



W. H. McNichols, Jr.
Mayor

"In Sickness and In Health . . ."



Analysis of a Battered Women Population

August 1980

70848

**Denver Anti-Crime Council
1445 Cleveland Place, Room 200
Denver, Colorado 80202**

*Charles D. Weller
Executive Director*

These materials and project efforts related to their production were supported by the U. S. Department of Justice, Law Enforcement Assistance Administration (Denver Mini-Block Program, 80-MB-14-D) and by The City and County of Denver.

"In Sickness and in Health . . ."

Analysis of a
Battered Women Population

Prepared by:

Stephen F. Browne
Criminal Justice Statistician

Denver Anti-Crime Council
1445 Cleveland Pl. Rm. 200
Denver, Colorado 80202

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS:

With increasing frequency domestic violence is being identified in seemingly tranquil families. Over the past few years, researchers and scholars have focused more attention on this social problem, hoping to explain why such behavior occurs and why the violence frequently is tolerated by the women for many years. With the emergence of the Safehouse for Battered Women in Denver, a commitment to contributing to the body of knowledge regarding the battering was made by the staff. Completion of this study honors that commitment.

The study was made possible by Ms. Carolyn Agosta, Safehouse director, and to the staff who diligently collected the information while assisting the women residents and their children. The data were collected over a two year period, and reflect a substantial proportion of the woman population residing in the Safehouse. Assisting the staff was Dr. Susan Wismer, project evaluator, who made the data available for analysis and who assisted in the data coding. Her knowledge of the population and questionnaire instrument facilitated the data analysis.

The efforts of several Denver Anti-Crime Council staff must be recognized for their diligent efforts in producing this study. Ms. Carolyn Smith, for her typing accuracy and patience when changes were made; Ms. Olivia Cook who entered the data into a computer file without error; and Ms. Karin Skagerberg who spent many hours editing and formatting the manuscript. To all three staff members, much appreciation for their efforts is expressed.

Finally, the Safehouse battered women must be recognized for their willingness to contribute their time and information in completing the lengthy questionnaire. Considering the emotional trauma they were experiencing at the time they were seeking the Safehouse assistance, completion of the questionnaire represents a significant contribution to all such research.

PREFACE:

Domestic violence has gained increasing attention in Denver, leading to the development of a number of shelter facilities and support service programs throughout the Metropolitan area. One such shelter facility opening within the City and County of Denver is the Safehouse for Battered Women.

Established in October, 1978, the Safehouse has endeavored to eliminate physical and psychological abuse from womens' lives by offering them temporary shelter, counseling, legal advocacy, and other support services. Women and their children can stay at the Safehouse for periods up to 90 days after which time they can return to the home or establish other living arrangements. Where the women choose not to live in the home, the Safehouse staff assists the women in locating satisfactory residence and obtaining employment to support themselves and their children.

The Safehouse's purpose is not to destroy the family unit by encouraging the emancipation of all its residents. Rather, Safehouse was established to offer a secure, safe living situation for women and their children, and a program which endeavors to eliminate future domestic violence. It is the project's objective to see the women return to a violence free home whenever possible, and to break the cycle of violence for the children. Where the batterer is willing to receive assistance, the Safehouse staff will offer services to the men or refer them to appropriate agencies for services.

The domestic violence literature reveals a social problem which will demand considerable future research. The study which follows was completed to

provide additional descriptive information on a battered women population and to address several theoretical positions promulgating explanations of how battering emerges and why the battering relationship frequently continues for extended periods. The learned helplessness, dependency, and learned violence theories provided the primary focuses for these Safehouse data.

Table of Contents

	<u>Page</u>
Acknowledgement-----	II
Prefase-----	III
Introduction-----	1
Description of Safehouse and its Population-----	11
Characteristics of the Victim-----	13
Characteristics of the Batterer-----	19
Battering History-----	22
Testing of the Theory-----	33
Summary-----	39
Appendix A: Stepwise Regression Variables-----	A1
Appendix B: Questionnaire-----	B1
Bibliography-----	C1

Introduction: Statement of the Problem

The social concern for domestic violence has resulted in increased reporting of such incidences to law enforcement and social service agencies and has caused the increase in social programs to address such problems. Studies utilizing police statistics indicate the prevalence of family violence. These data document the growing belief that family violence is more widespread than was once believed. Straus and Steinmetz have speculated, based on their research, that women and children comprise the largest victimized group in the United States. (Straus and Steinmetz, 1974) A number of social observers have postulated the increase of wife beating, violent behavior in siblings, and child abuse, each adding to a cumulative increase in domestic violence. (Gayford, 1975; Gilles, 1972; Straus and Steinmetz, 1973) Reports indicating the prevalence of domestic violence have frequently been limited to the incidence of serious offenses such as homicide or rape, where the repeated violence or atrocious violent behavior has drawn the attention of social scientists and reporters as opposed to the significance of the social problem in general.

According to a Kansas City Police Department study, 40% of all homicides were the result of domestic violence incidents. In 85% of these killings, the police had responded to at least one domestic violence call prior to the fatal incident. In half these homicides, the police had responded to calls for assistance five or more times during a two year period prior to the killing. (Gingold, 1976) Donald Lunde reported in Psychology Today that approximately 40% of all homicides in the U.S. are either husbands killing wives or wives killing husbands. (Lunde, 1975) Wolfgang's study of 588 homicides

found that 41% of the women victims were killed by their husbands as compared to 11% of the male victims who were killed by their wives. Miller and Gambs reported that 32.8% of the female homicide victims killed in California in 1971 were murdered by their husbands but only 8% of the men were killed by their wives. (Miller and Gambs, 1975)

The litany continues when police and research reports detailing domestic violence complaints are considered. Del Martin revealed that data showing domestic complaints by females to the police in several jurisdictions exceeded three quarters of the total complaints. For example, the female complaints for domestic violence comprized 82% in New York City, 75% in Washington, D.C., 85.4% in Detroit and 95% in Montgomery County, Maryland. (Martin, 1976)

In Atlanta, Georgia, 60% of all calls for service on the night shift were domestic violence calls, making this the highest single crime category requesting police assistance. Boston Police received 45 domestic violence calls a day, resulting in 18,000 such calls a year. (Worrier, 1975) The Oakland Police Department in California studied its calls for service during a six months period in 1970, discovering that the officers responded to 16,000 family disturbance calls during that time period. Finally, the Chicago Police Department surveyed its calls for service for an eight month period (September 1965 to March 1966) and determined that their responses to domestic violence calls exceeded the total responses to murder, rape, aggravated assault and other serious crime calls. (Martin, 1976)

Documentation of the existence of severe domestic problems would appear to abound based on police reports, analyses of police reports, and research efforts by social scientists. The focus of this paper will entail the

consideration of data germane to the problem of wife abuse. In reviewing the social and legal conditions which has allowed, if not promulgated wife abuse or wife battering, it has been reported that the beating of women by their husbands and lovers is a very commonplace crime. The "right" of physical chastisement of women by their husbands is grounded in English Common Law. Eisenberg and Micklow have indicated the legend that the historical grounding for the colloquial phrase, "rule of thumb" is based on the ancient right of husbands to beat their wives with sticks no thicker than their thumbs. (Eisenberg and Micklow, 1974) As late as 1824, the Supreme Court of Mississippi confirmed wife beating by their husbands as a right entitled to men. Murray Straus has stated:

The high frequency with which physical violence is used by married couples and especially the disproportionate frequency with which wives are the victims, reflects the structure of contemporary Euro-American societies in the form of cultural norms which implicitly make the marriage license a hitting license in the sexist organization of both society and the family system. Cultural norms legitimizing marital violence are found in the legal system, in literary works and everyday discourses and in sociological and psychological experiments and surveys. (Straus, 1976)

Batterings' common acceptance within the American social system is indicated by the humor frequently passed between males and females despite its sexist basis. How frequently has the comment been made that "in order to get a woman to do something she has to be kicked or hit?" Similarly, where individual battering situations are known it is not uncommon to hear the comment that, "she most probably deserved it, because after all he is such a nice guy!" If spouse

abuse is burdened with such humor, it has been supported by thoughtless social tolerance by neighbors and family alike and by the unfortunate arbitrary application of legal sanctions. Wife beating frequently is viewed as an acceptable resolution of marital disharmony especially when it occurs behind the home's closed doors; neighbors just do not feel they should get involved in family disputes. Police responses to battering incidents range from maintenance of safety and encouragement for participation in crisis intervention counseling programs to absolute disregard for the female victim and explicit support for the battering male. The significant point here is that the official response to battering cases does not always result in protection of the female victim through on-site counseling, crisis intervention, or removal of the victim from the battering situation.

Data indicating wife abuse incidences are available from a number of researchers. Battering incidence proportions vary in magnitude from approximately 10% to approximately 50% of the married women. For example, Harris reported that his sample showed that 10% of the women had been battered by their spouses or lovers in their homes, while Walker estimates battering incidences to have involved 50% of married women. (Harris, 1979; Walker, 1979) Generally, however, survey's indicate wife abuse occurs, to some degree, in 35% to 40% of the families. A recent national survey reported in Psychology Today revealed that 40% of the men questioned admitted they had struck their wives occasionally. (Straus, Steinmetz and Gilles, 1977) A study by Appleton of women seeking medical attention in one hospital, demonstrated that 35% of these women had been "struck with the intent to harm" which is a statistic comparable to the 37% reported by Levinger and Gilles. (Appleton, 1980; Levinger, 1966; Gilles, 1972) Limiting

many of these studies such as Appleton's, Levinger's and Gilles is the degree to which they can be generalized to the Universe of married couples or couples maintaining steady relationships. As a consequence, data purporting to demonstrate the battering problem remain estimates at best which await substantiation by systematic surveys or other research efforts. Despite this empirical limitation, experts in legal and social service professions are in agreement that wife-abuse is one of the most under-reported crimes in the country today. Indicative of the degree to which battering has been recognized as a serious social problem is the listing of the battered spouse syndrome by the International Classification of Diseases.

Research efforts in wife beating have been limited in their efforts to ascertain the sociological and psychological causal factors underlying such behavior. Steinmetz and Straus have indicated that the discussion of such assaultive behavior and the study of such deviant behavior has been a sociological taboo. (Steinmetz and Straus, 1974) Straus' work in the area of wife beating was the first to label such behavior as assaultive behavior, using the logic that it would be considered a violent criminal offense if it involved actors who were not married to each other (or maintaining a steady relationship), or did not occur in the confines of the home. (Straus, 1971, 1973) At best it can be stated that the systematic study of wife abuse is in its early stages and will require considerably more effort before the etiological forces leading to the deviance are correctly understood.

The theoretical literature purporting to provide etiological explanations for wife abuse and for why women remain in the battering relationships draws

on a number of behavioral and natural science explanations. Straus initiated a sociological evaluation of causitive theories by summarizing 15 theoretical statements explaining domestic violence. The theories included intrapsychic psychopathology, social learning theories, frustration, conflict, negative self-attitudes, structural systems, resource and attribution concepts, and substance abuse. (Straus, 1971) The most popular theoretical statements have been grounded in the concepts of learned and innate aggression, with the more recent theoretical evaluations leading to the conclusion that learning theory offers more theoretical bases for testing than does the theory of innate aggressiveness.

Recent writings have proposed that social conditions exist which promulgate tolerance if not encouragement of violence against women. For example, the frequent social response to women being physically and psychologically abused has been indifference, keeping women in these battering relationships. The expectation fostered by the legal system and family proponents is that women be responsible for supporting and caring for dependent children despite their exclusion from the economic market place or seclusion from higher paying employment positions. Women have, according to Martin, Straus, Steinmetz and Gilles, been debilitated socially by early sex role socialization and by maintenance of inequities between males and females. The socialization process has created wife abuse victims unable to protect themselves by leaving the scene or by seeking assistance from outside the family system. (Martin, 1976; Straus, Steinmetz and Gilles, 1977) The burden of guilt when wife abuse has taken place, frequently, is borne by women resulting in public shame, embarrassment, and, ultimately, loss of self-esteem.

Consistent with the example discussed by some who foster the notion that people experiencing racial discrimination should bear the responsibility for the discrimination, the typical social response to spouse abuse has been to blame the women for causing the violent outbursts by their husbands or boyfriends. (Walker, 1978) It has been a common belief that only women who "deserve it" are abused. A spin-off of this conceptualization is that women are really masochistic and secretly harbor the desire to be beaten. The notion of masochistic women, as proposed by Snell, et. al., which offered a convenient, yet popular, explanation of spouse abuse. (Snell, Rosenwald, and Robey, 1964) Perpetuation of the concept that women were responsible for the abuse inflicted upon them absolved men from the responsibility for assaulting their spouses while creating the false impression that women's behaviors or psychological states negatively affected the men's mental health. Men would not be "driven" to such assaultive behavior if women behaved normally.

The commonly held notion that women enjoy a sado-masochistic sexual relationship with the men in their lives has hindered the development of social sanctions against battering. The fact that neither empirical evidence nor ethnographic evaluations of intra-familial relationships does not support these misconceptions has not limited their popularity. The fact that the masochism conceptualization has its underpinnings in psychotherapy, biased by many male-centered terms, has fostered its common acceptance, especially within male social groups. Ethnographic information collected during interviews with battered women reveals, as should be expected, that battering incidents are abhorant to the women victims. The study by Snell, et. al., suggested that beatings are really the social end-product of interactions with women

who have negative personality characteristics (1964).

A current popular theoretical position explaining battering is predicated on learning theory, and fosters the assumption that victims or observers of battering relationships as children are less surprised by domestic violences. They are prone to accept such behavior. The underlying assumption is that people learn to be batterers and to be battered by internalizing such behavioral patterns as normative to the intra-familial relationships. Gilles for example, proposed that certain families have learned to accept certain levels of assault or violence "in the name of discipline." He discovered that adults who were struck frequently as children were more likely to be violent with their mates or close relationships than were the adults who had never been or were infrequently struck as children; "not only does the family expose individuals to violence and techniques of violence, the family teaches approval for the use of violence and thus violence becomes the norm." (Gilles, 1972)

Support for Gilles' position has been generated by Steinmetz and Straus, who reported learned violence patterns are acquired during early socialization by experiencing and observing domestic violences within the home. (Steinmetz, and Straus, 1973) Similar findings have been reported by reserachers studying child abuse and its passage from one generation to another. Kempe, in a classic study, reported that youth who experienced abuse were more likely as adults to abuse their own children. (Kempe, Silverman, and Steele, 1962) Each time children are physically punished or observe such punishment inflicted on siblings when being disciplined, they learn that violence is an appropriate behavioral pattern.

Several social writers have proposed that the nature of violent versus non-violent relationship is dependent, in part, on the relative power and dependency that exists between the actors. These variables are determined by the social positions maintained by the actors in the social system. In Emerson's formulation, the power of one person over another is based on the dependency relationship between the two participants. (Emerson, 1962) For battering relationships, the victim's dependency on the batterer is determined by the availability of alternatives to the victim and by the motivational investment in the relationship made by each actor. Women's dependency on men is based partly on the lack of alternatives to marriage available to them. Violence in the home involving wife beating then is partially a function of sex roles in the employment sector and in the family. Battered women face realities of economic survival and the responsibility of raising and caring for dependent children if they consider leaving the relationship. Ethnographic data reported from interviews with battered women reveal that many women remain in the violent relationship because of economics, dependent children, and no safe place to go, in addition to terror and fear. (Walker, 1978) From this standpoint, treatment alternatives for battered women must take into account provisions for economic support, child support services, and some type of Safehouse for shelter. Where emancipation is feasible for the women, training and job placement capabilities must be made available to facilitate economic independence, in addition to assistance in locating alternative housing.

The theory of learned helplessness has been proposed as a more general explanation of why women do not leave battering relationships. Elaborating on Martin Seligman's research, Walker has stated that women learn

that their voluntary responses to battering situations do not prevent assaults on them. A number of researchers have shown that "human experience with inescapable aversive events will cause interference with later learning. (Walker, 1978) As a result, motivational deficits to act develop which inhibit the woman's inclination to leave the violent relationship. Because women are socialized to perceive themselves as helpless people, they are jeopardized by early socialization which inculcates the construct that they have less power and ability to affect change in their relationships with men and by a psychological paralysis which develops through the batterings. In addition, cultural expectations exist for women to maintain the "happy family," and contented mates who must be protected from social degradation as batterers. As a result, women retreat and isolate themselves when battered, preventing friends and family from discovering the battering to which they are being subjected. The withdrawal is associated with depression which decreases the probability that assistance will be sought for herself, and the abuser. (Heppner, 1978; Walker, 1978) In support of the depression syndrome, it has been suggested that women as a group are more depressed than men, with non-working wives being more depressed than those women who are employed outside the home. (Chessler, 1972; Gove and Tudor, 1973; Radloff, 1975)

In summary, according to the learned helplessness syndrome, battered women, for the most part, do not believe they can escape from their batterers. In addition, it has been suggested by some writers that efforts to protect their mates contribute to the maintenance of the battering syndrome. Women lie to themselves about the battering relationship and its ramifications for their lives which has the direct result of preventing them from realizing that they

can change the situation and that support services may be available to them. Outside assistance is not accepted because they do not believe that the services will be effective. (Walker, 1978; Appleton, 1980)

Description of Safehouse and Its Population

The literature reveals a general effort by researchers to gain knowledge about battered women. Much of this effort is related to direct service delivery systems which have emerged in response to a growing awareness that women are being abused in great numbers; greater than was anticipated or believed possible. Much of the service program has developed in response to a decided lack of services for abused women and the disregard for the civil and human rights of these women. It has been suggested that the public awareness necessary to bring battering to the fore as a social problem is related to the consciousness raising which has accompanied the women's movement and equal rights efforts. Concomitantly, it can be stated that program development, necessary to offer battered women economic and marriage alternatives, has been due, in large part, to these same changes in women's social positions. This has been particularly true in Denver, Colorado where victim support systems have been developed. The initial impetus for such support systems emerged in response to Denver's chronic rape problem. Cooperative endeavors between law enforcement, victim support services, and Department of Social Services facilitated the development of a battered women's shelter. The need for such a shelter was dramatically documented by the victim support centers which, through the cooperation with the Police Department, were called upon increasingly to provide support to battered women and their children, many of whom were abused as well. The Safehouse for Battered Women was developed to provide shelter to women and their children,

in addition to employment development and placement, counseling, emancipation counseling, legal support and advocacy, and an array of child services. Services to children are considered crucial in order to break the "cycle of violence" believed to exist in which children begin to internalize the acceptable use of violence in domestic relationships.

The facility is small, having sufficient bed spaces for ten battered women and 20 children. Programmatically, the Safehouse is committed to eliminating battering from the women's lives either through changing the family situation or by emancipating the women from the violent mate. Women are able to remain in the Safehouse for up to 90 days after which time they return to the home or are assisted in establishing residence outside the home. The facility's purpose is to provide an immediate alternative living situation for the battered women and to facilitate changes within their violent family inter-relationships. Failure is considered to be the occurrence of a battering incident within six months following termination from the Safehouse. The project's aim is not to destroy the nuclear family, but to eliminate domestic violence. Because it was unknown how many women were experiencing domestic violence in Denver, the anticipated demand for services could not be accurately calculated. It was known that the 10 bed spaces for the women would never be vacant.

In response to the need for empirical data from which battered women's profiles could be developed and battering histories could be constructed, the Safehouse adopted the usage of an extensive questionnaire developed by Dr. Lenore Walker under a National Institute for Mental Health grant. Safehouse residents are asked to complete the questionnaire following their intake interview. The questionnaire is self-administered taking about 60 minutes to complete. The Safehouse has been operational for two years during which time 73 women completed

the survey or 65% of the total clients admitted to the project. A deviant case analysis was conducted to determine the response bias introduced by the missing questionnaires. The analysis revealed that younger women tended not to complete the survey. A slight difference in ethnic background existed with the respondent group showing a slightly larger proportion of Anglos. Within the minority ethnic group categories, the respondent group was comprized of a larger proportion of black respondents while the non-respondent group showed more Spanish American respondents. Women who reported having common law husbands were more likely to respond, proportionally, than were married women. The differences between respondents and non-respondents were not found to be significant, leading to the conclusion that the response bias would not invalidate the study's findings.

Characteristics of the Victim

Table 1 indicates a number of characteristics for the women and the batterer.. The average age for the women was younger than that for the batterer with the major proportional differences showing more women younger than 23 years of age and more men older than 42 years of age. Educational backgrounds are comparable with the women showing more college and graduate degrees than the men. The batterers were more likely to have been vocationally trained and to be employed. The racial information shows that the victimized women were more likely to be Anglo than either Black or Spanish American. Approximately 85% of the women reported they were married, of whom 17 women stated their marriages were common law. Thus, 27% of the reported marriages were marriages by common law. The remaining women (15%) were abused by men they were dating or living with. Five women reported that they were living with the men who

Table 1
Safehouse Battered Women Profile
 N=73

	Women		Batterer	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
<u>Characteristics</u>				
Age 18 - 23	26	35.6	12	16.4
24 - 29	23	31.5	23	31.5
30 - 35	15	20.5	17	23.3
36 - 41	7	9.6	6	8.2
42 +	2	2.7	13	17.8
Unknown	0	0.0	2	2.7
	\bar{X} = 27.8 Years		\bar{X} = 32.2 Years	
<u>Race</u>				
Black	12	16.4		
Anglo	37	50.7		
Chicano (Spanish Surname)	15	20.5		
Other	3	4.1		
No Information	6	8.2		
<u>Marital Status</u>				
Married	62	84.9		
Unmarried	11	15.1		
<u>Common Law Marriage</u>				
Yes	17	23.3		
No	56	76.7		
<u>Number of Previous Marriages</u>				
None	47	64.4		
One	20	27.4		
Two	5	6.8		
No Information	1	1.4		
<u>Education</u>				
Less than High School	20	27.4	23	31.5
High School Degree	27	37.0	28	38.4
Some College	20	27.4	20	27.4
College Degree	3	4.1	0	0.0
Graduate Degree	3	4.1	1	1.4
Unknown	0	0.0	1	1.4
<u>Vocational Training</u>				
Yes	17	23.3	30	41.1
No	53	72.6	28	38.4
No Information	3	4.1	15	20.5
<u>Current Employment Status</u>				
Employed	20	27.4	50	68.5
Unemployed	52	71.2	22	30.1
No Information	1	1.4	1	1.4
<u>Welfare Status</u>				
On Welfare	15	20.5		
Not Applicable	58	79.4		

beat them, with the remaining six living independently. For nearly two-thirds of the women, there had been no previous marriages. Where the women had been married before, all but five had been married only once before. No women had more than two marriages.

The Safehouse client population is not predominated by women on welfare support. Only about one-fifth of the client population reported they were on welfare at the time they left the home or battering relationship. Married and unmarried women showed the same proportion on welfare. Analysis of the data indicate that nearly three quarters of the women reported being unemployed, one-third of whom received welfare. As a result, the Safehouse population can be defined as one in which more than half the women (52%) were dependent on their mates for support. Unexpectedly, the majority (55%) of unmarried women reported neither being employed nor being on welfare, indicating that they were being supported by other means such as their families of procreation or men friends. The proportion of employed women in the Safehouse population is smaller than those found by Carlson (1977) and Appleton (1980).

Of the 35 women reporting they were employed or receiving welfare, approximately half reported income of less than \$5,000 per year, and an additional 23% reported incomes lower than \$10,000 a year (Table 2). Slightly less than 15% of the women reported personal incomes of more than \$10,000. The economic positions for the majority of the women were not strong especially when all but about 10% of them reported having at least one child and 63% reported having two or more children (See Table 2). When looking at the entire Safehouse population, three quarters earned less than \$5,000 a year or generated no income for themselves.

Clearly, the women in the Safehouse population are not economically self-sufficient.

Table 2

Income Reported by Women Who were Either Employed or on Welfare before Entering Safehouse

Income	Employed		Welfare		Total	
Less Than \$5,000	6	(30.0)	11	(73.3)	17	(48.6)
\$5,000 - \$10,000	8	(40.0)	0	(0.0)	8	(22.9)
\$10,000 - \$15,000	1	(5.0)	0	(0.0)	1	(2.9)
\$15,000 or more	3	(15.0)	1	(6.7)	4	(11.4)
Unknown	2	(10.0)	3	(20.0)	5	(14.3)
TOTAL	20	(100.0)	15	(100.0)	35	(100.0)

A large proportion of women have at least one child. In addition, eight women were pregnant when battered, two of whom were pregnant for the first time. Thus, while seven women reported no children, two of these women were pregnant. The dependency imposed by children is thought to limit the option available to women to leave the home or to fight back. Children must be fed and clothed and must go to school.

The battered women questionnaire facilitated the collection of much information but offered several limitations because of its construction. For example, as shown in Table 3, each woman was requested to describe the discipline used by her mother and father. The response categories leave much to be desired in being mutually exclusive; no information was given to define the difference

between strict and harsh. Be this as it may, Table 3 reveals that more women saw their mothers as being harsh, strict, or firm (64.4%) than they did their fathers (57.3%). More mothers were reported as being firm, but more fathers were seen as being strict. More mothers than fathers were reported as being lenient, overindulgent, or not using discipline. The application of discipline firmly or strictly does not indicate any battering or violence, while harsh application of discipline may. Each woman was asked whether physical or psychological abuse was experienced in her childhood home. Approximately 70% reported physical and/or psychological abuse. Again, it is difficult to determine how these women were operationalizing battering, however, it was defined the majority of women perceived themselves as having been battered by one or both parents, and therefore, the battering can be assumed to be real in its consequences for the women. This high proportion is contrary to Walker's findings (1978).

The most recent battering incident which led to her leaving the home or relationship involved physical battering as reported by all but 8.2% of the women. In a very large proportion (86.3%), the women were also psychologically abused, indicating the mental stress which accompanies physical battering incidents. In a small proportion of cases, the psychological stresses placed on the women was sufficient impetus to cause her to leave the home. The battering (either physical or psychological) was inflicted by the woman's spouse with about one-fifth the cases showing that the men with whom the women lived battered them. (See Table 4)

Table 3

Parental Discipline and Parental Battering Reported by Women
in Childhood Home

N=73

	Number	Percent
<u>Mother's Discipline</u>		
Harsh	11	15.1
Strict	16	21.9
Firm	20	27.4
Lenient	16	21.9
Over Indulgent	2	2.7
None	1	1.4
Unknown	7	9.6
<u>Father's Discipline</u>		
Harsh	9	12.3
Strict	22	30.1
Firm	11	15.1
Lenient	12	16.4
Over Indulgent	2	2.7
None	10	13.7
Unknown	7	9.6
<u>Violence in Women's Childhood Home</u>		
None	20	27.4
Physical	12	16.4
Psychological	20	27.4
Physical and Psychological	18	24.7
No Answer	3	4.1

Table 4

Women's Reported Battering in Most Recent Incident
N=73

	Number	Percent
<u>Women Psychologically Battered</u>		
Yes	67	91.8
No	6	8.2
<u>Women Physically Battered</u>		
Yes	63	86.3
No	10	13.7
<u>By Whom Most Recently Battered</u>		
Spouse	52	71.2
Man Living With	14	19.2
Ex-spouse	4	5.5
Other Family Member	3	4.1

Characteristics of the Batterer

The men responsible for the batterings inflicted on the Safehouse population were older, on the average, than the women. As shown in Table 5, their income earned characterizes them as being lower or lower-middle class socio-economically. Approximately half earned less than \$10,000 and an additional 23% earned between \$10,000 and \$15,000 per year. While the majority of men earned low or modest incomes, a small proportion was reported by the women to earn fairly high salaries. For example, 4% earned more than \$20,000 a year and 8% earned more than \$25,000 a year. Educationally more men were reported to have not finished high school than the women and they were less likely to have attended college. Slightly more than two-thirds of the men were employed, but it was not reported in what occupational areas they were

employed. The questionnaire requested such information but coding of these data did not occur. Besides education and salary earned while employed, no other indicants of social status were present.

Table 5
Characteristics of the Batterer
 N=73

Characteristics	Number	Percent
<u>Current Income</u>		
Less than \$5,000	19	26.0
\$5,000 to \$10,000	15	20.5
\$10,000 to \$15,000	17	23.3
\$15,000 to \$20,000	8	11.0
\$20,000 to \$25,000	3	4.1
More than \$25,000	6	8.2
Unknown	9	12.3
<u>Criminal Record</u>		
Yes	32	43.8
No	37	50.7
Unknown	4	5.5
<u>Violence in His Childhood Home</u>		
Yes	51	69.9
No	20	27.4
Unknown	2	2.7

Information describing the batterers, reported by the victims, reveals that a large proportion of men had some type of criminal record. This observation is consistent with those of Carlson (1977), Gayford (1975), and Steinmetz and Straus. (1974) The nature of the criminal record for these men is unknown, however, which limits the utility of this observation. Conceivably, the criminal record could stem from prior batterings reported to the police by the wife. More than half the women (62%) did state they had reported

prior beatings to the police and 22% said they had pressed charges in at least one of these cases. In addition, the emotional situation surrounding the battering relationship may have resulted in some women reporting criminal records when, in fact, none existed. Be this as it may, the women did respond that their mates did have criminal records in a substantial proportion of cases.

It has been a well reported observation that individuals observing or experiencing domestic violence in their childhood homes perpetrate violence as adults on their family members. (Gilles, 1972; Gayford 1975; Kempe et.al., 1962; Spinetta and Rigler, 1972) This observation is substantiated by the reported violent family backgrounds from which the men came. Fully, 70% were reported to have observed violence or were beaten by other family members. The more frequently reported violence in his home was his father beating his mother (32%). Less frequently, his mother and/or father beat him. Again, this observation must be qualified by the fact that the violence in the batterer's childhood home was reported by the Safehouse residents.

Victimization of the children by the adult male batterer does not occur as frequently as expected. This is especially true with regard to the physical abuse of the children. More frequently reported is the psychological abuse experienced by the children. One-third the women said their children had been physically abused while 52% reported psychological abuse to the children (Table 6). In that the childhood battering experienced by the mates involved their fathers beating their mothers rather than the siblings, it is possible that the men continue the learned behavioral pattern in their abuse of women to the exclusion of substantial child abuse. This would argue in favor of a

specific learned violence pattern in contradiction to a generalized learned violence behavior (Walker, 1978).

Table 6

Violence Directed Towards Children by Male Batterer (N=73)

Batterer Has:	Number	Percent
a. Physically abused own children	10	13.7
b. Physically abused women's children	15	20.5
c. Physically abused their children	2	2.7
d. Psychologically abused own children	22	30.1
e. Psychologically abused women's children	16	21.9
f. Psychologically abused other children	4	5.5
g. No information	4	5.5

Battering History

More than 90% of the women in Safehouse reported that they had been battered at least once before the incident which led to their leaving the home. The frequency distribution shown in Table 7 reveals that the women experienced many beatings prior to entering Safehouse with 45% reporting ten or more prior assaults. For nearly a third of the women, the beatings were a monthly occurrence. For all but a small proportion of women the batterings occurred several times a year. Similar findings of frequent abuse have been reported in the literature. (Appleton, 1980; Fields, 1978) Based on the frequency of abuse and numbers of incidents it would appear that for these women the marriage license is a license to hit. Analysis of the relationship between the

Table 7
Battering History of Women Residing in the Safehouse (N=73)

Battering History	Number	Percent
<u>Past Batterings</u>		
Yes	67	91.8
No	2	2.7
No Information	4	5.5
<u>Approximate Number of Previous Batterings</u>		
None	7	9.6
One	3	4.1
2-4	9	12.3
4-6	10	13.7
6-10	11	15.1
10-20	10	13.7
20 or more	23	31.5
<u>Frequency of Batterings</u>		
Daily	2	2.7
Weekly	15	20.5
Every Two Weeks	5	6.8
Monthly	1	1.4
Every Two Months	13	17.8
Twice a Year	18	24.7
Once a Year	6	8.2
Less Frequently	2	2.7
No Information	11	15.1
<u>Have Incidents Become more Frequent?</u>		
Yes	48	65.8
No	21	28.8
No Information	4	5.5
<u>Have Injuries Become more Serious?</u>		
Yes	34	46.6
No	28	38.4
No Information	11	15.1
<u>Proportion of Past Incidents in which Batterer was using Alcohol</u>		
All	20	27.4
75%	11	15.1
50 - 75%	6	8.2
25 - 50%	3	4.1
Less than 25%	10	13.7
None	14	19.2
No Information	9	12.3
<u>Factors Responsible for Starting Previous Batterings*</u>		
Money	34	46.6
His Short Temper	51	69.9
Pregnancy	11	15.1
Quality of Food Preparation	11	15.1
Effects of Alcohol	38	52.1
His Mental Instability	49	67.1
Women's Mental Instability	12	16.4
Jealousy	47	64.4
Women's Short Temper	13	17.8
Quality of Child Care	11	15.1
Quality of Housekeeping	11	15.1
Effects of Drugs	15	20.5
No Idea	10	13.7

Table 7 Cont.

Battering History	Number	Percent
<u>Did Women Leave Home After Previous Batterings?</u>		
Yes	50	68.5
No	17	23.3
No Information	6	8.2
<u>Was Divorce Ever Threatened after Previous Batterings?</u>		
Yes	54	74.0
No	11	15.1
No Information	8	11.0
<u>What was Response to Threat of Divorce?*</u>		
Increased Battering	14	19.2
Threatened Women	25	34.2
Asked Forgiveness	14	19.2
Promised to Stop Battering	25	34.2
Other Response	13	17.8
<u>Did Women try to Defend Herself During Past Batterings?</u>		
Yes	56	76.7
No	10	13.7
No Information	7	9.6
<u>Did Defense During Past Batterings Make Battering Worse?</u>		
Yes	45	61.6
No	11	15.1
No Information	17	23.3
<u>Did the Women Report the Assaults to Police?</u>		
Yes	45	61.6
No	24	32.9
No Information	4	5.5
<u>In What Proportion did she do anything physically or verbally to bring on attacks?</u>		
All	3	4.1
75%	4	5.5
50-75%	3	4.1
25-50%	11	15.1
Less than 25%	19	26.0
None	26	35.6
No Information	7	9.6

*Multiple responses allowed. Proportion based on N=73 for each response category.

number of prior batterings and their frequency indicates that as the number of prior batterings reported increased, so did the frequency with which the batterings occurred. For example, 58% of the women who reported more than 20 battering incidents in the past, stated they were battered at least every two weeks. Similarly, more than 60% of the women battered between 10 and 20 times reported being battered at least once every two months. (See Table 8) Women battered fewer than seven times in the past reported the beatings to occur twice a year or less frequently. This observation is consistent with that reported by Walker and Appleton who observed that the frequency with which batterings occur results in a shortening of the man's contrite or loving behavior along with the tension building phase leading to the abuse. The Safehouse data indicating increased frequencies supports a learned violence theory. (Appleton, 1980; Walter, 1978)

Table 8
Number of Prior Battering Incidents by Frequency of
 Batterings

Frequency of Batterings	Number of Prior Batterings					Total
	1-4	4-6	6-10	10-20	2-+	
At Least every two weeks	2 (20.0)	3 (33.3)	2 (22.2)	2 (25.0)	11 (57.9)	20 (36.4)
At Least Every Two Months	1 (10.0)	0 (0.0)	3 (33.3)	5 (62.5)	5 (26.3)	14 (25.4)
Twice a Year	6 (60.0)	5 (55.6)	2 (22.2)	1 (12.5)	3 (15.8)	17 (30.9)
Less Frequently	1 (10.0)	1 (11.1)	2 (22.2)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	4 (7.3)
TOTAL	10 (100.0)	9 (100.0)	9 (100.0)	8 (100.0)	19 (100.0)	55 (100.0)

Related to the increase in the abuse frequency is the increase in the seriousness of injury to the women. Crosstabulation of these two variables revealed that nearly 70% of the women reporting an increase in frequency also reported more serious injuries. This relationship was found to be statistically significant ($P > .001$) and is consistent with that found by Nielsen et. al. in their study (1979). Injuries inflicted to the women were varied but typically involved bruises, soreness and pain and lacerations. Associated with these physical injuries were a variety of psychological problems which manifested themselves in sleeplessness, lack of appetite, depression and anxiety. Physical injuries such as broken bones, internal injuries, and burns were reported in smaller proportions; although between 10% and 15% of the women did report having one or more of these serious injuries at least once in their prior batterings.

In regard to why the batterings occurred, the women were asked whether alcohol or drugs might have been precipitating factors or whether other personal, economic or familial difficulties were perceived as causing the batterer to become violent. In addition, the women were asked whether they "did anything verbally or physically to bring on the batterings." Alcohol use was reported by all but 20% of the women to have played some part in triggering the abuses. More specifically, half the women reported that at least half the previous battering incidents were preceded by alcohol intake by the batterer. More than one-fourth the women reported all the batterings were preceded by alcohol intake. These data tend to support the findings by Gilles and Gayford who reported the frequent presence of alcohol in battering situations. (Gilles, 1972; Gayford, 1975)

Analysis of the relationship between alcohol use and the number of past batterings indicated that alcohol was no more likely to be involved where long battering histories existed as when few prior beatings were reported. Thus, it would appear that alcohol did not constitute a precipitating factor for numerous prior batterings but instead is present in a large proportion of cases which have both short and long battering histories. Drugs were reported in approximately 15% of the prior batterings and 8% of the women reported drug use in at least 75% of the prior batterings.

As shown in Table 7, (Factors Responsible for Starting Previous Batterings), the variables most frequently reported as leading to abuse are those external to the women's behaviors or psychological states. The more frequently listed causal factors were money, batterer's short temper, effects of alcohol, batterer's mental instability and jealousy. Thus, from the women's perceptions, psychological or situational variables impacting the men were more likely to result in her being abused. Where variables specific to the women behaviorally or psychologically were mentioned, they were reported less frequently by factors of three or four in comparison to those attributable to the men.

Nearly 60% of the women indicated they did nothing verbally or physically to initiate the batterings or they did "something" in no more than 25% of the battering incidences. Less than 10% of the women felt they had precipitated all or 75% of the prior incidents. Thus, it would appear that the notion that women deserve to be battered is not supported by these data.

The obvious disclaimer to these data is that the women really are masochistic but won't admit their psychological enjoyment of being battered. If this were true, however, why would they seek assistance from a safehouse? The data strongly indicate that the women are unwilling actors in the domestic violence, at least they usually perceive themselves as being irresponsible for the abuse inflicted on them.

The women revealed that their leaving their home and relationship to enter the Safehouse was not the first time they had left. As shown in table 7, 68.5% of the women had left the home for some period of time following the past batterings. Such behavior is consistent with the findings reported by Pizzy (1974), Carlson (1977), and Walker (1978) for women who had been battered. Despite having left their homes in the past, the women returned to the relationship only to be beaten again. Whether such behavior is indicative of learned behavior as proposed by Maccoby and Jacklin (1974), and Walker (1979) or of economic dependency on the men (Martin, 1976) is difficult to determine based on the data reported by this population.

Two subgroups exist within the Safehouse population; one which experienced violence in their childhood homes either personally or observed it (N=51), and one which did not experience such violence (N=20). Initially, it was hypothesized that women who had experienced the violence would be resigned to the battering, expecting no cessation of the battering or positive change within the batterer, and that the second group of women would expect change while fearing an increase in the severity of the battering. The data in Table 9 present the frequency distributions for the multiple responses to the question of what caused the women to remain in the battering relationship.

The data in Table 9 indicate that many women in whose childhood home violence occurred are quite positive about their marriages as well as about the batterer, indicating they still love their husbands (55%); that they believe he will change - stop battering (57%); and that they feel sorry for him (45%). This last dimension appears to indicate that many of these women believe their husbands are not responsible for their violent behaviors. These women fear the violence will escalate even to the point of being killed should they attempt to leave the man permanently. Finally, there is an economic/familial limitation which was reported as binding the women to the relationship. The children need a father and there was nowhere to go because of economic limitations.

Women not experiencing childhood violence were more emphatic, as a group, about why they stayed in the relationship. Women in this group were more likely to affirm their commitment to their mates and their marriages. Three quarters of the women believed that the man would change and they were more likely to feel sorry for him. They were more likely to fear more serious injury if they attempted to leave the relationship and as likely as the first group to fear being killed. Economic and familial ties were reported more frequently as hinderances in leaving. Thus, while the women who did not experience violence in their childhood homes expressed belief in their marriages and mates, fear and economic/familial ties as those who had, they expressed these concerns in greater proportions. The major difference in the two groups was observed in the family and religious pressures which kept the second group in the home, and the larger proportion which stated that the mental battering in the relationship had decreased.

Table 9

Reasons for Remaining in Relationship for Women Abused as Children
and those not Abused

Why Women Remained in the Battering Relationship?	Women Abused as Children N=51		Women Not Abused as Children N=20		Total N=71	
	Number	Percent	Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Physical Battering lessened	11	21.6	3	15.0	14	19.2
Mental Battering Lessened	4	7.8	4	20.0	8	11.0
Physical Battering Stopped	1	2.0	1	5.0	2	2.7
Mental Battering Stopped	1	2.0	0	0.0	1	1.4
Fearful of Being Killed	18	35.3	7	35.0	25	34.2
Fearful of being hurt more seriously	20	39.2	12	60.0	32	43.8
Children need a father	16	31.4	9	45.0	25	34.2
Nowhere to go	24	47.1	14	70.0	38	52.1
Strong belief in marriage vows	16	31.4	10	50.0	26	35.6
Believes man will change	29	56.9	15	75.0	44	60.3
Still loves him	28	54.9	10	50.0	38	52.1
Only she can help him	6	11.8	3	15.0	9	12.3
Felt sorry for him	23	45.1	12	60.0	35	47.9
Economic reasons	18	35.3	10	50.0	28	38.4
Family pressure	6	11.8	6	30.0	12	16.4
Religious pressure	6	11.8	6	30.0	12	16.4

The final dimension to be considered in reviewing the battering history is that of the woman's activities to reduce the battering through her own positive efforts. Leaving the relationship permanently, and defending herself were viewed as two distinctly different but responsive behaviors which the women

could use to alleviate the battering situation. Nearly three-fourths of the women had threatened to divorce their husbands if the abuses did not stop and a slightly greater number had attempted to defend themselves. (Table 7) The responses by the men to these efforts were decidedly different. While fighting back resulted in the batterings becoming more severe for 62% of the women, the thought of losing the women (and children) if she really divorced him was threatening to about half the men. Where divorce was threatened, the batterings were intensified in only one-fifth the cases and 34% of the men threatened the women. Based on these data it would appear that the more effective weapon available to the women is the potential marriage termination. This observation is supported by Walker, who in describing the third phase of her intermittent reinforcement theory, characterizes the men as fearing the dissolution of the relationship (1978). It is during the period after the assault that the man is contrite and loving in an attempt to convince her that she should not leave because he will not beat her again.

The police offer a potential source of protection for victims of violent offenders, although in some jurisdictions the commitment to providing such protection to battered women has been questioned. In the Safehouse population, 62% of the women had reported at least one of the prior batterings to the police. This proportion is higher than that found by Appleton (1980). When asked about pressing charges against the men, about one-third, or 16 of 45 women, said they had pressed charges. Eighteen Safehouse women said they had sought legal assistance from an attorney, 12 had obtained a temporary restraining order and 9 pressed criminal assault charges as well. Of these 9,

six were dropped by the women. Clearly, battered women are reluctant about using the legal system after having called for police assistance.

In summary, the Safehouse women are no strangers to domestic violence with all but a few having had two or more prior beatings before entering the shelter facility. The history of these batterings has shown the women that the abuse can be expected to become more frequent and more serious. While most women report bruises and lacerations as the more frequent injury, the damage which can be caused in beatings can be cumulative leaving the victim scarred physically and psychologically. The women are trapped in the relationship by emotional and economic reasons. The love for her husband or boyfriend, the hope that he will improve, and the commitment to the marriage, operate to keep the women in the home as much as the fear of reprisal should she attempt to leave and not having the economic means to support herself and her children. Her most effective weapon is emotional with the threat of divorce apparently having the most impact on the batterer, at least for some period of time. Whatever the women try to do to protect themselves it does not appear to be sufficient in the longer term. All the women have been battered again, following her threats to divorce him or call the police, and following her attempts to defend herself. It very well may be that the value of a Safehouse in eliminating battering for some relationships is that the shelter offers a reasonably long demonstration to the man of what he would be losing in the relationship should he continue to batter her and she were to divorce him. Secondly, the Safehouse demonstrates to a woman that viable alternatives to a battering relationship are available if she chooses to use them.

Testing of the Theory

The women in Safehouse were frequently battered with increasing seriousness of injury prior to entering Safehouse. The duration of the relationship during which battering occurred varied considerably with a range of less than six months (N=10) to more than ten years (N=4). At question, then, is to what degree can the data account for why some women remained in the relationships for long time periods while others did not? To accomplish this, a stepwise multiple regression was conducted. Table 10 shows the factors entered into the regression analysis to predict the duration of the battering relationship. The 17 independent variables (defined in Appendix A) were entered into the equation utilizing four hierarchical inclusion levels predetermined by the hypothesized ability to predict the battering relationships' durations. The dependent variable was calculated from data indicating, 1) the length of the marital or current relationship; and 2) when the abuse began. The expected direction of the relationship between the dependent and individual predictor variables was defined prior to the regression analysis to determine the utility of the several theoretical positions, discussed above, in predicting the duration. To control for multicollinearity an intercorrelational matrix and factor analysis were developed, allowing highly correlated variables to be identified. A decision was then made to eliminate several variables to control for multicollinearity by constructing composite variables (as was the case with the use of supportive services) or by entering only one variable into the regression equation.

The variables entered into the regression equation explained 66% of the variance in predicting the duration. The beta weights reported in table 10, indicate that the theoretical positions in predicting the directions of the relationship between the predictor and dependent variables were, more often

Table 10
Regression Analysis Testing the Predictive Power of Several Theoretical Positions
on the Duration of the Battering Relationship

Factors	R ²	R ² Change	Predicted Dir. to Explain Re- lationship	BETA	F	Level Sig.
1. <u>Demographic Factors</u>	.180					
a. Woman's Income			-	.452	4.313	.05
b. Age Difference Between Men and Women			-	-.483	4.681	.05
c. Educational Differences Between Men and Women			-	.429	4.183	.05
2. <u>Learned Helplessness: Childhood Socialization</u>	.253	.073				
a. Violence in Childhood Home			+	.136	0.413	
b. Marriage is Forever			+	-.530	5.719	.05
c. Woman's Place is in the Home			+	-.140	0.631	
d. Women must be Peacemakers			+	-.271	1.178	
e. Man's job is to Earn a Decent Living			+	.499	3.788	
f. Man is Head of the Household			+	.073	0.413	
3. <u>Learned Helplessness: Adult Socialization</u>	.425	.172				
a. Fearful of Being Hurt More Seriously			+	.231	1.496	
b. Injuries have become more serious			-	.445	5.569	.05
c. Incidents have become more frequent			-	-.522	4.535	.05
4. <u>Dependency Factors</u>	.660	.235				
a. Economic Reasons Have Prevented Leaving			+	.430	3.628	
b. Nowhere to go			+	-.101	0.266	
c. Use of Available Services			-	.136	1.068	
d. Number of Children			+	-.205	0.932	
e. Ratio between men and womens' income			+	-.567	8.050	.01

than not, incorrect. The demographic factors suggested, in part, by Nielsen et.al., to affect marital dissolution did not show the correct direction in predicting the relationship duration. (1979) This was found to be the case for the learned helplessness and dependency factors. From a conceptual position, there were more variables reflecting learned helplessness which correctly predicted the direction of the relationship than was the case for either the demographic or dependency factors. This is particularly true for learned helplessness through adult socialization. The demographic and dependency variables explain the most variance, with the three demographic variables showing relatively large beta weights and also being significant at the .05 level.

Selection of the 17 variables entered into the regression analysis was based on the several theoretical positions previously presented, purporting to explain maintenance or dissolution of the relationship after battering commences. The demographic factors while not supporting the expected directions of the relationships were found to be significant with large beta weights. Womens' income and age and educational differences between men and women explain 18% of the variance. Only "age differences between men and women" is in the predicted direction while being statistically significant. For this population, women earning more money remain in the relationship longer as do women who have greater educational differences with their mates. Based on these data, little support is found for marital stability variables as described by Nielsen et.al. (1979) and Lewis and Spanier (1979) in explaining the relationships' durations.

A conceptualization of considerable interest in this study was that of learned helplessness. Based on responses to a variety of questions indicating generally

submissive attitudes acquired during childhood socialization and during the adult battering relationship, two learned helplessness dimensions were constructed. Nine variables were used in the two dimensions. The empirical support for learned helplessness based on childhood socialization experiences is mixed. Beta weights indicating the predicted directions are generally small and not significant. Where significance was found (marriage is forever) the beta weight was in the wrong direction. The Safehouse women evidently show rather traditional attitudes towards the man's role in the family as breadwinner and household head, but do not hold to the traditional, stereotypical views that the woman's place is in the home and that marriages had to be maintained in spite of physical or psychological abuse.

Learned helplessness acquired as a result of the adult battering relationship is generally supported. The predicted direction was shown in two of the three variables, with all three showing moderate to fairly large beta weights, two of which were significant at the .05 level. As was reported previously, the battering incidents for these women have become more frequent as well as more serious in the injuries inflicted by the batterer. The periods of contrite or loving behavior decrease in duration as the frequency of the batterings increase. Additional research must occur to determine whether increasing incidents or the decreasing supportive and contrite behavior are related and whether they have different effects on the duration of the battering relationship. Most injuries inflicted as reported by the women usually had not resulted in significant bodily injury. The injuries have been bearable as long as the trauma was followed by some loving, perhaps normal, family life. Because the injuries typically have not become life threatening or severe, the increase in severity has no effect on shortening the duration.

The final dimension constructed reflected dependency indicants which hold the women to the relationship because she is economically unable to leave, has no alternative to go to which is more secure than her home, she does not avail herself of support services or she has children to support. The data do not support a dependency theory in accounting for why women remain in their relationship. The data reveal relatively large beta weights for economic reasons holding the women to the relationship (and here the direction of the coefficient is as predicted) and the ratio between the man's and the woman's earned income. Only one variable (economic reasons) is in the predicted direction in accounting for the duration of the relationship. Strangely where the women reported they had nowhere to go the direction of the relationship between the independent and dependent variables was incorrect. The womans' use of community services and resources prolongs the relationship which is consistent with the finding by Nielsen et.al., and Appleton who suspected that their findings were due to the professional women in their samples. In that all but a few women in this sample used more than one outside resource such as the Department of Social Services, lawyers, and the church to seek support, these data argue against the hypothesized relationship with professional women and indicate perhaps a belief that the marriage can be saved and the battering terminated if appropriate assistance or knowledge can be acquired. (Appleton, 1980; Nielsen, et.al, 1979)

The number of children dependent on the women did not show the predicted direction; the greater number of children did not encourage women to remain in the relationship. Contrary to the findings of Nielsen et.al., dependency was not perceived by women who had more children in this population. While limited economic means was directly, and relatively strongly related to the dependent variable in the predicted direction, such was not the case with the

number of children. Accounting for this is the fact that this battered population has not been highly prolific (Gayford, 1975). Ninety percent of the population had at least one child, but only 16% had more than three children and 26% had more than two children. An intervening variable not available for analysis was the age of the children. Thus, children entering on to the scene relatively recently within the battering relationship may have a different affect on the woman's decision to leave the relationship; few young children may make leaving as difficult as several children. Be this as it may, the current data do not support a dependency argument, at least as indicated by the number of children.

Finally, the ratio between income generated by men and women was expected to directly influence the relationship's duration. The assumption, supported by this study, was that the women earned less than the man usually placing her in a dependent position for economic support. The data show a negative relationship between the ratio of mens' incomes to womens' and the dependent variable. This is contrary to the positive relationship predicted by the theory. The income distributions for the men and women do not show great differences in earned income. This is partially a function of the forced response categorization in the questionnaire. Two-thirds the women earn as much as the men or earn an amount which appears somewhat close to the mens' income based on the categorization of the response item.

A more revealing indicant of dependency may occur through the reporting of actual income. Despite this limitation in the response item, dependency as a function of the income ratio between the men and women does not show the predicted direction in support of a general dependency theoretical position.

In summary, the array of variables entered into the regression equation account

for a relatively large proportion of the variance in predicting the length of the battering relationship. Based on these data, support for the learned helplessness and dependency theoretical positions is limited, although there is empirical support for a learned helplessness acquired as battered adults. The notion of learned violence does not receive support based on the response to the question of whether violence in the childhood home occurred or not. The demographic variables included in the regression analysis explain 18% of the variance while showing relatively high beta weights. As an array of variables those categorized as dependency variables showed the greatest explanation of the variance (23.5%) but did so without support for the theoretical position. Additional specific data elements such as the age of the children and incomes reported in dollars may have improved the predictive power of the variables and supported the theoretical position.

In order to determine the relationship between the duration of the relationship and the many independent variables which may explain why women leave or remain in a violent relationship, a population which is about to leave the Safehouse should be obtained. Administration of some survey instrument after the women have made decisions to return to the home or to become emancipated may improve the explanatory powers of the response items, from a theoretical standpoint.

Summary

The Safehouse battered women population does not offer empirical data which support the theoretical positions stated previously. There is some support for a learned violence position for the men who batter the women with increasing frequency over time. Once the assaults begin they are not restricted in occurring more often over time for this population. As would be expected, the women do not enjoy being battered, but they do show an inclination to returning

to the battering relationship to be battered again. Leaving for short time periods is used by the women as a means of protecting themselves, but they have always returned to the relationship.

The population is characterized by one committed to the marriage and to the men despite the abuses inflicted by these men. Contrary to the conceptualization that battered women are afraid to secure support through service agencies; to talk to anyone about the abuses; or to leave the home or relationship, this population has made efforts to seek assistance from a number of sources. Why do they return to the relationship then? There is a fear element because the incidents have become more frequent and serious. This is not all, however. The women show a commitment to the relationship which has not been eliminated by the batterings. Use of multiple services and seeking lodging in a Safe-house may be interpreted as additional attempts to salvage the relationship. For the most part the injuries have not threatened their lives or caused permanent injury, indicating that the women may believe that assistance to save the relationship may still be plausible. Where the battering has reduced the positive, contrite periods between the batterings, the emotional benefits arising from the relationship for the women and children may be outweighed by the fear, pain and shame arising from the abuses. For this population, maintenance of the relationship appears to be preferable. From a theoretical perspective, maintenance of the relationship, perhaps should be considered from a Control perspective explaining the commitment, belief, involvement and attachment dimensions as promulgated by delinquency theory. (Hirschi, 1971) The data called for this study unfortunately does not permit such an analysis.

APPENDIX A

Stepwise Regression Variables

Appendix A
Stepwise Regression Variables

Independent Variables

1. Demographic Factors

- a. Womens' Income Ordinal categorization differentiating income into five categories:
1. Less than \$5,000 = 37 (50.6%)
 2. \$5,000 - \$10,000 = 10 (13.7%)
 3. \$10,000 - \$15,000 = 2 (2.7%)
 4. \$15,000 - \$20,000 = 4 (5.5%)
 5. \$20,000 - \$25,000 = 1 (1.4%)
- b. Age Differences between men and women Continuous variable indicating differences between mens' and womens' ages.
- c. Educational Differences between men and women Interval measure indicating absolute differences in education levels between men and women.
0. No difference = 26 (35.6)
 1. Some difference = 34 (46.6)
 2. Great difference = 13 (17.8)

2. Learned Helplessness: Childhood Socialization

- a. Violence in Childhood Home Dichotomous Variable
1. Yes = 20 (28.2%)
 2. No = 51 (71.8%)
- b. Marriage is Forever Dichotomous Variable
0. No = 29 (39.7%)
 1. Yes = 44 (60.3%)
- c. Woman's Place is in the Home Dichotomous Variable
0. No = 48 (65.8%)
 1. Yes = 25 (34.2%)
- d. Women must be peacemakers Dichotomous Variable
0. No = 42 (57.5%)
 1. Yes = 31 (42.5%)
- e. Man's job is to earn a decent living Dichotomous Variable
0. No = 26 (35.6%)
 1. Yes = 47 (64.4%)
- f. Man is Head of the Household Dichotomous Variable
0. No = 31 (42.5%)
 1. Yes = 42 (57.5%)

3. Learned Helplessness: Adult Socialization

- a. Fearful of Being Hurt More Seriously Dichotomous Variable
0. No = 40 (55.6%)
1. Yes = 32 (44.4%)
- b. Injuries have Become More Serious Dichotomous Variable
1. Yes = 34 (47.2%)
2. No = 28 (38.9%)
- c. Incidents Have Become More Frequent Dichotomous Variable
1. Yes = 48 (69.6%)
2. No = 21 (30.4%)

4. Dependency Factors

- a. Economic Reasons Have Prevented Leaving Dichotomous Variable
0. No = 44 (61.1%)
1. Yes = 28 (38.9%)
- b. Nowhere to go Dichotomous Variable
0. No = 34 (47.2%)
1. Yes = 38 (52.8%)
- c. Use of Available Services Continuous Variable
0. None = 6 (8.2%)
1. One = 15 (20.5%)
2. Two = 12 (16.4%)
3. Three = 13 (17.8%)
4. Four = 15 (20.5%)
5. Five = 6 (8.2%)
6. Six = 4 (5.5%)
7. Seven = 2 (2.7%)
- d. Number of Children Continuous Variable
0. None = 7 (9.6%)
1. One = 20 (27.4%)
2. Two = 26 (35.6%)
3. Three = 7 (9.6%)
4. Four = 5 (6.8%)
5. Five = 4 (5.5%)
9. Nine or More = 4 (5.5%)
- e. Ratio Between Mens' and Womens' Incomes Interval Variable
0. 0.0 = 24 (32.9%)
1. 1.1 - 1.9 = 23 (32.6%)
2. 2.0 - 2.9 = 12 (16.4%)
3. 3.0 - 3.9 = 11 (15.1%)
4. 4.0 - 4.9 = 3 (4.1%)

Dependent Variable

1. Duration of Battering Relationship

Interval Variable

1. Less than six months = 10 (13.7%)
2. Six Months to one year = 4 (5.5%)
3. One year to two years = 7 (9.6%)
4. Two to four years = 16 (21.9%)
5. Four to six years = 10 (13.7%)
6. Six to ten years = 17 (23.3%)
7. More than 10 years = 4 (5.5%)

APPENDIX B

Questionnaire

BATTERED WOMEN SYNDROM QUESTIONNAIRE
DEVELOPED BY LENORE WALKER

1. What is your age? _____ Height _____ Weight _____
- 1a. Ethnicity (circlce one)
Black White Hispanic Sur-name Amer. Indian Other _____
2. Are you married?
 Yes If yes, is it a common law marriage ____yes ____no
 No
3. If no--are you living with someone to whom you are not married?
 Yes
 No
4. If you have been previously married, how many times?
 None
 Once
 Twice
 Three times
 Four or more times
5. Check the number of educational years completed:
 Less than high school education
 High school education
 1-4 years of college attended
 Completed 4 years of college with degree
 Graduate degree (e.g. Master's, M.D., law degree, Ph.D.)
6. Have you ever had vocational training?
 Yes If yes, what vocation _____
 No
7. Are you currently employed (outside of home)?
 Yes
 No
8. Type of job: _____
9. What is your income?
 Less than \$5,000/year \$15,000 to \$20,000/year
 \$5,000 to \$10,000/year \$20,000 to \$25,000/year
 \$10,000 to \$15,000/year \$25,000/year and over
10. What is your combined family income?
 Less than \$5,000/year \$15,000 to \$20,000/year
 \$5,000 to \$10,000/year \$20,000 to \$25,000/year
 \$10,000 to \$15,000/year \$25,000/year and over
11. Are you on welfare?
 Yes No
12. Have you ever been employed (outside the home)?
 Yes No

13. Types of jobs you have held: _____

14. Are you currently pregnant?
 Yes
 No

15. If yes--is this your first pregnancy?
 Yes
 No

16. Do you have any children?
 Yes
 No

17. If you have children, how many do you have? List by age and sex. _____

18. If you have children, have any of your children been physically abused or beaten?
 Yes
 No
 Possibly, I'm not sure

19. If yes or possibly--which child (or children) have been physically abused or beaten?

Current Age	Sex	By Whom	When
_____	_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____	_____

20. Was there violence in your childhood home?
 None
 Physical
 Psychological (causing extreme high anxiety and tension)

21. If yes--who battered whom? Check any and all that apply.
 Father battered mother
 Mother battered me
 Father battered me
 Father battered my brother or sister
 Mother battered my brother or sister
 Mother battered father
 Other--please specify _____

22. Which term best describes discipline in your childhood home?

Mother	Father	
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Harsh
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Strict
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Firm
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Lenient
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Over-indulgent
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	None

23. Which of the following were considered immoral or wrong in your childhood home? Check all that apply.

<input type="checkbox"/> Stealing	<input type="checkbox"/> Drinking	<input type="checkbox"/> other
<input type="checkbox"/> Lying	<input type="checkbox"/> Smoking	
<input type="checkbox"/> Card playing	<input type="checkbox"/> Premarital sex	
<input type="checkbox"/> Nudity	<input type="checkbox"/> Masturbation	

24. What was the religion practiced in your childhood home? _____
 What religion do you practice today? _____

25. What was the importance of religion in your upbringing?

Extremely important
 Very important
 Moderately important
 Slightly important
 Not important

26. What is the importance of religion in your life today?

Extremely important
 Very important
 Moderately important
 Slightly important
 Not important

27. Which of the following attitudes were stressed in your childhood home? Check all that apply.

<input type="checkbox"/> Marriage is forever	<input type="checkbox"/> Women must be peacemakers
<input type="checkbox"/> Girl's goal is to marry well	<input type="checkbox"/> Men need to be strong
<input type="checkbox"/> Woman's place is in the home	<input type="checkbox"/> Man is the head of the household
<input type="checkbox"/> Man's job is to earn a decent living	

THE FOLLOWING QUESTIONS CONCERN "BATTERING." WE DEFINE BATTERING AS REPEATED PSYCHOLOGICAL OR PHYSICAL ABUSE.

28. Do you consider yourself to have been psychologically battered?

Yes
 No

29. Do you consider yourself to have been physically battered?

Yes
 No

30. From whom were you most recently battered?
- Current spouse
 - Man you're living with but not married to
 - Woman you're living with in gay relationship
 - Ex-spouse
 - Other family member--please specify: _____
 - Other--please specify: _____
31. Have you taken any legal action to end this relationship?
- Yes
 - No
- Describe: _____
-
32. Have you been separated?
- Never
 - Less than 6 months
 - 6 months to 1 year
 - 1-2 years
 - Over 2 years
33. If you are married to, or living with the man who did the battering, how long have you been in this relationship?
- Less than 6 months
 - 6 months to 1 year
 - 1-2 years
 - 2-4 years
 - 4-6 years
 - 6-10 years
 - Over 10 years
34. If the batterer was your ex-spouse or former male intimate, how long were you in that relationship?
- Less than 6 months
 - 6 months to 1 year
 - 1-2 years
 - 2-4 years
 - 4-6 years
 - 6-10 years
 - Over 10 years
35. If you never lived with the batterer, how long have you been in the relationship?
- Less than 6 months
 - 6 months to 1 year
 - 1-2 years
 - 2-4 years
 - 4-6 years
 - 6-10 years
 - Over 10 years

PLEASE ANSWER THE FOLLOWING QUESTIONS CONCERNING THE PERSON WHO HAS MOST RECENTLY HURT YOU.

36. Age _____ Height _____ Weight _____
37. Check the number of educational years he has completed:
 Less than high school education
 High school education
 1-4 years of college attended
 Graduate degree (e.g. Master's, M.D., Law Degree, Ph.D.)
38. Has he ever had vocational training?
 Yes
 No
 I don't know
39. Is he currently employed?
 Yes
 No
40. If yes--type of job _____
41. If he is not currently employed, has he been employed in the past?
 Yes
 No
42. If yes--what types of jobs has he had? _____
-
43. What is his current income?
 Less than \$5,000/year
 \$5,000 to \$10,000/year
 \$10,000 to \$15,000/year
 \$15,000 to \$20,000/year
 \$20,000 to \$25,000/year
 \$25,000/year and over
44. Was he in the military service?
 Yes
 No
 Did he receive an honorable discharge? If not, what kind _____
45. Does he have a criminal record?
 Yes
 No
46. If yes--state the nature of his criminal record (e.g. theft, rape, assault): _____
-
47. Was there violence in his childhood home?
 None
 Physical
 Psychological
 I don't know

48. If yes--what was the nature of that violence?

- Father battered mother
 Mother battered him
 Father battered him
 Father battered his brother or sister
 Mother battered his brother or sister
 Mother battered father
 Other--please specify: _____
 I don't know

49. Has he abused other adults beside you?

- No
 Physically
 Psychologically
 I don't know

50. Has the batterer sexually abused children?

- No
 Own children
 Your children
 Other children
 I don't know

51. Has the batterer physically abused children?

- No
 Own children
 Your children
 Other children
 I don't know

52. Has the batterer psychologically abused children?

- No
 Own children
 Your children
 Other children
 I don't know

THE FOLLOWING QUESTIONS ARE ABOUT THE MOST RECENT EPISODE OF BATTERING. IF YOU HAVE BEEN BATTERED PREVIOUSLY, THERE ARE QUESTIONS ABOUT THAT IN A LATER SECTION OF THE QUESTIONNAIRE.

53. Was the batterer using alcohol prior to hurting you?

- Yes How much? _____
 No
 Not sure, but think so

54. Were you using alcohol prior to being hurt by him?

- Yes How much? _____
 No

55. Was the batterer using drugs prior to hurting you?

- Yes What drug? _____ How much? _____
 No
 Not sure, but think so

56. Were you using drugs prior to being hurt by him?
 Yes What drug? _____ How much? _____
 No
57. Was a weapon used in the battering (including any household item used as a weapon, e.g. telephone cord, household knife)?
 Yes What weapons(s) _____
 No
58. What kind of injuries did you receive? Check any and all that apply.
 No visible injuries, but soreness and/or pain
 Bruises
 Broken bone(s)
 Cuts, lacerations
 Internal injuries
 Burns
 Sleeplessness
 Lack of appetite
 Overeating
 Depression
 Extreme anxiety
 Other--please specify: _____
-
59. Did you seek immediate help? Check all that apply.
 Medical Psychological
 Family Friends
 Legal Police
 Clergy
60. Did you try to hide your injuries?
 Yes Describe how _____
 No
61. In your own judgment, what factors are responsible for causing this assault? Check all that apply.
 Money Jealousy
 His short temper My short temper
 My pregnancy Quality of child care
 Quality of food preparation Quality of housekeeping
 Effects of alcohol Effects of drugs
 I have no idea Other--please specify: _____
 His mental instability
 My mental instability
62. Do you think you did anything verbally or physically to bring on the attack?
 Yes Describe: _____
 No
63. Did you try to defend yourself?
 Yes Describe: _____
 No
64. If yes--did the beating get worse after you tried to defend yourself?
 Yes
 No

65. Did you leave home after being beaten?
 Yes
 No
66. If yes--where did you go? _____
 When did you return? _____
67. If you didn't leave home, did you try to leave home?
 Yes
 No
68. Did he leave home after the beating?
 Yes
 No
69. If yes--where did he go? _____
 When did he return? _____
70. If he didn't leave home, did he try to leave home?
 Yes
 No
71. Did you discuss the incident after it was over?
 Yes
 No
72. What was his behavior like following the incident. Check all that apply.
 Friendly Asking forgiveness
 Contrite Silent
 Kind Angry
 Loving Childish
 Afraid Crying
 Sorry Sexually aroused
 Hostile Sexually unresponsive
 Mean Gave gifts
 Other-specify _____ Ashamed
73. What was your behavior like following the incident. Check all that apply.
 Friendly Asking forgiveness
 Contrite Silent
 Kind Angry
 Loving Childish
 Afraid Crying
 Sorry Sexually aroused
 Hostile Sexually unresponsive
 Mean Gave gifts
 Other-specify _____ Ashamed
74. Have there been past battering incidents before the current one you are reporting?
 Yes
 No
75. If yes--state the approximate number.
 Once before 6-10 times
 2-4 times 10-20 times
 4-6 times Over 20 times

76. How often do battering incidents occur?
- | | |
|--|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> 1 or more daily | <input type="checkbox"/> 1 or more bi-monthly |
| <input type="checkbox"/> 1 or more weekly | <input type="checkbox"/> 1 or more in 6 months |
| <input type="checkbox"/> 1 or more bi-weekly | <input type="checkbox"/> 1 or more a year |
| <input type="checkbox"/> 10 or more monthly | <input type="checkbox"/> Less frequently |

77. When did the battering begin in your relationship with this person?
- Before we got married or started living together
- After getting married
- During the first 6 months of living together
- 6 months to 1 year of living together
- Between the first and second year of living together
- After the second year of living together

- 77a. Have the incidents become more frequent in the last six months?

Yes

No

- 77b. Have the injuries become more severe in the last six months?

Yes

No

IF THERE HAVE BEEN BATTERING INCIDENTS PRIOR TO THE MOST RECENT ONE WHICH YOU DESCRIBED ABOVE, PLEASE ANSWER THE FOLLOWING QUESTIONS ABOUT THE PREVIOUS BATTERING IN GENERAL. IF THERE HAVE NOT BEEN PREVIOUS BATTERINGS, GO TO QUESTION #81.

78. What kind of injuries did you receive? Check any and all that apply.
- | | |
|--|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> No visible injuries, but soreness and/or pain | <input type="checkbox"/> Cuts, lacerations |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Bruises | <input type="checkbox"/> Internal injuries |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Broken bone(s) | <input type="checkbox"/> Burns |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Other--please specify _____ | |

79. Was the batterer using alcohol prior to hurting you?

In all previous batterings

In 75% or more of previous batterings

In 50-75%

In 25-50%

In less than 25%

In none

80. Were you using alcohol prior to being battered?

In all previous batterings

In 75% or more of previous batterings

In 50-75%

In 25-50%

In less than 25%

In none

81. Was the batterer using drugs prior to hurting you?

In all previous batterings

In 75% or more of previous batterings

In 50-75%

In 25-50%

In less than 25%

In none

82. Were you using drugs prior to being battered?
- In all previous batterings
 - In 75% or more of previous batterings
 - In 50-75%
 - In 25-50%
 - In less than 25%
 - In none
83. Were weapons used in previous batterings?
- In all previous batterings
 - In 75% or more of previous batterings
 - In 50-75%
 - In 25-50%
 - In less than 25%
 - In none
84. Did you try to hide your injuries?
- In all previous batterings
 - In 75% or more of previous batterings
 - In 50-75%
 - In 25-50%
 - In less than 25%
 - In none
85. Do you think you did anything verbally or physically to bring the attack on?
- In all previous batterings
 - In 75% or more of previous batterings
 - In 50-75%
 - In 25-50%
 - In less than 25%
 - In none
86. Do you think that you did anything after the assault started to make it worse?
- In all previous batterings
 - In 75% or more of previous batterings
 - In 50-75%
 - In 25-50%
 - In less than 25%
 - In none
87. In your own judgment, what factors were responsible for causing these assaults? Check any and all that apply.
- | | |
|--|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Money | <input type="checkbox"/> Jealousy |
| <input type="checkbox"/> His short temper | <input type="checkbox"/> My short temper |
| <input type="checkbox"/> My pregnancy | <input type="checkbox"/> Quality of child care |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Quality of food preparation | <input type="checkbox"/> Quality of housekeeping |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Effects of alcohol | <input type="checkbox"/> Effects of drugs |
| <input type="checkbox"/> I have no idea | <input type="checkbox"/> Other--please specify: _____ |
| <input type="checkbox"/> His mental instability | _____ |
| <input type="checkbox"/> My mental instability | _____ |
88. Did you ever leave home after any of these batterings?
- Yes
 - No

89. If yes--where did you usually go? _____
When did you return _____
90. If no--did you ever try to leave home after any of these batterings?
 Yes
 No
91. Did he ever leave home after any of these batterings?
 Yes
 No
92. If yes--where did he usually go? _____
When did he return? _____
93. If no--did he ever try to leave home after any of these batterings?
 Yes
 No
94. Did you ever threaten to divorce or leave him permanently?
 Yes
 No
94. What was his response?
 increase in battering
 threaten you
 asked for forgiveness
 promise to stop battering
 other
95. Did you ever try to defend yourself?
 Yes
 No
96. If yes--did the battering get worse after you tried to defend yourself?
 Yes
 No

THE FOLLOWING QUESTIONS ARE ABOUT YOUR REACTIONS TO BEING BATTERED AND ABOUT SEEKING HELP.

97. What have your reactions been to being battered? Check all that apply.
 Surprise Depression Anger, outrage
 Shame Love Powerlessness
 Self-blame Understanding Loneliness
 Fear Forgiving Wanted revenge
 Other--please specify: _____
98. With whom have you shared the knowledge of your assault(s)?
 No one Clergy Medical person
 Woman friend Relative Lawyer
 Man friend Social service person Other please specify: _____
99. Have you ever sought medical treatment for your injuries?
 No Yes How soon after incident did you go? _____
100. If yes--have you ever told medical personnel about the cause of your injuries?
 Yes
 No

101. Please describe how you feel you were treated by medical personnel, in general: _____

102. Have you ever reported an assault to the police?
 Yes How many times? _____
 No
103. If you contacted the police, what did they do for you? _____

104. How do you feel about what they did? _____

105. Have you ever pressed charges against your assailant?
 Yes
 No
106. If yes--what else did you do legally? Check all that apply.
 Visited lawyer
 Temporary restraining order
 Enforced the temporary restraining order when he came back
 Pressed criminal assault charges
 Dropped charges
 Other--please specify: _____
107. If you completed criminal proceedings, was the batterer convicted?
 Yes Describe his penalty: _____
 No
108. From which professional sources have you sought help about the problem of battering?
 None
 Social service agency (e.g. mental health center)
 Women's group
 Private practice mental health professional (e.g. psychologist)
 Marriage counselor
 Clergy
 Family doctor
 Other--please specify: _____

109. If you sought help, please describe the response you got from the professional source. _____

110. How did you feel about that response? _____

111. What causes (caused) you to remain in an intimate relationship with the batterer? Check all that apply.

- Physical battering lessened
- Mental battering lessened
- Physical battered stopped
- Mental battering stopped
- Fearful of being killed
- Fearful of being hurt more seriously
- Children need a father
- Nowhere to go
- Strong belief in marriage vows
- Believe he will change
- Still love him
- Believe only you can help him
- Feel sorry for him
- Economic reasons
- Family pressure
- Religious reasons
- Other--specify: _____

112. If you are no longer in an intimate relationship with the batterer, what has helped you to leave? Check all that apply.

- Fear of being killed
- Fear of being hurt more seriously
- Awareness he will not change
- Family support
- Children grew up
- Psychological help
- No longer afraid
- Legal help
- Women's groups
- Financial independence
- Medical advice
- Another man
- Safe House or another battered women's refuge house
- Recent publicity about this problem
- Other--specify: _____

THE FOLLOWING QUESTIONS CONCERN VIOLENCE INFLICTED ON THE MAN YOU ARE LIVING WITH BY YOU.

113. Have you ever caused physical injury to the man you are living with?

- Yes
- No

114. What are the factors responsible for causing you to inflict violence?

- Money
- His short temper
- My pregnancy
- Effects of alcohol
- Other _____
- I have no idea
- His mental instability
- My mental instability
- Self-defence
- Jealousy
- My short temper
- Effects of drugs

115. Does he do anything verbally or physically to bring on the violence?
 Yes Describe _____
 No

116. How often do these incidents occur?
 1 or more daily 1 or more bi-monthly
 1 or more weekly 1 ore more in 6 months
 1 or more bi-weekly 1 or more a year
 10 or more monthly Less frequently:

117. What kind of injuries does the man recieve? Check any and all that apply.
 No visible injuries, but soreness and/or pain Cuts, lacerations
 Bruises Internal injuries
 Broken bone(s) Burns
 Other--please specify _____

118. Have you ever used a weapon against the man you are livng with?
 Yes What weapons _____
 No

THANK YOU FOR THE TIME, THOUGHT, AND DIFFICULTY IN COMPLETING THIS QUESTIONNAIRE.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Bibliography

- Appleton, W., "The Battered Women Syndrome", Journal of the American College of Emergency Physicians, Vol. 9, February 1980, PP 84-91
- Carlson, B., "Battered Women and Their Assailants", Social Work, Vol. 22, 1977, PP. 455-460.
- Chessler, P., Woman and Madness, New York: Doubleday, 1972.
- Eisenberg, S., and Micklow, P., The Assaulted Wife: "Catch 22" Revisited, University of Michigan Law School, Ann Arbor: Michigan, 1974, P. 3.
- Emerson, R., "Power - Dependence Relations," American Sociological Review, Vol. 27, 1962, PP. 31-41.
- Fields, M., Testimony before the United States House of Representatives Committee on Science and Technology, 1978 in Nielsen, J., et. al., Why Women Stay in Battering Relationships: Preliminary Results, Paper presented at the ASA Annual Meeting, Boston, Massachusetts, August, 1979.
- Gayford, J., "Wife Battering: A Preliminary Survey of 100 Cases," British Medical Journal, Vol. 169, 1975, PP. 194-197.
- Gilles, R., The Violent Home: A Study of Physical Agression Between Husbands and Wives, Beverly Hills, California: Sage Publications, 1972.
- Gilles, R., "Violence and Pregnancy: A Note on the Extent of the Problem and Needed Services," Family Coordinator, January, 1975, PP. 81-86.
- Gilles, R., "Abused Wives: Why Do They Stay?" Journal of Marriage and the Family, November, 1976, PP. 659-668.
- Gingold, J., "One of These Days - Pow Right in the Kisser," Ms, August, 1976, P. 54.
- Gove, W., and Tudor, J., "Adult Sex Roles and Mental Illness," American Journal of Sociology, Vol. 78, 1973, PP. 812-835.
- Harris, L., and Associates, Inc., A Survey of Spousal Violence Against Women in Kentucky, Kentucky Commission on Women, July, 1979.
- Keppner, M., "Counseling the Battered Wife: Myths, Facts, and Decisions," Personnel and Guidance Journal, May, 1978, PP. 522-525.
- Hirschi, T., Causes of Delinquency, Berkly: University of California Press, 1971.
- Kempe, C., Silverman, F., and Steele, B., et.al., "Battered Child Syndrome," Journal of the American Medical Association, Vol. 181, 1962, PP. 17-24.
- Levinger, G., "Sources of Marital Dissatisfactions Among Applicants for Divorce," American Journal of Orthopsychiatry, Vol. 36, 1966, PP. 803-807.

- Lewis, R., and Spanier, G., "Theorizing About the Quality and Stability of Marriage," in Burr, et.al., Contemporary Theories about the Family, New York: Free Press, 1979, PP. 268-293.
- Lunde, D., "Our Murder Boom," Psychology Today, July, 1975, P. 35.
- MacCoby, E., and Jacklin, C., The Psychology of Sex Differences, California: Stanford University Press, 1974.
- Martin, D., Battered Wives, San Francisco: Glide Publications, 1976, PP.77-78.
- Miller, P., and Gambs, M., Quoted in a Proposal for "La Casa De Las Madres: Refuge for all Women," Los Angeles, California, 1975.
- Nielsen, J., Eberle, P., Thoennes, N., and Walker, L., "Why Women Stay in Battering Relationships: Preliminary Results," Presented at the August 1979, American Sociological Association Annual Meeting, Boston, Massachusetts.
- Pizzy, E., Scream Quietly or the Neighbors will Hear, London, Penguin Publications, 1974.
- Radloff, L., "Sex Differences in Helplessness with Implications for Depression," in Walker, L., "Battered Women and Learned Helplessness," Victimology: An International Journal, Vol. 2., 1978, PP. 525-534.
- Snell, R., Rosenwald, R., and Robey, A., "The Wifebeaters Wife: A Study of Family Interaction," Archives of General Psychiatry, Vol. 2., 1964, PP. 107-112.
- Spinetta, J., and Rigler, D., "The Child Abusing Parent," Psychological Bulletin, Vol. 27, 1972, PP. 296-304.
- Steinmetz, S., and Straus, M., "Family as Cradle of Violence," Society, Vol. 10, 1972, P. 50.
- Steinmetz, S., and Straus, M., "Social Myth and Social System in the Study of Intrafamily Violence," in Violence in the Family, New York: Harper and Row, 1974.
- Straus, M., "Some Social Antecedents of Physical Punishment: A Linkage Theory Interpretation," Journal of Marriage and the Family, Vol. 33, 1971, PP. 658-663.
- Straus, M., "A General Systems Approach to a Theory of Violence Between Family Members," Social Science Information, Vol. 12, 1973, PP. 105-125.
- Straus, M., "Sexual Inequality, Cultural Norms, and Wife-Beating," in Chapman, J., and Gates, M. (Eds), "Women into Wives: The Legal and Economic Impact of Marriage," Sage Yearbooks in Women's Policy Studies, Vol. 2, Beverly Hills: Sage Publications, 1976.
- Straus, M., Steinmetz, S., and Gilles, R., Presentation at the American Association for the Advancement of Science Conference, Denver, Colorado, 1977.

Walker, L., Psychotherapy and Counseling with Battered Women, " Presented at the American Psychological Association Meeting, January, 1978.

Walker, L., "Battered Women and Learned Helplessness," Victimology: An International Journal Volume, Vol. 2, 1978, pp. 525-534.

Walker, L., The Battered Women, New York: Harper and Row Publishers, 1978.

Worrier, B., Wifebeating, Massachusetts: New England Press, 1976.

END