

THE UNIVERSITY OF CALGARY

**Violence Against Women In Canada: An Examination of Home-of-Origin Violence,
Non-Familial Violence, and Wife Abuse**

by

Michelle Electa Mark

A THESIS

**SUBMITTED TO THE FACULTY OF GRADUATE STUDIES
IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE
DEGREE OF MASTER OF ARTS**

DEPARTMENT OF SOCIOLOGY

CALGARY, ALBERTA

APRIL, 1997

© Michelle Electa Mark 1997



**National Library
of Canada**

**Acquisitions and
Bibliographic Services**

**395 Wellington Street
Ottawa ON K1A 0N4
Canada**

**Bibliothèque nationale
du Canada**

**Acquisitions et
services bibliographiques**

**395, rue Wellington
Ottawa ON K1A 0N4
Canada**

Your file Votre référence

Our file Notre référence

The author has granted a non-exclusive licence allowing the National Library of Canada to reproduce, loan, distribute or sell copies of his/her thesis by any means and in any form or format, making this thesis available to interested persons.

The author retains ownership of the copyright in his/her thesis. Neither the thesis nor substantial extracts from it may be printed or otherwise reproduced with the author's permission.

L'auteur a accordé une licence non exclusive permettant à la Bibliothèque nationale du Canada de reproduire, prêter, distribuer ou vendre des copies de sa thèse de quelque manière et sous quelque forme que ce soit pour mettre des exemplaires de cette thèse à la disposition des personnes intéressées.

L'auteur conserve la propriété du droit d'auteur qui protège sa thèse. Ni la thèse ni des extraits substantiels de celle-ci ne doivent être imprimés ou autrement reproduits sans son autorisation.

0-612-20795-1

ABSTRACT

Using data from the 1993 Violence Against Women Survey, this thesis examines the relationships between home-of-origin violence, non-familial violence, and wife abuse among 8663 married and cohabiting women in Canada. It was found that home-of-origin violence is a significant predictor of wife abuse and non-familial violence. Women reporting violent fathers are significantly more likely to report wife abuse and non-familial violence (physical assaults, sexual assaults, unwanted sexual touching, and threats) than women reporting non-violent fathers. Women reporting violent fathers-in-law are also significantly more likely to report wife abuse than women with non-violent fathers-in-law. Further, the relationship between non-familial violence and wife abuse was explored, and it was found that women who reported experiencing non-familial violence are significantly more likely to report wife abuse. A final regression analysis was conducted to determine whether home-of-origin violence or non-familial violence was the better predictor of wife abuse. It was found that both home-of-origin violence and non-familial violence are important predictors of wife abuse.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I would like to take this opportunity to thank the individuals who helped make the completion of this thesis possible. To begin, I have appreciated the assistance of Dr. Tom Langford, not only for his abundance of knowledge and skill, but his willingness to offer advice whenever I needed it. Thomas Huang, Linda Costello, Diane Whitlow, and Margaret Duddy made my time at the University of Calgary more enjoyable by offering assistance when I required it, and always sharing a smile. I am also indebted to Dr. Joseph Hornick for serving on my examination committee, and sharing his insights about the problem of wife abuse in Canada.

I must thank Dr. Elaine Grandin for her support, time, and skill, without her assistance, this thesis would not be what it is. Dr. Grandin not only served on my examination committee, but served as a mentor and an unofficial co-supervisor. I have also been blessed with the opportunity to work with two scholars who served as supervisors. Dr. Eugen Lupri oversaw most of my work, and I have appreciated his insights, knowledge, and integrity to research. Dr. Merlin Brinkerhoff was able to fill the position of supervisor when Dr. Lupri was no longer able. Dr. Brinkerhoff has been an inspiration, not only in his scholarship, but in his energy and willingness to prioritize my work in the midst of a heavy workload and recent return from Mexico.

A big thank you to Poul, for his love, support, and sense of humor! You are a true blessing, and share in this accomplishment. Thank you to my parents and my family, who have shown their support in so many ways, to list them all would fill the following pages. Finally, I would like to thank God for giving me the strength and fortitude to complete this masters degree. The past couple of years have been chaotic, but He has been faithful to attend to all of my needs.

**This thesis is dedicated to my husband Poul, and my parents, Allan and Vernice Herbig.
Without your continual love and support, this project would not have been possible.
Thanks for showing me what a loving family is, both in times
of celebration, and in the mundane of the everyday.**

TABLE OF CONTENTS

APPROVAL PAGE	ii
ABSTRACT	iii
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS	iv
DEDICATION	v
TABLE OF CONTENTS	vi
LIST OF TABLES	x
CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION	1
INTRODUCTION	1
STATEMENT OF PROBLEM	3
OVERVIEW OF CHAPTERS	4
CHAPTER 2: LITERATURE REVIEW	5
INTRODUCTION	5
INTERGENERATIONAL TRANSMISSION OF VIOLENCE	5
Representative Samples	5
Non-Representative Samples	9
Support for the Intergenerational Transmission of Violence Theory	9
Little or No Support for the Intergenerational Transmission of Violence Theory	12
GAPS IN THE INTERGENERATIONAL VIOLENCE LITERATURE	14
NON-FAMILIAL VIOLENCE	15
Date/Boyfriend Violence	16
Known-Man Violence	18
Stranger Violence	19
Conclusions	21
GAPS IN THE NON-FAMILIAL VIOLENCE LITERATURE	22

CHAPTER 3: THEORETICAL PERSPECTIVES	23
INTRODUCTION	23
THEORETICAL OVERVIEW	23
Patriarchal Perspective.	23
Exchange/Social Control Theory	23
Symbolic Interaction Perspective	24
Conflict Perspective	25
General Systems Theory	25
Resource Theory	27
Culture of Violence Theory	27
Social Learning Theory	28
THEORETICAL RATIONALE OF PRESENT STUDY	29
 CHAPTER 4: METHODOLOGY	 31
INTRODUCTION	31
THE 1993 VIOLENCE AGAINST WOMEN SURVEY	31
Background and Objectives	31
Population and Sample Size	31
Data Collection	33
THE PRESENT STUDY	34
Subjects	34
Measures	35
Wife Abuse	35
Home-of-Origin Violence	37
Non-Familial Violence	37
Age	38
Education	38
Income	38
Employment Status	38

CHAPTER 4 (Cont'd.)

HYPOTHESES	38
Effects of Home-of-Origin Violence on Wife Abuse	39
Effects of Home-of-Origin Violence on Non-Familial Violence	39
Effects of Non-Familial Violence on Wife Abuse	39
Effects of Home-of-Origin & Non-Familial Violence on Wife Abuse	40
THE STATISTICAL METHOD	40
LIMITATIONS OF THIS STUDY	41
Retrospective Data	41
Self-Report Data	42
Using Women's Testimony or Interpretation of Events	42
Violence in Home-of-Origin	43
Reciprocal Violence	44
Conflict Tactics Scale	44

CHAPTER 5: RESULTS

INTRODUCTION	46
EFFECTS OF HOME-OF-ORIGIN VIOLENCE ON WIFE ABUSE	46
Prevalence & Incidence Rates of Wife Abuse	47
Home-of-Origin Violence and Wife Abuse	50
Multivariate Analysis: Effects of Home-of-Origin Violence on Wife Abuse	54
EFFECTS OF HOME-OF-ORIGIN VIOLENCE ON NON-FAMILIAL VIOLENCE	58
Prevalence Rates of Non-Familial Violence	59
Home-of-Origin and Non-Familial Violence	60
Multivariate Analysis: Effects of Home-of-Origin Violence on Non-Familial Violence	61

CHAPTER 5 (Cont'd.)

EFFECTS OF NON-FAMILIAL VIOLENCE ON WIFE ABUSE	63
Incidence Rates of Wife Abuse & Non-Familial Violence	65
Non-Familial Violence and Wife Abuse	67
Multivariate Analysis: Effects of Non-Familial Violence on Wife Abuse	68
EFFECTS OF HOME-OF-ORIGIN & NON-FAMILIAL VIOLENCE ON WIFE ABUSE	71

CHAPTER 6: DISCUSSION AND SOCIAL IMPLICATIONS	77
INTRODUCTION	77
RESULTS OF THE FIRST THREE EXPLORATORY ANALYSES	78
THE FINAL ANALYSIS	79
SOCIAL IMPLICATIONS	81
LIMITATIONS OF THE CURRENT STUDY	83
IMPLICATIONS FOR FURTHER RESEARCH	87
CONCLUSION	89

REFERENCES	91
-------------------	-----------

APPENDIX A: SECTIONS OF THE VAWS INTERVIEW SCHEDULE	96
--	-----------

LIST OF TABLES

Chapter 5:

Table 5.1	Prevalence and Incidence Rates of Wife Abuse, As Reported by Currently Married and Common-Law Women, Canada, 1993	48
Table 5.2	Incidence Rates of Wife Abuse in Current Relationship by Violence in Home-of-Origin, as Reported by Married and Common-Law Women, Canada, 1993	51
Table 5.3	Comparison of Average Incidence Rates of Wife Abuse Among Female Victims by Home-of-Origin Violence, As Reported by Currently Married and Common-Law Women, Canada, 1993	53
Table 5.4	Zero-Order Correlation Coefficients of Relevant Variables by Wife Abuse, Currently Married and Common-Law Women Canada, 1993	54
Table 5.5	Logistic Regression Models for Minor and Severe Wife Abuse Based upon Reports of Home-of-Origin Violence Among Currently Married and Common-Law Women, Canada, 1993	56
Table 5.6	Prevalence Rates of Non-Familial Violence, As Reported by Married and Common-Law Women, Canada, 1993	60
Table 5.7	Prevalence Rates of Non-Familial Violence by Home-of-Origin, as Reported by Currently Married and Common-Law Women, Canada, 1993	61
Table 5.8	Comparison of Average Prevalence Rates of Non-Familial Violence Among Female Victims by Home-of-Origin, As Reported by Currently Married and Common-Law Women, Canada, 1993	61
Table 5.9	Zero-Order Correlation Coefficients of Relevant Variables by Non-Familial Violence, Currently Married and Common-Law Women, Canada, 1993	62
Table 5.10	Logistic Regression Models of Non-Familial Violence Based upon Reports of Home-of-Origin Violence Among Currently Married and Common-Law Women, 1993	62

Table 5.11	Incidence Rates of Wife Abuse Occurring for the First Time, As Reported by Currently Married and Common-Law Women, Canada, 1993	65
Table 5.12	Prevalence Rates of Non-Familial Violence Up to One Year Preceding the Survey, As Reported by Married and Common-Law Women, Canada, 1993	66
Table 5.13	Incidence Rates of First Time Wife Abuse by Non-Familial Violence, As Reported by Female Wife Abuse Victims, Currently Married and Common-Law Women, Canada, 1993	67
Table 5.14	Zero-Order Correlation Coefficients of Relevant Variables by First Time Wife Abuse, Currently Married and Common-Law Women, Canada, 1993	68
Table 5.15	Logistic Regression Models of First Time Wife Abuse, Based Upon Reports of Non-Familial Violence Among Currently Married and Common-Law Women, Canada, 1993	69
Table 5.16	Final Logistic Regression Models of First Time Wife Abuse, Based Upon Reports of Home-of-Origin Violence and Non-Familial Violence Among Currently Married and Common-Law Women, Canada, 1993	74

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

INTRODUCTION

Straus et al. (1980) state that the family is perhaps society's most violent social institution. They argue that the use of force in teaching children is not only accepted but advocated, and the use of violence to keep one's "wife" in line has been considered until recently a private family issue. The last decade and a half has witnessed an explosion of studies and research efforts seeking to understand family violence. Many organizations have lobbied to eradicate family violence by educating the public about the unacceptable nature of violence, and providing treatment programs for both perpetrators and victims of abuse. Although there have been numerous studies and research efforts, many important questions about family violence remain unanswered.

For instance, researchers are still exploring factors that contribute to husband-to-wife violence. This question has and continues to guide a plethora of studies among researchers, each approaching the question from a multiplicity of theoretical perspectives. Social scientists desire to understand the factors that lead to family violence, and therapists and counselors seek to understand how these factors might be circumvented in order to offset the likelihood of future violence. Every piece of research has added to our understanding of family violence, nevertheless, much is still unknown.

The diversity of existing research on wife abuse may be confusing at times, but a phenomenon such as wife abuse is likely to have many causes. As a result, an adequate explanation of the problem will not occur from only one perspective or research attempt. The literature on wife abuse suggests several key factors in explaining violence. Factors such as home-of-origin violence, substance abuse, stress, age, socioeconomic factors, cultural norms, and personal characteristics are popular explanations of wife abuse in both the research and treatment literature.

Home-of-origin violence has been widely accepted as a causal factor of wife abuse by many researchers, and adamantly refuted by others (see Hotelling & Sugarman, 1986 for a review). Explaining violence in terms of witnessing or experiencing violence in

one's home of origin seems to make common-sense to some, and to others can be the source of public misperception and panic (Gelles & Cornell, 1990). Ongoing research into this question is important, as the information collected has the power to impact the lives of many people. For this reason alone, it is imperative that the information given to the public be accurate. Already the notion that violence is transferred from one generation to the next is said to have influenced men and women who have witnessed and experienced violence in their homes-of-origin to decide against marriage or children, in fear that they too might be abusive or abused. If witnessing or experiencing violence early in life is a causal link to future abuse, it is necessary to know this to help prevent future abuse, and to aid counselors in treating potential victims or perpetrators. On the other hand, if witnessing or experiencing violence in the home-of-origin is not as strong a causal link as speculated, it is important not to tunnel our vision on early witnesses of violence, but rather to the many other important causes and intervening factors. It is also important to identify factors which may offset the intergenerational transmission of violence, such as alternate role models, caring friends, religious involvement, education, and so on.

Because of its theoretical and practical importance, home-of-origin violence will be the main focus of this research study. The purpose of this study is to test the relationship between home-of-origin violence and wife abuse, as well as the relationship between home-of-origin violence and non-familial violence. Non-familial violence refers to physical assaults, sexual assaults, unwanted sexual touching, and threats by known men, male strangers, and dates/boyfriends. The decision to explore the relationship between home-of-origin violence and non-familial violence stems from the idea that if social learning theory is useful in explaining who is at greater risk of violence in one's home later in life, it may be useful in predicting who is at risk for male-to-female violence outside of the home later in life.

To take the social learning theory one step further, this study will also examine women who are victims of wife abuse to determine if non-familial violence is related to wife abuse. If a woman has experienced violence by a male stranger, date/boyfriend, or known man, perhaps she learns a vulnerability for violence which can generalize across contexts, one context being her home-of-procreation. Finally, the intergenerational and

cross-contextual effects are examined together, to determine if the relationship observed between non-familial violence and wife abuse is due to the overall effect of home-of-origin violence.

STATEMENT OF PROBLEM

Most of the studies testing the intergenerational transmission of violence theory have predominantly used clinical samples. When using representative samples, a common practice has been to generate support for the intergenerational transmission of violence theory through bivariate analyses (Straus & Gelles, 1980; Carroll, 1979). The complex nature of family violence suggests the necessity of more thorough multivariate analyses. In order to accomplish this task, the intergenerational transmission of violence theory will be tested with bivariate analyses, followed by multivariate analyses using logistic regression. The intergenerational transmission of violence theory explains violence in terms of the impact of witnessing or experiencing violence over time. It is the intent of this thesis to first explore the relationship between growing up in a home where one's father abused one's mother and being a victim of violence in one's own marriage or common-law relationship. Based on previous studies reporting gender differences in the transmission of violence, I plan to examine whether females who witnessed their fathers abusing their mothers are more likely than females who did not witness their fathers abusing their mothers to be physically victimized by their own intimate partners later in life. Further, it will be examined indirectly whether males who witnessed their fathers abusing their mothers are more likely to perpetrate physical violence in their own marriages and common-law relationships than males who did not witness their fathers abusing their mothers.

Second, this study attempts to integrate criminology and family sociology in two ways. This portion of the thesis will focus on two central issues, time and space. First the intergenerational transmission of violence theory is tested by studying women who have grown up in a violent home, and who have been victims of non-familial violence. Violence perpetrated by male strangers, known men, and previous dates/boyfriends is examined in light of the women's witnessing of violence in their homes-of-origin. Second, wife abuse is examined in light of women's experiences of non-familial violence. Perhaps being a

victim of non-familial violence teaches women a vulnerability to violence which is generalized across contexts. Such an analysis will examine whether females growing up in violent homes, or victims of non-familial violence are at greater risk of being victimized by males in their homes of procreation. If a relationship is found between non-familial violence and wife abuse, a final regression analysis will be conducted to determine whether non-familial violence or home-of-origin violence is the better predictor of wife abuse.

OVERVIEW OF CHAPTERS

The following chapter briefly reviews the intergenerational transmission of violence and non-familial violence literature. The third chapter provides a brief overview of the current sociological theoretical perspectives used in family violence research, and frames the research questions theoretically using the social learning theory. Chapter Four states the hypotheses and methods employed in the current study. The fifth chapter presents the results. The sixth chapter discusses the results and their implications.

CHAPTER 2

LITERATURE REVIEW

INTRODUCTION

The intergenerational transmission of violence theory has gained such popularity in modern culture that it appears to have become a type of cliché (Cappell & Heiner, 1990). When examining much of the treatment literature for spousal and child abuse, the belief that violence is learned in the home and passed on throughout consecutive generations is treated as known fact. A further read into the literature, however, begs the question of whether or not the intergenerational transmission of violence theory enhances our understanding of wife abuse, as studies find conflicting results. It is not yet clear whether the intergenerational transmission of violence theory helps to explain wife abuse, and whether it is useful in helping to predict who is more likely to commit wife abuse, and who is likely to become a victim.

Further, the literature on intergenerational violence and non-familial violence is sparse. For instance, literature which examines whether females who were raised in violent homes learn a predisposition for being victimized by men in different contexts is difficult to find. It is also hard to locate literature which specifically examines the relationship between non-familial violence and wife abuse. As such, the literature which is available will be examined in order to locate related issues and findings which help lead research efforts in this area.

The following literature review discusses the available academic research available on each of these issues. The first part of the chapter will examine the literature on the intergenerational transmission of wife abuse. The second part of the chapter will provide a brief overview of the literature on stranger violence, known man violence, and date/boyfriend violence.

INTERGENERATIONAL TRANSMISSION OF VIOLENCE

Representative Samples

Ulbrich & Huber (1981) conducted a national survey in the United States to explore the relationship between growing up in a violent home where there was parental

hitting, and attitudes held by men and women towards the role of women and violence against women. They found that witnessing violence did not affect men and women's attitudes about women's roles, but witnessing violence did affect attitudes about violence towards women.

Men raised in violent homes where the father was violent to the mother were more likely to approve of wife hitting if a woman was nagging. Males raised in homes where both parents hit each other were more likely to approve of hitting one's wife if she had hit first, or was seeing other men. Women raised in homes where both parents hit each other seemed to support violence against women when the woman was seeing other men. Females growing up in homes where the father was the aggressor disapproved of hitting women even if they were nagging, seeing other men, or they had hit first. Ulbrich & Huber also found that increased levels of educational attainment, and being Catholic were related to the disapproval of violence against women.

One major drawback of Ulbrich & Huber's study is that it only measures attitudes, and does not actually probe whether or not those in the survey actually carry out violent behaviours themselves. Although the attitudes seem to show increased support for violence among the children of violent parents, we do not know whether the attitudes have translated into behaviour by these individuals. Dibble & Straus (1980) have shown that people's attitudes toward aggression in the family are not necessarily consistent with their behaviour toward family members. For this reason others have attempted to study behaviour rather than attitudes.

In 1980 Straus, Gelles, & Steinmetz published Behind Closed Doors. It was one of the first books involving a discussion of several aspects of family violence. Straus et al. based the book upon the 1976 National Study of Violence in America, which interviewed 2143 subjects (representing 2143 families).

Straus et al. concluded from their analysis of these families, that children who observe their parents being violent with one another tend to be violent when they marry (1980). Compared to children who did not witness violence in their homes of origin, male respondents who recalled witnessing violence between their parents, reported greater rates of violence towards their wives in the previous year. Women respondents who witnessed

violence between their parents report being violent with their husbands at a higher rate than women with non-violent parents. They suggest that this difference in rates is the result of imitating the learned behaviour from one's family-of-origin. After reviewing the data, Straus et al. conclude that violence begets violence. They state that there is strong evidence to show that violence is learned in the family-of-origin, and passed on through generations.

Until this time researchers had focused upon physical punishment or witnessing violence between parents as catalysts for the intergenerational transmission of violence, however, no one had studied which of these two forms of violence was the best predictor of spouse abuse. Kalmuss (1984) recognized this gap in the literature, and using the same sample as Straus et al. (1980) she set out to determine whether physical punishment or witnessing violence between parents was more strongly related to spouse abuse. Kalmuss was also interested in looking at the same-sex link in the intergenerational transmission of violence (specifically male perpetration), as many researchers had been finding sex differences in the intergenerational transmission of violence.

After analyzing the data, Kalmuss found that while both parental hitting and parent-to-child hitting were positively related to severe spousal aggression, witnessing parental hitting was a stronger indicator of future parental hitting in one's family of procreation. One potentially problematic aspect of this finding is that reports of parent-to-child hitting are much higher than they are for witnessing parental violence. Kalmuss acknowledges this by saying that because parental hitting is rarer, it may have a greater impact on the witnesses than parent-to-child hitting does. The fact that parent-to-child hitting is so common, it may not be perceived by people as physical aggression. She suggests it might be necessary to examine severe physical aggression by parents towards their children instead of just "hitting" (1984).

When examining the same-sex link of intergenerational violence, Kalmuss found to her surprise that both males and females were more likely to report being violent to their spouses if their fathers had been violent to their mothers. Unfortunately, we do not know from this study if the same pattern occurs among children whose mothers are violent, or where both parents are mutually violent. To study the sex-link of learned

perpetration of violence, Kalmuss chose to include only those families who reported father-to-mother violence in the home-of-origin.

Cappell & Heiner (1990) studied a sub-sample of 888 people, from the 1976 National Survey of Physical Violence in American Families, the same survey used by Straus et. al. (1980) and Kalmuss (1984). Similar to Kalmuss (1984), Cappell & Heiner employed a multivariate model to study the intergenerational transmission of violence. Although Kalmuss and Cappell & Heiner both used log-linear analysis, Cappell & Heiner state that one form of aggression in the current family can be conditioned by other forms of aggression in the current family as well as by aggression in the family-of-origin, therefore they also chose multivariate models of association rather than recursively causal logistic regression, used by Kalmuss (1984). Unlike Kalmuss, Cappell & Heiner included families with at least one child, whereas Kalmuss included all couples in her study.

When examining the learned sex-specific behaviours across generations, Cappell & Heiner measured the presence or absence of aggression in the family-of-origin based on husband-to-wife aggression, wife-to-husband aggression, and parent-to-child aggression. By doing this they were able to include all of the violent home-of-origin families which Kalmuss did not include in her analysis (approximately half of the violent families in the study).

Cappell & Heiner found that when women and men were raised in homes with high levels of aggression, they did not learn to be perpetrators of violence, rather both men and women learned or inherited vulnerability to become *victims* of aggression. Those reporting interparental violence in their homes of origin report being abused in their homes of procreation. They also found that the women reporting being victims of spousal aggression, were more likely to report that they had hit their own children, but they did not find this relationship between males and their children. In contradiction to others who have found the male to be more influenced by violence in the home-of-origin (to become perpetrators of violence), this study found males to be the *least* likely to resort to violent outbursts even when raised in a violent home. In direct contradiction to the research already discussed, this study found no link between becoming perpetrators of violence and being raised in a violent home, rather both males and females were found to become likely

candidates for victimization in their marriages. It is interesting to note that using the same data set with a slightly different method of analysis, Cappell & Heimer found very different results than Straus et al. (1980) and Kalmuss (1984).

Non-Representative Samples

Many studies of intergenerational violence have been conducted with non-representative samples, usually dealing with severe cases, such as those within shelters, hospitals, and police records. The following studies fall within this category, studies which are unable to generalize to the larger population, but have had a significant impact on the way researchers of family violence approach the concept of intergenerational violence. The following review is organized into two sections, a) support for the intergenerational theory and b) little or no support for the intergenerational transmission of violence theory. For simplicity, the following reviews are organized by the dates of the articles, beginning with the most recent literature.

Support for The Intergenerational Transmission of Violence Theory

In their discussion of family violence intervention techniques, Tutty & Wagar (1994) state that children who have witnessed their mothers being abused by fathers learn aggressive or passive methods of dealing with conflict that leave them at risk for responding with violence or being victimized in their adult relationships. For this reason, Tutty & Wagar suggest that early intervention holds the best promise of short-cutting the intergenerational transmission of violence through teaching alternative means of problem solution.

Hamburger & Hastings (1991) investigated the personality and family-of-origin differences among three groups of domestically violent men and one non-violent comparison group who were matched for age and education. The domestically violent men consisted of male abusers referred for treatment who were either alcoholic or non-alcoholic, and a third group was identified through a community sample. It was hypothesized that each domestically violent group would show significant differences from the control group on measures of family-of-origin violence. However, only the alcoholic batterer group differed significantly from non-batterers on reports of witnessing or experiencing abuse. This piece of research suggests that not all male batterers are the

same, and that male batterers who are alcoholics are most affected by a violent home-of-origin. Nevertheless, they were unable to determine whether the alcoholism preceded the wife abuse, or occurred after the wife abuse began.

In the course of Caesar's research (1988), which involved studying forty-four men through qualitative interviews, it was found that violent men (wife batterers) reported more direct abuse victimization in the family-of-origin than non-violent men. Batterers also reported having witnessed more marital violence in the family-of-origin than non-violent men.

Roscoe & Benaske (1985) examined the relationship between courtship violence and wife abuse by interviewing 88 women clients at domestic violence shelters across the State of Michigan. In the course of the data analysis the researchers found that 46% of the female respondents indicated that they came from violent homes, where their parents (more frequently the father) were violent to each other. They conclude that a longitudinal study of children who have witnessed or experienced abuse in their home-of-origins, or longitudinal studies of women who are subjected to abuse during courtship would be helpful in increasing our understanding of intimate violence in marriage (1985).

Fagan et al. (1983) examined a data base consisting of 270 face-to-face interviews with domestic violence victims (all women) throughout the United States. The respondents were former clients of family violence programs. They found that 57% of the batterers (spouses to the sheltered victims) had been exposed to violence as children either as victims of child abuse, or as witnesses to spousal violence. Almost one third of the batterers were both victims and witnesses of familial violence.

After interviewing 52 abused women from a New York treatment facility, Rosenbaum & O'Leary (1981) concluded that witnessing domestic violence as a child may adversely affect the child's present and future behavior. It was hypothesized that witnessing parental violence would lead to an increased risk for males to become violent husbands, and an increased risk for females to become abused wives. The data found that abused wives were no more likely to have witnessed violence in their homes-of-origin than non-abused women. However, the data did indicate males raised in a home where they witnessed domestic violence were more likely to abuse their wives than males who did not

witness domestic violence in their homes-of-origin.

Linda MacLeod (1980) studied Canadian women in transition houses (for battered women) and found support for the intergenerational transmission of violence theory. Of the women in the transition houses, 36% of the battered women had been beaten as children, as had 56% of their mates (1980:24). Her data extend the intergenerational transmission of violence theory to say that not only do witnesses and victims of violence become perpetrators of violence, but as children, females learn to become victims of spousal violence within their own marriages.

In response to the lack of representative data on the intergenerational transmission of violence in the 1970s, Joseph Carroll (1977) attempted to create a sample which would have greater generalizability. He used a 96 person-sample, 23 of which consisted of a clinical sample selected from community guidance clinics, the other 73 were randomly selected from city and town directories, and comprised the non-clinical portion of the sample. Carroll found that exposure to high degrees of physical punishment as children leads to an increased likelihood that these children will resort to violence when adults. Carroll also found that children raised in families characterized by high physical punishment, low warmth (nurturance), and stress are more likely to report a higher frequency of family violence in their own families. He also states that the data demonstrate a sex link in the transmission of violence. Carroll states that males punished by fathers were more likely to be violent in their own families than the daughters who were punished primarily by their fathers. He also found females punished primarily by mothers were more likely to report violence in their homes of procreation than males punished primarily by their mothers.

To summarize the above findings, each of the articles found support for the intergenerational transmission of violence theory. Nevertheless, each finding differs somewhat from each other. Caesar (1988), Rosenbaum & O'Leary (1981) and Tutty & Wagar (1994) examined the effect of witnessing parental violence separate from experiencing direct violence when investigating wife abuse. This led Caesar (1988) to conclude that men witnessing parental violence are at greater risk of being abusive to their own wives or intimate partners. Tutty & Wagar (1994) concluded that witnessing

parental violence leaves both males and females at risk of being violent or victimized in their adult relationships (including non- intimate relationships). Lastly, Rosenbaum & O'Leary (1981) report that male witnesses of domestic violence are more likely to become abusive to their own wives.

MacLeod (1980), Hamburger & Hastings (1991), and Fagan et al. (1983), did not distinguish between spousal violence and child abuse in their analyses of the violence in the family of origin. Carroll did not distinguish between spousal violence and child abuse in his analysis of the violence in the family of procreation. Nevertheless, the following conclusions were found. Hamburger & Hastings found only alcoholic batterers to be affected by a violent home-of-origin. MacLeod (1980) found males of violent homes to be more likely to become abusers of their own wives, and females to be at greater risk of being victims of wife abuse. Carroll (1977) found children coming from violent homes-of-origin were more likely to report family violence in their own families of procreation. He also found that males and females report current family violence differently depending upon which parent was the primary aggressor in his/her home-of-origin.

Little or No Support for the Intergenerational Transmission of Violence Theory

MacEwen & Barling (1988) used a multivariate approach to examine intergenerational violence. Because both stress and intergenerational violence have become commonplace theories in explaining spousal violence, MacEwen & Barling were interested in understanding the relationship between stress and intergenerational violence as a predictive model for spousal abuse.

MacEwen & Barling state that zero-ordered correlations between violence in one's current relationship and violence in one's family-of-origin were significant. When conducting a bivariate analysis, it does appear that home-of-origin violence is related to future abuse. The researchers assert however, that violence in one's family-of-origin only predicts an initial reaction of aggression, not new instances of aggression, therefore it does not allow for a predictive model. It is also important to note that when controlling for education in the regression analysis, the predictive ability of violence in the family-of-origin was no longer significant. It is important that more multivariate analyses are carried out, as it appears the relationship between violence in one's family-of-origin and future

abuse is complex.

Pagelow (1984) asserts that there is not enough empirical support for the intergenerational transmission of violence theory. Based upon her own research conducted in 1981, she states that there are sex differences in how children respond to violence in the home-of-origin. She found slightly more support for males becoming perpetrators of violence when raised in a violent home, but she found no support for females becoming victims of violence when raised in a violent home (1984: 255-256). Pagelow suggests that because there is still only mild support for the assertion that males learn to be violent, more research is needed to make the relationship clear.

Based upon their experience running a treatment group for male abusers through the Calgary General Hospital, Brown & Chato (1984) argue that parental violence in the family-of-origin is not likely to be of major importance in causing their children to adopt this behavior. They state that parental violence in the male batterer's family or extended family-of-origin occurred in less than 41% of the cases. They also state that parental violence in the family or extended family of the batterer's spouses occurred in only 20% of the cases (1984: 6). They suggest that because there are so many spouse abusers that do not come from homes where there has been violence, they conclude that exposure to violence in one's family-of-origin does not play a significant role in developing violent characteristics in the batterer. In reading Brown & Chato's article it seems as though they are searching for a single determinant of wife abuse. In so doing, their approach has caused them to conclude home-of-origin is not important in furthering our understanding of wife abuse. I would argue however, their results suggest home-of-origin is very important. The fact that 40% of the male abusers in the treatment program share a background of violence is significant and warrants further investigation. Just because a variable is unable to account for every incident of wife abuse does not negate it's importance.

Saville et al. (1981) examined the question of women's predisposition to be battered by asking whether their sample of women had ever been assaulted by other men in previous violent relationships, or if, as children they had experienced violence within their families. Saville et al. interviewed 145 women from eight different women's shelters

in Sydney, Australia. They found only 14 women to show evidence for predisposition (9.6%), and therefore concluded that the majority of women in the sample were not predisposed to violence. Wife abuse was explained rather in terms of structural inequality that puts women in a disadvantaged position in a marriage relationship.

To recap, Saville (1981) and Pagelow (1984) both report that females do not learn to become victims of marital violence. Brown & Chato (1984) and Pagelow (1984) conclude that there is only mild support for the notion that males raised in violent homes are at greater risk of becoming wife abusers, and therefore state that other factors are more important. MacEwan & Barling (1988) found bivariate support for intergenerational violence; however, the predictive ability of violence in the home-of-origin was not significant when education was controlled for in the analysis.

GAPS IN THE INTERGENERATIONAL VIOLENCE RESEARCH

A major gap in the research is the lack of information regarding intergenerational transmission of violence in Canada. To my knowledge there has not been a national study which examined this topic, until 1993. Statistics Canada recently released the 1993 Violence Against Women Survey (VAWS) which examined risk and violence against women in Canada. It was reported briefly by Statistics Canada that they found support for the intergenerational transmission of violence theory. They state that "women with a violent father-in-law are three times more likely to have been abused by a current partner than women whose father-in-law was not violent" (Rodgers, 1994:7).

Second, there are few representative samples used in testing the intergenerational transmission theory. As stated earlier, many of the samples used by researchers are comprised of severe cases, including respondents from shelters, hospitals, police records, and so on. These samples are therefore unable to generalize to the larger population, and leave researchers with the question of whether or not the rest of population who have not sought refuge or treatment in a shelter, government program, or hospital program are actually similar to the sample of people who have participated in such programs.

A further gap in the research is the lack of multivariate models. Multivariate analyses provide us with a more complex model in which to study violence, and allow us to see beyond the simple bivariate relationships. I say this with caution however, as others

(Hotaling & Sugarman, 1986:101) have argued that multivariate analyses are not always the ideal; Hotaling and Sugarman state there is a higher chance of variables not showing a relationship to violence because their effects can be controlled or masked by other variables. Nevertheless, it is clear from the literature that the relationship between growing up in a violent home, and becoming violent is not a simple bivariate relationship, it is a complex and dynamic one. In order to properly study this relationship, we must employ models which will allow us to study the complexity of this relationship, therefore multivariate approaches are necessary, provided they have a clear theoretical basis. Multivariate studies allow for measurement of strength of relationships while controlling for possible rival explanations. If one has properly modeled their study, and makes diagnostic checks of the data, there should not be problems with data being masked.

NON-FAMILIAL VIOLENCE

As stated earlier, literature studying the relationship between home-of-origin violence and being a victim of non-familial violence is sparse. Literature studying the relationship between non-familial violence and wife abuse is even more difficult to find. Two studies somewhat related to the subject matter of this study were conducted by Hotaling, Straus & Lincoln (1990) and Tutty & Wagar (1994). Hotaling et al (1990) suggest the importance of merging sociology and criminology as they were the first ones to actually merge criminology and sociology themselves. Although the subject matter of their study differs from the subject matter of this study, Hotaling et al. found a strong relationship to exist between family violence and criminal behaviour. They found children victims of parental assault showed higher rates of violence outside of the home during adolescence. They also found adult male and female victims of spouse abuse to show higher non-familial criminal behaviour, including verbal and physical assault towards non-family members. They conclude by stating that the highest rates of criminal assaults were reported among persons who grew up in multi-assaultive families. It is obvious from this piece of research that the disciplines of sociology and criminology can learn much from one another.

Tutty & Wagar (1994), mentioned earlier in the literature review of intergenerational violence, suggest that witnessing one's father abusing one's mother

leaves children at risk for responding with violence or being victims of violence later in life. They state that this risk for being violent or being a victim of violence may also involve non-intimate relationships. Therefore experiencing violence by strangers, known men, and dates may be partially related to the victim's home-of-origin.

The following literature review draws upon available research on stranger violence, known man violence, and date/boyfriend violence. It is hoped that insights and ideas will be gleaned from this research to provide further ideas for the current study.

Date/Boyfriend Violence

The literature on dating violence is continually growing. Researchers have found that physical and sexual abuse before marriage occurs frequently, Canada being no exception (DeKeseredy & Kelly, 1993). It has been speculated by some academics that violence in dating relationships is a precursor to violence in marriage relationships (Roscoe & Benaske, 1985). Roscoe & Benaske found many women physically abused in marriage have also experienced physical abuse while dating. In studying 88 women clients at domestic clinics across the state of Michigan, these researchers found that women abused in their marriages were very similar to the female college students experiencing courtship violence. Precursors of violence such as jealousy, alcohol, and money issues were concordant between the two groups. The relationship between home-of-origin, the forms and frequencies of violence, and its varied causes were also found to be similar between abused wives and those abused in courting relationships. As a result, Roscoe & Benaske suggest that dating violence and wife abuse should not be treated as separate phenomena.

It has also been argued however that dating relationships and marriages are different in very significant ways, making violence in these contexts different (DeMaris, 1987). By examining three variables known to be the most significant factors in wife abuse (family-of-origin violence, social class, and balance of resources among partners) in courtship relationships, DeMaris found 484 college students to show significant differences on these variables. For males, only being punished harshly as a child was significantly related to inflicting harm on a partner, while being the victim of violence from a partner was related to both being punished and seeing one's mother hit one's father. For females, the only significant effect was that females who believed that they should have

control over the male in a relationship were more likely to be violent. As such, DeMaris suggests that models based on spouse abuse may not be helpful in predicting or understanding courtship violence.

In order to better understand the nature of dating violence Stets & Pirog-Good (1989) randomly sampled students at a large Midwestern University. They compared incidence rates of physical and sexual abuse between men and women. They found 17% of the men and 27% of the women to report being physically abused by one or more dating partners. Stets & Pirog-Good also examined whether or not men and women experiencing abuse in one relationship also experience abuse in other relationships. They found women and men who experienced physical abuse in one relationship did not experience physical abuse in other relationships above chance levels; however, they did find that women who experienced sexual abuse in one relationship were likely to sustain sexual abuse in more than one relationship (1989: 73).

Interestingly, this finding is contradictory to what other researchers have found. Cate et al. (1982) and Henton et al. (1983) found that while dating, men and women were more likely to sustain physical violence in multiple relationships, and that for most of the relationships, the violence was reciprocal. Cate et al. (1982) found that on average a respondent reported 2.71 physically violent partners. Henton et al. (1983) found respondents to report an average of two violent partners. Cate et al. (1982) also report that individuals who had been involved in a violent relationship were more tolerant of violent relationships than individuals who had not been involved in a violent relationship. Henton et al. (1983) report that males and females who had been in an abusive dating relationship had more positive attitudes toward premarital violence than persons not involved in a violent relationship, males showing the most tolerance.

The literature on dating violence is somewhat mixed, however it appears that courtship and spousal violence do have some similarities. Home-of-origin appears to be related to both courtship violence and wife abuse, although the relationship is still not clear. Also of interest to this thesis, it appears that revictimization does occur among the dating population. Stets & Pirog-Good demonstrate that even if one does not experience physical violence in multiple relationships, one is still likely to sustain sexual violence in

more than one dating relationship.

Known Man Violence

Most of the literature dealing with physical or sexual assaults by known men deal with incestual relationships by relatives, workplace harassment, and violence by dates/boyfriends (discussed above), each of which tend to deal with the perpetrator rather than the victim. The following research discusses the effects of early sexual victimizations on women later in life. The early sexual victimizations do not specifically refer to incestual relationships alone, many of the early sexual victimizations reported were perpetrated by other known males or strangers. Gidycz et al. (1993) surveyed 857 college women to assess the extent to which prior sexual victimization is a risk for subsequent victimizations (also referred to as revictimization theory). They found that there was a strong relationship between prior sexual victimization and subsequent sexual victimizations.

Koss & Dinero (1989) also found the "revictimization theory" to best predict women rape victims among college women. Women who had previously been sexually victimized were found to be at greater risk of future sexual victimizations. In studying the impact of "victim precipitation theories" (i.e. some aspect of the woman's behaviour triggered the offender's aggression) and "context theories" (i.e. likelihood of victimization increases directly with the amount of contact a woman has with potential perpetrators under conditions that foster sexual aggression), Koss and Dinero found "victim precipitation" and "context" theories to identify women who had been psychologically coerced by a male.

The literature on workplace harassment tends to explain the phenomenon in terms of the confluence of sex and power that characterizes relationships between men and women in western culture. In other words, the patriarchal order which has characterized the broader social system in society is also said to regulate the relationships between men and women in the workplace (Glass, 1988). Glass found women who were younger, never-married, divorced, and with more feminist sex-role attitudes more likely to report workplace teasing, jokes, looks, touching, phone calls, etc. Married women seemed to be more pressured for dates, and women with slightly lower levels of education were more likely to be pressured for sexual favors. Glass concludes, until "there is a significant

change in the male monopoly over the conduct of society", unwanted sexual advances and harassment will continue to plague women.

Schneider (1993, in Bart & Moran, 1993) found women experiencing workplace harassment and harassment leading to rape usually did not report the demeaning experiences or violence. She also states that structural inequality demonstrated in females' employment status, occupational segregation, employment discrimination, and economic dependency constrain women's choices and ability to confront the violence and abuse.

Research on sexual harassment and rape on campus occurring as a result of fraternity association is explained in terms of a social environment which encourages its members to view women as servers, sexual prey, and or bait (Martin & Hummer, in Bart & Moran, 1993).

Stranger Violence

Fagan & Wexler (1987) examined the research conducted on family violence and stranger violence. They state that for decades, criminologists have studied violence toward intimate partners and violence toward strangers as separate phenomena. Fagan & Wexler suggest that criminologists have had limited success in explaining either stranger or intrafamily violence on the basis of knowledge from a single discipline. They suggest an integrative approach, combining the research and theoretical models of different disciplines. Their examination of theoretical models and violence literature resulted in their suggestion of an integrated model that combines social, psychological, situational, and ideological sources of male violence. They assert that the literature that is available seems to support the intergenerational theory of violence, meaning that childhood exposure to violence, including both witnessing violence between parents or experiencing violence as a child will increase the likelihood of being involved in violence both in adolescence and adulthood. However, the research also suggests that growing up in hierarchical and traditional sex-role families may also increase the likelihood for violence. They hypothesized that these two conditions, in addition to community attitudes which legitimate violence, will increase the likelihood of committing violence inside and outside of the home.

Of interest to the issue of learned victimization, Fagan and Wexler allude to the

notion that victim selection may be a learned phenomenon. Based on the literature review and the apparent strength of the social learning theory in prior research, Fagan & Wexler (1987: 15) state that victim selection by violent males may also be socially learned, as is violent behaviour.

Most of the literature dealing with the victimization of women by strangers relates to the issue of rape. These studies overwhelmingly stress the relationship between incestual victimization in their home-of-origin and rape by non-relatives. Diana Russell (1986) found that 68% of the incest victims in her study reported being victimized by non-incestuous rape or attempted rape at some time in their lives, compared with 38% of non-incest victims. One of the phenomenon named as a contributing factor in the revictimization of women is learned powerlessness.

One idea which has circulated in the media and in self-defense classes when talking about rape, theft, or assault is the notion that perpetrators of these crimes can tell which women are more vulnerable, and less apt to defend themselves. Although there is not an abundance of literature on this topic, certain hypotheses can be inferred from the data that are available. For instance, Stevens (1994) details the self-reported victim target techniques used by 61 sexual offenders who were serving prison sentences in a maximum security facility. The data show that these criminals use rational choice in deciding who to attack, as they largely attacked females who they deemed vulnerable. Stevens states that to blame victims for a predator's decision to attack is unacceptable and inappropriate, nevertheless, Stevens writes victims who present themselves as vulnerable are at risk more often than other females. As such, he recommends that research should be conducted to help reduce female vulnerability and better methods of apprehending and confining predators.

Witnessing or experiencing violence may increase a woman's vulnerability for future violence because of a phenomenon known as learned helplessness or learned powerlessness. The interest in learned helplessness began with a classical conditioning study involving dogs, and evolved into one of learning theory's most widely applied concepts (Burger, 1990). Similar to the studies conducted with dogs, studies have found humans to learn helplessness when subjected to inescapable aversive stimuli, and to

generalize their perceptions of helplessness even when subjected to new controllable situations (Garber & Seligman, 1980 and Maier & Seligman, 1976, as discussed by Burger, 1990). Research has also found that an initial uncontrollable experience might not even be necessary to develop learned helplessness. People can simply be told that they are helpless to overcome an obstacle (Maier & Seligman, 1976, as discussed by Burger, 1990) or can learn through observation that they are helpless by watching others fail to overcome an obstacle (Brown & Inouye, 1978, as discussed by Burger, 1990). If a woman observed her mother being abused by her father, and/or was a victim of male violence herself, these experiences may be enough to teach her that she is unable to escape male violence. If a woman believes she is helpless to escape male violence, this may increase her vulnerability to future male violence.

Conclusions

The literature on dating violence is mixed regarding the similarity between courtship and spousal violence, but it appears that several victims of violent courtships may have witnessed violence in their homes of origin, and many experience courtship violence in more than one dating relationship. The literature on known man violence is varied, as it covers a wide range of violent relationships. Workplace harassment was found to be prevalent; however, it tends to be explained culturally, in terms of the patriarchal social system in North America. Campus violence, specifically violence perpetrated by fraternities has been explained in terms of social learning among peers. Rape, whether it is committed by a known man, stranger, or date/boyfriend has been found to be best predicted by the "revictimization theory", meaning that women who have been sexually victimized once are at a greater risk of being revictimized. Literature examining predatory rapists, or stranger rapists report that rapists choose females whom they deem to be more vulnerable.

Based upon the available literature, several questions arise. First, what differentiates women victims of violence from women who are not victims of violence? Are Tutty & Wagar (1994) correct in predicting that female witnesses of father violence are at greater risk of being victims of violence or perpetrators of violence later in life? Are women victims of violence truly more vulnerable to perpetrators, as suggested by

predatory rapists? Does their behaviour differ from women who are not victims of violence? Can women adopt perceptions of helplessness or powerlessness about male violence through prior negative experiences or observation of others? Do females who have witnessed domestic violence in their homes-of-origin learn victim-like characteristics which make them vulnerable to non-familial violence as well as wife abuse, and is that vulnerability apparent to those who perpetrate abuse? Further, does the re-victimization theory apply cross-contextually? In other words, do women who have been victimized by a stranger, known man, or date/boyfriend report higher rates of wife abuse than women who have not been victims of non-familial violence?

GAPS IN THE NON-FAMILIAL VIOLENCE RESEARCH

There are several gaps in the current research on non-familial violence. The first is the lack of Canadian literature on the topic. Most of the studies conducted on strangers, known men, and dates/boyfriends originate in the United States. Secondly, as is the case in the literature review on the intergenerational transmission of violence, there is a lack of national representative samples. As stated earlier, non-representative samples are unable to generalize to the wider population, and therefore, national representative samples are necessary. Third, most of the studies reviewed examined the characteristics of the perpetrators of violence more so than the characteristics of the victims. It is understandable that researchers wish to avoid the appearance of victim-blaming, but it is important that if a relationship exists between violence and characteristics of the victims, research be conducted to help explain how this effect can be reduced.

Finally, there is a lack of literature combining criminological and sociological perspectives, as intimate violence and violence outside of the home have been studied as separate phenomena. As suggested by Fagan & Wexler (1987), researchers may have greater success in explaining both family violence and non-familial violence (stranger, boyfriend, and known man violence) by merging the approaches of different disciplines.

CHAPTER 3

THEORETICAL PERSPECTIVES

INTRODUCTION

Family violence has become an important issue in many academic as well as lay circles. In order to understand and explain the problem of family violence, numerous theories have been extended and developed. Sociologists and other social theorists have been strong contributors to this theoretical discussion. Different from biological or psychological theories, the sociological perspective argues for a strong relationship between social structure and family life. Using a sociological perspective, family violence cannot be remedied without a change occurring in the larger social structure. This is not to say that psychological, biological, or other theories of violence are wrong, but that they are insufficient without the recognition of the effect of societal structure. The following briefly overviews the most current sociological theories being used in the study of wife abuse.

THEORETICAL OVERVIEWS

Patriarchal Perspective

A perspective which has had a great impact on the conceptualization, definition, and understanding of wife abuse is the patriarchal perspective. Although there are many forms of this theory, the core of the patriarchal perspective maintains that violence is linked to the traditional family arrangement where males play the authoritarian role. The inequality found in the family is a reflection of the inequality between men and women found in society. Feminists continue to trace the patriarchal norms present throughout history which make women the property of men, or placed women under the authority of men socially and economically (Dobash & Dobash, 1979; Yllo, 1983; Pagelow, 1984). Feminists argue that due to women's subordinate position, women are at a higher risk of being abused. They also maintain that until social structures change, leading to changes in attitudes and behaviour, women will continue to be targets of aggression and violence.

Exchange/Social Control Theory

This theory was proposed by Gelles (1983) and draws from exchange theory and

social control theory. Exchange theorists suggest that people engage in behavior either to attain rewards or avoid punishment (Homans, 1974). Exchange theorists have also noted that not all social interactions or exchanges are symmetrical and equal, some interactions can favor one party over another. Therefore, it has been suggested that if a person believes that controlling someone through violence will lead to a desired goal, and the violence is unlikely to be punished, one will be more likely to act out in violence.

Gelles also states that there are three variables which contribute to wife abuse in the family: the status of being aggressive, the inequality of women, and privacy from others. He argues that in certain situations men actually gain status by being aggressive, in other words, there are rewards for being a "macho man." He also suggests the difference in size, strength, and economic status places women in a subordinate position to men. Added to these variables is privacy. The home has been long regarded as sacred and private by legislators, friends, and neighbours. This attitude allows for family violence to occur in the home because violent behaviour is met with less intervention in the home than outside of the home. In other words, social control is low when intervention is low.

Symbolic Interaction Perspective

Symbolic interaction has been one of the most influential perspectives in modern sociology. The basic principle of this theory is that one's *self* is continually shaped and developed through one's participation in social life. In other words *self* is a social product. As such, some family violence theorists use symbolic interactionism to explain the roles people take, how people view themselves, how they perceive others view themselves, and how people deal with change and its impact on their identities. Symbolic interactionists are interested in how people define violence, and the consequences of such definitions (Gelles & Straus, 1979). Some symbolic interactionists suggest when identities are challenged or assaulted by negative evaluations by others, a violent reaction may be one possible outcome (Hepburn, 1973). The probability of violent behaviour occurring is enhanced or diminished depending on the meanings one holds of violence, and the level of responsibility and accountability one assumes for the behaviour.

Symbolic Interactionism does not account for all of the variables involved in family violence, but it does draw attention to important variables such as the creation and

influence of identity, conceptualizations of violence, status expectations, and the meanings one holds about violence. These variables are invaluable to the creation of a comprehensive integrated theory of wife abuse.

Conflict Perspective

The conflict perspective of spousal violence argues that violence is an example of relationships characterized by dominance and subordination. Marxist theory suggests that intense conflict is an inevitable feature of society. Simmel (1955) viewed conflict as a universal form of social interaction. Coser (1967) argues that conflict is a method of advancing one's self interests. If the marriage relationship is considered a dialectic relationship, governed by inherent contradictions, it can be viewed as a conflict-prone social group. From this assumption, several hypotheses can be posited as to why violence occurs in families. Sprey (1979) and Straus and Gelles (1979) identify several of the structures which can cause conflict in the family (As discussed by Lupri, 1990:22-25). First, family members share many hours together in a variety of activities, allowing for a greater number of opportunities for conflict to arise. Marriage also involves intense interaction, allowing for the sharing of intimate feelings and experiences. This vulnerability is not without its risks, as intimacy can at times be one-sided. One partner may be more willing to be open, and the other partner may choose to be distant. Thirdly, marriage or couple relationships are said to contain built-in structural conflicts. Either member can destroy the relationship by refusing to participate, and there is no opportunity for majority rule to help solve an argument in a two-person relationship. Fourth, the family is hierarchical, meaning that members have different amounts of power and dependence. It is argued that age and sex are the most important factors in determining one's level of power and dependence, with women and children having the least. Last, because the family is such a private and sacred social group, the family cannot rely on outside intervention to help solve its problems, except in rare situations. Given these built-in structural barriers, it is said the family is far more conflict-prone than other social groups.

General Systems Theory

The general systems theory is considered a multi-disciplinary theory, combining

various scientific efforts and attempting to establish concepts that can be used to generate hypotheses. Like its name, the General Systems Theory states that society is made up of systems, each acquiring inputs from its environment. Not only do systems acquire inputs, but inputs are transformed by the system, and subsequently returned to the environment. Systems are explained in terms of boundaries, positive and negative feedback, level of interaction with its environment, stability and openness to change or innovation. Each system has a boundary which separates it from its environment. Every system also differs in how it interacts with its environment, and if it does, how much or how little. Each system is unique in its homeostasis and its ability to deal with change.

Family researchers such as Straus (1973) have used the general systems theory to better understand family violence. The family is considered a system with boundaries and structures. The interactions which take place between members and with the rest of society serve to establish the family system. Straus has used this concept to suggest that family violence is a product of the system rather than of individual pathology. He also says the feedback which occurs in families, generates either stability or conflicts, such as violence. He argues positive feedback from violent acts produces an upward spiral of violence, and negative feedback serves to maintain the level of violence within tolerable limits. Family theorists examine prior exposure to violence, ideals and norms that people bring into relationships, power inequality, and commitment etc. in order to understand how violence is established and reinforced in the family system. These variables relate to the general systems theory of how boundaries are initially created, how positive feedback can affect future occurrences of abuse, how negative feedback can stabilize or stop violence, and how abuse victims deal with the choice to leave an abusive situation. Amongst these issues is the question of how goals are met through the use of violence.

Nevertheless, the basic tenet of the general systems theory is that the whole is greater than the sum of its parts. Rather than breaking down the system into smaller parts for study, it is argued that we will have greater insights if we look into the interaction between the sub-units. Therefore, the movement towards stability, the interchange between environment and the family, the impact of positive and negative feedback is not examined within the family system alone (Bersani & Chen, 1982).

Resource Theory

Like its name, resource theory explains relationships in terms of resources, specifically social, personal, and economic resources. Blood and Wolfe (1960) argue that people with the most resources have power over those who have fewer resources. When applied to the family, it is argued the person who contributes the most resources to the relationship will gain the most power in the relationship. Therefore, violence or excessive force exercised by a husband over his wife is explained in terms of the greater amount of resources the male brings to a relationship. However, it has been suggested by another resource theorist named Goode (1971) that, "the greater the other resources an individual can command, the more force he can muster, but the less he will actually display or use force in an orderly manner (Goode, 1971: 628)". Therefore, violence is only used as a resource when other resources are insufficient or lacking.

It has been suggested that as the normative structure of the family becomes more ambiguous, such as in western cultures where women's roles are changing, violence can be used as a way of maintaining or regaining one's higher status. This theory is also known as status inconsistency theory. When one's status is challenged by ambiguity, force may be used as a protective strategy. For instance, males have been traditionally ascribed with higher status by virtue of being a male; however, in the family setting a male may feel his status is threatened by the higher education and income status of his wife. In situations like this, status inconsistency may result and the use of violence can be a way to deal with the perceived incongruence. Violence has been considered in this context as the "ultimate resource" (Allen & Straus, 1980).

Culture of Violence Theory

The culture of violence theory suggests that violence is dispersed differently throughout society. Proponents of this theory argue the reason we can observe these differential distributions of violence is due to differential cultural norms and values about violence. For instance, some sectors of society are more violent than others because they have cultural rules and norms that legitimate violence. This theory draws upon learning theory, in suggesting that violence is a learned behaviour. It is theorized that members growing up in a society which has cultural rules and norms which legitimate or even

require violence will be more likely to learn to value violence themselves.

The culture of violence theory has sustained criticism because of its tendency to focus on subcultures such as the working class or ethnic groups (Grandin, 1995). Most studies using the culture of violence theory focus on lower socio-economic sectors of society. Despite its inadequacies, the culture of violence theory is useful in framing macrosociological questions about violence, and provides a good theoretical framework from which to work.

Social Learning Theory

Although several theories of family violence are currently being employed in family violence research, the theory which guides the intergenerational transmission of violence theory is the social learning theory, revived by Albert Bandura in the early 1960s (Bandura, Ross, & Ross, 1963). Bandura asserts that aggression is learned behaviour. Like other learned behaviour, aggression is learned through modeling and reinforcement. Bandura includes in his discussion the instrumental role that families play in contributing to the repertoire of aggressive behavior a person acquires during their lifetime. Bandura notes however, that not all observers will respond in the same way to all models (models being persons the child comes into contact with). He states that the reinforcement of the observed behaviour, attributes of the model, and observer characteristics affect the responsiveness to modeling influences.

Family violence researchers have applied social learning theory to family violence, especially in the research of intergenerational and intragenerational transmission of violence. Social learning theory suggests that children are more likely to grow up and replicate violent or aggressive behaviour when they have seen the behaviour positively reinforced, and when they have used the behaviour themselves and experienced positive reinforcement. A key issue in the social learning theory of violence is generalizability. Bandura (1971, 1973) demonstrates in his work that aggressive models can teach generalizable behaviours as well as specific ones.

Many family violence researchers have used this to argue that children growing up at home where they have observed abuse between family members will be more likely to use the same behaviour in their own families of procreation. Nevertheless, in social

learning theory, imitation is said to be extensively cognitively-mediated. That is, judgments are made by the observer as to how a behaviour will be received or workable in a specific situation (Bandura, 1973). Family violence theorists have suggested that if children learn that violence is a way of achieving a goal or desire, this may provide the reinforcement needed to replicate violent behaviour in one's own family of procreation. It has also been speculated that learning to be a victim of violence is learned in the same way violence is learned in the home. For instance female children growing up in homes where their fathers abuse their mothers may learn behavioural cues modeled by their mothers, which place them at greater risk of being abused in their own homes of procreation (Cappell & Heiner, 1990).

THEORETICAL RATIONALE OF PRESENT STUDY

As stated previously, the social learning theory has guided the intergenerational transmission of family violence research, but the social learning theory also seems a good theoretical model for examining the links between violence inside and outside of the family. Learning to be a victim of violence or abuse inside and outside the home will be examined in light of witnessing violence in one's home-of-origin. Perhaps witnessing father-to-mother violence in one's home-of-origin places women at greater risk for male-to-female violence outside of the home, as well as inside their own homes of procreation.

As indicated in the literature review, few studies have used multivariate approaches when examining the intergenerational transmission of violence. In order to better understand the relationship between being reared in a home where there is interparental violence, and becoming violent or a victim of violence later in one's own home-of-procreation, it is important to control for possible confounding variables. Due to the nature of the secondary data being used in this research study, structural variables as suggested by the sub-culture of violence and resource theories are feasible to measure quantitatively. The resource theory and the sub-culture of violence theory suggest the importance of variables such as age, education, income, and employment. These variables have been found to be important in prior studies of family violence (MacEwan & Barling 1988; Hamberger & Hastings, 1991; Lupri, Grandin, & Brinkerhoff, 1994). Therefore, age, education, employment, and income will be included in the logistic regression

analysis.

CHAPTER 4

METHODOLOGY

INTRODUCTION

Due to the financial expense and laborious task of collecting one's own data, the use of secondary data sets have become popular substitutes among both students and academics. Despite the benefits of reduced cost and feasibility, there are often serious drawbacks. Drawbacks in using secondary data sets include the inability to structure one's own questions, the exclusion of important subject matter, and methodological errors. Nevertheless, secondary data sets are often sources of rich information, of great use to those interested in accessing them.

The Violence Against Women Survey (VAWS) conducted by Statistics Canada in 1993 is the chosen data source for this research study. Not only does it provide Canadian data, lacking in family violence research, but it is a random sample of almost the entire Canadian female population making it representative and generalizable. The following is a brief overview of the survey's background and methodology.

THE 1993 VIOLENCE AGAINST WOMEN SURVEY (VAWS)

Background and Objectives

In February, 1991 the Canadian federal government decided to extend a government project called the Family Violence Initiative. The initiative involved education, training, intervention, treatment, and research including data collection. Health Canada, identified the collection of national data on violence against women as a priority of the Initiative. Statistics Canada was asked to develop and administer a survey which would provide reliable estimates of the nature and extent of violence against women by male partners, acquaintances, and strangers, and to examine women's fear of violence in order to support current and future federal government activities.

Population and Sample Size

The target population for the VAWS included women eighteen years and over living in Canada, excluding residents of the Yukon, Northwest Territories, and full-time residents of institutions. The survey employed Random Digit Dialing, a telephone sampling method. Households without telephones were excluded; however, Statistics

Canada estimated that persons living in such households represent less than 2% of the target population. Although survey estimates were weighted to represent persons without telephones, there is a possibility for a socioeconomic bias in the sample. The population without telephones is probably a lower socio-economic population, made up of families who cannot afford the expense of a telephone line. This bias is accentuated by yet another bias in favor of higher socio-economic populations. Affluent populations are more likely to have additional telephone lines, increasing their representativeness in the random digit dialing process. Although the data were weighted to compensate for these biases, it is important to recognize the tendency to favor higher socio-economic groups when using a telephone survey, and how these biases can influence the data.

In order to carry out sampling, each of the ten provinces was divided into geographic strata. For most of the provinces, one stratum represented the Census Metropolitan Areas (CMA) of the province and another stratum the non CMA areas. There were two exceptions to this rule: Prince Edward Island has no CMA, therefore did not have a CMA stratum. Montreal and Toronto were each considered separate geographical strata.

For ease and practicality, Statistics Canada eliminated non-working telephone banks as part of the Random Digit Dialing design. Banks that did not contain at least one residential number were not included in the Random Digit Dialing. After eliminating non-working banks, a random sample of telephone numbers was generated for each stratum. Statistics Canada states that 47.9% of the numbers dialed reached households. For each household that contained an eligible respondent, an attempt was made to conduct a VAWS interview with one randomly selected woman.

The sample consisted of 22,139 households and a Control Form was completed for each home selected. The Control Form listed all household members and collected the following basic demographic information: age, sex, marital status, and relation to the family reference person. If the household contained any women, 18 years of age or older, one was randomly selected. Of the households contacted, 19,309 included an eligible respondent. An interview was then completed with the selected person. Not all selected persons agreed to or were able to complete the interview. Therefore, 12,300 interviews

were obtained with enough information to be included in the files used for estimation and analysis, a response rate of 63.7%.

One notable procedure which may have decreased the response rate of the Violence Against Women Survey was the effort made to ensure that the respondent was not concerned about being overheard when participating in the survey. Interviewers were trained to recognize cues that the respondent may be concerned about being overheard. The woman is also asked throughout the interview if she is able to continue, particularly when she is disclosing abuse in a current relationship (Statistics Canada, 1993). In the event that a woman was unable to continue the interview or was concerned about being overheard, a toll-free number was provided so that she could reschedule or continue the survey at a more convenient time or place (Rodgers, 1994). Because of the sensitivity of the subject matter, respondents unable to complete the interviews were likely women who had been or were currently experiencing violence. Therefore, wife abuse victims may have comprised the majority of rescheduled calls. Statistics Canada has not indicated whether the women given the toll-free number to reschedule an interview actually called back and completed the survey. Therefore it is possible that the current sample underrepresents wife abuse victims. The 63.7% of the women who responded to the survey may differ significantly from the 36.3% of women who were sampled but did not participate.

Data Collection

Questionnaires and procedures were field tested twice before conducting the actual study. The first field test was conducted in May-June of 1992, and the second in September of 1992. Actual data collection took place between February and June of 1993. All interviewing took place from regional headquarters with centralized telephone facilities. Calls were made between 10:00 and 23:00, Sunday through Friday inclusive. No calls were made after 8:00 p.m. local time. Interviewers were trained by Statistics Canada staff in telephone interviewing techniques, survey concepts, and procedures in an eight day classroom training session. The relevant portions of the interview schedule are included as Appendix A.

The VAWS survey collected data using the CATI (Computer Assisted Telephone Interviewing) program. CATI is useful in that it allows survey questions to appear on a

computer screen. The interviewer asks the respondent questions as they appear on the screen, then enters the responses into the computer directly. Statistics Canada states that all records were scanned by editing programs designed to locate and correct invalid or inconsistent information.

THE PRESENT STUDY

The present study is comprised of four parts. Part I tests the intergenerational transmission of violence theory of wife abuse, which asks whether female witnesses of father-to-mother violence are more likely to report being victims of wife abuse than women who have not witnessed father-to-mother violence, and whether women with fathers-in-law who were violent to their mothers-in-law are more likely to report wife abuse than women who report non-violent fathers-in-law. Part II tests the effects of home-of-origin violence on women's experiences of non-familial violence. This part of the study asks whether female witnesses of father-to-mother violence are more likely to be victims of non-familial violence perpetrated by male strangers, known men, or date/boyfriends than women who have not witnessed father-to-mother violence. Part III tests the effects of women's experiences of non-familial violence on their reports of wife abuse. This part of the study examines whether women who have experienced non-familial violence are more likely to report wife abuse than women who have not experienced non-familial violence. Part IV tests the effects of both intergenerational violence and non-familial violence on wife abuse. It is speculated that home-of-origin violence is the best predictor of wife abuse. It is also hypothesized that the effects observed between non-familial violence and wife abuse is actually due to the overall effect of home-of-origin violence.

Subjects

To best discern the impact of witnessing violence in one's home-of-origin and experiencing violence in one's home-of-procreation, married and cohabiting women were selected. There are two advantages in choosing to combine married and common-law couples in this sample. For one, it will make the findings comparative to future studies conducted by Statistics Canada, as Statistics Canada announced in 1996 that they would no longer differentiate between common-law and married couples in future surveys.

Secondly, it is known that cohabiting couples experience more severe violence than married or dating couples (Stets & Straus, 1989). By combining currently married and common-law couples in this study, the sample should provide a larger group for studying current wife abuse. Because single women are excluded from the present study, the total sample size used in the present study is 8663 currently married and common-law women.

For the sake of parsimony, previous marriage and common-law relationships were not included in this study. The exclusion of previous marriage and common-law relationships reduces the number of women in Canada who report having ever experienced wife abuse. For example, Statistics Canada (1993) reports that 29 percent of Canadian women have experienced wife abuse some time in their lives, whether in a previous relationship or a current relationship. This number declines to 15.4% (see Table 5.1) when sampling only current relationships.

Measures

*Wife Abuse*¹. This study has chosen to follow Gelles and Straus (1979) in defining violence as an act committed with the intention or perceived intention of physically hurting another person. The physical hurt can range from minor to severe violence.

The ten items used to measure the use of physical violence in marriage or common-law relationships in this study are based upon a modified version of the Conflict Tactics Scale (CTS), developed by Straus (1979) and colleagues. The CTS was designed to measure three types of conflict tactics: reasoning, verbal aggression, and violence. The items measure violence in increasing severity, and can be sub-divided into minor, severe, and overall violence categories. The CTS has been used widely during the past two decades, and is considered to be a reliable and valid measure of the incidence of various types of violence. The following ten items were used to measure current husband-to-wife violence in this study:

1. Threatened to hit the partner with fists or with something that could hurt them

¹ To reflect the nature of wife abuse measured in this study, intimate violence, spousal violence, and wife abuse are used interchangeably. The term wife abuse is used so commonly, it can begin to sound benign. The term violence is used interchangeably with abuse to remind the reader of the seriousness of the abuse.

2. Threw something at the partner
3. Pushed, grabbed, or shoved the partner
4. Slapped the partner
5. Kicked, bit, or hit the partner with fists
6. Hit the partner with something
7. Beat up the partner
8. Choked the partner
9. Threatened to use, or used a gun or knife on the partner
10. Forced the partner into unwanted sexual intercourse

The use of prevalence rates and incidence rates are two of the most common methods of measuring wife abuse. The prevalence rate of wife abuse identifies the number of women who report having ever experienced violence during their marriage or common-law relationship. The incidence rate of wife abuse identifies the number of women who report having experienced violence in their marriage or common-law relationships in the year preceding the survey. Although the prevalence rates are useful in identifying wife abuse victims, incidence rates are considered to be more accurate. It has been suggested that serious errors in memory can occur even when the respondent is required to remember violent acts occurring in the year prior to the survey (Straus, 1990). For this reason, incidence rates will be used instead of prevalence rates when measuring wife abuse in the present study.

To further differentiate the types of wife abuse experienced by Canadian women, measures of overall, minor-only, and severe violence were calculated. Overall wife abuse was identified when the woman reported at least one of the ten mentioned forms of violence in the year preceding the survey. Minor-only wife abuse was measured when the female respondent reported at least one of the first four items in the list, but did not report any of the last six items in the year preceding the survey. Severe wife abuse was measured when the respondent reported at least one of the last six items in the list in the year preceding the survey.

Internal-consistency reliability is an indicator of how well the individual items of a scale reflect a common, underlying construct. Coefficient alpha is the statistic most often

husbands or fathers). For the purpose of this study, relatives were also excluded.

3. Date or Boyfriend Violence. To determine whether violence has occurred in one's dating relationships the female was asked whether she had been threatened, physically attacked, or forced into sexual intercourse by a boyfriend or date. The respondent's current partner was not included.

An overall cross-contextual violence rate was determined by counting the number of persons reporting at least one of the above mentioned assaults. This index was coded as 1 if any of the 11 acts had been experienced, and zero otherwise.

Age. Age has been found to be an important control variable in the study of family violence, specifically spouse abuse, as studies have consistently found that age interacts with several variables used to predict wife abuse (Lupri, Grandin, and Brinkerhoff, 1994). Lupri et al. also found that severe forms of violence decrease over the life course and with age. To offset the possible confounding nature of age, the respondent's age is included as a control variable. Age was collapsed into 12 categories ranging between "18 to 24 years" and "75 years and over".

Education. Education levels were measured with two questions which ask the respondent the highest level of education both she and her partner have attained. Both variables are comprised of thirteen categories ranging from no schooling to an earned masters or doctorate degree.

Income. One measure of income was included in the analysis, the respondents' reported total household income. The income measure ranged from \$ 0 to \$80, 000 or more per year.

Employment Status. This item was measured using two questions which asked whether or not the respondent and her partner were employed. Being employed was coded 1, unemployed was coded 0.

HYPOTHESES

As stated earlier in this chapter the present study is comprised of four parts. The corresponding hypotheses are presented below. The variables used in the analysis of each research question are listed in their respective sections.

Effects of Home-of-Origin Violence on Wife Abuse

Hypothesis: Women who report having fathers who were violent to their mothers will be significantly more likely to report violence in their current marriages or common-law relationships than women who report a non-violent father. Women who report having fathers-in-law who were violent to their mothers-in-law will be more likely to report wife abuse in their current marriages or common-law relationships than women who report non-violent father-in-laws. These two hypotheses can be diagrammed as follows:

Home-of-Origin Violence → → → → → Wife Abuse

Dependent Variable: Wife Abuse (occurring in the year preceding the survey)

Independent Variables of Interest: Father Violence, Father-in-law Violence

Control Variables: Age, Education, Income, Employment

Effects of Home-of-Origin Violence on Non-Familial Violence

Hypothesis: Women reporting that their fathers were violent to their mothers will be more likely to report non-familial violence than women not reporting home-of-origin violence. The relationship can be diagrammed as follows:

Home-of-Origin Violence → → → → → Non-Familial Violence

Dependent Variable: Non-Familial Violence (occurring in the year preceding the survey)

Independent Variable of Interest: Father Violence

Control Variables: Age of Respondent, Respondent's Education, Respondent's Employment

Effects of Non-Familial Violence on Wife Abuse

Hypothesis: Women reporting non-familial violence will be more likely to report wife abuse than women who have not experienced non-familial violence. The relationship can be diagrammed as follows:

Non-Familial Violence → → → → → Wife Abuse

Dependent Variable: Wife Abuse (occurring for the first time in the year preceding the survey)

Independent Variable of Interest: Non-Familial Violence (to ensure temporal order between the non-familial violence and wife abuse, non-familial violence was measured only if it occurred between the time the respondent was 16 years of age and one year before the survey was conducted. Incidents occurring in 1992 and 1993 were excluded.)

Control Variables: Father Violence, Father-in-law Violence, Age, Education, Income, Employment

Effects of Home-of-Origin and Non-Familial Violence on Wife Abuse

Hypothesis: It is hypothesized that the observed relationship between non-familial violence and wife abuse is actually due to the overall effect of home-of-origin violence. Therefore, non-familial violence is an intervening variable between home-of-origin violence and wife abuse. The relationship can be diagrammed as follows:

Home-of-Origin Violence → Non-Familial Violence → Wife Abuse

Dependent Variable: Wife Abuse (occurring for the first time in the year preceding the survey)

Independent Variables of Interest: Home-of-Origin Violence (father & father-in-law violence), Non-Familial Violence (to ensure temporal order between the non-familial violence and wife abuse, non-familial violence was measured only if it occurred between the time the respondent was 16 years of age and one year before the survey was conducted. Incidents occurring in 1992 and 1993 were excluded.)

Control Variables: Age, Education, Income

THE STATISTICAL METHOD

The data were first analyzed using cross-tabulations and difference of means t-

tests. While bivariate analysis is useful in showing strength and direction of association between two variables, multivariate analysis allows one to analyze both collective and separate effects of two or more variables on a dependent variable. For this reason, the data were subjected to logistic regression. In this case, logistic regression is preferable to ordinary least squares (OLS) regression because the distribution of the dependent variable is highly skewed and is better represented as a dichotomous rather than continuous variable (DeMaris, 1995). It has also been found to be preferable to loglinear regression because it maintains the integrity of the interval nature of the predictor variables (Morgan and Teachman, 1988, as referred to by Grandin, 1995).

LIMITATIONS OF THIS STUDY

Retrospective Data

Due to the lack of longitudinal data, this study is dependent upon cross-sectional, retrospective data. Longitudinal studies have an obvious advantage over cross-sectional ones in providing information describing processes over time. The main drawback of longitudinal studies is the great cost in time and money. For this reason, many have sought to study intergenerational violence with cross-sectional research. Although cross-sectional research can imply processes over time, it can be problematic. A researcher can assume that one variable precedes another variable, but only longitudinal studies can solve these temporal order speculations.

Another problem facing researchers using retrospective data is the issue of memory. When people are asked to recall what their homelife was like when they were children, people can make mistakes. For instance they can have errors in memory, distorted memories of what things were like, and/or misperceptions of specific events that occurred in their past, all of which could undermine the accuracy of their reports. Because this study asks females to recall violence and abuse occurring between their parents, and violent behaviour is much more memorable than behaviours such as eating habits, it is hoped that recollection of abuse will be less problematic.

The use of a younger age group may be advantageous when studying the intergenerational transmission of violence (Lupri, 1995). Problems with retrospective data may be lessened by using a younger sample because the length of time between the the

violent incidents they are asked to remember and the survey is shorter. Nevertheless, in this study it appeared advantageous to use a larger sample, and use age as a control variable. It has not been established that younger respondents are in fact, more accurate in their recollections than older respondents. It may be that older respondents are clearer about their homes-of-origin. Perhaps having a greater amount of time to reflect on one's home-of-origin allows one to gain perspective on the events that took place. Nevertheless, wherever possible, acts of wife abuse reported in the year preceding the survey will be used in the current study. By doing this it is hoped that less error will occur.

Self-Report Data

Another obvious limitation of this study is that it is dependent upon a survey. Although surveys are powerful mediums for acquiring information, when self-report is required, caution must always be exercised. When asking people about such a sensitive topic as family violence, people may edit their answers to make them socially desirable. Some may wish to not discuss their parents' violence and say it did not exist. Some, who have admitted to being victims themselves may wish to say they had been witnesses of violence in their homes of origin, in order to create a socially desirable excuse for their present victimization. All of these biases can affect the results of one's data, therefore caution must be used when drawing conclusions from self-report data.

One other issue facing a researcher using a secondary survey and data set is simple ignorance. A user of a secondary source is unaware of many practical issues. When one has not been involved in the survey construction, pre-tests, etc. one does not get a sense of what the researchers were thinking when they constructed the survey, what respondents were thinking when answering the questions, whether or not questions were adjusted after pre-tests, or how interviewers were instructed to answer respondents' queries. It would be helpful to know how respondents reacted to the questions of wife abuse, home-of-origin violence, and non-familial violence.

Using Women's Testimony or Interpretation of Events

The VAWS chose to interview women exclusively. When researching the relationship between violence in one's home-of-origin, and violence in one's current

relationship, one must be cautious about interpreting the relationship through the report of only one person. In one's current relationship, intimate violence occurs between two people, and can be uni-directional and/or reciprocal. To get a better picture of the nature of the violence, it would be helpful to know the perspectives and responses of the male partner as well.

In addition to the difficulties that arise when using self-report data, there are potential problems in using self-report data that require a person to comment about the behaviour, history, and experiences of others (in this case, a spouse). The women responding to this survey were asked to comment on such things as the amount of alcohol consumed by their partner, and whether their father-in-laws had been violent to their mother-in-laws. Possibility for error increases when relying on second-hand testimony. Not only can a person be honestly mistaken due to lack of information, one must also consider the possibility in this survey that a woman may bias her comments about her partner's violent behaviour, alcohol consumption, and his childhood homelife, or she may choose to hide the behaviour entirely.

Although bias, misconceptions, and errors can affect respondents' answers, some comfort is found from Stacey, Hazelwood, and Shupe's (1994) finding that women make excellent proxies of violent events. Stacey et al. found in the course of their research that men initially tend to rationalize, minimize, or deny their own real violence against women, both at the time of an arrest and in the counseling process. For this reason, Stacey et al. provide reason to be suspicious of males' reinterpretive accounts of violence. Stacey et al. state however that their own previous research suggests that battered women are often excellent proxies concerning details about violent men and fairly accurate observers about violent episodes. They conclude that female victims tend to be accurate in their accounts of violence, giving them a certain amount of credibility (1994).

Violence In Home-of-Origin

This study is limited in that it does not have specific measures of the type of violence in one's home-of-origin. It would be helpful to know whether wife abuse in one's home-of-origin was frequent or infrequent, severe or minor. It would also be helpful to know if other forms of violence occurred in one's home-of-origin, such as child abuse,

husband abuse, elder abuse, and sibling violence. These could be very important distinguishing factors in the learning of violence.

Reciprocal Violence

An additional drawback of the VAWS is that it does not account for reciprocal violence, as it fails to address wife-to-husband violence both in the home-of-origin and the home-of-procreation. The discussion of reciprocal violence began in 1975 when Straus and Gelles reported that women committed violence against men at approximately equal levels as men did against women. They also demonstrated that some of the assaults by women against their husbands or partners were not acts of retaliation or self-defense.

Stacey, Hazelwood, and Shupe (1994) argue that wife to husband violence should not be ignored in family violence studies. They argue that women's violence against men can no longer be considered a trivial factor in spousal violence (1994: 25). Similar findings have been found by sociologists studying Canadian families (Brinkerhoff & Lupri, 1988, and Lupri et al., 1994). Because the VAWS did not measure reciprocal violence, we are left to assume or predict that female to male violence in Canada is occurring in marriage or common-law relationships at the same rate as found by Lupri et al. (1994). With respect to the current interests of this study, it is disappointing that we cannot examine the nature of reciprocal violence and compare it to non-reciprocal spousal violence. The causes and effects of reciprocal violence may be different from the causes and effects of non-reciprocal violence occurring between married and common-law partners.

Conflict Tactics Scale

As stated earlier, the CTS is a scale used to measure the tactics often used by families when dealing with conflict. Although the CTS is one of the leading scales used in family violence research, and is respected as a reliable and valid scale, it has sustained some criticisms.

A major shortcoming of the Conflict Tactics Scale is its inability to address the meaning, motives, and consequences of violent acts. It has been argued that incidence rates for a selected number of violent acts does not allow for a meaningful understanding of what precipitated violent episodes, who initiated the violence, or what occurred as a

result of the violent acts. Motives and circumstances surrounding the events remain unknown (Straus, 1990).

Other problems with the CTS concern its construction. For one, there are only a limited number and types of violent acts used in the CTS, leaving hundreds of different types of violent acts excluded from the scale. Secondly, there are problems in equating each of the violent acts in the scale. The attempt to separate the minor and severe acts from each other is intended to help differentiate the level of seriousness from one act to another. Nevertheless, these indices do not differentiate the level of seriousness between items within the minor and severe indices. For example, within the severe scale the two following items are included, 'hit with something' and 'beaten'. It is quite obvious that being hit with something is different from being beaten.

Despite the drawbacks of the CTS, it continues to offer valuable insight into many forms of violence occurring in families, and has made comparability between studies possible. The contribution of the CTS in studying family violence is likely immeasurable.

CHAPTER 5

RESULTS

INTRODUCTION

The results chapter begins by exploring the effects of home-of-origin violence on wife abuse. Next, the effects of home-of-origin violence on non-familial violence are examined, followed by a study of the effects of non-familial violence on wife abuse. Finally, the impact of non-familial violence and home-of-origin violence on wife abuse are explored together, to determine which is the better predictor of wife abuse.

THE EFFECTS OF HOME-OF-ORIGIN VIOLENCE ON WIFE ABUSE

The following analyses present data to test the effects of home-of-origin violence on wife abuse¹, commonly referred to as the intergenerational transmission of violence theory. It was hypothesized in Chapter Four that women who reported that their fathers were violent to their mothers would be more likely to report experiencing wife abuse than women who reported that their fathers were not violent to their mothers. It was also suggested that women who reported that their fathers-in-law were violent to their mothers-in-law would be more likely to report wife abuse than women who reported that their fathers-in-law were not violent to their mothers-in-law. These two hypotheses can be modeled as follows:

Model 5.1

Home-of-Origin Violence → → → → → Wife Abuse

To explore the relationship between growing up in a home where there was father-to-mother violence, and experiencing wife abuse in one's home-of-procreation, data from the Violence Against Women Survey (VAWS) were subjected to analysis. Four

¹ As indicated in Chapter 4, wife abuse refers to violence reportedly perpetrated by either married or common-law males towards their female partners.

sets of findings are presented, beginning with an overview of the prevalence rates² and incidence rates³ of wife abuse. Next, comparisons of incidence rates of wife abuse between female victims who report violent fathers and women who report non-violent fathers are presented. To test the significance of the differences found between female victims reared in homes where there was father-to-mother violence, and female victims who were raised in non-violent homes, t-tests were conducted. Finally, the findings from two multivariate analyses are presented which depict important predictors of wife abuse, and examine the potential usefulness of the intergenerational transmission of violence theory in explaining wife abuse.

Prevalence and Incidence Rates of Wife Abuse

Table 5.1 provides a brief overview of the types of wife abuse measured in this study, the number of women who report having ever experienced each act of violence during their current marriage or common-law relationship, and the number of women who have experienced wife abuse in the 12 months preceding the survey. At the bottom of Table 5.1 prevalence and incidence rates for minor-only, severe, and overall wife abuse indices are provided.

As can be seen in the prevalence and incidence rate columns, the third form of abuse (pushing, grabbing, shoving) was by far the most frequently reported, followed by threatening and slapping the female partner (items 1 and 4, respectively). It is not surprising that both the prevalence and incidence rates of wife abuse found among this sample show higher rates of minor violence (the first four items) than severe violence. Researchers such as Straus (1990) have referred to minor violence as “ordinary violence” because these forms of wife abuse are much more common among marriage and common-law partners than severe forms of wife abuse.

The most commonly reported form of severe violence is being kicked, bit, or hit with her partner’s fist (item 5), followed by being forced into unwanted sexual intercourse

² Prevalence rates refer to the percentage of women reporting ever experiencing violence in their relationship.

³ Incidence rates refer to the percentage of women reporting violence in their relationship in the 12 months preceding the survey.

(item 10), hit with something (item 6), and being beaten (item 7).

Table 5.1 Prevalence and Incidence Rates of Wife Abuse, As Reported by Currently Married and Common-Law Women, Canada, 1993

Violent Acts Experienced by Respondent:	Prevalence Rates		Incidence Rates	
	N	%	N	%
1. Threatened to be hit by her partner with his fists or with something that could hurt her	649	7.5	227	2.6
2. Partner threw something at her	317	3.7	115	1.3
3. Partner pushed, grabbed, or shoved her	1111	12.8	339	3.9
4. Partner slapped her	408	4.7	127	1.5
5. Partner kicked, bit, or hit her with his fists	208	2.4	82	1.0
6. Partner hit her with something	100	1.2	45	0.5
7. Partner beat her	125	1.4	51	0.6
8. Partner choked her	104	1.2	51	0.6
9. Partner threatened to use, or used a gun or knife on her	62	0.7	34	0.4
10. Partner forced her into unwanted sexual intercourse	136	1.6	52	0.6
Minor-Only Wife Abuse Index ¹	947	10.9	231	2.7
Severe Wife Abuse Index ²	386	4.5	155	1.8
Overall Wife Abuse Index ³	1333	15.4	386	4.5
Number of Currently Married and Common-Law Women	8663			

¹ The minor-only wife abuse index for the prevalence rate contains all respondents who reported ever experiencing any of the first four acts (items 1, 2, 3, 4) at least once, but no severe acts of violence. The minor-only index for the incidence rate contains all respondents who reported experiencing any of the first four acts at least once in the 12 months preceding the survey, but no acts of severe violence.

² The severe wife abuse index for the prevalence rate includes women who reported ever experiencing any of the last six acts (items 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10) at least once. The severe wife abuse index for the incidence rate includes all those who reported experiencing any of the last six acts at least once in the 12 months preceding the survey.

³ The overall wife abuse rate for the prevalence rate combines the minor-only and severe scales. It includes the women who reported ever experiencing any of the ten acts (items 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10) at least once. The overall wife abuse index for the incidence rate contains those who reported any of the ten items at least once in the 12 months preceding the survey.

As can be seen in the prevalence rate column in the overall wife abuse row,

approximately 15 percent of married and common-law women have at some time experienced wife abuse in their relationship. The majority of these women are victims of minor-only violence (10.9%), and approximately one-third (4.5%) are victims of severe wife abuse. Not surprisingly, the number of women reporting intimate violence in the last year is considerably lower than the number of women reporting violence ever in their relationship. Looking at the incidence rate column in the overall violence row, it can be seen that 4.5% of the women reported wife abuse in the year preceding the survey. Similar to the prevalence rates, the majority of women are victims of minor-only wife abuse (2.7%).

In stark contrast to the rates of wife abuse reported in this study, Canadian researchers, Lupri (1989), Kennedy & Dutton (1989), and Smith (1990) report much higher incidence rates of wife abuse. For instance, in his national study Lupri found 18 percent of Canadians to report wife abuse, Kennedy & Dutton found 11.2 percent of Albertans reported wife abuse, and Smith reported an overall incidence rate of 13 percent of wife abuse in his Toronto study.

Despite the conservative prevalence and incidence rates of wife abuse found in this study, the rates still translate into large numbers of Canadian women. For example, 0.4 percent of married and common-law women reported that their partners had threatened to use or used a gun or knife on them in the last year. We know that there were 6.1 million married and common-law couples living in Canada in 1992, which means that approximately 24,400 Canadian women have experienced this form of violence in the last year. As can be seen in Table 5.1, the overall incidence rate of wife abuse is 4.5 percent. This means that in 1992 (one year preceding the survey) over a quarter of a million Canadian women experienced some form of assault in their intimate relationships. The human implications of wife abuse in Canada cannot be ignored. Within the families where wife abuse is taking place, every member of the family is affected. The women who are abused, the men who abuse them, and the children who witness the abuse are all victims of the abuse. Within society, the extended families and friends of those who are experiencing violence are emotionally affected, and can be drawn into the violent situation in a variety

of ways. Abuse can also affect the workplace where the victim or perpetrator of abuse are employed, as productivity is likely affected when an employee is physically or emotionally abused, or suffering from the effects of being abusive. School teachers, medical staff, counselors, and myriads of others who find abuse is taking place may become involved as they try to help or intervene.

Because the wife abuse rates found in this study are much lower than those reported by other Canadian researchers, it was decided that the prevalence rates should be included in Table 5.1 for the reader's information. Nevertheless, most family violence researchers prefer to use the incidence rates of wife abuse rather than the prevalence rates when discussing wife abuse research (Lupri, 1989; Smith, 1990; Kennedy & Dutton, 1989). Using rates of violence occurring in the previous year provides researchers with the number of women currently experiencing violence, and due to a shorter period of recall is considered to be more accurate (Straus, 1990). Therefore, the following analyses will focus on incidence rates rather than prevalence rates.

Home-of-Origin Violence and Wife Abuse

The purpose of this section is to examine the effects of home-of-origin violence on wife abuse. Table 5.2 presents the incidence rates of wife abuse for the sample of married and common-law women. Comparisons are made between women who report that their fathers had abused their mothers and women who report non-violent fathers. Comparisons are also made between women who report that their fathers-in-law had been violent to their mothers-in-law and women who report non-violent fathers-in-law.

As can be seen in Table 5.2, the majority of women growing up in violent homes do not become victims of wife abuse. Similarly, most of the women reporting that their fathers-in-law were violent to their mothers-in-law do not report wife abuse. At first glance, these results seem to suggest women do not learn a vulnerability for becoming victims of violence, and that men do not learn to be violent, in essence failing to support the intergenerational transmission of violence theory. Nevertheless, it has been argued that to find support for the intergenerational transmission of violence theory, not all victims or perpetrators of violence need to come from violent homes, nor do all children

reared in violent homes need to become victims or perpetrators of violence (Cappell & Heiner, 1990; Baron, 1986). Just because most persons reared in violent homes do not become violent or victims of violence does not preclude the possibility of a strong statistical association between home-of-origin violence and wife abuse. Baron goes on to state the intergenerational transmission of violence theory is "probabilistic rather than deterministic" (1986: 74); therefore one should not expect all children from violent homes to become violent or victims of violence. He states there are any number of mitigating factors which could offset the effects of growing up in a violent household, some of which will be included in the multivariate analysis.

TABLE 5.2 Incidence Rates of Wife Abuse in Current Relationship by Violence in Home-of-Origin, as Reported by Married and Common-Law Women, Canada, 1993

Type of Violence Experienced in Current Relationship Within the Last Year ¹	Father				Father-in-Law			
	Violent		Not Violent		Violent		Not Violent	
	<u>N²</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>%</u>
Minor-Only Wife Abuse								
Victims	66	5.0	153	2.4	49	7.3	140	2.3
Non-Victims	1243	95.0	6222	97.6	624	92.7	5997	97.7
Severe Wife Abuse								
Victims	60	4.3	87	1.3	59	8.0	69	1.0
Non-Victims	1343	95.7	6664	98.7	672	92	6437	99.0
Overall Wife Abuse								
Victims	126	10.2	240	4.0	108	18.0	209	3.5
Non-Victims	1112	89.8	5991	96.0	497	82.0	5805	96.5

¹ See bottom of Table 5.1 for operationalization of minor-only, severe, and overall wife abuse scales

² Ns may vary due to non-response, some women chose not to respond to the questions, or did not know enough to answer the questions about their fathers or fathers-in-law violence.

Pagelow (1982), who has been suspect of the intergenerational hypothesis, has also suggested that in order to provide scientifically sound empirical support for the intergenerational transmission of violence, studies should modify their focus to specific target categories of violent actors and victims of violence. She suggests categories be gender-specific, and types of home-of-origin violence be differentiated rather than lumped

together. In doing this, the information will provide a more useful perspective for explaining family violence.

Taking a closer look at Table 5.2, slight differences in wife abuse rates are observed when comparing women who report violence in their homes of origin (violent father) with women who report no violence in their homes of origin. Although the percentages are small, women who report violent fathers are more than twice as likely to report violence in their own relationships than women reporting non-violent fathers. Similarly, women who report violence in their partners' home-of-origin (violent father-in-law) are more than four times as likely to report violence in their current relationships than women who report no violence in their partners' home-of-origin (non-violent father-in-law). These same patterns are consistent among minor and severe indices; in fact, the differences are even more pronounced among women experiencing severe wife abuse. Women with a violent father are almost four times as likely to report severe abuse than women with a non-violent father. Women with a violent father-in-law are seven times as likely to report severe wife abuse than women with a non-violent father.

Since Table 5.2 indicates a large enough sample to study intergenerational effects among victims of wife abuse, a difference of means t-test was conducted. The overall violence index is excluded in the following table because minor-only and severe wife abuse indices provide the best measures of wife abuse (Grandin & Lupri, 1997). It was hypothesized that among women victims, respondents with violent fathers or violent fathers-in-law would report wife abuse at statistically significantly higher rates than women with non-violent fathers or non-violent fathers-in-law.

As can be seen in Table 5.3, the data support the hypothesis. The number of women reporting wife abuse differs significantly between women with violent fathers and women with non-violent fathers. Similarly, the differences in the number of women reporting wife abuse differs significantly between women with violent fathers-in-law and women with non-violent fathers-in-law. In short, the difference of means t-tests indicate that home-of-origin violence is significantly related to wife abuse when studying female

Table 5.3 Comparison of Average Incidence Rates of Wife Abuse Among Female Victims by Home-of-Origin Violence, As Reported by Currently Married and Common-law Women, Canada, 1993

Violence Experienced in Current Relationship Within the Last Year	Father					Father-in-Law				
	<u>Violent</u>		<u>Not Violent</u>		T-Value for Difference of Means T-value ¹	<u>Violent</u>		<u>Not Violent</u>		T-Value for Difference of Means T-value
	<u>Mean</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>Mean</u>	<u>N</u>		<u>Mean</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>Mean</u>	<u>N</u>	
Minor-Only Wife Abuse	0.080	66	0.024	153	2.92****	0.145	49	0.028	140	3.95****
Severe Wife Abuse	0.043	60	0.013	87	2.68****	0.081	59	0.011	69	3.45****

¹Values are significant at ****P≤ .001

victims. To further explore the relationship between home-of-origin violence and wife abuse among victims and non-victims, the data were subjected to multivariate analyses. Multivariate analyses are useful because they allow one to examine the effect of each predictor while controlling for other variables in the model.

Multivariate Analysis: Effects of Home-of-Origin Violence on Wife Abuse

Logistic regression was used to test the relationship between experiencing wife abuse and having a father who was abusive to one's mother, or having a father-in-law who was violent towards one's mother-in-law. Because the distribution of abuse among women is a skewed distribution, I chose to dichotomize the variable. When using a dichotomized dependent variable, logistic regression is preferable to ordinary least squares regression (Menard, 1995). To help identify the relevant variables, zero-order correlations were calculated. As can be seen in Table 5.4, statistically significant relationships were found between either minor-only or severe violence and each of the following variables: father violence, father-in-law violence, respondent's employment, spousal employment, respondent's education, spousal education, household income, and age. These variables will be used as control variables in the logistic regression analysis, as they have been reported as fairly good predictors of wife abuse in earlier Canadian studies (Lupri, 1989; Smith, 1990), and American studies (MacEwan & Barling, 1988; Hamberger & Hastings, 1991).

Table 5.4 Zero-Order Correlation Coefficients¹ of Relevant Variables by Wife Abuse, Currently Married and Common-Law Women, Canada, 1993²

Variables:	Minor Wife Abuse	Severe Wife Abuse
Father Violence	0.060****	0.085****
Father-in-Law Violence	0.091****	0.160****
Respondents Employment	0.030**	0.009
Spousal Employment	0.038****	0.013
Respondent's Level of Education	0.021	-0.034**
Spouse's Level of Education	-0.003	-0.048****
Household Income	-0.010	-0.040****
Age	-0.099****	-0.069****

¹Coefficients significant at * $P \leq .05$, ** $P \leq .01$, *** $P \leq .005$, and **** $P \leq .001$

²Ns vary due to non-response, and range between 6810 and 8432

The results of the multivariate analyses are presented in Table 5.5. Two models were used to test each of the two types of wife abuse, minor-only and severe wife abuse. In each case, the first model regressed the relevant wife abuse index on father violence and father-in-law violence. The second model regressed the relevant wife abuse index on father violence and father-in-law violence, while controlling for employment, education, income, and the age of the respondent. The results of the logistic regression analyses for minor-only wife abuse are discussed first, followed by a discussion of the severe wife abuse models. Because this analysis is exploratory, a test for interaction between father violence and father-in-law violence will not be conducted until the final analysis (Table 5.15).

Minor-only Wife Abuse. In Part A of Table 5.5, the statistical significance ($p \leq .001$) of the model chi-square test associated with Model 1 suggests that the additional variables add a significant proportion to the explained variance in minor-only violence over and above a model of complete independence (De Maris, 1992). In this model, both father violence and father-in-law violence are significantly related to the likelihood that minor-only violence occurred ($p \leq .001$ and $p \leq .001$, respectively). Other things being equal, having a violent father increased the odds that minor-only violence occurred by a factor of 1.821 or 82%. Regardless of having a violent father, having a violent father-in-law increased the odds that minor-only violence occurred by a factor of 2.886 or 189%. Both home-of-origin variables are significantly related to wife abuse; however, father-in-law violence shows a stronger relationship to wife abuse than father violence. This finding suggests that the effect of having a violent father is stronger for the learning of male aggression than the learning of female vulnerability.

As can be seen in Model 2 (Part A), when the control variables are added, father violence shows a small decrease in significance, whereas father-in-law violence remains at the same significance level ($p \leq .001$). Of the control variables added, age is the only variable which is significantly related to the likelihood that minor-only violence occurred. Other things being equal, having a violent father increased the chances that minor-only

Table 5.5 Logistic Regression Models for Minor and Severe Wife Abuse Based upon Reports of Home-of-Origin Violence Among Currently Married and Common-law Women, Canada, 1993

Variable:	Model 1		Model 2	
	b ¹	Exp(b)	b	Exp(b)
A. Minor Wife Abuse (N= 8663)				
Intercept	-3.853****		-2.012****	
Father Violence	0.600****	1.821	0.557***	1.745
Father-in-law Violence	1.060****	2.886	0.955****	2.599
Respondent's Education			0.057	1.059
Spouse's Education			-0.011	0.989
Household Income			-0.049	0.952
Respondent's Employment			-0.100	0.905
Spousal Employment			-0.312	0.732
Age of Respondent			-0.253****	0.776
Model Chi-Square	49.566****		97.595****	
Degrees of Freedom	2		8	
R ² _L ²	0.029		0.062	
B. Severe Wife Abuse (N= 8663)				
Intercept	-4.702****		-0.886	
Father Violence	0.854****	2.349	0.622**	1.863
Father-in-Law Violence	1.930****	6.890	1.773****	5.891
Respondent's Education			-0.064	0.938
Spouse's Education			-0.129**	0.879
Household Income			-0.122*	0.885
Respondent's Employment			0.130	1.139
Spousal Employment			-0.207	0.813
Age of Respondent			-0.259****	0.772
Model Chi-Square	131.500****		166.040****	
Degrees of Freedom	2		8	
R ² _L	0.103		0.147	

¹ Coefficients significant at *P≤ .05, **P≤ .01, ***P≤ .005, and ****P≤ .001

² R²_L is a rough approximation for assessing predictive efficacy: it ranges between 0 and 1.

violence occurred by a factor of 1.745 or 75%. Holding all other variables constant, having a violent father-in-law increased the chances that minor-only violence occurred by a factor of 2.599 or 160%. Regardless of employment, education, income, or having a violent father or father-in-law, a one unit increase in the respondent's age decreased odds that minor-only violence occurred by 0.776 or 22%. Despite the large significance levels and strong antilog coefficients, the predictive efficacy (R²_L) for each model is still very low (.03 and .06), suggesting that there are other important causal variables of minor wife

abuse not accounted for in the current model. For example, variables such as alcohol, prior violent relationships, personality characteristics, stress, and marital satisfaction have been found to be significantly related to wife abuse (Hotaling & Sugarman, 1986).

Severe Wife Abuse. Part B of Table 5.5 presents the results of two models used to estimate severe wife abuse. The model chi-square test ($p \leq .001$) indicates that Model 1 adds a significant proportion to the variance explained, suggesting that at least one of the variables added is important. The added significance of the model can be attributed to both father violence ($p \leq .001$) and father-in-law violence ($p \leq .001$). Regardless of father-in-law violence, having a violent father increased the odds that severe violence occurred by a factor of 2.349 or 135%. Regardless of father violence, having a violent father-in-law increased the odds that severe violence occurred by a factor of 6.889 or 589%. Although both home-of-origin variables show a significant relationship to wife abuse, the results indicate that there is a stronger effect for the learning of male aggression than the learning of female vulnerability.

Looking at Model 2 (Part B), the inclusion of education, income, employment, and age results in father violence ($p \leq .01$), father-in-law violence ($p \leq .001$), spousal education ($p \leq .01$), household income ($p \leq .05$), and the age of the respondent ($p \leq .001$) being significantly related to the occurrence of severe wife abuse. These are consistent with the findings reported in other empirical studies (Hotaling & Sugarman, 1986; Lupri et al., 1994; Fagan et al., 1983).

Holding all other variables constant, having a violent father increased the odds that severe abuse occurred by a factor of 1.863 or 86%. Controlling for the other variables in the model, having a violent father-in-law increased the odds that severe wife abuse occurred by a factor of 5.891 or 489%. Regardless of father violence, father-in-law violence, employment, age, and income, a one unit increase in the spouse's education decreased the odds that severe wife abuse occurred by a factor of 0.879 or 12%. Other things being equal, a one unit increase in household income decreased the odds that severe wife abuse occurred by a factor of 0.885 or 11%. Controlling for all other variables in the equation, a one unit increase in age decreased the odds that severe wife abuse occurred by

a factor of 0.772 or 23%.

The R^2_L values for the severe wife abuse models are much higher than they are for the minor wife abuse models. This suggests that the models are better predictors of severe wife abuse than minor wife abuse. Despite the better fit of the severe wife abuse models, the predictive efficacy (R^2_L) is still low, indicating that there are other important causal variables contributing to severe wife abuse which are not accounted for in these two models. As stated above, there are many other variables that are significantly related to wife abuse such as alcohol, self esteem, sex-role expectations, criminal arrest records, length of relationship, religious compatibility, and prior marriages (Hotelling & Sugarman, 1986).

In sum, bivariate analyses show slight differences in rates of wife abuse among females reared in violent homes and females reared in non-violent homes, when analyzing the entire married and common-law sample. Difference of means tests among female victims of wife abuse find a significant relationship between home-of-origin violence and wife abuse. Multivariate analyses also find a significant relationship between home-of-origin violence and wife abuse among victims and non-victims. Having a violent father and/or violent father-in-law remain significant predictors of minor and severe wife abuse even when controlling for socio-economic variables and age. When examining the goodness-of-fit of the wife abuse models, the predictive efficacy (R^2_L) indicates that home-of-origin violence is a better predictor of severe wife abuse than minor wife abuse. The R^2_L also suggests that there are other important causal variables not accounted for in these models.

EFFECTS OF HOME-OF-ORIGIN VIOLENCE ON NON-FAMILIAL VIOLENCE

The purpose of this portion of the analysis is to test the effects of home-of-origin violence on women's reports of non-familial violence. The decision to examine the relationship between home-of-origin violence and non-familial violence stems from the idea that if home-of-origin violence is useful in explaining who is at greater risk of violence in one's home later in life, it may be useful in predicting who is at risk for male-

to-female violence outside of the home later in life. The hypothesis can be modeled as follows:

Model 5.2

Home-of-Origin Violence → → → → → Non-Familial Violence
--

To test the effects of home-of-origin violence on non-familial violence four major sets of analyses were conducted. The results are provided in the form of five tables. First, the prevalence rates for each of the non-familial violence items is presented, with an overall prevalence rate of non-familial violence provided at the bottom of the table. Next, incidence rates of non-familial violence are compared between women who report violent fathers and women who report non-violent fathers. T-tests for difference of means were conducted among victims of non-familial violence, to test the significance of being reared in homes where there was father to mother violence, and being reared in non-violent homes. This relationship was then subjected to multivariate analyses.

Prevalence Rates of Non-Familial Violence

Table 5.6 provides an overview of the types of non-familial violent acts measured in this study, and the number of women who have experienced each type of violence. The overall prevalence rate of non-familial violence provided at the bottom of Table 5.6 indicates that 3394 or 39.2 percent of married and common-law women reported ever having been victims of at least one form of non-familial violence. The most commonly reported forms of victimization are unwanted sexual touching by male strangers and known men (item 2 and item 5). The next highest prevalence rate is being forced into unwanted sexual activity by a date or boyfriend (item 3) followed by being forced into unwanted sexual activity by male strangers and known men (items 1 and 4). It is interesting that the most commonly reported forms of victimization are sexual in nature. Being physically attacked by a date or boyfriend and being threatened by a male stranger were the next most frequently reported forms of violence (items 7 and 9). Prevalence

rates are evenly distributed across the remaining four items.

Table 5.6 Prevalence Rates of Non-Familial Violence, As Reported by Married and Common-Law Women, Canada, 1993

Violent Acts Experienced by Respondent:		N	%
1.	Male stranger ¹ forced her or attempted to force her into unwanted sexual activity	548	6.3
2.	Unwanted sexual touching by male stranger	1233	14.2
3.	Date or boyfriend ² forced her or attempted to force her into unwanted sexual activity	1079	12.5
4.	Known Man ³ forced her or attempted to force her into unwanted sexual activity	534	6.2
5.	Unwanted sexual touching by known man	1393	16.1
6.	Physically attacked by male stranger	255	2.9
7.	Physically attacked by date or boyfriend	404	4.7
8.	Physically attacked by a known man	223	2.6
9.	Threatened to be harmed by a male stranger	392	4.5
10.	Threatened to be harmed by a date or boyfriend	227	2.6
11.	Threatened to be harmed by a known man	246	2.8
Overall Victim of Non-Familial Violence Index ⁴		3394	39.2
Number of Married and Common-Law Women		8663	

¹ Stranger includes all males who are unknown to the female respondent.

² Date or boyfriend excludes husbands or common-law partners, therefore only the men who the respondent dated prior to her current partner are included.

³ Known man excludes husbands, partners, and relatives.

⁴ The overall non-familial violence index includes all respondents who report having ever experienced at least one of the eleven items.

Home-of-Origin Violence and Non-Familial Violence

Table 5.7 presents the prevalence rates of non-familial violence by home-of-origin violence for the sample of married and common-law women. Comparisons are made between women who report that their fathers had abused their mothers and women who report non-violent fathers. As can be seen among the victims of non-familial violence, women who report a violent father are more likely to report experiencing some form of non-familial violence than women reporting a non-violent father. Similarly, among non-victims of non-familial violence, women who report a non-violent father are more likely to report not being a victim of non-familial violence than women with a violent father.

Table 5.7 Prevalence Rates of Non-Familial Violence by Home-of-Origin, as Reported by Currently Married and Common-Law Women, Canada, 1993

<u>Father to Mother Violence in Home-of-Origin</u>				
	Father Violent (n= 1474)		Father Not Violent (n=6895)	
	<u>%</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>N</u>
Victims of Non-Familial Violence	53.6	790	36.3	2503
Non-Victims of Non-Familial Violence	46.4	684	63.7	4392

To test the significance of having a violent father on women's reports of non-familial violence, a one-tailed t-test for difference of means was used. It was hypothesized that among women victims, respondents reporting a violent father would report non-familial violence at a higher average rate than women reporting a non-violent father. As can be seen in Table 5.8, the data support the hypothesis. Female victims of non-familial violence are significantly more likely to report a violent father ($p \leq .001$) than a non-violent father.

Table 5.8 Comparison of Average Prevalence Rates of Non-Familial Violence Among Female Victims by Home-of-Origin, As Reported by Currently Married and Common-law Women, Canada, 1993

<u>Father to Mother Violence in Home-of-Origin</u>					
	Father Violent (1474)		Father Not Violent (6895)		T- Value For Difference Of Means
	<u>Mean</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>Mean</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>T-Value'</u>
Women Victims of Non-Familial Violence	1.072	790	0.604	2503	6.03****

' Values significant at ****P $\leq .001$

Multivariate Analysis: Effects of Home-of-Origin Violence on Non-Familial Violence

Table 5.9 shows the zero-order correlations between non-familial violence and variables assumed to be relevant to non-familial violence based on theory and previous empirical studies. The focus of this section is on the female respondents and their experiences of non-familial violence. Father violence is the independent variable of

interest, and age, employment, and education are entered as control variables. As can be seen in Table 5.9 bivariate associations are statistically significant at $p \leq .001$ and are included in the regression analysis.

Table 5.10 presents the results of the logistic regression analysis of non-familial violence. The first model regressed the non-familial violence index on father violence. The second model regressed the non-familial violence index on father violence, while controlling for age, education, and employment.

Table 5.9 Zero-Order Correlation Coefficients¹ of Relevant Variables by Non-Familial Violence, Currently Married and Common-law Women, Canada, 1993²

Variables:	Non-Familial Violence
Father Violent	0.090****
Age	-0.153****
Respondent Employment	0.087****
Respondent's Level of Education	0.033****

¹Coefficients significant at **** $P \leq .001$

²Ns vary due to non-response and range between 8369 and 8663.

Table 5.10 Logistic Regression Models of Non-Familial Violence Based upon Reports of Home-of-Origin Violence Among Currently Married and Common-Law Canadian Women, 1993

Variable	<u>Model 1</u>		<u>Model 2</u>	
	b ¹	Exp(b)	b	Exp(b)
Non-Familial Violence (N= 8663)				
Intercept	-0.562****		-0.629****	
Father Violence	0.706****	2.027	0.702****	2.020
Age of Respondent			-0.105****	0.900
Respondent's Education			0.089****	1.093
Respondent's Employment			0.094	1.098
Model Chi-Square	149.040****		487.990****	
Degrees of Freedom	1		4	
R ² _L ²	0.013		0.044	

¹Coefficients significant at **** $P \leq .001$

²R²_L is a rough approximation for assessing predictive efficacy; it ranges between 0 and 1.

The model chi-square associated with Model 1 ($p \leq .001$) suggests an improvement over and above a model of complete independence. In this model father

violence ($p \leq .001$) is significantly related to experiencing non-familial violence. Having a violent father increased the odds that non-familial violence occurred by a factor of 2.03 or 103%.

The model chi-square for model 2 is also statistically significant ($p \leq .001$), suggesting a better fit of data than model 1. With the addition of the control variables, father violence remains significant ($p \leq .001$). Age and the respondent's education also show significant relationships to non-familial violence. Other things being equal, having a violent father increased the odds that non-familial violence occurred by a factor of 2.02 or 102%. Regardless of father violence, education, and employment, a one unit increase in age decreased the odds that non-familial violence occurred by a factor of 0.90 or 10%. Holding all other variables constant, an increase in the respondent's education level increased the odds that non-familial violence occurred by a factor of 1.09 or 9%. This finding is peculiar, as it is in the opposite direction than was expected. One possible explanation is that women who have more education may have had increased contact with males during their college or university education, increasing the likelihood of violence. Further study is necessary to determine why education and non-familial violence are positively related.

Similar to the multivariate analyses in Table 5.5, the R^2_L for each model is small (0.013 and 0.044). Therefore, although home-of-origin violence in the female's home-of-origin is a significant predictor of non-familial violence, the R^2_L suggests there are many other important variables not included in these models.

In summary, it was found that home-of-origin violence is significantly related to non-familial violence. Women reporting a violent father are significantly more likely to report being threatened, physically assaulted, sexually assaulted, or touched inappropriately by a male stranger, date/boyfriend, or known man. The significance of these predictors remain even when controlling for age, education, and employment.

EFFECTS OF NON-FAMILIAL VIOLENCE ON WIFE ABUSE

In the first part of this chapter the relationship between home-of-origin violence and wife abuse was examined. Next, the relationship between home-of-origin violence

and non-familial violence was studied. It is the purpose of the following analyses to examine the relationship between non-familial violence and wife abuse. Based upon social learning theory, it was hypothesized that if a woman experienced violence by a male stranger, date/boyfriend, or known man, she may learn a vulnerability for violence which can generalize across contexts, one context being her home of procreation. To determine the effects of experiencing non-familial violence on reports of wife abuse, the data from the VAWS were explored further. Married and common-law women were selected if they reported being threatened, physically attacked, sexually assaulted, or touched inappropriately by a male stranger, known man, or previous date/boyfriend. As stated in Chapter Four, to ensure temporal order of non-familial violence and wife abuse, only those respondents who experienced non-familial violence prior to 1992 were included in the analysis. Reports of wife abuse were included only if the first act of abuse occurred in the year preceding the survey. By setting such limits on the data, it is possible to examine the effects of non-familial violence on wife abuse, without prior acts of wife abuse confounding the results. The relationship can be modeled as follows:

Model 5.3

Non-Familial Violence → → → → → Wife Abuse

Four major sets of findings are presented, beginning with an overview of the incidence rates of wife abuse and the prevalence rates of non-familial violence. Rates differ dramatically from those in Tables 5.1 and 5.6 due to the different limits set on the wife abuse and non-familial violence variables. Next, comparisons are made between women who report non-familial violence and women who do not report non-familial violence. To test the significance of the differences found between women who have experienced non-familial violence and women who have not experienced non-familial violence, difference of means t-tests were conducted. Finally, the results of the multivariate analyses are presented.

Incidence Rates of Wife Abuse and Non-Familial Violence

As can be seen in Table 5.11, 2.1% of the married or common-law women in this study have experienced wife abuse for the first time in the year preceding the survey. Due

Table 5.11 Incidence Rates of Wife Abuse Occurring for the First Time, As Reported by Married and Common-Law Women, Canada, 1993

Violent Acts Experienced by Respondent:	Incidence Rates	
	N	%
1. Threatened to be hit by her partner with his fists or with something that could hurt her	70	0.80
2. Partner threw something at her	29	0.33
3. Partner pushed, grabbed, or shoved her	150	1.70
4. Partner slapped her	30	0.35
5. Partner kicked, bit, or hit her with his fists	15	0.17
6. Partner hit her with something	7	0.08
7. Partner beat her	13	0.15
8. Partner choked her	12	0.14
9. Partner threatened to use, or used a gun or knife on her	2	0.02
10. Partner forced her into unwanted sexual intercourse	21	0.24
Minor-Only Wife Abuse Index ¹	142	1.60
Severe Wife Abuse Index ²	43	0.50
Overall Wife Abuse Index ³	185	2.10
Number of Currently Married and Common-Law Women	8663	

¹The minor-only wife abuse index for the incidence rate contains all respondents who reported experiencing any of the first four acts (items 1, 2, 3, 4) for the first time in the 12 months preceding the survey, but no severe acts.

²The severe wife abuse index for the incidence rate includes women who reported experiencing any of the last six acts (items 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10) for the first time in the 12 months preceding the survey.

³The overall wife abuse rate for the incidence rate combines the minor-only and severe scales. It includes the women who reported experiencing any of the ten acts (items 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10) for the first time in the 12 months preceding the survey.

to the restrictions discussed previously, incidence rates of wife abuse items are quite low. Nevertheless, they follow the same pattern found in Table 5.1. Minor wife abuse is reported more often than severe abuse. Being pushed, shoved, or grabbed is the most frequently reported form of minor wife abuse, and being forced into unwanted sexual intercourse is the most frequently reported form of severe wife abuse.

As can be seen in Table 5.12, slightly more than one-third (37.1%) of the married and common-law women have experienced some form of non-familial violence between the age of sixteen and the year preceding the survey. Similar to Table 5.6, the most frequently reported forms of victimization are unwanted sexual touching by male strangers and known men, and being forced into sexual activity by a date/boyfriend.

Table 5.12 Prevalence Rates of Non-Familial Violence Up to One Year Preceding the Survey, As Reported by Married and Common-Law Women, Canada, 1993

Violent Acts Experienced by Respondent:		N	%
1.	Male stranger ¹ forced her or attempted to force her into unwanted sexual activity	534	6.2
2.	Unwanted sexual touching by male stranger	1066	12.3
3.	Date or boyfriend ² forced her or attempted to force her into unwanted sexual activity	1058	12.2
4.	Known Man ³ forced her or attempted to force her into unwanted sexual activity	358	4.1
5.	Unwanted sexual touching by known man	994	11.5
6.	Physically attacked by male stranger	231	2.7
7.	Physically attacked by date or boyfriend	393	4.5
8.	Physically attacked by a known man	84	1.0
9.	Threatened to be harmed by a male stranger	318	3.7
10.	Threatened to be harmed by a date or boyfriend	216	2.5
11.	Threatened to be harmed by a known man	132	1.5
Overall Victim of Non-Familial Violence Index ⁴		3210	37.1
Number of Married and Common-Law Women		8663	

¹ Stranger includes all males who are unknown to the female respondent.

² Date or Boyfriend excludes husbands or common-law partners, therefore only men who the respondent dated prior to her current partner are included.

³ Known man excludes husbands, partners, and relatives.

⁴ The overall criminal violence index includes all respondents who report having experienced at least one of the eleven items between the time the woman was sixteen years of age and the year preceding the survey.

Non-Familial Violence and Wife Abuse

The following analysis examines the relationship between non-familial violence and wife abuse. As stated previously, only incidents of non-familial violence which occurred the year prior to the survey were included in this analysis. Incidents of wife abuse were also limited to those which occurred for the first time in the year preceding the survey. Table 5.13 presents the incidence rates of wife abuse occurring for the first time among married and common-law women by non-familial violence. Comparisons are made between female victims of wife abuse who report non-familial violence prior to the year of the survey, and female victims of wife abuse who do not report any non-familial violence. As can be seen among wife abuse victims in the minor-only wife abuse row in Table 5.13, women who report non-familial violence are more than twice as likely to report wife abuse than women who do not report non-familial violence. Similarly women who have experienced non-familial violence also report severe wife abuse at higher rates than women who have not experienced non-familial violence. Nevertheless, only the relationship between non-familial violence and minor-only wife abuse is statistically significant, as the t-values in Table 5.13 show. Among wife abuse victims, women who report non-familial violence are significantly more likely to report minor wife abuse than women who have not experienced non-familial violence. To further explore the relationship between violence inside the home and violence outside of the home, the data were subjected to multivariate analysis.

Table 5.13 Incidence Rates of First Time Wife Abuse by Non-Familial Violence, As Reported by Female Wife Abuse Victims, Currently Married and Common-Law Women, Canada, 1993

Violence Experienced in Current Marriage or Common-law Relationship Within the Last Year	Experienced Non- Familial Violence (n= 2590)			Did Not Experience Non- Familial Violence (n= 4925)			T- Value For Difference Of Means
	<u>%</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>Mean</u>	<u>%</u>	<u>N</u>	<u>Mean</u>	<u>T-value'</u>
Minor-Only Wife Abuse	3.1	80	0.013	1.3	62	0.004	1.79****
Severe Wife Abuse	1.0	27	0.003	0.3	16	0.001	0.63

'Values are significant at ****P≤ .001

Multivariate Analysis

Table 5.14 shows the zero-order correlations of relevant variables to be included in the logistic regression analysis. Most variables are significant when correlated with either minor wife abuse or severe wife abuse. Since spousal employment is not significant when correlated with either minor or severe abuse, it is excluded from the regression analysis. Because all the other variables show a significant relationship with at least one form of wife abuse, they are included in the analysis.

To ensure the effects of non-familial violence are not contaminated by home-of-origin violence, father violence and father-in-law violence are entered into the regression analysis as control variables. Table 5.15 presents the results of the logistic regression analyses for two models of wife abuse. The first model regressed the relevant wife abuse index on non-familial violence. The second model regressed the relevant wife abuse index on non-familial violence, father violence, father-in-law violence, age, education, income, and employment.

Table 5.14 Zero-Order Correlation Coefficients¹ of Relevant Variables by First Time Wife Abuse, Currently Married and Common-law Women, Canada, 1993³

Variables:	Minor Wife Abuse	Severe Wife Abuse
Non-Familial Violence	0.059**** ²	0.040****
Father Violent	0.047****	0.048****
Father-in-Law Violent	0.044****	0.046****
Age of Respondent	-0.092*	-0.047
Respondent Employment	0.027	0.004**
Spousal Employment	0.021	0.009
Respondent's Level of Education	0.015*	-0.030**
Spouse's Level of Education	-0.001	-0.030**
Household Income	-0.024****	-0.047****

¹Coefficients significant at * $P \leq .05$, ** $P \leq .01$ and **** $P \leq .001$

²Coefficients differ slightly from Table 5.4 because of the limits placed on the data, this table uses wife abuse occurring for the first time.

³Ns vary due to non-response, and range between 6847 and 8653.

Minor-Only Wife Abuse. As can be seen in Table 5.15, both minor-only wife abuse models are significant, suggesting that each model adds significantly to the variance explained. In Model 1, non-familial violence ($P \leq .001$) is significantly related to the

likelihood that wife abuse occurred. Having experienced non-familial violence increased the odds that minor wife abuse occurred by a factor of 2.39 or 139%. In Model 2,

Table 5.15 Logistic Regression Models of First Time Wife Abuse¹, Based Upon Reports of Non-Familial Violence Among Currently Married and Common-Law Women, Canada, 1993

Variable:	Model 1		Model 2	
	b ²	Exp(b)	b	Exp(b)
A. Minor Wife Abuse (N= 8663)				
Intercept	-4.390****		-1.850****	
Non-Familial Violence	0.871****	2.389	0.828****	2.290
Father Violent			0.453*	1.570
Father-in-Law Violent			0.489	1.630
Respondent's Education			0.043	1.040
Spouse's Education			-0.006	0.990
Household Income			-0.101	0.900
Respondent's Employment			-0.007	0.990
Age of Respondent			-0.314****	0.730
Model Chi-Square	26.130****		89.656****	
Degrees of Freedom	1		8	
R ² _L ³	0.020		0.090	
B. Severe Wife Abuse (N= 8663)				
Intercept	-5.800****		-1.230****	
Non-Familial Violence	1.094****	2.990	1.186***	3.270
Father Violent			0.686	1.990
Father-in-Law Violent			0.967*	2.630
Respondent's Education			-0.090	0.910
Spouse's Education			-0.307**	0.740
Household Income			-0.191	0.830
Respondent's Employment			0.468	1.610
Age of Respondent			-0.285****	0.750
Model Chi-Square	12.530****		61.670****	
Degrees of Freedom	1		8	
R ² _L	0.023		0.159	

¹Women reporting wife abuse for the first time in their relationship in the year preceding the survey are compared to women who have never experienced wife abuse ever in their relationship.

²Coefficients significant at *P≤ .05, **P≤ .01, ***P≤ .005 and ****P≤ .001

³R²_L is a rough approximation for assessing predictive efficacy. It ranges between 0 and 1.

non-familial violence, father violence, and age are significantly related to minor wife abuse having occurred. Other things being equal, having experienced non-familial violence increased the odds that minor-only wife abuse occurred by a factor of 2.29 or 129%. Regardless of the other variables in the equation, having a violent father increased the

odds that minor-only wife abuse occurred by a factor of 1.57 or 57%. Holding all other variables constant, a one unit increase in age decreased the odds that minor-only wife abuse occurred by 0.71 or 29%.

The multivariate models for minor-only wife abuse suggest that experiencing non-familial violence is a significant predictor of wife abuse. Women who have experienced non-familial violence are significantly more likely to report minor-only wife abuse in their current relationship. Control variables, father violence and age, are also significantly related to minor-only wife abuse. Women with violent fathers are more likely to experience minor wife abuse than women with non-violent fathers. Younger women are more likely to report minor-only wife abuse than older women. Nevertheless, despite the significance of non-familial violence in predicting wife abuse, the R^2_L indicates that there are other important causal variables of minor wife abuse not accounted for in these models.

Severe Wife Abuse. Similar to the models for minor-only wife abuse, both models for severe wife abuse are significant. Model 1 shows non-familial violence to increase the odds that severe violence occurred by a factor of 2.99 or 199%.

The addition of the five control variables in model 2 results in non-familial violence ($p \leq .005$), father-in-law violence ($p \leq .05$), age of the respondent ($p \leq .005$), and the respondent's level of education ($p \leq .01$) being significantly related to the occurrence of severe wife abuse. Controlling for the other variables in the model, experiencing non-familial violence increased the odds that severe wife abuse occurred by a factor of 3.27 or 227%. Regardless of the other variables in the equation, having a violent father-in-law increased the odds that severe wife abuse occurred by a factor of 2.63 or 163%. Other things being equal, a one unit increase in age decreased the odds that severe wife abuse occurred by a factor of 0.75 or 25%. Holding all other variables constant, a one unit increase in education decreased the odds that wife abuse occurred by a factor of 0.74 or 26%. The R^2_L for model 2 for severe wife abuse is much larger than the R^2_L for model 2 for minor wife abuse, suggesting that non-familial violence is a better predictor of severe wife abuse than minor wife abuse. Once again, the R^2_L suggests that there are other

important causal variables not accounted for in these models.

Both bivariate and multivariate analyses find non-familial violence to be significantly related to minor and severe wife abuse. The data suggest prior non-familial violence to be a good predictor of current wife abuse. Women who have experienced unwanted sexual touching, physical assaults, sexual assaults, and threats by dates/boyfriends, known men, and male strangers are more likely to report minor and severe wife abuse than women who have never experienced non-familial violence. The significance of non-familial violence in predicting wife abuse remains even when effects of home-of-origin violence and socio-economic variables are entered as control variables. The R^2_L suggests that the models are better predictors of severe wife abuse than minor wife abuse, and also indicate that there are other important variables not included in the models.

EFFECTS OF HOME-OF-ORIGIN VIOLENCE AND NON-FAMILIAL VIOLENCE ON WIFE ABUSE

Initial multivariate analyses found that women who were reared in homes where their fathers were violent to their mothers are significantly more likely to report wife abuse than women reared in non-violent homes; and found women reporting violent fathers-in-law to be more likely to report minor and severe wife abuse than women reporting non-violent fathers-in-law. Further it was found that women who grew up in homes where their fathers were violent to their mothers also show higher rates of non-familial violence than women who grew up in homes where their fathers were not violent to their mothers. Multivariate analyses shown in Table 5.15 demonstrate that women who have experienced non-familial violence report higher rates of wife abuse than women who have not experienced non-familial violence. The purpose of the following analysis is to examine the relationship between non-familial violence, home-of-origin violence, and wife abuse. It is suggested that the observed relationship between non-familial violence and wife abuse is actually due to the overall effect of home-of-origin violence. As suggested in Chapter Four, the relationship between home-of-origin violence, non-familial violence, and wife abuse can be modeled as follows:

Model 5.4**Home-of-Origin Violence → Non-Familial Violence → Wife Abuse**

In the following logistic regression analysis, father violence and father-in-law violence will be entered as the first causal variables of wife abuse. Similar to the regression results found in Table 5.5, home-of-origin violence will show a significant relationship to minor and severe wife abuse. It is hypothesized however, once non-familial violence is entered as a causal variable in Model 2, the significance of the home-of-origin violence variables will lessen. Such a finding would offer support of the final hypothesis, as detailed above.

To determine whether an interaction exists between father violence and father-in-law violence, an interaction term will be added to each model. Further, to ensure parsimony, variables found to be insignificant in the previous analyses are excluded in the current models. Therefore, the respondent's employment, and the spouse's employment are not included in the following models of minor and severe wife abuse.

Table 5.16 presents the results of the logistic regression analyses. Three models were used to test each of the two types of wife abuse. In each case, the first model regressed the relevant wife abuse index on father violence, father-in-law violence, and the interaction term (father violence by father-in-law violence). The second model regressed the relevant wife abuse index on father violence, father-in-law violence, the interaction term, as well as non-familial violence. The third model regressed the relevant wife abuse index on all of the above mentioned variables as well as the control variables age, income, and education.

Minor-Only Wife Abuse. As can be seen in the chi-square test for Model 1 (Part A), the introduction of father violence, father-in-law violence, and the interaction term to the equation adds significantly to the proportion of variance explained ($p \leq .001$) over and above a model of complete independence. Having a violent father increased the odds that minor-only wife abuse occurred by a factor of 2.15 or 115%. Having a violent father-in-law increased the odds that minor-only wife abuse occurred by a factor of 2.67 or 167%.

The interaction term (father violence by father-in-law violence) is not significant, indicating the effect of a violent father in predicting minor-only wife abuse is not dependent on father-in-law violence.

Looking at Model 2 (Part A), the addition of non-familial violence adds significantly to the variance explained over and above Model 1 ($p \leq .001$). Having a violent father, violent father-in-law, and being a victim of non-familial violence increased the odds that minor-only wife abuse occurred. The addition of non-familial violence leads to a slight decrease in coefficients, nevertheless, the relationships remain statistically significant. This suggests that non-familial violence and home-of-origin violence are both significant predictors of minor-only wife abuse.

As can be seen in Model 3 (Part A) the inclusion of the control variables makes a significant contribution to the proportion of variance explained ($p \leq .001$). When the control variables are added, all variables are significant except for the interaction term and the respondent's level of education, and the spouse's level of education. The socio-economic variables have a mediating effect on father violence and father-in-law violence, as a decrease in coefficients and decrease in significance levels occurs once the control variables are added to the equation. Nevertheless, all remain significant.

Controlling for the other variables in the equation, having a violent father increased the odds that minor-only wife abuse occurred by a factor of 1.88 or 88%. Holding all other variables constant, having a violent father-in-law increased the odds that minor-only wife abuse occurred by 2.15 or 115%. Other things being equal, experiencing non-familial violence increased the odds that minor-only wife abuse occurred by a factor of 3.14 or 214%. Controlling for the other variables, a one unit increase in income decreased the odds that minor-only wife abuse occurred by 0.87 or 23%. Regardless of father violence, non-familial violence, income, or education, a one unit increase in the respondent's age decreased the odds that minor-only violence occurred by 0.73 or 27%.

Table 5.16 Final Logistic Regression Models of First Time Wife Abuse¹, Based Upon Reports of Home-of-Origin Violence and Non-Familial Violence Among Currently Married and Common-Law Women, Canada, 1993

Variable:	Model 1		Model 2		Model 3	
	b ²	Exp(b)	b	Exp(b)	b	Exp(b)
A. Minor Wife Abuse (n=8663)						
Intercept	-4.348****		-4.731****		-1.865***	
Father Violence	0.765****	2.150	0.641**	1.899	0.632**	1.880
Father-in-law Violence	0.983****	2.672	0.879***	2.410	0.766**	2.152
Father Violence by Father-in-law Violence	-0.763	0.466	-0.690	0.502	-0.813	0.444
Non-Familial Violence			0.890****	2.435	0.820****	2.271
Spouse's Education					-0.042	1.043
Respondent's Education					0.005	0.995
Household Income					-0.136**	0.873
Age of Respondent					-0.311***	0.733
Model Chi-Square	18.629****		39.900****		91.848****	
Degrees of Freedom	3		4		8	
R ² _L ³	0.016		0.035		0.087	
B. Severe Wife Abuse (n= 8663)						
Intercept	-5.995****		-6.500****		-1.241	
Father Violence	1.561****	4.766	1.408****	4.088	1.069*	2.911
Father-in-law Violence	1.868****	6.474	1.775****	5.899	1.485***	4.415
Father Violence by Father-in-law Violence	-1.733*	0.177	-1.666*	0.189	-1.244	0.288
Non-Familial Violence			1.019***	2.769	1.145***	3.141
Respondent's Education					-0.083	0.921
Spouse's Education					-0.299**	0.742
Household Income					-0.171	0.843
Age of Respondent					-0.297****	0.743
Model Chi-Square	23.734****		32.221****		62.772****	
Degrees of Freedom	3		4		8	
R ² _L	0.054		0.073		0.161	

¹Women reporting wife abuse for the first time in their relationship in the year preceding the survey are compared to women who have never experienced wife abuse in their relationship.

²Coefficients significant at *P≤ .05, **P≤ .01, ***P≤ .005 and ****P≤ .001

³R²_L is a rough approximation for assessing predictive efficacy. It ranges between 0 and 1.

Severe Wife Abuse. Part B of Table 5.16 presents the results of three models used to estimate severe wife abuse. The model chi-square tests for all three models are significant. In Model 1, the introduction of father violence, father-in-law violence, and the interaction term to the equation adds significantly to the proportion of variance explained ($p \leq .001$) over and above a model of complete independence. Having a violent father increased the odds that severe wife abuse occurred by a factor of 4.76 or 376%. Having a violent father-in-law increased the odds that severe wife abuse occurred by a factor of 6.47 or 547%.

The interaction term (father violence by father-in-law violence) entered in Model 1 is significant at $p \leq .05$. If we designate father violence as the focus variable and father-in-law as the moderator variable, the interaction term associated with having both a violent father-in-law and a violent father is -1.733 (See DeMaris, 1995). For those not reporting a violent father-in-law, the effect of having a violent father is $\exp(1.561) = 4.766$. This suggests that having a violent father increases the odds that wife abuse occurred by about four times the odds associated with those not reporting a violent father. On the other hand, among those reporting a violent father-in-law, the odds of wife abuse occurring are $\exp(1.561 - 1.733) = 0.842$. This means that among those reporting a violent father-in-law, the odds of wife abuse occurring are 0.842 times as great for those reporting a violent father as opposed to those who do not report a violent father. The joint effect of having both a violent father and a violent father-in-law lessens the effect associated with father violence in the victim's home-of-origin.

As can be seen in Model 2 (Part B), the addition of non-familial violence makes a significant contribution to the proportion of explained variance ($p \leq .001$). The inclusion of non-familial violence leads to a small decrease in the coefficients, but does not effect the significance levels of the home-of-origin violence variables. Because, the addition of non-familial violence does not lead to a decreased effect of home-of-origin violence on reports of severe wife abuse, it is concluded that non-familial violence is not an intervening variable between home-of-origin violence and severe wife abuse. Rather, independent of

home-of-origin violence, non-familial violence increased the odds that severe violence occurred.

The inclusion of the control variables in Model 3 results in father violence ($p \leq .05$), father-in-law violence ($p \leq .005$), non-familial violence ($p \leq .005$), spousal education ($p \leq .005$), and the age of the respondent ($p \leq .001$) being significantly related to the occurrence of severe wife abuse. Interestingly, when the socio-demographic variables are included, the interaction between father violence and father-in-law violence is no longer significant.

Holding all the other variables constant, having a violent father increased the odds that severe wife abuse occurred by a factor of 2.91 or 191%. Regardless of non-familial violence, income, education, employment, or age, having a violent father-in-law increased the odds that severe wife abuse occurred by a factor of 4.42 or 342%. Other things being equal, experiencing non-familial violence increased the odds that severe wife abuse occurred by a factor of 3.14 or 214%. Holding all variables constant, a one unit increase in age decreased the odds that severe wife abuse occurred by a factor of 0.74 or 26%.

When examining the predictive efficacy of the minor-only and severe wife abuse models, the R^2_L values are small in models 1 and 2, and larger in model 3. The predictive efficacy is strongest in Model 3 for severe wife abuse, almost two times larger than the R^2_L for minor-only wife abuse. This suggests the current model is a better predictor of severe wife abuse than minor-only wife abuse. The R^2_L values also suggest there are other important variables not included in the analysis.

In summary, it was hypothesized that the relationship found between non-familial violence and wife abuse was actually due to the overall effect of home-of-origin violence, with non-familial violence acting as an intervening variable between home-of-origin violence and wife abuse. Instead, the data indicate that both home-of-origin and non-familial violence are significant indicators of wife abuse.

CHAPTER 6

DISCUSSION AND IMPLICATIONS

INTRODUCTION

The purpose of this thesis was to examine selected intergenerational and cross-contextual factors as they relate to wife abuse; that is, to look at wife abuse across space and time. First, the relationship between home-of-origin violence and current wife abuse (commonly referred to as the intergenerational transmission of violence theory) was examined. The intergenerational transmission of violence theory explains violence in terms of the social learning that occurs upon witnessing or experiencing violence over time. Based on previous studies reporting gender differences in the transmission of violence, it was hypothesized that females who witnessed their fathers abusing their mothers would be more likely than females who did not witness their fathers abusing their mothers to be physically victimized by their own intimate partners later in life. It was suggested that by witnessing one's mother being abused by one's father, women learn or inherit a vulnerability to be victims of male violence. It was also hypothesized that males who witnessed their fathers abusing their mothers would be more likely to perpetrate physical violence in their own marriages and common-law relationships than males who did not witness their fathers abusing their mothers.

Drawing on notions from both criminology and family sociology, the intergenerational transmission of violence theory was extended to test whether or not women who witnessed their fathers abusing their mothers would also be more likely to report being victims of non-familial violence than women who did not witness their fathers abusing their mothers. Further, wife abuse was examined in light of women's experiences with non-familial violence. It was hypothesized that having been victimized by a stranger, known man, or date/boyfriend may teach women a vulnerability to becoming a victim of male violence, and that this vulnerability may generalize across contexts (one context being a marriage or common-law relationship). Finally, home-of-origin violence, non-familial violence, and wife abuse were explored together, to determine whether home-of-origin violence or non-familial violence is the better predictor of wife abuse.

RESULTS OF THE FIRST THREE EXPLORATORY ANALYSES

As shown in the logistic regression results in Chapter 5, significant relationships were found between home-of-origin violence and wife abuse (Table 5.5), home-of-origin violence and non-familial violence (Table 5.9), and non-familial violence and wife abuse (Table 5.14). Table 5.5 shows that women who have violent fathers are significantly more likely to report wife abuse than women who have non-violent fathers, and women who have violent fathers-in-law are significantly more likely to report wife abuse than women who have non-violent fathers-in-law. It appears women may learn or inherit a vulnerability to be victims of wife abuse. It also suggests that males who have been reared in homes where their fathers were violent to their mothers perpetrate violence at significantly higher rates than males reared in non-violent homes, implying that the use of violence was learned in their homes-of-origin.

These findings are consistent with MacLeod's finding (1980) that female witnesses of father-to-mother violence are more likely to become victims of wife abuse, and Rosenbaum & O'Leary's finding (1981) that male witnesses of father-to-mother violence are more likely to be perpetrators of wife abuse. In addition, these findings are also consistent as far as they go, with Straus, Gelles, & Steinmetz (1980) who state that children who observe their parents being violent with one another tend to be violent when they marry. Unfortunately, it is not possible with the VAWS data to determine whether female witnesses of father-to-mother violence are more likely to be abusive towards their partners. The results of this study are partly consistent with Pagelow (1984) as she found some support for males learning wife abuse, but did not find women to display a vulnerability for becoming victims of violence. These findings are partially consistent with Cappell & Heiner (1990), who found both men and women inherit a vulnerability for becoming victims of spousal violence. Although the present analysis could not examine whether males learn to be victims of wife-to-husband abuse, it was found that women seem to show a vulnerability for wife abuse.

As illustrated in Table 5.9, witnessing father-to-mother violence in a woman's home-of-origin is related to being victimized by strangers, dates/boyfriends, and known men. Witnessing wife abuse in one's home-of-origin seems to place women at a

significantly higher risk for male-to-female violence outside of the home. Table 5.14 shows that non-familial violence is also a significant indicator of minor and severe wife abuse. Women who reported experiencing physical assaults, sexual assaults, unwanted sexual touching, or threats by known men, male strangers, or dates/boyfriends were significantly more likely to report experiencing minor and severe wife abuse. Similar to Hotelling, Straus, and Lincoln (1990) these data show a strong relationship between family violence and non-familial violence. Hotelling, Straus, and Lincoln found men and women raised in violent homes or currently living in abusive relationships to be more likely to perpetrate aggression outside of the home, whereas this study finds women who have been reared in violent homes-of-origin or have been victims of male violence outside of the home are significantly more likely to be victims of wife abuse. The results of both studies suggest the necessity of further research.

THE FINAL ANALYSIS

As a result of the significant relationships found between home-of-origin violence, non-familial violence, and wife abuse, a final logistic regression analysis was conducted (Table 5.15). As stated earlier, the purpose of the last regression analysis was to determine whether non-familial violence or home-of-origin violence is the better predictor of wife abuse.

As shown in Table 5.15, the addition of non-familial violence in the minor-only and severe wife abuse models results in a small decrease in coefficients and a small decrease in the significance levels of the home-of-origin violence variables. This finding suggests that although there is a small indirect effect of home-of-origin violence working through non-familial violence, both home-of-origin violence and non-familial violence are important predictors of wife abuse.

To better understand the relationship between father violence and father-in-law violence, an interaction term (father violence by father-in-law violence) was introduced in each of the regression models. An interaction between father violence and father-in-law violence was detected in the first two models for severe wife abuse (Table 5.18), but this interaction dissipated once the selected demographic variables were added in Model 3. Therefore, when controlling for income, age, and education in the models for severe and

minor-only wife abuse, no interactions between father violence and father-in-law violence are observed. This tells us that there is no joint effect between father violence and father-in-law violence when predicting wife abuse.

Age is a significant indicator of minor and severe wife abuse. While spousal education is significantly related to severe wife abuse, it is not significantly related to minor-only wife abuse. Income is significantly related to minor-only wife abuse, but not severe wife abuse. As previously stated, the sub-culture of violence theory suggests that violence is dispersed differently throughout society. It has been theorized that younger populations experience more violence than older populations, and lower socio-economic groups experience more violence than higher socio-economic groups. The relationship between age, income, education and wife abuse lends partial support for this theory.

Grandin & Lupri (1997) suggest that when studying wife abuse, examining minor-only and severe wife abuse indices separately provide better measures of wife abuse than overall violence indices. They state that an overall wife abuse measure masks the differences between minor and severe wife abuse. It is evident in the present study that there are important differences between minor-only and severe wife abuse, differences that may have been masked if an overall wife abuse measure were used. Looking at Table 5.15 it can be seen that the predictive efficacy¹ (R^2_L) for each model of wife abuse differs between minor-only and severe wife abuse. The predictive efficacy is strongest in Model 3 for severe wife abuse, and is almost two times larger than the predictive efficacy in Model 3 for minor-only wife abuse. This suggests the current model is a better predictor of severe wife abuse than minor-only wife abuse. Further to this, the final regression analysis found an interaction effect between father violence and father-in-law violence in the first two models for severe violence, but no interaction effect was found in the minor-only models. Finally, throughout the multivariate analyses, the severe wife abuse models show greater sensitivity to the socio-economic variables than the models for minor-only wife abuse. In fact, it is only in the final regression model that minor-only wife abuse shows a significant relationship to the socio-economic variables. It is clear from these differences that minor-only and severe wife abuse differ from one another, and should be

¹ R^2_L is a rough approximation for assessing the goodness of fit of the model; it ranges between 0 and 1.

treated as separate phenomena.

Another important observation which can be made when looking at Table 5.15 concerns the predictive efficacy of the final regression models. Table 5.15 presents the logistic regression results for the most comprehensive model of minor and severe wife abuse used in this study. Although the predictive efficacy for each model analyzed in this study are consistent with other social science research, they are still relatively small. The weak predictive efficacy of these coefficients suggest home-of-origin violence, non-familial violence, and the resource variables are limited in explaining wife abuse. There are many other important variables not accounted for in this analysis, reminding us of the complexity and magnitude of this problem. Variables such as alcohol and drug abuse, marital satisfaction, religious compatibility, stress, and prior violent relationships have also been found to be significantly related to wife abuse (Hotelling & Sugarman, 1986).

SOCIAL IMPLICATIONS

The major social implication of the above findings concerns the importance of educating the public on the harmful effects of parental violence on children. Providing nurturing environments for children is important, and nurturing environments require loving role models. Parents who treat each other with love, respect, and dignity teach their children to treat others with respect and dignity. Parents who demonstrate physical abuse teach children an unhealthy form of problem solving, and an unhappy way to live.

One needs to be cautious about sounding deterministic about the effects of witnessing parental violence. Not all male children who were raised by parents who were violent to one another end up being violent themselves. Not all women raised in violent homes become victims of wife abuse in their intimate relationships, or victims of non-familial violence. As shown in Table 5.2, the majority of women reporting violent fathers and violent fathers-in-law do not report being victims of wife abuse, telling us that there are other important causal variables other than one's home-of-origin contributing to this problem. Nevertheless, strong significant relationships between home-of-origin, wife abuse, and non-familial violence were discovered.

To offset the negative effects of witnessing father-to-mother violence, early therapeutic intervention probably holds the most promise (Tutty & Wagar, 1994). The

earlier a child unlearns the unhealthy messages they've learned at home, the earlier they can relearn healthy messages, and avoid future violence. Similarly, for adults who witnessed violence in their homes-of-origin and are entering or have established intimate relationships, treatment and advice for these risk factors may be very helpful. Although most witnesses of father-to-mother violence do not become victims or perpetrators of wife abuse, dealing with these issues before abuse starts in one's relationship is far better than having to react after abuse begins.

Another important implication concerns the finding regarding non-familial violence as an important predictor of wife abuse. The results indicate that women who are victimized by males outside of the home are somehow at greater risk for being abused inside their homes of procreation. To be victimized in one setting is alarming in itself, to have that victimization spread to other contexts is most disturbing. If women learn a vulnerability to violence after being victimized by a male outside of the home, women must be assisted to unlearn this vulnerability.

Stevens (1994) writes that victims who present themselves as 'vulnerable' are at risk for violence more often than other females. Although this finding cannot be validated with this research, it does appear that women who have been victimized in one setting are at greater risk of being victimized in another setting. Research needs to be conducted to discern how a vulnerability to violence is translated into the life of the female victim (i.e. perceptions, behaviours, and attitudes held by these women), and how female vulnerability can be reduced. Perhaps women who have been victims of male violence, learn or develop coping strategies intended to protect themselves from further victimization, but in so doing, learn behaviours that communicate vulnerability to potential perpetrators. For example, in a non-scientific setting I have observed that female victims of physical and sexual assault tend to avert eye contact. Potential perpetrators may have learned that women who avert eye contact are more vulnerable, and this behaviour triggers a response in the perpetrator. On the other hand, women who have witnessed father-to-mother violence or have been victims of male violence may learn to be more accepting and tolerant of male violence, increasing their vulnerability. Female vulnerability to male violence may be explained using the concept of learned helplessness. Women who have

observed or experienced male violence may have learned to perceive themselves as powerless to escape male violence, and this perception may have increased their vulnerability to future violence.

Further study is necessary to determine what 'vulnerability' actually means, and how it is translated into the life of the female victim. The relationship observed between non-familial violence and wife abuse also suggests that in the process of treating and working with wife abuse victims, other forms of victimization may need to be addressed.

Although not the focus of this study, the results indicate that younger women are more likely to experience wife abuse and non-familial violence than older women. The data also indicate that couples with fewer socio-economic resources such as income and education are more likely to experience wife abuse, especially severe wife abuse. This does not mean that older couples with more socio-economic resources are immune from wife abuse, but that younger couples with fewer resources need to be remembered when wife abuse programs are being established.

LIMITATIONS OF THE CURRENT STUDY

In this study it was found that females appear to learn a vulnerability for becoming victims of violence (wife abuse and non-familial violence), and indirectly it was found that males appear to learn to perpetrate wife abuse. Unfortunately, we cannot determine with the VAWS data set whether or not males learn to become victims of husband abuse and/or non-familial violence, and whether women learn to perpetrate violence towards their husbands or partners. Based on previous findings, it can be assumed that many of the women reporting wife abuse in the present study perpetrate violence towards their husbands or partners (Brinkerhoff & Lupri, 1988), unfortunately husband abuse and reciprocal violence cannot be examined with the VAWS data. As stated earlier, the VAWS chose to interview only female respondents. The female respondents were not asked if they had used violence towards their partners or children, nor did the VAWS ask whether the female respondent's mother was abusive or violent towards her father, and if this behaviour was reciprocal. Without this information, we are limited in the type of information we can examine. A related explanation for the wife abuse reported in this study might be that women who have seen their fathers abuse their

mothers may have also seen their mothers violent towards their fathers. In these cases, the female witness may have learned to initiate aggression towards her own husband or partner, and the wife abuse that ensued may have been the male partner's violent response to the female's initiation of violence. Without more information this possibility cannot be eliminated. Further, because the VAWS did not interview men, the information regarding the abusive men in this study must be interpreted with caution. Although Stacey, Hazelwood, and Shupe (1994) find women to be accurate in their recollections of abusive episodes, the information regarding the male's home-of-origin and current behaviour could have been validated if the husband or partner had been interviewed as well.

Another obvious limitation of this study is that it is dependent upon self-report data. Although surveys are powerful mediums for acquiring information, one must be cautious when using information about such sensitive topics as family violence. It is possible that respondents edited their answers to make them socially desirable. For instance, some may under-report abuse in their current relationship and over-report abuse in their homes-of-origin. Some, who have admitted to being a victim of violence may state they or their partner had witnessed violence in their home-of-origin to provide a socially desirable excuse for the behaviour. In fact, because questions about home-of-origin violence were asked right after the respondents answered questions about wife abuse, some respondents may have felt compelled to provide a reason for the abuse. Therefore, the importance of home-of-origin violence in explaining wife abuse may actually be inflated in this study.

Related to the limitation of self-report data is the use of recollection data. When respondents are asked to comment on past behaviours or events, errors can occur. Pagelow (1984:29) writes that "memory abilities are probably as varied among people as are fingerprints. Some people have razor sharp memories, while others have only blurred images and can recall just a few distinct images taken out of context". Therefore, when interpreting recollection data, one must remember accuracy in recollection among respondents may vary.

As stated earlier, a modified version of the Conflict Tactics Scales was used to construct two types of wife abuse, minor and severe. To provide a measure of violence

occurring outside of the home, a scale of eleven items was used to construct an index of non-familial violence. A major shortcoming of both of these scales is their inability to address the meaning, motives, and consequences of violent acts. An incidence rate of violence does not provide information about what precipitated the violence, who initiated the violence, and what occurred as a result of the violent acts (Straus, 1990). Another problem with the Conflict Tactics Scales and the Non-Familial Violence scale involves its construction. There are only a limited number and types of violent acts used in both scales, excluding a number of other possible acts such as confinement, emotional or psychological abuse, mutilation, and so on. Further, there are problems in equating each of the violent acts in the scale. To lump several different violent acts together in a scale, is to treat each item as equal to the other items in the scale. Unfortunately, some of items in the scales are more serious than others, and to treat each item equally may be misleading. The attempt to separate the minor and severe acts from each other in this study is intended to help differentiate the level of seriousness from one act to another. Nevertheless, these scales do not differentiate the level of seriousness between items within the minor and severe indices.

Although some support was found for the sub-culture of violence theory and resource theory when examining wife abuse (higher levels of education and income are associated with lower levels of wife abuse, and an increase in age is associated with a decreased likelihood of minor and severe wife abuse occurring), the impact of the resource and sub-culture of violence variables may be even greater among the Canadian population than was found with this study. The actual rate of wife abuse in this study may be somewhat suppressed because of the possible socio-economic bias of the VAWS telephone survey. As stated in Chapter 4, two percent of the population do not have telephones, and it can be hypothesized that this two percent represents a lower socio-economic group who cannot afford the expense of a telephone line. On the other hand, affluent populations may have more than one telephone line, increasing their representation in the random digit dialing procedure. This subtle bias may have influenced the group of people interviewed, reducing the rate of wife abuse reported, and softening some of the socio-economic effects detected in the regression analyses.

I would be remiss not to mention the incidence and prevalence rates of wife abuse measured in this analysis. To my knowledge, the rates of wife abuse reported in this study are the lowest ever recorded in Canada. Although this may not be a limitation per se, it is unclear why the wife abuse rates in this study are incongruent with other Canadian studies measuring the same number and types of violent acts occurring between marital and common-law partners. Further study is necessary to determine if, in fact, wife abuse rates have declined over the last few years, or if the low rates are a result of the survey itself.

Although telephone surveys have good degrees of success, many factors can affect survey responses. For instance, the mood of the survey and the types of questions leading into the wife abuse questions may have influenced the way the respondents answered the VAWS wife abuse questions. For instance, rather than using a less judgmental introduction to the issue of wife abuse (Straus, Gelles, & Steinmetz, 1980; Lupri, 1989 and Grandin, 1995) the VAWS began with the statement, *"We are particularly interested in learning more about women's experiences of violence in their homes. I'd like you to tell me if your husband/partner has ever done any of the following to you. This includes incidents that may have occurred while you were dating"*. Following this statement the respondent was asked *"Has your husband/partner ever THREATENED to hit you with his fist or anything else that could hurt you?"* Normally an introduction such as *"When disagreements arise, men and women often use different approaches to convince their partner that their approach is best or better..."* (Grandin, 1995) is used in order to make the respondents feel more comfortable and less conspicuous when talking about conflict and violence. Such an introduction would then be followed by questions about really minor acts, in order to sensitize the respondent before breaching tougher questions. Because the VAWS used such a harsh introduction followed by such a serious question, many of the female respondents may have been caught off-guard, causing them feel defensive, and less apt to respond to the wife abuse questions.

The 'yea sayer phenomenon' may also explain why the rates of wife abuse are so low. Because the series of wife abuse questions were asked one right after the other, and each question required a 'yes' or 'no' response, the women surveyed may have answered

'no' to the questions of wife abuse simply because of the pattern created in the survey format. Further, some of the women surveyed by Statistics Canada may not have been confident in their anonymity, and some of the respondents may not have been alone in their homes at the time of the survey causing them to feel uncomfortable answering the wife abuse questions. As stated earlier, women who were afraid of being overheard while participating in the survey were given the opportunity to reschedule the interview. Women who were uncomfortable answering the questions in the survey were allowed to decline or refuse to participate. Because of the sensitive nature of the survey, there is a strong possibility that many of the 36% of the sample who refused to participate or were unable to complete the surveys were victims of wife abuse, leading to a systematic underrepresentation of wife abuse victims.

On the other hand, the low rates reported in this study may reflect an actual decrease in abuse rates in Canada. It is possible that some of the couples experiencing spouse abuse at the times of the earlier surveys may have since divorced (Lupri et al., 1994). As well, the increased awareness of wife abuse as a social problem in Canada, and the increased availability of outside resources may be positively influencing Canadian families.

IMPLICATIONS FOR FURTHER RESEARCH

To better understand the intergenerational transmission of violence as it relates to wife abuse, it is necessary to include men in future studies. The focus of the VAWS was to study the victimization of women in Canada, and to educate the government on the types of programs to develop in order to diminish women's future victimization. To do this adequately requires the inclusion of men, and a broader range of questions. For instance it is important to identify all forms of violence occurring in one's current home of procreation, such as wife abuse, husband abuse, reciprocal violence, child abuse, and possibly elder abuse. Families experiencing one form of abuse may differ from families experiencing several forms of abuse. It is also important to ask who is the initiator of violence in the family. Further, it would be helpful to know whether a person grew up in a home where there was father-to-mother violence, mother-to-father violence, and reciprocal violence (where father-to-mother and mother-to-father violence is occurring).

By knowing more about the home-of-origin, one could identify whether different forms of violence affect child witnesses differently. For instance, would a male be affected differently by mother-to-father violence than father-to-mother violence? Perhaps female witnesses of mother-to-father violence are more likely to perpetrate husband abuse, and male witnesses of mother-to-father violence are more likely to be abused by their wives. It would also be useful to know whether the spousal abuse in one's home-of-origin was minor or severe. It is also important to know whether the respondent was abused as a child, and by whom. These differences may be key indicators of which males and females are more likely to become perpetrators or victims of violence in their own homes of procreation.

For the sake of parsimony we decided to exclude previous marriage and common-law relationships from the analyses. Nevertheless, the association between home-of-origin violence and wife abuse may have been even stronger had we included previous relationships in our sample. Further studies would be useful in determining whether stronger associations between home-of-origin violence and wife abuse exist when including previous marriage and common-law relationships in the analyses.

More in-depth study and analysis is required to understand the relationship between home-of-origin violence, home-of-procreation violence and non-familial violence. It would be helpful to know the severity and frequency of violence occurring in one's home-of-origin. It is also necessary to know whether other forms of violence occurred in one's home-of-origin in addition to father-to-mother violence. Such a distinction may provide insight into which children will be more likely to be victimized by males outside of the home, and in which contexts.

Qualitative interviews would be useful in providing information about the contexts in which familial and non-familial violence against women takes place. Perhaps this information would provide insight into additional causal variables which would be useful in further deciphering the relationship between prior exposure to violence and future experiences of violence across contexts.

The findings of this study suggest criminology and family sociology are not exclusive. Family violence, whether it be in the home-of-origin or home-of-procreation,

was found to be significantly related to the victimization of women outside of the home. This suggests that assaults normally studied by criminologists may have roots in the family, and assaults occurring between marriage partners may have ties to criminal assaults outside of the marriage. It appears that an integration of theories and research efforts would be profitable.

Finally, the use of multivariate analyses is helpful when studying the Intergenerational Transmission of Violence Theory. By controlling variables that may confound the results between the dependent variable and independent variables of interest, one can be more confident in the relationships studied. Other important variables to control for in further studies include more comprehensive socio-demographic variables, such as type of employment, ethnicity, whether one lives in a rural or urban center, and religious affiliation. As stated earlier, there are a number of predictors of wife abuse which have been found to be significant (Hotelling & Sugarman, 1986), these may also be important variables to control for in future research.

CONCLUSION

To better understand the causes of wife abuse and non-familial violence, the data from the VAWS were subjected to analysis, resulting in two major findings. First, the results of this study suggest that an important factor related to being a victim of wife abuse, victim of non-familial violence, or a perpetrator of wife abuse is growing up in a home where one's father was violent towards one's mother. This is a glaring reminder of the importance of providing our children with loving and nurturing environments in which to grow and develop. Children require families where their parents love each other and treat each another with respect and dignity. Without these environments, it appears that our children's future relationships with others can become casualties of the cycle of violence, inside and outside the home.

The second major finding of this study suggests that being a victim of non-familial violence is related to being a victim of minor and severe wife abuse. This is another example of how insidious the effects of violence can be in the lives of those exposed to it. Women who are abused by males outside of the home appear significantly more likely to be abused by their husbands or partners.

In conclusion, the abuse of women in Canadian society is a disturbing reality. Although this study found incidence rates of wife abuse to be the lowest ever recorded, the percentages of women reporting wife abuse translates into large numbers of Canadian women. The number of Canadian women experiencing male violence outside of the home is even more astounding. The significant role of home-of-origin violence and non-familial violence in predicting wife abuse requires further analysis and refinement to increase our understanding of this serious social problem.

REFERENCES

- Alcock, J.E. 1991. *Social Psychology* (second edition). Scarborough, Ontario: Prentice-Hall Canada Inc.
- Allen, Craig M. and Murray A. Straus. 1980. "Resources, power, and husband-wife violence." Pp. 188-208 in Murray A. Straus and Gerald T. Hotaling (eds.), *The Social Causes of Husband-Wife Violence*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Archer, John. 1977. "The psychology of violence." *New Society* 42 (784): 63-66.
- Bandura, A., D. Ross, and S.A. Ross. 1963. "Imitation of film-mediated aggressive models." *Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology* 66: 3-11.
- Bandura, A., and D. Ross. 1971. "Psychotherapy based upon modeling principles." Pp. 653-708 in A.E. Bergin and S.L. Garfield (eds.), *Handbook of Psychotherapy and Behaviour Change*.
- Bandura, A. 1973. *Aggression: A Social Learning Analysis*. New Jersey: Prentice Hall.
- Baron, L.
1986. "Book review: family violence by Mildred Pagelow." *Violence and Victims*, 1 (1): 71-76.
- Bersani, C. A. and H. Chen. 1988. "Sociological Perspectives in Family Violence." Pp. 57-86 in V.B. Van Hasselt et al. (eds.) *Handbook of Family Violence*. New York: Plenum Press.
- Brinkerhoff, Merlin B. and Eugen Lupri. 1988. "Interspousal violence." *Canadian Journal of Sociology* 13: 407-434.
- Brown, Robert J. and Fae L. Chato. 1984. "Characteristics of wife batterers: practice principles for effective treatment." *Forensic working papers* (Calgary General Hospital, dept. of psychiatry).
- Brown, Barbara, Barbara Carpio and Pebbe S. Martin. 1982. "Wife abuse: an old family problem, a new health problem." *The Canadian Nurse*, June: 23-28.
- Burger, Jerry M. 1990. *Personality*. Belmont, California: Wadsworth Publishing Company.
- Caesar, P. L. 1988. "Exposure to violence in the families of origin among wife abusers and maritally nonviolent men." *Violence and Victims* 3: 49-64.
- Cappell, Charles and Robert B. Heimer. 1990. "The intergenerational transmission of family aggression." *Journal of Family Violence* 5(2): 135 -152.

Carrol, Joseph. 1968. "The effects of aggression on the family." *Journal of Marriage and the Family* 30: 1-10.

Cate, R. M., and Henry. 1968. "Social psychology and the family." *Journal of Marriage and the Family* 30: 11-20.

Coser, Louis. 1966. "The family as a social system." *Journal of Marriage and the Family* 28: 1-10.

DeMaris, Alfred. 1968. "The family as a social system." *Journal of Marriage and the Family* 30: 11-20.

DeMaris, Alfred. 1968. "The family as a social system." *Journal of Marriage and the Family* 30: 11-20.

DeMaris, Alfred. 1968. "The family as a social system." *Journal of Marriage and the Family* 30: 11-20.

Dibble U. and M. 1968. "The family as a social system." *Journal of Marriage and the Family* 30: 11-20.

Dobash, R.E., and 1968. "The family as a social system." *Journal of Marriage and the Family* 30: 11-20.

Douglas, Harriet. 1968. "The family as a social system." *Journal of Marriage and the Family* 30: 11-20.

Fagan, J., D. Stev. 1968. "The family as a social system." *Journal of Marriage and the Family* 30: 11-20.

Fagan, J. and S. V. 1968. "The family as a social system." *Journal of Marriage and the Family* 30: 11-20.

Gelles, Richard J. 1968. "The family as a social system." *Journal of Marriage and the Family* 30: 11-20.

Gelles, Richard J. 1968. "The family as a social system." *Journal of Marriage and the Family* 30: 11-20.

Gelles, R.J. and M. 1968. "The family as a social system." *Journal of Marriage and the Family* 30: 11-20.

Glass, Becky. 1968. "The family as a social system." *Journal of Marriage and the Family* 30: 11-20.

- Goode, William J. 1971. "Force and violence in the family." *Journal of Marriage and the Family* 33: 624-636.
- Grandin, Elaine. 1995. "Intimate violence: asymmetry and symmetry." PhD. Dissertation. University of Calgary.
- Grandin, Elaine, and Eugen, Lupri. 1997. "Intimate violence in Canada and the United States: a cross-national comparison." In Press.
- Hamburger, L. and J. Hastings. 1991. "Personality correlates of men who batter and nonviolent men: some continuities and discontinuities." *Journal of Family Violence* 6: 131-147.
- Hepburn, J.R. 1973. "Violent behavior in interpersonal relationships." *The Sociological Quarterly* 14: 419-429.
- Henton, J., J. Koval, S. Lloyd, and S. Christopher. 1983. "Romance in dating relationships." *Journal of Family Issues* 4(3): 467-482.
- Homans, George. 1974. *Social Behaviour: Its Elementary Forms*. Robert Merton (Ed.) New York: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich.
- Hotaling, G., M.A. Straus and A. Lincoln. 1990. "Intrafamily violence and crime and violence outside the family. In Straus & Gelles (Eds.), *Physical Violence in American Families*. New Brunswick: Transaction Publishers.
- Hotaling, G. and D. Sugarman. 1986. "An analysis of risk markers in husband to wife violence: the current state of knowledge." *Violence and Victims* 1 (2): 101-124.
- Kalmuss, Debra. 1984. "The intergenerational transmission of marital aggression." *Journal of Marriage and the Family* 46 (February): 11-19.
- Kennedy, L.W. and D.G. Dutton. 1989. "The incidence of wife assault in Alberta." *Canadian Journal of Behavioural Science* 21(1): 40-54.
- Lupri, Eugen. 1995. Thesis Discussions re: the Intergenerational Transmission of Violence. University of Calgary.
- Lupri, Eugen. 1989. "Male violence in the home." *Canadian Social Trends* 14(Autumn): 19-31.
- Lupri, Eugen, Elaine Grandin and Merlin Brinkerhoff. 1994. "Socioeconomic status and male violence in the canadian home: a reexamination." *Canadian Journal of Sociology* 19 (1): 47-73.
- Lystad, Mary. 1982. "Violence in the home: a major public problem." *Urban & Social Change Review* 15(1): 21-25.

- MacEwan, Karyl E. and Julian Barling. 1988. "Multiple stressors, violence in the family of origin, and marital aggression: a longitudinal investigation." *Journal of Family Violence* 3 (1): 73-87.
- MacLeod, Linda. 1980. *Wife Battering in Canada: The vicious circle*. Hull, Quebec, Canada: Canadian Government Publishing Centre.
- Menard, Scott. 1995. *Applied Logistic Regression Analysis*. California: Sage Publications.
- O'Leary, Barling and Arias, Rosenbaum. 1989. "Prevalence and stability of physical aggression between spouses: a longitudinal analysis." *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology* 57 (2): 263-268.
- Pagelow, Mildred D. 1984. *Family Violence*. New York: Praeger Publishers.
- Pagelow, Mildred, D. 1982. "The cycle of violence in families: fact or fiction?" International Sociological Association Paper.
- Rodgers, Karen. 1994. "Wife assault in Canada." *Canadian Social Trends Autumn* (34): 3-8.
- Russell, Diana. 1986. "The incest legacy: why today's abused children become tomorrow's victims of rape." *Sciences* 26 2 (March-April): 28-32.
- Silver, L., C. Dublin, and R. Lourie. 1969. "Does violence breed violence? contributions from a study of the child abuse syndrome." *American Journal of Psychiatry* 126 (3): 404-407.
- Simmel, Georg. 1955. *Conflict and the web of group affiliations*, translated by Kurt H. Wolff and Reinhard Bendix. Chicago: Free Press.
- Smith, M. 1990. "Sociodemographic risk factors in wife abuse: results from a survey of Toronto women." *Canadian Journal of Sociology*, 15 (1): 39-58.
- Spector, Paul E. 1992. *Summated Rating Scale Construction: An Introduction*. Newbury Park: Sage.
- Sprey, Jetse. 1979. "Conflict theory and the study of marriage and the family." Pp. 130-159 in W. Burr, R. Hill, F. Ivan Nye, and Ira L. Reiss (eds.), *Contemporary Theories About the Family*, Vol. II. New York: The Free Press.
- Stacey, William, Lonnie Hazelwood, and Anson Shupe. 1994. *The Violent Couple*. Westport: Praeger.
- Statistics Canada. 1993. "The daily statistics canada: the violence against women survey." *The Daily Statistics Canada* November 18: 1-10.

- Stets, Jan. 1993. "The link between past and present intimate relationships." *Journal of Family Issues* 14 2 (June): 236-260.
- Stets, Jan & Maureen Pirog-Good. 1989. "Patterns of physical and sexual abuse for men and women in dating relationships: a descriptive analysis." *Journal of Family Violence* 4: 63-76.
- Stets, Jan & Straus, Murray A. 1989. "The marriage license as a hitting license: a comparison of assaults in dating, cohabiting, and married couples." *Journal of Family Violence* 4: 161-180.
- Stevens, Dennis J. 1994. "Predatory rapists and victim selection techniques." *The Social Science Journal* 3 (4): 421-433.
- Straus, Murray A. 1990. "The conflict tactics scales and its critics: an evaluation and new data on validity and reliability." Pp. 49-71 in Straus, M. A. and R. J. Gelles (eds.), *Physical Violence in American Families: Risk Factors and Adaptations to Violence in 8145 families*. New Jersey: Transaction Publishers.
- Straus, Murray A. 1979. "Measuring intrafamily conflict and violence: the conflict tactics (CT) scales." *Journal of Marriage and the Family* 41 (February): 75-88.
- Straus, Murray A. 1973. "A general systems theory approach to a theory of violence between family members." *Journal of Marriage and the Family* 41 (February): 75-88.
- Straus, Murray A., Gelles, Richard J. and Steinmetz, Suzanne K. 1980. *Behind Closed Doors*. New York: Anchor Press.
- Teichman, M. and Y. Teichman. 1989. "Violence in the family: an analysis in terms of interpersonal resource-exchange." *Journal of Family Issues* 4 (2): 127-142.
- Tutty, Leslie, and Janet Wagar. 1994. "The evolution of a group of young children who have witnessed family violence." *Social Work with Groups* 17: 89-104 .
- Ulbrich, P. and J. Huber. 1981. "Observing parental violence: distribution and effects." *Journal of Marriage and the Family* August: 623-631.
- Weidman, Arthur. 1986. "Family therapy with violent couples." *Social Casework: The Journal of Contemporary Social Work* April: 211-218.
- Yllo, K. 1983. "Using a feminist approach in quantitative research." Pp. in Finkelhor, D., R.J. Gelles, G.T. Hotaling and M.A. Straus (eds.), *The Dark Side of Families: Current Family Violence Research*. Sage: California.

APPENDIX A
RELEVANT SECTIONS OF THE VIOLENCE AGAINST WOMEN SURVEY
INTERVIEW SCHEDULE

Section J: Violence in Current Marriage or Common-law Relationship¹

- J1 We are particularly interested in learning more about women's experiences of violence in their homes. I'd like you to tell me if your husband/partner has ever done any of the following to you. This includes incidents that may have occurred while you were dating.**
- J2 Has your husband/partner ever THREATENED to hit you with his fist or anything else that could hurt you?**
- <1> Yes**
<2> No
<R> Refused
- J3 Has he ever THROWN anything at you that could hurt you?**
- <1> Yes**
<2> No
<R> Refused
- J4 Has he ever pushed, grabbed, or shoved you?**
- <1> Yes**
<2> No
<R> Refused
- J5 Interviewer Check Item:**
If (J2 = 2 or R) and (J3 = 2 or R) and (J4 = 2 or R) - go to J6, else go to J7
- J6 Has he ever been violent toward you in any other way?**
- <1> Yes**
<2> No
<R> Refused
- J7 Has he ever slapped you?**
- <1> Yes**
<2> No
<R> Refused

¹ Variables J6 and J11 were excluded in the present study because they were undefined (very few women responded to these questions).

J8 Has he ever kicked, bit, or hit you with his fist?

- <1> Yes**
- <2> No**
- <R> Refused**

J9 Has he ever hit you with something that could hurt you?

- <1> Yes**
- <2> No**
- <R> Refused**

J10 Interviewer Check Item:

If J6 = blank and (J7 = 2 or R) and (j8 = 2 or R) and (J9 = 2 or R) - go to J11, else go to J12

J11 Has he ever been violent toward you in any other way?

- <1> Yes**
- <2> No**
- <R> Refused**

J12 Has he ever beaten you up?

- <1> Yes**
- <2> No**
- <R> Refused**

J13 Has he ever choked you?

- <1> Yes**
- <2> No**
- <R> Refused**

J14 Has he ever threatened to or used a gun or knife on you?

- <1> Yes**
- <2> No**
- <R> Refused**

J15 Has he ever forced you into any sexual activity when you did not want to, by threatening you, holding you down, or hurting you in some way?

- <1> Yes**
- <2> No**
- <R> Refused**

J16 Interviewer Check Item:

If (J6 = 2 or R) and (J15 = 2 or R) - go to J29

J17 Has he been violent towards you on more than one occasion?

- <1> Yes - go to J20**
- <2> No**
- <R> Refused**

J18 When did it occur?

- <0> Last 12 months**
- <1> 1 year ago**
- <2> 2 years ago**
- <3> 3 years ago**
- <4> 4 years ago**
- <5> 5 years ago**
- <6> 6 years ago**
- <7> 7 years ago**
- <8> 8 years ago**
- <9> 9 years ago**
- <10> 10 years ago**
- <11> more than 10 years ago**
- <D> Don't know**
- <R> Refused**

J19 Interviewer - go to J23

J20 How many different times did these things happen?

- <2> Two**
- <3> Three**
- <4> Four**
- <5> Five**
- <6> Six**
- <7> Seven**

- <8> Eight
- <9> Nine
- <10> Ten
- <11> More than ten
- <D> Don't know
- <R> Refused

J21 When did the first one happen?

- <0> Last 12 months - go to J23
- <1> 1 year ago
- <2> 2 years ago
- <3> 3 years ago
- <4> 4 years ago
- <5> 5 years ago
- <6> 6 years ago
- <7> 7 years ago
- <8> 8 years ago
- <9> 9 years ago
- <10> 10 years ago
- <11> more than 10 years ago
- <D> Don't know
- <R> Refused

J22 When did the most recent happen?

- <0> Last 12 months
- <1> 1 year ago
- <2> 2 years ago
- <3> 3 years ago
- <4> 4 years ago
- <5> 5 years ago
- <6> 6 years ago
- <7> 7 years ago
- <8> 8 years ago
- <9> 9 years ago
- <10> 10 years ago
- <11> more than 10 years ago
- <D> Don't know
- <R> Refused

Section C: Violence by Strangers, Dates/Boyfriends, Others²

- C1** It is important to hear from women themselves if we are to understand the very serious problem of male violence against women. I'm interested in knowing whether any of the following has happened to you since the age of 16. Your responses are important whether or not you have had any of these experiences.
- C2** Has a MALE STRANGER ever forced you or attempted to force you into any SEXUAL activity by threatening you, holding you down or hurting you in some way?
- <1> Yes
 <2> No - go to C7
 <R> Refused - go to C7
- C3** Can you tell me how many times this has happened?
- <1> One
 <2> Two
 <3> Three
 <4> Four
 <5> Five
 <6> Six
 <7> Seven
 <8> Eight
 <9> Nine
 <10> Ten
 <11> More than ten
 <D> Don't know
 <R> Refused
- C4** In what year did this (the most recent) happen?
- year
- <D> Don't know
 <R> Refused
- C5** Interviewer Check Item:
 If C4 = 92 - go to C6, else go to C7

² Although the categories of known men used in C21, C27, C46, and D18 include fathers, brothers, and relatives, these categories were excluded in the present study.

C6 Was this in the last 12 months?

- <1> Yes**
- <2> No**
- <R> Refused**

C7 (Apart from this incident you have just told me about), has a MALE STRANGER ever TOUCHED you against your will in any sexual way, such as unwanted touching, grabbing, kissing, or fondling?

- <1> Yes**
- <2> No - go to C12**
- <R> Refused - go to C12**

C8 Can you tell me how many times this has happened?

- <1> One**
- <2> Two**
- <3> Three**
- <4> Four**
- <5> Five**
- <6> Six**
- <7> Seven**
- <8> Eight**
- <9> Nine**
- <10> Ten**
- <11> More than ten**
- <D> Don't know**
- <R> Refused**

C9 In what year did this (the most recent) happen?

-- year

- <D> Don't know**
- <R> Refused**

C10 Interviewer Check Item:

If C9 = 92 - go to C11, else go to C12

C11 Was this in the last 12 months?

- <1> Yes**
- <2> No**
- <R> Refused**

C12 Now I'd like to ask you about DATES and BOYFRIENDS.

C13 Excluding husbands or common-law partners, has a DATE or BOYFRIEND ever forced you or attempted to force you into any SEXUAL activity when you did not want to?

<1> Yes

<2> No - go to C18

<R> Refused - go to C18

C14 Can you tell me how many men have done this to you?

<1> One

<2> Two

<3> Three

<4> Four

<5> Five

<6> Six

<7> Seven

<8> Eight

<9> Nine

<10> Ten

<11> More than ten

<D> Don't know

<R> Refused

C15 In what year did this (the most recent) happen?

-- year

<D> Don't know

<R> Refused

C16 Interviewer Check Item:

If C16 = 92 - go to C17, else go to C18

C17 Was this in the last 12 months?

<1> Yes

<2> No

<R> Refused

C18 The following questions refer to OTHER MEN YOU KNOW, such as any relative, a doctor, someone at work, or anyone else. Please exclude husbands or partners.

C19 (Apart from this incident you have just told me about), has a MAN YOU KNOW ever forced you or attempted to force you into any SEXUAL activity by threatening you, holding you down or hurting you in some way?

- <1> Yes**
- <2> No - go to C25**
- <R> Refused - go to C25**

C20 Can you tell me how many men have done this to you?

- <1> One**
- <2> Two**
- <3> Three**
- <4> Four**
- <5> Five**
- <6> Six**
- <7> Seven**
- <8> Eight**
- <9> Nine**
- <10> Ten**
- <11> More than ten**
- <D> Don't know**
- <R> Refused**

C21 What was the relationship of these men (this man) to you?

- <1> Boss/supervisor**
- <2> Co-worker/co-volunteer**
- <3> Client/customer/patient**
- <4> Doctor**
- <5> Landlord**
- <6> Minister/priest/clergy**
- <7> Father**
- <8> Brother**
- <9> Other relative**
- <10> Teacher/professor**
- <11> Student**
- <12> Friend/acquaintance/neighbour**
- <13> Other specify _____**
- <R> Refused**

C22 In what year did this (the most recent) happen?

-- year

<D> Don't know

<R> Refused

C23 Interviewer Check Item:

If C22 = 92 - go to C24, else go to C25

C24 Was this in the last 12 months?

<1> Yes

<2> No

<R> Refused

C25 (Apart from this incident you have just told me about), since the age of 16, has ANY OTHER MAN YOU KNOW ever touched you against your will in a SEXUAL way, such as unwanted touching, grabbing, kissing, or fondling?

<1> Yes

<2> No - go to C31

<R> Refused - go to C31

C26 Can you tell me how many men have done this to you?

<1> One

<2> Two

<3> Three

<4> Four

<5> Five

<6> Six

<7> Seven

<8> Eight

<9> Nine

<10> Ten

<11> More than ten

<D> Don't know

<R> Refused

C27 What was the relationship of these men (this man) to you?

- <1> Boss/supervisor
- <2> Co-worker/co-volunteer
- <3> Client/customer/patient
- <4> Doctor
- <5> Landlord
- <6> Minister/priest/clergy
- <7> Father
- <8> Brother
- <9> Other relative
- <10> Teacher/professor
- <11> Student
- <12> Friend/acquaintance/neighbour
- <13> Other specify _____
- <R> Refused

C28 In what year did this (the most recent) happen?

-- year

- <D> Don't know
- <R> Refused

C29 Interviewer Check Item:

If C29 = 92 - go to C30, else go to C31

C30 Was this in the last 12 months?

- <1> Yes
- <2> No
- <R> Refused

C31 Now, I'm going to ask you some questions about PHYSICAL ATTACKS you may have had since the age of 16. By this I mean any use of force such as being hit, slapped, kicked, or grabbed to being beaten, knifed, or shot. I would like to begin by asking you about MALE STRANGERS.

C32 (Apart from any incident that you have already told me about), has a MALE STRANGER ever PHYSICALLY attacked you?

- <1> Yes
- <2> No
- <R> Refused

C33 Can you tell me how many times this has happened?

- <1> One**
- <2> Two**
- <3> Three**
- <4> Four**
- <5> Five**
- <6> Six**
- <7> Seven**
- <8> Eight**
- <9> Nine**
- <10> Ten**
- <11> More than ten**
- <D> Don't know**
- <R> Refused**

C34 In what year did this (the most recent) happen?

-- year

- <D> Don't know**
- <R> Refused**

C35 Interviewer Check Item:

If C34 = 92 - go to C36, else go to C37

C36 Was this in the last 12 months?

- <1> Yes**
- <2> No**
- <R> Refused**

C37 Now I'd like to ask you about PHYSICAL attacks by DATES and BOYFRIENDS. Please exclude husbands or common-law partners.

C38 (Apart from any incident that you have already told me about), has a DATE or BOYFRIEND ever PHYSICALLY attacked you?

- <1> Yes**
- <2> No - go to C43**
- <R> Refused - go to C43**

C39 Can you tell me how many men have done this to you?

- <1> One**
- <2> Two**
- <3> Three**
- <4> Four**
- <5> Five**
- <6> Six**
- <7> Seven**
- <8> Eight**
- <9> Nine**
- <10> Ten**
- <11> More than ten**
- <D> Don't know**
- <R> Refused**

C40 In what year did this (the most recent) happen?

-- year

- <D> Don't know**
- <R> Refused**

C41 Interviewer Check Item:

If C40 = 92 - go to C42, else go to C43

C42 Was this in the last 12 months?

- <1> Yes**
- <2> No**
- <R> Refused**

C43 The following question refers to PHYSICAL ATTACKS by OTHER MEN YOU KNOW, such as any relative, a doctor, someone at work, or anyone else. Please exclude husbands and partners.

C44 (Apart from this incident you have just told me about), since the age of 16, has any other MAN YOU KNOW ever PHYSICALLY attacked you?

- <1> Yes**
- <2> No - go to D1**
- <R> Refused - go to D1**

C45 Can you tell me how many men have done this to you?

- <1> One**
- <2> Two**
- <3> Three**
- <4> Four**
- <5> Five**
- <6> Six**
- <7> Seven**
- <8> Eight**
- <9> Nine**
- <10> Ten**
- <11> More than ten**
- <D> Don't know**
- <R> Refused**

C46 What was the relationship of these men (this man) to you?

- <1> Boss/supervisor**
- <2> Co-worker/co-volunteer**
- <3> Client/customer/patient**
- <4> Doctor**
- <5> Landlord**
- <6> Minister/priest/clergy**
- <7> Father**
- <8> Brother**
- <9> Other relative**
- <10> Teacher/professor**
- <11> Student**
- <12> Friend/acquaintance/neighbour**
- <13> Other specify _____**
- <R> Refused**

C47 In what year did this (the most recent) happen?

__ year

- <D> Don't know**
- <R> Refused**

C48 Interviewer Check Item:

If C47 = 92 - go to C49, else go to D1

C49 Was this in the last 12 months?

- <1> Yes**
- <2> No**
- <R> Refused**

D1 The next few questions are about FACE-TO-FACE THREATS you may have experienced. By threats I mean any time you have been threatened with physical harm, since you were 16. Again, I'd like to begin by asking you about MALE STRANGERS.

D2 (Apart from anything you have already told me about), has a MALE STRANGER ever threatened to harm you?

- <1> Yes**
- <2> No - go to D8**
- <R> Refused - go to D8**

D3 Did you believe he would do it?

- <1> Yes**
- <2> No - go to D8**
- <D> Don't know - go to D8**
- <R> Refused - go to D8**

D4 Can you tell me how many times this has happened?

- <1> One**
- <2> Two**
- <3> Three**
- <4> Four**
- <5> Five**
- <6> Six**
- <7> Seven**
- <8> Eight**
- <9> Nine**
- <10> Ten**
- <11> More than ten**
- <D> Don't know**
- <R> Refused**

D5 In what year did this (the most recent) happen?

-- year

- <D> Don't know**
- <R> Refused**

D6 Interviewer Check Item:

If D5 = 92 - go to D7, else go to D8

D7 Was this in the last 12 months?

<1> Yes

<2> No

<R> Refused

D8 (Apart from any incident that you have already told me about), has a DATE or BOYFRIEND ever threatened you face-to-face?

<1> Yes

<2> No - go to D14

<R> Refused - go to D14

D9 Did you believe he would do it?

<1> Yes

<2> No - go to D14

<D> Don't know - go to D14

<R> Refused - go to D14

D10 Can you tell me how many men have done this to you? .

<1> One

<2> Two

<3> Three

<4> Four

<5> Five

<6> Six

<7> Seven

<8> Eight

<9> Nine

<10> Ten

<11> More than ten

<D> Don't know

<R> Refused

D11 In what year did this (the most recent) happen?

-- year

<D> Don't know

<R> Refused

D12 Interviewer Check Item:

If D11 = 92 - go to D13, else go to D14

D13 Was this in the last 12 months?

<1> Yes

<2> No

<R> Refused

D14 The next question refers to OTHER MEN YOU KNOW. Again, please exclude husbands and partners.

D15 (Apart from any incident that you have already told me about), has a DATE or BOYFRIEND ever threatened you face-to-face?

<1> Yes

<2> No - go to D22

<R> Refused - go to D22

D16 Did you believe he would do it?

<1> Yes

<2> No - go to D22

<D> Don't know - go to D22

<R> Refused - go to D22

D17 Can you tell me how many men have done this to you?

<1> One

<2> Two

<3> Three

<4> Four

<5> Five

<6> Six

<7> Seven

<8> Eight

<9> Nine

<10> Ten

<11> More than ten

<D> Don't know

<R> Refused

D18 What was the relationship of these men (this man) to you?

- <1> Boss/supervisor**
- <2> Co-worker/co-volunteer**
- <3> Client/customer/patient**
- <4> Doctor**
- <5> Landlord**
- <6> Minister/priest/clergy**
- <7> Father**
- <8> Brother**
- <9> Other relative**
- <10> Teacher/professor**
- <11> Student**
- <12> Friend/acquaintance/neighbour**
- <13> Other specify _____**
- <R> Refused**

D19 In what year did this (the most recent) happen?

-- year

- <D> Don't know**
- <R> Refused**

D20 Interviewer Check Item:

If D19 = 92 - go to D21, else go to D22

D21 Was this in the last 12 months?

- <1> Yes**
- <2> No**
- <R> Refused**

D22 Have you ever received any threats that were not face-to-face, such as over the phone or through the mail, from any man that was not a husband or partner?

D23 What was the relationship of these men (this man) to you?

- <1> Boss/supervisor**
- <2> Co-worker/co-volunteer**
- <3> Client/customer/patient**
- <4> Doctor**
- <5> Landlord**
- <6> Minister/priest/clergy**
- <7> Father**
- <8> Brother**

- <9> Other relative
- <10> Teacher/professor
- <11> Student
- <12> Friend/acquaintance/neighbour
- <13> Other specify _____
- <R> Refused

D24 In what year did this (the most recent) happen?

__ year

- <D> Don't know
- <R> Refused

D25 Interviewer Check Item:

If D24 = 92 - go to D26, else go to D27

D26 Was this in the last 12 months?

- <1> Yes
- <2> No
- <R> Refused

D27 I realize these questions may have been difficult for you to answer, but it is only by hearing from women themselves that we can begin to understand this very serious problem.