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Chapter I
Introduction

The history of wife abuse can be traced through three major, intertwined and changing institutions: the family, the church, and the state. One of the earliest documented family systems was that of the Romans, nearly one thousand years before the birth of Christ. What is significant about these ancient families is the striking resemblance they bear to our own. Both developed out of strong patriarchal ideologies. In Rome men enjoyed a higher status than women within the home and society. They were head of the household and of the state. They had virtual life and death control over their wives, their children and their slaves. "Husbands and fathers could put a woman to death without recourse to public trial" (Dobash and Dobash, 1979, p. 37). Men were the decision makers and the lawmakers. Women were treated as second class citizens. They were forbidden to own property. They were generally denied any formal education and were prohibited from holding positions within the government. In short, women were denied access to the very institutions which controlled their lives. They were expected to be passive and submit to the will of their husbands and fathers. Any woman who stepped outside these boundaries were severely chastised and
punished. Both Roman law and attitude reinforced women's secondary position.

The status of women remained the same until the outbreak of the long Punic Wars during the second century. With the male populations significantly reduced due to the wars, women were "able to assume many of the men's responsibilities and had been freed from some traditional controls." (Dobash and Dobash, 1979, p. 39).

"Property began to be individually controlled, prohibitions upon women's inheritance was diminished, and a class of wealthy women arose. Many upper class women enjoyed traditionally male pursuits: politics, philosophy, attending military maneuvers, and joining new religious movements. There was a departure from the severe sexual code, and the single code from the past gave way before a proliferation of laws concerning the distinction among various types of infidelity, fornication, and adultery ... Chastisement (i.e. being beaten by rod or whip) was also still possible though in somewhat mediated forms.... By the 4th Century excessive violence on the part of either party, husband or wife, constituted a sufficient ground for divorce, but so did a wife's attendance at the games without her husband's permission." (Dobash and Dobash, 1979 p. 39)

The same pattern is evident in the 20th Century. Each of our major wars has been followed by significant, although sometimes temporary, change in the status of women. World War I saw the rise of the suffragists. Women won the vote and the first ERA was submitted to Congress, and continued to be submitted annually until the present. World War II saw the rise of women in the workforce (outside the home). Non-traditional areas of activity opened up to women for
the first time: the military, labor and politics. The war in Vietnam saw the rise of the Feminist Movement. Women struggled to ensure women equality in all aspects of their lives.

Contemporary wars shared other similarities with the influence of war on women's lives during the Punic Wars. First, the patriarchal position of the family did not change. Second, the return of the male population was followed by a religious resurgence, resulting in a conservative backlash surrounding the changing roles of women within the family and society.

Today, women, in spite of the material gains, are still expected to be subordinate to husbands. Husbands are still expected to keep their wives in their place. Husbands are still permitted the use of physical force and power to do so. Men continue to physically and emotionally abuse women. There is little active discouragement from doing so by either the Church or the State.

The structure of the Church clearly resembles the hierarchal structure of the family. Christ was viewed as husband and head of the Church, while the Church, personified as female, is viewed as his bride. Together they are father and mother to the faithful, who are viewed as children. In both the Old and New Testament emphasis is placed upon a woman's subordination and rightful subjection to a man.
Adam said this is now bone of my bones, and flesh of my flesh; she shall be called woman, because she was taken out of man. (Genesis 2:23)

But I would have you know, that the head of every man is Christ; and the head of every woman is the man; and the head of Christ is God. (I Corinthians 11:7)

Wives, submit yourselves unto your husbands as unto the Lord. For the husband is head of the wife even as Christ is head of the Church and he is the savior of the body. (Ephesians 5:22,23)

The Bible was often quoted as a rationale for "chastising" (i.e. beating, kicking, flogging) women, justifying its use as a means of saving her soul. Wife beating represented the continual subordination of women to the male authority of not only the church, but also the State.

The development of the legal system's view of women and the family followed a similar pathway. From ancient Rome through the Middle Ages and into the Nineteenth Century "women were chattels of their husbands, and as pieces of property it was important that they remain under control of and in possession of their owner" (Dobash and Dobash, 1979 p. 58). The position of women as property was reflected in the legal double standards that prevail today. Husbands could beat, even kill, their wives for a variety of offenses (i.e. talking back, drunkenness, adultery) without fear of reprisal. The same did not hold true for wives whose husbands committed the same offenses. Until the Nineteenth Century a man was legally justified in beating his wife "for her acts that went against his authority and/or her failure to live up to his ideals about her work, domestic or otherwise."
It was not until 1871 that wife beating was declared illegal, in Alabama and Massachusetts. In 1894 the Mississippi Supreme Court declared that a husband no longer had the right to chastise (beat) his wife. In 1910 a woman could seek a divorce on the grounds of cruelty. In 1977 the first laws were passed which specifically prohibited married and non-married couples from engaging in physical acts of violence toward each other. Ohio is one of the few states in which domestic violence is a crime. If an individual is convicted twice under this law the maximum sentence is a $1,000 fine and one year in jail. This compares to a maximum sentence of a $5,000 fine and four years in jail for a first time offense of promoting dog fighting in Ohio. The legal system is a reflection of societal attitudes. Wife beating continues.

Statistically, it is evident that time has neither changed society's attitudes nor diminished the scope of domestic violence. In their national study of 2,143 families, Gelles, Strauss and Steinmetz (1980) found that between fifty and sixty percent of the women were victims of violence. A study by the National Commission on Causes and Prevention of Crime and Violence in 1973 showed that twenty percent of college educated men and women felt that it was all right to slap their spouse under some circumstances. It has been estimated that as many as twenty-three million women will be physically abused in their lifetime. This
figure excludes emotional and sexual abuse which occurs between partners. Many women describe this kind of abuse as far worse than any physical abuse they have experienced. "It is within marriage that a woman is most likely to be slapped, shoved, severely assaulted, raped or killed" (Dobash and Dobash, 1979, p. 75).

Many theories and hypotheses have been proposed as an explanation of aggression in general and intra-family violence in particular. Among these are Freud's (1924) masochistic theory, Dollard and Miller's (1939) frustration-aggression hypothesis, Bandura's (1963) social learning theory, Goode's (1971) resource theory, the general system's theory proposed by Strauss (1973), and Walker's (1977) adaptation of Seligman's (1975) theory of "learned helplessness."

While the psychoanalytic concept of masochism has largely been discarded as an explanation of wife abuse, it maintains a certain popularity. Freud (1953) wrote "that masochism is not the manifestation of a primary instinct, but originates from sadism which has been turned around and directed against oneself whereby the active aim (sadism) is changed into a passive one (masochism), and some person is sought as an object who takes over the original sadistic role of the subject" (p. 190). The repression of sadistic impulses evokes within the individual a sense of guilt, which needs to be expiated "through punishment and suffering at the
hands of 'parental' power" (Freud, 1961, p. 168). In other words, women who are beaten, consciously or unconsciously chose aggressive, assaultive men as a way to atone for the guilt they experience as a result of their own aggressive, assaultive feelings.

According to the frustration-aggression hypothesis postulated by Dollard, Miller et al, (1939), "the occurrence of aggressive behavior always presupposes the existence of frustration, and contraverse, that the existence of frustration (or the interference with reaching a goal) always leads to some form of aggression" (p. 1). This hypothesis would predict that since the family is the source of much frustration, the family would be the setting for the display of much aggression. Statistics bear out the prediction. This does not explain why women and children are the predominant victims of intra-family violence. Dollard and Miller (1939) note that "aggression may be directed at the object which is perceived as causing the frustration or it may be displaced to some altogether innocent source ..." (p. 15). In the case of the battered woman, there is a no win situation. She is beaten either as the cause of his frustration or as the receiver of his displaced frustration. Since little punishment is anticipated by the batterer as a result of his behavior, and since "the inhibition of aggression is dependent upon the amount of punishment anticipated as the consequence of one's actions," the aggression continues in growing proportions.
Social learning theory moved from the inner determinants of behavior, depicted by Freud and Dollard and Miller, to a more complex explanation of human responsiveness. As a major proponent of this view, Alburt Bandura (1971) wrote that "psychological functioning is best understood in terms of continual reciprocal interaction between behavior and its controlling conditions...Most of the behaviors that people display are learned, either deliberately or inadvertently, through the influence of models in their life, and a special emphasis is placed on the role played by this direct, vicarious, symbolic and self-regulating process" (p. 5). The hypothesis would predict assaultive behavior in marriages of individuals who either observed and/or were the victims of violence in their families of origin.

Goode (1971) introduced two concepts to the study of intra-family violence: 1) The family, like other social units, is a power system, resting to some degree on force or its threat. 2) The greater the resources an individual can command, the more force he can muster, but the less likely he will actually display or use force in an overt manner.

Lenore Walker's use of Seligman's (1975) theory of "learned helplessness" and Murray Strauss's (1973) use of the general system's theory, represent the current state of the art. Domestic violence is viewed either as an individual problem or as a systems problem. Learned helplessness is
a response pattern which results when an individual learns "that their voluntary responses really don't make much difference in what happens to them, and they believe they no longer have any say or control in the situation" (Walker, 1977, p. 528). This hypothesis has been put forth to explain why women remain in abusive relationships. This trend, Walker would say, can be reversed by teaching women new skills that can increase a sense of power.

While Walker focused on the individual-as-problem, family systems theory focuses on the individual-as-symptom. "The appearance of a symptom reflects an acute and/or chronic disturbance in the balance of the emotional forces in the individual's important relationship systems, most particularly the family system" (Kerr, 1981 p. 234). For Strauss violence was a systematic product rather than a product of individual pathology.

In addition to the theories described above, there have been some empirical studies of battering, which have shown a relationship between child abuse and substance abuse and the perpetuation of violence.

Need For The Study

This study is needed to expand the focus of the literature and broaden the base from which the public and professionals view and work with battered women. Specifically, it is needed to increase the knowledge and awareness among practitioners. Domestic violence is a problem of
immense proportions. For years, however, clinicians have avoided the issue in their practice and maintained the conspiracy of silence in collusion with their clients. The result is a perpetuation of the myth that battering occurs only among deviant couples and to only a small segment of the population. Statistics alone show that this is clearly not the case. The fact is that historically clinicians, doctors, social workers and psychiatrists have treated marital/partner violence with a head-in-the-sand approach. Hilberman (1980) notes that "the clinicians response to battering has been characterized by inattention, disbelief and blame. Both male and female therapists share cultural myths that denigrate women, and women may not feel safe in revealing their 'secret'. The clinician may find it difficult to begin direct questions because details can be overwhelming. And as the amount of abuse among women increases it is likely that the clinician will have experienced it or seen it with a personal friend, and therefore may attempt to distance him/herself from it" (p. 1343). This cycle among therapists will continue until the psychological research increases in direct proportion to the extent of the problem. The issue of battering for therapy will remain as isolated as the battered woman himself.

In the past, when it was assumed that few women were beaten, the literature was content with a list of symptoms. When it is known that more than one million women are
beaten each year, descriptions can no longer serve as ade­quate explanations. If clinicians, counselors and shelter staffs are to effectively work with battered women, more indepth research and analysis is necessary. The direction this study will take will be toward preliminary develop­ment of a psychological profile of battered women. It will extend beyond the concepts of depression, learned helplessness and low self-esteem so commonly associates with battered women. The study's profile will be unique in several ways. This is one of the few studies to use comparable groups of battered and non-battered women. The past failure of researchers to provide for such a comparison has limited the conclusions drawn by the research. Without a comparison group of non-battered women, it is impossible to determine if it is the beatings or the behaviors which came first. With a comparison group, one can at least begin to address this issue.

This profile is unique because it will focus on three areas which have been used to predict whether a man will batter, but not whether a woman will be battered. These include a history of childhood violence, parental, and personal substance abuse. It is generally found that if a man experienced any of these there is a fifty to sixty percent chance that he will physically hurt his spouse or partner. It is surprising that not more has been done to determine if these circumstances may have affected a
battered woman.

The profile is also unique because it will explore two issues that have been either overlooked and/or avoided in the research. The first is the presence of incest and the second is the presence of psychological strengths among battered women. Shelter staffs in Texas, Illinois and Ohio have reported that forty to eighty percent of the women they have seen were incest victims as children. This compares with the sixteen percent (Rush, 1981) of cases of incest among girls that is statistically expected to occur. The literature, however, has remained silent on this issue. This study will explore the possibility that an incestuous background may play a major role in predicting the likelihood of a woman entering into a physically abusive relationship.

Psychological strengths is another area that has rarely been discussed in the literature. By focusing on pathology and excluding comparable groups of battered and non-battered women, past and present research continues to reinforce the assumption that, as a group, battered women are "psychologically disturbed." Unlike its predecessors, this study will shift the focus from "sickness" to "health" by examining a variety of "normal" psychological concepts (i.e. dominance, flexibility, tolerance). Through the use of comparable groups of battered and non-battered women, these
concepts can be assessed and psychological strengths and weaknesses can be compared. By developing counseling and shelter programs that include "normal" aspects of psychological development, service providers can assist battered women in focusing on their strengths as a means for change.

In summary, this study is needed because:
1. It is one of the few empirically based psychological studies to be done that relies on objective data rather than the subjective data of observation and structured interviews.
2. It is one of only three studies that has been found to compare battered and non-battered women. This is a vital component in research as a way of either affirming or denying the underlying assumptions that battered women are "sick", "masochistic" or somehow psychologically different from non-battered women.
3. It is one of the first pieces of research which will undertake the study of shelter staff observations that a majority of their residents have been victims of incest.
4. It is the first study to analyze psychological strengths as well as psychological weaknesses.
5. It is one of the few studies to attempt to provide clinicians, counselors, social workers and shelter staffs a broad based psychological profile going beyond concepts of depression, poor self-esteem and learned helplessness. It will offer service providers an expanded range of
personality characteristics and experiences upon which they can develop appropriate counseling strategies and programs.

**Purpose of the Study**

Ever since Freud labeled battered women as masochistic, there has been an underlying assumption that battered women are "sick". One purpose of this study is to examine this assumption by comparing similar populations of battered and non-battered women. It is beyond the scope of the study to determine what a woman's personality was like per se prior to being beaten by her spouse or partner. The focus of this study will be on those characteristics which currently exist, once a woman has been identified as battered. The emphasis in this study will be placed on the "normal" aspects of personality (i.e. self-assurance, maturity, responsibility) rather than the pathological (i.e. depression, paranoia). Using information derived from a personality inventory and self-report measures of childhood violence, personal, and parental substance abuse, this study will explore in which ways battered women are (1) similar to each other, (2) similar to non-battered women, and (3) the generalizability of these characteristics.

The second purpose is to examine the above questions in light of treatment and programming issues. As such, the psychological strengths of battered women are given as much importance as psychological weaknesses. Heretofore,
this element of strength has not been adequately recognized in the literature. Since shelters for battered women continue to be the primary source of assistance for battered women, the findings in this study may have major implications for the type of programming designed and implemented by shelter staff.

Research Questions

1. Which familial and psychological characteristics discriminate between battered women residing in a shelter and non-battered women?

Limitations of the Study

This study is limited in the following ways:

1. While battering affects all socio-economic classes of women, those individuals who seek refuge in shelters tend to be from the lower middle and lower economic segments of the population.

2. Women who are battered and seek shelter may have different characteristics than women who are battered and don't seek a shelter.

3. Since the separation of battered and non-battered women is dependent upon accurate and honest responses to a self-report measure of current levels of partner or spousal violence, it is probable that some battered women will be included in the non-battered group.

4. The subjects are limited to those willing to volunteer
their time and effort to participate in the study.

5. The research lacks generalizability beyond parts of Southwestern and Central Ohio.

Definition of Terms

For the purpose of this study, a woman will be defined as "battered" if she marks any item beyond the first two items on the Current Abuse Checklist. She will, therefore, be considered battered not only if she has been the victim of actual incidents of violence (i.e. slapped, choked, burned), but also if she has been the victim of threats of violence (i.e. threatened with a knife).

Within the confines of this study the terms "wife abuse", "spouse abuse," "battering," "intra-family violence" and "domestic violence" will be used interchangeably and will refer to a woman being physically beaten.
Chapter II

Review of the Literature

The review of the literature will consist of 1) a brief discussion of psychological and sociological theories (listed in chronological order) on aggression and intra-family violence (wife abuse) 2) a brief discussion of substance abuse and child abuse and their relationship to wife abuse 3) an analysis of a) structured and non-structured interviews b) empirical data c) comparative studies between battered and non-battered women and 4) a brief discussion on counseling strategies.

Theories

The discussion which follows is not meant to provide the reader with an all inclusive list of theories on violence and aggression, it is intended as an overview of a variety of theories which have emerged over the last fifty years and have had some impact on understanding the phenomena of wife abuse.

Masochist Theory

Freud describes two types of masochism. The first erotogenic masochism, is commonly referred to today as gaining sexual gratification through physical pain. The second, moral masochism, is the more complex and significant of the two. In "The Economic Problem of Masochism," Freud
writes that "moral masochism is not the manifestation of a primary instinct, but originates from sadism which has been turned around and directed against the self, that is to say, by means of regression from an object to the ego. In moral masochism, it is the suffering itself which matters..." As evidence of this phenomena, Freud cites "In a Child Being Beaten," his analysis of four female and two male patients, each of whom shared a fantasy in which a child is being beaten. For Freud the beating fantasy symbolically represented scars left over after the Oepipal process was completed, and represented the patient's struggle between his/her incestuous wishes and guilt, and a need for punishment for those incestuous wishes. "People who harbor fantasies of this kind develop a special sensitiveness and irritability towards anyone who they can put among the class of father. They allow themselves to be easily offended by a person of this kind and in that way (to their sorrow and cost) bring about imagined situations of being beaten by their father" (Freud, 1953, p. 191).

Bernard Berliner (1958) further developed the concept of masochism in "The Role of Object Relations in Masochism." It is more than sadism turned inward. It is the reenactment in adulthood of the original infantile trauma of "experiencing non-loving coming from the person whose love is needed....What is turned against self is not the person's sadism, but the sadism of the love object (i.e., parent)
who refuses to give love" (p. 50). According to Berliner, "The guilt and punishment experienced by the masochist is a reflection of the need for the love of a person who punishes and makes one feel guilty..." In identifying with the love object's sadism and subsequent "drive to punish", the masochist uses this drive, through the mechanism of the super-ego, to repress his feelings of hate toward the love object. Since hostility would cause the loss of the love object, he attempts to save the love through suffering and submission. "The sense of guilt experienced by the masochist should be called a sense of defeat. It is defeat by a rejecting parent in transference, and it is the defeat rather than the guilt that is introjected and forms a character pattern for acting out" (p. 54). For Berliner (1958), "The masochist is a victim of a traumatic childhood, and a troublemaker who entangles himself in conflicts by which he continues to make himself a victim again" (p. 53).

In her brief feminist analysis, Elizabeth Wates (1977) blames masochism on the "social factors and fixed ideologies concerning the nature of women that are correlated with actual restrictions and with positive rewards for masochistic behavior" (p. 538). It is the combination of social factors (i.e. pressure to marry, stigma of divorce) and enforced restrictions (i.e. difficulty in getting a non-traditional job), not masochism, which are underlying reasons why women remain in abusive relationships.
There is no empirical research which directly ties either erotogenic or moral masochism with being a battered wife. The closest related studies are those by Aaron Beck (1967) and Jim Lantz (1981), in which the masochist content (i.e. being thwarted, rejected, deprived) of dreams and early recollection recall is shown to correlate with feelings of depression.

**Frustration-Aggression Hypothesis**

The frustration-aggression hypothesis (regardless of the fact that it is rarely discussed) is worthy of some mention because it was a systematic attempt to understanding the process underlying aggression in human beings. As proponents of the theory, Dollard and Miller, et al. (1939), wrote that "Aggression is always a consequence of frustration." Controversy over this statement lead to its modification. In effect it came to read "Aggression is not always a consequence of frustration." The theory would predict that wife abuse is the direct result of the level of frustration experienced by the marital pair. The greater the frequency and intensity of the frustration, the greater is the frequency and intensity of the aggression. Conversely, aggression can be reduced if the punishment anticipated as a result of the aggression is greater than the strength of the frustration. In a sense the frustration-aggression hypothesis is the rationale underlying the "She nags him. He hit her." paradigm.

The frustration-aggression hypothesis, however, doesn't
succeed on several levels. It has been criticized for ambiguity in the definition of terms such as "frustration", "aggression" and "instigator". In theory, it has failed to explain why, under similar frustrating circumstances, women are less likely to respond with aggression than men. In research (Levy, 1941; Dollard and Sears, 1979) it has failed to clearly demonstrate a causal relationship between frustration and aggression. In general, the frustration-aggression theory has failed to address "the crucial problems of how aggressive responses are originally learned, of the form that aggressive responses initially take, and the role of factors other than interference with an ongoing response sequence (frustration) in the shaping and maintaining of aggressive behavior." (Bandura, 1963)

Social Learning Theory

The frustration-aggression hypothesis was gradually replaced by and absorbed into the social learning theory. Developed in the 1950's, it moved away from the underlying motives of psychoanalysis and the inferred innate drive status of the frustration-aggression hypothesis toward the importance of social influences on behavior. Social learning theory recognized that "new patterns of behavior could be acquired through direct experience or by experiencing the behavior of others (models" (Bandura, 1971 p. 3). Within the framework of this theory, models played a major role in the development of human behavior, while "reinforcement primarily served an informative and incentive function."
Models could enhance the probability of the expression of novel responses that were not previously found in an individual's repertoire, as well as elicit or inhibit previously learned responses. The extent to which an observer would imitate a model, however, was partly contingent on the rewarding or punishing consequences of a model's actions, and on the fact that "models who are rewarding, prestigeful or competent, who possess high status and who have control over rewarding resources are more readily imitated than are models who lack these qualities" (Bandura and Walters, 1963, p. 107). It appears that models, either directly or indirectly, were responsible for a lot of the subsequent actions of others and much research was devoted to the affirmation of this hypothesis. Although none of these studies directly tied the effects of modeling with the actions of the batterer and the battered woman, the social learning theory is often used to explain the actions of both. The research on aggression is of particular interest in the study of domestic violence.

A study of Davitz (1952) rejected the assumption of Dollard and Miller (1939) that a high degree of correlation exists between frustration and aggression. He proposed that an individual's response to frustration was governed by his previous experience. Aggression was seen as only one of many possible reactions to frustration. Using a group of forty children Davitz tested two hypotheses.
1) Those children trained in aggressive behavior prior to frustration would behave aggressively after encountering frustration. 2) Those children trained in constructive behavior prior to frustration would behave constructively after encountering frustration. Both hypotheses were generally confirmed. It could not adequately explain the ten children who did not respond in the predicted direction. Six in the constructive group performed more aggressively and four in the aggressive group performed more constructively following frustration. Davitz countered this inconsistency with the need to take the individual's total past history into account. His lack of a control group, however, prevented him from determining the extent to which the training was significant.

Bandura, Ross and Ross (1963) studied the effects of live aggressive models, filmed aggressive models, and filmed cartoon-like characters on the amount of aggression demonstrated by children. The experimental and control subjects were matched on the basis of ratings of their aggressive behavior in social interactions in nursery school. They made five predictions: 1) Children exposed to aggressive models would generalize responses to a new situation in which the models, and subsequent reinforcement, were absent. 2) Subjects who manifest high aggressive anxiety would perform less imitative and non-imitative aggression than subjects who displayed little anxiety over aggression.
3) Since aggression is generally considered inappropriate for girls, boys would display more aggressive behavior than their female counterparts. 4) Subjects who observed aggressive models would demonstrate more aggression when frustrated than those who were equally frustrated, but had no prior exposure to models exhibiting aggressive behavior. 5) The more remote the model was from reality, the weaker the tendency for the subject to imitate the behavior of the model.

All of the predictions were confirmed with the exception of the last one. The children exposed to film or real life models didn't differ from each other in their overall ratings of aggressive behavior. They did differ from the control group which performed significantly less aggressive responses. In addition, the sex of the model influenced the amount and kind of aggression which was expressed. Male and female subjects exposed to the male models, as compared to the female model, expressed significantly more aggressive gun play. Boys who observed the aggressive female model were less aggressive than boys exposed to the aggressive male model. It would appear that the effect of the model is partially determined by the sex appropriateness of the model's behavior.

Bandura and Kruper (1974) tested the hypothesis that "a person's self-evaluation may be dependent upon the degree to which he matches the behavior of models who he has
chosen for comparison and the self-reinforcement schedules which the model have adopted with respect to their own achievement" (p. 2). Children were randomly assigned to one of nine groups. Half of the subjects observed high criterion adults and peers and half observed low criterion adults and peers. These groups were further sub-divided so that half of the children observed the same sex model and half the opposite sex model. Children assigned to the control group were not exposed to any model and were tested only on the self-reinforcement task (game).

High criterion models for self-reinforcement rewarded themselves with candy and praise only if they obtained or exceeded a score of 20. If they failed, they denied themselves the candy and were verbally self-critical. The low criterion models for self-reinforcement displayed a similar pattern of self-reward and self-disapproval if they obtained or exceeded scores of 10. All of the children in the experimental group observed models who demonstrated how to play a bowling game prior to their own participation in the game. The scores were manipulated by the experimenter.

The summary of results is as follows:
1) Children in the experimental groups made reward contingent on performance versus the control group, where reward was independent of the task accomplished.
2) Children exposed to models with either high or low standards for reinforcement rarely rewarded self when
performance was at its lowest level, whereas relatively high proportions of control groups engaged in self-reinforcement for identically low scores.

3) The age and sex of the children and the age and sex of the model made no difference in the level of performance. This is in contrast to an earlier study by Bandura, Ross and Ross (1963).

4) The control and low criterion children rewarded themselves more for intermediate levels of performance than did the children in the high criterion groups.

5) High performance level children who observed the high criterion model engaged in exceedingly high proportions of self-reward relative to the controls and low criterion model group.

The study confirmed the hypotheses.

As can be seen from this small sample, children have generally remained the target for research on aggression. Proportionately fewer studies have been devoted to the acquisition and/or inhibition of aggression in adults.

Berkowitz and Rawlings (1963) predicted that under certain conditions watching fantasy violence would decrease the inhibition against the overt expression of aggression and increase the chances that aggression would be openly displayed. Small groups of male and female college students were shown a short film clip. Half were told that the protagonist deserved to be beaten (justified aggression)
and the other half told that the beatings were undeserved (less justified aggression). Prior to viewing the film the students were given a brief intelligence test. The administrator either was insulting and condescending or he treated the group in a neutral fashion. It would be predicted that students in the insulted/justified aggression group would indicate stronger hostility toward the administrator of the test on a post movie questionnaire than those in the insulted/less justified aggression group, the non-insulted/justified aggression group or the non-insulted/less justified aggression group. This result was confirmed.

Summarizing, these four studies demonstrate that
1) An individual's response to frustration is governed by his previous experience.
2) Exposure to aggressive models increases the likelihood of the expression of aggression.
3) Individuals learn to reinforce themselves for behaviors on the basis of how models in their lives have reinforced themselves for the same behaviors.
4) Justification of aggression reduces the inhibition against violence and increases the probability of open displays of aggression.

By merging the findings it becomes fairly evident why the social learning theory has been used to explain why men batter. Martin (1976), Davidson (1979) and Gelles, Strauss
and Steinmetz (1981) have all observed that the majority of batterers come from violent homes. They (batterers) were either beaten as children and/or saw their mothers beaten. "To the extent that observations of adults displaying aggression conveys certain degrees of permissiveness for aggressive behavior, it may be assumed that such exposure not only facilitates learning of new aggressive responses but also weakens competing inhibiting responses in individuals and increases the probability of the occurrence of previously learned patterns of aggression" (Bandura, Ross and Ross, 1963, p. 4). The boy (the girl being negatively reinforced for her aggression) learns from observing his father (model) that aggression is the appropriate response to frustration. He perceives that his father's aggression is effective. Both he and his mother are afraid and submissive. It is self-reinforcing (I'm the boss around here). It is justified aggression ("the dinner is cold"). The boy in learning to imitate his father significantly increases the probability of his own aggressive responses as an adult.

The evidence is less clear in explaining why a particular woman is battered. Unlike the batterer, there are contradictory reports about the amount of aggression she is exposed to as a child. Gayford (1975) and Gelles (1981) found a high incidence of violence in the family histories of the marital pair. Starr (1978) found more violence in
the background of battered women and Gasper (1980) found no difference in the amount of violence experienced by battered and non-battered women.

**Resource Theory**

Goode's resource theory was one of the first theories to directly address the issue of battering and intra-family violence. He proposed that force is an inherent part of family interactions. The extent to which force is expressed is largely dependent upon the number of resources one has. "The greater the resources an individual can command, the more force he can muster, but the less likely he will actively deploy or use force in an overt manner. Lower classes are more likely than middle or upper classes to use overt force because they lack the resources that yield force or power" (Goode, 1971, p. 628). This recognition of force or violence within families clearly destroyed the myth of domestic tranquility. In line with the social learning theory Goode (1971) stated:

"family processes set in motion many patterns that ultimately generate violence: they inculcate the evaluation that makes people want to force others to act in certain ways even at the risk of danger; they present models of the use of force and violence; they teach the various gradations of violence for different occasions; and they teach a set of rationalizations and justifications for violence. ... With 40-50% of all homicides occurring within the family, it would appear that many men and women have chosen homicide as a cleaner, neater solution than the dragged out acerbic destruction of ego and dignity that is inherent in breaking it off" (p. 632).
Although the function of resources in family violence has been downplayed with the mounting evidence (i.e. Gelles, Strauss, Steinmetz, 1981) of the frequency of middle and upper class violence, Goode's proposal had a major impact on the subsequent research on intra-family violence by advancing the idea that force and violence were normal and acceptable practices not limited to deviant individuals and families.

**Systems Theory**

Systems theory is based on the premise that the system (i.e. family) is of greater importance than the individual. The system's survival is dependent on two principles: morphostasis and morphogenesis. "The first means that the system must maintain constancy in the face of environmental vagaries. It does this through the environmentally active processes known as negative feedback. The second means that at times the system must change its basic structure. It does this through positive feedback or sequences that work to amplify deviance" (Hoffman, 1981, p. 50). (It should be noted that sociologists who advocate this theory have essentially reversed the psychological definition of positive and negative feedback. From a systems point of view, negative feedback serves to preserve the status quo, while positive feedback serves to destroy the status quo and promote newness.) Positive and negative feedback enters the system through "loops" or mutually caused,
interlocking events which have a circular effect on the system. For example, an increase in population leads to an increase in garbage which in turn leads to an increase in disease and decrease in population which leads to an eventual increase in population and completion of the loop. To gain an understanding of any system, one must first delineate the loops and then analyze the relationships which exist between them.

It is the interaction of the various loops which determine whether or not an individual and/or family will be perceived as deviant. Deviance takes on a more positive meaning under the auspices of systems theory. "Deviance promotes cohesions in systems where anxiety and hostility are encouraged. It acts as a mediator in situations where people are in conflict and serves a diversionary purpose. It keeps an unworkable system functioning long after it should have collapsed. ... The deviant is not a person with fixed characteristics, but rather a person involved in a process. While these actions may make no sense to outsiders, they are encouraged because it is presumably their actions which keep the family together" (Hoffman, 1981 p. 60).

By this definition the role of the battered woman (deviant) is of vital importance for the existence of the family system is dependent upon her. If she moves out of the system, it cannot sustain itself and will collapse. Kerr(1981) indirectly refers to the battering relationship
when he discusses a family system that is characterized by "a dominant spouse (batterer) who monitors the behavior of his/her partner on the right track, and a submissive spouse (batteree) who compromises his/her own functioning to preserve harmony within the relationship" (p. 244). The balance in the relationship will be maintained as long as stress is kept at a minimum. As stress rises, so does the violence, and the system becomes increasingly more dysfunctional.

Strauss (1973) has offered systems theory as a highly complex and abstract means for conceptualizing intra-family violence. Violence is not an intra-psychic process. It is the reflection of the system in which it is found. Systems theory stresses that the family-as-system does not operate in isolation, but in conjunction with other systems which impinge upon it. What affects one system affects all systems. Therefore, in order to fully comprehend family violence, one must be able to identify and analyze all the positive (i.e. reinforcement of use of violence) and negative (i.e. the legal system) feedback loops along with the morphogenic (i.e. divorce) processes which change the role structure of the family. Although Strauss (1973) wrote "that no one empirical research, no matter what the design, is likely to encompass the total operation of a complex system such as the family," he predicted that through the use of human stimulation techniques and computers, systems theory held the key to future understanding intra-family violence.
Learned Helplessness Theory

Learned helplessness was the first psychological theory which was directly applied to battered women. It grew out of Martin Seligman's experimental work with dogs. In study after study, he showed "that prior exposure of dogs to inescapable shock in a Pavlovian harness reliably results in interference with subsequent escape/avoidance in a shuttle box. While initially dogs show normal reactivity to shock, after a few trials they presumably 'accept' the shock and fail to make any escape movements." (Seligman, 1967) He labelled this phenomenon learned helplessness. Seligman also found that the degree to which the dog could control the shock also played a major role in determining whether the normal escape-avoidance response occurred or whether the learned helplessness response occurred. The less control the animal had, the more likely it was to become passive and inactive.

Generalized to human beings,"the learned helplessness theory has three basic components: information about what will happen, thinking of cognitive representation about what will happen (learning, belief) and behavior toward what does happen. It is the second, or cognitive representation component, where the faulty expectation that response or outcome are independent occurs. Thus, if a person does have control over response outcome variables, but believes she/he doesn't (have control), the person
responds with the learned helplessness phenomenon" (Walker, 1979, p. 47).

One problem with this application of learned helplessness is that the definition for learned helplessness closely resembles the cognitive explanation for depression: negative view of self, world and future, and even Miller and Seligman (1974) and Hiroto (1974) admit that learned helplessness may be a reaction to or a model for naturally occurring depression.

Despite the possibility that learned helplessness may merely be a description of depression, Lenore Walker has adopted this model as a psychological rationale for explaining why the battered woman becomes a victim, and how that process of victimization continues to function in her relationship with the batterer.

Readers will note that more than thirty years separate the masochistic theory, frustration-aggression hypothesis, and social learning theory from the resource theory, general systems theory and learned helplessness theory. During this interim, it slowly became apparent that wife abuse was a larger problem than had at first been surmised. Increase in information and knowledge lead to the following research, which went beyond the general theories of aggression and focused specifically on wife abuse as a phenomenon in its own right.
Non-Structured Interviews

In one of the early studies of battered women, J.J. Gayford (1975) interviewed 100 abused British women. Each was asked to respond to an open ended questionnaire and to participate in a personal interview. Her study generally consisted of a compilation of demographic data. All the women were suffering from a variety of injuries, ranging from bruises to broken bones. Twenty-three percent reported that they were exposed to family violence as children, and thirty-seven percent admitted abusing their own children. Drinking appeared to play a major role in their lives. Twenty-seven percent reported that their fathers were occasional or frequent heavy drinkers, compared with seventy-four percent of their husbands. In addition, forty-four percent noted that violence occurred regularly when their spouse was drunk. Twenty-one percent of the women had been diagnosed as depressed, thirty-four percent had attempted suicide, and seventy-one percent were taking anti-depressants and tranquilizers. Nearly all of the women sought help from an outside source. The majority contacted either the police (32%) or social service agencies (57%).

No clear attempt is made by Gayford to interpret the significance of the data. The study did point out the need for the continued establishment of shelters as a major source of support for victims of violence.
Elaine Hilberman and Kit Munson (1977) conducted non-structured interviews with sixty battered women. Their results were largely descriptive in nature, and no attempt was made to analyze the data. The study could roughly be divided into four parts: 1) current demographics 2) family history 3) marital relationship 4) psychological characteristics and treatment.

Forty of these women were black and the rest white. The women ranged in age from twenty to forty. Half still lived with their husbands and nearly all were educationally, economically and socially deprived. A composite of the group revealed that violence was a lifelong pattern. More than half were physically and/or sexually abused as children, observed their fathers batter their mothers, and often they bore the brunt of their father's alcoholic rages.

Ironically, Hilberman and Munson (1977) found that the marriages of the women in the study often paralleled that of their own parents. The marriage was characterized by the husband's violence, drinking, jealousy and by their own "overwhelming passivity and inability to act on their own behalf" (Hilberman and Munson, 1977 p. 9). In one-third of the cases, the violence or its aftermath spilled over onto the children in a domino effect: from father to mother to child. Pregnancies often increased the violence and resulted in miscarriages and premature births. Most of the women had attempted to leave the relationship, but returned due to lack of money, lack of support, threats, and promises that he would change.
support, threats, and promises that he would change.

Nine of the women were found by the authors to have had been previously diagnosed as depressed, four as character disorders, four as alcoholics, two as schizophrenics, and one as manic-depressive. Thirteen had been hospitalized for violent or psychotic behavior. Most complained of somatic concerns, anxiety and insomnia, had either contemplated or attempted suicide, and nearly all had been or were being treated with tranquilizers.

Hilberman and Munson concluded, based on their findings, that the low self-esteem and sense of powerlessness which characterized these women was the result of a lifetime of abuse, which was reinforced by their ability to rationalize and justify their husband's violent behavior out of their fear that they could not survive without him. Their belief in the myth that they could control his violence "by being good" and that they should stay for the sake of the children, are largely based on sex role stereotypes.

According to Hilberman and Munson, if counselors are to help battered women, they must begin the process "by challenging their myths, raising their consciousness about sex roles, and exploring the extent of their rage and the relationship between their anger, fear of loss of control and passivity" (p. 13).

Lenore Walker (1979) based her findings on a sample of 100 battered women who completed a single non-structured
interview with the author, and 300 battered women who participated in, but failed to complete, a single non-structured interview with the author. The one hundred women represented all ages, races, religions, education levels, cultures and socio-economic groups. Their ages ranged from 17 to 76, with the shortest battering relationship lasting two months and the longest fifty-three years. No attempt was made to statistically analyze the data and the results were reported in narrative form in Walker's articles and her book Battered Wives.

Walker found that these battered women shared strikingly similar battering histories and psychological characteristics. For most of the women the abuse came as a complete surprise, was found to be unpredictable, and was often preceded by psychological abuse. They reported that their partners had difficulty in controlling alcoholic and drug intake, were morbidly jealous, and often demanded unusual and often bizarre sexual activities. The women believed that their partners could accomplish things others could not do. They often reported being terrorized with weapons and threats of violence against other family members. (Walker, 1979)

The majority of the battered women were characterized by:

1. Low self-esteem
2. Belief in all the myths (i.e. it's normal, I deserved it) about battering relationships
3. Being traditionalists about home, strongly believing in family unity and the prescribed sex-role stereotypes.
5. Suffering from guilt, yet denying the terror and anger they felt.
6. Presenting a passive face to the world but having the strength to manipulate their environment enough to prevent further violence and being killed.
7. Have severe stress reactions, with psychophysiological complaints.
8. Using sex as a way to establish intimacy.
9. Believing that no one will be able to help her resolve her predicament except herself.
10. Lack of childhood violence.

(Walker, 1979, p. 31)

In addition to these observations, Walker made two major contributions to the research on abusive relationships. First, she conceptualized the cycle of violence. The first or tension building phase consists of the man becoming increasingly on edge and negative, and the woman trying to prevent his anger, while knowing that it will only worsen. As her attempts to cope with the escalating tension fail, the cycle moves into the second phase. The
second, or acute, phase, consists of the actual incident of violence, during which the batterer's rage is out of control. This is the most violent and the shortest segment of the three phases. The third, or resolution, phase consists of the batterer's apologies and promises that he will change. "Since almost all the rewards of being married occur during this phase for battered women, this is the time that it is most difficult for them to end the relationship" (Walker, 1978, p. 14). As long as the relationship remains unchanged, the cycle of violence will continue.

Walker's second contribution to the research was her choice of Martin Seligman's theory of learned helplessness as a "psychological rationale to explain why the battered woman becomes a victim in the first place and how the process of victimization is perpetuated to the point of psychological paralysis" (Walker, 1979, p. 43). She describes learned helplessness as having three basic components: information about what will happen, thinking or cognitive representation about what will happen (learning, expecting, belief, perception), and behavior toward what does happen....It is the second or cognitive representation component where the faulty expectation that response and outcome are independent occurs ....Thus, if a person does have control over response variables, but believes she/he doesn't, the person responds with the learned helplessness phenomenon....Therefore, the actual nature of controllability is not as important as the belief, expectation or cognitive situation.

(Walker, 1979 p. 47). From this perspective Walker would say that battered
women learn that their voluntary responses (i.e. getting dinner on time, not expressing anger) make little difference as to whether they will be beaten or not. Once they believe that they can do nothing to control or stop what happens to them (even if the belief is not based on fact), they become passive, submissive and powerless, and their victimization deepens with each cycle of violence.

Walker recommends that a combination of behavioral, insight-oriented, feminist therapy is the most effective therapeutic approach for helping a battered woman clarify her ambivalent feelings towards the batterer, develop effective strategies to overcome her sense of powerlessness and gain economic and psychological interdependence.

Preliminary research by Strauss (1974, 1979), Gelles (1976), and Steinmetz (1974) culminated in their book *Behind Closed Doors*. Their work represents the first national study of violence in the American home. Given the authors' general systems approach, the focus "centered on characteristics and circumstances within the realm of social causes. Psychological characteristics of individual family members is more a social problem than a psychological problem" (Strauss et al, 1980, p.78). Using a set format and the Conflicts Tactic Scale (an instrument designed specifically for this research) the authors interviewed one adult member in each of 2,143 intact families. "Intact" was defined as married or living together. The families were selected as a representative sample of the current census tract data
in the United States. Although attempts were made to secure equal numbers of interviews with men and women, more women (1,183) than men (960) responded to the survey. Governed by the general system approach, but restricted by an hour time limit per interview, Strauss, Gelles, and Steinmetz admitted that they were limited in the scope of the project. They concentrated, then, on only some of the social characteristics which impinge on family systems and which can result in violence. These include 1) the relationship between the couple 2) children 3) race, religion and region 4) education, income and occupation.

**Couple**

A violent act (i.e. slapped, kicked, beaten up) is committed at least once in 28% of all American marriages. The authors believed this figure was a substantial under-estimation due to 1) under-reporting individuals who view a slap or a push as normal and not worthy of mention 2) individuals who fail to report out of shame 3) lack of divorced individuals in the sample. Approximately 1.8 million wives and 2.8 million husbands are beaten by their spouses each year. Although a greater number of husbands are beaten, the data also shows that men tend to abuse women more often, do greater damage and have a higher rate of more dangerous violence. In addition, a large number of attacks seem to occur when a woman is pregnant and
the statistics don't show what proportion of violent acts by women were committed in self-defense.

While violence has been shown to be one way of resolving an argument, the authors were interested in other ways which have proven effective. "The Conflict Tactics Scales were used to measure intra-family conflict in the sense of the means used to resolve conflicts of interest. Three different tactics are measured: 1) Reasoning: the use of rational discussion and negotiation 2) Verbal Aggression: the use of verbal and symbolic means of hurting - such as insults or threats to hurt the other 3) Violence: actual use of physical force." As might be expected, the more conflicts a couple has the more likely there is to be violence. Interestingly, "neither recognition of these conflicts and attempts to deal with them by reason and negotiation nor ventilation of one's hostility with verbal aggression seems to help avoid the link between conflict and violence in marriage: (Strauss et al, 1981 p. 166). The most violent couples in this survey were those who scored the highest in the use of reason to resolve conflicts, followed by those couples who used the greatest amount of verbal aggression to resolve conflicts.

Children

The greatest incidence of childhood violence occurs between siblings. This is followed by parent to child violence. Seventy-three percent of the respondents reported
that at least one time in their child's life they used
some sort of force on the child. In line with social learn­
ing theory, the authors found that a) more mothers and
fathers were physically punished as teenagers, the higher
the rate of violence they inflicted upon their children b)
the more frequently a father punished his son, the more
likely the son would be an abusive parent. The same
held true for mothers and their daughters c) those individ­
uals who were hit as teenagers and saw their parents hit
each other were the most likely to have experienced violence
in their own marriage.

Race, Religion and Region

Although the authors found that minority racial groups
tended to have the highest rates of violence, they suggest
that this may have less to do with race and more to do with
the amount of stress and discrimination encountered by
this group.

The greatest amount of violence occurs in households
where there is no religious affiliation. The least amount
of wife abuse, child abuse and sibling abuse occurs in
Jewish families.

The greatest amount of wife abuse, couple abuse and
child abuse occurs in the Mid-West. The South has the low­
est rates of violence toward children.

Education, Income and Occupation

Most violent fathers and mothers graduated from high
school with the least violent parents being either grammar school drop-outs or college educated. College educated women are the least likely to be abused by their husbands, while women who did not complete high school are the most likely to be abused by their husbands.

In terms of income, families in this survey who made less than $6,000 had a rate of violence 500 times greater than those families who made more than $20,000.

Men who are unemployed or employed part-time have a rate of beating their wives twice as much and three times as much respectively as men who are employed full time.

While the authors view shelters and individual and family counseling as helpful, they feel these are only temporary solutions to long standing problems. If violence is to be reduced, the very fabric of society must be altered. "Norms which legitimize and glorify violence in society must be eliminated. Violence provoking stresses created by society must be reduced. Families must be integrated into a network of kin and community. The sexist character of society and the family must be changed and the cycle of violence from generation to generation must be broken: (Strauss, et al., 1981, p. 236).

**Empirical Studies**

Levinger (1966) studied sources of marital dissatisfaction among applicants for divorce. Using a standard format, he interviewed 600 couples who had recently filed
for a divorce. Their answers were divided into 12 categories of marital dissatisfaction - for example, physical abuse, verbal abuse, finances, drinking. The results indicated that 36.8% of the women versus 3.3% of the men complained of physical abuse as the major source of their dissatisfaction with the relationship. This was followed by drinking (26.5% versus 5%), and verbal abuse (23.8% versus 7.5%). Income appeared to play a role in the type of complaints stated by the women. Lower class wives were more likely to complain about finances, drinking and verbal abuse, while middle class wives were more likely to complain about lack of love and fidelity.

O'Brien (1971) hypothesized "that violence would be most common in families where the classically 'dominant' member (male-adult-husband) failed to possess the superior talents or resources upon which his preferred superior status is supposed to be legitimately based" (p. 693). One hundred and fifty (150) families were selected on the basis that a divorce action had been filed within nine months prior to the study. Only one spouse per family was interviewed. The resulting sample was not quite evenly divided between men (48%) and women (52%). Half of them were considered middle class and had been involved in long term relationships, lasting from thirteen to thirty-seven years. Twenty-five of the respondents spontaneously reported that the marriage had been marred by violence. Eighty-four
percent of these were women. A comparison of the two groups revealed that husbands in the violent homes were more likely than husbands in the non-violent homes to 1) be seriously dissatisfied with their jobs (44% versus 27%) 2) have failed to complete high school (44% versus 13%) 3) have a lesser education than their wife (56% versus 14%) 4) have a lower status occupation than their father-in-law (37% versus 28%) 5) have an income level that was the source of conflict (84% versus 24%).

Each subject also completed a Likert Scale, rating levels of either satisfaction or conflict with different behaviors. As would be expected, individuals who reported violence in the marital relationship scored consistently lower in satisfaction and higher in conflict than did those individuals who did not report violence. The data supported the hypothesis that violence was more likely to occur in households were males did not achieve their prescribed sex roles and attempted to affirm their status through the use of force.

Starr, Clark, Goetz, O'Malin (1979) studied a group of battered women who were current residents in a shelter or an out-patient program connected with the shelter. Although their research included a semi-structured interview, it also introduced the use of personality tests to the research on battered women. This is one of the first times that information about battered women was not solely derived
on the basis of a subjective interview.

The subjects consisted of fifty battered women. Their ages ranged from seventeen to fifty four, 70% were white, 65% had some high school education, the majority were married, and half described their childhood in negative terms. One-third of the sample had been exposed to childhood violence and/or had been sexually assaulted prior to marriage. Each woman was administered 1) 16 PF 2) Clinical Analysis Questionnaire 3) a psychosocial inventory, which was developed by the authors to obtain information about personal data, exposure to violence and self-perception. In addition, fifteen women were randomly selected for a one hour semi-structured interview.

The psychosocial inventory revealed that while one-half the women supported themselves by their own earnings, one-third felt it was the duty of the wife to obey her husband and that he made all the major decisions. The balance of power in the relationships reflected sex role stereotyping. There were many instances where husbands forced their wives to have sex, and one-third of the women admitted using sex as a way to appease their husbands and prevent violence.

By comparing the mean scores of the women with the expected average scores, the authors found that the majority of women scored in the normal range on most of the personality and clinical scales. Low scores on the 16PF
revealed that these women were shy and reserved, had low ego strength and undisciplined self-control. They were higher in introversion, frustration, tension and, surprisingly, self-sufficiency. The Clinical Analysis Questionnaire showed a similar pattern with more scales falling within the normal range. Scores which deviated from the norm included boredom, paranoia and schizophrenia. The authors explained the latter findings as a possible result of the women having been mistreated and having a need to retreat from the reality of a negative situations. Overall, Starr et. al. (1981) described these women as having low self-esteem, critical, immature, lacking in self-confidence and a clear self identity, and being uncomfortable in interacting with others.

The authors proposed that therapists assist battered women in becoming less isolated, in gaining more control in their environment and in learning how to express feelings appropriately and effectively.

Studies Relating to Alcohol and Violence

Although alcohol is often mentioned in conjunction with battering, very little research has been done which attempts to connect the two.

Bard and Zucker (1974) attempted to test the hypothesis that there was a causal relationship between alcohol and aggression. They studied 962 families over a twenty-two month period. These families were selected because the
police had been summoned to those homes on a family disturbance call. Out of all these cases, 252 alleged a physical assault, 72 alleged alcohol intoxication and 15 alleged both. Bard and Zucker (1974) concluded from their findings that 1) assaults usually do not precede the arrival of the police and that the officer's expectation of violence may, in itself, increase the likelihood of violence 2) family disputes are not usually influenced by alcohol usage 3) assaults are less common when alcohol has been used by the second party. They suggested that alcohol may actually damper negative feelings and that the cause and effect relationship between alcohol and aggression may be due to biased social perceptions.

In contrast to this study, Boyatis (1975) focused research on how alcohol is related to verbal inter-personal aggression, which is what often leads to physical fights. He studied a group of 149 males between the ages of 25 to 50. They were administered a questionnaire, adjective checklist, ten California Psychological Inventory Scales and two TAT cards. They were then divided into three groups. The first group was served distilled liquor, the second beer and the third soda pop. Each group was told that the experimenter was interested in how they spent their leisure time and the two four hour sessions were videotaped as they gathered in a "game" room. Their blood alcohol level was measured three times during the
second session. Two teams of observers recorded their behavior using a scoring system devised for the experiment, which looked at behavior such as joking, controlling, moralizing etc. Boyatis (1975) found that individuals who drank the most were more verbally interpersonally aggressive and scored lowest on the Social Integration factors. The latter was a function of age, the aggression acts scale, frequency of arguments were recorded and the Responsibility, Socialization and Self-Control Scales from the CPI. Boyatis concluded that the combination of a low degree of social integration, coupled with alcohol consumption, would serve to decrease an individual's inhibitions while increasing his perception of events as threatening and his acting in accordance with the perceived threats, (i.e. get into a fight). He suggested that the best means of rehabilitating these men would be to both increase their sense of social responsibility and their integration into society.

Summary

Chapter II reviewed six theories related to intrafamily violence, along with several studies that were based on interviews and empirical data. The most promising theories for understanding wife abuse appear to be a combination of social learning and general systems theory. The overall lack of research, particularly research including hard data, serves to reinforce the need for this study.
Chapter III

Methods

Selection and Description of the Sample

Data for this study were collected from January through June, 1982, at three Ohio shelters for battered women, and at Columbus Technical Institute, a two year technical college located in Columbus, Ohio.

The sample consists of 1) seventy (70) battered women who are currently residents in one of the three shelters 2) ninety-eight (98) non-battered women who are first year students currently enrolled in general psychology or general sociology classes. A total of 168 adult females volunteered to participate in this study. Columbus Technical Institute students were selected because of what appeared to be their resemblance to women admitted into the shelters. In general, these students have had more life experiences than the average college freshmen. They tend to be older, either married or divorced, are on grants or other types of financial assistance, and are returning to school after years of absence from education.

Approximately, every woman who was admitted into the shelter was approached by the case manager, who administered the study, and asked to voluntarily participate in the research. They were told that their participation would help
improve the services offered by shelters and help others better understand the issue of battering.

The women admitted into their respective shelters were considered "battered" by virtue of their admission. The women who are enrolled in the technical college will be considered "non-battered." Since the statistics show that at least one in four women will be beaten in their lifetime (Gelles, Strauss, Steinmetz, 1981), it was assumed that there were battered women in the non-battered group. While that cannot be totally controlled, The Spouse Abuse Scale (See Appendix B: Spouse Abuse Scale) was designed to help minimize the problem by serving as a screening device. If more than two items are checked on this scale, an individual is defined, within the context of this study, as battered. Of the 112 college women who volunteered to participate in this research, sixteen (16) were eliminated from the sample on the basis of their score on the Spouse Abuse Scale, four (4) were eliminated because they failed to complete the California Psychological Inventory (CPI), and four were eliminated because their CPI profiles were invalid. Of the eighty-one (81) women in shelters who volunteered to participate in this study, seven (7) were eliminated from the sample because they failed to complete the CPI, and four were eliminated because their CPI profile was invalid. This left a total of seventy (70) battered and ninety-eight (98) non-battered women who voluntarily participated in this study.
Setting and Description of Shelters

Since the average stay of a battered woman in a shelter is four to six weeks, it was difficult to gather a large enough sample over a relatively short time. Subsequently, it became necessary to contact more than one shelter to request participation in the study. The Directors of shelters located in Columbus, Ohio; Dayton, Ohio and Hamilton, Ohio agreed to let their residents voluntarily participate.

The shelter movement was begun by Erin Pizzey in 1975, with the founding of Chiswick Women's Aid House in London, England. In 1977, Columbus, Ohio became one of the first cities in the United States to establish a shelter. This was followed by Dayton, Ohio later the same year, and Hamilton, Ohio in 1979. Representing one of the largest, if not the largest, shelters in the country, Columbus can safely house thirty-five (35) women and children. Dayton can shelter approximately twenty (20) individuals, followed by Hamilton, with room for fifteen (15). All of the shelters are open twenty-four hours a day and operate twenty-four hour crisis lines. Columbus employs a full-time equivalent of eleven paid staff. Hamilton employs nine and one-half paid staff. Dayton employs eight paid staff. All three shelters are heavily dependent upon the assistance of volunteers. A woman can only be admitted into these shelters after she has been evaluated over the telephone.
by a counselor. Her admittance is dependent upon such factors as the current level of danger, availability of other resources and space in the shelter.

The purpose of these shelters is to provide each woman and her children with a safe and supportive environment in which she can assess her alternatives and determine and act upon goals. To this end, the case managers (all of whom have at least a Bachelor's degree) assigned to each woman and her children assists her in reducing the initial fear and anxiety she experiences when leaving her partner/spouse (this generally subsides by the third day), helps and supports her in her decision making, and works as an advocate with the woman and the various medical, social, legal, housing and mental health agencies she might encounter.

**Administration**

Each subject in this study was administered the demographic questionnaire, the Abuse Scales, and the California Psychological Inventory. Prior to taking part in the study, each subject was asked to sign a consent form and was reminded that all the information obtained from the various tests were both anonymous and confidential.

Due to the crisis nature of being battered and coming to a shelter, the battered subjects were not tested until at least three days after they have entered the shelter.
Instruments

The purpose of this research was to determine which familial and psychological characteristics discriminate between battered women in a shelter and non-battered women. A demographic questionnaire was also used and provided data on age, race, income, education, marital status, number of children, and use of prescribed medication.

Two instrumentation tools were utilized by this study: 1) the Abuse Scales 2) Harrison Gough's (1957) California Psychological Inventory. Both instruments and the demographic questionnaire were administered to all 168 adult females, both battered and non-battered, who participated in the study.

Abuse Scales

The Abuse Scales consisted of a Spouse Abuse Scale, Child Abuse Scale, Father Drug and Alcohol Abuse Scales, Mother Drug and Alcohol Abuse Scales, and Self Drug and Alcohol Abuse Scales. (See Appendix B: Scales) There are a total of eight (8) individual scales. Each scale consists of a set of statements which are rank ordered from least to most abusive. The rank order was determined using Thurstone's law of categorical judgment. (See Appendix A: Pilot Study) Subjects were asked to check every statement which applied to them, and were classified according to the worst one that was checked. In addition, the Spouse Abuse Scale was used as a means of screening out battered women from the non-battered population.
The scales were limited in that they were brief and transparent. No attempt was made to trick or mislead the subjects. While it is possible that some subjects could have chosen to respond dishonestly, this seems unlikely, since (1) all the subjects who participated in the study volunteered to do so, and there were no negative consequences if they did not take part in the research; (2) the subjects were instructed not to answer any with which they felt uncomfortable and that they could stop participating in the study at any time; (3) all answers were anonymous and confidential.

**California Psychological Inventory (CPI)**

The California Psychological Inventory (CPI) was developed by Harrison Gough in the 1950's. It consists of eighteen (18) scales. Each scale addresses personality characteristics that are important for social living and social interaction. It is largely a self-administered paper and pencil test. It can be given under a variety of conditions, to both individuals and groups, and takes approximately forty-five minutes to one hour to complete. (Most of the subjects in this study found it took one to two hours to complete) It is comprised of 480 true and false statements, the content of which consists of reports of typical behavior patterns, customary feelings, openness and attitudes about social, ethical and family matters. (Metargee, 1972)
The California Psychological Inventory has proven to be both a reliable and valid psychological instrument. In two studies using the test-retest method of reliability, Gough found generally high coefficients of stability. In the first, two hundred male prisoners took the CPI twice with seven to twenty-one days between testings. The coefficients ranged from .49 to .87 with a median of .80. As was expected, the short term coefficients were reasonably high. In another study, high school students were tested in their junior year and again in their senior year. The coefficients ranged from .49 to .77 with a median of .65 indicating moderate stability over one year.

Megargee (1972) notes that Gough placed his greatest emphasis on predictive validity - that is the ability of each of his CPI scale to either describe an individual in a certain way or to predict how the individual will perform under certain conditions. Numerous studies have been done on each of the eighteen scales with varied results. On the whole scales such as Dominance, Capacity for Status, Self-Acceptance, Sense of Well Being, and Socialization have been shown to be the better validated scales. In fact, Megargee (1972) reports "that the Socialization Scale is the best validated and most powerful personality scale around" (p. 65). Other scales such as Tolerance and Psychological Mindedness show mixed results. On the whole, the CPI remains a valuable instrument for measuring "normal"
psychological characteristics.

The eighteen (18) scales are divided into four classes and are as follows:

Class I: **Measures of Poise, Ascendency, Self-Awareness and Adequacy**

**Dominance Scale** (Do). According to Megargee (1972) the Dominance Scale consists of forty-six items of which twenty-three are keyed true and twenty-three keyed false. Many of the items deal with poise and confidence. It was designed to identify strong, dominant, influential and ascendent individuals who are able to take the initiative and exercise leadership.

**Capacity for Status** (Cs). According to Megargee (1972), the Capacity for Status Scale consists of thirty-two items of which eleven are keyed true and twenty-one keyed false. Many of the items deal with social poise and self-confidence. It reflects the personal qualities which underlie and lead to status and social attainment - being ambitious, forceful and interested in success, the kind of person who gets ahead in the world. (Lake, 1973)

**Sociability** (Sy) The Sociability Scale consists of thirty-six items, of which twenty-two are keyed true and fourteen false. Many of the items deal with enjoyment of social interaction. "It was devised to differentiate people with an outgoing, sociable participative temperament from those who shun involvement and avoid social visibility."
Adjectives which characterize high scoring women on this scale include dominant, aggressive, confident and outgoing. Low scoring women are characterized as cautious, meek, timid and withdrawn.

**Social Presence (Sp).** According to Megargee (1972), the Social Presence Scale was constructed to assess poise, self-confidence, verve and spontaneity in social interactions. Thus, it is closely related to Sociability, which is supposed to identify outgoing, gregarious people. "The high scorer in Sociability, if average in Social Presence, just plain likes people and their company. The high scorer on Social Presence likes to be in the presence of others, but uses them, manipulates them, and takes pleasure in clever onslaughts against others' defenses and self-deceptions." (Gough in personal communication with Megargee, 1971). This scale consists of fifty-six items, of which twenty-five are keyed true and thirty-one keyed false.

**Self-Acceptance (Sa).** The Self-Acceptance Scale consists of thirty-four items balanced between true and false keying. It was designed to reflect one's sense of personal worth and satisfaction with one's self, relative freedom from self-doubt and criticism about one's life. (Lake, 1972) It shares with Sociability and Social Presence items dealing with poise and self-confidence. Adjectives which characterize high scoring females on this scale include
adventurous, determined, demanding and sarcastic. Low scoring females are characterized as cautious, modest, shy and unassuming.

Sense of Well Being (Wb). The Well Being Scale is one of three validity scales - the other two being Good Impression and Communality. According to Megargee (1972) it was derived to discriminate individuals feigning neurosis from normals and psychiatric patients responding truthfully. High scores indicate health and verve, while low scores suggest diminished vitality and inability to meet the demands of everyday life. It is made up of forty-four items, of which five are keyed true and thirty-nine false. The content of this scale consists primarily of denials of various physical and mental symptoms.

Class II Scales: Measures of Responsibility, Socialization, Maturity, and Intra-personal Structuring of Values

Responsibility (Re). The Responsibility Scale consists of forty-two items, of which seventeen are keyed true and twenty-five false. The items generally indicate a concern for social civic and moral obligation. "It was designed to identify people who are conscientious, responsible, dependable, articulate about rules and orders, and who believe that life should be governed by reason. It differs from the related Socialization and Self-Control in that Responsibility emphasizes the degree to which values
and controls are conceptualized and understood." (Megargee, 1972, p. 56).

**Socialization** (So). The Socialization Scale was originally designed to measure delinquency, but it was found to measure a whole range of other characteristics. It indicates a strong sense of propriety, acceptance of rules, proper authority and custom, a person who seldom is ever gets into trouble. (Lake, 1973) In contrast to Responsibility and Self-Control, Socialization measures 1) the extent to which an individual will adhere to the mores established by his/her culture. (Megargee, 1972). This scale consists of fifty-four items of which twenty-two are keyed true and thirty-two false.

**Self-Control** The Self-Control Scale consists of fifty items, six of which are keyed true and forty-four keyed false. It deals with the restraint of irrational behavior in general and aggression in particular. According to Gough (1965), "The distinction among Self-Control, Responsibility, and Socialization is that while Responsibility measures the degree to which they influence the individual's behavior, Self-Control stresses the degree to which the individual approves of and espouses such regulatory dispositions." Adjectives which characterize high scoring females include calm, patient, self-controlled and peaceable. Low scoring females are characterized by arrogant, impulsive, temperamental and inhibited.
Tolerance (To). According to Lake (1973), the Tolerance Scale reflects an attitude of permissiveness, acceptance of others, open-mindedness, and lack of prejudice about beliefs and values quite different from one's own. It consists of thirty-two items of which three are keyed true and twenty-nine false. The general content of the items is directed toward openness and flexibility versus rigidity or dogmatism.

Good Impression (Gi). The Good Impression Scale is the second of the three validity scales. It was designed to identify people who try to create an overly favorable impression of themselves out of their concern about how others will react to them. It functions similarly to the L Scale ("fake good") on the MMPI. It consists of forty items, eight of which are keyed true and thirty-two false. The high scorer tends to emphasize the positive while denying any failures or problems.

Communality (Cm). The Communality Scale is the last of the three validity scales. It was designed to identify people who either answered in a random fashion or attempted to create an unfavorable impression. It functions similarly to the F Scale ("fake bad") on the MMPI. Subjects in this study who obtained a raw score of twenty or less were eliminated from the sample.
Class III: Measures of Intellectual Efficiency and Achievement Potential

Achievement via Conformance (Ac). According to Megargee (1972), the Achievement via Conformance Scale consists of thirty-eight items of which twelve are keyed true and twenty-six false. In manifest content, some items deal straightforwardly with enjoyment of school work and effectiveness in academic settings. Lake (1973) notes that it was designed to indicate someone with a strong need for achievement and who is best in situations having rules and structure.

Achievement via Independence (Ai). The Achievement via Independence Scale includes thirty-two items of which three are keyed true and twenty-nine keyed false. Many of the items suggest a high tolerance for ambiguity and a rejection of simple dogmatic or authoritarian attitudes. (Megargee, 1972) It was designed primarily to predict achievement in college undergraduate classes, but over time it was found it also indicated individuals who have a strong need for achievement and who are at their best in new or untried situations where they must work on their own independent of other's guidance. (Lake, 1973).

Intellectual Efficiency (ie). Originally referred to as "a non-intellectual intelligence test" the Intellectual Efficiency Scale was constructed to provide a set of
personality items that would correlate significantly with accepted measures of intelligence. (Megargee, 1972) It consists of fifty-two items, of which nineteen are keyed true and thirty-three false. Adjectives which characterize high scoring females on this scale include capable, independent, foresighted and efficient. Low scoring females are characterized as shallow, suggestable, restless and awkward. (Gough, 1957).

Class IV: Measure of Intellectual and Interest Modes

Psychological Mindedness (Py). The Psychological Mindedness Scale consists of twenty-two items of which six are keyed true and sixteen false. The item content suggests that persons who score high on this scale can summon their resources to concentrate tenaciously on a problem. (Megargee, 1972) Lake (1973) describes this scale as indicating the degree to which one is interested in and responsive to the inner needs, motives and feelings of others, being introspective, sensitive to others, and having a knack for understanding how others feel and react inwardly.

Flexibility (Fx). According to Megargee (1972), the Flexibility scale was designed to identify people who are flexible, adaptable and even somewhat changeable in their thinking, behavior and temperament. It consists of twenty-two items of which one is keyed true and twenty-one false.

Femininity (Fe). The Femininity Scale was derived in
terms of sex role stereotyping. High scorers indicate a tendency to help and support others through patience and being kind, and are generally gentle and sympathetic. Low scorers tend to be more decisive, robust and action oriented. (Lake, 1973) It consists of thirty-eight items, of which seventeen are keyed true and twenty-one false. Some of the Femininity items are fairly obvious, dealing with a preference for conventional female, as opposed to, male roles. (Megargee, 1972)

The California Psychological Inventory (CPI) has been used in hundreds of studies, both as the object of the research and as the instrument for the research. In the 1950's Gough began a series of studies to conceptually analyze the characteristics of high and low male and female scorers on the different scales.

His primary technique for accomplishing this has been through Adjective Checklist analyses. The method consists of having a group of people who are acquainted with an individual check off all those descriptions they feel characterize him on the Gough-Heilbrun Adjective Check List. Those adjectives agreed upon by several members of the assessment group are considered to be descriptive of him. When ACL descriptions are collected for a large number of individuals who have also taken the CPI, the stage is set for the ACL analysis.... Such a method of performing ACL analyses was used to generate the high and low adjective descriptions of people on each of the scales included in the CPI Manual. (Megargee, 1972 p. 123)

Since the use of adjectives plays a major role in the clinical interpretation of the CPI, Gregory and Morris (1978)
did a replication study using ninety-five undergraduate females who were members of sororities. The purpose of the study was to 1) determine which adjectives are reliably associated with high and low scorers 2) whether social changes (i.e. Women's movement) may have altered the relationship between scale scores and peer rated personality characteristics 3) determine absolute magnitude of correlation between peer rated adjectives and CPI Scales. (Gregory and Morris, 1980) Although over a decade had passed since Gough first introduced his adjectives, the results of this study confirmed the concurrent validity of the CPI. Most scales showed modestly strong relationships with adjectives which were at minimum consistent with the stated purpose of the scale. (Gregory and Morris, 1980) One difference which existed between these authors and Gough was that they believed that low scores reflected a general sense of maladjustment and weren't merely reflections of the opposite end of the continuum of the scale.

Betz and Bander (1980), studying the relationship between the MMPI Mf Scale and the CPI Fe Scale in determining masculine typed, feminine typed, androgynous, and undifferentiated (low levels of masculine and feminine characteristics) individuals, found that masculine typed and feminine typed subjects consistently obtained means scores that placed them at opposite ends of the Femininity continuum with feminine typed subjects scoring consistently
higher than masculine typed subjects.

Campbell and Chun (1977) found considerable overlap between the CPI Scales and Cattell's 16 PF Scales. There were five instances in which both were primary predictors of one another: 1) 16 PF's Emotion Stability/CPI's Well Being 2) 16 PF's Conscientious/CPI's Flexibility 3) 16 PF's Venturesome/CPI's Sociability 4) 16 PF's Tendermindedness/CPI's Femininity 5) 16 PF's Tense/CPI's Good Impression.

In addition, there appears to be considerable overlap at a factor level. Two predominant facts emerge for both 1) 16 PF's Introversion versus Extroversion/CPI's Extroversion 2) 16 PF's Adjustment versus Anxiety/CPI's Anxiety. The conclusion drawn from this study is that it appears that the 16 PF Scales and the CPI Scales generally measure the same personality characteristics.

Although the norm group consisted of six thousand males and seven thousand females with a wide range of ages, geographic areas, and socioeconomic backgrounds, Gough admits that this was not a true random sample of the population. Individuals in their early teens and late twenties, who are white, and from middle class backgrounds tend to be overly represented. Cross, Barclay, and Burger (1978) take the CPI to task for its failure to look at racial differences and test scores. They studied a group of 772 normal male and female, black and white, freshmen and sophomore students at community college. They found
"significant differences were demonstrated between black and white males, illustrating a differential in social living and social interaction for blacks when compared with whites. . . . There was considerable disparity in the factor structure for males of black college level students in comparison to white male students. . . . The same did not hold true for black and white female students, who showed a striking sameness when their factor structures were compared. Apparently, there is a similarity in social conditioning and social interaction which exists among black and white female community college student." (Cross et al., 1978, p. 602). The authors include the study by calling for more extensive research to examine the extent to which ethnic group membership plays a role in differential patterns of personality test scores.

In spite of its drawbacks, the California Psychological Inventory has been used in hundreds of studies and with millions of individuals. Once dubbed the "sane man's MMPI", the CPI seemed generally well suited for accomplishing the purpose of this study.

**Statistical Procedure**

The purpose of this study was to examine one research question: Which familial and psychological characteristics discriminate between battered women residing in shelters and non-battered women. Two statistical measures, stepwise discriminant analysis and multivariate analysis of variance
(MANOVA), were used to answer these questions by analyzing the data generated by the study.

A multivariate analysis of variance is used when one is interested in looking at a set of dependent variables rather than one dependent variable. It provides the researcher with one overall significant statistic. Multivariate tests were run on the Abuse Scales, and the California Psychological Inventory. "An F test is used to evaluate the null hypothesis of no difference between two group." (Downie and Heath, 1980) The presence of a significant F test indicates that differences, in fact, did exist between the two groups, and opens the way for further examination of the meaning of those differences.

In addition to the MANOVA, a stepwise discriminant analysis was performed. The purpose of stepwise discriminant analysis is to measure those characteristics in which groups are expected to differ, and to do so using the smallest number of variables that still retain the ability to explain the differences between groups. Mathematically, the objective is "to weigh and linearly combine the discriminating variables in some fashion so that the groups are forced to be as statistically distinct as possible. . . . It also derives a set of classification functions which will permit the classification of new cases with unknown membership." (Klecka, 1975) In other words, it attempts to predict which characteristics will determine
whether an individual belongs to one group as opposed to another group.

Summary

Chapter III has presented the description of the sample and the setting, and has discussed the instruments and the data analysis methods which were utilized in this study. Chapter IV presents the results of the findings.
Chapter IV
Analysis of Data

The analysis of the data will be presented in this chapter. The following statistical procedures, MANOVA, ANOVA, and stepwise discriminant analysis were performed to answer a single research question: What familial and psychological characteristics discriminate between battered women residing in a shelter and non-battered women.

Univariate tests were performed on the four intervally scaled demographic variables: age, school, income and number of children. Table I outlines the means, standard deviations, and univariate tests for these four demographic variables. Table 2 presents a distribution of the three nominal level demographic variables: marital status, race, and psychotropic medication. The mean scores of the battered group showed them to be older, with less education and income, and more children than the non-battered group. Among the battered women, 82.9% were white, 90% were married, common law married or living together, and 21.4% were taking prescribed psychotropic medication. In comparison, 69.4% of the non-battered group were white, 31.6% were married or living together, and 5.1% were taking prescribed psychotropic medication. A chi square was also
## Table I

**Univariate Analysis of Variance of the Demographic Data for Battered and Non-Battered Women**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Battered Women</th>
<th>Non-Battered Women</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean Score</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>28.96</td>
<td>8.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School</td>
<td>11.34</td>
<td>1.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income +</td>
<td>2.36</td>
<td>1.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Children</td>
<td>1.63</td>
<td>1.43</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p < 0.01

2 = $5,000-$10,000
3 = $10,000-$15,000
Table 2

Nominal Demographic Data for Battered and Non-Battered Women

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Battered Women</th>
<th>Non-Battered Women</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Percent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Marital Status</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Married</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>74.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Common Law</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Divorced</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Living Together</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>70</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Race</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>84.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>15.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>70</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Psychotropic Medicine</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>21.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>78.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>70</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
performed on the three nominal demographic variables: marital status, race, and prescribed psychotropic medication. Tables 3, 4, and 5 show each chi square in which the three shelters and the non-battered group are compared on marital status, race, and psychotropic medicine. Each of the chi squares was significant at the .01 level of significance. It should be noted, however, that over twenty percent of the cells have expected counts of less than five, and the tables are so sparse that the chi squares may be invalid tests.

In order to test for inter shelter variability, additional chi squares were run on all the demographic variables. These variables are: age, school, marital status, income, presence of children, medication, and race. Age and race were the only variables found to be significant at the .05 level of significance. Tables 6 and 7 show each chi square for age and race. It should be noted, however, that over twenty percent of the cells have expected counts of less than five, and the tables are so sparse that the chi squares may be invalid tests.

Table 8 outlines the means, standard deviations, and univariate tests for the abuse scales. The Spouse Abuse Scale, which was used to classify women as battered or non-battered, consisted of fifteen items. The first item was the least abusive (i.e. my spouse/partner yelled at me), the seventh item was moderately abusive (i.e. my spouse/
Table 3

A Comparison of the Dayton, Hamilton, and Columbus Shelters and Non-Battered Group by their Marital Status

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Shelters</th>
<th>1-Married</th>
<th>2-Common Law</th>
<th>3-Living Together</th>
<th>4-Divorced</th>
<th>5-Single</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1-Dayton</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-Hamilton</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-Columbus</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-Non-Battered</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>168</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4

A Comparison of the Dayton, Hamilton, and Columbus Shelters and Non-Battered Group by their Race

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Shelters</th>
<th>1-White</th>
<th>2-Black</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1-Dayton</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-Hamilton</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-Columbus</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-Non-Battered</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>129</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>168</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 5
A Comparison of the Dayton, Hamilton, and Columbus Shelters and Non-Battered Group by Prescribed Psychotropic Medicine

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Shelters</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>1-Yes</th>
<th>2-No</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1-Dayton</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-Hamilton</td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-Columbus</td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-Non-Battered</td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>20</td>
<td>148</td>
<td>168</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 6
A Comparison of the Dayton, Hamilton, and Columbus Shelters
by their Ages

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Shelters</th>
<th>1- 18-20</th>
<th>2- 21-25</th>
<th>3- 26-30</th>
<th>4- 31-35</th>
<th>5- 36-50</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1-Dayton</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-Hamilton</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-Columbus</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 7

A Comparison of the Dayton, Hamilton, and Columbus Shelters by their Race

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Shelters</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>1-White</th>
<th>2-Black</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1-Dayton</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-Hamilton</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-Columbus</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 8
Univariate Analysis of Variance for the Abuse Scales for Battered and Non-Battered Women

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scales</th>
<th>Mean Score</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Mean Score</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Probability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Battered Women</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spouse Abuse</td>
<td>9.06</td>
<td>3.16</td>
<td>0.69</td>
<td>0.82</td>
<td>629.97</td>
<td>0.0001*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child Abuse</td>
<td>8.24</td>
<td>4.58</td>
<td>7.31</td>
<td>3.23</td>
<td>2.42</td>
<td>0.1218</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Father's Drug Abuse</td>
<td>1.06</td>
<td>3.57</td>
<td>0.52</td>
<td>1.97</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>0.2146</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Father's Alcohol Abuse</td>
<td>3.44</td>
<td>4.70</td>
<td>3.16</td>
<td>3.94</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td>0.6354</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mother's Drug Abuse</td>
<td>2.87</td>
<td>2.70</td>
<td>0.68</td>
<td>2.40</td>
<td>0.52</td>
<td>0.4726</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self Drug Abuse</td>
<td>3.84</td>
<td>5.48</td>
<td>2.14</td>
<td>3.72</td>
<td>5.73</td>
<td>0.0178*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self Alcohol Abuse</td>
<td>2.46</td>
<td>3.25</td>
<td>2.30</td>
<td>2.61</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>0.7223</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Battered Women</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p < 0.01
partner threatened to kill me), and the last item was the most abusive (i.e. my spouse/partner shot me.). The Child Abuse Scale consisted of fifteen items. The first item was the least abusive (i.e. my mother yelled at me), the seventh item was moderately abusive (i.e. my father spanked me), and the last item was the most abusive (i.e. my father (step father, uncle, brother) sexually abused me). The Alcohol and Drug Abuse Scales consisted of twelve items and seventeen items, respectively. The first item on the Alcohol Abuse Scale was the least abusive (i.e. drink alcohol occasionally), the sixth item was moderately abusive (i.e. drinks every day), and the last item was the most abusive (i.e. became physically abusive because of drinking). The first item on the Drug Abuse Scale was the least abusive (i.e. smoke grass occasionally), the ninth item was moderately abusive (i.e. became verbally abusive because of drugs), and the last item was the most abusive (i.e. became physically abusive because of drugs).

Since the Spouse Abuse Scale was used to define whether a woman was considered battered or non-battered, it was expected to be significantly different for the battered group. In addition, the battered group had significantly greater drug use than the non-battered group.

Given the large number of dependent variables (the abuse scales and the CPI account for twenty-six of the thirty-three variables), it was decided that in order to
maintain the power of the MANOVA more than one MANOVA would be run. A MANOVA was then run on the abuse scales, the six Class I Scales (Dominance, Capacity for Status, Sociability, Social Presence, Self-Acceptance, Well Being), the six Class II Scales (Responsibility, Socialization, Self Control, Tolerance, Good Impression, Communality), the three Class III Scales (Achievement via Conformance, Achievement via Independence, Intellectual Efficiency), and the three Class IV Scales (Psychological Mindedness, Flexibility, Femininity). The MANOVA program yields not only a multivariate test for all variables, but also separate univariate tests for each of the dependent variables.

Separate univariate tests were significant at the .01 level of significance for the Spouse Abuse Scale, the Self Drug Abuse Scale, and at the .01 level of significance for eleven CPI Scales: Dominance, Capacity for Status, Sociability, Social Presence, Self-Acceptance, Well Being, Socialization, Tolerance, Achievement via Conformance, Intellectual Efficiency, and Femininity. The multivariate tests proved to be significant at the .01 level of significance for the abuse scales, and the Class I, Class II, Class III and Class IV Scales of the CPI. Table 9 outlines the means, standard deviations, univariate tests, and multivariate tests for the eighteen CPI Scales. The mean scores of the battered women were significantly lower than the mean scores of the non-battered women on ten
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>Battered Women</th>
<th>Non-Battered Women</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No. Items</td>
<td>Raw Mean Score</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>Raw Mean Score</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Probability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class I Scales</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dominance</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>22.76</td>
<td>7.18</td>
<td>25.50</td>
<td>6.35</td>
<td>6.16</td>
<td>0.0113*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capacity for Status</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>14.90</td>
<td>4.66</td>
<td>17.36</td>
<td>4.24</td>
<td>12.41</td>
<td>0.0001*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Esteem</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>20.51</td>
<td>5.79</td>
<td>23.02</td>
<td>5.07</td>
<td>8.56</td>
<td>0.0004*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Presence</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>28.10</td>
<td>7.22</td>
<td>31.86</td>
<td>5.98</td>
<td>31.77</td>
<td>0.0001*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self Acceptance</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>17.59</td>
<td>4.69</td>
<td>21.74</td>
<td>3.52</td>
<td>43.08</td>
<td>0.0001*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Well Being</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>27.89</td>
<td>6.36</td>
<td>32.12</td>
<td>5.63</td>
<td>20.36</td>
<td>0.0001*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class II Scales</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responsibility</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>24.74</td>
<td>5.94</td>
<td>25.89</td>
<td>5.99</td>
<td>1.79</td>
<td>0.1823</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Socialization</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>29.70</td>
<td>5.86</td>
<td>34.38</td>
<td>6.13</td>
<td>24.56</td>
<td>0.0001*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Control</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>26.73</td>
<td>7.30</td>
<td>26.01</td>
<td>7.67</td>
<td>0.37</td>
<td>0.5623</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tolerance</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>15.10</td>
<td>5.53</td>
<td>18.26</td>
<td>5.38</td>
<td>13.72</td>
<td>0.0001*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good Impression</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>13.47</td>
<td>5.46</td>
<td>14.36</td>
<td>5.37</td>
<td>1.73</td>
<td>0.1908</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conformity</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>24.61</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>24.98</td>
<td>2.58</td>
<td>0.84</td>
<td>0.3607</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class III Scales</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Achievement via Conformity</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>22.91</td>
<td>4.55</td>
<td>24.67</td>
<td>4.68</td>
<td>5.90</td>
<td>0.0162*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Achievement via Independence</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>16.46</td>
<td>4.26</td>
<td>17.62</td>
<td>4.24</td>
<td>3.08</td>
<td>0.0812</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intellectual Efficiency</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>29.36</td>
<td>6.07</td>
<td>33.50</td>
<td>5.65</td>
<td>20.36</td>
<td>0.0001*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class IV Scales</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychological Mindedness</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>10.13</td>
<td>4.03</td>
<td>10.46</td>
<td>2.42</td>
<td>0.30</td>
<td>0.5850</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flexibility</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>9.17</td>
<td>5.11</td>
<td>8.66</td>
<td>3.68</td>
<td>0.59</td>
<td>0.4630</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Femininity</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>24.94</td>
<td>3.35</td>
<td>22.42</td>
<td>3.63</td>
<td>21.04</td>
<td>0.0001*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p < 0.01
CPI Scales: Dominance, Capacity for Status, Sociability, Social Presence, Self Acceptance, Well Being, Socialization, Tolerance, Achievement via Conformance, and Intellectual Efficiency. The mean scores of the battered women were significantly higher than the mean scores of the non-battered women on the Femininity Scale.

**Stepwise Discriminant Analysis**

A stepwise discriminant analysis was used to determine which variables accounted for the difference between the battered and the non-battered groups. The variables which follow are listed in order (from most to least) in terms of how they count for the amount of variance. The first variable entered was age, followed by school, income, number of children, medication, race, child abuse scale, father's drug abuse scale, father's alcohol scale, mother's drug abuse scale, mother's alcohol abuse scale, self-drug abuse scale, self alcohol abuse scale, Dominance, Capacity for Status, Sociability, Social Presence, Self-Acceptance, Sense of Well Being, Responsibility, Socialization, Self Control, Tolerance, Good Impression, Communality, Achievement via Conformance, Achievement via Independence Psychological Mindedness, Flexibility, and Femininity. Wilkes Lambda is \( F=7.237 \text{ Df}=1,166 \text{ p}=0.0001 \)

Canonical correlation, and eigenvalue are listed in Table 10. The four variables which are loading heaviest on the discriminant function are: medication, school,
Table 10

Discriminant Analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Coefficient for Canonical Variables</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>-0.00264</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School</td>
<td>-0.32354*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income</td>
<td>-0.13152</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Children</td>
<td>0.29669*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medication</td>
<td>-0.47866*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race</td>
<td>-0.29193*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child Abuse</td>
<td>0.00274</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Father's Drug Abuse</td>
<td>0.08178</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mother's Drug Abuse</td>
<td>0.08298</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mother's Alcohol Abuse</td>
<td>0.00327</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self Drug Abuse</td>
<td>-0.00095</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self Alcohol Abuse</td>
<td>0.04581</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dominance (Do)</td>
<td>0.06764</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capacity for Status (Cs)</td>
<td>-0.02872</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sociability (Sy)</td>
<td>0.04174</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Presence (Sp)</td>
<td>0.00308</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self Acceptance (Sa)</td>
<td>-0.15935</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sense of Well Being (Wb)</td>
<td>-0.10015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responsibility (Re)</td>
<td>-0.00762</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Socialization (So)</td>
<td>-0.05695</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Control (Sc)</td>
<td>0.03370</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tolerance (To)</td>
<td>-0.05566</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good Impression (Gi)</td>
<td>0.08668</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communality (Cm)</td>
<td>0.10985</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Achievement via Conformance (Ac)</td>
<td>0.01294</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Achievement via Independence(Ai)</td>
<td>0.02063</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychological Mindedness (Py)</td>
<td>-0.05664</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flexibility (Fx)</td>
<td>0.09876</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Femininity (Fe)</td>
<td>0.10035</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* = loading heavily

Canonical Correlation 0.78302
Eigenvalue 1.58477
number of children, and race. Of the 168 subjects, 87.1% of the battered subjects were correctly classified in the non-battered group, and 75.7% of them were correctly classified in the battered group.

In comparison with their non-battered counterparts, the battered group were white and married with children. They had less education and income, and took more medication.

Additional Analysis

It must be considered that possibly the significant differences which exist between the battered and the non-battered groups are a result of the significant differences which exist between the two groups on all the demographic variables. As a means of exploring this possibility, a group of 27 battered and 27 non-battered women were matched on marital status, income, presence or absence of children and race.

Univariate tests were performed on the four intervally scaled demographic variables: age, school, income and number of children. Table 11 outlines the means, standard deviations, and univariate tests for these four demographic variables. Table 12 presents a distribution of the three nominal level demographic variables: marital status, race, and psychotrophic medication. As expected, with the exception of education, the mean scores of the battered group on age, income, number of children, marital status, prescribed medicine, and race were not significantly
Table 11

Univariate Analysis of Variance of the Demographic Data for Matched Groups of Battered and Non-Battered Women

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Raw Battered Women</th>
<th></th>
<th>Raw Non-Battered Women</th>
<th></th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Probability</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mean Score</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>Mean Score</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>28.11</td>
<td>8.42</td>
<td>28.00</td>
<td>7.77</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.9600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School</td>
<td>11.59</td>
<td>1.62</td>
<td>12.44</td>
<td>0.64</td>
<td>6.43</td>
<td>0.0142*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+Income</td>
<td>3.14</td>
<td>1.45</td>
<td>3.25</td>
<td>1.55</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>0.7880</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Children</td>
<td>1.37</td>
<td>1.18</td>
<td>1.07</td>
<td>0.91</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.7747</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p<.01

+3=$10,000-$15,000
### Table 12
Nominal Demographic Data for Matched Groups of Battered and Non-Battered Women

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Battered Women</th>
<th>Non-Battered Women</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number</td>
<td>Percent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Marital Status</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Married</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>70.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Common Law</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Divorced</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>18.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Living Together</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>27</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Race</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>81.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>18.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>27</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Psychotropic Medicine</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>22.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>77.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>27</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
different from the mean scores of the non-battered group. Table 13 outlines the means, standard deviations and univariate tests for the abuse scales.

A MANOVA was then run on the abuse scales, the six Class I Scales (Dominance, Capacity for Status, Sociability, Social Presence, Self Acceptance, Well Being), the six Class II Scales (Responsibility, Socialization, Self Control, Tolerance, Good Impression, Communality), the three Class III Scales (Achievement via Conformance, Achievement via Independence, Intellectual Efficiency), and the three Class IV Scales (Psychological Mindedness, Flexibility, Femininity). Separate univariate tests were significant at the .05 level of significance for Self-Acceptance, Well Being, and Femininity, and at the .01 level of significance for Socialization. The multivariate tests proved to be significant at the .01 level of significance for the Spouse Abuse Scale, and at the .01 level of significance for the Class II Scales of the CPI. Table 14 outlines the means, standard deviations, univariate tests, and multivariate tests for the eighteen CPI Scales. The mean scores of the battered women were significantly lower than the mean scores of the non-battered women on the three CPI Scales: Self-Acceptance, Well Being, and Socialization. The mean scores of the battered women were significantly higher than the mean scores of the non-battered women on the Femininity Scale.
Table 13

Univariate Analysis of Variance for the Abuse Scales for Matched Groups of Battered and Non-Battered Women

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scales</th>
<th>Battered Women</th>
<th></th>
<th>Non-Battered Women</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Raw</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>Mean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spouse Abuse</td>
<td>9.40</td>
<td>2.46</td>
<td>1.03</td>
<td>0.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Child Abuse</td>
<td>9.18</td>
<td>3.76</td>
<td>8.00</td>
<td>3.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Father's Drug Abuse</td>
<td>1.22</td>
<td>4.02</td>
<td>0.29</td>
<td>0.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Father's Alcohol Abuse</td>
<td>2.55</td>
<td>4.20</td>
<td>3.70</td>
<td>4.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mother's Drug Abuse</td>
<td>0.37</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.40</td>
<td>3.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mother's Alcohol Abuse</td>
<td>0.96</td>
<td>1.60</td>
<td>1.66</td>
<td>2.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self Drug Abuse</td>
<td>3.55</td>
<td>5.45</td>
<td>2.81</td>
<td>4.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self Alcohol Abuse</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>3.79</td>
<td>2.11</td>
<td>2.72</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p < 0.01
Table 14
Multivariate Analysis of Variance on the California Psychological Inventory
for a Matched Group of Battered and Non-Battered Women

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>Battered Women</th>
<th>Non-Battered Women</th>
<th>Multivariate Tests</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Raw Mean Score</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Items</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class I Scales</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dominance</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>22.96</td>
<td>8.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capacity for Status</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>19.55</td>
<td>4.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sociability</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>21.14</td>
<td>5.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Presence</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>28.92</td>
<td>5.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Acceptance</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>19.03</td>
<td>3.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Well Being</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>27.62</td>
<td>5.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class II Scales</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responsibility</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>25.74</td>
<td>4.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Socialization</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>23.37</td>
<td>6.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Control</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>26.62</td>
<td>7.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tolerance</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>16.18</td>
<td>4.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good Impression</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>15.33</td>
<td>4.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Communality</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>24.55</td>
<td>2.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class III Scales</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Achievement via Conformance</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>23.64</td>
<td>4.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Achievement via Independence</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>17.55</td>
<td>3.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intellectual Efficiency</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>30.29</td>
<td>6.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class IV Scales</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychological Mindedness</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>9.92</td>
<td>2.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flexibility</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>9.14</td>
<td>3.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Femininity</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>25.11</td>
<td>3.34</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p < 05
**p < 01
Summary

This chapter presented the findings of the study.

Chapter V contains a summary, conclusion, and recommendations.
CHAPTER V
SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

Chapter Five is divided into three sections: 1) summary of the research study 2) a discussion of the findings of this study and their implication 3) recommendations.

Summary

This study was undertaken to answer one research question: Which familial and psychological characteristics discriminate between battered women in a shelter and non-battered women?

The review of the literature was undertaken and revealed a need for more psychologically based and statistically sound studies on battered women.

This study was conducted at three shelters for battered women located in the State of Ohio, and at Columbus Technical Institute, a two year technical school. Seventy battered women and ninety-eight non-battered women participated in the study. All of the subjects were administered a demographic questionnaire, seven abuse scales, and the California Psychological Inventory.

A series of ANOVA's, MANOVA's, and stepwise discriminant analysis were performed on the data. Differences were found to exist between the battered and non-battered groups on the demographic questionnaire, the abuse scale,
and the California Psychological Inventory (CPI). The battered group was significantly older, had less education and income, and more children than the non-battered group. Among the battered women, 82.9% were white, 87.1% were married, common law married or living together, and 21.4% were taking prescribed psychotropic medications. In comparison, 69.4% of the non-battered women were white, 31.6% were married or living together, and 5.1% were taking prescribed psychotropic medications.

Among the abuse scales, the scores on the Spouse Abuse Scale, as expected, and the Self-Drug Abuse Scale, were significantly greater for the battered group when compared to the non-battered group.

Eleven of the eighteen CPI Scales were shown to be significantly different. The battered group scored significantly lower on ten CPI Scales: Dominance, Capacity for Status, Sociability, Social Presence, Self-Acceptance, Sense of Well Being, Socialization, Tolerance, Achievement via Conformance, and Intellectual Efficiency. The battered group scored significantly higher on the Femininity Scale than the non-battered group.

Since it is possible that the significant differences between the two groups are a result of significant differences on the demographic variables, a group of 27 battered and 27 non-battered women were matched on marital status, income, presence or absence of children, and race.
Holding the noted demographic data constant, it was found that only four of the original eleven CPI Scales continued to significantly differentiate between the battered and the non-battered group.

The discussion which follows relates the significance of the findings of this study with the current research on battered women.

**Discussion**

Two points need to be made before the onset of the discussion. First, it is beyond the scope of this study to determine what a woman's personality was like per se prior to being beaten by a spouse or partner. The focus will be on those characteristics which currently exist in women identified as battered in relation to those women identified as non-battered.

Secondly, the scores of both the battered and non-battered groups generally fell below the mean (T=50; SD 10) when compared with Gough's norm group. Gough found that scores above the mean indicate positive adjustment while those below the mean indicate problem areas, suggesting that both groups of subjects are below norms. (Megargee, 1972) This may have occurred because 1) all the members of this sample are generally older than the norm 2) the battered women have a lower SES 3) the non-battered women may have had proportionately more black members. (In Chapter 3 it is noted that race appears to make a difference
on how community college students score on the CPI [Cross, et al.] The extent of that difference, however, is less for black females than black males when compared to their sex appropriate counterparts. 4) the norms, themselves, are not really reflective of all populations. Gough readily admits that they were disproportionately white, middle class, and high school graduates. As a way around this problem, Megargee (1972) states that there are two aspects of considering relative elevations of scores 1) deviation from the norms of the most appropriate reference group 2) deviation from the general level established for the profile as a whole. Since no reference group exists for either technical college students or battered women, the second means of interpreting the CPI scores will be used for the purposes of this discussion, unless otherwise stated.

The discussion will be divided into three parts 1) significant differences between the battered and non-battered women beginning with the highest scores on the CPI 2) similarities between the two groups 3) recommendations for treatment and programming and further research.

The main question raised in Chapter 1 was whether there are characteristics which differ battered from non-battered women. This was answered in Chapter 4, which indicates that differences do appear to exist between the two groups. Eleven of the eighteen CPI Scales documented significant difference between the battered and non-battered
groups. Each of the significant scales will be discussed separately and when appropriate will be described in various combinations with each other.

The battered group scored significantly higher on the Femininity Scale not only in comparison with the non-battered group, but also in comparison with Gough's norm group - the battered group scored slightly above the mean. In a replication study of adjective correlates for the CPI done by Gregory and Morris (1978) sorority members who scored high on the Femininity Scale were described as calm, peaceable and patient - adjectives which underlie traditional concepts of femininity. In 1981, Betz and Bander showed that the Femininity Scale discriminated between those individuals who adhere to traditional male or female sex role stereotyping and those who do not. These studies, combined with the fact that the Femininity Scale is one and one-half standard deviations above the mean (T=40) established for the profile of the battered group, strengthens the argument that the battered women are moving in the direction of traditional roles for women. This lends some empirical support to 1) Walker's observations that her interviewees were more traditionalists with strong beliefs in the family unit as proscribed by female sex role stereotypes and 2) to her hypothesis that "those who have the most difficulty escaping a battering situation have a greater degree of traditional socialization patterns, and that sex role socialization in childrearing may be
responsible for indicating a faulty belief system that supports a woman's feelings of helplessness" (Walker, 1977, p. 528).

The low scores on the Dominance Scale suggests that battered women are more likely to be followers, to be submissive and shy, and to lack self-confidence when compared with the non-battered women. Hilberman (1978) and Walker (1980) observed similar characteristics among their interviewees, and data by Starr et. al. (1979) showed that battered women when compared with the norm group of the 16 PF had more difficulty with self-expression and were more shy, reserved and cautious in emotional experiences.

It is difficult to determine whether the significantly lower score on the Capacity for Status Scale for the battered group is the result of 1) the battered group possessing less of the qualities, i.e. self-confidence, social poise, absence of fears and anxieties which underlie and lead to status, or 2) the non-battered group possessing more of the qualities of actually achieved status by virtue of their higher levels of education and income. It is likely to be a combination of the two, with each to some extent reinforcing the presence of the other.

The low scores on the Sociability Scale suggest that the battered group are more likely to shun social participation and are less outgoing than the non-battered group. This supports Starr et. al. (1979) finding that the battered woman in her study tended to be reserved, introspective and
withdrawn. It could also be the end result of the increasing sense of physical and psychological isolation experienced by battered women which has been observed and noted by Martin (1975), Schuyler (1976, Heppner (1978), Davidson (1978), Dobash and Dobash (1979) and Gelles (1980).

This sense of isolation, coupled with the consistent observations throughout the literature that battered women appear to have a poor self-concept and low self-esteem (Davidson, 1978; Hilberman, 1978; Steinmetz, 1979; Walker, 1980), may underlie the battered groups' low scores on the Social Presence Scale and the Self-Acceptance Scale. These scales assess self-confidence and spontaneity in social interactions and a sense of personal worth and self-acceptance. It is unlikely these qualities would exist at a substantial level in the presence of a negative self-image as suggested by the descriptions of battered women in the literature.

These two scales are of further interest because they represent the only scales in which the non-battered group scored at or above the mean when compared with the normative sample. If Gough's assumption is correct that scores below the mean are indicative of problem areas, it would seem that the non-battered women, in spite of some apparent problems, do not seem to doubt themselves and their worth in the process. This is in direct contrast to the battered group.

It is not surprising that the battered group's score on the Sense of Well Being Scale is their lowest. It is one standard deviation below the profile mean and two
standard deviation below the mean when compared with Gough's norm group. Like Social Presence and Self-Acceptance, it is also affected by the level of one's self-concept. Low scores on this scale "suggest diminished vitality and inability to meet the demands of everyday life: (Megargee, 1972 P. 52).

It is understandable that the battered group would have scored significantly lower in light of the fact that all of the battered women either chose or were forced to leave their home as a direct result of being physically abused by their spouse or partner. Although all of the women were judged to be out of any immediate crisis prior to taking part in this study (three to four days), it is likely that there would be some continued physical and/or psychological effects as each woman begins the process of determining whether or not she wishes to end the relationship.

In summary, the battered group scored significantly lower than the non-battered group across the six scales which make up the Class I Scales. As a group these scales reflect characteristics shared by well-adjusted, outgoing, socially active, verbally fluent individuals who are socially posed, self-assured and interpersonally effective. (Megargee, 1972). These are factors which in combination promote a positive self-concept and self-esteem. Conversely, the low scores of the battered group across the six scales suggests, in comparison with the non-battered group, that the battered group has less self-esteem and a more negative
self-concept. Outside of the research by Starr et. al. (1979) this study lends the greatest empirical support for the consistent observations throughout the literature (Davidson, 1978; Hilberman, 1978; Steinmetz, 1980; Walker, 1980) that battered women "perceive themselves as unworthy, incompetent and powerless to change . . ." (Hilberman, 1977, p. 9).

Unlike the Class I Scales, there were only two Class II Scales which significantly differed between the battered and non-battered groups.

The low score on the Socialization Scale suggests that the battered group experiences more resentment, inferiority and alienation from their family and the world at large than the non-battered group. This finding lends some empirical support to Walker's (1978) use of the learned helplessness model as an explanation for why battered women remain in the abusive situation. The combined sense of isolation, alienation and inferiority may serve to reinforce the battered woman's belief that she is helpless and powerless in making significant changes in her life.

The low score on the Tolerance Scale suggests that the battered group is less trusting and confident and more closed, isolated, alienated and hostile than the non-battered group. The aspect of hostility has been noted by Walker (1979), and Hilberman (1978), who wrote "The battered women seem to constantly struggle with themselves to contain and control their aggressive impulses. . . . Their denial of their anger may be
their last defense against their homicidal rage (p. 9).

The theme of trust, or lack of trust in this instance, that runs throughout the Socialization and Tolerance Scales in contrast to Starr et. al's (1979) findings that battered women appeared to have the same level of trust as that of the norm group in the 16 PF Scale of trust vs. suspicion.

The Class III Scales assess intellectual efficiency and achievement potential. Given the fact that the non-battered group was comprised of first year students at a technical college, it was expected that differences between the two groups would probably be reflected in this area. Two of the three scales, Achievement via Conformance and Intellectual Efficiency, were found to significantly differentiate between the battered and non-battered groups, with the battered group scoring lower in both instances. Although a majority of the battered women completed high school, only a handful had pursued a higher education. The differences between the two groups may be due more to life circumstances than to intellectual capacity. It has been observed by shelter staff that their residents expend a great deal of physical and psychological energy to simply survive and to keep themselves and their children safe, leaving little time or energy to develop and enjoy academic interests.

Outside of the Spouse Abuse Scale, only the Self-Drug Abuse Scale was found to significantly differ between
battered and non-battered women, with the battered group scoring at a higher level on the Self-Drug Abuse Scale. This difference can largely be explained by the significant number of battered women who take prescribed psychotropic medicine compared with non-battered women.

It must be considered that possibly the significant differences which exist between the battered and the non-battered groups are a result of the significant differences which exist between the two groups on all the demographic variables. This was particularly evident with the discriminant analysis. As a means of exploring this possibility, a group of 27 battered and 27 non-battered women were matched on marital status, income, presence or absence of children, and race. Since all of the non-battered women were enrolled in a technical college, it was expected that the two groups would differ on level of education. The extent of this difference, however, was only about one year. Holding the noted demographic data constant, it was found that the Self-Drug Abuse Scale dropped out and that only four of the original eleven CPI Scales continued to significantly differentiate between battered and the non-battered group. These include Self-Acceptance, Sense of Well-Being, Socialization, and Femininity. If one rests the differences between the battered and the non-battered group on only the strength of these four CPI Scales, there still remains empirical support for the observations
of nearly every researcher on battering that battered women experience a sense of isolation, alienation, powerlessness and low self-esteem, overlaid by a need to fulfill their appropriate sex roles.

Since few studies have been done which attempt to compare battered with non-battered women, little attention has been paid to the ways in which the two groups are similar. Similarities represent possible sources of strength which are important in planning for a working with battered women.

With the exception of the Spouse Abuse and the Self-Drug Abuse Scales, no other significant differences were found between the two groups on the other five abuse scales. There was relatively little overall alcohol consumption or drug usage by the parents of the battered and the non-battered women. This is in contrast to the studies by Gayford (1975) and Hilberman (1978), where they reported a history of paternal alcoholism in one-fourth to one-third of their sample.

In addition to the Substance Abuse Scales, the overall scores on the Childhood Abuse Scale did not differentiate between the two groups. Most, however, did report being spanked on at least one occasion, lending support to the observation by Strauss, Gelles, Steinmetz (1980) "that the family is the setting in which most people learn the emotional and moral meaning of violence. . . . Those who love you are the ones most likely to hit you: (p. 102). On the surface,
the overall scores on this scale seem to support Walker's (1978) finding that battered women do not come from violent homes (Presumably spanking is not considered a violent act) in contrast to Gayford (1975) and Hilberman's (1978) findings of a high incidence of violence in the childhood histories of their respective samples.

Observations of shelter staff that many of their residents are incest victims, however, called for further examination of this scale. Upon closer inspection, it was found that nearly 18% of the battered women, compared with 4% of the non-battered women had responded "yes" to the question "My father (step-father, uncle, brother) sexually molested me." This represents a slightly higher percent of incest victims than the national average of 16% (Rush, 1981). The significance of this finding will be discussed later in the recommendations for further research.

Seven of the eighteen CPI Scales did not significantly differentiate between the battered and non-battered group. Each of these scales will be discussed separately using the profile mean and when appropriate will be described in various combinations with each other.

The similar low scores on the Responsibility Scale for the battered and non-battered groups suggests that neither group seems to be highly concerned about their social, civil or moral obligations and both may be struggling
with the degree to which values and controls are understood. (Megargee, 1972).

The scores on the Self-Control Scale suggest that both the battered and non-battered groups show "a similar generalized restraint of irrational behavior in general and aggression in particular" (Megargee, 1972, P. 66). This finding supports the observation by Walker (1978) that during Phase I of the cycle of violence the battered woman mustn't permit herself to get angry with him and the observations by Hilberman (1980) that "battered women rarely experience their anger directly" (p. 1342).

The relatively lower scores on the Responsibility Scale coupled with the relatively higher scores on the Self-Control Scales may reflect the struggle many women experience between expressing their anger directly and controlling their aggressive impulses.

Since non-valid profiles were removed from this study, it was expected that both groups would perform similarly on the validity scales of Good Impression and Communality. The overall profiles for both the battered and non-battered group suggest that the subjects in this study responded to the questions in a non-random fashion, and that their answers reflected a willingness to admit to human failings and anxieties without purposely creating an unfavorable or bad impression.
In relation to their profile mean, both the battered and non-battered groups scored similarly higher on the Psychological Mindedness and the Flexibility Scales. The first assesses the degree to which one has insight into the needs and experiences of others, and the second assesses the degree to which one is able to adapt and/or change one's thinking, behavior and temperament. The relatively higher scores for both groups of women on these two scales may reflect the degree of sex role stereotyping. Women in this society are still taught the importance of not only perceiving the needs of others, but also where possible to adapt their own needs to that perception.

In summary, the battered women in this study are both different and similar to the non-battered women. On one hand they have a greater sense of isolation and lesser sense of self-acceptance and self-esteem than do the non-battered women. On the other hand, they share characteristics (i.e. being flexible and responsive to the needs of others) that are not only common to the non-battered women but also to women in general.

**Recommendations for Treatment**

Based upon the findings of this study, the following are recommendations for short and long term work with battered women both in and outside of the shelter setting.

1) Given the low self-concept, lack of self-confidence and sense of physical and emotional alienation experienced by
battered women, it is important that shelter staff address the problems inherent in shifting an individual from nearly total isolation to communal living. One means of making this transition smoothly might be after the initial intake. At this time, the new resident and her children would be assigned another resident who could "show her the ropes" and serve as a liaison between the new resident and other residents. This would serve a dual purpose. For the new resident it would help minimize confusion, give her someone she could turn to outside of the counseling staff and provide her with a possible role model. For the older resident, it would give practice with and reinforce and support her ability to interact with another individual. For both, the sense of isolation would be further broken down.

2) The observations of Walker and Hilberman that battered women experience a sense of powerlessness and helplessness appear to be the long term effects of battering, low self-esteem, lack of self-confidence and self-acceptance, coupled with society's general indifference. Given the relatively short time in which women remain in shelters (an average time of four weeks), staff must work quickly if they are going to assist a battered woman in beginning to regain her sense of control and breaking down her sense of helplessness. As noted on the CPI and by Walker and Hilberman, battered omen do have self-control, but they chose to use it ineffectively by suppressing their feelings. There are two
areas over which a battered woman has the greatest control (outside of her children if they are under five years of age): her body and her mind. In line with Terry Davidson (1978) a battered woman can begin to help herself by building up her health and learning to practice relaxation on a regular basis. It is suggested that the shelter staff incorporate Jacobsen's technique for deep muscular relaxation or other forms of relaxation into a regular exercise routine in the morning, stressing the women's ability to control their bodies and the importance of practice.

Walker has consistently suggested that one way in which battered women have remained helpless is through the maintenance of a faulty belief system in which it is perceived that desired outcomes are not under one's direct control. In a case study, Diane Follingstad (1980) has shown that Rational Emotive Therapy (RET) is an effective treatment modality in realigning one's belief system.

Her counseling program essentially consisted of the following steps: 1) the individual discussed and listed all the beliefs and elements in the situation that kept her from changing her beliefs and prevented her ability to act 2) each belief was separately analyzed in terms of its reasonableness, how it was maintained, whether it was necessary to be maintained and that changing beliefs did not imply a need for action. Shelter staff have often noticed that many battered women's beliefs are actually
stated as his (the abuser's) beliefs. It is at this point that the staff may wish to help her learn to separate the two and begin to either work on and/or develop beliefs of her own. 3) Old beliefs are then modified or relabeled. For example, "I can't do anything" to "I was successful in baking that cake", new beliefs are substituted for old, unnecessary beliefs. For example, "I do have the right to express my feelings." 4) Work sheets and role plays are used to provide the individual with a source of practice. Given the limitation of staff and time, the relaxation and the counseling can be implemented in a group setting.

Assertiveness Training might also be utilized as another means of assisting the battered woman in becoming more powerful by taking control of her life in a more productive and effective manner. With Assertiveness Training, she can learn to recognize, perhaps for the first time, her own wants and feelings and begin to enhance her ability to express them in a clear and direct way. She should be cautioned that her increased assertiveness may result in his increased aggressiveness as a way of trying to put her back in her place. It is suggested she initially practice her new skill within a safe environment, i.e. other women at the shelter, the store clerk, her children.

3) it is recommended that all facets of the shelter program be directed towards reinforcing a sense of power and control among shelter residents.
4. For counselors outside a shelter setting it is recommended that they a) increase their awareness of and explore their own biases and myths about Domestic Violence b) ask an individual or couple as a standard question whether they have been the victims of violence in the past and/or present, thus stopping the collusion of silence that has historically existed between the battered woman and the clinician c) recognize that battering only gets worse if the behavior is not stopped and that both the woman and the counselor are working in a potentially dangerous situation d) be prepared for ambivalence on the part of the woman and long term counseling that incorporates relaxation, Rational Emotive Therapy, assertiveness training and knowledge of the phone number and workings of the local shelter 3) since most batterers refuse to come to counseling, if a woman is successful in increasing her self-concept and sense of control and is still living with her abuser, she should be prepared for the likelihood of the abuse initially increasing

Recommendations for Further Research

1) As noted earlier in this chapter, nearly 18% of the battered women had been incest victims. Linking the Social Learning Theory with the learned helplessness model, one wonders if battered women were taught as children to be victims, if they learned early in their lives that they were powerless to control what happened to them, and that to survive meant submission to the wishes of the men in
their lives. Further studies may want to investigate this vital area, which was only noted by Hilberman (1978) in passing, and may prove to be a key predictor in battering.

2) While Strauss, Gelles, and Steinmetz (1980) did a national study on violence, the psychological characteristics of the battered woman and her spouse/partner were admittedly absent. Additional national studies need to be done from a psychological perspective comparing not only matched groups of individual battered women in shelters and outside of shelters and non-battered women, but also matched groups of battered and non-battered couples as well as families. By choosing to interview only one adult in each family Strauss, Gelles, and Steinmetz (1980) lost a major opportunity for discussing the implications of the couple's response to the Conflict Tactics Scale. Further studies may want to investigate, analyze, and compare the responses on the Conflict Tactics Scale from the viewpoint of both the battered woman and her spouse/partner.

3. Further Studies may want to investigate the relationship between the battered woman and her children. This area of research has been noticeably missing. In what ways do a battered woman's poor self-concept, lack of self-confidence and self-acceptance, and sense of alienation effect her parenting skills in particular and her children in general? Although the literature has indicated that boys who witness their mother being beaten in turn beat their wives and that there are mixed results for girls, little has been done to
study the psychological effects of battering on children while they are still children.

4) Further studies may want to investigate whether any psychological changes take place as a result of a battered woman's stay in a shelter. This might be done through the inclusion of psychological measures during the initial intake, the final interview, and at various time intervals following her exit. The latter may be particularly difficult since many battered women do not wish to be recontacted once they have left and for some it could literally endanger their lives.

In summary, the empirical research on battered women and their families is still in its infancy -- producing more questions than answers.
APPENDIX A

Pilot Study - Design for Abuse Scales

Subjects

Thirty females voluntarily participated in the pilot study for the design of the eight abuse scales. They ranged in age from 20 to 43, in education from ninth grade to graduate school, and in income from below $5,000 to above $20,000. Thirty-three percent of the sample were married or living together, ten percent were divorced, and the rest were single. One-half of the sample had children and eighty percent were white. In line with the statistic that one in four women are battered, seven subjects were currently residents in a shelter.

Administration

All of the subjects were given a demographic questionnaire and asked to do a card sort for each of the abuse scales. They were told to arrange a series of statements for each of the abuse scales in order from the least to the most abusive statement if it had happened to them.

Purpose of the Scales

The purpose of the scales was to serve as a means of identifying battered and non-battered women and to determine the severity and frequency of (1) current abuse, (2) childhood abuse, (3) parental and personal substance abuse.
They were constructed based on Thurstone's law of categorical judgment, "which provided a rationale for the ordering of stimuli along psychological continuum, ..." and made possible the quantitative investigation of all kinds of values and subjected experiences. (Edwards, 1957).

Construction of the Scales

The scales were constructed according to the following steps;

1) Selection of items (i.e., being sworn at, threatened with an object, shot with a gun) which appear to represent a continuum of violence and substance abuse. These items were selected on the basis of the literature, questions raised by the literature, and discussions with the battered women's shelter's staff.

2) Presentation of the items were given to the above randomly selected group of thirty women who were instructed to rate them, in terms of their severity, from least to most severe.

3) Point values and order of items from least to most severe were determined using Thurstone's law of categorical judgment which is an extension of the general law of comparative judgment formulated by Thurstone in Case V. "The law consists of a set of equations relating parameters of stimuli and category boundaries to a set of cumulative proportions based on the number of times each stimulus of a set is judged to be in each category of a set of categories that are ordered with some respect to some physical
or other attribute. Distances between stimuli (and consequently the scale values) are expressed in variance units. Application of the model results in scale values and dispersions of both the stimuli and the category boundaries on the psychological continuum." In other words, if the group agrees that one item is more severe than another item, then those items will be further apart on the scale. Conversely, if the group disagrees, then those items will be closer together on the scale. It is the extent of agreement or disagreement that determines the ordering and spacing of items on the scale and also standard deviations. Information obtained by using Thurstone's Case V is sufficient to create an interval scale, i.e., it can be determined that the distance between items A and B is twice as large as the distance between items C and D. An arbitrary zero point was provided by the use of a "no abuse" item.

4) The eight abuse scales which follow this discussion were the result of the Thurstone Scaling method and were shown to have face validity.

Each subject in the study was defined as battered or non-battered on the basis of whether more than two items were checked on the Spouse Abuse Scale. In addition, she was classified according to the worst type of abuse she checked off on the other seven abuse scales.
Summary

The eight abuse scales were used in the actual study to determine if these dimensions measured differences between battered and non-battered women.
APPENDIX B

Please mark any of the items below which apply to you. Please indicate next to each item you have marked approximately how many times it has happened to you within the last 12 months.

1. My spouse/partner yelled at me ____
2. My spouse/partner swore at me ____
3. My spouse/partner threatened to hit me with an object ____
4. My spouse/partner threatened to hit me with his fist ____
5. My spouse/partner slapped me ____
6. My spouse/partner threatened me with a knife ____
7. My spouse/partner threatened to kill
8. My spouse/partner threatened me with a gun ____
9. My spouse/partner forced me to have sex with him ____
10. My spouse/partner choked me ____
11. My spouse/partner burned me ____
12. My spouse/partner broke one or more of my bones ____
13. My spouse/partner stabbed me ____
14. My spouse/partner shot me ____
Please mark any of the items below which applied to you during your childhood.

1. My mother yelled at me ____
2. My mother swore at me ____
3. My father yelled at me ____
4. My father swore at me ____
5. My mother spanked me ____
6. My mother threatened to hurt me ____
7. My father spanked me ____
8. My father threatened to hurt me ____
9. My mother threatened to hit me with an object ____
10. My mother threatened to kill me ____
11. My father hit me with an object ____
12. My father threatened to kill me ____
13. My mother burned ____
14. My father burned me ____
15. My father (step-father, uncle, brother) sexually abused me ____
Please mark any of the items below which apply to your father.

1. My father takes prescribed medication to calm his nerves _____
2. My father smokes grass a couple of times a month _____
3. My father smokes grass occasionally _____
4. My father smokes grass everyday _____
5. My father takes street drugs occasionally _____
6. My father takes street drugs a couple of times a month _____
7. My father lost a friendship(s) because of his drug taking _____
8. My father missed work because of drugs _____
9. My father was verbally abusive because of drugs _____
10. My father required medical attention because of drugs _____
11. My father was picked up by the police because of drugs _____
12. My father takes street drugs everyday _____
13. My father lost his memory because of drugs _____
14. My father lost his job because of drugs _____
15. My father has overdosed on prescribed medication _____
16. My father was physically abusive because of drugs _____
17. My father has overdosed on street drugs _____
Please mark any of the items below which apply to your mother.

1. My mother takes prescribed medication to calm her nerves 

2. My mother smokes grass occasionally 

3. My mother smokes grass a couple of times a month 

4. My mother smokes grass everyday 

5. My mother takes street drugs occasionally 

6. My mother takes street drugs a couple of times a month 

7. My mother lost a friendship(s) because of her drug taking 

8. My mother missed work because of drugs 

9. My mother was verbally abusive because of drugs 

10. My mother required medical attention because of drugs 

11. My mother was picked up by the police because of drugs 

12. My mother takes street drugs everyday 

13. My mother lost a job because of drugs 

14. My mother lost her memory because of drugs 

15. My mother overdosed on prescribed medication 

16. My mother overdosed on street drugs 

17. My mother was physically abusive because of drugs
Please mark any of the items below which apply to you.

1. I smoke grass occasionally ______
2. I smoke grass a couple of times a month ______
3. I take prescribed medicine to calm my nerves ______
4. I take street drugs occasionally ______
5. I smoke grass everyday ______
6. I take street drugs a couple of times a month ______
7. I lost a friendship(s) because of drugs ______
8. I missed work because of taking drugs ______
9. I was verbally abusive because of drugs ______
10. I required medical attention because of drugs ______
11. I use street drugs everyday ______
12. I was picked up by the police because of drugs ______
13. I lost a job because of drugs ______
14. I overdosed on prescribed medication ______
15. I lost my memory because of drugs ______
16. I overdosed on street drugs ______
17. I became physically abusive because of drugs ______
Please mark any of the items below which apply to your father.

1. My father drinks alcohol occasionally _____
2. My father drinks alcohol a couple of times a month _____
3. My father drinks alcohol to calm his nerves ______
4. My father lost a friendship(s) because of his drinking ______
5. My father missed work because of his drinking ______
6. My father drinks alcohol everyday ______
7. My father was verbally abusive because of his drinking ______
8. My father was picked up by the police because of his drinking ______
9. My father required medical attention because of his drinking ______
10. My father lost his memory because of his drinking ______
11. My father lost his job because of his drinking ______
12. My father was physically abusive because of his drinking ______
Please mark any of the items below which apply to your mother.

1. My mother drinks alcohol occasionally 
2. My mother drinks alcohol to calm her nerves 
3. My mother drinks alcohol a couple of times a month 
4. My mother lost a friendship(s) because of her drinking 
5. My mother missed work because of her drinking 
6. My mother drinks alcohol everyday 
7. My mother was verbally abusive because of her drinking 
8. My mother was picked up by the police because of her drinking 
9. My mother required medical attention because of her drinking 
10. My mother lost her job because of her drinking 
11. My mother lost her memory because of her drinking 
12. My mother was physically abusive because of her drinking
Please mark any of the items below which apply to you.

1. I drink alcohol occasionally  
2. I drink alcohol to calm my nerves  
3. I drink alcohol a couple of times a month  
4. I missed work because of my drinking  
5. I lost a friendship(s) because of my drinking  
6. I drink alcohol everyday  
7. I was verbally abusive because of my drinking  
8. I was picked up by the police because of my drinking  
9. I required medical attention because of my drinking  
10. I lost my memory because of my drinking  
11. I lost my job because of my drinking  
12. I was physically abusive because of my drinking
APPENDIX C

Demographic Questionnaire

1. What is your age? _____

2. Are you female _____ or male _____

3. What is the highest grade in school you have completed _____

4. Are you married _____ common law married _____
   divorced _____ living together _____ single _____
   widowed _____

5. What is your current family income for the last year?
   _____below $5,000 _____$5,000 to $10,000
   _____ $10,000 to $15,000 _____$15,000 to $20,000
   _____above $20,000

6. Do you have children at home? Yes _____ No _____

7. If you answered "yes" to #6, how many and what are their ages? __________________________

8. Are you currently taking any prescribed tranquilizer(s) (nerve medicine? Yes _____ No _____

9. If you answered "yes" to #8, list the name of the medication(s). __________________________

10. Are you white _____ or nonwhite _____
Table 15
Intercorrelation Matrix

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>AGE</th>
<th>SEX</th>
<th>SCHOOL</th>
<th>RACE</th>
<th>SECH</th>
<th>INCOME</th>
<th>CHILDF</th>
<th>MIDS</th>
<th>RACEF</th>
<th>FAAC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AGE</td>
<td>1.0000</td>
<td>-0.02399</td>
<td>-0.0544</td>
<td>0.3044</td>
<td>0.3044</td>
<td>-0.02399</td>
<td>-0.0544</td>
<td>0.3044</td>
<td>0.3044</td>
<td>-0.02399</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEX</td>
<td>-0.0499</td>
<td>1.0000</td>
<td>0.05199</td>
<td>0.1064</td>
<td>0.0666</td>
<td>-0.02791</td>
<td>-0.0700</td>
<td>0.0666</td>
<td>-0.02791</td>
<td>0.1064</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCHOOL</td>
<td>0.0432</td>
<td>0.0000</td>
<td>0.5093</td>
<td>0.1770</td>
<td>0.2218</td>
<td>0.3476</td>
<td>0.0690</td>
<td>0.1171</td>
<td>0.6257</td>
<td>0.4046</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INCOME</td>
<td>0.0444</td>
<td>0.05199</td>
<td>1.0000</td>
<td>0.2812</td>
<td>0.1714</td>
<td>0.1190</td>
<td>0.05842</td>
<td>0.07768</td>
<td>0.10752</td>
<td>0.7970</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHILDF</td>
<td>-0.2236</td>
<td>0.5093</td>
<td>0.0000</td>
<td>0.0000</td>
<td>0.1170</td>
<td>0.1243</td>
<td>0.4846</td>
<td>0.7236</td>
<td>0.0174</td>
<td>0.0000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MIDS</td>
<td>0.0110</td>
<td>0.1978</td>
<td>0.0000</td>
<td>0.0000</td>
<td>0.0554</td>
<td>0.0091</td>
<td>0.1453</td>
<td>0.5070</td>
<td>0.0206</td>
<td>0.0000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RACEF</td>
<td>0.0801</td>
<td>0.01978</td>
<td>0.0000</td>
<td>0.0000</td>
<td>0.0554</td>
<td>0.0091</td>
<td>0.1453</td>
<td>0.5070</td>
<td>0.0206</td>
<td>0.0000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FAAC</td>
<td>0.0666</td>
<td>0.5033</td>
<td>0.0000</td>
<td>0.0000</td>
<td>0.1170</td>
<td>0.1243</td>
<td>0.4846</td>
<td>0.7236</td>
<td>0.0174</td>
<td>0.0000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Intercorrelation Matrix - Continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>AGE</th>
<th>SEX</th>
<th>SCHOOL</th>
<th>INCOME</th>
<th>CHILD</th>
<th>NOCHLD</th>
<th>MFRS</th>
<th>RACE</th>
<th>SPAB</th>
<th>CHAD</th>
<th>FAD</th>
<th>FAAC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SPAB</td>
<td>0.08679</td>
<td>-0.05207</td>
<td>-0.30999</td>
<td>-0.48008</td>
<td>-0.17796</td>
<td>-0.34281</td>
<td>0.31089</td>
<td>-0.12224</td>
<td>-0.12474</td>
<td>1.00000</td>
<td>-0.06108</td>
<td>0.04959</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHAD</td>
<td>0.25600</td>
<td>0.4945</td>
<td>0.0001</td>
<td>0.0001</td>
<td>0.0216</td>
<td>0.0001</td>
<td>0.0001</td>
<td>0.0128</td>
<td>0.1104</td>
<td>0.0010</td>
<td>0.1660</td>
<td>0.0493</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FAD</td>
<td>0.02098</td>
<td>0.06833</td>
<td>-0.11832</td>
<td>-0.09986</td>
<td>-0.01986</td>
<td>-0.02703</td>
<td>0.07112</td>
<td>-0.07847</td>
<td>-0.04364</td>
<td>1.00000</td>
<td>-0.5642</td>
<td>0.81825</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FAAC</td>
<td>0.68946</td>
<td>0.39500</td>
<td>0.1332</td>
<td>0.0996</td>
<td>0.0063</td>
<td>0.1761</td>
<td>0.5204</td>
<td>0.2463</td>
<td>0.1764</td>
<td>0.9043</td>
<td>0.746</td>
<td>0.1764</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPAB</td>
<td>0.04606</td>
<td>0.02094</td>
<td>0.02552</td>
<td>0.06927</td>
<td>0.00019</td>
<td>0.02278</td>
<td>-0.00885</td>
<td>0.07552</td>
<td>0.00103</td>
<td>0.01370</td>
<td>0.24401</td>
<td>1.00000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHAD</td>
<td>0.00803</td>
<td>0.02094</td>
<td>0.06927</td>
<td>0.00019</td>
<td>0.02278</td>
<td>-0.00885</td>
<td>0.07552</td>
<td>0.00103</td>
<td>0.01370</td>
<td>0.24401</td>
<td>1.00000</td>
<td>-0.00008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FAD</td>
<td>0.06833</td>
<td>0.4945</td>
<td>0.0001</td>
<td>0.0001</td>
<td>0.0216</td>
<td>0.0001</td>
<td>0.0001</td>
<td>0.0128</td>
<td>0.1104</td>
<td>0.0010</td>
<td>0.1660</td>
<td>0.0493</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FAAC</td>
<td>0.39500</td>
<td>0.1332</td>
<td>0.0996</td>
<td>0.0063</td>
<td>0.1761</td>
<td>0.5204</td>
<td>0.2463</td>
<td>0.1764</td>
<td>0.9043</td>
<td>0.746</td>
<td>0.1764</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AA</td>
<td>0.01173</td>
<td>0.00670</td>
<td>-0.01134</td>
<td>0.01114</td>
<td>0.02680</td>
<td>0.01248</td>
<td>0.1768</td>
<td>0.00097</td>
<td>0.00103</td>
<td>0.01370</td>
<td>0.24401</td>
<td>1.00000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BB</td>
<td>0.00336</td>
<td>0.01285</td>
<td>-0.00354</td>
<td>-0.00354</td>
<td>0.00188</td>
<td>0.00000</td>
<td>0.0001</td>
<td>0.0001</td>
<td>0.0001</td>
<td>0.0001</td>
<td>0.0001</td>
<td>0.0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CC</td>
<td>0.00336</td>
<td>0.01285</td>
<td>-0.00354</td>
<td>-0.00354</td>
<td>0.00188</td>
<td>0.00000</td>
<td>0.0001</td>
<td>0.0001</td>
<td>0.0001</td>
<td>0.0001</td>
<td>0.0001</td>
<td>0.0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DD</td>
<td>0.00336</td>
<td>0.01285</td>
<td>-0.00354</td>
<td>-0.00354</td>
<td>0.00188</td>
<td>0.00000</td>
<td>0.0001</td>
<td>0.0001</td>
<td>0.0001</td>
<td>0.0001</td>
<td>0.0001</td>
<td>0.0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EE</td>
<td>0.00336</td>
<td>0.01285</td>
<td>-0.00354</td>
<td>-0.00354</td>
<td>0.00188</td>
<td>0.00000</td>
<td>0.0001</td>
<td>0.0001</td>
<td>0.0001</td>
<td>0.0001</td>
<td>0.0001</td>
<td>0.0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FF</td>
<td>0.00336</td>
<td>0.01285</td>
<td>-0.00354</td>
<td>-0.00354</td>
<td>0.00188</td>
<td>0.00000</td>
<td>0.0001</td>
<td>0.0001</td>
<td>0.0001</td>
<td>0.0001</td>
<td>0.0001</td>
<td>0.0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GG</td>
<td>0.00336</td>
<td>0.01285</td>
<td>-0.00354</td>
<td>-0.00354</td>
<td>0.00188</td>
<td>0.00000</td>
<td>0.0001</td>
<td>0.0001</td>
<td>0.0001</td>
<td>0.0001</td>
<td>0.0001</td>
<td>0.0001</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Intercorrelation Matrix - Continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>AGE</th>
<th>SEX</th>
<th>SCHOOL</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>INCOME</th>
<th>CHILD</th>
<th>NOCHILD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TO</td>
<td>0.0275</td>
<td>0.0564</td>
<td>0.2488</td>
<td>0.20872</td>
<td>0.7408</td>
<td>0.23184</td>
<td>-0.1964</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GI</td>
<td>-0.02540</td>
<td>0.04293</td>
<td>-0.13770</td>
<td>-0.03904</td>
<td>-0.00197</td>
<td>0.14212</td>
<td>0.08644</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CM</td>
<td>0.00181</td>
<td>0.7377</td>
<td>0.4165</td>
<td>0.0844</td>
<td>0.0545</td>
<td>0.0705</td>
<td>0.05631</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AC</td>
<td>0.15986</td>
<td>0.01751</td>
<td>0.29954</td>
<td>-0.03226</td>
<td>0.27679</td>
<td>0.06809</td>
<td>0.05908</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AT</td>
<td>0.00446</td>
<td>0.05466</td>
<td>0.14744</td>
<td>-0.00552</td>
<td>0.10468</td>
<td>0.05279</td>
<td>-0.03124</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IE</td>
<td>0.01057</td>
<td>0.04066</td>
<td>0.25037</td>
<td>0.18970</td>
<td>0.0308</td>
<td>0.34931</td>
<td>-0.19832</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PY</td>
<td>0.07091</td>
<td>0.08901</td>
<td>0.02687</td>
<td>0.00650</td>
<td>0.14470</td>
<td>-0.03857</td>
<td>0.06391</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FX</td>
<td>-0.10636</td>
<td>0.07591</td>
<td>-0.06162</td>
<td>0.07808</td>
<td>0.08066</td>
<td>0.08190</td>
<td>0.14525</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PE</td>
<td>0.0382</td>
<td>0.18370</td>
<td>0.10798</td>
<td>0.27268</td>
<td>0.00838</td>
<td>0.23262</td>
<td>0.24610</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HRMD</td>
<td>0.6407</td>
<td>0.0639</td>
<td>0.1633</td>
<td>0.00003</td>
<td>0.0335</td>
<td>0.00194</td>
<td>0.01171</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The table continues with correlations between various variables such as Age, Sex, School, MS, Income, Child, NOChild, and their interrelationships, with coefficients ranging from 0.0001 to 0.9978, indicating the strength and direction of the correlations. The table uses a correlation coefficient matrix to show these relationships.
### Intercorrelation Matrix - Continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>REDS</th>
<th>RACE</th>
<th>SPAB</th>
<th>CHAB</th>
<th>FADR</th>
<th>FAAC</th>
<th>MDR</th>
<th>MDCR</th>
<th>SEAC</th>
<th>DO</th>
<th>CS</th>
<th>SY</th>
<th>SP</th>
<th>SA</th>
<th>WB</th>
<th>RE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>REDS</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>-0.562</td>
<td>-0.380</td>
<td>0.386</td>
<td>-0.150</td>
<td>-0.933</td>
<td>0.234</td>
<td>-0.007</td>
<td>-0.372</td>
<td>-0.150</td>
<td>-0.933</td>
<td>0.234</td>
<td>-0.007</td>
<td>-0.372</td>
<td>-0.150</td>
<td>-0.933</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RACE</td>
<td>0.562</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>-0.187</td>
<td>0.350</td>
<td>-0.035</td>
<td>-0.230</td>
<td>0.069</td>
<td>-0.006</td>
<td>-0.462</td>
<td>-0.035</td>
<td>-0.230</td>
<td>0.069</td>
<td>-0.006</td>
<td>-0.462</td>
<td>-0.035</td>
<td>-0.230</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPAB</td>
<td>0.380</td>
<td>-0.187</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>-0.460</td>
<td>-0.103</td>
<td>0.462</td>
<td>0.050</td>
<td>-0.006</td>
<td>-0.187</td>
<td>-0.103</td>
<td>0.462</td>
<td>0.050</td>
<td>-0.006</td>
<td>-0.187</td>
<td>-0.103</td>
<td>0.462</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHAB</td>
<td>0.386</td>
<td>0.350</td>
<td>-0.460</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>-0.023</td>
<td>0.092</td>
<td>0.006</td>
<td>-0.006</td>
<td>-0.350</td>
<td>-0.023</td>
<td>0.092</td>
<td>0.006</td>
<td>-0.006</td>
<td>-0.350</td>
<td>-0.023</td>
<td>0.092</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FADR</td>
<td>-0.150</td>
<td>-0.035</td>
<td>-0.103</td>
<td>-0.023</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>-0.382</td>
<td>0.016</td>
<td>-0.006</td>
<td>-0.150</td>
<td>-0.035</td>
<td>-0.103</td>
<td>-0.023</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>-0.382</td>
<td>0.016</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FAAC</td>
<td>0.933</td>
<td>0.230</td>
<td>0.462</td>
<td>0.092</td>
<td>-0.382</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>-0.364</td>
<td>-0.006</td>
<td>0.933</td>
<td>0.230</td>
<td>0.462</td>
<td>0.092</td>
<td>-0.382</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>-0.364</td>
<td>-0.006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MDR</td>
<td>0.234</td>
<td>0.069</td>
<td>0.050</td>
<td>0.006</td>
<td>0.016</td>
<td>-0.364</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>-0.006</td>
<td>0.234</td>
<td>0.069</td>
<td>0.050</td>
<td>0.006</td>
<td>0.016</td>
<td>-0.364</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>-0.006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MDCR</td>
<td>-0.007</td>
<td>-0.006</td>
<td>-0.006</td>
<td>-0.006</td>
<td>-0.006</td>
<td>-0.006</td>
<td>-0.006</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>-0.007</td>
<td>-0.006</td>
<td>-0.006</td>
<td>-0.006</td>
<td>-0.006</td>
<td>-0.006</td>
<td>-0.006</td>
<td>1.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEAC</td>
<td>-0.372</td>
<td>-0.187</td>
<td>-0.187</td>
<td>-0.350</td>
<td>-0.103</td>
<td>-0.023</td>
<td>-0.006</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>-0.372</td>
<td>-0.187</td>
<td>-0.187</td>
<td>-0.350</td>
<td>-0.103</td>
<td>-0.023</td>
<td>-0.006</td>
<td>1.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DO</td>
<td>-0.150</td>
<td>-0.035</td>
<td>-0.103</td>
<td>-0.023</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>-0.382</td>
<td>0.016</td>
<td>-0.006</td>
<td>-0.150</td>
<td>-0.035</td>
<td>-0.103</td>
<td>-0.023</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>-0.382</td>
<td>0.016</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CS</td>
<td>-0.933</td>
<td>0.230</td>
<td>0.462</td>
<td>0.092</td>
<td>-0.382</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>-0.364</td>
<td>-0.006</td>
<td>0.933</td>
<td>0.230</td>
<td>0.462</td>
<td>0.092</td>
<td>-0.382</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>-0.364</td>
<td>-0.006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SY</td>
<td>-0.007</td>
<td>-0.006</td>
<td>-0.006</td>
<td>-0.006</td>
<td>-0.006</td>
<td>-0.006</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>-0.007</td>
<td>-0.006</td>
<td>-0.006</td>
<td>-0.006</td>
<td>-0.006</td>
<td>-0.006</td>
<td>-0.006</td>
<td>-0.006</td>
<td>1.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SP</td>
<td>-0.234</td>
<td>0.069</td>
<td>0.050</td>
<td>0.006</td>
<td>0.016</td>
<td>-0.364</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>-0.006</td>
<td>-0.234</td>
<td>0.069</td>
<td>0.050</td>
<td>0.006</td>
<td>0.016</td>
<td>-0.364</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>-0.006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SA</td>
<td>-0.007</td>
<td>-0.006</td>
<td>-0.006</td>
<td>-0.006</td>
<td>-0.006</td>
<td>-0.006</td>
<td>-0.006</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>-0.007</td>
<td>-0.006</td>
<td>-0.006</td>
<td>-0.006</td>
<td>-0.006</td>
<td>-0.006</td>
<td>-0.006</td>
<td>1.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WB</td>
<td>-0.372</td>
<td>-0.187</td>
<td>-0.187</td>
<td>-0.350</td>
<td>-0.103</td>
<td>-0.023</td>
<td>-0.006</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>-0.372</td>
<td>-0.187</td>
<td>-0.187</td>
<td>-0.350</td>
<td>-0.103</td>
<td>-0.023</td>
<td>-0.006</td>
<td>1.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RE</td>
<td>-0.150</td>
<td>-0.035</td>
<td>-0.103</td>
<td>-0.023</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>-0.382</td>
<td>0.016</td>
<td>-0.006</td>
<td>-0.150</td>
<td>-0.035</td>
<td>-0.103</td>
<td>-0.023</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>-0.382</td>
<td>0.016</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note:** The table above contains the intercorrelation matrix for the variables listed. Each cell represents the correlation coefficient between two variables.
### Intercorrelation Matrix - Continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>MDOR</th>
<th>MDAC</th>
<th>SCEDR</th>
<th>SFCAC</th>
<th>DOR</th>
<th>CS</th>
<th>SY</th>
<th>CR</th>
<th>SC</th>
<th>SA</th>
<th>WA</th>
<th>RE</th>
<th>SO</th>
<th>SC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SD</td>
<td>0.1235 -0.0839 -0.3112 -0.7654 0.2812 0.2976 0.2463 0.1234 0.2745 0.2376 0.1237 0.1238 0.1239 0.1239</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SC</td>
<td>0.0872 0.3009 0.0001 0.0002 0.0005 0.0000 0.0000 0.0000 0.0000 0.0000 0.0000 0.0000 0.0000 0.0000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TO</td>
<td>0.1298 0.3119 0.1322 0.0001 0.0005 0.1691 0.3164 0.2777 0.0001 0.0001 0.0001 0.0001 0.0001 0.0001</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GI</td>
<td>0.1173 0.0794 -0.1004 -0.3954 -0.0008 0.1065 -0.0649 -0.2378 0.2378 0.2378 -0.0001 -0.0001 -0.0001 -0.0001</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CM</td>
<td>0.1172 -0.0127 -0.0660 -0.0593 0.4280 0.5134 0.6519 0.4278 0.4278 0.4278 0.0001 0.0001 0.0001 0.0001</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AC</td>
<td>0.02605 0.00127 0.00000 0.00000 0.00000 0.00000 0.00000 0.00000 0.00000 0.00000 0.00000 0.00000 0.00000 0.00000 0.00000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AI</td>
<td>0.00583 -0.04085 0.10920 0.03627 0.18757 0.45737 0.27936 0.30468 0.15051 0.01288 0.56088 0.25797 0.44570 0.01257</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IE</td>
<td>0.09729 0.05324 0.03584 0.03240 0.52730 0.60699 0.63767 0.55867 0.47677 0.67373 0.47733 0.39793 0.35795 0.00158</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY</td>
<td>0.09568 0.05529 -0.15323 -0.24857 0.25682 0.26532 0.34537 0.58760 0.18782 0.28091 0.40975 0.12541 0.12817 0.00172</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FX</td>
<td>0.04564 0.02200 0.10997 0.00000 -0.08749 0.11392 0.17029 0.24374 0.02348 -0.07820 0.02374 -0.01678 0.18625 0.01515</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FE</td>
<td>0.09285 -0.12092 0.03873 -0.15536 -0.21656 -0.18073 -0.16756 0.26010 -0.21963 0.21650 0.07088 0.01170 -0.00124 0.01535</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TO</td>
<td>0.02775 0.29270 0.07592 0.15846 0.07206 0.07087 0.07051 -0.10574 0.03267 0.31115 0.0001 0.0001 0.0001 0.0001</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GI</td>
<td>0.31875 0.73777 0.4460 0.2121 0.5050 0.6090 0.92512 0.3791 0.06398</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CM</td>
<td>0.34652 0.4438 0.3907 0.0001 0.0001 0.0001 0.0001 0.0001 0.0001 0.0001 0.0001 0.0001 0.0001 0.0001</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AC</td>
<td>0.00014 0.02620 0.00026 0.01751 0.05230 0.0464 0.08001 0.07501 0.15576</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AI</td>
<td>0.02605 0.05524 0.15323 0.24857 0.25682 0.26532 0.34537 0.58760 0.18782 0.28091 0.40975 0.12541 0.12817 0.00172</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IE</td>
<td>0.09729 0.05324 0.03584 0.03240 0.52730 0.60699 0.63767 0.55867 0.47677 0.67373 0.47733 0.39793 0.35795 0.00158</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY</td>
<td>0.09568 0.05529 -0.15323 -0.24857 0.25682 0.26532 0.34537 0.58760 0.18782 0.28091 0.40975 0.12541 0.12817 0.00172</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FX</td>
<td>0.04564 0.02200 0.10997 0.00000 -0.08749 0.11392 0.17029 0.24374 0.02348 -0.07820 0.02374 -0.01678 0.18625 0.01515</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FE</td>
<td>0.09285 -0.12092 0.03873 -0.15536 -0.21656 -0.18073 -0.16756 0.26010 -0.21963 0.21650 0.07088 0.01170 -0.00124 0.01535</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AGE</td>
<td>0.02775 0.29270 0.07592 0.15846 0.07206 0.07087 0.07051 -0.10574 0.03267</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEX</td>
<td>0.93151 0.63094 0.0423 0.7248 0.8910 0.3638 0.1219 0.44077</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCHOOL</td>
<td>0.24698 0.02620 0.15167 0.29850 0.13446 0.25079 0.0262 0.4042 0.10709</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MS</td>
<td>0.06757 -0.12749 -0.0051 0.03248 -0.00052 0.18079 0.00650 0.07800 -0.27444</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| INCOME | 0.24199 -0.00506 0.18792 0.27109 0.19505 0.30087 0.18470 0.03500 0.79007 0.4311
### Intercorrelation Matrix - Continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>TO</th>
<th>CH</th>
<th>AT</th>
<th>TE</th>
<th>PV</th>
<th>FX</th>
<th>EF</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CHIL</td>
<td>0.2821</td>
<td>-0.0817</td>
<td>0.1306</td>
<td>0.0680</td>
<td>0.0796</td>
<td>-0.2642</td>
<td>0.0113</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NOCHIL</td>
<td>-0.1386</td>
<td>0.1612</td>
<td>0.1015</td>
<td>0.0980</td>
<td>-0.0727</td>
<td>0.1892</td>
<td>0.0481</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AC</td>
<td>0.0731</td>
<td>0.0681</td>
<td>0.1964</td>
<td>0.4413</td>
<td>0.1249</td>
<td>0.0647</td>
<td>0.0013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AT</td>
<td>0.1094</td>
<td>0.0684</td>
<td>0.0913</td>
<td>0.0419</td>
<td>0.1725</td>
<td>0.2652</td>
<td>0.0542</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TE</td>
<td>0.1931</td>
<td>0.0371</td>
<td>0.0963</td>
<td>0.0348</td>
<td>0.2347</td>
<td>0.0664</td>
<td>0.0141</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PV</td>
<td>-0.0839</td>
<td>0.0728</td>
<td>-0.1702</td>
<td>0.0587</td>
<td>-0.1546</td>
<td>-0.0796</td>
<td>-0.0365</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FX</td>
<td>-0.2749</td>
<td>0.0428</td>
<td>0.0927</td>
<td>0.0644</td>
<td>0.2084</td>
<td>0.6324</td>
<td>0.7017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EF</td>
<td>-0.3150</td>
<td>-0.0273</td>
<td>-0.0570</td>
<td>-0.1743</td>
<td>-0.1451</td>
<td>-0.2908</td>
<td>-0.1116</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHAB</td>
<td>0.0001</td>
<td>0.3455</td>
<td>0.0463</td>
<td>0.0023</td>
<td>0.0675</td>
<td>0.0001</td>
<td>0.2095</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CH</td>
<td>0.0998</td>
<td>0.0730</td>
<td>0.2495</td>
<td>0.0897</td>
<td>0.0379</td>
<td>0.0160</td>
<td>0.0770</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BAD</td>
<td>0.0267</td>
<td>0.1797</td>
<td>0.0047</td>
<td>0.0379</td>
<td>0.0470</td>
<td>0.0767</td>
<td>0.10210</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FAAC</td>
<td>0.1232</td>
<td>0.0201</td>
<td>0.5912</td>
<td>0.6261</td>
<td>0.3978</td>
<td>0.3739</td>
<td>0.1819</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MODR</td>
<td>-0.0714</td>
<td>-0.0627</td>
<td>-0.0127</td>
<td>-0.0540</td>
<td>0.0419</td>
<td>-0.3975</td>
<td>-0.0074</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MOAC</td>
<td>0.2340</td>
<td>0.4919</td>
<td>0.7773</td>
<td>0.4757</td>
<td>0.0893</td>
<td>0.0690</td>
<td>0.1322</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEOR</td>
<td>0.1172</td>
<td>-0.0828</td>
<td>-0.0209</td>
<td>-0.1874</td>
<td>-0.0828</td>
<td>-0.0472</td>
<td>0.0024</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEAC</td>
<td>0.1319</td>
<td>0.4189</td>
<td>0.7375</td>
<td>0.0279</td>
<td>0.4902</td>
<td>0.2092</td>
<td>0.4708</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DO</td>
<td>0.0812</td>
<td>0.5077</td>
<td>0.8976</td>
<td>0.5091</td>
<td>0.4397</td>
<td>0.1539</td>
<td>0.7771</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CS</td>
<td>0.0601</td>
<td>-0.1609</td>
<td>0.0483</td>
<td>-0.1561</td>
<td>0.1020</td>
<td>-0.0884</td>
<td>0.1139</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SY</td>
<td>0.3953</td>
<td>0.0524</td>
<td>0.3204</td>
<td>0.0433</td>
<td>0.1588</td>
<td>0.4486</td>
<td>0.1384</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SP</td>
<td>0.0529</td>
<td>-0.2001</td>
<td>-0.0869</td>
<td>-0.1719</td>
<td>0.0387</td>
<td>0.0380</td>
<td>0.0061</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SA</td>
<td>0.0489</td>
<td>0.2807</td>
<td>0.1847</td>
<td>0.4874</td>
<td>0.1879</td>
<td>0.2839</td>
<td>0.2497</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CS</td>
<td>0.0001</td>
<td>0.0001</td>
<td>0.0165</td>
<td>0.0011</td>
<td>0.0147</td>
<td>0.0001</td>
<td>0.0004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SY</td>
<td>0.0001</td>
<td>0.0000</td>
<td>0.0000</td>
<td>0.0000</td>
<td>0.0001</td>
<td>0.0001</td>
<td>0.0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SP</td>
<td>0.0501</td>
<td>0.1394</td>
<td>0.0852</td>
<td>0.2382</td>
<td>0.3046</td>
<td>0.0674</td>
<td>0.3176</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SA</td>
<td>0.0270</td>
<td>0.0189</td>
<td>0.1818</td>
<td>0.2657</td>
<td>0.1931</td>
<td>0.4747</td>
<td>0.1978</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note:** The table continues with more entries, not fully visible in the provided snippet.
Intercorrelation Matrix - Continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MB</th>
<th>G1</th>
<th>CM</th>
<th>AC</th>
<th>AI</th>
<th>IF</th>
<th>PV</th>
<th>FY</th>
<th>FF</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0.68577</td>
<td>0.59074</td>
<td>0.51747</td>
<td>0.65579</td>
<td>.51268</td>
<td>.27637</td>
<td>.30668</td>
<td>.20457</td>
<td>-.21561</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.00001</td>
<td>.00001</td>
<td>.00001</td>
<td>.00001</td>
<td>.00001</td>
<td>.00001</td>
<td>.00001</td>
<td>.00001</td>
<td>.00001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RE</td>
<td>0.58314</td>
<td>0.41291</td>
<td>0.21958</td>
<td>0.69424</td>
<td>.50381</td>
<td>.47983</td>
<td>.26671</td>
<td>.07274</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.00001</td>
<td>.00001</td>
<td>.00001</td>
<td>.00001</td>
<td>.00001</td>
<td>.00001</td>
<td>.00001</td>
<td>.00001</td>
<td>.00001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SO</td>
<td>0.44061</td>
<td>0.31658</td>
<td>0.28078</td>
<td>0.58041</td>
<td>.25790</td>
<td>.39798</td>
<td>.11377</td>
<td>-.14679</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.00001</td>
<td>.00001</td>
<td>.00001</td>
<td>.00001</td>
<td>.00001</td>
<td>.00001</td>
<td>.00001</td>
<td>.00001</td>
<td>.00001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SC</td>
<td>0.51410</td>
<td>0.71038</td>
<td>0.60638</td>
<td>0.60638</td>
<td>.64579</td>
<td>.36795</td>
<td>.25016</td>
<td>.16824</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.00001</td>
<td>.00001</td>
<td>.00001</td>
<td>.00001</td>
<td>.00001</td>
<td>.00001</td>
<td>.00001</td>
<td>.00001</td>
<td>.00001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TO</td>
<td>1.00000</td>
<td>0.50833</td>
<td>0.26773</td>
<td>0.66534</td>
<td>.75545</td>
<td>.72814</td>
<td>.36551</td>
<td>.27651</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.00000</td>
<td>.00000</td>
<td>.00000</td>
<td>.00000</td>
<td>.00000</td>
<td>.00000</td>
<td>.00000</td>
<td>.00000</td>
<td>.00000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GI</td>
<td>0.50833</td>
<td>1.00000</td>
<td>-.04426</td>
<td>0.57710</td>
<td>.35064</td>
<td>.39808</td>
<td>.32158</td>
<td>.09132</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.00001</td>
<td>.00001</td>
<td>.00000</td>
<td>.00001</td>
<td>.00001</td>
<td>.00001</td>
<td>.00001</td>
<td>.00001</td>
<td>.00001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CM</td>
<td>0.26173</td>
<td>-.04426</td>
<td>1.00000</td>
<td>.34486</td>
<td>.24219</td>
<td>.41559</td>
<td>.16542</td>
<td>.01192</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.00001</td>
<td>.00000</td>
<td>.00001</td>
<td>.00001</td>
<td>.00001</td>
<td>.00001</td>
<td>.00001</td>
<td>.00001</td>
<td>.00001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AC</td>
<td>0.66634</td>
<td>0.57710</td>
<td>0.34486</td>
<td>1.00000</td>
<td>.64838</td>
<td>.61370</td>
<td>.33306</td>
<td>.02649</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.00001</td>
<td>.00000</td>
<td>.00001</td>
<td>.00001</td>
<td>.00001</td>
<td>.00001</td>
<td>.00001</td>
<td>.00001</td>
<td>.00001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PV</td>
<td>0.72814</td>
<td>0.39080</td>
<td>0.41559</td>
<td>0.61370</td>
<td>.61751</td>
<td>1.00000</td>
<td>.20773</td>
<td>.20646</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.00001</td>
<td>.00001</td>
<td>.00001</td>
<td>.00001</td>
<td>.00001</td>
<td>.00001</td>
<td>.00001</td>
<td>.00001</td>
<td>.00001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY</td>
<td>0.72814</td>
<td>0.39080</td>
<td>0.41559</td>
<td>0.61370</td>
<td>.61751</td>
<td>1.00000</td>
<td>.20773</td>
<td>.20646</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.00000</td>
<td>.00000</td>
<td>.00000</td>
<td>.00000</td>
<td>.00000</td>
<td>.00000</td>
<td>.00000</td>
<td>.00000</td>
<td>.00000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FF</td>
<td>0.72814</td>
<td>0.39080</td>
<td>0.41559</td>
<td>0.61370</td>
<td>.61751</td>
<td>1.00000</td>
<td>.20773</td>
<td>.20646</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>.00000</td>
<td>.00000</td>
<td>.00000</td>
<td>.00000</td>
<td>.00000</td>
<td>.00000</td>
<td>.00000</td>
<td>.00000</td>
<td>.00000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Figure 1
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_____ = Battered Women
- - - - - = Non-Battered Women
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