A CRITICAL SURVEY OF METHODOLOGY USED IN EMPIRICAL RESEARCH ON THE SOCIAL SUPPORT, SOCIAL NETWORK, AND PERSONALITY CHARACTERISTICS OF ABUSED WOMEN

by

Jay Evans Cross
BSc., University of British Columbia, 1985

A Thesis Submitted in Partial Fulfilment of the
Requirements for the Degree of

MASTER OF ARTS

in the Department of Sociology

We accept this proposal as conforming
to the required standard

[redacted]
Dr. T. Rennie Warburton, Supervisor (Department of Sociology)

[redacted]
Dr. Paul M. Baker, Departmental Member (Department of Sociology)

[redacted]
Dr. Beverly A. Timmons, Outside Member (Department of Psychological Foundations in Education)

[redacted]
Dr. Norma I. Mickelson, External Examiner (Department of Communication and Social Foundations in Education)

University of Victoria

Supervisor: Dr. T. Rennie Warburton

ABSTRACT

This thesis analyzes sixty-one empirical research studies concerning the social support, social network, and personality characteristics of abused women. These studies were located through an extensive search of the woman abuse literature published between 1969 and 1989. Using the *MAP* (*M*ethodological *A*rchitectural *P*lan), each study was systematically examined for data sources and generation procedures, research design, reliability and validity of instruments, and statistical methods and measures.

The survey identified several serious problems in the research. Much of the social support and social network literature uses small, unrepresentative samples of shelter residents. In addition, the group "battered women" has been treated as an undifferentiated mass, which has reduced the validity of causal inferences. Further, in over half of the cases, battered women were asked to provide social support and social network information for their current out-of-abuse situation, rather than for the previous abusive situations, thereby minimizing any observable changes that may have occurred as a result of the abuse. The personality profile studies were also problematic; apart from the small clinically

based samples of abused women collected, nearly all were cross-sectionally designed. This has led many researchers to conclude improperly that specific schizophrenic-type personality factors of the abused woman solicited and maintained the abuse, rather than such characteristics having emerged either from the abuse itself or as an outcome of the social isolation that the women may have endured. The implications of these findings for future abuse research are discussed.

Examiners:

[redacted]

Dr. T. Rennie Warburton, Supervisor (Department of Sociology)

[redacted]

Dr. Paul M. Baker, Departmental Member (Department of Sociology)

[redacted]

Dr. Beverly A. Timmons, Outside Member (Department of Psychological Foundations in Education)

[redacted]

Dr. Norma I. Mickelson, External Examiner (Department of Communication and Social Foundations in Education)

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Appreciation is expressed for the guidance and assistance provided by members of my thesis committee: Dr. T. Rennie Warburton, Dr. Paul M. Baker, Dr. Beverly A. Timmons, and Dr. Norma I. Mickelson.

Special appreciation is expressed to my supervisor, Rennie Warburton, whose valuable suggestions, patience, and interest helped bring this study to completion.

I wish to dedicate this thesis to

T. Rennie Warburton.

INTRODUCTION

Despite its longstanding prevalence, the problem of woman abuse was not seriously examined by the research community in North America until the early 1970s (see Gelles, 1972; O'Brien, 1971; Steinmetz and Straus, 1974). Previously, the issue of woman abuse had either been hidden within medical and clinical discussions on male jealousy (Mooney, 1965; Mowat, 1966; Shepard, 1961), or, from a psychoanalytic viewpoint, the problem was shaped to fit the mold of female masochism (Deutsch, 1944; Freud, 1919; 1924; Reynolds and Siegle, 1959; Schultz, 1960; Snell, et al., 1964). In the social sciences during the 1950s and 1960s, "woman abuse" fell under the heading of "marital adjustment," with the focus on the dynamics of interaction within the conventional couple bond.

It was treated in a very broad, superficial way by survey analysis. Ethnographic studies occasionally reported violent behavior in marriages, but these observations were given only marginal attention and were typically dealt with under such "desensitizing" concepts as "marital instability" and "broken marriages" (Liebow, 1967; 1968). Although some of the major sociological and psychological writings on the family identified physical coercion as a source of power in the marital relationship (see Bach and Wyden, 1969; Komarovsky, 1964), the abuse of this power against women, specifically, was not highlighted.

Masked by more mainstream scholarly interests, the abuse of women was not considered to be a social problem or a subject for research in its own right until the 1970s.[1] Indeed, in the renowned publication of family sociology, the Journal of Marriage and the Family, no article with the word 'violence' in its title appeared from its founding in 1939 through 1969 (O'Brien, 1971). The first doctoral dissertation on the subject of family violence only became available in 1973 (Gelles, 1973). Articles on wife abuse in such prominent social work journals as Social Casework, Social Service Review, Social Work Research and Abstracts, did not appear until well into the mid-1970s (Davis, 1987). Similarly, it was only in 1976 that "wife abuse" was added as a topic in Sociological Abstracts, and a year later, a topic in the renowned medical abstracts, Index Medicus.

Largely as a result of the reemergence of the women's movement during the mid-to-late 1960s, academic interest in the problem of woman abuse increased (Gordon, 1988; Pleck, 1987). Researchers from diverse academic fields in the social sciences and in medicine began to publish studies on family violence in mainstream journals: Journal of Marriage and the Family, Journal of Social Psychology, American Journal of Community

---

[1] It should be noted that while Talcott Parsons (1947) did lay a theoretical and historical groundwork for a study on violence against women with his socio-psychoanalytic writings on aggression and "compulsive masculinity," the sociological community only picked up on it in the context of sex role socialization. Many feminist scholars reject this work because of its sexist nature.

Psychology, Criminology, and the Journal of the American Medical Association. In the 1970s and 1980s, as a response to the increased interest in the study of family violence and woman abuse in North America and abroad, at least seven specialized journals[2] and four "journal-type" magazines[3] were specifically created, nationally and internationally. Altogether, between 1972 and 1990, over 800 articles on the topic of abuse of women in dating, marital, and cohabitating relationships, and over 8000 articles on family violence in general (Geffner et al., 1990:ii) were printed. In addition, many successful national and international conferences were organized to provide a wider forum for the exchange of ideas in the developing areas of woman abuse.[4] In 1989 alone, well over 20 national and international conferences on family violence were held, to discuss the abuse of women and family violence.

Yet, despite the extensive academic discourse generated over the last two decades, our insights into the problem of woman abuse have not progressed enormously. While researchers

---

[2] (1) Journal of Interpersonal Violence (USA); (2) Violence and Victims (USA); (3) Journal of Family Violence (USA); (4) Aggressive Behavior (USA); (5) Victimology: An International Journal (USA); (6) The International Review of Victimology (England); (7) Violence Update (USA).

[3] (1) Transition (Canada); (2) The Family Violence Bulletin (USA); (3) VisaVis (Canada); (4) Response: to the Victimization of Women and Children (USA).

[4] For example, the Sixth Annual Conference on ABUSE AND VICTIMIZATION IN THE LIFE-SPAN PERSPECTIVE held at Children's Hospital, Boston, MA (March 22-24, 1990) listed in its prospectus the presentation of at least twenty papers related to family violence.

from a wide array of disciplines--including psychology, sociology, criminology, medicine, nursing and law--have contributed considerably to the development of an empirical research base, findings have often been inconclusive, contradictory and/or unreliable, compromising the usefulness of the results (Bridges and Weis, 1988). For example, reported incidence rates of woman abuse, for married couples, vary from as low as 6.1% to as high as 33.0% in the United States and from as low as 8.7% to as high as 36.1% in Canada. Similarly, for cohabitating couples, the rates vary from as low as 11.7% to as high as 37.8% in the United States and from 34.6% to 60.5% in Canada (see Ellis (1989:240) and Frieze and Browne (1989:178) for a review of these estimates). Weis (1989) observed recently that without more precise reporting it is difficult to know whether such abuse is increasing or decreasing.

In addition, there are discrepancies regarding the the degree to which the abuse of women is proportionate across age, socioeconomic, racial, and educational groups. Several researchers report that marital violence is unevenly distributed: that a higher incidence is found among blacks and other racial minorities (Cazenave and Straus, 1979; MacLeod, 1980; Straus et al., 1980) and among families where the husband is either a blue-collar worker or unemployed (Flynn, 1977; Prescott and Letko, 1977; Roy, 1977; Straus, Gelles and

Steinmetz, 1980).[5] Violence against women has also been found to occur more frequently in young families (i.e., where the husband and the wife are under 30 years-old), in families with fewer than six children, in families with no religious affiliation, and in families who live in large urban areas (Gelles and Straus, 1980; MacLeod, 1980).

By contrast, other researchers have found similar rates of wife battering across a broad range of socioeconomic groups and classes as well as racial and religious affiliations (Davidson, 1978; Mahon, 1981; Martin, 1976). For instance, in a major review of the literature on the "risk-markers" of abuse (see Hotaling and Sugarman, 1986), income and education of battered women were not found to be related to abuse. Similar reviews, on batterers, found these same factors to be only weakly associated with violent behavior (Sugarman and Hotaling, 1989a; 1989b). In a study examining the effect of race in explaining domestic violence rates, Lockhart (1985; 1987) found very little difference between blacks and whites. However, examined with respect to class, although a higher percentage of black women reported at least one victimization act, the median rate of episodes experienced by middle class white women was somewhat higher than experienced by middle class black

---

[5] The higher incidence of battering among lower classes compared to the upper classes, would be deceptive, since the less advantaged must depend on public resources, such as emergency rooms and shelters, and thus are more visible. In contrast, those with greater financial resources can better hide their victimization by seeking help in more private milieus (see also Stark and McEvoy, 1974).

women.

The research community is also strongly divided on the causes of woman abuse. For example, some researchers maintain that violence against women is rooted in the psychological make-up of battered women. In particular, some Freudian psychoanalysts and psychologists believe that it is the unconscious, neurotic, and masochistic personality attributes of the battered woman which lead her to provoke abuse from her partner. According to them, the woman remains in the abusive relationship and unconsciously engages in self-destructive behavior because of her oedipal conflict, which she attempts to resolve by rejecting the ma[redacted]nd, instead, provoking his aggression (Kleckner, 19[redacted] Lion, 1977; Metzger, 1977; Saul, 1972; Shainess, 1977, 1979, 1984; Snell, Rosenwald and Robey, 1964). However, in actual interviews with battered women, antecedent masochistic characteristics have not been found (Carlson, 1977; Davidson, 1978; Elbow, 1977; Flynn, 1977; Hanks and Rosenbaum, 1977; Waites, 1978). Other researchers have taken issue with this traditional masochistic interpretation (Caplan, 1984; Gingold, 1976; Martin, 1976; Pizzy, 1974; Roy, 1977; Star, 1980; Truninger, 1971; and Walker, 1979). They assert that to even consider female masochism as a possible cause of woman abuse is a blatant example of victim blaming, as, for example, in incidents where women are victims of rape, incest, and sexual harassment

(Horney, 1967).[6] Several researchers have proposed that battered women are victims with situations similar to victims of kidnap or natural disasters (Symonds, 1978; Symonds, 1979). Their common reactions include panic, confusion, and immobility, often leading to regressed behavior or withdrawal. Such victims may accept suffering, not because they like it, but because the alternative is greater suffering.

Dissatisfaction with the current state of the research in the field of woman abuse is evident in the literature. In a recent essay examining the literature on violence in intimate relationships, Diane Follingstad (1989:iv) cynically observed that some researchers had looked for the easiest rather than the best solution to a research problem. She argued that "Today's emphasis on publishing may be partially responsible for an emphasis on finding *some* sample on which to conduct *some* measure likely to produce *some* results that *some* journal would consider for publication." [Italics hers.] Robert Geffner et al. (1988:457) attributed the problem to structural causes, suggesting that "communication between the fields had been inadequate, conceptual schemata and research strategies were often divergent, and there had sometimes been competition between the professions dealing with family violence."

---

[6] In recent years, some clinical psychologists have recommended that the diagnostic category 'masochist' be stricken from the DSM III and be replaced with 'self-defeating personality disorder' (Walsh, 1987).

Conceding that any one of a number of reasons could account for existing discrepancies, most researchers acknowledge the problem to be one of a lack of adherence to methodological standards[7] (see Browning and Dutton, 1986; Dobash and Dobash, 1983; Ellis, 1987; Finkelhor, Gelles, Hotaling, and Straus, 1983; Follingstand, 1989; Frieze and Browne, 1989; Geffner, Rosenbaum and Hughes, 1988; Gelles, 1980, 1987, 1990; Gottfredson and Gottfredson, 1988; Healy, 1985; Greenblat, 1988; Heiner, 1985; Herek and Berrill, 1990; Holtzworth-Munroe, 1988; Knight and Hatty, 1985; Loseke, 1984; McNeely and Robinson-Simpson, 1989; Okun, 1986; Rosenbaum, 1988; Russel, 1977; Washburn and Frieze, 1980; Weis, 1989). Furthermore, methodological problems and inadequacies have delayed the development of satisfactory multidimensional causal models (Gelles, 1983). They have also presented a serious obstacle for the publication of family violence (particularly marital violence) research in better refereed journals (Rosenbaum, 1988), thus precluding the focus of necessary attention on this very critical issue.

In their review of the state of the family violence literature during the 1970s, Zigler (1979) and Gelles (1980)

---

[7] While the concern for better methodology comes from scholars in the research community as broad reflective statements with little generalizable empirical support, there is at least one review study which seems to shed some light on the issue, albeit only indirectly. For instance, Bridges and Weis (1988) conducted a meta-analysis of the crime and criminal violence literature published between 1945 and 1972 and found several strong links between discrepancies in findings among studies and differences in design and measurement. This work included the family violence literatures.

stressed that theoretical and methodological refinement would be critical for progress to occur in this field. In 1983, Finkelhor et al. reasserted these criticisms in four recommendations: (1) studies should link forms of family violence and abuse to more well-established research literatures; (2) studies should use more nonclinical samples; (3) studies should increase diversity of measurement instruments, data collection techniques, and research designs; and (4) studies should use more systematic theory building and testing. Discontent with the family violence and woman abuse literature continued into the mid to late 1980s. Several recent seminal empirical works have been forcefully critiqued (see for example Berk, Smyth and Sherman, 1988; Bograd, 1984; Brush, 1990; DeMaris and Jackson, 1986; Johnson and Ferraro, 1988; Stocks, 1988; Taub, 1989; Yllo and Bograd, 1988).[8] The most widely-used measure of violence, the Conflict Tactics Scale (CTS), has been lengthily defended (Straus, 1989; 1990). The Journal of Interpersonal Violence and other specialized journals have encouraged advancing and enhancing methodological procedure (see Erickson and Drenovsky, 1990; Gottfredson and

---

[8] For instance, in a recent article "Has Family Violence Decreased? A Reassessment of the Straus and Gelles Data," Timothy Stocks (1988) carefully examined Straus and Gelles' (1986) comparative analysis of the 1975 and 1985 national surveys on data on family violence and revealed several serious problems with their method (selection and statistical conclusion threats to validity) and interpretation, which had led readers to believe that family violence was decreasing when it was not (see also Straus and Baron, 1990). Similarly, Diane Taub (1989), in her review of DeKeseredy's book, Woman Abuse in Dating Relationships, panned the work for 1) using a nonprobability heterogeneous sample of men and controlling only for age, 2) relying on a sample ordinal level statistic and not using more appropriate multivariate technique, and 3) using a model with a time order and direction that was misleading and inappropriate.

Gottfredson, 1988; Smith, 1986; 1987).

Yet, despite these very broad-based reviews, critiques, and efforts, there is little useful empirical documentation of either the methodologies used in research on specific areas of abuse or the pervasiveness of problems associated with conducting research in these areas. Systematically recording these facts with a view towards developing reliable and valid research methods is a necessary initial step to achieving a more integrated literature which seeks solutions to the woman abuse problem without adding to the confusion. This thesis attempts to address the methodological deficiencies of the woman abuse literature by closely and systematically examining empirical research in these sub-areas.

The thesis seeks to accomplish two complementary purposes. First, it critically surveys and evaluates the empirical research methodology used in three separate sub- or meta-areas of the woman abuse literature: social support, social network and personality characteristics of battered women. Second, it explores feminist contributions to methodology in the area of women abuse and reviews their prospects as alternatives to mainstream practices. Chapter 1 provides some initial insight into the kinds of methodological problems inherent in this research through a detailed analysis of five representative studies drawn from the aforementioned areas. Chapter 2 sets

out the specific goals of this project and delineates the guidelines used to examine 61 empirical research studies in the areas of social support, social network and personality characteristics of battered women. The bulk of this thesis, chapters 3, 4, and 5, presents and discusses the results of the above systematic review of the methodology in the three areas of concern. The final chapter of this thesis, chapter 6, summarizes the findings of this review and addresses at greater length the second purpose of this report: feminist contributions to methodology.

CHAPTER 1

LITERATURE REVIEW

In this chapter, the findings and methodologies used in five studies from three areas of research: (a) social support, (b) social network, and (c) personality characteristics of battered woman, are critically reviewed.

A. SOCIAL SUPPORT AND THE ABUSED WOMAN: TWO STUDIES

In a classic social support study published in 1983, Roger Mitchell and Christine Hodson explored the impact of violence, social support, coping strategies and other theoretically related variables on the psychological health (depression, mastery and self-esteem) of battered women. Sixty battered women who had sought assistance from one of six shelters in the San Francisco Bay area completed a questionnaire packet within one week of arrival. To be part of this sample, a women must have been physically assaulted at least twice by a man with whom she had had an "intimate" relationship.

The researchers found that increased levels of violence, minimal personal resources, lack of institutional and informal social support, and greater avoidant coping styles were related to lowered self-esteem and higher levels of depression among these women. In addition, exploratory analysis suggested that

the level of violence in the relationship and the woman's personal resources may have indirect effects upon psychological adjustment through their impact on coping responses and the availability of social support. Women who had more independent social contacts from their partners were also more likely to receive supportive responses from friends than women who primarily socialized with their partners.

The findings also showed that as the level of violence in a relationship increased, women reported less independent social contact with family and friends and reported fewer people that they could count on as supporters. These same women tended to experience more avoidance responses from friends when they tried to discuss the violence occurring in their relationships.

Despite their revealing nature, the findings of the study were undermined by at least two major methodological problems. First, the study relied on a volunteer sample of abused women who had sought assistance from a shelter for abused women. Samples drawn from shelters, refuges, or transition houses largely consist of women from low socio-economic classes (Church, 1984; Gayford, 1975; Price and Armstrong, 1978; Rounsaville, 1978). These women may also have differed from other abused women in the community on at least several other dimensions: their willingness to identify abuse as a problem,

their readiness to leave home, their willingness to leave their husbands, their readiness to leave the violent situation, and their willingness to seek help (Holtzworth-Munroe, 1988:342; Steiner, 1987:36).

A second problem with the study was its failure to incorporate a control group. In the absence of such a group, it was not legitimate to conclude that battering triggered low self-esteem or depression, both of which might have stemmed from pre-battering experiences. The absence of a control group also precludes drawing the conclusion that social support is abuse responsive. It is possible that depression was lower and self-esteem higher among those who had support from members of their informal network, regardless of abuse.

In the second study, Beth Ann Firestein (1987) examined the relationship between abuse, social support, and the psychological health of college women in dating relationships. One hundred and twenty volunteer subjects from an introductory psychology class completed a questionnaire package containing known reliable and valid measures of self-esteem, relationship violence, perceived social support, and psychological distress. The package took one hour to complete. Twenty-three women identified themselves as having experienced violence at least once by their current partner.

In the multiple regression analysis, when self-esteem and psychological distress were each independently statistically regressed on violence, perceived social support from family and friends, and the interaction between these two variables, findings showed no significant main effects for violence. Moreover, the direction of the relationship between violence and the dependent variables was opposite to what the correlational analysis had predicted earlier in the analysis. Believing that these problems might be due to skewness in the violence variable, it was transformed logarithmically in an attempt to normalize its distribution. The transformation, however, did not bring about the desired fit when the data was reanalyzed. Finally, in a last effort attempt to minimize the effects of skewness, separate regression analyses were conducted on only the 23-member battered sample, and several social support indicators were collapsed into one. In this final analysis, when Firestein regressed psychological distress on violence, perceived social support, and the theoretically-based violence-support interaction term, no significant main or interaction effects emerged. Further, despite the large adjusted R^2 for the psychological distress model (R^2=0.32, F=3.02, and p=0.0551), as noted by the author, it merely "approached significance." When the same regression was carried out for the second dependent variable, self-esteem, while no significant main or interaction effects emerged, the model was found to be significant and accounted for a large

portion of the variance (R^2=0.37,F=3.75, p=0.0287).

Although a variety of reasons may have accounted for these difficulties with Firestein's work, several stand out. First, although well-known standardized scales were used to measure self-esteem, psychological distress, and social support, the subjects were asked to complete these measures for their current situations; thus, for many subjects, participation in the study took place well after the abuse was over: only one woman had experienced violence in the last month, 15 in the last one to six months, three in the last six to twelve months, and five more than one year earlier. Since there were no independent controls for "time since most recent abuse" and the distress measure used was not sensitive enough to measure the long-terms effects of abuse (e.g. post-trauma physical illness(es), suprabnormal experiences, food and sleep disorders, disorientations, phobias, etc.), it seems reasonable to conclude that the reported distress would have appeared somewhat diminished. A similar problem existed for the measure of social support. Participants were asked to identify aspects of social support for individuals that they had had contact with at least once every month. Thus, as defined here, "support" particular to the abusive or immediate post-abusive context would not be uniquely picked up. In sum, both the battered woman's psychological state and the social support she received were possibly more normal, or at the very least,

different, at the time of data collection than at the time for which the measurements were actually intended (i.e., immediately following the battering experience).

A second problem in Firestein's work was that she ignored a number of statistical assumptions in her analyses. In particular, her low subject-to-variable ratio for the regression analysis on the 23-member battered woman sample lowered the power of her analysis such that her significant multiple R^2s were possibly the result of alpha inflation.[9]

Finally, and perhaps the most serious problem in Firestein's study, was not correcting for experiment-wise error rates in her correlation matrices. The abnormally large zero-order correlations in the intercorrelation matrices might have misdirected her choice of variables in the hierarchical regression analysis.

B. SOCIAL NETWORKS AND THE ABUSED WOMAN: TWO STUDIES

Two studies, by McKenna (1986) and Jewells (1986), respectively, which examined how social network characteristics relate to violence and various dimensions of psychological well-being, will be discussed here.

---

[9] "Alpha inflation means that as either selection outcome variables exceed one, the likelihood of any single correlation being significant ($p < 0.05$ or 0.01) because of chance, increases. In other words, type 1 error becomes more likely." (see Malouff and Schutte, 1985:21).

In a cross-sectional survey of 112 self-defined battered women solicited through third parties (agency representative, care giver, and advertisement), Laura Smith McKenna (1985) examined the relationship between social network characteristics (size, loss of members, density, multiplicity, reciprocity, and frequency) of battered women and their psychological adaption. Her interview instruments included the Hirsh Social System Map (SSM), a self-administered measure of network density, as well as several open-ended and close-ended questions designed to measure the presence of a confidant, degree of reciprocity, and degree of multiplicity within each network. Two measures of psychological adaption were used: the Bradburn Morale Scale and the Brief Symptom Inventory (BSI). The BSI measured somatization, obsessive-compulsiveness, interpersonal sensitivity, depression, anxiety, hostility, phobic anxiety, paranoid ideation, psychoticism, and global distress.

The results of a canonical correlational analysis revealed that psychological adaptation of the battered woman was associated with her sociodemographic characteristics (e.g., age, number of children; p=.02), her experience with violence (e.g., relationship length, frequency and severity of violence; p=.01), and the supportiveness of her network (e.g., whether she had a confidante, percentage of nonsupportive responses; p=.001). However, **no** significant statistical relationships

could be found between psychological adaptation and any of the variables measuring network characteristics (network size, percentage of reciprocal relationships, percentage of multiplex relationships, family density, friendship network density, or boundary density between family and friendship networks). In other words, characteristics particular to a battered woman's social network were not associated with psychological adaption at all.

As with the social support studies discussed earlier, McKenna's (1985) social network study had several flaws which might have influenced these results. First, her relatively small, nonrandom sample of battered women came from a number of sources: women who had sought help from agencies providing services for battered women, women from the general public who had sought help from private service as well as those who had not sought professional help in dealing with the problem. These differences in the composition of the sample can lead to problems, particularly if the overall sample size is small. McKenna should have checked for collapsibility of the samples before pursuing data analysis. By collapsing the sample, factors which may have been unique to each sample site, became buried, averaged into the data. Thus, for example, network characteristics particular to women who had responded to an advertisement may have been different from those of women who had been volunteered through friends.

Second, there was no pair matching nor group matching of the battered and control groups on any demographic variables. McKenna's comparison groups originated from the results of other studies. These groups were not based on representative populations but mixtures of different kinds of groups with built-in systematic differences (out patients, non-patients, a non-clinical sample of employed women). There were also response bias problems (discussed further in footnote 29).

Third, as with the previous social support study, McKenna measured the current state of psychological health in the battered women which was confounded by unknown "intervening time of adjustment" (or healing time). In addition, although McKenna indicated that roughly 76.6% of her sample experienced physical violence in the past six months, she did not provide any indication of the severity or frequency of the violence during that time.[10] Furthermore, she only measured their current network structure, a structure no longer directly influenced by the actions of the male batterer or indirectly affected by living in an abusive context. Since only one-eighth of the battered women (15.3%) in her study were still living with the batterer,[11] the batterers could no longer

---

[10] These factors have been found to influence psychological adaptation (see Conway, 1987; Hilberman and Munson, 1977; Mills, 1984; Rounsaville and Weissman, 1978).

[11] 12.6% of the women interviewed lived at home without the batterer, 15.3% established residence in another home without the batterer, 9.9% lived with their parents, 2.7% lived with friends, 38.7% lived in a shelter, 1.8% lived with a new, non-battering mate, and 3.6% other.

directly "shape" the battered woman's network, as other studies have observed (see Cross and Gallant, 1991; Dobash and Dobash, 1979; Homer, Leonard and Taylor, 1984; 1985).

A final problem resided with McKenna's (1985) statistical analysis. In all, six large intercorrelation matrices were generated which guided her canonical correlation analysis and the interpretation of her final results, but none of the matrices were corrected for experiment-wise error rates. With resulting high alpha rates, many correlations appeared significant when they may not have been.

In the second study, Dolores Angelique Jewells (1986) examined psychological adaptation with social network size and frequency in 50 abused women (25 black and 25 white) and 50 non-abused women (25 black and 25 white). The abused women were randomly selected from a shelter in Lower Westchester County, New York, and the non-abused women were selected from women who made routine appointments to a gynecological clinic in a large municipal hospital. In an interview situation, women were asked to complete the Self-Report Checklist 90 (SCL-90), the Conflict Tactics Scale (CTS), and the Social Network Questionnaire (SNQ). The SCL-90 measured overall distress, hostility, depression, and interpersonal sensitivity. The SNQ measured network size, frequency of contact, and the importance of network members. It also included items designed to

identify the "negative network"--a subgroup of individuals which (by definition) encouraged the abuse.

As one of her major findings, Jewells (1986:69) observed that abused women scored higher on measures of depression, global distress, anxiety, and somatization than nonabused women. Perhaps her most important discovery, however, though was that depression and global distress correlated negatively and significantly with network size, and that depression, hostility, and global distress correlated negatively and significantly with network frequency. These results were in direct opposition to those of McKenna.

However, Jewell's findings, like McKenna's, were probably influenced by several methodological problems. First, while her subjects were "randomly" selected from women meeting the entry criteria at a shelter in Lower Westchester County, New York, the shelter's admission criteria as well as Jewell's procedures for "random sample selection" were not specified in her report. Therefore, it is possible that her sample may not have been as random as she believed it to be.

Second, her control group was a "random sample" of a group of women who were making routine appointments at a gynecological clinic at a large municipal hospital. The author, however, did not justify her choice for comparison

group. One cannot, therefore, assume that the control group was carrying out it's function of mechanically partialling out extraneous influences, since women who regularly attend a gynaecological clinic may themselves constitute a select group and may, therefore, introduce some kind of systematic bias to the comparative analysis.

Third, as with the previously discussed studies, the women in Jewell's study were asked to provide information on their current mental health. Since there was no indication of how long the women had stayed in the shelter (where they would receive counselling and support) and since Jewell provided no descriptive data on the kinds of abuse, recency of abuse, frequency of abuse, or how the abuse variable was even measured, the causal origin of the battered woman's current psychological state of mind was, at best, uncertain. Furthermore, the women were also asked to provide information on their social network in the last month. Since the characteristics of the abused women's network might have changed since the time of battering, it is likely that they might be more a reflection of the network either just before or during shelter stay than around the time of the abuse.

Finally, Jewell (1986) biased her statistical analysis when she systematically used Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) when Multivariate Analysis of Variance (MANOVA) was more appropriate

with her multiple predictor variables. Using the ANOVA with multiple predictor variables which are correlated in some unknown way increased her experiment-wise error rate (alpha rate). Also, since the same subjects were used for all statistical tests, the F tests were not independent.

C. PERSONALITY CHARACTERISTICS OF ABUSED WOMEN: ONE STUDY

Lisa Mahon (1981) investigated the personality characteristics of battered women using Catell's 16 Personality Factor Inventory (16PF) and attempted to identify common traits which might have interacted and contributed to physically abusive situations. Women were included in her sample if they had stayed in an abusive marriage for one year or more; had been battered two or more times; and were either married to, had lived in a common-law relationship with, or had cohabitated with an abusing man. So that they could complete the questionnaire, battered women in the sample were also required to know how to read English at a grade six and above level. The final study sample included 11 women, some who had been referred from a victim advocacy program in a southwestern city and others who had responded to a classified advertisement.

The respondents' mean raw scores for each factor on Form C of the 16 PF were compared to the mean raw scores established for the general population of adult females. On the basis of

a t-test analysis, significant differences were reported between the study sample and the general population on 5 of the 16 personality factors. A sixth characteristic was also reported (factor C) with the main findings because, according to the author, though not significantly different ($p<.10$), the measure seemed to suggest a substantial trend. The six differing factors in alphabetic index, along with the technical psychological title given in bipolar form, are as follows:

A. Sizothymia vs Affectothymia

B. Low intelligence vs High Intelligence

C. Ego Weakness vs Higher Ego Strength

F. Desurgency vs Surgency

G. Low Superego Strength vs High Superego Strength

Q_2. Group Dependency vs Self Sufficiency

Battered women scored significantly lower than the general population on Factor A, indicating that they were more reserved, detached, critical and cool than the general population of adult females. The mean score on Factor B indicated that abused women tended to have lower scholastic mental capacity than the general population. Factor C scores suggested that battered women tended to have weaker ego strength, and Factor F scores indicated that these same women tended to be more sober, prudent, serious, and taciturn than the comparison general population of adult females. The

battered women scored significantly higher than the general population on Factor G, indicative that they were more conscientious, preserving, staid, and more generally bound to rules on average. Finally, battered women scored significantly higher on average on Factor Q_2 than women in the general population, which indicated a greater tendency toward self-sufficiency. According to Mahon, all of these traits together reflected a general picture of a woman who tended to keep to herself, was motivated by inner values and moral rules, and may have had a poor capacity for dealing with conflicts.

Several distinct methodological problems, however, distorted the picture of the abused women in this kind of study. The first was concerned with the composition of the sample. While fifty names were given to the researchers, over four-fifths of these women were difficult to locate for various reasons.[12] This low response rate, together with the small sample size and the numerous sources of uncontrolled variation introduced by drawing a small sample from multiple sources, weakened the overall validity of the substantive interpretation that was flushed out from the comparative analysis. Furthermore, it should also be emphasized that because of the small sample size, many of the personality traits

---

[12] A large number of the women had moved in the interim (between using the victim advocacy program and being contacted); some refused to participate or were unable to be contacted for unknown reasons. Mahon (1981:147) notes that the most common reason for women refusing to take part in the study was the fear of the husband's response.

differentially associated with the battered woman in Mahon's sample could have easily arisen by chance.

Second, the "control group" was a general population of adult females which was used as standard for the 16PF. There was no matching of participants on specific demographic criteria.

A final criticism concerns the cross-sectional nature of Mahon's research. Although she concluded that the six factors identified in her study were antecedent to the battering, there was no evidence for this. Indeed, it is quite possible that the personality characteristics of women in her battered sample are an outcome of the violent battering context (as recently suggested by Lynne Rosewater, 1988), just as they might be a result of the socially-isolating circumstances under which abuse occurs. It is also possible that battering and social isolation interact in some way to influence personality. These alternative explanatory sources of personality change can, of course, only be tested using a prospective research design with a multivariate emphasis.

D. SUMMARY

The five studies discussed above were chosen to illustrate the variety of methodological problems typically found in the

abuse research. The first two studies examined the relationship between the informal social support received by the abused woman and her psychological health. They used small volunteer samples, lacked proper control groups, violated statistical assumptions, and used measures not sensitive enough to capture changes in the battered woman's health or the social support she receives. The second two studies examined the link between social network characteristics of battered women and their mental health. Similar methodological criticisms can be leveled against them: non-random samples, control groups with built-in systematic bias, very little exploratory data analysis before altering important variables, and administration of psychological and social network measures at inappropriate times. The final study in this pentet looked at the personality characteristics of battered women. The results of this study are suspect not only because of the use of a weak control groups but also because of a low sampling response rate.

CHAPTER 2

DESCRIPTION OF THE STUDY

The woman abuse literature has been growing at a staggering rate; methodological developments within that literature, however, have not been keeping pace. Since the kind and quality of methodology is known to guide or even shape findings in any one area,[13] it is very important to consider previous work in developing fields and set common standards for future contributions. While several recent methodological discussions and critiques in the area have addressed the abuse of women either by itself as a topic or in conjunction with other family violence literatures, because of the overwhelming number of methodologically heterogeneous works, and the hundreds of independent meta- or sub-areas which are researched by scholars with varying concern for methodological standards, there is often only room enough to generate peripheral understandings with little depth. Clearly, if any productive discussion of methodology and woman abuse is to be made, it is by way of concentrating efforts on much smaller areas. This thesis, therefore, considers the data sources and generation procedures, research design, reliability and validity of

---

[13] For example, Horowitz and Feinstein (1979:556) examined in detail 17 medical topics about which conflicting views had appeared in the literature. Their evaluation of these studies showed that most of them violated commonly acceptable standards of scientific investigation. Catania et al. (1990) recently reviewed the methodology literature on AIDS and concluded that despite the crisis, methodological developments have been slow in meeting the demands of AIDS investigators.

instruments, and statistical methods and measures used in three empirical areas important to understanding the abuse process. These areas are social support, social network characteristics, and the personality structure of battered women.

A. LITERATURE SEARCH

The documents included in this survey were located by reviewing the following twelve scholarly sources:[14] Sociological Abstracts, Psychological Abstracts, Social Work Research Abstracts, Women Studies Abstracts, ERIC, Inventory of Marriage and Family Literature, Index Medicus, and Dissertation Abstracts, Family Violence Bulletin, Eugene Engeldinger's recent bibliography titled, Spouse Abuse: An Annotated Bibliography of Violence Between Mates (1986), a bibliographic database of 851 records from the National Victims Resource Centre in Ontario, the quarterly bibliographies of the journal, Aggressive Behaviour from its beginning until its December 1989 issue, and recent issues (1989) of the magazine Current Contents. The extensive book collection on family violence in the McPherson Library at the University of Victoria was also screened for relevant material. Finally, the

[14] Numerous combinations of key words in abstracts and titles were considered in the literature search: [aggression, violence, abuse, assault, battering, beating, bashing, conflict] and [physical, psychological and emitional, dating, courtship, family, marital, spouse, partner, conjugal, domestic, wife, husband-wife]. Many of these key words existed as conjugated forms (eg. abuse, abused, abusive, abusing) which made the search extremely tedious. Odd classifications (eg. non-battered or ex-battered) were also considered because of a recent trend to include comparison and control groups within the titles of work.

reference sections of all documents discovered in these sources were examined for possible leads to other documents.

B. INCLUSION CRITERIA FOR THE SAMPLE

Documents were included in this survey if they met three inclusion criteria: (a) the studies were published or appeared as unpublished documents in the literature from December 1969 to December 1989; (b) the studies appeared in scholarly sources and resources listed in the previous section; and (c) the studies had used empirical measures related to either i) the social support experienced by battered women,[15] ii) the social networks of battered woman,[16] or iii) the personality attributes of battered women.[17]

C. METHODOLOGY

Studies which met the three broad inclusion criteria outlined in the previous section were critically examined for

---

[15] For example, the sources, types, degree of positive and negative social support measured by the Arizona Social Support Inventory Schedule (ASSIS), Norbeck Social Support Questionnaire (NSSQ), and the Social Isolation Index (SI), as well as the Helpseeking Index (HI) and other instruments.

[16] For example, size, density, multiplicity, durability, dispersion, homogeneity, frequency of contact, as measured by the Arizona Social Support Interview Schedule (ASSIS), Social Network Analysis Profile (SNAP), Social Network Questionnaire (SNQ), and other measures.

[17] For example, Form A and C of the 16 Personality Factor (16PF) questionnaire and the Minnesota Multiphasic Personality Inventory (MMPI).

specific aspects of research methodology using the *MAP* (*M*ethodological *A*rchitectural *P*lan). The *MAP* is an hierarchical, organizational framework which is set up for the systematic partition and reorganization of methodological information related to abuse studies (see Appendix A).[18] Specific building blocks of a particular study's methodological architecture--data sources and generation procedures, research design, reliability and validity of instruments, and statistical methods and measures--are removed from the main document using the *MAP* and placed in a data base--comparison table (see Tables 1 through 12)[19]--from which the content could be evaluated using frequency and simple bivariate contingency analysis. The *MAP* was created specifically for this thesis.

---

[18] The *MAP* was generated following an extensive review of published articles which critically reviewed, evaluated, and classified work done in the **Medical** (Altman, et al., 1983; Gardner, et al., 1983; Gore et al., 1977; Hokanson et al., 1987; LeFevre, 1988; Schor and Karten, 1966; White, 1979), **Epidemiological** (Scakett, 1979), **Health Sciences** (Rudolph et al., 1985), **Nursing** (Abraham et al., 1989; Brown, 1990; Duffy, 1985; Moody et al., 1988; Philips, 1989; Reid, 1982), **Educational** (Anderson and Kerr, 1969; Coburn, 1978; Kohr and Suydam, 1970; Moore et al., 1986; Stephens, 1967; Strauss, 1969; Suydam, 1968, Vockell and Asher, 1974; Ward et al., 1975), **Psychological** (Cook and Leviton, 1980; Dodd, 1965; Hermann and Whitman, 1984; Mosher-Ashley, 1987), and **Sociological** (Brown and Gilmartin, 1969; Chase, 1970; Hindelang, Hirschi and Weis, 1981; McTavish, et al., 1977; Huston and Robins, 1982) fields, as well as many other related areas (Bentler and Abramson, 1981; Berman and Caroll, 1984; Bernhard, 1986; Good, 1962; Jump, 1989; Reiss, et al., 1980).

[19] The tables serve two other functions: (1) to provide a opportunity for researchers in the area to observe and compare published and unpublished work, and (2) to allow replication, continuation and/or criticism of this thesis.

D. DATA ANALYSIS

Because of the small, heterogeneous sample of qualitatively different studies, data analysis was kept very simple.[20] Extracted material was coded and frequency analyzed using the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences, Personal Computer II (SPSS/PCII). Simple bivariate contingency tables were generated to identify patterns not apparent from visual inspection (see Light and Pillemer, 1982:19).

However, because of the small number of documents within the three areas of concern and the predominantly skewed nature of the data, very few statistical tests (e.g., Chi-Square contingency analysis) were carried out. Most of the data were descriptively reported in terms of observed frequencies. Glass, McGraw, and Smith (1981:226) have suggested that published literature reflects biases of journal editors and their respective disciplines such that most of them reward studies with findings of which they approve. Specific statistical bivariate differences between the published and unpublished literatures were, therefore, reported where possible.

---

[20] A quantitative meta-analysis was initially considered to be the model approach to analyzing information in from the 3 abuse literatures. However, because of the methodological problems and the heterogeneity of the studies reviewed here, with respect to sample selection, inclusion and exclusion criteria, a meta-analytic aggregation or results was not thought to lead to appropriate conclusions. For a recent review of the appropriateness of meta-analysis, see Light and Pillemer (1982), Kelly (1986), or Lynn (1989).

E. SUMMARY OF THE TYPES OF STUDIES COLLECTED

A total of 61 empirical studies which met the criteria for inclusion in this survey were located. Of these, 62.3% (n=42) were on social support, 18.8% (n=13) concerned social networks, and 18.8% (n=13) consisted of personality profile studies of battered women. Not all the studies fit comfortably into each category. Six of the studies contained social support and social network measures and one of the studies contained social support and personality information. When the studies overlapped with two different areas, the study was recognized twice under this system (see Table 23).

Of these 61 studies, 24.6% (n=15) appeared, published or unpublished, between 1975-1979, 36.1% (n=22) between 1980-1984, and 39.3% (n=24) between 1985-1989.

Published books, book chapters, or research articles made up 49.3% (n=34); the other 50.7% (n=35) of the studies were unpublished dissertations and theses.

CHAPTER 3

THE METHODOLOGY OF SOCIAL SUPPORT STUDIES ON ABUSED WOMEN

In all, five book chapters (11.9%), eight books (19.0%), ten journal articles (23.8%), 13 dissertations (31.0%) and six theses (14.3%) composed the sample of 42 separate works published between 1977 and 1989 which measured social support.[21] Just under half (45.3%) of these studies were unpublished works of which just under half existed in the form of nine dissertations generated in the last five years. Because the published (n=23) and unpublished (n=19) literatures were reasonably large and comparable in size, chi-square

---

[21] I was unable to obtain copies of all the papers on the topic of woman abuse and social support that came to my attention. M.A. Searle (1982) wrote an unpublished paper titled "Men who batter and isolation," referred to in Sonkin et al. (1985) The Male Batterer: A Treatment Approach. Barabara Wauchope's (1988) paper: "Help-seeking decisions of battered women: A test of learned helplessness and two stress theories," arrived too late to be incorporated into this thesis. I was also unable to obtain Homer, Leonard and Taylor's (1984) classical study on wife abuse and social support in Cleveland. A short form of their work can be found in Norman Johnson's edited volume titled Marital Violence: Sociological Review Monograph (1985). Gondolf and Fisher's book titled Battered Women as Survivors: An Alternative to Treating Learned Helplessness was also difficult to get hold of, as was Ruth Reidy's dissertation titled Battered Women's Utilization of Helping Agencies. Majorie Brook Bard's dissertation, Domestic Abuse and Homeless Women (1988), only came to my attention after this thesis was defended. Her dissertation is unique not only because it provides an amazing account of the isolation process experienced by women who are not part of the typical sampling frames considered in the area of abuse (namely, the homeless), but because the author is herself a battered woman. Through her own story and the life-histories of the homeless women she interviews, Bard crafts a revealing, horrific, painful account of the topsy-turvy world that battered women have to negotiate as they deal with a legal system that is not only unresponsive to their plight but actively insures their suffering to be more prolonged and more profound. Finally, since the completion of this thesis, a version of Lee Ann Hoff's (1984) lengthy dissertation, one of the 61 empirical case studies examined by this thesis, recently appeared in paperback under the title Battered Women as Survivors (1990). Similarly, Yoseffa Steiner's graduate work on battered women in Israel has also been published. The book is titled Nashim mukot (1990), and it is written in Hebrew.

comparisons between, for example, the types of social support studies (e.g. published and unpublished) and other factors (e.g. sample size, presence of a control group, etc.), could only occasionally be carried out without having to worry low numbers of cases within contingency cells. Although "time of first appearance of the document" was initially considered to be an important factor in explaining the kinds of methodological strategies employed by researchers in the area of social support and woman abuse, as aspects of the case studies were examined in aggregate, it became increasingly clear that a correlation between any variable (see Appendix B) and publication date would, in all probability, be spurious, since much of the unpublished literature had been written in the last five years. Further, any advanced statistical analysis (e.g., discriminant analysis, logistic regression, logit-loglinear analysis, etc.) which might have determined multiple categorical predictors of the 'type of literature' (i.e., published or unpublished) or it's statistical interactions (i.e., the relationship between 'type of literature' and 'sample size' is conditional on 'time of first appearance' of the document) was likely to fail because of the relatively low number of cases (n=42) in the social support literature in general.

A. DATA SOURCES AND GENERATION PROCEDURES USED IN SOCIAL SUPPORT STUDIES.

i) Sample Size

Sample size for the 42 social support studies was generally small, and varied from as low as 9 subjects to as high as 1,000 (see for instance Bowker, 1986). A sample size of 40 subjects was most commonly used. Nearly three-fifths (58.6%) of the social support studies used a sample size of 60 subjects or less. Published studies used much larger samples on average than did unpublished documents.

ii) Sampling Frame

Most social support studies gathered samples from transition houses (33.3%), followed by women's agencies (14.3%), and hospitals or clinics (9.5%).[22] Respondents to surveys in specific women's magazines (4.8%), women in colleges (4.8%) and women who reported partner assault to police (2.4%) were also recruited, but much less often. Only six of the 42 social support studies used random samples. The sampling frame for these studies typically consisted of telephone directories

---

[22] One reason that transition houses might be used more often than other sampling sources is because of the increased number of shelters and transition houses per capita in communities as the government responds to the problem of abuse in family households. Future literature reviews might do well to take this availability factor into account.

or police records. In one study (Stachura, 1979), a list of names in a Texas Department of Public Safety computer registry was used. Respondents in this particular study had to hold a valid driver's license.

Twenty-one percent (n=9) of the final samples were composites of two or sometimes three of these sources. For example, the battered woman sample in Bowker's (1983, 1984) first study was composed of 146 women who responded to announcements in Milwaukee newspapers and newsletters, to public service announcements on the radio, and to social issue commentators on the Milwaukee network TV stations. In a second study, Bowker (1985, 1988) combined the responses of these women with those of 854 women all over the United States who had completed an inserted questionnaire in Woman's Day magazine.

While there was great variation in the kind of sampling sources used in the published social support literature, including a threefold preference for mixtures of samples, the unpublished literature, particularly dissertation research, was twice as likely to recruit respondents from transition houses.

Nearly half (45.2%) of the 42 social support studies did not indicate the time period of data collection. Of the studies which included such information, 42.9% provided

specific details and 11.9% provided only partial details. Of the unpublished literature, 57.9% did not provide this information, over 1.5 times as often as the published work.

All of the 42 social support studies, explicitly or implicitly, provided some indication of the part of the world from which the sample was drawn. A majority were drawn from sub-populations in the United States (83.3%). Case studies from Canada (7.1%), Europe (4.8%), Israel (2.4%) and New Zealand (2.4%) were each represented, but their contribution was negligible in terms of mass. At least one study (see Pagelow, 1981) included battered women from both Europe and the U.S. The unpublished social support work was 1.5 times more likely to draw from U.S. samples than the published literature. When studies reported material on sampling source, most reported only the city or town (n=8), county (n=1), state or province (n=7), region of a country (n=2) or the country itself (n=8). Only 15 social support studies specifically identified an institution or registry, and most of these studies were published before 1980.

iii) Sampling Method

Of the 42 social support studies which reported their sampling method, 47.6% (or n=20) indicated that a purposive accidental sample was used, and 35.7% (n=15) used a purposive

volunteer sample (see Appendix A for definitions). In only six (14.3%) of the 42 social support studies was a random sample used (see Gelles and Straus, 1988; Pirog-Good and Stets, 1989; Roy, 1977; Schulman, 1979; Simko, 1988; and Stantura, 1979). Dissertations (35.0%) and articles (30.0%) primarily used purposive accidental samples; the pattern was less obvious in other kinds of documents.

iv) Inclusion/Exclusion Criteria (see Table 13)

In general, just over three-fifths of the social support studies (61.9% or n=22) used at least one kind of inclusion or exclusion criterion to bracket (restrict or control) extraneous variation in their samples. Over two-thirds of these studies were unpublished dissertations and theses. None of the 42 social support studies required that battered women be selected based on injury received, deliberateness (or intention) of abuse, or the duration of the abusive relationship. Kind of abuse, severity of abuse, recency of abuse, length of the relationship, area where abuse occurred, nationality, English language requirement and education of the victim were each included in one, two, or three studies. Other criteria, frequency of abuse (n=9), age restriction (n=7), and specified marital status (n=9) were all required by seven to nine studies. Fifteen social support studies (over half of the studies reporting inclusion/ exclusion criteria) specifically

stated that the women in their sample had to have experienced physical abuse. Nearly three-fourths (72.7%) of these studies were unpublished. Finally, 42.9% (n=21) requested that women in their sample be either (a) living with the batterer (9.5%), (b) not living with the batterer (26.2%), or (c) specifically indicated that it did not matter (7.1%). For over half of these studies (57.1%), this information was either unavailable or unclear in the way it was reported.[23]

v) Demographic Factors (see Table 14)

In general, most of the 42 social support studies provided very little demographic information. Four or fewer factors (out of twelve categories) were reported by 54.0% of the studies. Age (66.7%) and education (54.8%) were the most commonly reported, followed by marital status (45.2%), ethnicity (40.5%), presence of children (40.5%) and income (40.5%), employment (35.7%), occupation (33.3%), religion

---

[23] Important factors associated with abuse and social support (or isolation) have been blatantly neglected in research design by most published studies. These factors include cultural and language barriers, which, for many immigrants, have played a structurally, isolating role and have contributed in many ways to the battering situation. For instance, several studies have observed that women who do not speak English or who are immigrants from different cultures and countries, are more likely to experience violence from their male partners while living in North America (see for instance several recent dissertations and essays: Asian Women United of California, 1989; Hong, 1991; Bhaimik, 1988; Brismar, 1987:4; Jacques, 1981; Jang, Lee and Morello-Frosch, 1991; Rimonte, 1989; Riutort and Small, 1984; Szado, 1987; and Torres, 1987; Villapando, 1989:325-6) or while living in Britain (see Mama, 1989) than women who speak English and who are indigenous members of either of these two countries. The association between cultural isolation and battering is not simply a phenomenon of English speaking countries. Difficulties also have been reported by English-speaking women living abroad (Altman-Schevitz, 1990; Mahmoody, 1987).

(19.0%), living with the batterer (14.3%) and years married (14.3%), and class (7.1%). All of the unpublished dissertation and masters work reported demographic information to some degree; by comparison, only 20.0% of the published studies reported demographic material.

vi) Comparison Groups

Nearly two-fifths (38.1% or n=16) of the 42 social support studies used comparison or control groups. Eleven of the 16 studies used unequal battered and comparison samples, and in over three-fifths of these studies (n=7) the differences were large enough to contribute to large differences in the variance between the means of the battered and control group on different variables. Eleven of the 16 studies compared battered women with non-battered women. The remaining five studies either compared currently battered women with formerly battered women, battered women currently living with the batterer and women no longer living with the batterer, or American battered women and Asian battered women. One of these five studies, Simko (1988), in a rare community based quasi-type experiment, compared a randomly assigned experimental group of battered women with a randomly assigned battered control group.

In 5 of the 16 social support studies which used a

comparison group, the group was randomly chosen from an urban community. In four of these studies the comparison group was generated concurrently with the battered sample. In several other studies, different sampling procedures were used to generate the two groups. In Gordeuk's (1979) work, for instance, the battered group was composed of volunteers who were participants in a self-help program sponsored by the YWCA, while the non-battered comparison group was generated through a multi-level systematic random sampling of households in the telephone directories from two different cities. There was no matching of the two groups on any demographic characteristics.

In 5 of the 16 social support studies which used comparison groups, the authors reported matching the battered and comparison group on specific attribute variables. One study reported matching its samples but did not indicate what factors its samples were matched on (see Zimmerman, 1979). Two researchers reported matching their battered and comparison group on single demographic attribute variables such as educational level (Hofeller, 1982) or neighborhoods (Frieze et al., 1979). Other researchers matched their sample and comparison groups on multiple demographic variables, such as age, marital status, ethnic origin and socioeconomic level (see Steiner, 1987) or age, economic status, education of the wife, education of the husband, occupation of the wife, occupation of the husband, and length of the marital relationship (see

Parle, 1985). None of the five studies clearly described the procedures it used to match its battered and control groups.

In 6 of the 16 social support studies which used comparison groups, these comparison groups were neither randomly generated nor matched on specific variables.

In at least 4 of the 26 social support studies which did not use formal comparison groups, the authors compared the demographic attributes of their sample or the findings of their study with information from other sources. Meade-Ramrattan et al. (1980), for instance, compared their demographic data with the U.S. 1976 Census results. Chalmers and Smith (1988) compared aspects of their findings with a Canadian Quality of Life survey conducted in 1981. Flynn (1977) compared some of his findings to the early work of Gelles (1974). Finally, Pahl (1985) compared some of her findings on her battered participants to wage earners in Britain in 1977.

B. RESEARCH DESIGNS USED IN SOCIAL SUPPORT STUDIES.

i) Purpose of Work

Over one-third (38.1%) of the 42 social support studies were designed primarily to test hypotheses; the other two-thirds (61.9%) were primarily exploratory in their approach.

Over 71.0% of the studies where hypotheses were tested were unpublished dissertations and theses.

ii) Design of Study

Over two-thirds (78.6% or n=33) of the social support studies were cross-sectionally designed. Five of these studies had longitudinal components, that is, retrospective inquires were made regarding the first abuse, second abuse, worst abuse, and most recent abuse. Seven studies were strictly longitudinal in design, and with one exception (see Hoff, 1984), nearly all the information was gathered at only two time periods. The time intervals could range from three months (see Butehorn, 1985) to three years (see Pahl, 1985). Nearly all of the longitudinal designs began with women who had just entered a shelter (Alcorn, 1984; Butehorn, 1985; Chalmers and Smith, 1988; Heggie, 1986). Typically, in these "half-life", post-battering longitudinal designs, information regarding the abuse and social support was retrospectively gathered from a battered woman while she was staying at a shelter, and then follow-up information was gathered when she was recontacted sometime after she had left the shelter.

Only two experiments were carried out among the 42 social support studies. One involved asking women who were staying in a shelter what kind of social support resources they would

have needed had they experienced the conflict situations that the experimenter presented to them (see Brecker, 1987). The other experiment involved randomly assigning battering couples, identified by police records, to experimental and control groups where the experimental group would receive extra formal social support in terms of police aid (see Simko, 1988).

iii) Data Collection Period

Nearly four-fifths (78.6%) of the 42 social support studies were retrospectively designed. However, three-fifths (60.0%) of these studies were confounded by concurrent contextual components; that is, while the abuse information was collected for battering incidents at some point in the battered woman's past,[24] she was often asked to provide social support information (e.g., frequency of support, kind of support) only for her current post-abuse situation.[25] Further, rarely was

---

[24] This point was often unspecified. However, it was common for researchers to place temporal boundaries on when the abuse should have had taken place (e.g., 'within the last year').

[25] This could often lead to a confusing and inconsistent picture of the role social support plays in the process of abuse. In a very simple form, phase and phase shift can be modelled here in terms of a wave like motion. Let x = a*cos(wt) where x = the amount of violence per violent interaction, t = the time when the abuse occurs, w = 2*phi*f, where f = the frequency of violent interactions. Under normal circumstances, the social support received would mirror the violence equation, that is, x' = a'*cos(w't) where x' = the number of supportive interactions at one time, t = the time of abuse, and w' = 2*phi*f', where f' = the frequency of supportive interactions. However, because social support is measured long after the abuse is over, the social support received appears to shift so that it is now represented by x' = a'*cos(w't + phi/2). This shift leads to the social support variable (no. of supportive behaviors) being measured at half of what it should be when the violent relationship is at its worst.

the social support information context specific. That is, the social support measure was typically designed to measure general social support and not social support specific to the abuse.

Two of the 42 studies were concurrently designed, and another two were prospectively designed. There were no observable differences between the unpublished and the published literature on this aspect of design.

iv) Data Collection Method

Nearly two-thirds (65.9%) of the 42 social support studies used the interview technique as their data collection method. While over half of these studies used face-to-face interviews as the single method, others used a multi-method framework (21%), incorporating interviews and self- administered questionnaires or survey questionnaires into their study designs. Unpublished studies tended to use a multi-method approach to research design more often than published studies. Only two studies interviewed women over the telephone (see Gelles and Straus, 1988; Stantura, 1979).

v) Procedural Reliability

There was no systematic way of collecting procedural

reliability information for this thesis because of the heterogeneity in research designs. In general, however, where authors reported the strengths and weaknesses of their research design, or where this researcher observed certain obvious strengths and weaknesses, they were noted.

Most of the 42 social support studies which used questionnaires or interview schedules kept the completion time to under two hours. In several studies, however, the length of the interview could be from one to four hours (Kerr, 1982) and sometimes up to six hours long (Church, 1984; Limandri, 1985). This time range was never accounted for--did the interviewer or interviewee ever tire under the lengthy questioning? When interviews were conducted or questionnaires were administered, in many cases it was the researcher or trained interviewers who conducted the interview (Dobash and Dobash, 1979; Steiner, 1987; Thoennes, 1981). In just as many cases however, because of the confidentiality of the shelter or agency or hospital records, the researcher had to rely on untrained shelter or agency staff to administer the research instruments. This assumed that the researcher would have been able to gain the cooperation of the agency; in several studies, agencies refused to cooperate because of their wish to protect the interests of their clients (Beauparlant, 1987:125-9; Butehorn, 1985:151; Hoff, 1984:597; Smith, 1982:32-3).

Often there was little descriptive clarity, or even no indication at all of the setting or conditions under which the interview or questionnaire were administered. When these were discussed, in many cases they were unstandardized (see for example Meade-Ramrattan et al., 1980). Hoff (1984) conducted her interviews at her home, the battered woman's home, homes of the battered woman's relatives, coffee shops and shelters. Catherine Cavanagh (1978) reported that when she was interviewing battered women for the well-known Dobash and Dobash (1979) study, the children were often running around the shelter or crawling all over their interviewee mother and, in general, creating a distraction. Occasionally pilot studies were carried out to test the procedures and questionnaire (see for example Bhaumik, 1988; Dobash and Dobash, 1979; Schulman, 1979), but these were more a rarity than a constant.

In the few half-life longitudinal studies found in the social support literature, great care was taken by researchers in recontacting the battered women. For example, during the initial interview, while the battered woman was still in the protection of the shelter, Heggie (1986) obtained the permission from the battered woman to recontact her at a later date. When the author contacted the woman by phone three or four months after the first interview, the woman participant was first asked whether it was a safe time for her (the battered woman) to talk. If the woman participant acknowledged

positively, a ten-minute telephone interview was administered, otherwise the battered respondent was recontacted at a safer time. These kinds of procedures, however, did not help women who were still threatened by their abusive partner. For instance, Pahl (1985:27) reported the case of a husband who frequently returned to the house to check on his wife's movements. It was the woman's belief that he would never permit a follow-up interview and so she withdrew from the study.

Occasionally the criterion validity of the interview schedule or questionnaire instrument was established through cross-checking the responses with shelter intake records (see Bhaumik, 1988); at other times, aspects of the battered woman's stories were checked (with their permission) with members of her network (see Hoff, 1984). At least one author (see Brown, 1985:208-9) expressed the wish to include battered husbands in her study, but many of the participants made it clear that they feared their husbands' revenge if they had knowledge of their own participation (see also footnote 41). In still other studies, as a matter of accuracy, the battered women were recontacted to respond to the researchers' observations and interpretations of the data (Beauparlant, 1987).

In general, procedures were very poorly detailed, so that replication of many of the social support studies (or their

results) would be a very difficult task, if not an impossible one altogether.

C. RELIABILITY AND VALIDITY OF RESEARCH INSTRUMENTS USED IN SOCIAL SUPPORT STUDIES.

Four-fifths of the 42 social support studies which used a composite instrument (n=35) employed either a questionnaire or interview schedule, and 16.7% (n=7) of these studies (all of which had been published) did not include their composite instrument with the study. By contrast, all unpublished literature which used a composite instrument (n=14), included a version of the instrument at the end of the work.[26]

Reliability information was either fully or partially included in one-third (33.3% or n=11) of the social support studies which used a composite instrument; nearly two-thirds (63.6%) of these were unpublished works. In 63.6% of the studies which did not include any reliability information, over 70.0% were published, most of which were research articles.

In 78.8% of the 42 social support studies reporting use of a composite instrument, validity information on individual scales or indices was not reported; 63.4% of these studies were

---

[26] This undoubtedly reflects, to a large extent, restrictions placed by professional journals on the length of the articles they publish.

published. Only 21.2% (or n=7) included or partially included any reference to validity tests; 71.0% (n=5) of these studies were unpublished, and had either included (n=3) or partially included (n=4) appropriate validity information. These validity tests were roughly split between having been established and reported in previous studies and being carried out and reported within the current study.

Nearly half of the social support studies (47.2% or n=20), predominantly unpublished dissertations and theses works (n=14), used scales or indices. Seventy percent of these studies either included (n=2) or only partially included (n=10) information on scale reliability, and most relied upon reliabilities established in previous works. In the 35% of the studies which used scales, two studies included validity information, and another two only partially reported this information. Most studies which included this information were unpublished and most relied on validity established in previous work.

D. STATISTICAL METHODS AND MEASURES USED IN SOCIAL SUPPORT STUDIES (see Table 15)

While most social support studies (38.1%) used only one statistical technique, at least 28.6% used two different techniques, and 33.3% used three or more techniques. No

published or unpublished work, however, used more than five different statistical techniques. More of the unpublished than the published literature used more than one type of analysis (Chi-square=7.56, df=2, significance = .0229).

When all the categories listed in Table 15 were used, 95 methods were tallied. If the 10 social support documents that used only descriptive methods were removed, the remaining 32 demonstrated 62 methods, an average of 1.5 methods per document. When this was done separately for the published and unpublished social support literatures, the published literature used 0.5 different methods per document, whereas the unpublished literature used 3 methods per document.

The frequency and percentage of the various statistical methods used in social support studies are presented in Table 15. The methods are listed in the table in order of their frequency of use, rather than by degree of sophistication. If readers had a knowledge of descriptive statistics, they would have grasped nearly one-third of all statistical methods reported (27 of 72 methods). To have access to roughly 50% of the statistical information, readers would have had to know the first two methods listed in Table 15 (descriptive statistics and analysis of contingency). Knowing these same methods and two others (Pearson correlations, t-tests or regression) would give readers access to 71.6% of the statistical information.

These figures were not constant across the varying types of social support research. To have access to 59.1% of the statistical information in the published literature, readers would have to know descriptive statistics and Pearson Correlation; for the unpublished literature (56.9%), they would have to know at least three methods (descriptive statistics, t-tests, and contingency analysis). Knowing descriptive analysis and Pearson Correlation as well as two other methods (analysis of contingency and other multivariate tests) would give readers access to 84.1% of the statistical information in the published studies. By contrast, knowing at least five methods (descriptive statistics, t-tests, contingency analysis, Pearson correlation, and regression analysis) would give readers access to 84.3% of the statistical information in the unpublished documents.

E. DISCUSSION

The methodological quality of the social support research, as it applies to the area of woman abuse, leaves much to be desired. Most of the 42 social support studies used small, purposive samples of battered women that were not truly representative of any abused population. This trend inconveniently limited any multivariate approach that might have flushed out the most controlled explanatory relationship between social support and violence. Perhaps the most serious

problem in gathering the data was a failure to set comprehensive exclusion and inclusion criteria for the samples. As a consequence, the small groups of "battered women" in the social support literature were treated as an undifferentiated mass. In essence, it is theoretically unreasonable to assume that a woman who has been brutally beaten 40 times in the last year and who has required hospitalization on several occasions should be lumped together with a woman who has been 'accidentally' struck once in the last year by her partner. This gross pragmatic pooling or collapsing of battered women into a single sample only served to (a) attenuate the significance of predictive relationships which might have emerged, and/or (b) accentuate the significance of relationships which might not have existed had there been more specificity or refinement.

Another serious problem in this literature was the under-reporting of the demographic factors. Very few of the 42 social support studies accurately described the demographic factors which were believed to be associated with violence in their samples. Clearly, if such data goes uncontrolled, not only would any exploratory multivariate analysis be limited, but confounded relationships would go dangerously unattended, and in time, might lead to what has commonly been referred to

as a "whoozle effect" of the findings (Gelles, 1980).[27]

There were many problems in the research design of social support studies. Only one-third of the studies were designed to test hypotheses, and most of these were unpublished PhD dissertations. Many of the hypotheses, however, were either unsupported or in some cases not even tested because of the small sample sizes.[28] A large proportion of the studies were retrospective, cross-sectional, post-battering designs, and, therefore, could not effectively consider causal process. Of the few longitudinal designs existing in the social support literature, most were "half-life course" designs. That is, retrospective information was gathered from battered women staying in transition houses after they left their partner and then information was prospectively gathered from women sometime after they left the house. In these kind of designs, retrospective facts (e.g., she was unnaturally isolated in the abusive marriage) were often inappropriately inferred through extrapolating back from the battered woman's current non-abusive situation.

In the 42 social support documents examined in this

---

[27] As used here, a "whoozle effect" occurs when a finding leads future researchers in the area astray because of inadequate methodological precautions adopted earlier on in the research agenda from which that finding emerged.

[28] None of the social support studies conducted power analysis to estimate the sample size. Only two studies (see Gelles and Straus, 1988; Stantura, 1979:63-4) reported making adjustments to their sample sizes to minimize sampling error.

thesis, the most common method reported for gathering data was the interview. However, few of the studies provided adequate descriptions of their data collection procedures, and even fewer discussed measures taken to insure procedural reliability and validity.

Those authors who had examined the relationship between social support and abuse were generally conservative in their use of sophisticated statistical analyses. Most social support studies relied on descriptive analyses that did little to partial out spurious or indirect multivariate effects arising from competing sources of variation. There was some evidence that small sample sizes restricted the kinds of multivariate analyses that could have been conducted in this area. Often, because of the small sample sizes and the limitations of the statistical tests (e.g., rank ordered data only), violence as a dependent variable was collapsed into a dummy coded "violence" and "non-violence" dichotomy. Restricting the variation in this dependent variable seriously limited an accurate evaluation of the relationship between social support and abuse, particularly when the appropriate advanced multivariate tests (such as logistic regression, probit modelling, discriminant analysis, logit- loglinear analysis or non-parametric regression techniques like TOBIT, etc.) were not used.

Finally, in many of the social support studies, there were serious omissions in reporting the reliability and validity of the data-gathering instruments (e.g., composite questionnaires or scales). When such information was included, it was usually based on previous work and was established on populations other than abused women (e.g., university students). Failure to carry out reliability and validity tests on a sample of battered women similar in composition to a sample from the larger study prevents the reader from knowing whether the results of a study under question can be faithfully replicated at another time or whether the results are, in fact, valid.

CHAPTER 4

THE METHODOLOGY OF SOCIAL NETWORK STUDIES ON ABUSED WOMEN.

In the last decade, the empirical work on the social networks of the battered women has appeared predominantly in the form of unpublished dissertations (n=8) and theses (n=3). Only 2 published studies exist in the literature today which have incorporated elements of the network perspective as it is related to battered women. Six of the 13 studies which collected social network data on battered women (see Alcorn, 1984; Beauparlant, 1987; Butehorn, 1985; Heggie, 1986; Hoff, 1984; and Kerr, 1982) also collected social support data. Thus, these six studies were previously discussed in the preceding chapter, and will also be included in the caseload of social network studies considered in this chapter.

A. DATA SOURCES AND GENERATION PROCEDURES USED IN SOCIAL NETWORK STUDIES.

i) Sample Size

Sample size varied in the 13 social network studies from 9 to 112 respondents. Half of these studies included sample sizes of 30 subjects or less. Three-quarters of the studies had sample sizes of less than 60. Twenty subjects (n=2) was the most common sample size used in all 13 studies.

ii) Sampling Frame

While most of the samples in social network studies were gathered from shelters or transition houses (38.5% or n=5), other samples were drawn from other kinds of agencies (15.4% or n=2). Two studies drew three stage area random probability samples from the American population, and at least three of the 13 studies drew their samples from more than one institutional source. Samples from multivariate sources in the latter three studies were generally drawn from women who had sought help from agencies, women who had responded to advertisements in local newspapers and newsletters of organizations in a particular area, and women who were known within the professional and personal network of the researcher (see the work of McKenna, 1985).

Only four of the 13 social network studies reported a specific date of data collection. In only one of these four studies was the length of the time period specified (see Brown, 1985). Twelve of the 13 social network studies gathered their samples in the United States. While many of these studies (n=5) identified the city from which the sample was obtained, most only reported the region of the country, state or county (n=7) from which the sample was obtained.

iii) Sampling Method

Most of the social network studies used a purposive accidental sample (30.8% or n=4). There were, however, a wide variety of ways that social network samples were composed: three studies used a purposive volunteer sample, and another three studies used a mixed purposive volunteer and accidental sample. In addition, four other studies used a random probability sample. Jewell (1986), for instance, drew random samples of battered women from a listing of battered women staying in a shelter in Lower Westchester County, New York. Wickson (1988) drew a systematic random sample from a 1987 Victoria community telephone book. Finally, Byrne (1979) and Cazenave and Straus (1979) used a sample of 2,143 randomly selected American couples based on a comprehensive stratification of geographic region, type of community, and other population characteristics (see Weisbrod, 1976, for details).

iv) Inclusion/Exclusion Criteria (see Table 16)

Restrictive criteria for bracketing aspects of a sample's composition were used in 76.9% (n=10) of the network studies. Within its inclusionary or exclusionary framework, no social network study considered whether the battered woman had experienced injury or whether the abuse that was administered

was deliberate. Nor did any of the 13 studies consider the battered woman's nationality or her education as factors to be bracketed. The kind of abuse (n=3), severity of abuse (n=1), recency of abuse (n=3), duration of abuse (n=1), frequency of abuse (n=2), length of the relationship (n=3), relationship kind (n=3), the battered woman's native language (n=2), and where she lived (n=1) were each considered as criteria by either one, two, or three studies at most. Whether the woman had been physically abused (n=4), her age (n=5), and her marital status (n=5) were each used as criteria in four or five studies. Perhaps the most relied upon criterion in the social network studies was whether the battered respondent was still living (explicitly stated or inferred) with her partner. At least seven social network studies used this criterion to restrict their samples.

v) Demographic Factors (see Table 17)

Nearly all of the network studies (11 out of 13) included some demographic information. Out of the 9 possible categories of demographic factors, 42.3% reported 3 or fewer within their study. Education (n=8), age (n=7) and income (n=6) were most often reported, followed by ethnicity (n=5) and marital status (n=5), occupation (n=4), presence of children (n=4), employment (n=4), religion (n=3) and years married (n=2). Socioeconomic class and living with the batterer were reported by only one

study. Except for age, all of the above demographic factors were reported in unpublished dissertation and thesis work.

vi) Comparison Groups

Over half of the 13 social network studies (53.9%) used comparison or control groups. Three of these studies had an unequal battered and non-battered comparison group. In all three of these studies, the battered groups were smaller than the control groups by a 9:1 or 3:1 margin, depending on how the battering was defined. In at least one of the studies (see Wickson, 1988), the size differences between the battered and nonbattered groups were large enough to threaten statistical validity. In the remaining studies with relatively equal-sized battered and comparison groups, the comparison groups were made up of non-battered white and black women (Jewell, 1986), non-battered black couples (Brown, 1985), formerly battered women (Griffin, 1984), or abusive men (Beauparlant, 1987).

In 3 of the 7 social network studies which used a comparison group, the battered group and the non-battered group were concurrently generated from within the same community. In other studies, the groups came from different communities. For instance, while the sample of battered women was randomly selected from a single shelter in Jewell's (1986) work, the non-battered sample came from a random selection of women

regularly attending a gynecological clinic in a large municipal hospital.

Only one of the social network studies came close to matching its control group with its battered group. Griffin (1984), for instance, reported post hoc that the groups were highly comparable on age, ethnicity, marital status, and number of children. The samples, however, were not paired.

In only two social network studies were the comparison groups neither randomly selected nor matched (see Beauparlant, 1987; Brown, 1985). Sometimes this kind of problem was out of the hands of the researcher. Brown (1985), for example, intended to select a random sample from police records but was forced to modify her sample requirements when she found that the records were flooded with a host of uncontrollable inaccuracies.

In at least one of the six social network studies which did not use their own comparison group (see McKenna, 1985), results were compared with those of other studies which had used the same instruments but different groups of women (with an unknown battered composite). Laura Smith McKenna (1985), for instance, compared several of her findings on her sample of battered women with several different populations: (a) an employed, non-clinical sample of women where the incidence of

battering was unknown, (b) a sample of other women who were coping with major life-changes, and (c) two "normative" samples.[29] It is possible that several of her main findings would have been different had she compared her abused sample with only a random community control group or a matched pair comparison group.

B. RESEARCH DESIGNS USED IN SOCIAL NETWORK STUDIES.

i) Purpose of Work

Of the 13 network studies on battered women, 69.2% (n=9) tested hypotheses and the remaining 30.8% were exploratory. Among the network studies, there was a significant positive trend over time in the use of hypothesis testing. This trend, however, was probably more a reflection of scientific research practices of psychology (where most of the social network studies originated) rather than a general trend in the area of network research as it relates to abuse, or the area of woman abuse in general.

---

[29] McKenna (1985) did not explain what she meant by "normative." In one of the studies which she referred to as normative, the author used a random mail-out sample of 500 staff employees in a large university medical centre; 31.2% of this sample did not respond to the questionnaire (see Norbeck, 1982).

ii) Design of Study

Nearly three-fourths (69.2%) of the social network studies were cross-sectionally designed. The remaining quarter (n=4 dissertations) were longitudinally conceptualized (see Alcorn, 1984; Butehorn, 1985; Heggie, 1986; Hoff, 1984). One of the longitudinal studies (Hoff, 1984) involved a long-term participant observation of the women living within a shelter. The other three longitudinal studies gathered their information at two time periods and used half-life shelter designs (explained in the previous chapter). In Alcorn's study, of the 40 original participants, 31 could be reached in the follow-up 6 to 28 weeks after leaving the shelter. In Butehorn's (1985) study, while all of the original 25 battered subjects were eventually reached during the follow-up, 75% percent of the cases were not at their original phone numbers when contacted. Had it not been for the names of battered women's network members which were mentioned during the first interview, it seems likely that the follow-up part of the study would have failed.

iii) Data Collection Period

All of the 13 social network studies were retrospectively designed. However, as with the social support studies, a large portion of the network studies (n=11) had combined concurrent

or prospective components in their designs which muddled interpretation. In several studies, when characteristics of the battered women's network were measured, this was usually done well after the abuse was over or at an unknown time. The implications of this phase displacement have been alluded to in Chapter 2 of this thesis (see footnote 25). While many researchers had planned their research (e.g, by administering the research instrument as soon as the battered women arrived at the transition house) so that data would be collected on battered women who had recently experienced abuse, their plans did not work well in practice (e.g., battered women take refuge in shelters or seek support from agencies or respond to newspaper ads for many different reasons.)

iv) Data Collection Method

A variety of data collection methods were used in the 13 social support studies: 8 used an interview schedule, of which 2 also included self-administered questionnaires; 3 used only a self-administered questionnaire; 1 used a questionnaire survey; and 2 other studies used more in-depth techniques, such as participant observation, diaries, etc.

v) Procedural Reliability

In general, most social network studies which used questionnaires or interview schedules kept the completion time to well under two hours, with average completion rates between 45 minutes and 1.5 hours. Only one study reported an average completion time of two hours and twenty minutes (see Kerr, 1982). The author, however, had prepared the interviewees for a possible lengthy interview before the actual interview got underway. Sometimes there were good reasons for long interviews. Brown (1987), for instance, lengthened her interview so that the first five to ten minutes were used to establish rapport with the interviewee.

When interviews were conducted or when questionnaires were administered, they were usually carried out by one of the main authors of a study. This varied, however, depending on the number of participants in the study (see Byrne, 1979; and Cazenave and Straus, 1979), on the cooperation of the administration in organizations from which the battered women were to be sampled (see Heggie, 1986; Hoff, 1984) and on whether, of course, the study was unpublished graduate work. When the Response Analysis Corporation collected a sample of 2,143 randomly selected American couples in Gelles and Straus's 1976 National Family Violence study, great strides were taken to train a number of individuals to perform the task of

interviewing.

In many social network studies, explanations on how the interviews were carried out or how the questionnaires were administered were often poorly detailed. However, adequate explanations were provided in some of the social network studies, particularly among those carried out by sociologists (see Byrne, 1979; and Cazenave and Straus, 1979; Wickson, 1988; 1989). Wickson (1988), for example, explained in great detail how her 112 member sample was chosen from a 1987 Victoria telephone book, the procedures that she had used and the difficulties that she encountered in contacting her respondents, as well as how the questionnaires were mailed out and the difficulties that arose due to a mail strike. In terms of procedural replicability, this work is truly unique and is highly recommended. The study, however, is not without its methodological flaws. Had Wickson (1988) used reliable and valid measures of violence and social network structure in her questionnaire, as well as reliable and valid measures of dependency and attitudes toward violence, her work would have been of exceptional quality. As the results stand, they cannot not be trusted. Moreover, her operationalization of the violence variable--collapsing prevalence and incidence data (women who admitted to being abused 10 years ago were included with women who had been battered six weeks ago) and reducing their combined totals in her analysis to a dichotomy of

"battered" and "not battered"--not only restricted its variability but, with the few "battered" women that she was able to locate, led to a distorted picture of wife battery in her contingency analyses.

What Wickson (1988) should have done, which at least three other social network studies did (see Alcorn, 1984; Jewell, 1986; and McKenna, 1985), was to conduct pilot studies and pretests with known battered (e.g., residents of Victoria Transition House) and non-battered women so as to develop her procedures as well as to refine and validate her questionnaire, its scales, and its indices. For example, before undertaking her main study, Laura Smith McKenna (1985:166-171) conducted a small scale pilot study on 22 formerly battered women, where she tested her interview schedule and self-administered questionnaire and pre-tested data processing and analysis techniques. As a result of these smaller studies, modifications were made to the main study, including an attempt to decrease the length of the interview schedule and to set an appointment time of four hours for each interview.

C. RELIABILITY AND VALIDITY OF RESEARCH INSTRUMENTS USED IN SOCIAL NETWORK STUDIES.

Of the 76.9% (n=10) social network studies which used a composite instrument (an interview schedule or questionnaire)--

all of which were unpublished work--all included the instrument within the text of their study.

Of those social network studies which used a survey questionnaire or interview schedule, 58.3% showed little concern for reporting reliability. In the 38.5% (n=5) unpublished studies which did include such information, it was often only partially included. All of the reliability tests reported were based upon previous studies; no in-house reliability tests were conducted on battered women in any of the 13 network studies considered by this thesis.

Of the social network studies which used a survey or interview questionnaire, 33.4% (4 dissertations) included or partially included some measure of validity which had been established in a previous study.

Ten of the 13 network studies used scales or indexes. Of these, only half included or partially included information on the reliability of their instruments.

Only two studies reported validity tests for their scale instruments. The validity, however, had been established in a previous study.

D. STATISTICAL METHODS AND MEASURES USED IN SOCIAL NETWORK STUDIES. (see Table 18)

Most social network studies that were examined in this thesis used at least two types of statistical analysis (38.5%). However, the rest used either only one type of analysis (30.8%), or sometimes three or four types (30.8%).

The frequency and percentage of the various statistical methods used in the network studies are presented in Table 18 in order of their frequency of use. Readers familiar only with descriptive statistics or analysis of contingency would have knowledge of over one quarter (7 of 27 methods) of the statistical methods reported. To have access to 51.9% of the statistical information, readers would have had to have learned descriptive analysis as well as the next most common method, analysis of contingency. Knowing both these methods and two others (Pearson correlations and t-tests) would give readers access to 77.8% of the statistical information. These figures were consistent across the varying types of literature.

E. DISCUSSION

The quality of methodology used in the 13 social network studies leaves much to be desired. While there was no discernable pattern in the sampling frames that were employed,

the particular frames that were chosen often insured biased findings before the data was even collected. Only three social network studies used multiple sampling sources to try to increase variation in their sample; the success or failure of these attempts were never discussed. While most social network studies provided some indication of the origin of the sample, very few reported enough information within their texts to permit replication of their work, or at least to permit substantive comparison of their results with findings from other studies. Only one of the 13 social network studies reported the sampling period. While most of the social network studies used samples that were either purposive accidental or purposive volunteer, at least four of the social network studies used random probability samples. However, two of these random samples were drawn from rather limited populations. In common with the social support literature, perhaps the greatest problem in gathering the data was a failure to set comprehensive exclusion and inclusion criteria for the participant population. As a result, there was a pooling or collapsing of factors related to abuse which might otherwise have provided a more comprehensive understanding of the nature of the relationship between social network characteristics and abuse. Another serious problem in this literature was the inadequate description of the demographic profiles of the samples. This was disturbing since without such descriptive material, the chances of repeating or replicating the study

were limited.

There were many problems in the research design of each study. Nearly 70% of the social network studies were designed to test hypotheses, a finding probably attributable to the high dissertation density in the 13 studies examined in this section. As with the social support literature, many of the hypotheses were either unsupported or in some cases, could not be tested because of small sample sizes. A very large number of the studies were retrospective, cross-sectional, and post-abuse, limiting any understanding of the role social networks play in the social control of abuse (i.e., its origin, maintenance, or regression) or the role social networks play in simply deterring abuse. Of the longitudinal designs, most were "half-life course" designs. That is, retrospective information was gathered from battered women staying in transition houses (after leaving their abusive situation), and then information was gathered from the women sometime after leaving the shelter.

While the most common method used to gather data was the interview, a variety of other methods were also used. Very few studies, however, provided adequate descriptions of their data collection procedures or measures taken to ensure procedural reliability and validity.

Social network researchers have generally avoided the use of advanced statistical analyses. Most of the social network studies relied on descriptive analyses, analysis of contingency, Pearson correlations and T-tests. The simple tests were likely a reflection of the kinds of hypotheses that were tested,[30] but there was also some evidence that small sample sizes restricted the kinds of multivariate analyses that could be used to sort out the effects of extraneous factors. As with the social support literature, often because of the small sample sizes and the limitations of the statistical tests (e.g., continuous variables with normal distributions), violence as a dependent variable was collapsed into a rather limited dummy coded, "violence" and "non-violence" dichotomy.

Most social network studies seriously neglected reporting the reliability and validity of the instruments (e.g. composite questionnaires or scales) used. When such information was included, it was usually drawn from previous work which was based on samples from populations other than abused women.

Finally, the 13 social network studies reviewed in this thesis differed in the number and type of variables that were measured and related to relationship status. Because of the complex inter-relationships among these variables, a lack of

---

[30] It is unclear at this time whether it was the lack of knowledge of statistical applications which limited the proposed hypotheses, or whether the hypotheses, as stated, limited the kinds of tests that could be used.

commonality across studies made interpretation and comparison difficult.[31]

[31] While not specifically examined by this thesis, it is worth mentioning that there was an obvious lack of consistency between studies in the way social networks were defined and operationalized. Table 19 lists some of the ways respondents were asked to report aspects of their social network structure. The variation in the aggregate is significant, and as noted in the text above, it may lead to serious interpretation problems, particularly when comparisions are made between studies with results that are inconsistent or inconclusive. Another problem with the operationalization of the network in the 13 studies examined by this thesis was when they asked the respondent to list only so many of their network members. In doin so, they arbitrarily limited the size of the network *during the information gathering process*. This atheoretical, truncation of the network concept limited the full range of variation (in numerous network indicators) that could have been generated had the respondent been allowed to record what she perceived to be her complete network. Finally, a third observation that can be made was that none of the network studies measured the overlap between the battered woman's network and the network of her partner (see also Cross, 1991; Cross and Gallant, 1991; Mitchel and Hodson, 1983).

CHAPTER 5

THE METHODOLOGY OF STUDIES ON THE PERSONALITY CHARACTERISTICS OF ABUSED WOMEN.

One book (7.7%), one book chapter (7.7%), six articles (46.2%), three dissertations (23.1%) and two theses (15.4%), comprised a total of 13 studies which had measured the battered woman's personality traits.[32] A significant portion of these studies were accessible during the 1980s (92.3%); most of these works (69.3%) appeared during the first half of the 1980s. One of the 13 personality studies (see Smith, 1982) was included in the repertoire of social support studies examined earlier in this thesis (see Table 23).

A. DATA SOURCES AND GENERATION PROCEDURES USED IN PERSONALITY STUDIES.

i) Sample Size

Sample size in the 13 personality studies varied from 1 to 118 respondents. A sample size of 30 subjects was most commonly reported; the median was 17 subjects. Three quarters

---

[32] I was unable to obtain at least two papers on the personality characteristics of battered women. N. Palau (1981) presented a paper at the annual meetings of the American Psychological Association, Los Angeles, titled "Battered women: A homogeneous group? Theoretical considerations and the MMPI data interpretation (preliminary findings)." The reference can be found in Lynne Bravo Rosewaters (1988) article titled, "Battered or Schizophrenic? Psychological Tests Can't Tell." Also, Mary Ann Douglas and Ava Colantuono have written a paper titled "Cluster Analysis of MMPI Scores Among Battered Women." This paper can be purchased from the Family Violence Research Laboratory at the University of New Hampshire.

(n=10) of the studies used samples of 30 individuals or less; over 90.0% (n=12) used 60 subjects or less.

ii) Sampling Frame

Most of the single source samples in personality studies were gathered from hospitals or clinics (30.8% or n=4); other sources, such as transition houses (23.1% or n=3) and respondents to newspaper ads (7.7% or n=1) were also used. At least 4 studies (30.8%) used samples from more than one source. Hartik (1982), for instance, gathered her sample from acquaintances and friends, as well as from women who had responded to advertisements in the local free press or to advertisements in women's washrooms in San Bernardino County. Control of extraneous factors in her study was exercised at the sampling level. The women volunteers in her combined sample had to have been beaten on more than one occasion by their mates to the degree that "medical attention was warranted or the result of the abuse could be witnessed upon their person."

Only 5 of the 13 personality studies (38.5%) reported the specific period of data collection. However, all of the personality studies either explicitly or implicitly reported the United States as the country from which samples were obtained. Beyond this, information on the sampling frame was less specific. In fact, most studies (n=9) only reported the

region, state or county from which the sample was drawn. Names of transition houses or other institutions were reported less often (n=4).

iii) Sampling Method

While over a quarter of the 13 personality studies (n=4) used a purposive volunteer sample, most of the personality studies (n=8) used a purposive accidental sample. In only one of the 13 studies (see Gellen et al., 1984) was a description of the sampling method ambiguous enough not to be categorized under the MAP criteria. Unlike the social support or social network literatures, a random sample was not used in any of the 13 personality studies which reported their collection method. None of the published literature (comprising more than half of the overall sample) used volunteer samples.

iv) Inclusion/Exclusion Criteria (see Table 20)

Some kind of restrictive criterion was used to bracket the samples in 76.9% (n=10) of the personality studies. Within its selection criteria, none of the personality studies on battered women considered whether an injury had occurred, whether the abuse was deliberate or recent, or the duration of the abuse. As well, no study considered such bracketing factors as the battered woman's nationality, where she currently resided, or

the kind of relationship she was in or had been in. However, the length of the battering relationship (n=2), the battered woman's native language (n=2), and specific educational (n=2) or age (n=1) requirements were each considered as criteria by at least one or two studies. Further, the severity of abuse (n=4), the frequency of abuse (n=5), marital status (n=5) and whether the battered respondent was still living (explicitly stated or inferred) with her partner (n=6) were each considered as criteria in four, five or six studies. Finally, over half of the personality studies (61.5% or n=8) specifically stipulated that in order to participate the woman had to have experienced physical abuse.

v) Demographic Factors (see Table 21)

Many of the 13 personality studies provided some demographic information, mostly in the form of age (n=11), ethnicity (n=8), marital status (n=7) or education (n=6). Presence of children (n=5), class (n=3), employment (n=3), and years married (n=3) were reported, but at a much lower rate. Income (n=2), occupation (n=2) and living with the batterer (n=1) were only reported by two studies or less. Of the studies which included demographic information on the sample, most were published.

vi) Comparison Groups.

Over three-fifths (61.5% or n=8) of the personality studies used comparison or control groups. Three of these eight studies used unequal numbers of women in battered and comparison groups; the differences were large enough to possibly create invalid estimates in the proportion of explained and unexplained variance. Five studies compared the personalities of battered women with non-battered women, one study compared battered with ex-battered women (Smith, 1982), another study compared battered women with formerly battered and non-battered women (Carboneau, 1986), and still another study compared four different groups of women who had been battered (Rosewater, 1988).

In four of the personality studies, the authors reported matching the battered and comparison group on specific attribute variables. Gellen et al. (1984) matched their 10-member battered group with a 10-member non-battered group on race, age and socio-economic status. The three other studies (Avriam, 1981; Back et al., 1982; and Carboneau, 1987), matched their samples on group means using similar demographic data.

In two of the more recent studies, the authors used multiple comparison and control groups (see Carboneau, 1987; Rosewater, 1988). Using such groups led the researchers to

establish more refined conclusions and overcome some of the cross-sectional limitations of their data.

In five of the studies which did not use a control group, the authors compared the findings of their personality studies on battered women to standardized normal population scores which had been included with the scale. Armed only with the scores of the 'normal' population, however, researchers could not match their samples on the demographics of the local community (from which their battered samples were obtained), nor undertake any meaningful multivariate analysis (where variables other than abuse might explain a greater proportion of the variance in personality, e.g., helpseeking effectiveness, age cohort).

B. RESEARCH DESIGNS USED IN PERSONALITY STUDIES.

i) Purpose of Work

Six of the 13 personality studies which reported their purpose of work also tested hypotheses. The other seven were exploratory or applied (see, for instance, the work of Diane Follingstad, 1980).

ii) Design of Study

Nearly all of the personality studies (n=12) used a cross-sectional design. Only one study employed a longitudinal design (see Follingstad, 1981), but this study was, like most cross-sectional studies examined earlier in this thesis, limited by a post-battering emphasis. Whether cross-sectional or longitudinal in design, however, most researchers drew conclusions that went beyond the bounds of what their findings actually suggested. Collecting cross-sectional data on 10 battered women after they had arrived at shelters, Gellen et al. (1984:603), for instance, improperly concluded that "women in abusive relationships manifest, to some extent, disordered personalities. Consequently, they must be treated in conjunction with the abuser to bring about changes in the relationship." By contrast, Rosewater (1988) came to an opposite conclusion in her cross-sectional comparative work on 'currently' battered and 'formerly' battered women, noting in her final paragraph, "clearly the traits measured for currently battered women on the MMPI are reactive states, not character traits."

Neither Gellens et al. nor Rosewater should have drawn the causal conclusions that they did because neither provided evidence for either prebattering-postbattering differences or for no differences in personality characteristics between

abused women participants and their control or comparision groups. Were there any non-battered women that had the same traits as battered women? Likewise, were there any battered women that possessed the traits of a non-battered woman? More importantly, with small sample size, what is the probability of finding a trait difference by chance? While Rosewater's conclusions may be the more reasonable of the conclusions offered by the two studies (in light of what is known from the growing literature on Post Traumatic Stress Disorders), there is still a lot of room in this area for alternative hypothesis testing using prospective research designs (with multiple indicators, etc.).

iii) Data Collection Period

All but one of the 13 personality studies measured the battered woman's personality at the time of the study, sometimes long after the abuse was over. Because the pre-battering personality traits were unknown, personality cannot be understood as either a cause or an effect of the abuse. This point is best exemplified in Aviram's (1981:23) study where several participants made the following personal observations: "At the time I was extremely depressed, almost in shock, immobilized by the depression--but now ...that was years ago"; "I've changed a great deal since then--I was extremely dependent on him...now I'm dependent only on myself,

I learned to rely on myself [since he left me]"; "I'm much more independent now, no longer a little bunny rabbit...he'd say 'jump' and I'd ask how high on the way up. Now I'd never have a man who didn't respect me as a person...I feel too good about me ever to let that happen again." Avriam (1981) concluded that aspects of personality as measured by the tests were possibly no longer measuring the masochistic characteristics of the battered woman. He did not, however, consider alternative explanations (in line with his theoretical position): that the change in a woman's personality was only temporary, and that she might one day return to her pre-battering masochistic state, or, that the change in the battered woman's personality was permanent and an outcome of other factors associated with abuse, such as the isolation or the psychological abuse that the woman may have experienced, rather than the physical abuse itself (see Hoffman, 1984; Stein, 1982; Tolman, 1989).

iv) Data Collection Method

The 84.6% (n=11) of the studies which reported their data collection method also reported the use of a self-administered questionnaire. This was generally the only data collection method adopted by personality studies.

v) Procedural Reliability

Nearly all of the 13 personality studies administered the same personality trait measure (16PF or MMPI) in the self-administered questionnaire fashion. This made it difficult to tell whether or not the results of a particular study were independent of systematic error in the administration of the instrument or free from any systematic error in the construction of the instrument itself. Often personality measures were chosen because they were in vogue or they had unique application properties (e.g., a short completion time of 35-40 minutes, and/or they contained a motivation-distortion key, and/or the fact that the measure was appropriate for an individual with at least a grade six education). However, rarely were they chosen because they were the most reliable or valid measure available. While the instruments could be completed in a short period of time, this did not stop studies continuing for sometimes two (see Wilson, 1985) or even three hours (see Aviram, 1981).

The instrument administration procedures were underdescribed in most of the personality studies. While in some studies it was clear who administered the research instruments (usually the researchers themselves), in several other studies, however, the position of the administrator went unreported and could not be inferred from the text. In some

studies, great care was taken to see that the setting was comfortable for the participant. This was done, however, at the cost of increased distortion due to increased uncontrolled extraneous variables (e.g., setting). For instance, Aviram (1981) administered the personality instrument to her subjects while they were in their homes. In other cases, however, for reasons of safety or convenience, the subjects were given the scale at the experimenter's home or office at the University. It was for this reason that Smith (1982), for example, offered her subjects various settings in which to complete their questionnaires. Some researchers tried to resolve the subject-protection, study-validity tension. Arndt (1981), for instance, administered her instruments in a 'neutral' setting.

There were often factors which biased the condition of the battered women at the time the personality scales were administered. Aviram (1981), for instance, admitted that many women in her sample had received counselling before being given the MMPI. She also noted that only three of the 18 women remained with the batterer at the time of the interview. Star (1978) noted in her study that before the women were given the 16PF, they were at various stages in crises. Obviously, unless these factors are controlled in the selection of the battered sample (e.g., selecting a sample of battered women who have not had counselling) or are statistically controlled within the data analysis (e.g., in a regression analysis, by partialling

out the effects due to the number of hours of counselling), the effects of abuse or the significance of the measures of personality traits will appear somewhat diminished in the analysis.

Finally, reliability and criterion validity checks were occasionally reported in some of the 13 personality studies. Wilson (1985) made cross-checks with demographic information from shelter intake forms and used older children to verify the abuse. Hartik (1982) triple-checked her hand-scores to insure accuracy.

C. RELIABILITY AND VALIDITY OF RESEARCH INSTRUMENTS USED IN PERSONALITY STUDIES.

Four of the 13 personality studies (30.8%) used a composite instrument. Reliability assessment information was available for only one of the instruments used in these studies; validity information, however, was not reported for this or any other study.

All 13 personality studies used either the 16PF (n=6) or MMPI (n=7) scale to assess the personality of the battered woman. Half of the studies used form A of the 16PF instrument and the other half used form C. Only 7 studies (53.9%) included or partially included reliability information on the

16PF or the MMPI, of which 4 were unpublished dissertations or theses. Eight studies (66.7%) which mentioned the source of instrument reliability also mentioned that the reliability had been established in a previous study, or that it was at least only partially available. All of the dissertations and theses (n=5) reported this information in some detail.

Information pertaining to the validity tests for the 16PF and the MMPI were included or partially included in 7 of the 13 personality studies. All of these tests were carried out in a previous study on non-battered women. All 5 unpublished dissertations and theses were among the 7 personality studies that reported this information.

D. STATISTICAL METHODS AND MEASURES USED IN PERSONALITY STUDIES. (see Table 22)

Most personality studies used at least two statistical techniques (38.5%), and just as many used at least one (38.1%). Few studies (15.4%) used three or more techniques.

The frequency and percentage of the various statistical methods used by personality studies are presented in Table 22. The methods are listed in the table in order of frequency of use. Readers familiar with t-tests would have knowledge of just under two-fifths of all statistical methods reported (9

of 23 methods). To have access to over half (60.9%) of the statistical information, readers would have had to be familiar with t-tests as well as analysis of contingency. Knowing both these methods and analysis of variance, readers would have access to nearly three-fourths (73.9%) of the statistical information. These figures did not vary significantly across the different types of literature.

E. DISCUSSION

The quality of research designed to gather data on the personalities of battered women leaves much to be desired. Many of the personality studies (n=11) gathered samples from hospitals or clinics and transition houses. The women in these groups differed dramatically in terms of the severity of abuse they endured and the professional support they had received. Of the four studies which used mixtures of samples, not one of them considered examining the differences in personality in terms of sample history.

Most of the studies did not report the period of data collection, nor the specific location of the sample (e.g., the hospital or clinic). None of the samples in the 13 personality studies were randomly chosen. This kind of sampling bias, and the fact that very few personality studies set comprehensive exclusion and inclusion criteria for the participant

population, often left the researcher little statistical control over extraneous factors. In particular, ignoring factors which influence the state of mind of a battered woman (e.g., how often the abuse occurs, the length of time in a supportive shelter) leads to a spurious understanding of the nature of the relationship between personality and abuse. In effect, an MMPI score of a woman who had been severely beaten 40 times in the last year and required hospitalization would be averaged out with a woman who had been beaten just as much but who had received some professional counselling. This collapse of the sample and consequent attenuation of the data created an inaccurate picture of the abuse problem and the factors that might have explained either personality change under abusive conditions or whether the violence was due to abuse-provoking personality characteristics (a highly unlikely and controversial position) or a combination of both.

Another serious problem in this literature was the under-description of the demographic factors. Very few studies described the demographic variables of the participant population. Coupled with the lack of multivariate testing in this area, not partialling out or taking into account social factors as they relate to personality and abuse may be counterproductive, creating an ambiguous picture of the role of personality as either cause or effect of violence.

There were many problems in the research design within each study. Only half of the studies were designed to test hypotheses. All of the hypotheses, however, were extremely simple, i.e., 'There will be a difference in the personality traits between battered women and a "non-battered" control group.' Inspite of the lack of specificity and sophistication in these hypotheses, most authors drew conclusions which were not suggested by their data. Further, nearly all of the studies were concurrent and cross-sectionally designed. This, however, did not stop many of the authors from concluding that it was the abused woman herself who, because of the personality traits she possessed, caused or at least maintained the battering. Nor did it deter other authors from making an equally unqualified suggestion that the personality characteristics were an outcome of the abusive environment. It is not unreasonable to suggest here that prospective, longitudinal studies might be able to resolve the tension between these opposing conclusions.

The self-administered questionnaire was primarily the only data collection technique used, leaving the conclusion of personality trait studies (as they applied to battered women) vulnerable to a wide range of systematic errors. In this light, personality studies would gain from adopting a more multi-method, multi-trait triangulation approach which might resolve these problems.

Most personality studies relied on T-tests, usually comparing the 16PF or MMPI scores of battered women against the scores of a national "non-battered" standard. There was no multivariate testing that would partial out the effects of other variables that might have explained personality or abuse. The lack of such analyses, however, were most likely a consequence of the small samples that were gathered.

While there was some instrument reliability and validity information reported, this came mostly from the unpublished work. In general, however, no reliability or validity tests of the instruments were carried out on the data that was gathered.

CHAPTER 6

CONCLUSION

The substantive area covered by gender abuse studies deals with deep personal problems in human lives. Our institutional life, as it is conceived in the sociology of the family, is threatened by erosion of trust and the violence women have to bear. Sociologists' emphasis on the importance of dispassion and objectivity has, in C. Wright Mills' (1959) terms, lead to a certain cynicism and an unwillingness to apply the sociological imagination to improving the human condition. It was partly in response to this challenge that I began to look at issues covered in this thesis: such as, what methodological techniques are available to help us describe the problem of abused women and what has already been done to provide answers that would expand our theoretical grasp of the issues and our coming to terms with the need for constructive social therapeutic approaches.

This thesis has attempted to answer the following questions:

1) *What* was the general population that had been tapped in studies on woman abuse?
2) *Had* these studies chosen adequate research designs to answer the questions they set out to study?
3) *Were* the instruments used in the studies reliable and valid?
4) And in terms of analysis, *did* the statistics adequately present the data?

Obviously, unless the data and methods used to access it were of high standards, neither the theory nor the applications could be trusted. Sixty-one empirical studies in three major areas of woman abuse: social support, social network, and personality factors of abused women, were located through an extensive search of the woman abuse literature published between 1969 and 1989. Over half of the studies found were unpublished dissertations or theses. Using an instrument specifically constructed for this thesis, called *MAP* (*M*ethodological *A*rchitectural *P*lan), each study was systematically examined for its data sources and generation procedures, research design, reliability and validity of instruments, and its statistical methods and measures.

Studies in all areas of the abuse literature that were examined in this thesis suffered from similar problems. Samples were small, volunteer or accidentally derived, and generally unrepresentative of the battered population. When demographic data were included for the samples, they were reported imprecisely--probably a reflection of the general tendency not to conduct multivariate analyses. Clearly, a replication of these studies would be difficult. In most of the studies there was faulty conception of the substantive issue so that women in brutally violent marriages were compared with others where there was only intermittent and superficial violence. Further research should avoid treating battered

women as an undifferentiated mass.[33] Such indifference attenuates the significance of predictive statistical relationships which might have emerged and/or accentuates relationships which should never have existed had there been more specificity or refinement.[34]

Most studies used research designs which created an inaccurate picture of the battered woman and her battering experience. Comparison and control samples were often loosely composed, thus creating conditions for statistical invalidity

---

[33] Several researchers have tried to collapse various aspects of the abuse concept into a single variable. Kathleen Hofeller (1982:51-2,126-7) treated severity, frequency and duration as different dimensions of violence and this was reflected in her analysis. She did however, collapse the variables into an overall "abuse score". The choice of factors included in the analysis was that men would likely control the frequency and severity of the violence, whereas women would control the duration. Limandri (1985:79) treated severity of abuse as duration of abuse + frequency of abuse; the assumption here is that they are orthogonal and that each with equal weighting will be representative of the violence variable. In another study, Shupe et al. (1987:135) created a Life Endangerment Index (LEI), scoring two types of abuse as follows: Non-life-endangering behavior = 1; any life-endangering-behavior = 2; non-life-endangering injuries = 1; and any life-endangering injury = 2. Following the rating of any behavior, the values could range from 1-4, where 1 (or 1+0)= non-life-endangering to 4 (2+2) = dangerously life-endangering. Finally, Bowker (1984:61-62) factor analyzed seven marital violence categories and came up with two factors. The strongest variables in each of the factors were violence frequency and total years of violence. From these two variables, Bowker composed a bivariate marital violence typology similar to the LEI.

[34] As the significance level for all studies using statistical tests was usually set *a priori* at alpha=0.05, ignoring the heterogeneity of samples or effectively collapsing major explanatory variables set up conditions for inflated alpha and beta rates before any hypothesis testing could ever be carried out. Adjustments should have been made in order to compensate for alpha and beta inflation. Otherwise, if an unusual case of alpha inflation cannot be statistically controlled, a statement of the problem would suffice. (It should be noted that rejecting the null hypothesis when it is true is called a type I error for a statistical test. The probability of making a type I error is denoted by the symbol alpha. Accepting the null hypothesis when it is false is called a type II error. The probability of making a type II error when some specific alternative is true is denoted by the symbol beta.)

when conclusions were forced based on *a priori* hypothesis testing. Few studies included enough information to adequately assess the internal validity of the research design; of the studies which did provide some detail, a significant number lacked control over the research setting. Furthermore, most studies incorporated a retrospective, cross-sectional, post-battering design, and, therefore, could not effectively consider causal process. Women in these studies were often asked to complete indicators of social support, social network characteristics, or personality structure for their current situation which was, when it was reported, often unreasonably distant from the most recent abusive event. Most of the longitudinal designs were "half-life course" designs where retrospective information was gathered from the women staying in a transition house, and then follow-up information was gathered from the women sometime after leaving the shelter. In these kinds of designs, for social support and social network studies in particular, data were often retrospectively gathered or extrapolated backwards in time from the prospective changes in social support or social network characteristics after the woman left the shelter and was in a non-abusive situation.

A majority of studies in all three areas used descriptive statistics, or at most, very basic statistical tests like analysis of contingency or t-tests. Often the application of

these analyses did not meet the assumptions of the tests. In several studies, the subject-to-variable ratio was too low, there were low numbers of cases in contingency cells, and/or the author used large intercorrelation matrices without control of the experiment-wise error rate (see Collis and Rosenblood, 1985). In other cases, tests could not be carried out because of a seriously skewed abuse variable; that is, if abuse was to be treated as a continuous variable, often there would not be enough cases of battered women in a sample that had been physically abused more than one time to achieve a distribution that would satisfy the conditions of a particular statistical analysis. Even when the variable was logarithmically transformed in an attempt to normalize it, the changes necessary to meet the assumptions of a particular statistical test were often unsuccessful. Sometimes researchers were forced to collapse categories of variables critical to their analysis in order to test their hypotheses more effectively or explore other relationships. This obviously tempered the predictive power of the data and may have even forced a distortion of a particular concept under evaluation. Because of the idiosyncratic nature of abuse data, future researchers in the area should carry out systematic exploratory data analysis (EDA)[35] before considering any kind of statistical

---

[35] As used here, EDA means examining single distributions using histograms, stem-and-leaf plots, boxplots, quantile plots, symmetry plots, etc. Comparison of two distributions can be carried out using scatterplots, difference plots, qq-plots, running boxplots, draftman's plots, symbolic scatterplots, casement displays, starplots, or even chernoff faces. Specific diagnostics like residual plots, normal scores plots, as well as

analysis or data transformation.

Many studies in all three areas considered by this thesis did not report the reliability and validity of the instruments used in the research. When this information was reported, however, it was usually based on previous studies and on populations other than abused women. Obviously, it is critical that the reliability and validity of instruments be appropriately established: for example, on comparable samples, for comparable research objectives, and so forth.

All in all, in terms of the questions posed earlier, what do the findings of this thesis suggest? First, *what* was the general population that had been tapped in studies on woman abuse? While samples were composed of physically abused women, they were usually small, and the exact nature of their composition was often either very varied or unknown. Second, *had* the studies used adequate research designs to answer the questions they set out to study? Clearly they had not. The research designs were often poorly constructed and had low internal validity. Third, *were* instruments used in the studies reliable and valid? If they were, this information was rarely

---

outlier and leverage point tests (e.g. studentized residual, Cook's Distance, H_i, or pure-error lack of fit tests) can be used to assess the adequacy of regression models. Computer programs like SPSS, SAS, Sygraph or "S" can often generate these plots and other information with little difficulty (See Becker, et.al., 1988).

reported. Finally, in terms of analysis, *did* the statistics and other summary basis for comparison adequately present the data? Clearly they did not. In fact, because of the nature of the samples (small size and uncontrolled sample heterogeneity) the simple statistical analyses used may have lead to findings which were incorrect.[36] In sum, what the studies offer is a heterogeneous mixture of research methodologies that seems to have done more to distort the reality of the problem than to help create understanding and build a reliable and valid body of literature.

There is no more reasonable solution to these problems than to suggest that empirical research on the abuse of women, use higher methodological standards and that it be conducted with a prospective, multi-method, multi-trait, triangulating basis (see Denzin, 1970). In view of the pressure to publish in academic circles and the decreasing availability of adequate funding, this goal remains a daunting challenge.

On a more optimistic note, the disappointing findings that the field has generated so far are not atypical in a developing area of research as new as gender abuse. Thus, the findings of this thesis reflect the progression of the empirical woman

---

[36] In essence, the smaller and more heterogeneous the sample, the more likely a symptom-specific response (a statistical effect or relationship) to the abusive situation will be found by chance.

abuse literature to date. With the introduction of new and more refined theoretical and methodological approaches to the abuse research, higher standards can be expected in the future.

One such orientation which is relatively new to the woman abuse area and which deserves mention here is the feminist perspective. Feminist research, despite its "radical" appearance,[37] offers a sobering alternative to the previous methods which ignore the situational variants of the abusive process. As a backlash against the positivist domain which cradles frontline objectivity, many feminist researchers have embraced a historical-contextual, "realist," subjectivist approach to gender-power differentials. Data are often collected using open-ended in-depth interview methods, rather than preestablished coding schemes, in order to understand and validate the experience of women in a structurally-oppressive male-dominated society (Dobash and Dobash, 1979;1988). Using these grounded techniques, theory emerges out of the data itself rather than the other way around. This orientation has provided evidence as to the significance of male domination in the etiology of violence against spouses/partners and the importance of the family as a historically-situated institution

---

[37] The more "radical" feminist research has addressed the systematic and deliberate brain-washing techniques used by the batterer (Boulette and Anderson, 1985; Heppner, 1978; Martin, 1983: 77-80; NiCarthy, 1986:287; Okun, 1986:71-2,124). Researchers have compared the battered woman's situation with thought reform practices of the late 1940s and 1950s under the Chinese Communists (NiCarthy, 1986; Okun, 1986; Romero, 1985) and the cult practices of mind control (Boulette and Anderson, 1985).

(see Yllo and Bograd, 1988).

Much feminist methodology takes a common-sense approach to research. Some feminists, for instance, have argued that it is inappropriate to compare battered women to non-battered women because the resulting differences might promote a form of victim blaming (see Dobash and Dobash, 1979; Stark, et al., 1979; Wardell, et al., 1988).[38] Also, unlike sociologists and other researchers from related disciplines, who attribute wife battering to external stresses or changing cultural norms and who refer to such families as deviant, feminists argue that it is more a gender-power differential problem which is an inherent part of most normal families (Yllo and Bograd, 1988:19). The position that feminists have aligned themselves with has influenced the questions they have posed. For example, women who did not leave their abusive situation would be asked "what are the social factors which constrain women from leaving?" rather than "why do women stay?" The latter question not only blames the woman, but, according to some feminist symbolic-interactionists, it creates a whole separate deviant category--"battered women who stay" (see Loseke and Cahill, 1984). The feminist paradigm also directs interpretation; feminists, for instance, see the excuses and

---

[38] Applying this differences approach according to Martin Schwartz (1988:379), there would be a tendency to "isolate as deviant not only wife-beating but also beaten wives...[which illustrates] *a priori* assumptions that beaten wives are deviant and somehow complicit."

justifications that battered women offer for not leaving the abusive relationship as "survival strategies" rather than destructive masochistic behavior (see Koss, 1990:376; Wood, 1987). Obviously, such an interpretation has important implications for treatment or social and legal reform (see Comack, 1988). It may also involve an alternative explanation, grounded in rational choice, on *how* and *why* learned-helplessness evolves and *is used* under violent situations.[39]

Perhaps one of the most recent issues that feminist researchers have called attention to is the terminology and categories that are used to describe battered women. Feminists ardently point out that the term "battered woman" places emphasis on women who have been continuously, repeatedly and unrelentingly physically assaulted (Watkins, 1989:87). The term--originally created to draw attention to the seriousness of male violence against women--detracts from the seriousness of lesser forms of physical and emotional abuse which can damage women psychologically and set the stage for more extreme incidents of abuse. Moreover, the term has stigmatic properties which may disempower abused women by stripping them of their dignity and may interfere with their recovery process. Many feminists observe the need for renaming the problem in

---

[39] Learned-helplessness is understood to occur when repeated assaults, which lie beyond the victim's power to control, lead to a passive and listless psychological state (see Walker, 1979).

order to minimize the accompanying stigmata (Watkins, 1989:87).[40]

To summarize, as feminist research takes greater hold in the area of abuse, because of its more intuitively reasonable approach and its in-depth subjective appeal for women participants, one can expect a more comprehensive treatment of the abuse problem than has been brought to bear on it by the positivist paradigm with its efforts at methodological rigor. Indeed, in the light of the feminist orientation, it is quite reasonable to anticipate that, in time, critical research questions such as "what are the real barriers to doing research on abused women?" might be answered by the battered women themselves in terms of their abusive situations (see also Fleming, 1979:346) rather than by researchers with a positivist orientation who tend to ignore critical contextual aspects.

A. THESIS LIMITATIONS

In conclusion, several limitations of this thesis should be noted. First, the thesis could have elaborated more fully on how the concepts of abuse, social support, social networks or personality were defined or operationalized in each of the

---

[40] For instance, several well known feminist writers (Chapman, 1990; Gondoff, 1990; and NiCarthy, 1989) have recently pushed for violence against women to be treated under the rubric of human rights, thus making the problem a global issue, empowering women internationally through enforcing the UN Convention on ending discrimination against women.

studies. The four concepts are still in theoretical flux within their respective fields.

Second, despite a comprehensive review of the methodological literatures in over eight different substantive areas, most of them outside sociology, no instrument was found which allowed for systematic and comprehensive evaluation of the research methodology in the woman abuse literature or other areas. Therefore, an instrument called *MAP* was designed by this researcher (see Appendix A). For a number of reasons, however, reliability and validity tests were not undertaken with *MAP*, and they remain for future research to establish.

A final limitation of this thesis was that there was little discussion of the precautions that researchers took to protect the battered respondent from abuse related to participation in the research.[41] This is a crucial component

---

[41] Batterers have been known to physically interfere with the sampling process in several large research projects which attempted to gather random samples (see also footnote 12). Elise Wickson (1988:32), for instance, reported that during her telephone recruiting procedure, a number of husbands would demand to know who Wickson was and why she wanted to speak to their wives. She also reported that in several cases the husbands would listen to the contact call, and that in at least two cases the husbands ordered their wives not pursue the research and hang up. Northrop's (1985) pilot study on battered women collected using random-digit-dialing (RDD) procedures in Toronto found that 10% of the women refused to participate because of the nature of the study, and 14% of the women's partners refused for them. One of the husbands of a subject in Hofeller's (1982:163) had disabled the car so that his wife could not go to the interview. Hofeller writes, "By the time she was recontacted, the car was again in working order, but her husband had recently threatened to kill her and anyone who tried to help her. Since he owned several guns, the woman felt that meeting in person would represent a substantial risk to us both." Several difficult cases have also been referenced in the longitudinal literature. Arndt (1981:39) for instance, reported that

of any research process and is often neglected in methodological discussions on abuse.[42] At this point it seems appropriate to suggest to researchers that any future studies on the abuse of women should consider the life-threatening prospects of doing research in this area, for both the battered respondent and her significant others, as well as for the researcher (see Browne, 1987; Campbell, 1986; Stout and Thomas, 1991, Walker, 1989b).

---

women who were still living with their abusing husbands were afraid that their husbands would find out if they participated in a follow-up survey, and so withdrew. Pahl (1985:27) discussed a woman in his sample whose husband returned frequently to the house to check on her movements. It was her belief that he would most certainly not have permitted an interview so she, like the respondents in Arndt's work, dropped out of the follow-up. Finally, the abusive partner's discovery of an interview appointment was among the reasons five women missed a pre-arranged interview in Limandri's (1985:71) dissertation study.

[42] Some researchers have protected battered women in their research using a variety of techniques. For instance, researchers in several studies have made cautious statements during initial contact (see Parker, et al. 1990); some of these statements, however, may have taken on a deceptive form. Other researchers have gone to great lengths to provide as much choice as possible for the woman regarding the research setting and administration of an instrument. Still, other researchers have informed the battered woman of her options at the end of the research. For instance, Elise Wickson (1988) left wife abuse literature with the participants of her study. The subjects in Bowker's work (1984:25) were also given referral information. Finally, Barbara Parker in her recent article titled "A Protocol of Safety: Research on Abuse of Women," (1990:249) pointed out "it is vital to give the woman a business card or some means of contacting the researcher."

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Abraham, Ivo L., Deborah M. Nadzam, and Joyce J. Fitzpatrick
1989 Statistics and Quantitative Methods in Nursing: Issues and Strategies for Research and Education, W.B. Saunders Company.

Alcorn, Sandra Seeland
1984 The Support Networks of Battered Women Before and After Shelter Residence, Dissertation Abstracts International (University Microfilms No. 84-26237).

Altman, Douglas G.
1982 "Statistics in Medical Journals," Statistics in Medicine, 1:59-71.

Altman, Douglas G., Sheila M. Gore, Martin J. Gardner, and Stuart J. Pocock
1983 "Statistical guidelines for contributors to medical journals," British Medical Journal, vol 286, 7 May, 1489-1493.

Altman, Schevitz, Beatrice
1990 "Protecting American Victims of Abuse Stationed in the Military in German: A Gap Between Regulation and Reality," Response, 13(2):14-16.

Anderson, J. and A.H. Kerr
1969 "A Checklist for Evaluating Educational Research," Investigations in Mathematical Education, 2:ix-xi.

Arndt, Nancy Yvonne
1981 Domestic Violence: An Investigation of the Psychological Aspects of the Battered Woman, Dissertation Abstracts International (University Microfilms No. 81-29553).

1982 Domestic Violence: An Investigation of the Psychological Aspects of the Battered Woman," Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Southwestern Psychological Association, New Orleans, LA, March 24-27.

Aviram, Yamima Rubens
1981 Battered Women, M.A. Thesis, University of Illinois at Chicago Circle.

Bach, George and Perter Wyden
1969 "When Words Fail: Fighting with Fists and Fingernails," (Chapter 10) The Intimate Enemy: How to Fight Fair in Love and Marriage. William Morrow and Company, Inc.: New York.

Back, Susan Malone, Post, Robin Dee, and D'Arcy, Genet
1982 "A Study of Battered Women in a Psychiatric Setting," Women and Therapy, Vol 1(2):13-26, Summer.

Bard, Majorie Brook
1988 Domestic Abuse and The Homeless Woman: Paradigms in Personal Narratives for Organizational Strategists and Community Planners. Dissertation Abstracts International.

Bates, David; Tammy Chi; and David Northrop
1987 Woman abuse pilot study, phase II: Sample and field report. North York, Ontario: York University, Institute for Social Research.

Beauparlant, Solange
1987 The Nature of Social Support in the Lives of Men and Women in Abuse Related Situations in Canada, Dissertation Abstracts International (University Microfilms No. 88-00587).

Becker, R.A., J.M. Chambers and A.R. Wlks
1988 The New S Language. Pacific Grove: Wadsworth.

Bentler, P.M. and Paul R. Abramson
1981 "The Science of Sex Research: Some Methodological Considerations, Archives of Sexual Behavior, 10(3):225-251.

Bergman, B.; Larsson, G.; Brismar, B. and Klang, M.
1987 "Psychiatric Morbidity and Personality Characteristics of Battered Women," Acta Psychiatrica Scandinavica, 76(6):678-683.

Berk, Richard A.; Gordon K. Smyth; and Lawrence W. Sherman
1988 "When Random Assignment Fails: Some Lessons from the Minneapolis Spouse Abuse Experiment," Journal of Quantitative Criminology, 4(3):209-223.

Berman, Alan L. and Teresa A. Carrol
1984 "Adolescent Suicide: A Critical Review," Death Education, 8(Suppl):53-64.

Bernhard, Linda
1986 "Methodology Issues in Studies of Sexuality and Hysterectomy," The Journal of Sex Research, 22(1):108-128.

Bhaumik, Mayashree
1988 "A Study of Wife Abuse in Two Cultures: The American and the Asian American," Ph.D. Dissertation, University of Southern California.

Bograd, M.
1984 "Family systems approaches to wife battering: A feminist critique," American Journal of Orthopsychiatry, 54:558-568.

Boulette, Teresa Ramirez, and Anderson, Susan M.
1985 ""Mind Control" and the Battering of Women," Community Mental Health Journal, 21(1):109-118, Summer.

Bowker, Lee H.
1988 The Effect of Methodology on Subjective Estimates of Differential Effectiveness of Personal Strategies and Help Sources Used by Battered Women,"in Gerald T. Hotaling, David Finkelhor, John T. Kirkpatrick, and Murray A. Straus (eds.) Coping with Family Violence: Research and Policy Perspectives, Sage Publications, Inc.:California.

1986 Ending the Violence: A Guide Book Based on the Experiences of 1000 Battered Wives, Holmes Beach: Leaving Publications, Inc..

1984 Coping with wife abuse: personal and social networks, in Alfred Robert's (Ed.) Battered women and their families, New York: Springer. pp.168-191.

1983 "Informal Help-Sources," (Chapter 5) in L.H. Bowker's Beating Wife Beating. Lexington Books.

Brecker, Barbara Anne
1987 How battered Women Cope: Cognitive Appraisal, Coping Resources, and Coping Strategies, Dissertation Abstracts International. (University Microfilms No. 87-09602).

Bridges, George S. and Joseph G. Weis
1988 "Measuring Violent Behavior: Effects of Study Design on Reported Correlates of Violence," (Chapter 1) in Neil Alan Weiner's and Marvin E. Wolfgang's (eds.), Violent Crime, Violent Criminals, Sage Publications.

Brismar, Bo; Bo Bergman, Gunilla Larsson, and Ake Strandberg
1987 "Battered Women: A Diagnostic and Therapeutic Dilemma," Acta Chirurgica Scandinavica, 153(1):1-5.

Brown, Barbara Jean
1985 Violence in a Sample of Black Couples: A Multivariate Perspective, Dissertation Abstracts International (University Microfilms No. 85-25209).

Brown, Julia S. and Brian G. Gilmartin
1969 "Sociology Today: Lucunae, Emphases, and Surfeits," The American Sociologist, 4:283-91.

Brown, Sharon A.
1990 "Quality of Reporting in Diabetes Patient Education Research: 1954-1986," Research in Nursing and Health, 13:53-62.

Browne, Angela
1987 When Battered Women Kill. The Free Press: New York.

Browning, James and Donald Dutton
1986 "Assessment of Wife Assault with the Conflict Tactics Scale: Using Couple Data to Quantify the Differential Reporting Effect." Journal of Marriage and the Family, 48(May):375-379.

Brush, Lisa D.
1990 "Violent Acts and Injurious Outcomes in Married Couples: Methodological Issues in the National Survey of Families and Households," Gender and Society, 4(1):56-67.

Butehorn, Loretta
1985 Social Networks and the Battered Woman's Decision to Stay or Leave, Dissertation Abstracts International (University Microfilms No. 85-13594).

Caldwell, Robert A. and Bernard L. Bloom
1982 "Social Support: Its Structure and Impact on Marital Disruption," American Journal of Community Psychology, 10(6):647-667.

Campbell, Jacquelyn C.
1986 "Nursing assessment for the risk of homicide with battered women," Advances in Nursing Science, 8(4):36-51.

Caplan, P.
1984 "The myth of women's masochism," American Psychologist, 39:130-139.

Carboneau, Dolores
1986 "A Comparison of Psychological Traits in Currently Battered, Formerly Battered, and Non-Battered Women," Dissertation Abstracts International (University Microfilms No. 86-16584).

Carlson, Bonnie E.
1977 "Battered women and their assailants," Social Work, 122(6):455-460.

Caruso, Donna
1989 "Rural Battered Women: A Saskatchewan Field Workers' Experience in the Real West," Newest Review, 14(2): 24-8.

Cataina, Joseph A.; David R. Gibson; Dale D. Chitwood; and Thomas J. Coates
1990 "Methodological Problems in AIDS Behavioral Research: Influences on Measurement Error and Participation Bias in Studies of Sexual Behavior," Psychological Bulletin, 108(3):339-362.

Cavanagh, Cathrine
1978 Battered Women and Social Control: A study of help-seeking behavior of battered women and the help-giving behavior of those from whom they seek help. Masters Thesis, University of Stirling.

Cazenave, Noel A. and Murray A, Straus
1979 "Race, Class, Network Embeddedness and Family Violence: A Search for Potent Support Systems," Journal of Comparative Family Studies, 10(3):281-300.

Chalmers, Lee and Pamela Smith
1988 "Wife Battering: Psychological, Social, and Physical Isolation and Counteracting Strategies," in Arlene Tiger McLaren's (ed.) Gender and Society -- Creating a Canadian Woman's Sociology, Toronto:Copp Clark Pittman. (Pp. 221-244).

Chapman, Jane Roberts
1990 "Violence and Human Rights: New Directions for the 90s," Response, 13(2):2-5.

Church, Doris
1989 "How Health Professionals Should Help Domestic Violence Victims: A new Zealander's Prescriptions," National Organization for Victim Assistance (NOVA) Newsletter, 13(9):5-7.

Church, John
1984 Violence Against Wives: Its Causes and Effects. Battered Women's Support Group: Christchurch, New Zealand.

Coburn, Terrence G.
1978 "Criteria for Judging Research Reports and Proposals," Journal for Research in Mathematics Education, (January):75-78.

Cook, Thomas D. and Laura C. Leviton
1980 "Reviewing the literature: A comparison of traditional methods with meta-analysis," Journal of Personality, 48(4):449-472.

Collis, Betty A. and Lorne K. Rosenblood
1985 "The Problem of Inflated Significance When Testing Individual Correlations From a Correlation Matrix," Journal for Research in Mathematics Education, 16(1):52-55.

Comack, Elizabeth
1988 "Justice for Battered Women: The Courts and the 'Battered Wife Syndrome'" Canadian Dimension, 22(3):8-11.

Cross, Jay E.
1991 "Structural Characteristics of Battered Women's Social Networks: A Review and Reanalysis." Unpublished Manuscript. Columbia University, Department of Sociology.

Cross, Jay E. and Mary J. Gallant
1991 "Gender Differences in Support-Seeking: Some Observations from the 1985 National Family Violence Re-Survey." Paper to be presented at the Sociology of Emotions Roundtable, Topic: Methodological Issues in the Study of Emotions, American Sociological Association Annual Meeting, Cincinnati, OH, August 23-27, 1991.

Davidson, Terry
1978 Conjugal Crime: Understanding and Changing the Wifebeating Pattern. Hawthorn Books, Inc.: New York.

DeMaris, Alfred and Jann Jackson
1986 "Nonrespondent Characteristics and Bias in a Study of Batterers," Social Service Review, September:460-474.

Denzin, Norman K.
1970 The Research Act. Chicago, Aldine.

Deutsch, Helene
1944 The Psychology of Women, Vol.I. New York: Bantam.

Dobash Russell P. and R. Emerson Dobash
1985 "The contact between battered women and social and medical agencies," (Chapter 10) in Jan Pahl's (ed.) Private Violence and Public Policy: The needs of battered women and the response of the public services. Routledge and Kegan Paul.

1983 "Do We Need New Methods of Studying Wife Abuse?: The Context-Specific Approach," (Chapter 15) in David Finkelhor's, Richard J. Gelles's, Gerald T. Hotaling, and Murray A. Straus's (eds.) The Dark Side of Families: Current Family Violence Research, Sage Publications.

1979 "Relatives, Friends, and Neighbors," (Chapter 9) in Russell P. Dobash and R. Emerson Dobash Violence Against Wives: A Case Against the Patriarchy, The Free Press.

Dodd, Stuart C.
1965 ""Scient-Scales" for Measuring Methodology,"
-1966 American Behavioral Scientist, 9:15-39.

Duffy, M.E.
1985 "A research appraisal checklist for evaluating nursing research reports." Nursing and Health Care, 6:539-547.

Dworkin, Andrea
1986 "The Bruise That Doesn't Heal," in Wife Assault Information Kit, (April) Prepared by the Wife Assault Implementation Team, Ministry of Attorney General, Province of British Columbia. pp.24-26.

Elbow, Margaret
1977 "Theoretical considerations of violent marriages," Social Casework, 58(6):515-26.

Ellis, Desmond
1989 "Male Abuse of a Married of Cohabitating Female Partner: The Application of Sociological Theory to Research Findings," Violence and Victims, 4(4):235-255.

1987 "Wife Abuse: Gender at Home" (Chapter Five) in his book, The Wrong Stuff: An Introduction to the Sociological Study of Deviance, Collier Macmillan Canada, Inc.

Engeldinger, Eugene A.
1986 Spouse abuse: An annotated bibliography of violence between mates. Scarecrow Press.

Erickson, Rebecca J. and Cynthia K. Drenovsky
1990 "The Decision To Leave and Abusive Relationship: The Testing of an Alternative Methodological Approach," Journal of Family Violence, 5(3):237-246.

Ferraro, K.J. and Johnson, J.M.
1983 "How women experience battering: The Process of victimization," Social Problems, 30, 325-339.

Fiedler, Decky, Katherine Hooper Briar, and Marianne Pierce
1984 "Services for Battered Women," Journal of Sociology and Social Welfare, 11:540-557.

Finkelhor, David; Richard J. Gelles; Gerald T. Hotaling; and Murray A. Straus's
1983 "Section 1: Introduction," in David Finkelhor's, Richard J. Gelles's, Gerald T. Hotaling's, and Murray A. Straus's (eds.) The Dark Side of Families: Current Family Violence Research, Sage Publications.

Firestein, Beth Ann
1987 The Relationship of Abuse and Social Support to the Psychological Health of College Women in Dating Relationships, Dissertation Abstracts International (University Microfilms No. 87-17406).

Fleming, Jennifer Baker
1979 "Working With the Victim," (Chapter II) in her book Stopping Wife Abuse: A Guide to the Emotional, Psychological, and Legal Implications for the Abused Woman and those Helping Her. Anchor Books. pp.71-149.

Flynn, John P.
1977 "Recent findings related to wife abuse," Social Casework, 58(1):13-20.

Follingstad, Diane R.
1989 "Methodological Issues and New Directions for Research Regarding Violence in Relationships," The author can be contacted at: The Department of Psychology, University of South Carolina, Columbia, SC, 29208.

1980 "A Reconceptualization of Issues in the Treatment of Abused Women: A Case Study," Psychotherapy: Theory, Research, and Practice, 17:294-303, Fall.

Freud, S.
1924 "The economic problem of masochism," Standard Edition, 19:157-173.

1919 "A child is being beaten," Standard Edition, 19.

Frieze, Irene Hanson
1983 "Investigating the Causes and Consequences of Marital Rape," Signs: Journal of Women in Culture and Society, 8(31):532-553.

1980 "Causes and Consequences of Marital Rape," Paper presented at Division 35's Open Symposium at the Annual Meeting of the American Psychological Association, Montreal, Canada, September.

1979 "Perceptions of Battered Wives," (Chapter 4) in Irene Hanson Frieze, Daniel Bar-Tal, and John S. Carroll's (eds.) New Approaches to Social Problems, Jossey-Bass Publishers.

Frieze, Irene Hanson and Angela Browne
1989 "Violence in Marriage," in Lloyd Oblin's and Michael Tonry's (eds.) Family Violence (Volume 11), The University of Chicago press, Chicago and London.

Frieze, Irene Hanson; Shanon Hymer; and Martin S. Greenberg
1987 "Describing the Crime Victim: Psychological Reactions to Victimization," Professional Psychology: Research and Practice, 18(4):299-315.

Gardner, M.J., D.G. Altman, D.R. Jones, and D. Machin
1983 "Is the statistical assessment of papers submitted to the "British Medical Journal" effective?" British Medical Journal, 286:1485-1488.

Gayford, J.
1975 "Wife battering: a preliminary survey of 100 cases." British Medical Journal, 1:194-197.

Geffner, Robert; Mary Gail Milner; K. Ann Crawford; and Susan Kreager Cook
1990 Spouse/Partner Abuse: A Categorized Bibliography and Reference List, Family Violence Research and Treatment Program, The University of Texas at Tyler.

Geffner, Robert; Alan Rosenbaum; and Honore Hughes
1988 "Research Issues Concerning Family Violence," (Chapter 19) in Vincent B. Van Hasselt's, Randall L Morrison's, Alan S. Bellack's and Michel Hersen's Handbook of Family Violence, Plenum Press: New York and London.

Gellen, Murray I.; Hoffman, Roy A.; Jones, Margaret; and Stone, Mary
1984 "Abused and Nonabused Women: MMPI Profile Differences," The Personnel and Guidance Journal, 601-604. June.

Gelles, Richard J.
1990 "Methodological Issues in the Study of Family Violence," (Chapter 2) in Murray A. Straus's and Richard J. Gelles's (eds.) Physical Violence in American Families: Risk Factors and Adaptations to Violence in 8,145 Families, Transaction Publishers: New Brunswick.

1987 "Etiology of Violence: Overcoming Fallacious Reasoning in Understanding Family Violence and Child Abuse," in Family Violence. (Second edition) Sage Publications, Ltd..

1980 "Violence in the family: A review of research in the seventies," Journal of Marriage and the Family, 42(4):873-885.

1979 "Determinants of violence in the family: Toward a theoretical integration," In Burr, W.R., Hill, R., Nye, R.I., and Reiss, I.L. (Eds.) Contemporary Theories About the Family, New York: Free Press.

1973 The Other Side of the Family: Conjugal Violence. Dissertation Abstracts International (University Microfilms No. 74-07024).

1972 The Violent Home: A Study of Physical Aggression between Husbands and Wives. Beverly Hills: Sage Publications.

Gelles, R.J. and M.A. Straus
1988 Intimate Violence, Simon and Schuster: New York, NY.

Gelles, Richard J.; Straus, Murray A.; Harrop, John W.
1988 "Has Family Violence Decreased? A Response to J. Timothy Stocks." Journal of Marriage and the Family, 50 (February): 286-291.

Gingold, Judith
1976 "One of These Days--Pow Right in the Kisser," MS. Magazine, August, 51-54, 94.

Glass, G.V., McGraw B., and Smith, M.L.
1981 Meta-analysis in social research. Beverly Hills: Sage Publications.

Gondolf, Edward W.
1990 "The Human Rights of Women Survivors," Response, 13(2):6-8.

Gondolf, Edward W. and Ellen R. Fisher
1988 Battered Women as Survivors: An Alternative to Treating Learned Helplessness. Lexington Books: Lexington, Massachusetts.

Gordon, Linda
1988 Heroes of Their Own Lives: The Politics and History of Family Violence, Boston 1880-1960. New York: Viking.

Gore, Heila M.; Jones, Ian G.; and Rytter, Eilif, C.
1977 "Misuse of statistical methods: critical assessment of articles in BMJ from January to March 1976," British Medical Journal, 8 January, 1:85-7.

Gottfredson, Gary D.; Martin Reiser; and C. Richard Tsegaye-Spates
1987 "Psychological Help for Victims of Crime," Professional Psychology: Research and Practice, 18(4):316-325.

Gottfredson, Stephen D. and Don M. Gottfredson
1988 "Violence Prediction Methods: Statistical and Clinical Strategies," Violence and Victims, 3(4):303-324.

Grayson, Joann and Gary Smith
1981 "Marital Violence and Help Seeking Patterns in a Micropolitan Community," Victimology: An International Journal, 6(1-4):188-197.

Graham, Dee L.R., Edna Rawlings, and Nelly Rimini
1988 "Survivors of Terror: Battered Women, Hostages and the Stockholm Syndrome." (Chapter 10) in Kersti Tllo's and Michele Bograd's (eds.) Feminist Perspectives on Wife Abuse, Sage Publications, Inc.

Greenblat, Cathy Stein
1988 "A His Is a Hit Is a Hit...Or Id It?" (Chapter 14) in David Finkelhor, Richard J. Gelles, Gerald T. Hotaling, and Murray A. Straus (eds.) The Dark Side of Families: Current Family Violence Research. Sage Publications.

Griffin, Dorothy E.
1984 Coping Processes and Social Networks: A Comparison of Battered and Ex-Battered Women, Dissertation Abstracts International (University Microfilms No. 84-24576).

Harris, Roma M.
1988 "The Information Needs of Battered Women," RQ, 28(1):62-70.

Hartik, Lorraine M.
1982 Identification of Personality Characteristics and Self-Concept Factors of Battered Wives, R & E Research Associates, Inc.: Palo Alto, California.

Healy, Judith
1985 "After the Refuge: Methodological Issues in Follow Up Survey," in Susanne E. Hatty's (ed.) National Conference on Domestic Violence: Proceedings No. 12, Volume 1, 11-15 November 1985. Australian Institute of Criminology, Canberra ACT.

Heggie, Deborah Lynne
1986 The Influence of Social Networks on Battered Women, Dissertation Abstracts International (University Microfilms No. 86-26718).

Heiner, Robert Broder
1985 Family Violence Research: An Empirical Critique, Dissertation Abstracts International (University Microfilms No.86-15593).

Heppner, M.
1978 "Counselling the battered wife: myths, facts, and decision," Personnel and Guidance Journal, 56:522-525.

Hereck, Gregory M. and Kevin T. Berrill
1990 "Documenting the Victimization of Lesbians and Gay Men: Methodological Issues," Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 5(3):301-315.

Hermann, Bruce P. and Steven Whitman
1984 "Behavioral and Personality Correlates of Epilepsy: A Review, Methodological Critique, and Conceptual Model," Psychological Bulletin, 95(3):451-497.

Hilberman, E. and K. Munson
1978 "Sixty Battered Women," Victimology, 2:460-471.

Hindelang, Michael J.; Travis Hirschi and Joseph G. Weis
1981 Measuring Delinquency (vol.123 of the Sage Library of Social Research) Sage Publications, Inc., Beverly Hills, California.

Hofeller, Kathleen H.
1982 Social, Psychological and Situational Factors in Wife Abuse, R & E Research Associates, Inc.: Palo Alto, California.

Hoff, Lee Ann
1990 Battered Women as Survivors. Routledge: London.

1984 "Violence Against Women: A Social-Cultural Network Analysis," (Volumes I and II) Dissertation Abstracts International. (University Microfilms No. 84-22380)

Hoffman, Pat
1984 "Psychological Abuse of Women by Spouses and Live-in-lovers," Women and Therapy, vol 3(1):37-47, Spring.

Hokanson, James A., Charles T. Ladoulis, Francis B. Quinn, and Alexander C. Bienkowski
1987 "Statistical Techniques Reported in Pathology Journals During 1983-1985," Archives of Pathology and Laboratory Medicine, 111(2):202-7.

Holtzworth-Munroe, Amy
1988 "Causal Attributions in Marital Violence: Theoretical and Methodological Issues," Clinical Psychology Review, 8(3):331-344.

Homer, Marjorie; Leonard, Anne; Taylor, Pat.
1985 "Personal relationships: help and hindrance." in Norman Johnson's (ed.) Marital Violence: Sociological Review Monograph, 31:93-108, 1985.

1984 Private Violence: Public Shame--A Report on the Circumstances of Women Leaving Domestic Violence in Cleveland, Cleveland Refuge and Aid for Women and Children (CRAWC). Middesbrough, Cleveland.

Hong, Maria
1991 "Opening Doors: New Hope for Battered Asian Women." A. Magazine, the Asian American Quarterly, 1(1):22-25.

Horney, Karen
1967 Feminine Psychology. New York: W.W. Norton.

Hotaling, Gerald T. and David B. Sugarman
1986 "An Analysis of Risk Markers in Husband to Wife Violence: The Current State of Knowledge," Violence and Victims, 1(2):101-124.

Huston, Ted L. and Elliot Robins
1982 "Conceptual and methodological Issues in Studying Close Relationships," Journal of Marriage and the Family, November, 901-925.

Jacques, Karen N.
1981 Perceptions and Coping Behaviors of Angla American and Mexican Immigrant Battered Women: A Comparative Study, Dissertation Abstracts International (University Microfilms No. 82-11072).

Jang, Deeana; Debbie Lee; and Rachel Morello-Frosch
1991 "Domestic Violence in the Immigrant and Refugee Community: Responding to the Needs of Immigrant Women," Response, Issue 77, 13(4):2-7.

Jewell, Dolores Angelique
1986 Social Networks, Conflict Resolution Tactics, and the Personality Characteristics of Abused and Non-Abused Women, Dissertation Abstracts International (University Microfilms No. 86-16131).

Jobling, Megan
1974 "Battered wives: a survey," Social Service Quarterly, 47:142-145.

Johnson, John M. and Kathleen J. Ferraro
1988 "Courtship Violence: Survey vs. Empathetic Understandings of Abusive Conduct," Studies in Symbolic Interaction, 9:175-186.

Johnson, Weldon T. and John D. Delamater
1976 "Response Effects in Sex Surveys," The Public Opinion Quarterly, 40(2):165-181.

Jones, Ann
1980 Women Who Kill. Holt, Rinehart, and Winston: New York.

Jump, Victor
1989 Methods of Criminological Research, Contemporary Social Research:19, Series Editor: Martin Blumer. (See pp. 34-49).

Kelly, Alison
1986 "A method to the madness? Quantitative research Reviewing," Research in Education, 35(May):25-41.

Kerr, Mary Ann.
1982 The Social Networks of Twenty Battered Women. M.A. Thesis, University of Kansas, 124p.

Kleckner, J.
1978 "Wife Beaters and Beaten Wives: Co-Conspirators in Crimes of Violence." Psychology, 15:54-56.

Komarovsky, Mirra
1964 "Marriage and Power," (Chapter 10) Blue-Collar Marriage, Random House: New York.

Kohr, Richard L. and Marilyn N. Suydam
1970 "An Instrument for Evaluating Survey Research," The Journal of Educational Research, 64(2):78-85.

Koss, Mary P.
1990 "The Women's Mental Health Research Agenda: Violence Against Women," American Psychologist, 45(3):374-380.

Knight, Rosemary and Susanne Hatty
1985 "Methodological Perspectives on 'Domestic Violence'," in Susanne E. Hatty's (ed.) National Conference on Domestic Violence: Proceedings No. 12, Volume 1, 11-15 November 1985. Australian Institute of Criminology, Canberra ACT.

Kuhl, Anna F.
1982 "Community Responses to Battered Women," Victimology: An International Journal, 7(1-4):49-59.

Labell, Linda S.
1979 "Wife Abuse: A Sociological Study of Battered Women and Their Mates," Victimology: An International Journal, 4(2):258-267.

Landau, Simha
1989 "Family Violence and Violence in Society," in Emilio C. Viano's (ed.) Crime and Its Victims: International Research and Public Policy Issues, Proceedings of the Fourth International Institute on Victimology (NATO Advanced Research Workshop). Hemisphere Publishing Corporation.

LeFevre, Michael L.
1988 "Statistical Analysis in Family Medicine Research," Family Medicine, 20(5):359-63.

Levin, Saul M. and Lawrence Stava
1987 "Personality Characteristics of Sex Offenders: A Review," Archives of Sexual Behavior, 16(1):57-79.

Levit, Herbert L.
1985 "The Battered Woman," American Journal of Forensic Psychology, 3(2):9-14.

Liebow, Elliot
1967 Tally's Corner. Boston: Little Brown.

1968 "Why Marriage Does Not Work on Tally's Corner," (Chapter 14) in Jerold Heiss's (ed.) Family Roles and Interaction. (2nd Ed.). Rand McNally College Publishing Company: Chicago.

Light, Richard J. and David B. Pillemer
1982 "Numbers and Narrative: Combining Their Strengths in Research Reviews," Harvard Educational Review, 52(1):1-26.

Limandri, Barbara Jean
1985 Help-Seeking Patterns of Abused Women: Self-Esteem, Role Conflict, and Social Support As Influencing Factors, Dissertation Abstracts International (University Microfilms No. 85-13660).

Lion, J.R.
1977 "Clinical aspects of wifebattering," In M. Roy (Ed.) Battered Women: A psychosocial study of domestic violence (pp.126-136) New York: Van Nostrand Reinholdt.

Lockhart, Lettie L.
1987 "A Reexamination of the Effects of Race and Social Class in the Incidence of Marital Violence: A Search for Reliable Differences," Journal of Marriage and the Family, 49:603-610.

1985 "Methodological issues in comparative racial analyses: the case of wife abuse," Social Work Research and Abstracts, 21:35-41.

Lockhart, Lettie L. and Barbara W. White
1989 "Understanding Marital Violence in the Black Community," Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 4(4):421-436.

Loseke, Donileen R.
1987 "Lived Realities and the Construction of Social Problems: The Case of Wife Abuse," Symbolic Interaction, 10(2):229-243.

Loseke, Donileen R. and Spencer E. Cahill
1984 "The Social Construction of Deviance: Experts on Battered Women," Social Problems, 31(3):296-310.

Lynn, Mary R.
1989 "Meta-Analysis: Appropriate Tool for the Integration of Nursing Research?" Nursing Research, 38(5):302-305.

MacLeod, Linda
1987 Battered But Not Beaten...Preventing Wife Battering in Canada, Canadian Advisory Council on the Status of Women. June.

Mahon, Lisa
1981 "Common Characteristics of Abused Women," Issues in Mental Health Nursing, 3:137-157.

Mama, Amina
1989 The Hidden Struggle: Statutory and Voluntary Sector Responses to Violence Against Black Women in the Home. London Race and Housing Research Unit.

Mayer, Lawrence J. and John M. Johnson
1988 "Courtship Violence and the Emotional Career of Betrayal," Studies in Symbolic Interaction, 9:187-199.

MacKenzie, Dale A.
1985 "Wife Abuse: An Overview of Salient Issues," Canadian Journal of Community Mental Health, 4(1).

MacLeod, Linda
1987 Battered But Not Beaten... Preventing Wife Battering in Canada. Ottawa: Canadian Advisory Council on the Status of Women.

Mahon, Lisa
1981 "Common Characteristics of Abused Women," Issues in Mental Health Nursing, vol.3, Jan/June. 137-157.

Mahmoody, Betty (with William Hoffer)
1987 Not Without My Daughter, St. Martin's Press: New York.

Martin, Del
1983 Battered Wives. New York, Pocket Books.

McKenna, Laura Smith
1985 Social Support Systems of Battered Women: Influence on Psychological Adaptation, Dissertation Abstracts International. (University Microfilms No. 86-08582)

McNeely, R.L. and Robinson-Simpson, Gloria
1989 "The Truth About Domestic Violence: A Falsely Framed Issue," (Chapter 12) in Nicholas Davidson's (ed.) Gender Sanity. University Press of America: Lanham.

McTavish, Donald G.; James D. Clearly; Edward E. Bent; Lauri Perman; and Kjell R. Knudsen
1977 "Assessing Research Methodology: The Structure of Professional Assessments of Methodology," Sociological Methods and Research, 6(1):1977.

Meade-Ramrattan, Joanne, Mary L. Cerre', and Mary Lynn Porto
1980 "Physically Abused Women: Satisfaction with Sources of Help," The Social Worker, 49(4):162-66.

Metzger, M.
1977 "What did you do to provoke him? An analysis of the "battered wife syndrome"," Politics and Health Policy, 4:1-24.

Miller, Nick
1975 Battered Spouses. (Occasional Papers on Social Administration, No. 57). The Social Administration Research Trust. G. Bell and Sons, London.

Mills, C. Wright
1959 Sociological Imagination, Oxford University Press, Fair Lawn, N.J..

Mitchell, Roger E. and Christine A. Hodson
1986 "Coping and Social Support among Battered Women: An Ecological Perspective," (Chapter 10) in Steven E. Hobfoll's (ed.) Stress, Social Support, and Women. Hemisphere Publishing Corporation.

1983 "Coping with Domestic Violence: Social Support and Psychological Health Among Battered Women," American Journal of Community Psychology, 11(6):629-654.

Moody, Linda, Margaret E. Wilson, Kathleen Smyth, Rosanne Schwartz, Mary Tittle, and Mary Lou Van Cott
1988 "Analysis of a Decade of Nursing Practice Research: 1977-1986," Nursing Research, 37(6):374-379.

Moore, Gary E., Michael F. Burnett, and Barbara A. Moore
1986 "Approved Practices in Reporting Quantitative Research," Journal of Vocational Education Research, 11(4):1-24.

Morgan, Steven M.
1982 Conjugal Terrorism: A Psychological and Community Treatment Model of Wife Abuse. R & E Research Associates, Inc.:Palo Alto, California.

Mosher-Ashley, Pearl M.
1987 "Procedural and Methodological Parameters in Behavioral-Gerontological Research: A Review," International Journal of Aging and Human Development, 24(3):189-229.

NiCarthy, Ginny
1989 "From the Sounds of Silence to the Roar of a Global Movement: Notes on the Movement Against Violence Against Women," Response, 12(2):3-10.

1986 Getting Free: A Handbook for Women in Abusive Relationships (2nd ed.) The Seal Press.

Northrup, David.
1985 Woman abuse pilot study: Sample and field report. North York, Ontario: York University, Institute for Social Research.

O'Brien, J.E.
1971 "Violence in divorce prone families," Journal of Marriage and the Family, 33:362-698.

Okun, L.
1986 Woman Abuse: Facts Replacing Myths. Albany: State University of New York Press.

Pagelow, Mildred Daley
1984 Family Violence, New York: Praeger.

Pahl, Jan
1985 "The search for help," (Chapter 6) in Jan Pahl's (ed.) Private Violence and Public Policy: The needs of battered women and the response of the public services. Routledge and Kegan Paul.

Parker, Barbara; Yvonne Ulrich; and the Nursing Research Consortium on Violence and Abuse
1990 "A Protocol of Safety: Research on Abused of Women," Nursing Research, 39(4):248-250.

Parle, Rita Therese
1985 Wife Abuse Factors in Semi-Rural Nebraska, Dissertation Abstracts International. (University Microfilms No. 85-06768).

Parsons, Talcott
1947 "Certain Primary Sources and Patterns of Aggresion in the Social Structure of the Western World," Psychiatry, 10(May):167-81.

Peterson, Julie and Lib Hutchison
1982 "Informal Support Networks: Help for Battered Women," Response to Family Violence and Sexual Assault, 5:8-9.

Philips, Linda R.
1989 "Age: A Truly Confounding Variable," Western Journal of Nursing Research, 11(2):181-195.

Pirog-Good, Maureen and Jan E. Stets
1989 "The Help-seeking Behavior of Physically and Sexually Abused College Students," (Chapter 6) in Maureen A. Pirog-Good's and Jan E. Stets's (eds.) Violence in Dating Relationships: Emerging Social Issues. Praeger: New York.

Pleck, Elizabeth H.
1987 Domestic Tyranny: The Making of Social Policy against Family Violence from Colonial Times to the Present. New York: Oxford University Press.

Prescott, S. and Letko, C.
1977 "Battered Women: A Social Perspective." In Roy, M. Battered Women, Psychosociological Study of Domestic Violence. New York: Van Nostrand Reinhold Company. p.72-96.

Pressman, Barbara
1984 Family Violence: Origins and Treatment. Children's Aid Society of the City of Guelph and the County of Wellington.

Psarska, A.D.
1970 "Jealousy Factor in Homicide in Forensic Psychiatric Material," Polish Medical Journal, 9(6):1504-1510.

Ramrattan, J.; Cerre, Mary L.; and Porto, Mary Lynn
1980 "Satisfaction with Sources of Help: Physically Abused Women," The Social Worker, 48(4):162-66.

Raymond, Beth and Irene Gillman Bruschi
1989 "Psychological abuse among college women in dating relationships," Perceptual and Motor Skills, 69:1283-1297.

Reid, Barbara J.
1982 "Potential Sources of Type I Error and Possible Solutions to Avoid a "Galloping" Alpha Rate, Nursing Research, 32(3):190-1.

Reidy, Ruth J.
1988 Battered Women's Utilization of Helping Agencies. Dissertation Abstracts International, (University Microforms No. 89-06943).

Reiss, Ira L., Robert H. Walsh, Mary Zey-Ferrell, William L. Tolone, and Ollie Pocs
1980 "Research on Heterosexual Relationships," (Chapter 1) in Richard Green's and Jack Wiener's (eds.) Methodology in Sex Research: proceedings of the Conference Held in Chevy Chase, Maryland, November 18 and 19, 1977. U.S. Department of Health and Human Services.

Reynolds, R. and Siegle, E.
1959 "A Study of Casework with Sado-Masochistic Marriage Partners," Social Casework, 40:545-551.

Rimonte, Nilda
1989 "Domestic Violence among Pacific Asians." in Asian Women United of California (eds.) Making Waves: an anthology of writings by and about Asian American women. Boston: Beacon Press. Pp.327-337.

Riutort, Monica and Shirley Endicott Small
1984 Working with Assaulted Immigrant Women: A Handbook for Lay Counsellors. Toronto: Education Wife Assault.

Romero, Mary
1985 "A comparison between strategies used on prisoners of war and battered wives." Sex Roles; 13(9-10):537-547.

Rosenbaum, Alan
1988 "Methodological Issues in Marital Violence Research," Journal of Family Violence, 3(2):91-104.

Rosewater, Lynne Bravo
1988 "Battered or Schizophrenic: Psychological Tests Can't Tell," (Chapter 9) in Kersti Yllo and Michele Bograndʼs (ed.s) Feminist Perspectives on Wife Abuse. Sage Publications. pp.200-216.

1987 "A Critical Analysis of the Proposed Self-Defeating Personality Disorder," Journal of Personality Disorders, 1(2):190-195.

1985 "Schizophrenic, borderline or battered? in L.B. Rosewater and L.E. Walker (Eds.) Handbook of feminist therapy: Women's issues in psychotherapy. New York: Springer.

Rounsaville, Bruce J.
1979 "Theories in Marital Violence: Evidence from a Study of Battered Women," Victimology: An International Journal, 3(1-2):11-31.

Roy, Maria
1977 "A Current Study of 150 Cases," in Maria Roy's (ed.) Battered Women: A Psychosociological Study of Domestic Violence, Van Nostrand Reinhold Company.

Rudolph, Alice, Robert J. McDermott, and Robert S. Gold
1985 "Use of Statistics in the Journal of School Health 1979-1983: A Content Analysis," Journal of School Health, 55(6):230-223.

Russel, Diana E.H.
1977 "Book Review: Richard Gelles's The Violent Home: A Study of Physical Aggression between Husbands and Wives (1974)." Contemporary Sociology: A Journal of Reviews, Vol 16(5).

Schor, Stanley and Irving Karten
1966 "Statistical Evaluation of Medical Journal Manuscripts," Journal of the American Medical Association, 195(13): 1123-8.

Schulman, M.
1979 A Survey of Spousal violence against women in Kentucky. (Study No.792701) conducted for the Kentucky Commission on Women. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.

Schultz, L.G.
1960 "The wife assaulter," Journal of Social Therapy, 6:103-111.

Shainess, N.
1984 Sweet Suffering: Women as Victim. New York: Bobbs-Merrill.

1979 "Vulnerability to Violence: Masochism as Process," American Journal of Psychotherapy, 33(2):174-189.

1977 "Psychological aspects of wifebattering," Battered Women by Maria Roy (ed.), New York: Van Norstrand Reinhold Co.. pp.111-19.

Shupe, Anson; William A. Stacey; and Lonnie R. Hazlewood
1987 Violent Men, Violent Couples: The Dynamics of Domestic Violence. Lexington Books: D.C. Heath and Company.

Simko, Patricia Ann
1988 The Effects of Social Support on Victims of Domestic Violence, Dissertation Abstracts International (University Microfilms No. 88-25059).

Smith, Michael D.
1987 "The Incidence and Prevalence of Woman Abuse in Toronto," Violence and Victims, 2(3):173-187.

1986 "Effects of question format on the reporting of woman abuse: A telephone survey experiment," Victimology, 11:430-438.

1985 Woman abuse: The case for surveys by telephone. LaMarsh Research Programme on Violence and Conflict Resolution, Report No. 12. York University, North York, Ontario, Canada.

Smith, Teresa Sullivan
1982 Abused Wives: Communication and Personality Factors, MSc. Thesis, University of Delaware, August.

Snell, J.E., Rosenwald, R.J., and Robey, A.
1964 "The wife beater's wife: A study of family interaction," Archives of General Psychiatry, 11:107-113.

Sonkin, Daniel Jay; Del Martin; and Lenore E. Auerbach Walker
1985 The Male Batterer: A Treatment Approach. Springer Publishing Company:New York.

Star, Barbara
1979 "Psychosocial Aspects of Wife Battering." Social Casework 60, October, 479-87.

1978 "Comparing Battered and Non-Battered Women," Victimology, 3(1-2):32-44.

Star, Barbara; Clark, Carol G.; Goetz, Karen M.; and O'Malia, Linda
1980 "Psychosocial Aspects of Wife Battering," in Margaret Elbow's (ed.) Patterns in Family Violence, Family Service Association of American: New York.

Stark, E; A. Flitcraft and W. Frazier
1979 "Medicine and Patriarchal Violence," International Journal of Health Services, 9(3):461-493.

Stein, Kathy Greenberg
1982 Development and Validation of a Woman's Marital Psychological Abuse Scale, Dissertation Abstracts International (University Microfilms No. 8225681).

Steiner, Yosepha
1990 Nashim mukot. Tel-Aviv: Bererot hotsa'ah le-or.

1987 Need Structure and Self Concept of Battered Women, Dissertation Abstracts International (University Microfilms No. 88-03335).

Steinmetz, S.K. and Straus, M.A.
1974 Violence in the Family. New York: Dodd, Mead, and Company.

Stephens, J.M.
1967 "Making Dependable Use of Published Research: A Proposed Check List," The Journal of Educational Research, 61(3):99-104.

Stocks, Timothy J.
1988 "Feedback: Has Family Violence Decreased? A Reassessment of the Straus and Gelles Data," Journal of Marriage and the Family, 50(February):281-291.

Stout, Karen D. and Sharon Thomas
1991 "Fear and Dangerous in Shelter Work With Battered Women," Affilia, 6(2):74-86.

Straus, Murray A.
1990 "Injury and Frequency of Assault and the "Representative Sample Fallacy" in Measuring Wife Beating and Child Abuse," (Chapter 5) in Murray A. Straus and Richard J. Gelles (eds.) Physical Violence In American Families: Risk Factors And Adaptations to Violence in 8,145 Families. Transaction Publishers: New Brunswick.

1989 "The Conflict Tactics Scales and Its Critics: An Evaluation and New Data on Validity and Reliability," (Chapter 4) to be published in Murray A. Straus and Richard J. Gelles (eds.) Physical Violence In American Families: Risk Factors And Adaptations to Violence in 8,145 Families. Transaction Books.

Straus, Murray A. and Larry Baron
1990 "The Strength of Weak Indicators: A Response to Gilles, Brown, Geletta, and Dalecki," The Sociological Quarterly, 31(4):619-624.

Straus, Murray A., Richard Gelles, and Suzanne Steinmetz
1980 Behind Closed Doors: Violence in American Families. Garden City, NY: Doubleday.

Strauss, Samuel
1969 "Guidelines for Analysis of Research Reports," The Journal of Educational Research, 63(4):165-169.

Sugarman, David B. and Gerald T. Hotaling
1989a "Dating Violence: Prevalence, Context, and Risk Markers," in Maureen A. Pirog-Good's and Jan E. Stets's Violence in Dating Relationships: Emerging Social Issues, Praeger: New York.

1989b "Violent Men in Intimate Relationships: An Analysis of Risk Markers," Journal of Applied Social Psychology, 19:1034-1048.

Suydam, Marilyn N.
1968 "An Instrument for Evaluating Experimental Research Reports," The Journal of Educational Research, 61(5):200-3.

Symonds, A.
1979 "Violence against women: The myth of masochism," American Journal of Psychoanalysis, 35, 19-26.

Symonds, Martin
1980 "The "Second Injury" to Victims," Evaluation and Change (Special Issue) 36-38.

1978 "The psychodynamics of violence-prone marriages. American Journal of Psychoanalysis, 38:213-222.

Szado, Daniela
1987 "The Social Roots of Wife Battering: An Examination of the Phenomenon in Mediterranean Immigrant Communities," Canadian Women Studies, 8(2):41-2.

Taub, Diane E.
1989 "Woman Abuse in Dating Relationships: The Role of Male Peer Support -- A Book Review," Deviant Behavior, 10(3):297-8.

Thoennes, Nancy Ann
1981 Social Network Functioning Among Battered Women: The Consequences of Geographic Mobility, Dissertation Abstracts International (University Microfilms No. 82-09949).

Tidmarsh, Mannes
1976 "Violence in Marriage: The relevance of structural factors," Social Work Today, 7(2):36-38.

Tolman, Richard M.
1989 "The Development of a Measure of Psychological Maltreatment of Women by their Male Partners," Violence and Victims, 4(3):159-177.

Torres, Sara
1987 "Hispanic-American battered women: Why consider cultural differences?" Response to the Victimization of Women and Children, 10(5):20-1.

Villapando, Venny
1989 "The Business of Selling Mail-Order Brides." in Asian Women United of California (eds.) Making Waves: an anthology of writings by and about Asian American women. Boston: Beacon Press. Pp.318-327.

Vockell, Edward L. and William Asher
1974 "Perceptions of Document Quality and Use by Educational Decision Makers and Researchers," American Educational Research Journal, 11(3):249-258.

Waites, Elizabeth A.
1978 "Female Masochism and the Enforced Restriction of Choice," Victimology: An International Journal, 2(3-4):535-44.

Walker, Lenore E.A.
1989a "Psychology and Violence Against Women," American Psychologist, 44(4):695-702.

1989b Terrifying Love: Why Battered Women Kill and How Society Responds. Harper and Row, Publishers: New York.

1979 "How Battering Happens and How to Stop It" (Chapter 2) in Donna M. Moore's (ed.) Battered Women, Sage Publications.

Walsh, Mary Roth
1987 The Psychology of Women. Yale University Press, New Haven.

Ward, Annie W., Bruce W. Hall, and Charles F. Schramm
1975 "Evaluation of Published Educational Research: A National Survey," American Educational Research Journal, 12(2):109-128.

Wardell, Laurie; Dair L. Gillespie; and Ann Leffler
1983 "Science and Violence Against Wives," (Chapter 4) in David Finkelhor's, Richard J. Gelles's, Gerald T. Hotaling, and Murray A. Straus's (eds.) The Dark Side of Families: Current Family Violence Research, Sage Publications.

Washburn, Carol and Irene Hanson Frieze
1980 "Methodological Issues in Studying Battered Women," Paper presented at the Annual Research Conference on the Association for Women in Psychology, Santa Monica, California, March.

Watkins, Gloria
1989 "Violence in intimate relationships: a feminist perspective," (Chapter 12) in the author's book, Talking Back: thinking feminist, thinking black. South End Press: Boston, MA.

Wauchope, Barbara A.
1988 "Help-seeking decisions of battered women: A test of learned helplessness and two stress theories," A paper presented at the 1988 meeting of the Eastern Sociological Society.

Weis, Joseph G.
1989 "Family Violence Research Methodology and Design," in Lloyd Oblin's and Michael Tonry's (eds.) Family Violence (Volume 11), The University of Chicago press, Chicago and London. Pp.117-162.

Weisstein, N.
1970 "Kinder, Kuche, kirche as scientific law: psychology constructs of the female," in R. Morgan (Ed.) Sisterhood is Powerful, New York: Random House.

Wetzel, Laura and Mary Ross
1983 "Psychological and Social Ramifications of Battering: Observations Leading to a Counselling Methodology for Victims of Domestic Violence," Personnel and Guidance Journal, 61:423-8, March.

Wickson, Elise Jonina
1989 "Woman Abuse," Vancouver Island Public Interest Research Group (VIPIRG) Report. (Pp.1,4), April.

1988 Relational Networks of Women in Victoria and the Issue of Women Abuse in Intimate Bonds. M.A. Thesis, University of Victoria.

White, Susan J.
1979 "Statistical Errors in Papers in the British Journal of Psychiatry," British Journal of Psychiatry, 135:336-42.

Wilson, Judy Katrina
1985 The Psychological Functioning, Self-Concept, and Locus of Control of Battered Women in a Spouse Abuse Shelter, Dissertation Abstracts International (University Microfilms No. 86-06776).

Wood, Carol Sue
1987 Battered Women: An Exploration of Why They Return To The Abusive Situation. Dissertation Abstracts International. (University Microfilms No. 88-01221).

Woolson, Robert F. and Joel C. Kleinman
1989 "Perspectives on Statistical Significance Testing," Annual Review of Public Health, 10:423-40.

Yllo, Kersti and Michele Bograd
1988 Feminist perspectives on wife abuse. Beverly Hills, California: Sage Publications.

Zigler, E.
1979 Controlling child abuse in America: An effort doomed to failure? in R. Bourne and E.H. Newberger (eds.) Critical perspectives on child abuse. Lexington, MA: D.C. Health.

Zimmerman, Martin William
1979 Wife Battering: An Investigation of Alienation and Method of Conflict Resolution. M.S. Thesis, University of Maryland.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A: The *MAP* (Methodological Architectural Plan)

MAP is an hierarchical classification system designed to organize aspects of methodology within any one study or research area of abuse. This framework systematically separates out aspects of methodological information within a study based on categories outlined below, and incorporates these aspects into a comparison table from which patterns can be discerned and information and its content can be statistically analyzed.

Within each study, aspects of methodology are separated under four major headings. These headings are as follows:

A. DATA SOURCES AND GENERATION PROCEDURES
B. RESEARCH DESIGN
C. RELIABILITY AND VALIDITY OF RESEARCH INSTRUMENTS
D. STATISTICAL METHODS AND MEASURES

Methodological information under each of these major headings is further organized into several subdivisions, or categories. The category headings and their descriptions appear in capital letters below each of the major headings. Under each category are the ways the data has been recorded in the table (eg.text, modified text, or summary), the form the data was reported in the table, and the form the data was reported in the text of the thesis. The term 'text' as used in this classification system is defined as written or numerical material exacted word for word from within a published or unpublished document. The term 'summary' refers to textual material which has been exacted in a precis form from a published or unpublished document.

A. DATA SOURCES AND GENERATION PROCEDURES

SAMPLE SIZE: Number of clients, subjects, respondents, participants or interviewees that participate in a study.

Recorded Form: Text.
Tabular Form: Numerical
Reported Form: Categorical frequencies ('1-30', 31-60, 61-150, 151+.

SAMPLING FRAME: A listing of elements of a population.

Recorded Form: Modified Text.
Tabular Form:
1. Origin of Sample: (a) transition house, (b) registry, (c) agency, (d) hospital, (e) media, (f) college,

(g) police, (h) mixture, (i) not available.
2. Period of Data Collection: (a) specific, (b) non -specific, or (c) not available.
3. Location: Country, Province or State, City or Town, or Institution.

Reported Form: Categorical frequencies.
Notes: The category of specific means that the date of the start and ending of the data collection period was reported. A non-specific collection period means that only the length of the data collection period was reported.

METHOD OF SAMPLING: The type of sample that was collected collected.

Recorded Form: Summary.
Tabular Form: (1) Purposive volunteer, (2) purposive accidental, (3) mixed, or (4) random.
Reported Form: Categorical Frequencies.
Notes: A sample from a shelter could be considered purposeful and accidental at the same time; that is, battered women may be purposively gathered as part of the research protocol, and the study may also be dealing with women who were by chance, or accidentally, living in the shelter at the time the data was gathered (see Bhaumik, 1988:260).

INCLUSION/EXCLUSION CRITERIA: Statements restricting the kinds of battered or comparison group participants, thereby partially controlling extraneous variables.

Recorded Form: Modified Text.
Tabular Form: Injury, Deliberateness of Abuse, Kinds of Abuse, Severity of Abuse, Recency of Abuse, Duration of Abuse, Physical Abuse, Frequency of Abuse, Age Restriction, Marital Status Restriction, Length of Relationship, English Language Requirement, Nationality Requirement, Education Requirement, Living or Not Living With Batterer Requirement, Area, Relationship Kind.
Reported Form: Categorical Frequencies.

DEMOGRAPHIC CHARACTERISTICS: A demographic description of sample as an indication of sample homogeneity.

Recorded Form: Modified Text
Tabular Form: Age (mean, range, categories), Class, Religion, Marital Status, Education (mean, range, categories), Employment, Living with batterer, Income (mean, range, categories), Occupation, Number of Children.
Reported Form: Categorical Frequencies.

COMMENTS: Indicators of sampling reliability and validity.

Recorded Form: Summary.
Tabular Form: Questionnaire response rates, sampling bias, difficulties in matching of experimental and control groups, comparison with population demographic data.
Reported Form: Observation.

COMPARISON GROUP: Explicit or implicit control or comparison group incorporated into a study to aid interpretation of findings.

Recorded Form: Summary.
Tabular Form: Numerical.
Reported Form:
1. Existence of a Control/Comparison Group.
2. Difference in size of battered and comparison group.
3. Demonstration of Matching Procedures.

B. RESEARCH DESIGN

PURPOSE OF WORK: The primary reason(s) of the researcher for carrying out his or her work.

Recorded Form: Summary.
Tabular Form: (1) Hypotheses, (2) Working Hypotheses, or (3) Exploratory.
Reported Form: Categorical frequencies.

DESIGN TYPE:

Recorded Form: Summary.
Tabular Form: (1) cross-sectional, (2) longitudinal, or (3) experiment.
Reported Form: Categorical frequencies.
Notes: As used in the MAP classification scheme, cross-sectional studies examine data at one point in time. That is, the data are collected only on one occasion with the same subjects rather than on the same subjects at different points in time. By contrast, longitudinal studies collect data at different points in time. For example, panel studies are longitudinal works that which collect data from the same subjects at different points in time.

DESIGN PERIOD:

Recorded Form: Summary.
Tabular Form: (1) retrospective and concurrent, (2)

retrospective, (3) prospective, (4) concurrent, (5) prospective and retrospective, and (6) unclear.
Reported Form: Categorical frequencies.
Notes: In retrospective studies, an investigator attempts to link present events to events that have occurred in the past. There is an inability in this kind of study to draw causal linkages. Prospective studies explore presumed causes and move forward in time to presumed effect. In concurrent studies, data is collected for the subjects present situation.

METHOD: Empirical techniques used to gather data.

Recorded Form: Summary.
Tabular Form: (1) interview, (2) interview and self-administered questionnaire, (3) telephone survey, (4) interview and survey, (5) self-administered questionnaire, survey questionnaire, (6) other multi-method approaches, or (7) other methods.
Reported Form: Categorical frequencies.

PROCEDURES: A skeletal outline of design procedures.

Recorded Form: Summary.
Tabular Form: Summary of design procedures.
Reported Form: Observation.

RELIABILITY AND VALIDITY OF RESEARCH DESIGN: Aspects of research design which strengthen the procedural reliability and validity of a study.

Recorded Form: Summary.
Tabular Form: Evidence of data collection reliability or validity e.g. length of time to complete the instrument, interviewer training, who handled the interview or questionnaire, setting, multiple language instruments.
Reported Form: Observation.

COMMENTS: A list of aspects of research design which threaten reliability and validity in a research design.

Recorded Form: Summary.
Tabular Form: Author reported or observed difficulties in design procedures e.g. unclear setting or procedures, lengthy interviews, poor prescreening procedures.
Reported Form: Observation.

C. RELIABILITY AND VALIDITY OF RESEARCH INSTRUMENTS

COMPOSITE INSTRUMENT:

Recorded Form: Text.
Tabular Form: Name of instrument.
Reported Form: Categorical frequencies.

INSTRUMENT SCALES:

Recorded Form: Text.
Tabular Form: Name of instrument.
Reported Form: Categorical frequencies.

TYPE OF RELIABILITY DATA PROVIDED:

Recorded Form: Text.
Tabular Form: Type of reliability.
Reported Form: Categorical frequencies.

RELIABILITY SOURCE:

Recorded Form: Summary.
Tabular Form: Previous or concurrent study.
Reported Form: Categorical frequencies.

TYPE OF VALIDITY DATA PROVIDED:

Recorded Form: Text.
Tabular Form: Type of validity data.
Reported Form: Categorical frequencies.

VALIDITY SOURCE:

Recorded Form: Summary.
Tabular Form: Previous or concurrent study.
Reported Form: Categorical frequencies.

D. STATISTICAL METHODS AND MEASURES

TYPE OF ANALYSIS:

Recorded Form: Summary.
Tabular Form: (1) univariate, (2) bivariate, or (3) multi-variate.
Reported Form: Categorical frequencies unreported.

DATA ANALYSIS: Types of statistical methods used to assess the

statistical content of Articles (see Rudolph et al., 1985)

Recorded Form: Text.
Tabular Form:
1. Descriptive Statistics (content analysis, percentages, means, standard deviations, probability).
2. Contingency Tables (Chi-Square tests, Fischer's exact test, McNemar's test).
3. Multiway Tables (Log-linear procedures).
4. Nonparametric Tests (Kruskal-Wallis, one-way Analysis of Variance, Mann-Whitney test).
5. Nonparametric Correlations (Kendall's tau, Spearman's rho).
6. Pearson Correlations (Classical Product-Moment correlation).
7. T-Tests (One-sample, matched pair, and two-sample T-tests).
8. Analysis of Variance (Analysis of Variance, Analysis of Covariance, and F-tests).
9. Regression (Simple linear regression and multiple regression).
10. Other Multivariate Tests (Discriminant Function Analysis, Factor Analysis, Hotellings T, Logistic Regression, Multiple Analysis of Variance).

Reported Form: Categorical frequencies.

STATISTICAL CONTROL:

Recorded Form: Summary.
Tabular Form: Variables used in multivariate analysis, or stratification analysis.
Reported Form: Observation.

COMMENTS: Types of statistical errors generated through the commission and omission of a statistical application.

Recorded Form: Summary.
Tabular Form: Student's t-test (assumption of normality not met, equality of variances, independence of observations, more than two groups, indication of paired or unpaired data), Chi-square (no indication of null hypothesis or degrees of freedom, low numbers in cells, continuity correction omitted when crucial, independence of observations), misinterpretation of results, significance level, ANOVA (one-way, two-way, or repeated measures), subject to variable ratio too low for analysis, large correlation matrices and no control of the experiment-wise error rate, lack of reporting of important statistics, skewed variables.
Reported Form: Observation.

TABLES

TABLE 1: DATA SOURCES AND GENERATION PROCEDURES USED IN THE SOCIAL SUPPORT STUDIES ON ABUSED WOMEN.

Study	N	Sampling Frame	Method of Sampling	Inclusion/Exclusion Criteria	Demographic Characteristics	Comments
Rounsaville (1978)	31	Women who admitted being physically abused to surgical and pyschiatric services at the Yale New Haven Hospital Emergency Room (E.R.), and the Connecticut Mental Health Center (C.M.H.C).	Purposive Volunteer sample	1. Females over the age 16 who gave verbal evidence of being physically abused to any extent by an intimate male partner.	1. 35% were 25 years or less, 29% were 26-35 years, and 36% were 36 years and up. 2. 7% upper class, 13% middle class, and 80% lower class. 3. 65% white, 35% non-white. 4. 52% Catholic, 42% Protestant, and 6% other. 5. 68% married at the time of abuse, 29% were cohabitating, and 3% were not cohabitating.	1. Only 37% of the battered women identified were interviewed. These women consisted of those who were interested in counselling by a psychiatrist. 2. Subjects were representative of clientele of the E.R. and C.M.H.C..
Dobash and Dobash (1979)	109	Women in refuges for battered women in Edinburgh and Glasgow, refuges in smaller cities or towns in Scotland, and in their homes after leaving a refuge.	Purposeful sample	NA	1. Age range from 18 to 60 years. A majority were over 30 years. 2. 85% were married to the batterer.	
Gordeuk (1979)	30	"Women in Jeopardy" program at the YMCA in Salt Lake City, Utah, due to wife abuse after January 15, 1979.	Purposive volunteer sample	1. Women in a conjugal relationship for at least six months. 2. Women who are physically abused.	1. Mean age = 23.6 years 2. Mean years of education = 12.2 years 3. 45% were employed 4. 7% Protestent, 13% Catholic, 63% Mormon, 17% None or other. 5. Mean length of conjugal relationship was 5.46 years. 6. 83% were married. 7. Occupation status (4 pt. scale) was 1.67. 8. SES (scale) = 2.74.	1. 51% questionnaire return rate for battered women. 2. Abused wives who have no resources from family or friends are qualified for services extended by the Division of Family Services to Women in Jeopardy. 3. 53% questionnaire return rate non-battered women. Only 45% of these questionnaires were usable; that is, 24% of the original sample. 4. The author observed (p.63) that obtaining the abused sample from the Jeopardy program may have skewed the social isolation scores to a lower level since services could be received by only those women having no available resources from family or friends.
	60(c)	200 names obtained from the Salt Lake City Directory	250 names randomly selected using a table of random	1. Women in a conjugal relationship for at least six months.	1. Mean age = 25.9 years 2. Mean years of education = 12.1 years	

		(1978) and 200 names obtained from the Salt Lake City Suburban Directory (1977-1978) using a systematic sampling design.	numbers.	2. Women who have not been physically abused.	3. 75% were employed 4. 7% Protestent, 13% Catholic, 5% Jewish, 2% Greek Orthodox, 60% Mormon, 13% None or other. 5. Mean length of conjugal relationship was 5.47 years. 6. 98.3% were married. 7. Occupational statis = 2.08. 8. SES = 3.21.	
Stachura (1979)	93	List of names in a Texas Department of Public Safety computer registry from May 28, 1978 to July 28, 1978.	Systematic random sample generated by taking every nth name until 1,500 names were obtained.	1. List contains names of over 90 percent of Texans over the age of fifteen years. 2. These persons lived in areas which, when plotted on a state map, accounted for 188 of 254 counties in the State of Texas. 3. The area also covered all of the area in the Standard Metropolitan Statistical Areas (SMSA) in the state. 4. Respondents must hold a valid drivers license. 5. Victim of abuse by a spouse.	1. 80.6% female. 2. 75.3% white, 9.7% black, 12.9% Spanish. 3. 22.6% less than high school education. 4. 19.3% family income $6,000 or less, 31.1% $6,001-10,000, 45.2% 15,001-50,000, and 4.4% over 50,001.	1. 50.6% response rate.
	589(c)	(As above)	(As above)	As above, except non-victim of abuse by a spouse.	1. 44.3% female. 2. 82.6% white, 7.2% black, 9.2% Spanish. 3. 17.6% less than high school education. 4. 9.9% family income $6,000 or less, 29.2% $6,001-10,000, 49.9% 15,001-50,000, and 11.0% over 50,001.	
Zimmerman (1979)	11	Married couples in which the husband was currently on probation for an assaultive behavior against his wife. The cases were collected from the Special Offender's Clinic of the Maryland Division of Parole and Probation during the 6 month	Purposive Accidental	1. Assaultive offenses against a wife which included assault and battery and assault by striking. 2. Husband currently on probation for non-assaultive offenses. 3. Married couples.	Females: 1. 27% 18-22 yrs, 27% 23-29 yrs, 36% 30-39 yrs, and 9% 40-50 yrs. 2. 36% black, 64% white. 3. 9% no children, 36% 1 child, 36% 2 children, and 18% 3 or more children. 4. 82% less than high school. 5. Income: 73% $0-6,000, 27% $7-12,000.	1. The collection of cases was out of the control of the researcher. 2. No matching procedures discussed. Author notes however that an attempt was made to match the demographic characteristics of group 3 with the characteristics of group 1.

		period from October, 1978 through April, 1979.			6. Years married: 45% 0-2 yrs, 18% 3-5 yrs, 36% 6 or more yrs.	
	7(c)	Married couples in which the husband was currently on probation for a non-assaultive offense. Cases were collected from a general caseload of the Maryland Division of Parole and Probation during the 6 month period from October, 1978 through April, 1979.	Purposive Accidental	1. Offenses included shoplifting, traffic charges, and larceny. 2. Husband currently on probation for non-assaultive offenses. 3. Married couples.	Females: 1. 14% 18-22 yrs, 57% 23-29 yrs, and 28% 30-39. 2. 27% black, 57% white, and 14% other. 3. 43% no children, 28% 1 child, and 18% 3 or more children. 4. 28% less than high school. 5. Income: 86% $0-6,000, 14% $7-12,000. 6. Years married: 71% 0-2 yrs, 14% 3-5 yrs, 14% 6 or more yrs.	
	11(c)	Mainly personel of the probation offices.	Purposive Accidental	1. Married Couples. 2. Husband not on probation. 3. Couples not involved with the members of the above groups.	Females: 1. 9% 18-22 yrs, 64% 23-29 yrs, and 27% 30-39. 2. 18% black, 82% white. 3. 36% no children, 45% 1 child, and 18% 2 children. 4. 9% less than high school. 5. Income: 18% $0-6,000, 45% $7-12,000, and 36% $13-18,000. 6. Years married: 27% 0-2 yrs, 18% 3-5 yrs, 55% 6 or more yrs.	
Roy (1977)	150	1000 cases from AWAIC, comprised over a one year period from women who called the organization for help and information.	150 cases selected at random from 1000 AWAIC's case sample	NA	NA	1. Not all respondents answered the quesitons.
Carlson (1977)	101	260 women who appealed for assistance from the National Organization for Women (NOW) over an 18 mo. period beginning January 1976.	Purposive volunteer sample of 101 women selected from 260 women (who appealed to NOW) based on completion of information.	Based on whether they completed relevent information	1. 65% were beteen 21-30 years of age. 2. 72% white, 27% black, 1% oriental. 3. 60% married, 22% separated or divorced, 13% unmarried and living with assailent, and 5% were single and living apart from assailant. 4. One-third had less than high school, 25% were high school graduates, 35% had	1. The study reported cases where the information was most complete. This involved only 38.9% of the 260 women.

					college or vocational training, and 7% were college graduates. 5. Only 7 respondents earned $9000 or more. The majority employed outside the home earned $6000-9000. 34% earned less than $6000. 6. 43% were employed outside the home. 3 were employed in professional jobs, the remainder worked in clerical, or unskilled jobs. 7. 86% had children. Average no. was 2.23. Only 4 women reported five or more.	
Prescott and Letko (1977)	40	MS. Magazine readership during the summer of 1975	Purposive volunteer.	NA	1. 46% of respondents were between 30-39 years, 30% were less than 30 years, and 20% were greater than 39 years. 2. 82% of respondents had some college, completed college, or had some advanced degree. 3. 76% were employed, of which 56% were employed in professional and managerial occupations. 4. 49% were divorced, 46% were still married, and 5% were living with lovers. 5. Average no. children was 2.9.	1. Respondents were more likely to be supportive of women's issues, relatively young, more liberal, more educated, more frequently employed than women in general (p.79)
Frieze et.al. (1979)	41	Women who sought help for battering in a woman's shelter, filed legal action to remove violent husbands from their homes, or responded to publicity posted notices for women who have experienced violence in their marriages.	Purposive volunteer battered women respondents.	NA	NA	1. Unequal numbers between the battered and non-battered groups. 2. Group matching. According to the authors, mathcing neighborhoods for their battered and control group allowed for rouge control over age, ethnicity, and SES.
	27(c)	Battered women selected from the same neighborhoods as the battered	Randomly selected sample of battered women from the same neighborhood as the	NA	The "battered" and "battered control" group were reported to be demographically similar.	

		women above.	battered women.			
Pagelow (1981)	350	Clients from battered women's shelters in Florida and California (primarily), clients from shelters in England, Ireland, Finland, Norway, Denmark, Belgium, and the Netherlands, and non-sheltered battered women who had heard the investigator's presentations or read about the study.	Purposive volunteer sample (both within and beyond shelter residence.	Battered women were defined by shelters.	1. Mean age=29.91 yrs, median age=27.89, age range=17-68yrs. 2. 77.9% White, 14.1% Black, 3.7% Hispanic, 0.9% Asian American, and 3.4% other. 3. Marital Status: 80.5% husband or ex-husband, 18.3% lover or ex-lover, and 1.1% someone else.	1. [p.228] subjects report of violence range in occurance from 4-30 years. 2. No accurate determination of response rate. No records were kept on how many women were asked to participate but did not respond, nor how many sheltered women were not given the opportunity to participate.
Harris (1988)	40	Former residents of a shelter for battered women in Southern Ontario located in a small town.	Purposive accidental	NA	1. Mean age was 32.18 years. Range was 20-68 years. 2. Education ranged from leaving high school in seventh grade to completing an undergraduate degree. Mean length of education was 10.75 years. 12% of the respondents was completed some post-secondary education 3. 55% respondents were employed outside the home. Income was low. 4. 70% reported an annual income of less than $15,000. Only 1 woman reported earning an income of more than $30000. 5. 97.5% had children.	1. No indication of how much "former" means. 2. No indication of response rate.
Schulman (1979)	179	Eligible women in Kentucky residing in a houshold with a telephone between March 27 and April 19, 1979.	Random sample of 1,793 households using a RDD procedure	1. Women who had experienced some degree of physicla violence from their partners in the past 12 months. 2. Women who are married, or who have been living with a male partner in the past 12 months, even if they were now separated, divorced or widowed.	(OVERALL SAMPLE REPORTED).	1. 9% refused or terminated the interview before completion. 2. Survey did not include people in prisons, hospitals, or religious and educational institutions.
	1614	(As above)	(As above)	1. Women who had not	(As above)	

	(c)			experienced violence at all.		
Grayson and Smith (1981)	158	Women in physician's offices, the local hospital emergency room, mental health center, psychiatrists' office, halfway house, social services, legal aid, and the college counselling center, who responded to the survey during May to July, 1978. Women who responded to a short form of the survey placed in the newspaper.	Purposive volunteer.	1. Battered female respondents.	1. 13.9% were 10-19 years of age, 40% were 20-19 years of age, 27% were 30-39 years of age, 13.3% were 40-49 years of age, 4.4% were 50 years and older. 2. 56.1% were married, 20.6% were single, 18.7% were divorced, 3.9% were separated, and 0.6% were widowed.	1. No way of controling how often a subject may respond to the questionnaire. 2. Matched battered and non-battered volunteers substantially different. 3. Women who identified themselves as battered were abused by spouses (71.5%), boyfriends (20.3%), and relatives (8.2%).
	169(c)	(As above)	Purposive volunteer.	1. Non-battered female respondents.	1. 8.9% were 10-19 years of age, 47.9% were 20-19 years of age, 25.4% were 30-39 years of age, 12.4% were 40-49 years of age, 5.4% were 50 years and older. 2. 82.0% were married, 13.8% were single, 2.4% were divorced, 0.6% were separated, and 1.2% were widowed.	
Pahl (1985)	42	Battered women in a "Womens Center" in Britain in 1976.	Purposive accidental sample	NA	At first interview: 1. 52% 20-29, 29% 30-34, 17% 40 or more. 2. 43% Intermediate and junior non-manual, 12% Skilled manual and own account non-professional, 45% Semi- and unskilled manual, personal service workers. 3. 90% couples had a child under five some time or other during the years when violence was taking place.	1. Two refusals and six women were not re-interviewed for a variety of reasons [p.27]. 2. 84% response rate.
Parle (1985)	29	Women who reported spouse abuse to staff memebers of MNCMHC and the Grand Island Domestic Abuse Task Force.	Purposive accidental sample	1. Women separated from their abuser for more than three years or lived with him less than one year were screened out. 2. To be defined as abuse, women had to	1. Age: 41.4% 30 yrs or less, 58.6% 31-65 yrs. 2. 44.8% grade 8-12, 55.2% technical or college. 3. Occupation: 51.7% blue collar, 27.6% white collar, 20.7% other.	1. The second group was matched as much as possible with the first group for age, economic status, education of wife, education of husband, and length of marital relationship. 2. None of the women gave evidence of severe or chronic mental illness.

				score over thirty on the kind*frequency scale (ex-post facto).	4. 39.3% earned less than $6000, 60.7% earned $6000 or more. 5. Relationship length: 10.3% 2 yr or less, 27.6% 3-5 yrs, 62.1% over 5 yrs.	3. Representativeness of sample cross-checked with the 1980 census and other information on the community.
	29(c)	Clients of MNCMHC with other problems or women who agreed to participate.	Purposive volunteer non-battered sample	NA	1. Age: 69% 30 yrs or less, 31% 31-65 yrs. 2. 41.4% grade 8-12, 58.6% technical or college. 3. Occupation: 27.6% blue collar, 51.7% white collar, 20.7% other. 4. 37.9% earned less than $6000, 62.1% earned $6000 or more. 5. Relationship length: 24.1% 2 yr or less, 13.8% 3-5 yrs, 62.1% over 5 yrs.	
Bowker (1983, 1984)	146	Respondents to announcements in Milwaukee newspapers and newsletters, public service announcements on the radio, social issue commentators on the Milwaukee network TV stations, over a nine month period during 1980-81.	Purposive volunteer battered sample	1. A woman had to have been beaten physically at least once by a person with whom she was married or cohabitating at the time of violence. 2. Subjects were not accepted into the sample unless the violence had ended at least one year prior to the interview.	1. Mean age=38yrs. 27% were 30 years of age or younger, 57% were 31-50 years of age, 16% were over fifty years of age. 2. 91.8% white. 3. 94% were legally married. 4. 22% were homemakers, 22% were service workers, 20% were clerical workers, and 14% were professionals or managers. 5. 45% were Protestent, 41% were Catholic, and 12% were no religion at all. 6. Average family income=$22000. 29% of family incomes were $25000 or over. 7. 50% no longer living with the batterer.	1. Changed research sites so methodology fitted better [p.22] 2. Recruitment techniques differentially approved by subjects.
Bowker (1985, 1988)	1000	146 interviews with formally battered wives in South-eastern Wisconsin (all who had become "violence free" at the last year prior to the interview) plus 854 question-naires sent in by women all over the	Purposive volunteer battered sample.	NA	1. Average age was 38 years of age. 2. 90.6% white. 3. 90.6% were legally married to their batterers. 4. Half were Protestent, and one third were Catholic. 5. Half attended church once a month or more,	1. Two different samples. 2. Response rate was 87% [p.83]

		United States in response to an advertisement in Woman's Day Magazine.			and half had completed at least one college course. 6. 25.3% less than high school, 11.2% graduates of college. 7. Wives held at least one job outside of the home in nearly three fourths of the marriages. 43% professionals or white collar, 40% blue-collar or clericals. 8. Mean annual family income was $16000 in 1982. 9. Average number of children.	
Chalmers and Smith (1988)	105	709 women who had been in Regina's Transition house between 1976 and 1982.	Purposive accidental.	NA	NA	1. The 105 women may not have been representative of the 709 women in the shelter, or of battered women generally. 2. The battered woman sample was compared to data on a sample of women from the Praries (1981 Quality of Life Survey).
Thoennes (1981)	372	Battered women who heard about the project through local newspapers, radio and TV coverage, hospitals and mental health clinics, therapists, lawyers, teachers, speeches delivered by project personnel, and project fliers posted in schools, stores and other public locations in Colorado, Wyoming, Montana, Utah, South and North Dakota. The project covered a 2 year span from July 1978 to July 1980.	Purposive volunteer battered women living and women no longer living with their batterer.	1. Women screened using working definition of battering (p.60). 2. Only those women abused three or more times were scheduled for interviews (p.60) 3. Women must be willing to participate in interviews (p.61) 4. Women must have lived with a batterer. 5. Battered women living with and women non longer living with their batterer.	1. 80% White. 2. 50.1% Protestent, 24.7% Catholic, and 25% None. 3. 80% middle and working class, 20% lower and upper class. 4. Majority complated high-school. 5. 35% employed most of their lives, 8% homemakers, 57% interrupted career patterns. 6. 40% earned less than $5000, 4% earned $20000 or more.	1. $24 incentive offered to volunteers. 2. By choosing women who had been battered three or more times, variation in the smaple was limited. 3. The author discussed her sampling procedure at length.
	189(c)	A subset of the sample above.	Purposive volunteer sample	1. As above except women had to have lived with batterers and non-batterers.	NA	
Hofeller (1982)	50	Women responding to a local newspaper	Purposive volunteer sample	Women with a history of wife-beating.	1. 96% white. 2. 11% Catholic, 18%	1. Each "comparison" subject was matched with an "experimental"

		article, or women applicants for hotline counselors for House of Ruth, or women referred to the project by friends, social service workers, or private practioners.			Protestent. 3. 84% married once. 4. Average children=3, 74% had 2 or less children, 6% had 6 or more children.	subject on education level.
	50(c)	Women from local women's organizations, church groups, or women personally referred to the project.	Purposive volunteer sample	Women in non-violent marriages.	1. 100% white. 2. 26% Catholic, 22% Protestent. 3. 78% married once. 4. Average children=3, 74% 2 or less children, 6% had 6 or more children.	
Kerr (1982)	20	Women in two battered women's shelters in two small southern cities. The women contacted within a 29 week period were either attending small group discussions at the shelter or who, at the time, were working with a volunteer advocate.	Purposive accidental sample	1. Participants must be over 16 years old. 2. Participants must have suffered bodily injury from one or more physical attacks by a past or present or any other male with whom she lives or has lived if married.	1. Mean age was 35 years of age. Age range was from 19-59 years of age. 2. 80% were white, and 20% were black. 3. 45% were married, 5% were divorced, and 50% were separated. 4. Average education was 12.25 years. Subjects had completed between 8-17 years of education. 5. 40% were housewives, 50% were working full-time. and 10% were working part time. 6. Average family income was $9,315.00. 7. Average no. of children=2.85. Range in no. of children=0-7.	1. Based on small sample. 2. Demographic data was prospectively gathered for retrospective incidents.
Heggie (1986)	87	Battered women in shelters located in Los Angeles, Riverside, and Orange counties, as well as battered women in outreach groups associated with shelters, and women referred by therapists and temporary restraining order clinics.	Purposive accidental and volunteer sample.	1) Women must have experienced physical abuse within the past six months and 2) have lived with the abuser for a period of at least a month.	1. 54% were white, 20% were black, 22% were hispanic, and 4% belonged to other ethnic groups.	1. Unclear method of sampling. 2. 69% response at follow-up.
Mitchel and Hodson (1983, 1986)	60	Battered women who had sought assistance from one of six shelters in	Purposive accidental	Women must have been physically assaulted at least twice by a man whom she had an	1. Mean age was 27.4 years. 2. 48% were white, 44% were black, and 8% were	1. Unclear if women volunteered themselves or shelters volunteered women.

		the San Francisco Bay area.		intimate relationship.	other ethnic backgrounds. 3. 32% completed some high school, 35% had obtained some post high school training. 4. 68% earned $4,000 or less. 5. 51.6% were married to their assailant. 6. 91% were living with the batterer before coming to the shelter. 7. 2.1 children at the time of the battering incident. 8. Average relationship length = 5.4yrs.	
Limandri (1985)	40	San Francisco Bay Area community at large as well as five battered women's agencies (both shelters and non-residential services)	Purposive volunteer sample	1. Must identify themselves as abused women (no qualifications regarding the type, severity, recency or duration of abuse). 2. Had to speak English but not necessarily as a first language. 3. Had to be adults (iver 18 years old) who identified the abuser as male. 4. Included women who had left the abusive relationship as well as those who were still involved with the abuser.	1. Mean age = 34.6, Age range between 20-58 years. 2. 80.0% white, 7.5% black, 12.5% Asian, latin or other. 3. 12.5% cohabitating, 20% divorced, 15% married, 20% separated, and 30% never married. 4. 100% had graduated high school or better 5. 20% were homemakers, 22.5% were clerical workers, 35% were in management. 15% students, unskilled or skilled. 6. Average children 1.13, range=0-6. 7. Relationship length: mean=7.8yrs, range was <1-21 yrs.	
Butehorn (1985)	29	Women in a battered womens shelter located in a suburb south of Boston.	Purposive accidental sample	(Note: Author had to alter restrictions on sample as she collected her data.)	1. Average age was 29.6 years. Range in age was 18-55 years. 2. Mean number of years of education was 12.7. 3. 97% had work experience, but only 31% were currently working. 4. Mean income for the family unit was $16000.	1. Sample was significantly skewed on the author's 'leave the batter' variable and caused serious problems in her analysis.
Brecker (1987)	54	Women admitted to a shelter for battered women.	Purposive volunteer sample	(Implicit within the data collection procedure) Women who had stayed in the shelter for approximately one or	1. Age range 19-53 years. 2. 83.2% had completed high school. 3. Income range was from $0.0-$31,000. 68%	1. The author observed (p.129) that battered women who have sought shelter might impose a selection effect on the results.

				more weeks.	reported no income. 4. Length of relationship was from 2 mo. to 36 yrs. 5. Average no. of children.	
Beauparlant (1987)	10	Battered women from a shelter.	Purposive accidental sample	NA	1. 50% married to their abusers, 40% common law. 2. 30% had completed high school. 3. 100% unemployed with incomes ranging between $3,600 and $8,400 per year.	
	10	Batterers from non-violent support groups.	Purposive accidental sample	NA	1. 70% married 2. 70% had completed high school 3. 100% employed with incomes ranging between $12,000 and $40,000 per year.	
Firestein (1987)	23	Women college students in introductory psychology courses at a mid-sized state university.	Accidental volunteer sample	1) Included of experienced one violent act towards them by thier dating partner based on the CTS, 2) subjects who were legally married or 3) who reported that they were not currently involved in a dating relationship were not included for analysis.	OVERALL SAMPLE: 1. 88% were 19-20 years. Age range was 18 to 30-40 years. 2. 88% were white. 3. 79% were freshmen, 13% were juniors.	1. 83% response rate. 2. Demographic data not reported to the abused and non-abused groups. 3. The author notes (p.105) that her failure to find significant main effects or interactions was related to sample size.
	97(c)	(As above)	(As above)	(As above except non-violent acts by partner)	(As above)	
Steiner (1987)	61	All the battered women staying in one of four shelters in Israel during the three months of the study.	Purposive accidental sample	NA	1. 23% between 19-24 years, 26.2% between 25-29 years, 19.7% between 30-34 years, and 21.3% between 35-39 years. 2. 89.1% had incomes below average.	1. According to the author, the non-battered control group was similar to the battered group in marital status, ethnic origin, socio-economic level and age.
	61(c)	Women in the social services, baby clinics in disadvantaged neighborhoods and head-start programs.	Accidental volunteer sample	Non-battered women had to answer items "k"-"r" in the negative for the CTS.	1. 11.5% between 19-24 years, 14.8% between 25-29 years, 19.6% between 30-34 years, and 13.1% between 35-39 years. 2. 93% had incomes below average.	
Mead-Ramrattan,	47	Women contacted by staff at six hostels	Purposive accidental sample	NA	1. 38.3% were 30-39 years of age.	1. 43.5% response rate. 2. Sample consists of abused women

Cerre' and Porto (1980)		or shelters, two social service agencies and a hospital, a group counsellor, a therapist and two researchers with abused women contacts, all located in the Toronto area during June and July, 1979.			2. 57% were informally or legally separated, 25% were merried or living with a partner in common law, 8.5% were single, and 6.4% were divorced. 3. 53.2% had some or complete secondary level education, 34% had some post-secondary education. 4. 14.9% or respondents reported having managerial or professional occupations, and 27.7% were housewives. 5. 90% had children; none had more than five. 6. 12.8% had not worked outside the home at any time during cohabitation.	who have sought assistance, and is not representative of women who do not seek help, and have different ways of coping. 3. The demographic data of the battered women was compared with females from the Census.
Flynn (1977)	33	Victims of spousal assault recommended by a professional agency, and professionals providing secondary reports in Kalamazoo, Michigan during May and June, 1975.	Purposive accidental sample of victims and secondary reports from professionals	NA	Almost half were divorced or in the process of obtaining a divorce at the time of the study.	1. Nineteen of the interviews were gathered using secondary reports from professionals. 2. Great variation in the sources of the sample.
Kuhl (1982)	420	Women who sought treatment from one of 12 domestic violence programs in Washington state in a six month period.	Purposive accidental sample	NA	1. Mean age was 26 years. Age range was 17-79 years. 2. 81% white, 6% black, 6% native American, 8% minorities. 3. 52% were married, 23% were separated, 10% were living with a partner, 7% were divorced, 5% were never married, 1% were widowed, 1% were intimate but lived separately. 4. Mean educational level was 11.8 years. Education range was 3-20 years. 5. 50% were housewives, 26% were employed in a skilled job, 8% were unemployed, 3% were in semiskilled positions, 3% were in unskilled	10% did not answer the question of employment, and 29% the location quesiton.

					positions. 6. Mean income was less than $4999 7. 41% lived in an urban community. 8. 84% had children.	
Labell (1979)	512	Physically or sexually abused women admitted to Hubbarb House during its first two years of operation.	Purposive accidental sample	NA	1. Mean age was 29 years. Age ranged from 16-67 years. 2. 76.8% were white, 22.0% were black, 1.2% were other. 3. Mean education level was 11.08 years. Education range was 2-22 years. 4. 17.4% held skilled jobs, 38.5% held unskilled jobs. 5. 64.4% were married, 10.3% were single, 14.8% were separated, and 9.3% were divorced.	1. Only 75.5% reported occupations [p.260]
Church (1984)	101	220 Women who contacted the Support Group between 1 December, 1981 and 24 September, 1982.	Purposive accidental sample	1. Women who were frightened and left their name and/or telephone number. 2. Women who could be located in mid 1983. 3. Women who agreed to be interviewed.	1. Age of wife at the time of living together: 35% 15-19yrs, 37% 20-24yrs, 13.6% 25-39yrs, and 2.9% 40+ yrs. 2. Education: 5% primary education only, 34% 1-2yrs post-primary, 31% 3 yrs post primary, 16% 4-5 yrs post primary, 9% 1-2 yrs post secondary, and 6% 3 or more post secondary. 3. Socio-economic level for N=47 employed wives: 2% level 1, 4% level 2, 28% level 3, 34% level 4, 23% level 5, and 8% level 6. 4. Income: 34% Nil, 41% $1-4999, 17% $5000-9999, 9% $10000-19999 (New Zealand Dollars)	1. 70% Response rate. 2. Comparion of socio-econmic level and income with New Zealand national sample of females aged 15 yrs and over. Samples were similar. 3. Of the 145 women who wer eligible to participate, 17% had since changed their address, 10% had declined to participate, and 3% had been earlier misclassified.
Hoff (1984)	12	Women known to the state shelter and health networks, women in a shelter, and women known to University colleagues.	Purposive volunteer and accidental sample	NA	1. After range was 19-49 years. 2. 66% were white. 3. Jobs included teaching english, legal secretary, word processing, house cleaning, and human service professionals. 4. 92% had a high-school diploma.	1. The author notes (p.254) that the average scores in her analysis did not work because of her small sample size.

					5. No. of children rnaged from 0 to 6.	
Lockhart and White (1989)	155	Black women in 70 different community groups in a major southeastern metropolitan city during the winter of 1982.	Purposive volunteer sample (with respect to class hetero-geneity)	Black women legally married to or cohabitating with their marital partner in the study city.	1. 35.5% Upper class, 36.8% middle class, and 27.7% lower class. 2. 68% had more than a high school education. 3. 63% were clerical/sales or lower occupational. 4. Average age=36.1yrs. 5. 10.3% were cohabitating with thier marital partner as husband and wife, 89.7% were legally married to their partners. 6. Average length of marital relationship= 11.8yrs.	1. The sampling procedure deliberately sought heterogeneity in order to elucidate theory on this topic. 2. 88% return rate. 3. Author notes that the respondents represented a cross section of ages, education levels, occupations and social class positions.
Pirog-Good and Stets (1989)	48	Listings of courses at a large mid-western university during the spring of 1986 and 1987.	Two random samples of upper classes	1. Not married or dating. 2. Physically abused one or more times.	(ONLY AGE FOR OVERALL SAMPLE REPORTED)	1. 80% response rate (p.112) 2. Non-white samples eliminated due to low frequency. 3. Collapsed violence variable to a dummy. 4. According to author, sample representative of general population of upper-class students on age, sex, and area of study.
	666(c)	(As above)	(As above)	(As above)	(As above)	
Gelles and Straus (1988)		Households in the United States with a telephone	3,520 housholds selected at random, then random selection of adult member based in gender and marital status.	Household must include two adults, a male and female 18 years of age or older, who were: (a) presently married, or (b) presently living as a male-female couple; or a household migh include one adult 18 years of age or older who was either (c) divorced or separated within the last two years, or (d) a single parent living with a child under the age of 18.	NA	
Bhamik (1988)	39	A list of American women presently in Haven House	Purposive accidental sample	1. Woman must have suffered physical abuse at the hands of her spouse. 2. The women must be American.	1. Mean age = 31.5 years; mode = 27, age range from 22 to 55 years. 2. 38.5% Catholic, 46.2% Protestent, 0% Buddhist. 3. 74.4% high school graduates. 4. Mean Income = $4,058.00. Range = $0-	1. The author felt that Asian women in the Pacific-Asian Shelter were representative of the Asian community because ot was the only shelter in the community.

					18300. 5. 74.4% Currently Unemployed, 56.4% Previously Unemployed. 6. 43.6% White, 30.8% Black, and 25.6% Hispanic. 7. Mean no. of children = 2.5, range = 1-5.	
	30(c)	Asian women from Pacific-Asian Shelter.	Purposive accidental sample	1. Women must have suffered physical abuse at the hands of her spouse. 2. Women must be Asian-Pacific ethnic origin.	1. Mean age = 34.4 years; median = 31, age range from 21 to 46 years. 2. 30.0% Catholic, 33.3% Protestant, 30.0% Buddhist. 3. 83.3% high school graduates. 4. Mean Income = $5,604.00, range = $0 - 24000. 5. 76.7% Currently Unemployed, 63.0% Previously Unemployed. 6. 10.0% Chinese, 10.0% Japanese, 16.7% Filipino, 33.3% Korean, 3.3% Indian, 20.0% Vietnamese, and 6.7% Chinese/Vietnamese. 7. Average no. children = 1.9, range = 0-5.	
Simko (1988)	50	A sample of 841 households reporting a total of 1276 domestic violence incidents over a 10-month period, drawn from police records.	Volunteer battered women in a "family," randomly assigned to an experimental group.	Women in a "family" which may include: 1. married to each other; 2. related by blood; 3. related by marriage; 4. formerly married to each other; 5. not married, but living together; 6. not married but formerly living together; 7. parents of a child in common, regardless of whether they have been married or have lived together at the time. 8. Cases must have provided the precinct team with an address or a telephone number, otherwise they were excluded.	COLLAPSED DATA FOR 89 SUBJECTS: 1. Age range = 18-82, median = 37. 2. 96% women. 3. 43.8% black, 36.0% Hispanic, and 20.2% white. 4. 53.6% were high school graduates or more. 5. 47.2% currently employed. 6. Income: 24.7% earned less than $2000, 16.9% $2001-5000, 25.8% $5001-10000, and 32.5% had incomes greater than 10001. 7. Soruce of income: welfare = 43.8%, spouse - 38.2%, child support or alimony = 18%. 8. 88.8% had children.	1. Author only provides the collapsed demographic data.

				9. The cases must be 18yrs or older.		
	39(c)	A sample of 841 households reporting a total of 1276 domestic violence incidents over a 10-month period, drawn from police records.	Battered women in a "family," randomly assigned to a control group.	(As above)	(See above)	
Smith (1982)	12	Women currently in battering relationships identified by mental health professionals in one county in Pennsylvania, and by a social service agency and by mental health professionals in private practice in the same county.	Purposive accidental sample	Participants had to be 1) currently legally married, 2) living with a physically abusive spouse, 3) was at least twently-one years of age, 4) spoke and read the English language and had completed at least grade school education, and 5) had been physically abused by her husband at least one time.	1. 8% under 26yrs, 58% 26-35yrs, and 33% more than 35 yrs. 2. 42% high school or less. 3. Median yrs married was 11. 4. 66.3% were women without children. 5. Mean children = 1.67. 6. 58% working out of the home while married to the abusive spouse.	1. One of two voluntary community mental health centers was excused from participation. 2. Three social service agencies were contacted and asked to participate in the data collection process. Two refused (p.32) 3. Accurate count of distributed questionnaires was lost by one participating agency.
	16(c)	Ex-battered women identified by mental health professionals in one county in Pennsylvania, and by a social service agency and by mental health professionals in private practice in the same county.	Purposive accidental sample	Participants had to be: 1) either divorced or had established a separate residence for one year or more from their abusive spouse, 2) was at least twently-one years of age, 3) spoke and read the English language and had completed at least grade school education, and 4) had been physically abused by her husband at least one time.	1. 56% 26-35yrs, and 33% over 35 yrs. 2. 81% high school or less. 3. Median yrs married was 10. 4. 100% were women without children. 5. Mean children = 2.38. 6. 50% working out of the home while married to the abusive spouse.	
Alcorn (1984)	40	Women in three shelters outside the Chicago metropolitan area over a 5 mo. period.	Purposive accidental sample	Women had to be 1) residing in a shelter for at least three days, 2) Stable enough to be interviewed, 3) willing to be interviewed.	1. 10% under 20, 52.5% were between 20-30 years of age and 35% were between 31-40 years of age, 2.5% 41-50. 2. 42% were Protestent, 37.5% were Catholic, 7.5% Jewish, 10% No preference, 2.5% Other. 3. 46% had not completed high school. 4. 70% had no income, 7.5% < $5000, 12.5% $5000-10000, and 10% 10000-20000. 5. 52.5% were married	

and living with their abuser, 30.0% were cohabitating, 7.5% married but separated, and 10% divorced. 6. No. children: 5% 0, 25% 1, 32.5% 2, 25% 3, and 12.5% 4 or more. 7. Length of relationship: 42% < 2 yrs, 27.5% 2-5 yrs, 17.5% > 5-10 yrs, 7.5% > 10-15 yrs, and 5% > 15 yrs.	1. According to the author, the sample seemed to be representative of the women who were residents in the shelters at the time.

Notes. AWAIC = Abused Women's Aid in Crisis; (c) = comparision group (e.g. ex-battered or non-battered women); MNCMHC = Mid-Nebraska Community Mental Health Center; NA = Not Available; NOW = National Organization for Women; RDD = random digit dialing.

TABLE 2: RESEARCH DESIGNS USED IN SOCIAL SUPPORT STUDIES ON ABUSED WOMEN.

Study	Purpose of Work	Design Type	Data Collection Period	Data Collection Method	Procedures	Reliability of Data Collection	Comments
Rounsaville (1978-79)	Hypotheses	Cross-sectional	Retrospective and Concurrent	Interview	Interview using open-ended and structured quesitons.	1. Interviews took roughly 2 hrs. 2. No evidence of anonymity or conficentiality.	1. Location and interview setting unclear.
Dobash and Dobash (1979)	Exploratory	Cross-sectional	Retrospective and Concurrent	Systematic indepth interviews	Ninety-three interviews conducted in Women's Aid refuges, the remainder in the woman's home.		1. Children interfered with the interviewing.
Gordeuk (1979)	Exploratory	Cross-sectional	Retrospective and Concurrent	Intake interview and questionnaire administration	Questionnaire administered following intake interview. Participants completed it in their leisure and returned it ot the inhouse director of "Women in Jeopardy."	1. Trained interviewer 2. 45 min. to complete questionniare.	1. The interviewer screened out those subjects who were in a labile traumatic state. 2. Initial response rate was 37.8%. Procedures changed when the response rate appeared low. There was no check to see if a change in procedure led to a change in results.
Stachura (1979)	Exploratory	Cross-sectional	Retrospective and Concurrent	Survey questionnare	Survey packet sent out to respondents following telephone contact.	1. Pretesting of questionnaires. 2. Confidentiality stressed. 3. Follow-up procedures. 4. Multiple language questionnaire.	1. Lengthy questionnaire. 2. Numbered survey booklets. 3. 50.5% response rate.
Zimmerman (1979)	Hypotheses	Cross-sectional	Retrospective and Concurrent	Structured Interview.	Administration of tests to each memebr of a couple separately by the probation agent.	NA	1. Unclear procedures. 2. Untrained interviewer. 3. The author noted (p.59) that measuring alienation weeks or months after the battering occured may not reflect the level of alienation at the time of the incident.

Roy (1977)	Exploratory	Cross-sectional	UN	Intake questionnaires and indepth interviews			No information on interviewer training or interviewer effects
Carlson (1977)	Exploratory	Cross-sectional	Retrospective and Concurrent	Semi-structured interview	NA	NA	1. According to the author, some of the participants were in a state of disequilibrium at the time of the interview.
Prescott and Letko (1977)	Exploratory	Cross-sectional	UN	Survey questionnaire			
Frieze et.al. (1979)	Exploratory	Cross-sectional	UN	Structured interview	NA	NA	
Pagelow (1981)	Exploratory	Cross-sectional	Retrospective	Indepth interview, survey questionniare, participant observation.	UN	UN	1. Addressed on p.240
Harris (1988)	Exploratory	Cross-sectional	Retrospective	Time-line interview procedure	Participants were contacted by a member of the shelter staff and aksed to take part in a follow-up interview.	NA	1. Interviews were lengthy, some lasting for as long as 3 hrs.
Schulman (1979)	Exploratory	Cross-sectional	Retrospective	Structured telephone interview	Women contacted by an expert for a telephone interview.	1. Quality design questionnaire. 2. Unusually high quality of survey administration. 3. Strict supervision of interviewers. 4. Careful selection and training of interviewers. 5. Pilot study. 6. Expert "refusal converters."	1. Hired-hand research. 2. 18% of all completed interviews resulted from a recontact at another time.
Grayson and Smith (1981)	Exploratory	Cross-sectional	Retrospective	Newspaper and agency questionnaire	Questionnaire distributed and collected from many different sources.	NA	1. No definition of battering. 2. Different Questionniares used. 3. Multiple sources for which the questionnaires were distributed and collected from.

Pahl (1985)	Exploratory	Longitudinal	Prospective and Retrospective	Interviews using structured and standardized questionnaires	Women interviewed a few days after they arrive at the refuge, and a second interview, two years later.	NA	
Bowker (1983, 1984)	Exploratory	Cross-sectional	Retrospective	In depth interviews	Subjects recruited thru newspaper advertisements, television and radio, and personal presentations, posters, and word of mouth. Subjects called in for an interview.	1. Interviewer used combinations of probing, repeated questions, and reconciling inconsistencies to minimize problem of recall. 2. Round-the-clock contact line. 3. Subject given choice of interview location. 4. Anonymity and confidentiality stressed.	1. 2 cases dropped out because of vague information. 2. There were only 12 occasions where the subject never showed for an interview.
Bowker (1985, 1988)	Exploratory	Cross-sectional	Retrospective	In depth interviews and Survey questionnaire			1. Two different sampling methodology's used. 2. 87% response rate to questionnaires.
Chalmers and Smith (1988)	Exploratory	Longitudinal	Retrospective	Interview	NA	NA	
Thoennes (1981)	Hypotheses	Cross-sectional	Retrospective and Concurrent	Structured interview with open and closed ended questions	Prescreened battered women call to arrange interview.	1. Expert interviewers. 2. Pretested interview schedule. 3. Problems of recall considered. 4. Assurance of anonymity.	1. Prescreening could have eliminated battered women. 2. Interviewers sometimes sensed reluctance on the part of the subjects to discuss specific issues (such as child abuse). 3. Volunteers earned $24.
Hofeller (1982)	Hypotheses	Cross-sectional	Retrospective and Concurrent	1. Tape recorded open ended interview and questionnaire (battered group). 2. Mail questionnaire or telephone interview (non-battered	Administration of tape-recorded to battered women and control group.	1. Interviews were ordinarily 1.5 hrs long. 2. The subjects were not paid for their participation.	1. Setting of interview unclear. 2. Women in the experimental group answered the questionnaire at the end of the interview. Comparison subjects were either sent the material by mail or questionned over the telephone.

				group).			
Kerr (1982)	Exploratory	Cross-sectional	Retrospective (violence) and Concurrent (social support)	Structured interviews	Appointment set for an interview in a choic of setting.	1. Women warned before had that the interview would take 2 hrs. 2. Assurance of confidentiality. 3. Choice of interview location.	1. Average interview time was 2hrs and 20 min. Range was 1.5 to 3 hrs and 40 min.
Smith (1982)	Hypotheses	Cross-sectional	Concurrent	Questionnaire	Questionnaires distributed by hand to clients, by metal health officials to clients; clients returned them by mail.	1. 45 min, to complete the questionnaire.	1. 50 questionnaire packets accepted, only 28 completed and returned. 56% response rate.
Heggie (1986)	Hypotheses [p.55-6]	Longitudinal-Panel (Stay/ Not Stay)	Retrospective (violence) and Concurrent (social support)	Structured questionnaire	Completion of questionnaire in clinical setting. Follow-up 3-4 mo.s later over the telephone.	1. Care was taken to protect women at follow-up.	1. 69% of the original participants could be reached at follow-up. 2. Multiple test administrators. 3. Each woman was not given the tests under the same situaitons (single interview and group self-administration.)
Alcorn (1984)	Exploratory	Longitudinal	Prospective and Retrospective	Interview	Interview data collected prior to the women's shelter and following shelter life.	1. Pre-test with women in shelter. 2. Inter-rater reliability checked.	1. 11 of the follow-up interviews were conducted over the telephone. 2. 31/40 (77.5%) participated in the second interview. 3. Modification of ASSIS following Pre-test. 4. Follow-up interview ranged from 6 to 28 weeks because women were difficult to find.
Mitchel and Hodson (1983, 1986)	Exploratory	Cross-sectional	Retrospective (one month before they left thier partner)	Questionnaire packet	Respondents completed questionnaire packet.	1. Questionnaire package completed within 1 week after arrival at shelter.	1. 81% of respondents asked to participate in the study did so [p.636] 2. Procedures unclear.
Butehorn (1985)	Hypotheses	Longitudinal (return/not return)	Retrospective (six months) and concurrent	Open-ended interview butressed with the completion of several clinical scales	Interviews conducted in one of hte counselling offices at the shelter. A follow-up telephone interview conducted 3 mo.s later.	1. Interview lasted 1.5-3 hrs. 2. Subjects were gathered as soon as they entered the shelter.	1. No control for factors between T1 and T2 (follow-up) that may have led women to return. 2. Respondents given $20. 3. 3 mo. longitudinal.

							4. Difficulties with follow-up.
Limandri (1985)	Exploratory	Longitudinal and Cross-sectional	Retrospective and Concurrent	Interview	Taped interview by researcher and questionnaire completion	1. Screening procedures. 2. Follow-up interview with interested participants to seek their interpretation of the data. 3. Pre-test interview schedule on 3 different groups. 4. Pilot study.	1. Some deviations from the set procedures for 3 women. 2. Average interview to two hrs. Interviews ranged from 1-6 hrs. 3. The author noted (p.157) that her sample might not have the lower self-esteem that battered women should have because it was a long time after they had left the relationship.
Parle (1985)	Hypotheses	Cross-sectional	Retrospective	Interview with questionnnaire	Interviews conducted in the MNCMHC office and some in participants homes	1. Screening procedures. 2. No offer of recompense. 3. Represent-ativeness of sample cross-checked with the 1980 census. 4. Pilot of questionnnniare. 5. Examination for omissions and errors before the client left the room.	
Brecker (1987)	Hypotheses	Experiment	Concurrent	Paper-pencil instruments and questionnnaire	Administration of instrument by researcher	1. Women recruited 1 week after entering shelter.	1. No description of experimental set-up.
Firestein (1987)	Hypotheses	Cross-sectional	Retrospective	Questionnaire	Subjects signed up and reported to a room to answer a questionnaire on an opscan sheet.	1. One hour completion of questionnaire.	1. Subjects given course credit. 2. Subjects tested in groups of 30-70 people. 3. Measures of current psychological state.
Mead-Ramrattan, Cerre' and Porto (1980)	Hypotheses	Cross-sectional	Retrospective	Questionnaire	1. Verbal administration of questionnaire by various groups.	1. Comparison with 1976 National Census data.	1. "Abuse" referred to any physical contact which was not desired by the recipient. 2. 43.5% response rate. 3. Questionnaire administed by numerous groups and individuals which provide services for abused and battered women.
Flynn (1977)	Hypotheses	Cross-sectional	Retrospective	In depth	14 victims were	NA	1. Unknown interviewer

				interviews and secondary reports	interviewed face-to-face following contact from agency person. 19 professionals provided secondary reports.		or lenght of interview. 2. The victims interviewed tended to be more often of a higher economic and educational level.
Kuhl (1982)	Exploratory	Cross-sectional	Retrospective and Concurrent	Interview with questionnaire	One hour intake interview by program worker. Forms collected and sent to researcher.	1. Completion of the interview took 1 hr on average. 2. Trained intake interviewers.	1. Refusal rate unreported.
Labell (1979)	Exploratory	Cross-sectional	Retrospective (violence) and Concurrent	Intake and departure forms	UN		1. Information on many intake and departure forms was incomplete. 2. Ambiguous questions. 3. Different interpretations of violence. 4. Intake and departure forms modified during the study period.
Church (1984)	Exploratory	Longitudinal and Cross-sectional	Retrospective	Interview and schedule	Women contacted support group. Short time later, follow-up telephone interview. One year later, women invited to the refuge for second follow-up interview.	1. Interview schedule was piloted and revised five times using battered women. 2. Interviews conducted by a single interviewer. 3. Women knew the interviewer before hand which made them feel comfortable.	1. Nine of the interviews were conducted over the phone. 2. Interviews took 3.5 hrs to complete. Range was from 2.5 to 6 hrs. 3. A number of the participants found the interviews distressing. However, none of the subjects terminated their interview. 4. 70% response rate.
Hoff (1984)	Working Hypotheses	Longitudinal and Cross-sectional	Retrospective and Concurrent	Participant observation, structured in-depth interviews, personal diary material and poetry, structured questionnaires.	Participant observation with women 8-12 mo. after leaving the shelter. Contexts included general mealtime, mother-child interaction, entertainment, interaction with social network members.	1. Life history approach to battering. 2. Researcher was informed by many sources. 3. 6mo. getting acquainted phase in shelter.	1. Interviews in authors home, interviewees home, homes of relatives, coffee shop, and the shelter. 2. 40% drop out rate.
Beauparlant (1987)	Exploratory	Cross-sectional	Retrospective (violence) and Concurrent (support)	Observation, interviews, and document analysis	Tape recorded formal and informal interviews, participant observation in	1. Follow-up interview where participant would respond to the author's report	1. Rejected by a number of male-support groups. 2. Difficulties in contacting other interviewees such as

					shelters and male support groups	of observations and interpretation of his or her interaction and participation. It allowed for completion and clarification.	welfare agents.
Steiner (1987)	Hypotheses	Cross-sectional	Concurrent	Interview	Interview conducted in a private room in a relaxed atmosphere.	1. Skilled, trained interviewers 2. Expertly developed Needs questionnaire. 3. Pre-test. 4. Interviews 1-1.5 hrs. 5. Interviews began when women arrived at shelter. 6. Interviews done in private room, and relaxed atmosphere.	1. The interview process was difficult and prolonged
Bhamik (1988)	Hypotheses	Cross-sectional	Retrospective and Concurrent	Interview with questionnaire	Battered women approached within 2 or 3 days of entering shelter. Verbal administration of questionnaire items by the researcher.	1. Pilot study with 5 interviewees from each of the shelters in the study. 2. Expertly constructed translations of interview schedules. 3. 1 hr completions of interview. 4. Cross-matching of questionnaire data with intake forms.	1. No indication of where the interview was administered. 2. The author suggested that her hypothesis was 'statistically proven' by the data (p.234). 3. Credentials of the interviewer not provided.
Gelles and Straus (1988)	Exploratory	Cross-sectional	Retrospective and Concurrent	Telephone Interview	Telephone interview using hired hand researchers	Published separately	Critical reviews.
Simko (1988)	Hypotheses	Experiment	Prospective	Interview with questionnaire	Interviews conducted by research staff at the Victim Services Agency neighborhood office nearest the complaintants police precinct.	1. Random assignment to experimental and control group. 2. Multiple means of contact used.	1. No mention of interviewer training. 2. Attrition minimized by excluding sample members with no address or telephone number. 3. Eight housholds excluded because their files could not be located by police

							precincts. 4. Very low response rate (8.6%).
Lockhart and White (1989)	Exploratory	Cross-sectional	Retrospective (violence) and Concurrent (demographic)	Questionnaire	UN	NA	
Pirog-Good and Stets (1989)	Exploratory	Cross-sectional	Retrospective (abuse) and Concurrent (age)	Survey questionnaire	UN	1. Separate survey administered to 75 undergraduates to gage serious-ness of violent tactics.	

Note. UN = Unclear; NA = Not Available.

TABLE 3: STATISTICAL METHODS AND MEASURES USED IN SOCIAL SUPPORT STUDIES ON ABUSED WOMEN.

Study	Type of Analysis	Data Analysis	Statistical Control	Comments
Rounsaville (1978-79)	Univariate	Descriptive		1. The author should have considred contingency analysis.
Dobash and Dobash (1979)	Univariate	Descriptive and Qualitative		
Gordeuk (1979)	Bivariate	T-tests, Chi-square (with Fisher's exact), Pearson product moment correlation		
Stachura (1979)	Univariate, bivariate	Descriptive, Chi-square		
Zimmerman (1979)	Bivariate	Kruskal-Wallis one-way ANOVA, Mann-Whitney U-Test	Two control samples	1. Non-parametric tests used becasue of small sample size, the possibility of a skewed sample, and the possibility of different variances (p.39)
Roy (1977)	Univariate	Descriptive		Many respondents gave more than one answer, and up to two responses were coded for each respondent (p.457 of table 1)
Carlson (1977)	Univariate	Descriptive		
Prescott and Letko (1977)	Univariate	Descriptive		
Frieze et.al. (1979)	Univariate, bivariate	Descriptive		1. p>.10 considered exceptable in this study.
Pagelow (1981)	Bivariate, multivariate	Correlation, Chi-square, Multiple regression, Descriptive, Spearman rho correlations	Resources, Institutional response, Traditional Ideology	1. Not all significant tests are included in the tables.
Harris (1988)	Bivariate	Chi-square, Cramer's V, descriptive.		1.Low numbers of cases in cells.
Schulman (1979)	Bivariate	Descriptive, Chi-square	Non-victim control group	
Grayson and Smith (1981)	Bivariate	Chi-square, Correlation		1. Significance of correlation reported, but no correlation. 2. Chi-square used, but only significance reported.
Pahl (1985)	Bivariate	Descriptive		
Bowker (1983, 1984)	Bivariate	Correlation and Tau b, Descriptive, FA		1. Subject to variable ratio too low for FA (p.119).

				2. Large correlation matricies and no control of the experimental-wise error rate. Begets inflation of Type I errors.
Bowker (1985, 1988)	Bivariate, Multivariate	Descriptive, correlation and Tau b, Stepwise DA		1. Low classification rate on DA
Chalmers and Smith (1988)	Bivariate	Descriptive	1. Geographic Location (Urban vs. Rural). 2. Cause/Effect (Then vs. Now)	[Must get hold of the larger study]
Thoennes (1981)	Bivariate	Descriptive, Pearson's r, Partial Correlations, Heirarchical Multiple Regressions, Student's t-Test	1. Religion (Protestents vs. Catholics) 2. Race. 3. SES. 4. Age. 5. Mobility Patterns.	1. [pp.68-9] Throughout pages 75-83, the author refers to relationships and testing but does not show this. at least one of his significance tests p>.10. (p.82), yet he calls it significant. 2. Analysis was on prospective data (p.65). 3. Ordinal data was treated like rank data (p.68). 4. Sometimes the author collapses two tables (e.g. p.93), and other times he treats them differently (e.g. p.107). There was no statistical testing on the latter. 5. There was little testing reported with the tables. 6. The author was unable to conduct analyses on certain things because her cell size was too small (e.g. p.113-4). 7. Some groups are excluded from analysis because of small sample size (p.76-7) 8. Significance tests accepted at 0.10 level (p.82) 9. Problems with empty cells. 10 Multiple regression coefficients shown (p,147) but no indication of independent effects.
Hofeller (1982)	Univariate, Bivariate, Multivariate	Multiple Regression, Cannonical Correlation, DA, Correlations, Chi-square.	Other Stressful Situations	1. R square inflated due to low subject to variable ratios. 2. Percent classification or variance overlap overestimated becasue subject to variable ratio not high enough.
Kerr (1982)	Univariate	Descriptive		
Smith (1982)	Univariate	t-Tests	Comparison of the currently battered sample with the ex-battered woman sample.	1. Empty cells in Phi analysis (no adjustment made)
Heggie (1986)	Bivariate, Multivariate	Hierarchical Regression Analysis, Chi-square		1. The author does not show her inter-correlation matricies. 2. Her R square's are inflated becasue of Type I errors due to low subject to variable ratios. Lacks alpha correction.
Alcorn (1984)	Bivariate	Chi-square, Fischer's Exact Test, t-Test (compare across time)		1. Low number of cases in cells. Contingency tables not shown. Occasionally Chi-Square accepted at the .05-.10 level.

				2. Alpha rate increased when campare T-tests between T1, T2, and T3. (from .05 to 0.1427). This type I error can be decreased by decreasing the level of significance or using MANOVA. If MANOVA is significant, can look at individual main effects tests. Multiple regression also possible since controls for alpha rate.
Mitchel and Hodson (1983, 1986)	Bivariate, Multivariate	Correlation, MANOVA, descriptive, hierarchical regression analysis		1. "Number of times battered" is a skewed variable, yet it is used as a continuous variable. 2. The author reported that due to small sample size that the number of singificant interaction terms found did not exceed that which would have been expected by chance.
Parle (1985)	Bivariate	Chi-square (with Yates correction), t-test		1. Collapsed tables due to small no.s of cases in contingency cells.
Butehorn (1985)	Bivariate	Chi-square, T-tests		1. Not all statistics reported with tables. 2. Cell sizes too small due to skewed sample. Very little support for hypotheses. Significance tests arbitrarily moved from .05 to .10. The author could not conduct some statistical tests because there were too few women (n=1,n=3) in the cells (p.94). 3. Multiple t-tests as predictors increases Type I error.
Limandri (1985)	Univariate, Bivariate	Qualitative analysis, Pearson Correlation, Forward Listwise Regression Analysis, One-Way ANOVA, T-tests.	Self-esteem, severity, role conflict, functional support on number of helpers.	1. Problems with coding data. 2. Increased Type I error with forward listwise regression analysis. 3. Subject to variable ratio exactly 10:1 in the regression analysis. 4. Sample was collapsed into too many groups, decreasing the significance in one-way ANOVA's (p.111). 5. Small cell sizes led to significant t-tests differences (p.111).
Brecker (1987)	Multivariate	MANOVA for repeated measures, Stepwise multiple regression, Correlation analysis		1. Large correlation matricies with no control of the experiment-wise error rate. Increase in Type I error. 2. Over time, explained variance contributions from independent variables went uncontrolled because not all of these variables were included in regression analysis. 3. Significance of R square and standardized Beta's unreported.
Firestein (1987)	Multivariate	Hierarchical Multiple Regression, Descriptive, Correlation, t-tests	Clinical Setting	1. Collapsed violence variable. 2. Large correlation matricies and no control of experiment-wise error rate.

				3. Skewed abuse variable. Log transformation failed to achieve normal distribution. Further analysis performed on the "violent" subsample. 4. R square inflated because of low subject to variable ratios. 5. Multiple regression analysis used on multiple dependent variables. Should have used cannonical correlation instead. 6. Rejection of null hypothesis at p=0.0551. 7. High correlations among independent variables leads to multicollinearity.
Ramrattan, Cerre' and Porto (1980)	Univariate	Descriptive		
Flynn (1977)	Univariate	Descriptive		1. Results were haphazardly reported.
Kuhl (1982)	Bivariate	Descriptive and Chi-Square		
Labell (1979)	Univariate	Descriptive		1. Because of sample size, there was much room for exploration of the data beyond it's univariate nature.
Church (1984)	Univariate, Bivariate	Descriptive (Quartiles), Correlational analysis		
Hoff (1984)	Univariate	Descriptive and Qualitative		
Beauparlant (1987)	Univariate, Bivariate (by gender)	Interpretive, descriptive	Samples matched on age, marital status, ethnicity, and income level	1. Conclusions drawn from non-recursive model. 2. Pairs of independent variables regressed on to Self Concept. No overall regression equation. 3. Significance tests unreported with regression analysis. 4. Significance achieved in Chi-square analysis because of many cells with fewer than five cases (p.40,44). No Fishers Exact test.
Steiner (1987)	Bivariate, Multivariate	Chi square, t-tests, Multiple Regression, Correlation analysis	Safety, Physiological, Social and Self or Self Concept	
Bhamik (1988)	Bivariate, Multivariate	Descriptive, t-tests, ANOVA, Multiple Regression, DA		1. In place of ANOVA, author should have used MANOVA to avoid alpha level inflation. 2. High multicollinearity among social support variables.
Gelles and Straus (1988)	Univariate	Descriptive		
Simko (1988)	Bivariate, Multivariate	Pearson's r, Phi square, ANCOVA, ANOVA,		

		hierarchical loglinear analysis	
Lockhart and White (1989)	Bivariate	Kendall's tau-B, Chi-square, ANOVA	
Pirog-Good and Stets (1989)	Bivariate	Probit Models (log-linear analysis)	1. Elimination of certain categories of data [p.118]

Notes. ANOVA = Analysis of Variance; ANCOVA = Analysis of Covariance; DA = Discriminant Analysis; FA = Factor Analysis; MANOVA = Multiple Analysis of Variance; DA = Discriminant Analysis.

TABLE 4: SUMMARY OF RELIABILITY AND VALIDITY OF RESEARCH INSTRUMENTS USED IN SOCIAL SUPPORT STUDIES ON ABUSED WOMEN

Study	Composite Instrument	Scales/ Indexes	Type of Reliability Reported	Source of Reliability	Type of Validity	Source of Validity	Comments
Dobash and Dobash (1979)	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	
Roy (1977)	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	
Carlson (1977)	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	
Prescott and Letko (1977)	Survey Questionnaire		Prestested (p.79)	Current study.	NA	NA	
Frieze et.al. (1979)		Degree of Helpfulness	NA	NA	NA	NA	
Pagelow (1981)	Survey Questionnaire		Pretested Twice	Current study.	Cross check of agency records and self-reports.	Current study	
Harris (1988)	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	
Schulman (1979)	Survey Questionnaire		Pretested	Current Study	NA	NA	1. Both Spanish and English versions were pretested on women in a correctional facility.
Grayson and Smith (1981)	Family Violence Survey (short and long formats)		NA				
Pahl (1985)	NA (p.27)		NA	NA	NA	NA	1. Two different instruments used.
Bowker (1983, 1984)	(p.24)		1. Probing 2. Repeating Questions (p.24)	Current Study Current Study	NA NA	NA NA	
Bowker (1985, 1988)	NA		NA	NA	NA	NA	
Chalmers and Smith (1988)	NA		NA	NA	NA	NA	
Thoennes (1981)	Interview Schedule		Pretested with 19	Current study.	NA	NA	1. Ambiguous time social support data collected.

			battered women				
Kerr (1982)	Interview Schedule		See Gorton, 1979 (p.21)	Previous study	NA	NA	
Smith (1982)	1. Questionnaire for "Staying" Women.		NA	NA	NA	NA	
	2. Questionnaire for "Leaving" Women.		NA	NA	NA	NA	
		16PF (Form A)	Test-retest	Previous Study	Factor Analytic Concept Validity Concrete Validity	Previous Study Previous Study Previous Study	
Heggie (1986)		1.SNAP	See Brown (1985)	Previous study	NA	NA	Adjustments were made to SNAP without retesting its reliability.
		2.CTS	Readmin-istration of Scale	4 mo. later	NA	NA	
		3.Behavioral Intimacy Scale	Readmin-istration of Scale	4 mo. later	NA	NA	
Mitchel and Hodson (1983, 1986)		1. Times Battered	Cronbach's alpha	Current study	NA	NA	
		2. CTS	NA	NA	NA	NA	
Butehorn (1985)	1. PRQ		NA	NA	NA	NA	
	2. Follow-up Interview		NA	NA	NA	NA	
		1. SLS	NA	NA	NA	NA	
		2. RFFPS	NA	NA	NA	NA	
		3. SES	NA	NA	NA	NA	
Firestein (1987)		1.CTS (Form N)	NA	NA	NA	NA	
		2.PSS	test-retest	Previous study	NA	NA	
		3.SES	test-retest	Previous study	NA	NA	
		4.SCL-90-R	test-retest	Previous study	NA	NA	
Mead-Ramrattan, Cerre' and Porto (1980)	NA		NA	NA	NA	NA	
Flynn (1977)	Four Separate Questionnaires		NA	NA	NA	NA	Questionnaire justification of lack of validity testing.
Kuhl (1982)	Domestic Violence Assessment Form		Pretest	Previous study (by author)	Construct Validity	Previous study	

Labell (1979)	Admission and Departure Forms		NA	NA	NA	NA	1. Ambiguity of some of the questions. (p.259) 2. Violence ambiguously defined. 3. Intake and departure forms were modified many times during the two years to reflect changes in growth and development of the shelter (p.259)
Hoff (1984)	1. Self Evaluation Guide. 2. Social Network Questionnaire.		Inter-rater (p.68) NA	Previous study NA	Face Validity (p.78) NA	Previous Study NA	1. Small problems (pp.79-80). 2. According to the author, the Self-Evaluation Guide included explict social, cultural, and physical elements that might influence a person's overall health status, and impact on violence in the lives of women over time. 3. Social Network questionnaire is an adaption of Norbeck's Social Support Questionnaire.
		Values Index	NA	NA	NA	NA	
		CTS	Straus, Gelles and Steinmetz (1980)	NA	NA	NA	
Bhamik (1988)		1.CTS (Form N)	1. Alpha coefficient	1. Previous study	1.a.Content validity, b. construct validity	1.a. Previous study, b. Previous study	1. No concurrent or discriminant validity available (p.89) for the TFI scale. 2. Reliability of the EI scale was determined following data collection.
		2. TFI Scale	2. Split-half	2. Previous study	2. Convergent validity	2. Previous study	
		3. SCL 90-R	3. split-half	3. Previous study	3. Discriminant validity	3. Discriminant validity	
		4. EI Scale	4. Face validity	4. Determined following data collection	4. NA	4. NA	
		5. SI Scale	5. NA	5. Determined following data collection	5. Face validity	5. Current study	
		6. MEI	6. Cronbach's alpha	6. Determined following data collection	6. Face validity	6. Current study	
		7. PIHSE Scale	7. Inter-item	7. Determined following data collection	7. NA	7. NA	
		8. PFHSE Scale	8. Inter-item	8. Determined following data collection	8. NA	8. NA	
		9. SA Scale	9. NA	9. Determined following data collection.	9. NA	9. NA	
Simko (1988)	Interview	NA	NA	NA	NA		1. PCA showed only one

	Questionnaire						dimension when there should have been two dimensions.
		1. SSI	1. NA	1. NA	1. Construct Validity	1. Current study	
		2. SES	2. Cronbacks alpha	2. Previous study	2. NA	2. NA	
		3. SCL 90-R	3. Cronbacks alpha	3. Previous study	3. NA	3. NA	
Pirog-Good and Stets (1989)		ASSIS	NA	NA	NA	NA	
Parle (1985)	Structured Interview-Questionnaire		Set conditions	Current Study	Pilot	Concurrance of Expert opinion	1. Reliability obtained by clear instructions, uniform testing conditions, and standardization of responses.
		1. SI-A	1. Split-half	1. Current study	1. Content	1. Previous study	1. The SI-A is a modified version of Deans Social Isolation Scale.
		2. ATW	2. NA	2. NA	2. Factor Analytic	2. Previous study	2. Modified CTS used without retesting reliability or validity.
		3. SI-B	3. NA	3. Current study	3. Content	3. Concurrance of Expert opinion	
		4. CTS	4. Cronbacks alpha	4. Previous study	4. Concurrent, Content	4. Previous study	
Brecker (1987)	Demographic Survey	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	
		1. CI -- Part A	1. Alpha	1. Previous study	1. NA	1. NA	
		2. CI -- Part B	2. NA	2. NA	2. NA	2. NA	
		3. CI -- Part C	3. NA	3. NA	3. NA	3. NA	
		4. CI -- Part D	4. NA	4. NA	4. Content	4. Factor Analytic	
Hofeller (1982)	Interview Schedule		NA	NA	NA	NA	
	Questionnaire A		NA	NA	NA	NA	
	Questionnaire B		NA	NA	NA	NA	
	Questionnaire C		NA	NA	NA	NA	
Beauparlant (1987)	Research Guide I		NA	NA	NA	NA	
	Research Guide II		NA	NA	NA	NA	
	Data Sheet Guide		NA	NA	NA	NA	
Steiner (1987)	A. Demographics Questionnaire		A. NA	A. NA	A. NA	A. NA	1. "Needs Questionnaire" based on interviews with (1) battered women, (2) lower-middle class women, and (3) middle-class women.
	B. Needs Questionnaire		B. Test-retest	B. Current study	B. Content	B. Current study	
		1. CTS	1. Alpha	1. Previous study	1. Concurrent, Construct	1. Previous study	

		2. TSCS	2. Test-retest	2. Previous study	2. Content	2. Previous study	
Limandri (1985)	Help-seeking Interview Guide		NA	NA	Pilot	Current	1. Help-seeking Interview schedule constructed for this study.
		1. CTS	1. Alpha	1. Previous study	1. Construct, Concurrent	1. Previous study	
		2. SES	2. Test-retest	2. Previous study	2. NA	2. Previous study	
		3. NSSQ	3. Test-retest	3. Previous study	3. Construct, Concurrent	3. Previous study	
Stachura (1979)	1. Questionnaire (English Version) 2. Questionnaire (Spanish Version)		1. Pretested 2. Pretested	1. Current study 2. Current study	1. NA 2. NA	1. NA 2. NA	
Zimmerman (1979)	Demographic Questionnaire		NA	NA	NA	NA	
		1. DAS	1. Split-half	1. Previous study	1. NA	1. NA	
		2. CTS	2. NA	2. NA	2. NA	2. NA	
Gordeuk (1979)	Questionnaire		Test-retest	Current study	Content Validity	Previous study	
		1. SES	NA	NA	NA	NA	
		2. DAS	NA	NA	NA	NA	
		3. TFIS	NA	NA	NA	NA	
		4. VS	NA	NA	NA	NA	
Alcorn (1984)	Shelter Interview		Test-retest	Previous Study	NA	NA	
		ASSIS	Test-retest	Current Study	NA	NA	
Church (1984)	Interview Schedule (Form M, M-S)		Piloted and revised five times	Current Study	NA	NA	
Rounsaville (1978-79)		1. CES-D	NA	NA	NA	NA	
		2. SAS	NA	NA	NA	NA	
		3. RLE	NA	NA	NA	NA	
Lockhart and White (1989)	Questionnaire		NA	NA	NA	NA	
		1. CTS-HWV	1. Alpha	1. Previous study	NA	NA	
		2. CTS-WHV	2. Alpha	2. Previous study	NA	NA	
		3. HOI	3. NA	3. NA	NA	NA	
Gelles and Straus (1988)	Interview Questionnaire	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	

Notes: ASSIS = Arizona Social Support Inventory Schedule; ATW = Attitudes Towards Women Scale; CES-D = The Center for Epidemiological Studies Depression Scale; CI = Coping Inventory; CTS = Conflict Tactics Scale; DAS = Deans Alienation Scale; EI = Ethnic Identity; GSI = Global Severity Index; HOI = Hollingshead Occupational Index; HWV = husband-wife-violence; MEI = Marital Equality Index; NA = Not available; NSSQ = Norbeck Social Support Questionnaire; PCA = Principal Components Analysis; PFHSE = prior 'Formal Help-Seeking Efforts'; PIHSE = prior 'Informal Help-Seeking Efforts; PSS = Perceived Social Support; RLE = The Recent Life Events Scale; SA = 'Support Available'; SAS = Social Adjustment Scale; SES = Rosenberg Self-Esteme Scale; SI-B = Social Isolation Index; SNAP = Social Network Analysis Profile; SNL = Social Network List; SCL 90-R = The Symptom Check List 90-R; SI-A = Social Isolation Scale; SSI = Social Support Inventory; TFI = The Traditional Family Ideology; TSCS = Tennessee Self Concept Scale; VS = Violence Scale; WHV = wife-husband-violence.

TABLE 5: DATA SOURCES AND GENERATION PROCEDURES USED IN THE IN SOCIAL NETWORK LITERATURE ON ABUSED WOMEN.

Study	N	Sampling Frame	Method of Sampling	Inclusion/Exclusion Criteria	Demographic Characteristics	Comments
Byrne (1979)	143	2143 Intact American Couples in 1976.	National three stage area-probability random sampling technique.	Eligibility: 1. Individuals between the ages of 18 and 65 years. 2. Living together with a member of the opposite sex as a couple. 3. Married or cohabitating couples. 4. Must have experienced violence in the last year.	(OVERALL SAMPLE REPORTED) The sample was reported to be representative of American families.	1.65% completion rate. 2. According to the author, comparison with census data has shown the sample to be representative of American families in terms of major demogrpahic characteristics. However, their survey contaied 37% ferer blacks than would be expected of a truly random sample of the US population.
	1040 (c)	(As above)	(As above)	As above except no. 4.	(See above)	
Kerr (1982)	20	Women in two battered women's shelters in two small southern cities. The women contacted within a 29 week period were either attending small group discussions at the shelter or who, at the time, were working with a volunteer advocate.	Purposive accidental sample.	1. Participants must be over 16 years old. 2. Participants must have suffered bodily injury from one or more physical attacks by a past or present or any other male with whom she lives or has lived if married.	1. Mean age was 35 years of age. Age range was from 19-59 years of age. 2. 80% were white, and 20% were black. 3. 45% were married, 5% were divorced, and 50% were separated. 4. Average education was 12.25 years. Subjects had completed between 8-17 years of education. 5. 40% were housewives, 50% were working full-time. and 10% were working part time. 6. Average family income was $9,315.00. 7. Average no. of children=2.85. Range in no. of children=0-7.	1. Based on small sample. 2. Demographic data was prospective ly gathered for retrospective incidents.
Cazenave and Straus (1979)		Randomly generated 547 member subsample of 2143 intact American Couples in 1976.	National three stage area probability ramdom sampling.	Eligibility: 1. Individuals between the ages of 18 and 65 years. 2. Living together with a member of the opposite sex as a couple. 3. Married or cohabitating couples.	The author noted that the sample corresponded to census data on American couples.	1. According tp the author, a subsample of white respondents was used becase of complications and costs involved in working with the entire sample on the computer which was available.

				4. The women who experienced violence, must have experienced the violence in the last year.		
Heggie (1986)	87	Battered women in shelters located in Los Angeles, Riverside, and Orange counties, as well as battered women in outreach groups associated with shelters, and women referred by therapists and temporary restraining order clinics.	Purposive accidental and volunteer sample.	1) Women must have experienced physical abuse within the past six months and 2) have lived with the abuser for a period of at least a month. NA	54% were white, 20% were black, 22% were hispanic, and 4% belonged to other ethnic groups.	1. Unclear method of sampling. 2. 69% response at follow-up.
Griffin (1984)	31	Currently battered clients of of one of six agencies in Northern California providing services for battered women.	Purposive volunteer sample.	1. Participants must be clients of battered women's agencies who had been physically or psychologically abused at least twice by a man with whom they had lived. 2. Currently living with her abuser or living in a shelter for less than a month.	1. Average age was 30.55 years. 2. 67.7% white, 9.7% black, 22% other 3. 54.8% married. 4. 25.8% completed high school, 58.1% had post high school training. 5. 35% were employed. 6. 78% had a monthly income of less than $600 7. 26% did not have children. Mean=1.6.	1. Five battered women participants were excluded from the study because their questionnaires were incompleted or incorrectly answered and additional follow-up with these participants were excluded from the study because of incomplete questionnaires and one was excluded from the study because she had on-goin contact with her abuser for the purpose of reconciliation. 2. According to the author, the women in the battered and ex-battered group were highly comparable on age, ethnicity, marital status, and number of children. 3. The battered woman sample was conprised of women who were still living with their batterers as well as women who had recently left their abusers and were living in a battered woman shelter for less than a month. The author believes that this collapse of two samples may have confounded her results.
	31(c)	Former battered clients of one of the above six agencies in Northern California.	Purposive volunteer sample.	1. Participants must be clients of battered women's agencies who had been physically or psychologically abused at least twice by a man with whom they had lived. 2. Must have lived in a separate houshold from the batterer for a period of three months or more, and who did not have phone or personal contact with them except for the purpose of settling conditions of their separation.	1. Average age was 29.65 years. 2. 67.7% white, 19.4% black, 12.9% other. 3. 51.6% married. 4. 41.9% completed high school, 48.4% had post high school training. 5. 32.3% were employed. 6. 70.0% had a monthly income of less than $600. 7. 7% did not have children. Mean=1.6.	
Beauparlant (1987)	10	Battered women from a shelter	Purposive accidental sample	NA	1. 50% married to their abusers, 40% common law 2. 30% had completed high school 3. 100% unemployed with	

					incomes ranging between $3,600 and $8,400 per year.	
	10(c)	Abusive men from non-violent support groups	Purposive accidental sample	NA	1. 70% married 2. 70% had completed high school 3. 100% employed with incomes ranging between $12,000 and $40,000 per year.	
Wickson (1988)	21	The 1987 Greater Victoria phone book.	Random Sample of Battered Women	1) Females over 18 years of age, 2) which have been or are currently married or cohabitating with a man and 3) residing in Greater Victoria in 1987.	(OVERALL SAMPLE REPORTED)	1. 507 names drawn from a telephone book. Two-hundred women who agreed to participate were sent questionnaires. 112 responded (56% of 200). 2. The author did not give a complete breakdown of the reasons for nonresponse.
	91(c)	(As above)	Random Sample of Non-Battered Women	(As above)	(See above)	
Hoff (1984)	12	Women known to the state shelter and health networks, women in a shelter, and women known to University colleagues.	Purposive accidental and volunteer sample	NA	1. Age range was 19-49 years. 2. 66% were white. 3. Jobs included teaching english, legal secretary, word processing, house cleaning, and human service professionals. 4. 92% had a high-school diploma. 5. No. of children ranged from 0 to 6.	
Alcorn (1984)	40	Women in three shelters outside the Chicago metropolitan area over a 5 mo. period.	Purposive accidental sample	Women had to be 1) residing in a shelter for at least three days, 2) Stable enough to be interviewed, 3) willing to be interviewed.	1. 10% under 20, 52.5% were between 20-30 years of age and 35% were between 31-40 years of age, 2.5% 41-50. 2. 42% were Protestent, 37.5% were Catholic, 7.5% Jewish, 10% No preference, 2.5% Other. 3. 46% had not completed high school. 4. 70% had no income, 7.5% < $5000, 12.5% $5000-10000, and 10% 10000-20000. 5. 52.5% were married and living with their abuser, 30.0% were cohabitating, 7.5% married but separated, and 10% divorced. 6. No. children: 5% 0,	

					25% 1, 32.5% 2, 25% 3, and 12.5% 4 or more. 7. Length of relationship: 42% < 2 yrs, 27.5% 2-5 yrs, 17.5% > 5-10 yrs, 7.5% > 10-15 yrs, and 5% > 15 yrs.	
Brown (1985)	20	Atlanta police record information on violent relationships disseminated by the Domestic Violence network, Boston police records concerning violent relationships, and black women in abused relationships discovered accidentally. Inreviews were conducted between July and December 1984.	Purposive volunteer sample	Had to have been involved in romantic relationships in which they lived with their partners, married or unmarried, for at least 6 out of the last 12 months at the time of testing.	(OVERALL SAMPLE REPORTED) for female and male participants.	1. The orignial sample selection was modified due to several obstacles. 2. Five out of 300 couples responded to initial contact letters posted. 2 out of fifty couples volunteered as a result of door-to-door solicitation at police addresses given. Out of one-hundred and twenty-five potential subjects from the Domestic Crisis Intevention Unit, 14 subjects were recruited in Atlanta. 3. Male partners were included in the study depending whether the partner wanted them to be included or not. 4. Great difficult in trying to get women to volunteer. 6. Police records were innacurate. 6. Random selection of comparison sample from Atlanta telephone index was unsuccessful. 7. Incompetent police records (no names, only partial addresses, non-specific information on violence) from which subjects in Boston were drawn.
	20(c)	2. Black women and couples believed to fit the criteria of the study by community-based persons and personal aquaintences of the researcher.	Convenience volunteer sample	(As above)	(See above)	
Butehorn (1985)	29	Women in a battered womens shelter located in a suburb south of Boston.	Purposive accidental sample	(Note: Author had to alter restrictions on sample as she collected her data.)	1. Average age was 29.6 years. Range in age was 18-55 years. 2. Mean number of years of education was 12.7. 3. 97% had work experience, but only 31% were currently working. 4. Mean income for the family unit was $16000.	
McKenna (1985)	112	Women who sought help from four agencies in the San Francisco Bay Area, and women who responded to advertisements in local newspapers and newsletters of organizations in the Bay area, and through word of	Purposive accidental and volunteer sample.	Women had to 1) be 18 years of age or older, 2) able to speak and read English, 3) be self-defined as battered, and 4) report at least one physical assault by a cohabitating male.	1. 42.8% were 18-29 years of age, and 48.8% were 30-39 years of age. 2. 67.9% white, 16.1% black, and the remainer were either other ethnic groups or Native Americans. 3. 26.8% were Catholic, 29.5% were Protestent. 4. 30.4% were married, 20.5% were divorced,	1. No accurate count of the number of women who responded negatively to the solicitation for subjects (p.37). Of the over 190 women who responded to the solicitation of subjects, 60.5% were interviewed. 2. Age categories unequal.

		mouth in the researchers' professional and personal networks.			34.8% were separated, and 12.5% were never married. 5. 13.4% had never completed high school, 37.5% had 1-3 years f college, 17% were college graduates, and 2.7% had professional degrees. 6. 40.5% were clerks or sales/technicians, and 32.4% were semi-skilled laborers. 7. Household income: 17.2% $5000-9999, 28.3% 10000-19000, 13.1% 20000-29000, 16.1% 30000-39999, and 20.2% 40000 or more. 8. Using the Hollingshed index of social class, 14.4% were class II, 41.5% class III, 37.8% class IV, and 6.3% class V.	
Jewell (1986)	25	White battered women in a shelter in Lower Westchester County, New York.	Random Sample of white women from a shelter	1) Women had to be between the ages of 20 and 40, have been married or lived in a monogamous relationship for at least one year, and 2) and have never had psychiatric hospitalization.	1. Average age was 28.08 years. Age range was 20-38 years. 2. Average years at school was 12.44 years. Range of schooling was 10-16 years. 3. Mean yrs married=5.2, range=1-12. 4. Occupation (4 pt. scale)=1.8, range=1-4. 5. Religion (4 pt. scale)=1.48, range=1-3.	1. Occupation and religion reported in terms of numerical scores. 2. Unclear why the control group is from a gynecological clinic.
	25	Black battered women in a shelter in Lower Westchester County, New York.	Random Sample of black women from a shelter	(As above)	1. Average age was 27.72 years. Age range was 21-37 years. 2. Average years at school was 11.32 years. Range of schooling was 8-14 years. 3. Mean yrs married =6.04, range=2-17. 4. Occupation (4 pt. scale)=1.48, range=1-4. 5. Religion (4 pt. scale)=1.6, range=1-3.	
	25(c)	White non-battered women who were making routine appointments in the gynecology clinic at	Random sample of white women attending a gynecology clinic	(As above)	1. Average age was 28.24 years. Age range was 21-38 years. 2. Average years at school was 11.84 years.	

	a large municipal hospital.			Range of schooling was 8-16 years. 3. Mean yrs married =5.92, range=1-14. 4. Occupation (4 pt. scale)=1.78, range=1-4. 5. Religion (4 pt. scale)=1.68, range=1-2.
25(c)	Black non-battered women who were making routine appointments in the gynecology clinic at a large municipal hospital.	Random sample of black women attending a gynecology clinic	(As above)	1. Average age was 26.84 years. Age range was 20-36 years. 2. Average years at school was 11.44 years. Range of schooling was 8-14 years. 3. Mean yrs married =5.44, range=1-11. 4. Occupation (4 pt. scale)=1.36, range=1-3. 5. Religion (4 pt. scale)=1.8, range=1-4.

Note. (c) = comparision group; NA = not available.

TABLE 6: RESEARCH DESIGNS USED IN SOCIAL NETWORK STUDIES ON ABUSED WOMEN.

Study	Purpose of Work	Design Type	Data Collection Period	Data Collection Method	Procedures	Reliability of Data Collection	Comments
Byrne (1979)	Hypotheses	Cross-sectional	Retrospective (violence) and Concurrent (demographic)	Structured Interview	NA	1. Interviews lasted between 45 min and one hr. 2. Interviews were structured in such a way that socially questionable behaviors could be reported in a non-threatening context.	1. Sixty-five percent completion rate. Sixty percent for metropolitan areas, and Seventy two point three percent for non-metropolitan areas. 2. Only intact couples interviewed. 3. Post-hoc creation of indicators due to secondary analysis of the data.
Kerr (1982)	Exploratory	Cross-sectional	Retrospective (violence) and Concurrent (network)	Structured Interview	Appointment set for an interview in a choice of setting.	1. Women warned before had that the interview would take 2 hrs. 2. Assurance of confidentiality. 3. Choice of interview location.	1. Average interview time was 2hrs and 20 min. Range was 1.5 to 3 hrs and 40 min.
Cazenave and Straus (1979)	Exploratory	Cross-sectional	Retrospective and Concurrent	Structured Interview	NA	1. Interviews lasted between 45 min and one hr. 2. Interviews were structured in such a way that socially questionable behaviors could be reported in a non-threatening context.	1. Sixty-five percent completion rate. Sixty percent for metropolitan areas, and Seventy two point three percent for non-metropolitan areas. 2. Only intact couples interviewed. 3. Post-hoc creation of indicators due to secondary analysis of the data. 4. According to the authors, there are limitations involved in using only structural measures of network embeddedness.
Heggie (1986)	Hypotheses	Longitudinal - Panel (Stay/Not Stay)	Retrospective (violence) and Concurrent (network)	Structured Questionnaire	Completion of questionnaire in clinical setting. Follow-up 3-4 mo.s later over the telephone.	1. Care was taken to protect women at follow-up.	1. 69% of the original participants could be reached at follow-up. 2. Multiple test administrators. 3. Each woman was not given the tests under

							the same situaitons (single interview and group self-administration.)
Griffin (1984)	Hypotheses	Cross-sectional	Retrospective	Structured Questionnaire	Women ask to volunteer by agency staff. Agency staff administers questionnaire.	1. One hr to complete questionniare. 2. To monimize risk of discomfort, questionnaire administed by agency staff or volunteers who were trained in providing supportive counselling.	1. Women were eliminated (pp.67-8) 2. Procedures were poorly described: unknown setting.
Beauparlant (1987)	Exploratory	Cross-sectional	Retrospective (violence) and Concurrent (network)	Observation, interviews, and document analysis.	Tape recorded formal and informal interviews, and participant observation in shelters and male support groups	1. Follow-up interview where participant would respond to the author's report of observations and interpretation of his or her interaction and participation. It allowed for completion and clarification.	1. Rejected by a number of male-support groups. 2. Difficulties in contacting other interviewees such as welfare agents.
Brown (1987)	Hypotheses	Cross-sectional	Retrospective (violence) and Concurrent (network)	Interview questionnaire	Subjects interviewed in their own home. Couples were interviewed separately by different interviewers at the same time.	1. First 5-10 min of the interview was used to establish rapport with the subject. 2. Uses male and female subjects.	1. Used multiple subject selection procedures. 2. Some interviews were conducted ouside the house.
Wickson (1988)	Hypotheses	Cross-sectional	Retrospective (violence) and Concurrent (Networks)	Survey questionnaire	Subjects were solicited by phone, and then sent a questionnaire with a self-addressed envelope.	1. Respondents were given from ten days to two weeks to complete and return questionnaires.	1. No monitoring of incoming questionnaires. 2. No information on the development of the questionnaire or her new violence index. 3. Her hypotheses were not explored. Her "attitudes toward violence" index was not considered in the analysis.
Hoff (1984)	Working Hypotheses	Longitudinal	Retrospective and Concurrent	Participant observation, structured in-depth inter-	Participant observation with women 8-12 mo. after leaving the shelter.	1. Life history approach to battering. 2. Researcher was	1. Interviews in authors home, interviewees home, homes of relatives, coffee shop, and the

				views, personal diary material and poetry, structured questionnaires.	Contexts included general mealtime, mother-child interaction, entertainment, interaction with social network members.	informed by many sources. 3. 6mo. getting acquainted phase in shelter.	shelter. 2. 40% drop out rate. 3. Eighty one percent of respondents asked to participate in the study did so [p.636]
Butehorn (1985)	Hypotheses	Longitudinal (return/not return)	Retrospective (six months) and concurrent	Open-ended interview butressed with the completion of several scales.	Interviews conducted in one of the counselling offices at the shelter. A follow-up telephone interview conducted 3 mo.s later.	1. Interview lasted 1.5-3 hrs. 2. Subjects were gathered as soon as they entered the shelter.	1. No control for factors between T1 and T2 (follow-up) that may have led women to return. 2. Respondents given $20. 3. 3 mo. longitudinal. 4. Difficulties with follow-up.
Alcorn (1984)	Exploratory	Longitudinal	Prospective and retrospective	Structured Interview	Interview data collected prior to the women's shelter and following shelter life.	1. Pre-test with women in shelter. 2. Inter-rater reliability checked.	1. 11 of the follow-up interviews were conducted over the telephone. 2. 31/40 (77.5%) participated in the second interview. 3. Modification of ASSIS following Pre-test. 4. Follow-up interview ranged from 6 to 28 weeks because women were difficult to find.
McKenna (1985)	Hypotheses	Cross-sectional	Retrospective and concurrent	Interview and Questionnaire	Telephone screening and an interview set up.	1. Comprehensive pilot study on 22 formerly battered women. 2. Comparison of demographic data with other studies.	1. Modifications of procedures and questionnaire following pilot study.
Jewell (1986)	Hypotheses	Cross-sectional	Retrospective	Questionnaires	Staff at both the shelter and gynecological clinic informed women seeking these services that they might participate in a study. The women were given a questionnaire to complete.	1. 1.5 hrs to complete questionnaire. 2. Pilot study carried out on twenty women living in a large urban setting.	1. Very poor explanation of procedures and description of setting.

Note. ASSIS = Arizona Social Support Inventory Schedule; NA = Not Available.

TABLE 7: STATISTICAL METHODS AND MEASURES USED IN SOCIAL NETWORK STUDIES ON ABUSED WOMEN.

Study	Type of Analysis	Data Analysis	Statistical Control	Comments
Byrne (1979)	Bivariate	one-way ANOVA, two-way ANOVA		1. Secondary Data Analysis
Kerr (1982)	Univariate	Descriptive		
Cazenave and Straus (1979)	Bivariate	Descriptive, Chi-square	Race, Class, and Age	
Heggie (1986)	Bivariate, Multivariate	Hierarchical Regression Analysis, Chi-square		1. The author does not show her inter-correlation matricies. 2. Her R square's are inflated becasue of Type I errors due to low subject to variable ratios. Lacks alpha correction.
Griffin (1984)	Bivariate	two-tailed t-Tests, Pearson's r, Chi-square		1. Large correlation matricies with large correlations and no control of experiment-wise error rate. 2. Low number of cases in cells of contingency analysis. Chi-square test results were not reported.
Beauparlant (1987)	Univariate, Bivariate (by gender)	Interpretive, Descriptive	Samples matched on age, marital status, ethnicity, and income level.	
Wickson (1988)	Bivariate	Descriptive, Somer's D		1. Many cells were empty or had few cases in them. She should have collapsed the tables and used Fishers Exact Test. 2. Mostly nominal data therefore limited interpretation 3. Her violence measure was conceptually underdeveloped and inferrior to the CTS.
Hoff (1984)	Univariate	Descriptive and Interpretive		
Brown (1985)	Multivariate	Correlation, Hierarchical Multiple Regression, Multiple Linear Regression, t-tests		1. Explained variance in hierarchical multiple regression was not reported. 2. High predictor to subject ratios. Significance of multiple R was primarily the result of alpha inflation.
Butehorn (1985)	Bivariate	Chi-Square, t-tests		1. Not all statistics reported with tables. 2. Cell sizes too small due to skewed sample. Very little support for hypotheses. Significance tests arbitrarily moved from .05 to .10. 3. Multiple t-tests as predictors increases Type I error.

Alcorn (1984)	Bivariate	Chi-square, Fischer's Exact Test, t-Test (compare across time)	1. Low number of cases in cells. Contingency tables not shown. Occasionally Chi-Square accepted at the .05-.10 level. 2. Alpha rate increased when campare T-tests between T1, T2, and T3. (from .05 to 0.1427). This type I error can be decreased by decreasing the level of significance or using MANOVA. If MANOVA is significant, can look at individual main effects tests. Multiple regression also possible since controls for alpha rate.
McKenna (1985)	Bivariate, Multivariate	Canonical Correlations, Pearson Correlation, Descriptive	1. Large correlation matricies and no control of the experiment-wise error rate. Increase in type I error.
Jewell (1986)	Bivariate	two-way ANOVA, Kruskal-Wallis Test, Chi-square, Descriptive.	1. Use of ANOVA with multiple dependent variables which are correlated in some unknown way, increasing the experiment-wise error rate (alpha rate).

Note. ANOVA = Analysis of Variance; MANOVA = Multiple Analysis of Variance.

TABLE 8: SUMMARY OF RELIABILITY AND VALIDITY OF RESEARCH INSTRUMENTS USED IN SOCIAL NETWORK LITERATURE ON ABUSED WOMEN

Study	Composite Instrument	Scales/ Indexes	Type of Reliability Reported	Source of Reliability	Type of Validity	Source of Validity	Comments
Byrne (1979)	Questionnaire		NA	NA	NA	NA	
Kerr (1982)	Interview Schedule		See Gorton, 1979 (p.21)	Previous study	NA	NA	1. Hougue-Gorton Instrument adapted for battered women without testing (p.23)
Cazenave and Straus (1979)	Instrument Schedule		NA	NA	NA	NA	
		CTS	NA	NA	NA	NA	
Heggie (1986)		1. SNAP	See Brown (1985)	Previous study	NA	NA	
		2. CTS	NA	NA	NA	NA	
		3. BIS	Cronbach's alpha	Current Study	NA	NA	
Griffin (1984)	1. SNQ (Modified ASSIS)		NA	NA	NA	NA	
	2. SDQ		NA	NA	NA	NA	
		Ways of Coping Checklist	NA	NA	NA	NA	
Wickson (1988)	Relational Networks of women in Victoria		NA	NA	NA	NA	
		Attitides towards violence scale	NA	NA	NA	NA	
Hoff (1984)	1. Self Evaluation Guide.		NA	NA	NA	NA	
	2. Social Network Questionnaire.		NA	NA	NA	NA	
		Values Index	NA	NA	NA	NA	
		CTS	Straus, Gelles and Steinmetz (1980)	NA	NA	NA	
Brown (1985)	1. Personal Data Sheet		NA	NA	NA	NA	
		2. POMS	Test-retest	Previous study	Factorial, Face, Predictive, Construct	Previous study	

		3. SRE	Test-retest	Previous study	3. Construct	Previous study
		4. MAST	Test-retest	Previous study	4. Internal	Previous study
		5. TFI	Split-half	Previous study	5. Construct	Previous study
		6. FVS	Split-half	Previous study	6. Concurrent	Previous study
		7. AVI	Test-retest	Previous study	7. Construct, concurrent	Previous study
		8. SSQ	Test-retest	Previous study	8. Concurrent	Previous study
			Alpha	Previous study	9. Face,	Previous study
		9. CTS	Coefficients		Concurrent	
		10. M-C/SD Scale	Test-retest	Previous study	10. Concurrent	Previous study
Butehorn (1985)	1. PRQ		NA	NA	NA	NA
	2. Follow-up Interview		NA	NA	NA	NA
		1. SLS.	NA	NA	NA	NA
		2. RFFPS.	NA	NA	NA	NA
		3. SES.	NA	NA	NA	NA
Alcorn (1984)	Shelter Interview		Test-retest	Previous Study	NA	NA
		ASSIS	Test-retest	Current Study	NA	NA
Beauparlant (1987)	Research Guide I		NA	NA	NA	NA
	Research Guide II		NA	NA	NA	NA
	Data Sheet Guide		NA	NA	NA	NA
McKenna (1985)	Demographic and Personal Data Questionnaire.		Pilot Study	Current Study	Pilot Study	Current Study
		1. BMS.	NA	NA	NA	NA
		2. BSI.	NA	NA	NA	NA
		3. CTS.	NA	NA	NA	NA
		4. NSSQ.	NA	NA	NA	NA
		5. SSM.	NA	NA	NA	NA
Jewell (1986)	SNQ		Pilot Study	Current Study	Pilot Study	Current Study
		1. SCL-90.	NA	NA	NA	NA
		2. CTS.	NA	NA	NA	NA
		3. SNQ.	NA	NA	NA	NA

Note. ASSIS = Arizona Social Support Inventory Schedule; AVI = Approval of Violence Index; BIS = Behavioral Intimacy Scale; BMS = Bradburn Morale Scale; BSI = Brief Symptom Inventory; CTS = Conflict Tactics Scale; FVS = Family Violence Scale; MAST = Michigan Alcoholism Screening Test; M-C/SD = Marlowe-Crowne Social Desirability Scale; NA = not available; NSSQ = Norbeck Social Support Questionnaire; POMS = Profile of Mood States; PRQ = Personal Resource Questionnaire; RFFPS = Responsibility Fear Future Plans Scale; SCL-90 = Self-Report Symptom Checklist 90; SDQ = Socio-Demographic Questionnaire; SES = Self Esteem Scale; SLS = Staying Leaving Questionnaire; SNAP = Social Network Analysis Profile; SNQ = Social Network Questionnaire; SRE = Schedule of Recent Experience; SSM = Hirsch Support System Map; SSQ = Social Support Questionnaire; TFI = Traditional Family Ideology Scale.

TABLE 9: DATA SOURCES AND GENERATION PROCEDURES USED IN THE IN PERSONALITY STUDIES ON ABUSED WOMEN.

Study	N	Sampling Frame	Method of Sampling	Inclusion/Exclusion Criteria	Demographic Characteristics	Comments
Star (1978)	46	Women entering Haven House during the 12 month period from 1 May 1976 to 30 April 1977.	Purposive accidental sample	Self-reported physical abuse.	1. Mean age was 30 years. 2. 65% were white, 17% Mexican Americans, 11% black, 2% Asian, 4% other. 3. 35% Catholic, 35% Protestent, 2% Jewish, 2% Mormon, 2% other, 26% none. 4. Average no. children was 2.0.	1. Haven House gave priority to women of limited resources [Sampling bias favoring lower SES.] 2. Intake procedure varies depending on how full the facility is. (p.35) [Sampling Bias against nonemergency cases] 3. 140 women came to Haven House but only 70 agreed to participate in the study [Response Bias, p.33]. The final sample consisted of 58 women.
	12(c)	Women entering Haven House during the 12 month period from 1 May 1976 to 30 April 1977.	Purposive accidental sample	Self-reported non-physical abuse.	1. Mean age was 31.6 years. 2. 75% were white, 17% Mexican Americans, and 8% were black. 3. 25% were Catholic, 33% Protestent, 17% Jewish, 8% Mormon, 17% none. 4. Average no. children was 1.	
Star, Clark, Goetz and O'Malia (1980)	57	Women living in shelters located in southern California and Arizona, and women from out-patient programs in Los Angeles and the surrounding area. The study was undertaken from January to June 1977.	Purposive accidental sample	At least six months were spent in a marital or common-law relationship with men from whom they recieved severe, repeated, and demonstratable injury.	1. Mean age was 32 years. Age range was 17-54 years. 2. 70% were white, 12% black. 3. 42% were Protestent, 22% were Catholic 4. 65% had attended some high school, 28% had participated in academic or vocational programs beyond high school, and 7% did not progress beyond elementary school. 5. 80% were legally married, 20% were common-law or living with relationships.	1. Only 50/57 participants completed personality tests. 2. Length of stay in shelter is uncertain. 90% of the womne in the smaple were battered within three months prior to initiating the study, and the rest had been battered within the past year.
Hartik (1982)	30	Women referred from aquaintences and/or friends, and women responding to adver-	Volunteer battered women	1. Women who had been or were presently involved in a marital relationship, whether	1. Mean age was 33.6 yrs. 16.7% 16-25yrs, 30% 26-35yrs, 36.7% 36-45yrs, 10% 46-55yrs, and	1. Samples not matched. 2. 46 of the women were presently living with the batterer. 3. Posted dds and signs stated: "Are

	tisements in the local free press and advertisements in women's washrooms. All subjects were obtained within the San Bernardino County.		legal or common-law. 2. Adult females who had been beated on more than one occasion by their mates to the degree that medical attention was warrented or could be witnessed upon their person.	6.7% 56-65yrs. 2. 86% white, 3.3% black, 6,7% Mexican American, 3.3% Oriental. 3. 13% Catholic, 60% Protestent, 6.7% Jewish, 3.3% other. 4. 90% were high school graduates 5. 73% married, 6.7% divorced, 6.7% unmarried but living toegther. 6. 40% were unemployed /housewife, 46% were either secretarial, waitress, or laborer. 7. No. of children: 16.7% 0, 6.7% 1, 33.3% 2, 26.7% 3, 10% 4, 3.3% 5, 3.3% >5. Mean=2.7. 8. Family Income=10% $5000-6999, 36.7% 7000-9999, 33.3% 10000-14999, 13.3% 15000-19000, 6.7% 20000+.	you a battered wife? Call 862-2940. Confidential." Obviously, women who were battered but who did not consider themselves as battered probably did not respond.
30(c)	Women referred from aquaintences and/or friends, and women responding to advertisements in the local free press and advertisements in women's washrooms.	Volunteer non-battered women	1. Women who had been or were presently involved in a marital relationship, wither legal or common-law. 2. Never been battered by their husbands.	1. Mean age was 37.9 years. 10.0% 16-25yrs, 23.3% 26-35yrs, 26.7% 36-45yrs, 23.3% 46-55yrs, and 16.7% 56-65yrs. 2. 93% white, 3.3% black, 3.3% Mexican American, 10% Jewish, 3.3% other. 3. 16% were Catholic, 56% were Protestent, 10% Jewish, 3.3% other, 13.3% none. 4. 80% were high school graduates. 5. 70% were married, 13.3% divorced, 6.7% separated, 6.7% widow, 1% living together but unmarried. 6. 23% were unemployed/ housewife, 53% were either secretarial, witress, or laborer. 7. No. of children: 10.0% 0, 13.3% 1, 36.7% 2, 16.7% 3, 6.7% 4, 6.7% 5, 10.0% >5. Mean=2.4. 8. Family Income=3.3% $5000-6999, 40.0% 7000-9999, 30.0% 10000-14999, 20.0% 15000-19000, 6.7% 20000+.	

Mahon (1981)	11	Women referred from a victim advocacy program in a south-western city and a woman who responded to a classified advertisment.	Purposive volunteer sample	Every woman had to be: 1) either married, had a common-law relationship, or cohabitation with the abusing man, 2) had been involved in the abusive situation for one year or longer, 3) had been battered two or more times, demonstrating deliberate physical injury, and 4) was able to read English at a sixth grade level.	NA	1. Difficulty in obtaining subjects due to high number who had moved after their contract with the program, who refused to participate, or who were unable to be contacted for various reasons. (p.47) 2. Subjects from the Victim Advocacy program had sought help, possibly creating a sample selection bias.
Smith (1982)	12	Women currently in battering relationships identified by mental health professionals in one county in Pennsylvania, and by a social service agency and by mental health professionals in private practice in the same county. The study period was August thru February 1981-1982.	Purposive accidental sample	Participants had to be 1) currently legally married, 2) living with a physically abusive spouse, 3) was at least twenty-one years of age, 4) spoke and read the English language and had completed at least grade school education, and 5) had been physically abused by her husband at least one time.	1. 8% under 26yrs, 58% 26-35yrs, and 33% more than 35 yrs. 2. 42% high school or less. 3. Median yrs married was 11. 4. 66.3% were women without children. 5. Mean children = 1.67. 6. 58% working out of the home while married to the abusive spouse.	1. One of two voluntary community mental health centers was excused from participation. Three other social service agencies were contacted and asked to participate in the data collection process. Two refused (p.32) 2. Accurate count of distributed questionnaires was lost by one participating agency. At least 50 questionnaire packets were accepted by potential subjects, and 28 were completed and returned by mail.
	16(c)	Ex-battered women identified by mental health professionals in one county in Pennsylvania, and by a social service agency and by mental health professionals in private practice in the same county.	Purposive accidental sample	Participants had to be: 1) either divorced or had established a separate residence for one year or more from their abusive spouse, 2) was at least twenty-one years of age, 3) spoke and read the English language and had completed at least grade school education, and 4) had been physically abused by her husband at least one time.	1. 56% 26-35yrs, and 33% over 35 yrs. 2. 81% high school or less. 3. Median yrs married was 10. 4. 100% were women without children. 5. Mean children = 2.38. 6. 50% working out of the home while married to the abusive spouse.	
Gellen, Hoffman, Jones, and Stone (1984)	10	Residents of a South Florida Residential treatment center for distressed women.	UN	Participants should have been physically harmed by a conjugal partner.	1. Mean ages was 31 years. Age range was 19-42 years. 2. 80% white, 10% black, and 10% hispanic. 3. Married. 4. Primarily middle class.	1. An "abused woman" was defined as one who has been physically harmed by a conjugal partner. 2. The author notes that there was no control for severity of abuse. 3. No description of general population was given. 4. According to the author, the

	10(c)	Women from the general population.	UN	Participants should not be be physically harmed by a conjugal partner.	1. Mean ages was 31 years. Age range was 19-42 years. 2. 80% white, 10% black, and 10% hispanic. 3. Married. 4. Primarily middle class.	experimental group was matched with the control group on race, age ,and SES.
Arndt (1981)	30	Women in Wife Abuse Shelters throughout the State of Conneticut, the YMCA Abused Women's Shelter, Family Agencies in Fairfield County, private psycho-therapists in the Greater Bridgeport area, the Outpatient Department of the Greater Bridgeport Community mental Health Center, and Elmcrest Psychiatric Institute.	Purposive volunteer sample	Participants were women who 1) admitted to being physically battered, 2) were willing to participate in filling out a personality inventory, and 3) were willing to talk further about themselves and their abusive situation.	(DATA REPORTED FOR 18 OF 30 WOMEN WHO COMPLATED THE INTERVIEW) 1. Age range 21-52 yrs. Mean age=33 yrs. 2. 100% white. 3. 44.4% Catholic, 16.7% Protentent, 16.7% Episcopalian, 5.6% Jewish. 4. 33.3% married, 16.7% single, 5.6% widow, 22.2% divorced, 22.2% separated. 5. Length of relation-ships: 5-30 yrs, mean-16yrs. 6. 50% attended college, 44.4% graduated from high school, 5.6% had a bachelors degree, and 5.6% had a Masters degree. 7. Occupational histories included: waitress, secretary, bookkeeper, saleswoman, author, technician, guidance counsellor, office manager, etc. 8. Income range $4000-15000.	1. 'Physically battered' as used in this study, referred to some act of aggression by their male partner on more than one occasion. 2. Only 18 of 30 women completed the interview.
Back, Post and D'Arcy (1982)	30	Patients at the Colarado Psychiatric Hospital between 1975 and 1978.	Purposive accidental sample	Participants had to have a) a history of marriage or a in a relationship which they had lived with their male partner and 2) completed a MMPI test instrument at the beginning of hospitalization.	1. Mean age was 30.50 years. 2. 30% were currently married. 3. 47% did not complete high school, 53% had a high school diploma or higher. 4. 31% were currently employed. 5. Average no. children = 1.73.	1. 24 patients were excluded from the study because there was insufficient information about their relationships with men, 30 reported a history of battering by partners, and 62 reported no history of physical abuse. 2. Subjects were matched on age in some analyses.
	30(c)	Patients at the Colarado Psychiatric Hospital between 1975 and 1978.	Matched sample of non-battered women	(As above)	1. Mean age was 39.52 years. 2. 53% were currently married.	

					3. 16% had not completed high school, 84% had a high school diploma or higher. 4. Average no. children = 1.90.	
Wilson (1985)	16	Women residing in a spouse abuse shelter in a rural and suburban northeast section of Florida.	Purposive accidental sample	Participants must have 1) been presently battered or escaping another battering incident [eligibility for admission to shelter] and 2) entered the shelter for the first time.	1. Age range was from 20 to 50 years old. 2. 100% were white. 3. Variety of religious beliefs. 4. Lower to middle socio-econimic classes. 5. Most were legally married to their abuser. 6. Children range=2-3.	1. All subjects were in the shelter for the first time.
Charboneau (1986)	12	General population of the midwestern and western United States in the middle and lower income, non-shelter, non-crisis environment between January 1985 and February 1986 in the area of USD.	Purposive accidental sample	1. Currently battered.	1. Mean age was 33.75 years. Age range was 26-47 years. 2. 100% white. 3. Average education was 13.00 years. Education range was 12-16 years. 4. 91.7% were sharing home with batterer.	1. The sampling procedure was not discussed at all. 2. The research sample was from midwestern and western United States in middle and lower income, non-shelter, non-crisis environments in that eahc subject was living in her own home. 3. A common bond among the subjects was that they sought counselling from the author of the study or other USD students offering counselling in the counselling practicum and internship programs of the Educational Psychology and Counselling division at USD. 4. Lenght of time since battering for currently battered women: average=2mo.; range=1-6mo. Average for formerly battered women was 5.08 yrs; range=2-15yrs. 5. According to the author, demographic information (age, education, religion, earnings, race, and living arrangements) was used to help match and provide equivalence among the groups.
	12	General population of the midwestern and western United States in the middle and lower income, non-shelter, non-crisis environment.	Purposive accidenal sample.	1. Formerly battered.	1. Mean age was 31.25 years. Age range was 22-40 years. 2. 100% white. 3. Average education was 13.58 years. Education range was 12-17 years. 4. 100% not sharing home with batterer.	
	12(c)	General population of the midwestern and western United States in the middle and lower income, non-shelter, non-crisis environment.	Purposive accidental sample.	1. Non-battered women.	1. Mean age was 30.25 years. Age range was 21-43 years. 2. 100% white. 3. Average education was 15.5 years. Education range 13-17 years.	
Aviram (1981)	18	Respondents to ads in area newspaper "personal" columns, primarily neighborhood papers (Lerner and Pioneer Press publications).	Self-selected battered sample	Women beaten by husbands or boyfriends.	1. Mean age was 33.25 years. Age range was 25-54 years. 2. Wide range of ethnic groups and social classes.	1. Need for more demographic data to be reported. 2. The battered women were in different phases of the battering relationship. (p.23) 3. Subjects were matched on age and marital status. Chi-square analysis revealed that experimental and control groups did not differ singificantly on educational level, sex, and distribution of siblings, or religious preference. Other
	18(c)	University subject pool of a large mid-western urban university.	Matched (age and marital status) non-battered sample	NA	NA	

						tests revealed that the subjects dod not differ in occupation.
Follingstad (1980)	1	Single subject undergoing therapy.	Purposive accidental sample	NA	27 years of age.	
Rosewater (1988)	50	Battered women from Women Together (a battered women's shelter)	Purposive accidental sample	NA	(ONLY COLLAPSED AGE AND ETHNICITY DATA REPORTED FOR THE ENTIRE SAMPLE) 1. Age range=17-53. 2. 58 White, 54 Black, 4 Hispanic.	1. The authors definition of currently battered women was one who had been battered in the last year. Formerly battered women had not been battered for at least one year, but had been battered within the last two years. 2. All subjects were women who had sought refuge at shelters or other similar sources and were nearly all low-income women.
	29	Battered women from the Family Violence Program (aimed at early intervention with domestic violence cases)	Purposive accidental sample	NA	(See above)	
	27	Battered women from the Witness Victim Service Advocacy (aimed at victim advocacy)	Purposive accidental sample	NA	(See above)	
	12	Formerly battered women who had been clients of these agencies.	Purposive accidental sample	NA	(See above)	

Note. (c) = comparison group; MMPI = Minnesota Multiphasic Personality Inventory; NA = not available; SES = socio-economic status, USD = University of South Dakota.

TABLE 10: RESEARCH DESIGNS USED IN PERSONALITY STUDIES ON ABUSED WOMEN.

Study	Purpose of Work	Design Type	Data Collection Period	Data Collection Method	Procedures	Reliability of Data Collection	Comments
Star (1978)	Exploratory	Cross-sectional	Concurrent	Test battery and interview	Background information completed during initial intake period in shelter. HIG and 16PF instruments were distributed and collected by shelter staff during 3rd and 4th week of stay in the shelter. Interviews were arranged following collection.	The author noted that Form C of the 16PF was chosen because it was shorted (35-40 min completion time) and it used a lower vocabulary level. This was important since the shelter favored women of lower SES.	1. In three to four weeks of stay, personality traits may no longer reflect the response to battering. 2. There is little control over administration effects. 3. Unequal numbers of battered and non-battered women. 4. According to the author, because people other than the researcher were involved with the distribution and collection of instruments, the return rate for the instruments varried. 5. No violence data was collected. 6. Battered women participating in the study were at various stages of crisis when they arrieved at the shelter. 7. The two groups shared similar statistical means in the areas of age, height, weight, ethnicity, and birth order.
Star, Clark, Goetz and O'Malia (1980)	Exploratory	Cross-sectional	Concurrent	Test battery and interview	Personnel from shelters and agencies involved distributed and collected the research instruments and arranged interview appointments with the women.	(See above)	
Hartik (1982)	Hypotheses	Cross-sectional	Concurrent	Test Instrument	The researcher screened potential participants over the telephone. Each participant in individual sessions	1. Most participants completed the 2 questionnaires in less than 1.5hrs. 2. Hand-scores	1. Underdescribed procedures: e.g. the research setting.

					was asked to complete the questionnaires.	were tripple checked to ensure accuracy. 3. Emphasis was placed on the importance of responding to all question, choosing the response most likely to be chosen when the subject was not completely sure the description fit her.	
Mahon (1981)	Exploratory	Cross-sectional	Concurrent	Test Instrument	NA	1. Form C of the 16PF was used because it was the shortest form of PF test=25-30 min. to complete. 2. Form C contains a motivation distortion key, a check for subjects who want to create a good impression.	1. Assumption: personality traits might interact and contribute to physical violence in marriage (p.139) [Study design will not show this] 2. The test is appropriate only for those whose educational level if grade six or above.
Smith (1982)	Hypotheses	Cross-sectional	Concurrent	Test Instrument	Instruments given out and collected by mental health professions in the study.	1. Those battered wome nwho rejected the questionnaire also rejected the label "abused or battered wife." 2. Subjects were offered various settings in which to complete their questionnaire. 3. Approximately 45 minutes to complete the quesitonnaire.	1. Assumption of the research: traits might interact and contribute to the maintenance or disruption of the abusive marriage. 2. No control over test administration. 3. Procedures poorly explained. 4. 50 questionnaire packers accepted, only 28 completed and returned. This is a 56% response rate.
Gellen, Hoffman, Jones, and Stone (1984)	Hypotheses	Cross-sectional	Concurrent	Test Instrument	Oral administration of test instrument.	NA	1. Very poor discussion of test administration procedures. 2. Author concluded "Women in abusive relationships manifest to some extent, disordered personalities. Consequently, they must be treated in

							conjunction with the abuser to bring about changes in the relationship.
Arndt (1981)	Hypotheses	Cross-sectional	Concurrent	Test instrument and semi-structured interview	Test instrument administered in private offices and/or conference rooms.	1. Interviews held in a neutral setting. 2. 16PF test and the interview each took one hour to complete. 3. Lengthy discussion on the standardization sample.	1. Only 18 of 30 participants agreed to fill out the questionnaire, and 12 of 30 agreed to the follow-up interview.
Back, Post and D'Arcy (1982)	Hypotheses	Cross-sectional	Concurrent	Test instrument and interview	Test instrument administration at beginning of hospitalization.	1. Chart data on history of abuse was recorded by a medical student who was blind to predictors and group assignment.	1. Patients and families interviewed by 2nd yr psychiatry residents and clinical psychology interns.
Wilson (1985)	Exploratory	Cross-sectional	Concurrent	Test instrument and interviews	Administration of test instrument in a second inteview four days after entry into the shelter.	1. Cross-checks with demographic information from shelter intake forms and varification of abuse by older children (p.65) 2. When the resident had problems reading the measurement instruments due to injuries, the interviewer read the questions to her. 3. Interview and testing divided into two 2 hour periods. 4. Use of a method which allowed the woman to develop rapport and trust with the interviewer, so that intensely personal questions could be asked. 5. Used a structured interview	

						questionnaire previously described by Pagelow (1989). 6. All interviews were completed by the same researcher to maintain uniformity and to develop rapport and trust with each subject.	
Charboneau (1986)	Exploratory	Cross-sectional	Concurrent	Test Instrument	Administration of test-instrument in written form.		1. Poor explanation of procedures e.g. time to complete, setting of administration.
Aviram (1981)	Hypothesis	Cross-sectional	Concurrent	Test Instrument and questionnaire/structured interview	Following an appointment, administration of tests and interview schedule, typically in subject's home.	1. Each session lasted approximately 1.5hrs. Some control group sessions were often shorter, and some sessions with the battered women ran over 3 hrs.	1. According to Aviram, "it is possible that the apparent inconsistency arises from the fact that the tests are "present state" measures, but many women have changed in important ways [p.23, 25]. 2. Most subjects were interviewed in their homes, although some, for reasons of safety or convenience, preferred to meet at the experimenter's home or office at the university. 3. Many women had received counselling before being given the MMPI. 4. Only 3 of the 18 women remained with the batterer at the time of the interview.
Follingstad (1980)		Longitudinal	Prospective	Test Instrument	Test instrument completed during second therapeutic session, and again 9 months later.	NA	
Rosewater (1988)	Creation of a personality profile	Cross-sectional	Concurrent	Test Instrument	Women completed the test instrument as part of the intake forms for shelters.		

Note. NA = Not Available; UN = Unclear.

TABLE 11: STATISTICAL METHODS AND MEASURES USED IN PERSONALITY STUDIES ON ABUSED WOMEN.

Study	Type of Analysis	Data Analysis	Statistical Control	Comments
Star (1978)	Univariate	t-Tests, Chi-square, Gamma		1. No statistical control for unequal sample sizes. 2. Gamma's large because of small numbers of cases in cells. 3. The author occasionally ignores significance of t-tests and makes unscientific conclusions.
Star, Clark, Goetz and O'Malia (1980)	Univariate	Descriptive Significance tests	Comparison with normative sample.	1. Normative sample independent of community of origin
Hartik (1982)	Univariate	one way ANOVA, t-tests		
Mahon (1981)	Univariate	t-Tests	Comparison with raw scores established by the institute for Peronality and Ability Testing for the general population of adult females.	1. Nothing discussed by what is meant by the normative sample
Smith (1982)	Univariate	t-Tests, z-scores, Phi coefficient, Chi-square	Comparison of the currently battered sample with the ex-battered woman sample.	1. Empty cells in Phi analysis (no adjustment made).
Gellen, Hoffman, Jones, and Stone (1984)	Univariate	Fisher Exact Probability Test, one tailed t-Tests	Comparison of physically harmed sample with matched sample form the general population.	1. Fisher Exact Probability test used to determine whether the proportion of abused women with abnormally high scores on MMPI was significantly different from the proportion of women with high scores in the control group.
Arndt (1981)	Univariate	one tailed t-Tests	Comparison of physically harmed sample with matched sample form the general population.	
Back, Post and D'Arcy (1982)	Univariate, Bivariate	t-Tests, Stepwise DA, Chi-square	Comparison of battered and non-battered women.	1. No Protection of alpha level. Stepwise techniques are inappropriate becasue they give larger than normal significance tests.
Wilson (1985)	Univariate Bivariate	t-Tests, Pearsons r		
Charboneau (1986)	Bivariate	one way ANOVA, Scheffe' method of multiple comparisons	Comparison of currently battered women and formerly battered women with non-battered women.	
Aviram (1981)	Multivariate	MANOVA, ANOVA, FA, Chi-square analysis, Kolmogorov Smirnov test,	Comparison between battered and non-battered samples.	1. Only certain scales of the MMPI considered [biased analysis that if other scales were used, the author would have likly reached a different conclusion. 2. Sample size was too low to use FA and MANOVA because the subject to variable ratio was too low.

Follingstad (1980)	Univariate	Descriptive	Comparison of personality profile before and after treatment.
Rosewater (1988)	Bivariate	one-way ANOVA, Correlation	Comparison of personality profiles with a known population of adult females.

Note. ANOVA = Analysis of Variance; DA = Discriminant Analysis; FA = Factor Analysis; MANOVA = Multivariate Analysis of Variance; MMPI = Minnesota Multiphasic Personality Inventory.

TABLE 12: SUMMARY OF RELIABILITY AND VALIDITY OF RESEARCH INSTRUMENTS USED IN PERSONALITY STUDIES ON ABUSED WOMEN

Study	Composite Instrument	Scales/ Indexes	Type of Reliability Reported	Source of Reliability	Type of Validity	Source of Validity	Comments
Star (1978)		1.16PF (Form C)	Reliability coefficients	Previous Study	Direct Validities	Previous Study	
		2. HGI	Test-retest	Previous Study	NA	NA	
Star, Clark, Goetz and O'Malia (1980)	1. Background Information questionnaire.		NA	NA	NA	NA	
	2. Psychosocial Inventory.		NA	NA	NA	NA	
	3. Clinical Analysis Questionnaire (Part II)		NA	NA	NA	NA	
	4. Interview Schedule		NA	NA	NA	NA	
		16PF (Form C)	NA	NA	NA	NA	
Hartik (1982)		1.16PF (Form A)	Test-retest	Previous Study	Direct validity	Previous Study	
		2.TSCS	Test-retest	Previous Study	Content Validity	Previous Study	
Mahon (1981)		16PF (Form C)	Test-retest	Previous Study	Factor Analytic	Previous Study	
Smith (1982)	1. Questionnaire for "Staying" Women.		NA	NA	NA	NA	
	2. Questionnaire for "Leaving" Women.		NA	NA	NA	NA	
		16PF (Form A)	Test-retest	Previous Study	Factor Analytic	Previous Study	
					Concept Validity	Previous Study	
					Concrete Validity	Previous Study	
Gellen, Hoffman, Jones, and Stone (1984)		MMPI	NA	NA	NA	NA	
Arndt (1981)		16PF (Form A)	Test-retest	Previous Study	Direct Validity	Previous Study	
Back, Post and D'Arcy (1982)		1. MMPI	NA	Previous Study	NA	NA	
		2. DSMII	NA	NA	NA	NA	
Wilson (1985)	Pagelow's Structured Interview		Pretest	Previous Study	NA	NA	

	Questionnaire					
		1. MMPI	Test-retest	Previous Study	[pp.56-7]	Previous Study
		2. TSCS	(p.56)	NA	NA	NA
		3. ANS-IE	NA	NA	NA	NA
Charboneau (1986)		MMPI	Test-retest (p.53)	Previous Study	[p.54]	Previous Study
Aviram (1981)	"Intake" questionnaire (demographic data).		NA	NA	NA	NA
		1. MMPI	NA	Previous Study	NA	Previous Study
		2. Leary's Interpersonal Checklist	NA	Previous Study	NA	Previous Study
		3. Gough Adjective Check List	NA	Previous Study	NA	Previous Study
Follingstad (1980)		MMPI		Previous Study	NA	NA
Rosewater (1988)		MMPI	NA	NA	NA	NA

Note. ANS-IE = Adult Nowicki-Strickland Internal-External Control Scale; HGI = Buss-Durkee Hostility Guilt Inventory; MMPI = Minnesota Multiphasic Personality Inventory; NA = Not Available; 16PF = 16 Personality Factor; TSCS = Tennessee Self Concept Scale.

TABLE 13: Kinds of Inclusion/Exclusion Criteria Used in Social Support Studies on Abused Women.

KINDS OF CRITERIA	PERCENT REPORTED	N	N(Unpub)*
INJURY	0.0	0	0
DELIBERATENESS	0.0	0	0
KINDS OF ABUSE	7.1	3	3
SEVERITY OF ABUSE	4.8	2	2
RECENCY OF ABUSE	4.8	2	1
DURATION OF ABUSE	0.0	0	0
PHYSICAL ABUSE	35.7	15	10
FREQUENCY OF ABUSE	21.4	9	5
AGE REQUIREMENT	16.7	7	5
MARITAL STATUS	21.4	9	6
LENGTH OF RELATIONSHIP	7.1	3	3
ENGLISH LANGUAGE REQUIREMENT	4.8	2	2
NATIONALITY REQUIREMENT	2.4	1	1
EDUCATION REQUIREMENT	2.4	1	1
LIVING OR NOT LIVING REQUIREMENT	42.9	21	11
AREA REQUIREMENT	2.4	1	0
RELATIONSHIP KIND	9.5	4	1

*=maximum number of unpublished studies is 19.

TABLE 14: Kind of Demographic Factors Reported in Social Support Studies on Abused Women.

DEMOGRAPHIC FACTOR	PERCENTAGE REPORTED	N	N(Unpub)*
AGE	66.7	28	12
Mean	31.0	13	5
Range	28.6	12	7
Categories	35.7	15	5
CLASS	7.1	3	1
ETHNICITY	40.5	17	8
RELIGION	19.0	8	4
MARITAL STATUS	45.2	19	5
EDUCATION	54.8	23	13
Mean	14.3	6	3
Range	7.1	3	1
Categories	38.1	16	10
EMPLOYMENT	35.7	15	6
LIVING WITH BATTERER	14.3	6	3
INCOME	40.5	17	11
Mean	11.9	5	3
Range	7.1	3	3
Categories	26.2	11	7
OCCUPATION	33.3	14	5
PRESENCE OF CHILDREN	40.5	17	8
Mean	23.8	10	3
Categories	23.8	10	5
YEARS MARRIED	14.3	6	5

*=maximum number of unpublished studies is 19.

TABLE 15: Kinds of Statistics Used in Social Support Studies on Abused Women.

KINDS OF STATISTICS	PERCENT REPORTED	N	%PUB	N*	%UNPUB	N**
DESCRIPTIVE	64.3	27	42.9	18	21.4	9
CONTINGENCY TABLES	38.1	16	14.3	6	23.8	10
PEARSON CORRELATION	35.7	15	19.0	8	16.7	7
T-TESTS	23.8	10	0.0	0	23.8	10
REGRESSION	23.8	10	7.1	3	16.7	7
OTHER MULTIVARIATE TESTS	19.0	8	11.9	5	7.1	3
ANOVA	11.9	5	2.4	1	9.5	4
NONPARAMETRIC CORRELATION	7.1	3	7.1	3	0.0	0
NONPARAMETRIC TESTS	2.4	1	0.0	0	2.4	1
MULTIWAY TABLES	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0
TOTAL		95		44		51

*=Published
**=Unpublished

TABLE 16: Kinds of Inclusion/Exclusion Criteria Used in Social Network Studies on Abused Women.

KINDS OF CRITERIA	PERCENT REPORTED	N	N(Unpub)*
INJURY	0.0	0	0
DELIBERATENESS	0.0	0	0
KINDS OF ABUSE	23.1	3	1
SEVERITY OF ABUSE	7.7	1	1
RECENCY OF ABUSE	23.1	3	2
DURATION OF ABUSE	7.7	1	0
PHYSICAL ABUSE	30.8	4	3
FREQUENCY OF ABUSE	23.1	3	3
AGE REQUIREMENT	38.5	5	5
MARITAL STATUS	38.5	5	4
LENGTH OF RELATIONSHIP	23.1	3	2
ENGLISH LANGUAGE REQUIREMENT	15.4	2	2
NATIONALITY REQUIREMENT	0.0	0	0
EDUCATION REQUIREMENT	0.0	0	0
LIVING OR NOT LIVING REQUIREMENT	53.8	7	6
AREA REQUIREMENT	7.7	1	1
RELATIONSHIP KIND	23.1	3	3

*=maximum number of unpublished studies is 11.

TABLE 17: Kind of Demographic Factors Reported in Social Network Studies on Abused Women.

DEMOGRAPHIC FACTOR	PERCENTAGE REPORTED	N	N(Unpub)*
AGE	53.8	7	7
Mean	23.1	3	2
Range	46.2	6	6
Categories	23.1	3	3
CLASS	7.1	1	1
ETHNICITY	38.5	5	5
RELIGION	23.1	3	3
MARITAL STATUS	38.5	5	5
EDUCATION	61.5	8	8
Mean	23.1	3	3
Range	15.4	2	2
Categories	38.5	5	5
EMPLOYMENT	30.8	4	4
LIVING WITH BATTERER	7.7	1	1
INCOME	46.2	6	6
Mean	15.4	2	2
Range	7.7	1	1
Categories	23.1	3	3
OCCUPATION	30.8	4	4
PRESENCE OF CHILDREN	30.8	4	4
Mean	15.4	2	2
Categories	15.4	2	2
YEARS MARRIED	15.4	2	2

*=maximum number of unpublished studies is 11.

TABLE 18: Kinds of Statistics Used in Social Network Studies on Abused Women.

KINDS OF STATISTICS	PERCENT REPORTED	N	%PUB	N*	%UNPUB	N**
DESCRIPTIVE	53.8	7	7.7	1	46.2	6
CONTINGENCY TABLES	53.8	7	7.7	1	46.2	6
T-TESTS	30.8	4	7.7	1	23.1	3
PEARSON CORRELATION	23.1	3	7.7	1	15.4	2
ANOVA	15.4	2	0.0	0	0.0	2
REGRESSION	15.4	2	7.7	1	7.7	1
NONPARAMETRIC TESTS	7.7	1	0.0	0	7.7	0
OTHER MULTIVARIATE TESTS	7.7	1	0.0	0	7.7	1
MULTIWAY TABLES	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0
NONPARAMETRIC CORRELATION	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0
TOTAL		27		5		22

*=Published
**=Unpublished

TABLE 19: Operational Definitions of Criteria for Social Network Membership to Battered Women's Network.

Kerr (1982)	"I want to learn something about the people with whom you interact or have contact with." (p.83)
Alcorn (1984)	"...I would like to get an idea of the people who were important to you when the first incidence of violence occurred." (p.190)
Griffin (1984)	"Please list the names of people you actually talked to during the significant battering incident that you described in Questionnaire II." (p.166)
McKenna (1985)	"Please list each significant figure in your life. Consider all the persons who provide personal support for you or who are important to you for any reason, positive or negative." (p.92)
Jewell (1986)	"This questionnaire is designed to get a list of the people you know and see regularly." (p.102)
Heggie (1986)	"List up to five members who are the most important in your life at this time whether you like them or not. Please include your spouse/boyfriend." (p.73)
Firestein (1987)	"List the initials of up to 20 people who are significant in your life...and with whom you have some sort of contact at least once a month." (p.58)
Wickson (1988)	"Among the people you think of as friends, please list the first names of those you feel closest to. Stop when you feel that you have named your closest ties. (Do not include immediate family or relatives here...).

TABLE 20: Kinds of Inclusion/Exclusion Criteria Used in Personality Studies on Abused Women.

KINDS OF CRITERIA	PERCENT REPORTED	N	N(Unpub)*
INJURY	0.0	0	0
DELIBERATENESS	0.0	0	0
KINDS OF ABUSE	0.0	0	0
SEVERITY OF ABUSE	30.5	4	1
RECENCY OF ABUSE	0.0	0	0
DURATION OF ABUSE	0.0	0	0
PHYSICAL ABUSE	61.5	8	4
FREQUENCY OF ABUSE	38.5	5	2
AGE REQUIREMENT	7.7	1	1
MARITAL STATUS	38.5	5	2
LENGTH OF RELATIONSHIP	15.4	2	0
ENGLISH LANGUAGE REQUIREMENT	15.4	2	1
NATIONALITY REQUIREMENT	0.0	0	0
EDUCATION REQUIREMENT	15.4	2	1
LIVING OR NOT LIVING REQUIREMENT	46.2	6	2
AREA REQUIREMENT	0.0	0	0
RELATIONSHIP KIND	0.0	0	0

*=maximum number of unpublished studies is 5.

TABLE 21: Kinds of Demographic Factors Reported in Personality Studies on Abused Women.

DEMOGRAPHIC FACTOR	PERCENTAGE REPORTED	N	N(Unpub)*
AGE	84.6	11	5
Mean	53.8	7	2
Range	46.2	6	4
Categories	7.7	1	1
CLASS	23.1	3	2
ETHNICITY	61.5	8	4
RELIGION	38.5	5	2
MARITAL STATUS	53.8	7	3
EDUCATION	46.2	6	3
Mean	7.7	1	1
Range	7.7	1	1
Categories	38.5	5	2
EMPLOYMENT	23.1	3	1
LIVING WITH BATTERER	7.7	1	0
INCOME	15.4	2	1
Mean	0.0	0	0
Range	0.0	0	0
Categories	15.4	2	1
OCCUPATION	15.4	2	1
PRESENCE OF CHILDREN	38.5	5	2
Mean	23.1	3	1
Categories	15.4	2	1
YEARS MARRIED	23.1	3	1

*=maximum number of unpublished studies is 5.

TABLE 22: Kinds of Statistics Used in Personality Studies on Abused Women.

KINDS OF STATISTICS	PERCENT REPORTED	N	%PUB	N*	%UNPUB	N**
T-TESTS	69.2	9	38.5	5	30.8	4
CONTINGENCY TABLES	38.5	5	23.1	3	15.4	2
ANOVA	23.1	3	15.4	2	7.7	1
DESCRIPTIVE	15.4	2	15.4	2	0.0	0
PEARSON CORRELATION	15.4	2	7.7	1	7.7	1
OTHER MULTIVARIATE TESTS	15.4	2	7.7	1	7.7	1
MULTIWAY TABLES	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0
NONPARAMETRIC TESTS	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0
NONPARAMETRIC CORRELATION	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0
REGRESSION	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0	0
TOTAL		23		14		9

*=Published
**=Unpublished

TABLE 23: Cross-Listing of the Social Support, Social Network, and Personality Studies Used in this Thesis.

Study	Social Support	Social Network	Personality Structure
Carlson (1977)	*		
Flynn (1977)	*		
Prescott and Letko (1977)	*		
Roy (1977)	*		
Rounsaville (1978)	*		
Star (1978)			*
Byrne (1979)		*	
Cazenave and Straus (1979)		*	
Dobash and Dobash (1979)	*		
Frieze, et al. (1979)	*		
Gordeuk (1979)	*		
Labell (1979)	*		
Schulman (1979)	*		
Stachura (1979)	*		
Zimmerman (1979)	*		
Follingstad (1980)			*
Meade-Ramrattan, Cerre' and Porto (1980)	*		
Star, Clark, and O'Malia (1980)			*
Arndt (1981)			*
Aviram (1981)			*
Grayson and Smith (1981)	*		
Mahon (1981)			*
Pagelow (1981)	*		
Thoennes (1981)	*		
Back, Post, and D'Arcy (1982)			*
Hartick (1982)			*
Hofeller (1982)	*		
Kerr (1982)	*	*	
Kuhl (1982)	*		
Smith (1982)	*		*
Alcorn (1984)	*	*	
Bowker (1983,1984)	*		
Church (1984)	*		
Gellen, Hoffman, Jones and Stone (1984)			*
Griffin (1984)		*	
Hoff (1984)	*	*	
Brown (1985)		*	
Butehorn (1985)	*	*	
Limandri (1985)	*		
McKenna (1985)		*	
Pahl (1985)	*		

Parle (1985)	*		
Wilson (1985)			*
Charboneau (1986)			*
Heggie (1986)	*	*	
Jewell (1986)		*	
Mitchel and Hodson (1983,1986)	*		
Beauparlant (1987)	*	*	
Brecker (1987)	*		
Firestein (1987)	*		
Steiner (1987)	*		
Bhamick (1988)	*		
Bowker (1985,1988)	*		
Chalmers and Smith (1988)	*		
Gelles and Straus (1988)	*		
Harris (1988)	*		
Rosewater (1988)			*
Simko (1988)	*		
Wickson (1988)		*	
Lockhart and White (1989)	*		
Pirog-Good and Stets (1989)	*		

JAY EVANS CROSS

CURRICULUM VITA

Born at: Thunder Bay, Ontario, March 24, 1962

DEGREES:

BSc., 1985, Chemistry, University of British Columbia
M.A., 1991, Sociology, University of Victoria

HONOURS AND AWARDS:

Paul Lazersfeld Fellowship, Columbia University, (1990-)
University of Victoria Deans Scholarship (1988-1989)
University of Victoria Faculty of Graduate Studies Travel Grant (Summer, 1988)
University of Victoria Graduate Students Society Travel Grant (Summer, 1988)

TEACHING EXPERIENCE:

Teaching Assistantship (1987-1988)

Soci 301 Social Control and Deviant Behaviour (3 Units)
Soci 342 World Demography (1/2 Units)
Soci 343 Canadian Demography (1/2 Units)

RELEVANT RESEARCH EXPERIENCE:

Research Associate on Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council of Canada Grant (SSHRCC; 1989-1990) Surviving Destruction of the Self: A Sociological Analysis of Holocaust Accounts.

Research Assistant on University of Victoria Work Study Program (1988-1989) Surviving Destruction of the Self: A Sociological Analysis of Holocaust Accounts.

Research Assistant on University of Victoria Challenge Grant (Summer 1988) Surviving Destruction of the Self: A Sociological Analysis of Holocaust Accounts.

MAJOR PUBLICATIONS:

Surviving Destruction of the Self: Sociological Analysis of Holocaust Accounts, (with Mary J. Gallant) Studies in Symbolic Interaction (Revised and resubmitted, 1991).

The Verstehen Approach to the Research Act: In-depth Interviews with Holocaust Survivors. (with Mary J. Gallant) Chapter prepared for Subjectivity in Social Research (1991), edited by Carolyn Ellis and Michael Flaherty.

PRESENTATIONS:

Gender Differences in Support-Seeking: Some Observations from the 1985 National Family Violence Re-Survey. To be presented with Mary J. Gallant at the Sociology of Emotions Roundtable, Topic: Methodological Issues in the Study of Emotions, American Sociological Association Annual Meeting, Cincinnati, Ohio, August 23-27, 1991.

Wayward Puritans in the Ivory Tower: Gender Abuse as Collective Process in Academia. To be presented with Mary J. Gallant at the Labor Studies: Gender and Work Session, Society for the Study of Social Problems Annual Meeting, Scholarship in Pursuit of the Just Society, Cincinnati, Ohio, August 21-23, 1991.

The Moral Order Within the Self: Challenged Identity and Surviving the Holocaust. To be presented with Mary J. Gallant at the Potpourri Session, Meeting of the Society for the Study of Symbolic Interaction, Cincinnati, Ohio, August 23-27, 1991.

Profound Trauma: Doing Emotion-Work During the In-depth Interview. Presented with Mary J. Gallant at the Emotions and Lived Experience Session, Meeting of the Society for the Study of Symbolic Interaction, Washington, DC, August 12-13, 1990.

Surviving Destruction of the Self: Sociological Analysis of Holocaust Accounts. Presented with Mary J. Gallant at the New Empirical Investigations in Symbolic Interaction, Meeting of the Society for the Study of Symbolic Interaction, Atlanta, Georgia, 26 August 1988.

PARTIAL COPYRIGHT LICENSE

I hereby grant the right to lend my thesis 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 or 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 for 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 permission.

Title of Thesis: A CRITICAL SURVEY OF METHODOLOGY USED IN EMPIRICAL RESEARCH IN THE SOCIAL SUPPORT, SOCIAL NETWORK, AND PERSONALITY CHARACTERISTICS OF ABUSED WOMEN.

Author [redacted]
(Signature)

Jay Evans Cross

10 April 1991
(Date)