         | 20           |
| Total           | 14<br>14.4%                | 7<br>7.2              | 28<br>28.9                   | 48<br>49.5                         | 97<br>100.0  |

|           | <u>Symmetric</u> | <u>With Battered<br/>Dependent</u> | <u>With Income<br/>Dependent</u> |
|-----------|------------------|------------------------------------|----------------------------------|
| Somers' D | 0.189            | 0.142                              | 0.281                            |

Number of missing observations = 14

---

Table 46

## CROSS TABULATION OF ALTERNATIVE CAPITAL

Capital

| <u>Violence</u> | <u>No Alter-<br/>native</u> | <u>All in<br/>Husband's<br/>Name</u> | <u>Credit in<br/>Husband's<br/>Name</u> | <u>All Joint<br/>Account</u> | <u>Total</u> |
|-----------------|-----------------------------|--------------------------------------|---|------------------------------|--------------|
| Not<br>Battered | 1<br>100.0%                 | 2<br>100.0                           | 2<br>66.7                               | 44<br>86.3                   | 49           |
| Yes<br>Battered | --<br>-- %                  | --<br>--                             | 1<br>33.3                               | 7<br>13.7                    | 8            |
| Total           | 1<br>1.8%                   | 2<br>3.5                             | 3<br>5.3                                | 51<br>89.5                   | 57<br>100.0  |

|           | <u>Symmetric</u> | <u>With Battered<br/>Dependent</u> | <u>With Capital<br/>Dependent</u> |
|-----------|------------------|------------------------------------|-----------------------------------|
| Somers' D | -0.016           | 0.018                              | -0.015                            |

Number of missing observations = 54

---

Table 47

## CROSS TABULATION OF ALLOWANCE FROM HUSBAND

| <u>Violence</u> | <u>Allowance</u> |            | <u>Husband<br/>Receives</u> | <u>Total</u> |
|-----------------|------------------|------------|-----------------------------|--------------|
|                 | <u>No</u>        | <u>Yes</u> |                             |              |
| Not<br>Battered | 59<br>77.6%      | 11<br>78.6 | 2<br>100.0                  | 72           |
| Yes<br>Battered | 17<br>22.4%      | 3<br>21.4  | --<br>--                    | 20           |
| Total           | 76<br>82.6%      | 14<br>15.2 | 2<br>2.2                    | 92<br>100.0  |

|           | <u>Symmetric</u> | <u>With Battered<br/>Dependent</u> | <u>With Allowance<br/>Dependent</u> |
|-----------|------------------|------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| Somers' D | -0.037           | -0.040                             | -0.034                              |

Number of missing observations = 19

---

Table 48

## CROSS TABULATION OF "WHO HANDLES THE FAMILY BUDGET?"

Who Handles

| <u>Violence</u> | <u>No Family<br/>Budget</u> | <u>She Does</u> | <u>Husband<br/>Does</u> | <u>Both Do</u> | <u>Total</u> |
|-----------------|-----------------------------|-----------------|-------------------------|----------------|--------------|
| Not<br>Battered | 1<br>100.0%                 | 31<br>72.1      | 7<br>77.8               | 36<br>83.7     | 75           |
| Yes<br>Battered | --<br>-- %                  | 12<br>27.9      | 2<br>22.2               | 7<br>16.3      | 21           |
| Total           | 1<br>1.0%                   | 43<br>44.8      | 9<br>9.4                | 43<br>44.8     | 96<br>100.0  |

|           | <u>Symmetric</u> | <u>With Battered<br/>Dependent</u> | <u>With Who Handles<br/>Dependent</u> |
|-----------|------------------|------------------------------------|---------------------------------------|
| Somers' D | -0.111           | -0.087                             | -0.151                                |

Number of missing observations = 15

---

Table 49

WHO CALCULATES THE INCOME TAX?

| <u>Violence</u> | <u>Who Calculates</u> |                     |                |                          |                                    |                     | <u>Total</u> |
|-----------------|-----------------------|---------------------|----------------|--------------------------|------------------------------------|---------------------|--------------|
|                 | <u>She Does</u>       | <u>Husband Does</u> | <u>Both Do</u> | <u>Pay Someone To Do</u> | <u>Filed &amp; Done Separately</u> | <u>Other Person</u> |              |
| Not Battered    | 21<br>70.0            | 24<br>88.9          | 16<br>80.0     | 12<br>80.0               | 1<br>50.0                          | 1<br>100.0          | 75           |
| Yes Battered    | 9<br>30.0             | 3<br>11.1           | 4<br>20.0      | 3<br>20.0                | 1<br>50.0                          | --                  | 20           |
| Total           | 30<br>31.6            | 27<br>28.4          | 20<br>21.1     | 15<br>15.8               | 2<br>2.1                           | 1<br>1.1            | 95<br>100.0  |

|           | <u>Symmetric</u> | <u>With Battered Dependent</u> | <u>With Calculates Dependent</u> |
|-----------|------------------|--------------------------------|----------------------------------|
| Somers' D | -0.057           | -0.041                         | -0.093                           |

Number of missing observations = 16

## INSTRUCTION SHEET

PLEASE READ THE FOLLOWING INSTRUCTIONS BEFORE COMPLETING THE QUESTIONNAIRE:

1. For the purposes of this research: both legally married couples and couples "living together," are intended when reference is made to "spouse" or "marriage" in general. The term "immediate family member" refers to your spouse, children, your mother, father, sisters or brothers. "Relative" refers to your grandparents, aunts, uncles, cousins, etc.
2. Wherever possible answer all the questions in order of presentation.
3. Complete the General Information (Part IV) questions regardless of how much you complete throughout the questionnaire.
4. Answer the questionnaire on your own giving your opinion on the subject.
5. Usually there is only one response necessary for each item unless specifically stated otherwise.
6. Use either a pen or pencil to indicate your answer; please print clearly.
7. Answer honestly from your own store of knowledge. All answers are CONFIDENTIAL.

## PART I

## PERSONAL BONDS AND THEIR CONTENT

The following questions in this section ask for general information about your leisure time activities and your relationships with friends and family. This is an area where you are the expert, so feel free to answer fully as all information in this, and the remaining sections is confidential.

1. (a) Do you and your spouse share many leisure time activities?

Yes \_\_\_\_\_

No \_\_\_\_\_

(b) Do you participate in any leisure activities without your spouse?

Yes \_\_\_\_\_ (if yes) Typically, what sorts of things do you do?

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

|  |                               |
|--|-------------------------------|
| Who with?<br>(May check<br>more than<br>one) | friend _____                  |
|  | immediate family member _____ |
|  | relative _____                |
|  | alone _____                   |
|  | other _____                   |
| How often?                                   | rarely _____                  |
|  | occasionally _____            |
|  | regularly _____               |

No \_\_\_\_\_

(c) Does your spouse participate in any leisure activities without you?

|                    |            |                    |
|--------------------|------------|--------------------|
| Yes _____ (if yes) | How often? | rarely _____       |
|                    |            | occasionally _____ |
|                    |            | regularly _____    |

No \_\_\_\_\_

2. (a) Please indicate the level of agreement between you and your spouse on the following items by circling the appropriate number from 1-5 in the right hand column, corresponding to the scale below.

|                                       | Strongly<br>Agree<br>5 | Agree<br>4 | Disagree<br>3 | Strongly<br>Disagree<br>2 | Undecided<br>1 |
|---------------------------------------|------------------------|------------|---------------|---------------------------|----------------|
| (1) housework                         | 1                      | 2          | 3             | 4                         | 5              |
| (2) family budget                     | 1                      | 2          | 3             | 4                         | 5              |
| (3) children                          | 1                      | 2          | 3             | 4                         | 5              |
| (4) pets                              | 1                      | 2          | 3             | 4                         | 5              |
| (5) leisure time                      | 1                      | 2          | 3             | 4                         | 5              |
| (6) family car                        | 1                      | 2          | 3             | 4                         | 5              |
| (7) friendships with the opposite sex | 1                      | 2          | 3             | 4                         | 5              |
| (8) church attendance                 | 1                      | 2          | 3             | 4                         | 5              |
| (9) gifts                             | 1                      | 2          | 3             | 4                         | 5              |
| (10) vacations                        | 1                      | 2          | 3             | 4                         | 5              |
| (11) unfaithfulness                   | 1                      | 2          | 3             | 4                         | 5              |
| (12) major holidays (e.g. Christmas)  | 1                      | 2          | 3             | 4                         | 5              |
| (13) in-laws                          | 1                      | 2          | 3             | 4                         | 5              |
| (14) working wives                    | 1                      | 2          | 3             | 4                         | 5              |
| (15) working mothers                  | 1                      | 2          | 3             | 4                         | 5              |
| (16) sexual relations                 | 1                      | 2          | 3             | 4                         | 5              |

- (b) Do any of the above items lead to arguments between you and your spouse?

Yes \_\_\_\_\_ (if yes) How often? rarely \_\_\_\_\_  
 occasionally \_\_\_\_\_  
 regularly \_\_\_\_\_

Which item leads to the most arguments?

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

No \_\_\_\_\_

3. For each of the statements below, please indicate the frequency (Regularly, Occasionally, Rarely, or Never) with which they occur in your relationship with your spouse, by placing a check mark "✓" in the appropriate column next to the statement. An example is provided.

|                           | Regularly | Occasionally | Rarely | Never |
|---------------------------|-----------|--------------|--------|-------|
| e.g. sharing a joke       | ✓         | _____        | _____  | _____ |
| (1) sharing of ideas      | _____     | _____        | _____  | _____ |
| (2) lots of discussions   | _____     | _____        | _____  | _____ |
| (3) lack of communication | _____     | _____        | _____  | _____ |
| (4) bickering             | _____     | _____        | _____  | _____ |
| (5) loud arguing          | _____     | _____        | _____  | _____ |
| (6) physical violence     | _____     | _____        | _____  | _____ |





7. (b) How do you typically interact with your closest friends?  
(May check more than one.)

telephone \_\_\_\_\_  
 face-to-face \_\_\_\_\_  
 letters \_\_\_\_\_  
 any combination of above \_\_\_\_\_

8. (a) Do you ever confide in any of your friends?

Yes \_\_\_\_\_ (if yes) How often? regularly \_\_\_\_\_  
 occasionally \_\_\_\_\_  
 rarely \_\_\_\_\_

What kinds of things do you feel comfortable in  
 confiding? \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_  
 \_\_\_\_\_

What sorts of things are you not likely to  
 confide? \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_  
 \_\_\_\_\_

No \_\_\_\_\_

9. Some people say they like their friends to be of the same sex, while others prefer friends of the opposite sex. Are any of your friends of the opposite gender?

Yes \_\_\_\_\_ (if yes) How many? \_\_\_\_\_

No \_\_\_\_\_

10. Is anyone in your immediate family or relatives among your closest friends?

Yes \_\_\_\_\_ (if yes) What is their relation to you?

\_\_\_\_\_  
 \_\_\_\_\_

No \_\_\_\_\_

11. For each of the statements below, please indicate the frequency (regularly, occasionally, rarely or never) with which they occur in your relationship with your spouse by placing a check mark "✓" in the appropriate column next to each statement. An example is provided.

|  | Regularly | Occasionally | Rarely | Never |
|--|-----------|--------------|--------|-------|
| e.g. You like your neighbours.                                       | _____     | _____✓_____  | _____  | _____ |
| (1) You depend on his choices for friends.                           | _____     | _____        | _____  | _____ |
| (2) He objects to your time spent with friends.                      | _____     | _____        | _____  | _____ |
| (3) You give up important activities to keep him happy.              | _____     | _____        | _____  | _____ |
| (4) He frequently checks up on you when you are away from the house. | _____     | _____        | _____  | _____ |
| (5) You feel unable to make decisions unless he guides you.          | _____     | _____        | _____  | _____ |
| (6) He generally tells you what to do.                               | _____     | _____        | _____  | _____ |
| (7) He gets angry if you ignore his advice.                          | _____     | _____        | _____  | _____ |
| (8) You show fear when his impatience worsens.                       | _____     | _____        | _____  | _____ |
| (9) He has excessive temper outbursts.                               | _____     | _____        | _____  | _____ |
| (10) You question his judgement.                                     | _____     | _____        | _____  | _____ |
| (11) He has destroyed or injured many of your personal possessions.  | _____     | _____        | _____  | _____ |
| (12) You only keep things around that he chooses for you.            | _____     | _____        | _____  | _____ |
| (13) He is overly cruel or overly kind.                              | _____     | _____        | _____  | _____ |
| (14) He questions your faithfulness to him.                          | _____     | _____        | _____  | _____ |

## PART II

## TRAUMATIC BONDS

The next set of questions deal with your opinions on violent behaviour of any kind between couples. In this section and the following the terms "physical abuse," "wife battering," "assaults," "beating," and "attacks" are used interchangeably to refer to repeated, deliberate violence, both physical and emotional by a husband towards his wife without her consent, and which may or may not result in injuries. The term "verbal abuse" refers to name calling, threats, harassment or any other belittling or demeaning comments by a husband to his wife. Some people have first hand knowledge in this area, others do not. Please answer as best you can.

12. (a) What would you consider to be physical abuse in a relationship?

---



---

- (b) What would you consider to be verbal abuse in a relationship?

---



---

13. Has a woman you know personally ever been abused by her spouse?

Yes \_\_\_\_\_ (if yes) Was she a friend \_\_\_\_\_  
 immediate family member \_\_\_\_\_  
 relative \_\_\_\_\_  
 other (please specify) \_\_\_\_\_

No \_\_\_\_\_

14. (a) How common do you feel wife battering is in Canadian families?

Very common \_\_\_\_\_  
 Somewhat common \_\_\_\_\_  
 Uncommon \_\_\_\_\_  
 Very uncommon \_\_\_\_\_

14. (b) Are there some people you think would be more likely than others to be involved in an abusive relationship?

Yes \_\_\_\_\_ (if yes) Who? \_\_\_\_\_

Why? \_\_\_\_\_

No \_\_\_\_\_ (if no) Why? \_\_\_\_\_

14. (c) In your opinion are there some situations in families more likely than others to lead to wife battering?

Yes \_\_\_\_\_ (if yes) What? \_\_\_\_\_

No \_\_\_\_\_

15. Is wife battering legal in Canada?

Yes \_\_\_\_\_

No \_\_\_\_\_

Don't know \_\_\_\_\_

16. Please indicate your level of agreement with the following statements by circling the appropriate number from 1-5, in the right hand column, corresponding to the scale below.

|  | Strongly<br>Agree<br>5 | Agree<br>4 | Disagree<br>3 | Strongly<br>Disagree<br>2 | Undecided<br>1 |
|--|------------------------|------------|---------------|---------------------------|----------------|
| (1) Physical abuse of wives by their husbands is a private matter between the couple. The government, legal system and social agencies should not interfere. | 1                      | 2          | 3             | 4                         | 5              |
| (2) Verbal abuse of wives by their husbands is a private matter between the couple. The government, legal system and social agencies should not interfere.   | 1                      | 2          | 3             | 4                         | 5              |
| (3) In many instances of abuse, wives bring the assaults on themselves by provoking their husbands.  | 1                      | 2          | 3             | 4                         | 5              |
| (4) Husbands who batter their wives are mainly mentally ill or alcoholics or both.   | 1                      | 2          | 3             | 4                         | 5              |
| (5) Physical violence occurs between couples only when an argument gets out of hand.   | 1                      | 2          | 3             | 4                         | 5              |
| (6) Wife battering is usually part of a pattern that only worsens over time.   | 1                      | 2          | 3             | 4                         | 5              |
| (7) Battered wives often have been sexually abused as children.  | 1                      | 2          | 3             | 4                         | 5              |
| (8) Battered wives are more likely to be children of mothers who were battered wives themselves.   | 1                      | 2          | 3             | 4                         | 5              |
| (9) Husbands who batter their wives most often grew up in homes where this was a part of the normal way of life.   | 1                      | 2          | 3             | 4                         | 5              |
| (10) Women would not be abused if they were better wives to their husbands.  | 1                      | 2          | 3             | 4                         | 5              |

17. (a) If a woman you knew personally was being physically abused by her husband, what would you advise her to do?

---

---

---

- (b) What advice would you give to a woman being verbally abused by her husband?

---

---

---

18. Many women stay with, or return to abusive husbands. Why do you think this happens?

---

---

---

## PART III

## EXPERIENCED VIOLENCE

In this section you are asked to relate your own experiences in the matter of traumatic bonds. Since some behaviour of this sort may occur in any relationship, answer the questions for which you have information as fully as you can. Those questions for which you do not have direct knowledge, indicate this and go on to the next question. Any help you can provide in this section is greatly appreciated.

19. Have you ever been physically assaulted by a loved one, such as your spouse?

Yes \_\_\_\_\_ (if yes) Please explain \_\_\_\_\_  
 \_\_\_\_\_  
 \_\_\_\_\_

No \_\_\_\_\_ (IF NO - SKIP TO QUESTION 32)

20. (a) The first time you were assaulted by your spouse, were you married to each other then?

Yes \_\_\_\_\_

No \_\_\_\_\_ (if no) Were you dating \_\_\_\_\_

engaged \_\_\_\_\_

living together \_\_\_\_\_

other (please specify) \_\_\_\_\_  
 \_\_\_\_\_

(b) How long had you been together? \_\_\_\_\_

(c) How old were you? \_\_\_\_\_

(d) How long ago was this? \_\_\_\_\_

21. After the first time in which physical violence occurred between you and your spouse, did it ever happen again?

Yes \_\_\_\_\_ (if yes) How often? every week \_\_\_\_\_  
 every other week \_\_\_\_\_  
 once a month \_\_\_\_\_  
 once every 2 months \_\_\_\_\_  
 once every 3 months \_\_\_\_\_  
 2 or 3 times a year \_\_\_\_\_  
 twice a year \_\_\_\_\_  
 once a year \_\_\_\_\_  
 less than once a year \_\_\_\_\_

No \_\_\_\_\_ (if no) Do you believe it will ever happen again?

Yes \_\_\_\_\_ No \_\_\_\_\_

Comments \_\_\_\_\_  
 \_\_\_\_\_  
 \_\_\_\_\_

22. (a) Was there a time of day during which the assault(s) were more likely to occur?

Yes \_\_\_\_\_ (if yes) Was it:

morning (6:00 a.m.-12:00 p.m.) \_\_\_\_\_  
 afternoon (12:00 p.m.-6:00 p.m.) \_\_\_\_\_  
 evening (6:00 p.m.-12:00 a.m.) \_\_\_\_\_  
 night (12:00 a.m.-6:00 a.m.) \_\_\_\_\_

No \_\_\_\_\_

(b) Were the assault(s) more likely to occur on certain days?

Yes \_\_\_\_\_ (if yes) Which? \_\_\_\_\_  
 \_\_\_\_\_  
 \_\_\_\_\_  
 \_\_\_\_\_

No \_\_\_\_\_

22. (c) Approximately how long did the attack(s) last:

Under 15 minutes \_\_\_\_\_  
 15 minutes - 30 minutes \_\_\_\_\_  
 30 minutes - 45 minutes \_\_\_\_\_  
 45 minutes - one hour \_\_\_\_\_  
 Longer than one hour \_\_\_\_\_

23. Did the assault(s) involve any of the following: (Please indicate the frequency [regularly, occasionally, rarely, never] by placing a check mark " " in the appropriate column to the right of the item.)

|   | Regularly | Occasionally | Rarely | Never |
|---|-----------|--------------|--------|-------|
| (1) Taunts                                | _____     | _____        | _____  | _____ |
| (2) Namecalling                           | _____     | _____        | _____  | _____ |
| (3) Threats                               | _____     | _____        | _____  | _____ |
| (4) Slapping                              | _____     | _____        | _____  | _____ |
| (5) Bruising                              | _____     | _____        | _____  | _____ |
| (6) Kicking                               | _____     | _____        | _____  | _____ |
| (7) Choking                               | _____     | _____        | _____  | _____ |
| (8) Beating with fists                    | _____     | _____        | _____  | _____ |
| (9) Use of a weapon                       | _____     | _____        | _____  | _____ |
| (10) Sexual assault                       | _____     | _____        | _____  | _____ |
| (11) Humiliation in front<br>of friends   | _____     | _____        | _____  | _____ |
| (12) Humiliation in front<br>of relatives | _____     | _____        | _____  | _____ |
| (13) Humiliation in front of<br>children  | _____     | _____        | _____  | _____ |
| (14) Other? Please comment                | _____     |              |        |       |

24. Was the use of alcohol or drugs (ever part of the attack(s) on you?

Yes \_\_\_\_\_ (if yes) Were you both under the influence of  
 drugs/alcohol? \_\_\_\_\_  
 Husband only under the influence? \_\_\_\_\_  
 How often? rarely \_\_\_\_\_  
 occasionally \_\_\_\_\_  
 regularly \_\_\_\_\_

No \_\_\_\_\_

25. (a) Did you (ever) receive any injuries from the assault(s) that required medical attention?

Yes \_\_\_\_\_ (if yes) How often? rarely \_\_\_\_\_  
 occasionally \_\_\_\_\_  
 regularly \_\_\_\_\_

Would you describe them? \_\_\_\_\_  
 \_\_\_\_\_  
 \_\_\_\_\_  
 \_\_\_\_\_

No \_\_\_\_\_ [IF NO, SKIP (b), (c), and (d)]

(b) How did you (usually) treat the injuries?

By self \_\_\_\_\_

Saw doctor in office \_\_\_\_\_

- Who usually took you there?
- What did you tell the doctor about your injuries?

\_\_\_\_\_

Went to Emergency in hospital \_\_\_\_\_

- Who usually took you there?
- What did you tell the doctor about your injuries?

\_\_\_\_\_

Other (please specify) \_\_\_\_\_

(c) Were you ever hospitalized because of injuries received as the result of (any) of the assault(s)?

Yes \_\_\_\_\_ (if yes) How many times? \_\_\_\_\_

For how long? \_\_\_\_\_

No \_\_\_\_\_

(d) Do you have any permanent disabilities or conditions as the result of (any) of the assault(s)?

Yes \_\_\_\_\_ (if yes) Would you explain? \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

No \_\_\_\_\_

26. (a) In a typical situation in which you were assaulted, what did you do immediately after the assault? \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

(b) What did you do the next day after the assault? \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

27. During (any of) the assault(s), did you (ever) fight back?

Yes \_\_\_\_ (if yes) What did you do? \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

No \_\_\_\_ (if no) Was there a reason why you didn't fight back?

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

28. Have you ever separated from your spouse because of the assault(s)?

Yes \_\_\_\_ (if yes) How many times has separation occurred?

\_\_\_\_\_

For how long? \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

Where did you stay while you were separated?

own home/spouse left \_\_\_\_\_

transition house/shelter \_\_\_\_\_

hostel \_\_\_\_\_

hotel/motel \_\_\_\_\_

friend's home \_\_\_\_\_

immediate family member's home \_\_\_\_\_

relative's home \_\_\_\_\_

other (please specify) \_\_\_\_\_

No \_\_\_\_

29. (a) Did you ever seek professional help in response to the violence in your relationships?

(Please answer each one.)

|                     | Yes | No | No. of Times |
|---------------------|-----|----|--------------|
| police              |     |    |              |
| doctor              |     |    |              |
| psychiatrist        |     |    |              |
| psychologist        |     |    |              |
| marriage counsellor |     |    |              |
| lawyer              |     |    |              |
| clergy              |     |    |              |
| other               |     |    |              |

29. (b) What advice did the professional help give you?

|                     |  |
|---------------------|--|
| police              |  |
|                     |  |
| doctor              |  |
|                     |  |
| psychiatrist        |  |
|                     |  |
| psychologist        |  |
|                     |  |
| marriage counsellor |  |
|                     |  |
| lawyer              |  |
|                     |  |
| clergy              |  |
|                     |  |
| other               |  |
|                     |  |

29. (c) Did the professional help change the pattern of abuse at all?

Yes \_\_\_\_ (if yes) How? \_\_\_\_\_  
 \_\_\_\_\_  
 \_\_\_\_\_  
 \_\_\_\_\_

No \_\_\_\_

30. (a) Did you ever confide in anyone other than a professional about the assault(s)? (Please answer each one.)

|                     | Yes | No | No. of Times |
|---------------------|-----|----|--------------|
| mother              |     |    |              |
| father              |     |    |              |
| sister              |     |    |              |
| brother             |     |    |              |
| same sex friend     |     |    |              |
| opposite sex friend |     |    |              |
| neighbour           |     |    |              |
| other               |     |    |              |

30. (b) For those you answered "No" to in Question 30 (a) do you think they suspect that you are/or have been assaulted?

Yes \_\_\_\_ (if yes) Who? \_\_\_\_\_

Does this matter to you? \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

No \_\_\_\_ (IF NO - SKIP TO QUESTION 31)

30. (c) For each question you answered "Yes" to in 30 (a) what did they advise you to do?

|                     |  |
|---------------------|--|
| mother              |  |
|                     |  |
| father              |  |
|                     |  |
| sister              |  |
|                     |  |
| brother             |  |
|                     |  |
| same sex friend     |  |
|                     |  |
| opposite sex friend |  |
|                     |  |
| neighbour           |  |
|                     |  |
| other               |  |
|                     |  |

31. (a) Did you ever ask anyone for help during an assault(s)?

Yes \_\_\_\_\_ (if yes) Who? friend \_\_\_\_\_  
 neighbour \_\_\_\_\_  
 immediate family member \_\_\_\_\_  
 relative \_\_\_\_\_  
 other \_\_\_\_\_

How often? rarely \_\_\_\_\_  
 occasionally \_\_\_\_\_  
 regularly \_\_\_\_\_

What did they do? \_\_\_\_\_  
 \_\_\_\_\_  
 \_\_\_\_\_

No \_\_\_\_\_

31. (b) Did anyone ever call the police for you during an assault(s)?

Yes \_\_\_\_\_ (if yes) Who? friend \_\_\_\_\_  
neighbour \_\_\_\_\_  
immediate family member \_\_\_\_\_  
relative \_\_\_\_\_  
other \_\_\_\_\_

How often? rarely \_\_\_\_\_  
occasionally \_\_\_\_\_  
regularly \_\_\_\_\_

What did the police do? \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

## PART IV

## GENERAL INFORMATION

Finally, I would like to ask you some background questions. Please feel free to add your own comments about this questionnaire or the subject in general, in question 44.

32. What is your age?

Under 20 \_\_\_\_\_

20 - 29 \_\_\_\_\_

30 - 39 \_\_\_\_\_

40 - 49 \_\_\_\_\_

50 - 59 \_\_\_\_\_

60 or over \_\_\_\_\_

33. (a) What is your current marital status? Are you?

Married \_\_\_\_\_

Single \_\_\_\_\_ [SKIP QUESTIONS 38(b), 40, 42]

Divorced \_\_\_\_\_ [SKIP QUESTIONS 38(b), 40, 42]

Widowed \_\_\_\_\_ [SKIP QUESTIONS 38(b), 40, 42]

Other (Please specify) \_\_\_\_\_

(b) For how long? \_\_\_\_\_

(c) Have you ever been married before?

Yes \_\_\_\_\_

No \_\_\_\_\_ [SKIP QUESTIONS 34(d) and (e)]

34. Do you have any children?

Yes \_\_\_\_\_ (if yes) (a) How many? \_\_\_\_\_

(b) Age(s) \_\_\_\_\_

(c) Sex(s) \_\_\_\_\_

(d) Are any from a previous marriage?

Yes \_\_\_\_\_ (if yes) Are they living with you

No \_\_\_\_\_ now? \_\_\_\_\_

Yes \_\_\_\_\_

No \_\_\_\_\_ (if no) Where  
are they living? \_\_\_\_\_

(e) Are you happy with the living arrangements you  
have made for these children? \_\_\_\_\_

No \_\_\_\_\_

35. What is your educational background? (What is your spouse's?)  
(Please check "Yes" or "No" for each one.)

Did you complete:

elementary school

high school

some university/college

vocational/technical training

university degree

post-graduate degree

|                               | You |    | (Spouse) |    |
|-------------------------------|-----|----|----------|----|
|                               | Yes | No | Yes      | No |
| elementary school             |     |    |          |    |
| high school                   |     |    |          |    |
| some university/college       |     |    |          |    |
| vocational/technical training |     |    |          |    |
| university degree             |     |    |          |    |
| post-graduate degree          |     |    |          |    |

36. What is your ethnic background?  
(What is your spouse's?)

Caucasian

Oriental

Native Indian

East Indian

Black

Other (please specify) \_\_\_\_\_

| You | (Spouse) |
|-----|----------|
|     |          |
|     |          |
|     |          |
|     |          |
|     |          |
|     |          |

37. What is your religious denomination?  
(What is your spouse's?)

Protestant

Catholic

Jewish

Other (please specify) \_\_\_\_\_

| You | (Spouse) |
|-----|----------|
|     |          |
|     |          |
|     |          |
|     |          |

38. (a) Are you currently employed outside the home?

Yes \_\_\_\_\_ (if yes) What is your occupation? \_\_\_\_\_

Full-time \_\_\_\_\_ Part-time \_\_\_\_\_

No \_\_\_\_\_ (if no)

Are you:

a homemaker? \_\_\_\_\_

Have you ever worked  
outside the home?

Yes \_\_\_\_\_ No \_\_\_\_\_

(if yes) Occupation \_\_\_\_\_

retired? Previous occupation \_\_\_\_\_

unemployed? Previous occupation \_\_\_\_\_

student? \_\_\_\_\_

Other? (please specify) \_\_\_\_\_

38. (b) Is your spouse currently employed?

Yes \_\_\_\_\_ (if yes) What is his occupation? \_\_\_\_\_

No \_\_\_\_\_ (if no) Is he retired? \_\_\_\_\_  
 Previous Occupation \_\_\_\_\_

Unemployed? \_\_\_\_\_

Previous occupation \_\_\_\_\_

Student? \_\_\_\_\_

Other? (please specify) \_\_\_\_\_

39. What is your combined family income?

Under \$10,000 \_\_\_\_\_

\$11,000 - \$19,000 \_\_\_\_\_

\$20,000 - \$29,000 \_\_\_\_\_

\$30,000 - \$39,000 \_\_\_\_\_

\$40,000 - \$49,000 \_\_\_\_\_

\$50,000 - \$59,000 \_\_\_\_\_

\$60,000 - \$69,000 \_\_\_\_\_

\$70,000 or over \_\_\_\_\_

Don't know \_\_\_\_\_

40. Who earns more?

You \_\_\_\_\_

Spouse \_\_\_\_\_

About equal \_\_\_\_\_

Don't know \_\_\_\_\_

41. Do you have your own: (Please check "Yes" or "No" for each one.)

Chequing account \_\_\_\_\_

Savings account \_\_\_\_\_

Credit cards \_\_\_\_\_

| Yes | No |
|-----|----|
|     |    |
|     |    |
|     |    |

If you answered "No" to any of the above; are they:

in both names \_\_\_\_\_

all in husband's name \_\_\_\_\_

42. (a) Do you receive an allowance from your husband for your personal expenses?

Yes \_\_\_\_\_ (if yes) Do you have a separate housekeeping allowance? Yes \_\_\_\_\_  
 No \_\_\_\_\_

No \_\_\_\_\_

Comments \_\_\_\_\_  
 \_\_\_\_\_  
 \_\_\_\_\_

42. (b) Who handles the family budget? You \_\_\_\_\_  
 Spouse \_\_\_\_\_  
 Both \_\_\_\_\_

(c) Who calculates the income tax return? You \_\_\_\_\_  
 Spouse \_\_\_\_\_  
 Both \_\_\_\_\_

43. Do you have your own car?

Yes \_\_\_\_\_  
 No \_\_\_\_\_

44. Do you have any comments?

Thank you for your help.

APPENDIX C  
TELEPHONE CONTACT SHEET

Is this the \_\_\_\_\_ residence?

Is there a MRS. \_\_\_\_\_? (OR) Is this MRS. \_\_\_\_\_?

My name is \_\_\_\_\_, and I'm conducting research with the Sociology Department at the University of Victoria. (PAUSE) Your name was randomly selected to participate in a study being conducted in the Victoria area. If you agree to participate, you will be sent one questionnaire to complete; you'll have approximately ten days to do so, and all your answers will be kept completely confidential and anonymous. (PAUSE) The first section of the questionnaire deals with your relationships with your family and friends, while the last section asks standard background questions. The middle section of the questionnaire deals with the more sensitive area of wife abuse in Canada. A typical question would be, "What sort of advice would you give to women being abused?" Are you willing to participate?

Your address is \_\_\_\_\_ POSTAL CODE?

VITA

Surname: Wickson Given Names: Elise Jonina

Place of Birth: Saskatoon, Sask. Date of Birth: May 21, 1958

Educational Institutions Attended, With Dates of Entering and Leaving:

University of Victoria, B.C. 1977 to 1981

University of Victoria, B.C. 1982 to 1983

University of Victoria, B.C. 1986 to 1988

Degrees, Diplomas, Etc., Awarded, with Dates and Names of Institutions:

B.A. 1981 University of Victoria

Honors and Awards:

Sara Spencer Graduate Research Award, 1987

B.C. Public Interest Research Grant, 1987

PARTIAL COPYRIGHT LICENSE

I hereby grant the right to lend my thesis (dissertation if appropriate) (the title of which is shown below) to users of the University of Victoria Library, and to make single copies only for such users or in response to a request from the Library of any other university, or similar institution, on its behalf or for one of its users. I further agree that permission for extensive copying of this thesis for scholarly purposes may be granted by me or a member of the University designated by me. It is understood that copying or publication of this thesis for financial gain shall not be allowed without my written permission.

Title of Thesis/Dissertation

RELATIONAL NETWORKS OF WOMEN IN VICTORIA AND  
THE ISSUE OF WOMEN ABUSE IN INTIMATE BONDS

Author



(Signature)

ELISE J. WICKSON

Sept 8 1988

(Date)